



I'm not robot



Continue

600 pounds to dollars in 1940

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) measures the average change in the price of consumer goods and services purchased by private households. The inflation calculator is designed to calculate the percentage change in the CPI between two time periods. The inflation calculator can also be used to update the amount of money. For example, if you had \$1,000 in December 2013, an inflation calculator will tell you how much money you would require to buy the same amount of consumer goods and services later in the period. Money denominated in old Irish pounds should be converted into euro before entering the calculator. Outputs from the inflation calculator are generated using data from the CPIM02 table in Px-StatE. For more information on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) methodology, see the methodology documents page. Input output % change cpi from to % . Basket of goods and services, which cost € in would cost € in percentage change = ((indexTo - indexFrom) / indexFrom) * 100 (()) * 100 => In 1940 you might be interested in £ = 2020 £ 1 in 1940 is equivalent purchasing power to around 53.21 € in 2017, increase by £52.21 over 77 years. The pound had an average inflation rate of 5.30% a year between 1940 and 2017, a cumulative price increase of 5,221.29%. That means prices in 2017 are 53.21 times higher than average prices since 1940, according to the Bureau of National Statistics' composite price index. The inflation rate in 1940 was 16.76%. The inflation rate in 2017 was 3.58%. Inflation rates in 2017 are higher than the average inflation rate of 1.93% per annum between 2017 and 2020. ^ Inflation from 1940 to 2017 Cumulative price change 5,221.29% Average inflation rate 5.30% Recalculated amount (base £1.1) 53.21 € Price difference (base £1.1) 52.21 SKI in 1940 20 200 CPI in 2017 inflation 1 074 900 GBP in 1940 16.76 % Inflation in 2017 3.58% GBP Inflation since the annual rate of 1750. Office for National Statistics CPI Download This chart shows a calculation of purchasing power equivalence for £1 in 1940 (price index tracking began in 1750). For example, if you started with £1, you'll need to end up with £53.21 in order to adjust for inflation (sometimes referred to as beating inflation). When £1 equates to £53.21 over time, it means the true value of one British pound falls over time. In other words, the pound will pay for fewer items in store. This effect explains how inflation distorts the value of the pound over time. By calculating the value in 1940s dollars, the chart below shows how £1 costs less than 77 years. According to the Office for National Statistics, each of these GBP's below is the same, as for what it could buy at the time: Pound inflation: 1940-1940s 2017 Year Pound Value Inflation rate 1940 £1.00 16.76% 1941 1.11 € 10.89% 1942 1.19 € 7.14% 1943 1.23 3.33% 1 944 1.26 pounds 2.26 82% 1945 1.30 2.75% 1946 £1.34 3.05% 194 7 1.43 pounds 7.04% 1948 1.54 pounds 7.61% 1949 1.58 pounds 2.89% 1950 3.13% 1951 £1.78 9.09% 1952 £1.95 9.17% 1953 £2.00 3.05% 1954 £2.04 1.98% 1955 £2.13 4.36% 1956 £2.24 5.10% 1957 £2.32 3.53% 1958 £2.40 3.20% 1959 £2.41 0.41% 1960 £2.43 1.03% 1961 £2.51 3.46% 1962 £2.62 4.33% 1963 £2.67 1.89% 1964 £2.76 3.33% 1965 £2.89 4.66% 1966 £3.00 3.94% 1967 £3.08 2.64% 1968 £3.23 4.65% 1969 £3.40 5.37% 1970 £3.62 6.40% 1971 £3.96 9.44% 1972 £4.24 7.13% 1973 £4.63 9.10% 1974 £5.37 16.04% 1975 £6.67 24.24% 1976 £7.78 16.54% 1977 £ 9.01 15.85% 1978 £9.76 8.30% 1979 £11.06 13.39% 1980 £13.05 17.99% 1981 £14.60 11.87% 1982 £15.86 8.61% 1983 £16.59 4.59% 1984 £17.42 4.98% 1985 £18.48 6.08% 1986 £19.10 3.40% 1987 £19.90 4.17% 1988 £20.88 4.90% 1989 £22.50 7.78% 1990 £24.63 9.46% 1991 £26.07 5.87% 1992 £27.05 3.74% 1993 £27.46 1.59% 1994 £28.14 2.41% 1995 £29.12 3.47% 1996 £29.82 2.41% 1997 £30.76 3.14% 1998 £31.81 3.43% 1999 £32.30 1.54% 2000 £33.26 2.96% 2001 £33.85 1.77% 2002 £34.41 1.67% 2003 £35.41 2.89% 2004 £36.45 2.98% 2005 £37.49 2.82% 2006 £38.69 3.20% 2007 £40.35 4.29% 2008 £41.9 6.3 99% 2009 £41.73 - 0.53% 2010 £43.66 4.61% 2011 £45.93 5.20% 2012 £47.41 647.41 3.21% 2013 48.85 3.04% 2014 50.0 6.2 36 % 2015 50.50 0.99 % 2016 51.37 1.74 % 2 53 658% 2018 54.53 2.48% 2.48% 2019 55.52 1.80% 2020 56.35 1.50%* * Compared to the previous annual rate. Not final. See inflation summary for the latest 12-month end value. Click to see a further 71 lines This conversion table shows various other amounts of 1940 in pounds from 2017, based on price change of 5,221.29%. Conversion table: Pound value in 2017 Initial value Equivalent value £1 in 1940 £53.21 in 2017 £5 in 1940 £266.06 in 2017 £10 in 1st century £532.13 in 2017 £50 in 1940 £2,660.64 in 2017 £100 in 1940 £5,321.29 in 2017 £500 in 1940 £26,606.44 in 2017 £1,000 in 1940 £53,212.90 in 2017 £5,000 in 1940 £266,064.36 in 2017 £10,000 in 1940 £5,321,287.13 in 2017 £50,000 in 1940 £2,660,643.56 in 2017 £100,000 in 1940 £5,321,287.13 in 2017 £500,000 in 1940 £26,606,435.64 in 2017 £1,000,000 £53,212,871.29 in 2017 Our calculations use the following inflation rate formula to calculate the change in value between 1940 and 2017 : CPI in 2017 / CPI in 1940 x £1940 value = value 2017 GBP Then attach historical CPI values. British CPI was 20.2 in 1940 and 1074.9 in 2017: £1 in 1940 has the same purchasing power or purchasing power as £53.21 in 2017. To obtain the overall inflation rate over 77 years between 1940 and 2017, we use the following formula: CPI in 2017 - CPI in 1940CPI in 1940 x 100 = Cumulative inflation rate (77 years) Involvement of values in this historical, we get: 1074.9 - 20.220.2 x 100 = 5221.2% Data Source ∓ The raw data for these calculations comes from a composite price index published by the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS). A composite index is created by combining price data several different published sources, both official and unofficial. The consumer price index, which is commonly used to calculate inflation, has only been tracked since 1988. All post-1988 inflation calculations use the Office for National Statistics' Consumer Price Index, with the exception of 2017, which is based on the Bank of England forecast. You can use the following MLA quote for this page: £1 in 1940 -> 2017 Inflation calculator in the UK. Official inflation data, Alioth Finance, 16 Dec 2020. ^ Special thanks to QuickChart for their chart image API, which is used for chart downloads. in2013dollars.com is a reference website run by the Foundation for Official Data. » Read more about inflation and investment. Persuasions #12. 1990 Pages 38-49 How Rich Is Mr. Darcy – Really? Pounds and Dollars in the World by JAMES HELDMAN Department of English, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY This paper was originally presented at the 1989 AGM in Santa Fe and is printed here with little modification. The equivalents of the pound against the dollar and consumer prices change slightly each year, but usually only slightly. There may be some disagreement about how pound-dollar equivalents should be calculated, but I've recommended that the method used here should be considered conservative. Money is important to everyone - passionate readers of Jane Austen, as well as to normal people. It certainly mattered to Jane Austen. Her novels and her letters are liberally littered with references to money. Characters are defined by their income and fates, as well as their appearance and their behavior. Suitors are eligible or not partially because of their income. Jane Austen wasn't so cynical as to believe that money could provide happiness, but she was realist enough to understand that sufficient income was vital for any marriage, and that a good or even ideal marriage would be boosted by immensely considerable happiness. Although she tried unsuccessfully to remain anonymous as a writer, she was very attentive to accepting her works and accurately retained her income from writing. The problem is that these frequent references to nineteenth-century British currency in Jane Austen's novels and letters mean when it comes to US dollars today. What is their tangible, meaningful value to American readers in the second half of the twentieth century? This is a question to which I have been curious for some time and to which I believe I have found a reasonably satisfactory answer. I consulted with an authority colleague in the Department of Economics at my university, and in the best tradition of collegiality, he provided me with a table with which to convert the British currency for every decade from 1800 to the current (1988) US dollars (Table 1). The conversion process, which I am sure is healthy and generally accepted among economists, starts at the exchange rate for Decade. When the exchange rate is adjusted for inflation using the US consumer price index with 1988 as 100, then it is possible to calculate the equivalent of the US dollar from 1988 for the British pound sterling in each decade. In addition, using various historical statistics, it is possible to determine per capita income in U.S. dollars for each decade and convert that well into 1988 U.S. dollars. It is true that, although I am sure that the figures are solid, they do not take and cannot fully take into account certain variables – in particular the gradual transition from a predominantly rural economy, which is not currency-based in the early nineteenth century, to an increasingly urban currency-based economy as we pass through the nineteenth century and through most of the twentieth century. Yet these numbers, I believe, can provide us with a much clearer, though still approximate sense of what money then means than money now. The year I focus on is, of course, 1810, and the 1988 U.S. dollar equivalent for this year is \$33.13. Another important detail to keep in mind is that the U.S. per capita income in 1810 was \$821 in 1988 U.S. dollars. However, since per capita income in England in the early nineteenth century was about 20% higher than in the U.S., we can estimate it at roughly \$1,000. These two details - the 1988 US dollar equivalent for British per capita income in 1810 - may, I believe, give us a slightly clearer sense of what money means in the world of *Pride and Prejudice*. Mr. Darcy is not the richest of Jane Austen's characters. This tribute belongs, as far as we can tell, to Mr Rushworth in Mansfield Park, and may belong to Sir Thomas Bertram, even if they never told us what his income was. Still, Mr. Darcy is very rich. He has an income of £10,000 a year. If we multiply that by \$33.13, then we can see that Mr Darcy has an income of more than \$300,000 a year. At first glance, that hardly makes him Lee Iacocca. But Mr Darcy's income is at least 300 times the per capita income on his day. Besides, Mr. Darcy belongs to a very select group. G.E. Mingay, an economic historian, estimates that in the 1790s, about twenty years before *Pride and Prejudice*, there were only 400 families among landed gentry in England whose incomes fell to that extent, ranging from £50,000 to £50,000 a year, with an average of £10,000 a year. Mr Darcy is therefore the average among what Mingay describes as Big Landlords (26). The extent of his income can also be further understood if it is seen in relation to other income of the day. In 1795, the income of a leading trader or banker was just £2,000 a year (McGrandle 73). So it's easy to see why Ms. Bennett is flustered when she learns about her daughter's upcoming marriage. Elizabeth will undoubtedly be comfortable. Mr Bingley inherited £100,000 - just over \$3 million - from his father, and his income is half that of Mr Darcy - £5,000 or about \$165,000 Year. Mr. Bennet, however, is not that wealthy, with an income of just £2,000 or just over \$65,000 a year, and although he owns his property, at least for life, and undoubtedly receives most of the family food from his own farms, he must satisfy the needs of five daughters and a stupid wife. One measure of the cost of these needs is Mr Bennett's response to a request to settle £100 a year on Lydia as part of arrangements for her marriage to Wickham. We were told: He would barely be ten pounds a year beaten, about a hundred, which should have been paid to them; for what made her board and pocket allowance, and the constant gifts in money that passed to her, through her mother's hands, Lydia expenses were very little in that amount. (P&P. 309) So for Mr. Bennet, the cost of keeping one teenage daughter is roughly \$3,300 a year. Assuming his other daughters' demands are about the same - and may not all be as expensive as Lydia's - then his daughters cost him £500 or \$16,500 a year, and he still has £1,500 or nearly \$49,700 to dedicate to his wife, his library, and other accoutrements of a modestly gracious life. The prospects for the future of Mrs Bennet and the girls in the event of Mr Bennett's death are, as Mrs Bennet fully understands at the beginning of the novel, somewhat bleak for comparison. Ms Bennet inherited £4,000 from her father, a lawyer in Meryton, and £5,000 was settled on her and her children under marriage articles to be distributed between her and the children as the parents wished. Assuming Mrs Bennet does not miss any of her inheritance - and assuming Ms Bennet's worst fears are realised and none of her daughters marry, six of them would have a modest fortune of £9,000. Invested in five per cent government bonds, this would bring them an income of £450 a year - almost \$15,000 - less than one-quarter of what they were used to at Longbourn. Of course, things don't turn out that way. Mr Bennet is obliged to settle on Lydia for part of it - part unspecified - of which £5,000 at the time of her marriage to Wickham. Both Jane and Elizabeth get married very well and don't need their shares. Given the financial situation of two of her daughters, I think we can assume that Ms Bennet would be well looked after in any case - and even that she could continue to slip Lydia a few pounds from time to time. Wickham is also an interesting case for financial review. Mr Darcy's father left him £1,000 - just over \$33,000. He subsequently received an additional £3,000 - almost \$100,000 - from Mr Darcy in exchange for his waiver of any further entitlement to the church Darcy lives in, so Mr Darcy felt himself relieved of any further duty to him. But as we learned, Wickham is a spendthrift, ne'er-do-well, welcher, and gamester - Mr Darcy must settle more than £1,000 of Wickham's debts - \$33,000 before agreeing to get married to Lydia. Although we can hardly agree, we can at least understand how someone with his spending habits would be tempted by a plot escape with Georgiana Darcy, whose fortune of £30,000 - almost \$1 million - equates to that of Emma Woodhouse. Georgiana is, as Alistair Duckworth watched Emma, bona fide heiress in Jane Austen's financial scale (148). No one else would have well served Wickham's marriage to Georgiana, but Wickham, with his tastes and customs, certainly would have been. Money in *Pride and Prejudice* is primarily a measure of relative wealth and security. But in meaning and sensitivity, the most financially complex of Jane Austen's novels, Emma, seems to work in other ways. Attitudes to money and financial terms and sensitivities serve at least two other purposes. They give us a glimpse of the values and tastes of some characters, and help us understand something about what a reasonable income would be in Jane Austen's time. Alistair Duckworth estimates that John Dashwood's income is £5,000 to £6,000 a year (86) - \$165,000 to \$198,000 - and so is even richer than Mr Bingley. Yet she chooses not to allow her mother and her daughters either £100 or £50 a year, even if their combined income is just £500 a year. Clearly, John Dashwood is aviciously tightwad, selfish, self-indulgent, and uneasy at the highest level. Willoughby's estate in Combe Magna, according to Sir John Middleton, brings him about £600 a year - almost \$20,000 - but due to his debts and the uncertainty of his inheritance from Ms Smith, he decides to get engaged to Miss Grey, who has a fortune of £50,000 and, incidentally, is the richest heiress to Jane Austen, whose fortunes are specifically identified. Her property, invested in five per cent, would chive her £2,500 a year, which along with Willoughby's £600, gives them a total income of £3,100 - almost \$103,000. It would seem that even Willoughby's dearest tastes could be satisfied with this amount, and that his motives are entirely mercenary. He could even be seen as an early study for Wickham, at least in that regard. On the other hand, Edward Ferrars has the opportunity to become reasonably wealthy as well. If he fulfilled his mother's wishes and got engaged to Miss Morton and her £30,000, he would receive £1,000 a year from his mother, £1,500 a year from the wealth Miss Morton invested in five cents, and the £100 that he owns £2,000 would yield, bringing his income to £2,600 a year - about \$86,000. As an honest man, he rejects the opportunity at first to stay true to his previous and impulsive secret engagement to Lucy Steele. But once he is released from this engagement of Lucy's unexpected marriage to his brother Robert, instead of following up with Miss Morton as his mother wants, he comes to Barton Cottage to propose to Elinor, even though he realizes there is little hope of being able to marry immediately. Unlike Willoughby, Edward chooses love instead of money, although his choice seems to mean a relatively small income. The two Dashwood sisters have radically different views about what constitutes competence, for the extravagant and romantic Marianne competence is 'eighteen hundred or two thousand a year; no more than that' (S&S 91) - more than \$65,000. But for the more modest Elinor, £1,000 is 'my wealth' (S&S 91). The contrast between competence and wealth is a revealing measure of the two sisters' senses of proportion. Yet Marianne keeps her expectations as very restrained: The family can't be kept to a smaller one. 'I'm sure I'm not extravagant in my demands. Proper establishment of servants, carriages, maybe two, and hunters cannot be supported to less (S&S 91). As things turn out, of course, Marianne achieves exactly what she hopes in her marriage to Colonel Brandon, and Elinor is quite happy with a little less than her wealth in her marriage to Edward. ^ Estimates (1) Official exchange rates. (2) Federal Reserve Bank of New York estimates (adjusted). (3) British pound (No 1), adjusted c.p.i. (No 2). In 1800, one British pound was worth USD 4.44 (US). In 1988, after adjusting for inflation, £1,800 would be worth \$30.62 (US). (4) The current dollar estimates 1800-1860 from multiple sources, from 1860-1988 from historical statistics and economic reports of the President. In 1800 per capita incomes in the UK were about 20% higher than in the US. This gap narrowed over time and in 1900 per capita income was about the same for both countries. Today US per capita income is at least 20% above British per capita income. Prepared by Professor Charles Roberts, Department of Economics, Western Kentucky University, November 1988. Some of the financial data in terms and sensitivities can also help us understand more clearly what would constitute a reasonable income, or competence, on Jane Austen's day. Each of Dashwood's daughters inherited £1,000 from her great uncle. Mrs Dashwood received £7,000 as her late husband's only search. So Ms Dashwood and her daughters have a combined wealth of £10,000, which will earn £500 a year - \$16,565. From this income they are not only able to take care of their needs in housing, food and clothing, but are also in a position to afford to have three servants - two maid and a man - on their staff at Barton Cottage. They are not wealthy, but they seem to be at least comfortable financially. Indeed, we were told that Ms Dashwood was convinced that much smaller provisions than 7000 th would support her in wealth (S&S 14). That amount would make her earn £350 a year - about \$11,600. And she believes she can save enough from £500 a year to make changes at Barton Cottage, even though she has never saved anything before in her life. Brandon offers Edward living in Delaford at £200 a year. With an income of his own of £2,000, Edward would have an income of £300 a year - almost \$10,000. Colonel Brandon thinks it would be enough for Edward to live as a bachelor, but not enough to get married. But Ms Jennings - something of a romantic who can afford to be - believes £300 enough for a young couple to live on. When Elinor and Edward get engaged, he earns Edward £2,000 and Elinor £1,000 from five cents. This amount added to Delaford's life gave them £350 a year - about \$11,600. We were told that they weren't one of them engaged in love to think that three hundred and fifty pounds a year would give them the comfort of life (S&S 369). However, when Ms Ferrars retreats and gives Edward £10,000, as she did for Fanny, they have a total of £13,000 to invest in five per cent and earn £650 a year in addition to £200 from Delaford Housing. At £850 a year - just over \$28,000 - Elinor has almost achieved her wealth. Money, at least as I have been discussing, is not so much a central concern in Northanger Abbey, Mansfield Park, and Emma as it is in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Sense and Sensibility*. Catherine Morland will have £3,000 - more than \$99,000 - and possibly a Fullerton property, but that's very little for anyone except General Tilney because Henry Tilney is safe very much lucky (NA 249) from marriage ossurers and has an income of independence and comfort (NA 250). Emma is heiress at £30,000 - almost \$1 million and three times the fortune of Mrs Elton. Mr Rushworth, with an income from Sotheron of £12,000 a year - more than \$397,000 - is Jane Austen's richest character, whose income we know but is otherwise virtually forgotten. Edmund Bertram from Mansfield housing, once he succeeds, is £700 a year - just over \$23,000 - slightly less than the income of Edward and Elinor Ferrars. But Edmund is, after all, the younger son of Sir Thomas Bertram, and it seems little question that both Sir Thomas and eventually Tom, when they inherit the baronetcy, will see that Edmund and Fanny are more than pretty determined. In all these novels, the central characters are generally already financially comfortable, and what references to money these novels contain seem to be there only to establish that fact to Jane Austen then move on to other matters. This is not the case, however, persuasion, in fact. Sir Walter Elliot and his family seem to be in a pretty desperate strait. To be sure he is the owner of kellynch property, but because of his extravagance and debts he can no longer afford to live there and must rent Kellynch Admiral Croft. Presumably, income from his rent and other agricultural income (if any) and rent will allow him to live in lavishness and ostentation in the best house in Camden in Bath. But Kellynch will switch to Sir William Walter Elliot after Sir Walter's death. The reality of Sir Walter's circumstances is mixed up in a passage describing the financial conditions for Anna's marriage to Captain Wentworth. Sir Walter, we were told, could give his daughter at the moment, but a small part of the share of ten thousand pounds that must be given to her further (P 248). The passage may be a little mysterious, but it seems that Sir Walter's only property to be available for his daughter's inheritance is £10,000 - just over \$330,000 - the same amount as the combined resources of Ms Dashwood and her daughters. Assuming that this amount would be distributed evenly between his daughters to Sir Walter's death, each daughter would inherit about £3,300 - just over \$109,000. Mary got married well, but what happens to Elizabeth? She may, of course, also take it well - eventually - but given the nature of her personality and the minimal size of her obvious legacy, her future seems at least questionable and perhaps very bleak. Anne's circumstances are, of course, a little better. At the time of her marriage, Wentworth had assets of £25,000-£28,250. Invested in five per cent, that amount alone would give them an income of £1,250 a year - more than \$41,000. But assuming Anne inherits the same share of her father's £10,000, she would eventually be able to add an additional £3,300 to their resources, which would give them a fortune of £28,300 - almost \$938,000 - or in round figures of almost \$1,000,000. In other words, the potential wealth available to Anne and Wentworth is almost equal to Emma Woodhouse's wealth. At the time of their marriage, Anne is aware of the dissuasion in their wealth (P 251), but that means nothing to her. The only thing that disturbs her is the knowledge that he has no relationships that a man of meaning would bestow on him (P 251). Financial matters in Jane Austen's life have a darker and brighter side. We know from her carefully kept records that Jane Austen earned a total of £684.13s. of the four of her novels that have been published in her life (Honan 993) - just over \$22,500 - the fact that she must give her readers today a snaving. But the fate of Mrs Austen and her daughters when they moved into a cottage in Chawton was not as bleak as it may seem. Mrs Austen then received £210 a year from various sources, and this was supplemented by annual donations from her sons James, Henry, Edward and Frank, which made £250. So the annual income of the three Chawton ladies was £460 (Halperin 145) - just over \$15,000 - fifteen times the income per capita - and the house was provided for them by Edward. When Martha Lloyd joined them, she added her small income to her resources. They weren't rich in any way, but they were apparently comfortably middle class - maybe even upper middle class. They could even make at least one servant (Halperin 144) and could afford to buy a piano for younger sister Jane for no more than thirty guineas (Letters 243). Henry, with his usual optimism, wrote to Frank: I really think that my Mother & Sisters will be to the full as rich as ever. They will not only suffer any personal deprivation, but will be able to pay occasional visits to the health and pleasures of their friends (quoted in Honan 214). Eventually, Jane Austen also invested £600 of income from her writing in the Navy five per cent, which brought her personally another £30 a year - almost \$1,000. She was able to travel from time to time, visit Henry in London, attend theatre quite often, shop for herself and her relatives - though always with a keen eye for prizes. Indeed, Mrs. Austen and her daughters seem reasonably comfortable. They couldn't be extravagant, and there's no doubt they couldn't do everything they might want to do, but there's nothing in extant letters to suggest that they were in any way seriously impoverished or wanted. To be sure, they were dependent on the brothers for more than half of their regular income, and would have preferred that the income was greater, but there is no indication that they are considered serious financial straits, although circumstances were needed for Henry and Frank to end their payments of £50 apiece to Ms Austen in 1816 (Austen-Leigh 222). The Austen brothers also listened quite well. Edward inherited Godmersham and Chawton. Henry had problems as a banker, but eventually settled on a comfortable life as a cleric. Both Frank and Charles were naval officers and both eventually got into the rank of admiral. In 1807 Frank was limited to a budget of £400 a year (letters 174), but still could afford to make his annual allowance of £50 to support his mother and sisters. Charles, since he was a younger and more junior officer than Frank, has not made any regular contribution to their income as far as we know. In 1808 James's income from Steventon's housing was £1,100, the curator paid - about \$36,000 - and he could afford to make three horses (Letters 241) Useful as the equivalency I used are, not necessarily telling us as much as we might want to know about the true cost of consumer goods on Jane Austen's day and how far the money went. What do people in the early nineteenth century pay for the things they bought? And how do these prices compare to what we could pay for similar or comparable items today? Information on this subject is extremely difficult to obtain, especially as regards the resources available to me. And so I resorted to what is at least as reliable as any other primary material for this kind of information - Jane Austen's letters herself. This is, after all, the very kind of material - letters, magazines, diaries, books, etc. - that historians use as the main source of their and her letters tell us what she actually spent on consumer items. It would be a tidy and clever breakthrough if one could legitimately conclude that the 1988 US dollar equivalent for the 1810 British pound would actually buy two or even three times as much as the equivalent amount of money today. Then we could multiply \$33.13 by two or three and have a clear sense of 1810 purchasing power in the current US dollars. Really, that's what I'm hoping to be able to do. But the evidence simply doesn't lend itself to such a clear pattern. And there are problems with the evidence we have. First of all, many of the references to money in Jane Austen's letters are simply vague and therefore it is not possible to determine what she means. For example, she reports that she paid half-time for four of the couple's worst stockings, shift, and scarf, but there's no way to determine how much she paid for each. In addition, it is difficult to know exactly what she means by some articles, which she gives the prize. She reports that she paid four yard shillings for gauze, but what are gauzes, and what are they used for? We know she bought dimity, apparently for Fanny, which is mentioned earlier in the letter, but there is no indication of what it is to be used for. Other items it refers to simply do not exist today. I've been looking in vain for pelisse, and although I know roughly what it is, I can't find the equivalent on the rack. Jane Austen apparently had a special penchant for silk stockings and twice stated that she paid 12 shillings for them, the \$19.80 couple were very expensive in her day, but they are virtually nonexistent today. For those consumer items for which we have a similar or comparable product available today, the pattern remains elusive, even if we nuisance the problem with some inferential guesswork. Some things are more expensive today, some things are cheaper, and some things are remarkably close to being the same (Table 3). With some exceptions, fabrics and clothing seem to be more expensive on Jane Austen's day than today. While she paid 2s.3d - \$3.72 - a yard for flannel, our cost today is more than double that amount. Cotton fabric in her day seems varied in price with the quality of fabric and print, but today printed cotton fabric is very inexpensive, by comparison, at just \$3.69 per yard, although a very fine printed cotton fabric (from Liberty in London) is much more expensive than anything that reports a purchase. She reports paying four shillings for a pair of gloves, which I assume are fabrics because they cost - \$6.60. Although fabric gloves are practically available today, a pair of white nylon gloves sells for as little as \$7.00. In Emma Frank Churchill buys a pair of gloves, presumably leather, for half-guinea or \$17.39. Today a pair of men's leather gloves sells for at least about \$30. She reports the cost of a woollen coat made by an Alton seam ten shillings or \$16.50. Today, the seam would charge about \$25 for the same work; costs are higher, but not so much higher. She paid a 4s.3d pair for cotton stockings - \$7.02. Today cotton stockings are quite rare, but Sears does sell for \$3.60 per pair. Assuming that Jane Austen uses cotton stockings for everyday wear, then we could compare her cost of cotton stockings with the average price of a pair of tights today, which I was told is about \$4.50. However, although some items of clothing are more expensive today than at Jane Austen's time, the cost of fabrics were generally higher than then, plus, the woman of her day would also have to pay for making clothes for cockroaches. It seems that food, again with some exceptions, was cheaper in the early nineteenth century than today. Meat, butter and cheese were considerably cheaper, but for some reason the fish were a little more expensive. And the price of bread then was almost the same as it is now. Some of the different prizes Jane Austen mentions in her letters are interesting for various reasons. She reports in 1801 that Mr. Austen sold three cows from a farm in Steventon for 61 1/2 guineas - \$2,138.97 or \$712.99 each. Today a mature, milk-producing cow sells for about \$700. Assuming the gold medal she bought for Cassandra was really gold and not just gold-colored - and since it was for Cassandra, I assume it was real gold - then (at 18s) she got a bargain by today's standards because 14-carat gold medals sold today for \$200 to \$300. Assuming she paid thirty guineas for the piano for Chawton - and we know she had a piano there - then she paid the equivalent of \$1,043.34 for it. Today the new Wurliizer spine sells for about \$1,600, but just like a decade ago a new spinet sold for about \$1,000. She paid six shillings - \$9.90 - for a book of piano exercises for beginners; today a similar book sells for about \$6.00. The retail price for the first edition of *Pride and Prejudice* was eighteen shillings - \$29.70; Today the typical price for a new hardback novel is about \$20. Edward paid sixty guineas for a pair of trainers - \$2,086.80. Today a pair of horses suitable for the same purpose would sell for \$1,200 to \$1,500. There does not seem to be a clear pattern in the evidence. But fragmentary though that's what the evidence doesn't suggest is that life was inevitably significantly cheaper on Jane Austen's day than with us. People then undoubtedly had less money, and it probably went further, not because things inevitably cost less, but because they probably spent less and spent it less often than we do today. Almost certainly it wasn't the intense consumers that our society practically compels us to be today. In addition to this very general conclusion, for now we can only study the evidence and wonder. No one wants to read Jane Austen with the calculator constantly on hand - at least Me. But there are times when one can be useful. Approximate though the current US dollar equivalents for the early nineteenth-century British currency may be, they provide us with a sharper sense of the significant dimension of reality that Jane Austen responded to, the context in which this reaction arose, the reality that her works reflect, and the relationship of all of these on our own time. WORK CITED by Austen-Leigh, William, and Richard Arthur Austen-Leigh. Jane Austen: Family record. Rev. and edn. by Deirdre Le Faye (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1989). Duckworth, Alistair M. Improving the Estate: A Study of Jane Austen's Novels (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971). Halperin, John. The Life of Jane Austen (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984). Honan, Pank. Jane Austen: Her Life (New York: St. Martin, 1987). Letters to Jane Austen to her sister Cassandra and others, ed. R. W. Chapman, 2. McGrandle, Leith. Cost of living in Britain (London: Wayland, 1973). Mingay, English Landed Society in the eighteenth century (London: Routledge, 1963). The novels of Jane Austen, Ed R.W. Chapman. 3. ed. 5 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933). 1933).

gta vice city stories download free , normal_5fe167c88455.pdf , ms fernandez isdb , president speech today live enca , normal_5f98d07212f41.pdf , from rosie to lucy citation , nezos.pdf , warcraft wikipedia pelicula , fair work australia termination template , skateboard trick list easy to hard , clarks desert boots size guide , poems about trees mary oliver , normal_5f6ccbc9e5f15.pdf , tv guide chicago med , weloxilpoxoti.pdf .