

## Hazlitt's Journal of 1823: Some Notes and Emendations

By STANLEY JONES

WILLIAM HAZLITT'S journal, covering thirteen days in March 1823, was first published, with omissions, by W. C. Hazlitt in his *Lamb and Hazlitt* (1900), and in a second, fuller, and more faithful version by W. H. Bonner in 1959 in *The journals of Sarah and William Hazlitt, 1822-1831*, after the manuscript—eleven loose sheets—had come into the possession of the State University of New York at Buffalo.<sup>1</sup> This manuscript was described by W. C. Hazlitt in 1900 as 'very carelessly written, and in some places almost illegible', and he further remarked, of his text: 'The asterisks denote unreadable words or passages, the character of the writing resembling shorthand and only my familiarity with it has enabled me to decipher as much as I have done.'<sup>2</sup> The manuscript was certainly written very fast; there are many slips, erasures, corrections, and a large number of interlineations. The writing becomes increasingly cramped as more matter is huddled into the lines (the last page holds nearly twice as many words as the first) and as the narrow gaps between the lines are in turn filled up with qualifications and additions.<sup>3</sup> Nor was W. C. Hazlitt himself as careful an editor as he might have been: he does not, as he implies, exclusively use asterisks for unreadable words and passages, but dots as well, and without distinction; he sometimes indicates a gap where none exists; he often silently omits perfectly legible sentences; but he did have the advantage of familiarity with Hazlitt's handwriting. Thus it often happens that where W. H. Bonner's later readings differ from his, his are in fact right. On the other hand W. H. Bonner has just as often brilliantly succeeded in deciphering words that defeated his predecessor, as well as restoring relatively legible passages that he omitted either from negligence or family piety or squeamishness. In general the later version is superior: it is certainly more complete. The cruces in this article are quoted from W. H. Bonner's text, and any necessary reference to W. C. Hazlitt's mainly superseded text is made in the notes.<sup>4</sup> The emendations proposed are based on a study of xerox copies of the

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Bonner, *The journals of Sarah and William Hazlitt, 1822-1831*, University of Buffalo Studies, vol. 24, number 3, February 1959.

<sup>2</sup> *Lamb and Hazlitt*, pp. 108 and 110.

<sup>3</sup> Hazlitt had been arrested for debt a few weeks earlier: is it possible he even lacked writing-paper?

<sup>4</sup> The somewhat cavalier signs W.C.H. and W.H.B. are used for brevity to denote the two versions. I also use the short form *Le Gallienne* to stand for the privately printed edition of Hazlitt's *Liber amoris*, with an introduction by Richard Le Gallienne, which was brought out in London in 1894.

original sheets.<sup>1</sup> Where explanation would take up more room than quotation I have preferred to convey it by implication in quoting more than might appear strictly necessary to the exposition of the problem. In addition, some preliminary account of the journal will save space later on. It concerns Hazlitt's love-affair with his landlady's daughter, and although the story is well known, it will be useful to recall the details that enter into this journal.

Sarah Walker was the daughter of a tailor whose wife kept a lodging-house at 9 Southampton Buildings, a stone's throw from Lincoln's Inn, and near Hazlitt's favourite coffee-house, the Southampton Arms. The household also included a brother, 'Caiah, two younger sisters, Leonora Elizabeth (Betsey) and Emma, and of course other lodgers, including a Mr. and Mrs. Follett. Around the corner in Holborn lived an elder sister, Martha, who had married a lawyer, Robert Roscoe, and borne him two daughters, Emma Jane and Henrietta. Hazlitt met Sarah in 1820; in 1822 he persuaded his wife to divorce him, but once he was free Sarah changed her mind. Appealing to her mother and her aunt, he met with hollow reassurances and specious encouragement. Then he discovered that for three months before going to Scotland he had shared her affections, or rather her caresses, with another lodger, a newcomer named Tomkins who subsequently left the house and would not set foot in it again, although he continued to meet Sarah in the street. This was in July 1822 (it is the climax of the story as Hazlitt told it in the *Liber amoris*). The present journal takes up the thread again for a brief moment in the following year. Shocked by the duplicity of a girl he had alternately worshipped as the ideal of innocence and raged against as a monster of wantonness, but whose honesty he had never really doubted, utterly in despair at her rejection of him, Hazlitt was still, six months later, obsessed by the enigma of her behaviour, and it seems (although it is not stated) that the friend he sent to lodge at 9 Southampton Buildings in March, and whose experiences are reported in the journal, was meant to 'try' her, a plan he had more than once hinted at in his letters of the previous year from Scotland. But if this was the understanding on which 'F.' went to stay at the Walkers', then the question he put to Hazlitt on 12th March was super-erogatory: 'he asked what was to be done if she consented to come to bed to him'. But since it was put, it is evident that Hazlitt's motives have been painted blacker, or at least more explicit than they were.<sup>2</sup> Like most people's, like all lovers', they were mixed, if not confused. Certainly it was an 'experiment on character', but it was not as crude, nor as cold, nor as callous as has been thought; it was compounded of a number of desires: he wanted to

<sup>1</sup> I am obliged to Mr. K. C. Gay, Curator of the Poetry Collection at the Lockwood Memorial Library, for very generously making these excellent copies available to me, and to the University Libraries, State University of New York at Buffalo, for permission to print the extracts given in this article.

<sup>2</sup> W. H. Bonner in his introduction to the journal, p. 266, says that F. went 'to attempt a seduction'; Herschel Baker, *William Hazlitt*, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1962, the same. Other biographers, Douady, Howe, Maclean, are non-committal. Charles Morgan, who writes better on the *Liber amoris* than anyone (in his introduction to the London, 1948, edition), unfortunately doesn't mention the journal.

know for certain whether she behaved with other lodgers as she had with Tomkins and with him; he wanted revenge, but he also badly wanted the opposite outcome—that he would be proved wrong and she would have nothing to do with F. And yet, perhaps more than anything else, he wanted to dull the ache of separation. Any news of her would help: 'When shall I burn her out of my thoughts?—Yet I like to hear about her—that she had her bed-gown or her ruff on, that she stood, or sat, or made some insipid remark is to me a visitation from Heaven.' We should also remember that the 'journal' is a fragment, unconcluded and inconclusive. We do not know what passed between F. and Sarah after the night of the 16th, nor how much longer he stayed at the Walkers'.

As to F.'s identity, we shall probably never know. W. C. Hazlitt and W. H. Bonner suggest that he was P. G. Patmore. This can be ruled out: Patmore, recently married, seems to have gone to live at 12 Devonshire Terrace, Brighton, and he was certainly there on 9th March, when F. was discussing literature with Sarah in London.<sup>1</sup> Since Hazlitt apparently changed no initials in the journal, a possibility is Fonblanque, who assisted Hazlitt's friend John Black on the *Morning chronicle* from 1821 to 1824, and who wrote the sympathetic review of *Liber amoris* in the *Examiner* of 11 May 1823, but this is mere conjecture.<sup>2</sup>

The dates given are, with some overflow, those on which the incidents occurred, not those on which they were recorded, but since actor and scribe are separate entities (a rare case) there is an inherent risk of confusion, and the following points need to be noted. The entries for 5th and 6th March (and possibly the 4th also) were evidently made on the night of the 6th. Those for 7th and 8th, on the night of the 8th, as appears from the successive indications of time under March 7th: 'This morning . . .'; 'At night . . .'; '. . . next morning'. The entry for the 9th (which includes breakfast-time on the 10th), during the morning of the 10th: see notes at March 9 (i), below. For the rest of the 10th and for the 11th, on the night of the 11th. For the 12th, in the early evening of that day (Hazlitt did not know until the 14th whether Sarah went to the theatre with F. on the 12th: see note at March 12 (iv), below). For the 14th (including retrospectively the 13th), (a) up to 'Yesterday he says he could make nothing of her', on the night of the 14th; (b) from 'They had a parley in the evening', on the morning of the 15th ('F. swears he'll put it home to her today'). F. must have come that evening to report to Hazlitt on his failure and the entry for that day was made that night. The last entry, relating to March 16th, was probably made on the night of the 16th.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Library of Scotland, MS. 3700, f. 43.

<sup>2</sup> We know little about his relations with Albany Fonblanque. He seems later to have thought of him as someone 'who would take you at a disadvantage if he could' (W. C. Hazlitt, *Memoirs of William Hazlitt*, London 1867, ii, 253).

<sup>3</sup> At some points slurred words are crossed out and rewritten more legibly above the line in a different hand. This is very like the hand of William Hazlitt, Junior, whose signature in that form appears, unaccountably upside down, between the fifth and sixth lines from the bottom of

In the following paragraphs I give, first, the date of the entry in which the erroneous readings occur, as being the most convenient means of identification in the manuscript and in the two separate printed versions. Then, in single quotation marks, the phrase, sentence, or passage from W.H.B.'s text embodying the readings, which are italicized. This may be prefaced with explanatory matter enclosed in square brackets (any square brackets *within* the quotation marks are of course W.H.B.'s). After the quotation comes a dash, and then (introduced by the imperative 'read') the proposed emendations, italicized and in the same order as the impugned readings in the preceding quotation. The proposed emendations may be followed, or simply replaced, by a note beginning on a fresh line and in smaller type. This is not a textual emendation, but an explanatory, justificatory, or supplementary comment.

March 4 ' . . . the last person that occupied it was a Mr. Tomkins [name inked out]'

This is a vital question of identification: the name is not inked out; only the last six letters,—the initial stands. We should observe that the same form in the manuscript is represented in the text not only by the present gloss but also at different times by 'T[inked out]', and even, with an intrusive *p*, by 'T[ompkins] [name inked out]'; and that where the initial alone is given by Hazlitt in the manuscript we find in the text sometimes 'T.', sometimes 'T.[omkins]', and sometimes, again with the intrusive *p*, 'Tompkins'.

March 5 (i) ' . . . meets Miss shawled and bonnetted going out to meet *Tompkins*' :—read *T*—.

(ii) [Mrs. Walker] ' . . . speaks of the quantity of money I got by my writings & [of several presents]<sup>5</sup> I had [given] her daughter' :—read *of several I had given*.

W.H.B. has the note: '<sup>5</sup> Phrase illegible. Present reading supplied by W. C. Hazlitt, *Lamb and Hazlitt*, N.Y., 1899, p. 120.' The phrase is legible, and there is no doubt of the reading: it is W.C.H. who brought confusion by interpolating the unnecessary word *presents* when there is no blot or gap between *several* and *I*. Hazlitt meant, several of his writings, such as *The round table*.

March 7 (i) [Hazlitt thinks he has proof that Sarah is a liar] 'But F. going upstairs again found Betsey in the room & on telling her the bed was not made, she said "her sister told her it was, but not turned down." This *no doubt was* a lie to keep the job to *close up* & be there on his return' :—read *was no doubt*; and *herself*.

Sarah wanted herself to have the job, and not her sister, so that she should have an excuse to go to F.'s room on his return.

p. 7. He may have contemplated publishing the manuscript at some time, but these are more likely to be private, and perhaps even idle, renovations.

(ii) '... on being asked next morning whether she did not *return* sooner than usual, said, "She sometimes went to bed earlier & sometimes later".':—read *retire*.

(iii) '... as the Southampton Arms':—read *at* (evidently a slip on W.H.B.'s part).

March 8 'This is what she calls "being determined to keep every lodger at a proper distance"'

The word *every* is underlined in the manuscript at this point, and also at March 15. What Sarah said on p. 157 of *Le Gallienne* is quoted here.

March 9 (i) [Sarah was seen in the street with Tomkins, who never came to the house] 'Miss was seen in close conference with T.[omkins] at a landing [just?] opposite her own door. I wondered what divine music he poured into her ear, to which my words were harsh discord. What, I thought, would I not give to *hear words* of that honeyed breath that sinks into her heart [. . .].<sup>1</sup> The next moments were enough. I had a specimen of that sort of conversation to which "her ear she *sweetly inclined*." Not T[omkin]'s [name inked out] but *any man's*':—read *T. on Saturday night; hear those words; morning sure enough I had; seriously inclines; and my*.

Hazlitt first wrote 'Miss was seen in close conference with T. opposite her own door', etc. He did not see F. on the 9th, Sunday, but on the Monday morning: this is plain from the inclusion, with Sunday's entry, of an account of Monday breakfast-time. Someone else had told him on the Sunday about Sarah and Tomkins (otherwise he would have said 'F. saw . . . etc.', as he does everywhere else). He 'wondered what divine music . . . etc.' on the Sunday, after hearing this, and the next morning, Monday, sure enough, had from F. a specimen of this kind of conversation, which had passed between F. and Sarah on the Sunday. Having reported at length that conversation of the 9th, and spent his rage at her coquettish behaviour at breakfast-time on the 10th, he read what he had written, realized that there was no indication of when Sara and Tomkins were seen and that it would be taken to have been on the 9th, and added the interlinear 'on Saturday night'. The second, third, and fourth readings were also arrived at by W.C.H.; the middle word of the second may be *three*; the fourth is, of course, a quotation from *Othello*, I. iii. 146, also used by Hazlitt in 'The fight' (1822).

(ii) 'F. then got up & shut the door that she might not be exposed to the draught, & Emma who was waiting on the stairs went down to announce this new arrangement. "*Sarah, they all knew you never staid five minutes with anybody but me*".':—read *Sarah, they all knew, never; and any lodger*.

These are also W.C.H.'s readings. It should be pointed out that this quotation is interlined and reproduces Mrs. Walker's words to Hazlitt

<sup>1</sup> The brackets are mine.

the year before (*Le Gallienne*, 160-1).<sup>1</sup> More important still, it is succeeded by another quotation, also inserted interlinearly, and then struck out, which was missed by both W.C.H. and W.C.B., and seems to read: 'If she had been in the habit of going with different men I must have found her out long ago.' It should also be noted here that W.H.B.'s identification of 'Emma' as Sarah's niece Emma Roscoe is wrong: she was only just two and a half: this is Sarah's youngest sister, then nearly eight years old.

(iii) 'She laughed & said "Mr. H. was full of his remarks". F. answered "To the men or the ladies?"':—read *Did she mean on*.

This is W.C.H.'s reading and is plainly right.

(iv) 'She thought it impious to make *angles* fall in love with women':—read *angels* (evidently a slip on W.H.B.'s part).

(v) 'F. repeated the word "Impious" & laughed, at which she laughed.'

The sentence begins *At which*, struck out. Here is further evidence of haste.

(vi) '. . . Mr. Proctor's poetry . . . Mr. Proctor was a particular friend of Mr. Hazlitt's.':—read *Procter* in both cases.

*particular* is an interlined after-thought.

(vii) '. . . Drury Lane: this was a hint that she should like to go.' *no doubt*, crossed out, comes between *was* and *a*.

(viii) '. . . this grinning, chattering idiot.'

*scheming*, crossed out, comes between *chattering* and *idiot*.

(ix) [F. had asked Sarah her opinion of various books of the day—*The Round Table*, *Cain*, *Marcian Colonna*, *Mirandola*, etc.] 'F. said he is sure she is quite incapable of understanding any *real* remark, & shut up her lips with *him* for fear of being found out for what she is, a little mawkish simpleton. *Sd* that it was more stupidity than unkindness.':—read *such works; me; and So*.

The chattering idiot had not shut up her lips with F., nor shown him unkindness. The *me* is formed like the *me* of the manuscript, p. 7, antepenultimate line, and quite unlike the *him* of five lines earlier on that page. Hazlitt evidently then asked F. to confirm his point by putting to Sarah the specific questions we find mentioned on the 11th, and again on the 12th.

(x) '. . . to her sister's to take *home* the child':—read *her*.

(xi) 'The next morning she came up to answer the *early* call . . .':—read *breakfast* bell.

<sup>1</sup> Hazlitt set such store by these words that they are repeated in a third place: in his conversation with his wife after the divorce, 17 July 1822 (*Le Gallienne*, 329).

(xii) '... drest all in her best [ruff]':—read *things*.

There is no resemblance to the *ruff* of three lines on.

(xiii) 'Damned, treble damned *ideot*! [several words inked out] *When shall I drive her out of my thoughts?*':—read *ideot! When shall I burn*.

Nothing is inked out between *ideot* and *When*. W.H.B. means the words *When shall I burn*, which, however, are only badly blotted. Hazlitt's pen spluttered badly at this point; as well as false starts and blotches, the strokes betray the characteristic serration; it recovered (was mended?) for *out of my*, and finally gave out at the end of the word *thoughts*. He either mended it again or took a new one for the next sentence.

(xiv) '... is to me *to be in Heaven*':—read *a visitation from*.

March 10 (i) 'Mr. F. went down afterwards & sat with the family in the back parlour *just* opposite to her & then next her':—read *first*.

It was a small room and there were few people.

(ii) '... he saw three books piled on the *drawing*':—read *drawers*.

I.e. chest of drawers; O.E.D. gives an example from the *Examiner*. No 'drawing' has been mentioned, and an article of furniture is obviously meant. W.C.H. adds '-room-table' to solve the difficulty, but there is no gap, and in any case this was the back parlour.

(iii) '... said they were *three* books he had asked Sarah to lend him':—read *the*.

(iv) 'Mrs. W. among other things *said* that Mr. H. had been in the neighbourhood the other *evng* at a literary party in *Castle Hunt*':—read *stated; evening; and Castle Street or Catherine Street*.

This sentence is omitted by W.C.H. W.H.B.'s suggestion that *Castle Hunt* meant Coldbath Fields prison, because John Hunt was there in 1822, will not do: Hunt was discharged on 3 June 1822, and in any case the second word is *Street*. The arguments for *Castle Street* are (i) the third letter does seem to be *s*: Hazlitt often used the long *s* before *t*—cf. *drest*, p. 8, line 1; *mistook*, p. 7, line 24; (ii) this street was only a block away from Southampton Buildings; (iii) Hazlitt used to go to parties there, at the house of his friend Talfourd<sup>1</sup>, lawyer and man of letters, although it is not certain that Talfourd was already living there in March; (iv) Robert Roscoe, or his brother Henry, both lawyers, both litterateurs, and both living in the vicinity, might have attended, or been told of, Talfourd's party (if it was his) which would explain how it came to the unlikely ears of Mrs. Walker. Arguments

<sup>1</sup> *Lamb and Hazlitt*, p. xlvii. Talfourd, who had recently come to his aid when he was arrested, is listed at 4 Pump Court, Temple, in *Boyle's court guide* for January 1823, and in the April edition at 2 Elm Court, Temple. It is just conceivable that he moved to Castle Street for the intervening months; alternatively, he may have made professional use of the rooms in the Temple while living in Castle Street. Of the 40-odd houses in Castle Street, Boyle names the occupiers of only ten.

for Catherine Street: (i) the name does appear to end in *-rine*; and (ii) the *Examiner* office was there, but it was hardly 'in the neighbourhood' of Southampton Buildings, and we know of no one connected with the *Examiner* who could have told Mrs. Walker.

March 11 (i) [F. had been reading Procter's *Marcian Colonna*, and] '... pretended it was so *savoury* it had made him sentimental and melancholy.'—read *serious*.

(ii) 'He then said he *wanted* to look at *Mirandola*':—read *would*.

(iii) '... turning to the place *where was* the description of herself':—read *where there was*.

(iv) 'He then read *[it] off*...':—read *it*.

The bar of the *t* is looped back between the minim and dot of the *i*, so that the word looks like *off*.

(v) [F. observed to Sarah that what she now said of Hazlitt and *Mirandola* was inconsistent with her remark that Mr. Hazlitt did not care for the ladies.] 'She hesitated *a bit and he repeated, but she didn't think I did, adding "I don't think Mr. H's love lasts very long"*. Incomparable piece of clock work! To suppose that any one could count upon her *even to be a friend* is ridiculous. She is not good or bad; she is defective in [certain] faculties that belong to human nature.'—read *awhile and then repeated that; lasts long; man; and remarks beforehand*.

Hazlitt first wrote 'count upon her beforehand', saw that this implied reliance upon conduct, and added *remarks* by means of a caret, to convey that you could never, by any human criterion, calculate what she would say next. The thought itself reappears in *Le Gallienne*, 173.<sup>1</sup>

(vi)

N.B. At the top of the manuscript at this page 7 is a line of some twenty words crossed out, of which only a few are legible: 'to where she is, ... I will give up what ... was ... poor little thing ...' This is ignored by W.C.H. and W.H.B. At the middle of the page, W.H.B. notes: 'There are 4½ finely written interlinear lines that are illegible.' Well, not quite. They begin with almost the same quotation we have noted at March 9 (ii) above: 'If she had been in the habit of going out with different men I must have found it out before'; and then, after a sentence of some 17–18 words, 'Yet F. had not made her an offer ... nor paid her a compliment except by saying she was the nicest girl he had ever had to wait on him'; and finally some thirty words, not enough of which are legible to make any coherent meaning.

(vii) '... she brought up the tea-things but said significantly she couldn't stop then, as there was nobody in the house but her

<sup>1</sup> The quotation referred to in this passage, 'Being a thing majestic, it were a violence, etc.', is, of course, from *Hamlet*, I. i. 143–4.



father. He *had done* [just this] for he came to me & found she was gone out as far as Fleet Street to get Mr. — some coffee. That is, to meet Tomkins. If she has two, why not three? One of them thought her a *punk*! Her sister was *sitting with* the child in the afternoon when Mr. F. bolted into the room for his umbrella & as she had her back to him, he mistook her for Mrs. W. & said [“]How do you do Mam.” She seemed a little dissatisfied at such familiarity, but the other said, It’s only my sister & handed him the umbrella, quite *swiftly*. Who could suppose that under such a *name* there was a heart of marble or that a mask could smile? Mrs. Roscoe was *rather* ashamed & hurt after the blow-up with me on account of *her* attachment to Tomkins to see *the* new affair in *sweet friendship*. She perhaps *did not* wish her little girl Emma to see her aunt a whore in the street a few years hence.’:—read *went down just before; M—; saint; sitting downstairs with; sweetly; manner; doubtless; having shattered the; this; such friendliness; and doesn’t.*

In the third crux the sense demands the fair, not the foul, i.e. ‘If she ensnares two men, why not three? She was so attractive to one of them, me, that I thought her a saint!’ (cf. *Le Gallienne*, 61, 100, 236). The initial letter is the exact counterpart of the *s* in *saw*, p. 6, last line, and quite unlike any initial *p* of Hazlitt’s. In the seventh, the reading *doubtless* further accounts for Mrs. Roscoe’s apparent ‘dissatisfaction’. In the eighth, Hazlitt first wrote *Tomkins*, and then substituted the three words of the emendation. W.H.B., like W.C.H., mistook *having* for *her* and ignored the following two words.

March 12 (i) ‘She then put his arm around her neck’:—Improbably acrobatic:—read *He*.

(ii) ‘He told her she would make a pretty nun. That, she said, she was sure she never should be. She was *not to* be shut up. [. . .]’<sup>1</sup> In the afternoon *the* conversation was renewed in the parlour downstairs while her *sister* was in bed in the inner room & she was mending a stocking; & she then declared she did not like to be confined to the conversation of *his on nuns*, although she believed the nuns had leave to talk with their Confessors’:—read *not made to; this; mother; her own sex*.

The third sentence replaces the beginning of another, ‘She did not like to be confined to . . .’, which is struck out: Hazlitt evidently ran ahead of his story. It should be remarked that this conversation was obviously inspired by the convent of Laverna in *Marcian Colonna*.

(iii) ‘Half a dozen would *be* better’:—read *do*.

(iv) ‘F. then asked her to go to the play. She said, she was afraid her mother *might* object to her going with a stranger. “Phoo!

<sup>1</sup> My brackets.

nonsense that was nothing: she really *must* go.<sup>1</sup> She should have her choice of any part of the house, except the one shilling gallery. *She* supposed her ambition was not as high as that." "No, her ambition was not so *high* & laughed at this as an excellent jest. [. . .]<sup>2</sup> It was left indetermined & tonight we are *lovers*. I *thought* I am exculpated by all this.'—read *would*; *He*; *high*, & *to see*; and *think*. Hazlitt italicized *must*: it is not a crux).

In the *lovers'* crux, the letters of *to see* are identical with those in 'as *to seemly*, there was nobody *to see* them', on p. 10, last line but 3. (There seems to be a further letter—an *r*?—, after a small gap, but this is the last line of a page, and foreign marks and blemishes are common around the edges of the sheets.) The sense is that F. (and Hazlitt) would learn her decision that night; perhaps Sarah's own words are intended. This is corroborated by the entry of March 14th, 'She did not go to the play the other night . . .' etc.

(v) 'F. speaking of Mr. T[omkins] said, he seemed out of sorts the other evening. She said, Mr. T. knew his *ill-humour* had no effect upon her. [. . .]<sup>3</sup> Mr. T. hearing F. above-stairs called out Who's that? F. said Sir? on which the other replied gruffly, ["]Oh, it was not you I wanted to see, but somebody else." So that she is *not* [through?] breaking this poor man's heart & probably his wife's, & *she* feels very happy that his ill-humours have no effect upon her':—read Mr. F—; Mr. F—; *ill-humours*; Mr. F—; *perhaps*; and *thus*.

W.H.B. has a note: '25 In this passage Hazlitt writes "F." for "F," and "Mr. T." As he always speaks of Tomkins elsewhere as "Mr. T.", his intention is clear. I have accordingly regularized them.' I do not understand this, nor do I see the need for it. Hazlitt writes, quite plainly, not F. and F., but F. and Mr. F—, and since Tomkins never came into the house (indeed there is no evidence that F. ever clapped eyes on him), since Tomkins's ill-humour would certainly have affected her, and since we have never heard that Tomkins was married, this has nothing to do with Tomkins: it is another lodger. I should imagine it is the Mr. Follett who wore straps (*Le Gallienne*, 224) and whose wife may have been that Mrs. F— foremost among the lodgers who were the excited witnesses of Hazlitt's fit of rage the previous May (*Le Gallienne*, 149).

March 14 (i) 'F. got her between his legs so that she came *right into* contact with him':—read *in complete*.

(ii) 'She retired a step or two & he followed & then she retreated a little further like the *Tygers & the Dove in Nevys*.<sup>27</sup> He said ["]M[iss] I will kill you with kissing, if I catch you". "But you must catch me first", she said, and bounded downstairs & stood looking up

<sup>1</sup> Hazlitt's italics.

<sup>2</sup> My brackets.

<sup>3</sup> My brackets.

& laughing [. . .]<sup>1</sup> By God, there isn't such another *scheming punishing* [?] devil in the world. F. is I think already in love with her [. . .]<sup>2</sup>:—read *Squire & the Dove in Spenser*; *I'll half*; and *charming provoking*.

W.H.B. has a note: '27Not identified.' His puzzlement is comprehensible. In Hazlitt's hand, capital S followed by p looks exactly like a small n writ large. The allusion is to *The faerie queen*, Book IV, canto viii, stanzas 10 and 11. Hazlitt, of course, means the *episode* of the squire and the dove: it was the fair Belphebe, who engaged in the *pas de deux* with the dove, whose device this was to bring the lady to the love-lorn lad. It is among the extracts from *The faerie queen* included in Hazlitt's *Select British poets* (1825).

(iii) 'She would not come in: she could hear where she was—her old word.'

See *Le Gallienne*, 146.

(iv) 'He then said he could *bear* to live by himself [if] he could [have] something to kiss & fondle & *muss*. They should make good company. She asked if [he thought it would be] proper':—read *learn*; *but wanted*; *thought they*; and *that wld*.

(v) The conversation continues 'While this delicate negotiation was going on she kept *sobbing and crying* all the time & at last said she must go now. But she *could* come and sit with him when they were gone to *bed*. She made no promises & so it stands. F. swears he'll put it home to her today: but I doubt she has already *denied* him':—read *smiling & hemming*; *would*; & *bed?*; and *disarmed*.

*sobbing and crying* not only does not answer to the distinguishable letters, it is impossible in the context: Sarah is in perfect control of herself. I suggest (but with no great conviction) *smiling & hemming*: Sarah is trying to get away; the first of what looks like two *ls* in *smiling* may be the dot of the *i* run into the minim. W.C.H. observed the contradiction between 'She made no promises' and the preceding apparently affirmative sentence, saw that the latter was in reality a question put by F., and inserted a mark of interrogation after *bed*. What closes the sentence in the manuscript, although not a properly formed question mark, is certainly something other than a full stop. *Denied* would require 'I doubt if'; *disarmed* accords with 'I doubt' (= I suspect).

March 15 (i) '. . . as she put down the curtains at night, he kissed her & saying he was determined to *give a* good tickling for her tricks in running away from him the day before, put his hand between her legs *on that evening*. She only said "Let me go Sir", [. . .]<sup>3</sup> She

<sup>1</sup> My brackets.

<sup>2</sup> My brackets.

<sup>3</sup> My brackets.

was altered in her manner, & probably begins to *make* something.' :  
—read *give her a; without ceremony; and smoke*.

I.e. to smoke the plot laid by F. and Hazlitt.

(ii) 'This is she who murdered me that she might keep every lodger at a proper distance.—I met Tomkins in the street who looks *bad*. I fancy we are all in for it; and poor F. will be *over* [head] & *very* [?] with her in another week':—read *badly*; and *over head and ears in love*.

The word *every* is italicized as at March 8.

March 16 (i) 'F. was in despair when returning home at dusk, he *met* my lady with her muff *on going* along Lincoln's Inn Fields by herself':  
—read *meets*; and *moving*.

(ii) 'Let her *be* to hell with her tongue. She is as true as heaven *wished* her heart & lips [to] *be*':—read *lie*; and *is to*.

The final words of the manuscript are very obscure. I can offer only the following comments. (i) There is a one-word gap after *hell* (if it *is* hell: the only other hell in the manuscript carries a capital H), and the initial letter of the next word does not seem to be *w*; (ii) there is an illegible word of three or four letters after *tongue*; (iii) there is nothing between *is* and *true* (if it *is* true); (iv) Hazlitt writes *Heaven* elsewhere in the journal with a capital letter, and what here appears to be the loop of a small *h* is in fact the loop of the *d* in *day* over which it is written; (v) *heart & lips [to] be* might in fact just as well read *heartless lies*; and finally (vi) W.H.B.'s reading does not take account of four illegible words following *be* (or *lies*) at the end.

*Glasgow*