

16, New Burlington Street. W.

London

16th July 1890.

My dear Sir,

I thank you sincerely for
your kind letter of the 2nd, especially
for the "adding" to the name of
"adding to your name a distinction"

"which would, in fact, be no distinction,
" as I fancy you are more widely known
" than McGill itself." This is so remarkably

an echo of the postscript of the enclosed letter,
that I feel I must send it to you. It is from

the D. Murray of Oxford who is editing
that glorious Dictionary of the English language.
In a letter which I had sent asking him
whether the word "endow" had changed in
signification during the past two centuries,
I signed myself as, "Honorary Fellow of the
Royal Society of Literature," thinking that
as to be an Hon. F. R. S. L. is a distinction
conferred only on writers of eminence in
some branch of literature, D. Murray
would be the more willing to answer my
inquiry.

You will see that he says:— "I am sure Mr.
" Washington Moon does not need any lustre from
" the R. S. L., but he rather confers it upon
" that body, whose name cannot be so well
" known as his own."

Kindly defer speaking about me
until you receive from me a copy
of the new edition of "Men & Women of the Time,"
which shall be accompanied by some vols
of my other works, probably about Oct^r.

Yours faithfully

Geo. Washington Moon.

Sir J. Dawson, Bt. F.R.S. &c &c

Mom
From Dr. MURRAY,
(Sunnyside, Banbury Road,) *Re Deuce,*

OXFORD, 10 July 1889

Dear Sir,

Our slips afford us light on your question. They show "endor" only in the ordinary senses, technical & general - the latter = gift, enrich, invest with.

I presume that when the two become 'one flesh' the wife becomes jointly possessed with her husband of all that he has, and that it is this gifting w. enriching or investing which is meant - the first composer of the words having never supposed that the keen criticism of the 19th c. would mistake or doubt ~~about~~ their meaning.

I cannot however adduce any example quite parallel, or any in which ~~there is~~ endor is used elliptically for 'endor with the ^{joint} use of' or with full participation in'. I suppose *cele va sans dire* in the case in point. Has anybody ever doubted as

to the meaning during the ages? or is
it merely the Married Women's Property
Act, and Women's Rights doctrines
that have raised it? I expect suppose
that a modern lawyer would use more
cautious language - though I fancy
that even now some such addition as
'to and for your sole use and benefit'
would be necessary to obtain a hearing
in court for such a claim.

Yours very truly

James M. Murray

I am sure Mr Washington Moon
does not need any luster from the D. S. L.,
but he rather confers it upon that body,
whose name cannot be so well known as
his own.