

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Carol Percy, 'Grammatical Lapses in Dr John Hawkesworth's Voyages (1773)', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 26 (1995), 145-68

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=124869&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

Grammatical Lapses in Dr John Hawkesworth's *Voyages* (1773)

Carol Percy

Captain James Cook, the self-educated son of a Yorkshire farm labourer, kept the journal of his first great circumnavigational voyage (1768-1771) as part of his captainly duties. The success of this latest voyage determined the Admiralty to publish an official account of it and of the three previous British Pacific expeditions. The editorship was awarded to Dr John Hawkesworth, a prolific participant in the London world of arts and letters; the resulting three volumes appeared in 1773 and were known as Hawkesworth's *Voyages*.

Although Hawkesworth obtained the contract through his friendship with Charles Burney and David Garrick, he was also well qualified for the task. A literary intimate and imitator of Samuel Johnson, Hawkesworth had long been a reviewer and editor for the *Gentleman's Magazine*. John Lawrence Abbott's biography of Hawkesworth catalogues the range of his writings: as well as editing his own periodical, the *Adventurer* (1752), Hawkesworth had edited Swift's works and letters (1755, 1766); and had written a biography of Swift (1755); an oriental tale, *Almorán and Hamet* (1761); *Edgar and Emmeline*, a comic drama (1761); and a translation of Fenelon's *Telemachus* (1768).¹ Hawkesworth's language, written and spoken, was notably precise: Abbott cites, among other testimonials, the *Annual Review's* posthumous description of how his

fertile mind teemed with ideas, which he delivered in so clear,
and yet concise a manner, that no one could be at a loss perfectly
to comprehend his meaning, or ever tired by hearing him speak;

and Fanny Burney's observation that she had 'never heard a man speak in a style which so much resembles writing'. Moreover, as a reviewer, Hawkesworth (like

many of his peers) 'was particularly fussy about grammatical violations'.²

Hawkesworth's corrections to Cook's grammar have already attracted scholarly attention: they have been discussed by Carey McIntosh in *Common and Courtly Language: the Stylistics of Social Class in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (1986); and by myself.³ Both McIntosh and I have compared Hawkesworth's text with J. C. Beaglehole's modern edition of Cook's journal, which uses as its base text the only holograph manuscript. Beaglehole notes that Hawkesworth may have worked from the transcript of the journal submitted to the Admiralty, and thus in all instances I have compared the corresponding passages in Cook and Hawkesworth with this 'Admiralty' transcript, apparently in the hand of Cook's clerk Richard Orton.⁴ I have also compared the texts of both Cook and Hawkesworth with that of the young gentleman naturalist Joseph Banks, one of the Royal Society's representatives on the voyage: his journal was a source not only for several sections of Cook's journal, but also for Hawkesworth's 1773 published account.⁵ It is unfortunate, though typical of the period, that Hawkesworth's working papers do not survive. The Admiralty might have sent Hawkesworth an interleaved copy of Cook's journal in which corrections and additions could be made: a letter to John Douglas, the editor of Cook's second and third voyage journals, describes such a resource.⁶

Unsurprisingly, the overwhelming majority of Hawkesworth's systematic linguistic corrections accord with educated usage and/or with prescriptive rules articulated by such influential grammarians as Robert Lowth. A small number demonstrate more idiosyncratic preferences for one variant over another equally acceptable one: for instance, Hawkesworth preferred the now-obsolete *except* to *unless* as a negative conditional conjunction; and never retained conditional clauses formed by subject-verb inversion, a construction common in the language of such other educated writers as Jane Austen and indeed through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁷

Here, however, I describe and interpret Hawkesworth's very rare retention of variants he usually avoids, particularly those which had been proscribed by his contemporaries. While some grammatical lapses might be blamed on Hawkesworth's hasty editing or on the printer, others can be attributed to Hawkesworth's temporary appropriation of the nautical register, distinguished by otherwise non-standard verb forms (*sweeped, hove*) and concord errors (*thirty-two fathom*). Moreover, at least twice the variant forms can be traced to the journal of Joseph Banks, which Hawkesworth used along with Cook's when writing the

history of the *Endeavour's* voyage. Such 'power of prestige' to influence linguistic behaviour in the intensely language-conscious eighteenth century has been described by Tieken-Boon van Ostade.⁸

It must be noted that comparing the language of Cook's journal with Hawkesworth's, or with that of the wealthy Banks, who had attended Eton and Oxford, cannot provide a completely clear distinction between forms characteristic of 'uneducated' and 'educated' usage respectively. The extent of Cook's self-education is unknown. Even Banks's written language was far from elegant: his academic performance at Eton had been undistinguished, and his intellectual energies there and at Oxford had been directed towards natural history.⁹ In 1807, declining an invitation to join a Belles Lettres Society, Banks claimed – exaggerating no doubt, and no doubt casting sly aspersions on belles lettres generally – that he was 'scarce able to write my own Language with Correctness, and never presumed to attempt Elegant Composition, Either in Verse or in Prose in that or in any other tongue'.¹⁰ Moreover, even Hawkesworth had relatively humble origins and was always socially insecure.¹¹ Neither can Cook's journal and Hawkesworth's edition of it be contrasted neatly as 'informal' and 'spoken' versus 'formal' and 'written': although Cook did not know that he was writing a book, his journal was a public document written for the Admiralty, and contains passages in which he is obviously trying to write in a formal register. Whenever possible, I have put the variants in question into contemporary context, descriptive and prescriptive. The descriptive context includes references to 'literary' writers and of course to such reference works as *The Oxford English Dictionary* and Visser's *Historical Syntax of the English Language*.¹² References to *The Dictionary of English Normative Grammar 1700-1800 [DENG]*, a comprehensive survey of linguistic expressions criticized in the earliest extant editions of eighteenth-century grammars, provide the primary prescriptive context.¹³

1 Verb morphology: the past tense and past participles of irregular verbs

Cook's irregular verb paradigms contained many variant forms. The following discussion uses PresE paradigms, and follows Quirk et al's classification according to the presence or absence of alveolar suffixation; variation of the base vowel; and identity of the forms of the past tense and the past participle.¹⁴

In the eighteenth century, variant forms of the principal parts of a number of irregular verbs were more acceptable in practice than in precept. However, Cook's 'regular' forms like *knowed* and *choosed*, rarely mentioned in the grammar books, had clearly been marginalized from educated usage. But, like many other writers, Cook sometimes used the same irregular form as both past tense and past participle, e.g. *run/run*, *drove/drove*, despite the concerted objections of many contemporary prescriptivists.¹⁵ Indeed, Hawkesworth himself has been identified as the author of a short article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* which described the confusion of past tense and past participle forms as 'blunders in' and 'transgressions . . . against grammar'.¹⁶ Hawkesworth's extensive revision to Cook's text has sometimes obscured his attitude to some of Cook's low-frequency verbs, but those unambiguous substitutions made to Cook's language by Orton and Hawkesworth almost always accord with contemporary prescription (and indeed with PresE usage).¹⁷ Below I discuss a few exceptions to this pattern.

In PresE the base vowel in the infinitive form of verbs like *keep*, *lose*, and *sweep* contrasts with the base vowel in the past tense and (identical) past participle. The *Endeavour* journal contains several past tense forms with the vowel of the infinitive, though the forms with a contrasting vowel are more common: *kept* (75), *kept* (1); *lost* (16), *los'd* (1); *sweep'd* (1). The past participle forms are all standard: *kept* (7) and *lost* (9). *Kept* and *los'd*, not documented in eighteenth century use by the *OED* and discussed by few eighteenth-century prescriptivists, have no parallel in Hawkesworth's text.

Hawkesworth does retain the single example of past tense *sweeped*, though using it in the same passage as *swept*. Regular *sweeped* is documented as a past participle by the *OED*, not with the nautical sense 'to draw something . . . over the bottom of a body of water in search of something submerged'. Only one grammarian, Wiseman (1764), condemned *sweeped*.¹⁸

25 Aug 1770 (401-3) After dinner I sent the Boats again to *sweep* for it first with a small line which succeeded, and now we know'd where it lay we found it no very hard matter to *sweep* it with a hawser; this done we hove the Ship up to it by the same hawser. . . By this time it was dark and obliged us to leave of untill day light in the Morning when we *Sweep'd* it again and hove it up to the bows,

Hawkesworth III 649-50 I sent the boats again after

dinner, with a small line, to discover where it lay; this being happily effected, we *swept* for it with a hawser, and by the same hawser hove the ship up to it. . .As soon as it was light, we *sweeped* it again, and heaved it to the bows:

Cook often uses now-obsolete forms of the past participle identical in form to the past tense. Some, like the past participles *beat* (4), *bore* (1), *drove* (9) and *wrote* (2), he uses consistently; others appear alongside the now standard forms in *-en*, e.g. *eat* (13) and *eaten* (2); *fell* (3) and *fallen* (4). Hawkesworth's changes are with few exceptions in the direction of PresE: a very few representative examples include *beat* (p.102) to *beaten* (II 151) or, making a semantic substitution, to *rubbed* (p.356/III 567); *fell* (p.223) to *fallen* (II 375); the single occurrence of *stole* (p.75) to *stolen* (II 82). However, though he once changes Cook's past participle *broke* (p.184) to *broken* (II 318), Hawkesworth does use *broke* independently as a participle on at least one occasion; past participle *broke* remains in the second edition also. The *OED* notes that '*broke* was exceedingly common in prose and speech during the 17th-18th century'.¹⁹

14 Jan 1769 (43) it looked as if it was breaking
Voilently on a ledge of rocks

Hawkesworth II 41 the waves had exactly the same
appearance as they would have had if they had *broke* over a ledge
of rocks;

In Cook's text, several old OE class three verbs have past tense variants with the vowel of the past participle: *begun* (10), *began* (43); *run* (44), *ran* (2); *sprung* (40); *stunk* (1). Past tense *sprung* and *stunk* attracted little prescriptive attention: for instance, Fisher (1779) was one of only two to condemn *sprung*,²⁰ which Hawkesworth indeed retains (16x; e.g. p.150/II 269; p.267/III 427; p.379/III 606). The continued resilience of these forms is attested in the *OED*.²¹ *Begun* and *run*, in contrast, were concertedly condemned by Lowth (1762) and many later writers. Indeed, though Cook's clerk Richard Orton occasionally retains preterite *begun* in the Admiralty transcript, he once substitutes *began* (p.141/MS A 17 Jul 1769), the only form to appear in the Hawkesworth edition. However, though Hawkesworth usually changes preterite *run* to *ran*, four examples of *run* survive in the printed edition: it is possible that the printer mistook the closed <a> for open <u>. Later,

for Jane Austen, *run* seems to have had negative connotations: Phillipps observes the form in the 'vulgar' Anne Steele's dialogue.²²

17 Jun 1770 (348) we weigh'd and *run* in to the Harbour
in doing of which we *run* the Ship a shore twice,

Hawkesworth III 556 we ventured to weigh, and push in
for the harbour; but in doing this we twice *run* the ship aground:
See also p. 193/H II 332), p. 403/III 650, and p.459/III 783.
These remain in the second edition of Hawkesworth.²³

In addition to *sweeped* above, the *Endeavour* journal contains other verbs or verb forms in specifically nautical use: these include *heave*, with past *hove* (26) and past participle *hove* (1); *stove* (1), past tense of *stave* 'to break'; *wear* 'to put a ship about', past participle *wore* (1). *Stove* does not appear in Hawkesworth's text. He retains the single occurrence of past participle *wore* (p. 254/III 415), the usual form in the period.²⁴ His treatment of past tense *hove*, a form described by Johnson (1755) as archaic, is inconsistent: though he retains it four times, he once – perhaps to make it rhyme with *sweeped* – changes it to past tense *heaved*, the variants appearing within a few lines of each other; an even more extensive revision changes past tense *hove* (p.7) to past participle *heaved* (II 3). The single occurrence of the past participle *hove* (p.403) has no direct parallel in Hawkesworth.

25 Aug 1770 (403) this done we *hove* the Ship up to it by
the same hawser. . .By this time it was dark and obliged us to
leave of untill day light in the Morning when we Sweep'd it again
and *hove* it up to the bows,

Hawkesworth III 649-50 this being happily effected, we
swept for it with a hawser, and by the same hawser *hove* the ship
up to it. . .As soon as it was light, we sweeped it again, and
heaved it to the bows: See also p.348/III 555; p.245/III 402
(2x).

2 Auxiliaries with the perfective

In the *Endeavour* journal, both *be* and *have* appear as auxiliaries with the perfect tenses of mutative intransitive verbs. The paradigm was indeed in flux: Rydén and Brorström's monograph documents 'the development of the paradigm from a clearly *be*-dominated paradigm around 1700 to an almost entirely *have*-dominated paradigm around 1900'.²⁵ Although Cook's usage seems particularly progressive in the light of their study, it is important to realize that his journal contains a perhaps disproportionately high proportion of the verbs and syntactic constructions favourable to *have*.²⁶

By Cook's time, the *be/have* paradigm had received a little attention from grammarians, the conservative *be* attracting somewhat more negative attention than the newer *have* by the 1770s, and much more by the 1790s; Cook's usage therefore seems nearer the progressive and 'correct' end of the continuum.²⁷ Hawkesworth's changes to Cook's text are generally in this direction also. When their texts correspond, Hawkesworth does substitute *have* for *be* more often than he substitutes *be* for *have*, but there are other factors to consider. At least once (p. 57/II 67) the change accompanies a recasting of the narrative from present to past; on several other occasions (e.g. Cook p. 318, p. 363), the substitution can be seen as a stylistic choice that emphasizes action rather than state. Indeed, (possibly) with *gone* and (certainly) with *past* Cook's *be* is a copular rather than a perfective auxiliary:

5 Nov 1769 (194) after the natives *were gone* I went with the Pinnacle and longboat into the river to haul the Seine

Hawkesworth II 333 after the natives *had left us*, I went with the pinnacle and long-boat into the river with a design to haul the seine,

22 Jul. 1770 (363) and this harpoon must have been a good while in as the wound *was* quite *heald up*.

Cf. Banks II 98 but the wound it had made in going in *was* intirely *grown up*;

Hawkesworth III 584 it appeared to have been struck a considerable time, for the wound *had* perfectly *healed up* over the weapon.

17 May 1770 (318) Stood on NNE untill 8 oClock when *being past* the breakers and having deepen'd our water to 52 fathom we brought too untill 12 oClock

Hawkesworth III 514 We stood on N.N.E. till eight o'clock, when *having passed* the breakers, and deepened our water to fifty-two fathom, we brought to till midnight,

On a number of occasions, Hawkesworth retains *be* in the past perfect.²⁸

28 Dec 1769 (227) At Noon the gale *was* a little *abated* but had still heavy squalls attended with rain.

Hawkesworth II 377 At noon the gale *was* somewhat *abated*, but we still had heavy squalls.

On two occasions only does Hawkesworth appear to substitute *be* for *have*, but in both cases he has in fact transcribed Banks' journal.

28 May 1769 (95) Tootaha. . .who *had moved* from Apparra to the SW part of the Isl^d.

Hawkesworth II 132 He *was now removed* from Tettahah, where Mr. Hicks had seen him, to a place called ATAHOUROU, about six miles farther,

Cf. Banks I 281 This morn the pinnace set out for the Eastward with the Cap^m D^r Solander and myself. Dootahah *was removed* from Tettahah where M^r Hicks saw him on the 24th to Atahouro, about 6 miles farther,

Hawkesworth's use of Banks' journal explains his inconsistent treatment of the perfect infinitive in otherwise similar contexts:

14 Mar 1770 (265) In land behind this opening were mountains the summits of which were cover'd with snow that seem'd *to have fallen* lately and this is not to be wonder'd at for we have found it very cold for these 2 days past.

Banks I 473 behind these were another ridge of hills coverd in many places with snow, which. . .we conjecturd *to be* newly

falln.

Hawkesworth III 425 and on the land behind it are mountains, the summits of which were covered with snow, that appeared *to have been* recently *fallen*;

18 Mar 1770 (267) snow, part of which we suppos'd *to have fallen* in the pm and fore part of the night at the time that we had rain,

Hawkesworth III 427 snow, part of which we supposed *to have fallen* during the night, when we had rain.

3 *Concord in the noun phrase*

As in PresE, variation between uninflected and inflected plural forms occurs in such categories as animal names and quantitative nouns: the uninflected form is often used in a collective sense, especially after explicitly plural determiners. Often, the variants appear in quite similar contexts. Cook's usage seems typical of informal language of the period, and despite what might be regarded as a violation of concord, Hawkesworth occasionally retains the idiom.

Some animal names, as in PresE, function as both collective and count nouns in Hawkesworth's text as well as in Cook's manuscript journal. Although Hawkesworth does not use any one noun often enough to generate 'rules', for instance correlating such determiners as numerals or *a few* with count nouns, or charting his increasing acceptance of collective nouns as he proceeds through the journal, the variation in both texts seems typical of the period. A few grammarians had demonstrated an awareness of the idiom: Elphinston (1765), for instance, found plural *carps* and *tenches* 'inelegant', though finding 'several *fish, fowl, salmon, teal*' 'colloquial'; later, Bicknell (1790) described the collective use of such nouns as *carp* (*How many carp . . . have you?*) as 'ungrammatical' and used by 'tradesmen', but nevertheless authorized by 'custom . . . as well as many other departures from strict grammar; especially in conversation'.²⁹

5 Nov 1769 (194) We hauled the Sene in several places in the River but caught only *a few Mullet*,

Hawkesworth II 333 With the seine we had very little

success, catching only *a few mullets*,

5 Dec 1769 (219) but by far the greatest part we purchass'd of the Natives and these of Various sorts, such as Shirks, sting-rays, *Breams*, Mullet, Mackarel and several other sorts;

Hawkesworth II 370 The fish we procured here were sharks, sting-rays, *sea-bream*, *mullet*, makrel, and some others

11 Jan 1770 (232) and being in 42 fathom water the people caught *about 10 or a Dozⁿ Bream*,

Hawkesworth II 383 being in forty-two fathom water, the people caught *a few sea-bream*.

This idiom was not present in every nautical idiolect. In the following example, Cook's shipboard clerk Richard Orton prefers an *s*-plural with a quantifier:

30 May 1770 (332) we saw *two turtle* [MS A *Turtles*] but caught none

Hawkesworth III 532 we saw *two turtles*, but we were not able to take either of them:

8 Oct 1770 (431) two Malays who sold us *3 Turtle*

Hawkesworth III 710 two Malays on board, who brought *three turtles*. See also p.359/III 575.

Hawkesworth retained *turtle* as a collective noun as long as it was not preceded by a quantifier or was not otherwise ambiguous:

19 July 1770 (361) those that came on board were very desirous of having *some of our turtle*

Hawkesworth III 581 we soon perceived that they had determined to get *one of our turtle*. See also p.358/III 579; p.366/III 590; p.384/III 611-2 (2x); p.395/III 630; p.396/III 636; p.458/III 782.

Explaining the inflection in the next example is complicated by the manuscript

tradition, but the potential ambiguity of uninflected *turtle* in Hawkesworth's sentence should be noted:

18 July 1770 (361) at this time we had *12 Turtle* [changed from *Tortoises*; cf. MS M *Tortoise or Turtle*] upon our decks

Hawkesworth III 580 we were told that the *turtles*, of which we had then no less than twelve upon the deck,

Hawkesworth was more likely to inflect Cook's uninflected quantitative nouns, still common in informal and nautical use but less acceptable in formal written English. *DENG* records several objections to such uninflected plurals as 'ten thousand *fathom*' and 'six *foot*' from the mid 1760s, but mostly from the 1780s and 1790s.³⁰

With the exception of some nautical idioms discussed below, Cook's uninflected plurals were nearly always corrected, as this brief survey of some representative nouns will show. The single occurrence of *month* with a numeral is corrected to Cook's usual *months* (24) by Orton:

13 Jul 1769 (117) Between a 11 and 12 oClock we got under sail and took our final leave of this people after a stay of just *Three Month* [MS A *Months*],

Hawkesworth II 182 Thus we took leave of Otaheite, and its inhabitants, after a stay of just *three months*;

Hawkesworth corrects uninflected *story* (1) and *pound* (8), retaining only the phrase *twelve pound shot* (p.107/II 157):

7 Dec 1768 (33) The Houses are mostly of Stone generally *one and two Story* high,

Hawkesworth II 27 the houses, in general, are of stone, and *two stories* high;

14 Jul 1770 (359) Mr Gore being out in the Country shott one of the Animals before spoke of, it was a small one of the sort weighing only *28 pound* clear of the entrails.

Hawkesworth III 577-7 Mr. Gore, who went out this day

with his gun, had the good fortune to kill one of the animals which had been so much the subject of our speculation. . .this individual was a young one, much under its full growth, weighing only *thirty-eight pounds*. See also p.354/III 565; p.368/III 592.

On a few occasions, uninflected forms appear in the Hawkesworth text. Interestingly, although Cook never uses *foot* with plural meaning, the unchanged plural appears once in the Hawkesworth edition; the error is corrected in the second edition.

7 Dec 1768 (34) their being no other Method to come at a Ships bottom as the Tides doth not rise above *6 or 7 feet* at the New and full Moon,
Hawkesworth II 38 for, as the tide never rises above *six or seven foot* [H² II 38 *feet*], there is no other way of coming at a ship's bottom.

Certain nautical idioms survive in Hawkesworth's text: uninflected *fathom* is frequently retained in a variety of syntactic contexts, while collective *sail* survives only in two partitive constructions.³¹

7 Nov 1768 (19) At 6 Sounded and had *32 fathom* [MS A *fa^m*] water
Hawkesworth II 16 we found ground at the depth of *32 fathoms*

14 Jan 1769 (43) but found . . . the depth of water from *30 to 12 fathom*
Hawkesworth II 41 finding the ground . . . shallowing from *thirty to twelve fathoms*

But

15 Jan 1769 (43) At 2 pm the Master return'd with an account that there was Anchorage in *4 fathom water* and a good

bottom

Hawkesworth II 41 he reported, that there was anchorage in *four fathom*, and a good bottom

13 Jan 1770 (233) we were about 4 Leagues from the Shore in that direction, in this situation had *40 fathoms* [MS A *fa^m*] water.

Hawkesworth II 384 at about four leagues from the shore, we had *forty fathom* of water. See also, at random, p.30/II 36; p.44/II 43; p.144/II 256, etc.)

5 May 1771 (468) At 1 PM weigh'd and Stood out of the Road in Company with the Portland and *12 Sail of Indiamen*.

Hawkesworth III 798 At one o'clock in the afternoon, of the 4th of May, we weighed and stood out of the Road, in company with the Portland man of war, and *twelve sail of Indiamen*. See also p.432/III 710.

Unfortunately, none of the eleven instances of *sail* with a quantitative determiner alone has a parallel in the Hawkesworth edition. For example:

22 Jun 1771 (475) At Noon had *13 Sail* in Sight Not in Hawkesworth.

4 Pronouns: 'other' with plural meaning

Both *other* (5x) and *others* (116x) occur with plural meaning in Cook's text. Plural *other* is attested in other eighteenth-century texts, and may have been unexceptionable in partitive constructions into the nineteenth century. Only a few grammarians considered (and condemned) plural *other*: Elphinston (1765), Stubbs (1777), and two writers in the 1790s.³² Cook, perhaps significantly, once changes *other* to *others* when revising the text:

13 Jul 1769 (139) the River Plate where she disposed of all her European goods and purchas'd *other* to trade with the Islands in the South Seas. Not in Banks, MS A, or

Hawkesworth.

Postscript (478) the River de la Plata, where they disposed of all their European goods, brought for that purpose, and purchased *others* to trade with the Islanders in the South sea, not in Hawkesworth.

Orton corrects the three examples of non-partitive *some . . . other*, but retains – as does Hawkesworth – the single partitive construction:

28 Oct 1768 (17) to the westward of it by *some* charts and to the Eastward by *other* [MS A *others*],

Hawkesworth II 15 to the westward of it by *some* charts, and to the eastward by *others*,

17 Jul 1769 (141) soon after I went a Shore, accompanied by M^r Banks, D^r Solander and D^r Munkhouse, Tupia, the King of the Island and *some other* of the Natives who had been on board since the morning.

Hawkesworth II 251 I went immediately ashore, accompanied by Mr. Banks, Dr. Solander, Mr. Monkhouse, Tupia, King Cooke, and *some other* of the natives who had been on board ever since the morning.

5 *Suffixless adverbs*

By the 1770s, adverbs identical in form to adjectives had long been condemned by contemporary grammarians.³³ However, these suffixless adverbs (or 'forms in - \emptyset ') seem to have remained more acceptable in some contexts than in others. Though Hawkesworth's usage almost always accords with prescriptive opinion, he retains a few of Cook's constructions: the adverb *leisurely*; and *close* and *new* attributively modifying past participles. He is clearly self-conscious about words like *perpendicular* and *strong* used as quasi-predicatives: to these words he generally, though not always, adds *-ly*.

The *Endeavour* journal contains such quasi-predicative constructions with forms in - \emptyset as *the sun shines bright* or *the tide runs strong*. They are particularly

frequent with verbs of motion with subject complements, including *blow, come, get out, make, ride, rise, run, and set*. In such constructions, a particular word (*bright, strong*) may be analyzed either as a kind of predicate adjective or an adverbial modifier of the verb. The form in $-\emptyset$, when perceived as an adverbial, has held its own in many common expressions; in other cases it alternates with the form in *-ly*.³⁴ Cook's own usage varies: for instance, *rise* occurs with *perpendicular* (3), *perpendicularly* (1), and *upon a perpendicular* (6).

Hawkesworth's emendations to Cook's journal are similarly variable. For instance, although he changes *blow but faint* (p.137) to *blow but faintly* (II 247), and sometimes substitutes *strongly* (p.246/II 405; p.370/III 593; p.400/III 647) or *with considerable strength* (p.30/II 36-7) for *strong* when it occurs with *blow, come, and set*; he does occasionally retain the form in $-\emptyset$ (p.53/II 66; p.137/II 247; p.148/II 262; p.427/III 705), a construction also found in the dialogue of some of Jane Austen's more literate characters.³⁵ Similar variation occurs with *perpendicular*:

18 Sep 1768 (8) The Tide flowes full and change North and South and *rises perpendicular* 7 feet at spring Tides and 4 feet at Neep-tides.

Hawkesworth II 10-11 The tides at this place flow at the full and change of the moon, north and south; the spring tides *rise seven feet perpendicular*, and the neap tides four.

14 Mar 1770 (265) The Land on each side of the entrance of this harbour *riseth almost perpendicular* from the Sea to a very considerable height

Hawkesworth III 425 On each side the entrance of the opening, the land *rises almost perpendicularly* from the sea to a stupendous height, See also p.265/III 425; p.326/III 607.

The premodification of verbs, especially past participles, by such forms as *close* and *new* is well documented through the nineteenth century.³⁶ Hawkesworth retains a few examples, eg. *new* with past tense *berthed* (p.362/III 584) and *close* with past participle *covered* (p.103/II 152), though he changes *covered close* (p.122) to *closely covered* (II 198):

Banks I 293 The stones were now laid and the dog *well cover'd* with leaves laid upon them.

20 Jun 1769 (103) These were likewise cover'd with leaves and over them hot stones, and then the whole was *close cover'd* with mould:

Hawkesworth II 152 some of the stones . . . being placed at the bottom, were covered with green leaves: the dog, with the entrails, was then placed upon the leaves, and other leaves being laid upon them, the whole was covered with the rest of the hot stones, and the mouth of the whole *close stopped* with mould:

13 Jul 1769 (122) after the rinde is scraped off it is laid in heaps and *cover'd close* with leaves Cf. Banks I.344.

Hawkesworth II 198 the fruit . . . is *closely covered* with leaves;

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, adverbs in $-\emptyset$ were particularly common before adjectives, as individual entries in the *OED* will attest. Especially after the publication of Lowth's grammar, such forms were also stigmatized. The editors have labelled post-1750 *tolerable* as nonstandard, as were undoubtedly other forms by that time. Hawkesworth almost always avoids them.³⁷

7 Dec 1768 (30) but as all the Coast is *exceeding high* terminating at top in peek'd Hills,

Hawkesworth II 36 as all the coast is *very high*, and rises in many peaks,

24 Nov 1769 (209) The land on the East side of the broad part of this River is *tollerable high* and hilly,

Hawkesworth II 356 On the east side of the broad part of this river the land is *tolerably* high and hilly;

Some of the variation between forms in $-\emptyset$ and $-ly$ in the *Endeavour* journal can be attributed to Cook's use of Banks' journal, from which he copied the otherwise unattested *prodigiously* and *scarcely*. Also, Cook's forms in $-\emptyset$ are more likely to be found before attributive adjectives: e.g. '*extreem* hot weather', but 'The Inhabitants . . . are *extremely* civile and polite'. Interestingly, the only adverbial forms in $-\emptyset$

found in the narrative of Jane Austen's novels involve attributive constructions, and it is only in one attributive adjective construction that the Hawkesworth edition retains the intensifier *exceeding*:

25 Jan 1769 (51) this Bay . . . affords plenty of
exceeding good wood and water.

Hawkesworth II 64 it affords plenty of *exceeding good*
wood and water.

Though Lowth (1762) and many others after him had specifically condemned *exceeding*, it is one of the few such adverbs found in the 1773 edition of Johnson's *Dictionary* (1773), 'not analogical, but . . . long admitted and established', and is indeed well attested. Later, in Austen's dialogue, *exceeding* is confined to the language of her elderly or vulgar characters.³⁸

That Hawkesworth might have overlooked *exceeding* suggests that the variant was less marked for him than it might be, and was indeed present in his own idiolect. However, if Hawkesworth's working papers consisted of interleaved Cook, it is possible that it was the printer who copied *exceeding* directly from Cook's own text, though Hawkesworth's sentence is contracted and its subject, *it*, differs from Cook's *This Bay*.

Adjectives in *-ly* have a few corresponding adverbs in the *Endeavour* journal: *friendly* (3x) and *leisurely* (1x). Grammarians had considered this class of words since the sixteenth century; Greenwood (1711) deliberately excludes them from his discussion; and *DENG* records not only Lowth (1762) and others after him but also the author of *The English Scholar Compleat* (1706) requiring an adverbial form distinct in some way from the adjective.³⁹ Hawkesworth indeed changes adverbial *fair* and *friendly* (p.216) to *in a very fair and friendly manner* (II 366), and retains none of Cook's other zero-forms. Nevertheless, despite his habitual avoidance of zero-forms, Hawkesworth retains adverbial *leisurely* from Banks' journal:

11 Oct 1769 (172) for we saw them carried aCross the
river in a Catamaran and walk *leisurely* off with the other
natives.

Banks I 406 the 3 boys. . .nimbly ran and joinde the party
who walkd *leisurely* away

Hawkesworth II 295 our three prisoners . . . ran nimbly

back and joined their companions, who walked *leisurely* away

Zero-forms also appear in the writings of Boswell and Austen.⁴⁰

6 *Prepositions: redundancy and variation*

One aspect of prepositional usage attended to was redundancy: a few writers explicitly preferred *near* to *near to*, for instance.⁴¹ Redundant prepositions with *hence*, *thence*, and *whence* attracted much more prescriptive attention: Johnson (1755) describes *from thence* as 'a vicious expression, which crept into use even among good authors, as the original force of the word *hence* was gradually forgotten. *Hence* signifies *from this*.' *DENG* records many grammarians, beginning with Greenwood (1711) who find *from* redundant. Priestley (1768) finds phrases with *from* 'very common', though improper.⁴²

Like many eighteenth-century writers, Cook always uses the preposition *from* with *hence* (7x), *thence* (9x) and *whence* (11x). Interestingly, Hawkesworth's usage is sometimes 'incorrect', though some of his emendations demonstrate linguistic self-consciousness. While he sometimes substitutes a noun phrase for *hence* or *thence* (p.33/II 27; p.187/II 323; p.426/III 704), he retains the preposition more often than he removes it:

23 Aug 1770 (401) here the Flood also sets to the NW, to the extremity of New-Wales, *from thence* West and SW into the India Sea.

Hawkesworth III 648-9 here also the flood sets to the north west, and continues in the same direction to the extremity of New Wales, *from whence* its direction is west and south west into the Indian sea. See also p.196/II 339; p.226/II 377; p.430/III 709

14 Nov 1768 (22) Soon after we anchor'd a boat came on board bringing several of the Viceroy's officers who asked may [sic] questions in respect to the Ship, *from whence* She came,

Hawkesworth II 19 in less than a quarter of an hour, another boat came on board with several of the Viceroy's

officers, who asked, *Whence* we came, See also p.361/III 580.

Despite a long history of prescriptive comments, variation between (and among) prepositions remains characteristic of PresE. Prescriptive opinions often conflicted. Unsurprisingly, Hawkesworth's treatment of some expressions in Cook's text accords with the prescriptions of some writers and violates those of others.

Samuel Johnson distinguished between *compare . . . to* ('when the comparison intends only similitude or illustration by likeness') and *compare . . . with* ('when two persons or things are compared, to discover their relative proportion of any quality'), and was echoed by Wood (1777) and Knowles (1796). *With* was also Baker's (1770) preferred form: he and six other writers preferred *in comparison with* to *in comparison of*; only Elphinston (1765) preferred *of* to *with*. The *OED* documents all these variants through the nineteenth century.⁴³

Cook's prepositional usage with *compare* and *comparison* varied. Where Johnson required *with* (1x), Cook's verb *compare* more often occurs with *to* (4x). Cook uses *in comparison to* (1x) and *in comparison of* (1x), the latter copied from Banks. The 'incorrect' *to* never appears in Hawkesworth. Cook's *in comparison to* becomes *in comparison with*. With the verb, Hawkesworth keeps Cook's single instance of *with* (p.299/III 483), and never retains *to*, recasting the expression with *comparatively* (p.374/III 599) and with *in comparison of* (p.247/II 405). Though avoided by some prescriptivists, *in comparison of* appeared in Johnson's *Dictionary* (1773) and, later, in Jane Austen's novels.⁴⁴

23 Aug 1770 (393) for the Hills and Mountains put together take up but a small part of the Surface *in comparison to* what the Planes and Vallies do which intersect or divide these Hills and Mountains:

Hawkesworth III 622 and the hills and mountains, taken together, make but a small part of the surface, *in comparison with* the vallies and plains.

7 Conclusions

As a rule, Hawkesworth corrects what would have been regarded as grammar

errors in Cook's text. But on a very few occasions, marked forms remain in the edited text. A few of these may perhaps be attributed to the printer. These include the four examples of past tense *run*, which nevertheless remained in the second edition. Alternatively, with many such variants remaining in educated spoken and even written language despite the objections of grammarians, the occasional presence of such forms as past participle *broke* – not found in Cook or Banks, and thus unambiguously Hawkesworth's own – should be unsurprising. Similarly, despite sporadic complaints about *in comparison of* and much more concerted objections to adverbial *exceeding*, the presence of these forms in Johnson's *Dictionary* as well as their ample documentation in the *OED* hint that Hawkesworth's retention of them, however sporadic, reflects his own usage. Considerably less ambiguous than Hawkesworth's single retention of *exceeding* is the fourfold presence of the 'redundant' preposition in expressions like *from whence*; that it was nevertheless a marked form for Hawkesworth can be argued by its removal on two other occasions. In short, the prescriptivists were not always in agreement; and the influence of even the most influential prescriptivists on even the most linguistically self-conscious editors had its limits.

The syntactic context of the surviving marked forms is an additional factor to consider. The occasional variant survives in a construction where it has been shown to flourish in the language of other educated writers of the period, again suggesting that Hawkesworth's failure to apply a prescriptive rule may reflect his own usage. 'Plural' *other* is removed by Cook's clerk Richard Orton on three occasions, but is retained by him and by Hawkesworth also in a partitive construction, the one context where it was to persist longest in educated usage. Interestingly, the sole instance of adverbial *exceeding* modifies an attributive adjective, a context already identified as one favouring the zero form. The very occasional zero form before a past participle, e.g. *close covered*, also accords with descriptive studies, though on at least one other occasion Hawkesworth prefers the *-ly* form in the same context.

Cook's collective noun *sail* survives only in constructions like *twelve sail of Indiamen*. The presence of such nautical phrases in Hawkesworth's text is more than occasional, though often unpredictable. While *sail* survives only in partitive constructions and collective *turtle* is retained except after quantifiers, the distribution of other nautical idioms which violated grammatical rules is less predictable. For instance, the unmarked plural *fathom* is retained in a variety of syntactic constructions, though on a very few occasions (again unpredictably) being replaced with the more landlubberly *fathoms*. Past tense *heaved* and *hove* coexist, *hove* for

instance sometimes retained and sometimes changed to *heaved*, the more common variant on land.

Finally, a few other inconsistencies in Hawkesworth's text result from his preference for Banks' text over Cook's. Banks is an influence on the two occasions where Hawkesworth substitutes *be* for Cook's perfect auxiliary *have*: Hawkesworth's use of Banks' text explains his inconsistent treatment of Cook's perfect infinitive *to have fallen*, once retained, and once replaced with the younger Banks' perhaps more conservative *to have been fallen*. The choice of the perfect auxiliary was not, it seems, a usage issue. More strikingly, although Hawkesworth on other occasions avoids the adverbial use of forms with adjectives in *-ly*, the sole such form retained is adverbial *leisurely* from Banks' journal. Here, his retention of a form otherwise marked for him clearly indicates how Hawkesworth's regard for Banks' social standing triumphed, albeit temporarily and perhaps unconsciously, over his diligent application of prescriptive grammar rules.

NOTES

¹ John Lawrence Abbott, *John Hawkesworth, Eighteenth-Century Man of Letters* (Madison, 1982).

² J. L. Abbott (1982), p. 21 and p. 143; pp. 98-99, 108.

³ Carey McIntosh, *Common and Courtly Language: the Stylistics of Social Class in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Philadelphia, 1986), pp. 105-14. This subject is discussed more extensively in C. Percy, 'The Language of Captain James Cook: Some Aspects of the Syntax and Morphology of the *Endeavour* Journal, 1768-1771', (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1990) and in an article forthcoming in *English Studies*.

⁴ Cook's holograph journal, Canberra, National Library of Australia MS 1, has been edited by J. C. Beaglehole as *James Cook: The Voyage of the 'Endeavour', 1768-1771* (Cambridge, 1955), vol. I of *The Journals of Captain James Cook on his Voyages of Discovery*: hereafter cited by date and/or page. The 'Textual Introduction' spans pp.ccxviii-ccxxv; see also A. Lysaght, 'A Note on the Admiralty Copy of Cook's Journal in the Endeavour', *The Journal of H.M.S. Endeavour 1768-1771* [facsimile edition of MS A] (Guildford, 1977), pp. 10-12. The 'Admiralty' MS, hereafter cited as 'MS A', is London, Public Record Office, Adm 55/40. John Hawkesworth, *An Account of the Voyages Undertaken by the Order of his Present Majesty for Making Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere*, 3 vols (London, 1773): hereafter cited as 'Hawkesworth' or 'H' by volume and page number.

⁵ Joseph Banks, *The 'Endeavour' Journal of Joseph Banks, 1768-1771*, ed. J. C. Beaglehole, 2 vols (Sydney, 1962): hereafter cited as 'Banks' by volume and page number.

⁶ London, British Library, MS Egerton 2180, pp. 19-19^v.

⁷ In an article forthcoming in *English Studies* I discuss these and other habits of Hawkesworth's.

⁸ I. Tiekens-Boon van Ostade, 'Negative DO in Eighteenth-Century English: the Power of Prestige', *Dutch Quarterly Review* 16 (1986), 296-312.

⁹ Harold B. Carter, *Sir Joseph Banks, 1743-1820* (London, 1988), pp. 23-26.

¹⁰ London, British Library Add. MS 33981, p. 256v.

¹¹ J. L. Abbott (1982), p. 5; W. H. Pearson, 'Hawkesworth's Alterations', *The Journal of Pacific History* VII (1972), 45-72 (at 56).

¹² *The Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, 2nd ed., 20 vols (Oxford, 1989) [OED]; F. Th. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 3 pt. (4 vols) (Leiden, 1963-73).

¹³ Bertil Sundby, Anne Kari Bjørge, and Kari E. Haugland, *A Dictionary of English Normative Grammar 1700-1800*, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 63 (Amsterdam and

Philadelphia, 1991) [*DENG*]. *DENG* has effectively superseded S.A. Leonard's *The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage 1700-1800*, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 25 (1929; rpt. New York, 1962). The history of particular usage issues is admirably presented in *Webster's Dictionary of English Usage*, ed. E. Ward Gilman (Springfield, Mass., 1989) [*Webster's . . . Usage*].

¹⁴ See Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London, 1985), pp. 103ff.

¹⁵ *DENG*, pp. 225-36. Gill (1619) seems to have been the first to articulate the principle that different forms should reflect different functions.

¹⁶ J. H., 'Rules for Writing and Speaking Correctly', *Gentleman's Magazine* 34 (1764), 519-20; J. H. identified as Hawkesworth by J. L. Abbott (1982), p. 108.

¹⁷ Carey McIntosh (1986), p.108, mentions Hawkesworth's corrections of *throw'd* and past participle *bore*.

¹⁸ *OED*, *sweep*, v. II 17. *DENG*, pp. 308-12.

¹⁹ *OED*, *break*, v.

²⁰ *DENG*, p. 235, p. 311.

²¹ *OED*, *spring*, v. and *stink*, v.

²² K. C. Phillipps, *Jane Austen's English* (London, 1970), p. 147.

²³ John Hawkesworth, *An Account of the Voyages Undertaken by the Order of his Present Majesty for Making Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere*, 2nd ed., 3 vols (London, 1773).

²⁴ *OED*, *wear*, v.²

²⁵ M. Rydén and S. Brorström, *The 'Be/Have' Variation with Intransitives in English With Special Reference to the Late Modern Period*, Stockholm Studies in English 120 (Stockholm, 1987), p. 10.

²⁶ Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, 'Social Ambition Reflected in the Language of Betsy and Richard Brinsley Sheridan', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 92 (1991), 237-46 (at 241-43), documents similar progressiveness in the Sheridans' language.

²⁷ M. Rydén and S. Brorström (1987), pp. 206-11; *DENG*, pp. 180-1.

²⁸ See also p.242/II 400 (*were come*), p.322/III 518 (*was . . . decreased*), p.211-12/II 359 (*were gone*).

²⁹ G. L. Lannert, *An Investigation into the Language of 'Robinson Crusoe', as compared with that of other 18th century Works* (Uppsala and Cambridge, 1910), pp. 35-38; Bror Oscar Eilert Ekwall, *On the Origin and History of the Unchanged Plural in English*, Diss., Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 8/3 (Lund, 1912), passim; W. Sattler, 'Zur englischen Grammatik. VII. Plural', *Englische Studien* 12 (1889), 366-404 (at 376-87); *DENG*, pp. 125, 293.

³⁰ *DENG*, pp.126-27.

³¹ *OED*, *fathom*, sb. 3b; G. L. Lannert (1910), p. 32; O. Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, 7 vols. (1909-49; rpt. Copenhagen and London, 1949-54), II §3.62; *OED*, *sail*, sb.¹ 4a; E. Ekwall (1912), pp. 115, 123; W. Sattler (1889), p. 401.

³² *OED*, *other*, adj. pron. (sb.) B 4-6, esp. 5b; O. Jespersen, *Grammar*, II, §17.75-6; W. Franz, 'Zur Syntax des älteren Neuenglisch. Possessivpronomina', *Englische Studien* 17 (1892), 384-402 (at 397-98); G. L. Lannert (1910), p. 58; W. Uhrström, *Studies on the Language of Samuel Richardson* (Uppsala, 1907), p. 31. *DENG*, p. 300.

³³ I. Simon, 'Dryden's Revision of the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*', *Review of English Studies* ns 14/54 (1963), 132-41 (at 133); J. Greenwood, *An Essay towards a practical English Grammar* (London, 1711), p. 161; S. Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols (London, 1755), *soonly*; *DENG*, pp. 200-04. However, see J. Elphinston, *The Principles of the English Language Digested*, 2 vols. (London, 1765), I 375-76; A. Bayly, *A Plain and Complete Grammar of the English Language* (London, 1772), p. 61.

³⁴ O. Jespersen, *Grammar*, III §17.2.1ff; R. Quirk et al (1985), §7.20.

³⁵ K. C. Phillipps (1970), p. 179.

³⁶ W. Franz, 'Zur Syntax des älteren Neuenglisch. Das Adverb', *Englische Studien* 18/2 (1893), 191-219 (at 191, 200); O. Jespersen, *Grammar*, II §15.31; *OED*, *close*, a. and adv. C 2, *new*, adv. II 3a. However, see I. Simon (1963), p. 133.

³⁷ C. McIntosh (1986), p.111, lists *tolerable*, *remarkable*, and *prodigious*. *OED*, *considerable*, a. (and sb.) 7, *near*, adv.² (and prep.) I 5b, *prodigious*, a. (adv.) B, *scarce*, a. and adv. B 2, *tolerable*, a. (adv.) 5a, etc. *DENG*, pp.200-03.

³⁸ K. C. Phillipps (1970), p. 180; S. Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols (London, 1773), *exceeding*, adv. W. Franz, 'Das Adverb' (1893), p. 194; O. Jespersen, *Grammar*, II §15.28; *OED*, *exceeding*, ppl. a. and adv. B; W. Uhrström (1907), p. 101; E. K. Sheldon 'Boswell's English in the "London Journal"', *PMLA* 71 (1956), 1067-93 (at 1078).

³⁹ P. G[reaves], *Grammatica Anglicana* (Cantabrigiae, 1594; rpt Menston, 1969), p. 11; J. Greenwood (1711), p. 161; *DENG*, p. 203.

⁴⁰ E. K. Sheldon (1956), p. 1092; K. C. Phillipps (1970), p. 178.

⁴¹ *DENG*, p. 355.

⁴² S. Johnson (1755), *hence*, adv. or interj. 8; *DENG*, p. 370. J. Priestley, *The Rudiments of English Grammar* (London, 1768), p. 134.

⁴³ S. Johnson (1773), *compare*, v.a. and *comparison*, n.s.; *DENG*, p. 88 and p. 96. *OED*, *comparison*, sb. 5a-c; *compare*, v.¹ 2.

⁴⁴ S. Johnson (1773), *comparison*, n.s. 3; K. C. Phillipps (1970), p. 194; W. Franz, 'Zur Syntax des älteren Neuenglischen. Präpositionen', *Englische Studien* 20/1 (1895), 69-104 (at 98).