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BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

It is perhaps difficult from our contemporary vantage point to credit fully the very high stature that John Hawkesworth (1720-1773) enjoyed as a literary figure in the eighteenth century. We are probably used to seeing his name mentioned by the significant biographers of the period—James Boswell or Sir John Hawkins are good examples—as being present at various important gatherings, almost as though he were just another literary camp follower, and perhaps we think of him as simply one of those who made up the Johnson circle. And yet this is in no way a true reflection of his importance in the period. If we look more closely at his career it is clear that not only was it one of considerable diversity, but also that it brought him widespread public acclaim. Indeed, from the numerous statements in praise of his work, it is apparent that he was regarded by many during his life as a major literary figure.

Hawkesworth was something of a phenomenon in his time. At his death in November 1773 the Lloyd’s Evening Post referred to him as one of the “finest literary ornaments” and said he was to be ranked “in the first line of Moral Writers.” What might be seen here as the hyperbole often found in eulogy was more than a kind acknowledgement of Hawkesworth’s literary accomplishments: in a variety of writings he had enlivened, as few others, the Age of Johnson; except for his fatal connection with Captain Cook’s Voyages his reputation might have passed intact to the nineteenth century and in turn to our own. While Hawkesworth lacked the range and depth of a Samuel Johnson (with

1 The authors are most grateful to the staff of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, especially Miss Glenise Matheson, the Keeper of Manuscripts, for their help in preparing this checklist.


3 29 November—1 December, 1773. Hawkesworth died on November 17.
whom he was often compared) and can hardly be ranked even with the lesser members of the Johnson circle—Goldsmith, for example—his literary contributions to the age are intrinsically worthy and shed light on this new age of authorship.

Hawkesworth's literary career effectively began in June 1741 when the Gentleman's Magazine published his poem entitled "The Fop, Cock, and Diamond". This was the first of a number of poems that he contributed to the magazine during the 1740s and signalled the beginning of a connection that linked the man and the publication throughout the middle decades of the century. By the late 1740s Hawkesworth had assumed some control over the magazine (he joins Johnson and others in a pictorial frontispiece to the 1747 volume) and by the mid 1750s he had become its literary editor. From this position and through his numerous contributions to the publication, especially book and drama reviews, Hawkesworth exerted considerable influence over the cultural life of the nation. It was at St. John's Gate, the home of the Gentleman's Magazine, that Hawkesworth met Samuel Johnson, a man who was to influence his career as no other. It was Hawkesworth, not Boswell, who knew Johnson during the latter's early London years, and towards the end of his life Johnson commented to Mrs. Thrale: "After my coming to London you will be at a Loss again; though Jack Hawkesworth and Baretti both, with whom I lived quite familiarly can tell pretty nearly all my Adventures from the Year 1753".4 Theirs was a relationship of considerable depth, a friendship cemented by many shared interests (literature chiefly) and those larger affinities of spirit that are harder to specify. Johnson invited Hawkesworth to join the first of his celebrated clubs, the Ivy Lane, which he founded in 1749, and it was here that a young man without formal education received instruction that could not be found in the nation's finest schools. And Hawkesworth possessed the kind of wit that would please such a mentor and qualities of person that caused Johnson to turn to him during a major crisis in his life—the death of his wife, Tetty, in 1752. At this time, Thomas Tyers records, Johnson "sent for Hawkesworth, in the most earnest manner, to come and give him consola-

4 Thraliana. The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809, ed K.C. Balderstone, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1951), i. 173. The date may be in error since the period of familiarity took place before 1753. Hereafter cited as Thraliana.
tion and his company". Neither Boswell nor Hawkins knew, in fact, that Hawkesworth not only comforted Johnson but handled the details of Tetty’s burial at his church in Bromley, Kent.

Inspired by Johnson’s friendship and example, Hawkesworth firmly established himself on the literary scene during the 1750s. There was scarcely a literary genre that he did not attempt. His *Adventurer* periodical, published between 1752 and 1754, was an immediate success and won many admirers for him, a number of whom found it more pleasing than many of its distinguished competitors. Sir William Forbes, for example writes:

> With less of stiffness and formality than the ‘Rambler’ and ‘Idler’ of Johnson, and more of real instruction than the ‘World’ or ‘Connoisseur’, the chief periodical papers of our own times of ascertained merit, the ‘Adventurer’ seems to combine the peculiar merits of them all; so that I do not know, if, since the days of Addison and Steele, who had the merit of introducing into the circle of literature that popular and excellent form of composition, a work of higher value of that nature has appeared than the ‘Adventurer’.

Although Johnson and others contributed many worthy essays to the *Adventurer*, Hawkesworth’s seemed especially tuned to the taste of the age, especially in his domestic and Eastern stories that offered readers vivid, if abbreviated, versions, of the worlds inhabited by Pamela, Clarissa, and Rasselas. Mrs. Thrale claimed that his “Story of Sultan Amurath” (*Adventurer*, nos. 20, 21, 22) was “better than any Eastern Tale of Johnson’s, ...” But, even more than this, of *Adventurer* no. 17 she commented “nor can Fielding or Burney or even Richardson himself hope to exceed the last mentioned Specimen of Hawkesworth’s Powers”.

The *Adventurer* established Hawkesworth’s position as a serious moralist and a fine stylist in the Johnson manner. Additionally, it brought him recognition from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who conferred a Lambeth doctorate on him in 1756. Such success, however, seems to have had an adverse impact on a number

---


6 *An Account of The Life and Writings of James Beattie, LL.D.*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh, 1807), iii. 237.

7 *Thraliana*, ii. 696.
of his contemporaries, and Hawkesworth is spoken of disparagingly by such figures as Boswell, Hawkins, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Edmond Malone. With the first two there may have been envy of Hawkesworth’s close association with Johnson. Boswell says little of Hawkesworth in the *Life*; either through deliberate omission or lack of real evidence he gives no account of any meeting between him and Johnson. If Boswell had known that Hawkesworth played some role in the transmission of Johnson’s account of his meeting with the king to Sir James Caldwell, which served as the principal source for one of the greatest scenes in the *Life*, perhaps he would have been more charitable to him. But he and Hawkins apparently shared a dislike of Hawkesworth and saw to it that Johnson’s friend received little favourable coverage in their lives of the century’s most famous writer. Whatever envy Hawkesworth’s literary success with the *Adventurer* generated, however, his future as a professional writer was, at least for some years, assured.

In 1755 Hawkesworth published an edition of Swift’s works that was the first attempt in England at a complete edition. These volumes are interesting now as one views them as part of that complicated process of producing reliable texts of Swift’s masterworks; they are even more valuable as one reads the extensive notes Hawkesworth appended to such works as *Gulliver’s Travels* and various scatological poems that show how a sensitive eighteenth-century reader perceived the strong moral thrust of even Swift’s more controversial writings. And Hawkesworth’s account of Swift’s life, with which he prefaced his edition, is admirable in its evenhandedness and objectivity. In a period given to extreme attitudes towards Swift, it attempted a critical balance and a measured appreciation unusual for its time. It was this account that Johnson singled out for praise in his own “Life of Swift” and on which he modelled, however silently, portions of his account of the Dean.

Hawkesworth’s connection with Swift ceased at this time, though not indefinitely. In 1766 he edited Swift’s correspondence, bringing to light for the first time those letters that constitute

---

the celebrated *Journal to Stella*. The middle years of the century were busy ones for Hawkesworth. While much of his writing appeared anonymously in the columns of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he nevertheless publicly associated himself with a variety of writings. In 1756 he altered Dryden's *Amphitryon* and in 1759 Southerne's *Oroonoko* for David Garrick and Drury Lane, essentially purifying them for the delicate sensibilities of the mid-century stage; in 1761 he produced an original play, *Edgar and Emmeline*, that provided viewers with an astringently comic assessment of the relationship of the sexes that anticipated the greater riches of Goldsmith to come. These plays involved Hawkesworth directly with the colourful world of the green room and the roar of the crowd and, more important, cemented his friendship with Garrick. Also in 1761 Hawkesworth published his *Almoran and Hamet, An Oriental Tale* that evoked immediate comparisons with Johnson's *Rasselas*, though for all its grace and fluency it has little of the philosophical depth of Johnson's masterpiece. In 1768 Hawkesworth brought a decade of writing virtually to a close with his translation of Fénélon's *Telemachus*, a version that brought universal praise and can be read to this day as a pleasing approximation of the original.

A good deal of Hawkesworth's time during these years was taken up with a role that he seems to have been increasingly called upon to play—that of literary adviser. Numerous figures turned to him for help, among them Robert and James Dodsley, Fulke Greville, and Sir James Caldwell. Undoubtedly, one of the reasons that Hawkesworth's assistance was frequently solicited had to do with his position as literary editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. It meant among other things that he was able to include lengthy extracts from the works of friends and favourable notices of plays in which he had some interest. He was able, for example, to help Christopher Smart by publishing some of his poems in the poetry section of the magazine. They began appearing, up to the number of twenty, after Cave's death in January 1754. As Arthur Sherbo remarks, Smart must have been particularly grateful for this, having just emerged from a lean period of two years in which none of his poetry had appeared in the magazine. Hawkesworth also boosted the reputation of his friend Johnson in the magazine in laudatory reviews of *Irene*, the *Dictionary*, *Rasselas*, and his *Shakespeare*, and at the same time he called attention to the writings of Hogarth,
Boswell, Baretti, Goldsmith, Sterne, and Smollett. Thus, while Hawkesworth received the scorn of some, many others had cause to value him as an adviser and friend. Among these was Fanny Burney, who provides a discerning and judicious picture of Hawkesworth that reflects well upon his character by one who came to know him well.

In early 1769 she wrote in her Diary: “Our party last evening was large and brilliant. Mr. Greville, the celebrated Dr. Hawkesworth, Mr. Crisp and my cousin dined with us”. She noted of Hawkesworth that she had “never heard a man speak in a style which so much resembles writing. He has an amazing flow of choice words and expressions ... He is remarkably well bred and attentive, considering how great an author he is”. In February 1773 she commented unequivocally: “I like the Doctor more and more every time I have the pleasure of seeing him; that stiffness and something resembling pedantry, which formerly struck me in him, upon further acquaintance and more intimacy either wear off or disappear. He was extremely natural and agreeable”.

Hawkesworth remained on intimate terms with the Burney family to the end of his life and participated in the larger Burney circle that included many talented figures. It was, in fact, Charles Burney who performed the signal and fateful service of recommending Hawkesworth to Lord Sandwich as a suitable person to compile an account of the South Sea voyages of John Byron, Samuel Wallis, Philip Carteret, and James Cook. This was the most ambitious task that Hawkesworth undertook in his relatively short life, and it was to leave hanging over this most


10 The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768-1778, ed. Annie Raine Ellis (London, 1889), i. 43, 109-91. Hereafter cited as Early Diary.

11 Early Diary, i. 133-34. For Hawkesworth’s extensive involvement in Cook’s Voyages see Abbott, Hawkesworth, Chap. VII. The full title of what promised to be Hawkesworth’s masterwork is An Account of the Voyages undertaken by the order of his present Majesty for making discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere, and successively performed by Commodore Byron, Captain Wallis, Captain Carteret, and Captain Cook, 3 vols. (London, 1773).
moral of writers charges of blasphemy and immorality. The task that Hawkesworth had to perform was to compile from the journals of the various captains an official version of the series of South Pacific expeditions that had been undertaken since the end of the Seven Years War. This in itself was beset with pitfalls. Hawkesworth discovered that tailoring the harsh realities of exploration to the sensitive taste of his audience was not at all easy. To begin with, the Admiralty, who had commissioned the account, apparently wanted Hawkesworth to deal tactfully with the less attractive parts of the voyages—the killing of South-Sea islanders, and the seamier side of life on board ship. But in addition to that, there was the thorny problem of how to describe the sexual ethics of the Tahitians and their amorous encounters with the sailors.

The story of the publication and reception of *Cook's Voyages*, or simply the *Voyages*, as it has become known, is a complex one, and there are many factors that account for the public outcry against Hawkesworth. The first casualty of the edition was Hawkesworth's friendship with Garrick. Under the impression that Hawkesworth was indebted to him for the commission, Garrick had requested him to sell the printing rights to Thomas Becket. Hawkesworth, however, unaware of any obligations, sold them to Strahan and Cadell, who paid the record price of £6,000. Garrick never really forgave Hawkesworth for this; writing to Antoine Suard on 20 July 1773, he said "He and I, are divided forever!"  

But there was worse to come. When the book came out in May 1773 it contained an introduction in which Hawkesworth questioned the existence of a particular Providence. Immediately Hawkesworth was attacked in the press for this blasphemous idea. Twelve lengthy epistles from a correspondent calling himself "Christian" were published in *The Public Advertiser* in which Hawkesworth's arguments were analysed and re-analysed. The hysterical dogmatism of his letters may be judged from the following answer to a correspondent who had been misguided enough to attempt a defence of Hawkesworth by referring to Alexander Pope: "But pray, Sir, how came Mr. Pope to be quoted in a Controversy relative to Providence? I should have

thought *his having been a PAPIST* would have been deemed a sufficient Reason to have destroyed *his* Authority on any subject *the least connected with Religion*. Mr. Pope, Sir, thought the consecrated Wafer the *identical body of Christ*!"  

To add fuel to the flames, in his account of the lives of the Tahitians Hawkesworth had allowed himself to speculate on the nature of primitive societies in a way that outraged public opinion. These now seem to us the most interesting part of Hawkesworth’s edition, for it is here that we can see his tolerance and his desire to stimulate discussion of important anthropological issues. But it was not seen so at the time. There were scores of letters published in the newspapers attacking him. “Christian’s” attitude was typical. “Our women”, he commented in *The Public Advertiser* for 3 July 1773, “may find in Dr. Hawkesworth’s *Book* stronger Excitements to vicious Indulgences than the most intriguing French Novel could present to their Imaginations ...”. His reaction was not the only one, however, as the following anecdote from *Baldwin’s London Weekly Journal* for 26 June 1773 makes clear:

On Sunday last, at a house in H—street, that facetious little Commander, Lord A—was reading some passages of Dr. Hawkesworth’s new Voyages to a company of Ladies. The particular Parts he was reading happened to be those relative to the people of Otaheite, wherein the Historian gives a description of that singular assembly among them called the Arreoy. The nature of The Meeting is, that a certain Number of both sexes meet, in order to indulge with each other in promiscuous Love, and to pair themselves together in Couples, as their Fancy shall suggest, without restraint or Limitation. Mrs P—11 was one of the company present. She listened to the Description with great Attention and Pleasure till she could contain no longer. Starting up from her Chair, clapping her hands together, and throwing up her Eyes towards the Roof of the Room she exclaimed “Oh good God! that we had such an assembly here”.

During the latter months of 1773 Hawkesworth’s health grew steadily worse. In October he went to dine at the Burney’s, and Fanny describes him as “thin, livid, harassed!” Charles Burney attempted to cheer him up, telling him that it was because of his

---

success that he had made so many enemies, and that they were really envious of him. Hawkesworth replied that he was preparing "a full and general answer" for his critics\textsuperscript{14}. But this unfortunately was never to see the light of day.

On Wednesday, 17 November, Hawkesworth died "of a lingering fever" at the house of a Dr. Grant in Lime Street. Mrs. Thrale claimed that he was the victim of a conspiracy by his enemies to kill him and that to this effect a notice was put in the papers saying he had died before he had actually done so, but there is no evidence of this. His death was seen by many of his friends as a result of his extreme sensitivity. Mrs. Thrale said that the attacks on him "broke his Heart", adding rather cryptically "no Imitation of Johnson in that at least—He would not easily be teized to Death, his Enemies may let alone trying"\textsuperscript{15}. The papers, which had formerly given so much space to attacking Hawkesworth, now published sympathetic and even eulogistic accounts of his career and character. It was too late, however, and in spite of the efforts by Hawkesworth's widow to publish her husband's works little was done to perpetuate his memory.

With the accounts of Johnson's life by Boswell and Hawkins, and the various other central documents of the period, all that was remembered of Hawkesworth in the nineteenth century was his supposed rejection by his friends, his foppishness, and his mistakes over the Voyages. Edmond Malone even implied that Hawkesworth committed suicide by taking an "immoderate dose of opium"\textsuperscript{16}. But if we allow his friends to speak for him, and look with less prejudiced eyes at the varied range of activities in which he was engaged as author, literary adviser, critic, and editor, then we must recognise that there is more to Hawkesworth than the picture painted by his detractors. He was a significant force in mid-eighteenth century literary society, and the letters of his which have survived make this significance clearer.

\textsuperscript{14} Early Diary, i. 263.

\textsuperscript{15} Hawkesworth's death was reported in The General Evening Post for Thursday, 18 November 1773 and other papers. Thraliana, i. 328.

\textsuperscript{16} Sir James Prior, The Life of Edmond Malone, Editor of Shakespeare (London, 1860), p. 441. For the circumstances of Hawkesworth's death and a refutation of the charges of suicide, see Abbott, Hawkesworth, Chap. VIII.
HAWKESWORTH'S LETTERS

The tendency of humanity to wish to converse (even at some distance) coupled with a postal technology that made circulation of letters within London and throughout the kingdom safe, predictable, and, even by modern standards, remarkably swift, turned eighteenth-century England into a nation of letter writers. Its chief heroine, Clarissa, came of age and descended into tragedy in a world wholly defined by the letter; virtually every great writer and thinker expressed himself or herself in letters when not engaged in the more demanding terrain of philosophical treatise, novel, or essay. While most eighteenth-century correspondence has passed away with the general detritus that characterizes any age, its chief figures are defined in some cases by thousands of letters in numerous volumes: Walpole, for example, left some 4,000 letters; Richardson's correspondence fills nineteen volumes in the Shakespeare Head Edition. It is difficult to think of a writer of consequence who is not simultaneously defined by correspondence—Boswell, Johnson, Cowper, Gray, and Sterne come quickly to mind; Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Lord Chesterfield are, of course, primarily remembered for their skillful exercise of this genre.

Hawkesworth’s correspondence might have rivalled some of the century’s larger ones. This is no idle claim. John Gough Nichols states, in fact, that had Hawkesworth’s “papers been preserved like those of Dr. Birch, they would have afforded the most valuable materials for the literary history of the last century”. Nichols was probably thinking of Hawkesworth’s involvement in the Gentleman’s Magazine, which put him at the centre of London’s literary and cultural worlds. A direct testimony to the existence of substantial Hawkesworth correspondence comes from Samuel Johnson. With Mary Hawkesworth and John Ryland he made serious, though finally futile, efforts to produce an edition of Hawkesworth’s writings that would have long since ensured him a place in English literary history.

Johnson speaks specifically of the inclusion of letters in this edition. "Of the letters", he comments to John Ryland in a letter of 12 April 1777, "there are some which I should be sorry to omit, some that it is not proper to insert, and very many which as we want room or want matter we may use or neglect. When we come to these we will have another selection". Johnson mentions no precise number, but it appears as if substantial correspondence existed. Apparently Johnson would not have included any letters Hawkesworth wrote to him, if he still persisted in the view he expressed to Mrs. Desmoulins on 5 August 1775. "You may tell him [Garrick]", he writes, "that Dr. Hawkesworth and I never exchanged any letters worth publication; our notes were commonly to tell when we should be at home, and I believe were seldom kept on either side. If I have any thing that will do any honour to his memory, I shall gladly supply it, but I remember nothing".

Much of Hawkesworth's correspondence, then, must have fallen victim to the vagaries of time and place. One wonders if Mary Hawkesworth, frustrated by her inability to complete an edition of her husband's works and saddened by his loss of reputation, destroyed his papers before her own death. Then again, they might still survive in some archive still unknown to students of his life. Sufficient letters have survived, though, to make possible a reasonable assessment of his life and literary activities in the later eighteenth century. Hawkesworth is represented in this checklist, which has attempted to account for all of his correspondence, by ninety-eight letters. Seventy-one of these are in his hand and signed; one is in his hand, though not signed. While twenty-two of these letters have seen partial or complete publication, most are scattered throughout the English-speaking world in public and private collections. There is no substitute for reading these letters in their entirety in order to savour Hawkesworth's contribution to the eighteenth-century familiar letter, but that is not possible for most readers. This

checklist will at least direct students to the locale of various letters; the brief commentary that follows will alert them to some of their contents.

It is not clear that Hawkesworth constructed his letters according to any specific theory of letter writing. His age, however, gave considerable thought to the proper form even so seemingly casual an utterance should take. Although many letter writers of the age were aware of the epistolary practices of Cicero, Pliny, and Seneca, not to mention various Renaissance humanists and their own French contemporaries, polite conversation served as the principal analogue to letter-writing. A familiar letter, they felt, should ideally elevate “nature” over “art”; the seemingly unplanned discourse was preferred to the premeditated utterance. Regardless of theory, though, the eighteenth-century letter admitted a range of voices: Burke no less than Sterne writes in a manner that is natural, though the former’s style is plain, the latter’s associative, allusive, metaphorical; Walpole’s epistolary style differs from Chesterfield’s no less than Swift’s from Johnson’s, though all speak in ways that reveal their character while meeting the demands of this genre.

While Hawkesworth’s correspondence does not alter the image of the man created by other materials or by a reading of his literary and journalistic works, it confirms our view of him, and on quite personal terms. Although this checklist is presented by collection, Hawkesworth’s letters might better be described in the following categories: letters written by the professional man of letters; letters written as a mentor or moralist; letters written seeking or acknowledging favours; letters written to family or close friends. Such categories are hardly discrete; there are a number of occasions when a letter to a close friend also deals with literary and professional matters. His correspondence is marked by the conversational style favoured by his world, though with the formality Fanny Burney noted in Hawkesworth when she observed that she had “never heard a man speak in a style which so much resembles writing.... All he says is just, proper, and better expressed than most written language.” But Hawkesworth was capable of that modulation of voice demanded by

20 Early Diary, i. 43.
the varied recipients he addressed: writing as mentor or moralist he speaks in a tone quite distinct from the one he uses to address a close friend; similarly, the authoritative tone he adopts as a professional man of letters differs from the one in which he solicited favour from a patron.

Hawkesworth's handwriting changed little over the years; the style of his first extant letter written in 1742 (Hyde Collection, item 1) differs little from those he wrote during the year of his death in 1773. It is quite unlike Johnson's flat, broad strokes and caused his editor to inquire of John Ryland: "Who was his Amanuensis? that small hand strikes a reader with terror. It is pale as well as small" 21. He made no effort in his correspondence, as Walpole and others, to be a chronicler of his age; while references to the literary world abound, allusions to politics, culture, and commerce are more incidental to Hawkesworth's letters than a deliberate part of them. Still, collectively his correspondence holds up a mirror to his age and documents it, if only in casual ways. With few exceptions Hawkesworth avoids writing in a personal manner, or at least in a way, such as Boswell's, that deliberately calls attention to himself. With one possible exception, his letter describing a visit to Christopher Smart, he seems not to have aimed for literary effect, though in his capable hands all prose enjoyed stylistic elevation.

Not surprisingly, Hawkesworth's role as a professional man of letters appears to have generated the greatest portion of his correspondence. Two letters to the Reverend Mr. Pegge (Bodleian Library, items 1 and 2), for example, show him serving as a literary middleman, apparently between some booksellers and Pegge, the former hoping that the latter would undertake a study of English counties. More important is a letter written to Ralph Griffiths on 3 March 1769 (Bodleian Library, item 3) that confirms Hawkesworth's reviewing for the Monthly Review. References in this letter to Owen Ruffhead and William Warburton also suggest Hawkesworth's larger involvement in his literary world. Far more significant is Hawkesworth's letter to Robert Dodsley on 14 September 1756 (British Library, item 1) in which he provides a lengthy critique of Cleone. Dodsley had called on not simply a friend for comments on his play but the dramatic critic of the Gentleman's Magazine. Hawkesworth's letters to

21 Johnson Letters, ii. 169.
Dean Zachary Pearce (Westminster Abbey MSS., items 1, 2, and 3) reflect that men of power turned to him because of his position in this influential periodical. At Pearce’s apparent urging, but not without some concern about the magazine’s editorial policies as well as possible statutory violations, Hawkesworth became involved in a current religious dispute, submitting a piece signed “J.H.” entitled “A Defence of the Bishops for not Attempting to bring about an Alteration in the Articles, and Liturgy of the Church of England; to favour the admission of Dissenters into her Communion”.

Other correspondence in this checklist demonstrates Hawkesworth’s active life as a professional man of letters. Few are more important than his letter to David Henry in 1756 (Yale University, Osborn Collection, item 2), which provides essential details about his official role in the Gentleman’s Magazine prior to 1756 and his official position of literary editor after this date. Not surprisingly, several letters are involved with Hawkesworth’s most famous, ultimately infamous, work—his rendition of Cook’s Voyages. On 18 September 1771 he wrote to Charles Burney (National Library of Australia, Canberra, item 1) in a profusion of thanks to his friend for his efforts to secure the contract to write Cook’s Voyages. He also mentions others who would support his claim to this rich literary prize—Garrick, Lord Lyttleton, and Mrs. Montague. Less than a month later, on 6 October 1771 (National Library of Australia, Canberra, item 2), Hawkesworth reported to Burney the happy news that he had been awarded the contract and the captains’ journals had been turned over to him. Hawkesworth’s letters to Garrick on 5 May 1773 (British Library, item 10) and 7 May 1773 (Hyde Collection, item 7) give vivid testimony, however, to the disaster the Voyages settled upon him; they detail his rupture with Garrick over the settlement of publication rights of his text on William Strahan, which was only prologue to a larger loss of reputation that he would endure before his death. Hawkesworth’s last extant letter to Charlotte Lennox on 16 October 1773 (Harvard, item 2) is more representative, though, of his career in letters. Here he advises a fellow writer about securing engravings for a new edition of The Female Quixote. She had obviously called upon Hawkesworth to assist her in this literary matter.
a role that he had played with vigor throughout the middle decades of the century. In a slightly different vein, his correspondence also reveals that he served some as a mentor or moral and spiritual adviser.

With the publication of his *Adventurer*, Hawkesworth emerged as a leading stylist and moralist, his essays applauded by polite society, his rectitude rewarded by a Lambeth doctorate in 1756 by the Archbishop of Canterbury. His two letters to the Reverend Thomas Bagshaw (*Loveday MSS.*, items 1 and 2), both involving theological discussions, probably represent a far larger body of discourse on religion that he engaged in with this and other clergymen. Others turned to him for instruction and clarification in difficult matters of faith. In two letters to a Miss Eliott in July 1767 (*British Library*, items 7 and 8) Hawkesworth assures an anxious recipient that Christian salvation is not dependent upon mere exercise of faith (which is beyond some) but in the conduct of one’s life, in the exercise of benevolence and duty. This view clearly anticipates his speculations about the operation of Providence in his *Cook's Voyages* that caused many not yet converted to the deism of Pope and Franklin to respond with outrage.

If the familiar letter looked generally to polite conversation as a model to emulate, in its more formal state it approached the highest expression of linguistic manners. Not surprisingly, Hawkesworth’s formal letters are written with great skill. Even though they were close friends, Hawkesworth’s letter to Benjamin Franklin on 5 January 1771 (*American Philosophical Society*, item 3) is marked more by formality than familiarity since he solicits Franklin’s support, and gracefully so, for the appointment of the Reverend Mr. Ackland to the afternoon preachership at the Founding Hospital. Although Sir William Forbes had obviously asked Hawkesworth to render his opinion on a text that he had sent him, the latter responded on 10 June 1770 (*University of Durham Library*) less with the authoritative tone of the literary editor of the *Gentleman’s Magazine* and more with an awareness of his recipient’s standing in society. Hawkesworth’s letter to the Earl of Sandwich on 19 November 1771 (*Sandwich*) involving his receipt of materials necessary to write Cook’s *Voyages* is chiefly defined by that tone of deference he felt that he owed his patron. His solicitation of Lord Bute on 2 March 1761 to secure the right to dedicate his oriental tale, *Almoran and Hamet*, to
the king (British Library, item 2) must serve as a model for such appeals. Isaac Disraeli, who reprinted it in part, saw in "This elegant epistle ... that delicacy in style which has been so rarely practised by an indiscriminate dedicator" 23.

As one might expect, Hawkesworth's personal correspondence—letters to his sister (Folger Shakespeare Library, items 1 and 2) and to Joseph Highmore (Freeman, items 1, 2, and 3)—is far less formal and provides details essential in constructing a portrait of his life. Two letters, both written to close acquaintances, are among the most interesting in all of his correspondence. They provide ample illustrations of his fluent mastery of the familiar letter while illuminating the lives of two of the century's greatest writers. Hawkesworth wrote to Fulke Greville on 14 March 1756 (Hyde Collection, item 2) in the relaxed tone that one friend naturally addresses another. In an almost jocular assessment of Johnson's response to Greville's Maxims, Characters, and Reflections (a text Hawkesworth collaborated with), Hawkesworth provides confirmation of Boswell's assertion that Johnson did not read a book "through" 24. Perhaps the most remarkable entry in this checklist is Hawkesworth's letter to Mrs. Margaret Hunter, Christopher Smart's sister, in October 1764 (Hunter) reporting on his visit to the poet. If Hawkesworth did not deliberately set out to create a literary letter, the effect is just that, as the talents of the essayist, novelist, and dramatist are combined to present a vivid portrait of this troubled genius that has been reprinted four times. No student's of Smart's life can afford to ignore it.

While much of Hawkesworth's correspondence is scattered throughout the world, the largest cache of his letters—those he exchanged with Sir James Caldwell and his wife—are preserved in the John Rylands University Library, Manchester 25. These are instrumental in constructing his biography and shed light on one of his deepest friendships. They are, in fact, an amalgam of the kinds of letters that he wrote as a professional man of letters and as mentor and adviser and clarify the more personal aspects of his character. In illuminating Hawkesworth's life they also

define the contours of the world of Sir James Caldwell: they reveal how their shared interests developed into a strong friendship; they demonstrate how over the years a man of position turned to a man of letters to assist him not only with his correspondence but with his writing in general; they show that Hawkesworth superintended the education of Caldwell's sons at Bromley, Kent, that Caldwell lobbied in behalf of Hawkesworth's literary works and gained him admission to levels of society not ordinarily accessible to a writer. One letter that Hawkesworth wrote to Sir James on 11 December 1767 (Rylands, item 17) reflects the depth of their friendship in an emotional tone rarely seen in his correspondence. "I miss you, my dear Sir James, like the friend of my heart", Hawkesworth writes to his absent friend, and adds that he hopes Caldwell "will come again in the spring for I shall feel very forlorn in London without you".

Fortunately, Hawkesworth's correspondence can be enriched by seventeen letters written by Mary Hawkesworth. These suggest what a larger reading of her life demonstrates—that she was intimately involved in the professional life of her husband, an adviser to one who advised an age on essential issues. Her letters are characterized by a clear style; among the most important are those written in defence of her husband's reputation during the troubled last months of his life and the sad aftermath of his death. All of her letters in the Folger Shakespeare Library deal with the disaster that Cook's Voyages brought. Her husband could have wished for no finer defence of his theological position in the Voyages than Mary Hawkesworth presented to Mrs. John Duncombe in a letter of 14 December 1773 (Freeman, item 1). But there is no clearer testimony to the hurt she suffered in this terrible controversy than her comment to Sir James Caldwell on 20 July 1776 (Rylands, item 2) that Cook's Voyages were the "Coup de grace to all my hopes of happiness on Earth".

While it is no consolation to the Hawkesworths, who endured pain known only to themselves, this checklist demonstrates that sufficient epistolary capital remains to help reconstruct the career of a writer whose contributions to English literary history deserve to be recognized.
LETTERS OF JOHN HAWKESWORTH

American Philosophical Society (Bradford Collection)

1. To “My dear Madam”
   no date
   ALS
   Note: one of several letters from Hawkesworth to the Stevenson family. The Yale Franklin Papers shed light on Margaret Stevenson and her daughter Mary (Polly) Stevenson; see also Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., “‘All Clear Sunshine’: New Letters of Franklin and Mary Stevenson Hewson”, Proceedings of The American Philosophical Society, c (Dec. 1956), 521-36. This letter was apparently written before April 1763, since Wanstead is mentioned. The household moved to Kensington, according to the Franklin Papers, around April 1763. The recipient is apparently Margaret Stevenson; Mary (Polly) is mentioned in the second line of the letter.

2. To “My dear Madam”
   Wednesday 2d Feb. 1770
   ALS
   Note: this seems to be addressed to Mary Stevenson [Hewson] (the reference in the last line to “your Mother” would seem to confirm it).

3. To Benjamin Franklin
   Bromley Kent 5th Jan. 1771
   ALS

Bodleian Library

1. To The Revd. Mr. Pegge
   London 28th April 1759
   ALS
   MS. Eng. Letters d. 45, f. 367

2. To The Revd. Mr. Pegge
   Sunday Night 6 O’clock
   ALS
   MS. Eng. Letters d. 45, f. 371
   Note: the date here must be close to the previous letter.

As far as the form of entry for each letter is concerned, date, address, etc., we have kept as close as possible to a literal transcription.
3. To "My dear Sir" [Ralph Griffiths]
   Bromley Kent 3d March 1769
   ALS                      MS. Add. C. 89, f. 157?
   Note: the contents of the letter indicate that Griffiths was the recipient.

_Boston Public Library_

1. To Dr. Grainger
   Bromley Kent 9th Febry 1759
   ALS                      Mellen Chamberlain Autograph Collection

_British Library_

1. To Mr. Doddsley
   Bromley Kent 14 Sept. 1756/Tuesday :
   ALS                      Add. MS. 29300, ff. 43-44
   Note: the contents of the letter, which concern the play Cleone, indicate that the recipient was Robert and not James Doddsley

2. To "My Lord" [Lord Bute]
   London March 2d. 1761
   ALS                      Add. MS. 5720, f. 88
   Note: reproduced in part in Isaac Disraeli’s, _The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors_ (London, 1859), pp. 199-200.

3. To Mr. Lockyer Davis
   Sunday night 4th Augt. 1765
   ALS                      Add. MS. 4293, ff. 78-79

4. To Mr. Doddsley
   Bromley 10th. May 1766
   ALS                      90. d. 15
   Note: as Robert had died in 1764 the recipient must have been James. This letter and the one following are attached to a copy of _The Spendthrift._

5. To Mr. Doddsley
   Wed: 14 May 1766
   ALS                      90. d. 15

6. To Miss Elliott
   Bromly Kent 12th June 1767
   ALS                      Add. MS. 45224, ff. X119-120

7. To Miss Elliott
   Bromley Kent 16th. July 1767
   ALS                      Add. MS. 45224, ff. X121-122

8. To Miss Elliott
   Bromly/22 d. July 1767
   ALS                      Add. MS. 45224, ff. X123-4
9. To Miss Eliott
   Wednesday 8th. Decr 1767
   ALS Add. MS. 45224, ff. X125-126

10. To "My dear Sir" [David Garrick]
    Wed. Evening [5 May 1773]
    ALS Add. MS. 28104, ff. 45-46
    Note: from the discussion of the Voyages the year is clearly 1773.
    The faint date (6 May) added to the top of the MS. is wrong, as
    is James Boaden who reproduces the letter in The Private Cor-
    respondence of David Garrick (London, 1831), i. 535, since Wednes-
    day fell on 5 May.

Chalmers
1. To Mr. Bridgen [Edward Bridgen]
   Bromley, Kent, Nov 8, 1765
   Letter printed in part in Alexander Chalmers, The British Essayists
   (London, 1802), XXIII, pp. xviii-xix.

Cornell University Library
1. To Mrs. Ryland
   14 Febr 1753
   ALS

Cradock
1. To Joseph Cradock
   Great Ormond-street, opposite Powis House, 5th May 1773
   Printed in Joseph Cradock, Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs
   (London, 1828), i. 136.

University of Durham Library
1. To Sir Wm. Forbes Bart.
   Bromley Kent 10th June 1770
   ALS Forbes Papers, Box F/131

Folger Shakespeare Library
1. To Mrs. Ryland
   Bromley Kent Sunday 11th Decr 1768
   ALS MS. W.b.472
2. To Mrs. Ryland
   no date
   ALS MS. W.a.168
3. No salutation

To [Mr. Cholmondely]
Thurs. noon
ALS MS. W.a.168

Note: Cholmondely is mentioned in the opening of the letter, which must be post-1756 since "Dr. Hawkesworth" is referred to; Hawkesworth was granted his doctorate in 1756.

Freeman

The following letters are printed in part or in whole in R. Freeman, Kentish Poets (Canterbury, 1821), ii:
1. To Joseph Highmore (1757, partial), ii. 180
2. To the Rev. John Duncombe (Feb. 10, 1758, partial), ii. 182-3
3. To Joseph Highmore (1760), ii. 192-3
4. To Joseph Highmore (Bromley, Sunday night, 3d Feb. 1760), ii. 194-5
5. To Mrs. Duncombe (Bromley, Kent, 19th December, 1767), ii. 196-8

Harvard

1. To Mrs. Lenox [Charlotte Lennox]
   St. John's Gate [Friday] 30th April 1756
   ALS bMS. Eng. 1269 (30-31)
2. To Mrs. Lennox
   Bromley Kent [Saturday] 16th October 1773
   ALS bMS. Eng. 1269 (30-31)
   Note: both of these letters have been published by Duncan Isles "The Lennox Collection", Harvard Library Bulletin, xix (1971), 43-44 and 168-170.

Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania
1. To Dr. Franklyn
   Bromley Kent Wed: night 8 Nov 1769
   ALS The Charles Roberts Autograph Collection

Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
1. To Mr. Strahan
   Bromley Kent Wed: 4th May 1757
   ALS Simon Gratz Collection, Case 10, Box 25
2. No salutation
To [Dr. Franklin]
Bromley Kent. Fryday night [May 15? 1772]
ALS Dreer Collection of American Prose Writers
Note: reprinted in The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, xix. 142. The letter is endorsed “To Dr. Franklin”, but not in Hawkesworth’s hand. The date is assigned by the Yale editors, based on Franklin’s letter to Hawkesworth of Friday, 8 May 1772—pp. 133-4 in the same volume.

Hunter
1. To “Dear Madam” [Mrs. Margaret Hunter]
London, October, 1764

Huntington Library
1. To Mr. Dodsley
Sunday night 10 Decr 1759
ALS HM 12238
Note: the recipient is clearly Robert Dodsley since the letter is concerned with his play Cleone.
2. To “Dear Sir”
To Mr. Dodsley
[Nov./Dec. 1759]
ALS HM 12235
Note: letter refers to the contract for Oroonoko which was signed on 6 December 1759. James Tiernay gives evidence to suggest that the recipient was James Dodsley in “Edmund Burke, John Hawkesworth, the Annual Register and The Gentleman’s Magazine”, HLQ, xlii (1978), 61.
3. To Mr. Dodsley
Bromley Novr 19th. 1766
ALS HM 12237
Note: Robert Dodsley’s death in 1764 shows James to have been the recipient of this and items 4, 5 and 6. They are reprinted by James E. Tiernay in his article, previously cited, 62-67.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>To Mr. Dodsley</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ALS</th>
<th>HM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bromley Kent. Fryday 19th. Decr 1766</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>HM 12236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bromley Kent 9th March 1767</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>HM 12239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>14 March 1767</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>HM 12240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wed Morn.</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>HM 12234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hyde Collection**

1. To The Rev. Mr. Parry
   Nov 24: 1742/at No. 6 Plumbtree Court Holborn
   ALS

2. To Fulke Greville Esq
   Bromley Kent 14th. March 1756
   ALS

3. To “Dear Sir”
   Fryday 20th. April 1759
   ALS

4. To “Sir”
   Bromley Kent 19th. June 1763
   ALS

5. To the Rev. Mr. Currey
   London 28th Novr 1765
   ALS

6. To Mr Davis [Lockyer Davis]
   Fryday 14th. March 1766
   ALS
   *Note: the contents suggest the recipient was Lockyer Davis.*

7. To “Dear Sir” [David Garrick]
   Great Ormond Street Fryday night [7 May, 1773]
   ALS
   *Note: Boaden in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, i. 536, has the wrong date for this letter—see Hawkesworth’s letter to Garrick, B.L. Add. MS. 28104, ff. 45-46, number 10 on this list, and the note following.*
Liebart (in the possession of H. W. Liebart, 282 York Street, New Haven, Connecticut)
1. To “Dr Sir” [John Hoole]
   Bromley Kent Sunday night [between 5 and 10 December, 1768]
   ALS
   Note: the date is suggested in a note to the letter by Herman Liebart. The letter refers to Hoole’s play Cyrus (for which Hawkesworth wrote the epilogue) which was acted on 3 December 1768.

Loveday (in the possession of Mrs. S. Markham, Tamerisks, Symn Lane, Wotton-under-Edge, Glos. England)
1. To the Rev. Thomas Bagshaw
   8 April 1763
   ALS
2. To Thomas Bagshaw
   no date
   ALS

Mitchell Library, Sidney
1. To “My dear Madam”
   Bromley Kent 11 June 1766
   ALS
   Ah 11
   Note: the reference to a Mr. Eliott suggests the letter may have been written to a member of the same Eliott family as seen in the B.L. MSS. (Add. MS. 45224, ff. X119-126)
   Bromley Kent 19th. March 1768
   AL but not signed
   Safe 1/80 Papers in the Autograph of Capt. James Cook

National Library of Australia, Canberra
1. To Dr. Burney
   London 18 Sept 1771
   ALS 332/1
2. To Dr. Burney
   Bromley Kent 6 Oct 1771
   ALS 332/2
3. To “My dear Friend” [Fanny/Charles Burney]
   no date
   ALS 332/3
4. To Dr. Burney
   Fryday Night 8th Octr. 1773
   ALS 332/4
John Rylands University Library (Bagshawe Muniments)

The following letters are to be found in the Bagshawe Muniments, the John Rylands University Library, Manchester, U.K. An account of them can be found in Dr. F. Taylor’s article, “Johnsoniana from the Bagshawe Muniments in the John Ryland’s Library: Sir James Caldwell, Dr. Hawkesworth, Dr. Johnson, and Boswell’s use of the ‘Caldwell Minute’,” Bulletin of The John Ryland’s Library, xxxv (1952-3), 211-247.

1. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent Febry 8th 1758
   copy B3/10/37

2. To Sir James Caldwell
   Decr. 11th. 1761
   copy B3/10/79

3. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent Decr. 18th 1761
   copy B3/10/81

4. To Sir James Caldwell
   11th Jan: 1763
   ALS B3/16/128

5. To Sir James Caldwell
   July 2d 1763
   copy B3/10/137

6. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bond Street July [?] 1763
   copy B3/10/138

7. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley 2d Novr. 1763
   ALS B3/16/129

8. To Sir James Caldwell
   Tuesd. Evening 5 o’clock [1763]
   ALS B3/16/130
   Note: letter refers to the Memorial of Mrs. Bagshawe submitted to the King in 1763.

9. To Sir James Caldwell
   Sunday morn: 2 o’clock [1763]
   ALS B3/16/131
   Note: year endorsed on the back in the hand of W. H. G. Bagshawe.

10. To Lady Caldwell
    Bromley Kent 9th Feb: 1766
    ALS B3/31/26
11. To Sir James Caldwell
   Fryday One in the Morn [February 1766]
   ALS B3/16/132
   Note: letter attached to one from Caldwell to Pitt dated c. February 1766.

12. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent 11th Jan. 1767
   copy B3/10/209

13. To Sir James Caldwell
   London 19th Jan. 1767 Monday
   ALS B3/16/133

14. To Sir James Caldwell
   September 27th 1767
   Copy B3/10/228

15. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent 3d Octr. 1767
   ALS B3/16/134

16. To Sir James Caldwell
   [Octr 9 1767]
   ALS B3/16/135
   Note: date given on address page by W. H. G. Bagshawe. The figure “7” is in dots, perhaps indicating Bagshawe’s uncertainty as to the precise year. A further date, “July 10th 1763?” in another hand, has been crossed through by Bagshawe. There is a copy of this letter, B3/10/139, in the hand of an amanuensis.

17. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent 11th Decr. 1767
   copy B3/10/234

18. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromly 4th March 1768
   ALS B3/16/136

19. To Lady Caldwell
   Bromley Kent 4th March 1768
   ALS B3/31/27

20. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent 6th May 1768
   copy B3/10/243

21. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley May 23d 1768
   copy B3/10/245

22. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley Kent 2d April 1769
   copy B3/10/272
23. To Sir James Caldwell  
   Bromley Kent 9th April 1769  
   copy  
   B3/10/276

24. To Sir James Caldwell  
   Bromley Kent 1st May 1769  
   copy  
   B3/10/280

25. To Sir James Caldwell  
   Bromley Kent 21st Dec 1770  
   ALS  
   B3/16/137

26. To Sir James Caldwell  
   London 25th May 1771  
   copy  
   B3/10/348

27. To Sir James Caldwell  
   Bromley Kent 20th of August 1771  
   ALS  
   B3/16/138

28. To “Sir” [James Caldwell]  
   Paternoster Row  
   Fryday two o’Clock  
   ALS  
   B3/16/139

_Sandwich_ (Mapperton House, Beaminster, Dorset)

1. To “My Lord”  
   To [the 4th Earl of Sandwich]  
   Bromley Kent 19th Novr. 1771  
   ALS  
   F/36/1, “Report on the correspondence and papers of John Montagu, 4th Earl of Sandwich”

_Scots Magazine_

1. To “Dear Miss”  
   Bromley Kent 14th Dec. 1748  
   _The Scots Magazine_ (July 1746), lviii. 451-54

   Note: The editors are indebted to Professor Arthur Sherbo for drawing their attention to this item.

_Tillotson_ (in the possession of G. Tillotson, Birkbeck College, University of London)

1. To Mr. R. Dodsley  
   Bromley Kent 3 Novr. 1757  
   ALS

_Westminster Abbey_ (the Muniment room and library, Westminster Abbey)

1. To “My Lord” [Dean Zachary Pearce]  
   Bromley Kent 9th. Decr 1764  
   ALS  
   WAM 64373
2. To "My Lord" [Dean Zachary Pearce]
   Bromley Kent. 12th. Jan: 1765
   ALS  WAM 64374

3. To "My Lord" [Dean Zachary Pearce]
   Bromley Kent 20th. Jan: 1765
   ALS  WAM 64375

4. To "My Lord" [Dean Zachary Pearce]
   Bromley Kent 9th. March 1768
   ALS  WAM 64376

5. To "My Lord" [Dean Zachary Pearce]
   Monday afternoon
   ALS  WAM 64377

Yale University (the Osborn Collection, James M. and Marie Louise)

1. To "Dear Friend"
   1738
   copy

2. To "Dear Sir" [David Henry of the Gentleman's Magazine]
   1756
   copy

3. To the Revd. Mr. Mitchell
   Bromley Kent 3d Decr. 1770
   ALS

4. To "My dear Madam"
   1773
   copy

LETTERS OF MARY HAWKESWORTH

American Philosophical Society

1. To "My dear Hervy"
   25th July 1762
   ALS

2. To Miss [Mary] Stevenson [Hewson]
   Bromley 28th Augt 1763
   ALS

3. To Miss [Mary] Stevenson [Hewson]
   [22 June 1768]
   ALS
   Note: the date is suggested by the entry "22; 6; 8" on the address page.
4. To “My dr friend”  
no date  
ALS  
Note: the last line of the letter suggests the recipient was Mary Stevenson [Hewson].

Cradock

1. To Joseph Cradock  
January 30th, 1774  

Folger Shakespeare Library

1. To Mrs Garrick  
June 10 1773  
ALS  
MS. W.b. 487  
2. To Mrs Garrick  
Ormond Street 12th June [1773]  
ALS  
MS. W.b. 487  
Note: letter refers to the rift which occurred between Garrick and Hawkesworth in 1773.

3. To Mrs Garrick  
Bromley 26th Novr./1773  
ALS  
MS. W.b. 487  
4. To Mrs Garrick  
Bromley/17th Jan/1774  
ALS  
MS. W.b. 487  
5. To “Dr Madam”  
To [Mrs Garrick]  
Bromly 11th June/1775  
ALS  
MS. W.b. 487  
Note : contents confirm Mrs. Garrick as the recipient.

Freeman

1. To Mrs. Duncombe  
Bromley, 14th. Dec. 1773  
Printed in R. Freeman, *Kentish Poets* (Canterbury, 1821), ii. 204-7  
2. To Mrs. Duncombe (December 1781, partial) *Kentish Poets*, ii. 191-2

Hyde Collection

1. To Mrs Garrick  
Bromly 20th June/1773  
ALS
John Rylands University Library (Bagshawe Muniments)

1. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley 14 June 1776
   copy B3/16/143

2. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromley 20th July 1776
   copy B3/10/459

3. To Sir James Caldwell
   Bromly 27th Augst. 1777
   ALS B3/16/144

4. To Mr Kilburne
   Bromley in Kent May 10th 1774
   copy B3/16/146