Abstract

This chapter develops an account of the continuities and contrasts between 'Romantic Gothic' and 'Victorian medievalism', focusing on the figures of Robert Southey and William Morris. Bringing together the historical perspectives developed in Morris's conservationist activities with the SPAB and his utopian romance, *News from Nowhere*, and in Southey's 'black letter' works of 1817 including his edition of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, I argue for the early and late nineteenth-century presence of what might be called an alternative 'history of the Gothic'. This is Gothic as what Morris called a 'style historic', articulated either side of the 1840s and the rise of historicism in architecture and 'medievalism' in literature. Where Morris ultimately chose a harder-edged Nordic 'Gothic' over the 'maundering medievalism' of Tennyson and Rossetti, Southey consistently avoided the category, despite being present at its inception with his review of the 1817 work in which the word 'medieval' first appeared. Revising received literary-historical narratives and semantic histories of 'Gothic' being subsumed by the medieval, I suggest the long-nineteenth-century articulation and the ongoing significance of a more granular, aphasic and rhizomatic approach to the art and culture of the middle ages.

2.2. From Romantic Gothic to Victorian Medievalism: 1817 and 1877
Tom Duggett

> No doubt within the last fifty years a new interest, almost like another sense, has arisen in these ancient monuments of art; and they have become the subject of one of the most interesting of studies, and of an enthusiasm, religious, historical, artistic, which is one of the undoubted gains of our time; yet we think that … those last fifty years of knowledge and attention have done more for their destruction than all the foregoing centuries of revolution, violence, and contempt. For Architecture, long decaying, died out, as a popular art at least, just as the knowledge of mediaeval art was born. So that

the civilised world of the nineteenth century has no style of its own amidst its wide knowledge … of other centuries.

So runs the preamble to the 'Manifesto' of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), founded by William Morris in 1877.[1] Setting his face against the 'strange and most fatal idea' – John Ruskin's 'Lie' – of architectural 'Restoration', and the 'professional office-made versions' of antiquity represented by its 'Revivalist' twin, Morris developed a countervailing 'active view of history', involving hopes for a genuine revival of the 'master-art' of architecture, in a society remade by and for art.[2] In a lecture of the same year on the 'Decorative' or 'Lesser Arts', Morris spelt out the paradox that the discovery of the 'new sense' of 'history', within a national legacy of ancient architecture, had led to a mode of strangely unhistorical being. Before 'ecclesiastical zeal' and 'study' had led restorers into 'sweeping away' all changes 'at least since the Reformation', old churches had been 'altered and added to century after century, often beautifully, always historically', persisting through a combination – in itself historically valuable – of 'neglect' and 'violence', and 'ordinary obvious mending'.[3] Morris saw that the 'symbolic' 'historicism' of the ecclesiological movement – epitomised in the work of architects such as A.W.N. Pugin and G.E. Street – had perhaps been an adequate vehicle for the fifty-years' growth of the 'new sense' of art and history, or a whole conception of 'culture'.[4] We were now determined, Morris said, 'to know the reality of all that has happened, and to be put off no longer with the dull records of the battles and intrigues of kings and scoundrels'.[5] But another transformation was needed, he suggested in 1884, if the Gothic dream was not to lapse into nightmare:

> Surely it is a curious thing that while we are ready to laugh at the idea of … the Greek workman turning out a Gothic building, or a Gothic workman turning out a Greek one, we see nothing preposterous in the Victorian workman producing a Gothic one … I may be told, perhaps, that … historical knowledge … has enabled us to perform the miracle of raising the dead centuries to life. But to my mind it is a strange view to take of historical knowledge and insight, that it should set us on the adventure of trying to retrace our steps towards the past … Surely such a state of things is a token of change … of the visible end of one cycle and the beginning of another'.[6]

Morris's perception of a pattern in history is in part an effect of his 'conversion' – the year before – to Marxism. But the same sense of Gothic architectural form as alternatively 'historic*ist*' death or 'historic*al*' rebirth, is equally present in his early short story for the *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*, 'A Night in a Cathedral' (1856). In 'A Night', written after Morris's Anglo-French cathedral tour of summer 1855, the Gothic architecture of Amiens cathedral appears alternately in nightmares of monstrous finished forms and dream-visions of what Morris would later call 'inchoate' and 'half-conscious' 'moulding':

> I looked out boldly into the darkness, and tried to fill up the details of the architecture, as I had seen them in the daylight. … I had been particularly struck by the calm pure beauty of some of [the stone-carvings in the aisles of the choir]; and now, standing before [them] in the darkness, I tried to recal those countenances, to still the tumult of my dread by their heavenly repose. They came out from the blankness, but with partial distinctness; after a little while passing off into foul and ugly faces, of demons and wicked men, which increased my fright.[7]

In his own 'inchoate' way, and with the half-suggestion of the 'historical sense' arising *in* achieved architectural forms, Morris adumbrates what Stephen Bann, following Michel Foucault, calls the early nineteenth-century 'dialectic' of the loss and rediscovery of history: the dawning of 'a deep historical perspective in which "man" was to lose his central position as the measure of all things, in which provinces of thought like natural history and the study of language would turn out to have their own separate genealogies and laws of development' – and the past turned out not to be a single narrative of development but rather the congeries or ever-varying constellation of diverse temporalities.[8] As Nick Groom puts it in a recent essay on Thomas Chatterton and the 'catacthonic' or 'intra-historical', the arrival of Romanticism is bound up with the arrival of the new view of history: shifting out of eighteenth-century antiquarianism and Whig narratives of historical progress towards a sense of the past as an 'echo-chamber' or un-place with 'vertiginous depths'. The 'ultimately simple configuration [of defined] events' gives way to a perception of the 'histories-beneath-history' and the 'assemblages' of 'decentric thought'.[9]

The way had been prepared for Morris to grasp this 'deep historical perspective' by writers and artists going back beyond John Ruskin to Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who had treated Gothic buildings as prime examples of such 'temporalized' 'things'; capable, as Foucault would put it, of 'reflecting' back a history newly understood not to exist except as 'interwoven in ["man's"] own being', his habits and acts.10 Romantic antiquarianism 'makes manifest on the surface the naked fact that man found himself to be devoid of history, but that he was already working on the rediscovery deep inside him … of a historicity which was bound essentially to himself'.11 Architecture being, in Ruskin's phrase, 'a creation of his own, born of his necessities, and expressive of his nature', it was capable of being seen as 'in some sort, the work of the whole race ["of man"], while the picture or statue is the work of one only'.12 As Coleridge had suggested in his 1818 lectures on 'The Gothic Mind' – thirty years before Ruskin on Gothic and the 'historical' admission 'of a richness of record altogether unlimited', and forty years *after* Goethe (in the words of Friedrich Nietzsche) apprehending the 'soul' of the past in the 'intricate … palimpsest' of Strasbourg cathedral looming up through the dark 'historical clouds' – Gothic architecture was 'sublime art' precisely because it was bound up with historical change, with the middle-ness of the 'Middle Ages' as such.13 'Imagine', said Coleridge,

> a Cathedral, of York, of Milan or of Strasburg, with all its many Chapels, its pillared stem and leaf-work Roof, as if some sacred [pagan] grove … had been awed into stone at the approach of the true divinity … [while] the chaunt of penitence and holy pity from consecrated Virgins sobbed and died away in its dark recesses … [A]nd behold … the warrior Monarch kneeling [before] the aged Bishop or mitred Abbot … [A]nd in this assemblage thus collected before your imagination you will see and recognize the completion of the Æra —.14

What I propose in this chapter is, therefore, a serious (if not quite a literal) treatment of Morris's 1877 suggestion of a sort of 'fifty-year effect' for the architectural revival – as well as of his conception of progressive 'cycles' or cultural trends, moving through and then beyond 'visibility'.15 Adopting a mode of historical reading that, as I will show, is itself a product of the earlier decades of the nineteenth

century, I aim to link and to draw a dynamic contrast between these two 'moments' in the modern history of 'the Gothic'. If 'Romantic Gothic' and 'Victorian Medievalism' constitute sequential 'chapters' within a single cultural narrative, they are also conceivable as adjacent but distinct formations, excavated here by way of two parallel 'sections' through the larger and more unevenly developed conceptual field (and 'feel') of 'Gothic'.[16] Each 'moment' has at least a fifteen-year penumbra, but for convenience, I encode them here as two years with a sixty-year interval: 1817 and 1877.

A recent survey by David Matthews locates true cultural 'medievalism' in the 1840s: a decade not of 'inauguration' but of 'unique and never to be repeated … cultural dominance'.[17] But there is a strong case to be made for both 1817 and 1877 – respectively, midwinter spring and St. Martin's summer – as parallel moments of 'dominance' for (what Ruskin would call) this 'Gothic' 'form' of culture and society.[18] The year 1817 was marked by such works of Gothic imagination and of 'cultural Gothicism' (Nick Groom's term) as – to give only the most obvious examples – Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, Lord Byron's *Manfred*, Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, and the launch of *Blackwood's Magazine*. In this year, the 'Jacobin poet' turned poet laureate Robert Southey also published one of three new editions – following a gap in the publication record of almost two hundred years – of Thomas Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*.[19] And within the year, Southey alone had published or initiated no fewer than four further major works of medievalism, which also included a (pirated) play about the Peasants' Revolt, a history of the Jesuits and South America, and a two-part four-volume history of the English 'Church and State'– an output that may amply justify Veronica Ortenberg's account of Southey as the Romantic poet, whether 'radical' or 'reactionary', 'most committed of all to medievalism'.[20] E.P. Thompson notes of the middle and late century that an 'attraction [to] medievalism and Catholicism' ran across the whole cultural scene: 'Revolutionary and reactionary alike were caught in the same current'.[21] But rarely was this cultural stream bridged quite so effectively or so interestingly as by Southey in 1817. With both the seditious *Wat Tyler* (1817) and the ultra-loyalist *Quarterly Review* to his name, Southey was not only – as his 'second generation' enemies would have it – an 'apostate' or 'epic renegade', but indeed, as Byron admitted, an 'entire man of letters'.[22] Southey in 1817 is thus my main case-study in 'Romantic Gothic'.

The year 1877, meanwhile, marked by the founding of the SPAB under the combined colours of Morris, Ruskin and Thomas Carlyle, represented a cultural moment so suffused with Gothicism that Morris came close to suggesting that the word itself ought to be retired – to lie fallow until it might again nourish meaningful thought.

1817 and 1877: Robert Southey and William Morris

Already in 1814, Robert Southey was being heralded as the foremost exponent of a new wave of 'Gothic' literary experimentation. Lord Byron woke the publisher John Murray in the middle of the night to compare notes on Southey's *Roderick, the Last of the Goths* (1814). *Roderick*, said Byron, was 'as near perfection as poetry can be – which considering how I dislike the school I wonder at', and adding that Southey 'might safely stake his fame upon the last of the Goths'.[23] For the reviewers in the *British Critic* and the *Quarterly Review*, meanwhile, the poem showed Southey to be at the leading edge of the 'Gothic' historical revival and the 'chivalrous spirit [now] revived amongst us'.[24] But in the 1820s, with the end of the Napoleonic Wars and what Jerome McGann describes as the second-generation turn away from an insular 'redemptive (cultural) scheme', and towards a more cosmopolitan imagination of 'loss' and open-ended 'failure', Southey had come to expect his 1817 works of occluded Gothic to have a long voyage into posterity.[25] His *Colloquies on Society* – a series of interlinked conversations with the ghost of Sir Thomas More, 'last of the old' world, as Morris would later call him, conceived in 1817 but not published until after Catholic Emancipation in 1829 – would, Southey predicted, 'be read hereafter, whatever be their fortune now'.[26] 'One edition will sell; some of the rising generation will be leavened by it, and in the third and fourth generations its foresight will be proved, and perhaps some of its effects may be seen.'[27]

Southey's pretensions to the historian's power of partial prophecy have often been mocked. As Thomas Babington Macaulay put it in his devastating piece on the *Colloquies* in the *Edinburgh Review*, Southey had 'foretold, we remember, on the very eve of the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, that these hateful laws were immortal'.[28] Southey had, indeed, 'the very alphabet to learn' of the historical and political-economic 'sciences' that he claimed to be explaining to the nation: his

method, '[t]o stand on a hill, to look at a cottage and a factory, and to see which is the prettier'; making 'the picturesque the test of political good'.29 As Macaulay's review morphed into a 'classic' of liberalism, Southey's book dwindled to the status of a footnote.30 But as R.J. Smith observes in *The Gothic Bequest*, the *Colloquies* were more quietly influential than mainstream literary history would suppose, containing 'in embryo … much of the social criticism of Pugin, Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris'.31 Southey's set-piece contrasts between monasteries and cotton mills, and the cottages of manufacturing and agricultural labourers are, in effect, 'verbal sketch[es]' for 'the illustrations comparing medieval with nineteenth-century towns' in Pugin's *Contrasts* (1841). 'It was a fancydress version of Coleridge's clerisy and the literary equivalent of the Acts to build Anglican churches in the industrial towns … a Tory version of the Alfredian myth'.32

This chapter seeks to amplify Smith's claim for the *Colloquies*, but to shift away from condescension to the poet's 'fancydress', and towards attending seriously to the sense of historical reenactment and what Stephen Bann and other historians of 'distance' call the post-Romantic desire to 'live the past'.33 As Bill Shiels has argued, Southey along with William Cobbett was instrumental in reviving Thomas More as a complex figure of early modern Englishness, and was thus also a key figure in the framing of what Raymond Williams called the whole 'humanist challenge', with its English roots in More and his *Utopia* (1516).34 The major mid-century statements of the 'culture' position were also lineal descendants of Southey's work. Thomas Carlyle at one point envisioned his *Past and Present* (1843) as a sort of sequel to Southey's *Colloquies* with More: a ghost-dialogue with the shade of Oliver Cromwell.35 John Ruskin's 'The Nature of Gothic' (1853), meanwhile, is closely modelled upon the account of the 'fragmentation, mechanization, and enslavement of the modern factory worker' in Colloquy VII.36 The impact of Southey's book in 1829–30 was indeed such as almost to short-circuit the supposed 'dichotomy' (as Stefan Collini and Philip Connell call it) within 'Victorian thought and sensibility' between 'political economy' and 'cultural critique' in its 'Carlylean … Ruskinian or Morrisian' forms.37 Going on transatlantic hearsay and positive reviews like the one in the *Quarterly* for July 1829, the US-based *Western Monthly Review* imagined Southey's book as a sustained historical contrast, liable to 'stagger' even the best-trained 'young republican',

between the age of 'faith' and its 'huge gothic buildings' on the one hand, and the 'present times' of 'canals' and '*evidence* for every thing' on the other.[38]

Despite the admittedly few direct links between Southey and Morris, they make a particularly illuminating contrast for the history of the Gothic. Both 'entire men of letters', in Byron's phrase, Morris was by comparison – and in the terms that Southey used to describe his own 1816 meeting with Morris's forbear in industrial philanthropy, Robert Owen – the 'practical man' to Southey's dry scholar.[39] Both men built monasteries in their heads in early adulthood, looking back also to Nicholas Ferrar's early seventeenth-century Anglican religious community at Little Gidding.[40] But where Morris's 'FICTIONARY' at Merton Abbey at least bordered on 'social experiment', Southey restricted himself to visiting co-operatives and diagnosing the difficulty of their co-existence with commercial society.[41] And where Morris in later life became a sort of itinerant preacher of socialism, overcoming his ingrained shyness and alienating old friends such as Sir Edward Burne-Jones in the process, Southey increasingly cleaved to his 'compleat seclusion [like] the monks of St Bernard' in his library at Greta Hall, even as he gained public notoriety and (among conservatives) political respect.[42] The two men travelled opposite political roads after leaving Oxford. The former 'Jacobin poet' picked up the laureateship from Walter Scott in 1813 as the best available establishment 'place'; Morris, the late Socialist convert, 'shuddered' at the prospect of taking over the mantle of Tennyson.[43] Southey is present in the text, but absent from the index, of Fiona MacCarthy's definitive biography of the Victorian 'life for our time' (as her subtitle calls Morris). And whatever Southey's evident role in staking out the 'culture' position in the 1820s and 30s, as Raymond Williams and Philip Connell have shown, that terrain was fully occupied in Morris's day by subsequent, more immediate influences. In his lecture on 'How I became a Socialist' and his developing 'ideal' of social reformation by 'art', Morris states these important influences quite clearly. Among all those who were quite content with the 'mechanical' 'civilization of this century … there were a few who were in open rebellion … a few, say two, Carlyle and Ruskin'.[44] In a list of the 'basically conservative' ingredients from which Morris brewed his radical form of medievalism, Richard Frith thus places the laureate alongside Carlyle, Ruskin, Scott and Cobbett, and observes that 'all of these writers were important influences' – with 'the exception of Southey'.[45]

This formulation of the relationship, however – a key ingredient if not a direct 'influence' – seems about right. Southey was, as Tim Fulford has shown, a prime mover in the aesthetic and technological shift back towards illustrated books that would (arguably) culminate with the Kelmscott Chaucer and Morris's reinvention of the illuminated manuscript.46 Southey devoted significant attention to the visual qualities of his books and experimented – like Wordsworth – with the historical encryption effect of the 'Gothic character' or 'black letter', which Morris in turn would seek to 'redeem from the charge of unreadableness' with his 'Troy' and 'Chaucer' fonts for the Kelmscott Press.47 In terms of 'historical feel', meanwhile, Southey was a precursor lastingly transumed by Carlyle, who moved in the late 1820s from youthful contempt towards a sort of emulous second-selfhood.48 In his *Reminiscences* (1881), Carlyle represented Southey the *Quarterly* reviewer as a precursor in point of feeling, but also as a figure too mired in eighteenth-century orthodoxies – such as 'the Protestant Constitution of these kingdoms' – to grasp real truth:

> In spite of my Radicalism, I always found very much in these Toryisms which was greatly according to my heart; things rare and worthy, at once pious and true, which were always welcome to me, though I strove to base them on a better ground than his, – his being no eternal or time-defying one, as I could see.49

In 'Signs of the Times' (1829), an essay that ultimately replaced the review of *Colloquies* that Carlyle had been keen to write for the *Edinburgh Review*, Southey and his kind were relegated firmly to what Carlyle would later figure as the 'Dry Rubbish' heap of the 'Eighteenth Century'.50 'Signs' nevertheless reveals its debt to Southey in echoes of the passages in Southey's book attacking the heart–searing 'political system' founded on 'manufactures', decrying the 'mechanical character' of 'our whole manner of existence'.51 Looking forward to the 'contrast' format of *Past and Present*, 'Signs' also looks back to Southey's use of parallel images of prehistoric and medieval monuments, and his sustained 'picturesque' description of the 'hamlet of Millbeck' and its cottages belonging to the farming and the manufacturing poor. The farmers' cottages, 'built of the native stone without mortar', Southey had

suggested, appeared 'beautifully' 'old', 'adjusted' to 'their place' by the 'scene' and 'time'. But for the 'new cottages of the manufacturers', built 'upon the manufacturing pattern … naked, and in a row', Southey foresaw no such reversion: 'Time cannot mellow them; Nature will neither clothe nor conceal them; and they remain always as offensive to the eye as to the mind!'[52] The same part of Southey's book also provides the template for the cases made by both Carlyle and Ruskin against 'mechanism', with its contrast between the many-windowed 'manufactory' of modern times and the 'convent' of old.[53]

The sort of historical 'dialectic' that Morris would develop from Ruskin before finding it in Marx was also latent in Southey's *Colloquies*. In Colloquy XIII, the idea of a change of 'spirit', measurable in the building of cotton-mills rather than monasteries, becomes a progressive speculation that the former may in some sense re-constitute the virtues of the latter: 'May not the manufacturing system be … tending to work out, by means of the very excess to which it is carried, a remedy for the evils which it has brought with it … a palingenesia, a restoration of national sanity and strength, a second birth [?]'.[54] This speculation is informed by Southey's long-running conversation with the census-taker and Parliamentary official John Rickman, about the need for a whole range of new co-operative institutions, 'communities … convents … colleges', including 'Beguinages' or 'protestant nunneries' aimed at ameliorating the condition of destitute women.[55] Rickman promised to march in step with Southey on this 'chivalrous enterprize', but doubted that the time was yet 'ripe for this optimum grade of civilization', projecting 'a treatise on the due limits and administration of liberality, the excesses & aberrations of which in the shapes of Foundling Hospitals, Poor Rates, Gaols, &c. – &c. – &c. – will otherwise overturn the Society of which under due Regulation it would be [the] highest ornament'.[56] Southey was much more committed to what Raymond Williams terms 'the positive functions of government', believing 'the mass of mankind … are what our institutions make us', as well as taking a more localist view that would restore 'economic independence' by 'multiply[ing] farms' and giving each 'labourer … his grass plot and garden'.[57] But Southey shared Rickman's dialectical view of co-operative societies, as initially popularised by Robert Owen, as 'overturner' and 'highest ornament'. In August 1829 he wrote to Walter Savage Landor of co-operative societies such as one in Birmingham taking the dangerous step of declaring their aim

as 'nothing short of a community in land and in goods'.58 This was for 'plain, practicable, strong-headed men' to open the way for 'such fellows as Cobbett' to turn the good 'principle' to 'an engine of mischief'. A forthcoming article in the *Quarterly* by the physician and king's librarian Dr Robert Gooch was, Southey added, the first significant engagement with Owenism by a 'public writer'. Gooch's view of 'the bright side of the question' needed balancing with Southey's 'darker apprehensions'. 'Yet', Southey concluded,

> if we can keep this principle within its proper bounds, so as to secure the well-being of the whole lower order, without pulling down the higher orders … I should then indeed gladly sing my *Nunc dimittis*! At present the ship is driving fast toward the breakers, and it behoves those who know their duty, to cast about in what manner they may best construct rafts from the wreck (they who may survive), when they shall have stood by it to the last. 59

To 'cast about' to 'construct rafts' from the materials of existing society is both to insure against and to help precipitate the breakup of the old vessel. Standing by the old order, Southey both fears and relishes the utopian potential in its wreckage. He somehow hopes there can be communism for the 'lower order' and commercial society for the 'higher'; that is, a real-world achievement of the simultaneous subsistence within shared textual space of two incompatible 'worlds' as depicted in More's *Utopia*.60 The vision is the Romantic-conservative, Carlylean one – of delving a yard beneath present-day radicals and liberals to effect more historically 'momentous' change. As Southey put it in a letter to his brother, Henry Herbert Southey, on 28 July 1829,

> Gooch is much interested about the Cooperative Societies: and so is Rickman and so am I. Lockhart, which I hardly expected, will print Goochs paper upon them. It will be somewhat remarkable if H. M.'s Librarian and his P. L. should lend their hearty aid to an incipient change in society, likely to be more extensive and momentous in its consequences than any that has preceded it.61

But it was precisely the possession of such an 'incipient' or 'momentous' view of history that Carlyle denied to his Romantic precursor. A superficial presentism,

Carlyle suggested in 'Signs', was evident in the predicament of such Church-and-State theorists as Southey and Coleridge, left bewildered by the submergence of the rough historical beast:

> The repeal of the Test Acts, and then of the Catholic disabilities, has struck many of their admirers with an incredible astonishment. Those things seemed fixed and immovable; deep as the foundations of the world; and lo, in a moment they have vanished, and their place knows them no more! Our worthy friends mistook the slumbering Leviathan for an island … But now their Leviathan has suddenly dived under; and they can no longer be fastened in the stream of time; but must drift forward on it, even like the rest of the world …[62]

This was far from fair to the time-sense actually developed in Southey's *Colloquies*, which rather approximates to Lorenz von Stein on a sense of modern history as a 'labyrinth of movement', and a way of reading that Stein's twentieth-century interpreter, Reinhart Koselleck, specifically figures as poetic or picturesque: 'If history is experienced as the movement of diverse streams whose mutual relations constantly undergo different degrees of intensification, petrifaction, or acceleration, then its general motion can be apprehended only from a consciously adopted point of view.'[63] According to the opening prospectus issued by the ghostly figure of Thomas More, the book uses landscape viewing as a heuristic for the re-education of the reader in the dynamic art of historical judgement: 'By comparing the great operating causes in the age of the Reformation, and in this age of revolutions, going back to the former age, looking at things as I then beheld them, perceiving wherein I judged rightly, and wherein I erred, and tracing the progress of those causes which are now developing their whole tremendous power, you will derive instruction …'.[64]

Carlyle's 'Signs' does nevertheless represent the arrival of a still-more-mobile time-sense, both comparing and tracing the links between periods, and producing from this diorama-like moving contrast a 'Dynamical' sense of each 'Day' as the 'conflux of two Eternities', in among which we may wisely seek to 'adjust our own position'.[65] And it is arguably in 'Signs', written for the generally more optimistic or 'radical' *Edinburgh Review*, that the Morrisian 'active view of history' and

'moulding … recreation' of the past first finds articulation. 'Nay, after all', Carlyle writes in 'Signs':

> our spiritual maladies are but of Opinion; we are but fettered by chains of our own forging, and which ourselves can also rend asunder. … Are the solemn temples, in which the Divinity was once visibly revealed among us, crumbling away? We can repair them, we can rebuild them. The wisdom, the heroic worth of our forefathers, which we have lost, we can recover. That admiration of old nobleness, which now so often shows itself as faint dilettantism, will one day become a generous emulation, *and man may again be all that he has been, and more than he has been*.66

Southey the antiquarian was thus a prophecy (in Carlyle) of Ruskin the historical visionary. To the extent that Southey was subsumed under the already archaic vision of Carlyle, he would have represented to Morris's generation of the 1850s an attitude to the past that was itself still moving but already unusable. As Fiona MacCarthy suggests, when Morris read Carlyle's *Past and Present* at Oxford in the early 1850s, he was 'affected deeply and lastingly', but found it ultimately 'too grotesque' in comparison with the 'high-flown clarities' emerging in the works of Ruskin – Carlyle falling between the two waves, as Jonathan Bate suggests, of the more radiant 'Wordsworthian ecology' that peaked again in Morris after Ruskin.67 But this double disconnection between Morris and Southey remains odd inasmuch as Southey is almost unavoidable as a presence and key mediating figure in Morris's account of the books that influenced him. Items 51–53 in Morris's list of books, grouped together in the 'bible' category of works that 'I don't know how to class', are those where Southey was alternately a mediator and an influence: Thomas More (*Utopia*), and the *Works* of Ruskin and Carlyle.68 On this view, Morris's claim for Ruskin's originality as the first to lay hold of the 'key' to social issues in the 'essence of art' reads rather like a belated reversal – ironically underwritten by the overwriting of Southey on both sides of the 'culture' debate – of Thomas Macaulay denouncing Southey's *Colloquies* as a merely 'picturesque' approach to economics and history.69

To reclaim Southey as a precursor of a future-oriented Morrisian Gothic is not to deny the element of retrograde eighteenth-century 'antiquarian humour' in his

works.70 Southey was, as he well knew himself, always liable to lapse into what Friedrich Nietzsche and Carlyle alike would decry as a the 'repulsive spectacle' of the antiquary 'raking together' 'bibliographical' 'dust', 'encased in the stench of must and mould', degrading the impulse to serve the 'fresh life of the present' into to a mere 'insatiable thirst for … antiquity'.71 But the rest of this chapter seeks to suggest that it was the distinctive work of first Ruskin and then Morris to extract and enhance the progressive potential and genuine social commitment lurking, 'inchoate' and 'imminent', in the antiquarian 'Gothic' of that Romantic first generation. And while such an argument inevitably proceeds by obliquities and observations of affinities, there is one evident 'hyperlink' between the generations in the shape of Southey's 1817 edition (taken over, like the laureateship, from Walter Scott) of Thomas Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur* – a book that Dante Gabriel Rossetti linked with the Bible in 1857 as 'the two greatest books in the world'.72 As noted earlier, Southey's edition is a landmark in the recovery of medieval romance. It is distinctive for its use of Gothic font and woodcut illustration on the title page, as well as the liberal use throughout the text of illuminated initial letters (see figure 1). The book is also notable for its twenty-one-part Preface, designed in apparent imitation of the old text itself – which is said by Southey to resemble not a 'tree' but a sort of 'prickly pear', a set of joints growing upon each other, 'all equal in size and alike in shape, and the whole making a formless and misshapen mass'.73

Morris and Burne-Jones discovered Southey's edition of Malory in a Birmingham booksellers in the weeks immediately after their Anglo-French cathedral tour of summer 1855.74 They were instantly galvanised. 'This', as MacCarthy significantly puts it, 'was the Malory summer'. Morris purchased the book immediately, and worked from it in the composition of his first published volume of poems, *The Defence of Guenevere* (1858). Southey's *Malory* thus became for the Pre-Raphaelites a sort of portable Rouen cathedral – described later by Morris as the historic achievement of 'the work of the associated labour and thought of *the people*, the result of a chain of tradition unbroken from the earliest stages of art' (1895); this specific work of the older antiquarian an early material ground for Morris's later analogy, in a fragmentary essay of the 1890s, between the 'long[ing] for' beautiful buildings and beautiful books.75 Both Southey and Morris distanced themselves from Thomas Dibdin's 'bibliomania'. Southey suggested that he was qualified to edit and

comment upon Malory and other old texts precisely because his 'knowledge' was not over-encumbered with black-letter obsessions.[76] Morris would become famous for his instinctive ability to date and classify books and manuscripts.[77] And Southey's role in the bibliographical retransmission of Malory was, consciously or otherwise, one that Morris would later take on for himself. The *Morte d'Arthur* was one of the books that Morris projected to re-edit for the Kelmscott Press, 'with at least a hundred illustrations by Burne-Jones'.[78]

But of more fundamental importance than this baton-pass between Southey and Morris as individual scholar-poets is the accomplishment of just the sort of generation-skipping transference that Southey had foreseen for his 1817 works of 'cultural Gothicism'. For Morris to work from Southey's 1817 edition of Malory was precisely to choose 'Romantic Gothic' over the intervening forms of 'Victorian medievalism'. Ruskin had defined 'mediaevalism' as a 'Gothic form' of society, fusing 'architecture', 'religion' and 'national life', and Morris would not distinguish the meaning or respective historical 'feel' of the two words until his autobiographical letter (to the socialist Andreas Scheu) of 1883. The poems in *The Defence of Guenevere* were to be seen, he then told Scheu, with overtones of his contemporary assault on mere historicism and the 'Lie' of restoration, in the context of that early 'revival of Gothic architecture': 'exceedingly young … very mediaeval'.[79] Before he had found a 'corrective' in the 'old Norse literature' of 'courage', Morris had thus erred upon what the letter to Scheu calls the 'maundering side of mediaevalism'.[80] But something like this later distinction of the 'Gothic' and the 'medieval' is already evident in *The Defence*, and in the choice of Southey as source text. For there were two other editions of Malory available, both published in 1816, and both based, unlike the Southey edition that had gone back to the Caxton text of 1485, on the 'more accessible' Stansby edition of 1634.[81] Tennyson knew Southey's edition but worked from a copy of one of the 1816 editions, by Walker and Edwards, a gift from Leigh Hunt, Southey's long-term enemy and poet of the technicolour medievalism of *The Story of Rimini* (1816).[82] In his survey of *Medievalism: The Middle Ages in Modern England* (2007), Michael Alexander devotes a chapter to the Victorian obsession with Malory, and draws a telling contrast between the 1816 editions, 'inexpensive and in modernised spelling', and the 'elaborate and scholarly' Southey edition.[83] In Southey's own words, his edition required of the reader a 'certain aptitude' for

enjoying works for which 'the fashion … has passed away'.[84] For Morris to work from Southey's old-form 'scholarly' 1817 edition, rather than the popular 'modern' 1816 editions, in effect reversing Tennyson's choice of sources, was thus to contest what MacCarthy calls the prevailing 'rotund' forms of mid-century medievalism, and to adumbrate what Morris would later define as a 'style historic in the true sense'.[85]

What was a complaint against Southey in the 1810s – his anti–modern '*black letter* … manner' – became the standard compliment paid to Morris in the 1870s: 'he occupies himself exclusively with old stories, and goes back to the old sources of language for words to put them in'.[86] And while contemporary reviews of Morris's *Defence* generally found the poetry deficient in comparison with Tennyson, there was also a dawning realisation of a loss of real history in the peak medievalism of the 1840s. The review in the *Literary Gazette* by Richard Garnett draws a telling contrast:

> The difference between the two poets obviously is that Tennyson writes of mediaeval things like a modern, and Mr. Morris like a contemporary. Tennyson's 'Sir Galahad' is Tennyson himself in an enthusiastic and devotional mood; Mr. Morris's is the actual champion, just as he lived and moved and had his being some twelve hundred years ago. … Tennyson is the modern *par excellence*, the man of his age; Rossetti and Morris are the men of the middle age; and while this at once places them in a position of inferiority as regards Tennyson [and the Romantic 'golden age of British poetry'], it increases their interest towards ourselves… [87]

Southey's more granular, aphasic and rhizomatic approach to the art and culture of the middle ages thus underpins the 'difficult … unsettling and demanding' poetry of Morris's *The Defence of Guenevere* (1858); and sets the terms for the oblique Gothic of *News from Nowhere* – framed in 1890 as a set of fugitive 'chapters' from a Utopian Romance.

The value of recovering a line of influence from Southey to Morris in a volume on the 'History of the Gothic' is now, I hope, becoming clear. In suggesting that much if not all of what was present in late-blooming Victorian medievalism was already present in first-generation Romanticism, I have been recovering a tradition

that is about Gothic and History, and that has relatively little to do with the Gothic novel or other forms of Gothic in commercial pop culture. As Nick Groom has recently suggested, 'if [Walpole's] *Otranto* drafted the template that effectively redefined Gothic as a magical medievalist style, the [prevailing] political and social forms of Gothic' nevertheless 'continued'.[88] In recent work on Ruskin's articulation of the 'psychological' novelty of a 'wolfish life' that is *therefore* 'ennobling', Richard Adelman draws a telling contrast between Ruskin's 'Gothic' of the 'grey, shadowy, many-pinnacled image … within us' and the 'Gothics' of Ann Radcliffe and 'Monk' Lewis, which rather deploy 'extreme moral depravity' within a rusticated discourse of enlightenment.[89] But if Adelman envisages Ruskin as in effect re-inventing Gothic as had Walpole before him, with 'Gothic' works from Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847) onwards giving the term a markedly different inflection, a genealogical perspective linking Southey and Morris tends to suggest that this is more an effect of Ruskin working from quite different materials and in a quite different tradition. Ruskin is, in effect, going back past Horace Walpole, under the transumptive influence of the more authentically 'Gothic' first-generation Romantics, to the prevailing 'political and social forms' of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It is by this way that, as I have already been suggesting, Ruskin arrives at his account of 'mediaevalism' as a 'Gothic form' of society, fusing 'architecture', 'religion' and 'national life and character'. But the category of the 'Gothic' is not thus simply subsumed by the 'medieval'. By linking back to Southey and his self-consciously 'Gothic' writings on the one hand, and forward to Morris and his ultimate choice of a harder-edged (Nordic) 'Gothic' over the 'maundering … mediaevalism' of Tennyson and Rossetti on the other, it seems possible both to reclaim 'Gothic' from critical misuse, and to reposition it as a *zeitgeist* term – a word in the process of becoming, through contestation and self-contradiction, a 'concept', or what the historical-semanticist Reinhart Koselleck might call a category of historiographical reflection.[90]

The 'style historic': William Morris and Late-Victorian Gothic

It was not for the Lake Poets – not for Wordsworth or Coleridge, and still less for Southey – that Morris kept the key role in his narrative of Gothic resumption.

Morris's taste in books was for those – as he put it – 'far more important than any literature': 'bibles' that seemed to have 'grown up from the very hearts of the people'.91 Ruskin's *Stones* – 'one of the very few necessary and inevitable utterances of the century' – was evidently such a book.92 Ruskin had grasped that in 'the element of sensuous pleasure, which is the essence of all true art', lay the intrinsic solution to the problem of 'pain' in 'labour' and the 'general unhappiness and universal degradation' accompanying the economic subjugation of 'material nature'. For to 'feel', as Ruskin put it, 'their souls withering within them … to be counted off into a heap of mechanism … – this, humanity for no long time is able to endure'.93 And from the 'lesson' thus taught 'that art is the expression of man's pleasure in labour', for Morris it followed 'that the hallowing of labour by art is the one aim for us at the present day'.94 As Ruskin had argued most influentially in his chapter, 'The Nature of Gothic' (1853), this mission for the arts was most entirely expressed in architecture. Not 'merely a science of the rule and compass', it was one of the highest and most distinctively *human* and 'poetic' of the arts: 'more than any other subject of art, the work of man, and the expression of [his] average power … born of his necessities, and expressive of his nature'.95 '[T]he common expression of our life', adds Morris the 'practical Socialist'. The 'true architectural work' is a 'harmonious' and all-inclusive 'co-operative … art': 'a genuine thing'.96

Ruskin's 'The Nature of Gothic' may be, as Dinah Birch puts it, 'largely distinct from the historical context of Gothic buildings'.97 But as Lars Spuybroek urges in 'The Digital Nature of Gothic' (2011), Ruskin forecasts a contemporary programme of 'digital' architecture in the broadest sense. '[I]mplanting craft into machinery' will not mean slowing 'modern' modes of replication to human speeds, but resuming the 'complex motor schema' of Ruskin's 'clumsy … old Venetian', who works with pre-modern tools in a way productive of both 'imperfection' and 'transfiguration' at once.98 Extending his reading all the way to the 'cut-and-paste' paradigm of the modern word-processor – essentially contested as it is by Morris's manifesto for a re-creative 'art which we have made our own' – Spuybroek's 'vital' rereading of Ruskin leads towards a reconception of the computer 'not as a machine [but as] a way of positioning … inside matter itself' digital processes of 'stepwise' 'iterative' change.99 With its failing 'majesty', its 'exhortation' to advance *beyond* mere 'engine-turned' efficiency, Ruskin's account of 'Gothic' is not only 'human'

and poetic, but – as Morris put it in his 1892 preface – most characteristically 'ethical and political', indeed inherently social.[100] 'And it is, perhaps', says Ruskin of this 'dignifying' aspect of this 'subject of art',

> the principal admirableness of the Gothic schools of architecture, that they thus receive the results of the labour of inferior minds; and out of fragments full of imperfection, and betraying that imperfection in every touch, indulgently raise up a stately and unaccusable whole.[101]

In his 1889 lecture to the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society, 'Gothic Architecture', Morris developed Ruskin's relatively static account of 'Gothic' edification into a dynamic vision of the Gothic future. To contrast the sort of 'eclectic' neo-classical architecture 'which is a mere imitation of what was once alive', and that 'organic' style 'which after a development of long centuries has still in it … capacities for fresh developments', was to discover a way out of the unhistorical, style-less paralysis of the present:

> [W]hen the modern world [comes to] a change as wide and deep as that which destroyed Feudalism … the style of architecture will have to be historic in the true sense; it will not be able to dispense with tradition; it cannot begin at least with doing something quite different from anything that has been done before; yet … the form of it … as well as the spirit, must be Gothic; an organic style cannot spring out of an eclectic one, but only from an organic one. In the future, therefore, our style of architecture must be Gothic Architecture.[102]

Delivered the year before the publication at the Kelmscott Press of his 'Utopian Romance' *News from Nowhere* (1890), it is one measure of the importance that Morris gave to this lecture that he later published it in a Kelmscott edition (1893). And its prime significance is its suggestion of a transformation of 'Gothic' into a prospective idea rather than a merely retrospective or nostalgic form: in Percy Bysshe Shelley's terms, a 'vitally metaphorical' recreation of the closed collocation and given associations of 'Gothic Architecture'.[103] Those two plain words form Morris's lecture title, and his prediction of the future indeed ends on this common-sense (and, until the 1970s, long-dominant) collocation.[104] But what Morris does in both lecture and

romance is to open up a space within the phrase similar to that in the 'dynamical' texts of Carlyle and Southey. As I shall suggest in more detail in a moment, his lecture ends up not really talking about 'Gothic Architecture' at all. The centre of interest lies rather in the space between those two words – in the notion of a 'style … historic' and 'the future'.

There is an intriguing – and, I would suggest, specifically *Gothic* – temporality on display in Morris's lecture, one which has to do with historical distance and proximity and the contradictions involved in the 'organic' resumption of an artistic practice, cut off from its material and social conditions and contexts. In *News from Nowhere*, set in the London and Oxfordshire of the year 2102, Morris indulges himself in a revenge upon 'complacent' Victorian modernity. It is, the narrator William Guest learns, 'the nineteenth century, of which such big words have been said', that 'count[s] for nothing' among people 'who read Shakespeare and ha[ve] not forgotten the Middle Ages'.105 The frontispiece of the Kelmscott edition draws similar mental brackets around the 'modern' world, presenting the 'old house' in the 'hereafter' (see figure 2) – and the end of the story in the beginning. 'Gothic' seems to lurk – a word on the precipice of becoming an historical concept – in the words of the beautiful but unattainable, gamine grey-eyed Ellen, touching the old gray stone walls of Kelmscott Manor itself: '[L]ovely still amidst all the beauty which these latter days have created', seeming to have 'waited for these happy days, and held in it the gathered crumbs of happiness of the confused and turbulent past'.106

This casting of the modern world as the true 'dark age' generates pathos and a pleasing historical 'shape', picking up on Ruskin's own classification of the historical sense into 'Classicalism, Mediaevalism, and Modernism', with 'medievalism' as the middling 'Gothic form'. But the access of historiographical pathos comes at the cost of opening Morris's desired Gothic resumption to the same charge of 'simulation' that he levels at neo-classicism. The 'brick box' nineteenth century being, by Morris's own account, almost as profoundly cut off from the 'graceful … fourteenth-century type' of architecture as was the 'New Birth' from classical Rome and Greece, how could his Gothic Architecture be anything other than a rehearsal of dead 'forms' without their animating 'spirit'?107 How was it, indeed, anything other than a re-tread of the same overly-historicist 'tendency' that, as Nietzsche would put it, ultimately

'directed the Italians of the Renaissance' away from 'the fresh life of the present' and towards dust-heap-raking antiquarian irrelevance?108

The idea of a 'style … historic in the true sense' seems to be Morris's solution to the problem. In *News from Nowhere*, the buildings of the new society 'embrace the best qualities of the Gothic of northern Europe' and of 'the Saracenic and Byzantine'.109 But they do so without any 'copying'. The architecture of 2102 is thus not Gothic in particular 'historical' 'form', but in underlying historical identity – so as, ironically, much better to deserve the apparently forgotten name. There are only four uses of the word 'Gothic' in the text, and all of them are Guest's. 'Gothic' is thus simultaneously a governing trope and a term almost entirely unheard in Morris's 'new society'. The architecture of the early twenty-second century seems more in keeping with Charles Voysey's Colwall (1893; figure 3) and the 'general period flavour' somehow distilled from the 'period detail little … kept', than even with Morris's own rebuttal of Puginesque 'gimcrack' 'Historicism' at his and Philip Webb's Red House (1859–60; figure 4).110 Coming unexpectedly upon a 'whole mass of architecture', organically 'amidst' and 'bor[n]e upon' 'the pleasant fields' – as if Morris's ideally insular house-and-garden had been turned inside-out to make a whole garden-society – Guest finds himself transported far beyond the degraded 'modern' present, feeling the future in the weirdly nostalgic instant: he 'chuckle[s] for pleasure' at the sight, and feels 'fairly … as if I were alive in the fourteenth century'.111 The historiographical equivalent of the 'dolly zoom', Morris's continual paralleling of 'the Mediaevals' and the people of Nowhere on the basis of an equally sharpened 'sense of architectural power' generates a prospect of open–ended futurity that is not one of alterity and anxiety, but strange familiarity and *rest*. In the words of the summative statement given by his historical interpreter and guide, old Hammond, this is a future-past not of vanished horizons of expectation, but rather of what Southey, writing at his most Wordsworthian, had called the 'palingenesis', the far-flung archaising renewal, or circuitous voyage forward into the past:

This is how we stand. England was once a country of clearings amongst the woods and wastes, with a few towns interspersed, which were fortresses for the feudal army, markets for the folk, gathering places for craftsmen. It then became a country of huge and foul workshops and fouler gambling-dens,

surrounded by an ill-kept, poverty-stricken farm, pillaged by the masters of the workshops. It is now a garden, where nothing is wasted and nothing is spoilt, with the necessary dwellings, sheds, and workshops scattered up and down the country, all trim and neat and pretty.112

'Gothic' thus features in *Nowhere*, like the 'art' that old Hammond says is now so 'necessarily' bound up with all production as to have 'no name amongst us', or the 'book-learned' 'history' that young Hammond can barely comprehend ('when a person can read, of course he reads what he likes to'), as a word in progressive litotic mood: self-cancelling and self-realising; withdrawing, like Voysey's Colway, from historic*ist* detail into historic*al* self-actualisation.113

Morris's contemporary lecture on 'Gothic Architecture' thus needs to be understood in the context of a sort of creative forgetting, a phasing-out *and* reconsecration, of the profaned word and collocation – which had peaked in English usage in the mid-to-late 1840s and again from the late '60s up to around 1876.114 The printing of the lecture in the Kelmscott Press series in 1893 – in black and red, on paper and on vellum, the press's first 16mo pocket-size edition – was part and parcel of an implicit programme of cultural revalidation. The 'master-art' of 'Architecture' had also been handled in precisely this way in Morris's early lecture, 'The Lesser Arts' (1877), as a name almost too sacred to be spoken. Refusing to 'meddle', Morris could 'scarcely … more than … echo' the Gothic chapter in Ruskin's *Stones*, and repeat that the seeds of social and industrial malaise lay in the contemporary 'divorce' of all the '*popular*', 'decorative' arts from architecture, painting and sculpture. But the way forward was the way back. 'Let us', Morris had urged, study to become unstudied, approaching the art of the ancients 'wisely': so as to be 'taught by it, kindled by it; all the while determining not to imitate or repeat it; to have either no art at all, or an art which we have made our own'.115

Speaking before his socialist 'conversion', and expecting only 'to see in time' and perhaps not with 'our own eyes' the face of such a change, Morris in 1877 had prophesied first the 'death of all' arts, followed – as he conceded it was his 'comfort' to believe – by a re-birth from 'some tradition, some memory of the past', saved in the face of hopeless odds, from brutalising mechanical industry on the one hand, and

the 'Lie' of 'restoration' on the other, by the defenders of the arts.[116] This was a catastrophic rather than an incremental or a dialectical vision. But it was – as Morris himself later implicitly conceded – more an 'echo' of Ruskin, and the binds and crutches of his tragically declining 'old buildings', used earlier the same year in the founding circular of the SPAB, than Morris's own vision.[117] And if the time-signature of Ruskin was thus the stop-gap *and* the *longue durée* – 'stay it … where it declines; do not care about the unsightliness of the aid … and many a generation will still be born and pass away beneath its shadow' – Morris after his 'conversion', and specifically in the 1889 lecture on 'Gothic Architecture', was obliged to give practical consideration of transformation, of means to ends. 'In the future …' he (almost) concludes, suggesting with the phrase both 'going forwards' and 'in the end', and hinting at the possible legitimacy of an initial phase of Gothic 'copying', distinct from the mere 'imitation' of neo-classicism. The way has already been prepared for this suggestion by oblique phrasing that seems to pull in a direction opposite to its content, so as to mime the induction of a fresh creative energy: the art of the future 'cannot begin at least *with* doing something quite different from anything that has been done before'.

The 'historic' character of Morris's resumed Gothic, it might be said, then, consists in its double time-signature, the backward-looking futurity of *departing from* the 'form' and 'style' of what has gone before. Morris thus produces an imaginable future out of the transumptive sense of the Gothic Revival – not quite present in Ruskin or Pugin, and more nearly there in Carlyle, writing after Southey – that a yet *better* spirit lies in waiting in the external forms of a reinvented tradition.

Coda

This chapter has been a story of the Gothic twice told, and told backwards both ways. So I would like to conclude by briefly telling it forwards, moving towards William Morris from Robert Southey. In his thirteenth 'Colloquy', Southey's odd blend of antiquarianism and ghost story produces what I have called a sort of midwinter spring of Victorian medievalism. The ghost of Thomas More joins Montesinos overlooking a cotton mill beside the river Greta, which, 'with the dwelling-houses and other

buildings appertaining to such an establishment', forms a settlement for which English has no word, but which inevitably 'reminds one of a convent'.[118] Invited to contemplate and compare the cotton mill and the convent, the 'hopeful' figure of Montesinos applies his 'great scale' of historical 'improvement'.[119] At different 'times and places', each institution may promote or 'retard' 'progress'.[120] The 'manufacturing system' embodied in the mill is part of a continuous historical process from the sixteenth century, remaking the 'means' and 'men' previously 'devoured', as More had put it in *Utopia*, by enclosure and sheep farming.[121] Southey's Sir Thomas replies with a more timeless view of good and evil: 'Bad as the feudal times were, they were less injurious than these commercial ones to the kindly and generous feelings of human nature, and far, far more favourable to the principles of honour and integrity'.[122]

Between these statements, the 'prospect' nevertheless emerges of 'feudal times' being reconstituted in commercial society. This was a form of time for which, like the 'establishment' beside the Greta, English had as yet no word. 'Mediaeval' had only entered general usage in the 1820s, after being first attested in the peak-Gothic year of 1817, and 'mediaevalism' would not appear until a year after Southey's death, in 1844.[123] Southey actually wrote a review of the work in which 'mediaeval' first appeared.[124] But he seems never to have used the adjective himself, continuing in *Colloquies* and in his other works of the 1820s and '30s to speak in more nominal terms of 'the middle ages', 'old times', the 'old English heart', and 'antiquity' in general.[125] This near-miss between Southey and the category of 'the medieval' may have been merely accidental. But in context, and bearing in mind the rapid senescence of the term, as in Morris's reference to 'maundering … mediaevalism', the disconnection seems symptomatic of the sort of distinction in feeling for the past that this chapter has sought to recover. What David Matthews in his 'new semantic history' refers to as the greater neutrality and nicely delimiting periodicity of 'medieval' is, at its root, the 'modern' antithesis of the 'Gothic' historical perspective of Southey and the Lake Poets.[126] This is the 'catacthonic' or 'intra-historical' perspective of the inborn 'immensity' yet-remembered, the 'history' with 'no beginning' adumbrated by Wordsworth in the 'Intimations' Ode and in book two of the 1805 *Prelude* (ll. 109, 134; ll. 369, 237-8). It is the view that Coleridge, referring back beyond Edmund Burke 'prescription' to Edward Coke's 'common-law' or

'immemorial' doctrine of usage 'time out of mind' , phrased in terms of the gathering 'history of the Idea' and the 'potential' and 'latency' of an 'insular', 'self-evolving Constitution'.[127] And it is the historical orientation underpinning Southey's language, rejecting John Milner's charge of having misrepresented 'every vulgar superstition' as a Catholic doctrine, that he regarded not present-day Catholic 'theory' but rather 'historical facts', being concerned to trace what the Roman Church's 'practice' '*has always been*' (my italics).[128] The very form of the *Colloquies*, staking out a space for a dialogue between ages, pre-emptively rejects any conception of the 'medieval' as the bad old – or even Carlyle's 'deep-buried' – past.[129] Indeed, nostalgia for 'feudal times' is clearly already beginning to turn into something much closer to John Ruskin's dynamic and recuperative force of 'mediaeval*ism*', as Southey's Sir Thomas asks his Montesinos: 'May not the manufacturing system be … tending to work out, by means of the very excess to which it is carried, a remedy for the evils which it has brought with it?'[130] And Montesinos replies by envisioning just such a 'remedial process … going on':

> [P]erhaps … were time allowed … we might then hope for a palingenesia, a restoration of national sanity and strength, a second birth … perhaps, I say … and were time allowed … for I say this doubtfully, and that ghostly shake of the head with which it is received does not lessen the melancholy distrust wherewith it is expressed.[131]

The hesitations and ellipses mime the effect of ghostly apparition. Montesinos falters in his speech at Sir Thomas's 'ghostly shake of the head'. Thus registering what Wordsworth's 1821 sonnet 'Mutability' calls 'the unimaginable touch of time', the simultaneous 'drop' and 'sustain' of 'outward forms', of ancient 'towers' in 'silent air', Southey at the heart of the *Colloquies* opens the way towards the transfiguring vision of Morris's *Nowhere*: the recrudescence within – or *after* – 'modernity' of the Gothic past, a genuine 'second birth' rather than a merely formal after-echo of old England.[132] Albeit that this will be a cultural rebirth of 'doubt' and 'melancholy, rather than of naïve religion or simple faith; the revivalism of the less deceived.

Notes

1 William Morris, 'The SPAB Manifesto' (1877), available from: <https://www.spabis.org.uk/what-is-spab-/the-manifesto/> [last accessed 23 January 2019]

2 See John Ruskin, 'The Lamp of Memory', from *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, in Dinah Birch (ed.), *John Ruskin: Selected Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 24-27; W.R. Lethaby, quoted in E.P. Thompson, *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary*, 3rd ed. (Pontypool: Spectre Classics, 2011), p. 227; Thompson, *William Morris*, p. 239; William Morris, 'The Lesser Arts', in *News from Nowhere and Other Writings*, edited by Clive Wilmer (London: Penguin, 1993), pp. 231-54 (p. 234); Richard Frith, '"The Worship of Courage": William Morris's *Sigurd the Volsung* and Victorian Medievalism', in L.M. Holloway and J.A. Palmgren (eds), *Beyond Arthurian Romances* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 117-132 (p. 118).

3 Morris, 'The Lesser Arts', in *News from Nowhere*, p. 247.

4 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 247. On the conception of culture, see Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780–1950*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), pp. 20–31.

5 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 237.

6 Morris, quoted in Thompson, *William Morris*, p. 239.

7 Morris, 'A Night in a Cathedral', *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*, vol. 5 (May 1856): 312–14. See also Morris's 1884 lecture, quoted in Thompson, pp. 236–37, which envisages the 'mists of pedantry' lifting, and superficial notions of civilisation and improvement relaced by a dynamic historical 'sense' of 'deep sympathy' with the 'half-conscious aims' of the past: '[I]nchoate order in the remotest times, varying indeed among different races and countries, but swayed always by the same laws, moving forward ever towards something that seems the very opposite of that which it started from, and yet the earlier order never dead but living in the new, and slowly moulding it to a recreation of its former self'.

8 Stephen Bann, *Romanticism and the Rise of History* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995), pp. 9-10.

9 Nick Groom, 'Catachthonic Romanticism: Buried History, Deep Ruins', *Romanticism* 24:2 (2018): 118–133. Groom's language draws on Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, as well as Foucault. See Gilles Deleuze and Félix A. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (London and New York: Continuum, 2004).

10 Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 402.

11 Foucault, quoted in Bann, *Romanticism and the Rise of History*, p. 10.

12 John Ruskin, 'The Nature of Gothic', in Dinah Birch (ed.), *John Ruskin: Selected Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 32-63 (p. 56).

13 See Ruskin, *Selected Writings*, pp. 21–22; Friedrich Nietzsche, 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life' in *Untimely Meditations*, edited by Daniel Breazeale, trans.R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 57-124 (p. 73); and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Lectures 1808–1819: On Literature*, 2 vols, edited by R. A. Foakes (London and Princeton, NJ: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Princeton University Press, 1987), vol. 2, pp. 74–75.

14 Coleridge, *Lectures 1808–1819: On Literature*, vol. 2, pp. 74–75.

15 The 'fifty-year effect' is Stephen Greenblatt's phrase for 'the time in the wake of the great, charismatic ideological struggle in which the revolutionary generation that made the decisive break with the past is all dying out and the survivors hear only hypocrisy in the sermons and look back with longing at the world they have lost'. See Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory: Expanded Edition* (Princeton NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013), pp. 248-9. Greenblatt is discussing the imaginative recuperation – occurring with Shakespeare in the 1590s – of the 'dismantle[d]' 'edifice' of Purgatory (see also p. 50). The resonances with Morris's 'Manifesto' for the SPAB are evident; though 'fifty years' will commonly tend to slip – as it does in Walter Scott's artful reflections on historical representation in *Waverley* (1814) and *Ivanhoe* (1819) – to 'sixty' and even 'sixty or seventy years' (see *Ivanhoe*, ed. Ian Duncan [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996], p. 14).

16 See Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, vol. 1 (Twickenham: Strawberry Hill, 1762), pp. 107–8.

17 David Matthews, *Medievalism: A Critical History* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2015), p. xi.

18 See John Ruskin, 'Traffic', in *The Crown of Wild Olive: Three Lectures on Work, Traffic, and War* (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1866), pp. 79-138 (pp. 82, 94-6, 102-12).

19 See Robert Southey to John May, 9 March 1803: '[F]ar more than … Coleridge & Wordsworth … it is I who in the language of Mr Canning & Mr Cobbet am [*par excellence*] the Jacobine [*sic*] poet'. See *The Collected Letters of Robert Southey*, 6 parts, edited by Lynda Pratt, Ian Packer, Tim Fulford and Carol Bolton, 2009–2016. <www.rc.umd.edu/editions/southeys_letters/> [last accessed 29 May 2019], letter no. 765. See also Robert Southey (ed.), *The byrth, lyf, and actes of Kyng Arthur: of his noble knyghtes of the Rounde Table, theyr merveyllous enquestes and aduentures, thachyeuyng of the Sanc Greal; and in the end le Morte D'Arthur, with the dolourous deth and departying out of thys worlde of them al; With an Introduction and Notes by Robert Southey, Esq. . . . Printed from Caxton's Edition, 1485*, 2 vols. (London: Longman, 1817).

20 The works described here are *Wat Tyler, A Dramatic Poem* (unpublished by Samuel Ridgeway in 1794, and published in three unauthorised editions in 1817 by W.T. Sherwin, J. Fairbarn and W. Hone); the second volume of Southey's three-part *History of Brazil* (1810-19); and *The Book of the Church* (2 vols, 1824) and *Sir Thomas More: or, Colloquies* (2 vols, 1829). See also Veronica Ortenberg, *In Search of the Holy Grail: The Quest for the Middle Ages* (London and New York: Continuum, 2006), p. 45.

21 Thompson, *William Morris*, p. 24.

22 See Byron's journal entry of 22 November 1813, in Lionel Madden (ed.), *Robert Southey: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1972), p. 157.

23 See Peter Cochran, *Byron and Bob: Lord Byron's Relationship with Robert Southey* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2010), p. 46.

24 See *The British Critic* 3 (April 1815): 353–89 (p. 354); and *Eclectic Review* 7 (August 1811): 672–88 (p. 673).

25 See Jerome J. McGann, 'Poetry', in Iain McCalman (ed.), *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 270–79 (pp. 277–78).

26 See Morris, 'Foreword to *Utopia*', in *News from Nowhere*, p. 373; and see Southey to Neville White, 20 January 1829, in Charles Cuthbert Southey (ed.), *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, 6 vols, (London: Longman, 1849–50), vol. 6, p. 22.

27 Southey to Walter Savage Landor, 14 August 1824, in John Wood Warter (ed.), *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, 4 vols. (London: Longman, 1856), vol. 3, pp. 437–38.

[28] See Robert Southey, *Sir Thomas More: or, Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society*, edited by Tom Duggett, 2 vols (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 808–9. Southey's defenders at *Fraser's Magazine* turned Macaulay's acknowledgement of Southey's 'considerable influence' back against him, pointing out that by his own progressive lights, such 'influence' as Southey's could not have come from a reputation as 'a prophet or an evangelist', but rather his 'accomplished scholars[hip]' in that 'General history' which is '"Philosophy teaching by example"'. See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 808, 831–32.

[29] See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 789, 799.

[30] See Esther Wohlgemut, 'Southey, Macaulay and the Idea of a Picturesque History', *Romanticism on the Net*, 32–33 (2003/4), <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/009261ar; §19–20> [last accessed 22 January 2019]; and *Sir Thomas More*, pp. xxvi, xxxiii.

[31] R. J. Smith, *The Gothic Bequest: Medieval Institutions in British Thought, 1688–1863* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 157.

[32] Smith, *The Gothic Bequest*, p. 157.

[33] See Bann, *Romanticism and the Rise of History*, p. 130–62; Mark Salber Phillips, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven and London, 2013), 'Introduction' and chapter 6; and Peter Burke, 'A Short History of Distance', in Mark Salber Phillips, Barbara Caine, and Julia Adeney Thomas (eds.), *Rethinking Historical Distance* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 21–33.

[34] See William Shiels, 'Thomas More', in Gareth Atkins (ed.), *Making and Remaking Saints in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Manchester University Press, 2016), pp. 112–26; and see also Williams, *Culture and Society*, p. 24: 'The very form of the *Colloquies* – the bringing of More to question the new society – indicates a conscious continuity with the first phase of the humanist challenge, in which many of the ideas now concentrated in the meaning of "culture" were in fact laid down'.

[35] See Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, edited by Chris R. Vanden Bossche (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2005), p. xxvii.

[36] See Joseph Bizup, *Manufacturing Culture: Vindications of Early Victorian Industry* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2003), pp. 19, 84, 180–81.

[37] See Philip Connell, *Romanticism, Economics and the Question of 'Culture'* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 5.

[38] See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 819–20.

39 Southey wrote to John Rickman of Owen as just 'such a Pantisocrat as I was', and imagined an influence that never was: 'Had we met twenty years ago the meeting might have influenced both his life & mine in no slight degree: during those years he has been a practical man, & I have been a student, – we do not differ in the main point, – but my mind has ripened more than his'. See Southey to John Rickman, 25 August 1816, *Collected Letters of Robert Southey*, letter no. 2832.]

40 See Fiona MacCarthy, *William Morris: A Life for Our Time*, 2nd ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 2010), pp. 63–68; and Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. xliv–xlvi.

41 See MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, pp. 452–60; and Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. xxxvi–xliii.

42 See Thompson, *William Morris*, pp. 267–68, 274, 322, 701; W. A. Speck, *Robert Southey: Entire Man of Letters* (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 2006), p. 174; and Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 632n. Southey rejected the various public roles that came his way in the 1820s and 30s, including a seat in Parliament, a librarianship in Edinburgh, an editorship with the *Quarterly Review*, and a Chair in History at the University of Durham.

43 See Speck, *Robert Southey*, pp. 154–55; and MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, p. 632.

44 Morris, 'How I Became a Socialist', in *News from Nowhere*, p. 381

45 Richard Frith, '"The Worship of Courage"', p. 118.

46 See Tim Fulford, 'Virtual Topography: Poets, Painters, Publishers and the Reproduction of the Landscape in the Early Nineteenth Century', *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net*, 57–58 (February-May 2010) < http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1006512ar> [last accessed 22 January 2019]

47 See Kenneth Curry, *Southey*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 121; Steven H. Gale (ed.), *Encyclopedia of British Humorists: Geoffrey Chaucer to John Cleese*, 3 vols. (New York and London: Garland, 1996), vol. 2, p. 1044; and Tom Duggett, *Gothic Romanticism: Architecture, Politics, and Literary Form* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 172–76; MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, pp. 613-4. Southey 'claimed' to have 'set the fashion' for using 'black letter on … title pages (Speck, *Robert Southey*, p. 10), and the *Monthly Review* pointed out that the '*black letter* title-page (History of Brazil)' was itself '[a] warning … that this book is not composed in the fashionable manner of the present day' but rather that of 'the chronicles of other times' (*Monthly Review*, 69 [December 1812]: 337–52).

48 See Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, pp. xxvi-xxvii. Transumption, as theorised by Harold Bloom, is a 'total, final act of taking up a poetic stance in relation to anteriority of poetic language', a

dialectical development of belatedness to achieve a partial position of priority, or the 'illusion of having fathered one's own father'. See Bloom, *A Map of Misreading* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 136.

49 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. lxxxiii; and Thomas Carlyle, *Reminiscences*, edited by K.J. Fielding and Ian Campbell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 387–38.

50 See Connell, *Romanticism, Economics and the Question of 'Culture'*, p. 9; Carlyle, *Past and Present*, pp. 50–53; and Carlyle, *Chartism* in Alan Shelston (ed.), *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, (London: Penguin, 1971), pp. 119-202 (p. 198).

51 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 92; and Carlyle, *Selected Writings*, p. 67.

52 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 96.

53 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. xxxiv–xxxv, 296.

54 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 88, 297–98.

55 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. xxxix, xliv–xlv.

56 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. xliv–xxxix.

57 See Williams, *Culture and Society*, p. 24; Southey to Robert Harry Inglis, 22 February 1829, *Life and Correspondence*, vol. 6, pp. 28–29.

58 Southey to Walter Savage Landor, 22 August 1829, *Selections*, vol. 4, pp. 144–47.

59 Southey to Landor, 22 August 1829, *Selections*, vol. 4, pp. 144–47.

60 For an account of this doubleness in More's *Utopia*, see Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*: *From More to Shakespeare*, revised ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), pp. 22–23.

61 Southey to Henry Herbert Southey, 28 July 1829, in Kenneth Curry (ed.), *New Letters of Robert Southey*, 2 vols. (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1965), vol. 2, pp. 341–42.

62 Carlyle, *Selected Writings*, pp. 62–63.

63 Reinhart Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. and edited by Keith Tribe (New York and Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2004), pp. 60, 62.

64 See Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 11.

65 Carlyle, *Selected Writings*, p. 63.

66 Carlyle, *Selected Writings*, p. 83; my emphasis.

67 See MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, p. 71; and Jonathan Bate, *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 58–59.

68 William Morris, *The Collected Letters of William Morris*, 4 vols, edited by Norman Kelvin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984–96), vol. 2, p. 517.

69 'I know indeed', Morris conceded in his Preface, 'that Ruskin is not the first man who has put forward the possibility and the urgent necessity that men should take pleasure in Labour; for Robert Owen showed how by companionship and goodwill labour might be made at least endurable' (Morris 1993: 368). The reference is to Robert Owen 'of Lanark' (1771–1858), 'that … most practical of all enthusiasts', as Southey called him (*Sir Thomas More*, p. 33), whose industrial 'villages of union' united in opposition both the establishment and the forces of plebian radicalism. For William Cobbett, writing in the crisis year of 1817, Owen's progressive-regressive utopian 'villages' looked more like a paternalist plot against the rights of the people: less communities of goods than 'parallelograms of paupers' (see *Political Register*, 2 August 1817). In Morris's account, Owen was too much a man of his time – at once too idealistic and too mechanistic – to have provided his system with an inherent 'motive power'. The difference in Ruskin's work, Morris claimed, was specifically the laying hold of the 'key' of 'art', which Owen in his 'tim[e] … could [not] possibly have found'. See Morris, *News from Nowhere*, pp. 368–69.

70 The phrase is Wordsworth's, from *The Excursion* (III, 139).

71 Friedrich Nietzsche, 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life', p. 73.

72 J. W. Mackail, The Life of William Morris, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Green, 1899), vol. 1, p. 91.

73 See Marylyn Parins (ed.), *Sir Thomas Malory: The Critical Heritage* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 95, 101.

74 MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, pp. 96-7.

75 'If I were asked to say what is at once the most important production of art and the thing to be most longed for, I should answer, a beautiful house; and if I were further asked to name the production next in importance and the thing next to be longed for, I should answer, a beautiful Book. To enjoy good houses and good books in self-respect and decent comfort, seems to me to be the pleasurable end towards which all societies of human beings ought now to struggle.' William Morris, *The Ideal Book: Essays and Lectures on the Arts of the Book*, edited by William S. Peterson (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), p. 1.

76 See *Collected Letters of Robert Southey*, letter no. 1360*; and *Sir Thomas Malory: The Critical Heritage*, pp. 6-7.

77 See MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, pp. 35, 42.

78 See 'An Annotated List of all the Books printed at the Kelmscott Press', p. 65, available at: <http://morrisedition.lib.uiowa.edu/BookArts/cockerell-kelmscott-annotated-list.pdf> [last accessed 22 January 2019]; and MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, p. 97.

79 William Morris to Andreas Scheu, 15 September 1883, in *Letters*, vol. 2 (A), pp. 228–29; and see MacCarthy *A Life for Our Time*, pp. 142, 161.

80 Morris to Scheu, 15 September 1883, *Letters*, vol. 2 (A), pp. 228–29.

81 See *Sir Thomas Malory: The Critical Heritage*, p. 7.

82 See David Staines, *Tennyson's Camelot: The Idylls of the King and Its Medieval Source*s (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1982), p. 27.

83 Michael Alexander, *Medievalism: The Middle Ages in Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 105-26 (p. 113).

84 Alexander, *Medievalism*, p. 113.

85 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, pp. 347-8.

86 See Peter Faulkner (ed.), *William Morris, The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1973), pp. 208–9.

87 See *William Morris, The Critical Heritage*, pp. 33–36.

88 Nick Groom, 'Catachthonic Romanticism', p. 120.

89 Richard Adelman, 'Ruskin & Gothic Literature', *The Wordsworth Circle* 48:3 (Summer 2017): 152–63 (p.153).

90 See Reinhart Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 75–92. On the expansion of 'Gothic' into a 'critical term' that has 'lost all substance', see also Maurice Lévy, '"Gothic" and the Critical Idiom', in Allan Lloyd Smith and Victor Sage (eds), *Gothick Origins and Innovations* (Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1994), pp. 1–15; and Alexandra Warwick, 'Feeling Gothicky?', *Gothic Studies* 9:1 (2007): 5–15.

91 See Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. xxix.

92 See Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 367.

93 See Ruskin, *Selected Writings*, p. 43.

94 See Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 367.

95 See John Ruskin [Kata Phusin]. 'The Poetry of Architecture: No. 1, Introduction', *The Architectural Magazine and Journal*, 4 (November 1837), pp. 505-8 (p. 505); and Ruskin, *Selected Writings*, p. 56.

96 See Morris, *News from Nowhere*, pp. 331, 345.

97 See Dinah Birch, 'Clarity is Poetry', *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 5985, 15 December 2017; available at https://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/public/clarity-is-poetry-ruskin/ [last accessed 22 January 2019]

98 Ruskin, *Selected Writings*, pp. 46, 39-41.

99 Lars Spuybroek, *The Sympathy of Things: Ruskin and the Ecology of Design* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2011), pp. 15, 26–29.

100 See Ruskin, *Selected Writings*, pp. 39, 41, 48; and Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 369.

101 Ruskin, *Selected Writings*, p. 39.

102 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, pp. 347-8.

103 See Percy Bysshe Shelley, 'A Defence of Poetry', in Richard Herne Shepherd (ed.), *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley, Vol. II* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1906), pp. 1-38 (p. 4).

104 This is according to a Google Ngram search using the corpus 'English', and with the 'wildcard' function (which finds the 'top ten substitutions' for an asterisk placeholder) and the default 'smoothing' setting (which gives a 'moving average' to make 'trends more apparent') both enabled. Such a search shows the collocation 'Gothic style' overtaking 'Gothic architecture' around 1969; the trajectory in 2008, the end-date of the corpus, shows the 'style' collocation dipping back beneath 'architecture'. The research behind the Ngram Viewer is described in Jean-Baptiste Michel, Yuan Kui Shen, Aviva Presser Aiden, Adrian Veres, Matthew K. Gray, William Brockman, The Google Books Team, Joseph P. Pickett, Dale Hoiberg, Dan Clancy, Peter Norvig, Jon Orwant, Steven Pinker, Martin A. Nowak, and Erez Lieberman Aiden, 'Quantitative Analysis of Culture Using Millions of Digitized Books', *Science* (14 January 2011), pp. 176-182 [published online 16 December 2010]. See also http://books.google.com/ngrams

105 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 84.

106 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 220.

107 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, pp. 344, 226.

108 Nietzsche, 'On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life', pp. 73, 75.

109 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 62.

110 See Nikolaus Pevsner, *An Outline of European Architecture*, revised edition (Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith, 2009), p. 209; and MacCarthy, *A Life for Our Time*, pp. 45, 155, 353.

111 See Morris, *News from Nowhere*, pp. 105, 62.

112 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 105.

113 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 160.

114 According to the Google Ngram search detailed in note 102 above.,

115 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 244.

116 Morris, *News from Nowhere*, p. 244.

117 See Peter Faulkner, 'Ruskin and Morris', *Journal of the William Morris Society* 14:1 (2000): 6–17 (p. 11).

118 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 296.

119 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 16, 390.

120 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 296.

121 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 41–4.

122 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 298.

123 See David Matthews, 'From Mediaeval to Medievalism: A New Semantic History', *The Review of English Studies* vol. 62, no. 257 (November 2011): pp. 695–715 (pp. 701, 705).

124 The word 'mediaeval' is first attested in Thomas Dudley Fosbrooke's *British Monachism: or, Manners and Customs of the Monks and Nuns of England*, 2nd ed. 2 vols. (London: John Nichols, 1817), vol. 1, p. vi. See also Matthews, 'From Mediaeval to Medievalism', p. 701. Southey reviewed Fosbrooke's 1817 edition, having long owned and admired the 1802 first edition, in an essay published in the *Quarterly Review* in 1819. See 'British Monachism' in *Quarterly Review* 22:43 (July 1819), pp. 59–102; and *Collected Letters of Robert Southey*, letters nos. 2494, 3149, 3197, 3335. 'Mediaeval' is already a capacious term in Fosbrooke's usage, used to describe variously 'customs', 'principles', 'fashions' and 'Architecture' (Fosbrooke, pp. vi, 18, 273). Southey's review describes Fosbrooke's book as 'a great store of curious and recondite information', which displays 'in the liveliness of [its] expression … a vigorous and original mind' (p. 94n). But the new coinage of 'mediaeval' – a fairly simple matter of code-switching from the Latin '*medium aevum*', as Matthews points out (p. 702) – goes unnoticed.

125 Southey's Anglican history in *The Book of the Church* (1824) describes the hope of 'every sound old English heart' in the early reign of Charles II 'that the constitution of their fathers, in Church, as well as in State, was now to be restored'. See Robert Southey, *The Book of the Church*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1824), vol. 2, p. 475. See also *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 112, 54, 242.

126 See Matthews, 'From Mediaeval to Medievalism', pp. 700, 704; and Matthews, *Medievalism: A Critical History*, p. 53; and see also my account of Wordsworth and the 'Gothic' political tradition in Tom Duggett, *Gothic Romanticism: Architecture, Politics, and Literary Form* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), *passim* but especially pp. 19-20, 32-5, 102-6.

127 See Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *On the Constitution of the Church and State*, ed. John Colmer (London and Princeton, NJ: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 21-31, 85-103; R.J. Smith, *The Gothic Bequest*, *Medieval Institutions in British Thought, 1688–1863* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 3-12, 39-40, 92; Sean Silver, 'The Politics of Gothic Historiography, 1660-1800', in Glennis Byron and Dale Townshend, eds., *The Gothic World* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2014), pp. 3-14 (p. 9).

128 See Stuart Andrews, *Robert Southey: History, Politics, Religion* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2011), pp. 122-33.

129 Carlyle, *Past and Present*, p. 52.

130 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 297–98.

131 Southey, *Sir Thomas More*, p. 298.

132 See William Wordsworth, *Sonnet Series and Ininerary Poems, 1819–1850*, edited by Geoffrey Jackson (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), p. 197.