

'News from Nowhere in Recent Criticism' Revisited

Tony Pinkney

In the summer 1983 issue of what was then *The Journal of the William Morris Society* Peter Faulkner published an excellent article with the title 'News from Nowhere in Recent Criticism'. He noted that 'one result of the new structuralist emphases in literary criticism which is encouraging for admirers of Morris is the greater attention now being given to works of fiction outside the canon of nineteenth-century realism', including Morris's utopia itself. While registering a caveat about these new modes of literary theory ('sometimes carried to absurd lengths in the denigration of the realist approach'), Peter then proceeded to give a thoughtful account of essays on *News from Nowhere* by Bernard Sharratt and Michael Wilding which broadly operated in this emergent field of literary study.¹ I have always admired the project that this essay represents, and as my own tribute to Peter Faulkner's long career in Morris studies I wish to repeat it thirty years on, to report back to the wider Morris world from the frontiers of literary and cultural theory in what I hope will be a lucid and accessible way, particularly in relation to *News from Nowhere* itself.

Since Peter wrote his essay in 1983 we have seen an extraordinarily energetic development of the whole field of literary theory, which I was lucky enough to experience as a postgraduate student at Oxford University with Terry Eagleton, who was one of the main movers and shakers in that area. The 'structuralist emphases' which Peter's article invoked were very soon overtaken by broader developments which can be summed up by the terms 'post-structuralism' and 'postmodernism'. These themselves were then superseded by many subsequent movements, to the point, indeed, where, during the early twenty-first century, it can seem that literary and cultural theory have hectically burned themselves out, and books have recently been published with such titles as the 'death of theory' or 'after theory' (the latter by Eagleton himself). What I want to do in this article is to update Peter's now classic essay by evoking in broad brushstrokes the overall ethos of literary theory across these last thirty years (at least as I see it), and then to

raise some questions as to how this might affect our approach to Morris’s utopia. I shall try to do this in a non-technical way, so that the reader can test my theory-inspired propositions about *News from Nowhere* against his or her own experience of the text, or particular sections of it.

If we wanted to sum up in a phrase or two what the literary theory revolution meant to literary studies during the 1980s and beyond, then we might say that it entailed a shift from a ‘hermeneutics of restoration’ to a ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’. Hermeneutics is the practice of interpretation, and a ‘hermeneutics of restoration’ is simply literary-theoretical jargon for traditional literary criticism, which aims through careful reading of the work to ‘restore’ or make manifest the original intention the author had in mind in writing or – a slightly different emphasis – the meaning of the text in its own right as a self-sufficient literary entity. On this viewpoint, criticism is a humble servant to the text, aiming to illuminate the latter’s conscious meanings, and this is without a doubt an entirely valuable thing to do, a skill of close reading which it is always worth teaching and learning.

But a ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ does something quite different. It has absorbed the lessons of those great nineteenth-century masters of suspicion Marx, Nietzsche and Freud, and reads in a more aggressive and sceptical manner, looking for those odd little discrepant details where a literary work suddenly seems to say something other than its official or conscious meaning, where it begins to unravel itself in interesting ways. Marx, Nietzsche and Freud are anti-humanists, which is to say that they believe that human consciousness is not master in its own house, that we are determined by unconscious structures and motivations (economic, linguistic, sexual) which we can never fully bring to light. Perhaps this emphasis is the reason why Peter Faulkner in 1983 cautiously reported on the emergent theory movement at arm’s length rather than whole-heartedly embracing it; for the anti-humanism of it and its great intellectual forebears is at odds with Peter’s own stress on the humanistic dimensions of literature, as with his fine 1975 study of *Humanism in the Novel*.²

If all this sounds rather abstract, let us at once move to a specific Morrisian example. I imagine that most readers of this journal approach *News from Nowhere* in the spirit of a hermeneutics of restoration. They believe, that is to say, that in his utopia Morris set out to portray a plausible socialist revolution and the fully-developed communist society which follows from it, and that he succeeded admirably in both aims. Even if we have the odd reservation here or there (perhaps the women get a slightly raw deal in the Hammersmith Guest House, for example), we are likely to agree with A.L. Morton that ‘it is not only the one Utopia in whose possibility we can believe, but the one in which we could wish to live’.³ I am strongly inclined to believe this myself, but my early training in literary theory, in interpretative suspicion, also makes me fasten on that curious

moment where, as old Hammond expounds this happy and neighbourly new society to William Guest in the British Museum, he suddenly says, 'I am old and perhaps disappointed'.⁴ What are we to make of this curious statement, and how much weight should we give it in our overall approach to *News from Nowhere*?

Traditional Morris studies has 'dealt' with this statement for the most part by ignoring it, by pretending that it is not there, that old Hammond simply does not say it; I have found hardly any discussion of this remark in the long history of *News from Nowhere* reception, though it is of course possible that I have missed something important somewhere. Yet old Hammond is utopia's historian and conscience. Installed in the British Museum, he is its very memory and intellectual guardian, and therefore everything he says is necessarily important. Literary theory is sometimes accused by its traditionalist opponents of being abstract and high-handed in its approach to texts, of not bothering with the close, careful reading that criticism from I. A. Richards, F.R. Leavis and William Empson among others made so central to its activities. Yet in the particular case we are dealing with here, in which the 'hermeneutics of suspicion' is fastening on a phrase – 'old and perhaps disappointed' – which conventional Morris studies has hardly ever attended to, literary theory is reading more, not less, closely than traditionalist criticism.

Just what is old Hammond 'perhaps disappointed' about? We don't know – he doesn't elaborate. The remark is made in a chapter 'Concerning Love', so does it refer to his earlier emotional-sexual life? Well, perhaps. But we might also take it as a tiny hint that, in some as yet indeterminate sense, all may not be as well with the Morrisian utopia as we might like to think, that even its most articulate spokesperson has certain significant reservations about it.

Consider another remark of old Hammond's, from the later discussion of incentives to labour in communist society: 'how can you prevent the counter-revolution from setting in except by making people happy?' (pp.79–80). 'Counter-revolution': how can a term as politically dark as this one, with all its connotations of retributive reactionary violence, possibly come up in utopia, and above all from its most politically astute commentator? Again, as with old Hammond's 'perhaps disappointed', the interpretative question is what weight we should give to an unsettling term which traditional Morris studies has for the most part dealt with by ignoring altogether. Does Hammond really believe that counter-revolution is some sort of possibility in Nowhere, which does after all, as we know, have its share of old grumblers and Obstinate Refusers, and that it therefore requires some anticipatory thought? I would suggest that 'counter-revolution' is a startling term in the midst of Morris's sunny and neighbourly utopia; it shocks us nearly as much as his glimpse of the new Hammersmith Bridge shocks William Guest (though in reverse emotional direction) and sends us spluttering under the hermeneutic waters again.

Let us move on to an earlier statement of Hammond’s, which gives us a sense of his relation to the other Nowherians: ‘I don’t think my tales of the past interest them much. The last harvest, the last baby, the last knot of carving in the market-place is history enough for them’ (p.47). It is the tone of that final ‘for them’ which interests me here. Tone is always an important, and difficult, issue in literary interpretation; it is an oral category particularly tricky to ‘prove’ from a written text, and within mainstream *News from Nowhere* criticism we already have significant disputes in this area. For example, Perry Anderson disagrees with John Goode over the tonality of the opening description of the Socialist League meeting, and *News from Nowhere*’s most recent editor, David Leopold, is on Anderson’s side here.⁵ So is Hammond in our passage just neutrally recording the fact that his passion for history puts him at a tangent to the other Nowherians, in which case the word ‘them’ is not heavily stressed in this formulation? Or might we not, in the spirit of a hermeneutics of suspicion, let the darker tonalities of ‘disappointed’ and ‘counter-revolution’ play across his words here, so that the younger Nowherians’ lack of concern for history may be a genuine problem for him, even a sign of the shallowness of the lives they lead in Nowhere. In this case, ‘them’ takes on much more emphasis and even perhaps tones of contempt and dismissal, to the point where we might have to turn, for literary equivalents, to Tiresias scorning the typist and house-agent’s clerk in T.S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land*, or W.B. Yeats in ‘Sailing to Byzantium’, as he rages against the young who, ‘caught in that sensual music ... neglect monuments of unageing intellect’.⁶

So far I have been identifying moments of unease in *News from Nowhere*, tiny textual awkwardnesses which run against the grain of Morris’s genial utopian world; and you may feel that these examples are too minor to bear the interpretative weight I am beginning to put upon them (and yet they are undeniably there in the book, so if you disagree with my readings, how *do* you propose to deal with them?). Yet such tiny textual fragments surely come to more sustained focus in Ellen’s great warning to Nowhere later in the book, when, Cassandra-like, she remarks: ‘I think sometimes people are too careless of the history of the past ... Who knows? Happy as we are, times may alter; we may be bitten with some impulse towards change, and many things may seem too wonderful for us to resist, too exciting not to catch at, if we do not know that they are but phases of what has been before; and withal ruinous, deceitful, and sordid’. (p.167) Is not this old Hammond’s ‘counter-revolution’ writ large? His lonely worry in the British Museum about such dark matters is suddenly active out there in the wider world of Nowhere, and indeed in the mouth of one of its most energetic younger members; but at this point we pass over into a whole new series of questions about Ellen’s role in the book, and before I address that issue another theoretical detour may be in order.

Literary theory, then, takes us from ‘restoration’ to ‘suspicion’, interpreta-

tively speaking; and it also, and relatedly, involves us in a quite new conception of the literary or cultural text. When I was an undergraduate during the late 1970s, in a Leavisite Department of English Literature, we used to write many essays designed to demonstrate the 'unity' or even 'organic unity' of the literary works we were studying, the ways in which, as in Coleridge's famous image of the snake with its tail in its mouth, texts curl back upon themselves in an aesthetically satisfying internal harmony, all the local parts contributing benignly to the greater whole. Thus the Porter scene in *Macbeth*, in its drunken ribaldry, appears to run counter to the weighty issues of regicide at stake in the main body of the play, but a spot of judicious close analysis would demonstrate that, in its comic mode, it raises themes germane to *Macbeth* as a whole (damnation, etc) and thus the play is 'unified' after all.

However, literary and cultural theory, for a variety of detailed reasons I will not go into here, abandons this model of the organic unity of the text; and I wish to offer two startling formulations of the new model of the literary work which give, if not the detailed argumentation, at least a powerful *feel* of this new conception of the artwork. The first is from the French critic and theorist Roland Barthes, in his (in)famous essay on 'The Death of the Author':

We know now that a text consists not of a line of words, releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God), but of a multi-dimensional space in which are married and contested several writings, none of which is original: the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of culture ... criticism is today unsettled at the same time as the Author. In multiple writing, in effect, everything is to be *disentangled*, but nothing *deciphered*.⁷

And the second is from the American Marxist theorist Fredric Jameson, in his magisterial 1991 book on *Postmodernism*:

Our own recent criticism, from [Pierre] Macherey on, has been concerned to stress the heterogeneity and profound discontinuities of the work of art, no longer unified or organic, but now a virtual grab bag or lumber room of disjoined subsystems and random raw materials and impulses of all kinds. The former work of art, in other words, has now turned out to be a text, whose reading proceeds by differentiation rather than by unification.⁸

Now if literary texts are indeed radically self-divided in these ways, then, in turning back to *News from Nowhere* itself, we shall be inclined to see division where traditional Morris studies has seen integration; where it sees a 'well-knit' work (to borrow one of *News from Nowhere*'s own favourite adjectives), we shall be inclined to see different threads coming apart at the seams. Let us take three examples here: the genre of the work itself, the journey up the Thames and, finally, the figure of Ellen.

‘Some Chapters from a Utopian Romance’, as the title page of the book tells us: not just ‘utopia’ and not just ‘romance’, but some intriguing new generic hybrid of the two. Now traditional Morris studies takes the word for the deed here: it assumes that these two genres are successfully fused in *News from Nowhere* and proposes to go on and demonstrate this reconciliation in detail, rather as I did in my old undergraduate *Macbeth* essay. A literary theory-inspired approach, suspicious as ever, at once makes the other assumption: that these two genres will be pulling in opposite directions throughout the text, threatening to split it down the middle, with each one of the two tending to undo the characteristic strengths and qualities of the other; and it will then go on to show in detail how that is so. I’m not going to argue the latter case in detail here (I’ve offered a sketch of how the argument might go elsewhere), but am just using this example to dramatise the underlying interpretive stances involved.⁹

Let us take a more concrete case, the wonderful journey by rowing boat up the Thames to Kelmscott which, we can all agree, constitutes one of the most delightful aspects of Morris’s utopia. Instead of just admiring it, however, we need to ask some searching questions here: why does the text include, or to formulate the matter more actively, make such a journey? Again, there will be different perspectives on the upriver trip depending on your underlying model of the literary text. If you are committed to a model of organic unity, then you will see William Guest’s exploration of London and his subsequent river trip into Oxfordshire as benignly complementary: having seen how a communist utopia remakes urban existence, he will then want to see its new modes of rural living too; or, in Krishan Kumar’s terms, the ‘intellectual-urban’ London chapters are complemented by the ‘emotional-rural’ ones in which, through his developing relationship with Ellen, Guest finally comes to belong to the new society.¹⁰

From the viewpoint of a hermeneutics of suspicion, however, and with a model of literary texts as fractured and self-conflictual, we shall be inclined to see the upriver journey in quite different terms. It is, after all, one of the platitudes of utopian studies that during the nineteenth century a major shift takes place within the genre. In the classic texts, such as Thomas More’s *Utopia* or Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, utopia exists within one’s own time period but in some far-flung corner of the globe and it therefore takes an epic feat of spatial travelling to get there. From the nineteenth century, however, utopia becomes a future political possibility of one’s *own* society: it exists within one’s own social space, but not yet, and it therefore involves a feat of time-travelling to get to it, such as the dream-vision of Morris’s William Guest, which takes him forward from late-Victorian London to twenty-second-century England. Utopian journeying becomes a matter of time rather than space; and this makes sense in a fully historicised period in which utopia has become something one could politically *build* through a mass movement rather than just a hypothetical possibility one

might stumble across somewhere. Oneiric time travelling thus transports William Guest from the dysfunctional Socialist League meeting on the first page of *News from Nowhere* to the fully formed post-revolutionary society of the far future; and once there he briefly tours London with Dick Hammond in order to experience the new world at first hand. Subsequently in the British Museum he encounters old Hammond, who explains to him both the underlying social principles of the new order and how it came into being in the first place. So Morris's utopia seems to conform perfectly to the new model of the genre.

But no sooner has it done so than William Guest is, bafflingly, propelled on a major *spatial* journey: one hundred and thirty miles by rowing boat up the river Thames from the Hammersmith Guest House to Kelmscott Manor. This is clearly a reversion to a mode of utopian voyaging which history seemed to have left definitively behind, as if we were almost back in the world of the great sea voyages of More and Bacon themselves. What we witness here, then, on this showing, is a startling structural self-division in Morris's utopia – its reversion from a fully contemporary nineteenth-century utopian mode to an earlier and now anachronistic utopian form, and its generation, late in the day, of a startling new character in the process.

For as Guest travels up the river with Dick and Clara, he encounters at Runnymede the extraordinary figure of Ellen. If, as Oscar Wilde once asserted, any map of the world which does not contain the country of Utopia is not worth glancing at, then I think we can say equally firmly that any account of Morris's *News from Nowhere* which does not give substantial critical attention to Ellen will not be worth bothering with, because it will have ignored a crucial component of the text. With Ellen, as all *News from Nowhere* critics have acknowledged, a new energy – indeed, an unusual intensity – enters the work. That Morris registered this fact himself is shown by Bruce Glasier's entertaining anecdote: 'when he was writing that book I told him that I had fallen in love with Ellen, and he said that he had fallen in love with her himself!'¹¹ But the crucial question for us here is: is Ellen simply an organic continuation of the earlier sections of the text, is she consonant with the values which underpin *Nowhere*, even if she intensifies them; or is she, on the other hand, something fundamentally other in the book, a radical new start in a quite unpredictable direction? Traditionalist criticism will obviously plump for the former option and try to show how 'well-knit' she is with everything else in the book; literary theory-inspired readings will incline to the latter option.

Yet even within traditional Morris criticism, the occasional clairvoyant commentator has seen that Ellen is not simply an intensification of what has preceded her in Morris's utopia, but rather something quite different. Here, for example, is Tom Middlebro in 1970: 'the picture is not entirely a subjective dream of peace, as is shown by the figure of Ellen. She is a forecast of the next age, which will be more

vigorous, more intellectual, and more willing to absorb the best from the past; and both Guest and Ellen are in his view ‘misfits’.¹² And an even sharper formulation of Ellen’s relation to the rest of the text is given by Frederick Kirchoff in 1979: ‘Morris’s treatment of Ellen is not merely a new element in the book; it is a repudiation of the earlier chapters of his utopia’.¹³ That is finely said indeed, and it points us towards the literary-theory model of the radically self-divided text.

However, if we want to answer my question – is Ellen continuous with or a radical break from the rest of Morris’s utopia? – we don’t need to theorise in the void; for we do in fact have an answer from the text itself on this matter, when William Guest reflects that: ‘of all the persons I had seen in that world renewed she was the most unfamiliar to me, the most unlike what I could have thought of. Clara, for instance, beautiful and bright as she was, was not unlike a *very* pleasant and unaffected young lady; and the other girls also seemed nothing more than very much improved types which I had known in other times. But this girl ... was in all ways so strangely interesting; so that I kept wondering what she would say or do next to surprise and please me’. (p.157) At which point, with Ellen acknowledged as the radically other, we really are in the presence of the self-conflictual text which literary theory had modelled for us, and which we can sum up in *News from Nowhere* as:

Garden-city London (Dick, Bob, Clara, Annie) *versus* Upper Thames (Ellen).

But if Morris’s utopia is indeed self-divided in this way, then what theoretical models can we bring into play to make some sense of this internal self-conflict? There are many aesthetic binary oppositions, both traditional and literary-theoretical, which could be applied here, some of which I have developed myself elsewhere. If garden-city London is the beautiful, then Ellen may be its traditional and dangerous opposite, the sublime. If Morris’s London is a static utopia, then Ellen on the upper Thames may represent a ‘kinetic utopia’ (to borrow H.G. Wells’s useful term). If London is the ‘réactif’ or ‘lisible’, then Ellen would be the ‘actif’ or ‘scriptible’, to borrow pairs of opposites from that most inventive of theorists, Roland Barthes. Or if the new London is ‘utopia as representation’, then Ellen is utopia as process, productivity, enunciation (Fredric Jameson).¹⁴ This game can go on almost indefinitely, with as many binary oppositions as literary theory can afford (monological *vs* dialogical as in Mikhail Bakhtin, or symbolic *vs* semiotic as in Julia Kristeva). I do not intend to expound each of these binary oppositions here, but in all of them, as I hope you will have sensed, Ellen is seen as a disruptive force. So it may now be useful to try to give a feeling for the overall political argument about *News from Nowhere* to which they all, in their rather different ways, add up.

We have seen, in approaching Morris’s great work as suspicious rather than restorative readers, that old Hammond is ‘perhaps disappointed’, that he floats

the notion of counter-revolution and worries about the lack of awareness of history among his younger comrades; and Ellen summarises these minor discordant notes of this otherwise delightful utopia in her alarm that Nowhere is so immersed in immediate sensory pleasures that it may actually backslide towards capitalism. Then, in a second interpretative move, standing back from detail and examining Morris's text more globally, in the light of the postmodern theory of the text as fractured, we grasp the structural self-division of this work, comprising as it does the time-travelling utopia of garden-city London and the (anachronistic) space-travelling utopia of the Upper Thames and Ellen – the latter being radically discontinuous from all the other younger Nowherians in the book. At which point, it seems to me, an overall hypothesis as to the relationship of these two fragments of Morris's text to each other becomes possible.

Green, spacious and unhurried as it is, garden-city London and the kind of neighbourly young Nowherians it produces is infinitely to be preferred to the class-divided late-Victorian city from which William Guest himself hails, no doubt at all about that. To that extent, and in that particular framework of comparison, we must continue to defend it against its critics. But it is not, for all that, Morris's last word on the matter, his last word on utopia – which is precisely that on which there can be no last word. The new London is indeed, in the end, too placid and too pastoral, and its utopians too forgetfully immersed in the pleasurable present, to the point where there is at least some theoretical possibility of slip-page back to capitalism. At which point Morris's text, deeply frustrated by its own initial creation, shatters its unitary structure and breaks dynamically away from garden-city London, launching itself on the Thames journey and generating the uncategorisable figure of Ellen in the process. Ellen is a new kind of utopian, a harbinger of some new kind of utopia which the text can never flesh out – indeed, does not want to, because it too would then, like garden-city London, freeze into a static representation in its own right. Ellen is thus a perpetually transgressive energy, potentially 'disastrously troubling' the culture around her as she already has by her own admission troubled the young men in the Thames valley, (p.162) generating new narrative and political possibilities in the process; she is the place, in short, where the future – a future beyond Morris's own death – can enter his utopia, which thereby continues to resonate for us in the postmodern period in interesting ways.

In picking up the threads of Peter Faulkner's admirable essay, I have had the advantage over him of writing at the end of the literary theory revolution in English studies, whereas he was writing as it just got under way in the English academy during the early 1980s. I have tried, therefore, to give a broader feel of the overall ethos of literary and cultural theory during the last thirty years. However, it should not be thought that I have exhausted the field; for there are many interesting theoretical readings of *News from Nowhere* out there which adopt other

frameworks from those that have concerned me here (Wolfgang Iser’s theory of the ‘implied reader’ or Jacques Derrida’s ‘hauntology’, which would focus on William Guest as ghost, are examples here). And the recent ‘death of theory’ has certainly been much exaggerated, so that there will be many more such readings in the future from theoretical and political perspectives which do not yet exist; these too will merit reporting back on in non-specialist mode. Peter Faulkner’s 1983 essay on and around *News from Nowhere* is thus, like Ellen herself, open to the future in quite radical ways. It is, then, not just the intellectual content of Peter’s own work on Morris that is important to us, but the formats and models he has invented for such work now and in the future, as with the ‘*News from Nowhere* in Recent Criticism’ rubric, which is a task will need to be carried out over and over again.

NOTES

1. Peter Faulkner, ‘*News from Nowhere* in Recent Criticism’, *Journal of the William Morris Society*, V, No. 3, Summer 1983, pp. 2–7. For a helpful general survey of the field of literary theory, see Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory*, third edition, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009, 338 pp.
2. Peter Faulkner, *Humanism in the English Novel*, London: Elek for Pimlico, 1975, 196 pp.
3. A.L. Morton, *The English Utopia*, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1978, p. 221.
4. *News from Nowhere*, Oxford: World Classics, 2003, edited by David Leopold, p. 50 (afterwards Leopold, *NfN*). All future page references to this edition are incorporated in my text.
5. Perry Anderson, *Arguments within English Marxism*, London: Verso, 1980, p.170, footnote 30; Leopold, *NfN*, p.183.
6. T.S. Eliot, *Selected Poems*, London: Faber, 1982, pp.59–60; W.B. Yeats, *Selected Poetry*, edited by A. Norman Jeffares, London: Pan Books, 1990, p.104.
7. Roland Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986, pp. 52–53.
8. Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London: Verso, 1991, p. 31.
9. See my ‘The Dialectic of Nature in Nowhere’, *Journal of William Morris Studies* XIX, No. 3, Winter 2011, pp. 50–63.
10. See Krishan Kumar, ‘A Pilgrimage of Hope: William Morris’s Journey to Utopia’, *Utopian Studies*, 5, 1994, pp. 89–107.
11. Bruce Glasier, *William Morris and the Early Days of the Socialist Movement*, London: Longmans, Green, & Co, 1921, p.140.

12. Tom Middlebro, 'Brief Thoughts on *News from Nowhere*', *Journal of the William Morris Society*, II, No. 4, Summer 1970, pp. 9–10.
13. Frederick Kirchoff, *William Morris*, Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979, p.135.
14. For beautiful *vs* sublime, see my 'Dialectics of Nature in Nowhere', pp. 58–61 (Note 9 above). On kinetic utopias, see my 'Kinetic Utopias: H.G. Wells's *A Modern Utopia* and William Morris's *News from Nowhere*', *Journal of William Morris Studies*, XVI, Nos 2 and 3, Summer-Winter 2005, pp. 49–55. On *actif-réactif* and *lisible-scriptible*, see my blog post on 'Roland Barthes on Nowhere', 27 February 2012, at <http://williammorrisunbound.blogspot.com/>; and for the Jameson categories, see my 'William Morris, Fredric Jameson and the Question of Utopia', *Research in Marxist Aesthetics*, Shanghai, forthcoming 2013 (in Chinese).