

Postgraduate English

www.dur.ac.uk/postgraduate.english

ISSN 1756-9761

Issue 14

September 2006

Editors: Ollie Taylor and Kostas Boyiopoulos

Mary de Morgan: Out of the Morrisian Shadow

Marilyn Pemberton*

* University of Warwick

Mary de Morgan: Out of the Morrisian Shadow

Marilyn Pemberton

University of Warwick

Postgraduate English, Issue 14, September 2006

The influence of William Morris (1834 – 1896) on politics, design, poetry and utopian literature is irrefutable, but in this article I want to show how his political and social philosophy equally inspired Mary Augusta de Morgan (1850 – 1907), an almost forgotten writer of fairy tales. The fairy tale reader expects and anticipates that the main protagonist, who is usually poor, marginalized and disempowered, will eventually acquire great wealth and power, and will “live happily ever after”, which reveals a utopian yearning for a better, fairer world for him or herself. Jack Zipes supports this claim that fairy tales have a utopian function: “within the tales lies the hope of self-transformation and a better world”^[1] and “for many late Victorian authors, the writing of a fairy tale meant a process of creating an *other world*, from which vantage point they could survey conditions in the real world and compare them to their ideal projections.”^[2] This longing for a better world is often exacerbated by the “radical inadequacy of the present”^[3] and I suggest that writers such as Charles Kingsley, George MacDonald, Christina Rossetti, Laurence Housman, Oscar Wilde, E. Nesbit, Andrew Lang and Mary de Morgan chose the fairy tale genre in order to exploit its utopian function and so to critique the society in which they lived. Although de Morgan did write her fairy tales in order to “delight and instruct”^[4] her younger readers I believe that she also sought to challenge the older ones into appraising their world and envisioning a better one.^[5] The fairy tales that I will analyse in this article are ones that reveal concerns and preoccupations felt particularly by Morris, and indicate, I suggest, his influence on her imagination. I will refer extensively to Morris’s *News From Nowhere*, which, although published in 1890, contains all his ideals expressed over the preceding years in his lectures and essays. This utopian novel reveals in great detail what needs to be done in order to

eradicate everything he loathed about Victorian society, and to live according to the ‘spirit of the Middle Ages.’^[6]

The Morris and de Morgan families were intimate, due initially to the close relationship between William Morris and Mary’s brother William Frend de Morgan (1839 – 1917), but this friendship extended to all family members as shown in a letter to Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, dated 28 July 1890, in which Jane Morris says that she considers Mrs de Morgan and her daughter to be “great friends.”^[7] William and Mary’s father, Augustus de Morgan (1806 – 1871), was a famous mathematician^[8] who became the first professor of mathematics at University College London in 1828. He was a man of principle and twice resigned his post: once in 1831 when he disagreed with an action taken by the managing Council, and, having been reinstated in 1836, again thirty years later when he considered that the university’s fundamental position of religious neutrality was being undermined. He wrote many books, not only mathematical, but also on puzzles, riddles and lore.

In 1837 Augustus married Sophia Elizabeth Frend (1809 – 1892), herself a highly intelligent woman and a great philanthropist, who did more than her fair share of work for the poor and needy: amongst other things she started a society for providing playgrounds for disadvantaged children and she assisted Elizabeth Fry in improving prison conditions. She was also an ardent campaigner *against* slavery and vivisection, and *for* higher education and the suffrage for women.^[9] She was avidly interested in phrenology and spiritualism;^[10] and something of especial interest is a small hand-written notebook held in the de Morgan archives in the University of London library, which contains analyses of the dreams of some of her young children, more than thirty years before Freud’s more famous *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900). She has many detailed notes of six-year-old Mary’s dreams, in which her deceased sister Alice^[11] often appeared in the role of guide through the highly symbolic dream landscape.

Both Augustus and Sophia had interesting and often controversial lives, which were worthy of documenting; Sophia wrote her husband's biography,^[12] and Mary edited her mother's own recollections of her life.^[13] Augustus and Sophia had seven children, three who pre-deceased them both and one who pre-deceased Sophia. William Frend de Morgan (1839 – 1917) was the second eldest and worked initially as a maker of stained glass, then moved to making pottery and ended his days as a financially successful writer; but it is as a ceramic artist and for his rediscovery of lustre pottery that he is now most remembered and revered. William Frend de Morgan first met William Morris in 1863 when he produced stained glass and ceramic tiles for The Firm, ceasing only in 1872 in order to set up his own kiln. The men's friendship, however, continued throughout their lives, and Nick Salmon's chronology of Morris's life includes many references to the two travelling and socialising together and mentions their visits in 1880 to various sites looking for new premises for Morris & Co.

In 1887 William Frend de Morgan married Evelyn Pickering (1855 – 1919) who, at the age of seventeen, became one of the first women students at The Slade School of Art. She was a successful painter and was considered by George Frederick Watts (1817 – 1904) as being ““a long way ahead of all the women ... and considerably ahead of most of the men.”” She was ““the first woman artist of the day – if not of all time.””^[14] Both William and Evelyn supported women's suffrage and, like Sophia de Morgan, campaigned against vivisection and were interested in spiritualism, Evelyn being a practising medium. They were both deeply involved in the Arts and Crafts movement and this enabled Mary de Morgan to associate with the Morris, Burne-Jones, and Kipling families, to whose children she is known to have read her fairy tales.

The biographical details of Mary's life are sparse but there are some tantalising glimpses of her in *William de Morgan and His Wife*,^[15] written by Mrs. Wilhelmina Stirling, Evelyn's younger sister. At the age of thirteen Mary was considered to be a ““precocious little minx””^[16] who grew up to be a ““talented woman, who amused people by her witty sayings and quick repartees.””^[17] Mary

not only wrote three anthologies of fairy tales,^[18] but also numerous articles, covering such topics as “The New Trades-Unionism and Socialism in England,”^[19] “The Jewish Immigrant in East London”^[20] and “The Education of Englishmen,”^[21] all of these being for American magazines. In the de Morgan archives there are also typed short stories, but as yet I am unable to determine whether these have ever been published.

It is for her fairy tales, however, that Mary de Morgan was best known during her lifetime, one reviewer even favourably comparing her with Hans Christian Andersen,^[22] but like many Victorian women writers, her name elicits little reaction today. Regardless of her relative success as a writer the 1901 census records that she was living alone and working as a typist and shorthand writer. In 1905 she moved to Cairo in order to take charge of a girl’s reformatory, where the warmer, drier Egyptian climes better suited her consumptive condition; nevertheless she died of phthisis in 1907.

One writer’s utopia is often another writer’s dystopia and Thomas More’s concept of utopia is very different to that of William Morris, Edward Bellamy or Charlotte Perkins Gilman, for instance. However, there is a common thread running through all utopian literature: the desire to eliminate fear, sickness, oppression, poverty and inequality – whether racial, sexual or class. The Victorian fairy tale writers similarly explored these concerns, but the more specific and time-bound issues relating to an industrialised society were also addressed. Charles Kingsley’s *The Water Babies* (1863), for instance, condemned the treatment of chimney sweeps^[23] and the cramming of information into a child’s head until, like an over-ripe turnip, it “split and shrank till nothing was left.”^[24] Similarly Oscar Wilde’s *The Happy Prince* (1888) revealed the prevalence and consequence of greed and materialism in Victorian society.

By the second half of the nineteenth century the physical impact of industrialisation on the environment was apparent and writers such as Charles Dickens^[25] and Friedrich Engels articulated admirably the hardship suffered by

the factory worker living miserably in “the worst houses in the worst quarters of the towns” in streets that were “generally unpaved, rough, dirty, filled with vegetable and animal refuse, without sewers or gutters, but supplied with foul, stagnant pools instead.”^[26] But the great thinkers of the day, such as Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), John Ruskin (1819-1900), Matthew Arnold (1822-1888), and William Morris, were equally concerned with the more intangible affects of industrialisation. Morris believed, for instance, that man’s very nature was being destroyed by the physical changes resulting from relocation from the rural to the urban, and that the values by which he had traditionally lived for hundreds of years were being undermined. He also feared, amongst other things, that the ability to mass-produce goods not only bastardised the product itself but also led to a spirit of “competitive commerce,” which, as he claimed in his lecture “The Lesser Arts,” could be equally called “greed of money,”^[27] which, in its turn, led to the ideologies of individualism and materialism.

A. M. W. Stirling reports how, in 1896 “William Morris had ended his brilliant career after a period of protracted suffering, during which Mary de Morgan had been among those who ministered to his darkened hours.”^[28] Such a close association and her presence at many events at Kelmscott House infer, I suggest, that de Morgan would have been familiar with Morris’s political dogma. Her fairy tale “Siegfrid and Handa,” published in 1877 as part of her first volume of fairy tales, particularly reflects his argument against mass-production. It is interesting to note that Morris’s lecture “The Lesser Arts,” in which he addresses this same issue for the very first time, was given in the same year.

In this fairy tale de Morgan introduces a serious social and political issue into fairyland, in order to show how the establishment of mass-production can threaten the stability of a community living by traditional values, in which the quality of life *for everyone* depends on co-operation *by everyone*. De Morgan’s story contains the familiar fairy tale motifs of the forest at the edge of the village, an evil goblin type, a spell that must be broken, a girl who must be rescued, animal helpers, and a poor, marginalized protagonist. In common with the vast majority

of fairy tales “Siegfrid and Handa” is set in an indeterminate past; it is this lack of specificity that enables a fairy tale to be effectively timeless and therefore able to be appropriated by any and every generation.

The story starts with an almost perfect description of a utopian community, one that could equally have existed in Morris’s *News From Nowhere*:

In the border of a large forest there once stood a little village, where all the people were happy, for they were all good and industrious and honest. It was the pleasantest little village in the world. No fevers or illnesses ever came near it. The people died only of old age, and all the children were well grown and strong. The villagers never quarrelled with each other, but lived as peacefully as the flowers in the forest. ^[29]

This is utopia indeed, for all man’s usual fears are absent: there is no sickness, no strife, no unemployment, no poverty, no crime, no weakness, no premature death and even the bordering forest, which in fairy tales often symbolises “the dark, hidden, near-impenetrable world of our unconscious,”^[30] is here a place of beauty and peace and the animals within are never hunted. We learn also that the work of the villagers is shoemaking, milling, baking, farming and other traditional rural crafts so beloved by the Arts and Crafts movement.

There is, for instance, but one shoemaker called Ralph, who is Siegfrid’s father, who makes shoes and boots for all the villagers and who takes great pride in his work; the supply of footwear is provided to meet the annual demand for good quality goods. This state of affairs reflects Morris’s vision of a utopia, which he describes in *News From Nowhere*; in this future England Hammond explains to Guest that

the wares which we make are made because they are needed: men make for their neighbours’ use as if they were making for themselves, not for a vague market of which they know nothing, and over which they have no control... whatever is made is good, and thoroughly fit for its purpose. ^[31]

De Morgan mirrors this principle and tells us that every year each villager comes to Ralph asking for a new pair of shoes or boots and he produces goods of the highest quality, which fit well and are long lasting:

He had plenty to do, but he took a long time in making each pair, for he always wanted them to be well made, and would have been ashamed if he had been told that they had worn out before their time or did not fit well.^[32]

This imaginary idyll is brought to almost total ruin by the arrival of one ugly old man^[33] who sets up a stall of shoes and boots of enticing colours and all three times cheaper than those sold by Ralph. De Morgan was obviously an impressionable lady and the influence of Christina Rossetti's *Goblin Market* (1862) is evident in the siren call of this disruptive intruder:

Come, buy! Come, buy!

Shoes for all!

Who'll try? Who'll try?

Red shoes and blue shoes,

Black shoes and white shoes,

Thick shoes and thin shoes,

Strong shoes and light shoes!^[34]

The themes of temptation and redemption are common to both Rossetti's and de Morgan's texts, but the former is more concerned with the religious and sexual consequences, whereas the latter condemns the villagers for their material greed.^[35]

In one of his lectures “How We Live and How We Might Live,” delivered to the Socialist Democratic Federation in 1884, Morris attempts to answer anyone who questions why mass-produced goods are not beneficial:

Well you may say, but it cheapens the goods. In a sense it does; and yet only apparently, as wages have a tendency to sink for the ordinary worker in proportion as prices sink; and at what cost do we gain this appearance of cheapness!^[36]

The cost is made apparent in the fairy tale and in retribution for their total disregard of the craftsman’s skill and their decision to buy cheap, shoddy goods at the expense of the shoe-maker, not only is the victim and his family impoverished, but also the village is brought to almost total ruin by famine, drought and fever:

All the grass was dried up, and the cows had nothing to eat, so that there was no milk to be had; and then the wells and the streams began to dry up, and the people began to fear there would soon be no water either. The rains did not come, and then, worst of all, a bad fever broke out in the village, and many persons fell sick.^[37]

This degeneration into dystopia not only affects the villagers themselves, but also the innocent forest animals, which are now hunted and killed for food. A far worse misfortune follows with the disappearance of six village girls, including Siegfried’s especial friend Handa, all of whom have fallen foul to their vanity and succumbed to the temptation to buy pretty but useless shoes. It transpires that the evil gnome has entombed, immobilised, and silenced them and will ultimately kill them, in order to prolong his own life and his own potential to harm.^[38] As in *Goblin Market* the consumer of the tempting wares is in danger of becoming the consumed.

In this fairy tale it is the women who are first tempted and it is they who persuade their men-folk to buy their boots from the old man, rather than from Ralph. I consider that de Morgan encourages women in particular to think carefully about

what they buy and about how the goods are produced. She implies that anyone who buys goods that are bought “at the cost of someone else’s loss”^[39] is effectively complicit in the degradation and impoverishment of the workers and the devastation of the community; it is by their silence and inaction that the power of the manufacturer grows. She articulates clearly Morris’s own assertion that by purchasing mass-produced goods “’tis the lives of men you buy!”^[40]

In this very imaginative fairy tale, then, de Morgan articulates the fears that people such as Morris and Ruskin felt, regarding the flooding of the market with cheap, useless items, made by unskilled people, along with the disappearance of good quality goods and craftsmanship. The result, as de Morgan indicates, is the poverty and degradation of the workers, which itself leads to a fearful and sick society that ultimately turns on the weak and the innocent. As Hammond recalls of the nineteenth century

to this “cheapening of production”, as it was called, everything was sacrificed: the happiness of the workman at his work, nay, his most elementary comfort and bare health, his food, his clothes, his dwelling, his leisure, his amusement, his education – his life, in short.^[41]

Morris argues against this obligation of people to buy the mass-produced goods and Hammond, Morris’s mouthpiece, relates how, after the revolution:

the wares that we make are made because they are needed... there is no longer any one who is compelled to buy them. So that whatever is made is good, and thoroughly fit for purpose. Nothing can be made except for genuine use; therefore no inferior goods are made... we are not driven to make a vast quantity of useless things.^[42]

In order that we may “live the way we might live,”^[43] a way that has been lost through selfishness, greed and commercialism, the whole concept of mass production must be thrown out, the goods themselves destroyed and the producers dispatched. De Morgan finishes the story in accordance with Morris’s directive that “all that fury of manufacture has to sink into cold ashes,”^[44] and it is only

with the annihilation of the cheap wares and the goblin himself that life returns to normal.

The devastating effect of the introduction of mass-production is repeated by de Morgan in another tale, called “The Bread of Discontent” (1880), one of the stories in her last volume of fairy tales. In this story it is not the consumer of the goods whom de Morgan attacks, but rather the producer who has given in to the temptation of having his goods produced by means other than his own hands, making him nothing better than one of the “capitalists and salesmen,”^[45] as Morris calls them.

In this story a baker flies into a rage when a whole batch of bread is burnt and in his anger he throws the loaves onto the floor. His frustration is of course totally contrary to the belief of Morris, for whom any blemish or flaw adds to the beauty and worth of the product. In *News From Nowhere*, for instance, Guest admires the drinking glasses, although they are “somewhat bubbled and hornier in texture than the commercial articles of the nineteenth century.”^[46] I suggest that Morris’s advocacy of the flawed, hand-made item as opposed to the regular, indistinguishable mass-produced product, applies equally to bread. Out of one of the blackened loaves comes a little black imp who promises, in return for a home in the baker’s oven, to bake perfect bread every time. There is a caveat of course to the imp’s offer: anyone eating the bread will become discontented for no apparent reason and they will think themselves most unfortunate “whether they are so or no.”^[47] Like someone asking why mass-production is such a bad thing, the baker asks why it would make the consumer unhappy, after all “if it is good bread it won’t do any harm, and if it is bad they won’t buy it.”^[48]

Having convinced himself that there is no real harm to the consumer, and there is certainly a benefit to himself, he agrees to the deal with the imp. The people, being ignorant of the method of production are effectively compelled to buy the bread and are unaware of the reason for their sudden, overwhelming sense of dissatisfaction. One person, for instance, is left twenty thousand pounds in a will,

but after eating a slice of the bread, his pleasure turns to dismay at the thought of how much *more* useful thirty thousand pounds would have been. Similarly a doctor who has sat with a patient through the night and ensured that he would live thinks that he should have let the man die after all, rather than that he should have to face the misfortunes that life will undoubtedly throw at him. And so each person who eats the baker's enchanted bread grows more and more despondent and angry at life. Only the baker is immune, for he knows not to eat the bread. "Every atom of bread he made was sold at once, so he cared not one whit for the trouble of the other people, and laughed to himself when he heard them complaining, and thought of the words of the dark little elf."^[49] Eventually the baker's very cheerfulness annoys the townsfolk and they eventually turn on him, flogging him almost to death and destroying his bakery. This last violent, anarchical act actually saves them because when the oven is smashed to pieces it can no longer be home to the imp and he scuttles away, taking his magic with him. Thereafter, of course, everyone recovers their former good humour and the baker is content to make the bread with his own hands knowing that "there were worse things than having his loaves burnt black."^[50]

Unlike many fairy tales neither "Siegfrid and Handa" nor "The Bread of Discontent" ends with the protagonist gaining any great wealth or winning the hand of a princess; rather the prize to be won is the recovery of a way of life *prior* to the introduction of the evil that disrupted their previous harmony, and this prize is for the whole community, not just an individual. What is revealed in both these stories is de Morgan's vision of a dystopian future, resulting *from* the introduction of mass-production, and resulting *in* the greed of the manufacturer, the discontent of the consumer and the eventual collapse of society. In "The Bread of Discontent" de Morgan condemns the manufacturer of mass-produced goods and apportions no blame to the consumers because they are, in this case, unaware and effectively compelled to buy mass-produced goods; but in "Siegfrid and Handa" she very much criticises the consumer who knowingly buys such goods.

I also want to mention a short story de Morgan wrote sometime after 1880 which illustrates succinctly her opinion of the effects of greed on the individual.^[51]

“Leila’s Gold” is a simple tale which tells of a young woodman’s daughter who loves gold and hoards every penny in the hope that one day she will become “a great lady, and wear silks and satins, and have pearls and diamonds,” and, by inference, have a higher status and be of more importance. This would indeed, in her eyes, be a fairy tale life. Leila refuses to give even one penny to a starving mother and child and she is therefore cursed so that every drop of her blood turns into a gold coin. At first this magical source of money is a blessing rather than a curse to Leila and she draws her own blood daily in order to get richer and richer and more and more powerful; eventually she becomes the queen of the land. But each day she grows paler and paler and weaker and weaker as she literally bleeds herself dry. Wealth as a result of greed does not bring her happiness, but rather discontent, fear and the prospect of death.^[52] One day she can no longer produce any gold when it is needed to pay the soldiers and they turn on her, destroy the palace and eject her.

Anarchy is again endorsed and it is the people themselves who finally turn against her when she fails them; for wealth alone does not bring respect and loyalty, and gold coins make for an unstable political foundation. She is eventually redeemed by the love of Denis, a childhood friend. Her love of money turns to loathing, this change of heart breaks the curse and she is content not to “want more money than she [has] a right to have”. These words would have been endorsed by Morris, who asked his audience at a lecture delivered to the Hammersmith Branch of the Socialist League on November 13th 1887 “what brings about luxury but a sickly discontent with the simple joys of the lovely earth? What is it but a warping of the natural beauty of things into a perverse ugliness to satisfy the jaded appetite of a man who is ceasing to be a man – a man who will not work, and cannot rest?”^[53] I believe that in this short story de Morgan is criticising greed and the inappropriate status and power accorded to those who have acquired the most material wealth.

Morris was a disciple of John Ruskin and from a letter from Mary de Morgan's mother, we know that the family possessed Ruskin's *The Crown of Wild Olive* (1866) and there is no reason to doubt that they would similarly have read *Unto This Last* (1862), in which Ruskin compares "the circulation of wealth in a nation" to "that of the blood in the natural body." He goes on:

For as diseased local determination of the blood involves depression of the general health of the system, all morbid local action of riches will be found ultimately to involve a weakening of the resources of the body politic. ^[54]

I think that it can be validly argued that in "Leila's Gold" de Morgan uses Ruskin's analogy to illustrate, through the genre of the fairy tale, the effects of commercial greed on the individual and on the nation, something which concerned Morris enormously.

In the three stories that I have briefly described de Morgan uses violence to trigger change, and it is often the masses that become anarchic, but there are also examples of individuals being maimed or physically punished before dystopia becomes utopia. Siegfried, for instance, has to give an owl one of his own eyes before the bird will promise to help him collect all the shoes and boots so that they can be burnt. In my thesis I explain the religious connotations of this act but in the context of this article this exemplifies the necessity for personal sacrifice in order to attain communal betterment. The use of violence and anarchy is worthy of further investigation but I argue that one of de Morgan's influences is Morris's belief in the need of revolution in order to instigate a change for the better. In *News From Nowhere* Hammond explains that at the time when England was going through its transformation "the world was being brought to its second birth; how could that take place without a tragedy?"^[55]

William Morris obviously appreciated fairy tales for in *News From Nowhere*, rather than the people of the future forgetting "such childishness"^[56] they decorate their communal dining halls with pictures of the tales and the stories are told to the children in order to feed their imagination. It is fitting, therefore, that

Mary de Morgan should use her fairy tales to critique aspects of society that Morris felt particularly passionate about. By creating a magical fairyland she was able to criticise the current world and to suggest changes to improve it, something she was not empowered to do in the “real” world.

It is perhaps not surprising that Mary de Morgan was overshadowed not only by her parents and brother, but also by the very influential circle of artists she mixed with, particularly William Morris but I disagree wholeheartedly with a contemporaneous critic’s evaluation that her stories are “very slight, but they are pretty.”^[57] No one seems to have recognised the political messages that I consider to be so inherent in her stories, which are as relevant in the twenty-first century as they were over one hundred years ago. I have suggested that Mary de Morgan was influenced by William Morris, but I suggest also that she was an imaginative writer in her own right, who took his ideals, embroidered them into her own fairy tales and spoke them with her own voice. It is time for Mary de Morgan to come out of the shadow cast by William Morris and to be recognised as an exciting writer, worthy of our respect and our critical attention.

Endnotes

^[1] Jack Zipes, *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales* (London: Heinemann, 1979) ix.

^[2] *Victorian Fairy Tales: The Revolt of the Fairies and Elves*, ed. Jack Zipes (London: Routledge, 1991) xxix.

^[3] Jean Praelzer, “Response. What Happened to History,” in *Feminism, Utopia and Narrative*, ed. by Libby Falk Jones and Sarah Webster Goodwin (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1990) 199.

^[4] Bruno Bettelheim, *The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales* (London: Penguin Books, 1976) 53.

^[5] Fairy tales were not just the domain of children, and most Victorian adults would have read them knowing that they often contained multiple layers of meaning, some of them only comprehensible to the older reader.

^[6] William Morris, *News From Nowhere or an Epoch of Rest* (London: Routledge, 1987) 113.

^[7] Nick Salmon, “The William Morris Internet Archive: Chronology”. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/morris/works/chrono.htm> (9 Jan. 2006). This refers to Mary de Morgan and her mother.

^[8] The de Morgan Law is still used today in software programming.

^[9] She helped found the Bedford College for Women in 1849.

^[10] She wrote on the subject in *From Matter to Spirit: The Result of Ten Year’s Experience in Spiritual Manifestations* (London: Longman, 1863).

^[11] Elizabeth Alice de Morgan (1836 – 1853).

^[12] Sophia de Morgan, *Memoir of Augustus de Morgan: By His Wife Sophia Elizabeth de Morgan. With Selections from His Letters* (London: n.p., 1882).

^[13] *Threescore Years and Ten: Reminiscences of the Late Sophia Elizabeth de Morgan*, ed. Mary de Morgan (London: Richard Bentley & Son., 1895)

^[14] A. M. W. Stirling, *William de Morgan and His Wife* (New York: Henry Holt and Co, 1922) 193.

^[15] See above.

^[16] A. M. W. Stirling, 62.

^[17] *ibid.* 105.

^[18] *On a Pin Cushion* (London: Seeley, Jackson & Halliday, 1877), *The Necklace of Princess Fiorimonde* (London: MacMillan & Co., 1880) and *The Wind Fairies* (London: Seeley & Co. Ltd., 1900).

- [19] *The Homemaker – a Monthly Magazine*, January 1891, 336-9.
- [20] *Sylvia's Journal*, May 1894, 316-9.
- [21] *The Chautauquan*, February 1899, 427-36.
- [22] *The Spectator*, 18 November 1876, 1446.
- [23] As a result of this book the Chimney Sweepers Regulation Act was created, banning the use of children for sweeping chimneys. Lila Marz Harper, "Children's Literature, Science and Faith: *The Water Babies*" in *Children's Literature: New Approaches*, ed. by Karin Lesnik-Oberstein (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), 118-43.
- [24] Charles Kingsley, *The Water Babies* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 302.
- [25] Particularly in *Hard Times* (1854).
- [26] Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (London: Penguin Books, 1987) 70-1.
- [27] William Morris, "The Lesser Arts," in *Political Writings of William Morris*, ed. by A. L. Morton (New York: International Publishers, 1973) 42.
- [28] A. M. W. Stirling, 230.
- [29] Mary de Morgan, "Siegfrid and Handa" in *The Necklace of Princess Fiorimonde and Other Stories* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1963), 62.
- [30] Bettelheim, 94.
- [31] *News From Nowhere*, 82.
- [32] "Siegfrid and Handa", 62.
- [33] Which implies, as any reader of fairy tales knows, that he is also evil.
- [34] *ibid.*, p. 64.

[35] There are in fact religious symbols and images in de Morgan's fairy tale, which I explore in my thesis, but for the purposes of this article I am concentrating on her obvious criticism of mass-production.

[36] William Morris, "How We Live and How We Might Live," in *Political Writings of William Morris*, 139.

[37] "Siegfrid and Handa," 67.

[38] This sexual subtext demands further analysis.

[39] "How We Live and How We Might Live," 137.

[40] William Morris, "Art and Socialism" in *Political Writings of William Morris*, 114.

[41] *News From Nowhere*, 79.

[42] *ibid.* 82.

[43] "How We Live and How We Might Live," 152.

[44] *ibid.*, 139.

[45] "The Lesser Arts," 42.

[46] *News From Nowhere*, 86.

[47] "The Bread of Discontent," 242.

[48] *ibid.*, 242.

[49] *ibid.*, 248.

[50] *ibid.*, 251.

[51] I cannot find by whom or when this story was published but the copy does refer to de Morgan as being the author of "The Necklace of Fioremonde," so it

must have been after 1880. I found the story printed on a single sheet of paper among the de Morgan archives at University London Library.

^[52] As indeed it did for Schwartz and Hans in Ruskin's *The King of the Golden River* (written 1841, pub. 1850).

^[53] "The Society of the Future," in *Political Writings of William Morris*, 193.

^[54] John Ruskin, "The Veins of Wealth," in *Unto This Last and Other Writings of John Ruskin*, ed. Clive Wilmer (London: Penguin, 1987), 183-184.

^[55] *News From Nowhere*, 112.

^[56] *ibid.*, 85.

^[57] *Manchester Guardian*, 27 November 1880. This was found on a note handwritten by the reviewer, amongst the de Morgan archives.