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The latter part of 2017 saw two notable Morrisian exhibitions open, one on each side of the Atlantic. In Ohio, the Cleveland Museum of Art’s *William Morris: Designing an Earthly Paradise* opened in October, and will run until November 2018. There, visitors can see a number of Morris’s textiles, wallpapers and carpets, several volumes published by the Kelmscott Press, as well as an embroidery by May Morris on loan from the Cranbrook Art Museum. Other news from the United States brings only sadness, as readers will be sorry to learn of the passing of Jack Walsdorf, a former President of The William Morris Society in the United States and an avid collector of Morris’s books and other materials. I briefly met Jack at Kelmscott House during the Society’s AGM in 2016, and I was immediately struck by his warmth, his sense of fellowship and his capacity to extemporise in his introduction of the afternoon’s lecture – all qualities which I know will be much missed by his colleagues. I extend condolences to his family and friends. The obituary which follows was first published in *Useful and Beautiful*, the newsletter of The William Morris Society in the United States.

Across the great Atlantic, in Walthamstow’s William Morris Gallery, *May Morris: Art & Life* opened successfully during the same month of October, curated by Anna Mason and Rowan Bain. The exhibition was mounted in conjunction with the publication of two important new books: Lynn Hulse has edited *May Morris: Art & Life – New Perspectives*, published in association with the Gallery, whilst Thames & Hudson, in collaboration with the Victoria and Albert Museum, have published *May Morris: Arts & Crafts Designer*, with contributions from Anna Mason, Jenny Lister, Rowan Bain, Hanne Faurby and the Society’s President Jan Marsh. The exhibition and books will undoubtedly go some way towards recovering and securing May’s reputation as a designer, helping her posthumously to step out of her father’s shadow. Visitors to the exhibition will enjoy being able to see some fine examples of May’s art embroidery, including *Westward Ho!* (designed by May and worked by Jane during the early 1880s), May’s adaptation of *Minstrels with Cymbals* (c. 1880s), *Maids of Honour* (c. 1890s), *Orange Tree* (1897) and *The Heavens Declare* (1910). The selection of materials reveals the development of May’s own unique and distinctive style, honed in her early work as head of Morris and Co.’s embroidery department. On display in the exhibition, visitors can also see items including Morris’s *Vine* (embroidered by May and others in the form of a wall-hanging during 1916) and *Olive and Rose* (mounted in a fire screen). Other highlights include examples of May’s jewellery (two necklaces, a ring, sleeve clasps, a hair ornament, pendant and girdle), as well as some of her watercolours, early sketchbooks and a painting of Jenny and May by George Howard, based on sketches he made during their visit to Naworth Castle during 1870. The curators also give prominent
attention to May’s political involvement with the socialist movement.

I am pleased to be able to introduce an issue of the *Journal* which contains an illuminating scholarly article by Peter Faulkner on the relationship between Morris and the nineteenth-century dramatist Henry Arthur Jones, based on a talk that Peter delivered at Kelmscott House on 11 June 2016. Morris was no particular fan of the theatre, but he did undertake a number of commissions for productions of Jones’s plays. On the evidence presented here, this work seems to have kindled an attitude of veneration for Morris on the part of the younger man. Elsewhere in this issue, Wendolyn Weber offers a thoughtful exploration of Morris’s travels in Iceland, and Stephen Williams persuasively recovers the activist contribution of Robert Banner, an often overlooked member of Morris’s political network. I am also glad to publish the latest instalment of David and Sheila Latham’s biennial annotated bibliography.

Finally, I would like to take the opportunity to make a request that has been aired once or twice before in these pages. New subscriptions to the *Journal* are always welcome, and especially so from university or college libraries. If you are in a position to do so, please consider checking whether your institutional library receives the Society’s publications and, if it does not, contact the librarian to recommend a subscription. An institutional library can subscribe to the *Journal* by becoming a corporate member of the Society.

Owen Holland
Editor
Obituary
Jack Walsdorf (1941-2017)

The Walsdorf family

John ‘Jack’ Joseph Walsdorf, 76, formerly of St. Anna, died on Sunday, 9 July 2017, of a pulmonary embolism in Portland, Oregon. Born on 19 June 1941, the sixth child of Johanna (Wollner) and Dr. I. A. Walsdorf, Jack attended grade school in St. Anna, Wisconsin, and graduated from Kiel High School. As a fullback on the football team, he took lifelong pride in being named all-conference.

Jack had a passion for reading and his life evolved as a book lover’s journey. In 1964 he graduated from Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh, and then received his master’s degree in Library Science from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He began his career as a Reference Librarian at the Milwaukee Public Library. In 1966, through an exchange program, he went to the city of Oxford, England, working as a Lending Librarian. At the end of the exchange Jack got a job working for the bookseller Blackwell’s of Oxford. Jack worked for Blackwell’s for thirty-one years; his last position was Vice President of Academic Sales in America.

In 1989, the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Alumni Association named him Man of the Year. After leaving Blackwell’s, he worked for another bookseller, Albris (2003-2006), and travelled far and wide with his ‘Book Lover’s Road Show’. He also lectured about collecting books, private presses and printers, especially William Morris. Jack published a dozen books, as well as articles on both printing and collecting. A lifelong collector, Jack was addicted to the ‘joy of the hunt’ and acquired his own library, which at one time numbered over 7,000 books. In addition to the pleasure of reading, he loved the look and feel of
books as well as giving them to friends and acquaintances.

Jack shared his interests with both of his children and his partner of twenty-six years, Marylou Colver of Lake Oswego, Oregon.

He is survived by his daughter Quinn Walsdorf of Albuquerque, New Mexico, and granddaughters Emily and Alison Walsdorf of Portland, Oregon; brother William and sister-in-law Mary Walsdorf of Broomfield, Colorado; and sister Catherine (Molly) Meyer of Green Bay; sister-in-law Ruth Walsdorf of New Holstein; and former spouses Karen Sykes and Bonnie Allen. His parents; son John (JJ) Walsdorf; sister Marian Schmitz; brothers Jim and Tom Walsdorf; and brothers-in-law Tom Meyer and Joe Schmitz preceded him in death. We will miss his strong opinions as much as his gentle, ribbing humour.
In his biography, J.W. Mackail wrote of Morris and the theatre:

In the contemporary theatre and in the modern actor’s art Morris had not, and never affected to have, the slightest interest […] Since the days of his early enthusiasm for Robson and Kean he hardly ever had gone to a play, unless on some rare occasion when he took his children or was dragged off by a friend.²

This view has been generally accepted, with Morris’s *The Tables Turned; or, Nupkins Awakened* (1887) being described by Mackail as ‘the most singular’ – and, by implication, most uncharacteristic – ‘of all Morris’s literary adventures’.³ But in an article in the *Journal* in the Spring of 1998, that fine scholar Nicholas Salmon suggested that Morris’s attitude to the theatre was not as negative as it had been thought to have been. In addition to *The Tables Turned*, Salmon drew attention to Morris’s relationship with Henry Arthur Jones, for whose play *The Crusaders* Morris was employed to design the scenery during 1891.⁴ In this article I shall provide further information about Morris and Jones, which was not then available to Salmon.
The entry for Henry Arthur Jones (1851-1929) in Sir Paul Harvey’s *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* draws attention to his productiveness, stating that he ‘wrote in all some sixty plays, and also *The Renascence of the English Drama*, 1895, *Foundations of a National Drama*, 1913, and *The Theatre of Ideas, a Burlesque Allegory*, 1914’. The information about him on which the present article is based is largely derived from *Taking the Curtain Call: The Life and Letters of Henry Arthur Jones*, written by his daughter Doris Thorne and published in 1930, in which she makes use of Jones’s own autobiographical article ‘The Days of My Youth’. I have also consulted some scholarly works that are quoted later. As space is limited, and my focus here is on the relationship between the two men, specific plays are discussed only when they throw light on the relationship.

Henry Arthur Jones was born in a village in rural Buckinghamshire during 1851. His father was a farm labourer, usually working fifteen hours a day (p. 4), and his mother a rigorous Baptist. Henry was the eldest of five sons; he started school at the age of five and did well, but he had to leave at twelve to work for his uncle in a draper’s shop in Ramsgate, which he hated. Next he worked in a draper’s in Gravesend, where he ‘began his constant and life-long reading of Milton, his favourite poet’ (p. 9). He moved to London at the age of eighteen, where he worked in a warehouse but spent as much time as he could afford in reading and going to the theatre. Soon he was to meet a fellow worker of his own age with whom he had ‘a discussion about logarithms’. This was a remarkable man well known to Morrisians, Emery Walker:

> This discussion [about logarithms] was the beginning of a remarkable lifelong friendship, which, starting in early manhood, grew stronger with the passing years and definitely enriched and influenced for good all my father’s life. He had ‘a genius for friendship’ and was deeply attached to a good many people throughout his long life; but the hold Sir Emery Walker had on his affections was unique. It was through him that H.A.J. knew William Morris and his friends; and Morris and Walker guided and influenced him in his love for, and his purchase of, many beautiful things.

(p. 13)

Doris records that she once asked George Bernard Shaw whether he remembered when he had first met her father. Shaw replied: “I never remember the time when we weren’t the best of friends”; and he went on to say he supposed they first met at Emery Walker’s (p. 187). A tight group of friends was forming, and would endure.

In London, Jones met and fell in love with Jane Eliza Seely. They became engaged, but had too little money to marry. Henry therefore applied for a better-paid job, and
obtained it despite his youth. It was as a commercial traveller for the West of England branch of Rennie Tetley, textile manufacturers. He worked hard and did well at his demanding job, while keeping up his reading and developing an enthusiasm for the theatre. Evidently a serious young man, he sought to understand Herbert Spencer’s system of philosophy – ‘a hard nut to crack’, allowing himself to read Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats in ‘my lighter hours’ (p. 16). And he asked Walker to look out for him the Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights, from Marlowe to Beaumont and Fletcher (p. 17). By 1875 Jones was making enough money to marry; Emery Walker was best man at the wedding in Holborn (p. 21). As Jones’s commercial territory was still the West of England, the couple took as their first home The Hermitage, in Exwick, a suburb of Exeter. So it was at the Theatre Royal in Exeter that Jones saw the first performances of his work, which he subsidised: the one-act It’s Only Round the Corner was produced on 11 December 1878, and Hearts of Oak, a domestic drama in two acts, during June 1879.

Jones took the risk of leaving his job as a commercial traveller early during 1879 to devote himself to writing for the stage, and the family moved from Exwick to Hampton Wick. His London career began during October 1879, but progress was slow until the autumn of 1882, when things changed dramatically. Doris proudly puts it as follows: ‘with the production of The Silver King, on 16th November, he leapt into the front rank of British dramatists, a position he was to hold unchallenged for the rest of his life’ (p. 37). In this context we find the first cross reference to Morris, in a letter Morris sent to Jenny from Merton Abbey on 5 November 1883:

All well here: the place quite busy: another order for a carpet. I am reckoning on doing a good evening’s work as Mother & May are going out on the spree: Silver King with the De. M[organ]s.7

No spree for the workaholic Morris.

The success of The Silver King, a melodrama about a man wrongly accused of murder, placed Jones on a firm financial basis for the rest of his life. He began to publish articles and to give lectures on the importance of drama, arguing that it ought to be valued as the equal of painting, music and literature; he disliked the theatre being regarded as merely a place of entertainment. We might see this argument as comparable to that of Ruskin, followed by Morris, to the effect that craft should be seen as of equal value to fine art. Jones attempted to give his plays more realism and depth by introducing social issues and employing satire, in a lengthy career that included among other plays Saints and Sinners (1884), Wealth (1890), The Middleman (1889), Judah (1890), The Dancing Girl (1891), The Crusaders (1891), The Case of Rebellious
Susan (1894), Michael and his Lost Angel (1896), The Liars (1897), Mrs. Dane's Defence (1900) and The Lie (1914). The mixture of elements in Jones’s plays is often uneasy. The critic Kerry Powell remarks that ‘Jones’s later work was less obviously melodramatic than The Silver King, but never eradicated its influence’. His later plays were ‘fashionable society dramas that dealt with controversial subjects in a tentative manner’. Because of this, Jones has been little considered or performed during the last hundred years.

Jones moved to Hill House, Chalfont St. Peter, in 1884, and then to Townshend House, Regent’s Park, in 1887, where he spent fourteen happy and largely successful years. Townshend House had been the home of the painter Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836-1912) who, Doris tells us, ‘had painted several parts of the house’, including ‘[the] inscription “Where friends meet hearts warm”’ in her mother’s boudoir, and ‘a magnificent painted ceiling in [her] father’s study’ (p. 77). It was around this time that Jones came to know Morris. Doris writes (unfortunately without giving a date):

My father introduced himself to Morris at Earl’s Court station, soon after Emery Walker had pointed him out to H.A.J; they travelled together in the same carriage as far as Hammersmith, discussing Socialism vigorously the whole way.

(p. 92)

As we do not know what Jones’s political views were at the time, we can only speculate as to the form the conversation took. Doris only tells us that her father once said to her that ‘Morris was a fourteenth-century workman who fell into the nineteenth century by mistake’, and that he often quoted Morris’s well-known – unpolitical – dictum: ‘[h]ave nothing in your house you do not know to be useful or believe to be beautiful’ (p. 93).

There is no reference to Morris’s venture into drama, The Tables Turned, first performed on 15 October 1887, but a relationship between Jones and Morris was maintained. On 17 October 1888 Morris wrote to Jenny in a lively fashion: ‘I suppose May told you how we went to hear Mr. H.A. Jones read his play? I really got rather interested in it before it was over.’ Jones was evidently a powerful reader; Doris recalls that her father often said that Sir George Alexander, the actor-manager, ‘would never allow him [Jones] to read a play, because he said he would then be certain to think the play a good one, as H.A.J. read all his plays magnificently’ (p. 124). In this context, it is notable that Morris admits that even he ‘got rather interested’ in the reading. Norman Kelvin suggests that the play Jones might have invited Morris and May to attend his reading of was The Middleman, which was produced during 1889. It
concerned a skilled pottery-maker seeking to discover ‘the secret of the old method of glazing’ and succeeding at the last minute (p. 81). The critic Guy Willoughby considers it ‘arguably the first indigenous “problem play” on the British stage’, quoting Jones’s own description of it as showing a ‘fight between grasping commercialism and creative genius’.10 Perhaps Kelvin thought that this related to the contemporary Arts and Crafts movement. Morris’s view of the decoration of Townshend House was markedly different from that of the Joneses; he remarked in his letter cited above, that Jones ‘lives in Tadema’s old house, & there are scraps of the Tadamesque decoration left about the place: I don’t admire them: they appear to me too much made up of goose giblets and umbrellas’. Kelvin does not comment on this odd but surely dismissive phrase.

In April 1889 Jones’s Wealth was produced at the Haymarket. The Athenæum for 4 May recorded, surprisingly:

Among those present was Mr. William Morris, an unusual guest on such occasions, but lured, possibly, by the knowledge that one of the characters was a representative of a mild form of Socialism. With him was his daughter, bearing a striking resemblance to her mother, and recalling numerous pictures of Rossetti.11

Wealth concerns an iron-master, Matthew Ruddock, who wants his daughter Edith to marry his favourite (and ruthless) nephew John, who will inherit the business. But Edith loves Paul Davoren, described by Doris as ‘a rival iron-master’, who is a political radical. When Edith refuses to marry John, Matthew dismisses her from his home, and he is eventually driven to madness by the unscrupulous John. Harmony is restored when the determined Edith marries Paul and is reconciled to her father on his deathbed, and he leaves the business to Edith and Paul. The emphasis is on love rather than politics, as can be seen from Doris’s summary of the ending: ‘Edith, happily married, returns to her dying father, who in a last short lucid interval blesses her and her husband, leaving them his property’ (p. 78). This is Doris’s account. The play is described very differently, in the same year, by Harley Granville-Barker, in an article on “The Coming of Ibsen”.12 Granville-Barker recalls that Wealth had received a poor review in The Saturday Review in 1889, which said that it lacked a plot. But Granville-Barker, a more political person than Doris, saw ‘the real trouble’ with the play as having been in the subject matter: ‘Capital and Labour, and Labour demanding its rights’.13 The hostile reviewer had argued that political discussions ‘are very much out of place on the stage, for audiences are not composed of Conybeares, Cunninghame Grahams and William Morrises’, all men of the left. Granville-Barker
adds: ‘[n]o indeed, audiences were not, and are not; one wishes to heaven they were!’14 In his view the politics of the play amounted only to ‘a little mild advocacy of profit-sharing’, but we should remember that ‘the Trafalgar Square riots were not three years old’, and therefore give Jones credit for his courage in tackling the issue of Capital and Labour. Here we find ideas that might well have been discussed with Morris making a prominent appearance in a play by Jones. But although the play was produced successfully in New York and in several European cites, it did not do well in London and was not published.

In *Commonweal* for 13 July 1889, Henry Halliday Sparling’s ‘Notes on News’ contained the observation:

Two announcements which were made last week are among the cheering ‘straws’ that show which way the social ‘wind’ is blowing. Ibsen’s ‘Pillars of Society’, literally translated by Mr. Wm. Archer, is to be performed at the Gaiety Theatre on Tuesday, July 16, and the promoters of the undertaking are most anxious to make it known that there will be no tampering with the text. A new play by Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, called ‘The Middleman’, will be put on the stage in the autumn by Mr. E.S. Willard at the Shaftesbury. It is said to be a study of contemporary life on similar lines to those of the same writer’s striking production ‘Wealth’, now running at the Haymarket. Not world-shaking events in themselves, but how much they mean!15

Sparling is happy to place Jones with Ibsen in the encouraging development of a progressive strain in contemporary drama.

On an unpolitical level, Jones had a great success in 1891 with *The Dancing Girl*, a melodrama in which a lascivious aristocrat seduces a Quaker girl, Drusilla, who becomes a dancer in America, and dies after appearing in public on a Sunday. Kerry Powell argues in his *Oscar Wilde and the Theatre of the 1890s* (1990) that the play had a significant influence on Wilde’s *A Woman of No Importance*. He argues that in plays of this kind, which deal with ‘fallen women’, the woman always pays in the end, though the men usually pay too. He shows that these themes were popular at the time, as shown also in Pinero’s *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray* in 1893. According to Powell, both Wilde and Pinero ‘create women with a past who command more strength, and engage more sympathy, than was ordinarily the case, but neither successfully disentangles his heroine from the melodramatic web spun by the likes of Jones’.16

In 1891 Jones came closer to Morris when he took the bold decision to rent a London theatre in which he could manage and produce one of his own plays. Perhaps surprisingly, he chose *The Crusaders: An Original Comedy of Modern London Life*, a satire
on reformers. One wonders what Morris might have made of it, if he did indeed read the play. In it, the London Reformation League aims to make London pure and sweet and clean. The fiery idealists of the group are Philos Ingarfield and Una Dell. Ingarfield is described as a ‘new variety of inspired idiot. Something between an angel, a fool, and a poet. And atrociously in earnest. A sort of Shelley from Peckham Rye!’ One thing that the League does is to take ‘five hundred poor seamstresses out of the worst sweating shops in the East End’, and set them to growing roses on a rose-farm near Wimbledon Common. Meanwhile, Ingarfield conducts a party of men described as ‘ne’er-do-wells’ to Costa Rica to give them a new start in life. But all these idealistic schemes come to nothing. The aristocratic people of Wimbledon do not like the presence of so many vulgar girls from the slums, and the ne’er-do-wells start rioting and plundering in Costa Rica. The government of that country demands big damages from England. The cynical Lord Burnham sums the situation up by saying: ‘[s]o the net result of our reforming London is a revolution in South America and two pence on the income tax’. The play ends, all too characteristically of Jones, with Una reiterating the ideals of the Society and appealing to Philos to act to implement them. He seems about to do so when the glamorous Cynthia Greenslade, in whose Mayfair drawing room the play had begun, kisses him on the forehead. He asks ‘[c]an’t you love me?’, to which she replies: ‘[y]ou saved me! Do with me as you please!’, while dropping at his feet. The final stage direction reads: ‘UNA looks at them, then goes off hopelessly at door at back’. The play was published with an interesting Preface by William Archer, who related the play to other recent publications, remarking: ‘Mr. Jones, like the authors of Looking Backward and News from Nowhere [published respectively in 1887 and 1890], fantasticates on the future, though his future may be conceived as somewhat nearer than Mr. Bellamy’s or Mr. Morris’s millennium’. Doris tells us that her father had spent a year writing the play and had faith in it, and ‘he determined to spare no expense over the production and mounting’. She then reveals that ‘[h]e gave William Morris carte blanche to design and make the furniture’ (p. 92). In the preface to The Theatre of Ideas (1915), Jones made an even stronger claim: ‘I gave William Morris carte blanche for the scenery and furniture, and he advised me on the whole production’. We can only wonder what that advice might have been. We see an indication of this cooperation in a letter to Morris on 8 July 1891 which runs:

Dear Mr. Morris
Can I see you for a few minutes on Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning?
I’ll call on you at Oxford Street or Hammersmith?
I want to consult you about the decoration of a stage scene.
I hope you have quite recovered from your gout.

Very faithfully yours
Henry Arthur Jones

The letter is businesslike but friendly; it seems likely that there were more letters of
the kind at the time, but they have not been found.

The Pall Mall Gazette for 5 October 1891 gave an interesting account of what it
termed ‘MR H.A. JONES’S NEW PLAY’:

The title Mr. Henry Arthur Jones has chosen for his new play now in rehearsal
at the Avenue is ‘The Crusaders’. It deals with modern social London life, and
is less melodramatic in character than any of the author’s previous
productions. ‘The Crusaders’ will be in three acts. The first takes place in a
drawing room in Mayfair, the second, outdoors, at Wimbledon; the third,
indoors, at Wimbledon. The furniture has been designed by William Morris,
and will (of course) be a poem in itself. So will the wall-paper. The Referee
reports that Mr. Jones’s preliminary outlay thereby meaning all expenses
incurred prior to the first night – will exceed £3,000.

On 9 February 1890 (the year is unconfirmed – could it not be 1891?), Morris wrote
to George Jack, who had taken over from Webb as Morris and Co.’s chief furniture
designer: ‘I looked at your design for the sideboard & liked it very much’. Kelvin
suggests that this sideboard was probably the one made for The Crusaders. This is
confirmed by Amy Gaimster in her book on Jack, in which she illustrates what she
terms an ‘inlaid mahogany cabinet’ designed 1890-91, which ‘formed part of the
furniture made especially for Henry Arthur Jones’s play The Crusaders’. She quotes
from the programme: ‘[t]he furniture and draperies have been made by Messrs.
William Morris and Company, 449, Oxford Street’, which was followed by a request:
‘[t]he indulgence of the audience is asked on the first night between the acts as the
stage is small and the scenery rather elaborate’. Gaimster notes that ‘[t]he inlaid floral
patterns are particularly bold, perhaps so that the striking contrasts would be easily
seen by the play’s audience’. Unfortunately for Jones, The Crusaders was not a success,
being booed on its first night, 2 November 1891, and Jones lost some £4,000 in the
venture. Morrisians may be pleased to learn that ‘[a]ll the papers praised the scenery
and the mounting, but their criticisms of the play were in most cases severe’ (p. 95).
There is no evidence as to why Morris took on the commission, but, apart from
knowing Jones personally, he seldom rejected potential work for the Company.
In her remarks on the furniture for the play, Doris wrote, ‘I think he was prouder of his William Morris room than of any other of his beautiful possessions: it was exhibited at the Ideal Home Exhibition at Olympia in 1929’ (p. 92). She also remarks that ‘the tapestry and inlaid screen’ designed for *The Crusaders* were exhibited at the Louvre in 1914 (p. 92). From this it sounds as if Jones bought many or all of the furnishings from one part of the play, probably the first act, and took them into his own home to create a Morris room, items from which were later shown in important exhibitions. In her *William Morris Textiles*, Linda Parry states that ‘Persian Brocatel’, designed by John Henry Dearle around 1890 and first used at Stanmore Hall, the home of the wealthy William Knox D’Arcy, during that year, was used in the production.27 Gaimster tells us that the cabinet was donated to the Victoria and Albert Museum by Doris, in memory of her father, in June 1929; it can still be seen there. Gaimster confirms that it was exhibited at the exhibition of British and Irish Decorative Arts at the Louvre in 1914, and at Olympia in 1929.28 She tells us that Jones kept in the cabinet his manuscripts and Kelmscott Press books; the latter must have been bought later in the nineties, as the Press only began publishing during April 1891.29 Jones was clearly a great admirer of Morris’s work in various forms.

After Morris and Co.’s work on *The Crusaders* in 1891, the next recorded contact between Jones and Morris occurred on 19 March 1894, when Morris wrote from Kelmscott House to Jones at the Garrick Club:

> Dear Mr. Jones
> I am going to the country tomorrow, and shall be away until the 1st April. So I shall not be able to come, for which I am sorry. Thank you for asking me.

I have so far been unable to identify the occasion to which this invitation refers. A month later, 23 April 1894, Morris wrote to Jones from Kelmscott House to decline an invitation to attend the first night of *The Masqueraders* at the St. James’s Theatre. The reason Morris gave for turning down Jones’s invitation was that ‘I cannot come out on a Saturday; though I am not an Israelite it is a kind of sacred day to me. I wish you all manner of success for your new play.’31 Kelvin remarks in his editorial note:

> Morris’s reply may reflect his apathy towards the theater in general or may mean simply that he customarily was at work on designs on a Saturday evening. Whatever the reason, the implied indifference to a new play by Jones contrasts with the latter’s enthusiasm for Morris and his work.”32
This is certainly true. Doris refers to the letter quoted above (p. 93), observing that it was ‘among many letters to my father [from Morris]’, although no others are quoted. It would be good to think that such letters might yet be discovered. *The Masqueraders*, whose hero is, in Doris’s words, ‘a high-minded, hopelessly unworldly astronomer’ (p. 129), struck Shaw as unreasonably negative in its view of human nature, as he told Jones:

> how frightfully pessimistic your play is! Hang it all, Regent’s Park, with all its drawbacks, is better than Andromeda. Why don’t you chuck up these idiotic moral systems according to which human nature comes out base and filthy? It’s the systems that are wrong and not we. I believe in the good old Molière-Labiche-Sheridan line; they would have been very well contented with myself and Walker and Morris and the rest of us, and not have sighed for any Andromeda.

(p. 127)

Shaw sees Socialists like Morris and Walker and himself as optimists about the future of society, who do not need to resort to astronomical fantasy.

In connection with the theatre, both Salmon and Kelvin mention that, in addition to their work for *The Crusaders*, Morris and Co. also provided stage sets for *The Case of Rebellious Susan*, which opened during October 1894. I have found no evidence for this. While the title of this play might make one think of radical politics, the play itself could not be further away from radicalism. Susan is the neglected wife of an adulterous husband, a strong-minded young woman who contemplates taking revenge by having an affair herself. Willoughby observes something typical of Jones in the conclusion: ‘she is deterred from this unusually bold move by a fear of social rather than moral consequence, as outlined for her by a typically prudent Jonesian raisonneur, Sir Richard Kato’.33

In cultural politics, Jones could be liberal: in 1892 he participated in the movement for the Sunday opening of museums (p. 96), and in 1898 he advocated the creation of a National Theatre (p. 168). Doris quotes his 1893 article ‘Middleman and Parasites’, in the June number of the *New Review*, which ‘made a vigorous attack on the middleman system, whereby thousands of men made a living through the ignorance, carelessness and folly of their fellow-creatures’, its tone expressing sympathy with ‘the lower classes’ (p. 99). Jones applauded the call of John Burns for the establishment of a Department of Labour and the Fine Arts, even arguing that Labour should come first, ‘because it is more necessary for us to have wholesome bread and well-built houses and good clothes than good pictures and plays. Yes, put
Labour first’ (p. 100). In fact, however, the Ministry of Labour was not established until 1916. But in national politics Jones’s views became increasingly conservative. His daughter gives the following account:

As a young man, under the influence of Emery Walker and William Morris, my father flirted with Socialism, but from the Great War onwards he became an uncompromising Die-Hard. He often quoted Swinburne, who said to him, ‘When Topsy (Morris’s nickname) was at Oxford, he was the bluest of blue Tories. You always know when a man talks one sort of nonsense when he’s twenty, he’ll be talking the other kind when he’s forty.’ In his Notes he says, ‘He could work but he could not think. What a splendid worker was Morris! But he thought that he could think. That is the great evil of democracy. It teaches men to think that they can think. And upon this quite unproven hypothesis it entrusts them with votes.’

(p. 100)

It is not clear whether Swinburne ever made the remark attributed to him, or when, or whether the words quoted from Jones’s Notes are those of Swinburne or Jones, but at all events that are surprisingly hostile to Morris. Jones could be remarkably inconsistent.

For his admiration for Morris’s craftsmanship persisted. In 1896 he bought a copy of the Morris and Co. tapestry of Botticelli’s *Primavera*, which had been woven for Wilfrid Scawen Blunt earlier during the year. When Morris paid his last visit to Blunt at Newbuildings at the end of May 1896, he saw the tapestry in the drawing room. According to Blunt’s Diaries, quoted by Kelvin, the tapestry was ‘very decorative and brilliant in the drawing-room’, and Morris said that ‘it turned out better than he expected’. Parry tells us that the second version, purchased by Jones, ‘was woven with a more decorative border of fruit and flowers than the plain winding leaf design of the Blunt original’. Aymer Vallance recorded that Blunt’s tapestry was exhibited at the Arts and Crafts Exhibition in 1896, and Jones may have seen it there; I know of no evidence that Blunt and Jones were acquainted.

*The Liars*, which Doris considered her father’s ‘greatest play’ (p. 152), opened on 6 October 1896 at the Criterion, and ran for 291 nights; it was also performed in New York and Melbourne. The play is a comedy of high society, containing the line ‘I may be an ass, but I’m not a silly ass’ (p. 155). A rumour apparently circulated at the time that the play had been written by Oscar Wilde, and that Jones had put his name to it to avoid scandal. As we are told that Jones knew and did not like Wilde, the rumour may have been disturbing to him. But apparently he enjoyed quoting
Wilde’s three rules for writing plays: ‘[t]he first rule is not to write like Henry Arthur
Jones, the second and third are the same!’ (p. 156).  
Kerry Powell notes that The Liars was one of several plays by Jones whose heroes ‘almost wreck their careers in public
life by becoming involved in illicit love-affairs, but recognize before it is too late what
Jones calls the “tow-path of duty”’. The final outcome can be relied upon to take
us back to convention.

Morris died in 1896, but he was not forgotten by Jones. For Christmas 1902 he
gave his daughter a copy of Morris’s Architecture, Industry and Wealth with the inscription:

MY DEAR DORIS,

This was the greatest man I have met in my life.

Your loving

DADDY.

(p. 92)

Apparently ‘he always said that the three greatest men he had ever known were
William Morris, Hiram Maxim, and Veniselos, and he never altered his opinion’ (p.
92). Whether Morris would have appreciated being classed with the inventor of the
Maxim gun is unlikely, but he might well have liked the company of the leader of the
Greek national liberation movement at the end of the nineteenth century. Architecture,
Industry and Wealth: Collected Papers was published in 1902 in an attractive typographical
format. It contains eleven important lectures on the topics indicated by the title, from ‘The History of Pattern-Designing’ in 1882 to ‘The Influence of Building Materials upon Architecture’ in 1892. It is hard to see how the Jones who gave this book to his daughter could have believed that Morris was a ‘splendid worker’ who
could not think.

Jones visited America on business in 1905 and the three following years, visits that
‘consolidated and strengthened many of his friendships and increased his enduring
love and admiration for America and the American people’ (p. 194). He knew
Professor George P. Baker and admired his work in making drama a significant part
of the literary curriculum at Harvard. Jones gave a lecture there on ‘The Cornerstone
of Modern Drama’, and wrote to Baker on 26 October 1906 to congratulate him on
his achievement, and to send him a very valuable gift, described by Doris as ‘his
greatest treasure, a vellum-bound copy of the Kelmscott Chaucer’ (p. 199). Jones
praised the book, and Morris, at considerable length:

I may, perhaps, say a word about the book itself. It is the loving handwork of
the greatest man whom I have ever known. It may be claimed for William
Morris that his reputation would be a high and honourable one if it rested upon any one of his achievements; upon his poetry alone; his tales and essays alone; his dyeing alone; his weaving alone; his printing alone. In every one of these arts he accomplished the good and faithful work of an ordinary lifetime. He abides with us as a living witness to the essential unity of art; he continually affirms that, like the other two great realities, like Religion, like Love, it is something that must be bought without money and without price. For this beautiful volume brought him no profit, and left him with no payment for all his labour and all his lovely designs. The main idea of his later years was a hatred of the base commercialism which has degraded the ordinary workman from an artist into a machine, and has cheapened and demoralised and disfigured the whole fabric of modern civilisation. But his hatred was not sullen or stagnant; it accompanied an active, ceaseless search for a social lever that could again raise the workman into an artist, and thereby bring taste and dignity and simplicity and beauty into ordinary everyday homes. With the hope that the spirit in which William Morris printed this volume may guide the nascent art of America, and with renewed assurances of gratitude and friendship towards yourself,

I am, dear Professor Baker,
Always faithfully yours,
HENRY ARTHUR JONES.

(pp. 199-200)

This seems to me an eloquent and intelligent tribute to Morris, although pedants among us may wonder whether anything can be ‘bought’ without money and without price’. Morris had died some ten years earlier but was evidently still very much in Jones’s mind. Whether American artists would subsequently work in the spirit that Jones attributes to Morris might make a good topic for debate.

As we have seen, Doris attributed her father’s most reactionary views to the period ‘from the Great War onwards’, so that ‘at the end of his life it was only rarely that one could wring from him a grudging and superficial acknowledgement of the wrongs or disabilities of working men’ (p. 99). The ultra-patriotic Jones devoted much of his energy during and after the war years to attacking, in the strongest possible terms, those who did not share his outlook, in particular two of his former friends, H.G. Wells and Bernard Shaw. Both angered him by refusing to enter into controversy. In Patriotism and Popular Education (1919) Jones directly attacked Wells’s politics and advanced the argument that the education of working-class children, who constituted eighty per cent of the population, should be strictly vocational, because ‘popular
education was one of the main sources of unrest in the working class’ (p. 263).

The book is addressed to H.A.L. Fisher, the President of the Board of Education, and Jones was congratulated on it by Rudyard Kipling and, more surprisingly, by R.B. Cunninghame Graham, the Radical M.P. and former comrade of Morris, who had been beaten and arrested on Bloody Sunday, 13 November 1887, and sent to prison for six weeks. In his letter, he told Jones: ‘[y]our ideas are practically the same as those of poor old Morris, at whose feet I brought myself up, politically’ (p. 264). It is not easy to see how he came to this conclusion; perhaps he was referring to Morris’s dismissal of formal academic education as limited and limiting. In Chapter 24 of News from Nowhere the travellers row past Eton, and Dick tells Guest that it had once been ‘a great college or teaching place’ intended for poor men’s sons, but had become a place where the rich could ‘get rid of the company of their male children for a great part of the year’.42 He explains that ‘we cannot use it quite as the founder intended, since our ideas about teaching young people are so changed from the ideas of his time; so it is used now as a dwelling for people engaged in learning; and folk from roundabout come and get taught things that they want to learn; and there is a great library there of the best books’. He adds: ‘[t]here are often plenty of boys there, who come to get taught; and also […] to learn boating and swimming’.43 (Modern readers will regret the limitation to boys). The suggestion is of a liberal and holistic kind of education, recalling the early days of progressive schools like Dartington. For the thoroughly democratic Morris there could be no question of different forms of education for different social groups. He never moved away from the ideal he expressed in ‘The Lesser Arts’ in 1878: ‘I do not want art for a few, any more than education for a few, or freedom for a few’.44 His commitment was to the Society of Equals.

In his letter, Cunninghame Graham recalls that as a young man he had been a Socialist, largely owing to Morris. He goes on: ‘I had hoped in Socialism to find a gradual demise of selfishness and the gradual establishment of better feeling between man and man’ (p. 265). He then offers a disillusioned commentary in terms that would have appealed to Jones:

You will admit, I think, that my ambition was not a low ambition. That I was deceived, and that all the golden dreams of Morris have vanished in the nine bestial and inartistic years of the reign of King Edward, the War, and now in the increasing inartisticness of everything, the prostitution of the stage and literature, and now in the ever-increasing selfishness and lack of patriotism of the working classes, have not been my fault. The ambition (I think) remains all right. Poor, dear old Morris! Take him for all in all […]!'
But a slightly different note emerges at the end, as Cunninghame Graham recalls all the uncomfortable travelling he has done recently during the war, including being ‘with the skipper on the bridge looking out for torpedoes, I have thought – where are the dreams of Morris? But on arriving at port, or at the camp, they have come back; they always do. Let us, I say cherish them … Vale’ (p. 266).

In 1921 Jones continued his polemics with My Dear Wells: A Manual for the Haters of England, and then turned his attention to Shaw, spending some three years writing what he intended to be a book called Bernard Shaw as a Thinker. He failed to complete the book, but published the first six chapters in the English Review in 1923, and three others as a book entitled What is Capital? in 1925. Quite what entitled Jones to see himself as someone who could outthink Wells and Shaw is far from obvious, but he was not a self-doubter. The congratulatory letters he received for his attacks on Wells and Shaw show clearly how sharply divided English political culture was at the time (pp. 282 ff).

But friendships were always very important to Jones, and amid his physical sufferings during the late 1920s, Dorothy tells us, ‘[h]e was uneasy unless he saw Sir Emery Walker regularly; I love to remember their welcome to each other and how, when Sir Emery was going to dine with us, as soon as the door-bell rang H.A.J. would struggle out of his armchair to meet his friend with outstretched hand’ (p. 326). (The outstretched hand is shown in several caricatures of Jones by Max Beerbohm, with whom he was on good terms). Walker was a pall-bearer at Jones’s funeral on 10 January 1929. Sir James Barrie, Rudyard Kipling and Sir Arthur Pinero were also invited to be pall-bearers, but were prevented by illness from attending the funeral. Doris remarks movingly: ‘[m]y deepest sympathies were with dear Sir Emery Walker, who in acting as a pall-bearer paid a last tribute of love and admiration to a close and unbroken sixty years’ friendship’ (p. 356). It was Walker, as we have seen, who brought Morris and Jones into a real if somewhat one-sided relationship. It is fitting that the Emery Walker Library at Cheltenham contains twelve books and plays by Jones, together with a number of other publications, including the Order of Service from Jones’s funeral.45
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Iceland occupies a peculiarly important place in the life and work of William Morris. The land, its history and culture are compelling to him, first in his literary dreams, then in his actual experience, and finally in his enduring memories, translated into his later work. Morris’s long-running reverence for the medieval is most overtly expressed in his translations of Old Norse poetry and sagas. It appears in the medieval settings of his original poetry and prose romances, but it also informed much of his creative production and his ideas for a reformed modern society. Morris’s journeys to Iceland during 1871 and 1873 and his recorded account of them stand at an important moment in his personal life, in his development as a writer and activist, and in the confirmation of his aesthetic identity. Morris himself considered the first journey a transformative experience; his journal reveals, however, the complexity of the process.

Many scholars and biographers have argued the importance of Iceland in Morris’s development as both an author and an activist. As E.P. Thompson has put it, stressing the medieval aspect of Morris’s engagement with Iceland, ‘[h]e drew strength […] from the energies and aspirations of a poor people in a barren northern island in the twelfth century. There can be few more striking examples of the regenerative resources of culture than this renewal of courage and faith in humanity which was blown from Iceland to William Morris, across eight hundred years of time.’¹ Yet Gary Aho has argued, on the other hand, that ‘[s]uch statements [as Thompson’s, above] are extravagant’, that Iceland’s importance has been overestimated and the precise nature of its influence on Morris, particularly in social terms, misunderstood, owing to his biographers’ ‘attempts to push Morris’s interests and achievements into coherent patterns’.² Aho sees in Morris’s Iceland experience, as conveyed through the journals and seen in his translations and treatments of Icelandic literature, an intriguing lack of coherence. Drawing from Raymond
Williams’s suggestion that ‘the prose and verse romances […] seem so clearly the product of a fragmented consciousness’, Aho emphasises the moments of disjunction and dislocation created by Morris’s stylistic and descriptive choices in his translations and in his accounts of his own travels in Iceland, concluding that the journals’ ‘uncertainties and ambiguities […] deserve further attention, attention that might lead to more valid conclusions about William Morris and Iceland’. Marcus Waithe has more recently suggested that there is a distinct difference between what the Iceland journals convey and ‘what the country eventually meant to him’; rather, ‘[o]nly in recollection […] did he assemble his memories into the kind of politically symbolic encounter with another culture’ that he subsequently describes ‘so confidently’ in later essays. For Waithe, the journals are better treated ‘as an experiential quarry, best considered in combination with later sources, with documents that indicate the uses to which Morris eventually put his memories of the country’.

Waithe argues that the ‘tendency to idealize in retrospect, and the occasional discrepancy between the bad-tempered traveller and the wistful socialist of later years, really only indicate that the significance and meaning of Morris’s experiences evolved in his mind as he moved through life’. But we might also see in this suggestion an indication that Morris himself engaged in the practices that Aho accuses his biographers of pursuing: creating coherent patterns out of interests and achievements that were not always entirely coherent at first blush. Without necessarily disagreeing with the preceding scholarship on Morris and his Iceland experience, this article aims to engage with Aho’s suggestion that the uncertainties and ambiguities in the journals require greater attention, and to argue that Morris’s often profound (and prosaic) discomfort while travelling in Iceland is an essential component of the various forms the Icelandic inspiration took in Morris’s later work. The unpleasantnesses and contradictions faced by Morris the traveller also work in dynamic relation to the prodigious talents of Morris the scholar, artist and designer. While Morris’s medievalism inspired his travels in Iceland, his great talent for design simultaneously informed and shaped his sense of the medieval. The actuality of Iceland, however, posed jarring challenges to Morris, creating rather a looming spectre of disorder and disjunction across his preconceived notions of the country. Morris’s struggles with that disjunction can be read in the journals, and the transformative powers of the journey ultimately lie at least as much in this experience of discomfort and dismay, the dissatisfactions of Iceland, as they lie in the pleasures and wonders of his travels.

In Iceland, Morris struggled with romantic expectations and harsh realities. Awesome and forbidding landscapes, the ghosts of the saga age, the starkness of contemporary Icelandic life, and the frequent rude reminders of his status as a tourist produced in the doughty traveller equal parts elation and melancholy. While his
stylised saga translations and adaptations demonstrate the romantic ideals he saw in
the medieval Icelandic material, the Icelandic journals demonstrate both Morris’s
enduring reverence for the place and his struggles to reconcile the reality of
nineteenth-century Iceland, and the reality of himself as a traveller through it, with
his imaginary constructs. Morris wants to position himself, as traveller, as something
more than a tourist. His knowledge of the historical and legendary landscape lends
a layer of meaning beyond that experienced by those who have merely come to see
the geysers; his self-identification as a poet and transmitter of the saga lore lends
emphasis to the personal significance of what he sees; and what he sees sometimes
strikes him with a deeper understanding of and appreciation for places and situations
he had previously known only through texts. Yet for every awesome vista, there seems
to be a relatively unimpressive mound near a boggy patch; the great historical figures
are brought into sharp, prosaic relief by the example of modern Icelanders
demonstrating the life of farmers in unforgiving conditions; and Morris is as often
overwhelmed and depressed by the ruggedness of the terrain as he is inspired by it.
Moreover, he is constantly faced with the reality of his position, regularly falling out
of the sublime and saga-haunted landscape and back into the realm of the tourist:
detailing meals eaten, comfort of lodging, conversations with the locals, and the
discomforts of the weather or of his companions. Morris is, however, at least
sometimes aware of the disjunction, and some of his best narrative moments come
when he seems to recognise himself standing in a liminal space between imagination
and reality. For Morris, then, Iceland is both inspiring and unsettling: inspiring in the
weight of cultural nostalgia, for great people and events, both real and imagined;
inspiring in the spirits and atmosphere that the wild, alien landscape necessarily
conjures; and unsettling in its often jarring effects and the struggle it creates in Morris
to make sense of it all.

The journey itself, and the effects it wrought, also came at a time when Morris
needed a reprieve from a number of stresses. Morris the designer was a creator of
beautiful order; his wallpaper designs capturing the organic riot of nature in
gorgeously repeating patterns. But throughout the 1870s Morris the man, as husband,
as businessman, and as a concerned observer of society, was beset with disorder and
disappointment.

Morris’s interest in Iceland began when he was already established as both a poet
and a designer. In middle age, Morris studied Icelandic with Eiríkr Magnússon, and
the two would collaborate on several translations. The year 1869 saw the publication
of Grettis Saga: The Story of Grettir the Strong and ‘The Saga of Gunnlaug the Worm-
tongue and Rafn the Skald’ (in the Fortnightly Review); Völsung Saga: The Story of the
Volsungs and Niblungs, with Certain Songs from the Elder Edda followed in 1870; and ‘The
Story of Frithiof the Bold', parts 1 and 2 (in Dark Blue), in 1871. After the visits to Iceland, Morris and Magnússon produced *Three Northern Love Stories, and Other Tales* in 1875, and Morris reworked the Volsung material with *Sigurd the Volsung and the Fall of the Niblungs* in 1877. In this same period, he was also reorganising ‘the Firm’ into Morris and Company to make it more profitable, and creating some of the textiles and wallpapers that continue in popularity today. The designs, such as *Jasmine, Vine, Larkspur, Acanthus* and *Chrysanthemum*, reveal Morris’s love of nature and his gift for creating beautiful patterns.

Morris’s Iceland years were personally difficult and seem only to have intensified the issues that drove him throughout his life. Peter Faulkner observes that, despite the achievements of these years, ‘Morris was by no means completely fulfilled’:

The incompleteness of his marriage, the arguments over the reconstitution of the Firm, the feeling that his products ministered in the long run only to the ‘swinish luxury of the rich’, Janey’s serious illness in the summer of 1876, the lack of response to *Sigurd the Volsung* – these are elements in the more sombre side of Morris’s thinking at the time, which occasionally finds expression in his letters.6

In 1871, the most immediate source of dismay in Morris’s life was the affair between his wife Jane and Dante Gabriel Rossetti; when Morris left for Iceland, Rossetti stayed on as a member of the household. Morris’s marriage difficulties have been suggested as the driving reason behind the journey: by simply leaving the scene, Morris was spared the pain of trying to put on a good face about the affair.7 But for all that the trip may have presented an opportunity to escape a humiliating domestic situation, there remained the positive set of reasons revolving around Morris’s fascination with Icelandic literature. At the same time, Iceland also presented a distinctly non-Rossettian landscape, and Purkis suggests that part of the pilgrimage involved a determination ‘to recover his own vision’ following his disillusionment with Rossetti and his circle.8

Peter Preston notes that the domestic problems and the ‘sense of despair, loss and emotional loneliness following the failure of his marriage’ were part of a larger set of discontents, ‘compounded of a growing dissatisfaction and impatience with the materialism of modern European civilisation, [and] anger at the divisiveness of English society’.9 According to Preston, ‘Morris travelled to Iceland out of a deep need, compounded of a love for the country, its language, history and literature and the immediate difficulties of his personal life: it was both a geographical exploration and a period of self-discovery, a journey both in the physical world and to the depths
of his own being’. Purkis and Preston alike see Morris’s Iceland experience as psychologically restorative, both to his sense of manhood and as a confidence-builder for his subsequent political activism. Iceland thus takes on significance for Morris on several separate, but ultimately interrelated, fronts: at the same time that it offers an escape from his marital disappointments, it also becomes a proving ground for his own reassertion of masculine self-worth; the political heritage of medieval Iceland and the relatively class-free social structure of contemporary Iceland speak to his discontents over modern social inequality and materialism; and the experiences in Iceland, from the models of Icelandic society to the striking natural wonders, speak deeply to his aesthetic sensibilities, reinforcing his design instincts and influencing his later literary work.

Iceland, it should be noted, had become a relatively popular European tourist destination during the nineteenth century. In her analysis of Morris’s travels to Iceland, Phillippa Bennett cites the appeal, in certain traditions of travel writing and for certain travellers, of those locations ‘at the margins of the world’ where ‘marginal and wondrous topographies allowed the adventurous traveller to make direct contact with the marvellous and the extraordinary in an essentially privileged place […]’. In the increasingly mapped and chartered world of the nineteenth century, she notes, ‘such privileged wonder-filled places were increasingly hard to find.’ But Iceland, with its remote location and fantastic topography of glaciers, geysers, volcanoes and lava beds, offered such a locale and ‘thus continued to fulfil a latent desire in the nineteenth-century traveller to inhabit a marginal and marvellous space’. Morris’s special engagement with Iceland was that of the saga-enthusiasts who were ‘drawn to Iceland through a profound admiration for its literature and mythology’, and ‘distinguished themselves from mere sensation-seekers by conceiving their own journeys to the saga-steads as devotional pilgrimages’.

The fantastically harsh topography lent itself to supernatural interpretations: the volcanic landscape of Iceland had inspired continental European visitors from the Renaissance onward to mark it as the location of the gates to hell. For saga-enthusiasts, moreover, the harshness of Viking Age life amongst the early settlers had left an additionally marvellous legacy, as the country has from its earliest days of settlement been rich with reported hauntings and supernatural manifestations. Morris welcomes such marvels. He notes, for instance, ‘the shoulder of Armansfell, the haunt of the land-spirits’ (p. 166); the ‘Bairn’s Force’, a landscape feature named for a tale of witchcraft (p. 161); and ‘the stead of Fróðá haunted once by those awful ghosts of the pest-slain and the drowned in Eyrbyggia’ (p. 135). The sagas offer a number of ghost stories, and Morris relishes the spots attached to them. Of the purported burial mound of the saga-age hero Gunnar he writes: ‘that is Gunnar’s Howe: it is most
dramatically situated to remind one of the beautiful passage in the Njala where Gunnar sings in his tomb’ (pp. 48-49). On traversing a particularly impressive landscape in the vicinity of the hero and outlaw Grettir’s legendary fight with an undead farm labourer, Morris states: ‘so there you have no unworthy background to Glám the Thrall and his hauntings’ (p. 88). Glám is an example of the Old Norse *draugr*, a malevolent corpse that refuses to be laid to rest. Morris is far from unnerved by such tales and the spirits attached to them; he conjures the figure of Glám again in relating an occurrence with a ‘big carle’ he dubs ‘Wolf the Unwashed’ who, assigned to tend to the horses, instead gets drunk and climbs onto the roof of an outbuilding ‘on which he sat astride [like Glám] and presently began to howl out a dismal song’ (p. 104). The horrifying spectre of the *draugr* straddling the roof of the hall while Grettir awaits him inside becomes fodder for a comical anecdote about the tippling Icelandic help.

The ‘land-spirits’ and ghosts of the saga age are likely to have had a limited frightening effect on Morris because they belong within the fantastic, literature-inspired expectations that he carries with him into the land. In stark contrast to such literary cool-headedness, however, Morris records how, ‘being moved by silly travellers’ tales’, he experiences a fear so strong that it ‘extinguished curiosity’ the first time he is invited into a bonder’s house for coffee: ‘the house was of turf of course, with wooden gables facing south, all doors very low, and the passages very dark’. And what is the source of his concern? Morris writes that ‘my flesh quaked for fear of – the obnoxious animal’, refraining even from calling the horrifying creature by name. The source of his terror is the spectre of the louse, assumed to haunt the typical farmer’s abode. The episode concludes comically with Magnússon accidentally firing his gun while unloading it, very nearly shooting their host in the head and lodging a bullet in the door beam above him (p. 44).

There is something sufficiently deadpan in Morris’s account of his lice-fears and the mortification he and Magnússon feel over nearly shooting their host, that one cannot be entirely certain that he is himself entirely aware of the comedy – or all of the layers of the comedy – in the situation. Yet Morris certainly has his humorous moments and frequently engages in earnest self-deprecation, a tone that resonates with his well known appreciation for jests and joking. If we think him insensitive for his jokes at the expense of the Icelander he dubs ‘Wolf the Unwashed’, we may also recall that Morris himself was no stranger to being the object of ridicule. May Morris observes that the tale ‘has been told time and again’ of the boisterous and welcoming character of Morris’s Red House, where regularly ‘laughter sounded from the fragrant little garden as the host, victim of some ingenious practical joke, fulfilled the pleased expectation of his guests by conduct at once vigorous and picturesque under the
torment’. George Henry Blore speaks of the jokes ‘of which Morris, from his explosive temper, was chosen to be the butt, but which in the end he always shared and enjoyed’, further adding that in the face of the ‘relentless humour’ of his friends, ‘[i]n all, Morris was the central figure, impatient, boisterous, with his thickset figure, unkempt hair, and untidy clothing, but with the keenest appreciation and sympathy for any manifestation of beauty in literature or in art’. Morris’s natural sense of humour must lead him to recount a potentially fatal accident as a remarkably funny incident, but that keenness of sensibilities noted by Blore also seems to surface here, where Morris is left to his own devices to lampoon himself. Instead of performing a picturesque response to a targeted jest, here he captures a more poignant comedy of ridiculousness in lived experience. A great deal of the charm of the Iceland narrative comes in Morris’s willingness to reveal such moments, particularly when he admits to his own ‘milksopishness’ even as it is a source of disappointment in himself.

Morris unfailingly records his tendency to lose things, from the strap that tied a beloved tin pannikin ‘(which made such a sweet tinkle)’ (p. 33) to his saddle bow, to the pannikin itself (ill-tied with a piece of string whose knot came undone), to a slipper hastily shoved into a pocket and subsequently dislodged; pannikin and slipper both are miraculously returned by the good Icelanders who later happened upon them. He chastises himself for failing to complete a difficult hike in a cave and thus having missed the sight of a great frozen waterfall at the end (p. 84), and, on riding in a difficult rainstorm, notes: ‘I don’t like to confess to being a milksop: but true it is that it beat me: may I mention that I had a stomach-ache to begin with as some excuse’ (p. 87). Likewise Morris records that his explanation to a priest who has joined them on an excursion, that he is winded from hiking because he is ‘heavily clad and booted’, is met with a tap on the belly and the response, stated ‘very gravely’: ‘[b]esides you know you are so fat’ (p. 161).

Yet Morris also steadfastly refuses to see himself as a mere tourist. On arriving at Geysir, one of the more popular sights for European visitors, he notes disappointedly: ‘this […] is our journey’s end today, and I feel ashamed rather that so it is; for this is the place which has made Iceland famous to Mangnall’s Questions and the rest, who have never heard the names of Sigurd and Brynhild, of Njal or Gunnar or Grettir or Gisli or Gudrun’ (p. 66). The natural wonder of the impressive geyser is subsumed, for Morris, under the sign of Geysir as a prime tourist destination for those merely visiting Iceland for its natural wonders. Strewn with the litter of countless previous visitors, the place grates on Morris’s sensibilities: ‘[s]o there I sat on my horse, while the guides began to bestir themselves about the unloading, feeling a very unheroic disgust gaining on me’; ‘quoth I, “we can’t camp in this beastly place”’ (p. 66).

Morris complains of the Geysir-viewers who come to the place yet ‘have never
heard the names of Sigurd and Brynhild, of Njal or Gunnar or Grettir or Gisli or Gudrun’ because he himself has heard of those names and knows them well. His quest in Iceland is one of excavating and experiencing the past by means of historical locations and antiquities, from decorative belt buckles to pewter porridge pots. He appreciates the Icelanders’ enduring knowledge of the details of their past and regularly presents the travel itinerary in terms of the saga-age inhabitants of the land. For instance: ‘Biorn the boaster of the Njala lived in one of three steads called the Mark on the south side of this grim valley, Kettle of that ilk on another: and a little way north of it is Thorolfsfell where Kari lived after marrying Njal’s daughter’ (p. 56); or ‘this is Grettir’s-head where he lived at the time he slew Thorir Red-beard his would-be assassin’ (p. 85). Preston suggests, moreover, that not only does Morris’s knowledge of the Icelandic past inform his apprehension of the sights, but also ‘Morris reveals his sense of the Icelandic past largely by the way in which he maps onto its modern landscape the characters and events of the sagas’.18 Sometimes he creates a degree of remove, with qualifying phrases such as ‘it is said’, or ‘by tradition’, but, according to Preston, ‘elsewhere he makes a more direct identification, so that whatever there might be of myth in the sagas takes on the certainty of history by its unequivocal topographical placing’.19

There is therefore a dynamic relationship between Morris’s knowledge of Icelandic history, his imaginative engagement with the saga material and the landscape itself. And the impressiveness of that landscape, for all that it invites scorn when he considers that some travellers might come to Iceland solely to see its natural wonders, also plays an important role in Morris’s apprehension. Morris frequently notes how the sights stir his imagination: strolling about the stead at Bergthorsknoll, he comments that a knoll behind the present house ‘to my excited imagination looked like the fallen-in walls of the stead of the Sturlung period’ (p. 41). Describing a vista of mountains, a lava plain, ‘tumbling peaks’ lit by the sun shining through rain and ‘over this wall a boundless waste of ice all gleaming’, Morris adds that ‘just over this gap is the site of the fabulous or doubtful Thorisdale of the Grettis-Saga; and certainly the sight of it threw a new light on the way in which the story-teller meant his tale to be looked on’ (p. 77). He comments often on the extraordinary and wonderful qualities of the land: ‘[t]he day, though still raining softly, got very wonderful as we rode on’ (p. 85); he sees rainbows ‘beyond everything of the sort I ever saw’ (p. 85); ‘I got an impression of a very wonderful country’ (p. 88); ‘like a piece of another world it looked’ (p. 197). Sometimes, however, the landscape is overwhelming. Soon after his arrival, Morris comments, ‘[m]ost strange and awful the country looked to me as we passed through, in spite of all my anticipations’ (p. 28); elsewhere, he admits to ‘feeling tired and a little downhearted with the savagery of the place’ (p. 54); and yet
elsewhere, ‘the whole place had a softness about it that saddened one amidst all the grisliness surrounding it, more than the grimmest desert I had seen’ (pp. 161-62). On viewing the purported location of Grettir’s lair, he comments: ‘[i]t was such a savage dreadful place, that it gave quite a new turn in my mind to the whole story, and transfigured Grettir into an awful and monstrous being, like one of the early giants of the world’ (p. 149).

This sense of monstrosity is notable, given that the sagas tend to serve as Morris’s compass throughout his Icelandic travels, and given that his general struggle tends to be with reconciling present-day Iceland with the heroic images of it that the sagas have provided. Morris notes, for instance, that the apparent intelligence of a bonder, who has been to Scotland and thus seen something of life beyond Iceland, is not much to his benefit, since he is now discontented with Iceland (p. 94). Similarly, Morris is impressed with the Icelanders’ general good humour, but also struck by their laziness. These observations are in direct tension with Morris’s idealised reading of the Icelandic people, as they served to inspire his own socialist beliefs.

Preston notes rather that in Morris’s praise for the present-day Icelandic people he focuses on ‘their courage and contentment in spite of their hard lives. The main immediate lesson he seems to have drawn from the experience concerned the fortitude and lack of resentment he required to face his own personal difficulties.’20 Here one can see the blending and merging of Morris’s personal struggles with his social convictions. Preston also cites a telling passage from one of Morris’s letters: ‘“Then the people”, he wrote in his letter to Norton, “lazy, dreamy, without enterprise or hope: awfully poor, and used to all kinds of privations – and with all that gentle, kind, intensely curious, full of their old lore […] and so contented and merry that one is quite ashamed of one’s grumbling life”’.21 There is a distinct note of criticism in some of Morris’s descriptors; he finds many of the Icelanders to be ‘lazy’, ‘dreamy’ and unenterprising, but they redeem themselves with the fact that they persist in existing – and cheerfully, at that – under circumstances that boggle his mind. There is a necessary disjunction between the socially-minded individual who himself enjoys significant material comfort and those members of society who do not. Indeed, the safer mental path for such an individual when faced with such a contrast is to focus on the emotional states and personal constitutions of all involved, on laudable good humour as against his own ‘grumbling life’.

Ultimately, however, the reality of Icelandic life is often unnerving to him and creates a strong sense of melancholy:

Just think, though, what a mournful place this is […] how every place and name marks the death of its short-lived eagerness and glory; and withal so
little is the life changed in some ways […] But Lord! what littleness and helplessness has taken the place of the old passion and violence that had place here once – and all is unforgotten; so that one has no power to pass it by unnoticed: yet that must be something of a reward for the old life of the land, and I don't think their life now is more unworthy than most people's elsewhere, and they are happy enough by seeming. Yet it is an awful place: set aside the hope that the unseen sea gives you here, and the strange threatening change of the blue spiky mountains beyond the firth, and the rest seems emptiness and nothing else: a piece of turf under your feet, and the sky overhead, and that's all; whatever solace your life is to have here must come out of yourself or these old stories, not over hopeful themselves.

(p. 108)

Morris concludes these thoughts with a declaration of homesickness and asks, of his readers or himself, ‘I hope I may be forgiven’ for it (p. 108).

Morris's saga-informed appreciation for Iceland thus entails a balancing act. The contemporary Icelanders disappoint him with the prosaic reality of their existence and force him to find comfort in their cheerful endurance and the traces of their history yet to be found in their lifestyles and their memories. The landscape sometimes inspires him with newfound understanding and appreciation for the sagas, but at other times leaves him feeling threatened and exhausted. When Grettir becomes a monstrous being, seen in the context of the unforgiving landscape he reportedly inhabited, Morris allows his apprehension of the land to overwhelm the very thing that lends structure to his travels, his imaginative connection to the saga literature.

There is a telling moment relatively early in the journal of 1871 when Morris describes the extreme anxiety experienced when fording a river on horseback: ‘the water seemed coming in a great hill down on us, running so fast by us that I quite lost any sense of where I was going, and felt no doubt that the horses were backing; the disorientation only abates once they reach the shallows ‘with a curious sensation of having suddenly in one stride gone many yards, and there we were again safe on dry – stone’ (p. 52). From here they traverse a landscape of cliffs ‘most unimaginably strange’ (p. 52) with ‘caves in them just like the hell-mouths in 13th century illuminations’ (p. 53). Morris shifts from one source of disorientation to another as he struggles to articulate the look of the land, resorting to comparisons like that of the hell-mouths, or ‘a Robinson Crusoe hut with an over-hanging roof to it’ (p. 53), or, in describing the look of clefts in the rock wall, ‘a horrible winding street with stupendous straight rocks for houses on either side’ (p. 53). Morris projects a vision of civilised order, a street lined with houses, onto the landscape in an effort to make
it comprehensible, yet that vision becomes grotesque, the street ‘horrible’ and the houses ‘stupendous’, because the land defies his efforts to categorise it.

Bennett argues that Morris consistently engages with Iceland in a state of wonder, and with ‘a vocabulary of wonderment’ that marks ‘a genuine attempt to articulate in his own terms the emotionally and psychologically complex relationship he developed with the Icelandic landscape during his tours of 1871 and 1873’.22 Travel through the wonders of Iceland affords him an immediate experience of the sublime, mediated through the state of wonderment and then transmitted, especially through the late romances, such as *The Roots of the Mountains* (1889) and *The Story of the Glittering Plain* (1891) and *The Well at the World’s End* (1896). Bennett argues that ‘it was through the imaginative terrains of his last romances that Morris ultimately found his most effective means of communicating both the nature and the far-reaching implications of his experience of this topography of wonder’.23 We ought also to consider the lag between the *Journals* and the last romances, the element of terror encompassed in that initial experience of the sublime, and how the deployment of wonderment might serve to mitigate the sense of awfulness Morris so often experiences in Iceland.

Jane Cooper, in her work on ‘The Iceland journeys and the late Romances’, notes the general consensus that the Icelandic landscape influenced Morris’s later writings and offers a detailed, close comparison of the romance descriptions and Morris’s landscape descriptions in the *Journals*.24 She adds, however, that Morris’s imagination also played an important role in the descriptive process. Cooper cites May Morris, in one of her introductions in the *Collected Works*, on ‘the influence of mediaeval manuscripts and Morris’s own illuminating work on the descriptions of towns in his poems’: “one is tempted to say that the visualization of [them] is made up of three elements: of the poet’s vision, of the memory of the places actually seen, and of the picture of them by the mediaeval artist” (IX, xviii).25 Here we can see the important element of design in the transition from the *Journals* to the romances, as the descriptions are clearly informed by a combination of personal memory of actual landscapes, medieval models and Morris’s personal artistic sensibilities.

Morris the designer consistently engages in a re-imagining of his materials, and that includes his experience of Iceland itself. May Morris, writing the introduction to the *Journals* for the *Collected Works* and remembering from ‘the child’s point of view’, recalls that, prior to the journeys, ‘Iceland had begun to be one of the familiar fairyland places in our imagination […]. The wonder side of it we knew something of already, through the legends of Iceland and through our own Storyteller [Morris].’26 Through Morris’s letters home, ‘Iceland became and has been ever since a real thing, at once overpoweringly beautiful and overpoweringly melancholy’, and yet even this ‘real thing’ is transmitted through the perspective of Morris the ‘Storyteller’.27
May Morris also comments, rather romantically, on the greater detachment of the second *Journal* of 1873 (which, unlike the first, Morris did not return to later but left in its unfinished state), suggesting ‘that he had withdrawn into a frame of mind in which he saw the wilderness in its real loneliness’ and whereby ‘the elemental horrors had seized upon him and perhaps he saw sights and heard sounds from another world than that in which he and his fellow-travellers were moving – who knows indeed where the poet wanders when he withdraws into his own country?’

This seems to encapsulate Morris’s Icelandic experience in its entirety, as Morris the poet and artist struggles to incorporate and adapt his apprehension of (and about) Iceland in accord with his preconceived notions and desires for the country. That lonely wilderness and its elemental horrors are transformed by Morris’s withdrawal ‘into his own country’; as a poet, he makes the country his own, according to his needs and designs. In more prosaic terms, May Morris quotes a letter from Morris to his wife Jane from the first Icelandic excursion (11 August 1871): ‘[y]ou’ve no idea what a good stew I can make, or how well I can fry bacon under difficulties. I have seen many marvels and some terrible pieces of country.’

That sense of accomplishment permeates the second journal, where much of the anxiety of the travel has disappeared. Morris notes, for instance, ‘I have quite lost all nervousness in the rivers now’ (p. 206), and does not lose his bearings anymore. Following a deep river fording, he remarks, ‘[n]evertheless the whole thing had got unfrightful to me now and I crossed it pipe in mouth, not troubling myself at all’ (p. 225).

Victorian medievalists like Morris sought links to nature, the sublime and the supernatural in much the same manner as had the earlier writers of the romantic era. Alice Chandler comments: ‘[j]ust as medievalism was very much a part of the desire to give man a sense of social and political belonging, so it was an attempt, in the decline of any transcendental order, to naturalize man in the universe and make him feel related to it’. As Chandler further notes: ‘what was a living faith for the Middle Ages can be only the memory of a myth for contemporary [i.e. Victorian] man’. Morris seeks an authentic encounter with his medieval Iceland but discovers the impossibility thereof. In the *Journals*, he struggles with unexpected spectres of disorder in the social realities of the Icelandic people and in the overwhelming natural features of the land, which also recast his understanding of his medieval sources in sometimes overwhelming ways. His experience of the sublime in nature is as harrowing as it is wonderful. As Morris details his travel experiences – wondrous, disappointing and prosaic alike, vacillating between rainbows, rocks and bacon – he often finds himself wobbling, disoriented, in a space where imagined expectations (of both Iceland and himself as traveller) and actual experience clash.

That experience of disorientation also leads to surprising moments of honesty.
and clarity. Purkis argues that the *Icelandic Journals*, though never published in Morris’s lifetime, should be regarded as one of his greatest works, though ‘partly by accident’.32 Most importantly, ‘there was no attempt to invent a special kind of style as in the saga translations and the later romances, and yet it is here that we find the most successful application of his principles in writing English prose: clarity and the dislike of the ornate’.33 Purkis compares the ‘drive to simplicity and virility in the words and syntax’ in the prose of the *Journals* to Morris’s turn to simplicity in furniture design; but the prose of the (unpublished) journal is of course bracketed by that of his literary endeavours in the translations and romances, and the simplicity of furniture bracketed by the splendour of his wallpapers.34 We might therefore see here the signs of a ‘fragmented consciousness’, as argued by Williams and Aho. But we might also see in these stylistic vacillations a remarkable flexibility and willingness by Morris to entertain disjunction across his own work – or, put another way, to explore multiple artistic and interpretative possibilities in the face of creative and intellectual challenges.

Kristin Ross has remarked on Morris’s tendency in his lectures ‘to call his references to ancient Iceland or to the ancient Teutons a “parable”’. ‘A parable’, Ross adds, ‘is not about going backwards or reversing time but about opening it up – opening up the web of possibilities’.35 Waithe suggests that Morris’s ultimate attitude towards the past and its artifacts ‘involved a delicate balancing act: the past was to be used, but not stolen; studied, but not imitated; preserved, but certainly not “restored”’.36 Both Ross and Waithe speak to Morris’s awareness of instability, of indirect as opposed to direct connections, and of a need, we might say, for conscious, flexible deployment of the imagination, particularly if one aims to build models for the future out of examples from the past. Might we not see a measure of Morris’s Iceland experience in these observations? Whatever his original desires or intentions for his travels in Iceland, in spite of his assiduous efforts to map his journey, the place and its inhabitants, onto his saga-informed expectations, Morris finds himself thwarted. His experience is fragmented, often uncomfortable. If nineteenth-century Iceland perplexes him, then his own moments of ‘milksopishness’ as a traveller also highlight, on a personal level, the frequent disjunction between ideals and realities. Yet Morris does not attempt to hide his failings or his distress; he inhabits them, and he records them.

It is undoubtedly important that Morris ultimately gained significant personal confidence during his Icelandic travels. But if we focus solely on how Morris may have poured that confidence into his subsequent public speaking endeavours or into wrestling the sublime landscape into the descriptive passages of the later romances, we risk eliding the enduring impact of the uncertainties and ambiguities he encountered. The *Icelandic Journals* alone cannot convey how Morris ultimately brought his artistic and political sensibilities to bear on his experience of Iceland or
the symbolic significance it came to hold for him. But the *Journals* do preserve a crucial element that does not necessarily appear in Morris’s direct later uses of Iceland, its landscape or its past, so much as in his attitude towards how one should engage with the past, or indeed project possibilities for the future.

Waithę remarks on the special place Morris occupies in the history of utopian literature, with the publication in 1890 of *News from Nowhere*:

*It invites participation, and frustrates closure, in such a way as to leave its readers considerable interpretative leeway [...]*. His contribution to utopian literature is distinguished by an apparent willingness to entertain conflict. He allows the imperfect to intrude upon and unsettle the perfect with startling regularity. He demonstrates an unflagging taste for the disruptive, a consistent unwillingness, in the words of C.S. Lewis, to institute ‘world-without-end fidelities’.³⁷

Morris accepts, even invites, imperfection and entertains conflict – with an eye, perhaps, for the inevitability of disruption and impossibility of perfection. Failures and discomforts can prove transformative in positive ways. Perhaps Morris’s encounters with the jarring disjunctions of Iceland were ultimately far more valuable than a more smoothly-flowing and ideal-affirming experience would have been. The coherent meaning that Morris ultimately forged over time out of the entirety of his engagement with Iceland, past and present, literary, prosaic, topographical, social and of himself as a traveller across its layered landscapes, might seem rather fragile, fragmentary, under closer scrutiny of its individual component parts. There are weaknesses and contradictions. Morris the milksop, sitting sodden and miserable atop his pony or dejected and short of his hiking goal, terrified of lice, alarmed and disoriented by frightening river crossings and stark landscapes, may invite laughter and pity. His struggles in Iceland might seem in some respects to undermine his later displays of confidence, but his *Journals* also preserve an important record of Morris as a man engaging head on with discomfort and uncertainty, relaying those discomforts alongside the wonders of Iceland, conveying the states of ambiguity and liminality that result – and, in the end, becoming comfortable with it all.
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Robert Banner, William Morris and the Socialist League

Stephen Williams

When he died in 1910 Robert Banner was described by his friend Andreas Scheu as ‘perhaps the best of the British comrades’.¹ The two men first met in Edinburgh – where Banner was born in 1855 – in or around 1875 when Scheu arrived in the Scottish capital to work. At this time Banner, whose parents had been Chartists, was an apprentice bookbinder and already secretary of the Edinburgh Republican Club. According to its previous secretary, John Morrison Davidson the well-known radical journalist, the club assembled ‘the choicest spirits in the ranks of labour’.² Scheu, an experienced and charismatic Austrian revolutionary, was a significant influence on the young Banner, introducing him to the ideas of Marx and Engels then relatively unknown in Britain.³ These ideas came to underpin Banner’s political thinking for the rest of life.

An eager twenty-four year old correspondent with Marx and Engels in the autumn of 1880 and already an advocate of nationalising the means of production, Banner was the earliest of the ‘small number of exceptionally gifted working men’, described by E.P. Thompson, to propagate explicitly revolutionary socialist ideas and attempt organisation building.⁴ Moreover, thanks to Scheu’s tutoring, Banner was able by 1878 to deliver a coherent conception of socialism, à la Marx and Engels, with expropriation of capitalists and landowners at its core. Hence, while a declared supporter of the Land Nationalisation League during the summer of 1882, along with Ernest Belfort Bax, Adam Weiler, Ambrose G. Barker and others of a similar perspective, Banner insisted that common ownership needed to be extended from land to ‘Mines, Factories and Machinery for the equal distribution of wealth’. He went on, quoting from the Communist Manifesto, ‘our goal that was sketched by Marx and Engels, when the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, will be replaced by an association, wherein the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all’.⁵ Similarly, when the Democratic Federation
was considering adopting republicanism as a creed, Banner ‘cautioned the meeting against being led away with the idea that Republicanism was always synonymous with liberty. He instanced various acts of what he considered despotism as great as any to be found under a monarchy’, and argued that ‘the whole question turned upon what sort of republic they wanted to institute in England. In his opinion it should be a social democratic one.”

Given Banner’s early point of entry into revolutionary socialism, it is perhaps surprising that he was overlooked by many of his contemporaries when they came to write their reminiscences, and has been ignored in much of the modern scholarship on the early history of British socialism, meriting often only a walk-on part as a member of the group that left the Social Democratic Federation and went on to form the Socialist League. Part of an explanation for this can be found in Banner’s decision, taken soon after 1886, to cease any meaningful political activity outside of his adopted home of Woolwich, south-east London, where his lasting achievement occurred during the period immediately following the Socialist League years. The foundations of the Labour Party’s independent political identity in Woolwich were put down during the late eighties, leading to the election of a Labour Member of Parliament and a Labour borough council in 1903; Banner’s role in this was second to none. That Banner wrote very little besides letters to the press and left no personal papers is also of significance in explaining his relative obscurity, as is the fact that he was never a self-publicist nor was he politically ambitious, making him a queer fish among the leadership of the early socialist movement, easily ignored and quickly forgotten. Scheu recognised this soon after Banner’s death, taking Harry Quelch, editor of Justice, the SDF’s newspaper, to task for failing to publish an obituary or even a notice of death. As if to put the record straight, albeit twenty-five years later, Harry Lee, onetime SDF secretary, wrote in his history of the Federation that of those who split away in 1884, Morris, Belfort Bax, Scheu and Banner were ‘decidedly losses to the SDF’.

This essay, part of a wider study of Banner’s life and work, focuses on his socialist activity during the early and mid-1880s when he encountered all the notable personalities in the movement, including William Morris. Following a brief outline of his early trade union and political work in Edinburgh, attention will turn to Woolwich, south-east London, where Banner arrived during the summer of 1882 with his wife, Helen, and their four children following political setbacks and the loss of life savings when a Scottish building society collapsed. Originally destined for America, Banner was intercepted by Scheu who convinced the young bookbinder that he should join him in his political work in London, having himself moved to the capital during the previous year.
Banner completed his apprenticeship in 1877 and immediately took up activity in the Bookbinders’ and Machine Rulers’ Consolidated Union where he immediately created waves upsetting the traditionally Gladstonian labour aristocrats forming the local committee. From the union branch he was sent as delegate to the Edinburgh Trades Council, where his perspective that trade unions should be fighting organisations engaged in class struggle repeatedly got him into trouble and eventually led to his removal in 1881.11 Ambitious plans hatched by Banner during the summer of 1881 to establish a Scottish Labour Party committed to nationalisation of the means of production and affiliated to the Socialist International petered out, after which he turned his attention to the fledgling Democratic Federation, gathering together potential Edinburgh members during May 1882, attending the first annual conference later that month and becoming a member of the Executive.12

Working with Scheu, Ernest Belfort Bax and James MacDonald he helped persuade the Federation to engage in Sunday open-air meetings in public parks and squares, against the advice of chairman and leading force H.M. Hyndman, who, according to Scheu, ‘criticised the Sunday meetings as a “continental idea” which
the English people would never allow to become established in London’. Scheu believed Hyndman’s views on this subject were characteristic of his hostility to foreign influence which he deeply resented. Scheu’s account continued with Hyndman remarking: ‘Scheu doesn’t know any better, but Bax should and could put him wise, if he himself had not spent so much time on the continent and picked up such ideas himself. The English working class will never allow the holiness of their Sunday to be taken away.’13 Banner later provided a similar account of these discussions, adding a brief description of how he chaired the first socialist meeting held in Regent’s Park on a Sunday during February 1883, which proved successful and became a regular pitch for the Democratic Federation.14

With typical energy and enthusiasm Banner threw himself into Woolwich civil society, his name appearing in reports of local discussion and debating groups where his strident and class conscious contributions would have jarred against the traditional Tory narrative of the town dominated by military interests.15 Naturally, Banner targeted the Invicta Working Men’s Club in William Street as an assembly to influence, and he was soon enconced there as a committee member and participating in the Club’s discussions on abolition of the monarchy, women’s enfranchisement, the imposition of financial strictures on members of the royal family and separation of Church and State.16 In debating these traditional radical causes, the staple diet of working men’s clubs across London, Banner constantly attempted to stretch the argument to demonstrate how only through a commitment to class struggle and replacing capitalism with socialism would the lives of working people improve substantially. For Banner, this was first and foremost a question of understanding the operation of capitalism and appreciating how socialism would be different because it would function with a new set of social relations. He attempted to explain this to a correspondent in a local newspaper in 1886, who had counterposed ‘civilization’ with socialism. Banner wrote:

[H]e desires me to show him wherein Socialism differs from ‘the ordinary laws of civilization’. If he can be a little clearer and inform me what ‘the ordinary laws of civilization’ are, I shall be most obliged to him, and so, I think, will most lawyers. But perhaps he means what distinguishes civilization from Socialism. Well, this is easily done. Civilization is built upon the wage-slavery of the workers. It is divided into two classes – a possessing and a non-possessing class – one producing, the other non-producing; the non-producing class owning all the land, mines, factories, tools, machinery and means of exchange, the producing class owning nothing but the labour-force in their bodies. Thus civilization involves classes and class antagonisms. Socialism, on the other
hand, involves the abolition of classes, and class antagonisms by the
substitution of collective, or co-operative, for class ownership of mines,
factories, land etc., owned and organised for the benefit of those who work.17

A similar analysis was also conveyed from the platform outside the Royal Arsenal
gates every Sunday evening from the spring of 1884, with Banner as the constant
chairman and sometimes the only speaker. Hyndman spoke twice, Frank Kitz, R.P.B.
Frost and H.H. Champion also addressed meetings there. Predictably, Scheu became
a regular fixture in Woolwich, combining visits to his friend with public meetings, as
in May 1884 when a crowd of 400 gathered to hear him on ‘Objections to Socialism’.
Banner reported that Scheu’s address ‘made a great impression’, and commented
more generally that following Hyndman’s recent debate on socialism with secularist
Charles Bradlaugh, ‘[t]here is a marked change taking place in sympathies of many
freethinkers […] towards the more advanced sections who have all along stood up
for socialism’.18 By June, when Scheu returned to Woolwich, a branch of the
Federation was being set up and had meetings fixed at their club in the Connaught
Coffee Tavern in New Road.19

Meanwhile, Banner continued to have a London-wide profile within the
Federation, often being asked to speak at open-air meetings which became his métier.
Described by his friend, George Samuel, as ‘a marvel of learning in economics and
sociology’, Banner’s platform oratory skilfully combined an explanation of complex
ideas with engaging, often amusing, references to current political events.20 A
participant in a number of the Federation’s meetings at Westminster Palace Chambers
during early 1883, it was here that Banner pointed out Morris to Scheu, who later
recounted this to J.W. Mackail for his Morris biography: ‘[t]he business had scarcely
started when Banner, who sat behind me, passed a slip of paper, “The third man to
your right is William Morris”’.21 Scheu then gave Mackail a physical description of
Morris which he later included almost word for word in his autobiography.22 Scheu
became a good friend of Morris and a regular visitor to Kelmscott House, where on
at least one occasion he was accompanied by Banner.23

Scheu had taken a dislike of Hyndman when he first encountered him at the
Federation’s founding conference during June 1881. On this occasion, Scheu was with
Morrison Davidson, who later wrote that the pair ‘shook the dust from our feet and
left the hall’ when Hyndman objected to any consideration of the monarchy, ‘it being
an institution too sacred to be discussed’. For Morrison Davidson, ‘though the hand
(of the Federation) might be that of the Democratic Esau, the voice sounded
uncommonly like that of the Tory Jacob’.24 Scheu believed Hyndman to be a jingoist,
an autocrat and an unprincipled politician; a ‘political juggler’ was how he described
him to his friend Bernard Shaw. For Hyndman’s part the feeling was mutual, he being resentful of what he believed to be Scheu’s patronising attitude to the new socialist movement in Britain. During the period of Scheu’s membership of the Federation’s executive between 1883 and 1884 a ‘bitter feud grew up’ between the two men in which Scheu, according to Shaw, distinguished himself as ‘the first anti-Hyndmanite’.

Unsurprisingly, Banner was at one with Scheu and although not a member of the Executive during his friend’s tenure, we know he attended various ‘invitational’ and members’ meetings in these twelve months, including one at Anderson’s Hotel, Fleet Street during January 1884 at which a motion was discussed demanding ‘universal suffrage, proportional representation and payment of members as a means of obtaining reduction in hours, socialization of means of production, and the organisation of society’. To this, the reporter to the first issue of Justice wrote, ‘Banner pressed for general propaganda of socialistic ideas, and had little reliance on mere politics. He trusted more to social agitation. He thought the first thing was the right to live; the right to vote would then be easily obtained. He believed in no half-hearted acceptance of political reform, and looked on all labour as lost which did not bring about the social revolution of the people.’

Following another Federation gathering in July, Banner, according to Morris, came away ‘much downcast at the turn things are taking’, following a discussion of an issue reflecting division among French socialists and how this impinged on the British socialist movement. Ostensibly concerning the location of an international socialist conference, the discussion was fundamentally about whether the Federation supported the French ‘revolutionary Marxists’ led by Paul Lafargue and Jules Guesde or the reformist ‘Possibilists’ of Paul Brousse. We know Hyndman backed the ‘Possibilists’ and Bax the ‘revolutionary Marxists’, and it is almost certain that the supporters of each side fell into line, Banner with Bax, Eleanor Marx Aveling and Edward Aveling. Although Morris was at this time becoming increasingly aware of the difficulties of working with Hyndman as Federation chairman, his instinct was to ‘patch up the division of the executive and get on with the real work’. Hence his note to Scheu in July, ‘I had Bax here last night and begged him to be more politic’, and later, ‘Banner is to come to me on Saturday. I want to encourage him and also keep him from running a-muck.’ Banner, like Scheu, who was remembered by one contemporary as one ‘who would never let an opportunity pass of losing his temper’, could be confrontational, and doubtless with his friend now away from London, Scheu having moved back to Edinburgh during July 1884, he was ready to take on the mantle and would certainly have been prepared to defend him when snipes were made. In this vein, Morris reported to Scheu during August 1884 that Banner, at his first meeting
back on the executive, ‘was ready to jump down anyones throat’.33

The annual conference of the Federation at the beginning of August 1884 had seen the adoption of a comprehensive socialist programme and a new name, the Social Democratic Federation (SDF). It was also significant because Hyndman’s position was weakened with his removal from the office of President and the election of Banner, Joseph Lane, Marx Aveling and Aveling to the executive, meaning he could no longer guarantee a majority for his leadership. Over the next few months, relations on the executive deteriorated with one dispute after another, around which the battle lines were drawn between the pro- and anti-Hyndman factions. Things came to a head during mid-December following Morris’s return from a short tour of Scotland, when he reported details of a letter from Hyndman to members in Glasgow that had been made known to him, denouncing Scheu as an anarchist who would destroy their organisation if they allowed him to do so. Up to this moment Morris had believed reconciliation was possible, but no longer. Gathering together those opposing Hyndman on the executive in what he called a ‘cabal’, Morris sought to win a vote of confidence in Scheu and remove Hyndman from the editorship of Justice. We know that Banner was independently in contact with Scheu over these affairs and had advised him to come to London to answer Hyndman’s accusations at an executive meeting planned for 23 December. At first Morris did not think this necessary but was persuaded of it at a meeting of the ‘cabal’ at the Avelings’ home on 18 December at which Banner was not present but was reported to be in full agreement.34 It is almost certain that it was at this meeting that the group decided they would leave the SDF whatever happened at the forthcoming executive meeting.

Scheu attended the meeting on 23 December, mounting, in Morris’s words, ‘a really noble and skilful defence of his character against Hyndman’.35 But with business not concluded, the executive reconvened four days later to repeat the arguments, including a contribution from Banner which Morris related to the absent Scheu as follows: ‘Banner spoke badly and not much to the point’, not the first time he had commented negatively on the bookbinder’s interventions in meetings.36 While Banner was, to use Sidney Webb’s words, ‘a great Woolwich street orator’, he appears on occasion to have been inadequately prepared for important meetings and his contributions could wander, probably mistakenly relying on his skills to extemporise.37 Not that the power of argument would sway opinion at this point on the executive, voting going as expected, with the Morris faction winning a majority and then astounding Hyndman by resigning en bloc to form the Socialist League.

Banner moved quickly to transform the Federation’s Woolwich branch into the Socialist League, drafting in Morris at the end of January 1885 to make the case. Kelvin’s interpretation of Morris’s attendance at the Woolwich meeting, that it was
an example of his ‘dislike of conflict among socialists’ illustrated ‘by his readiness to keep an SDF lecture so soon after the weeks of acrimony’, is clearly mistaken, as it was in fact a pre-emptive strike at the Federation heavyweights James Murray and J.E. Williams who visited three days later. Of this meeting Banner reported that Murray and Williams spoke for two hours in a tirade against the majority led by Morris but failed to prevent secession of the branch to the League. However, despite Banner’s untiring efforts, the branch failed to register with the Farringdon Street office and never sent a delegate to the annual conference, probably because there were never more than a dozen or so members who became casualties of the split, with some drifting away. Nevertheless, Banner continued to proselytise for the League in Woolwich, maintaining the Sunday evening Arsenal gate meetings, selling Commonweal and pamphlets in the ‘Socialist Platform’ series. A meticulous reader of the Woolwich press, he regularly made his presence known in the correspondence columns, mostly addressing current political and economic matters. When prompted, Banner would not hesitate to display his erudition, as in April 1885 when he treated the editor of the Woolwich Gazette to a lecture on the history of the French National Workshops started after the revolution of 1848. Showing them to be ‘the invention, not of the friends, but the enemies of socialism’, Banner quoted heavily from Marx’s article covering the subject from the June 1850 edition of the Democratic Review, a publication he knew well, having inherited a complete run from his father.

By the mid-1880s Banner had an established record at the Invicta Working Men’s Club where members elected him into key positions of responsibility. Heavily populated by Scots who had moved to Woolwich and Plumstead to work mostly as engineering craftsmen at the Royal Arsenal, the Club – which was renamed the Woolwich District Radical Club in December 1884 – was receptive to Banner’s influence, who, as a teetotaller, concentrated on the political rather than social aspects of associationism. He was a hard worker and able to draw in speakers with established reputations – Morris gave his ‘How We Live, and How We Might Live’ lecture there during May 1886. Banner clearly deployed his club office and delegacy in ways to extend radicalism towards socialism.

As club delegate at the Fabian conference on ‘Land, Capital and Democratic Policy’ during June 1886 at the South Place Institute, Banner contributed to a number of the debates, adding to the League’s official presence there represented by Morris, Aveling and A.K. Donald. On the land question he differed with Bradlaugh’s proposal to cultivate waste land while it was still in private hands because it would create a ‘system of outdoor relief’ in which the capitalists who owned land would be able to beat down the wages of workers. Responding to the suggestion that compensation should be made to landowners in the event of nationalisation, Banner was ‘loudly
cheered’ when he appealed to delegates to reverse the argument and ‘ask how the working class would be recompensed because they had all along been compensating the propertied class […]'. Landowners should be told that land does not belong to them and if they did not give it up it would be taken from them. And if they did not like the transaction they could do as many of the working-classes have often done – they could emigrate.”

With apparent incredulity he tackled the individualist Wordsworth Donisthorpe’s exposition of Social Darwinism in which the strong prey on the weak, some of whom may ‘go to the wall’, with the warning that when the socialists got their chance things could be reversed and ‘they might show how this could be done’. Finally, contesting G.W. Foote’s assertion that socialism would undermine personal freedom, Banner asked: ‘what freedom had they now? He must sell his labour to John Jones or he must starve. If he was caught starving wilfully he would be punished for it (laughter). If he was starving and not caught it would be said he was insane. This was the beautiful freedom they had.”

The Radical Club also allowed Banner to express his support for the struggle for Irish independence, a cause he had been connected with since his Edinburgh days when he worked with Scottish members of the Irish Land League. Joining with leading lights of Radical and Liberal Clubs in south-east London during April 1887 at a demonstration against proposed extension of coercion legislation, Banner explained that the new bill had been introduced ‘because the people of Ireland had found out they had no room for idle, and useless classes, and the people of England would find out that the men oppressing the Irish people would very quickly frame a bill to oppress English people as well’. He then asked the large crowd ‘if any of them had been into the Houses of Parliament? Every time he went there, he came away with a greater contempt for it than he had before. When he sat in the Speaker’s Gallery, it always seemed to him that M.P. at the end of the member’s name meant something more than Member of Parliament; he thought it also might mean “Midnight Plunderer”. (Laughter and applause).”

Banner’s hostility to the Parliamentary process was deep-seated and had been encouraged by Scheu when they were together in Edinburgh. Certainly by 1882 Banner was arguing publicly that ‘[p]arliamentary government is a mockery, and the cry for the franchise is a sham. What is wanted is not more voting power, but the people to understand how they are being cheated and robbed.” Sadly, we do not have a published report of Banner’s lecture ‘The Fraud of Politics’ delivered at the League’s office during May 1886, but we can be fairly certain that it would have developed themes espoused elsewhere and been in accord with Morris’s views expressed in the ‘Whigs, Democrats and Socialists’ lecture read at the Fabian
conference at which Banner was Woolwich club delegate.

In spite of being often unavailable to attend Council meetings because of overtime working and lack of cash for travel, Banner maintained a high level of commitment to the League in its first eighteen months of existence. Re-elected to the Council at the first annual conference during July 1885, he was in demand as a speaker beyond Woolwich and for a while maintained a regular Sunday afternoon pitch at Deptford before hotfooting it back to Woolwich for the established early evening meeting at the Arsenal gates. He did, however, become increasingly dissatisfied with the League’s notoriously poor system of administration, which on one occasion sent him to consecutive speaking engagements, at a personal cost in travel of four shillings, only for there to have been nothing organised. In an angry note to League secretary H.H. Sparling, he stated, ‘[i]t is not by anarky (sic) but organisation progress will made. If we cannot organise a meeting in the open-air, how are we going to organise to destroy capitalism?’.48

Banner’s association of poor organisation with anarchy is instructive and chimes with the letter of resignation from the League by Thomas Binning at around the same time. Both Banner and Binning were print craftsmen familiar with strong trade union organisation that they would have contrasted with the shabby practices in the League. Intriguingly, Binning was working at his trade as a compositor in Edinburgh during the 1870s and 1880s, but we cannot be sure he met Banner there. In his letter of resignation Binning wrote:

I earnestly hope the League is not going to degenerate into a mere Quixotic debating society for the discussion of philosophical fads. I care not how angelic may be the theories of Anarchists or Anarchist-Communists. I contend that the real solid basis of the Revolutionary movement is the economic question […]. If the League means business let it not waste time in metaphysical subtleties such as the precise shade of difference between “Rules” and “Arrangements”, etc.49

Doubtless, Binning was referring to discussions preceding the annual conference in June on the ‘Manifesto’ submitted by two Council members, Joseph Lane and Henry Charles, for a reorganisation of the League at the heart of which was the replacement of the Council by weekly meetings of members. Intended to act as a bulwark against centralisation and domination by London members, the proposals sought to anticipate ‘the near future society […] based on free federated communes’. A swift response came from a number of existing and previous Council members – Aveling, Marx Aveling, Banner, Bax, Binning, A.K. Donald, Frederick Lessner, Scheu and Thomas
Wardle—who had come to make up the Social Democratic faction. The rebuttal took Lane and Charles to task for proposals that would compound the problem of London domination by granting to those who were able to attend meetings rights that ‘country’ members could not exercise. For the signatories, it was the ‘imperative duty of all our members to devote their utmost energies to the work of propaganda, and not to waste time on administrative experiments. Methods of procedure, however admirably adapted for carrying on the work of a commune in a socialistic condition of society, are of little value to a revolutionary body who have to conquer the conditions that can make practicable the carrying out of their ideal.’

In the aftermath of the conference, where the Lane and Charles proposals were rejected, Charles accused Banner of circulating rumours ‘calling into question my sincerity as a member of the Socialist League’, and demanded that such allegations be retracted in a clear statement to the new Council of which he, but not Banner, was a member. Banner made no retraction and soon after was out of the League, disappointed at the growing influence of the anarchists as the Council was reduced in size.

Banner’s decision to resign his membership just as the Social Democrats on the Council were becoming organised is a puzzle, particularly as he continued to operate in Woolwich as if still a League member for another two years. He retained an account at the office for multiple copies of Commonweal for resale, reported regularly to the secretary on activities, requested speakers for the Sunday meetings and himself attended the 1887 conference as a visitor. While we cannot be sure of Banner’s motives for being at this conference, it is likely he was expressing an interest in the debate tabled on the League’s attitude to electoral contests, including those for Parliamentary seats. After a good deal of behind-the-scenes activity, a motion went forward in the name of Mahon including support for ‘[p]arliamentary, municipal and other local-government bodies […] to be taken advantage of for spreading the principles of Socialism and organizing the people into a Socialist Labour Party’. E.P. Thompson’s unsurpassed account of these events suggests that Engels may have had a hand in drafting the sophisticated motion, which situated electoral activity within the broad terrain of working-class struggle. Following the defeat of the motion at the conference, a group of its supporters, Mahon, Aveling, Marx Aveling, Bax, Donald, Binning and W.H. Utley came together as a faction to fight for their position within the League. Although not a member of this faction, now out of the League, Banner was certainly in communication with some of its members, Donald, Mahon and Binning, and was probably seen as a key contact. Intriguingly, some of Banner’s contact with members of the faction was mediated through Henry A. Barker, the
League’s secretary, who like Banner had once held strong anti-parliamentary views but by this time favoured engagement in elections and would continue to feature in socialist politics after separating from the League in 1888.55

One of Banner’s letters to Barker was written in the week following the procession on Trafalgar Square on ‘Bloody Sunday’, 13 November 1887, where London’s radicals and socialists challenged the ban on public meetings in the Square imposed by Metropolitan Police Commissioner Sir Charles Warren. Banner was with the Woolwich District Radical Club as the south London contingent crossed Westminster Bridge into Bridge Street where they were confronted and attacked by a large police cordon in a brutal and unexpected manner. Banner told Barker that ‘it was nearly a header for me, I got my hat knocked into a shape which made me think for sometime I had either lost or found a hat!!’56 Following ‘Bloody Sunday’ Banner joined in the activities of the Law and Liberty League acting as one of the coordinators of the Woolwich Vigilance Circle formed to monitor police behaviour and mobilise support for the free speech struggle.57 And he was almost certainly the ‘Bookbinder’ who gave evidence to the London Liberal and Radical Union’s inquiry into the events of 13 November, in which the police attack on the Woolwich marchers was described as ‘indiscriminate […] the police rode in amongst the people hitting left and right’.58

Having rethought his attitude to socialists contesting elections sometime between the League’s second and third annual conferences, Banner was now in favour and would unite again with a number of the faction’s leading protagonists over the next three years in the Labour Union and the Legal Eight Hours International Labour League, both organisations in which Banner was to take his part and which aspired to establish an independent socialist Labour party. This motivation was also instrumental in Banner joining the Fabian Society during November 1890 and not earlier, as stated by Kelvin.59 Although on friendly terms with Shaw, Sidney Webb, Hubert Bland and Edward Pease, Banner’s belief in the centrality of class struggle meant he was not a ‘natural’ Fabian and his entry to the Society at this stage was part of an organised attempt by a group of socialist working men, including Pete Curran and Fred Hammill, to ditch the policy of permeation in favour of the establishment of independent labour representation and so line up the Fabians with others working towards this goal.60 Successful in rallying support for this position, Banner and a number of like-minded comrades were elected to the Fabian Society Executive in 1892, and he was able to sign the Society’s election manifesto of that year without reservation because its policy had shifted significantly in favour of independent labour representation.

Banner’s short period of League membership was obviously of significance to him, and one can speculate about how this was related to the influence of Morris.
Unlike Scheu and a number of other artisans who came to socialism during this period and related craft issues to the challenge of creative labour, there is no evidence to suggest that Banner engaged with these matters, as he remained a trade bookbinder and bindery union organiser all his working life. There are a couple of tantalising lines in letters from Morris in January 1885 suggesting that this might have been different if Banner had found work with T.J. Cobden Sanderson, but nothing came of it. And when in 1904 Banner’s trade union imaginatively and courageously launched a new publication with his enthusiastic support, The Bookbinding Trades Journal, his name featured on issues of pay and conditions of bookbinders, but not on craft matters which were covered extensively.

Similarly, Banner appears not to have been particularly influenced by ethical considerations of socialism, preferring instead to make the case using economic arguments of which he had a firm grasp. Shaw told an audience in 1889 how he had been advised by Banner to read Marx’s Capital when in the early eighties he had attempted to contradict Marxism at a Democratic Federation meeting. An unmistakable member of what Morris called ‘the intellectual proletariat’, Banner, who had been au fait with the Communist Manifesto since his teenage years, when he read his father’s copy of Red Republican in which the first English translation had appeared, was by the early 1890s said to be ‘deriding with virile common sense the puny attacks made on Marx by a certain section of economic students’. The driving force behind the Woolwich ‘Socialist Society’ set up during the autumn of 1887, Banner based its evening educational classes on political economy in order that the workers in attendance could act as effective ‘socialist missionaries’. Banner, who had become a social democrat of the European Marxist persuasion by the late 1870s when Scheu arrived in Edinburgh and introduced him to continental developments, was still convinced of these ideas during the 1890s when Harry (later Lord) Snell encountered him in Woolwich. Forty years later Snell remembered Banner as a ‘widely read man, a Marxian in economics and in politics an out-and-out social democrat’.

Banner’s sustained record of intense trade union activity and leadership of London’s bookbinders demonstrated he was undeterred by any of the antipathy, and in some cases hostility, to industrial work evident in sections of the Social Democratic Federation and Socialist League. Having played an important role in securing an eight-hour working day for London letterpress bookbinders during 1890, where his knowledge of economics was invaluable in negotiations with the employers, Banner could accurately cite this industrial struggle as evidence of how workplace and political struggles could be linked. The demand for a statutory eight-hour working day remained central to Banner’s political and industrial activity for the next decade,
making him one of those Marxists whom Pierson identified as having ‘retained a belief in the dialectical interaction between consciousness and political practice [and] especially likely to participate in the immediate struggles of the workers’.66

Although in his industrial and political activity Banner was always capable of working with others of differing perspectives, he was not one of Anna Vaninskaya’s ‘socialist hybrids’, even if the organisations to which he belonged exhibited ‘internal variety’ and ‘ideological incompatibilities’.67 Notwithstanding the uncertainty about what actually constituted the ‘scientific socialism’ of Marx and Engels at this time because so little had been made available in English, Banner was sure in his own mind that the core of these ideas were correct and they remained his lifelong guide.68 Tellingly, Banner’s first letter to Marx in September 1880, written as a ‘humble admirer’, concerned the possible translation of *Capital* because he believed its availability in English was indispensable for those involved in the class struggle.69 For Banner, the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels provided the tools to understand capitalist exploitation and the rationale for a socialist society. As with any scientific endeavour, dealing with complex and abstract arguments was challenging and difficult to convey to workers, but Banner believed this to be the fundamental task of socialists. In the debate at the first League annual conference during July 1885 when consideration was being given to the content of *Commonweal* and the possibility of bringing it out in weekly instead of monthly instalments, he made his views clear:

Robert Banner wanted a weekly paper. He wanted a daily, as probably the rest of the members of the League did. In fact, he wanted a Social revolution, but he had to wait for it. But how were they going to get a weekly? First, where was the money to come from? And second, where were the writers to come from? And did they seriously want a Socialist rag, with no literary ability in it? If they did want the superficial light stuff that some of them had been talking about, let them buy other papers. Socialists had been told long enough and often enough that their ideas were unscientific. And now, when this was being shown to be false, actually some of the Socialists themselves objected. If they were going to write for the dregs of the people, they might be sure that they would not understand anything that might be written. But if they wanted to appeal to intelligent people, they must make these see that the whole thing is based upon science. In fact, that is the great difficulty of Socialism, that it is a complex scientific question, and therefore can’t be dealt with superficially. We have to teach this difficult question to the working classes, and the first thing to do is to make them understand our language.70
While sometimes temperamentally explosive, Banner did not share what Fiona MacCarthy identifies as Morris’s ‘waywardness and danger’ and susceptibility to anarchist influence, instead positioning himself unequivocally as a disciple of Marx and Engels. The critique of what he regarded as organisational anarchy in the League extended to anarchism as a political philosophy which Banner regarded as organisationally introspective and inherently sectarian. On this and other litmus test issues, Banner established himself as a trusted member of the Engels ‘clique’ extended by Eleanor Marx Aveling through her involvement in the labour movement during the late 1880s, and he was consulted as attempts were made by the group to establish a socialist Labour party, win support for the Marxist Socialist International Congress and campaign for the legal eight-hour working day. It was no coincidence that, alongside Scheu, Banner’s longest political association and friendship was with Eleanor Marx, at whose funeral he spoke and whose death he wanted investigated.

In 1891 Banner told George Samuel that he ‘maintain[ed] the warmest personal admiration and respect for Morris’, even though he probably agreed with Scheu’s verdict that Morris had been too soft on the anarchists in the League. When requested to speak at Hammersmith he would always oblige and, many years later, when chairman of the Library Committee of Woolwich Borough Council, he directed those in charge of requisitions for the new Plumstead Library to ensure that there was a shelf of books by Morris. Perhaps it is not too fanciful to suggest that Banner had his old comrade in mind when, shortly before his death, he remarked that although the socialist movement had carried out two of the Chartist principles, ‘agitate and organise’, they had not succeeded with the third, to ‘educate’.
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William Morris: An Annotated Bibliography
2014–2015

David and Sheila Latham

This bibliography is the eighteenth instalment of a biennial feature of The Journal. We give each original entry a brief annotation meant 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 includes books, pamphlets, articles, exhibition catalogues, and dissertations about Morris, arranged alphabetically by author within each of the following five categories:

- General 10 - 60
- Literature 61 - 96
- Decorative Arts 97 - 137
- Book Design 138 - 151
- Politics 152 - 168

The General category includes biographical surveys and miscellaneous details as well as studies that bridge two or more subjects. The Author Index provides an alphabetical order as an alternative means for searching through the 168 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 having 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, or by email attachment to dlatham@yorku.ca.
PART I: WORKS BY MORRIS

   An Italian translation of the 1884 edition of *Art and Socialism*. (Not seen).


   Bound in fine leather and blocked in gold with a design by Neil Gower inspired by Morris, this fine press edition is printed on Korolla Laid Ivory paper in two colours, with gilded page edges (8½ × 5¾ inches).

   A Spanish translation of political writings by Morris, including ‘How We Live and How We Might Live’. (Not seen).

   A Romanian translation of the 1888 edition of *A Dream of John Ball*. (Not seen).

   This continuously updated website provides ‘readable annotated texts of Morris’s poetry and selected prose, prepared in accordance with current scholarly and critical norms, using current technology for text-searching, manuscript presentation, and comparison of multiple versions’. The archive is organised according to the following headings: Morris’s Life, Poetry, Prose, Diaries, Essays, Translations, Periodicals, Publications, and Manuscripts.

   The facsimile edition of Morris’s 1874 illuminated calligraphic transcription of the Odes of Horace in Latin is accompanied by a translation by W.E. Gladstone and an introduction by Clive Wilmer.

   This illustrated collection of quotations by Morris includes comments by his acquaintances. It was published to accompany the National Portrait Gallery’s

PART II: PUBLICATIONS ABOUT MORRIS

GENERAL
10. Aldred, Oscar. ‘I Wish I Was Where I Was When I Was Wishing I Was Here: Mentalities and Materialities in Contemporary and Historical Iceland.’ *Historical Archaeology*, 49.3 (June 2015): 21-34.
   A phenomenological discussion of nineteenth-century visits to Iceland by Morris and others considers how Victorian tourism and Morris’s translation of the sagas improved the image of the Vikings and influenced ‘the production of archaeological knowledge and placemaking’.

   Paintings, chalk drawings, cartoons, and inscribed books from Rossetti to Jane between October 1857 and August 1879 indicate the changing intimacy of their relationship.

   Joseph Twyman, a furniture designer, and Oscar Triggs, an English professor (later fired as a radical), founded the ‘Morris Movement’ in Chicago in 1903, the first Morris society, promoting egalitarian cooperatives and arts and crafts.


15. Elletson, Helen. *Highlights from the William Morris Society’s Collection*. Hammersmith,
Featuring sixty items chosen from the Society’s collection by Helen Elletson, this well-illustrated book is a collaborative production by The William Morris Society and students at University College London.

The three-part poem evokes the relationships of Morris, Rossetti, and Jane Burden, with Jane posing as Proserpine and as Iseult whose room is ‘filled with what he […] will later make beautifully’.


After serving in the U.S. army during World War II and writing a dissertation and book on George Meredith, Kelvin taught English at the City College of New York and lived several summers in London to complete *The Collected Letters of William Morris* (1984-96).

The Society of Antiquaries is fundraising to preserve Kelmscott Manor through dinner events and auctions of art and antiques.

Edward and Stephani Scott-Snell sublet Kelmscott Manor during the 1940s, lectured at schools on Morris’s ideals, and co-wrote (under the surname Godwin) *Warrior Bard: The Life of William Morris* (1947).

This Italian study introduces Morris as a founder of the Arts and Crafts movement, a furniture designer, and a socialist. (Not seen).


Illustrations of stained glass, wallpapers, tapestries, and furniture show Morris favouring ‘a delicate naturalism’ that made use of native plants, birds, and flowers.


The annotated bibliography is divided into 18 categories, each one beginning with an introduction that surveys the eight to ten books or articles recommended as the most helpful studies within each field of Morris’s work.

‘Spring frosts can be depended upon to roll through the gardens of William Morris’s Cotswolds garden, but his vision of a “heaven on earth” remains intact.’
Morris is one of the most distinguished representatives of the revolutionary form of romanticism.

Published to accompany the 16 October 2014–11 January 2015 exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery, London, this examination of the breadth and depth of Morris’s influence on socialism, the Arts and Crafts movement, and the garden city movement discusses more than fifty individuals who either worked with Morris or were influenced by his example, his designs, and his vision, including C.R. Ashbee, Walter Crane, Edward Carpenter, George Lansburg, Raymond Unwin, Eric Gill, Bernard Leach, Clement Atlee, Sir Gordon Russell, Sir Terence Conran, Dorothy Elmhirst, and Lily Yeats.

Introducing the exhibition ‘Anarchy and Beauty’ that she curated at the National Portrait Gallery, MacCarthy explains that *News from Nowhere* indicates what a ‘thoroughgoing anarchist’ Morris was, that ‘his originality as a visionary thinker lies in the case he makes for the centrality of art’, and that his influence on other designers has been profound and far reaching.


An auction is scheduled in September 2014 to raise funds for preserving Kelmscott Manor, a farmhouse built by Thomas Turner in 1600 but turned into a manor in 1864 before the Morris family moved there in 1871.

The exhibition catalogue for the 15 March–1 June 2014 exhibition at Cartwright Hall, Bradford; the 20 June–21 September 2014 exhibition at the Lady Lever Gallery; and the 4 October–4 January 2015 exhibition at the William Morris...
Gallery explores the role of Jane Morris as Dante Rossetti’s muse and the embodiment of Pre-Raphaelite beauty. More than thirty paintings, drawings, studies, and photographs are included.


Harry Ward, an employee of the British Library’s department of manuscripts, might have encouraged Morris and Burne-Jones to study the Bedford ‘Missal’ (c.1410-30), and later, with his knowledge of linguistics, helped Morris with his work on Icelandic manuscripts.

To mark its 50th anniversary The William Morris Society has introduced a single logo based on Morris’s *Bird* design to unify its communications.


A note on the exhibition ‘Anarchy and Beauty’ at the National Portrait Gallery is followed by brief introductions to houses and museums associated with Morris.

This survey of Morris’s life and work for a general audience includes over 100 illustrations. (Not seen).

Two paintings held in the Cheltenham Art Gallery and Museum show the topographic landscape of the North Cotswolds from 1710 to 1725, contrasting the open fields favoured by Morris in *News from Nowhere* (good for communal haymaking) with the closed private fields divided by hedgerows (as per the
Parliamentary Enclosures).


This collection of essays produced to accompany the Royal Albert Memorial Museum’s exhibition held in Exeter, 22 November 2014–12 April 2015, includes discussions of several works by Morris that demonstrate his interest in medieval art, architecture, literature, book design, and politics.


Morris drew upon his experience with the heroic past and the present hardships of Iceland to measure global modernity and English domesticity and to share his new cultural values with his wife and daughters.


Drawing upon May Morris’s introductions to *The Collected Works of William Morris*, Parkins shows that ‘in the Morris household, the pleasurable sensual apprehension of the objects or materials worked by the hands of the craftsperson was inseparable from the complex feelings of connection with others’.


Following an examination of the archival record on Jane Burden, Parkins presents a thematic analysis of Jane’s life and work and a critique of the series of tropes used by the Pre-Raphaelites to characterise Jane. Her relationships with Rossetti and Blunt, and her inability to break free of her ‘working class’ past are discussed.


The press has been unfair to post-Morris owners of Red House (Charles Holme and Ted Hollamby) for supposedly not working hard enough to preserve the original character.


This digital bibliography is a short-title list of more than two thousand books and manuscripts owned by Morris. A continuously updated work-in-progress, it is divided into the categories of nine centuries, from the eleventh to the nineteenth, and within each century the reader can click chronologically to view the books published that year, and click again to view more details of each book.


55. Stott, Martin. ‘Anarchy and Beauty.’ *Town & Country Planning*, 83.12 (December
In this review of the 16 October 2014–11 January 2015 exhibition ‘Anarchy and Beauty: William Morris and his Legacy, 1860-1960’ at the National Portrait Gallery, London, Stott praises Morris’s influence on the garden city movement and on so many designers, and disagrees with Fiona MacCarthy’s assertion that Morris was an anarchist.


We should think beyond Morris’s wallpapers to remember his many achievements, from writing Christmas carols, lecturing on socialism, and running a successful business, to raising funds for the Victoria and Albert Museum’s purchase of the Ardabil carpet.


Jane Morris was an important inspiration for Dante Rossetti’s art and influenced the melancholic female role in Victorian England by posing as women in medieval literature and classical mythology.


Comparisons of Red House and Kelmscott Manor raise issues concerning their post-Morris histories and preservation, such as the questionable alterations to Kelmscott Manor windows and interior walls during the 1960s and ’70s.


This collection of 1100 letters begins after Webb had completed Red House and shows his close collaboration with Morris in various design projects for Morris and Co., as well as with the founding and work of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Webb admired and was inspired by Morris, his lifelong friend, and maintained a correspondence with Jane and May Morris.


LITERATURE


*News from Nowhere* slows and denies ‘the entropic law of irreversible time’, thus severing the connection between physics and capitalist economics by freeing time from the industrial clock.


Morris’s depiction in *News from Nowhere* of boredom as removed from restlessness and suffering is contrasted with James Joyce’s depiction of boredom in *Ulysses* as a restless distraction that includes utopian daydreaming.


The prose romances demonstrate the need to transfer hope from personal desire to social integration, from escape from strife to a radical force for revolutionary action.


In addition to establishing the importance of wonder as central to Morris’s visionary literature, Bennett provides detailed analysis of each of his prose romances of the 1890s and considers them to be the culmination of his diverse writings on art and architecture, nature and the environment, and politics and socialism.


Dante Rossetti’s two mysterious Malorian paintings are no more than ‘points of departure’ for Morris’s mysterious poems ‘*The Blue Closet*’ and ‘*The Tune of Seven Towers*’, as close analyses of the two paintings and two poems reveal.


In her study of Morris’s literary development, Boos moves from his early interests in history, architecture, communal living, and ethical principles to analyses of his juvenilia and his *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine* poems and prose. She then devotes much of her analysis to *The Defence of Guenevere* volume, including its
sources, its gender representations, and its relationships with Victorian social and political issues.

67. ----. “‘A Holy Warfare against the Age’: Essays and Tales of *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*.” *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 47.3 (Fall 2014): 344-68.
Morris’s ‘The Story of the Unknown Church’, which, like other tales in the magazine, memorialises ‘artistic sublimation and the notion of redemption through loss’, is discussed in relation to essays by William Fulford and Godfrey Lushington and tales by Fulford, Burne-Jones, and R.W. Dixon.

Among Morris’s most personal poems, these forty-two lyrics explore triangular love relationships of adultery and betrayal, but they deal less with the loss of love than with an ethical dread of potential bitterness, and probe the purpose of pain and the silence of gods.

From his first poem (‘The Mosque Rising’), which condemns the violence of Christian soldiers slaying Muslims, to his last romance (*The Sundering Flood*), which condemns jousts, weapons, and fortified castles in favour of tools of architecture for peaceful work, Morris celebrates not violent soldiers but masons, poets, sculptors, ‘and seekers after peace and justice’.

A reading of Twain’s *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court* and his speech ‘The New Dynasty’ in relation to Morris’s *A Dream of John Ball* and essays for *Commonweal* shows that Morris and Twain shared common views on labour and capitalism.

A comparison of *A Dream of John Ball* with Charlotte Yonge’s *The Wardship of Steepcombe* and Mary Branston’s *The Banner of Saint George* highlights how Morris’s ‘a-historical tongue’ and very different vision still resonate with readers today.

*News from Nowhere* is ecological rather than technological, and like Mary Bradley
Lane’s *Mizora*, is concerned with social causes and the impact of political changes on individuals.


The Victorian reception of *The Earthly Paradise* made Morris a public figure whose poem and its own storytellers address audiences as collective, participating publics and speak on their behalf.


British and American utopian literature shared five interrelated themes concerning economics, ethics, the environment, education, and evolution, and depicted ‘a united, harmonious society, characterised by association, community, and cooperation’.


Morris’s translations of Old Norse sagas, his travels in Iceland, and his own poems ‘The Lovers of Gudrun’ and *Sigurd the Volsung* influenced his notion of heroism in life and literature.


A study of Morris’s *The Story of Sigurd the Volsung and the Fall of the Niblung* in conjunction with its Old Norse sources reveals how Morris silences the female characters and foregrounds male identity by his focus on the body, performance, and the built environment.


Reprinted as a shorter version of chapter 3 of Hanson’s *William Morris and the Uses of Violence* (London: Anthem, 2013).


Recorded at three of Morris’s homes, Hayman sings ten of Morris’s chants for socialists intended to be ‘true to Morris’s ideals’ while being made ‘relevant to the 21st century’.

79. Helsinger, Elizabeth K. ‘Poem into Song.’ *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory*
Morris, William Blake, and John Clare sought to see how ‘their poetry might affect popular cultures of song’ by restoring to song what it ‘had lost in an age of commercial remediation for large audiences’.


The verse in Chants for Socialists and the songs embedded in his prose romances showcase the social act of singing as an act of fellowship, as Morris ‘awaken[s] desire for the collective life’ through the power of prosody.


The influence of Keats’s ‘Lamia’ on Victorian aestheticism is traced through Dante Rossetti, Morris, Pater, Swinburne, Whistler, and Michael Field, and their depictions of Guenevere, Mona Lisa, and Sappho in poetry.


More about Swinburne and Burne-Jones, this essay discusses Tannhäuser in Morris’s ‘The Hill of Venus’ tale from The Earthly Paradise as supporting love over sin, the classical pagan over the Christian papacy, and queer otherness over masculine authority.


The epigraph from Morris’s ‘Defence of Guenevere’ in Atwood’s Alias Grace is discussed as supporting the roles of hypnosis and violence in her novel.


Morris’s translation of Beowulf, with all of his archaisms, helps his audience to effectively gain access to the poem’s Germanic time and place, as well as Morris’s socialist message.

85. Latham, David. ‘The Pre-Raphaelite Tongue: The Politics of Antiquarian

Morris’s antiquarian poetics inspire us to replace the colonial mentality of biblical and classical mythology with the most poetic ways of knowing, principles articulated in his lectures on Gothic culture and exemplified in his early poetry, Socratic dialogues, political lectures, and prose romances.


Morris’s poems provide examples of the defining characteristics of Pre-Raphaelite poetry, including the artifice of a self-reflexive art and the jarring juxtaposition of incongruities revealed in the metaphorical closets and cellars of Camelot.


The decorative surface of the ‘Defence of Guenevere’ enforces an undetermined perspective that invites the reader to participate in a ‘collective and collaborative’ recreation of past experience arising from the tension between the historic distance of what is inaccessible and the collaborative engagement with what is comprehensible.


Analyses of Morris’s early poetry and prose from the 1850s through Sigurd the Volsung (1876) show his early commitment to social equality and safeguarding the environment from the threats of capitalism and industrialisation.


Morris’s short stories from the 1850s – ‘The Story of the Unknown Church’, ‘The Hollow Land’, and ‘Lindenborg Pool’ – are influenced by Ruskin’s views on art and society.

A sequel to *News from Nowhere* should consider seven principles: the appropriateness of a utopian sequel, the alternative possibilities suggested within the text, the theoretical breakthroughs in subsequent utopian thought, the dissident voices within the narrative, the potential development of minor characters, the guidance of Victorian maxims, and the return journey downriver to the crowds of London.


Morris was drawn to the love triangles of the sagas and to the Nordic myths that convey ‘tenderness, misery, despair, beauty, harshness, and solitude’, with happiness derived from the heroic endurance of fate in the wilderness and dreadfulness of the world.

DECORATIVE ARTS
Although Morris’s ethical views on how a thing is made are more relevant than ever, his view that a commitment to beauty can be a remedy for labour problems (such as the exploitation of workers in sweatshops) has come to be ‘highly suspect’.

Morris’s approach to the design and manufacture of carpets is analysed in detail with reference to archival and historical sources (including carpets Morris knew) and in terms of the intellectual and architectural frameworks, and the technical aspects of motif selection and hand-knotting styles favoured by Morris, with the Clouds carpet (1885) as a prime example.

A reclining chair upholstered in Morris’s Avon pattern is illustrated as a product of Morris & Co.

A discussion of furniture inspired by Morris and designed by others, includes chairs by Philip Webb, Gustav Stickley, and C.F.A. Voysey, a blanket chest by Sidney Barnsley, and a walnut sideboard by Ernest Gimson.

The contributions of Morris, along with Enid Marx, Peggy Angus, and Marthe Armitage, are emphasised in a discussion of the history of block-printed textiles and wallpapers.

Morris and Co. stained-glass windows can be divided into three phases: the early 1860s, the aesthetic 1870s, and the heavy-leaded and vivid-coloured windows of the 1880s. Morris did not use the highest quality glass, but his designs were considered the best.

The original sketchbooks of designs for stained glass that Philip Webb produced
for Morris and Co. show that, like other members of the Firm, Webb valued the pictorial qualities of windows.


Published to accompany the 6 December 2014–8 March 2015 exhibition ‘Love Is Enough: William Morris & Andy Warhol’ at the Modern Art Oxford gallery, this well illustrated catalogue presents images and commentaries under the following chapter headings: Art is for Everyone; Camelot; A Conversation; Hopes and Fears for Art; A Factory as it Might Be; Flower Power.


Curators Deller, Mason, and Shiner discuss the similarities and differences between Morris and Warhol in terms of their childhoods and family backgrounds, their work environments, and their artistic and entrepreneurial abilities.

Prejudice against the machine ‘can be traced back to William Morris’, who ‘blamed the machine for the decline in standards’.

In a letter Faulkner corrects Chris Eckersley’s inaccurate opinion of Morris’s view of machines (see Eckersley #108).

Nature was a major source of inspiration for the art and designs of Morris who, as a leader of the Arts and Crafts movement, influenced the embroiderer Nicola Jarvis and the mixed-media artist Gina Bosworth.

111. Finel Honigman, Ana. ‘William Morris & Andy Warhol.’ Artnews, 114.4 (April

---


In 1881 Morris designed an altar dossal, with ‘sweeping curves of stylized foliage set against an almost golden felt background’, now restored by the priory church at Lanercost, Cumbria.

Greensted corrects Chris Eckersley’s inaccurate opinion of Morris’s view of machines (see Eckersley #108 and Faulkner #109).

After meeting Morris in the office of George Street, Bodley became an ‘enthusiastic collaborator’ with Morris, Marshall, Faulkner and Co. in the production of stained glass windows that were medieval and modern but showing ‘a delicate transparency’ until around 1870 when their working relationship ceased.

Essays on craft and folk art, including ‘William Morris in our Time’, are reprinted here from magazines over the past thirty years.

The Morris and Co. stained-glass windows featuring Saints Cecilia and Margaret in the Second Presbyterian Church of Chicago recall the love of music Morris and Burne-Jones held since joining the Oxford Plain Song Society as college students.

This collection of appliqué projects based on May Morris’s designs was inspired by the author’s viewing of 200 of May’s original pencil drawings at the
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. The small projects are described as being ‘achievable for all skill levels’.


With reference to the Panelled Room, or White Room, at Kelmscott Manor, designed by Morris and Webb, Huxtable argues that Morris influenced a shift away from colour-saturated interiors to simple white interiors that accentuate ornament, as further demonstrated by such designers as McIntosh and MacDonald, Kolomon Moser and Josef Hoffmann, and Carl Larsson.


A large spray-printed image of a wild Morris throwing a luxury yacht juxtaposed with a display of his hand-carved printing blocks, shown at curator Jeremy Deller’s exhibition ‘English Magic’ at the British pavilion in Venice, 2013, explores questions about the cross-cultural understanding of non-verbal patterns.


George Ohr (1856-1918), known for his disfigured pottery creations, demonstrated a kinship with Morris’s social ideals and may be seen as a model of the successful, fulfilled labourer that Morris describes in his writings.


The results of a controlled experiment in which Morris designs were used as a source of inspiration for new textile designs and compared with designs that did not use a source suggest that there is a positive advantage to using historical inspiration in textile design.

Accompanying the exhibition at the Modern Art Oxford gallery, 6 December 2014–8 March 2015, this guide includes essays and interviews with curator Jeremy Deller, and several experts including Michael Parry (Sanderson) on Morris’s designs for wallpapers, Alison Gee on the ‘Enduring Brand’ of Morris and Co. today, and Kathy Haslam on the creative impact of Kelmscott Manor.

Sophia George, the Victoria & Albert Museum’s first Game Designer-in-Residence, has created the Strawberry Thief iPad game.

As a fundraiser for the Art Fund, designer Dan Pearson will mow the wildflower meadow at the Compton Verney Art Gallery into the pattern of Morris’s Trellis wallpaper as a lasting exhibition outside the Gallery.

J.E. Millais’s Isabella and Mariana and F.M. Brown’s Work, but especially the art of Walter Crane – his unpublished illustrated poem ‘The Craftsman’s Dream’, his paintings for decorating firms, his tempera At Home: A Portrait, and his designs for socialist pamphlets and membership cards – have a linear delineation similar to patterning that makes the pictorial decorative as well as politically radicalised.

An ebonised reclining chair designed by Philip Webb is upholstered with Morris’s Avon printed cotton.

Introduced to Morris’s work by his teachers, Caroline Anstruther and C.R. Ashbee, Miller became a prolific and successful carver of stone memorials and ecclesiastical woodwork in medieval and Arts and Crafts styles.


The Wightwick Manor Museum in Wolverhampton has acquired a series of four watercolour sketches of animals (1886) that are original designs for Morris’s The Forest tapestry.

132. Sambrook, Justine. ‘Red House, Bexleyheath, 1860.’ RIBA Journal, 122.1
Philip Webb and Morris designed Red House together, fusing Webb’s ‘practical common sense’ with Morris’s ‘romantic utopianism’.


134. Ujszászi, Zsuzsanna. ‘The Pre-Raphaelite Journey into the Middle Ages.’ Acta Universitatis Sapientiae: Philologica, 7.1 (December 2015): 29-43. The medievalism of Morris’s poems ‘The Tune of Seven Towers’ and ‘The Blue Closet’ and Rossetti’s paintings of the same name is discussed in parallel readings of their images and texts.


BOOK DESIGN


139. Crespo-Martín, Bibiana. ‘El Libro de Artista de Ayer a Hoy: Seis Ancestros del Libro

In the philosophy presented in his 1893 lecture ‘The Ideal Book’, Morris is one of six artists (with Piranesi, Goya, Blake, Mallarmé, and Vollard) who have had a major influence on the development and design of artists’ books today.


Morris was indeed a Pre-Raphaelite and shared their interest in book and manuscript collecting, with Morris’s collecting divided into three phases: 1864-80 eclectic; late 1880s typography; and 1890s expensive medieval manuscripts.


Morris purchased the *De Regimine Principum* (1473) by Aegidius Romanus because the printer was Günther Zainer whose typeface inspired Morris’s *Troy* and *Chaucer* font.


Morris predicted that printed books might be replaced by bottles with patent stoppers, suggesting the possibility of recorded books.


Morris’s translation of *The Aeneid* into English was not appreciated because its archaisms seemed out of context, but it could have been improved if the translated text had been amalgamated with the historical illuminations of Morris’s Latin version that he was preparing at the same time.


Though he declined Morris’s invitation to be a business partner, Walker was his steadfast advisor on all aspects of the Kelmscott Press, especially in the use of modern photography for designing a roman and a gothic type and for adapting ornamental initials for electrotype.


Christie’s Auction house is offering a hand-operated printing press used for printing *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* by Morris and Burne-Jones.

146. Sly, Ronald. *A Little Job for William Morris: A Memoir of Robert Catterson-Smith*. Hertford:
The grandson-in-law of the wood engraver Catterson-Smith provides information from letters by Morris and Burne-Jones concerning their collaboration with Catterson-Smith and W.H. Hooper in the preparation of Burne-Jones’s illustrations for Kelmscott Press books, including *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*.


Morris’s criticism of Giamattista Bodoni reveals how Morris considered the particular relationship of image and text and the general relationship between aesthetic and ideological viewpoints of book design.


Morris politicised his interest in Virgil’s *Aeneid* as an indictment of Roman and British imperialism by turning from the beauty of his calligraphy and Burne-Jones’s visual images to the political agenda of his verbal translation for a wider audience.


Following his experiments with calligraphy and illumination, Morris transitioned to print as part of his negotiation strategies for constructions of Victorian social identity and of an idealised past.


Morris’s printing principles for the modern book had different influences in Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium, with Belgian printers either applauding or avoiding Morris.


Morris’s rules from the ‘Ideal Book’ (1893) for handmade paper and distinctive watermarks were followed by Dutch private presses until they switched to using Japanese paper.

**POLITICS**


Morris condemns ‘practical Politics’ as rationalising our conformity to the ‘real world’, like poultry debating ‘the all-important subject, “with what sauce shall we be
In his depiction of enquiry and dissent as troubling to the stability of society in News from Nowhere, Morris is less in line with Marxism than he is with J.S. Mill’s liberalism and defence of open dialogue as a means for dynamic thought and resistance to dogma.

In his speech delivered to the Relationships Alliance, London, on 29 January 2015, the British Labour Party politician recalls Morris’s answer to what makes life worthwhile (‘love and work’), and argues that fairly paid work helps us support and spend time with loved ones.

Morris’s News from Nowhere and Ruskin’s Unto This Last ‘suggest equally complex relations’ to our current ecological and political concerns.

This Turkish study of Morris is set within the context of Marxism and art history. (Not seen).

Morris’s writings and art, being a projection of his own individual style, taste, and integrity, developed an appreciative following, induced cooperative enterprise, and influenced social change.

Between 1890 and 1915 members of the international socialist movement were responsible for translating News from Nowhere into fourteen languages: Dutch, French, Swedish, German, Italian, Russian, Finnish, Czech, Polish, Spanish, Japanese, Serbian, Norwegian, and Bulgarian.

A discussion of Morris’s utopianism as a strategic extension of his political and propagandistic writings is set against the influential interpretations of Miguel Abensour and E.P. Thompson that Morris’s utopianism should be seen as open-ended, heuristic, and anti-political.


As ‘Morris’s perfect political partner’, Eleanor Marx supplied the economic and strategic reasons to the SDF for the split with Hyndman, and stood with Morris when police brutally broke up the Dod Street gathering on 20 September 1885 and arrested Morris.


‘Through its mission to build a more fulfilling world through ethical commerce, craftmanship, and fun, the contemporary e-commerce site Etsy participates in the discourse of politicized craft that Morris articulated’.


Morris considered three distinct stages for dreaming the future: the contemplation of the concept of communism, the exhortation to embrace the revolution, and the reflexive rethinking of political transformation.


As an early eco-socialist, Morris believed that ‘capitalism is fundamentally incompatible with the Earth’s ecological balance’.


Both Morris and Élisée Reclus studied the tribal society of medieval Iceland as a decentralising path to socialism.


‘The Communism of William Morris’ is reprinted from the 1959 lecture delivered to the Art Workers Guild, first published in 1965 by the William Morris Society.

Transforming political rhetoric into a ‘discursive engagement’ with the discontinuities of public thinking, Morris narrates *News from Nowhere* through a common rhetorician who is non-exceptional, as are the givers of goods and services whose economic exchange is governed by ‘non-equivalence’ and ‘deferred compensation’.

Morris’s 1890 correspondence with A.T. Rickarby carries on a debate with Bishop Alfred Barry, with Morris defending atheism against Barry’s capitalist society of beasts founded on robbery.

Webb’s account of his visit to Oxford (reprinted here from *The Commonweal*, 4 December 1886) is considered within the context of the formation of the Oxford Branch of the Socialist League, in which Charles Faulkner played an important role on the executive and as an advocate for socialism.
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W.R. Lethaby, in his biography of Philip Webb entitled *Philip Webb and his Work* (1935), opens by noting that Webb’s active life ‘covered the latter half of the nineteenth century – the mature Victorian epoch. He was little known, but that, as the spinster said, was “by choice”; few ever heard of him just because he was so great a man.’

These four volumes of Webb’s letters open a door to this quiet, unassuming man. The letters that survive are all to friends or concerned with business; no family correspondence has been found except one early letter from his mother, marking his birthday in 1852, but what a wealth of correspondence is here. These are letters personal – to friends – and businesslike to clients, and the range of correspondents include the Howards, Charles and Kate Faulkner, Ruskin, Rossetti, and of course the Morrices. In all Webb’s kindness and decency shine through. Here he writes to Jane Morris following Rossetti’s mental collapse in 1872: ‘I have always taken a great interest in you, and none the less that time has tossed all of us about, and made us
play other parts than we set out on. I see that you play yours, well and truly under the changes, and I feel deeply sympathetic on that account — for, my old own tumbles are not so absorbing that I cannot attend to the tumbles of those who are wrapt about, with the pains of life which are not ignoble’ (I, p. 55).

In writing to Alexander Cassavetti, a client who has questioned the cost of alterations to his house in Addison Road, he offers the following: ‘I was rather annoyed on reading your letter received last night, not because it would seem as if it reflected on me, but rather that my explanations to you must have been somewhat misleading could not have been full enough or clear to you, & if that is the case I am really very sorry. It is not an uncommon thing, I assure you, for Architects’ clients to be surprised when the final accounts come in, as ’till that time, they have, as a rule, hardly realized the amount of things wh’ have been added to the contract, beyond those things (especially in an altered house) wh’ could not have been foreseen’ (I, p. 140). The crossings out and insertions in the draft reproduced here show the care he took in all he did. Would that we received such courteous correspondence from our builders these days.

Writing late in his life to W.R. Lethaby, who had become a close friend, he laments his old age and comments on the demise of his contemporaries: ‘I had thought that old and trustworthy friend, Norman Shaw, would have held out as long as myself — but No, and he had done good serious work, & could have done more if he had lingered longer’ (IV, p. 314). A few months later, also to Lethaby, he writes: ‘I’m somewhat down in the mouth now, from the discomfort of my memory having failed me, to keep company with my 84 or 85 years on this earth – if so be? There, I cannot write a letter – as you see, and so says your affectionate, Philip Webb’ (IV, p. 316).

Painstakingly tracked down and collected from various sources, these 1100 letters from 1864-1914 are a fascinating insight into the life of a quiet, generous man. Comprehensive footnotes give context to the correspondence and the index, always vital in collections of this sort, is full and helpful.

Penny Lyndon


This attractive and informative book is the result of the painstaking work of Dr. Desna Greenhow, who managed in two years to read and transcribe the 300,000 words of Mary Watts’s diaries, which are here reduced to about one third. The extracts from the
diary seen as endpapers show the challenge of the task. From the succinct and informative Introduction we learn that the wedding of George Frederic Watts and Mary Fraser-Tytler took place on 20 November 1886, when Watts was sixty-nine and Mary thirty-six. Soon after, Watts suggested to Mary that she should keep a diary about their life together. ‘It turned out to be’, in the editor’s words, ‘a cementing element in their relationship, and a fascinating document in its own right’ (p. 9). In these pages we come to see the events of the couple’s life together. They lived at first in Watts’s Little Holland House in Kensington and then, as winters in unhealthily foggy London became increasingly difficult, spent two winters in the country with their friends Andrew and May Hitchins in their house near Compton in Surrey. They then decided to build for themselves nearby a house they called ‘Limnerslease’, designed by the architect Ernest George. The diary shows both the intimacy of the relationship and the couple’s sociability and philanthropy, as well as the industriousness of Watts (usually referred to by May as ‘Signor’) and his encouragement of May in developing her creative talents.

Watts’s two best artist friends were Frederic Leighton and Edward Burne-Jones, who both appear frequently in these pages, along with Georgiana Burne-Jones. Watts’s fine 1871 portrait of Leighton is reproduced in colour, while Burne-Jones is shown in a powerful full-page undated photograph by Frederic Hollyer, the photographer (who was well known to the couple). Leighton’s conversational powers greatly impressed Mary; for 25 February 1891 we read: ‘[n]o fog in his mind! When he talks he reminds me of exquisitely skilful piano playing. The management of words is so deft, so exactly right, no false note, & swift as thought is swift’ (p. 67) – though she thought less highly of his paintings. Of the Burne-Jones exhibition, we read on 25 January 1893: ‘she [Georgie] must be very glad & proud to see such a lifework spread out before her & yet it does not represent much more than half, nothing of the glass windows, which Signor thinks his greatest work, for he made that art, nothing like it having gone before’ (pp. 114-15). Others who appear here include Canon Samuel Barnett, Walter Crane (whose 1891 portrait is shown in colour), Millais (whose 1871 portrait is also reproduced), Holman Hunt, Meredith, Gertrude Jekyll, Conrad Dressler, Cecil Rhodes and the Holidays, with Thomas Hardy and Oscar Wilde on the margins: a remarkable collection! Ruskin does not appear in person, but his work is admired, although Watts saw Ruskin’s temperament as very different from his own. When the couple were in Egypt, the entry for 3 February 1887 tells of their seeing the ‘marvellous’ temple of Karnak, about which Watts observed that ‘there was something in the line of the cheek of the Sphinx which touched him more’. Jane adds: ‘[t]here Ruskin & he differ, for Ruskin finds more beauty in everything else. To the lines of the human form he is blind’ (pp. 21-22).

The Wattses were not intimate with Morris, so references to him are sparse. But
they are also full of interest. In the first, for 2 March 1891, the couple are visited by Morris’s friend Mrs. Aglaia Coronio, ‘who was very delightful as usual, full of bright thoughts’:

She was telling us about Morris & his wonderful quick sight & length of memory. He drew her one day the whole & complete design & the pattern of the carpet in H. Hunt’s picture *The Awakened Conscience*, & he had not seen it for twenty years. She had just seen it & she said it was all correct, though not the woman’s head. They had some discussion about it so she took the drawing to H. Hunt, who said it was the most wonderful bit of memory as he had repainted the head ten years ago.

Aglaia also taught Mary Rossetti’s comic poem about Valentine Prinsep:

There is a creator called God,  
Whose creations are sometimes most odd,  
I maintain & I shall  
That a creature called Val  
Reflects little credit on God.

(pp. 67-68)

The next reference to Morris is on 7 April 1893, and is her most critical remark, suggesting that Morris’s work somehow failed to be truly democratic:

Signor & I were talking this morning of the loss of beauty, which seems almost inevitable in all forward movements now, but we need that spirit to be more universal, democratic. Burne-Jones, tho’ a priest of the Temple of Beauty, speaks to the cultured. Morris also, & these democrats are not practical. I have always felt that Morris should have had a shop of common things, beautiful in form and colour.

(p. 124)

The entry for 12 June 1893 records a visit by Henry James and a discussion with Watts. The latter’s 1870 portrait of Morris (now in the National Portrait Gallery; not reproduced here) pleased James most: ‘[h]e says a face passed through the mind of Signor comes out like a better self!’. In her *Portrait Catalogue*, quoted in a footnote, Mary calls Morris: ‘[p]oet and author in prose. Great artist of decoration. A man of extraordinary power and no less extraordinary energy’ (p. 131).
The final group of references to Morris occur in relation to his death. On Friday 2 October 1896:

Morris released from his sufferings. Mrs Holiday told me yesterday that he had all his life had a great fear of death. In these last days he had allowed himself to think ‘there might be a place where I would wander about again’.

(p. 164)

It is interesting to place this comment of Kate Holiday, the wife of the designer Henry Holiday and herself Morris’s favourite embroiderer, in the context of other accounts of Morris’s last days. Two days later, on the Sunday, the Wattses went to visit the Burne-Joneses at the Grange:

We went out, after a fine interval, to the Grange. We knew there were sad hearts there, & we found them both in. They were touched at my darling’s going to them. They know it is so seldom that he is moved to leave his work.

They are very good. Georgie is determined to be brave, but to both it is the cutting off of just such a friend as Leighton was to Signor, even perhaps a more unbroken intercourse, for every Sunday of the year he breakfasted with them.

She dwells upon the thought of his life, accomplishing so much, fulfilling so much, work she believes has never been half recognised which will go on living. She says ‘he is not dead’, & that is true.

(p. 164)

The Wattses went to see the exhibition in honour of Morris put on at the New Gallery, as recorded in the entry for 6 October. The exhibition prompted Watts to say: ‘[a] great art revival. Morris, Gilbert, & Burne-Jones have shaped it, I suppose that is not too much to say.’ The exhibition was closed on 6 October for Morris’s funeral at Kelmscott, while the Wattses went on to Regent Street: ‘[a] wreath of laurel lay upon the case holding the splendid [Kelmscott Press] books, & on it a sonnet in Walter Crane’s writing. Touching, beautiful words, a life’s monument to the great dead. Thro’ a storm of wind and pelting rain he is being laid to rest at Kelmscott today’ (p. 165). That was the case, though it is difficult to see how Mary could have known of it at the time. Perhaps she was making use of the information in the entry for 7 October:

Georgie Burne-Jones here, who gave us a touching account of dear Morris’s funeral. His coffin was met at the station by a waggoner & his wain, the cart
just trimmed with vines & flowers by one of the young men in his works! All simple. He was laid to rest under the green sod. A wild wet day for it, the rain just stopping for those ten minutes by the grave side.

(p. 165)

The Wattses’ concern for the poor and unfortunate was deep and genuine, based on what they both saw as the importance of the spiritual. On 20 February 1893 he told Mary: ‘the older I get the more I am aware that the only reality that exists is the spiritual’ (p. 119). On 12 October 1896, Mary remarks, on reading the recent novel The Children of the Ghetto (1892) by the Jewish writer Israel Zangwill, ‘every book of the kind that I read now makes me feel certain that we are moving on towards a universal creed’ (p. 166). This type of spirituality meant that, when the village of Compton needed a new cemetery, Mary persuaded Watts that they should build a Cemetery Chapel on the site. She would design and decorate it, running a class for local people to help in the making of the terracotta tiles she wanted to use on the exterior, and setting up the Compton Pottery; the exterior was completed successfully in 1898. Mary also took responsibility for the decoration of the circular interior, for which she designed relief panels in gesso, showing angels and the Tree of Life; she again made use of the talents of the local community. (There is a fine colour photograph showing the remarkable quality of the decoration). It was fortunately almost complete when Watts died in 1904, and the Chapel has become the building for which, along with the Gallery itself, visitors come today. In her note to the final entry in the diary, Dr. Greenhow tells us how active Mary remained in Compton until her death, which did not take place until 1938. Hers was a remarkable achievement, and admiration for her can only be increased by the publication of this excellent book.

Peter Faulkner


One of the many memorable features of Fiona MacCarthy’s biography of Morris is her decision to include places, and voyages to those places, in her list of reference notes, alongside more conventional literary and historical sources. MacCarthy’s decision is apt, not least because a strong sense of place was so crucial to Morris’s understanding of the world through which he moved. From Iceland to Epping Forest, MacCarthy’s biography is, in part, a story of many journeys. At a more localised
level, Sally Goldsmith repeats MacCarthy’s gesture towards place consciousness in this illuminating and engaging pamphlet, informing readers at the outset that she lives at ‘the very edge of Sheffield’ in view of ‘a stone eighteenth-century farmhouse, known as St. George’s Farm’ (p. 1), which also happens to be the primary object of her discussion. This seemingly coincidental connection has clearly borne fruit, for Goldsmith, in an enduring interest and research project.

Utopia comes in many forms. Textual manifestations of the utopian genre belong to the same broad structure of feeling as intentional communities and back-to-the-land communes. During the late 1870s, John Ruskin outlined his plans to inaugurate a utopian project of the latter kind under the auspices of the Guild of St. George, originally established by Ruskin during 1871, and formally constituted with its present name during 1878. By 1880, the Guild had acquired five pieces of property, including: a group of cottages overlooking the Mawddach estuary in Barmouth, north Wales; a stretch of woodland and orchard near Bewdley in Worcestershire; a small museum at Walkley, near Sheffield; and St. George’s Farm, near Totley (sometimes referred to by Ruskin as Abbeydale or Mickley). In this short pamphlet, published by the Guild’s latter-day incarnation in the form of a charitable Education Trust, Goldsmith re-examines the history of Ruskin’s attempt to settle a group of labourers on the farm near Totley which was, at the time, a small village on the outskirts of Sheffield composed mainly of ‘agricultural labourers, farmers, ganister miners, scythe and file grinders’ (p. 11) – inauspicious terrain for the realisation of the good life.

Ruskin first announced the idea in his series of monthly letters Fors Clavigera: Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain (1871-84), and initially professed himself content that ‘here is at last a little piece of England given into the English workman’s hand, and heaven’s’ (p. 25). However, Ruskin’s relations with the farm’s labourers soon soured, as their communist ideals and aspirations proved markedly at odds with his paternalistic aims. Besides Ruskin, Goldsmith’s cast of characters includes the poet and simple lifer, Edward Carpenter, two Sheffield Quakers, Henry Swan and Edwin Priest, the Christian socialist and republican William Harrison Riley, and Ruskin’s gardener, David Downs, who were all, in different ways, and for different lengths of time, involved in the project at St. George’s Farm. Ruskin had appointed Swan as the curator of the nearby St. George’s Museum in Walkley, and Swan played an important role in introducing Ruskin to a group of workers who attended a series of mutual improvement classes at Isaac Ironside’s Sheffield Hall of Science, and declared themselves to be communists.

Of the nine men (including Priest) who signed an agreement to work on the farm in June 1877, Joseph Daniels was a joiner, Frederick Williams was a stone mason, John Maloy was very probably a bootmaker, W. Skelton Hunter was a surgical
instrument maker, Henry Fellows was a stove-grate fitter, Ebenezer Richardson was an engine fitter, Joseph Sharp was an ex-Chartist and harp player and Henry Richardson was a fork manufacturer. This group of skilled artisans, most of whom were accompanied by their wives and dependent children, decided to engage in cooperative labour on the land, partly, it seems, from political conviction, but they were ‘[h]ardly a promising lot in terms of farming and gardening’ (p. 37). Goldsmith also gives particularly prominent attention to Mrs M.A. Maloy, who published a testimony of her experience of the farm – painting Ruskin in an especially negative light – in *Commonweal* during 1889, towards the end of Morris’s tenure as editor. Maloy’s article was one of a series of articles published in *Commonweal*, as part of a discussion of the farm’s history that had been sparked by Carpenter’s obituary of Joseph Sharp, entitled ‘A Minstrel Communist’. Other correspondents included William Harrison Riley, George Sturt and John Greenwood. This correspondence suggests the extent to which small-scale utopian experiments, such as that practised at St. George’s Farm, formed part of the Socialist League’s internal culture of debate and strategic deliberation.

In retelling the story of the Totley communists, Goldsmith also brings to bear her own lived experience of participating in ‘a frugal utopia a thousand feet up on the bleakest moors near Huddersfield, together with twelve other adults, plus children, goats and chickens’ (p. 1). It can be especially difficult to recover the history of such ephemeral and often fractious, short-lived experiments because, as Goldsmith acknowledges, ‘history is written by unreliable narrators’ (pp. 2-3), a category in which she freely includes herself. As she puts it – partly as a speculative comment on the history of St. George’s Farm, and partly as a reflection on her own lived experience – ‘[d]iffering aims, different ideas of how to organise work and money, tensions around expected levels of input, as well as personality clashes, can be a volatile mixture’ (p. 47). The early days of St. George’s Farm were certainly rocky, though it eventually came under the tenancy of George Pearson and his family, who, along with John Furniss and his family, made a reasonable success of both St. George’s Farm and the nearby Moorhay Farm, which both families ‘ran […] collectively’ (p. 78). These two families were, according to Carpenter, ‘a less voluble and more practical body of Communists’ (p. 81).

Given the relative paucity of textual traces, the task of piecing together a coherent narrative of the farm’s development and dissolution is not an easy one. Several scholars, including W.H.G. Armytage, Stuart Eagles and Jan Marsh, have contributed to our understanding of this history. Most recently, Mark Frost’s *The Lost Companions and John Ruskin’s Guild of St George: A Revisionary History* (2014) has done much to challenge foregoing assumptions about the role of various key participants in the
farm, particularly William Harrison Riley and Henry Swan. Goldsmith makes clear at a number of points that her pamphlet is heavily reliant on Frost’s research, especially his discovery of a number of new archival sources, transcripts of which Frost generously shared with Goldsmith for the purposes of her study. Goldsmith’s proximity to the major landmarks of the story she narrates makes this a lively and appealing rendition of (mostly) familiar material, and she draws on the Carpenter Collection held in the Sheffield Archives, which contains some illuminating correspondence relating to the farm.

Owen Holland
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