THE CHARLES LAMB BULLETIN

The Journal of the Charles Lamb Society

NEW SERIES NO.38 *April 1982*

SOUTHEY AND WILLIAM WINTERBOTHAM: NEW LIGHT ON AN OLD QUARREL

Ralph Anthony Manogue

Wat Tyler was the greatest public success of Robert Southey's career, although not for reasons he himself wished. Dashed off in the summer of 1794 when the influence of Godwin was strongest upon him, the play was stolen by the Reverend William Winterbotham, a friend and partner of the radical publisher James Ridgway. Reneging on their promise to publish the play, as they feared its appearance would only add to already delivered jail sentences for sedition, they severed connections with Southey, but kept the play. Although Southey forgot about the manuscript, Winterbotham, seeing much in it with which he personally identified, appropriated it for possible use at a more propitious time. That day came 23 years later - in 1817, when Southey, then a High Church Tory, was Poet Laureate.

During this time the "Lakers" had been ridiculed for their conservatism by the young radicals, including Byron and Hunt. Contributing to this commotion in October 1816 Southey printed "A Plan for the Reform of Parliament on Constitutional Principles" in the *Quarterly Review* wherein he argued against radical measures of reform. On 11 February 1817 he contributed another article to the *Quarterly Review* in which he advocated the deportation of all those who preached sedition. Winterbotham remembered Southey had once preached Priestleyan communism in *Wat Tyler* and quietly arranged to have the play printed on February 13th, causing a brouhaha.

In his letter to William Smith, Southey relates how he came to write *Wat Tyler*: "In my youth...I fell into the political opinions which the French Revolution was then scattering throughout Europe... ... I wrote *Wat Tyler*, as one who was impatient of all oppressions that are done under the sun."[1] He gave the manuscript to Robert Lovell in October 1794 to take to London to give to James Ridgway, the radical bookseller of York Street, St James, to consider for publication. It was left in his hands until December when Southey himself came up to London for three days and called upon Ridgway, then in Newgate Prison. There the poet was told by the bookseller and H D Symonds (a fellow prisoner and business partner)[2] that they would print it, and if any profit accrued he was to have such a proportion as they should think equitable. On January 12, 1795, he wrote to Edith Fricker: "Went to Gerald [sic] to Ridgway concerning *Wat Tyler*. I am to send them more sedition to make a 2 shilling pamphlet. They will print it immediately, give me 12 copies and allow me a sum proportionate to the sale if it sells well."[3] During his visit to his publishers in jail, a dissenting minister named William Winterbotham was present, as were two other persons: "The name of the one was Lloyd - I believe he had been an officer in the army; that of the other was Barrow. I remember him a bishop's boy at Westminster."[4] There the business ended, or so Southey thought. He returned to Bristol, plunged into his involvement with Coleridge and Pantisocracy, Edith Fricker, and *Joan of Arc*. Never receiving proof sheets,

Southey concluded that Ridgway and Symonds had decided against publishing because they thought it unfit or too seditious.[5] So little did Southey think of it that he never asked for the return of the manuscript.

There the matter stood for twenty-three years. As far as Southey knew, the manuscript was lost. It was never published. No one mentioned it to him. He apparently forgot about it.[6]

However, without warning on February 13, 1817, Sherwood, Neely and Jones published *Wat Tyler*, setting off a furore and bringing Southey's popularity as a poet, ironically, to its zenith. The timing was perfect. Henry ("Orator") Hunt had recently reminded the Prince Regent of the fate of Charles I. In December 1816 an attempt was made to seize arms and capture the Tower in the tradition of Wat Tyler whose name was invoked by the insurgents led by Dr James Watson, the younger. Early in 1817 Parliament assigned secret committees to hold subinvestigations into subversive activities. Its findings were published on February 18, 1817.[7] On January 28, 1817, Southey had recommended the revival of Grenville's bill against seditious libel and the suspension of habeas corpus to check "the revolutionary spirit which is going abroad like a lion seeking whom it may devour."[8]

From the correspondence of the persons in the controversy and from the affidavits of the injunction we can now reconstruct what happened to the missing manuscript.

The Reverend William Winterbotham, now dissenting minister from Plymouth, had had the manuscript in his possession for more than twenty years, no doubt intending to make some use of it. (Both Ridgway and Southey deny in their affidavits giving the MS to Winterbotham.[9])

Winterbotham (1763-1829) had been born in Aldgate, London. First a Methodist and then a Baptist minister, he was a well-known radical. On November 5 and 8, 1792, he preached two sermons on the Gunpowder Plot and revolution, in which he espoused the democratic view against kingly authority. In Plymouth the feeling for the French Revolution was high, and the authorities considered the sermons seditious. On November 27, 1793, he was sentenced to two years imprisonment and a fine of £100 for each sermon, or four years in jail and £220. He spent some time at New Prison, Clerkenwell, and then Newgate, where he was a fellow prisoner and sympathizer with Ridgway and Symonds. They continued to be friends later on. He was released from prison on November 27, 1797, and returned to preach in Plymouth. He moved in 1808 to Newmarket where he remained until his death in 1829. Such are the highlights of his life gathered from the *D.N.B.* - however, the highlights only.The rest is to be found in the long-forgotten book, privately printed: *The Rev. William Winterbotham: A Sketch* (London: Ballantyne & Co., 1893), by Sir William Howard Winterbotham. To this biography Sir William appended the Winterbotham "Pedigree showing descendants of William Winterbotham," July 28, 1893, vi, 40. Before the *Sketch* was written, little was known of Winterbotham. From this and other sources it is now possible to give a complete record of his part in the "*Wat Tyler*" affair.

Commentators on the *Wat Tyler* scandal have said little about Winterbotham. George Saintsbury characterized him as a dissenting minister "no one ever heard of, right out of the blue." Nevertheless, he was noted during his day as a dissenter. What is known of his immediate ancestors and his own early life is principally derived from a series of biographical letters, which

very shortly before his death, he addressed to his oldest son, Rayner.

His grandfather, William Winterbotham, lived at Oldham, in Lancashire, where he engaged in freightage. His father fought for the Pretender at Preston Pans and Culloden. Marrying at the age of forty, he sired William who was born in Aldgate, London, December 15, 1763, and christened at Aldgate Parish Church on Christmas Day.

As his family was poor, William was reared by his maternal grandparents, to whose early teaching he would later trace his ardent love of liberty. Returning to London in the spring of 1774, he saw his parents for the first time since infancy. They had no sympathy for their son's independence; his father attempted to crush his spirit by "stern repression," discipline carried over into his schooling. While being corrected, he told his schoolmaster he would never have another opportunity of repeating the "outrage," and he quit school at twelve. This action created a furore at home, and he contemplated running away to sea. A few months later, however, he became an apprentice to a silversmith. Leaving home before he was thirteen, he was articled for a year and bound at fourteen at Goldsmiths' Hall for the term of seven years.

In London, he read poetry, history and geography. Separated from his master by "painful circumstances," he obtained employment in the West End and might have succeeded there, save for the "evil society and dissolute life into which he had been drawn." At length, broken in health and in great poverty, he was forced to return home, where for eleven months he "languished severely ill."

The death of a fellow apprentice caused him to repent. Converted to Calvinist Methodism by the experience and a series of sermons, Winterbotham entered the nonconformist Church at Pennington Street. In 1787 he was called upon to preach in Sydenham. Possessed of "great natural powers," he was urged by the Countess of Huntingdon to become a minister. Early in 1789, he became a Baptist. In December of that year he was invited to become the Assistant Minister of Plymouth Church. For three years he laboured there with "much success and benefit."

On Monday, November 4, 1792, he preached "imprudently" at How's Lane Meeting House. Plymouth was feverish with excitement over the French Revolution. There was some prejudice against him already because he had taken part in a local dispute against the Corporation. The sermon, given on the double anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, dealt largely with the deliverance of the nation at those times. He pointed out that the Revolution of 1688 recognized that the right of Kings to rule is derived from the people - that in deposing one dynasty and setting up another, the people exercised an undoubed right, and that upon the existence of that right rested the title of the House of Brunswick to occupy the throne. He spoke of the abuse of the country, and particularly of the corrupt state of Parliamentary representation and the grievous weight of the taxes necessitated by the rapid increase of the National Debt; he said it was the duty of every citizen to promote reform in every legal way.

The sermon created considerable excitement in Plymouth. It was reported to the government, and a prosecution was discussed. In order to contradict the falsehoods, Winterbotham preached a second sermon on Sunday, November 18. Apparently, the text of the sermon and that of the indictment differed substantially. It appears that he was the victim of "deliberate and

malicious invention of the two persons who alone supported" the charges at the trial. Separate indictments were found against him for the two sermons, and the trials took place at the Devon Summer Assizes at Exeter, on July 25 and 26, 1793. A full "Report" of both trials was published by him during 1794.

His grandson-biographer believes that the verdict of guilty was the result of prejudice and panic on the part of the jury, as the defense was ably conducted, and the judge "laid the case honorably before the jury." The guilty verdict at the second trial he cites as a travesty of justice, the fault of the two witnesses, whom he says the cross-examination utterly discredited, for the judge cautioned the jury to find him innocent.

From July to November Winterbotham continued his ministerial duties at Plymouth, "assailed on all sides by the calumnies of his enemies," and deserted by many friends and acquaintances. On November 21, 1793, he appeared before the Court of King's Bench in London. By some unaccountable oversight, the judge presiding at the case did not make note of the special character of the evidence of the second trial, nor could it now be found outside the judge's report. Had the facts been known, a new trial on the second indictment might have been granted. As things stood then, however, nothing more could be done.

He was sentenced and confined to Clerkenwell where his health and spirits gave way. Deprived of exercise and regular occupation, he complained through counsel and was transferred to the state side of Newgate. There he enjoyed a private apartment, the society of Ridgway, Holt, Symonds, Muir, Palmer and Gerrald, also confined for political offenses, and the visits of friends at reasonable hours. In fact, anything short of liberty could be purchased at Newgate for money.

He spent much of his time in study and writing. Using the shorthand notes of William Bowring taken before the Honorable Baron Perryn at his trial, he published the transcripts. He accuses some of the jury of sleeping during the trial, and most of not taking notes or comporting themselves in a way which suggested they wished to dispense justice. The pamphlet sold for two shillings. It ran to four editions in 1794.[10] In addition, he published "The Commemoration of National Deliverances and The Dawning Days," two sermons, London, 1794, 8°; "Proposal for publishing by subscription ... A selection of Sacred and Moral Poetry from the English Poets" Dated State Side of Newgate, June 11, 1796, sold by H D Symonds & W Button, Paternoster Row, London [1796] s. sh. 8°; (the Editor's Advertisement is dated Newgate January 1, 1797; selection includes Southey's "Ode to Romance"); and a new edition of Dr Gill's *Body of Divinity*, 3 vols., 8°.

January 21, 1795, from the State Side of Newgate for Ridgway, Symonds and Daniel Holt, Winterbotham published *An Historical, Geographical, Commercial and Philosophical View of the United States of America and of the European Settlements in America and the West Indies*, in 4 vols. 8 vo. for £3 or $5.00.[11] In 1796 the first American edition with additions and corrections was published by John Reid, New York. There was a second edition of the London version printed for the compiler in 1799 by Ridgway. Moreover, he prepared an atlas for his history in 1796, which was also published by John Reid as *The American Atlas* (there had been a previous London edition in 1794). While still in prison, he composed *An Historical, Topographical and Statistical View of the United States of America, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* with the help of "others". This was a new edition printed

by S Gosnell for J Ridgway in four volumes in 1819. It lists Winterbotham of Nailsworth, Gloucestershire. An earlier edition had been commended by the *London Monthly Review* in 1795, iii, 471. Earlier Winterbotham had written *An Historical, Geographical and Philosophical View of the Chinese Empire, to which is Added a Copious Account of Lord Macartney's Embassy*, 1795, 8°, published by James Ridgway. It ran to a second edition that year and was noticed in the *London Monthly Review*, 1796, i, 376.[12]

While in prison, he received financial aid from many sources, some of them unknown. A "Mrs. Rayner" made him an allowance of £50 a year throughout his term. After his release, he received £1000 anonymously. On the day of his discharge, November 26, 1797, he married Mary Brend of Plymouth, who had been a witness for his defense. They subsequently had four sons and two daughters.

During a considerable part of his imprisonment, he occupied a room forming one of a suite of apartments with Ridgway, Holt and Symonds. Their names occur together on some tokens coined at this time, with a picture of Newgate on the other side. He shared a room with Holt; they were waited upon by a servant, selected from the female prisoners. His friends had no difficulty visiting him. A payment to the turnkey always opened the door to visitors.

His imprisonment undoubtedly affected his general health, and probably shortened his life. Still by joining in prison sports, by frequent baths, by strict attention to his doctor's advice about diet and clothing, he managed to maintain a fair degree of health, unlike Holt. He left prison, however, a very different man. His sentence had enabled him to cultivate his intellectual powers, but it depressed him mentally and physically.

He preached the first sermon after his release at the old Baptist Meeting House in Devonshire Square, London. He was received everywhere with courtesy and hospitality as one who had suffered for freedom. Although he had not intended to return to Plymouth, he did so at the city's "general desire." On January 1, 1801, he was publicly ordained as the minister of the George Street Baptist Church where he officiated until October 3, 1803, or March 1804, when he moved to Shortwood.[13]

He retired to the country for his health, "no doubt aided in his decision by the prejudice which still existed against him and which checked his usefulness." In 1808, he moved to Newmarket where he spent the remaining twenty-one years of his life. On March 31, 1829, he died at 66. His will (P.R.O. Prob 11/1764) divides his estate amongst his wife and six children.

A diligent reader throughout his life, Winterbotham opposed any civil disqualification on religious grounds. He lived to see the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and long enough to be assured that Catholic emancipation would be successful. Although Parliamentary reform, which he had ardently promoted, was long delayed, he lived to see public opinion rapidly rising in its favor. He supported free trade, and hated slavery.

E P Thompson puts the trial of Winterbotham in proper focus: "After each great shift in popular mood, a hardening and contradiction commonly takes place. And this was reinforced in the first months of 1793 by three causes: the execution of the French King; the opening of the war, and the commencement of legal persecution of reformers. Among the latter were a Dissenting minister, the Rev. William Winterbotham, imprisoned for four years for a sermon which scarcely went further than the views as to the Sovereign's accountability already popularized by Dr. Price..."[14]

But let us return to the *Wat Tyler* affair. When Southey brought suit to stop the publication of the play and repress it on the grounds he had never assigned copyright nor granted permission for the copright to be assigned, Winterbotham filed a counterclaim. In his affidavit[15] he swore that Southey visited him frequently and during one of the visits left the drama with him, requesting him to publish it to aid the reform movement, because Ridgway had rejected it. Winterbotham swore that in 1794, he considered it "utopian and injudicious," and so the MS remained in his hands.

Winterbotham's affidavit states that in prison at this time for sedition and libel were H D Symonds, Daniel Holt and James Ridgway; that he became acquainted with Robert Southey in "consequence of the occasional visits" of the laureate to him and his fellow prisoners; that on one such visit he was in the company of Daniel Isaac Eaton and that Southey offered the manuscript of *Wat Tyler* to Winterbotham for publication as "the offering of his heart in the cause of freedom." Winterbotham swore that Southey professed no intention of profit; that if it were not published as a separate pamphlet, it might be published in a periodical then being published by Eaton; that Eaton expressed to Southey "no doubt of its being published;" and that Southey said to Winterbotham upon leaving, "You may do as you like with it, probably I shall never see you again unless you cross the Atlantic," or words to that effect.

Winterbotham further swore that on the very evening he and Daniel Holt read the manuscript they agreed not to publish it "not withstanding the excellency of many of its passages, the visionary schemes of equality, ... and the levelling doctrines which in their opinion...were more calculated to serve the cause of a Faction than to promote the happiness of mankind." Winterbotham determined to "suppress the publication...altogether...[and] placed it with other unpublished manuscripts [in his] sole possession...for more than twenty years." He believes the manuscript was put into his hands no earlier than the close of 1795, or in the first six months of 1796, although he has no written confirmation of this fact. He swore he was approached by Eaton and others subsequently with a request to publish it or permit them to publish it, but he had refused to do so because of these objections and his "feeling of delicacy towards...Robert Southey, whose political sentiments and connections appeared...to be much altered..."

When Winterbotham saw *Wat Tyler* published by some unknown person, he and some friends compared it with the original manuscript still in his possession. "Notwithstanding certain omissions and alterations apparently accidental" [Winterbotham's phrase], the printed poem was found by them to have been derived from his "manuscript or some copy of the same however it may have been obtained." He swore it was printed without his desire, authority, privity, consent or connivance, and that through whatever means it reached the public, he conceives himself to be very ill treated, and files this counterclaim.[16]

Joseph Cottle further complicated the issue later on when he printed a letter from a "Mr Foster" to himself dated June 22, 1843, wherein Foster says Southey visited Winterbotham in prison and just as a token of kindness gave him the MS of *Wat Tyler*. "It was no fault of Winterbotham that it was published. On a visit to some friends at Worcester, he had the piece with him, meaning I suppose to afford themselves a little amusement at Southey's expense, he being held in great reproach, even contempt as a turn coat. At the house where Winterbotham was visiting two persons keeping the piece in

their reach at bed-time, sat up all night transcribing, of course giving him no hint of the manoeuvre. This information I had from one of the two operators."[17] Cuthbert Southey categorically denies Foster's statement and complains of Cottle's unnecessary obfuscation of the issue: "A letter addressed by Mr. Foster to Mr. Cottle, and published by him in his *Reminiscences of Coleridge and Southey* (p.235), rather involves the matter in more difficulty than explains it... But even if it had been so [Cuthbert says that Robert distinctly said that he did not give the manuscript to anyone], how came Winterbotham to appear in court and justify the publication upon oath if the circumstances were as Mr. Foster relates?" (*L C*, IV, 255.)

Moreover, Winterbotham contended in his affidavit that it was Daniel Isaac Eaton who had actually published the work, and that Eaton and Southey had embraced in prison as a sign of warm fraternal love.[18] This was accompanied by the affidavit of Sherwood, Neely, and Jones attesting to their being the successors of Symonds deceased, "and proving a letter, as charged by the bill to be one of the handwriting of the Defendant Sherwood, which letter was addressed by him to Ridgway, and read as follows:

> Dear Sir, in reply to your note yesterday, I cannot satisfy you how "*Wat Tyler*" found its way before the public. It is not our property. We sell it for another person, but this much I can assure you, that it was not found among Mr. Symond's papers, nor do I believe that he ever had it in his possession, except on the occasion mentioned by Mr. Ridgway.[19]

In their answer to Southey's complaint, Sherwood, Neely and Jones stated that they could not say whether or not Southey wrote the poem in 1794 or at some other time, whether or not he was under 21 when he wrote the poem, whether or not he gave the poem to Ridgway for his perusal and or consideration in 1794 or any other time, whether or not Southey came to London to confer with Ridgway, was under 21 at the time of the conference, and returned to the country after the conference, and whether or not Ridgway and Symonds declined to publish it. They deny Ridgway or Symonds ever authorized them to print or publish it, and claim the copyright was given up by Southey to William Winterbotham as a gift after the poet was 21. Furthermore, they claim the poem's nature prohibited copyright. They admit to selling it for another whose identity they decline to disclose. They admit Symonds died on April 1, 1816. They deny printing the poem, but admit publishing and selling an authentic edition of the poem. They refuse to disclose their profits, deny Southey's claim to copyright, title, profits and injunction, and ask expenses.[20]

Southey, of course, had subpoenaed Sherwood, Neely and Jones and "all others as yet unidentified" to appear in court and answer his charge. He states that Ridgway did not authorize Sherwood, Neely and Jones to print and publish the poem so that they did so to benefit someone else. Charging that Ridgway and Symonds abandoned all intentions of printing, Southey accuses Sherwood, Neely and Jones of bringing out a "pretended copy." He calls for an accounting and surrendering of the profits, the identity of the unknown person for whom they sell the poem, the restoration of the copyright, and injunction against further printing, publishing and selling, and damages.[21]

The trial ran for two days (March 18, 19, 1817) and the injunction was refused by Lord Eldon on the grounds that a "person cannot recover in damages for a work which is in its nature, calculated to do injury to the

public."[22] Since Southey had not established - and on this argument could not establish - his right to the property in *Wat Tyler*, the injunction was refused. Southey now saw he was dealing with perjurers and gave up litigation, determined to transfer his defense to the press where he knew he was on firmer ground.

But what of Winterbotham? He emerges at last from the shadows of Southey's Jacobin days. Previously an obscure and shadowy figure, he can now be seen as a liberal clergyman of reform, with history-writing propensities, who seized the opportunity to purloin a manuscript replete with sentiments he closely cherished from an unknown youth of unproven but recognized talents to use in his own radical pursuits when the proper time appeared. That he would use it to discredit its author with whom he was then in sympathy was an irony he little dreamed of in 1794. That the vicissitudes of England in the 1790s would bring Southey face to face in 1817 with his own political creation, now a demi-Frankenstein, is an irony the future poet laureate never envisioned.

NOTES

1 *A Letter to William Smith, Esq., M.P. from Robert Southey, Esq.* in *The Life and Correspondence of the Late Robert Southey*, ed., Rev. Cuthbert C Southey (Longman, 1850), hereafter abbreviated *L C*. See *L C*, IV, 375-376.

2 "Southey v Sherwood," 2 *Merivale*, 435: Henry Merivale, *English Reports* (London, 1817), Vol.2, p.435.

3 Kenneth Curry, ed., *New Letters of Robert Southey* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1965), I,91. He means Joseph Gerrald and James Ridgway.

4 *L C*, IV, 255.

5 Curry, II, 153-154.

6 2 *Merivale*, 435. Southey's original MS version of 1794 (MS Eng. poet e. 10) together with Southey's 1837-1838 final edition of his complete works (MS Don. d.4) are in the Bodleian Library. He had given Ridgway a copy and had retained the "original scrawl" (*L C*, IV,239) which he donated together with his other MSS to the Bodleian after finishing the 1837-1838 final edition of his complete works.

7 Geoffrey Carnall, *Robert Southey and His Age* (Oxford, 1960), p.162.

8 BL Add: Ms. 28, 603.

9 Public Record Office C13/1692/4. Although Hoadley (See Frank Taliaferro Hoadley's "The Controversy over Southey's *Wat Tyler*" in *Studies in Philology*, XXXVII [1941], 81-96) consulted *Merivale* in the preparation of his article, he did not consult the affidavits as I have. He used the court summary merely to piece the history of the fate of the manuscript together. I have examined all the affidavits on file in the Public Records Office and have incorporated much new information into the history of the manuscript, noted where necessary. Ridgway swore that the poem had been published without his desire, authority, will, privity or consent and that he had no claim to copyright. See P.R.O. C31/372 Part 2.

10 See William Winterbotham, *The Trials of William Winterbotham*, dated Newgate, January 23, 1794. Printed for Winterbotham, London, 1794. Sold by J Ridgway; H D Symonds; D I Eaton; B Crosby; D Holt; B Phillips;

J Campbells; W Page and Brice, Exeter.

11 Vol.IV of the London 1795 edition has an engraving of Winterbotham painted by Taylor, engraved by W Grainger, which I have examined. The *Sketch* contains two portraits also.

12 See *Trials of Wm. Winterbotham*, London, 1794, 8vo.; also *London Monthly Review*, 1794, i, 466.

13 I am indebted to Mr W Best Harris, FLA, City Librarian, City of Plymouth, for this last fact in a letter to me, September 11, 1969.

14 *The Making of the English Working Class* (London, 1965), pp 113-114. George Dyer (*A Dissertation on the Theory and Practise of Benevolence*, London 1795, p.87) believed "there is a pretty general opinion concerning the injustice, even according to the forms of law, of Winterbotham's sentence."

15 Public Record Office C31/372 H. PT2.

16 In a footnote to a letter from Samuel Taylor Coleridge to T G Street, dated March 22, 1817, Ernest Hartley Coleridge asserts that *Wat Tyler* was published by Daniel Isaac Eaton at the insistence of Winterbotham. However, Coleridge is basing his assertion on hearsay as Southey categorically denied this. (See *Letters from the Lake Poets to Daniel Stuart*, ed. E H Coleridge [Printed for Private Circulation: London, West & Newman Co. 1889], p.268.)

17 *Reminiscences* (New York, 1847), p.177. This is Rev. John Foster (1770-1834) a Baptist minister (preached at Bristol) and prolific writer. His friend Cottle published several of Foster's letters mentioning Coleridge and Southey in his *Reminiscences*. This statement on Foster's part is hearsay evidence and is nowhere validated. For details of Foster's life see *Life and Correspondence*, ed. J E Ryland, London, 1846, 2 vols.

I queried Mr Bertram R Davis with reference to this statement of Foster's. "As regards Foster's 'secret history of that affair,' I think it is pure phantasy, totally at variance with the truth which shines clear in Southey's own testimony. I suspect that Winterbotham's amanuenses are relations of the mythical Mrs Harris of immortal memory or, if ever clothed in flesh and blood, as eternally elusive as the Messenger from Porlock. As well hope to find their 'copy' as to learn what song the Sirens sang or the names of those who fell at Thermopylae!" (Letter to me, November 4, 1969.) All efforts to establish the existence of this manuscript and/or its location have proven fruitless.

18 In a letter to the Editor of *The Courier* March 17, 1817, Southey states unequivocally that he was never within the walls of Newgate Prison but that one time, "*that he never saw Daniel Eaton in his life*," and the story of the embrace is an "impudent falsehood." He says he never knew or cared in what way Winterbotham was connected with Eaton, Barrow and Lloyd. (See *L C*, IV, 255.) In his letter to Gen. William Peachey April 9, 1817, he characterized Winterbotham's affidavit as not containing a single word of truth, and that he saw Winterbotham only once in his life and that was in Ridgway's apartment in Newgate. When the claim of possession was challenged by a counterclaim, Southey did not care to incur additional expense in establishing a claim that was opposed by direct perjury. "Moreover, my object was that of avowing the work, and disclaiming its opinions and this I had done." See Curry, II, 153-154.

In a letter to Wynn, March 22, 1817, he says he never dreamt of Winterbotham as a publisher, further that he was connected with Symonds as he was in his book about America. (Southey's library held a copy of this history.) Furthermore, he says that if he had ever met Daniel Isaac Eaton it was not possible that he should forget so "notorious a person." *Selections from Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. John Wood Warter (London, 1856), III.66.

19 2 *Merivale*, 435.

20 P.R.O. C13/1692/4. See Public Record Office C31/372 Part 2, an affidavit by one Thomas Bousfield vouching for the fact that the handwriting of the letter to Ridgway from William Sherwood is that of Sherwood.

21 P.R.O. C13/1692/4. P.R.O. C31/372 Part 2 (Southey's affidavit) repeats the facts of his complaint.

22 2 *Merivale*, 439. The Southey vs Sherwood case achieved a great deal of notoriety. It is cited throughout the century and into the early part of this one in copyright texts as a precedent.

Dr Manogue is Professor of English at Middlesex College, Edison, New Jersey

'AMICUS REDIVIVUS' REPERTUS: A new discovery about George Dyer

D E Wickham

It is well known that Charles Lamb's kindly and eccentric friend George Dyer (1755-1841) was educated at Christ's Hospital and Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his BA degree in 1778. It is apparently not known at all that his university career was supported by an exhibition from a Clothworkers' Company trust fund.

The Clothworkers' Company, one of the 'Great Twelve' Livery Companies of the City of London, made their first educational award in 1551 - of the then very worthwhile sum of £5. Over the centuries numerous gifts of money intended to provide similar awards have been entrusted to the Company, among them a bequest made early in 1599 by a Clothworker called William Hewitt or Hewett. The terms of Hewitt's will required the Company to make four payments a year, one of them to 'some poor honest scholler of the universitie of Cambridge' who would promise to study and profess divinity thereafter in the said university.

There seems little doubt that Dyer, said by the Dictionary of National Biography to be the son of a watchman at Wapping who is recorded in Venn's 'Alumni Cantabrigienses' as John Dyer, 'Citizen and Shipwright', was poor. His being a Christ's Hospital Grecian shows that he was a scholar. All the authorities avoid discussing Dyer's degree and the Emmanuel College Archivist suggests that, although the College records are unhelpful, he was bound to have studied classics, perhaps Hebrew, perhaps theology, perhaps some mathematics - but that all of this is mere surmise. Dyer's becoming a Unitarian at some date (soon?) after 1779 rather goes against any promise to study and profess divinity, i.e. theology, but the Company would not necessarily insist that a beneficiary fulfilled all the conditions for an award if there were no ideal candidate available.

Dyer went up to Cambridge in 1774. The Court Orders of the Clothworkers'

Company for 23 August 1776 (pp.800-1) record that 'This day...George Dyer, a poor Scholar of Emanuel [sic] Coll, Cambr[idge] was chosen to receive Mr Hewitt's Exhib[ition] for the same time [i.e. six years] provided [he] do continue...so long at College and without any preferment; and on the contrary [his] said Exhib[ition] to cease & determine'.

The Exhibition was worth £10 a year, a substantial addition to a poor scholar's funds since, by the Court of 4 October 1780 (p.62), 'It is ordered that in future no Scholar shall be eligible to be chosen to receive an Exhibition from this Company who at the Time of their disposing thereof shall enjoy an Exhibition or Exhibitions to the amount of £30 a year from any other Society person or persons what or whomsoever'.

By the 1770s the Hewitt exhibition was paid out of the income from the Company's property in Bartholomew Lane beside the Bank of England and Stephen Popham, Dyer's predecessor in the award, had been paid at Midsummer. For reasons which are not entirely clear but which probably involved linking the two names and confirming that payments were made half-yearly, the Bartholomew Lane Estate section of the General Account ledger for 1775-6 (p.38) includes an entry which would have rejoiced Charles Lamb's book-keeping heart:

'July 9 By Cash p^{d} to Geo: Dyer of Eman^{l} Coll Cambr (Succ^{r} to s^{d} popham) for ¼ years Exhibition, due at Michs 1776... -- -- --'

Thereafter the exhibition was paid twice a year at £5 a time, on 28 December 1776 and 15 July 1777, on 2 January and 27 June 1778, and on 5 January and 8 September 1779. It is probable that the Company's Archives contain all the appropriate receipts in the bundles of Wardens' Vouchers. To take one example, we have the signature of Dr Richard Farmer, master of the College (see the DNB), certifying that George Dyer 'behaves himself soberly & regularly & resides statedly in College', a certificate of residence which, in a similarly formal mode, was, until about a year ago, still required by the Company from each scholar before an award cheque could be dispatched. To this is attached a scrap of paper bearing, on one side, 'I have only room to subscribe myself your dutiful son, G. Dyer. Eman. Coll. Cambr.' and, crammed on the other, a signed request 'to pay my father ye Bearer ye money due to me from y^{r} Company', a written receipt for £5 dated 28 December 1776, and the signature of John Dyer. The final year's account shows that Dyer was paid 1¼ years' award up to Michaelmas 1780, on 3 January, 3 April and 2 October in that year, a total of £12.10.0. This was his last payment and a new name appears in the next account.

There had been minor difficulties during 1780. The Company's Court Books show numerous references over the centuries to rumours that Clothworker exhibitioners had left their universities, though probably the majority of these proved to be untrue. No sources are given for the rumours and one can only conjecture that would-be exhibitioners were trying to force the pace. Thus, on 1 March 1780 (p.45), 'The Court were informed that Geo: Dyer who receives an Exhibition from the Company has quitted Coll. but it not being known whether he has entirely quitted, or still continues to keep his Terms; an Offer was made by Mr Burfoot [a Member of the Court] to make Inquiry concerning the same, which was accepted of by the Court'.

All was well. On 5 April 1780 (p.48) 'Thos Burfoot Esq. acquainted the Court that upon Inquiry he finds Mr Geo: Dyer still continues to keep his Terms at College Whereupon it is Ordered that he may continue to receive his Exhibition'.

On 6 September 1780 (p.59) 'A Letter from Mr Geo: Dyer was read to the Court, returning Thanks for the Exhibition he has enjoyed from this Company and resigning the same Whereupon It is Ordered that another poor Scholar of the University of Cambr[idge] be chosen at the next Court to receive the said Exhibition in his Room'. Dyer had received preferment (Lucas' *Life of Charles Lamb*, chapter XIV) and was an usher at Dr Grimwood's respectable academy at Dedham in Essex for a salary which, from his emphatic letter concerning the afterwards-suppressed paragraph in the first version of Elia's essay 'Oxford in the Vacation', we know was *not* £5 a year. The request for payment of the final quarter's instalment of his exhibition, of £2.10.0, to the bearer Mr John Barnes, is in the Company's Archives. It is dated from Dedham, 28th August [1780], though Barnes' receipt is dated as late as 2 October 1780. On that day George Dyer's connection with The Clothworkers' Company came to an end.

NOTE George Dyer had a weakness for footnotes. This footnote acknowledges that weakness and also records that the late 18th and early 19th century exhibitions offered by The Clothworkers' Company did excellent service on the fringes of literature. From 1771 to 1776 the Company paid a Heath award to Vicesimus Knox, presumably his parents' twentieth child and later compiler of the 'Elegant Extracts' (1789); from 1806 to 1812 a Heath exhibition went to Thomas Barnes, the son and grandson of Clothworkers, but later celebrated as editor of *The Times* (1817-41); and George Dyer's Hewitt exhibition of 1776-80 was held by one William Radcliffe from 1780 to 1786 and from 1786 to 1792 by Henry William Makepeace Thackeray of St John's College, Cambridge. This was the eldest brother of George Thackeray, the future Provost of King's College who collected rare books, and it has not been possible to prove any relationship with William Makepeace Thackeray the author.

D E Wickham, MA is Archivist of The Clothworkers' Company

BOOK REVIEW

Robert Ready: *Hazlitt at Table*. E Brunswick, NJ: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1981. pp.126

After finishing this slim volume, I turned back to Hazlitt's essay in *Table-Talk*, "On Criticism," and found there a passage strikingly relevant to Ready's book:

> A critic does nothing now-a-days who does not try to torture the most obvious expression into a thousand meanings, and enter into a circuitous explanation of all that can be urged for or against its being in the best or worst style possible.

Hazlitt, of course, was not guiltless of the very sins he condemns here, and it would hardly be just to Ready's effort to leave this analysis at such a point. In fact Ready has many good ideas on a topic well worth exploring, but his venture is perhaps too narrow in scope and too encumbered with avant-garde critical lingo.

Essentially, Ready's aim is "to look at each essay in *Table-Talk* and consider the totality which is the volume itself." The method has been applied successfully to poetry and short fiction, but rarely to essay collections and never to Hazlitt's *Table-Talk*, which was published in two volumes (1821-22 and 1824), the one collection fashioned by Hazlitt that

brings together some of his most well-known and finely tuned familiar essays. Ready argues that the *Table-Talk* pieces fall into four groups that interlock and reflect one another, and that the book has a sort of tenuous cohesion which is simultaneously self-frustrating and self-fulfilling. At the end of the volume Ready reprints Lamb's unpublished review of the first volume of *Table-Talk*, justly letting Lamb have the last critical word.

Though Ready spends a whole chapter on "On Familiar Style," his prose often lapses into trendy opacity. Consider, for example, his definition of the four patterns that emerge from *Table-Talk*:

> These groups or patterns may be identified as follows: essays on the devaluation of writing by other activities of mind and body; essays on the corporate or personal exclusiveness that restrict artistic and social imagination; essays on bipolar oppositions that purposefully invert their initial terms; and essays or subjects of a more lyrical or centrally "familiar" concern to Hazlitt's own emotional life. (p.23)

Of these four categories, only the last struggles out of torpidity with anything resembling clarity. With this passage, we turn to Hazlitt again: he urges us to choose "the best word in common use" and to "avail ourselves of the true idiom of the language."

If at times Ready obfuscates, at other times he is crystal-clear, making deftly a complicated point. "Hazlitt did not write in straight lines," Ready declares.

> He is a bad model for freshmen... Hazlitt's insistence on the aggregate nature of individuality produces in the essays the positive ability not to restrict the personality of the essayist himself but rather to let the speaker's complex being - his perceptions, feelings, confessions, principles - have enough space to reveal their interactions and their dissimilarities. (p.20)

This last sentence may be difficult to negotiate, but it does resonate with the motifs of Hazlitt's thoughts and connects those tenets to his essayistic craft. At other spots suggestive insights crop up: Ready, for example, links Hazlitt's life-long passion for democracy to his distrust of institutionalized prose (p.44) and to his celebration of common, "familiar" language (p.86). Elsewhere he compares Hazlitt's antithetical method with Hogarth's caricatures (p.60); later he correlates the metaphor of journeying - common to Hazlitt and Romantic art generally - with the process of the sympathetic imagination (p.75).

But some observations are lost in obscure verbiage, others in up-beat jargon, others in a display of "his acquaintance with all the topics and resources of criticism" ("On Criticism"). Many of the gods of modern criticism are here: Freud, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Northrop Frye, Edward Said, Harold Bloom. At some points excursions into the pronouncements of these sages are relevant; at others, they only lead us astray. Though literary students of 1981 may know what is meant when Hazlitt "decomposes" (p.26) and "unpacks" (p.41), Hazlitt himself would probably have been offended by the first and befuddled by the second.

There are a number of points Ready could develop, others he could explore for the first time. For example, did Hazlitt select and arrange the *Table-Talk* essays himself, or did the publishers decide this? What changes did Hazlitt make when the Paris edition was printed, and what do these

indicate of his mind and method? Are there differences between the essays written only for the volume versus those written for the *London* or *New Monthly* magazines? What more can we say about the impact of Hazlitt's life in 1820-23 on the shape and texture of these superb essays? What about the whole essay tradition, of which Hazlitt was acutely aware and of which he wrote? Finally, it seems to me, Ready has failed to fully scrutinize the most important context for Hazlitt's collection of essays: the tradition of table-talk, the rich heritage of allusive, fragmentary and brilliant conversation that reached its zenith, perhaps, with the Regency talkers: Coleridge, Hazlitt, Lamb, De Quincey. Hazlitt was fascinated with conversation, as the titles of his three essay collections (*The Round Table, Table-Talk, The Plain Speaker*) and the insistent recurrence of talking as a theme in the essays suggest. Prose pictures of the great talkers of the period abound - making one long for just half-an-hour with Coleridge in full throat, or Hazlitt passionate about Napoleon - and Hazlitt himself has left us a priceless depiction of Lamb talking, who "stammered out such fine, piquant, deep, eloquent things in half a dozen half-sentences as he does," and whose "jests scald like tears..."

If Lamb was capable, as Hazlitt claims, of cutting into the haunch of letters, his review of the first volume of his friend Hazlitt's *Table-Talk* is a fine display of his surgery. Lamb's review closes Ready's volume, and in fact accounts for nearly twenty pages of the whole. Lamb was evidently asked by Leigh Hunt to review Hazlitt's work for the *Examiner* in 1821, but as relations between Hunt and Hazlitt improved after the latter's depiction of Shelley and Hunt outraged the *Examiner*'s editor, Hunt evidently decided to scrap the review. The reasons are not far to seek. The review (in private hands until acquired by the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library) resentfully attacks Hazlitt's unsympathetic delineation of friends (including, of course, Lamb himself): "We suspect that Mr. Hazlitt does not always play quite fairly with his associates..." He presents "certain poor whole-length figures dangling with all the *best & worst* of humanity about them displayed with cool and unsparing impartiality ..." (p.104). Lamb protests such "friendly" garrotting even more strongly in cancelled passages; he obviously prefers *amicus redivivus* to *amicus invidious*.

But Lamb has many acute and sympathetic things to say which reveal as much or more about Elia than the Table-Talker. He applauds Hazlitt's strong *eidolon*: "He talks to you in broad daylight... He attracts, or repels, by strong realities of individual observation, humour, and feeling." He correctly points out how much the essays *do* resemble "the talk of a very clever person" "animated in a convivial party." He singles out favorite Elian themes for praise: the past and future, idiosyncratic personages, will-making, reclusiveness. It is an important document, not only for its wealth of biographical innuendo, but for its aesthetic commentary as well, because Lamb places Hazlitt squarely in the English essay tradition. Ready is not the first to publish it: Roy Park, in his *Lamb as Critic* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), came out with Lamb's text only, the lengthy quotations from Hazlitt's excised. Ready did not know of this until his book went to press.

In the end, one must admit that Lamb has said as much in his review as Ready in the pages preceding. Ready throws out a number of excellent ideas in the course of his exposition, and his whole task is one that needs to be undertaken. The form of Hazlitt's essays generally, and especially the whole

As always, we were happy to have with us both girls and boys from Christ's Hospital and Grace Before and After Meat was spoken by Robert Giles and Andrew Neal, Grecians of Christ's Hospital, Horsham.

We were particularly glad to have Miss Tucker with us this year, before the imminent amalgamation of the Girls' and Boys' Schools and the move from Hertford, where some buildings remain which Coleridge would have known. So let us repeat the enjoyment of hearing her with the added pleasure of being able to mull over her words in print.

MISS ELIZABETH TUCKER

It is a strange chance that I am here to-day as guest of honour at your annual luncheon, qualified to be so by one thing only, namely that I happen to be the Head Mistress of the Girls' School of Lamb's own Alma Mater Christ's Hospital. I am indeed honoured that you should think this a worthy reason to invite me to propose your dear Charles' toast, and I thank you warmly for asking me so to do.

Your Secretary, herself an old girl of the Girls Christ's Hospital, suggested I might speak of school days friendships, and that suggests primarily a reference to that great name of English letters, Samuel Taylor Coleridge. But I should also like to see whether Charles Lamb would recognise in our school to-day anything familiar to his own day, and secondly look at Charles through my own spectacles and share with you the harmonies struck by my reading of his essays.

In admiration Lamb talks of Coleridge, not only, and rightly so, for his brilliance but also I feel because Lamb never reached the highest rung of the Hospital's scholastic ladder, because of his stammer remaining a Deputy Grecian and not himself becoming like Coleridge a Grecian, being prepared for University. To this day there is a hierarchy of classes in Christ's Hospital: no classless society ours. The other great school difference between Coleridge and Lamb was that of their masters: Lamb enjoyed the genial, happy-go-lucky atmosphere created by the Rev. Matthew Field where he tells us "we lived a life as careless as birds," under a master as loth to use the rod as Boyer, Coleridge's master, was loth to refrain from using it. Does this account for the easy atmosphere of Lamb's mind when compared with the haunted, brooding qualities of Coleridge's? Which schoolmaster would we approve to-day? In 'Witches and other Night Fears' Lamb appears to castigate himself for the wholesome nature of his dreams when he says "the poverty of my dreams mortifies me," and to envy Coleridge "his icy domes and pleasure houses and caverns 'where Alph the sacred river runs' to solace his night solitudes." We would not be without one or the other of these two sons of our House and literature, but I know whose mind I would prefer to have lived with, and I sense that the fear of Boyer's anger must have had some effect on that keen youthful imagination at a critical time.

What a charge we school teachers have! How restless our desire for learning and for imparting that learning: and to us our Lamb has salutary words to say: "The modern schoolmaster is expected to know a little of everything... He must be *superficially*, if I may say so, omniscient...he is so used to be teaching that he wants to be teaching *you*." In this last he reminds me of that witticism dreaded by all my professional colleagues "You can always tell a teacher but you can't tell him much."

But Lamb, it appears, was fortunate in his own Rev. Matthew who allowed him

to stretch his mind or not in the easy way permitted in those days when schooldays were not bounded by the dreaded public examinations, but were days of exploration in ancient and modern literature. Lamb certainly learnt to observe life and to comment on it, to observe his fellows and to bring them alive for us across the years.

He imbibed also from Christ's Hospital the lesson that Boyer thundered at his class up at his end of the Grammar School that the School was now his family: he remained close friends with Coleridge and his circle throughout his life, and like his fellows to-day formed fresh friendships, as with Leigh Hunt, from amongst those nurtured at Christ's Hospital after his own school days were over. Indeed these friends were a substitute for the family he longed for but denied himself when he dedicated his life to his sister, Mary. And it was through the eyes of his school friends, with their circumstances less fortunate than his own, that he viewed his schooldays in that brilliant essay 'Christ's Hospital thirty-five years ago,' apologising then to his friends for the privileges, of delicacies and holidays and protection,that perforce he had not been able to share with them. Holidays, punishments, food and schoolmasters form the staple of Elia's essay, as of letters home still; in the 'Recollections' we have the serious side of his comments on Christ's Hospital, namely that the Christ's Hospital boy is no charity boy: to-day how proud we remain of our practice of aid to parents, how annoyed the children of the House are to be thought different from their contemporaries, how quick are they to correct the impression expressed by those they meet that Christ's Hospital is in any way other than its independent spirit comparable to the great fee-paying public schools.

The Christ's Hospital boy or girl is still also a religious personage: prefacing and ending every meal with the 'Grace Before or After Meat,' attending Chapel, and performing first-class music there: our carols at Christmas would, I hope, still transport Charles Lamb to the fields outside Bethlehem. Religious we are too in another sense, that of duty to each other - the school is indeed a family, where older cares for younger and younger for older in a series of tasks performed in due order by each year group as they go up the school. In return for tables laid, knives carried, water poured by their juniors, the seniors are the ones who wait on their juniors at table, long ones as in the Ackerman's print, in our dining hall at Hertford still. There is a routine of school duties, and woe betide even the Head Mistress on the first occasion when she makes a new girl choose between the importance of washing up or of seeing herself: she can wait, to neglect the washing up would incur the wrath of a senior, much more to be feared than herself.

Is it small wonder then that the epithet that Lamb rejected when used by his friends was applied to him and illustrated in his own gentle-hearted care of his dear sister, with whom in our imaginations still he is indeed playing at her beloved piquet? The school created then as it tries to do now a kindness that displayed itself in the life afterwards led by its alumni.

Yes, kindness is the hallmark of Lamb: and it shines through his writing as well as his life: it is as well he did not himself proceed to the schoolmaster's desk, he would perhaps not have written for *us*, as well that the dream children he yearned for had to wait still on Lethe's side, as well that he found his friends' children did not absorb his creative powers, as well that his art form of essay was short enough to allow its completion

in the life of a fully employed man in brief intervals of his care for Mary: nor would we swap any of his essays for that novel, however good it might have been. Novels introduce us to an imagined world, Lamb's world is wholly real. And in his world nothing is more real than his kindness: there is the kindness of his gift of the freshly baked cake to the beggar, and his remorse at his act, which could have been construed as unkindness to the aunt who'd baked it (how generous was this gift to the beggar can be gauged by the description of Lamb's being unable to resist the luxuries eaten even before the eyes of his schoolfellows!). Then there is the kindness to the chimneysweeps in the parties held for them and on ordinary days in the gift of a mug of sassafras and bread to accompany it; the kindness of the unknown sender of the beautiful Valentine to the damsel who lived opposite; the kindness of the postscript to the Old Benchers where Elia chastises himself for his lack of knowledge of the Bencher Salt and bids the New Benchers cherish the injured Salt kindly, as he says, "for he is himself the kindliest of human creatures."

Kindliest of all but one, himself, and it is with this thought I should like to leave you as I bid you rise and drink to his immortal memory to-day.

NEWS FROM MEMBERS

COLEBROOK COTTAGE : from Mrs Cheyne

Colebrook Cottage, the Islington home of Charles and Mary Lamb in the 1820s, is illustrated in two books just published in London.

The Blue Plaque Guide to London, a carefully researched work on more than 600 London homes of the famous, includes Lamb's house among its sixty-odd drawings by the author. Actually of course the house bears a brown plaque; placed there apparently in 1907 at a time when the London County Council were honouring their chosen houses with plaques made by Minton of chocolate brown terracotta. Its wording:

LCC
Charles Lamb
"Elia"
1775-1834
Essayist
Lived Here

The Blue Plaque Guide to London by Caroline Dakers. Macmillan £7.95.

The second book is *A Portrait of Islington*, actually a collection of charming sketches of Islington's most appealing spots seen in terms of architectural or human merit. The drawing of Colebrook Cottage is one of several fairly new 'portraits' that show it in its present-day form, no longer detached as Lamb himself described it and with two, not three, windows to the upper "lightsome drawing room".

A Portrait of Islington, by Ann Usborne. Published by Damien Tunnicliffe. £3.95.

ALFOXTON PARK (see *Bulletin* No.34 - April 1981)

Under the headline "Wordsworth's woods become a deer sanctuary" Bulletin No.5 of the League against Cruel Sports reported that the League has purchased (for £50,000) Alfoxton Park. The bulletin comments:

The woods - an area of outstanding natural beauty - contain rare and endangered plant species which the League hopes to protect along with the hunted animal. They also have a national historical value; they provided the inspiration to Wordsworth who wrote many of his best-known poems whilst he lived there.

This good news is especially welcome as we look forward to Mr S A J Tottman's "teach-in" on Coleridge's poem "This lime-tree bower my prison" in March.

BRECON HOUSE, ENFIELD (see *Bulletin* No.37)

We learn that the Appeal against the refusal of planning permission to develop Brecon House, Gentleman's Row, Enfield has been rejected and congratulate the local Residents' Association on the success of their campaign.

ALLIANCE OF LITERARY SOCIETIES

Thanks to the initiative of the George Eliot Fellowship, this Alliance now has 28 member societies, including the CLS and embracing such diverse organisations as The Francis Bacon Society, the Richard Jeffries Society, the Friends of Shandy Hall and the Parson Woodforde Society. Mrs Adams of the George Eliot Fellowship writes: "If a voice of protest is needed now, it can be a strong and powerful one! If your society needs help at any time to preserve some part of our national literary heritage, please contact the secretary of each society - they are all willing to come to your aid".

CLS LIBRARY

The Deputy Librarian of the Guildhall Library writes:

> ...with some reorganisation of our shelf space at Guildhall Library we have moved the Charles Lamb Collection to its own shelving in a more secure situation. Unfortunately it is not immediately accessible to readers and we must in future ask for some notice before we can deal with enquiries. Would you please make this clear to your members so that there is no embarrassment and delay when they do come to the Library.
>
> If we could be informed a day or two in advance we can arrange for any book to be immediately available when the reader calls."

SUMMER VISIT

By kind invitation of our Chairman, Dr D.G.Wilson, and Mrs Wilson, our summer visit for 1982 will be to their home: 19 Chiltern Avenue, Bushey, Herts, on *Saturday 19th June* for a buffet luncheon from 12.30 pm. Please let Dr Wilson (01-950 1316) or Mrs Huxstep (01-940 3837) know if you are coming and also if you require transport from Stanmore (Jubilee Line).

We are sure members will understand if we ask them to respect a non-smoking household and not to smoke inside the house.

Older members will remember many happy visits to the home of Mr and Mrs Walter Farrow during Mr Farrow's Chairmanship of the CLS - this promises to be an equally enjoyable occasion.

AUTUMN VISIT FOR BIBLIOPHILES: "Lilies", Weedon, Aylesbury, Bucks.

This fifty-roomed mansion, set in beautiful grounds, houses an amazing collection of books, paintings, posters and curiosities; it is the country

branch of Peter Eaton, antiquarian booksellers, of Holland Park. We are contemplating a visit to "Lilies", suggested dates being 11th September or 25th September 1982.

As the house is fairly off the beaten track, we should need some car-owners willing to offer lifts. If you would be interested in such a visit, please contact Madeline Huxstep (01-940 3837) no later than 8th May.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The Annual General Meeting of the Charles Lamb Society will take place on Saturday, 8 May 1982, at the Mary Ward Centre, 9 Tavistock Place, London WC1, beginning at 2.45. Nominations are invited for the vacancies on the Council arising from those members retiring in accordance with the Society's rules. Nominations should be sent to the Hon. Secretary as soon as possible, after ensuring that the nominees are prepared to stand.

BOOK MARKET

From: D E Wickham, 116 Parsonage Manorway, Belvedere, Kent.

Reginald L Hine's *Charles Lamb and his Hertfordshire*, 1949

A very fine copy of a very readable book which goes far beyond Hertfordshire. Spine slightly faded and label scratched. To be sold because I have found an even better copy with a dustwrapper. £7.00 + postage

NEW MEMBERS

Mr C O S Douglas, 212 Risley Avenue, London N17 7EN
Mr J Haefner, Lillian Penson Hall, Room 338, Talbot Square, London W2 1TT
Ms C Huff, Lillian Penson Hall, Talbot Square, London W2 1TT
Mr W F McKenna, University of Newcastle, New South Wales 2308, Australia
Mr E W Nye, Flat 56, Churchill College, Cambridge CB3 ODS
Mr J E Riehl, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Dept of English, PO Drawer 44691, Lafayette, Louisiana 70504, USA
Miss C M G Sandison, University Library, Sheffield S10 2TN
Mr and Mrs R Wilson, 11 Church Crescent, London N3