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“Bibliotherapy,” wrote W. B. McDaniel in 1956, “is unquestionably a war baby. It is a hospital library baby of World War 1.” Oxford don H. F. Brett-Smith gave that war baby a national identity, a British one, when he reportedly ministered with books during the First World War, simultaneously helping to create one of bibliotherapy’s most pervasive origin stories. The source of this often-cited account appears to be a 1984 letter to the _Times Literary Supplement_ (“The Mission of English Literature”) by the teacher and essayist Martin Jarrett-Kerr. Brett-Smith had been Jarrett-Kerr’s tutor at Oxford. According to the story laid out in the _TLS_, having been declared unfit for military service in the war, Brett-Smith was employed instead by hospitals to advise on suitable reading materials for wounded men. In the course of this work, Brett-Smith compiled a so-called “fever chart” of therapeutic books that could be safely distributed to shell-shocked soldiers, at the apex of which lay the novels of Jane Austen.

At the same time as Brett-Smith was judging the likely effect of particular books on soldiers’ recovery, on the other side of the Atlantic the baby was being named, by the American journalist Samuel McChord Crothers, first in a series of lectures, then in an article published in the _Atlantic_ in 1916. Lecturing to an audience of Pennsylvania librarians in October 1914, a few days before the beginning of First Ypres, Crothers observed that, “the
librarian’s science might be termed bibliotherapy.” Librarians, he suggested, “should treat people who come to the library as patients who come with various kinds of maladies, most suffering from mal-nutrition.” A movement to establish patient libraries in American hospitals, asylums, and tuberculosis sanatoria, with the intention of promoting patient wellbeing through reading, had already been in existence for several decades. Crothers’s specific intervention was to coin a term for this movement, and to deploy a medicalising discourse to represent the work of all library practitioners, not just those working in a hospital setting. Crothers’s coinage was to prove enormously influential, both during and after the war. In 1919, Christopher Morley made the concept the bedrock of his fictional depiction of a New York second-hand bookshop and its “practitioner of bibliotherapy” owner, Roger Mifflin. Employing a similar set of terms to Crothers, Morley depicts a store placard warning against “malnutrition of the reading faculty,” and Mifflin argues that New Yorkers are reading more books than ever before because the “terrific catastrophe of the war has made them realize their minds are ill.” They are reading, “hungrily,” for a cure.

In a 2016 position piece for The Lancet, Jonathan Bate and Andrew Schuman draw together many of the most familiar threads of the bibliotherapy story. They start their narrative with Crothers, provide a broad chronological summary of views about the “therapeutic value of words,” before going on to describe Brett-Smith’s “fever chart” of books suitable for the wounded. Recent accounts of the history of bibliotherapy during this period by Janella D. Moy and Liz Brewster sketch out a similar series of names and events. They trace a line of continuity between the use of therapeutic reading in the treatment of shell-shocked soldiers during the First World War and post-war work among traumatized veterans conducted by professional librarians working in American Veterans Bureau and Administration hospitals. As neat as these commonly-accepted origin stories are, however, neither Crothers nor the “fever chart” on their own proves adequate for describing
bibliotherapy’s relationship with military reading cultures during the First World War. Moy’s and Brewster’s synoptic histories, meanwhile, illustrate another tendency within the existing scholarship on the history of bibliotherapy. Historians who have examined the links between activities in wartime hospital libraries and post-war bibliotherapeutic practice have concentrated almost entirely on the American side of the story, overlooking activity in Britain beyond the “fever chart.”

Important as American interventions were for the development of bibliotherapeutic techniques, both during and after the war, the tendency to focus on them to the exclusion of all other forms of wartime bibliotherapy distorts the picture of its origins and development during this period. Not only have the specific features of what Sara Haslam has called British “literary caregiving” been neglected, so too has the extent to which American wartime bibliotherapeutic practice was influenced by work conducted in British military libraries—and hospital libraries—during the first three years of the war. The central element in the British story sketched out by Bate and Schuman, meanwhile, turns out to be something of an evidential cul de sac. No one has yet found any contemporary evidence documenting Brett-Smith’s wartime activities or verifying the existence (or present-day whereabouts) of the “fever chart.” The single piece of evidence vouching for its existence continues to be Martin Jarrett-Kerr’s 1984 letter to the TLS.

We cannot claim to have re-discovered the fever chart. Our analysis instead uses archival sources in order to recover the theory and practice of literary caregiving in hospital wards during the war and after 1918. Paying close attention to what Christine Pawley calls the “institutional middle layer”—that is, the role of institutions of reading in mediating the relationship between books and their readers—we examine the archives of the British Red Cross and the Endell Street Military Hospital, as well as the personal papers of the volunteer librarians who staffed both, in order to reconstruct the narrative of British wartime literary
caregiving and suggest where such an account might fit into the wider histories of bibliotherapy.14

**The War Library and “Literary Caregiving”**

Helen Mary (May) Gaskell was the generating force of the War Library, a charitable literary institution which she resolved to create on the first night of the war in 1914. Gaskell was wealthy and well connected and she used her networks to engage a wide range of volunteers, sponsors, and donors in her venture. The scheme had powerful backers. Gaskell and her brother, Mr Beresford Melville, funded the library from its outset, but politicians and society figures including Alfred (Lord) Milner, an old friend of Gaskell’s who had made his name in South Africa as High Commissioner and Governor of the Cape Colony from 1897, provided support for the scheme. Lord Haldane, meanwhile, Asquith’s close advisor in the War Office, secured the recognition of the War Office for the library.15 Looking back on her activities in 1934, when she stepped down from her position with the British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library (the successor to the War Library), she reflected on the specifically gendered nature of her intervention. Her resignation letter asserted the value of continued female leadership once she had stepped down: “[C. T.] Hagberg Wright and I long ago decided that it is necessary that one member of the Committee should be a lady in touch with the social side of life.” Specifically, she knew, her work had involved instrumentalizing “unrecorded but helpful” female emotional labor: “thanking Royalty […] and donors, entertaining, showing people over the hospital library to encourage their sympathy, making our needs known in public & private ways, speaking, writing, & seeing people etc etc.”16

“Literary caregiving,” the term we use in this article in preference to bibliotherapy, refers to the practice of using literature, normally in volunteer-led institutions or contexts, to
minister to, or alleviate the symptoms of, the sick and wounded through responsive and empathetic interactions and methods. The term is in part a response to Gaskell’s own narrative strategy in her written account of the library, in which the increasingly desperate call of sick and wounded soldiers for books is interwoven with their medical condition and/or injury. Her organised response was to benefit her readers as they recover, “physically and mentally.”17 In this way, the support for the scheme of the head of the Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC), Sir Arthur Sloggett, must be noted as particularly significant. We use the phrase “literary caregiving” here for two further reasons. Firstly, it registers the gendered and affective aspects of volunteer labor in British military hospital libraries during the First World War and the ways in which these were often foregrounded in contemporary accounts of this work. Secondly, while recent definitions of bibliotherapy tend to be broad and all encompassing—Liz Brewster, for instance, calls it “the premise” that “information, guidance, and solace can be found in books”—we recognize that in the period under discussion, “bibliotherapy” was defined and perceived more narrowly.18 While it certainly made claims for the consoling and palliative nature of reading for the sick and wounded, British discourse surrounding wartime hospital libraries did not as a rule employ the highly medicalized language—and the direct analogies between books and pharmaceuticals—that were a relatively common feature of early twentieth-century American bibliotherapeutic discourse.19

In fact, British hospital librarians and commentators maintained a noticeable ambivalence about applying the word “bibliotherapy” to their own operations well into the middle of the twentieth century, associating it with a set of specifically American theories and practices distinct from their own.20 A 1933 Times article describing a course on hospital librarianship offered at the London School of Economics, for instance, sought to distance it from what it called the “bibliotherapy” of “earnest American investigators,” who were prone to “theorize too quickly about the appropriate literary prescriptions” for various ailments.
Instead, this report emphasized above all the need for providing sick patients with “an abundance of the lightest and most distracting kind of fiction,” relating the post-war drive to provide hospital libraries to the work of the War Library, calling it “one of the acceptable legacies of the war.”

While we acknowledge that the activities of British wartime literary caregivers and American bibliotherapists were closely related, we suggest that emphases and orientations in British hospital libraries during this period—towards caregiving and “personal intercourse” between librarian and reader and away from a purely pharmaceutical understanding of the “literary cure”—were distinct enough to justify the use of separate terminology.

In 1923, wanting to “find out all that can be known of Hospital Libraries” for a piece published in the *Yorkshire Post*, Alice Herbert tracked down the novelist Beatrice Harraden, who had worked as honorary librarian in the “Library Department” of Covent Garden’s Endell Street Military Hospital from 1915. Harraden is little-known now, but one of the handful of female Australian doctors to serve in the war, Eleanor Bourne, described her in an unpublished memoir as the “famous authoress of *Ships That Pass in the Night*.” When Herbert interviewed Harraden about hospital libraries her first response was, “[y]ou should ask Mrs Gaskell of the War and Peace Library Scheme.” If Herbert had consulted May Gaskell (or the pamphlet she published with the Red Cross in 1918) she would have been able to acknowledge her foundational role in the development of such libraries from 1914 as well as the practice and theory of literary caregiving that she helped establish. “Take choice of all my Library, and so beguile thy sorrow” was Gaskell’s epigraph for her 1918 pamphlet, where she described the “personal touch” that had underpinned her library’s ministrations to sick and wounded soldiers from its inception in August 1914. Gaskell believed that the “librarian science” was primarily a responsive as well as a curative one. When books were “called for, cabled for, demanded, implored,” they might be works of history, reference,
gardening or boxing, as well as novels, and the library would attempt to provide them. The fiction that was “dear to the soldiers,” Gaskell records, was by O. Henry, Rudyard Kipling, Alexandre Dumas, Nat Gould, Sexton Blake, Rex Beach, Jack London, and Marie Corelli. Collections of “Best Poems” and “Love Poems” were also in high demand. Some readers wanted Montaigne, Shakespeare, or Wordsworth, and books by these authors were available as well. The War Library was also occasionally donated valuable rare books, including first editions of novels by Dickens, Thackeray and Charlotte Brontë. These were generally sold to generate funds. On Rudyard Kipling’s suggestion, scrapbooks were made for the typhoid and dysentery cases, who might be too weak to hold anything other than the 8-leaved collections of pictures and very short stories that volunteers supplied for Hospital Ships in particular.

Together, these works of literature formed a “flow of comfort” sourced from donations direct to the library’s head-quarters in Marble Arch and, later in the war, house collections in the South and East of England. These collections were organized by, for example, Lady Maud Warrender, a concert singer and War Library volunteer: “[o]nce a week I collected a group of my friends, and having notified every householder in a certain district that we were coming, we started off in a Red Cross Ambulance lorry, calling at every house. We found an extraordinary response, filling the lorry from floor to roof” and thereby contributing to the “millions of books” that were sent out from Surrey House. Householders would have been alerted to their coming by War Library publicity in the British Press, making the plight of bookless wounded soldiers vividly apparent to readers. An appeal published in the Banbury Advertiser on 3 August 1916 asked readers to “Imagine yourself lying in a stifling tent, covered with flies by day and mosquitoes by night—think of the long, hot hours, the weariness, the pain—think of the patient courage and heroism of our soldiers and sailors who endure it all. A letter came to us last week: ‘We shall bless the name of the War Library forever; I don’t know what we should do without your books.’”
Idealized accounts of wartime literary caregiving written from the volunteers’ perspective also found their way into the newspapers, indicating the sorts of practices that existed outside the institutional framework provided by charities like the War Library. An article published in The Times in April 1915, entitled “What to Read to the Wounded,” describes the dilemma facing the “friends” of a temporarily paralyzed British soldier who wanted to read aloud to him in bed. After a “highly trained nurse” predicts that the soldier’s pre-war diet of detective novels and adventure stories in illustrated magazines would prove too taxing to him in his wounded state, they are forced to try other tactics. Scouring the English literary canon for “slow stories” fit for the “strong man flat on his back,” they initially suggest Sir Walter Scott, but are rebuffed. Finally, in a tantalizing echo of H. F. Brett-Smith, they settle by mutual agreement upon Jane Austen and, “beginning with Pride and Prejudice and passing to Emma,” proceed to read the entire Austen canon aloud to him, an activity which proves to be “as soothing to the pulse as might be a walk to a convalescent through the half deserted rooms of Kensington Palace.”

The other instrumental part of the War Library’s operations fell to volunteer honorary librarians, whose task it was to distribute books and magazines to patients in the wards. May Gaskell had evidently used her wide social network to encourage prominent literary figures to volunteer in this way. These volunteers worked in War Library depots, which would be used to set up libraries in War Hospitals, as well as carrying out library work in the hospitals themselves. When the author William Pett Ridge wrote his memoir A Story Teller: Forty Years in London in 1923, he recalled being asked by War Library staff to “take the congenial task of honorary librarian in the Third London General Hospital at Wandsworth.” “Congenial” as this may have seemed in retrospect, it must nevertheless have been a demanding role. Ridge’s Chief Surgeon at the Third London noted that in “a hospital of 2,600
beds [Ridge] had his work cut out for him in maintaining his stock as the patients came and went in numbers that would have been thought impossible in a civilian hospital.”

Gaskell was in no doubt about the physical and mental benefits of literary caregiving. Her response was evidence of the “great stimulus to many forms of welfare” prompted by what the British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library secretary Marjorie Roberts referred to in a 1930 pamphlet as “the unprecedented horrors of war.” This organized and strategic response, one of “enormous proportions” according to one history of the Red Cross, nonetheless did not become a professional venture, either during the war itself, or during its post-war afterlife as the British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library. Both the War Library and the post-war Hospital Library service relied on charitable donations, volunteer labor, and significant grants from the British Red Cross to cover costs until the schemes were able to achieve a measure of self-sufficiency. The War Library received £62983 5s 6d. from the Joint War Committee of the Red Cross and Order of St. John over the course of the war. In 1919, its successor, the British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library, initially called the “War and Peace Hospital Library,” was allocated just over £22316 to provide books for hospital libraries, with the specific intention that these would form “part of the after-care of sick and disabled ex-servicemen.” This sum consisted of the £5316 14s 5d. remaining on the War Library’s books in October 1919, along with an additional grant from the British Red Cross of £17000.

The institutional context in which wartime and inter-war British hospital libraries existed meant that their activities are much less visible in the historical record than those of their counterparts in the United States. Specific problems of historical documentation arise from the gendered and informal nature of British wartime hospital librarianship. Literary caregiving initiatives in Britain—like much charitable work generally—were enabled by “familial and friendship networks,” female emotional labor, and other affective ties which
often resisted formal documentation.\textsuperscript{37} The historical record that this kind of work has left behind is therefore relatively thin, at least at the level of print publication. In order to reconstruct an account of the “institutional middle layer” in British hospital libraries during this period, we have therefore turned to other sorts of evidence—letters, diaries, scrapbooks, fundraising material and other forms of ephemeral publicity, as well as archival documents. By examining these sorts of records, we aim to provide not only an account of literary caregiving in the War Library and the Endell Street Military Hospital, but also to uncover the social networks that linked the two operations and enabled them to function.

**Endell Street Military Hospital**

Sybil (Countess) Brassey ran the War Library Depot in Alexandria, distributing to Egyptian hospitals the 20,000 books and magazines sent to Egypt from Surrey House every three weeks.\textsuperscript{38} Brassey and her husband were National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) supporters before the war, and Brassey, who was listed on the War Library Committee by September 1916, had the most visible suffrage links of any of the War Library’s personnel. She is described as a “major” Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) subscriber by Martin Pugh, and she visited Endell Street Military Hospital, which, through its founders Dr Louisa Garrett Anderson and Dr Flora Murray had strong roots in WSPU politics, in early November 1915.\textsuperscript{39} A few days later, on 9 November, Lady Brassey drove Elizabeth Robins to work in the library there.\textsuperscript{40} There were other significant personnel and cultural links between the two literary ventures, although the most important for the purposes of this article are practice-based. Robins’ diary records that she was socialising with Viscount Samuels, Postmaster General, and Lord Haldane, for example, in 1915—both men were instrumental in the success of the War Library.\textsuperscript{41} Furthermore, Robins recorded in her diary driving to Surrey House, the War Library’s London headquarters, in June 1915, and she
also notes more than one meeting with Zoe (Margaret) Hadwen, most remarkably recording her collection of sacks of spare books destined for Gaskell’s War Library on 16 September.\(^{42}\)

Post-war letters survive between May Gaskell and Elizabeth Robins, and Gaskell wrote warmly to Elizabeth Robins about her book *Theatre and Friendship*, which published letters between Robins and Henry James. Gaskell reminisced about her own relationship with the writer, citing a “never to be forgotten” dinner they attended alongside Lord Milner, at which they discussed the war and tried to raise James’ depressed spirits.\(^{43}\)

Endell Street, in London’s Covent Garden, was the third wartime hospital run by Drs Flora Murray and Louisa Garrett Anderson. Their first was opened in Paris after an epiphany similar to Gaskell’s in August 1914. They knew they wanted to open a hospital when war was declared. They were equally certain that the British War Office would not be interested in an offer by women, especially women who had been active WSPU members, so they went to the French, who were. The Union des Femmes de France wrote to them on 22 August 1914 to thank them for “l’offre si genereuse” and confirmed in a letter on 2 September that they would be operating under the French Red Cross and the French War Office.\(^{44}\)

The women of the Women’s Hospital Corps, as they termed themselves, were running 100 hospital beds in a transformed Hôtel Claridge by the end of September 1914, with a staff of female surgeons, nurses, stretcher bearers and orderlies. The American ambassador had visited by the 22 September promising “all kinds of help.”\(^{45}\)

Although there is no written record of the reasons the women decided to add a library to their hospital environment after Sir Alfred Keogh himself, impressed by their success in France, met with them in early 1915 and asked them to return to London and work under the RAMC, there is a discernible thread as to their views on the therapeutic importance of books in Louisa Garrett Anderson’s letters from 1912.

In letters she sent while an inmate at Holloway Prison in March 1912, a result of suffragette militancy, Anderson made specific reference to being allowed to have books, and
to her reading. Two years later, as she and Murray were setting up in Paris, she made a direct link between the suffering of the “these bruised men,” with minds “full of horrors,” and the kind of soothing atmosphere they were trying to establish to care for them. Their hospital would be one that treated minds as well as bodies, and they planned to task their orderlies with, for example, reading to the men. She and Murray went further still in London, recruiting two volunteer librarians for Endell Street in 1915, and Flora Murray stated in her book about Endell Street that the “value of the library […] cannot be over-estimated.” The five thousand titles that were generally in the library were designed to “cater for every taste.” In ways that connect overtly with Louisa Garrett Anderson’s 1914 observations on the state of mind of their patients, Elizabeth Robins reflected later that “we learned that many men were more wounded in their minds than in their bodies. The best way, often the only way, to get on with curing their bodies was to do something for their minds.” Books were the “something” that Robins and Beatrice Harraden undertook to deploy in their care.

Murray and Garrett Anderson had become minor celebrities in Paris, and they received a constant stream of visitors, many of whom were aristocratic and all of whom wanted to help either financially or in person. The fascination continued at Endell Street, well-stoked by the media: “we can agree with the car-driver that the WHC hospital is the best in London … the surgeons take great interest in and pains with their patients… The whole hospital is a triumph for woman, and incidentally it is a triumph for suffragettes.” This piece, published in the Sydney Daily Telegraph in November 1915, was typical—the Daily Sketch recorded in July 1916 how the men were being “doctored as well as nursed by women’s tender hands.” The library, however, was a focal point of press attention. Flora Murray’s cuttings book, held in the Women’s Library archives, includes many examples, and three on the first page are dedicated to the work of the library. The articles, from 5 January 1916, are
headed “What soldiers read” and provide accounts of Beatrice Harraden’s talk the day before to the National Home-Reading Union at the University of London.

Harraden is quoted citing from her notebooks a list of titles that are very similar to Gaskell’s top requirements at the War Library: Nat Gould, Marie Corelli, William Le Queux, Sexton Blake, Alexandre Dumas, Rex Beach, Robert Louis Stevenson, and H. Rider Haggard. The personal touch that Gaskell valued was also employed in Endell Street, with bedside consultations as the librarians tried to find out what would restore men’s spirits and energies. The specifically gendered nature of this form of literary caregiving is a focus in ways suggested by the two extracts quoted above, which also highlight similarities with Gaskell’s bibliotherapeutic practice at the War Library. “[W]oman’s war work,” also alliterated in the same piece as “Women’s skill and sympathy,” in this library is shown to be consultative, observant and respectful: “the sick men have everything their own way; their tastes are studied, no one tries to alter or improve them.”

This approach was not accidental. The library’s operating system was based on careful psychological assessment: the women found that “the very idea of reading was [to some men] a terror” and that “many had very little power of concentration in their enfeebled condition.” Books could only heal in these cases if they were identified through “direct personal intercourse,” Harraden argued in her piece about the library published in the *Cornhill Magazine* in November 1916. Libraries were necessary, she believed, in both civil and military hospitals. They needed to be stocked with a wide range of books, but, even more crucially, librarians needed to be employed who would “study the temperaments, inclinations and possibilities of the patients,” enabling that “direct personal intercourse” which would most accurately determine what would “amuse, help, stimulate, lift—and heal” their readers. The books they could focus on, first of all, were most likely to be by the popular writer Nat Gould, and his work was the most frequently requested amongst the men. Gould forms a brief
case study in Harraden’s piece: “a certain type of man would read nothing except Nat Gould”; “however ill he was, however suffering and broken, the name of Nat Gould would always bring a smile to his face” even if it was only in anticipation of being better.\(^5\) Her co-librarian reflected in 1919 on the categories of soldiers she too had worked with, again in terms of their illness and responses to it. Robins detailed cases that were still “too serious for the ministrations of a librarian” but noted how the same librarians were taken into the confidence of the soldiers as they recovered—how stories were shared and conversations had, and how the men’s feelings about the doctors and their treatment was a major topic.\(^5\)

One result of this kind of care, the papers reported, was that “there is more reading at the ‘all-women’ hospital than at any other in London.” What made it “the finest library in London” was the fact that “no matter what book it is the men want, they have it.”\(^5\) Another was that the library turned into a lending library of sorts—the *Falkirk Herald* reported that “in several instances men who had become outpatients had asked to be allowed to take books home and come and exchange them.” Harraden noted one case of a soldier she had recently bumped into when he was arriving to change a book. He had, she was quoted as saying, “progressed from [the weekly] The Union Jack to Dumas,” and she believed “he would end with Shakespeare.” Harraden made no secret of the fact that she wanted these patients if possible to widen their reading, and “good books” were always “within their reach.”\(^5\) But the main reason the *Daily Telegraph* thought that the library was “a story in itself” was that it had been built “upon the intellectual requirements” of its readers. Taste was encouraged, not required, to grow organically “until many are found to ask for Tennyson.”\(^5\) Harraden evidently felt strongly enough about this mission to continue to furnish men’s reading as they continued their rehabilitation at home.

Marjorie Roberts, Organising Secretary of the Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library, cited her belief in the “magic power of reading” in 1930, and situated it in
the rise of psychology as she argued for a return to wartime levels of understanding of the need for books in hospitals. Harraden fictionalized the hospital and library in her novel *Where Your Treasure Is* (1918) in which she had demonstrated above all that magic at work. Deep in the novel she portrays “a librarian carrying a large packet of Nat Gould’s novels with the same anxious care” that others may place on “a consignment of Burmah rubies”. She pursues the treasure metaphor in the story of Seymour, a soldier wounded not only in the flesh but in the spirit. The horrors of war had numbed him. He had lain for two days, grievously wounded and unfound amongst a number of dead comrades, himself longing for release and death which did not come. The memory of that awful time still haunted him … They were healing his body in hospital; but Seymour’s real self, the self that did not show, that gave no sign, no response and yet counted more than anything, remained out of their reach.

But, Harraden’s plot recounts, “a miracle took place,” and Seymour comes “back to life” when he is supplied with books and conversation on the subject he is passionate about: precious stones. Later in the novel the title “treasure” is shown to indicate whatever book satisfied the varied literary needs among the patients. The only constant being the fact they were all given “exactly what they wanted” in a process which did not expose any lack of education, any lack of erudition, or cause any shame.

**Personal/Professional Networks and Literary Caregiving**

The ability to manage this “miraculous” therapeutic process was put down not just to the women’s gender—and any resultant powers of sympathy—but also their professional
backgrounds as writers. An article in the \textit{Daily Chronicle} noted that “the Tommies appreciate the fact” that they have a “real live novelist to look after their library,” one who “knows just the sort of books that a certain man wants to read.”"\textsuperscript{64} The \textit{London Opinion} reported that when Harraden had been ill for a few days she was “greatly missed” by the wounded Tommies, “whose taste in books she seems to know better than they do themselves.”"\textsuperscript{65} At least one reporter was curious enough to speculate about the personal and professional cost of running the library: “these two eminent literary women are making a considerable sacrifice; they spend practically all their time at the hospital, which leaves them little leisure for work.”"\textsuperscript{66}

Mention of their professional backgrounds is instructive, because the networks the women had built over 30-year careers, as well as the ways they had augmented them during suffrage campaigning, were essential to the business model, and also helped to ensure that the literary caregiving at Endell Street became particularly well-known amongst contemporary writers and publishers, whereas the War Library’s reach was more an “establishment” one, in terms of socially and politically prominent figures.\textsuperscript{67} “We began by writing to our publisher friends,” Harraden explained in her article in the \textit{Cornhill Magazine}, and they responded with “splendid consignments of volumes of fiction, travel, and biography and hundreds of magazines.”\textsuperscript{68} The authors they knew “rallied willingly,” and personal networks also helped to fill the bookshelves. Beatrice Harraden wrote to the editor and poet St John Adcock in August \textit{1916}, thanking him for a book he had sent. “I shall read it myself and then put it on our library shelves for our men.”\textsuperscript{69}

Elizabeth Robins left her position in the library ahead of a long trip to the United States in early spring of \textit{1916}. What was potentially Endell Street library’s most significant single legacy resulted from her continued championship, and her strategic deployment of the political and cultural connections many of these literary women shared, obscured though they may sometimes have been by the social mores of the time. While she was preparing to leave
for her voyage, Robins met with Mrs Humphry Ward and heard about Theodore Roosevelt’s encouragement of her work as supportive of his pro-interventionist propaganda. Robins had also received an earlier briefing from Sir Edward Grey, who knew that Colonel House, the American ambassador, would be on the same ship Robins was taking, along with Henry James’ nephew, headed home to visit his sick uncle. House was on his way to advise Wilson as to what America’s decision about entering the war should be. The ship sailed on 26 February and on the same day Robins met ‘Harry’ James walking on deck. Soon after Colonel House was “pointed out” to her, Robins’ diary records, and by 29 February Robins had been invited to take tea with the Colonel and his wife. House was, Robins observes, “not at all close-mouthed” and, according to her diary they discussed Edward Grey’s position on war, and Roosevelt’s suggestion that Mrs Humphry Ward should help to write America into the war. Robins agreed to write to Ward, in fact, and encourage her not to overplay her propaganda hand: House felt that should she “berate” the more hesitant Wilson it would “fatally weaken her power.”

Robins’ subsequent intervention may have been more significant still. She told House all about Endell Street and its soldier patients. She described the care provided by the hospital and how the sacrifices she had learned about had impressed her. Her stories impressed House too, and he suggested she write a piece for the *New York Times* which he would “godfather.” House, meanwhile, travelled on to give his advice to Wilson. He asked Robins to come and meet Wilson as well. There is no record that she did so, and America did not enter the war for some months, of course. But the strong inference from those ship-board encounters is that her views, and her stories of Endell Street, will have made up part of the report House took to a President who was reluctant to commit America to war. It is in ways such as this that these women’s wartime literary work can be discerned. Archival recovery is
therefore essential to a full understanding of First World War British literary caregiving, its contexts, and its legacies.

**Conclusion: Legacies and Afterlives**

When Library of Congress librarian Theodore Wesley Koch prepared a paper reporting on the activities of British wartime schemes to distribute books to soldiers and the wounded for the American Library Association conference in June 1917, he did so for a very particular reason. Prefacing his detailed accounts of British operations, he wrote that: “No time should be lost in interesting those who have the means, the leisure and the executive ability to see that similar work is started in the United States.” “Cooperation or affiliation with the British organizations should be considered,” he added.\(^75\) Koch’s specific role as a conduit through which intelligence on British wartime book programmes for soldiers helped to inform the wartime work of the American Library Association in 1917–19 has been generally overlooked.\(^76\) In fact, this information channel meant that the American Library War Service was in a position to swiftly implement the lessons learned and principles established in British camp and hospital libraries when the United States entered the war in April 1917. Aside from its immediate value to the wartime ALA, Koch’s reporting provides a unique window onto the activities of British wartime book charities while they were still operating, one with enduring historical value. When more recent historians have described the activities of British wartime libraries—including the War Library—they have tended to do so through Koch, relying on the vivid (though brief) anecdotes of military reading practices, capsule summaries of library operations, and sample statistics that Koch’s publications provide.\(^77\)

Despite the existence of Koch’s testimony, the larger story of British wartime literary caregiving and its post-war legacy has been generally neglected, particularly in the existing
scholarly literature on the history of bibliotherapy, which has tended to focus on American developments.\textsuperscript{78} During the war itself, the American Library Association displayed a sound grasp of the principles of publicity, producing its own periodical, the \textit{War Library Bulletin}, and subsequently describing its wartime activities in a range of publications drawing on the Association’s own archives.\textsuperscript{79} When control of the military hospital libraries it helped to establish passed to the Veterans Bureau in 1922, the ALA maintained a close working relationship with them, setting up a hospital libraries subcommittee and ensuring that libraries in the Veterans Bureau system were staffed by professional, ALA-accredited librarians.\textsuperscript{80} Despite the often straitened financial conditions they worked in, librarians employed in Veterans Bureau and Administration hospital libraries in the post-war years saw it as part of their professional responsibilities to describe their operations—and the emerging bibliotherapeutic theories underlying them—in professional journals, particularly the Veterans Bureau and Administration \textit{Medical Bulletin}.\textsuperscript{81} A three-part bibliography on hospital libraries and bibliotherapy that the British \textit{Library Association Record} published in 1931 provides some early testimony to the success of this publishing programme in helping to determine the shape of the subsequent scholarly archive—practically all of the sources listed are American.\textsuperscript{82}

Literary caregiving and hospital librarianship in Britain during the First World War was undertaken and administrated by charities rather than professional organisations like the ALA. Reliant as they were on public donations and voluntary labor, the priorities of charities like the War Library lay in fundraising and there was little emphasis on recording their activities for the historical record. The primary way in which they interacted with a wider public was through fundraising appeals and newspaper advertorials. Largely ephemeral in nature, these appeals generally did not achieve any visibility in the subsequent literature. The
records at Endell Street were further removed from easy recovery: staff disbanded, doctors lost their jobs, writers returned to their novels.\(^8^3\)

Although the War Library was ultimately able to continue its operations after the war as the British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library, this pattern persisted into the immediate post-war years. Staffed by volunteers, and reliant to a large extent on donations and subscriptions from participating hospitals, the Red Cross Hospital Library often had little in the way of working capital. Its staff spent most of the 1920s working privately behind the scenes. May Gaskell’s diary notes from this period, preserved in the British Red Cross Archives, reveal a demanding work schedule—travelling around the country visiting hospital administrators and attempting to encourage further hospitals to subscribe to the scheme.\(^8^4\) There was, however, no accompanying attempt to abstract a set of theoretical principles from the scheme’s activities, nor to document its effects in medical or library journals. The high level of organisation both here and in the case of Endell Street’s library did not therefore translate into the kind of recordkeeping that easily supports later scholarship. The women were not, after all, professional librarians, whatever other professional expertise and networks they brought to these ventures and used to improve their results.

A lack of effective publicity meant that the Hospital Library service was sometimes invisible even to the medical community that it had been set up to serve. After an inspection visit to hospitals in the British occupation zones in Germany in 1921, Gaskell and C. T. Hagberg Wright reported that they “were disappointed to find that, notwithstanding our letters and postcards to the hospitals a total ignorance of the existence of the Red Cross Hospital library as a living thing was evident.”\(^8^5\) Only after 1930, with the appointment of the ambitious, energetic and outward-facing Marjorie Roberts as Organizing Secretary, did the British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library begin systematically to pursue engagement with the library and medical professions, organizing sessions at British Library
Association conferences and instigating the establishment of hospital library sub-committees by the International Hospital Association and IFLA, the International Federation of Library Associations.86

Paying close attention to the unpublished and the non-scholarly archive can help recover something of the story of British First World War literary caregiving. These sources reveal the wider social and ideological contexts that sustained the literary caregiving initiative and the importance of gender—and suffrage networks in particular—to the success of the project. The anecdotes that charities’ fundraising material used to encourage donations, meanwhile, can be revealing in other ways. They indicate the working assumptions of literary caregivers about the ways in which books could heal and comfort both minds and bodies. The language choices they make, and the remarks recorded about the ways different sorts of reading matter could act as access routes to various kinds of patients, enabling them to begin the process of healing, suggest something about how these assumptions relate to the discourses and practices of what would subsequently become known as bibliotherapy. Recovering the global histories of bibliotherapeutic practice will involve broadening its accepted origin stories to encompass the war work undertaken by voluntary literary caregivers for the Red Cross War Library and in curative spaces like the Endell Street Hospital library.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Toni Bunch, Siobhan Campbell, Elizabeth Crawford, Patricia Ferguson, Karim Hussain, Mary Mahoney, Jesse Miller, Gillian Murphy, Jane Potter, Alison Ramsey, George Simmers, Shafquat Towheed, and Vincent Trott, as well as audiences at the Fictional First World War conference, University of Aberdeen, April 2017, and the peer reviewers at Literature and Medicine for their comments
and advice. Sara Haslam acknowledges with pleasure her particular debt to Wendy Moore and Jennian Geddes. Edmund King would like to thank audiences at SHARP 2018 and SHARP 2019 for feedback on earlier versions of this research.

Notes

1 The phrase “medicinable literature” is taken from Anon, “What to Read to the Wounded,” 6.
3 This story was subsequently re-told in Kent, “Learning History with, and from, Jane Austen.”
4 Crothers, “A Literary Clinic,” 291–301. For details of Crothers’ earlier lectures, see Dufour, “Reading for Health,” 2n3.
5 “Keystone State Library Association,” 108. For a fuller account of Crothers’s background and approach to “reparative” reading, see Miller, “Medicines of the Soul,” 21–30.
7 Morley, Haunted Bookshop, 16.
8 Morley, Haunted Bookshop, 5; 9.
9 Bate and Schuman, “The Art of Medicine,” 742–43.
12 Haslam, “Reading, Trauma, and Literary Caregiving.”
13 For a critical examination of the extant evidence and the considerable gaps in it, see Owen, “Conscripting Gentle Jane,” 38–9. We would like to thank Patricia Ferguson for sharing with us her research on Brett-Smith.
14 For a definition of the “institutional middle layer” and a brief discussion of its importance in library history, see Pawley, Reading Places, 15.
15 For the background, history, and organizational and funding details of the War Library, see Haslam, “Reading, Trauma, and Literary Caregiving.”
16 Gaskell to Lord Balniel, 12 March 1934. Charles Theodore Hagberg Wright (1862–1940) was Librarian at the London Library; he joined Gaskell as joint Honorary Secretary of the War Library at her request in 1915.

17 Gaskell, Red Cross and Order of St John War Library, 8.


19 For the representation of books as literal medical prescriptions in early to mid-twentieth-century American bibliotherapeutic discourse, see Connor, “Prescribed Reading,” 260–2, Dufour, “Reading for Health,” 36–9, and Mahoney, “Library as Medicine Cabinet.”

20 Writing in 1954, Gilbert Barker, the Librarian of what was by then The St. John and British Red Cross Hospital Library service, described “Hospital Librarianship” as functionally equivalent to “Bibliotherapy, as it has been baptised by our American friends.” See Barker, “The St. John and British Red Cross Hospital Library,” 393. In a piece published in 1990, Ronald Sturt suggested that British librarians had until the 1960s generally used the phrase “reading and mental health” rather than bibliotherapy. See Sturt, “Psychology of Reading,” 60.


22 Alice Herbert (1867–1941) was a novelist who expressed her interest in social issues affecting women in, for example, Garden Oats (1914). See Kemp, Mitchell, and Trotter, Oxford Companion to Edwardian Fiction, 180–1.

23 For details of Harraden’s life and publishing career, see Kemp, Mitchell, and Trotter, Oxford Companion to Edwardian Fiction, 174–5. Eleanor Elizabeth Bourne (1878–1957) was the first Queensland woman to study medicine, and her papers are held at the State Library of Queensland. Her short memoir, describing her time as a member of the medical staff at Endell Street, is entitled “Twenty Eight Years Ago.”


25 Gaskell, Red Cross and Order of St John War Library, 5.

26 Ibid., 8.

27 Ibid., 4.

28 Ibid., 7.

29 Warrender, My First Sixty Years, 125. This was the mansion offered by Gaskell’s friend Lady Battersea as a collection base for the books. Warrender included a five-page extract from Gaskell’s pamphlet as an Appendix to her memoir, 290–5. She later joined the Committee of the War Library and, when May Gaskell wrote to Lord Balniel in March 1934 to resign from the Committee (in the letter quoted above), she suggested Warrender as
her replacement, citing her long service with the Library and organisation of the house collections during the war years.


31 Anon, “What to Read to the Wounded,” 6. It is, perhaps, not coincidental that Austen was then approaching her centenary year, an event that attracted a good deal of memorializing attention in the context of the First World War. See Watson, Author’s Effects, 138–9.


33 Roberts, Hospital Libraries, 1.

34 Best, Story of the Red Cross, 136.

35 See Reports by the Joint War Committee, 272; Sturt, “Hospital Libraries in England and Wales,” 34–5.

36 British Red Cross and Order of St John Hospital Library Committee Minute Book, JCM/7/1/1/1, 8; 12–13.


38 Brassey’s husband, Earl Brassey, was a Liberal party politician who helped finance the library in 1914. See Brassey, Episodes and Reflections, 184–5.

39 Pugh, March of the Women, 218. Pugh cites the WSPU’s annual reports and the Janie Allan papers as sources for this information. For the background to this hospital and its suffrage contexts, see Geddes, “Deeds and Words” Geddes, “The Women’s Hospital Corps,” as well as Moore, Endell Street.

40 Robins, Diary, 9 November 1915. Brassey receives several other mentions in Robins’ diaries—they met on 10 June and 27 October 1915, for example.

41 See Haslam, “Reading, Trauma, and Literary Caregiving.”

42 Robins, Diary, entries for 29 June 1915, 16 September 1915, and (regarding Hadwen) 27 May 1915. (Hadwen had “called for” her at Endell Street.) Robins also knew the poet Eva Anstruther, Honorary Director of another First World War military book charity, the Camps’ Library. For a discussion of the Camps’ Library, see King, “‘Books Are More to Me than Food,’” 251–3.

43 Robins, Letters dated 10 September 1931 and 27 July 1932. Lady Brassey had sent Gaskell the book. Henry James is fundamental to a late chapter of this story. The combination of his long relationship with Elizabeth Robins, his American birth, and his views on the war fed the dynamic that demonstrated the soft power wielded by Endell Street, and this well-connected representative of it in particular.

44 Anderson, Letters regarding Women’s Hospital Corps, 7LGA/2/2/1.
Lord Esher, the liberal politician and historian whose 1904 report had led to the fundamental reorganisation of the British Army, was particularly impressed and wrote on 17 January 1915 (7LGA/2/1/28) urging them to continue their work in London: “were I wounded, I would prefer your hospital to any I have seen—and I have seen most! It would be a disaster for our fellows if your sympathetic handling of them were withdrawn.”

Anderson, Papers relating to Holloway Prison, 7LGA/1/2/3; 7LGA/1/2/4.

In the same letter she describes the challenges of the wounds; wounds she was not trained for (and nor was any other surgeon). See Geddes, “Deeds and Words,” 85–6. There are many accounts of visits to suffrage prisoners which include mentions of books being carried in, and Elizabeth Robins notes this activity in her diary.

Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, 193; 194.


“We are inundated with visitors, distinguished military and lay. The Duchess of Westminster has sent 6 of her doctors and many of her nurses to see over our hospital,” Louisa wrote to her mother on 4 October 1914. See Anderson, Letters from Women’s Hospital Corps, 7LGA/2/1/2.

Murray, Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.

All the press reports quoted from here, unless cited separately, are taken from cuttings included in Flora Murray’s Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.

Murray, Scrapbook, cutting from *Daily Chronicle* (25 April 1916). “Women’s Work” and “Women’s war work” were common headings at the time. For an example, see Fawcett, “Women’s Work in War Time.”

Cutting from the *Schoolmistress* (3 February 1916), in Murray, Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.


Robins, “Soldiers Two.”

The article, pasted into Murray’s cuttings book, is titled “The Soldiers’ Lady Librarians” but no newspaper title or date is given. See Murray, Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.

Anon, “Soldiers’ Books: The Chief Desires of the Wounded,” *Falkirk Herald* (12 January 1916): 4. This article is a digest of Harraden’s original lecture to the Home Reading Union.

*Daily Telegraph* cutting, dated 12 August 1916, in Murray, Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.

Roberts, “Hospital Library,” 526.


Murray, Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.

Article dated 24 September 1916 in Murray, Scrapbook, 7LGA/3.

This is, nonetheless, a perplexing view of the socio-politics and economics of a situation where women had to be paid for their work in order to live, as both Robins and Harraden did.

Sponsors of the 1918 British Red Cross sale at the Books, Manuscripts and Autograph Letters section at Christie’s, for instance, included the authors J. M. Barrie, Thomas Hardy, and E. V. Lucas, the Shakespeare critic Sydney Lee, *British Weekly* publisher William Robertson Nicoll, and the bibliophile and forger Thomas J. Wise, along with C. T. Hagberg Wright. This list of names indicates the close degree of engagement that existed between Red Cross operations and the British literary, library, and publishing worlds by the end of the war. See E. V. Lucas to William Robertson Nicoll, 9 February 1918, MS 3518/1/1/28.


Adcock papers, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

Robins, Diary, 1916, entry for 23 February 1916. Mrs Humphry Ward’s propaganda books *England’s Effort – Six Letters to an American Friend* and *Towards the Goal* were published in 1916 and 1917, the latter with a foreword by Theodore Roosevelt. Robins records in her diary that Ward had taken Roosevelt’s encouragement to write in support of the cause to the British Government (primarily C. F. G. Masterman who was running British propaganda efforts at the time out of Wellington House). Ward received, Robins notes, official “advice and help.” Robins herself records having taken letters to Masterman’s “propaganda office” at “Buck[ingham] Gate” (Wellington House was based there) the previous day, 22 February—this is all pertinent context for her transatlantic trip. For a brief account of Wellington House and its relationship to the British book trade, see Potter, “Book in Wartime,” 570–1.

Robins, Diary, 1916, entry for 5 February 1916.

Robins, Diary, 1916, entry for 29 February 1916.

Robins, Diary, 1916, entry for 2 March 1916.

The text of piece is published as an Appendix to Robins, *Theatre and Friendship*.

Koch, “Books in Camp, Trench and Hospital,” 103. For the circumstances under which Koch’s paper was reported at the conference, see “Louisville Conference,” 327.
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