THE CHARLES LAMB BULLETIN

The Journal of the Charles Lamb Society

NEW SERIES NO.36 *October 1981*

FEAR OF THE GALLOWS

Madeline Huxstep

Introduction

An audience of Elians will hardly need reminding of the source of my title. In the essay "The Last Peach" Lamb starts, dramatically enough,

> I am the miserablest man living. Give me counsel, dear Editor. I was bred up in the strictest principles of honesty and have passed my life in punctual adherence to them. Integrity might be said to be ingrained in our family. *Yet I live in constant fear of one day coming to the gallows.*

He then goes on to ascribe this dread to the arrest of Fauntleroy (of whom more anon).

> From the apprehension of that unfortunate man...I date my horrors. I never can get it out of my head that I shall some time or other commit a forgery, or do some equally vile thing. To make matters worse, I am in a banking house. I sit surrounded with a cluster of bank-notes. These were formerly no more to me than meat to a butcher's dog. They are now as toads and aspics. I feel all day like one situated among gins and pitfalls.

He recalls a childhood incident when he stole a peach and then, reverting to the present, writes

> The sight of my own fingers torments me. They seem so admirably constructed for - pilfering. Then that jugular vein which I have in common... My very dreams are tainted. I awake with a shocking feeling of my hand in some pocket.

Now - is this Lamb merely indulging in some black humour at the expense of the unfortunate Henry Fauntleroy, who since 1814 had sold £170,000 worth of stock (for which he was trustee) by forgery? At the Old Bailey he was found guilty of "uttering" and was hanged on 30 November 1824 before a crowd of 100,000. Or is Lamb expressing real fears? Fears perhaps shared by many of his readers?

This afternoon I should like to examine the state of Law and Order during Lamb's life-time - the penal code, the law enforcement agencies and various crimes and criminals which Lamb refers to in his essays and letters.

The Penal Code

Trevelyan in his *Social History* observes

> Throughout the eighteenth century Parliament went on adding Statute after Statute to the 'bloody code' of English law until finally there were 200 capital offences.

The list of offences punishable by death reflected the traditional concern of the English law with threats to property and money more than with attacks on people. They included horse- and sheep-stealing - a hangover from an agrarian society which was fast vanishing; coining; stealing goods from a shop of a value of five shillings or stealing anything from the person. In 1833 Job Cox, a postman, was condemned to death for stealing a letter, although this was commuted to transportation for life. The year before, at Ascot Races, a man of 70 was sentenced to be drawn and quartered for throwing a stone at William IV, although here again sentence was commuted to transportation for life - he did not long survive.

As penalty was piled on penalty, the whole system was riddled with illogicalities. Attempted murder could be lightly punished but to slit a man's nose was a capital offence.

The philosophy, if such it can be called, behind the penal system was a belief in the efficacy of punishment and deterrence, and a calculated opposition to the concept of the reform of the criminal. The more public the execution, the greater the deterrent effect, it was reasoned. As Lamb remarks, again with reference to Fauntleroy "Thousands would go to see a Quaker hanged." In 1783 public executions ceased to take place at Tyburn, but continued outside Newgate and two other London prisons. Enormous crowds were attracted to these 'free shows'. At the execution in 1807 of Holloway and Haggerty for the murder of John Steele, owner of a lavender warehouse in Catherine Street, Strand, a crowd of 40,000 became so out of control that, at the end of the day, nearly 100 were lying dead or insensible.

As a next line of defence, courts had the power to sentence offenders to transportation to the penal colonies in Australia and Tasmania. As late as 1816 a law was passed prescribing seven years transportation for *poaching* and in 1834 six farm labourers, famous in history as the Tolpuddle Martyrs, were transported for administering an illegal oath in their efforts to raise agricultural wages from seven shillings to ten shillings a week. I have here a copy of an old *canal* notice "The punishment for tampering with these works is transportation."

For most people transportation as an alternative to execution meant a slow death as opposed to a speedy one, inspite of Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough's description of transportation as "a summer's excursion, in an easy migration, to a happier and better climate." One would like to think he was joking, but I fear he was not! Transportation did not end until 1857 and then more because of opposition from Australia than any change of heart here.

Apart from criminals, the prisons were also full of debtors and political offenders, such as the Hunt Brothers, whose imprisonment for libel provoked Lamb's remark "What a wretched thing a Lord Chief Justice is, always was and will be."

The pillory was abolished early in Victoria's reign, although public executions continued. From the 1820s onwards death penalties for innumerable offences were progressively removed from the statute book. The abolition of the death sentence for stealing at a stroke reduced executions by two-thirds - and also on the list were forgery (too late to save Fauntleroy), rioting, incitement to mutiny, aiding criminals to escape and armed smuggling.

One curious survival - as we were reminded by Miss Aaron in the Crowsley Memorial Lecture - was the use of the stocks, Lamb having suffered this humiliation in 1809 for indulging in horseplay with a fellow-clerk while a religious service was in progress.

In the courts, a prisoner could not give evidence on his own behalf although he could make a statement before sentence was passed. It was not until 1898 that the accused could give evidence - as Lord Birkett drily remarked "a great boon to those who have a good defence but a terrible handicap to those who have not."

Just as surprisingly it was not until 1836 that counsel was allowed to address the jury on behalf of a prisoner charged with a felony.

The result of this harsh penal system was that juries, more merciful than the law, refused to convict in the face of the evidence. Technical defences were much relied on. But above all the system was ineffective because the chances of arrest were so slight.

Also as we know the law could be surprisingly compassionate. When Mary Lamb stabbed her mother the coroner's inquest the following day returned a verdict of "Lunacy" and released her to the care of her brother.

The Social Background

With such a draconian penal system, the question arises "What were successive governments so frightened of?" I suppose the short answer is "violent change" - change which could tear apart the whole social fabric.

Lamb was born in the year of the battle of Lexington; when he was fourteen the Paris mob stormed the Bastille; when he was eighteen Louis XVI was executed. From 1793 to 1815, England was in a continual state of war, both against external foes but also against any stirrings of revolution within the country. The Revolution which had been hailed in such terms as

> "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive
> But to be young was very heaven!"

was viewed with dread by British governments, a dread which intensified rather than diminished after Waterloo. Events such as the Massacre of Peterloo and the Cato Street conspiracy were ruthlessly dealt with.

Governments were slow to appreciate that England had been transformed from an agrarian to an industrial society, with the consequential growth of urbanisation. Machine-smashing by the Luddites in 1811/12 was the corresponding working-class reaction to anticipated unemployment. As late as 20 December 1830 we find Lamb writing to George Dyer of his alarm at rick-burning in Enfield and commenting wrily "It was never good times in England since the poor began to speculate on their condition." For while industrialisation brought great prosperity to some, for many it meant poverty and squalor. Lamb in the essay "Home is home though never so homely" looks with a sympathetic eye on the plight of the urban poor.

If life was hard for civilians, it was infinitely more harsh for those dragged from their home surroundings by the Press gang to man Nelson's navy or for those who enlisted in the army to escape problems caused by drink, unemployment, women and the law.

The state of the towns

By the late eighteenth century, London's notorious slums included Drury

Lane, St Giles, Southwark, Clerkenwell and parts of Westminster beyond the Abbey. St Giles in particular was the sink of London - the abode of vagrants and petty thieves, when any stranger was likely to be robbed. At every street corner was a gin-shop, and this lasted until 1847 when New Oxford Street was built. Fagin-type schools trained young thieves and the printers of Seven Dials cashed in on the public fascination in crime with a torrent of ballads and broadsheets. Covent Garden and Drury Lane were centres of brothels and prostitution.

Nor was disorder confined to the lowest classes. The "Bucks", mostly members of the aristocracy, would rampage through the dark streets (gas lighting was first introduced in Pall Mall in 1810) breaking windows and overturning stalls. Riots broke out at Covent Garden in reaction to the increase in theatre prices.

Vagrants were taken up and lodged in prison or a parish institution. Lamb, in "The decay of beggars in the Metropolis" writes compassionately

> Immersed between four walls, in what withering poor-house do they endure the penalty of double darkness?

It is interesting to note that although Charles and Mary lived on the fringes of this lawless area, this does not seem to have affected their social life or prevented visiting with friends, going to the theatre and so forth. While living in Covent Garden Lamb's sole comment appears in a letter to Miss Wordsworth (21.11.1817) "Mary saw a thief..."

Law Enforcement

Before 1829, there was no day-time surveillance of the streets. The Bow Street Runners, set up by the Fieldings in the mid-eighteenth century, and known as "Robin Redbreasts" on account of their scarlet waistcoats, were more in the nature of a detective force - executing warrants, raiding gaming houses, pursuing and arresting highwaymen and foot-pads. They were armed with staves and pistols.

Otherwise the government had recourse to the military to maintain law and order and repress the mobs - as, for example, during the Gordon Riots of 1780 and at Peterloo in 1819.

The great change came towards the end of Lamb's life with the creation in 1829 of Peel's Police Force in the Metropolitan area. Three thousand men were organised in five divisions, each with eight sections, and each section having eight beats. Every street was patrolled at least once every twelve hours. They wore a uniform of top hat, blue tail coat with a leather belt, white trousers, and carried a rattle and a truncheon. At first they were unpopular and regarded as an extension of the military - "Peel's Bloody Gang" was one term of opprobrium. However, they speedily won acceptance at least among the respectable classes and the system was extended country-wide.

Much reliance was placed on informers. Informers were rewarded on a sliding scale - for example, £10 for information leading to the conviction of a sheep-stealer, up to £40 in cases of treason, robbery and counterfeiting. Since 1699 the so-called "Tyburn Ticket" Act exempted informers from holding any office in a parish or ward where a crime had been committed; this was not abolished until 1818.

The murder in the House of Commons itself of the Prime Minister, Spencer

Perceval, in 1812 excited, not unnaturally, the greatest sensation in the country. A Cabinet Council was called, and the mails were stopped until instructions were prepared to secure tranquillity in the districts.

Lamb, crime and criminals

Richard Altick in his book *Victorian Studies in Scarlet* comments that Lamb shared in the murder fever of the 1820s. I think he did share in it but was not obsessed by it. The Essays and Letters are peppered with allusions to current causes célèbres but perhaps no more than someone writing today might comment on IRA bombings or the search for the Yorkshire Ripper.

From Lamb's writings I have garnered a few examples:

(i) *Mary Blandy* "The female parricide" executed at Oxford in 1751 for poisoning her father who objected to her engagement, figures in "The Old Benchers of the Inner Temple" as the subject of a notable faux pas by Samuel Salt.

(ii) *Thomas Griffiths Wainewright.* In a letter to Bernard Barton (2.9.1823) Lamb refers to "kind, light-hearted Wainwright." Around this time T G Wainewright (Lamb's Janus Weathercock) was exercising his talents not only as Art Critic of the London Magazine but also in forging signatures to a power of attorney in order to collect a legacy of over £5000 from his grandfather. In 1828 and 1830 he successively poisoned his uncle, mother-in-law and sister-in-law. The Insurance Company, understandably suspicious about this alarming mortality rate in the Wainewright family, refused to pay up. Wainewright sued the insurers, but lost his case. In 1837 he incautiously returned to England, was arrested and convicted on the old forgery charge and transported to Van Diemen's Land where he died in 1847.

[It is nothing to do with Lamb, but may be of interest that Swinburne writing to W M Rossetti mentions the murder of his mistress, Harriet Lane by another Wainwright. "I must express to you the deep grief with which I see the honoured name of Wainwright associated with a vulgar and clumsy murder - utterly inartistic and discreditable to the merest amateur."]

(iii) *William Thurtell* was arrested by Ruthven, one of the foremost Bow Street runners, for the murder of William Weare at Elstree. There are several references to him in Lamb's letters - writing to Bernard Barton in January 1824, he complains of general lassitude so that not even Thurtell's execution can raise a flicker of interest. Later the same year, writing to Miss Hutchinson, he is interested to have met the clergyman who officiated at Thurtell's last moments.

(iv) *Henry Fauntleroy.* Lamb's pre-occupation with this case has already been mentioned in connection with the essay "The Last Peach" which itself is a re-write of a letter to Bernard Barton dated 1 December 1824.

(v) *Burke and Hare.* The sensational case of Burke and Hare is also noted by Lamb. Writing to Proctor (22.1.29) he says "Arn't you glad about Burke's case? We may set off the Scotch murderer against the Scotch novels: Hare, the Great Unhanged!"(Hare turned King's Evidence and escaped the gallows.)

(vi) *On Thieves* in general, we may refer to Lamb's famous letter to Barron Field (31.8.1817) beginning "How does the land of thieves use you?.."(Field had gone to Sydney as Judge of the Supreme Court.)

(vii) Perhaps the most extraordinary contact was in December 1832 when Lamb was living in Enfield. Moxon called unexpectedly and Lamb walked to the Crown and Horseshoe for a pint of porter. At the inn he met Benjamin Danby who was fated to be murdered later that night by his fellow-domino-players. Lamb was called to the inquest and hinted he was under suspicion of the crime. The neighbourhood he damns as "murderous Enfield".

Conclusion

In a letter to Bernard Barton (December 1829) Lamb inveighs against bankrupts and urges that bankrupts be hanged. "I declare I would, if the state wanted practitioners, turn hangman myself, and should have great pleasure in hanging the first bankrupt after my salutary law should be established." So we have come round full circle - we started with Lamb's fears of being hanged, we end with his volunteering to be the hangman!

Based on a talk given to the Society by our Hon. General Secretary, who is herself a magistrate, on 10 January 1981.

"JANE!"

Stella Pigrome

If you are thinking that the "Jane" of my title is Jane Austen herself, I'm afraid you have been fooled - she is in fact Miss Jane Fairfax of *Emma*. The occasion is the ball at the *Crown*, which Emma has considered as "peculiarly for her", but which the newly-married Mrs Elton takes to be in *her* honour. Emma has been standing by Frank Churchill and they have overheard Mrs Elton praising him to Jane Fairfax. "At this moment Frank began talking so vigorously" that Emma concludes he does not want to hear more. A few minutes later Mrs Elton is heard holding forth to her husband:

> 'Oh! You have found us out at last, have you, in our seclusion? - I was this moment telling Jane, I thought you would begin to be impatient for tidings of us.'
>
> 'Jane!' repeated Frank Churchill, with a look of surprise and displeasure. - 'That is easy - but Miss Fairfax does not disapprove it, I suppose.'

Emma at this point does not know that Frank and Jane are secretly engaged, hence his concern, and supposes that it is merely Mrs Elton's generally ill-bred behaviour which offends Frank as it does her and others of the more discerning inhabitants of Highbury.

Emma has already been put out by the way Mrs Elton, a newcomer, has taken up Jane Fairfax (she does not herself see the parallel with her own patronage of Harriet Smith).

> 'Jane Fairfax is absolutely charming, Miss Woodhouse. - I quite rave about Jane Fairfax... You will laugh at my warmth - but upon my word, I talk of nothing but Jane Fairfax...'
>
> 'Poor Jane Fairfax!' - thought Emma. -'You have not deserved this...

> The kindness and protection of Mrs Elton! "Jane Fairfax and Jane Fairfax." Heavens! Let me not suppose that she dares go about, Emma Woodhouse-ing me!'

In an age when we are commonly likely to find ourselves addressing acquaintances by their Christian names because we do not know their surnames, and when a Prince of Wales can publicly refer to his future bride as "Diana", it seems odd that a Christian name should cause such a stir, but in Jane Austen's time the use of a Christian name, like handshaking, was reserved for intimate family occasions, and was not always practised then. Much more formality was observed than we are accustomed to, especially within the upper classes, a legacy from the eighteenth century and earlier.

Outside the family the use of the Christian name can normally only be justified by a longstanding friendship, or, between the sexes, by an engagement. In *Northanger Abbey*, when Catherine Morland and Isabella Thorpe meet in Bath, we are told that

> The progress of the friendship between Catherine and Isabella was quick as its beginning had been warm, and they passed so rapidly through every gradation of increasing tenderness that there was shortly no fresh proof of it to be given to their friends or themselves. They called each other by their Christian name, were always arm in arm when they walked, pinned up each other's train for the dance, and were not to be divided in the set.

Undoubtedly the moving spirit here is the gushing Miss Thorpe, who is "four years older than Miss Morland, and at least four years better informed" in the matter of "dress, balls, flirtations and quizzes", "of which the free discussion has generally much to do in perfecting a sudden intimacy between two young ladies."

In *Mansfield Park*, Mary Crawford has correctly been addressing Fanny as "Miss Price" for several months, until she thinks that her brother Henry has succeeded in "making a small hole in Fanny Price's heart", and that they are as good as engaged. Then she writes to her:

> 'My Dear Fanny, for so I may now always call you, to the infinite relief of a tongue that has been stumbling at *Miss Price* for at least the last six weeks... Go on, my dear Fanny, and without fear; there can be no difficulties worth naming...'

and she signs herself "Yours affectionately." But Fanny is determined not to accept Henry, thereby entering into a family connection with Mary, and replies only to "Dear Miss Crawford," though Mary continues to call her Fanny when writing to her at Portsmouth.

In *Sense and Sensibility*, Marianne Dashwood and Willoughby are obviously seen to be attached to one another, and Mrs Dashwood has little doubt that they are engaged, though nothing has been said, and she has too much delicacy to ask questions. Elinor is more cautious in her belief, but comes to think it must be so on the strength of a low-voiced conversation in her presence, when Marianne refuses a horse which Willoughby has given her.

> 'But, Marianne, the horse is still yours, though you cannot use it now. I shall keep it only till you can claim it...'
>
> This was all overheard by Miss Dashwood, and in the

> whole of the sentence, in his manner of pronouncing it, and in his addressing her sister by her Christian name alone, she instantly saw an intimacy so decided, a meaning so direct, as marked a perfect agreement between them. From that moment she doubted not of their being engaged to each other ...

But in fact they were not, and Marianne ends her story married to Colonel Brandon, while Elinor is united to Edward Ferrers, freed at last from his undisclosed four-year long engagement to Lucy Steele. Because Lucy has revealed the circumstances to Elinor under a promise of secrecy which causes Elinor much pain and embarrassment, Lucy refers to him as "Edward," but calls Elinor "Miss Dashwood."

Among other engaged couples, Mr Darcy once addresses Elizabeth Bennet as "Elizabeth", and in the cancelled chapter of *Persuasion*, when he proposes in person instead of by letter as in the revised version, Captain Wentworth exclaims "Anne, my own Anne." When Mr Knightley and Emma become engaged, Mr Knightley, a lifelong friend who has always called her "Emma", says:

> '"Mr Knightley!" - You always called me "Mr Knightley"; and, from habit, it has not so very formal a sound.- And yet it is formal. I want you to call me something else, but I do not know what.'
>
> 'I remember once calling you "George", in one of my amiable fits, about ten years ago. I did it because I thought it would offend you; but as you made no objection, I never did it again.'
>
> 'And cannot you call me "George" now?'
>
> 'Impossible! I never can call you anything but "Mr Knightley." I will not promise even to equal the elegant terseness of Mrs Elton, by calling you Mr K. But...I will promise to call you once by your Christian name. I do not say when, but perhaps you may guess where, - in the building in which N. takes M. for better, for worse.'

There is very little Christian naming between friends. Elizabeth Bennet and Charlotte Lucas are on these terms, and Charlotte is so called by other members of the Bennet family, but it is striking that whereas Elizabeth is known in her family as "Lizzie", she is always called "Eliza" by Charlotte, copied by Caroline Bingley in the more formal version of "Miss Eliza Bennet." Catherine Morland and Miss Tilney only come to Christian names in a moment of crisis, when Catherine is suddenly sent away from Northanger by General Tilney.

Emma, after the loss of "poor Miss Taylor" on her marriage to Mr Weston, finds a new companion in Harriet Smith, brought to Hartfield by her father's elderly friends. At the first meeting Emma

> had particular pleasure in sending them away happy. The happiness of Miss Smith was quite equal to her intentions. Miss Woodhouse was so great a personage in Highbury, that the prospect of the introduction had given as much panic as pleasure - but the humble, grateful, little girl went off with highly gratified feelings, delighted with the affability with which Miss Woodhouse had treated her all the evening, and actually shaken hands with her at last!

Emma is soon calling Miss Smith "Harriet," but she always remains "Miss Woodhouse." Emma is always "Emma" to Mrs Weston, but although for the last seven years they had lived as friends rather than governess and pupil, Mrs

Weston is always "Mrs Weston". The one person with whom Emma might be expected to be on Christian name terms is Jane Fairfax, but Emma dislikes her, and she is usually "Miss Fairfax," but Emma is sometimes guilty of "Jane Fairfax-ing" her.

Perhaps rather more strange to us than the lack of Christian names is the reverse custom by which women often address and refer to their men friends by their surnames alone. Eighteenth century examples of this occur in Sheridan's *Rivals*, where Lydia Languish talks about her "Beverley", and Julia calls her young man "Faulkland", while he calls her "Julia."

When Isabella Thorpe becomes engaged to Catherine's brother James she calls him simply "Morland", and when she drops him in the hope of catching Captain Tilney, *he* becomes "Tilney". Jane Bennet refers to "Bingley" after they are engaged, and Mr Wickham is plain "Wickham" to Lydia both before and after they are married. The most noticeable example of this usage is in *Sense and Sensibility*, where both Mrs Dashwood and Marianne frequently refer to "Willoughby", though Elinor uses the more conventional form. His unexplained departure and continued silence cause Marianne great distress, culminating in an unexpected meeting at a party in London, when she utters her heart-rending:

> 'Good God! Willoughby, what is the meaning of this? Have you not received my letters? Will you not shake hands with me?'

It may or may not be significant that this use of the surname alone occurs in the three books which were all first drafted in the 1790s, though they were revised later to an extent not precisely known, and also in a limited way in *The Watsons*, generally held to have been begun in the early 1800s, though *I* believe it has an earlier origin. Elizabeth Watson, in her account of a young man she might have married but for the machinations of a sister uses only his surname:

> 'When we first knew Tom Musgrave I was particularly attached to a young man of the name of Purvis... Everybody thought it would have been a match... Penelope makes light of her conduct but I think such treachery very bad... I shall never love any man as I loved Purvis... I have lost Purvis, it is true, but very few people marry their first loves. I should not refuse a man because he was not Purvis.'

It is this practice no doubt which leads Lady Catherine de Bourgh to address her two nephews as "Darcy" and "Fitzwilliam".

When we come to the later books, however, this custom has disappeared, with one exception. When Mrs Elton returns Emma's call, she describes her visit to Randalls.

> 'And who do you think came in while we were there?'
>
> Emma was quite at a loss. The tone implied some old acquaintance - and how could she possibly guess?
>
> 'Knightley!' continued Mrs Elton; 'Knightley himself! - Was not it lucky? - for not being within when he called the other day, I had never seen him before, and of course, as so particular a friend of Mr E.'s, I had a great curiosity. "My friend Knightley" had been so often mentioned, that I was really impatient to see him; and I must do my caro sposo the justice to say that he need not be ashamed of his friend. Knightley, is quite the gentleman. I like him very much. Decidedly, I think a very gentleman-like man.'

After she had gone:...

> 'Insufferable woman', was [Emma's] immediate exclamation.
>
> 'Worse than I had supposed. Absolutely insufferable! Knightley! I could not have believed it. Knightley! - never seen him in her life before, and call him Knightley! - and discover that he is a gentleman! A little upstart, vulgar being, with her Mr E. and her caro sposo, and her resources and all her airs of pert pretension and under-bred finery. Actually to discover that Mr Knightley is a gentleman! I doubt whether he will return the compliment and discover her to be a lady.'

Although Mrs Elton continues to say "Knightley" it is clear that by the time *Emma* was published in 1816 it was no longer the done thing. Perhaps this old-fashioned habit was a product of Mrs Elton's Bristol mercantile background.

Men often address and refer to one another by their surnames, but hardly ever use Christian names.

Some differences are seen in modes of address within the family between the earlier and later books, but they may be due in part to differences in age groups.

If we look first at husbands and wives, we find that some of them might have no Christian names at all, for all we learn of them. For example, the elderly Mr and Mrs Allen, in *Northanger Abbey*. "I can never get Mr Allen to know one of my gowns from another," complains his wife. She is always "Mrs Allen". Mr and Mrs Gardiner, in *Pride and Prejudice*, never use Christian names, though we learn from letters that his was Edward, and her initial was M. Perhaps Mary, the third Bennet girl, was named after her.

Probably, however, the best known parents are Mr and Mrs Bennet, who have no names, though I suspect hers was Jane, since it is highly probable that her eldest daughter would have been named after her. Everybody remembers her anguished *cri de coeur*:

> 'Oh! Mr Bennet, you are wanted immediately, we are all in an uproar. You must come and make Lizzie marry Mr Collins, for she vows she will not have him, and if you do not make haste he will change his mind and not have *her*.'

The impact of this would be very much less, I suggest, if Mrs Bennet had burst in calling "George", or "Jack".

This conjugal formality is seen earlier in the 18th century: for example, Mrs Hardcastle in *She Stoops to Conquer* always calls her husband "Mr Hardcastle", although he does call her "Dorothy". Surprisingly, the unprincipled Lovelace, in Richardson's *Clarissa*, takes exception to a breakdown of this custom. In pursuit of Clarissa he has come to the glove shop where she has taken lodgings and demands to see her. The woman behind the counter assures him she is not at home.

> 'She is abroad - she is in the country- '
>
> 'In the Country! Not at home! Impossible! You will not pass this story upon me, good woman. I *must* see her. I have business of life and death with her.'
>
> 'Indeed, sir, the lady is not at home! Indeed, sir, she is abroad! -
>
> She then rung a bell: 'John,' cried she, 'pray step down! Indeed, sir,

> the lady is not at home.
>
> Down came John, the good man of the house, when I expected one of his journeymen, by her saucy familiarity.'

Lovelace would have had no complaint to make in households where there is a title. Lady Bertram's husband is always "Sir Thomas" to his wife.

In the later books we find that although Mrs Weston always calls her husband "Mr Weston", he does once call her "Anne, my dear", and although Mrs Admiral Croft addresses her husband as "Admiral", he does call her "Sophy". A change in fashion, or perhaps less formality among the rising middle classes? Mr Weston came of a family that had been "rising into gentility and prosperity" but he had been in the militia and made money in trade. Perhaps it had broadened his outlook, and the Navy had done the same for the Admiral, who had sprung from a respectable gentleman's family.

Among the younger married couples there is on the whole less stiffness. Although Charlotte Palmer in *Sense and Sensibility* always calls her husband "Mr Palmer", Mr Collins in *Pride and Prejudice* varies between "Mrs Collins", "my dear Charlotte" and "my wife". In *Persuasion*, completed in 1817, the young Musgroves are Charles and Mary to each other. Harriet Smith reports of Mr and Mrs Elton "'He called her "Augusta". How delightful!'"

Just as the normal polite form of greeting was the bow and the curtsey, so the universal form of address was "Sir" and "Madam" or "Ma'am", and this was current within the family circle also. Children knew it was their duty to show respect to their parents, and they addressed them as they would anyone else, but it was customary for small children and young ladies to say "papa" and "mamma". Catherine Morland at seventeen accepts an invitation to Northanger subject to "papa's and mamma's approbation", and old Mr Woodhouse is always "papa" to Emma. Elizabeth Bennet sometimes calls her mother "mamma", and at other times "ma'am", but in moments of distress, as when trying to restrain her from holding forth publicly on Jane's expected engagement in the hearing of Mr Darcy, she uses the full form:

> 'What is Mr Darcy to me, pray, that I should be afraid of him? I am sure we owe him no such particular civility as to be obliged to say nothing he may not like to hear.'
>
> 'For heaven's sake, madam, speak lower. - What advantage can it be to you to offend Mr Darcy? - You will never recommend yourself to his friend by so doing.'

Sons normally say "sir" and "ma'am" to their parents. Reginald de Courcey in *Lady Susan* writes to his father as "my dear sir", but the less well-bred John Thorpe is less formal.

> 'Ah, mother! how do you do? said he, giving her a hearty shake of the hand: 'Where did you get that quiz of a hat, it makes you look like an old witch? Here is Morland and I come to stay a few days with you, so you must look out for a couple of good beds somewhere near.' And this address seemed to satisfy all the fondest wishes of the mother's heart, for she received him with the most delighted and exulting affection.

Except for papa and mamma, third person references to parents always require the possessive pronoun. When Tom Bertram is trying to persuade Edmund that there are good reasons for performing a play, he says:

> 'I have no fears and no scruples. And as to my father's being absent, it is so far from an objection, that I consider it rather as a motive; for the expectation of his return must be a very anxious period for my mother, and if we can be the means of amusing that anxiety, and keeping up her spirits for the next few weeks, I shall think our time very well spent, and so I am sure will he. -It is a *very* anxious period for her.'
>
> As he said this, each looked towards their mother. Lady Bertram, sunk back in one corner of the sofa, the picture of health, wealth, ease and tranquillity, was just falling into a gentle doze, while Fanny was getting through the few difficulties of her work for her.
>
> Edmund smiled and shook his head.
>
> 'By Jove, this won't do,' cried Tom, throwing himself into a chair with a hearty laugh. 'To be sure, my dear mother, your anxiety - I was unlucky there.'
>
> 'What is the matter?' asked her ladyship in the heavy tone of one half roused. - 'I was not asleep.'
>
> 'Oh dear no, ma'am, nobody suspected you... Well, Edmund... But *this* I *will* maintain - that we shall be doing no harm.'

In her letters, Jane always refers to "my mother" and usually to "my father", but in reporting his death to her brother Frank she does say "Our dear father has closed his virtuous and happy life." But it is still "My mother bears the shock as well as possible." Third person Mother was clearly regarded as a vulgarism, and Jane gives us only two examples, both quoting servants or their families.

When the Austen ladies were preparing to move from Southampton to Chawton, Jane writes: "My mother has been talking to Eliza about our future home - and she, making no difficulty at all of the sweetheart, is perfectly disposed to continue with us, but till she has written home for *Mother's* approbation, cannot quite decide. - *Mother* does not like to have her so far off..."

In *Mansfield Park*, Mrs Norris is helping with the arrangements for the play the young people are getting up, and prides herself on her economies on curtain rings.

> 'I *am* of some use, I hope, in preventing waste and making the most of things...I forgot to tell Tom of something that happened to me this very day. - I had been looking about me in the poultry yard, and was just coming out, when who should I see but Dick Jackson making up to the servants' hall door with two bits of deal board in his hand, bringing them up to father, you may be sure; mother had chanced to send him of a message to father, and then father had bid him bring them two bits of board, for he could not no-how do without them. I knew what all this meant, for the servants' dinner bell was ringing at the very moment over our heads, and as I hate such encroaching people (the Jacksons are very encroaching - I have always said so - just the sort of people to get all they can) I said to the boy directly (a great lubberly fellow of ten years old, you know, who ought to be ashamed of himself), *"I'll* take the boards to your father, Dick; so get you home again as fast as

> you can." The boy looked very silly and turned away without offering a word, for I believe I might speak pretty sharp; and I dare say it will cure him of coming marauding about the house for one while - I hate such greediness - so good as your father is to the family, employing the man all the year round!'

Similarly, references to uncles and aunts are always to "my uncle" and "my aunt", and these persons are normally designated by their surnames, including married aunts. In *Pride and Prejudice* "my aunt Philips" is Mrs Bennet's sister, who had married her father the attorney's clerk, who had succeeded to the business; her husband is the "broad-faced, stuffy uncle Philips breathing port wine" who follows his guests into his drawing room for a "nice comfortable noisy game of lottery tickets, and a little bit of hot supper afterwards." "My aunt Gardiner", however, is the wife of Mrs Bennet's brother, "my uncle Gardiner," "settled in London in a respectable line of trade", "a sensible gentlemanlike man, greatly superior to his sister as well by nature as by education." If Darcy were to marry Elizabeth her uncles and aunts would be recognised as his, a point not missed by Caroline Bingley.

> She often tried to provoke Darcy into disliking her guest, by talking of their supposed marriage, and planning his happiness in such an alliance.
>
> 'I hope...you will give your mother-in-law a few hints...as to the advantage of holding her tongue; and...do cure the younger girls of running after the officers. - And if I may mention so delicate a subject, endeavour to check that little something, bordering on conceit and impertinence, which your lady possesses.'
>
> 'Have you anything else to propose for my domestic felicity?'
>
> 'Oh! yes. - Do let the portraits of your uncle and aunt Philips be placed in the gallery at Pemberley. Put them next to your great uncle the judge. They are in the same profession you know; only in different lines.'

There is no record of Uncle and Aunt Philips appearing at Pemberley either in person or in paint, but Mr and Mrs Gardiner were always welcome there.

Unmarried aunts are allowed their Christian names, just as Cassandra and Jane Austen were Aunts Cassandra and Jane to their nephews and nieces - but there are not many spinster aunts in the novels. Emma is one. She is very fond of her sister's children, and is indignant when the two eldest are brought to stay and their father suggests she may find them in the way. Mr Knightley suggests they could be sent to him, but she denies that she has a lot of engagements, and adds:

> 'And as to my dear little boys, I must say, that if Aunt Emma has not time for them, I do not think they would fare much better with Uncle Knightley, who is absent from home about five hours where she is absent one - and who, when he is at home, is either reading to himself, or settling his accounts.'
>
> Mr Knightley seemed to be trying not to smile, and succeeded without difficulty, upon Mrs Elton's beginning to talk to him.

We might have expected the bachelor Mr Knightley to be Uncle George, but there is no such precedent in the novels, though in Jane's own family there are references to Uncle Charles and Uncle Henry.

Uncles and aunts are also brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, but are more usually known as and addressed as "brother" and "sister". Mr Gardiner writes to Mr Bennet as "my dear brother", and when Isabella Thorpe and James Morland are engaged, and Catherine makes it clear to Isabella that she could never consider John Thorpe as a possible husband, she says "My dear friend, you must not be angry with me. I cannot suppose your brother cares so very much about me. And you know, we shall still be sisters." From Mrs Elton we hear a great deal about "My brother, Mr Suckling," of Maple Grove. "You would be amazed to hear how my brother, Mr Suckling, sometimes flies about. You will hardly believe me, but twice in one week he and Mr Bragge went to London and back again with four horses."

Emma's sister Isabella is married to Mr Knightley's younger brother John, who thus becomes her "brother", but this relationship is not extended to Mr Knightley, though he is her sister's "brother." At the ball at the Crown Mr Weston is "calling on everybody to begin dancing again":

> 'Whom are you going to dance with?' asked Mr Knightley.
>
> [Emma] hesitated a moment, and then replied, 'with you, if you will ask me.'
>
> 'Will you?' said he, offering his hand.
>
> 'Indeed I will. You have shown that you can dance, and you know we are not really so much brother and sister as to make it at all improper.'
>
> 'Brother and sister! no, indeed.'

Those who have begun to see in what direction Mr Knightley's feelings are leading him cannot be surprised at the strength of his disclaimer.

But brother or not, some formality is often retained. Caroline Bingley, tired of a conversation between Darcy and Elizabeth "in which she had no share" suggests some music. "Louisa, you will not mind my waking Mr Hurst?"

Among the older generation it is common for sisters to address and refer to one another as "sister", even using their surnames. When it is arranged for Fanny and her brother William to travel home to Portsmouth in Sir Thomas Bertram's carriage, Mrs Norris was

> ...suddenly seized with a strong inclination to go with them - to go and see her poor dear sister Price...She must say that she had more than half a mind to go with the young people; it would be such an indulgence to her; she had not seen her poor dear sister Price for more than twenty years...and she could not help thinking her poor dear sister Price would feel it very unkind of her not to come by such an opportunity.

William and Fanny were horror-struck at the idea. Luckily, Aunt Norris recollects that

> though taken to Portsmouth for nothing, it would be hardly possible to avoid paying her own expenses back again. So her poor dear sister Price was left to all the disappointment of her missing such an opportunity; and another twenty years absence, perhaps, begun.

This practice continued well into the nineteenth century; for example, in the *Mill on the Floss*, Maggie has her Aunt Glegg and Mrs Tulliver her sister Pullet and sister Deane.

Jane Austen also reflects the common practice by which a step-mother is referred to as a "mother-in-law" - Mrs Dashwood and Mrs Weston.

Beyond the immediate family a further relationship formally recognised as a form of address is "cousin". In *Mansfield Park* Fanny never addresses Edmund by name, but always calls him "Cousin", though she is always Fanny to him, as to her other cousins. Although she was brought up with her girl cousins for seven years, she sometimes addresses the elder girl as "Miss Bertram", and Tom sometimes as "Mr Bertram." The term cousin was elastic, and could cover a "distant relation" like Mr Collins, who is nevertheless described by Mr Bennet as "my cousin". He in turn claims Mr Bennet's daughters as "my fair cousins". Sir John Middleton, in *Sense and Sensibility*, is first described as a relation of Mrs Dashwood, but he had previously visited the family "too long ago for his young cousins to remember him." His mother-in-law, Mrs Jennings, regarded the Dashwoods as cousins too, "or something like it", and her cousins the Miss Steeles Sir John regarded as cousins to the Dashwoods too, "after a fashion".

Family relationships were important, but the hierarchy had to be preserved. The head of the family is "Mr Musgrove", or "Mr Dashwood", or "Mr Churchill", so junior male members are always referred to and addressed as "Mr Charles Musgrove", "Mr John Dashwood", "Mr Frank Churchill", and their wives are correspondingly "Mrs Charles Musgrove", "Mrs John Dashwood", and so on. Mr Knightley's younger brother is always "Mr John Knightley", even to his father-in-law. As Sir Thomas Bertram has a title, his elder son is Mr Bertram, and his younger son Mr Edmund Bertram. Similarly, the eldest daughter of the family is always "Miss Bennet, Miss Dashwood, Miss Elliot". The younger sisters are "Miss Elizabeth Bennet, Miss Marianne Dashwood, Miss Anne Elliot", although within a family party or among old friends, especially as between an older person and a younger one, this may be shortened to "Miss Eliza", or "Miss Anne". When, in *Sanditon*, completed as far as it went in 1817, Lady Denham calls her young companion "Miss Clara" Charlotte Heywood considers this an "old-fashioned formality."Collectively sisters were the "Miss Dashwoods", or the "Miss Bennets" - not, as I dare say most of us were brought up to believe, the "Misses Elliot", which must have been a later innovation.

When Fanny Price and Mary Crawford are talking in the Parsonage garden they are interrupted by the arrival of Edmund and Mary's half-sister Mrs Grant (always so addressed by the young Crawfords).

> 'My sister and Mr Bertram... I am so glad that your eldest cousin is gone that he *may* be Mr Bertram again. There is something in the sound of Mr *Edmund* Bertram so formal, so younger-brother-like, that I detest it.'
>
> 'How differently we feel!' cried Fanny. 'To me, the sound of *Mr* Bertram is so cold and nothing-meaning - so entirely without warmth or character! It just stands for a gentleman, and that's all. But there is nobleness in the name of Edmund. It is a name of heroism and renown - of kings, princes and knights; and seems to breathe the spirit of chivalry and warm affections.'
>
> 'I grant you the name is good in itself, and *Lord* Edmund or *Sir* Edmund sound delightfully; but sink it under the chill, the annilhation of a Mr - and Mr Edmund is no more than Mr John or Mr Thomas.'

Here Jane has allowed a family joke to creep in. She had or pretended to have certain likes and dislikes in the matter of personal names. When staying with her brother Edward at Godmersham she comments on a visitor brought to the house for a night or two.

> Mr W[igram] is about 5 or 6 and 20, not ill-looking and not agreeable. - He is certainly no addition. - A sort of cool, gentlemanlike manner, but very silent. - They say his name is Henry. A proof how unequally the gifts of fortune are bestowed. - I have seen many a John and Thomas much more agreeable.

This comment was written a few months after the completion of *Mansfield Park*. When Jane was born her father wrote: "She is to be Jenny, and seems to me as if she would be as like Harry as Cassy is to Neddy." There is no evidence that these family shortenings continued beyond early childhood, but Harry certainly became Jane's favourite brother Henry, which seems to have given her a taste for the name. "Henry at White's! Oh, what a Henry!" He was a lively, amusing and attractive companion, and she has imparted these qualities to the two young Henries of the novels - Henry Tilney and Henry Crawford (the latter flawed however by his sad lack of principle). But no one could be less like them than old Mr Woodhouse, who shares their name, though we only learn this from himself:

> 'Henry is a fine boy, but John is very like his Mamma. Henry is the eldest, he was named after me, not after his father. John, the second, is named after his father. Some people are surprised, I believe, that the eldest was not, but Isabella would have him called Henry, which I thought very pretty of her.'

A name she disliked was Richard. "Mr Richard Harvey's match is put off until he has got a better Christian name, of which he has great hopes." During the snowy winter of 1814 she writes:"Mr Richard Snow is dreadfully fond of us."

The reference remembered from the novels, however, is the description of Mr Morland in *Northanger Abbey*, where she creates a parent very unlike the conventional father of the romantic novel.

> Her father was a clergyman, without being neglected, or poor, and a very respectable man, although his name was Richard - and he had never been handsome.

This seems to me to hark back to Jane's youthful *History of England*, where she says of Richard III:

> The character of this prince has been very severely treated by historians, but as he was a *York*, I am rather inclined to suppose him a very respectable man.

It has been suggested however that there may be a sly reference here to Richard Crosby, the publisher who bought the original version of the book but failed to publish it.

When she was living in Southampton, Jane wrote of a friend:

> I cannot yet satisfy Fanny as to Mrs Foote's baby's name, and I must not encourage her to expect a good one, as Captain Foote is a professed adversary to all but the plainest; he likes only Mary, Elizabeth, Anne, etc. Our best chance is of "Caroline", which in compliment to a sister seems the only exception.

Jane seems in general to share Captain Foote's preference. The novels abound in Mary, Elizabeth, Jane, Fanny, Anne, Charlotte, with a sprinkling of the more romantic names: Lydia, Louisa, Henrietta, Maria, Penelope, and finally, Diana and Clara, in her last unfinished *Sanditon*. Her men are mostly plain too - John, George, Edward, James, Charles, Henry - with only one excursion into the exotic - Mr Fitzwilliam Darcy. Did Elizabeth ever call him by it? Did she dare shorten it to "Fitz"? When they were first engaged, Elizabeth had to check herself from commenting on his relationship with Bingley because "She remembered he had yet to learn to be laughed at, and it was rather too early to begin." But after they are married his young sister Georgiana saw him, with "astonishment bordering on alarm" "the object of open pleasantry", and she discovered that "a woman may take liberties with her husband, which a brother will not always allow in a sister more than ten years younger than himself."

I fear that Jane Austen would not be very pleased with the liberties I have taken in referring to her as "Jane" - she was, after all, "Miss Jane Austen", not even "Miss Austen" (and still less the "Austen" of so many modern critics. "Ms Austen" I have yet to see) - though she did once send her sister a forgiving and amused message in reply to one from the young man who had introduced her to the fellow guest so undeservedly named Henry -

> Pray give 't'other Miss Austen's' compliments to Edward Bridges when you see him again.

Note. Readers interested in the subject of the above paper may like to follow up one aspect of it in a paper issued by the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland: Occasional Paper No.33 - *Kinship Terminology in Jane Austen's Novels* by I. Schapera. London 1977. £4.

Based on a talk given to the Society on 7 March 1981

BOOK REVIEW

Reading Coleridge: Approaches & Applications. Essays in honour of Earl Leslie Griggs. Edited by Walter B Crawford. *Cornell*.pp 288 £9.

"When I die, there will be something for the professors! These wretched rascals! And it does not help, it does not help in the least, even if it is printed and read over and over again. The professors will still make a profit out of me, they will lecture away, perhaps with the additional remark that the peculiarity of this man is that he cannot be lectured about."

Thus the great Dane, Kierkegaard. Coleridge would have sympathised. The lectures go on, and, despite, our economic crises, the books still stream from the presses. Some, like Professor Whalley's edition of the *Marginalia*, may be a tax upon our pockets but are unarguably worth producing. But some of the others? As a test case, what about a volume which discusses that pellucid poem *Frost at Midnight* like this:

> "In the interface of two childhoods in Coleridge (his own and his son's), two kinds of time interlock: the poet's ruminative sense of human time, past and future, comes in synchrony with eternal time, without loss, indeed with extension, of grounding in the spatial paramenters of two places and two persons"?

To be honest, I cannot see any intelligent reader of S T C *needing* that kind of comment, and I wish more academics would recall the example of Chaucer's Clerk of Oxford:

> "Noght o word spak he more than was nede."

Fortunately, not all of the volume under review is as bad as that. R A Foakes, for instance, adds new and interesting correctives to his findings on Collier's versions of the 1811-12 Shakespeare Lectures presented in *Shakespeare Survey 23* (1970); John Beer, as always, has helpful things to say on *Coleridge and Wordsworth: the Vital and the Organic*; Stephen Prickett writes briefly but illuminatingly on the double-branched Coleridgean succession he sees among the Victorian "clerisy" - secular thinkers like Mill or Mark Pattison as well as the religious Coleridgeans centred around Maurice; Thomas McFarland ponders anew what S T C could do with contemporary notions of polarity drawn from science and political theory; Carl Woodring calls attention, in an essay on *Sara fille*, to her *Phantasmion: A Fairy Tale* (1837) as "a *Lord of the Rings* with less of Disney's Seven Dwarfs, and a Christian, this-world relation of Ursula Le Guin's *Earthsea*." (Well, at least that makes you want to go and read it!)

As a whole, however, Professor Crawford's volume seems lacking in a justifying purpose or direction. For at least one reader it made rather a sad memorial to Earl Leslie Griggs, who, anyway, has left us enduring monuments of his own. Perhaps an edition of *Phantasmion* would have been better? Or an *Imaginary Conversation* between S T C and Kierkegaard?

C R W

OBITUARY

The sudden death of Vi Ezard came as a great shock to us. A Londoner, like Lamb, she had spent most of her life in the City of London, leaving it on retirement to live at Sydenham. Joining the Charles Lamb Society after attending a meeting in 1947, she soon became an active and lively member, always cheerful and friendly. For the last ten years she has faithfully performed a very important&onerous task in despatching the CLS Bulletins each quarter. We owe her an enormous debt and are very appreciative of her generosity in giving up time to do such a job.

In her retirement she took up Bowls. With her customary enthusiasm she found much enjoyment in the game.

We shall miss her gay companionship, and we shall remember her with gratitude and affection.

As a final gesture she left the Society £250 in her will.

F S R

Miss Elsie Hunt died on 2 June 1981, following four heart attacks and a stroke - all of which she bore with characteristic fortitude. She had been a member of the Society since 1974 and her lively personality, sense of humour and practical contributions to Council meetings will be much missed.

The Service of Thanksgiving for her life, held on Thursday 9 June, bore witness to the range of her interests and to the regard in which she was held by young and old in many walks of life. She herself derived much pleasure from the meetings of the Society and the companionship of its members.

We extend our sympathy to her nieces, Mrs Forrest and Mrs New, and to other members of her family.

M R H

NEWS

VISIT TO CHRIST'S HOSPITAL, HERTFORD

We were fortunate in a beautiful sunny day for our visit on 13 June to Christ's Hospital, Hertford, where we were most kindly entertained by Miss Tucker and her senior girls. In the midst of A-Level revision, the girls generously took time to show us over the school buildings, bringing our sense of the community splendidly to life by their comments and conversation. We were also particularly pleased to have Mrs Bishop with us and to hear her account of what the school was like when her daughter, our Hon. General Secretary, was a pupil there. For ourselves we detected her name on the Honours Board on the occasion of her becoming a scholar of Somerville and were glad when the girls told us that these honours boards were among the "essentials" that they had pleaded should go with them when they join the boys at Horsham.

It was impossible not to be grieved that these beautiful buildings, some of them being the oldest extant remnants of the Christ's Hospital of Lamb's time - Coleridge for a short time was here when it was the Junior School - were no longer to be used for their present purpose. It would not surprise us if, on the occasion of the final removal, tears were to be seen on the faces of the Bluecoat boys and little maids who stand over the gate and on the front of the building.

In the meantime, we are most grateful to have been able to see it while it is still a school and to have felt a little of its happy atmosphere. We thank Miss Tucker for allowing us to come and for giving us a most welcome tea and we wish her and the school everything that is good for the future.

OUTLOOK

Mr Ledwith writes, enclosing a copy of the first number of a new Christ's Hospital magazine from Horsham. He says:

> 'Somewhere about 1922, Christ's Hospital, Horsham, produced a literary Magazine, "The Outlook", in addition to the official school magazine "The Blue". It was run by boys, no doubt with some encouragement and help from masters. My own connection with it was simply to print it (in school hours) in the Manual School.
>
> It died, was resurrected in the 60s or 70s, died again, and has just experienced a second resurrection with a master, Tim Kirkup, housemaster of Lamb A, as leader of the editorial board of boys.'

The first number is full of interest and budding talent and we hope the venture will go from strength to strength.

CHARLES LAMB SOCIETY LIBRARY

Mr Padwick, Deputy Librarian of the Guildhall Library, writes that "The collection has now been sorted into two parts: one, works by Charles Lamb himself and the other works about Lamb or associated with him in some way. The first has been arranged in order of title and edition, the second alphabetically by author, so that any book in the collection is now accessible to members of your Society."

A number of books and pamphlets have been repaired and in some cases boxed.

Mr Padwick says, "We shall shortly be taking over additional storage at Guildhall Library and we hope to be able to allocate more space to the collection so that it is brought together in its two parts and made more convenient for anyone wishing to consult it".

Books repaired include *A Christmas Letter, Prince Dorus, A Tale of Rosamund Gray, Tales from Shakespeare* (2 vols), *Moments with Charles Lamb, King and Queen of Hearts.*

MARY WARD CENTRE

The Centre is appealing to the many organisations which currently use the Centre in Tavistock Place for funds towards the purchase of a new Centre at 42-43 Queen Square, WC1. These are two very attractive Georgian houses (Grade II listed buildings), within easy reach of Holborn and Russell Square underground stations. After being private residences from 1729 to 1856, the houses have since been used as a School of Art for Ladies, a Trade School for Girls, a secondary school and a branch of an adult education institute.

Queen Square itself contains a variety of hospitals and educational societies. Famous residents include Dr Charles Burney and his daughter Fanny; William Morris and F D Maurice.

The CLS is very pleased to support this Appeal - a coffee morning and Bring-and-Buy Sale was held for this purpose on 19 September and it is hoped that members will also wish to make individual contributions, which may be sent to Mrs Madeline Huxstep at 1a Royston Road, Richmond, Surrey. (Cheques payable to "Mary Ward Centre Appeal".)

GRIFF HOUSE HOTEL

In May The George Eliot Fellowship asked for our support in opposing the erection of a petrol filling station adjoining Griff House, the former home of George Eliot. A letter was sent to the Planning Officer for Nuneaton, signed by the Hon. Secretary and eight other members, opposing the proposed development. In June we were informed that planning permission had been REFUSED, one ground being that the introduction of a petrol filling station would be detrimental to the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building.

This happy outcome shows how necessary it is for members to be vigilant in resisting developments harmful to our literary heritage.

M R H

NEW MEMBERS

Mr A E Barlow, 19 Aviary Walk, Bedford, MK41 7JB
Mrs C M M Bevan, Parsonage Farm, Croscombe, Nr Wells, Somerset
Mr D Davis, The Old Post Office, Littlebury, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 4TD
Mr G Dearmer, 68 Walsingham, St John's Wood Park, London NW8
Benjamin Franklin Fisher IV, University of Mississippi, College of Liberal Arts, Mississippi 38677, USA
Mr J A Leavold, 17 Marshalls Way, Wheathampstead, Herts
Miss S R Wallace, 36 Grindley Street, Edinburgh EH3 9AP
Washington State University Library, Acquisitions Dept, Pullman, Washington 99163, USA