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Editorial – Fears and Hopes

Patrick O’Sullivan

If I am ever asked (I think it unlikely) to fill out one of the questionnaires often published in the colour sections of weekend broadsheet newspapers, my answer to the question ‘If you could bring something extinct back to life, what would it be?’ would be ‘The British Labour Party!’ Of course, events during the recent UK party conference season, including Mr Miliband’s apparent rediscovery of at least part of his mojo, and the shameful attack on his late father by ‘the newspaper that supported Mussolini, Mosley, Franco, and Hitler’, may lead me, over the next few weeks and months, to modify my view, but if so, I would consider that something to be applauded.

And for once, I do not seem to be alone. Over the past year, judging by the letters page of The Guardian, the same subject has been a major pre-occupation of the UK chattering classes, with correspondents asking ‘Where is the Labour Party?’, and ‘Who can revive the spirit of ’45?’, and asserting that while ‘Labour’s achievements are something to be proud of’, the party now needs ‘to inspire hope’, to ‘assert fundamental principles’, and ‘connect with the new generation’. Its leader, when not being told to resign, is exhorted not to be timid, and reminded that ‘voters cry out for bigger ideas’. There has also been discussion of ‘the Labour Party we’d like to vote for’, and the recent announcement of ‘Left Unity’, a new party ‘to the left of Labour’.

Various columnists have covered much the same ground. The principal exponent is Polly Toynbee, who thirty years ago was campaigning vigorously for the SDP, but who over recent months has asked ‘What would Labour do?’, and ‘Will Labour have the guts to fight . . .?’, while exhorting Ed Miliband (not for the first time) to ‘be of good cheer, be bold [and] stop jumping at shadows’, and suggesting that ‘a Labour win is still on – if alienated Tories and Lib Dems play ball’. Much of this literature is pessimistic, however, so that we also read Catherine Bennett claiming that ‘all for one and one for all is so old-fashioned now’, and Jonathan Freedland maintaining that, nowadays, ‘life in the UK just isn’t fair’. John Harris asks ‘Where is Labour going wrong?’ and ‘Is it time for a left-wing version of UKIP?’, while Deborah Orr believes that ‘it’s time for a better capitalism’ (urgent reading of News from Nowhere recommended, Ms Orr!), and that
today, idealism gets you nowhere. Similarly, Andrew Rawnsley believes that ‘The two Eds … (must) convince voters (that) … a Labour government will be disciplined’, Geoffrey Wheatcroft asks ‘What is the Labour party for?’ (and claims that ‘The decline of interest in politics is worse news for Labour’), while Suzanne Moore argues that ‘ordinary people have lost interest on party politics’.

Martin Kettle, a man who has long proclaimed ‘the death of socialism’, asserts that ‘A Lib-Lab deal in 2015 may be Ed Miliband’s only chance of government’. However, the great Iain Banks, interviewed shortly before his recent death, may have been much nearer the mark: ‘Squeeze practically any Tory, any Blairite, and any Lib Dem of the Orange Book persuasion, and it’s the same poisonous Thatcherite pus that comes oozing out of all of them’. The only regular Guardian columnist who seems to me not to have lost his nerve in the face of the great god of the free market is Seumas Milne, who even during the days leading up to her funeral advocated ‘It’s time to bury not just Thatcher, but Thatcherism’, and – and à propos of ‘Falkirk’ – that ‘Labour’s links with the unions are its greatest asset’, and that ‘The real problem is that trade unions … aren’t influential enough’.

Part of the ‘real problem’ here is not right-wing politicians implementing right-wing policies – who could quibble with that? – but that nowadays many so-called ‘centre-left’ parties also concede that capitalism and the ‘free’ market are the only game in town. Thus, even under the (re)new(ed?) dispensation of ‘Red Ed’ Miliband, the Labour party’s current economic platform is still based on the idea of ‘caring capitalism’, and its claim to be a better manager of the economy than its opponents – a pitch still requiring a certain suspension of belief, even when compared to the thundering ineptitude of the present administration. Consequently we have not one but three main parties, all of whom maintain that the sole cure for our current economic ills is ‘austerity’ – i.e. an increase in inequality – one of which makes the feeble claim that it will implement its programme of cuts more kindly than the others. But if capitalism is the only viable economic system, why not vote for the party of rentiers and ‘greedy gamblers on the stock exchange’ – i.e. those who understand it best?

As to what New Labour was for, rather than ‘governing the country’, or ‘serving the people’, it is of course the case that it possessed only a single goal – to be re-elected. All policies, all responses to all issues, from day one of Tony Blair’s first administration, were subordinated, via the ‘focus group’, to this sole strategy. Remember the campaign against single mothers anyone? (Implemented, to her eternal shame, by Harriet Harman, although at least she had the decency (?) to do it incompetently, and get the sack.) Notice the constant references throughout thirteen years of New Labour to ‘hard working families’? Both of these campaigns – and their associated rhetoric, now taken up by the coalition – set the agenda for the reinstatement of the concept of ‘the deserving poor’, and the reversal of the
great principle on which democratic socialism was originally built – ‘from each according to their ability, to each according to their need’.

Of course we might say that the United Kingdom is a special case, in that its electoral system is so manifestly unrepresentative that parties can only govern if they capture the electoral ‘middle ground’ – i.e. appeal to petit-bourgeois *mores*. This is a principle long known to psephologists, who have eponomised it as ‘Essex man’, ‘Worcester woman’ or ‘white man van’, and also to Rupert Murdoch, who was maybe one of the first to appreciate that in order to control the outcome of UK parliamentary elections, all you need to do is secure the votes of a small number of lower middle class electors in an even smaller number of constituencies. Hence the embracing by New Labour of the social values of the *Daily Mail*, and the craven attitude of successive New Labour cabinet ministers in their dealings with the Murdoch empire.5

In fact, were our politicians to study economic history, they would learn that almost all of the same austerity policies they now advocate were tried during the 1930s, and failed.6 As we are currently seeing, not only in Greece and Spain, but all across Europe, austerity only works if you force down wages, casualise labour, increase job insecurity, de-skill work, and create general misery (thus demoralising the workforce). Most of this is due, of course, to implementation of ‘supply side’, ‘free-market’, austerity economic policies by right-wing politicians, at least some of whom, like the well-heeled clique at the heart of our current coalition, several of whom inherited (or married!) their own wealth, have seized on ‘the recession’ as an opportunity to put in place economic and social measures which contribute little to actual economic recovery (e.g. caps on welfare spending), but which they and their political antecedents have been itching to implement for at least a generation.

Although he *may* later have changed his mind, throughout most of his political career, as documented by Florence Boos in her introduction to his *Socialist Diary*, Morris remained militantly opposed to socialists standing for parliament. His reasons were that ‘many of them will be drawn into ... error by the corrupting influence of a body professedly hostile to Socialism’, and that ‘the effort towards success in parliament will swallow up all other effort, that such success in short will come to be looked upon as the end’. Above all, there was his ‘deep ethical’ contempt for the ‘failure and disappointment and stupidity and causeless quarrels, and in short all the miseries that go to make up the degrading game of politics’. And in *News from Nowhere*, he explained his position in what may have been, at least at the time (1890–1891), its entirety.
chapter xiii, ‘Concerning Politics’

Said I: ‘How do you manage with politics?’
Said Hammond, smiling: ‘I am glad that it is of me that you ask that question; I do believe that anybody else would make you explain yourself, or try to do so, till you were sick of asking questions. Indeed, I believe I am the only man in England who would know what you mean; and since I know, I will answer your question briefly by saying that we are very well off as to politics, – because we have none. If ever you make a book out of this conversation, put this in a chapter by itself, after the model of old Horrebow’s Snakes in Iceland’.

‘I will’, said I. 7

Instead, what Morris believed was needed was

(A) revolutionary body (which) will find its duties divided into two parts, the maintenance of its people while things are advancing to the final struggle, and resistance to the constitutional authority, including the evasion or disregard of the arbitrary laws of the latter. Its chief weapons ... will be co-operation and boycotting ...

And again in News from Nowhere, he states that one major reason for the workers’ success, was that they possessed ‘... a regular organisation in the struggle against their masters (the Combined Workers), ... (which) had now taken the form of a federation of all or almost all the recognised wage-paid employments, ... .8

Somewhat ironically, given the recent furore, Morris’s position is not so very different from that of the late Ralph Miliband, who in Parliamentary Socialism (1979) concluded that ‘the party’s deep attachment to parliament, and with it to the British state, overrides episodic and largely rhetorical commitments to socialist change, and leads to an under-valuation, and indeed often an outlawing, of extra-parliamentary, social and industrial struggle and politically oriented civic organisation’. Instead, what was needed was for socialists inside and outside the Labour party to collaborate closely, including on broad, non-electoral, political projects of socialist education and consciousness-raising through every possible means. However, Miliband also argued – again, at the time – that a new party of the left was still needed, along with a change in the electoral system and political collaboration across party divides, so that he still retained his faith in the institution of parliament. (So much for his having ‘hated Britain’ and for his Marxist ideas being inimical to ‘British values’).

Hilary Wainwright, writing before the current controversy, believes that what has happened since Ralph Miliband’s time, under New Labour, means that the factors which for so much of the twentieth century kept socialists active in the Labour Party have been destroyed, but that at the same time ‘we are ... sur-
rounded by the carcasses and fading memories of numerous attempts to create new parties of the left’.

Thus (current) material and political imperatives converge for all those broadly on the left to collaborate outside of electoral politics. The need presents itself in a more acute way than ever it did in Ralph Miliband’s lifetime to create an independent political force far wider than the Labour Party – and reaching out to social liberals as well as to environmental, feminist and community activists – whose leadership and primary political orientation must be rooted not in Westminster but in communities and workplaces in every city, town and village.

In a wider context, movements such as UK Uncut, Occupy, Los Indignados, 98%, and democratic elements of early phases of the Arab Spring (mostly young people), many vindicate this view. If so, as has been iterated on these pages many times, Morris’s ideas have never been as relevant as they are today, and we Morrisians have much work to do.

However, demographic factors may be against us. We have also recently learned of the existence of a new cohort of potential voters – ‘Generation Y’ – whose political values and ideas are well to the right of those of their parents and grandparents. This group is said to feel less connection to society at large than previous generations, to be less supportive of social institutions such as the NHS, and less likely to favour benefits for those who fall on hard times. It is also said that the Tories are winning over this generation (while losing touch with older voters), and that even Labour voters are increasingly turning against the poor. Consequently, in order to get back into power, the British Left must re-connect with this new generation.

Whether such fears are justified or not – and there does seem to be some doubt about the validity of this story – the fact that they gained credence, even for a ‘media moment’, is perhaps symptomatic of a more general unease regarding the political values of those raised during the decades since the ‘victory’ of the free market – say since about 1980 – along with a similar feeling that the legacy of the French Revolution, that the world will somehow continue to ‘get better’, no longer applies. John Peel, not a man given to political analysis, once said that it would take three generations to rid this country of the impact of Thatcherism, but maybe he was being optimistic. But what such fears, however unjustified, lead us to, is a question which should indeed preoccupy those who want a ‘better’ world, which is – Why, during periods of economic hardship, do people often vote for right-wing parties, not left-wing? And the answer lies, I think, in that part of the ‘degrading game of politics’ which means that while left-wing parties appeal to people’s hopes – a very ‘Morris’ word – right-wing politicians appeal to their fears. Thus, in conceding political and economic hegemony to the free market, ‘centre-left’ parties such as New Labour have robbed young people of hope.
The key syllogism which ‘justifies’ ‘austerity’ appears to be ‘All debts are bad. Therefore all debts must be paid. Anyone who does not pay their debts is a bad person’. However, this argument is currently applied much more to nations than to individuals, as witnessed by the policy of German bankers towards Greek and Spanish ‘debt’. But as Ann Pettifor regularly points out, there is currently about ten times as much private debt in the UK as public, yet no-one seems to pay it much attention. According to David Graeber, there is no moral dimension to debt, as debt is merely exchange which has not been brought to completion (p. 121). Such unresolved exchange must be between equals, however (p. 120), which is why it has also been easy, if it is not, for puritanical moralists from Luther onwards to castigate the less-equal parties as ‘undeserving’; the reason why interest rates inflicted on poor people are much higher than those charged to the rich.

In fact, again according to Graeber, debt is so deeply embedded in our economic system, and has been since Sumerian times, that it is difficult for us to conceive of any other kind of arrangement. However, modern debt is qualitatively different from its historical antecedents in one very important respect, which is that whereas throughout most of human history private debt has been owed ultimately to the state – the king or the emperor – with the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694, public debt (i.e. that of King William III), became owed to private individuals – the bankers. As Graeber continues

This was a great deal for the bankers (they got to charge the king 8 per cent annual interest … and simultaneously charge interest on the same money to clients …) but it only worked as long as the original loan remained outstanding. To this day, the loan has never been paid back. It cannot be; if it ever were, the entire (UK) monetary system … would cease to exist. (p. 49)

The … origins of (modern) capitalism then, (are) not the [modernist] story of the gradual destruction of traditional communities by the impersonal power of the market. It is rather the story of how an economy of credit was converted into an economy of interest; of the gradual transformation of moral networks by the … impersonal … power of the state’. (p. 332)

Even at the time of Adam Smith, it was not the case that an impersonal market operated via the influence of an impersonal ‘invisible’ hand. Most traders still carried on the main part of their business on credit. Smith could hardly have been unaware of this. (p. 335)

In fact the politician ultimately responsible for the current financial crisis is not, as often said, Bill Clinton, who deregulated the US home loans market, thus causing much of the ‘sub-prime’ crash of 2008, or Ronald Reagan, whose earlier deregulation policies the film director Michael Moore blames for the same crisis, or even his cold-war ally Margaret Thatcher (who certainly was responsible for
the widespread return of beggars to UK streets). No, the real culprit is, according Graeber, good old Richard Milhous Nixon, who on 15 August 1971 announced that foreign-held US dollars would no longer be convertible into gold, (p. 360) thus meaning that ‘all national currencies were henceforth … “fiat money”, backed only by public trust’. (p.53)

The idea that there is something called ‘the market’ is not so very different.

Markets aren’t real. They are mathematical models created by imagining a self-contained world in which everyone has exactly the same motivation and … knowledge, and is engaged in the same self-interested calculating exchange. … There’s nothing wrong with this. The problem comes when it enables some(one) … to declare that anyone who ignores the dictates of the market shall be surely punished or that since we live in a market system, everything (except government interference) is based on principles of justice: that our economic system is one vast network of reciprocal relations in which, in the end, … all debts are paid. (pp. 114–115)

But there’s a deeper scandal. … The moment … unlimited profit was considered a perfectly viable end …, this political, magical element became a … problem, because it meant that even those … who … made the system run[,] had no convincing loyalty to anything, even … the system itself. (p. 345)

Thomas Hobbes, who in *Leviathan* (1660) developed this pessimistic version of human nature into what he clearly considered an adequate philosophical theory of society, also realised that truly ‘free’ markets , in the modern sense, can only fully exist under the aegis not of the shrunken state so many right-wing ‘libertarians’ long for, but in a closely governed, authoritarian society. Hence perhaps the economic success of ‘communist’ China, and probably the reason why most ‘fiscal conservatives’ are usually economic liberals, but social authoritarians. 12

By using the collapse of an inherently unstable world economic system as an excuse to implement their own ‘put people back in their place’ class agenda, right-wing politicians, over the past three decades, have perpetrated a stupendous confidence trick on the rest of humanity. But by conceding them the political, economic, social and moral high ground, particularly in the matter of the supremacy of the ‘free market’, so-called ‘left-wing’ parties such as New Labour have allowed them to destroy our young people’s hopes. After thirty-seven years in higher education, I think I know which is the greater crime.

In this issue, Peter Faulkner traces the relationship between Morris and that author of truly vigourous verse, Robert Browning. David Kopp then discusses the influence on Morris, and similarities and differences between their ideas, of William Cobbett, a man whose thought, for those of us who live in the coun-
tryside, especially ‘Tory anarchists’, have never really been completely eclipsed. Stephen Williams gives what we hope will be the first of two accounts describing the life of Georgiana Burne-Jones in Rottingdean, and David and Sheila Latham contribute the latest installment of their Morris bibliography (2010–2011). We also carry reviews of books on Morris’s ‘Poems of Protest’, Morris and the uses of violence, and a Burne-Jones special issue of the Journal of Stained Glass. Morris is then discussed in the context of Victorian poetry, followed by books on ‘Morris and craft’, and the impact of Morris’s ideas on the architect Charles Spooner, the Arts and Crafts country house, art museums in industrial Britain, and art publishing in Victorian England. Finally, we review a collection of some of Jonathan Meades’ diatribes, ‘Museums without walls’.

NOTES

1. I was recently somewhat nonplussed to read Imelda Staunton (‘The Q&A’, The Guardian, 29 June 2013; http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2013/jun/29/imelda-staunton-q-and-a, as accessed 3 October 2103) saying much the same thing, and realising I’d been scooped! However, my hard disk contains a draft of this article pre-dating publication of Ms Staunton’s statement. Honest!


3. I make no apology for confining my survey, and my sources, to the pages of The Guardian: any wider casting of my net would seriously (further) jeopardise my sanity. In any case, this is the main public forum for the people whose views I am discussing. However, in order to avoid further repetitive citation of http://www.theguardian.com/uk, from now I list only dates on which particular letters or articles were published. Some citations refer also to The Observer, but electronic versions of both newspapers are located on the same website. Letters columns referred to are – in that order – 18 January, 13 and 19 September, 26 April, 30 July, 20 March, 22 September, 11, 14
and 12 August 2013.

4. Dates of articles cited: 21 August, 23 July, 20 and 13 September, 17 August, 12 July, 11 August, 9 September 2013, 28 December 2012, 3 August, 9 June, 29 July, 19 August, 10 July, 22 August, 14 June, 16 April, 10 and 11 September 2013. Interesting how it is not only the younger Milibands who are nowadays politically well to the right of their parents’ generation. Martin Kettle is of course the son of Arnold Kettle, author of *Introduction to the English Novel*, and *The Guardian* also boasts as one of its leading lights Simon Hoggart, son of the great Richard Hoggart, whose *Uses of Literacy* is, for me anyway, ‘up there’ with *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists* in the very short list of books which come anywhere near accurately depicting twentieth century working-class life, but nowadays a man whose views on wind turbines are beginning to read like those of a ‘climate-denier’.

5. In which case I fail to understand why members of the current Labour shadow cabinet object to being labelled ‘boring’ (13 September). Their entire strategy, after all, is to appear so bland that they cannot possibly offend anyone. Surely the term ‘boring’ is therefore, in this context, not so much an insult as a compliment? As for New Labour’s courting of right-wing tabloids, did they never notice that, as with the Tea Party, such people are never satisfied? Concede them one set of ridiculous ‘free market’, ‘small state’ policies, and they come up with another, even more rabid wish-list.


8. ‘The Policy of Abstention’ (1887), Boos, p. 7; NfN, Chapter XVII, ‘How the change came’, p. 91.


11. According to David Stuckler and Aaron Reeves (‘We are told Generation Y is hard-hearted, but it’s a lie’; 30 July), ‘this narrative is misleading, (and) based on cherry-picking of the data’. Support for welfare spending among young people has in fact risen 3.5% since 2010. What is more, Oliver James (16 April) detects, in a separate set of polling data, a switch among the wider British public away from ‘the greed is good, selfish individualism … Thatcherism and Blatcherism engendered’.


As a teacher of science, I was always disappointed (but not surprised) that so many of my students believed so deeply that ‘the laws of the free market’ represent ‘scientific’ laws, when in fact all they really are is a set of rules for managing only one of several possible kinds of economic system. In science, as demonstrated by Galileo, a law must either be ‘general’ (‘universal’; i.e. there can be no earthly realm where one set of laws apply, and another, celestial realm, in which a different set operates), or, as Einstein later showed, ‘special’ (i.e. it operates only in one specific set of conditions). Therefore, because the free market is only one of a number of perfectly workable economic systems, its ‘laws’ are not universal laws in a scientific sense, but merely a set of arrangements between humans (‘rules’), designed to operate one particular kind of economic system. (Whereas as we also all know, ‘gravity is not a custom’). They are probably therefore not even the ‘special laws’ of the free market, and even if they are, in my opinion we cannot allow them to continue to operate for much longer, as they cause far too much human misery, and are seriously damaging our planet.
William Morris and Robert Browning

Peter Faulkner

Robert Browning was born in Camberwell in 1812, twenty-two years before Morris. Coming from a Dissenting family, he was educated privately and at the recently established and secular London University in 1828–9. He published his first volume of poems, *Pauline*, in 1833, followed by *Paracelsus* in 1835 and *Sordello* in 1840. Eight volumes of *Bells and Pomegranates* appeared between 1841 and 1846, the year of his marriage to Elizabeth Barrett, and a two-volume edition entitled *Poems* came out in 1849. He published *Christmas-Eve and Easter Day* in 1850, and *Men and Women* in two volumes in 1855. None of these early poems were well-received, criticism focussing on alleged obscurity and affectation.1

However, the poems had some admirers. In a ‘biographical talk’ Morris gave at Kelmscott House on 28 November 1892, recorded by Sydney Cockerell, he remarked, ‘After the Tennyson period Rossetti introduced me to Browning, who had a great influence on me. I have read Sordello from beginning to end, though I don’t remember what it is about’.2 Fiona MacCarthy tells us that *Sordello* was ‘read over and over by Morris and his friends’,3 and Rossetti gave a copy of Browning’s poems to Bernhardt Smith in 1849, adding the initials PRB to the name on the fly-leaf.4 Both Robert and Elizabeth Browning were included in the ‘List of Immortals’ drawn up by the Brotherhood in 1848.5 Donald Thomas observes that Rossetti called on Browning in 1852 to express his admiration. ‘Despite the general indifference to his poetry, there were younger men, loosely grouped round the Pre-Raphaelites, who had begun to take it up’.6 When the Brownings came to London in 1855 to see to the publication of *Men and Women*, they invited Rossetti to dinner and became good friends. On the evening when Tennyson memorably read *Maud* – as sketched by Rossetti – Browning was also present, and read ‘Fra Lippo Lippi’, perhaps, as Jan Marsh suggests, ‘in honour of the young PRBs, spiritual heirs to the Florentine painter’.7 Thomas records that Rossetti ‘heard with delight the first reading of “Fra Lippo Lippi”’: Browning read ‘with as much sprightly variation as there was in Tennyson of sustained continuity … Truly a night of the gods, not to be remembered without pride and
Rossetti described Browning’s poetry at the time as ‘my Elixir of Life’. Marsh tells us that Rossetti’s favourites from *Men and Women* were ‘Fra Lippo Lippi’, ‘Cleon’, ‘Karshish’, ‘Bishop Blougram’s Apology’, ‘How it strikes a Contemporary’, and ‘Childe Roland’. The poems specified evidently appealed to both Morris and Rossetti, who perhaps discussed them with each other before Morris published his review in the March 1856 issue of *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*. The review is the work of a young and unsophisticated enthusiast, its style is direct and its approach down-to-earth. It begins by declaring a sensible approach, not derived from Browning’s apparently random ordering of the poems:

> I am not going to attempt a regular classification of Robert Browning’s ‘Men and Women’, yet the poems do fall naturally into some order, or rather some of them go pretty much together; and, as I have no great space, I will go through those that do fall together, saying little or nothing about the others.

Morris follows the contemporary practice of quoting at length from the poems he discusses; the following account is more selective, but presents all the material in the form quoted in the review. What evidently appeals to Morris is the quality suggested by Browning’s title; he is excited to encounter a number of vividly evoked characters in interesting situations. By contrast with modern literary criticism, he has little to say about Browning’s poetic technique, and struggles when he tries to do so in the later part of the review.

The first group identified by Morris consists of three poems of ‘belief and doubt’, ‘The Epistle of Karshish’, ‘Cleon’ and ‘Bishop Blougram’s Apology’, all of them ‘dramatic’ in ‘not expressing, except quite incidentally, the poet’s own thoughts’. (p. 326) Morris is interested in the protagonists; he contrasts the Arab physician Karshish with the poet and artist Cleon: the ‘Arab is the more genial of the two, less selfish, somewhat deeper, I think’. (p. 326) Morris quotes the words wrung from Cleon in the agony that the approach of death produces in him; Cleon is said to decline into ‘a kind of careless despair’, (p. 328) and he ends by expressing what Morris sees as jealousy of Paulus and his followers – the apostle Paul has come to preach in the locality, and Protus wishes Cleon to pass a letter on to him. (Morris quotes only the concluding two lines, but the whole passage is effectively realised):

> And (as I gathered from a bystander)  
> His doctrines could be held by no sane man.

Morris’s concluding comment is: ‘Poor Cleon! he was not wont to accept things on hearsay; yet now has his pride so lowered him ...’. (p. 328) Frederick Kirchhoff provides a psychological explanation; for him, Cleon is perceived as the ‘alienated aesthete’ that Morris fears he may become; the young Morris is sympathetic to
Cleon’s ‘frustrated desire for intensity of life’ but shocked by his elitism, which ‘frightens Morris into a denunciation of revealing passion’. At all events, is striking that Morris does not reflect on what may be seen as the central issue touched on by Browning, the Christian promise of immortality not available to believers in the old Greek gods.

In the poem whose full title is ‘An Epistle containing the strange medical experience of Karshsish, the Arab physician’, Morris is again interested primarily in the central character. Morris finds Karshish more sympathetic than Cleon, and writes thoughtfully about his perplexity in writing, for his old master in medicine, an account of a remarkable recent experience. He has met ‘one Lazarus, a Jew/Sanguine, proportioned, fifty years of age’, who claims to have been brought back to life by one Jesus several decades previously. Karshish is impressed by the integrity of Lazarus, but cannot believe what he has been told, and must think him mad. For Morris, it is all ‘gloriously told’, although no account is given of the how the narrative achieves its force. What impresses Morris is how sensitively Karshish responds to the extraordinary story that he has been told and cannot believe:

The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think? 
So, the All-Great were the All-Loving too; 
So, through the thunder comes a human voice 
Saying “O heart I made, a heart beats here! 
Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself. 
Thou hast no power nor may’st conceive of mine, 
But love I gave thee, with myself to love, 
And thou must love me who have died for thee!” 
The madman saith He said so: it is strange.

Morris likes the humility of Karshish’s response, which he contrasts with Cleon’s “it is not possible”; Karshish only says, ‘it is strange’. (p. 329) But again Morris’s interest is in the character portrayed rather than the belief under discussion. Other Victorians, particularly Tennyson, were drawn to the theme of doubt and belief, but this was never a preoccupation for Morris.

Morris gives less space to the more expansive ‘Bishop Blougram’s Apology’, a poem which runs to 1014 lines, perhaps because ‘it embraces so many things’. He finds himself disliking the Bishop, of whom he gives an accurate account: ‘he is more selfish even than Cleon, and not nearly so interesting: he is tolerably well content with the present state of things as regards himself, has no such very deep feelings, and is not so much troubled with doubts probably as even he says he is’. (p. 330) Morris concludes with the line, ‘For Blougram, he believed say half he spoke’, perhaps with some exasperation. The skilful casuistry of the bishop – or the poem – which attracts modern readers had no appeal to Morris. No one could
have been less of a casuist.

Morris identifies ‘the next band that seem to go together’, those on the theme of art: ‘Andrea del Sarto’, ‘Fra Lippo Lippi’, ‘Old Pictures at [for, in] Florence’, ‘A Toccata of Galuppi’s’ and ‘Master Hugues of Saxe-Gotha’. The poems about the two painters ‘Andrea’ and ‘Lippo’ are praised for their vividness in terms that we have come to expect and which reach an extravagant climax here: ‘What a joy it is to have these men brought up before us, made alive again, though they have passed away from the earth so long ago; made alive … shown to us as they really were’. (pp. 330–331) Morris finds himself taken into the mind of Andrea as he sits by Lucrezia, whom he knows to be unworthy of his love but from whom he cannot free himself: ‘Oh! true story, told so often, in so many ways’. Again, it is the vivid portrayal of a scene that Morris enjoys, as when Lucrezia becomes bored with Andrea's loving speech, because her ‘cousin’ is waiting below: and so you can almost see the flutter of her dress through the doorway, almost hear her feet down the stairs, and the greeting of the bad woman without a heart with that “cousin”. Almost? nay, quite!’ (p. 332)

Morris then considers ‘Fra Lippo Lippi’, quoting Lippo’s self-justifying account of his life as artist and monk, given to the officer who is questioning him, and his resentment of his pious critics:

And yet the old schooling sticks, the old grave eyes
Are peeping o'er my shoulder as I work,
The heads shake still: “It's art's decline, my son!
You're not of the true painters, great and old:
Brother Angelico's the man, you'll find:
Brother Lorenzo stands his single peer—
Fag on at flesh, you'll never make the third”.

Morris calls this, in a rather world-weary way, ‘an oft-told tale, to be told many times again, I fear, before the world is done with’. (p. 333) He then quotes from Lippo’s speech about the value and purpose of art:

For, don't you mark? we're made so that we love
First when we see them painted, things we have passed
Perhaps a hundred times nor cared to see;
And so they are better, painted – better to us,
Which is the same thing. Art was given for that;
God uses us to help each other so,
Lending our minds out.

To this, Morris adds what feels like a heartfelt gloss:
It is very grand, this intense love of art; and I suppose that those who cannot paint, and who therefore cannot feel quite the same herein, have nevertheless sometimes had a sick longing for the power to do so, without being able to give any reason for it, such a longing as I think is felt for nothing else under the sun, at least for no other power. (pp. 334–335)

It is not clear whether Morris is expressing his opinion about the appeal of painting – which he was to undertake as a result of Rossetti’s encouragement – or whether he sees painting as one of the range of arts in which a man might desire to excel. His final comment returns to Lippo the painter, with whom Morris feels some sympathy: ‘you see, he had not a very good education, and yet is not so selfish as one might have expected him to be either’. (p. 334) Browning has brought him into a world in which Lippo is a convincing human presence.

Morris thinks equally highly of a less well known poem, ‘Old Pictures at Florence’. Not surprisingly, he enjoys its ‘indignant vindication’ of the early medieval painters, whose art is not perfect, like that of the Greek sculptors, but is preferable because of its higher aim: ‘higher in the thoughts that it called up in men’s minds; higher too, that in its humility it gave more sympathy to poor struggling, falling men’. (p. 334) Browning had clearly read his Ruskin on this topic in *The Stones of Venice*, as of course had Morris, who goes on to quote the telling stanza:

Wherever a fresco peels and drops,
Wherever an outline weakens and wanes
Till the latest life in the painting stops,
Stands One whom each fainter pulse-tick pains!
One, wishful each scrap should clutch its brick,
Each tinge not wholly escape the plaster,
A lion who dies of an ass’s kick,
The wronged great soul of an ancient Master. (p. 334)

Here, unusually, Morris is responding to the poem’s argument rather than to any dramatisation of character.

Morris then praises the two poems dealing with music. He quotes enthusiastically from ‘A Toccata of Galuppi’s’, saying that the music itself could hardly be more effective than the poem, which ‘rings so gloriously throughout; not one line in it falls [sic] from beginning to end’. (p. 335) ‘Master Hugues of Saxe-Gotha’ is judged of equal merit: ‘exquisite in melody, it is beautiful also in its pictures, true in its meaning’. He quotes the first stanza as being ‘almost as good as any for its music’:
Hist, but a word, fair and soft!
Forth and be judged, Master Hugues!
Answer the question I’ve put you so oft:
What do you mean by your mountainous fugues?
See, we’re alone in the loft. (pp. 335–336)

Here Morris shows awareness of the effects of the music of poetry, but he struggles to express his admiration for its ‘melody’; ‘there is something perfectly wonderful to me in the piling up of the words from verse to verse. The thing fascinates me, though I cannot tell where the wonder is: but it is there’. This is a dimension of poetry which he lacks the vocabulary to explore.

Morris then moves on to his third group of poems, which he identifies as ‘more concerned with action than thought’ and ‘wholly dramatical’. (p. 336) These are ‘Before’ and ‘After’, ‘Childe Roland to the dark tower came’, ‘The Patriot’ and ‘A Light Woman’. Morris begins with ‘The Patriot’. In his view, ‘the man’s life is shown wonderfully, though the poem is so short’; he admires the protagonist, who has done his best although aware that the people he has freed would not remain faithful to him. Again, it is the character and his story to which Morris is attracted. ‘A Light Woman’ is described as ‘slight sketch’ about ‘[T]elling lies for truth’s sake’, told ‘in a masterly way’; the last lines – ‘And, Robert Browning, you writer of plays/ Here’s a subject made to your hand!’ – suggest to Morris that ‘we may hear something more about it soon’ – presumably in the form of a play. ‘Before’ and ‘After’ are described as ‘rather parts of the same poem, than separate poems’. The former is said to be written in ‘a splendid fighting measure’, giving the point of view of ‘a bystander, just before a duel’ – though Ian Jack and Robert Inglesfield suggest convincingly that he is one of the seconds.14 Characteristically, Morris is interested in the psychology of the results of what he calls a ‘terrible unrepented sin’, and refers to Nathaniel Hawthorne’s The Scarlet Letter, published in 1850, which deals powerfully with this topic. To conclude his account of the situation shown, which is left inconclusive – ‘death may equalize it somewhat’ – Morris quotes the whole of the companion poem, ‘After’. He regards these two poems as among ‘the most perfect that Robert Browning has written, as perfect in their way as “Evelyn Hope” among the love-poems’.

Morris is at least equally enthusiastic about ‘Childe Roland’. He deplores a critic who had called the poem an allegory and faulted Browning for not having revealed what happened to Roland in the tower. In Morris’s view, ‘the poet’s real design is to show us a brave man doing his duty, making his way on to his point through all dreadful things. And has not Robert Browning shown us this well? Do you not feel as you read, a strange sympathy for the lonely knight, so very, very lonely, not allowed even the fellowship of kindly memories?’ (p. 339) Morris
quotes a passage which describes one of the knights who has evidently failed in the quest:

... I fancied Cuthbert's reddening face
Beneath its garniture of curly gold,
Dear fellow, till I almost felt him fold
An arm in mine to fix me to the place,
That way he used. Alas! one night's disgrace!
Out went my heart's new fire and left it cold.
Better this present than a past like that –
Back therefore to my darkening path again.

Morris has again been drawn into the story, and to admire what we are shown of the calm and determined knight. He applauds the poet's decision to leave the reader 'with that snatch of old song ringing through our ears like the very horn-blast that echoed all about the windings of that dismal valley of death', quoting the poem's celebrated three last lines:

I saw them and I knew them all; and yet
Dauntless the slug-horn to my lips I set,
And blew. “Childe Roland to the dark tower came”. (p. 340)

Any reader aware of Morris's admiration of the courage he associates with the Middle Ages, and later with Iceland, will not be surprised by his asserting at this point: 'In my own heart I think I love this poem the best of all in these volumes'. Kirchhoff observes that Morris over-simplifies the poem and makes Roland 'the heroic figure he wishes to be'. This seems to me too severe; the heroic reading is one of the possibilities open to the reader. But there are certainly others; Marsh tells us that, for Rossetti, the poem 'spoke eloquently of the artist's dreams and frustrations', a reading which seems to be accepted by the editors of the Oxford Browning, whose note on the 'lost adventurers, my peers' referred to by Roland in Stanza XXXIII states: 'Here the reference is probably to earlier poets'.

But Morris admits that he is not sure of his judgement of 'Childe Roland', because 'this and all the other poems seem to me but a supplement to the love-poems, even as it is in all art, in all life; love, I mean, of some sort: and all that life or art where this is not the case is but a wretched mistake after all' (p. 340) – a highly romantic assertion which we might want to relate to Morris's feelings for Jane at the time. At all events, this leads him into an account of his fourth grouping, the love-poems. Morris argues that Browning offers more in this area than do other poets, and admits that he finds it particularly difficult to discuss these poems, as 'love for love's sake, the only true love' can be adequately expressed only in poetry. His personal involvement is shown in the dramatic exclamation
'Pray Christ some of us attain to it before we die!', an exclamation which goes well beyond what we think of as literary criticism. 'Evelyn Hope' is found to be 'quite perfect in its way; Tennyson himself has written nothing more beautiful'. (p. 341) Morris finds himself driven to quote at some length from this poem commemorating the death of a sixteen-year-old girl. He begins in the fourth stanza and continues to the last:

I loved you, Evelyn, all the while;  
   My heart seemed full as it could hold;  
There was space and to spare for the frank young smile  
   And the red young mouth and the hair's young gold:  
So, hush! I will give you this leaf to keep;  
   See, I shut it inside the sweet cold hand.  
There, that is our secret! go to sleep;  
   You will wake, and remember, and understand. (pp. 341–342)

This conclusion again shows Morris's admiration for Browning's ability fully to realise a dramatic scene, as he writes of 'the darkened room [and ] the wise, learned, world-worn man hanging over the fair, dead girl, who “perhaps had scarcely heard his name” .

Of the other love poems, 'A Woman's Last Word' is found 'perfect in thought as in music', conveying 'intense passion'. (pp. 341–342) Morris's quotation shows that he was sensitive to the lyrical effects that can be achieved by the use of short lines:

Meet, if thou require it,  
   Both demands,  
Laying flesh and spirit  
   In thy hands!  

That shall be to-morrow  
   Not to-night:  
I must bury sorrow  
   Out of sight.  

Must a little weep, Love  
   Foolish me!  
And so fall asleep, Love,  
   Loved by thee.’

But, as we have come to expect, Morris does not try to analyse the lyrical effect achieved here.

Morris then praises 'By the Fireside', with its focus on the lover's total com-
mitment. Parts of the poem – which runs to fifty three five-line stanzas – remind
him of Tennyson’s *Maud*, perhaps the effect of its ‘melody; it is all told in such
sweet, half-mournful music, as though in compassion to those who have not
obtained this love, who will not obtain it while they live on earth, though they
may in Heaven’ (p. 343) – an unusually wistful conclusion. Again, Morris shows
awareness of the poem’s musical quality, although he cannot analyse it. He also
praises the love conveyed for ‘the beautiful country where the new life came to
him’ and the poem’s ‘pictures of the fair autumn-tide’:

Oh, the sense of the yellow mountain flowers,
   And the thorny balls, each three in one,
   The chestnuts throw on our path in showers,
   For the drop of the woodland’s fruit’s begun,
   These early November hours.

This is the first reference in the review to pictorial qualities, not often notable
in Browning’s poetry but prominent in Morris’s middle-period poetry, as in the
poems for the months in *The Earthly Paradise*.

Morris then turns to ‘The Statue and the Bust’, a poem which runs to two
hundred and fifty lines, though he does not remark on its length. He accuses the
lovers in this ‘sad story’ of ‘cowardly irresolution’, again treating them as if they
were living beings. Morris thinks it one of the best poems in the two volumes:
‘the rhythm is so wonderfully suited to the story, it draws you along through the
days and years that the lovers passed in delay, so quietly, swiftly, smoothly’. (p.
344) The reference to rhythm here shows Morris becoming more aware of the
formal qualities of the poems he discusses in the later part of the review. Jack and
Inglesfield, writing in the era of modern literary criticism, remark appositely that
the stanza used in the poem is ‘an abbreviated form of terza rima, which creates a
rapid movement that contrasts with the failure of the lovers to take action’.18

In ‘The Last Ride Together’ Morris again finds himself drawn into the dra-
matic situation of the lovers, with a prevailing mood of accepted failure. He is
struck by ‘strange feeling’ at the end, when we are aware of the narrator’s wonder
about the meaning of his beloved’s silent presence in the final stanza:

What if we still ride on, we two,
   With life for ever old yet new,
   Changed not in kind but in degree,
   The instant made eternity, –
   And Heaven just prove that I and she
   Ride, ride together, forever ride? (p. 345)

In ‘Riding Together: William Morris and Robert Browning’ in 1992 Amanda
Hodgson drew attention to the similarity of the title of this poem to Morris’s
‘Riding Together’, and to the two poems’ shared dramatic qualities.19

Morris admits he is puzzled by ‘In a Balcony’, but gives an account of his understanding of the two central characters; unlike less sympathetic critics, he is not put off by the fact that ‘it is all intricate and difficult, like human action’. (p. 345) He refers to an earlier reviewer who had found ‘Women and Roses’ obscure, and offers his own understanding of the situation evoked. He admits that his account ‘does not sound very well’, and generalises from this into the view that it does not often help poems much to solve them, because there are in poems so many exquisitely small and delicate turns of thought running through their music and along with it, that cannot be done into prose, any more than the infinite variety of form and shadow and colour in a great picture can be rendered by a coloured woodcut; which (in the case of the poem) is caused, I suppose, by its being concentrated thought. (p. 346)

The idea of ‘solving’ a poem, as if it were a kind of puzzle, is of course contrary to all Romantic ideas of poetry. That Morris finds the issue difficult is evidence both of his youth and of his insight. He is aware of the peculiar quality of poetry, and feeling his way towards an adequate response to it.

Morris considers that ‘the final dedication to E.B.B’ [‘One Word More’] provides a worthy crown to the love poems, and quotes its conclusion:

Oh their Rafael of the dear Madonnas,
Oh, their Dante of the dread Inferno,
Wrote one song – and in my brain I sing it;
Drew one angel – come, see, on my bosom! (p. 346)

Morris ends his review less than tidily. He apologises for not having discussed a number of other poets that he clearly admires, such as ‘Saul’, ‘A Grammarian’s Funeral’, ‘Lover’s Quarrel’ [‘A Lover’s Quarrel’], ‘Mesmerism’ and ‘Any Wife to Any Husband’, offering as his consolation the thought that ‘we shall have a great deal more to say of Robert Browning in this Magazine and then we can make amends’. It certainly shows that the young Morris did not regret the demands made by Browning on his readers. He argues that it is deplorable that Browning’s reputation for obscurity has led readers to neglect him, but that is the usual course of events: ‘it was so last year with “Maud”; it is so with Ruskin’, whose popularity has declined as ‘his eager fighting with falsehood and wrong’ is now denounced as unfair. Something similar happened with the Pre-Raphaelites, but fortunately the public seems to have come round – ‘though to this day their noblest pictures are the least popular’. Morris concludes wryly: ‘Yes, I wonder what the critics would have said to “Hamlet Prince of Denmark”, if it had been first published by Messrs. Chapman and Hall in the year 1855!’ (p. 348) Morris’s enthusiasm is conveyed in the extrava-
Eugene LeMire rightly finds in the review ‘honest independence combined with moral and aesthetic sensitivity and soundness of judgment that position Morris in advance of his time’; 20 MacCarthy praises the review as ‘generous and conscientious’ 21 and Frederick Kirchhoff goes so far as to call it ‘a prime document of Morris’s development as a poet’. 22 It certainly shows the young Morris as a perceptive and thoughtful reader of contemporary poetry, and we can link his observations to the poems that were to constitute _The Defence of Guenevere and Other Poems_, published two years later.

After encountering Morris’s intelligent enthusiasm, it is striking to be reminded that _Men and Women_, which both Robert and Elizabeth had hoped would establish Browning’s reputation, was negatively received by reviewers in England. Indeed, Jack and Inglesfield state that ‘The critical reception of _Men and Women_ was no doubt the greatest disappointment of Browning’s poetical career. No second edition was called for in England’ – though the reception was ‘distinctly better’ in the United States. 23 The first review to appear, in _The Athenaeum_, enquired ‘Who will not grieve over energy wasted and power misspent?’ to be followed by _The Saturday Review_’s opening statement, ‘It is really high time that this sort of thing should, if possible, be stopped’. 24 Carlyle, though he praised the ‘opulence of intellect’ in the poems, advised the poet to mend the fault of ‘unintelligibility’: ‘That is a fact – you are dreadfully difficult to understand, and that is really a sin’. 25 Ruskin recognised the power to be found in the poems, but questions ‘the Presentation of the Power’, going so far as to say that ‘when I take up these poems in the evening I find them absolutely and literally a set of the most amazing Conundrums that ever were proposed to me’. 26 Browning defended himself in a dignified way in a letter to Ruskin a week later: ‘Do you think poetry was ever generally understood – or can be? … A poet’s affair is with God, to whom he is accountable, and of whom is his reward: look elsewhere, and you find misery enough. Do you believe people understood _Hamlet_?’ 27 Rossetti was one of the few to share Morris’s view. He wrote to William Allingham, ‘What a magnificent series is _Men and Women_. Of course you have it half by heart ere this’. 28 In this context, we can understand Elizabeth’s observation in April 1860 that no-one in England ‘except a small knot of pre-Raffaelite men, pretends to do him justice’. 29

On 1 May 1891, when Morris was trying to put together material for his _Poems by the Way_, he told Charles Fairfax Murray that he liked ‘The Long Land’ – of which Murray had evidently sent him a draft – in a way, but then exclaimed:

But O the callowness of it! It cannot be altered, and I should shudder at seeing such ingenuous callowness exposed to the public gaze. Item it is tainted with imitation of Browning (as Browning then was). 30
This confirms the influence of Browning on the young Morris; although the poem was not included in Poems by the Way, May Morris did print it in a section of ‘Early Poems’ in the Collected Works, Vol. XXIV, pp. 58–62. In this context, it is surprising to find that when Morris gave the ‘biographical talk’ in November 1892, quoted earlier, he spoke more of the influence of Elizabeth Barrett Browning than of her husband:

I read Mrs. Browning a good deal at Oxford. She was a great poetess – in some respects she had greater capacity than Browning, though she was a poor rhymer. I refer to the earlier work; Aurora Leigh I consider dull.31

Elizabeth Barrett Browning had successfully published her Poems in 1844, Sonnets from the Portuguese in 1850 and Casa Guido Windows in 1851. Morris did not follow her example of writing social-problem poems such as the popular if sentimental ‘The Cry of the Children’. We may see it as a limitation in Morris that he found dull Aurora Leigh, one of the finest Victorian narrative poems, which engages powerfully with social issues from a point of view admired by modern feminists. Mackail was presumably referring to Morris’s 1892 talk when he mentions his having paid tribute to her influence shortly before he died; he states that Mrs Browning’s poetry was popular during Morris’s Oxford years, and suggests that her influence may account for the ‘slovenly rhymes’ in some of Morris’s early poems.32 Later critics have sometimes found these rhymes adventurous rather than careless.

When Morris published The Defence of Guenevere and Other Poems in 1858, to largely uncomprehending reviews, Browning seems to have been one of its defenders. Mackail recorded that ‘Browning himself, it may not be without interest to know, was one of the earliest and most enthusiastic admirers of this volume’.33 Mackail also quotes J.W. Hoole of Queen’s College as having asked Morris about the influences on the style of his Arthurian poems, to receive the reply: ‘More like Browning than anyone else, I suppose’. Mackail goes on to develop the idea cogently: ‘What both alike aim at and attain is the realization, keen, swift and minute, of some tragic event or situation …’ Of Morris’s Froissartian poems, Mackail remarks, ‘They might aptly be headed Dramatic Lyrics and Dramatic Romances of the fourteenth century. The range is much less than Browning’s; but the intensity of realization is even greater, and it is free from the slightest trace of parade or pedantry’.34 Mackail’s argument is convincing, although it does not apply to all the poems in Morris’s volume. Mackail does not employ the term ‘dramatic monologue’, although that term had come into use as a critical term to characterise a poem with ‘a first-person speaker who is not the poet’, to use an abbreviated version of Alan Sinfield’s 1977 definition.35

If we try to relate the poems of The Defence of Guenevere to the four groups Morris found in Browning, we will find that the categories of ‘belief and doubt’
and ‘art’ yield no examples at all; Morris was highly unusual among Victorian writers in not having been troubled by – or indeed interested in – the issue of religious belief, and although he wrote about artists and craftsmen in prose, they did not feature prominently in his poetry. It is the poems concerned ‘more with action than thought’ that constitute by far the majority of the collection, and include those usually characterised by editors as Arthurian and Froissartian because of their subject-matter. A magnificent example is ‘The Haystack in the Floods’, while ‘Concerning Geffray Teste Noire’ shows evidence of Morris’s preparedness to risk obscurity rather than to lose drama. MacCarthy writes perceptively about Browning’s influence on Morris as having encouraged him to launch into dramatic action without any preamble, and not to find resolution essential: ‘These are difficult poems, unsettling and demanding’. As to love poetry, Morris is nowhere near as prolific as Browning, despite his expressed admiration for the genre, but he has the beautiful ‘Praise of My Lady’ and the less direct ‘Summer Dawn’. In addition, Morris also wrote the remarkable group of fantasy or symbolist poems, such as ‘The Blue Closet’ and ‘The Tune of Seven Towers’, which have no parallels in Browning, with his preference for forms of realism. It is in the poems of action that the influence of Browning makes itself felt.

Morris’s review of *Men and Women* appeared in March 1856, but he does not appear to have met Browning until he moved to London in August 1856, where he took lodgings with Burne-Jones at 1 Upper Gordon Street; they moved to 17 Red Lion Square in November. MacCarthy tells us that by that time Morris and Burne-Jones were on friendly terms with Robert Browning, ‘the greatest poet alive’, and that both the Brownings were impressed by Morris’s ‘dramatic’ poetry.

However, no significant relationship developed between Browning and Morris, and their poetry – and lives – came to follow very different paths. Morris did send Browning copies of *The Life and Death of Jason* and at least the first volume of *The Earthly Paradise*. Browning acknowledged the *Jason* in a letter of 25 May 1867, showing his awareness of its pictorial qualities:

What a noble, melodious and most beautiful poem you have written! I lay it down, at the last line, to say this – but often and often again do I hope to read it, and see the pictures in it by your help. I don’t at all wonder that you have done so admirably, however – how should I, with your other book, which has been my delight ever since I read it? I did not think that I should be easily reconciled to your keeping silence this long while, but this poem justifies you indeed. Thank you heartily and affectionately.

His acknowledgement of the *Earthly Paradise* volume, dated 7 June 1868, was equally positive, and thoughtful about Morris’s relating of past and present:
Here is your book read at last, – and beautiful it proves: affecting me much as do Handel’s fine ‘suites’, as he calls them, for the clavecin of his day: all the newer for their archaic tinge, all the more varied (to the appreciatively observant) because of the continuous key and recurring forms, – the New masked in the Old and perpetually looking out of the eyeholes of its disguise. It is a double delight to me – to read such poetry and know you, of all the world, wrote it, – you whose songs I used to sing while galloping by Fiesole in old days, – ‘Ho, is there any will ride with me?’

In this context, it is disconcerting to find Browning writing to Isabel Blagden on 19 January 1870 about *The Earthly Paradise* and suggesting that his admiration was directed exclusively to Morris’s early work: ‘Morris is sweet, pictorial, clever always but a weariness to me by this time. The lyrics were “the first sprightly runnings” – this that follows is a laboured brew with the old flavour but no body’. It is clear that by 1870 the two poets’ practices had nothing in common, and any contact between them was on social and political rather than poetic lines.

Morris clearly regarded Browning as a liberal thinker likely to support some of the causes he himself believed in. Browning’s liberalism was well known, and he was indeed one of the convenors of the first national conference of the Eastern Question Association in December 1876, to which Morris was to devote so much of his energy at that period. When Morris wrote to Browning in November 1879 about the threat to St Mark’s, Venice, he received Browning’s assurance that he agreed with Morris’s view, although he would not speak at the protest meeting being organised in Oxford: ‘I never speak’. Morris also invited Browning to sign the petition against the widening of Magdalen Bridge in Oxford in December 1881, and sent a long letter to him in November 1887 asking him to sign a letter, organised by the Socialist League, seeking for mercy to be shown in the case of the Chicago anarchists. But Browning was no socialist, and indeed supported the British occupation of Egypt in 1882 and dissented from Gladstone’s truly liberal policy when he committed himself to Home Rule for Ireland. Browning’s sonnet ‘Why I am a Liberal’, written in 1885 in response to an invitation from a left-wing Liberal journalist for contributions on that theme which became a book with the same title, shows his public position in its last six rhetorical lines:

**But little do or can the best of us:**

**That little is achieved through Liberty.**

**Who then dares hold – emancipated thus –**

**His fellow shall continue bound? Not I,**

**Who live, love, labour freely, nor discuss**

**A brother’s right to freedom. That is ‘Why’.”**
Trevor Lloyd has remarked that ‘in general his desire for liberty did not express itself in a belief that everybody has an equal claim to an equal amount of liberty’. At the same time Morris was publishing *The Pilgrims of Hope* in *Commonweal*. His hopes, conveyed through the protagonist Richard and going far beyond Browning’s range, were for the millions to be emancipated from their drudgery through revolutionary change:

> Tis the lot of many millions! Yet if half these millions knew  
> The hope that my heart hath learned, we shall find a deed to do,  
> And who or what shall withstand us? And I, e’en I, might live  
> To know the love of my fellows and the gifts that earth can give.48

By this time Browning was a public figure, and the founding of the Browning Society in October 1881 by F.J. Furnivall and Miss Emily Hickey confirmed his public position, though also arousing criticism as a piece of self-advertisement. Max Beerbohm’s splendid cartoon, ‘Browning taking tea with the Browning Society’, shows him, as Thomas puts it, ‘seated smugly among earnest young men and intense maiden ladies’. This is perhaps unfair; Browning did not attend meetings of the Society, although he was grateful for its support – no other Society existed to celebrate a living poet. It is in this context that we find Morris’s last reference to Browning in his correspondence. It occurs in letter to Theodore Watts-Dunton of 25 March 1892, thanking him for his review of *Poems by the Way*. In the review, Watts-Dunton had made some critical remarks about Wordsworth and Browning as having gained the attention of the British public through the ‘unpoetic’ part of their writings: the ‘versified prose of Wordsworth and the prose without versification of Browning can by their very defects reach the British public’. Morris, never an admirer of Wordsworth, has been struck by these remarks – they ‘raised a grin in me’ – and he responded interestingly and in some detail:

> You know, though Browning was a poet, he had not a *non-* but an *anti-*poetical  
> side to him; and this is why he has achieved a popularity among the ‘educated  
> middle-classes’. Who though they are badly educated are probably over-educated  
> for their intellect. Yes the Briton has no interest in a book if it is merely a work of  
> art, ie if it is meant to endure, the ephemeral is all he cares about; as he naturally  
> thinks his own dear life so damned important. And yet though I am not a patriot  
> (as you know) I doubt if said Briton is more anti-poetical than the men of other  
> nations. Only he seems more anti-artistic, I think because he has gone further  
> through the mill of modernism; some survivals of the old artistic spirit still  
> cling in a queer paradoxical way to Frenchmen & Germans: to Englishmen none,  
> unless they have gone through the mill and come out at the other.50
Here Morris brings the letter to a rapid conclusion, as if embarrassed by these musings: ‘Excuse this yarn and with thanks again & best wishes’. But the letter shows that Morris was interested in Browning as a figure in late nineteenth-century English culture as it passed through ‘the mill of modernism’, a figure he has come to see as very different from the vigorous and demanding poet he had encountered with such excitement in 1855.
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Two Williams of One Medieval Mind: Reading the Socialist William Morris through the lens of the Radical William Cobbett

David A. Kopp

In January 1883 William Morris joined the Democratic Federation and declared himself a Socialist. As a writer, he turned his full attention to the task of aiding in the propaganda of the new cause. If social revolution was to be necessary, those who would carry the torches would need to be educated: ‘to teach them, in as much detail as possible what are the ends and the hopes of Social Revolution’.2 Morris began reading in earnest about economics and Socialism, and it was at this time that he seems to have enthusiastically discovered the writings of William Cobbett (1763–1835), which, according to E. P. Thompson, ‘had a pronounced influence upon the forthright polemical style of his own Socialist writings’.3 The strong appeal of the radical Cobbett for Morris, however, was based not solely on the earlier man’s rhetorical abilities, but in a mutual affinity for England’s medieval past, and a conviction that the greater social and economic freedoms enjoyed by labourers in ‘Old England’ could be used in support of their own agenda for radical political and social reform. Cobbett, therefore, who preceded Morris by several generations, serves as a unique lens through which Morris’s Socialist writings can be viewed, both in the historical context of nineteenth-century radicalism and its sometime bedfellow, the Medieval Revival.

Influenced in part by Henry Myers Hyndman’s The Historical Basis of Socialism in England, a copy of which he obtained early in 1884,4 Morris came to believe that a case could be made for an indigenous presence of Socialism in England,
particularly during the fourteenth century: ‘That time was in a sense brilliant and progressive, and the life of the worker in it was better than it ever had been’. Morris, who had immersed himself in the history and art of England during the Middle Ages since his boyhood, found a new voice for his medievalism in a belief that the life of the medieval labourer was one of greater liberty, equality and brotherhood than that of the worker in Victorian England. A Dream of John Ball, Morris’s story of the Peasants Revolt of 1381, was first published in 1886 as a serial in Commonweal, the newspaper of the Socialist League, of which Morris was the editor. Based largely on a contemporary account of the uprising by John Froissart, the story is of ‘the men of Kent’ and their leader, the hedge-priest John Ball, as they prepare to march to confront King Richard II in order to demand their freedom from oppression by anyone who ‘layeth law on other men because he is rich’. Ball preaches hope for a world which will return to the social ideals of Genesis, when Adam and Eve worked without any human master. This is the world of the English farmer, specifically the rural Essex in which Morris spent his childhood. It is also the land of William Cobbett’s ‘chopsticks’, and the riots in the unquiet country which threatened the stability of the British government during the decade leading up to the Reform Act of 1832:

The Essex County inhabitants of Morris’s childhood — the boy himself — had good reason to recall the fourteenth century rebellion, its heroes, and its rhymes. The poverty experienced by craftsmen, farmers, and agricultural workers and the disruption of former patterns of life may have been greater during these years than any in the previous five hundred. It was one of the regions caught up during the 1820s and 1830s in what William Cobbett called the ‘Rural War’ between landlords and country labourers threatened by agricultural and industrial mechanisation and by the decline in employment and wages.

William Cobbett was not only chronicler of the Rural Wars. He was also widely denounced as a chief instigator of the ‘Swing’ Riots of the 1820s, some going so far as to identify him as ‘Captain Swing’ himself. According to a witness of one of his speeches, ‘not only by oblique hints did he inflame their minds, but openly did he predict that that and every other part of the country would be visited with similar outbreakings as to those then raging in Kent’. Cobbett’s Radicalism grew somewhat enigmatically from his original Tory roots while he was living as an exile in Philadelphia (1794–1800) after being threatened at home with a court-martial for attempting to bring fellow soldiers to justice for corruption in the British Army. Faced with a strong anti-British attitude, Cobbett found his voice as a pamphleteer: writing under the pen-name ‘Peter Porcupine’, he supported British interests and constitutional monarchy against pro-French ‘republicans’ such as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. When he returned to England in 1800, in order to avoid imprisonment after
being found guilty of libel in the United States, his radical voice was given a new organ in his *Political Register*. The enemy was now the ‘Pitt System’ and its plutocracy of bankers, jobbers and brokers, who, he believed, had conspired against rural farm workers by increasing the National Debt during the American and French wars. Food prices rose and wages fell, making life hard for the labourer – the issue which became the *cause célèbre* for his Radicalism for the remainder of his life.

In the opening paragraph of *A Dream of John Ball*, Morris connects Cobbett with the landscape of the Essex of 1381: ‘an island of shapely trees and flower-beset cottages of thatched grey stone and cob, amidst the narrow stretch of bright green water-meadows that wind between the sweeping Wiltshire downs, so well beloved of William Cobbett’. In Morris’s mind, the radical Cobbett comes from the same English soil as the radical John Ball. More important, Cobbett was a successful public orator who knew how to speak to labourers: ‘he found the tone, the style, and the arguments which could bring the weaver, the schoolmaster, and the shipwright, into a common discourse’. In Morris’s words, Cobbett was ‘the master of plain speaking’. He saw in Cobbett a skill for language which he himself did not possess, but wished to learn and to put into practice: ‘How often I have it said to me, You must not write in a literary style if you wish the working classes to understand you’.

Ian Dyck suggests that the beginning of the ‘Great Depression’ in 1874 renewed interest in rural poverty, and brought Cobbett’s name back into the public *milieu*: ‘Richard Heath entitled an essay on Cobbett “A Peasant Politician”’. Matthew Arnold, in 1880, remarked that Cobbett’s politics were governed by “the master-thought … of the evil condition of the English labourer”’. Perhaps it was at this time that Morris became aware of Cobbett. He first mentions his name during August 1883, when he asks Ellis & White’s bookshop: ‘Could you lay hands for me on the works of William Cobbett – any all of them’. In September, his enthusiasm is expressed to his daughter Jenny in words which suggest a first-time reader: ‘I have got a lot of W. Cobbett’s books; such queer things they are, but with plenty of stuff in them’. Cobbett was a prolific author, but according to May Morris, her father apparently obtained only three of his better known works: ‘I have just been re-reading Cobbett’s *Rural Rides*, a book that amused my father very much. He used to quote largely from it to us, as well as from his *Cottage Economy* and *Advice to Young Men*.

*Rural Rides* (1830) is Cobbett’s diary of his journey on horseback in southern England from 1822–1826 (Figure 1). Each ‘ride’ was originally published separately in his *Political Register*. The purpose of his effort was to compile a first-hand empirical account of the ‘Condition of England’ – by his own description, ‘hearing what gentlemen, farmers, tradesmen, journeymen, labourers, women, girls, boys and all have to say; reasoning with some, laughing with others, and observ-
As William Stafford remarks, it is a work of populism and does not address the needs of a single class, although Cobbett is most convincing when complaining of the poverty of his own, the labourers. There is hardship at all levels of rural society – landlord, tenant farmer, and labourer – caused by falling prices for farm produce. Rents had been fixed when prices were high during the French and American wars, and had now become unaffordable. In attempts to make payments, farmers have either lowered workers’ wages, or laid off hands. Many labourers had no choice but to leave the countryside for jobs in the industrial towns. ‘A national debt, and all the taxation and gambling belonging to it

Figure 1 – Frontispiece, William Cobbett, Rural Rides (1853). Image by permission of the Hathi-Trust Digital Library. Since Cobbett’s works were for the most part out of print when Morris sent Ellis & White looking for them in 1883, the copies he used were undoubtedly second-hand. The 1853 edition of Rural Rides edited and published by James Paul Cobbett was the most recent edition in print at the time Morris ‘discovered’ Cobbett.
have a natural tendency to draw wealth into great masses. These masses produce a power of congregating manufacturers, and of making the many work at them, for the gain of a few”. Life is being sucked out of rural England by the ‘wens’, the polluted and overcrowded industrial cities – ‘Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Paisley, and other Hell-Holes of 84 degrees of heat. There misery walks abroad in skin, bone and nakedness’. London is *The Great Wen*, the all-devouring Wen, the Wen of all wens.

Morris first adopts Cobbett’s *wen* in his lecture ‘Art Under Plutocracy,’ in November 1883: ‘It is my business here to-night and everywhere to foster your discontent with that anarchy and its visible results … with the hideousness of London, the wen of all wens, as Cobbett called it’. At the end of *A Dream of John Ball*, when the dreamer awakes, he looks toward the fields of Richmond Park:

… looking like the open country; and dirty as the river was, and harsh as was the January wind, they seemed to woo me toward the country-side, where away from the miseries of the ‘Great Wen’ I might of my own will carry on a day-dream of the friends I had made in the dream of the night and against my will.

Morris here is echoing Cobbett not only in the use of a word, but also in the connection between pollution and the cities. While on his ride through ‘Hampshire, Surrey and Down to the Wen’, Cobbett observes something in the sky coming up the valley: ‘Is it smoke, or is it a cloud?’ he asks the farmer to whom he has been speaking. ‘The day had been very fine hitherto; the sun was shining very bright where we were. The farmer answered, “Oh, it’s smoke, it comes from Ouselberry, which is down in that bottom behind those trees”’. The ‘smoke-cloud, dense manufacturing mist’ in John Ruskin’s ‘The Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century’ is remarkably similar to this description, and the date of that lecture (1884) suggests that Ruskin may have been reading Cobbett upon recommendation by Morris.

Cobbett contrasts the ugliness of the industrial wens with the idyllic beauty of rural England in its landscape: ‘a country where high downs prevail, with here and there a large wood on the top or the side of a hill, and where you see, in the deep dells, here and there a farm-house, and here and there a village, the buildings sheltered by a group of lofty trees’. Though Morris apparently did not always agree with Cobbett’s selection of the most beautiful spots in England, he seems to have imitated his style in many of his own landscape descriptions. And in *News from Nowhere*, in a passage which reads as though it might have come from the pages of *Rural Rides*, he returns England to its rural ideal:

England was once a country of dwellings amongst the woods and wastes, with a few towns interspersed, which were fortresses for the feudal army, markets for the folk, gathering places for the craftsmen. It then became a country of huge and
foul workshops and fouler gambling-dens, surrounded by an ill-kept, poverty-stricken farm, pillaged by the masters of the workshops. It is now a garden, where nothing is wasted and nothing is spoilt, with the necessary dwellings, sheds, and workshops scattered up and down the country, all trim and neat and pretty.

In his contemptuous description of the period preceding the revolution, Morris perhaps purposely imitates Cobbett’s vitriol with several hyphenated words, in what E.P. Thompson called ‘Cobbett’s trick of naming’. This is exemplified by words such as ‘stock-jobber’ and ‘tax-eater’.

The revival of cottage crafts was one of Cobbett’s greatest causes. This clearly resonated with Morris, whose own childhood was spent in a household with ‘homemade beer and bread, real butter and real cream and the like’. Upon discovering Cobbett in 1883, he praises him to Jenny: ‘One little book called Cottage Economy is very amusing, and there is a chapter in it on the making of straw plait: the article on the pig is touching’. At the time of its publication (1823), Cobbett believed that much of the misery of rural labourers was being brought about by the influence of urban manufacturing centres and their ‘cheap and nasty’ goods. Cobbett hoped that tenant farmers and labourers could defeat the manufacturers and taxgatherers by returning to the system of making as many things at home as possible. The problem was the population had largely forgotten how to feed and clothe itself, so in Cottage Economy he took on the task of that education. In Cobbett’s view, Old England was always a land of plenty: “The people of England have been famed, in all ages, for their good living; for the abundance of their food and goodness of their attire. The old sayings about English roast beef and plum-pudding, and about English hospitality, had not their foundation in nothing”. The way back to that better time was for the English family to regain the skills needed to live independently, making their own clothes, baking their own bread and brewing their own beer.

For Cobbett, the clothes of the simple labourer are a thing of nostalgic beauty: ‘The landlady sent her son to get me some cream, and he was just such a chap as I was at his age, and dressed in the same sort of way, his main garment being a blue smock-frock, faded from wear, and mended with pieces of new stuff, and of course, not faded’. Women too are far more attractive in their cottage-made clothing than in the ‘showy and flimsy’ fabrics made by the machinery of the industrial mills: ‘are they less pretty, when their dress is plain and substantial, and when the natural presumption is that they have smocks as well as gowns, than they are when drawn off in the frail fabric of [the mill]’.
they seemed to be dressed specially for the occasion … gaily and with plenty of adornment’. 38 This was not always the case: before the Revolution, under the control of industrial enterprise, manufactured goods prevailed and handicrafts had been forgotten:

[T]he consumer is perfectly helpless against the gambler; the goods are forced on him by their cheapness, and with them a certain kind of life which that energetic, that aggressive cheapness determines for him … the traditions of a thousand years fall before it in a month … and whatever romance or pleasure or art existed there, [was] trodden down into a mire of sordidness and ugliness.39

Cobbett saw his cottage economy, given enough time, winning back England for rural crafts, and defeating the manufacturers and the capitalists. Morris was less patient and advocated social revolution. Cobbett would have been pleased none-the-less with the outcome in Morris’s own account: the inhabitants of Nowhere re-learn the skills of the cottager, since many ‘had even forgotten how to bake bread’.40

Cobbett’s view of education supports his insistence on the need to foster appreciation for the basic skills of the English homestead at an early age. He received his own education working at his father’s farm in Farnham in Surrey: ‘a due mixture of pleasure with toil’, without which ‘I should have been at this day as a great a fool, as inefficient a mortal, as any of those frivolous idiots that are turned out from Winchester and Westminster School or from any of those dens of dunces called Colleges and Universities’.41 He distrusts public education: ‘schools over which the parents have no control, and where nothing is taught but the rudiments of servility, pauperism and slavery’.42 Instead, he is an advocate of home-schooling, and charges parents with the responsibility ‘to give, if they are able, book-learning to their children, having first-taken care to make them capable of earning their living by bodily labour’.43 The Cobbett pedagogy would certainly have produced a capable individual in Morris’s Nowhere, where cottage skills are primary for all children: ‘They all of them know how to cook; the bigger lads can mow; many can thatch and do odd jobs at carpenting; or they know to how to keep shop. I can tell you they know plenty of things’.44

Cottage-crafts are, for Cobbett, rooted in the soil of England. It is this sense of the organic which gives him the voice to condemn those things which take the English labourers away from their native heritage and legacy: ‘A nation is made powerful to be honoured in the world, not so much by the number of its people as by the ability and character of that people’. 45 Cobbett’s own medievalism is based in his observation that the character of the people of the England of the past was ‘greater’. When he visits the ruins of the Abbey at Highworth, Wiltshire, he offers a description laden with dustsceawung:
It was once a most magnificent building; and there is now a door-way, which is the most beautiful thing I ever saw, and which was nevertheless, built in Saxon times, in the ‘dark ages’ … If, in all that they have left us, we see that they surpassed us, why are we to conclude, that they did not surpass us in all other things worthy of admiration?46

Morris, of course, was a man of similar words and feelings long before he ever read Cobbett, and, along with Ruskin, lauded the greatness of medieval art as a testament to the freedom labourers enjoyed in the society in which they worked: ‘The medieval craftsman was free in his work, therefore he made it as amusing to himself as he could; and it was his pleasure and not his pain that made all things beautiful that were made’.47 In an article entitled, ‘Artist and Artisan,’ published in Commonweal in September 1887, Morris makes mention of Cobbett’s assessment of St Paul’s Cathedral: ‘Again, along with William Cobbett, contrast the dungeon-like propriety of St. Paul’s, the work of a “famous” architect with the free imagination and delicate beauty of the people-built Gothic churches’.48 In Morris’s paraphrase, Cobbett anticipates Ruskin’s ‘slavery argument’ in the Stones of Venice against the homogenous perfection required of workers in Classical (or Wren’s Neoclassical) architecture.

For Cobbett and Morris, labour is a precious resource, and part of human greatness. Morris gives it an almost spiritual purpose: ‘A man at work, making something which he feels will exist because he is working at it and wills it, is exercising the energies of his mind and soul as well as of his body’.49 Labour, therefore, should not be wasted on meaningless toil. In Rural Rides, Cobbett comes upon a group of men who normally work on the farm, but because farmers are too poor to pay them, are paid by means of parish poor-rates assessed on the farmers to carry out ‘meaningless’ road work:

The hop-picking is now over; and now [the men] are employed by the Parish; that is to say, not digging holes one day and filling them up the next; but at the expense of half-ruined farmers and tradesman and landlords, to break stones into very small pieces to make nice smooth roads lest the jolting, in going along them, should create bile in the stomachs of the overfed tax-eaters.50

Here is labour as useless as that used to make ‘glass beads,’ but Cobbett also gives us the non-producers, the consuming ‘tax-eaters, and their base and prostituted followers, dependents, purveyors, parasites and pimps’51 — those, who in Morris’s words, ‘do not produce[,] … and consume out of all proportion to their due share’.52 On this issue, Morris and Cobbett are of one voice: Morris, using Cobbett’s vocabulary, refers to the commercial manufacturers as ‘parasites of property’.53 But Cobbett has still another metaphor: ‘locusts, called middle-men, who create nothing, who add to the value of nothing, who improve nothing,
but who live in idleness, and who live well, too, out of the labour of the producer and the consumer’. Cobbett believes that it is not simply middle-men, however, who burden the lives of the working poor; it is the entire government-banker-capitalist system, what Cobbett likes to call the *The Thing*. The most hated members of this parasitic, controlling group are the ‘stock-jobbers’. These are ‘the agents to carry on gambling. . . . [they] call themselves gentlemen; or at least, look upon themselves as the superiors of those who sweep the kennels’. The tenor of Cobbett’s homiletics can be heard when Morris describes England as ‘this stock-jobber’s heaven’, and when he labels the middle-man ‘the gambler, who uses both consumer and producer as his milch cows’.

Both writers add the army to the list of parasitic ‘tax-eaters’. Cobbett suggests that since they are used to pay the military salaries and pensions, poor-rates be called ‘wages’:

\[T\]he whole amount of these poor-rates falls far short of the cost of the standing army in time of peace! So that, take away this army, which is to keep the distressed people from committing acts of violence, and you have at once, ample means of removing all the distress and all the danger of acts of violence.

Cobbett clearly remembers the use of the militia against rural uprisings during his own lifetime, which no doubt increased his sense of outrage over its cost. Morris reading Cobbett may have envisioned a similar use of the military during the soon-to-come revolution. Like Cobbett, he condemns the expense of ‘the soldiers by land and sea who are kept on foot for the perpetuating of the national struggle for the share of the product of unpaid labour’, and places them with the other members of the class of ‘accidental labour … the soldier, the thief, or the stockjobber’. Because producer and consumer are separated by middle-men who fight each other on a ‘battlefield’ of commerce, producing things which nobody wants, the solution is to foster a more direct relationship in trade between maker and user. Once more Cobbett returns to the heritage of Old England:

The fair and the market, those wise institutions of our forefathers … bring the producer and consumer in contact with each other. Whatever is gained is, at any rate, gained by one or the other of these. The fair and the market bring them together, and enable them to act for their mutual interest and convenience.

Morris describes the plenty and variety of a medieval market in *The Well at the World’s End*: ‘the scent of fresh herbs and worts and fruits; for it was market day, and the country-folk were early afoot, that they might array their wares timely in the market-place’. In *News from Nowhere*, the cash-less market, and the pleasantness of its free exchange is emblematic of the liberty, equality and fraternity of a Socialist England, which for Morris is a reflection of the England of the
medieval past.

The decorative arts employed by fourteenth-century villagers in *A Dream of John Ball* are indicative of the happiness and freedom of the labourer in society. Cobbett, too, observes in the 'more noble' art of medieval England an emblem of the economic liberty enjoyed by its workers:

> After we came out of the cathedral [Winchester], Richard said, ‘Why, Papa, nobody can build such places now, can they?’ ‘No, my dear’, said I. ‘That building was made when there were no poor wretches in England, called paupers; when there were no poor-rates, when every labouring man was clothed in good woolen cloth, and when all had a plenty of meat and bread and beer’.63

During Cobbett’s own lifetime, he watched the food of working people reduced to water and oatmeal: ‘No society ought to exist where the labourers live in a hog-like sort of way’.64 He argued against those who would attribute such deteriorating conditions to increase in numbers: ‘the country has never varied much in the gross amount of its population’.65 For Cobbett, the great size of old churches, and amount of land which had formerly been ploughed speaks to a large population in England’s past and fully repudiates the theories of the ‘Monster Malthus’.

What has changed is a diminishment in the lives of the working poor. Cobbett interprets history as a declensionist, observing in *Rural Rides* those deteriorating conditions which support his argument that ‘Englishmen had liberties in the past, which are now being invaded by greedy, corrupt and oppressive governments’.66

> But, the fact is, that, where honest and laborious men can be compelled to starve quietly, whether all at once or by inches, with old wheat ricks and fat cattle under their eye, it is a mockery to talk of their ‘liberty’, of any sort; for the sum total of their state is this, they have ‘liberty’ to choose between death by starvation (quick or slow) and death by the halter.67

In ‘How we live and how we might live’ (1884) Morris echoes Cobbett’s link between liberty and hunger: ‘So you see, as we live now, it is necessary that a vast part of the industrial population should be exposed to the danger of periodical semi-starvation … for their degradation and enslavement’.68 In ‘The Aims of Art,’ also published in 1888 in *Signs of Change*, he repeatedly refers to ‘the Artificial Famine caused by men working for the profit of a master’.69 But Morris, however, takes Cobbett further down the road of liberty, equality and fraternity towards Socialism than he might have wished to travel (even when ceremoniously repatriating the bones of Thomas Paine in 1819 in the aftermath of the Peterloo Massacre):
So for fear you my Socialist friends should refuse to hear me any longer allow me to remind you, that William Cobbett asks this pertinent question: ‘What is a slave?’ and answers it thus, a slave is a man without property. In that I wholly agree. What are you to do if you have no property? You cannot get up when you will, go to bed when will, eat and drink as you will.\(^{70}\)

Cobbett’s words here are from *Advice to Young Men*, (Figure 2) where, in the context of making an appeal for reform of Parliament (not for revolution, however), he urges readers to be mindful of not turning labourers into slaves; someone ‘who has no share in making the laws in which he is compelled to obey’.\(^{71}\) Morris can be forgiven for reading a sense of communal property in Cobbett. At times it is expressed as nostalgia for the English past:

> Time was when the inhabitants of this island, for instance, laid claim to all things in it, without the words owner or property being known. God had given to all the people all the land and all the trees, and everything else, just as he has given the burrows and the grass to the rabbits, and the bushes and the berries to the birds.\(^{72}\)

It is also evident in Cobbett’s appeal for a return to a feudal system of customary rights to common land in order to help the poor feed themselves. Cobbett never denies the right of land-holders to charge rent, but it must be reasonable: ‘it is a little step towards a coming back to the ancient small life and lease holds and common fields … when almost every man that had a family had also a bit of land’.\(^{73}\) Being poorer than one’s neighbour, however, is not a bad thing and is largely relative. ‘So that poverty is, except where there is an actual want of food and raiment, a thing much more imaginary than real’.\(^{74}\) Like Rousseau, Cobbett believes that Civil Society arose at the same time as ‘property’, along with the notion of mine and thine: ‘One man became possessed of more good things than another, because he was more industrious, more skillful, more careful, or more frugal: so that Labour, of one sort or another, was the Basis of all property’.\(^{75}\) Morris would perhaps find this more difficult to paraphrase in support of his own collectivist cause.

Morris found in Cobbett a ‘trail-blazer’ for reform who was prophetic in his understanding of the need to address the deteriorating condition of the working poor: ‘a man of great literary capacity of a kind, and with flashes of insight as to social matters far before his time … a powerful disruptive agent, but incapable of association with others’.\(^{76}\) Morris strongly believed that the Democratic Federation would be the key to success in any campaign to win England to Socialism: ‘… remember without organization the cause is but a vague dream, which may lead to revolt, to violence and disorder, but which will be speedily repressed by those who are blindly interested in sustaining the present anarchical tyranny
Figure 2 – Cover of Advice to Young Men, William Cobbett (1887). By permission, Bruce Hunt, oldlondonbooks.co.uk.
which is misnamed Society’. In contrast, the early nineteenth century Radicals – Cartwright, Burdett, Hunt, Lovett, Cobbett – were free-thinking orators and writers who made little attempt at formal organisation. Unlike Morris and his fellow Socialists, they did not consider themselves revolutionaries. In the wake of the atrocities following the French Revolution, Cobbett writing in 1816 carefully styled himself a ‘reformer’:

I know of no enemy of reform and of the happiness of the country so great as that man, who would persuade you that we possess *nothing* good, and that *all* must be torn to pieces. … We want great alteration, but we want nothing new. Alteration, modification to suit the time and circumstances; but the great principles ought to be, and must be, the same, or else confusion will follow.

Cobbett, though a successful agitator, lacked the vision for change embraced by Morris. In the heat of argument, he frequently called for an end to the current conditions, ‘blow this funding and jobbing and enslaving and starving system to atoms’, but, he offered little in the way of an alternative. Robert Owen’s early experiments in Socialism, ‘Villages of Co-operation’, an idea much-admired by Morris as a revival of the medieval commune, was belittled by Cobbett as ‘Mr. Owen’s Parallelograms of Paupers’. When in 1830 Britain teetered precariously towards civil war, Cobbett, in his *Political Register*, threw the support of his ‘country labourers’ behind the Whig Reform Bill as the only means for Britain to avoid its own French Revolution. After its passage in 1832, Cobbett, along with a small group of other Radicals including, Joseph Hume and Thomas Attwood, took seats in the newly ‘reformed’ Parliament, believing that they could work towards a political solution for the working-class, who had sadly achieved very little in the Bill’s final form. Morris, from the vantage of another fifty years of failed struggle of Labour against Capitalism, and benefitting from his studies of Fourier, Engels and Marx, might have offered some advice to these men on the folly of their attempted legislative solution:

Communism can never be realized till the present system of Society has been destroyed by the workers taking hold of the political power.

Although Cobbett and Morris followed the same path in their radicalism, and their championship of medieval England as a better time for the ordinary labourer, unlike the Socialist Morris, the Radical Cobbett, fettered by his Tory roots, could never imagine a complete overthrow of government and its replacement with a new order organised by labourers and based on the principles of equality, fraternity and liberty, exemplified by the workers of England’s medieval past.
NOTES

9. Cobbett uses the term to refer to ‘village workers.’
10. Eisenman, p. 98.
12. Morton, p. 35.
15. ‘Monopoly: or, How Labour is Robbed’ (1887); CW, Vol. XXIII, p. 241.
17. To Ellis and White, 18 August, 1883, in Kelvin, p. 215.
18. To Jane Alice Morris, 4 September 1883, in Henderson, p. 183.
22. *Rural Rides*, p. 82.
25. Morten, p. 113.
30. ‘News from Nowhere’ (1890); Morten, p. 254.
37. *Cottage Economy*, p. 95.
38. Morten, p. 349.
39. ‘How We Live and How We Might Live’ (1885); *CW*, Vol. XXIII, p. 8. (Afterwards ‘How we live’)
40. Morten, p. 363.
42. *Cottage Economy*, p. 9.
43. *ibid*.
44. Morten, p. 209.
47. ‘The Aims of Art’ (1886); *CW*, Vol. XXIII, p. 90. (Afterwards ‘Aims of Art’)
56. ‘The Hopes of Civilization’ (1885); *CW*, Vol. XXIII, p. 73.
64. *Rural Rides*, p. 90.
66. Stafford, p. 265.
72. *Advice*, para. 332.
73. *Rural Rides*, p. 344.
74. *Advice*, para. 57.
75. *Advice*, para. 333.
Making daily life ‘as useful and beautiful as possible’: Georgiana Burne-Jones and Rottingdean, 1880–1904

Stephen Williams

When in 1880 Edward and Georgiana Burne-Jones bought a house in Rottingdean, Sussex, it was a village relatively unaffected by the rapid pace of change in late-Victorian England. While there had been growth in the fashionable holiday trade spilling over from Brighton, the downland village by the sea retained its rural character with agriculture as still the largest employer of local labour. It was, in fact, the bucolic and unspoilt nature of Rottingdean which attracted Edward and Georgiana as they searched for a second home outside London. Burne-Jones had considered Brighton, but rejected it as too busy and commercial. He found Rottingdean in 1877 and, having recognised the charm of the place, suggested Georgiana take a look when she planned a visit to Brighton in 1880.¹

Characteristically, the energetic Georgiana walked the four miles from Brighton and later described her impressions of the village:

It was a perfect autumn afternoon when I walked across the downs and entered the village from the north; no new houses then straggled out to meet one, but the little place lay peacefully within its grey garden walls, the sails of the windmill were turning slowly in the sun, and the miller’s black timber cottage was still there. The road I followed led me straight to the door of the house that stood empty on the village green, and we bought it at once.²

Time spent at Rottingdean was limited by Edward’s work commitments in London, but gradually the couple became more attached to the place Georgiana described as ‘our haven of rest’, and by 1886 they had named the home North End House, linking it to 49 North End Road, the address of The Grange, their London home.³ By the end of 1888 they had bought the adjoining house, Aubrey
Cottage, which they asked W.A.S Benson to extend and join to North End House, giving Edward a studio and creating accommodation for the extended family which Georgiana loved to have near her, especially their grandchildren. Georgiana’s description of herself ‘circling round’ her family reveals much about the pleasure she took in children.4

Acquisition of Aubrey Cottage also meant that the Burne-Joneses were able to stymie what they believed to be expansion plans for the nearby Downlands Seaside Infirmary for Children which catered for juveniles afflicted with tubercular and cutaneous diseases. These children, mostly from London poor law authorities, were sent to Downlands because it was believed that their health would benefit from the seaside environment. Established in 1879, the home experienced financial difficulties during the 1880s leading eventually to bankruptcy and the sale of the institution to Charles Reed, a Rottingdean grocer and draper who with his brother, Samuel, a tax collector, owned land and property on the west side of the High Street and had an eye on possible development. It was these circumstances which Burne-Jones referred to when he told Lady Leighton that they had to buy the property in order to stop it being used as a ‘sanatorium for scrofulous orphans’.5 At this stage the Infirmary was operated by Julia Hall, but it was owned by Samuel Reed and it is likely that Georgiana had either him or Charles in mind when she wrote to Charles Norton that ‘We should not have done this however for anything short of compulsion. We are so fond of our tiny house here – but there was a likelihood of a very tiresome neighbour taking it and that would have spoilt our comfort as we are very close to each other, and we were obliged to do it’.6

The Reeds were aspiring members of the Rottingdean establishment which included the de facto squire Steyning Beard, with his 3,000 acres (ca 1200 ha), the farmer and largest employer of labour, William Brown, the well-connected clergyman of St Margaret’s Church, the Rev. Arthur Thomas, and a number of wealthy families living in or close to the gentry houses facing the village green. From these families came the churchwardens, overseers, surveyors and assessors of the parish during the years immediately preceding the Local Government Act of 1894. Beard also represented Rottingdean on the first East Sussex County Council of 1888, thereafter becoming Alderman, and was for a time a member of the Newhaven Union Rural Sanitary Authority, of which Brown was also a member. Also occupying a large house on the village green was the family of Edward L.J. Ridsdale, who in 1880 had been instrumental in seeing that Rottingdean was connected to Brighton’s fresh water supply, and whose son E. A. Ridsdale, a free-thinker and author of science books, would become the first chairman of Rottingdean Parish Council and later Liberal MP for Brighton. The Burne-Jones and Ridsdale families were already close – Georgiana and Edward L.J.’s wife Esther were particular friends – when in 1892 they became connected
through the marriage of Georgiana’s nephew Stanley Baldwin to Lucy, the Ridsdale’s eldest daughter.

These connections, the improved accommodation, and the enjoyment of living in a village they grew to love, encouraged the Burne-Joneses to spend more time there, so that by September 1890 Georgiana could report to Norton that ‘It is strange how we turn to the country life now, and get more and more to consider Rottingdean as our main home’. By this time she was well established and respected in the village owing to her support for local charities, and her having paid during the early 1890s for a local woman to be trained as a cottage nurse and midwife. Evidence relating to this first nursing scheme in the village – a second followed in 1904 – is scanty, but it is likely that it was loosely based on the model of the Cottage Benefit Nursing Association pioneered across the county border in Surrey. Although short-lived, this initiative was remembered fondly by a group of women who wrote to Georgiana lamenting her electoral defeat in 1897.

We know even less about the success or otherwise of Georgiana’s informal attempts to encourage the education of villagers through discussion and the distribution of literature for that purpose, but we need not necessarily assume that it was as uncomfortable an experience for those taking part as portrayed by the Burne-Joneses’ self-conscious granddaughter Angela Thirkell, in her account of life at North End House forty years later. Once she was elected to Rottingdean Parish Council in 1894, it is more likely that Georgiana’s visits to villagers’ cottages, highlighted by Thirkell as a source of embarrassment, would have been taken up with practical matters such as allotments and footpaths rather than the merits of Ruskin’s *Fors Clavigera*.

Doubtless the earnest Georgiana did feel a duty to introduce villagers to the ideas of those she admired, more often than not meaning William Morris, particularly his ideas relating art and society. We know she ordered multiple of copies of *The Aims of Art* from the Socialist League in 1887, almost certainly for distribution in the village, and correspondence to friends provides ample evidence that Georgiana took every opportunity to spread Morris’s ideas. But there is nothing to suggest that she explicitly propagated for socialism in Rottingdean, or made links with active local socialist groups. Instead, Georgiana’s ideas for radical reform in Rottingdean were presented in a way which sat comfortably within the type of advanced Liberalism/progressivism then current, and with which she would be familiar from London, overlaid with a distinctive emphasis on fostering participation by working people in village institutions.

Unlike Morris, Georgiana was encouraged by the political circumstances following election of Gladstone’s administration in 1892, and wrote to her friend Rosalind Howard:
To think that there should be such a compact majority at this moment on the side of truth and justice, is invigorating. We do live in wonderful times. My faith increases in the progress of the world, and in the idea that all things and people help towards it ... I am quite out of the political world – as I always was – but I am intensely interested in the struggle going on in it now, which is a type of bigger thing’.  

That the Liberal administration was formed with the support of Irish Nationalist MPs was undoubtedly of significance to Georgiana because she had opposed British policy in Ireland throughout the 1880s, but had not joined any campaign or organisation of opposition. She made her views clear in a letter to friend Catherine Holiday who in November 1890 was observing social conditions of the poor in County Donegal:

Thank you for letting me know that you have started for Falcarragh. I feel humiliated to be here in my easy home while you have gone there – but I send you my love and respect and sympathy. I have just been reading a letter from Sir John Swinburne in the Daily News about the Olphert evictions, which he says are to begin today, and putting the case against it for the 1,000th time ... one would believe no human being could turn another out of house and home at this season for any cause – it is monstrous, and yet those of us who do nothing against it almost seem to approve of it by silence.  

At the time Georgiana was expressing these feelings of a guilty conscience for her lack of engagement with causes close to her heart, she was finding her way in practical activity as a Council member of the South London Art Gallery, where she joined Edward in 1890. If Burne-Jones’s presence on the Council was that of a figurehead, the same could not be said of Georgiana, who threw herself into its work; raising funds, appealing publicly and privately for the loan of paintings, organising exhibitions, and crucially by 1893 mediating between conflicting views of the Gallery’s management as its chairman Lord Leighton attempted to prise the institution out of the loving but limiting grasp of its founder, and transfer responsibility to the local authority.  

Galvanised by this activity, enjoying a period of independence within her marriage, released from some of the secretarial duties she undertook for Edward, and now confident in her ability to conduct public work, Georgiana seized the opportunity to help shake things up in sleepy Rottingdean when election by secret ballot for the first Parish Council was declared during the first week of November 1894. She was able to put her name forward for election because she was listed on the local government electoral register as the married female occupier of North End House, Georgiana’s contest was not undertaken alone, but was part of an organised challenge by village progressives to the Rotting-
dean establishment group which had traditionally dominated parish affairs. Although the progressive group did not identify itself as such, that is what they were, and they declared their collective intention to contest the election during early November, when a meeting led by E. A. Ridsdale and Stephen Welfare, a hotelier and omnibus proprietor, put forward an outline manifesto including plans for municipal allotments. An approved list of progressive candidates was quickly assembled and endorsed by a well-attended public meeting held at Welfare’s White Horse Hotel. As well as Ridsdale, Welfare and Georgiana, the progressive ‘slate’ included a chemist, a Congregational minister, two shopkeepers and a number of working men, but significantly no agricultural labourers. The establishment figures, who obviously expected an easy ride during the elections, reacted angrily to the challenge accusing the progressives of bringing ‘party politics’ into the village, and suggesting that a number of their candidates had only recently become interested in Rottingdean, whereas they had a proven track record in parish affairs.

Georgiana was particularly energetic during the election campaign, knocking on doors, entering public houses and speaking at meetings, prompting Burne-Jones to write ‘She is so busy – she is rousing the village – she is marching about – she is going like a flame through the village’. The final week of the campaign saw the publication of Georgiana’s Open Letter to the Electors of Rottingdean about Parish Councils, an exposition of the legislation introducing elected parish councils, and a reasoning for why that reform was important. Crucially, the Open Letter argued, elected parish councils gave villagers who were entitled to vote the chance to replace the outdated system of church-based parochial administration with democratic and representative local government, carrying powers to improve the quality of village life. Concluding with a challenge to Rottingdean’s electors to make a ‘fresh start’, Georgiana wrote:

I am not asking you to vote for me or for those who think as I do; but I speak because I want you to know what is offered to you, and I am sure many of you have not been told what it is. Many a man goes across the world to find a fresh chance to better his life, and here is one brought to our doors. Shall we take it?

The Open Letter contributed to what was obviously an intense political debate in the village during the week leading up to the poll on 17 December, with a Brighton newspaper reporting that ‘The contest has excited the greatest interest in the village. Poems and pamphlets were flying about in all directions, and considerable feeling was manifested on both sides’. Such energy clearly transmitted itself to the voters, because there was a 79 per cent turnout in the election which saw eight progressives elected, six of them, including Georgiana, heading the poll, and only three establishment candidates returned. Among those defeated were a Baronet, a retired colonel of the Indian Army and a clergyman
who finished bottom of the poll. To complete the rout, two progressives were elected from Rottingdean ward to the newly-established Newhaven Rural District Council. Georgiana recounted details of these victories the following day in a letter to Catherine Holiday remarking that it had been ‘a strong pull, but successful, and I am happy, though very tired’.  

Despite the progressives’ clear majority on the Parish Council, they found it difficult to implement election commitments because of opposition and delay from those with vested interests who resented the passing of the old system of parochial administration. Transfer of overseers’ responsibility for collection of rates to the parish was completed in the absence of previous office holders, which Council chairman E.A. Ridsdale said was ‘an example of the way in which things had been conducted in the past’. Attempts to take control of local charities met with obfuscation and fending off, as when Beard, one of the three establishment figures elected to the Council, was forced to reveal that his ‘gift’ of the village Reading Room to the parish in 1885 was made with no deeds or details of trustees. When the Parish Council proposed compensation of £250 to transfer ownership of the Reading Room to the local authority, Beard rejected the offer.

There were similar difficulties securing land for allotments, the issue for Ridsdale ‘that really the election turned on ... (and which) ... the village spoke with no uncertain sound upon ...’. Following repeated attempts to persuade Beard and Brown, also an establishment parish councillor, to release land for rent at realistic prices, Georgiana proposed that the issue be referred to East Sussex County Council for compulsory purchase. At this point, the Marquess of Abergavenny, a County Council Alderman with over 15,000 acres (6000 ha) in Sussex including a large portion of Rottingdean land, offered a 2½ acre (1 ha) cow-field adjoining the village school at £6 per acre which was accepted but not without Georgiana stating that it was overpriced, a view confirmed by a contemporary survey, which found a maximum rent of £4 in a comparable Sussex parish.

Land ownership was also at the heart of what was to prove the most controversial and intractable problem facing the first Rottingdean Parish Council. The issue surfaced in August 1889 when two strips of waste ground either side of the Woodingdean Road were enclosed with posts and chains by Beard and his tenant farmer Brown. Across these strips ran a series of footpaths used by farm workers and villagers and there had been at one time a small wooden bridge across a watercourse providing access for pedestrians. Beard claimed he possessed authority to enclose the land because of an award of a steward’s copy grant dating from March 1866 to his uncle Charles Beard, by the Lord of the Manor, the Marquess of Abergavenny, effectively transferring ownership of the land. If there was village resentment at the enclosure in 1889, as Georgiana suggested seven years later, it was not publicly expressed, doubtless because of the deference shown to Beard who owned rented property as well as land, and the economic power of
Brown as the largest employer of farm labour in Rottingdean. This authority was confirmed by the appointment of Beard and Brown as joint surveyors in the parochial administration before 1894.

It was precisely this kind of arrogant and acquisitive action which Georgiana believed could be prevented with the introduction of elected parish and district councils. Indeed, she argued it was their ‘duty’ in Rottingdean to raise the issue, which she and the progressive majority duly did at the first opportunity, challenging the legality of the enclosure and petitioning Newhaven Rural District Council for removal of the obstructions. The Parish Council was encouraged in this by advice from the Local Government Board to district councils in January 1895 that they possessed a duty to protect public rights of way threatened with enclosure. Considerable energy and resources were put behind the challenge including seeking the opinion of Queen’s Counsel who advised that the case for enclosure was unsound, and the gathering of witness statements confirming continued and unfettered public use of the land during the years between the copy grant issue and the erection of post and chain obstructions.

Ultimately, the case failed, for two reasons. First, a majority of the Newhaven Rural District Council – among them Steyning Beard’s son Ernest, who represented Telscombe ward – accepted the case put by Beard in a private meeting with the Council Clerk, that the copy grant entitled him to enclose the land. Second, subsequent referral of the case to East Sussex County Council occurred concurrently with the second Rottingdean Parish Council elections during March 1896, which led to the progressive majority being overturned, and with it the political drive to pursue the issue. Therefore, when the County Council considered the matter in October 1896, it was advised that while there was sufficient evidence to justify an action against the enclosure, it recognised ‘the changed attitude of the Parish Council’, that no public right of way had been interfered with, and the matter was duly dropped. Following this episode, the Burne-Joneses’ son Philip remonstrated by removing the chains, announcing this act in the local press and advising Beard that he would take the matter up with the Commons Preservation Society. A watching brief was kept by the Society, but it probably decided against supporting legal action because in 1892 a very similar case had been lost. Georgiana also took to direct action as protest, with an annual picnic and procession on the land during which she was forced to contend with jets of water directed at her by Brown’s wife, Mary. The value of the enclosed land was eventually estimated at £250 in 1910, when the estate was sold following Beard’s death.

The parish election of March 1896 was a setback to Georgiana and the progressives, with the majority passing to the establishment candidates who elected Beard as chairman. The turn-out of 53 per cent was particularly disappointing, and was the main reason for the loss of progressive seats. While it was the case
that there had been, and would continue to be, a good deal of across ‘party’ agreement on a number of plans for local services, the radical direction of the Parish Council which had attracted wider attention was lost. Henceforth, proposals to introduce genuinely forward-looking policies for the parish and the district, such as the attempt in 1896 to petition the District Council to adopt building bye-laws for basic standards of drainage, daylight and ventilation, were voted down by Beard and his supporters.

This particular decision was almost certainly perceived by the Burne-Joneses as indicative of a growing willingness to open the village, and to remove any perceived barriers, to expansion and commercialisation. Charles Reed, elected to the Parish Council in 1896 and the District Council in 1898, with his brother Samuel, who had been appointed Parish Clerk in 1895, began house building during these years, and were directors, with a number of other Parish councillors, of the Steam Laundry Company which partnered New & Mayne, the electric lighting and power company whose noise and smoke pollution forced Edward into the Chancery Division of the High Court in November 1895. When New & Mayne failed at the end of the decade, the Reeds, and other local businessmen, were on hand to take over its operations. Beard was also a founding director of the company which operated the seashore tramroad linking Brighton to Rottingdean which was so despised by Edward that there was ‘rejoicing’ in the Burne-Jones home when a storm wrecked the equipment in December 1896. For Burne-Jones, allowing the link was a case of Rottingdean behaving as a ‘silly little village, always bursting itself to join Brighton’.

The building of a new private school during 1893–94 at the northern edge of the village by establishment figures George and Henry Mason, on land sold by Beard, to designs by architect and local conservative Samuel Thacker, possessed a whiff of cronyism, and when a public footpath was taken in by landscaping of the school’s playing fields Philip ‘put up posters all over the village during the night inciting the people to stick up for their rights’. With the support of the Brighton and District Footpaths Preservation Society, Burne-Jones was himself involved in negotiations to agree a new footpath which although an improvement on what was first proposed, was still noticeably less pleasant for walkers than the now lost ancient right of way. Other building developments also concerned Edward and Georgiana, including the very large St Mary’s Home for Female Penitents, and the row of cottages built by Steyning Beard in the area known as Court Ord, which Burne-Jones believed ‘had ruined the place. They have dwarfed the valley’. Increasingly, Georgiana felt that the character of the village was being lost. She sometimes left the place when it was busy with tourists during summer, and at one stage it was thought that she might move elsewhere.

Those with local business interests began to dominate the Parish Council after 1896 as the local Primrose League, a body linked to the Conservative Party, and
therefore linked to the Conservative Party, organised and successfully delivered the establishment vote. As this went on, the progressive vote fell away, with the 1897 election marking a watershed as Georgiana, Ridsdale and Welfare all lost their seats. Dismayed by these results, and by wider events, Georgiana told Sidney Cockerell that the reverses had 'made me realise how slow is the growth of freedom in the world even more than I usually do'.

Such events certainly influenced Georgiana’s thinking as she turned her attention to encouraging the involvement of villagers in local institutions. She was the driving force behind the Rottingdean Agricultural Credit Society set up in September 1896 in order to provide a village bank based on cooperative principles. When in 1897 a village meeting was called in order to plan an event to celebrate Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee, Georgiana’s proposal, amid a clamour for bonfires and memorials, was for a district nurse to be appointed to serve the local community. She made an appeal for working-class men and women candidates to stand in the Parish elections in order to ensure that their authentic voices were heard and their interests represented, reflecting that ‘If I had lived in one of the worst cottages in the village during the two years that I was on the Parish Council, I know that I should have done better for you than I did – for I don’t think I should ever have let the subject drop, and that is needed everywhere in order to get things done’. Georgiana advised villagers to use their collective voice through Parish Meetings which she believed could guide and influence elected councillors. The emphasis here was on villagers taking pride in and responsibility for their own community through meetings at which all could have their say, sentiments not unlike those expressed by Morris in ‘How Matters are Managed’, Chapter XIV of News from Nowhere, which we know Georgiana was re-reading at precisely this time.

That Georgiana was held in high regard by the Rottingdean progressives and their working class supporters was demonstrated by the decision that she stand in the 1898 Parish Council election, not as a candidate in the village, but for one of three seats in Black Rock ward, created following the 1896 election. Black Rock, east of the village and bordering on Brighton, was included in Rottingdean parish but had traditionally been regarded as an outpost. As a consequence, its needs had often been neglected. Its population was overwhelmingly working-class with many employed in the nearby gas works and in market gardens. Working-class progressive candidates had been returned from Black Rock since 1894, but subsequent debate gave rise to the suggestion that with voters required to travel up to three miles (4.8 km) to the village to vote, the parish be divided into two wards, one for Rottingdean village, the other for Black Rock. The proposal was endorsed by the County Council, and at the 1897 election Black Rock returned three progressives. Designation of one of these ‘safe’ seats in the 1898 election for a titled lady from one of the village green properties illustrated the esteem in
which Georgiana was held, and the degree of organisation of those progressives living in Black Rock ward.

Notwithstanding Georgiana’s return to the Parish Council in 1898, the group of four progressive councillors were to exert little influence on policy as Beard, now seemingly elected as perpetual chairman, ensured that the parish was rate-conscious, non-interventionist and acted in accord with Newhaven Rural District Council and East Sussex County Council, both dominated by coalitions of business and landed interests. Georgiana kept up an excellent record of attendance – she was even present at a meeting in the month following Burne-Jones’s death in June 1898 – and maintained her commitment on footpaths and allotments, but the excitement of the first fifteen months of Council work was now only a memory. She was elected again in 1899 and 1900, but decided to stand down in 1901 when the tenure of office of Parish councillors was extended to three years. As if to symbolise the change and how little she could now achieve on the Council, the final proposal made by Georgiana for the regulation of the village green and the area by the coast where there is a break in the cliffs known as ‘The Gap’, was successfully countered by Brown and George Mason, with a motion that ‘it lay on the table’.46

Georgiana also found herself out of step with villagers, including her nephew Rudyard Kipling, over British government policy in South Africa, and more generally her opposition to all forms of militarism. Kipling, the son of Georgiana’s older sister Alice and her husband John, settled in Rottingdean with his wife and young family during 1897, renting a large house only yards from North End House. Georgiana loved having the Kipling family on her doorstep, but she did not approve of Rudyard’s imperialist views and was unhappy when he became a focus of local support for military action against the Boers towards the end of 1899. Kipling’s sponsorship of the Navy League branch in the village, establishment of a rifle club with indoor and outdoor ranges, and support for a company of Rottingdean volunteers who marched and drilled on the green across from North End House, all heightened feelings of jingoism and imperialism so abhorrent to Georgiana.47 She would also have been disappointed that these activities brought Kipling into alliance with her political opponents, the nexus of business and landed interests associated with the Primrose League and the Westminster constituency MP, Sir Henry Fletcher. Although Georgiana still looked forward to visits of the Kipling family to her home, she recognised that her views were incompatible with Rudyard’s, and after a while avoided discussion of the war. As she wrote to Charles Norton in January 1902 (quoting Swinburne), ‘Rudyard as dear as ever, but alas, the heart’s division divideth us’.48

Georgiana had declared against British military action in South Africa during October 1899, when she was a signatory of a national petition in favour of a
‘patient and pacific policy’ of negotiation. This petition gave rise to the South African Conciliation Committee, which Georgiana joined with Philip, an essentially middle-class organisation which sought to achieve ‘the rational refutation of irrational arguments’ and ‘consciously restricted itself to shedding truth upon imperialist distortions’. The Committee included a women’s section in whose activities Georgiana participated. Georgiana also did what she could in everyday life to persuade people that the war was irrational and unjust, but this task was not easy, particularly as reports of loss of life reached the village. Never one to shirk what she believed was a moral duty, she made a final protest against the war on the day in June 1902 when the village was celebrating victory by hanging from a bedroom window of North End House a banner bearing the words ‘We have killed and also taken possession’.

A good deal of mythology and confusion surrounds this event, not least its repeatedly incorrect dating to 1900. This confusion has almost certainly happened because the account by Rottingdean historian Seaburne Moens, places it following the Relief of Mafeking in May, 1900. Successive historians and biographers – but not it must be said those Kipling scholars who correctly date the event – have used his account as their guide: hence the muddle. Moens also suggested, and again this has been repeated by others, that had not Kipling been summoned to address the assembled crowd, an attack on North End House might have resulted. Probably the most comprehensive and reliable contemporary report was included in a local daily newspaper and is reproduced below:

Several versions have appeared in London papers of incidents at Rottingdean on ‘Peace Monday’. What actually occurred is thus related by our correspondent. It is a well-known fact that Lady Burne-Jones is a sympathiser with the Boers. Her nephew, Mr Rudyard Kipling is not. On ‘Peace Monday’ while the people of Rottingdean were at the thanksgiving service in the Church, Lady Burne-Jones had placed on the wall facing the main street, just underneath her bedroom window, a large black board on which was the following inscription in bold white letters: ‘We have killed and also taken possession’. No doubt this would have been taken down by the young men of the village, but the discreet village constable advised Lady Burne-Jones to have it taken down and at five o’clock in the evening it disappeared. In the evening, on the village green in front of North End House, a large number of people gathered and treated her ladyship to ‘free entertainment’. Later, the crowd was augmented by a rougher element and it was then that Mr. Kipling came out from The Elms. He did not address the crowd, but carried on a wordy war with a few of the men. He then went home, followed by a crowd singing ‘He’s an absent minded beggar’, to the accompaniment of boos and hisses. For an hour or more the crowd serenaded him and then dispersed. The next morning a notice to the effect that gymnasium would be closed to the
villagers until further notice was put up. It was also expected that the rifle-range
would be closed but Mr. Kipling had no power to do that. Lady Burne-Jones left
the village on the following morning early.  

These events occurred while Georgiana was working on the second volume
of the biography Burne-Jones had requested she write. He had died unexpectedly
on 17 June 1898 and his ashes were laid in a grave in the churchyard of St Marga-
ret’s, Rottingdean, the Church where a number of his stained glass windows were
located. Less than a week had passed when Sydney Cockerell visited Georgiana
and noted that she had ‘that air of determined resignation that I had seen in her
days after Morris’s death. She was very well, she said, and was very thankful to
have known the two men as others had known them, and we must pay for the
wine that we had drunk.’  

Having given over the lease of her London house to Charles Fairfax Murray
in October 1898, Georgiana’s permanent home became North End House where
she made Edward’s studio her ‘sanctum’. Here she would work most days on the
biography until three in the afternoon. After some delay, owing to an extended
period of illness in 1903, she wrote the final words at the end of March 1904. This
was followed by editing, proof-reading, indexing and dealing with the publisher,
with which she was helped by her daughter Margaret, Margaret’s husband J.W.
Mackail, Carmel Price, and Philip. Publication of the biography in November
1904, two volumes of Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones, ‘by GB-J’, was a relief to
Georgiana but also the cause of some sorrow as she described to Cockerell three
days after it appeared ‘I expect you will understand the profound sadness which
accompanies the fulfilment of my purpose, and how much I miss the daily labour
at it – and how it seems to me that I have parted with something precious – almost
lost it – sharing it with everyone’.  

Towards the end of her life Georgiana reflected on time spent and concluded that
‘I find in looking backwards that my life falls into decades, and I reckon myself to
have been more or less reborn in them’. In relation to her years of both part-time
and permanent residence in Rottingdean, the 1890s stand out clearly as a decade
of activity and engagement, a contrast to the first ten years when her presence in
the village passed by with few highlights. Not that Georgiana was unconnected to
politics during the 1880s, which in fact was a ‘long’ decade of political discovery
for her. It began alongside Morris during the agitation of the Eastern Question
Association of 1876–1877, where she was impressed with the politicised workers
who sang Morris’s ‘Wake, London Lads’, so much so that nearly two decades later
she believed they could be roused again by the song as a demonstration against
British government policy in Crete approached. These experiences determined
Georgiana to ‘renounce patriotism’, a stance she held for rest of her life, notably – as we have seen – during the South African war of 1899–1902.60 She was also alive to the ferment of radical political ideas during the 1880s, including Henry George’s proposals for a single tax on land as a way of achieving land restoration, which through Michael Davitt, was connected to the plight of the Irish landless poor and the case for Home Rule, both of them issues close to Georgiana’s heart. She was impressed with George at his London meeting of January 1884 but told Norton that ‘for my own part I believe in no one cure for the evils of the present state of society, nor have I made up my mind on the subject of compensation, but fair would I try any reasonable and just plan for bettering the relations of human beings to each other’.61

Georgiana’s discussions with Morris concerning socialism are well documented, and need not be repeated here.62 We know that Morris approved of her first Open Letter, and was pleased when she was elected to Rottingdean Parish Council, but he remained unconvinced of electoral contests as a route to socialism.63 She, for her part, possessed no ideological objections to contesting elections, and was encouraged that a group of Rottingdean progressives emerged with whom she could collaborate. As far as one can identify, there was no autonomous socialist or trade union activity in Rottingdean during these years, so that its progressivism was led by Liberals who were, nonetheless, receptive to promptings to adopt radical policies. The stated priorities of the first Rottingdean Parish Council were close to many of those proposed by Herbert Samuel, a radical Liberal, in his Questions for Parish Council Candidates, issued by the Fabian Society in August 1894. Although we cannot be certain because she never spoke or wrote on the subject, it is likely that Georgiana would have had some sympathy with ideas expressed by Fabian Society members. She would certainly have been aware of the Fabian Society, as part-architects of progressive policies then being implemented by the London County Council and a number of other metropolitan vestries.

Nevertheless, just as she probably remained outside organised political parties all her life, believing them ultimately to represent the ‘partition of mankind’,64 Georgiana did not join the Fabian Society. She also circumscribed her political activity to Rottingdean village, never seeking nomination to the District Council or participation in campaigning organisations such as the Women’s Local Government Society, supporting progressivism at parish council level, in which her friend Rosalind Howard was prominent. The village was a wide enough canvas for Georgiana where she believed, after the Parish Council was established, a real difference could be made.

Initial enthusiasm of the progressive majority was soon countered by stalling and opposition of those with vested interests who meantime organised themselves for future elections. The progressives’ loss of control of the Parish Council
in 1896 came as a major disappointment, and was compounded by the knowledge
that it had occurred because of a decline in the turnout of those who had enthu-
siastically voted for change in 1894. Georgiana’s reference to these processes, in
her letter to village women during July 1897, went some way toward identifying
her own failings, and by association, those of other progressive councillors, to
represent Rottingdean’s working people, particularly on issues of housing and
provision of drains for cottages. The shortage of affordable housing had been
raised by the progressives during 1895, but they did not go beyond a feeble appeal
to landowners to build new homes. The poor condition of the village drainage
system had been apparent for many years, with successive warnings from the
Medical Officer for Health about possible risks as a consequence, of diphtheria
and typhoid. Predictably, during the years immediately preceding local gov-
ernment reform in 1894, Rottingdean’s establishment resisted calls for major
drainage works, fearing the effect on the local rate. When in control of the Parish
Council, the same mentality meant delay, so that work was not completed until
1901, and even then a number of cottages had not been connected to the mains
and still relied on common privies or earth closets.

On these matters Georgiana identified a missing voice on the Parish Council,
that of ‘working women who know by experience exactly what is wanted to make
a home healthy and comfortable and therefore would be a useful member of a
council one of whose duties is to report unhealthy and wretched dwellings to
the Medical Officer of Health’. In spite of these exhortations, and an increase
in the number of women listed on the local government electoral register, no
working women were elected to the Council in this period, and in an ironic twist
the second woman to win a seat, in 1899, was Penelope Lawrence, a founder of
Roedean School. Unable now to influence public hygiene, during 1904 Geor-
giana turned her attention to matters of personal health with the setting up of a
village nursing service.

Her direct involvement with Rottingdean Parish Council and other civic
institutions convinced her of the need for working people to represent their own
interests. This policy inevitably, in a village setting, required erosion of defer-
ence and fostering of participation in decision-making, tasks to which she gave
increasing attention after the loss of the progressive majority in 1896. If Geor-
giana was at one with Morris on what perhaps we can describe as the broadly edu-
cative precondition for social change, she differed on the importance of reforms.
Unlike Morris, Georgiana believed wholeheartedly in the value of making
reforms which improved the lives of working people – she never viewed them as
palliatives – and it is not fanciful to suggest that she understood piecemeal change
which challenged inequality, protected the environment, improved health, and
engendered a sense of citizenship, communality and public service untainted by
the cash nexus, particularly in a rural village setting, as prefiguring the socialism
described in *News from Nowhere*. In a letter to Charles Norton in 1906 Georgiana wrote of her desire to make daily life ‘as useful and beautiful as possible’, a sentiment which not only expressed a debt to Morris, but also revealed that alongside an unashamed reformism there was present in her thinking an idealism which, to be properly realised, required ‘a new order of things’.69

**NOTES**


3. Traditionally, accounts of the Burne-Joneses’ house purchases in Rottingdean date the naming of North End House as 1889, following acquisition of the adjoining property, but Georgiana’s correspondence reveals that the name was being used by the summer of 1886; GBJ to Charles Norton, 29 August, 1886; Norton Papers, Harvard Houghton Library, Harvard, MS Am 1088 (820). Hereafter Norton Papers. *Page’s Brighton Directory*, 1888, p. 95, confirms the early use of the name. Anthony S. Payne and Eddie Scott, in their *Rottingdean in Old Picture Postcards*, Zaltbommel: European Library, 1895, photograph 56, state this accurately. See also Richard Coates, *A Place Name History of the Parishes of Rottingdean and Ovingdean*, Nottingham: English Place Name Society, 2010, p. 128

4. GBJ to Rosalind Howard, 4 February 1884; Castle Howard Archive, J22/27/172.
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23. Minutes, Rottingdean Parish Council, 20 April 1895; East Sussex Records Office (Hereafter ESRO), DB/B/54/1.


25. Minutes, Rottingdean Parish Council, 4 July 1895; ESRO, DB/B/54/1.


28. Minutes, Newhaven Rural District Council, 22 February 1895; ESRO, DL/D/211/1
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35. Minutes, Rottingdean Parish Council, 18 September 1896, ESRO, DB/B/54/1.
36. National Archives, Public Record Office PRO/J15/2143
38. d’Harcourt, p. 139.
39. Second Annual Report of the Brighton and District Footpaths Preservation Society, 1894; ESRO, Acc. 6849; East Sussex News 3 August, 1894
42. GBJ to Sydney Cockerell, 27 March 1897; NAL/MSL/1958/693/6.
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45. GBJ to Jenny Morris, 22 July 1897; British Library Add Ms 45346f.115.
The Parish Councils Act – What it is and how to work it, August 1894, written by Herbert Samuel, suggests (p. 5) that ‘the Parish Council is in many ways merely the executive committee of the Parish Meeting’. John Morrison Davidson, in another guide to the Act, went further, arguing that the village meeting should have conferred on it the name of the parish council, thus making every ‘every adult, male and female a parish councillor’; John Morrison Davidson, The Villagers’ Magna Charta. London: Reeves, 1894, p. 23.
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Sussex Daily News, 18 June 1902. Points of clarification from the newspaper report include: ‘Peace Monday’ was June 2 1902; ‘a large black board’, it was, in fact, a cloth banner; ‘He’s an absent minded beggar’ – Kipling’s pro-war poem set to music; ‘a notice to the effect that the gymnasium’ – the gymnasium at St Aubyn’s School, a private preparatory school in the village used by the volunteer organisations – the School’s headmaster, Charles Stanford, was a supporter of the Primrose League and from 1900 a Parish Councillor; ‘rifle range’ – according to Kipling this was located on land which required the permission of ‘the Marquis, the Squire and the Farmer’ (Abergavenny [William Nevill], Steyning Beard, and William Brown); Michael Smith, Kipling’s Sussex. Brighton: Brownleaf, 2008, p. 208.
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William Morris: An Annotated Bibliography 2010-2011

David and Sheila Latham

This bibliography is the sixteenth instalment of a biennial feature of The Journal. We give each original entry a brief annotation meant in order to describe its subject rather than evaluate its argument. Although we exclude book reviews, we include reviews of exhibitions as a record of temporal events.

We have arranged the bibliography into six subject categories appended by an author index. Part I includes new editions, reprints, and translations of Morris’s own publications, arranged alphabetically by title. Part II lists books, pamphlets, articles, exhibition catalogues, and dissertations about Morris, arranged alphabetically by author within each of the following five categories:

General  15-63
Literature  64-105
Decorative Arts  106-157
Book Design  158-168
Politics  169-188

The General category includes biographical surveys and miscellaneous details as well as studies which bridge two or more subjects. The Author Index provides an alphabetical order as an alternative means for searching through the 188 items of the bibliography. Though we still believe that each of Morris’s interests is best understood in the context of his whole life’s work, we hope that the subject categories and author index will save the impatient specialist from needing to browse through descriptions of woven tapestries in search of critiques of ‘The Haystack in the Floods’.

With the rising costs of inter-library loan services and personal travel, we would appreciate receiving copies of publications. They can be sent to us at 42 Belmont Street, Toronto, Ontario M5R 1P8, Canada, or by e-mail attachment to <dlatham@yorku.ca>.
PART I: WORKS BY MORRIS

   A French translation of Morris’s lectures ‘The Arts and Crafts of To-day’ (1889), ‘Art under Plutocracy’ (1883), and ‘The Socialist Ideal: Art’ (1891).
   A bilingual edition in English and Spanish of Morris’s reviews and lectures on poetry, art, and printing. The introduction (pp. 7-43) is followed by Morris’s review of Dante Rossetti’s *Poems* (1870), ‘Art and the Beauty of the Earth’ (1881), ‘The Aims of Art’ (1887), ‘Arts and Crafts Today’ (1889), ‘An Address ... at ... Birmingham [on the Pre-Raphaelite school of art]’ (1891), ‘The Wood-cuts of Gothic Books’ (1892), and ‘The Ideal Book’ (1893).
   A French translation of Morris’s political lecture, ‘How We Live and How We Might Live’ (1884), and an interview with Christian Arnsperger: ‘Construire le Biorégionalisme, une Démocratie par le Bas’.
   This miniature edition, limited to twelve copies, is printed from the 1888 Reeves & Turner edition.
   A Turkish translation of Morris’s 1891 utopian romance, *News from Nowhere*.
   An early Spanish translation in 1903 of Morris’s 1891 utopian romance, *News from Nowhere*.
   A French translation of Morris’s 1888 prose dream-vision, *A Dream of John Ball*.
   Boos transcribes, annotates, and introduces two important manuscripts of Morris’s lectures: ‘Socialism’ (1885) is a ‘radical-egalitarian stump-speech’
addressed to the working class and ‘What we have to look for’ (1895) is a wise plea addressed to his fellow socialists concerning the future ideals of the political movement for a new society.

First staged in 1887, this 2010 performance of Morris’s play by professional actors was put on especially for the Coach House by theatre director Garry Merry.

Boos transcribes, annotates, and introduces the manuscript for this 1885 lecture, ‘part of a series of critiques of capitalism’, this one arguing that a revolution against the social order is necessary in order to end the ‘mercantile variant of Hobbes’s “ceaseless war of man against man”’.

Boos transcribes, annotates, and introduces the manuscript for this lecture delivered eight times (1888-90) as a reminder to his fellow socialists that a successful revolution requires a ‘near-complete equality of conditions’ and a steadfast refusal to engage in the ‘degrading game of [the] politics’ of Parliamentary reform.

Boenig’s scholarly edition of Morris’s prose romance uses May Morris’s volume from The Collected Works as the copy text, adding textual variants from the 1894 Kelmscott and the 1895 Lawrence and Bullen editions as well as a detailed set of explanatory notes. The introduction analyses Morris’s prose style, Anglo-Saxon diction, and the relation of the romance to Pre-Raphaelitism and socialism.

Published as a ‘sourcebook for artists and beginning graphic designers’, this book contains six hundred images of Morris’s creative work, mainly from those held in the collections of the Victoria and Albert Museum.
PART II: PUBLICATIONS ABOUT MORRIS

General

   Dolmetsch recalled that Morris, attending one of his concerts, was moved to tears by the beauty of his virginal playing.

   The socialist legacy of Morris’s Arts and Crafts ideals can be compared with the work of such artists and designers as Stephanie Syjuco, whose cheap store-bought garments and objects are made by hand, and Zoe Sheehan Saldana, whose unauthorised copies of art use recycled materials.

   Morris will be the subject of the inaugural exhibition in the new Two Temple Place gallery in London, opening to showcase regional collections.

   The fourteen essays all demonstrate that Morris’s ‘ideas and practices are as important now as they were in the nineteenth century’. See individual entries for Bennett (66), Botto (20), Gagnier (173), Hale (38), Latham (83), Levitas (47), Mabb (177), Marsh (135), Miles (51), Pinkney (89), Preston (58), Smith (183), Tobin (185), Vaninskaya (187), and Walter (153).

   The origins of Morris’s life-long views of architecture, of history as a repository of our collective memory, and of the ‘Lesser Arts’ as expressions of our ideals of fellowship, are traced back to his first published essay in 1856.

   Rossetti viewed Morris as an artistic and sexual rival. He envied Morris’s ease with writing poetry and desired Jane even more because of her attachment to Morris.

in Paris, and the February-June 2012 exhibition in San Francisco, defines the
Aesthetic movement as cultivating beauty in order to escape from the ugly
vulgarity of materialism. Morris’s books, illuminated manuscripts, tiles, tex-
tiles, and wallpapers are discussed and illustrated.
22. Capet, Antoine. ‘Between Ouvriérisme and Élitism: The Dualism of Wil-
Many of the apparent paradoxes concerning Morris’s love of beauty and his
interest in the working class arise from his dislike of modern, elitist sophisti-
cation and his passion for returning to the sources of popular folk art.
Thirteen cartoons from the 1860s and 1870s, poking fun at Morris cooking,
drinking, weaving, reading aloud, and trying to remove his shoes, are pre-
aced with a brief discussion of the amused affection and underlying tension
which the cartoons reveal about Burne-Jones’s feelings for Morris.
‘Several entries found only after publication’ of the first edition (2002) are
added, errors are corrected, and descriptions are more extensive in this sec-
ond edition.
25. Crawford, Alan. *After Kelmscott: The Arts and Crafts Movement in the Cots-
pp.
Years after Morris moved into Kelmscott Manor, the pastoral Cotswolds
attracted Ernest and Sidney Barnsley and Ernest Gimson with their Arts and
Crafts furniture workshops, Katherine Adams and her bookbindery, C.R.
Ashbee’s Guild of Handicraft for furniture, jewellery, and metalwork, and
later Gordon Russell and his workshop for furniture and radio cases.
The origins of the Society are traced back to a week-long ‘William Mor-
ris Celebrations’ in 1918 at Red Lion Square organised by the Cooperative
Holidays Association Rambling Club. From this event arose the Kelmscott
Fellowship which relied as much upon the energetic Fred Tallent during the
1920s and 1930s as did the William Morris Society on Ronald Briggs during
the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. The accomplishments and controversies of the
Society and the William Morris Centre at Kelmscott House are well detailed,
as are the many activities and publications in the U.K., U.S., and Canada.
The fifty-year history of The Journal is told since its beginnings in 1961, from
its financial problems to its editorial focus, from its letterpress to its offset litho production, and from The Journal of the William Morris Society to The Journal of William Morris Studies.

28. Cruise, Colin. ‘“Sick-sad dreams”: Burne-Jones and Pre-Raphaelite Medievalism’. Yearbook of English Studies, 40.1/2 (2010): 121-40. Complaints first raised by reviewers of Morris’s Defence of Guenevere about his non-ecclesiological medievalism in the style of illuminated manuscripts with microscopic detail were similarly directed at Burne-Jones’s art; the designs for the Kelmscott Chaucer and for Morris & Co. stained glass are contrasted with Ford Madox Brown’s Chaucer Reading in the Court of Edward.


32. Faulkner, Peter. ‘The Odd Man Out’. Journal of the Decorative Arts Society 1850 to the Present, 34 (2010): 76-91. Though his poetry and art inspired the Aesthetic movement, Morris disliked devotion to beauty for its own sake, arguing that art should not be intended for a cultured elite but must transform society in order to improve the lives of all citizens.


34. Freeman-Moir, John. ‘Crafting Experience: William Morris, John Dewey,

John Dewey’s conception of experience as an ‘outward-looking openness’ is similar to Morris’s utopian vision in terms of Dewey’s analysis of habit, coordinated action, and the craft of artful experience.


Following Morris’s route through Iceland, Greenlaw combines critical commentary on excerpts from Morris’s Icelandic journals with observations and poetic meditations about her own extended visit. She thereby creates a ‘part memoir, part prose poem, part criticism, part travelogue’.


The anti-Malthusian and neo-Lamarkian evolutionary principle behind Morris’s focus on ‘making socialists’ led H.G. Wells to abandon Morris, repudiate *News from Nowhere* in *Modern Utopia* (1905), and disagree with Bernard Shaw.


Preferring Darwin’s later consideration for a neo-Lamarkian inheritance of such characteristics as socially-learned utopian values, Morris rejected the Malthusian conception of Darwinian evolution based on capitalist individualism and competition for scarce resources.


‘At odds with everyday life theory’ about existential anxieties and urban industry, Morris is uncanny in his interest in the ‘good old things’ about tra-
dition, stable communities, and daily encounters with nature.


45. Lacombe, Benjamin, and Agata Kawa. Le Carnet Rouge [The Red Notebook]. Paris: Seuil Jeunesse, 2010. 40 pp. This fictional story about young Morris’s experiences with leaving home aged thirteen for school at Marlborough, where he became more interested in exploring nature than in his lessons, was written in French by Lacombe for older children and adults, and is illustrated by Kawa.


ber of the Hampshire House Social Club for education and art exhibitions, fought to preserve the house and garden, and wrote Hammersmith community histories and a utopian novel, *The New Britain."


Life-long friends from their days at Exeter College, Burne-Jones and Morris collaborated on hundreds of projects which contributed to the success of Morris & Co. and the Kelmscott Press. Adding to the Firm’s commissions, the poems and stories which Morris wrote and read aloud provided Burne-Jones with themes and images which he used and reused for decades in paintings, drawings, tiles, and tapestries which were often placed in the homes of patrons in coordination with Morris & Co. furnishings. Burne-Jones sympathised with Morris’s concerns for art and culture in a capitalist society, but objected to the time consumed by Morris’s devotion to the socialist cause.


Now declared an historic district, Rose Valley is a suburb of Philadelphia where the American architect William Price attempted in 1901 to establish a community based on Morris’s *News from Nowhere*, converting mills into housing and building new homes from local stone, focusing on a Guild Hall for cultural meetings.


A pencilled sketch of Morris by Rossetti in 1858 was owned by Louisa Crabbe, an actress known as Ruth Herbert, who modelled for thirteen portraits by Rossetti.


Under the general editorship of Florence Boos, the *Morris Online Edition* will make scholarly editions of Morris’s texts readily available within the digital contexts of the internet which we are only now beginning to understand.


The aesthetic theories of Morris, Walter Pater, Grant Allen, and Vernon Lee focus on bodily sensations rather than moral feeling, because they believe that ‘aesthetic pleasure makes enjoyable the interconnectedness of bodies, minds, and matter’.


56. ----. ‘William Morris and the Art of Everyday Life’. In her *William Morris and the Art of Everyday Life*. Ed. Wendy Parkins. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers, 2010. 1-22. The spectrum of Morris’s interest in daily life ranges from his decrying the banality of Victorian modernity to his desiring a utopia wherein ‘pleasure, beauty and happiness’ are ‘freely available to all’. See individual entries for Boos (159), Cowan (72), Dunstan (31), Hart (122), Highmore (40), Kinna (44), Gerrish Nunn (140), and Parkins (55-56).


Co. works in Oxford is included.

Review of the 28 October 2011 – 29 January 2012 ‘William Morris: Story Memory Myth’ exhibition at the Two Temple Place gallery in London explains the ways in which William Waldorf Astor a century ago renovated the property for his business offices which will now be a venue for art exhibitions.

The catalogue of the 28 October 2011 - 29 January 2012 ‘Story Memory Myth’ exhibition at the Two Temple Place gallery in London, curated by Esmé Whittaker and organised in conjunction with the William Morris Gallery at Walthamstow, examines the ways in which ‘Morris told stories through pattern and poetry’ with a focus on Chaucer, Norse saga, Arthurian legend, and Greek myth. The exhibits include embroidery and woven tapestry, printed books, drawings, paintings, tiles, textiles, wallpaper, and stained glass by Morris, Burne-Jones, Ford Madox Brown, Rossetti, Lucy Faulkner, Philip Webb, and Margaret Lowthian Bell and her daughters.

Two Temple Place gallery, which will present the 28 October 2011-29 January 2012 ‘William Morris: Story Memory Myth’ exhibition, is one of three historic houses opening in London in order to showcase the British Arts and Crafts movement.

Nine interesting families owned Red House from 1865 to 2003, when it was purchased by the National Trust. As admirers of Morris, Webb, or Ruskin, each owner was largely respectful to the original design so that much of its character remains today.

**Literature**

Morris’s *News from Nowhere* and General William Booth’s *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (1890) confront ‘national problems with global solutions and use realist conventions to make their highly idealistic ventures*
seem viable’ and are thus drawing on the different allegorical elements for his Commonweal serialisation and his Kelmscott edition.

Within the context of two other conference papers, Arata summarises Naomi Levine’s 2011 article on the terza rima tercet of ‘The Defence of Guenevere’.

Morris’s last romances rejuvenate our sense of ‘the wondrous and the wonderful’ as ‘non-possessive, non-reductive’ values which challenge us to question and to quest for meaning and thereby embrace communal relationships and environmental regeneration.

An excerpt from his last heroic poem shows Morris’s uniqueness in his detachment from swift movement and savage violence with no ‘moralizing judgments’.

Henri Lefebvre’s notion of a traumatic moment ‘at the heart of everyday life’ is central to the lives of the stoic protagonists of *The Defence* poems who struggle against the violence and degradation which arise from ‘feudal abuses of power’.

Morris’s ‘personal, aesthetic, communal, and egalitarian convictions’ regarding the beauty of nature, our pleasure in work, the role of craft, and the role of simplicity are expressed in *News from Nowhere* and echoed by twentieth-century Marxists.

After reviewing Walter Wilkinson’s Morris-inspired *The Peep Show* in 1927, Lawrence began ‘A Dream of Life,’ his unfinished utopian novel very much influenced by Morris’s *News from Nowhere* at a time when Modernist dystopias were the fashion.

71. Campbell, Lori M. ‘Who Wears the Pants in Faërie? The Woman Question

The chapter on Morris supports a thesis which explores the role of the portal as a magical nexus point for movement between worlds in order to illustrate the power dynamics of the real world.


74. Gad, Fadwa Mahmoud Hassan. ‘Utopian Fiction and Imperial Homogeneity: The Case of William Morris’s *News from Nowhere* (1890) and Yussuf Sybaai’s *The Land of Hypocrisy* (1949)’. In *Colonization or Globalization?: Postcolonial Explorations of Imperial Expansion*. Ed. Silvia Nagy and Chantal J. Zabus. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2010. 41-56. Visionaries rather than reformists, Morris and Sybaai are both non-dogmatic and non-violent, but whereas in *News from Nowhere* Morris shows that the ‘disruptive quality of utopia totally separates the dream from bleak reality’, Sybaai focuses on the tension between dream and reality.

75. Halsall, Alison. ‘H.D. and the Victorian Spectres of *White Rose and the Red*’. *College Literature*, 38.4 (Fall 2011): 115-33. In her novel, H.D. depicts Morris and Elizabeth Siddal as haunted by feelings of isolation which they combat by ‘appropriating elements of a medieval past gleaned in dreams and séances to realise a more concrete sense of self in their mid-nineteenth-century present’.

An analysis of *The Defence of Guenevere and Other Poems, Sigurd the Volsung, Chants for Socialists, A Dream of John Ball, The Roots of the Mountains*, and *News from Nowhere* reveals that Morris was committed in his writings to an ideal of violent battle, with combat presented as a renewing and regenerative force.

Violent combat is a ‘crucible for the forging of identity,’ as Morris explores warfare as the means to ‘reconstruct the imagination with the body’, but he destabilises the medieval ‘rhetoric of heroism and brotherhood’ ‘against the background of mid-nineteenth century details about the nature of manliness’.

In *News from Nowhere* Morris responds to the Victorian philosophical and economic debates about the dangers of unreflectiveness, as he joins the ‘socialist critique of rational individualism in order to recuperate habit’ as acquired and acculturated rather than innate.

Like Rossetti’s painting, Morris’s poem ‘The Blue Closet’ exploits aesthetic self-reliance, but in place of Rossetti’s colour, Morris appropriates ‘literary song, narrative, and symbols … to fashion effects resembling those of music’.

In contrast to Walter Besant’s dystopian *Inner House* (1888), Morris’s *News from Nowhere* envisions utopia as a natural community founded upon the reunion of humanity and nature.

Contrary to Fredric Jameson’s faith in a revival of utopian writing, our contemporary feminist, ecologist, and sci-fi writers are usually dystopian. By not pursuing the kind of clear social theory we find in *News from Nowhere*, the first ‘ecotopia’, they may spell the end of the utopian tradition.

83. Latham, David. ‘“Between Hell and England”: Finding Ourselves in the

A Dream of John Ball and News from Nowhere are discussed within three frameworks: the Aristotelian function of metaphor as essential to our daily growth; our current postmodern crisis in the humanities compared with the post-Victorian crisis in the arts addressed by Morris; and third, Morris’s political concept of heaven as a unifying motif in his artistic, literary, and political work.

Following Byron and Robert Browning, Morris exploits Dante’s terza rima as the medium for conveying the adulterous affair in ‘The Defence of Guenevere’, emblematising Guenevere’s torn desires between Arthur and Launcelot.

In News from Nowhere Morris is reacting to what is depicted as a negative ecological shift in Richard Jefferies’s After London (1885) by converting the empowerment of nature into a positive redemption welcomed by humanity in the future.

‘Work illuminates our political imaginary’ in Morris’s News from Nowhere, Carlyle’s Past and Present, and Ruskin’s The Stones of Venice by questioning ‘the possibility of human association based on rule, and replac[ing] it with a practice of beginning, reading, and augmenting each other’s work’.

Morris (in News from Nowhere), A.R. Ammons, Ursula Le Guin, Chief Seattle, Henry David Thoreau, and David Treuer, illustrate the ways in which literature can incite ‘paradigm shifts in our habitation’, as they provide ‘multiple temporal, cultural, and literary views of possible ways of living’ in a wild world.

Within its series of tensions between the romance genre and the political utopia, News from Nowhere depicts nature as torn between the beautiful and the sublime, between a liberated landscape and the powerful force of a natural woman.
Full of Ruskin’s three essential elements – pure air, water, and earth – News from Nowhere sacrifices some of the fire of modernity in comparison with Ursula Le Guin’s The Dismissal, Ernest Calenbach’s Ecotopia, and Kim Stanley Robinson’s Pacific Edge.

Morris’s poems are not escapist but are designed in order to remind us to compare the old days of heroes and heroic deeds with the ‘empty days’ of his modern age, ‘refracting the cultural anxiety’ of Victorian Britain.

Following a general introduction to Pre-Raphaelite literature which comments briefly on early reviews of The Defence of Guenevere, this anthology represents Morris with a selection of fourteen poems from The Defence, and two excerpts from The Earthly Paradise.

Compared with Tennyson’s weary, passive Mariana, Morris’s Jehane is a powerful, knowledgeable woman who voices her will, takes action, ‘turns her community upside down’, and engages the reader’s sympathy.

Comparisons of Morris’s ‘Pilgrims of Hope’ with Gissing’s Workers in the Dawn, of A Dream of John Ball with Demos, and of News from Nowhere with New Grub Street, illustrate Morris’s influence on Gissing as ‘almost a fusion of voices’.

The chapters discuss the Arthurian interests of Tennyson and Morris, Swinburne’s sensual imitation of Morris, Gissing’s response to Morris’s socialism, and Morris’s influence on Yeats’s interest in the fantastic. (Not seen.)

The five prose romances of the 1890s concern the passing of time and thus are poised between one land and another, between childhood and adult-
hood, between a reimagined ‘medieval past and childlike discovery of the present’.


The figure of Morris, with his views on the interdependence of art and life, ‘looms large’ in Henry James’s novel, in which the protagonist rejects his violent revolutionary goals after being exposed to art and culture through museums.


Morris’s News from Nowhere (1891), Robert Hugh Benson’s The Dawn of All (1911), and Herbert Read’s The Green Child (1935) reflect the ideologies of their respective eras, with Morris’s utopia exploring England as a landscape and as a national identity.


News from Nowhere reveals Morris’s interest in turning the eugenics policy of selective-breeding against the upper classes themselves as a means to dismantle their power structure, but such political controls threaten ‘the very freedoms Nowhere would uphold’.


Yeats’s use of the phrase ‘changed, changed utterly’, from Morris’s early story ‘A Dream’, shows Morris’s influence on ‘Easter, 1916’ as a kindred spirit of uncertainty about the role of the artist in mediating spiritual transformation and public memory.


The relapse to wild nature and barbarism depicted in Richard Jefferies’s After London (1885) is very different from the restoration of nature in Morris’s News from Nowhere and the medieval sensibility of his prose romances.


An analysis of themes, images, and prosody argues that Hopkins’s verse, with its social vision and demonstration of good craftsmanship fused with moral
thinking, echoes Morris’s views on the social detriment resulting from mass production versus the social and aesthetic benefits of artisan-made products.

Influenced by the teachings of Carlyle and Ruskin, Morris attempted to change and renew society by educating the working class with his lectures about art and labour, and by his depiction of an ideal society in *News from Nowhere*.

Set within the Victorian debate over dichotomous social organisations, which range from mythical Teutonic marks and Roman imperial centres to socialist romance and capitalist realism, Morris is discussed as a reader and author of the New Romance who explores communal values and identities. *A Dream of John Ball, The House of the Wolfings, The Roots of the Mountains, The Story of the Glittering Plain, and News from Nowhere* are discussed within the context of emerging literary traditions, scholarly debates, and socialist factions.

Using a framework of Cognitive Poetics, this study examines the ways in which Morris’s *News from Nowhere* blends material anchors, such as coins and watches, with conceptual ideals, such as Ellen, in order to engage the reader emotionally.

‘Rapunzel’ and ‘The Wind’ are read as poems which show the young Morris already combining the decorative style of a romanticist and the social themes of the political activist.

*Decorative Arts*

Review of the 28 August 2010-2 January 2011 Delaware Art Museum exhibition which suggests that May Morris ‘stepped out of her father’s shadow’ in order to modernise Morris’s principles.
Edward Burne-Jones’s tapestries influenced Melchior Lechter’s murals in Germany, but their differences owe much to Lechter’s agreement with Wagner’s (and Nietzsche’s) concept of the artist is an inspired genius, and Burne-Jones’s with Ruskin (and Morris) that the artist is a practising craftsman.

A study of the significance of textiles in the art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which includes a chapter on Morris. (Not seen.)


While Morris was the exemplar of practical activity for the Arts and Crafts movement, Edward Burne-Jones provided a large part of the visual ‘vocabulary’, and was especially a stimulating rather than an inhibiting force in design and production of stained glass.

111. ‘Culture’. *Architect*, 100.7 (July 2011): 71-75.
Six postage stamps have been issued by the Royal Mail in order to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the founding of Morris & Co.

Designs for jewellery, such as her ‘William Morris/Winslow Homer disc necklace’, by American artist Rachael Carren, draw upon textile designs by Morris.

An overview in English, French, and German of Morris’s life and achievements introduces ten detachable sheets of his patterns, accompanied by instructions for such craft projects as a butterfly and a windmill.
Ferry, Emma. ‘“The Other Miss Faulkner”: Lucy Orrinsmith and the “Art at Home Series”’. *The Journal of William Morris Studies*, 19 (Summer 2011): 47-64.
Lucy Orrinsmith painted tiles and embroidered for Morris & Co., engraved woodblocks for book illustrations, and wrote *The Drawing Room: Its Decoration and Furniture* (1877), passages of which echo Morris’s ‘Making the Best of It’ (1882).

In order to mark its 150th anniversary, Morris & Co. has launched four archive collections of cotton prints, embroideries, wallpaper, and woven fabrics, including ‘Kelmscott Tree’ by May Morris, and ‘Mary Isobel’ by J.H. Dearle.

Hilles House in Gloucestershire was designed and built in 1914 in the Arts and Crafts style by the architect Detmar Blow, who drove the cart which carried Morris to his funeral in Kelmscott churchyard.

Red House was Morris’s Palace of Art, Kelmscott Manor his dream home and Arts and Crafts garden, while Kelmscott House exemplified his taste for a balance of utility with austere beauty; his designs appear in the many illustrations throughout the book of other Victorians’ homes.

Despite the cold weather, a crowd gathered as three unidentified women on the Bowery near the New Museum decorated two dumpsters, one in a green wallpaper pattern by Morris: ‘They’re so pretty and so domestic,’ said a passer-by visiting from Australia.

An exploration of the German response to nineteenth-century art includes a discussion of the impact of the English Arts and Crafts movement and Morris’s ideas on German designers.

Morris’s prominent but complicated role in the Arts and Crafts movement is discussed with an extended focus on the decorations for the rooms of Kelmscott.
scott Manor and Kelmscott House. Analysis of the artwork by Morris & Co. focuses not on originality, but on the relationship between the rhetoric and the objects, in order to demonstrate the ways in which decorative art should function in our daily lives.


123. Harvey, Charles, Jon Press, and Mairi Maclean. ‘William Morris, Cultural Leadership, and the Dynamics of Taste’. Business History Review, 85 (Summer 2011): 245-71. Pierre Bourdieu’s theories of the ways in which taste formation and transmission arise from class competition, are exemplified by the success of Morris & Co. in shaping Victorian taste via social networking with the ruling class.


A folded sheet which provides a pattern for a thirteen-block appliqué quilt based on Morris wallpaper and textile designs.

A folded pattern-sheet for a quilt which incorporates designs from tiles and architecture.

An appliqué pattern design with instructions for a lap-quilt or wall-hanging inspired by the *Strawberry Thief* design, suits both beginners and advanced quilters.

The catalogue of the 14 June-3 October 2010 ‘Schlafende Schönheit’ exhibition at Belvedere, Vienna, of Victorian painting from the Museo de Arte de Ponce (Puerto Rico) which includes material relating to decoration of the Oxford Union by Morris, Rossetti, and Burne-Jones. (Not seen.)

Morris, Webb, and Burne-Jones intended the Green Dining Room at the South Kensington Museum – the first ‘Aesthetic interior’ – as a manifesto for Aestheticism; its decorated panels and stained glass suggest that Morris was illustrating the green and golden Garden of Hesperides from his poem *The Life and Death of Jason*.

Morris revolutionised pattern design and inspired J.H. Dearle and a host of other designers.

Wightwick Manor in Wolverhampton, originally designed during the 1880s by Edward Ould, and now owned by the National Trust, is filled with Pre-Raphaelite paintings, Arts and Crafts furnishings, and Morris & Co. textiles.

Intriguing questions regarding Morris’s oil painting *La Belle Iseult* are traced through forty years of correspondence among Morris’s friends and family,
with speculations that Ford Madox Brown or Rossetti may have added finishing touches.


Newly-discovered original decorations at Red House, which complicate the restoration process, contradict the recollections of Georgiana Burne-Jones and others. A recovered letter from Webb confirms Morris’s essential management of ‘the Firm’ from its earliest years.


Morris’s seemingly luxurious enterprises, including the Kelmscott Press, were modelled on his theory of a sustainable socialism which argues for less haste and waste via well-made, beautiful objects meant to last, produced by craft workers engaged in pleasurable work.


The Aesthetic Movement originated not with Morris, but with the industrial designer Christopher Dresser during the 1850s, aided by Philip Cunliffe Jones, director of the South Kensington Museum, and such teachers there as Richard Burchett.


This design activity book for children contains a brief introduction to ‘the Firm’, followed by a ‘workshop’ of related exercises: a stained-glass window for colouring, a crossword puzzle, and a quiz.


Review of the 26 January-17 October 2010 ‘William Morris: A Sense of Place’ exhibition at Blackwell, the Arts and Crafts house in Bowness-on-Windermere, Cumbria.


Morris’s arguments for ‘the beauty of life’ merged with various late Victorian discourses on ‘art in daily life’, such as that by Amy Woods in the magazine Girl’s Own Paper.


Though Morris described tapestry in terms applicable to Whistler’s art, his
idealisation of the heroic role of the artist-craftsman became the cornerstone of Arts and Crafts works such as Walter Crane’s Red Cross Hall murals, which exemplify the public art described in *News from Nowhere*.


The application of Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of ‘Habitus’ applied to what we know of the experiences of Jane Morris and Georgiana Burne-Jones in Red House, shows that such women were not decorative objects, but were emotionally-invested in the processes of artistic labour.


Includes a chapter on ‘The Rugs of William Morris’. (Not seen.)


Working in the Circulation Department at the Victoria and Albert Museum from 1947 to 1978, Barbara Morris was an expert on textiles, ceramics, and glass; she joined Sotheby’s in 1978 and later the BBC’s ‘Antiques Road Show’.


An illustrated account of Morris’s techniques, innovations, sources of inspiration, major designs, and collaborative experiments which underlines his importance as ‘the best-known and most influential figure involved in 19th-century textile production’.


Morris in 1855, W.R. Lethaby in 1880 and 1882, and C.R. Ashbee in 1886, each toured Picardy in order to study Gothic architecture. Paradoxically, they developed the Arts and Crafts as a ‘quintessentially English style ... from what was in part a specifically French one’.


Review of the 26 June-17 October 2010 ‘William Morris: A Sense of Place’ exhibition at Blackwell, the Arts and Crafts house in Bowness-on-Windermere, which considers the location an ideal domestic space for this exhibition of art works by Morris and his friends.


Morris defined architecture as ‘the art of construction’, but education today
is ‘undervaluing the skills involved in making architecture’.

A brief account of Morris’s experiments with the printing of wallpapers which mentions the Firm’s designers and best-known patterns.

The Royal Mail released six stamps in order to mark the 150th anniversary of the founding of Morris & Co. in 1861: Morris’s cotton print Cray, and designs by William De Morgan, Philip Webb, J.H. Dearle, Kate Faulkner, and Edward Burne-Jones.

Stained-glass windows in churches of the Boston area by Morris and Burne-Jones influenced several architects and designers, including Ralph Adams Cram, Bertram Goodhue, and Charles Connick.

After he first advised it on its purchases of Iznik pottery, Persian carpets, and medieval tapestries (including the Troy tapestry), and decorated its Green Dining Room, the V & A now houses the largest collection in the world of Morris’s works.

May Morris’s designs listed in the annual Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society catalogues from 1888 to 1928, and her published articles on embroidery, document her important contributions to Morris & Co.

Although Morris eventually ceased using arsenical pigments in his wallpapers, he still compared the ‘arsenic scare’ to ‘witch fever’.

Review of the 26 June-17 October 2010 ‘William Morris: A Sense of Place’ exhibition at Blackwell, the Arts and Crafts house in Bowness-on-Windermere, Cumbria, includes the interior design for 1 Palace Green, Kensington, a collaboration by Morris, Philip Webb, and Edward Burne-Jones.

The catalogue of the 26 June-17 October 2010 ‘William Morris: A Sense of
Place’ exhibition at Blackwell, the Arts and Crafts house in Bowness-on-Windermere, Cumbria, which presents designs, textiles, books, and photographs collected from public and private collections to illustrate the life and work of Morris as the ‘Father of the Arts and Crafts’ movement.

A ‘particularly fine, previously unrecorded hand knotted carpet by William Morris c1880’, purchased by the William Morris Gallery, is shown in a high quality photograph.

**Book Design**

Morris’s aesthetic and socialist theory, as shown in his work with the Kelmscott Press, is presented in the context of the ideas of John Ruskin, and European thought, and of Morris’s broader influence on other book designers, such as Lucien Pissaro of the Eragny Press, and Harry Graf Kessler of the Cranach Press.

The expensive limited editions of Morris’s Kelmscott Press books were produced consistently with his socialist ideals involving the cooperative work of compositors, engravers, and printers.

The Folio Society’s recent facsimiles of the Kelmscott *Chaucer* and of Eric Gill’s Golden Cockerel edition, invite a comparison of Morris and Burne-Jones’s 1896 edition, which was intended to be illustrative of the narrative tale, and Gill’s of 1929-31 which was intended to be decorative for the page.

Brief references are made to Morris’s rebellion against the Victorian taste for slender-lined type as a sign of refinement.

A discussion of the history and collections of the Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum in The Hague (the oldest museum in the world dedicated
to books, founded in 1852) which highlights the acquisition of a collection dedicated to Morris.

A bookbinder describes the dark blue goatskin with multi-coloured inlays and decorative gold and blind tooling in Morris floral designs which she used in order to bind a copy of the Longman, Green 1903 edition of A Dream of John Ball.

Maret is a typeface designer whose work is influenced by the work and writings of Morris and T.J. Cobden-Sanderson and who has worked with Joyce Lancaster Wilson at the Tuscan Alley Press in San Francisco.

Paying close attention to the design and printing of the early books he collected, Morris adapted older types for the Kelmscott Press while emphasising the importance of ink and paper, and ensuring a visual balance between text and illustration.

The history of the ownership of each of the four hundred and twenty-five paper and thirteen vellum copies of Morris’s Kelmscott masterpiece is pursued from 1896 to the present. Details include their sales by Bernard Quaritch and other book sellers and auction houses, their re-bindings, and their re-sales to new owners.

As a great admirer of Morris and collector of Kelmscott Press volumes, Proctor filled his diaries with references to Morris’s books and their prices at sales, the dispersal of Morris’s library, accounts of visits to Kelmscott Manor and meetings with Jane, Jenny, and May Morris, and with Sidney Cockerell and other friends and associates of Morris.

Like chairs, which should not be emotionally or physically uncomfortable, books should provide a convenient reading experience and thus avoid the precious design of iconic fine books such as the Kelmscott Chaucer.
Politics


170. Bevir, Mark. The Making of British Socialism. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2011. 85-105. Morris was influenced by the intellectual tradition of Romanticism and the domestic self-realisation of Protestantism which led to his pursuit of a purist rather than revolutionary approach to socialist action, believing that we must change our attitudes and daily lives rather than our political institutions.

171. Claeys, Gregory. Imperial Sceptics: British Critics of Empire, 1850-1920. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. Morris was an active anti-imperialist campaigner for self-sufficiency over international trade whose socialism may have been influenced by the civics tradition of Positivism.

172. Gagnier, Regenia. ‘Good Europeans and Neo-Liberal Cosmopolitans: Ethics and Politics in Late Victorian and Contemporary Cosmopolitanism’. Victorian Literature & Culture, 38.2 (September 2010): 591-614. Reconciling freedom and equality, the Fine of aesthetics and the Good of ethics, Morris was an ‘educator of the emotions’ who, in contrast to the current neo-cosmopolitanism of Western Europe, represents a substantive cosmopolitanism shared with J.K. Huysmans.


Though Morris and Ernest Belfort Bax co-wrote a manifesto and two editions of a book on socialism, the two diverged in their views of the roles of history and utopianism in socialism.


Engels and Morris reinterpreted Darwin in order to denaturalise capitalist competition and replace it with socialist cooperation as the next stage of evolution.


Mabb discusses ten of his works of art which demonstrate the ways in which capitalism ‘abuses Morris designs for purposes which Morris never intended ..., undermining the utopian possibilities which the designs originally attempted to negotiate’.


A key figure in the tradition of Ecosocialism, Morris is as much a theoretical figure as Herbert Marcuse, as both are critical aestheticists who equated ‘art for art’s sake’ with ‘art for politics’ sake’, and fought to protect the world from industrial capitalism.


Reactions to the Royal Society of London’s report on the *Global Food System* carry echoes of both *Brave New World* and *Looking Backward*, whereas *News from Nowhere* provides a much better model of the way in which human support systems would work in a truly ecological society.


Robert Tressell’s explanation of surplus value is similar to that in Morris’s *A Dream of John Ball* of the seductive lie that we all can become rich by robbing each other.


*News from Nowhere* – ‘a perfect description of an ecological society’ – is an expression not of desire, but of the necessity for a sustainable world, while the anarchist collectives of Republican Spain (1936-37) provide us with a practical model of ‘ecosocialism’ which worked, despite the depredations of the Spanish Civil War.
Since the 1970s, more than twenty sources have recognised Morris as a radical pioneer of a new environmental ethic, as Morris’s writings anticipate the need for an ecocentric world-view based on ‘local production for local need’. Critiques by E.P. Thompson, John Goode, Perry Anderson, and Paul Meier all strove to assimilate Morris into their own Marxist theories which acknowledged Morris’s fusion of aesthetics and politics.

Morris’s socialism is relevant because of his experience as an artist, his emphasis on the qualitative aspects of work to make it pleasurable, and his focus on the creative imagination. Moreover, his views of socialism reveal why so-called socialist regimes in the past have failed because work was treated as toil.

Just as Morris used newspapers and magazines in order to spread the socialist word, so the William Morris Society website reaches a wider public, sharing Morris’s socialist vision in a non-profit manner.

During his last years, Morris may have conceded the need to campaign for parliamentary power in order to mend divisions between socialist factions, but he remained steadfast in his focus on ‘making Socialists’ who would support a revolution.

For his socialist conception of the mythical village community of the mark, Morris drew upon the Victorian historians and philologists who wrote about Teutonist ideology from their own liberal or conservative viewpoints.

Whereas the Commonweal version of A Dream of John Ball give prominence
to Morris’s disgruntlement with the kind of political agitation pursued by both the anarchist and the reformist factions of the Socialist League, the Kelmscott Press edition represents Morris’s encouragement of a reflective style of socialist propaganda based on ‘slow rumination’.
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Edited by Peter Faulkner


In this attractively produced small book Michael Rosen, the former Children’s Laureate, believes he has collected all of Morris’s socialist poetry with the exception of the long Pilgrims of Hope. This, oddly, has never been done before and he deserves our respect, even though he fails to fulfil his intention.

During 1884, as a member of the Social Democratic Federation (SDF), Morris first brought out ‘The Day is Coming’ as an SDF leaflet, then publishing in Justice, ‘The Voice of Toil’, ‘All for the Cause’ and ‘No Master’. After the formation of the Socialist League in 1885, ‘The March of the Workers’ and ‘The Message of the March Wind’ (later used as the opening of The Pilgrims of Hope) were printed in Commonweal. These six poems were gathered as Chants for Socialists, a Socialist League pamphlet of the same year. Later editions added ‘Down among the Dead Men’ and ‘A Death Song’, the lament for Alfred Linnell, who had died from injuries sustained on ‘Bloody Sunday’, 1887. The eight poems were last increased by two when Chants for Socialists was combined with The Pilgrims of Hope for the Longmans’ Pocket edition of 1915, and two ‘May Day’ poems, first published in Justice during the early 1890s, were added. So there were only ten poems in total. This complex history of publication is confused further by their being divided between volume IX (1911) of the Collected Works – because Morris had included Ve in his final verse collection, Poems by the Way (1891) – and volume XXIV (1915), where May Morris was obliged to print the remaining five as ‘Late Poems’, the familiar title of Chants for Socialists not being used.

To the ten poems of the final edition of Chants for Socialists Rosen has added three. He has selected ‘The Earthly Paradise: Apology’ from The Earthly Paradise (1868) since, he argues, ‘it is a fairly undisguised statement of atheism or “unbelief”, a rare and subversive idea in Victorian England’. (p. 53) A less controversial choice is ‘Wake, London Lads’ of 1878, clearly a political song since it was written
to be performed by a choir to open the Eastern Question Association meeting protesting against Britain going to war with Russia. The third, ‘Socialists at Play’, was not only published in *Commonweal* during 1885, but also brought out as a leaflet.

Rosen has, though, missed two of Morris’s socialist poems, both collected in *Poems by the Way*, but also included in the Independent Labour Party’s *Labour’s Song Book* of 1924. ‘Drawing near the Light’ originally appeared during 1885 in *Commonweal*:

Lo, when we wade the tangled wood,  
In haste and hurry to be there,  
Naught seems its leaves and blossoms good,  
For all that they be fashioned fair.

But looking up, at last we see  
The glimmer of the open light,  
From o’er the place where we would be:  
Then grow the very brambles bright.

So now, amidst our day of strife,  
With many a matter glad we play,  
When once we see the light of life  
Gleam through the tangle of today.

And from 1890 there is ‘The Day of Days’:

Each eve earth falleth down the dark,  
As though its hope were o’er;  
Yet lurks the sun when day is done  
Behind tomorrow’s door.

Grey grows the dawn while men-folk sleep,  
Unseen spreads on the light,  
Till the thrush sings to the coloured things,  
And earth forgets the night.

No otherwise wends on our Hope:  
E’en as a tale that’s told  
Are fair lives lost, and all the cost  
Of wise and true and bold.
We've toiled and failed; we spake the word;  
None hearkened; dumb we lie;  
Our Hope is dead, the seed we spread  
Fell o'er the earth to die.

What's this? For joy our hearts stand still,  
And life is loved and dear,  
The lost and found the Cause hath crowned,  
The Day of Days is here.

Lest it be thought that it is the archaic diction, inversions and exhausted romant-icism which has led Rosen knowingly to exclude these items, it needs to be said these are standard for the Poems of Protest – as are repeated reference to ‘light’, ‘strife’, ‘Hope’, ‘the Cause’ and ‘the Day’. Rosen also reprints Morris’s great statement of 1894, ‘How I Became a Socialist’, the vigour and interest of its prose contrasting with the inertness and somnolence of his propagandist verse:

Think of it! Was it all to end in a counting-house on the top of a cinder-heap,  
with Podsnap’s drawing-room in the oYng, and a Whig committee dealing out champagne to the rich and margarine to the poor in such convenient proportions as would make all men contented together, though the pleasure of the eyes was gone from the world, and the place of Homer was to be taken by Huxley? [p. 63].

And yet Morris’s socialist chants were immensely popular with – and indeed sung by – the British socialist movement of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. In 1888 Edward Carpenter selected no fewer than five of the Chants for Socialists for his Chants of Labour: A Song Book of the People. No writer was represented by as many; Shelley by only three, and Burns and Whitman two each. As late as 1924, in the Independent Labour Party’s Labour’s Song Book Morris was still the most popular with seven poems, whereas Carpenter was represented by three, Blake and Burns two each, and Shelley only one. Tom Mann concluded his pamphlet of 1894, What the ILP Is Driving At, with ‘the grand words of William Morris’, the opening lines of ‘The Day is Coming’:

Come hither, lads, and hearken, for a tale there is to tell,  
Of the wonderful days a-coming, when all shall be better than well.

Fred Jowett, to become a cabinet minister in the first Labour Government of 1924, recalled the Bradford and Leeds socialists singing on their summer rambles ‘The March of the Workers’:
What is this, the sound and rumour? What is that all men hear,
Like the wind in hollow valleys when the storm is drawing near,
Like the rolling on of the ocean in the eventide of fear?
'Tis the people marching on.

Rosen remembers his father, the educationalist Harold Rosen, also bursting out with these words, sung to Morris’s prescribed tune of ‘John Brown’s Body Lies Mouldering in the Grave’. This was during the 1950s, but he is likely have picked the song up, as also ‘Down among the Dead Men’, while a student Communist during the late 1930s.

In contrast, the literary critics were snippy. Reviewing Poems by the Way, Richard Garnett, who had responded enthusiastically to The Defence of Guenevere over thirty years earlier, commented: ‘We can allow but little worth to Mr Morris’s purely socialistic poetry’; and Oliver Elton believed that the songs ‘written expressly in honour of the “Cause”’ are not always the happiest or strongest in the book’. Thereafter writers on Morris have almost without exception ignored Chants for Socialists. E.P. Thompson did take them seriously in William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary (1955), although observing sadly, though not unfairly, that the ‘Chants cannot be said to lay the foundations of a poetry of revolutionary realism’; ‘Morris rarely expresses any sense of vitality in the working class, but only in the Cause itself, the hope of the future’.

Otherwise the principal commentator has been the late Nicholas Salmon in ‘The Communist Poet-Laureate: William Morris’s Chants for Socialists’, the fine article he published in the Journal of the William Morris Society in 2001, and which Rosen very usefully reprints in Poems of Protest (although, most regrettably, unproofed). Salmon boldly concurs that such judgments as Garnett’s and Elton’s are ‘fair in literary terms’ but argues that they ‘have had the effect of greatly underestimating the impact of Chants as socialist propaganda’. (p. 77) In the context of the widespread appreciation of all kinds of music which had developed during the Victorian years, he sees Morris as consciously employing song as a political weapon – beginning with the Eastern Question Association meeting of 1878. Morris was certainly ‘responding to contemporary society in a way that disproves the absurd allegations that he was some sort of romantic dreamer out of touch with his age’, but Salmon goes too far in claiming that therefore he, ‘without doubt, was the first Victorian modernist’. (p. 82) Who, though, is content with the words of a Richard Wagner or a Bob Dylan without the accompanying music? Similarly, it is not the texts of Morris’s songs which we should be reading. What is required is a CD of their choral (and any other) settings (some by none other than Gustav Holst). Is the recovery of these a possibility?

Redwords is an imprint of the Trotskyist and obsessively agitational Socialist Workers Party, of which Rosen is a prominent member. How, one wonders,
will the SWP rank-and-file respond to Morris’s poems? The following notice appeared in the SWP’s Socialist Worker (31 December 2012):

William Morris was one of the most respected and admired decorative artists and writers in Britain in the 19th century.
He was also a committed member of the Socialist League.
Like all good socialists, he organized – speaking at over 1,000 meetings. He also wrote regularly in socialist newspapers.
His Chants for Socialists and other revolutionary verse make up the centrepiece of a new collection published by Redwords. They were written to be performed to gatherings.
He marked events like the death of a worker after a vicious police attack and described how a small group of revolutionaries could become a majority. ‘This is the host that bears the word … A lightning flame, a shearing sword, a storm to overthrow’.
He looked back to the traditions of equality and beauty that he saw in the Middle Ages to criticize the horrors of his times. This collection helps to keep his ‘word’ alive.

Morris would surely have approved.

David Goodway


Has a new methodology recently emerged in Morris studies? If so, it seems to go something like this. First, take a concept which is simultaneously a major social issue of our time and a complex philosophical problem which has our best theorists and philosophers assiduously attending to it. Then apply this concept to Morris’s life and writings with: 1. marvellous close reading skills which constantly open new angles on these familiar texts; 2. a superb grasp of Victorian cultural and historical realities which acts as a check on your wilder flights of textual interpretation; 3. a confident grasp of whole swathes of recent literary and cultural theory which makes sure that Victorian contextualism does not bog you down too much and allows you to remain boldly speculative in diverse ways; and 4. an iconoclastic intention to knock to pieces some pre-existing and complacently accepted orthodoxy of Morris interpretation. Thus Marcus Waithe took the concept of hospitality as the formative idea for his 2006 study William Morris’s Utopia of Strangers – hospitality being a notion which catches up all our contemporary
hopes and anxieties about immigration into Europe and about which the philosopher Jacques Derrida had written so powerfully. In so doing, Waithe’s book challenges the reigning orthodoxy of *News from Nowhere* as a uniquely open, pluralistic, decentralist, hospitable text and convincingly shows that things are a good deal more complex and problematic in Morris’s utopia than that.

And now Ingrid Hanson has fastened upon the notion of violence, which is at the centre of current social thinking in so many ways – Al-Qaeda terrorism, right-wing extremism (as with Anders Breivik), domestic violence, liberal-humanitarian military intervention (Syria, most recently), child abuse, violence against animals and/or nature – and about which the ‘Elvis of cultural theory’, Slavoj Žižek, has written unsettlingly in *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections* (2009). Hanson’s *William Morris and the Uses of Violence, 1856–1890* is a stunning contribution to Morris studies, no doubt about that. While Žižek himself is not present, such older theorists of violence as Georges Sorel and Hannah Arendt certainly are. But the figures here who mediate between such general accounts of violence and Hanson’s own more literary concerns are Georges Bataille, with his ‘energy economy’ of expenditure, destruction and loss, and René Girard, whose *Violence and the Sacred* reflects on sacrificial violence as a means of community renewal. In a series of powerful readings of Morris’s work, a pervasive orthodoxy – what we might term the ‘green Morris’, a Morris of anti-militarism and environmental sensitivity, of willow trees and floral print designs, of placid river trips (both textual and biographical) up the Thames to Kelmscott – is decisively defamiliarised. The Morris who emerges from Hanson’s book is, rather, from the early gothic stories of *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine* onwards, devoted to ‘the generative effects of extreme, disorientating physical violence’. During the course of her book Hanson almost rewrites the Cartesian *cogito* for us. In the case of Morris, it is not so much a matter of ‘I think, therefore I am’, or even of ‘I do craftwork, therefore I am’, but rather ‘I fight and kill, therefore I am’.

I do not think Morris’s early gothic stories have ever been made to seem as rich, disturbing and beautiful as they are here. Hanson’s subsequent account of ‘The Defence of Guenevere’, which construes the queen as a female warrior fighting with all the linguistic and physiological modes at her disposal against the State violence which threatens her, is a definitive reinterpretation of that central poem. The chapter on *Sigurd the Volsung* focuses on another crucial concept in Hanson’s book, ‘manliness’, which is bound up with the practice of violence in complex ways. If Sigmund and Sinfjotli’s wolvish violence verges on the monstrous, Sigurd’s own valour must tread an uneasy path between this and the ‘dastardly’ second-hand collective violence of Siggeir or Atli (and, meantime, Brynhild and Gudrun develop some of the warrior aspects of Guenevere herself). So far, so good; but in the battles of the Germanic romances, particularly *The Roots of the Mountains*, Morris’s work is seen as coming alarmingly close to imperialist or
protofascist modes of racial cleansing. And finally, in her subtle treatments of the socialist literary texts, Hanson shows that, while Morris’s assessments of the necessity of violence in social change varied across the years of political commitment, his literary works remained deeply absorbed in the notion of redemptive violence. Here she challenges commentators such as Florence Boos, who have seen Morris in his later years as tending more towards pacific methods of social change.

As I have suggested, Waithe and Hanson take powerful contemporary concepts and their associated current theoretical debates to produce detailed and persuasive reinterpretations of Morris and his Victorian context. But their books also prompt the question: could one run the traffic the other way round? Could the new discoveries made about Morrisian hospitality and Morrisian violence in these two books be used as ways to think productively about early twenty-first-century issues of European immigration or military intervention and terrorism? Morris himself, after all, at fullest stretch from 1883 onwards, aspired to be a thinker of the future as well as an analyst of the present—a future which is now our present. So can there be a Morrisian hermeneutic or a Morrisian cultural studies of our present moment and its predicaments?

Let us stick to the issue of violence, since it is Hanson’s book rather than Waithe’s which is basically under examination here (though some reflection on the relation between hospitality, or its failure, and violence would fruitfully bring the two books together), and take a recent and deeply troubling instance of violence on our streets. Could the Morrisian imagery, narrative paradigms and thematic analysis of violence which Hanson uncovers tell us anything revealing, anything which could not be known by other means, for example, about the killing of soldier Lee Rigby in Woolwich on 22 May of this year? If they cannot, then Hanson has produced a brilliant book on William Morris and that is that—a sufficient academic achievement, by any standards. But if they can (and I suspect they can, though I do not have space to offer a detailed analysis here), then she has given us a usable Morris, a Morris for our times as well as his, a Morris who is asking, both intellectually and imaginatively, the kinds of question which also engage Slavoj Žižek in his Violence: Six Sideways Reflections. And that is certainly the Morris we most need.

Tony Pinkney
This a very attractive and informative volume, which we should have saluted much earlier. Its striking front cover features a vivid detail from the Resurrection window at Hopton-on-Sea, while the cartoon appears on the back cover. The quality of the numerous illustrations is worthy of celebration, and the contents are varied, lively and scholarly. The contributors all sing from the same hymn-sheet, but their tones vary widely and keep the reader’s interest in different ways.

The Guest Editorial by Fiona MacCarthy offers, as we would expect, a clear and enthusiastic account of Burne-Jones’s work in the medium, beginning with Jesus the Good Shepherd for James Powell & Sons in 1857, and continuing until his death of 1898, by which time he had produced no fewer than seven hundred and eighty-six designs for Morris. MacCarthy stresses that Burne-Jones’s first ambition was to be a painter, but that this did not pay well enough. She quotes his letter to May Gaskell in 1893: ‘I have never been able to live by my pictures – but for the designs of windows I should have lived in some poverty always. I have done many hundreds of them, and from some points they are as good work as I do – from the point of design namely’. His stained-glass work is said to have had a steadying influence on his sensitive personality. Georgiana is quoted about how, from the early days of their marriage, Burne-Jones would work during the day at the demanding art of painting, and in the evenings in a more relaxed way at his designs, even continuing when visitors were present. Windows for churches supplied much of the early work of the Firm, and these were carried out by Burne-Jones in the spirit of what he himself called ‘Christmas Carol Christianity’, more emotional than theological. His design work increased after the reorganization in 1875 into Morris & Co., including his impressive complete set of windows for St Martin’s, Brampton. Here MacCarthy quotes from Burne-Jones’s irresistible Account Book with Morris & Co., which features significantly later in the book under review: he is being (under)paid a mere £200 for ‘a colossal work of fifteen subjects – a masterpiece of style, a chef d’oeuvre of invention, a capo d’opera of conception’. She follows Alan Crawford in seeing such entries not as complaints but as part of the ‘easy, elusive, bantering relationship that underlay Burne-Jones and William Morris’s fruitful collaboration’ which survived the political differences between the two men resulting from Morris’s commitment to revolutionary Socialism in 1883. For MacCarthy, Burne-Jones’s late glass, seen in what is now Birmingham Cathedral, and in the Gladstone memorial at Hawarden, shows ‘a new burst of stylistic confidence’. She ends on an agreeably personal note: ‘The discovery, in detail, of these resplendent windows – from Darley Dale to Lynd-
hurt, from Edinburgh to Boston – has been one of the major excitements of my life’. It would be hard to imagine a more fitting way to launch this remarkable Journal.

Under the heading ‘History’ we find four articles. John Christian’s ‘Painter-Designer or Designer-Painter?’ offers a thoughtful account of the two aspects of Burne-Jones’s work. He identifies forty paintings which derive from stained-glass designs, and thinks particularly highly of The Days of Creation – the glass at Middleton Cheney, the Last Judgment – glass at Easthampstead, and the Angeli Laudantes and Angeli Ministrantes – glass in Salisbury cathedral. Burne-Jones is described challengingly as ‘a natural draughtsman and designer’. Occasionally, Christian suggests, Burne-Jones produced unsatisfactorily ‘hybrid work’; in this context, A.C. Sewter is quoted, arguing that the greatly admired late windows in Birmingham are excessively pictorial. (It is for readers to decide whether they judge the powerful Last Judgment, reproduced here, on these terms). Christian concludes that Burne-Jones was not always clear in his own mind about his aims, but came to realise that ‘his enthusiasm for very diverse formal values might set up tensions in his work, putting its integrity at risk if not actually courting disaster’. I was inclined to wonder – though Christian does not do so – whether these tensions might be seen in a positive light.

Albert Tannler’s ‘Edward Burne-Jones and William Morris in the United States: A Study of Influence’, draws attention to the seven Burne-Jones and Morris windows in the United States, three in Boston and four in New York State, and relates them to the development of stained glass there. He gives a useful account of the opalescent glass patented by John La Farge in 1880, and developed by Charles Tiffany, who introduced large-scale methods for its production. It was originally favoured by the designer Ralph Cram, but by 1907 he came to dismiss it as ‘not legitimate stained glass’. Tannler discusses Donald MacDonald’s Elizabeth Gregory Memorial window of 1885, the Tiffany Our Saviour (1896), and George Hallowell’s The Angel appearing to Mary (1897). He concludes with a consideration of the legacy of the Arts and Crafts: drawing on research by Peter Cormack, he gives an account of the work of Charles Connick (1875–1945), who was inspired by the ideas of Christopher Whall; his work culminated in the ambitious (illustrated) transept window All Saints (1939) in the Church of Our Saviour, Boston. This is an illuminating piece, especially for the non-American reader, though ending modestly with the suggestion that more research needs to be undertaken on the Gothic tradition in his country.

Brian Clarke is a maker rather than an academic, and his ‘Vast Acres and Fleet ing Ecstasies’ is written with passion and commitment as its opening sentence testifies: ‘I believe it to be self-evident that on the whole stained glass practised in isolation produces at best minor and at worst catastrophically poor glass’. For him, Burne-Jones is one of the very small number of makers who have had an
adequate sense of the relationship between architecture and glass. He stresses Burne-Jones's delight in his chosen material, and his ability to bring the best out of it — with Morris's backing. He notes the frequent appearance in his glass of ‘exquisite fleeting moments’ deriving from his ‘infatuation with material beauty’ — the wonderful Trumpeting Angels at Cheddleton are illustrated to show this. Clarke insists on the ruthless self-control required of the glass designer, the need not to indulge in ‘gratuitous beauty’. He draws attention to the striking and too often neglected ‘secondary narratives’ to be found in many of the windows, particularly in the predellae, as in Christ Church, Oxford and Jesus College, Cambridge. He rightly emphasises that Burne-Jones was not a solitary figure, but part of what he well describes as ‘a collegiate crusade against ugliness’. In this, Clarke sees him as more fortunate than the contemporary stained-glass artist, whose relation to architects is ‘little more than a cynical box-ticking exercise’; instead of a ‘fecund marriage’ we now have ‘one-night-stands that are as barren as a brick’. Burne-Jones is celebrated for bringing ‘fertile uninhibited vivacity to this ancient form of art’, and is seen by Clarke, because of his closeness in time to the birth of the modern art of photography, as ‘the first modern artist’. Whether we agree with this remark or not, we must surely enjoy the energy of Clarke’s writing; and it is salutary to be reminded of the problems faced by the stained-glass maker today.

The History section concludes with Martin Harrison’s ‘ “Pure gold, clear as glass”: Burne-Jones in Transition and the Lyndhurst New Jerusalem’. Harrison argues convincingly that the difference between the original design for this important window and its final form should be understood as the earliest example of Burne-Jones moving from medievalism to classicism under the influence of Ruskin. In 1862 Ruskin took him to Northern Italy, encouraging him to admire the ‘grandeur and grace’ of Luini. Thus the window as it finally emerged had moved away from the mode of Fra Angelico towards that of Luini, whose influence could be seen in the ‘more solid anatomies and rounded facial types’. Harrison also suggests that the withdrawal of Burne-Jones’s design of Christ in Majesty for the central tracery light, and its replacement by Webb’s more abstract Trinity, weakened the overall effect, and is a reminder that Morris and Burne-Jones did not always get their own way with their clients. It was interesting to read in the Notes on Contributors that Harrison has abandoned plans to revise his respected 1980 book Victorian Stained Glass in order to produce ‘a volume of thematic essays on 19th-century stained glass’ — a book to look forward to.

The ‘Research and Methodology’ section provides the most substantial piece of scholarship in Douglas Schoenherr’s ‘Edward Burne-Jones’s Account Books with Morris and Company (1861–1900): An Annotated Edition’. Schoenherr reminds us that the two volumes of Account Books, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge, have never been published in full before: Sewter quoted
effectively but not comprehensively from the Credit side of the Book when he felt it to be appropriate, while not referring, for obvious reasons, to the Debit side. The publication of the Account Books in full here is a major work of scholarship, on which Schoenherr is to be congratulated. In his introduction to what he fairly calls the ‘funniest account books in the history of book-keeping’, he draws attention to, and reproduces, the caricatures which enliven the accounts, and which have often been reproduced. In these, Schoenherr sees no evidence of tension between the two men, but only of the quality of their ‘fabled friendship’, showing ‘a day-to-day relationship full of ribald humour and fun, all at Morris’s expense’. He draws attention to the development of wit in Burne-Jones’s comments on the designs, often quoting his comments to great effect. Schoenherr also points out that Burne-Jones’s annual payments from Morris placed him securely in the middle class. He draws attention to the valuations of Burne-Jones offers of own work in the Account Books; with characteristic thoroughness, Schoenherr is able to inform us that, out of 908 designs, Burne-Jones judged forty-four to be particularly successful, and twenty-one to be failures; the successes, it is suggested, are among the windows particularly admired today, such as the Salisbury Angels and the series of windows in Birmingham cathedral – the subject of an extravagant, and often quoted, outburst by Burne-Jones.

Schoenherr also discusses the Debit side of the books, which give evidence of Burne-Jones’s purchases of wallpapers, textiles and furniture for his houses, and so throws light on their decoration – the Hollyer photographs of The Grange support this – and on the Burne-Joneses’ lack of concern for comfort, amusingly commented on later by their granddaughter Angela Thirkell. A final table shows the number of designs for each of the media in which Burne-Jones practised: 786 out of 908 for stained glass; the next largest group are sixty for tapestries and twenty-three for embroideries. The Account Books occupy pages 123 to 183, but there is more scholarship to come from Schoenherr: a checklist of Burne-Jones’s designs for Morris & Co. in chronological order, and information about the sale by Morris & Co. of Burne-Jones’s cartoons during 1901–1904. The section concludes with Tony Benyon’s very useful biographical listing of stained-glass workers employed by James Powell & Sons, by Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co. and by Morris & Co.

The publication concludes with some interesting material not related to Burne-Jones, in sections headed ‘Contemporary Practice’, ‘Technical Enquiry’, ‘Reviews’ and ‘Obituaries’. It is good to be reminded of the continuation of the tradition of work in stained glass by Fellows and Associates of the BSMGP, despite the difficulties that they must experience in the condition described so vividly by Brian Clarke. All in all, this is a volume to be warmly welcomed, and everyone associated with it deserves enthusiastic recognition.

Peter Faulkner
Rosie Miles’s contribution to the Bloomsbury ‘Texts and Contexts’ series begins by remarking on the profound influence on her life of Morris’s ‘The Haystack in the Floods’, which she first came across as an undergraduate. She sees this as symptomatic of how important Victorian poetry can be for the modern reader. The series clearly aims to introduce students to literature that they may not have encountered before, and to encourage them to read intelligently and enjoy the experience. In this, the energy and clarity of Miles’s writing enables her to succeed.

The format is that of the series: Part One offers contexts, social and cultural on the one hand, literary on the other. As we would expect today, attention is given to the political developments of the era, to the relations between the sexes the roles ascribed to women, to questions of faith and doubt, and to the importance of the expanding Empire. The literary context is that of post-Romanticism, and attention is rightly drawn to the development of the dramatic monologue and to the diminishing status of poetry during the later part of the century. This made it possible for Wilde to claim that poetry could develop more freely than prose because the general public were not interested in it.

Part Two is the most substantial; it offers some advice on reading Victorian poetry, considers the metres and rhythms used in it, and then focuses on specific texts. The choice maintains a good balance between the canonical and some less-known works. Tennyson is an unignorable introductory presence, with most attention rightly given to In Memoriam, a poem that offers insights into almost all the significant issues of its time, and employs a wonderfully engrossing poetic form for that purpose. Miles then discusses some of Robert Browning’s monologues, bringing out well their dramatic and often disturbing qualities. Elizabeth Barrett Browning’s Aurora Leigh comes next, and it is worth reflecting that this poem was little known before the coming of modern feminism. The same may be said of Christina Rossetti’s ‘Goblin Market’, an extraordinary and sensuous poem which is a surprising creation of the ascetic Anglo-Catholic poet. This is followed by Dante Gabriel Rossetti’s ‘Jenny’, a dramatic monologue about a man’s encounter with a prostitute; its complexity is well brought out. It is linked by its subject-matter to Augusta Webster’s ‘A Castaway’, which is shown to be a powerful poem which deserves to be better known. Miles concludes this section with an account of fin de siècle poetics; she makes a good case for the work of the little-known Jewish poet Amy Levy and that of Arthur Symons, who made an impact as both poet and critic.

Part Three offers some wider contexts. In discussing the criticism of Victorian poetry from the 1950s to the 1980s Miles draws attention to the expansion of the
canon, especially through growing attention to the work of women poets and other marginalised groups. ‘Afterlives and adaptations’ is an important section, because it gives Miles the opportunity to draw attention to the poetry of Hopkins and Hardy, two great poets who do not fit easily into chronological accounts. She then considers the modernist critique of Victorianism, arguing that Yeats, Eliot and Pound were more influenced by their Victorian predecessors than they were prepared to admit. Finally, she brings out, through citing examples, the continuing shadowy life of Victorian poetry in our contemporary culture.

This section is not one which would have appeared in earlier accounts of Victorian poetry; Neo-Victorianism, as this field is now known, is an interesting recent development. Miles is able to draw attention to a variety of contemporary works alluding to Victorian poetic sources, including Arnold’s ‘Dover Beach’, Tennyson’s ‘Lady of Shalott’ and Christina Rossetti’s ‘Goblin Market’, and concluding with a stanza from Wendy Cope’s version of Edward Fitzgerald’s popular *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*:

> Here with a Bag of Crisps beneath the Bough
> A Can of Beer, a Radio – and Thou
> Beside me half-asleep in Brockwell Park
> And Brockwell Park is Paradise enow.

I realise that Miles had to work on a small compass, but I regretted the absence of the peasant poet John Clare, whose Green concerns are so relevant now, of the anti-imperialist Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, and of the Yeats of the 1890s – perhaps Irish writers will appear in a separate volume. And of course I would have liked more discussion of poems by Morris, though there are allusions to several of them. It must also have been a difficult constraint for Miles, who has written so well about the relation between texts and visual material in the period, to have been denied illustrations. She discusses some of the relevant material with her customary acuteness, but the reader cannot help wishing to see some of the images referred to. However, all in all, the reader of this book will encounter a wide variety of Victorian poetry and of critical approaches to it, including feminism, queer theory and post-colonialism, and should be encouraged by it to go on to read more widely. The format of the series ends each section with some questions, aimed to concentrate student responses. There is also a useful bibliography of anthologies and critical works.

*Peter Faulkner*

Talia Schaffer’s *Novel Craft* is an original contribution to the field of Victorian studies with its focus on what the author herself acknowledges is a neglected and undervalued cultural practice of the period, ‘despised domestic handicraft’. (p. 25) The book seeks to remedy this omission by offering both a detailed account of different kinds of Victorian handicraft and their significance for the literature of the period, for as Schaffer observes, ‘there is scarcely a nineteenth-century novel that does not feature a craft’. (p. 9) The book is therefore part historical study of Victorian handicraft and part literary analysis of the different ways in which handicraft functions in thematic, structural and authorial terms in novels by Elizabeth Gaskell, Charlotte Yonge, Charles Dickens and Margaret Oliphant. In both contexts, Schaffer demonstrates the ways in which handicraft is crucial to our understanding of Victorian ideals and concerns in regard not only to aesthetics but also to gender, economics, methods of production and consumerism; far from being a purely nostalgic or marginal activity, she seeks to show how handicraft ‘stages a tension between historicity and modernity’, (p. 7) sometimes resisting but also frequently embracing some of the major social, cultural and technological changes of the period.

The Introduction provides an overview of the development of domestic handicraft with a particular focus on its changing nature and significance from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. Its conventional association with ‘middle-class women’s homebound status’ (p. 6) is discussed, but also its circulation in the craft bazaar which provided an alternative—and indeed in some ways subversive—form of economic transaction, leading to an insightful analysis of the ways in which handicraft interrogated anxieties about value during the nineteenth century with the shift to a new credit economy. Schaffer also refutes conventional associations of handicraft with the traditional and regressive, discussing how it ‘flamboyantly embraced the latest technologies’ and ‘the mass-produced commodity’, with practitioners purchasing factory-produced items ‘to wrap, glue, spangle, or paint’. (p. 8) The Introduction also explores one of the unifying motifs of the book—the role of paper. Charting its trajectory from luxury item to ubiquitous commodity to ‘debased [...] worthless waste’, (p. 18) Schaffer’s book provides a fascinating analysis of paper’s material and symbolic function in the literature of the period and considers how the novel, as a paper as well as an intellectual construction, might itself be understood as a craft artefact.

The introductory outline of what Schaffer terms the ‘craft paradigm’ is supplemented in Chapter One by a more detailed consideration of the changing nature and status of domestic handicraft between the early, mid and late Victorian periods. From its late-eighteenth-century associations with the social elite,
Schaffer notes how during the early nineteenth century handiwork was ‘increasingly identified with a middle-class sensibility’ focused on thrift and ‘domestic management’. (p. 33) Its subsequent role in the Great Exhibition of 1851 is interpreted by Schaffer as its high point in Victorian culture – a moment when handicrafts aligned themselves with both the materials and the methods of production usually associated with industrial manufacture and thus became an alternative expression, rather than a rejection, of mid-Victorian values. The proliferation of craft manuals during this period consolidated the status of domestic handicraft, but it was a status soon challenged, according to Schaffer, by new aesthetic ideals and shifting gender roles, resulting in its decline during the late-Victorian period and its increasing association with ‘a retrograde past’. (p. 50)

Schaffer supports this account of the triumphs and vicissitudes of domestic handicraft though her analysis in the following chapters of four Victorian novels predominantly of the mid-Victorian period: Gaskell’s Cranford (1851–53), Yonge’s The Daisy Chain (1856), Dickens’s Our Mutual Friend (1864–65), and Oliphant’s Phoebe Junior (1876). Each chapter offers an innovative and persuasive analysis of the significance of handicraft in manifesting and interpreting the novels’ broader concerns but also in understanding the authors’ own perceptions of their craft as writers and of their novels as crafted objects. In her discussion of Yonge’s The Daisy Chain, Schaffer imaginatively explores the extension of craft ideology to colonial practice in the novel, with an emphasis on the taming and shaping of wildness into the ornamental and the civilised, while in the chapter on Phoebe Junior, Schaffer claims that Oliphant ‘replaces the craft paradigm with the new consumerist ethos that ushers in modernity’ (p. 146) and aligns the eponymous heroine with newly emerging aesthetic ideals that signified the demise of handicraft.

The chapters on Cranford and Our Mutual Friend focus on novels which will no doubt be more familiar to the majority of readers, and approaching them through the concept of handicraft enables Schaffer to present some original insights and arguments. Schaffer proposes that the Cranfordians’ espousing of a craft aesthetic ‘becomes a way of expressing fidelity to powerful ideologies of femininity’ (pp. 64–65) and of rejecting contemporary economic and manufacturing systems, together with the increasing fluidity of class boundaries. This chapter also elaborates on the discussion of the role of paper introduced earlier in the book with a perceptive account of the ways in which newspapers, notes and letters are central to the plot and structure of the novel. In a fascinating extension of this argument, Schaffer notes that Gaskell’s original title for the novel was The Cranford Papers, the idea being that each section would constitute its own ‘paper’ – a conception intended, Schaffer claims, as a response to Dickens’s The Pickwick Papers. Just as the Cranford women create items out of ‘small fragments’, (p. 64) so the very structure of the novel embraces the concept of the
fragment in its episodic construction and hence provides another expression of the craft paradigm.

Many of the characters in *Our Mutual Friend* are similarly salvagers of fragments and, for Schaffer, Betty Higden is the dominant practitioner whose work ‘restoring, recycling, purifying, transforming’ signifies for Dickens a ‘humane economy’. (p. 119) However, while the Cranford women thrive through their craft aesthetic, Schaffer claims that those who operate through a similar aesthetic in the Dickens novel – Mr Venus, Jenny Wren and Betty Higden in particular – serve ultimately to demonstrate that ‘craft is no way to live’, (p. 142) a point brought home poignantly by the death of the increasingly marginalised and impoverished Betty. Hence while the idea of salvaging is used by Dickens ‘to critique the practices of mid-Victorian capitalism’, (p. 134) the demise of handicraft is already projected in the pages of this novel, nowhere better exemplified than in the denigration of paper, a key craft material, either to representations of unstable financial transactions such as bills and shares or to mere litter.

Schaffer’s book thus offers much that will be of interest to both enthusiasts of Victorian cultural history and of Victorian literary studies. However, for enthusiasts of William Morris the book will, I suspect, be less satisfying for two reasons in particular: its reductive analysis of the Arts and Crafts movement, and its problematic depiction of Morris as a key representative of that movement. Throughout her book Schaffer repeatedly places the Arts and Crafts movement in antagonistic opposition to the practitioners of handicraft, an oppositional stance which she claims was deliberately assumed by proponents of the Arts and Crafts. With its salvage ethos and accommodation of factory-produced goods, Schaffer claims that domestic handicraft ‘tainted the Arts and Crafts categories, mixing the taboo with the sacred’, (p. 57) and contravened the Arts and Crafts emphasis on truth to materials. While there is substance in this argument, Schaffer’s interpretation of Arts and Crafts practitioners as essentially misogynistic, espousing an ‘antagonistic language’ which ‘was often constructed against a domestic female enemy’, and seeking to ‘redefine the home as the exclusive space of male professional activity’, (p. 153) is far less convincing and appears almost wilfully to overlook the role of women in the Arts and Crafts movement.

Furthermore, William Morris is mentioned in passing on several occasions but solely as a representative of the Arts and Crafts movement, which overlooks the far more complex vision which Morris developed in regard to the role of art in society, and the integral relationship between his aesthetic and political theories. For example, in her final chapter, which provides an interesting overview of craft ideals and practices during the twenty-first century and their Victorian inheritance, Schaffer presents Morris’s ideas as an exemplar of ‘Arts and Crafts dogma’ which would reject such humble handicraft pursuits as knitting. (p. 179) Had Schaffer read Morris’s lecture ‘How We Live and How We Might Live’ (1884) she
would have had to revise her claims. In that lecture, Morris claims the right of every person to possess their ‘share of skill of hand which is about in the world’ in which he includes handicrafts as well as the fine arts, while in his lecture ‘The Society of the Future’ (1888) he overtly celebrates the ‘elementary arts of life’, which for him include ‘sewing’ as well as ‘smithying’.

While Morris was indisputably the enemy of shoddy materials and poor quality products, he was clearly not the enemy of handicraft itself, and deserves more considered treatment by Schaffer. That said, her book is a valuable contribution to the field of nineteenth-century cultural and literary studies and, more generally, to continuing debates about the nature, role and purpose of handicraft in contemporary society.

*Phillippa Bennett*


Glen Adamson’s *The Invention of Craft* is a thought-provoking and challenging book which builds on his earlier monograph *Thinking Through Craft*. Adamson wrote this book while co-curating the V. & A.’s *Postmodernism: Style and Subversion 1970–1990* exhibition, and this fact alone should make it clear that it is not a celebration of the eternal values of the handmade object. The central thesis is clearly stated in the title: what we call ‘craft’ is not a discrete entity but a new category which emerged in order to describe a particular kind of labour. It is important to note that this was a negative term: craft became a category for describing types of work defined against progressive labour: ‘It [craft] emerged as a coherent idea, a defined terrain, only as industry’s opposite number, or “other”’. (p. xiii)

*The Invention of Craft* successfully contests a series of assertions frequently deployed in the defence of traditional craft. Using the work of economic historians such as Maxine Berg, Adamson presents a revisionist account of the industrial revolution: quite a small proportion of Victorian workers worked in factories, many industrial innovations were developed by artisans in workshops, and skill levels did not decline but increased during this period. The idea that industrialisation caused the division and specialisation of labour is countered by an account of an eighteenth-century bureau, via which Adamson points out that ‘speed, separation and specialization were all driving factors in craft workshops of the eighteenth century’. (p. 10) Here the production of a craft object involved many of the aspects commonly associated with the division of labour during the industrial revolution.
In a section entitled ‘The Age of the Reveal’, the author suggests that the ‘theatricalization of knowledge ... was a quintessential nineteenth-century pleasure’, and goes on to offer an explanation as to how this period ‘invented’ craft: ‘in the nineteenth century, craft expertise was to be a public matter. No longer would it be exchanged tacitly, bit by bit behind the closed doors of a workshop, but exhaustively, in the wide open arena of the marketplace’. (p. 57) Using Michael Oakeshott’s distinction, practical (i.e. craft) knowledge was positioned against ‘technical’ knowledge. The former was represented as secretive, mysterious and of the past, while the latter was depicted as open, democratic and progressive. Many of the famous innovators of the eighteenth century used this rhetoric extensively, including Josiah Wedgwood ‘who (whether digging canals or marketing own wares) was never shy about identifying his own private advantage with that of the public’. (p. 70) The irony here was that the published technical explanations were inadequate for anyone attempting to reproduce the innovation because the practical (or ‘tacit’) element of the knowledge was missing. In this sense, public representation of innovation through technical knowledge just masked the continuing importance of practical knowledge. Many innovations which were actually discovered in workshops by artisans were later publically represented as the result of technical knowledge. This process amounts to the ‘erasure of craft from the story of modern invention’ and marks the necessity for the invention of the negative category of craft, the necessary ‘other’ to technical knowledge.

Adamson points out that ‘craft’ could often be used in an oppressive sense: once it had been defined as traditional, retrogressive and secretive, this category served as a useful way of justifying European superiority over colonial subjects: ‘intuitive craft was evidence of a preliminary stage of development, a lower rung on the ladder of civilization’. (p. 93) With craft as material evidence, curators and theorists could justify a historical narrative about the relative backwardness of the native populations in India, North America and the rest of the world, and justify ‘progressive’ European interventions.

Each chapter examines a thematic historical subject and then applies the resulting conceptual framework to the work of recent artists. When discussing this work Adamson adopts the phrase ‘postdisciplinary practice’, following the idea that ever since Marcel Duchamp’s ‘ready-mades’, artists have relied less on skills and materials and more on the invention of new artistic processes. These new practitioners ‘are more likely to function as “producers”, in the sense that the word is used in the film industry. They bring about the specific conditions that make the work happen’. (p. 34) Adamson discusses the role of the maker within a number of these projects, for example Paul Ferguson’s work as a wood-carver for the late fashion-designer Alexander McQueen, and Ai Weiwei’s famous Sunflower Seeds installation at Tate Modern which used over one hundred million
hand-made ceramic seeds. Such examples do not allow the author to reach any optimistic or even clear ideas about the role of making in contemporary art, but do go some way to examining its role in a variety of contemporary contexts.

Many of Adamson's arguments are convincing, or at least plausible, but the breadth of the historical narrative is somewhat stretched in his selective interpretation of Pugin, Ruskin and Morris, whom he admits he treats as 'fundamentally reactive to earlier ideas'. (p. xxii) Adamson interprets the Arts and Crafts Movement as a simple inversion of the modern idea of craft: instead of being secretive and retrogressive, craft was recast as democratic and progressive but was 'tied down by tradition, an anchor moored in the past'. (p. 210)

The treatment of these figures is not convincing, little aided by an approach informed by a psychoanalytical understanding of the word trauma: the basic idea being that craft revivalism is a contradictory response to the 'trauma' of modernity. While acknowledging that Pugin described modern experience 'in such a way that it can be critically engaged', Adamson describes him as 'escapist' and 'blind to the fictional qualities of his ideal medieval world'. (p. 189) This is naive: surely Pugin's exaggerations in *Contrasts* are rhetorical devices (both visual and linguistic) used to emphasise his point? Little attention is paid to the pragmatic side of Pugin's career: Adamson fails to mention his remarkable success at the Great Exhibition (despite using Morris's absence as evidence of escapism) and it is unfortunate that no attempt was made to examine Pugin's pragmatic negotiations with progressive manufacturers such as Herbert Minton and John Hardman.

Ruskin comes in for similar treatment, and the suggestion that in *The Stones of Venice* 'putting back the clock is exactly what Ruskin thought he was trying to do' (p. 196) will amaze those familiar with Ruskin's career: it is difficult to think of another Victorian writer so committed to engaging with the development of contemporary art. Tellingly, Adamson uses David Pye's 1970s critique of 'The Nature of Gothic', and finds it curious that Pye's chapter is 'not very well known'. (p. 194) But his admission that Pye sometimes might seem 'myopic' provides the answer: while Ruskin discusses furnishings and carvings, his broader argument ranges across the ethics of labour and the possibility of dignity and satisfaction within work, whereas Pye is pedantic by comparison – his interests are far narrower and while he might refute Ruskin quite well on specific details, he does not even begin to engage with the broader thrust of Ruskin's work.

Adamson does not discuss any of Morris's texts or objects in detail. He claims that Morris engages in the same kind of medieval escapism as Pugin, and frequently criticises him for failing to acknowledge the progressive artisanal work which took place in workshops around the country. Again, portraying Morris in this way fails to acknowledge his pragmatic engagement with contemporary political issues, and does not recognise Morris's use of the Middle Ages as a stra-
tectic critique of contemporary labour relations: Morris is criticised as though he was just a misleading historian. The reason that Adamson’s critique of the Arts and Crafts movement seems so narrow is that there is a great difference between his approach and that of figures such as Morris. Although Adamson acknowledges that we should be concerned about ‘the alienation that has resulted from separation and specialization in countless workplaces’, (p. 10) he is not fundamentally concerned with the ethical aspects of labour. The book is openly presented as ‘akin to intellectual history’, and an attempt ‘to track the development of an idea over time’, (p. xiv) but this does not justify a very selective critique of figures such as Ruskin and Morris who were engaged with very different issues. At stake here is whether the craft debate is about the politics of labour, or whether ‘craft’ should be regarded as a term within cultural criticism. Adamson is a leading proponent of the latter, but many will still find value in the former.

I have no doubt that this book will be very influential in our understanding of craft, but have some reservations about the central claims. While many of the myths which mask an informed understanding of craft history are convincingly contested, if the author’s claims are correct, how can we explain why so many people were convinced of the value of craft not only during the nineteenth but also the twentieth century? If the ideas we associate with ‘craft’ were so retrogressive, why did they appeal so strongly to the counter culture of the 1960s? Were all the followers of a traditionalist figure such as Bernard Leach simply misguided? The scale and loyalty of those who believed (and still believe) in ‘craft’ as a stance against mainstream culture simply cannot be accounted for within Adamson’s narrative.

Depiction of the Arts and Crafts movement as essentially reactionary and escapist is disappointing. Personally, I find this particularly misguided in the light of a recent visit to Jeremy Deller’s ‘English Magic’ at the Venice Biennale. Deller is just the kind of ‘postdisciplinary practitioner’ whom Adamson endorses, but he was happy to use the figure of William Morris in a flagrantly anti-escapist manner. Deller’s image of Morris flinging Roman Abramovich’s yacht into the Lagoon is clearly a fantasy but no less effective for being so. ‘English Magic’ shows that a creative strategy which creates a collision between past and present can still be a highly effective means of gaining insight into the contemporary world.

Charles Spooner was a disciple of Ruskin and Pugin, and greatly influenced by William Morris. He lived nearby in Chiswick Mall, and was elected to the Hammersmith Socialist Society in 1891; he joined the SPAB in 1907, and served on the committee from 1914 to 1938. He adapted Ravenscourt Park as a workshop during his brief engagement in business with the firm of Elmdon & Co. In 1914 he helped organise workshops for Belgian refugees at Hampshire House in Hog Lane, behind Upper Mall. He was greatly concerned for Belgium, and designed prefabricated wooden churches to be erected there, though it is not clear how many were actually built. Although Hamilton suggests that his designs were hardly outstanding and might not be described as Arts and Crafts today, his credentials were confirmed when he was elected to the Arts Workers Guild in 1887, and in 1890 to the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society.

A considerable amount of space in this book is devoted to Spooner’s churches. He was not only related to the famous Warden of New College, but also to several bishops, and this, together with his High Anglican beliefs, might seem a recipe for success as a church architect. In fact, his commissions were relatively few. He built six churches and contributed to others. The churches were mainly Anglican. I have listed these for the convenience of those who might like to visit them.

The medieval church of St Peter and St Paul, Exton, Hampshire had been rebuilt in 1847, and Spooner was commissioned to furnish and redecorate the interior in 1891. Hamilton is unable to define the exact style here, calling it Art Nouveau, but the cheerful stencilling of the walls, now restored after whitewashing, as Peter Cormack pointed out to the author, ‘reflects the totally English fabric patterns of William Morris’. The Row Chapel, Hadleigh, Suffolk (1891–2) is ‘a timber-framed 13C chapel (rebuilt)’. This is Pevsner’s description and he does not credit any of the work to Spooner who transformed it into a ‘roadside mass chapel’. Much of Spooner’s work has disappeared, and Hamilton has photographed what remains.

St Bartholomew, Ipswich (1894–1909) was funded by Spooner’s aunt, who was very High Church. The first designs seem to show a noble building with a tower, rising above an area of the town known as ‘California’. The inhabitants already possessed a Methodist Chapel, and did not welcome Mass and confessions from Fr Cobbold, who wore ‘on his head the continental biretta’. Hamilton describes the church as ‘large, high, spacious and full of light’. It lay unfinished for many years, and was finally completed by Munro Cautley in 1926, though there is no tower. It looks like a huge red-brick barn.

St Michael and All Angels, Little Ilford (1896–1906) was a large church for an
area where the population had considerably increased. It was demolished in 1990, and replaced by the Froud Centre i.e. a community centre. A section is set aside for worship, and a few remnants of Spooner’s work are kept there. St Anselm, Hatch End, Pinner (1901–2) was built by E.E. Jones in 1894–5 and contains various examples of Arts and Crafts work. The West window is by Selwyn Image. Spooner designed the huge rood screen, which was regarded as provocative; rood screens were reintroduced into English churches only during the 1880s. According to Peter Cormack ‘it is the largest piece of figural carving in the Arts and Crafts that we know of’.

St Christopher, Haslemere, Surrey (1902–3) was built for a rather special community; for example there was the Haslemere Peasant Arts Society, founded to ensure ‘the revival of a true country life where handicrafts and the arts of husbandry shall exercise body and mind’. A second church was needed, and Spooner encountered no opposition to his simple ‘medieval’ building; it seats only two hundred and thirty people. Hamilton calls it ‘cosy’ and ‘rather magical’. A number of craftsmanlike features were introduced. For example, small stones are placed in the mortar like the heads of nails. This is called ‘galleting’, and was traditional in the area. One thinks of Lutyens and the Surrey style. Spooner closely supervised every piece of furniture. The amazing reredos was painted by his wife Dinah.

His Roman Catholic Church, St Hugh of Lincoln, Letchworth, (1907–8), was considered by its priest to be ‘the only church worth looking at west of Constantinople’. It has now been transformed into the church hall. In the case of Holy Spirit, Rye Harbour, Sussex (1912–13), Spooner was called in to enlarge a church by Teulon. This gave him a chance to produce a ceiling like an upturned boat, and to provide new choir-stalls.

St Gabriel, Aldersbrook, Wanstead (1912–14) is a brick church, somewhat smaller than the one at Ipswich, but this time Spooner was able to crenellate. Like Little Ilford, this was another area of London’s expansion where the population had hitherto been served by a ‘tin tabernacle’. They were poor and there was not much money available. The colours Spooner had envisaged for the interior seem to have disappeared. Pevsner was not impressed by this church, but the revised Buildings of England: London 5 seems much more generous.

St Paul, East Ham (1932–3) was Spooner’s last complete church. Hamilton describes its style as stripped-down Romanesque, but Spooner said: ‘The design does not attempt to reproduce any so-called style of architecture, but rather to suit the brick of which the church is built’. I think Pugin might have approved this statement, but it also shows the point during the 1930s at which Gothic Revival architecture crosses over into Modernism.

In his day Spooner was better known for his carved wooden chairs and lecterns; in 1912 he produced electrical fittings. As a member of the Art Workers Guild,
Spooner specialised in Church Furniture. Among the churches to which he supplied such furnishing, besides those already mentioned, was Holy Innocents, Paddenwick Road, Hammersmith; there he installed a ‘medieval’ rood screen (ca 1901). This has been moved to the west end since 1989. There is an unusual lectern at Holy Trinity, Halstead, (1903) which is mentioned by Pevsner; the reading desk is supported by four wooden shafts and two iron candle holders project at either side. Hamilton calls this ‘eccentric’; I feel that something as original as this really shows an Arts and Crafts designer experimenting in the direction of the Modern. Spooner’s work in this field caught the attention of W.R. Lethaby, who appointed him to a teaching post at the Central School of Arts and Crafts in 1899. For thirty years he taught furniture design in wood and metalwork, and he seems to have been happy to do this. Among his colleagues was May Morris.

I suppose Charles Spooner, in the end, was not a great success as an architect, and he is little known today. I think he became discouraged and stopped working at projects he could have finished; but he really could not cope with the new requirements and cost-counting which changed his well-laid plans. And now, as Hamilton explains, some of his churches have been destroyed and some of his adaptations to churches, following his High Anglican beliefs, have been taken out. But this book seems to me to play down the whole context of his career. Unlike the situation during the nineteenth century there was no great will or indeed funding to see new churches built. Yet something had to be done as the built-up area of London and other cities increased. Those growing up in East London or similar districts newly built between 1890 and 1939 will remember those unlovable redbrick church buildings where we went to meetings of Scouts or Guides. The churches were both new and yet out-of-date compared to what was being built in Europe. Spooner in his own way took up the challenge, and Alec Hamilton has carefully documented what remains of his work.

John Purkis


Clive Aslet, a former editor of Country Life, has been able to use the photographic archive held by the magazine to compile a survey of Arts and Crafts country houses. It is a splendid visual treat and Morrisians will be pleased to see places we have often visited, such as Webb’s Standen or Barnsley’s ‘Cotswold Idyll’ of Rodmarton Manor and Sapperton Cottages. The houses are displayed
in chronological order, yet I must admit to being unable to match the title to
the earliest houses shown in the book. Are Brantwood and Red House so to be
described? Did Ruskin and Morris say to their architects ‘Design me an Arts and
Crafts House’? In fact Aslet says that Brantwood was not really built to exemplify
Ruskin’s ideals. He calls Red House ‘a Gothic Revival parsonage house’, and
adds the charming detail that it ‘was – and is – penetratingly cold in winter, and
roasting in summer’.

Surely the description ‘Arts and Crafts’ best fits houses fashionable and con-
temporary with the magazine itself, which was founded in 1897. Even though
Morris had just died, his ideas lived on, and are everywhere displayed in the new
buildings by architects such as Lutyens. Many of the gardens were designed by
Gertrude Jekyll, who was the gardening editor of the new magazine. Morris’s
vision of the medieval hall meant that the centre of the house was often open
plan or an atrium. The feelings generated by these houses also owe something to
descriptions in News from Nowhere. Remember that Morris said that Kelmscott
Manor seemed to ‘grow out of the soil’. Therefore new houses had to appear to be
not just old, but very old indeed. There were limitations to the taste exemplified
by Country Life, as the rest of the world began to move on. There were no refer-
ences to Charles Rennie Mackintosh, and, as Aslet says ‘the magazine did not do
Art Nouveau’.

The essential principles of the Arts and Crafts country house may be said to
derive from the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and some of the
architects discussed in this book sat on the SPAB committee. If, as architect, you
find that there is an original house on the site you are building on, it should be
retained and incorporated into the new work. It does not matter that there are
wide variations of style. No, it is a glory, even if the final house looks like a suc-
cession of higgledy-piggledy bits added on down the centuries. For a new build,
the less like its own time the house looks the better, and one should use ancient
methods of craftsmanship. But all this leads in practice to various kinds of cre-
ative deception, as is already to be seen at Standen – a house which looks like a
medley but which was all built at the same time (1891–4). Another example: one is
easily deceived by Lutyens’s treatment of Nathaniel Lloyd’s house at Great Dixter,
in which a fifteenth-century building was given modern additions according to
these principles, but then you must remember that its medieval hall was moved
there from another site; yet against that, the hall would otherwise have been
destroyed. And so people came to believe, well, kid themselves, that the houses
really could be old; as Robert Lorimer said about Munstead Wood (built by Luty-
ens in 1896), ‘It looks so reasonable, so kindly, so perfectly beautiful, that you feel
that people might have been making love and living and dying there, and dear
little children running about – I was going to say 1,000 years – anyway 600’.

Health was a prime concern; the houses were often sited in open heathland
or woodland, as in Surrey. The gardens were to be integrated with the house. Aslet supports all these points with reference to Morris: ‘a theme of News from Nowhere is the vitality of a population which spends a proportion of its time in the open air. Morris praises the sun-browned skin of the women’. Second, the utilities and services of the house should appear to be medieval; ‘they were likely to be equipped with big fireplaces, with firedogs to support roaring logs, perhaps with an inglenook to take maximum benefit’. Then, as electricity became widely available, the oddest-looking ‘medieval’ light fittings were concealed about the rooms. Aslet has an eye for such Arts and Craft details and yet inserts the odd and unexpected witty remark about the aims and personalities of the architects. Standen is carefully described, but says Aslet, ‘Webb strenuously avoids being picturesque’. Detmar Blow was discovered sketching in Abbeville Cathedral by Ruskin. ‘On learning that Blow wanted to become an architect, Ruskin expressed his view of the profession. It was to be avoided’.

One of the most interesting sections of the book shows how all this led to ‘New Ways of Living’. Here Aslet has room for Le Bois de Moutiers, a Lutyens house near Dieppe, which we visited on one of the Society’s tours of France. Blackwell in Cumbria was built by Baillie Scott, a man of cosmopolitan tastes, who was interested in the future, not the past. He was a disciple of The Studio, a rival magazine, so that this house was not described in Country Life until 1986. Madresfield, an older house, had its extraordinary chapel completely transformed by an Arts and Crafts team from Birmingham. This became a model for a similar chapel in Evelyn Waugh’s Brideshead Revisited.

At the end of the book, having been given to understand that this tradition of building came to an end during the 1930s, we are given examples of later enthusiasm for the Arts and Crafts down to the present day. Some of the champions of the post-war period were associated with the William Morris Society. Examples are John Brandon-Jones, who ‘stamped the values of the Arts and Crafts onto several civic buildings, including the Hampshire County Council Offices at Winchester’, and Roderick Gradidge, author of The Surrey Style, whose legacy to the Art Workers’ Guild put new life into that institution. And in our own times Aslet singles out for praise the architect Charles Morris, who designed the Orchard Room at Highgrove, where Prince Charles holds conferences. Aslet’s caption to the accompanying photograph states that the extra-ordinary ‘dumpy columns were inspired by the market house at nearby Tetbury’ and that inside more ‘companionable columns are intended to help shy guests overcome feelings of social intimidation’. Charles Morris has started a company called The English House, where you can buy examples of his Arts and Crafts fittings, including the Rodmarton Single Arm Round Base Wall Light. Think of the possibilities for the British economy that this enterprise will lead to.

John Purkis


*Transformative Beauty* is to be welcomed as a lucid and well documented account of the establishment of Art Galleries in the three major English cities of Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester during the later part of the Victorian period, with some attention to subsequent developments. Woodhouse-Boulton opens her Introduction with Whistler’s 1885 *Ten O’Clock Lecture*, with its witty attack on the way people were being invited to look ‘not at a picture, but through it’, (quoted p.1) a challenging critique of the movement the book discusses. She shows the pervasive influence of Ruskin in this area – as in others – and argues that the two central assumptions of the movement to establish local museums were that art could offer a kind of domestic space to humanise the industrial scene, and that it could draw attention to Nature and higher values than those of the cities in which they were established. But these explicit aims, she suggests, were always likely to be modified by the inherent complexity of works of art.

The first chapter, ‘Ruskin, Ruskinians and City Art Galleries’, shows in detail how inspiring Ruskin was for the proponents of museums in all three cities that the book concerns. In Birmingham, with its powerful Liberal party, Nonconformist preachers of a ‘civic gospel’ were influential and successful. It was here that Morris delivered lectures in 1879 and 1880 (quoted in the text), and the collection contained artifacts intended to encourage workers towards better principles of design. This practical element was less prominent in Liverpool – a great port rather than a manufacturing city, where the Walker Art Gallery was the gift of a wealthy Tory brewer – and in Manchester, where it is suggested that civic pride played as large a part as the desire for social reform; it was in Manchester that the first Ruskin Society was founded as ‘The Society of the Rose’ in 1879. Since we tend to assume that Morris always found it necessary to go well beyond Ruskin in his politics, it is striking to be told that in all three cases Ruskin criticised the founders of the museums for not going far enough to effect radical changes in the relations between the classes; for instance, he told the Liberal councillor, James Picton, who had sent him a book about Liverpool, that he would much rather have one about Carnavon or Conway or Flint, and that he considered Liverpool as ‘the cause of the destruction of Flint, and of most of Lancashire!’ (p. 37)

The second chapter deals with the debate over Sunday opening, opposed dur-
ing the mid-century by religious groups, but achieved in Liberal Birmingham in 1872, in Liverpool in 1891, and in Manchester restrictedly in 1879 and more fully in 1895; this is a cause we know Morris supported. The cities would offer the gallery as an alternative to the pub, as a quasi-domestic space for civilised behaviour. The third chapter considers the works of art bought or borrowed by the galleries, arguing that these were intended to be read by visitors as valuable experiences through the subjects represented in them. Thus most of the paintings were examples of contemporary British art, with the Pre-Raphaelites and their followers to the fore. These were the pictures also being bought by the new middle-class for their private collections. In this context, we can understand why in 1892 Manchester bought Millais’ *Autumn Leaves* rather than a Rembrandt. The subject-matter of paintings had to be in some way inspiring.

Chapter 4 deals with the ways in which the museums presented their collections to the public through publications and lectures: ‘narrative and literary sentiment’ were emphasised rather than ‘form and colour’, a preference attributed to English taste by W.B. Richmond in 1898. Woodhouse-Boulton argues that the materials issued by the museums seldom showed awareness of the most recent developments in art criticism at the time – though it is surprising that she makes no reference at all to Walter Pater, who had published *The Renaissance*, with its proto-aestheticist attitude as early as 1873. The question of changing attitudes is conveyed through the accounts given at different times of three paintings from each collection: Alfred East’s *Hayle, from Lelant* and Burne-Jones’s *Star of Bethlehem* in Birmingham; Albert Moore’s *A Summer Night* and Holman Hunt’s *Triumph of the Innocents* in Liverpool; and J.C. Hook’s *Under the Sea* and Millais’ *Autumn Leaves* in Manchester. Woodhouse-Boulton argues that the accounts of these paintings show there were ‘tensions’ within Victorian attitudes to art, which is not as surprising as she seems to imply. The chapter ends with a quotation from an article about museum collections by a modern critic, Giles Waterfield, in 1995, finding that the early catalogues were a ‘depressing reflection on the state of art museums and art historical knowledge in nineteenth century Britain’. (p. 145) Attractively, Woodhouse-Boulton takes a less judgmental approach, arguing that the Victorian supporters of art museums were pursuing a conscious policy which encouraged viewers to see art as ‘an essential antidote to the moral and physical ugliness of nineteenth-century industrial society’. (p.146)

The final chapter deals with developments during the twentieth century, shifting the emphasis ‘From Experience to Appreciation’, as the chapter’s subtitle puts it. This change took place in the broader context of developments in Europe and the USA, placing more stress on the innate qualities of works of art, and less on subject matter. Woodhouse-Boulton refers to the Post-Impressionist Exhibitions in London in 1910 and 1912 as beginning the process of establishing
a new artistic canon with a strong bias towards French art. Museum directors during the 1920s possessed explicitly educational aims, with a stronger sense of art history. Buildings were expanded, and social facilities such as shops and restaurants developed; experience showed, not surprisingly, that free exhibitions drew the largest crowds. As the curatorial profession expanded, local control was diminished, though differences between the three galleries remained, with Birmingham continuing to place more emphasis on craft and locality. The account given here repeats some of the earlier material, but argues convincingly that the decline of attention to the usefulness of the collections to their communities did not affect their popularity as the twentieth century moved on.

In a brief Epilogue, Woodhouse-Boulton neatly contrasts the celebration of British art in the first catalogue of the Tate Gallery in 1899, with the official guide published in 1934 declaring the French Impressionists as the painters most worthy of attention. What we now see as the anti-Victorianism of Bloomsbury is effectively represented by an essay on ‘Victorian Taste’ by Clive Bell in R.S. Lambert’s Art in England in 1938, in which he castigates the Victorian tendency, shown by such figures as Ruskin and Prince Albert, to see art as occupying an indeterminate place ‘somewhere between religion and hygiene’. (p. 176) She also notes that in the book admiring attention is drawn to the design of such products as aeroplanes and cars, and to patronage by companies such as Shell-Mex and B.P. (We are likely to think of Frank Pick and the London Underground in this context). The complexity of cultural history is suggested by the revival of interest in Victorian art, and particularly the Pre-Raphaelites, in recent years. The book’s conclusion combines retrospect with hope: ‘Although they never lived up to the hopes of their more idealistic founders, art museums always hold that potential, as art itself does, to change the way we see the world, and perhaps – as some of those Victorian reformers hoped – to thus galvanize us to change it’. This reviewer was inclined to applaud here, and to note with pleasure that the author had succeeded in handling these issues without once resorting to the phrase ‘cultural industries’.

Katherine Haskins book on The Art Journal is in some ways a complementary work. It offers a well-researched account of the magazine which ran from 1839 to 1912, and most influentially from 1850 to 1880, during which period it published no fewer than eight hundred commercial fine-art prints, and so exercised a remarkable and little-studied influence on Victorian middle-class taste. Haskins argues that its assertive and long-serving editor, Samuel Carter Hall, spotted a gap in publishing for an expanding middle class which wanted advice on taste, which he was very happy to provide. In an article on ‘The Progress of British Art’ in 1848 Hall gave a clear account of the mission of the magazine; it aim was to encourage interest in:
High Art, for National purposes – as a means of Education, as the annalist of our History, as the inculcator of Moral Truths, as the promoter of Commerce; the agent towards Social Refinement – this only is worth promoting, worth struggling to promote. (p. 67)

This book is an account of Hall’s success. It shows that he attracted a good deal of criticism from various quarters, but succeeded in his aim, partly through the textual material, but mainly through the numerous prints, both in the magazine and as separate products for display in the home. The textual material was mostly supplied by Hall, his wife Anna, and the assistant editor James Dafforne, supported by the critic Anna Jameson. Haskins suggests that the three-column small-type presentation (illustrated on pp. 85 and 86) helped to give authority, though it looks uncomfortably cramped to a modern reader. Attention is rightly drawn to Ruskin’s important but little known ten-part article on engraving, published during 1865 and 1866 as ‘Cestus of Aglaia’ or ‘The Girdle of the Graces’. But Ruskin was at other times critical of what he saw as the lack of idealism in The Art Journal, particularly in relation to religious art. The Journal favoured a traditional kind of Raphaelesque art, which Ruskin denounced as weakly secular and sentimental when compared to the medieval Italian painters or the modern Pre-Raphaelites.

It is of course the prints which have provided the main material for Haskins’ book. These were mostly what are known as steel engravings, though Haskins illuminatingly tells us that the plates were not composed of steel, a difficult metal to work, but prepared on copper plates and faced with a thin sheet of iron in the process known as electroplating; this was a very durable medium, so that prints could be published in large numbers. (p. 49) Painters whose work we are shown include Charles Lesley, Augustus Callcott, William Collins, Marcus Stone, Thomas Webster, H.W. Pickersgill, David Wilkie, Clarkson Stanfield, Henrietta Browne, Frederick Leighton, Jean Millet, J.M.W. Turner, W.C.T. Dobson, William Dyce and, a particular favourite – Edwin Landseer, seven of whose works are shown. Landseer was perhaps the Journal’s favourite artist, and it helped to ensure that by the end of the century Landseer prints were proudly on show in innumerable middle-class homes. In the religious category, there are prints of Old Master paintings by Domenichino, Annibale Carracci and Raphael. And Turner – seven of whose paintings are illustrated – is an unexpected presence here. The Art Journal supported his cause as part of its campaign on behalf of British artists, despite the severe criticism often given at the time to his innovative later works, and what seems to the modern viewer their painterly unsuitability for engraving. We are shown The Fighting Téméraire, Hurrah for the Whaler, Erebus!, Rain, Steam and Speed, and The Snowstorm, in engraving in which the craftsmen show enormous skill, though it is hard now to share Hall’s view that in this
form the paintings are more attractive, because more comprehensible, than the originals. What would Turner have made of these prints, taken from the Turner Collection after the artist’s death?

The heroes of the book are the highly skilful engravers, whose names appear in this book with the prints: R. Staines, W. Miller, G. Finden, W. Ridgway, H. Bourne, J.D. Cooper, A.T. Willmore, L. Stocks, H.S. Beckwith, W. Taylor, R. Cousen, P. Lightfoot, R. Wallis, T.A. Prior, C.W. Sharpe, L. Stocks, A. Masson, E. Goodall, J.C. Armytage, J. Cousen, R. Brandard, F. Joubert, S.S. Smith, H. Knolle, G. Levy, T. Vernon, W. Holl, P. Lightfoot, C.G. Lewis, C. Mottram, T. Landseer and C. Cousen. Many of these names are omitted – like those of many of the artists – from the shamefully inadequate index, which contrasts strikingly with the very full Bibliography. Although these men, of whom we are told there were some one hundred and sixty, (p.40) are held up for collective admiration, we learn disappointingly little of them as individuals; this is also true of most of the minor painters shown. It would have been interesting, for example, to learn more about W.C.T Dobson, praised in the Journal in 1860 as offering the kind of sacred art in which the British school was deficient. Readers were told, pace Ruskin, that the ‘PreRaffaelites of the day are not the men for such work; the mind of Dobson and his style of painting are adapted to the requirements of the time’. It is a pity that the grounds for this judgment are not spelled out. Dobson’s 1853 painting The Almsdeeds of Dorcas from the Royal Collection was praised for its Raffaelesque qualities; Dobson, we are told, does not look back further than to ‘him of Urbino’, and ‘in doing this he acts wisely and well’. (p. 159)

By around 1880 technological changes meant that the role of the craftsman in printing processes had declined; it was never to be recovered, as photographic processes took over. Hall ended his association with the Journal in 1880, although it survived until 1912. The skill of the reproductive engravers was no longer needed. Haskins has written their elegy, which lends a more emotional tone to her Conclusion, and in particular its section on ‘The Tyranny of Rule’. This phrase is taken from William Ivins’ 1969 book Prints and Visual Communication in which Ivins, the curator of prints at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, deplored the effects, on critical taste in art, from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, of a dependence on mass-produced reproductions in the form of prints. Ivins took the modernist position, praising what he saw as the superiority and authenticity of prints created by artists for themselves without the intervention of ‘the engravers’ shops’. (p.192) Haskins believes that this stress on the artist’s autonomy is unfair to ‘the unique connective qualities of fine art publishing’ which have been neglected in recent criticism. She advocates a more inclusive idea of Victorian visual practice, and argues that we should not be discouraged from this undertaking by the realisation that what will be revealed is ‘a bourgeois history’. (p.193)

My own position is closer to that of Ivins. While no aspect of history should be
ignored, and that of the master print-makers and their public is of considerable interest as a part of the history of taste, it is surely more rewarding aesthetically and critically to devote our attention to the most vital arts of their times, which the Art Journal’s practice did little to illuminate for our retrospective eyes. In this sense, Haskins is involved in a more limited scholarly arena than Woodhouse-Boulton, since the scope of and public for our museums remain of undeniable importance. But in relation to a significant contemporary issue, I was impressed by Haskins’ reflections on her experience in researching The Art Journal in our age of digitisation and the internet. Modern media made the research immensely more practicable, but she does not regret the time she had spent earlier with ‘the actual volumes’. This had enabled her to develop a sense of what the physical presence of the magazine might have felt like in a Victorian home. The conclusion she draws from this for researchers today and in the future is well balanced and challenging:

I make this point because I am both excited about the future of research aided by electronic resources and concerned that the digital transformation of our information spaces does not diminish our ability to comprehend, in all dimensions, the history we work to recover. (p.15)

Peter Faulkner


Jonathan Meades is an architectural writer and television programme-maker. Museum without walls is a compilation of fifty-four articles and six television scripts written over a couple of decades and loosely organised around themes including place, memory, blandness, ‘edgelands’ and urban regeneration. He is an architectural writer who hates architects – the feeling is heartily reciprocated – and who is really more interested in places, ‘the greatest of free shows’ as he calls them, than architecture as such. Meades’ greatest strength as a writer is his strong opinions, quirkily expressed, what he calls ‘heavy entertainment’. Take architects: ‘If we want to understand the physical environment we should not ask architects about it. After all if we want to understand charcuterie we don’t seek the opinion of pigs’. (p.13)

Meades can certainly be ‘on point’ as the Americans say, and his debunking of some of the absurdities of the regeneration and architectural industries can be hilarious, even breathtaking. This is informed by a lot of hate though, and
hate can only go so far. Reflecting the range of things he has written about — the regeneration ‘gravy train’, Letchworth’s dreary legacy, the futile vanity of ‘landmark’ buildings, Birmingham’s beauty, why buildings are best left unfinished, shopping malls, Pevsner, Nairn and Sterling — he admits to a gamut of seldom-submerged antipathies. ‘Beaverbrook observed that his father taught him to hate, to hate. I enjoyed no such tuition. I’ve had to teach myself. It comes easily enough when you are presented with such objects as good taste, Georgian tidiness and the nasty bland synthetic-modern legacy of New Labour, made in the image of the grinning Tartuffish war criminal himself — but the happy Christmas Day will come when our Christian bomber and his gurning hag magically mutate into the Ceaucescus of Connaught Square. (The house has a basement)’. (p. xv)

In a way, his writing style is the real purpose of the book, not the ideas he is trying to convey. But, for much of the time, it does not work. There is a great piece on the lower Lea Valley in East London before its sterilisation by the ‘entirely despicable, entirely pointless’ 2012 Olympics, ‘… a festival of energy-squandering, architectural bling worthy of a vain third world dictatorship’. He takes time to describe the most extensive terrain vauge of any European capital city in ways with which connoisseurs of ‘edgelands’ writing will be familiar, ‘… greasy carpet tiles, collapsing nissen huts, pitta bread with green mould, rotting foxes, caravans and washing lines, an oasis of scrupulously tended allotments … you get the picture’. But instead of painting it, Meades beats the reader around the head with a single sentence running to a full page, with over forty examples.

This is an example too of Meades’ obsession with lists. He begins with insight and ends up tedious. The swagger and pose in his prose is endearing because so much written in the regeneration and architectural press can be little more than uncritical boosterism of what Meads calls ‘nursery colours’, ‘toytown rustication’, and ‘a children’s entertainer’s garrulous importunacy’, the kind of thing Owen Hatherley in A guide to the new ruins of Great Britain so winningly sends up. But Hatherley has the measure of Meads the contrarian, or as he calls him, ‘the magic mushroom guzzling rationalist’. Self-indulgence hardly does justice to Meades’ style. Any self-respecting editor would have taken a hatchet to a lot of this prose. Novelists are frequently entreated to ‘kill their babies’ in order to make sure their work is readable. I can assure you that no babies were killed during the making of this book.

Meads likes to venture into the politics of architecture. He can be amusing and pointed. At its best, his prose is peppered with bon mots. Stalinist architecture is low-brow, Nazi architecture middle-brow. There is a section on architects, some of whom he likes, others whom he loathes. In discussing (and in discussion with) Zaha Hadid, he makes a number of good points about sexism in architecture, especially in the UK (much less the case in France and Switzerland apparently),
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and takes an amusing sideswipe at the American (now rather old) New Urbanists, ‘begetters of crass kitchy retro-developments such as Seaside, Florida’, (p. 363) and their British standard-bearer Leon Krier. Krier went on from teaching Hadid at the Architectural Association to becoming the Prince of Wales’s architectural advisor, and ‘then the brain (if that’s the word) behind such volkisch excrescences of the New Urbanism as Poundbury, the cottagey slum of the future disgracefully dumped on a greenfield site on the edge of Dorchester’. (p. 367)

Meades does not like ‘that kind of thing’ at all, so the Arts and Crafts Movement, and Garden Cities, are fair game. Letchworth is pretty much dismissed because ‘the future mass-murderer Lenin went to inspect it’, (p. 103) though its real failings seem to have been that it exemplified ‘a generation of architects whose flock-like impetus was folksy, rustic, merry Englishish’, (p. 76) but his airy dismissals have a point. Nineteenth century suburbia was architecturally centripetal. It sought to join itself to the city. It used urban styles and urban planning. It acknowledged its link to the core of the city. Whether it was grand, like Bayswater, or humble, like Bow, it looked inwards. Bourneville, Port Sunlight, Letchworth did not.

Predictably, Meades cuts a swathe through the Arts and Crafts Movement. ‘Never was Never Never Land more persuasively realised than by the rurally fixated, childlike luddite of the Arts and Crafts. Never was twee, cutesy, unthinking saccharine, smiley, eager-to-please, easy-on-the-eye winsomeness, carried off by a greater genius than the young Lutyens’. (p. 103) Not surprisingly, Morris comes in for the full treatment, and is dismissed, along with Ruskin, Carlyle, Matthew Arnold, H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw, and that ‘well-intentioned old fool Ebenezer Howard’, as part of the ‘officer-class gullible’, and as someone ‘who thought expensive wallpaper was going to change the world’. (p. 102) Meades likes to have a go at Morris. Interspersed among the articles and polemics are some film and television scripts. One, *Victoria died in 1901 and is still alive today*, is a glorious confection of stereotype and prejudice mixed in with insight and humour. This is Morris; ‘You know the type. He was a cerebral Conran who propagated the art of living in the Middle Ages rather than the art of living in France [Meades lives in France]. He was the River Cafe with a beard’, and ‘Morris was forever trying to recreate his childhood which had been a prelapsarian commune with nature, baking hedgehogs in clay and riding a pony dressed in a suit of armour (sic) – as one does. We all had a childhood. What is peculiar about Morris was his desire to inflict his childhood on a nation. What was even more peculiar is that he succeeded’. (p. 202)

It is probably fair to say that political analysis is not one of Meades’s strong points. A debate between him and, say, Jeremy Deller, on Morris’s relevance in the twentieth century, would be instructive, if a bit one-sided. In the end, *Museum*
without walls is both an amusing and an irritating romp through some of the key issues facing architects, planners, regeneration types and anyone interested in ‘place’ or the built environment. But it shows its origins. What would be a hilarious article in the Sunday Telegraph Magazine, or a thought-provoking if wacky programme on modern architecture on More 4, when brought together at great length, really does not translate into a successful book. At half the length it might have worked, but his editors did not kill those babies.

Martin Stott
Erratum

Please note the following error, which has only recently been brought to our attention.


Page 94, para 1, sentence 2 should read

Although I have a considerable interest in literary utopias, this is not because I find them socially plausible or consider – with the notable exception of *News from Nowhere* – they would be pleasurable to live in, but because they are most revealing of their author or of the time and place in which they were written.
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