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Materializing Morris Dancing: Tangible Aspects of an Intangible Heritage

Introduction

Morris dance, and other traditional dances, are a classic example of ‘intangible’ heritage, as opposed to other aspects of cultural heritage that take a more physical or tangible form, such as historic buildings, ancient monuments or archaeological artefacts. Indeed, the recognition of the very notion of ‘intangible heritage’ by UNESCO in 2003 was a welcome move to recognise that heritage or historic value was not just something that could be ascribed to monuments, landscapes or objects. Instead, expressions of cultural identity, often passed on through performance, social practice or habituated skills were also deemed of significant cultural value and deserved to be protected. It has been argued that a key aspect of the move to embrace intangible heritage was recognition that heritage could be understood not just as bounded, and often decontextualized, physical objects or locations, but also as cultural processes,¹ a perspective that emphasised the value and innate significance of traditional ‘folk’ practices, such as morris dance.

UNESCO have identified four distinct elements of ‘intangible heritage’ – all of which are reflected in the traditional dance practices of the British Isles:

- it is both traditional and contemporary – having its roots in the past, but expressed in contemporary society;
- it is inclusive to some degree and helps maintain and create certain senses of identity;
- it is representative and thrives on its basis in communities and depends on those whose knowledge of traditions, skills and customs are passed on to the rest of the community;

• it is community-based: intangible cultural heritage can only be heritage when it is recognised as such by the communities, groups or individuals that create, maintain and transmit it – without their recognition, nobody else can decide for them that a given expression or practice is their heritage.  

All these dimensions of intangible cultural heritage, particularly the links between past and present and the importance of community in maintaining and passing on the tradition, are of clear relevance to a range of folk-dance traditions across the world. UNESCO have realized that many of these international dance traditions (although significantly not morris dance) reflect these aspects of heritage; many are inscribed on the Representative Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage; ranging from the Breton fest noz tradition (inscribed 2012), the Saman dance of Indonesia (inscribed 2011), Spanish flamenco (inscribed 2010), Huaconada ritual dancing from Peru (inscribed 2010) and the ritual hopping processing of Echternach in Luxembourg (inscribed in 2010). Disappointingly, Britain has yet to accede to the 2003 Convention on Intangible Heritage and is thus not represented on the UNESCO List.

However, of course, whilst the ultimate expression of these traditions is in the transient and passing moment of performance itself, unless captured photographically on film, not all aspects of many such traditions are purely intangible. They all have important physical dimensions; most, if not all, have specific costumes, regalia and are regularly associated with specific physical spaces or landscapes. This tangible dimension to intangible cultural heritage is indeed recognised by the official UNESCO definition of intangible cultural heritage:

\[
\text{Cultural Heritage means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills \textit{as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith} –}
\]


that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage.

The relationship between music and its physical expression is one that has become increasingly a topic of scholarly engagement, public debate and wider popular writing. There is a recognition that the process of creating heritage out of music can be a formal process (structured, top-down and institutional) or an informal (unstructured, bottom-up) one.

Figure 1. Diagram showing transformation of tangible and intangible heritage during place-production in relation to music (based on Darvill, ‘Rock and Soul’, Figure 1, Redrawn by David Petts).

Most scholarship has focused on the relationship between music and places rather than music and objects, often placing this relationship

---


within a wider framework of formal or informal ‘place-making’ and ‘place-marking’. Tim Darvill has attempted to explore in schematic form the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage in relation to place-making in popular music and it is not a stretch to expand the scope of this model to include the collection and cataloguing of artefacts and objects, as museum objects and memorabilia (Figure 1).

The Tangible Heritage of Morris Dancing

This new emerging approach to musical heritage has largely been limited to certain genres. In particularly, there has been an engagement with the heritage of popular music (as broadly defined), and to a lesser extent blues, jazz and country and western, but little with folk-music and dance traditions.

This paper is a first attempt to explore how these tangible, materialized aspects of morris dance traditions in Britain have been recorded, collected and commemorated. It makes no claim to be a comprehensive survey, but instead hopes to point the way towards how both the morris dancing community itself as well as institutions engaging with social history, particularly museums have dealt with this material, as well as consciously and unconsciously developed new ways of commemorating and memorializing the tradition.

The material aspects of morris dancing embrace a range of objects, including costumes, bell pads, sticks and handkerchiefs, as well as the wider set of regalia associated with some sides, such as cake stands, swords and ritual animals of various forms. Much of this is used regularly by sides in their performances. However, I want to focus on how these material items have been turned into heritage through museum collection and commemoration practices. There are many, many different definitions of the slippery term ‘heritage’.

---


7 Darvill, ‘Rock and Soul’, Figure 1.


9 See, for example, John Carman, 2002. *Archaeology and Heritage: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2002); David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cam-
For the purposes of this paper I want to follow John Carman’s notion of heritage being created through a process of bracketing or of categorization, distinguishing them from other, perhaps more mundane sites or objects, through the process of collecting and documentation, with a specific emphasis on preserving time depth and reflecting not just performance but institutional history and social context.10

In recent years I have been trying to pull together a list of morris and traditional dance material held in museums in England; whilst far from comprehensive, this process has allowed us to glimpse the ways in which morris-dance-related objects have ended up entering formal museum collections. The most extensive collection of morris material is held in the Pitt Rivers Museum (PRM) in Oxford. This is primarily an ethnographic and anthropological museum, and was established in 1884 by General Augustus Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, a key figure in the development of archaeological fieldwork as well as the collection and categorization of material culture from a typological perspective.11 Although the bulk of the collection was derived from outside Europe, there was also a small, but important collection of material derived more locally. Amongst the morris-related material – the collection comprises:

- A morris-dance ‘costume’ acquired in 189512 – in fact, an assemblage of disparate elements including a shirt and baldrick,13 trousers with bell-pads,14 waistcoat,15 top hat,16 collecting box,17 handkerchiefs18 and sticks.19 The baldrick and

10 Carman Archaeology and Heritage, p. 22.
13 Pitt Rivers Museum (PRM), Accession No 1895.46.1.1.
14 PRM, Accession No 1895.46.1.2.
15 PRM, Accession No 1895.46.1.3.
16 PRM, Accession No 1895.46.1.4.
17 PRM, Accession No 1895.46.1.7.
top hat were probably from Kirtlington, the box and sticks from Headington, but the others are of unknown provenance;

- A further collection of bell-pads\(^{20}\) – from Finstock\(^{21}\) (Figure 2). Ramsden,\(^{22}\) a 1902 set from an Oxford revival performance (Figure 3),\(^{23}\) and a 1986 set from Headington;\(^{24}\)

Figure 2 (left): Bell-pad collected from Finstock in 1895, Pitt Rivers Museum Oxford (1895.45.10.1); Figure 3 (right): Bell-pad made for the revival of Morris dances arranged for the Coronation festivities in Oxford 1902, Pitt Rivers Museum (1903.57.1). (Photographs by David Petts, reproduced by permission of the Pitt Rivers Museum.)

- There is also a collection of whittle-and-dubs\(^{25}\) four pipes, one drum and two beaters – not all with provenance but some from Leafield.\(^{26}\)
This material has been well studied, primarily by Mike Heaney, Alice Little and the Pitt Rivers ‘The Other Within’ project 2006-2008, and the recent Percy Manning centenary events have ensured that they are well known. The key point to note is that most of this material was donated to the museum (founded in 1884) in its first 25 years. The collectors themselves included key figures such as Percy Manning, who collected widely in the spheres of social history, folklore and archaeology donating material to the Pitt-Rivers and the Ashmolean. Much of Manning’s folklore collection, including morris-related material, such as probably a morris dancer’s costume from Bampton, was sold to the English Folk Dance Society at Cecil Sharp House in 1929, where they were later destroyed in the Blitz. Another key collector was Henry Balfour, the first curator of the Pitt Rivers, who donated overall around 15,000 items to the museum from all over the world. The Pitt Rivers was ideally located to be a centre for the collection of early morris material, as it combined both physical proximity to the heartland of the tradition, with the presence of a museum and wider body of academics and researchers who were actively collecting. In practice this meant that the material collected


26 PRM, Accession Nos: 1903.129.21 (pipe), 1903.129.22 (drum), 1903.129.22.2 (beater); 1938.34.21, 1938.34.220 (pipes), 1938.34.548 (tabor stick), and 1962.7.75 (pipe).


was very much from the immediate proximity to Oxford, with most material from an area with 10-15 miles of the Museum. However, the Pitt-Rivers collection, whilst very important, is perhaps unrepresentative, its collections being acquired through some element of structured and targeted collection by investigators or their proxies. In most other cases, the collection of traditional dance-related material by museums has been far more *ad hoc*. Outside the Pitt Rivers Museum, the most extensive collection of material can be found, perhaps not surprisingly, in the collections of the Oxfordshire Museum Service (OMS), which holds a number of morris-related artefacts.

The earliest documented object in the OMS collection is a top hat belonging to Tom Hemmings from Abingdon and was probably worn by him in the 1930s, which entered the collection in 1980 (Figure 4).\(^{30}\) Apart from this, most of the collection is far more recent. It includes two hats\(^{31}\) and a waistcoat\(^{32}\) accessioned in 2006 and belonging to Joe Marns, a member of Icknield Way Morris Men, who died eight years earlier.\(^{33}\) There are also two articles of mumming regalia: a tatters coat worn by Bold Slasher in Abingdon in the 1970s\(^{34}\) and a decorated top hat used in the Sunningwell mummers’ play in the mid twentieth century.\(^{35}\) A final intriguing and unique piece is a red cotton embroidered banner belonging to the English Folk Dance Society (Oxford Branch).\(^{36}\) This must date to between 1911 when the Society was founded and 1932 when it merged with the Folk Song Society. It is decorated with embroidered images of Will Kemp and a pipe-and-tabor player. It was held privately, having been given by Mrs Chaundy to the donor, Peter Lund, who passed it onto the Oxford Museums Service in 1995. Mrs Chaundy was presumably the wife of Theodore Chaundy (1889-1966), an Oxford University Fellow who

---


\(^{32}\) OMS, Accession No: OXCMS : 2006.19.3.


\(^{34}\) OMS, Accession No: OXCMS : 1979.187.5.


also had an interest in morris dance and its history, and a key early figure in the EFDS in Oxford.37

Figure 4: Black silk plush top hat worn by Tom Hemmings, Abingdon c.1920 © By kind permission of Abingdon County Hall Museum.

It is useful to compare the collections of material in the Pitt Rivers Museum with that in the Oxfordshire Museum Service. Whereas the

Pitt Rivers collection is primarily related to pre-revival teams, and seems to have been mainly entered the collection via working scholars with active interests in folklore, the material in the Oxfordshire Museum Service seems instead to have entered the collections by donation. These donations have primarily come through individuals directly associated with morris dancing or through close associates or family members. Geographically, the Oxfordshire Museum Service collection is very biased towards southern Oxfordshire – Wantage, Abingdon, Sunningwell – in contrast to the Pitt Rivers Museum collection which is more derived from West Oxfordshire – on the Cotswold fringe, indicating where the early collectors were most active.

Outside these two collections, the acquisition of morris-related material by museums is very thin and appears to have been largely fortuitous.38 This has meant it has not been easy to track down examples, with local museums often not cataloguing their material in a way that makes for easy identification of dance-related material. A set of bell-pads and baldric made for William Kimber by Harvey in 1913 and a further pair of bell-pads are held at Halsway Manor, although it is not certain when these entered the collection there. The manor was instituted as a centre for folk arts in the mid 1960s, whilst Kimber died in 1961, but the biography of the baldric is unclear.

Another isolated item is the triangle, seemingly a nineteenth-century military one, held in the National Trust property at Snowshill Manor in Gloucestershire,39 which was allegedly used by a local morris side to accompany their dance, although there is very little further information about it. More up-to-date is a Westminster Morris costume held in the Museum of London, accessioned in 2000.40 Northampton Museums holds the hobby horse41 used by the Yardley Gobion side between 1880 and 1920; it seems to have been donated to the museum in the early 1950s, possibly following the death in 1947 of

39 National Trust Object ID NT 1335370.
41 Northampton Museums, ID29.1954-55,
Thomas Cadd, the leading figure in the Yardley Gobion morris. A more modern costume is the rag jacket, hat and bell-pads worn by Harry Mousdell, who danced with Chanctonbury Ring Morris Men and Broadwood Morris Men, which is held by Horsham Museum, who also hold a 1980s costume worn by a member of Magog Ladies.42

Lack of context can be a problem when identifying material associated with traditional dance. Slightly outside the central concern of this paper with Cotswold morris is the case of some interesting material held in York Castle Museum which includes a set of six dance swords43 with ribbons at one end and a set of bones allegedly used by a local ‘plough stots’.44 Neither of these acquisitions has any contextual information about their source of origin, and they have limited information even about who collected them.

This issue of provenance is particularly acute when it comes to examining collections of musical instruments that may or may not be related to morris dance. The Bate Collection of Musical Instruments at Oxford University holds a pipe, tabor and beater, which arrived in the museum in 1947 and seem to have originally been collected by the musicologist Canon Francis Galpin.45 It also holds a pipe originally from the Overy collection.46 All this material was accessioned as being ‘morris dancers’ but it is not clear whether this is note is contemporaneous with acquisition or based on a later assumption. A tabor also allegedly associated with morris dancing is held by the Horniman Museum,47 although its provenance is unclear, and a tabor pipe in the same museum actually appears to be French and was collected by Arnold Dolmetsch.48 A pipe-and-tabor set is also held by the Victoria and Albert Museum.49 Probably early nineteenth century in date, it was professionally made by Falkner and Christmas and do-

---

42 Teresa LeFevre, pers.comm. to the author, 30 October 2014.
43 York Museums Trust (YMT), Accession No YORCM DA7604.
44 YMT, Accession No YORCM: 187.
45 Oxford University Faculty of Music, Bate Collection, Accession No: x01.
46 Oxford University Faculty of Music, Bate Collection, Accession No: x02.
47 Horniman Museum, Accession No: 211.312-92.
49 Victoria and Albert Museum, Accession No: 1563-1902.
nated by the Royal Academician John Seymour Lucas. Were these ever used in anger or simply acquired as an artist’s props? Lucas was a painter of genre images of British historical scenes, so it is possible that a pipe-and-tabor might have been used in his art, although an initial rapid survey of his known artwork has failed to identify a depiction of the items in question.

**Morris Materials in Context**

In summary, there is a corpus of morris-dancing-related material in local museums, which can be divided into two categories: early material (primarily in the Pitt Rivers Museum) seemingly related to pre-revival sides and acquired through active collection; and a second group of material related to revival sides, mainly post-war and primarily acquired through donation. The relative lack of early material is interesting but perhaps not surprising. The living tradition was largely ebbing away just before the active collecting antiquarians and folklorists started to become interested in this material.

A key issue is that the concerted collection of rural artefacts and folklore material only really developed in the early to mid twentieth century, and post-dated the disappearance of the pre-revival tradition. For example, in the geographic areas associated with morris, it was not until the 1930s that there was a sudden increase in the collection and display of rural and folkloric material in what Laura Carter has recently called the ‘first wave’ of folk museology.\(^5\) Swinford Museum (Filkins), which holds a set of bellpads from Filkins, was founded in 1930s by George Swinford. Lavinia Smith’s collection in East Hendred opened in 1932,\(^5\) the collection acquired by rural writer H.J. Massingham commenced in 1935, in Gloucester the museum in Bishop Hooper’s Lodging which was dedicated to the ‘display of folk culture and historical relics of the county of Gloucestershire’ opened

---


in 1935. This pattern is found more widely across England: the Cambridge and County Folk Museum opened in 1935 and the Kirk Collection in York opened in 1938. These collections and collectors were still able to acquire relatively easily material related to agricultural practices, which, despite the on-going process of mechanization, had not changed massively since the later nineteenth century. However, the original morris tradition had largely dwindled away by the end of the nineteenth century and had been subsequently revived, but largely without the original regalia and costumes; the objects and items related to the revival was not however at this stage seen as something worth collecting by the 1930s collectors. Significantly, the earliest collected material related to morris found its way into a major ethnographic collection (Pitt Rivers Museum) rather than a social history museum. It has been argued that this kind of anthropological collection of what later became deemed ‘folk’ material slotted it into a cultural scheme that saw them as ‘survivals’ from earlier cultures rather than as active parts of living culture. Indeed Edward Burnett Tylor, Oxford University’s first Professor of Anthropology, is credited as being the first person to develop this position theoretically. Tylor himself collected English folk-related material, including a set of morris bell-pads that were donated to the Pitt Rivers on his death in 1917. It has been argued that this position was also one broadly adopted by Percy Manning.

Moving beyond this early phase of collection, with one or two exceptions such as the Yardley Gobion hobby horse, most material seems to have entered museums in the 1980s and after, although this is an

53 Carter, 'Rethinking Folk Culture', p. 9.
56 Douglas, ‘Folklore, Survivals and the Neo-Archaic.’
58 Little, ““Good Morning Ladies and Gentlemen””, p. 226.
admittedly small sample. This maybe because from this point we are reaching the end of the dancing careers of those who became involved in the revival in the 1950s, and there is an increased sense of both a passing of generations and of the need to record and remember the histories and traditions of revival sides. This may also perhaps reflect and recognise an increased sense of self-confidence in the legitimacy of revival sides in their own right as bearers of distinct local traditions. Not surprisingly, in an activity where the sense of preserving and maintaining a living tradition is acute, there appears to have been a clear sense of the importance of the histories of individual sides, as well as the wider tradition. This is something we see in the widespread keeping and curation of more or less official paper archives belonging to morris sides, as well as formal and informal histories (which in itself is an important and under-studied phenomenon). One way in which such material sometimes ‘bubbles to the surface’ is through temporary exhibitions held at local museums or other venues brought together by particular sides to celebrate key events such as anniversaries. These might be curated by the side themselves, such as the recent exhibition by Grimsby Morris Men at the Museum of Lincolnshire Life, or develop as more structured outputs from research projects such as the ‘This Girl Can’ exhibition of carnival morris material held at Cecil Sharp House in 2017 curated by Lucy Wright and ultimately arising out her doctoral research. However, as well as paper archives, some sides still curate older artefacts and elements of costumes which have not entered museum collections. For example, the Abingdon ox horns; although a replica is used to dance out with on most occasions, other original regalia (the sword and mazer) are taken out, whilst the original horns are curated, but not in a museum context (Figure 5).

59 e.g. Judge, ‘The Ancient Men.’
61 Keith Chandler, ‘The Abingdon Morris and the Election of the Mayor of Ock Street’, in Aspects of British Calendar Customs, ed. by Tess Buckland Juliette Wood (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic
The Traditional Bampton Morris Dancers still use their original sword and cake tin, and elsewhere, Ilmington still dance out with a hobby horse constructed in 1899 for Sam Bennett; and of course, the Abbot’s Bromley dancers continue to use what are presumably the original sets of horns held in the church. As well as objects used in dancing out, other items are in the possession of members of sides, even though not used in performance. For example, the nineteenth-century Brackley baldric,62 and Cecil Sharp’s three-hole pipe made by Carl Dolmetsch in the early 1920s and held by Foresters Morris Men.63


The importance of such curation of morris costume and regalia is one that could itself be found in pre-revival sides. Henry Radband, a dancer for the Bampton side, claimed that the bells he used had belonged to his father and grandfather – presumably implying they were at least fifty years old. Some of the bells collected from dancers by Percy Manning in the late 1890s reputedly dated to c.1830 and 1840 – meaning they were believed to be 60-70 years old when acquired. Bells could also be passed between sides: a set of bells seen by Cecil Sharp at Ilmington (Warwickshire) had been bought by one of the dancers from a man named Hartwell, who was one of the dancers from nearby Blackwell – and were said to be 100 years old in 1912. There are also cases of bells on bell-pads being inscribed with the date of a particular event. For example, the bell pads worn by Arthur Dixey of Bampton, who died in 1966, were inscribed with the date 1898. Whilst the simple re-use of bell-pads might have simply been a practical response to the cost of making new ones, the fact that the history of individual items was recorded and passed on suggests that they were important in making and maintaining links between different generations of dances; this is a phenomenon that seems to have been important for past and current sides.

Memorializing Morris: Creating a Morris Place

There is another important aspect to the materializing of morris dance as heritage: the memorialization and monument alization of place. Obviously, some dance traditions have a very close connection with particular landscapes and locations, such as Abingdon’s Ock Street, the gardens of Bampton, the route taken by the Abbot’s Bromley Horn Dancers. However, places can be important for other reasons, such as the homes or birthplaces of key figures in the tradition, or even memorials erected to commemorate the foundation of particular dance sides.

64 21, 1938.34.220 (pipes), 1938.34.548 (tabor stick), and 1962.7.75 (pipe).
Despite the important of transient performance at these sites, there is an increasing number of cases of the creation of formal patterns of commemoration of morris within both urban and rural landscapes. Perhaps the finest example of this is Headington, on the North-east edge of Oxford, where there is quite a landscape of commemoration associated with Cecil Sharp and William Kimber. The location where Cecil Sharp first encountered morris dancing on Boxing Day 1899 had a plaque placed there on the sixtieth anniversary of the event in 1959 (also the centenary year of Sharp's birth). This was originally the site of Sandfield Cottage, where the encounter occurred, but with its demolition and replacement with flats in the 1960s the plaque was kept and now sits incongruously just below a satellite dish on the side of 1960s building (Figures 6-7). A short distance from there is William Kimber Crescent, constructed in 1958 (the year before the erection of the plaque). William Kimber was himself present at both the opening of the road and the erection of the plaque (Figure 8).

Figure 6: William Kimber unveiling the plaque on Sandford Cottage at Headington Quarry on 26 December 1959, 60 years after his meeting with Cecil Sharp. The morris Fool with William Kimber is Arthur Kimber. (photograph © The Morris Ring Archive. Reproduced with permission).
Figure 7: The 1959 plaque at site of former Sandfield Cottage relocated onto the wall of residential block (photograph © David Petts).
Interestingly, the Headington plaque is not the only plaque to one of Sharp’s encounters with the tradition. There is another at the vicarage at Hambridge in Somerset, recording where he first heard John England singing ‘The Seeds of Love’ in 1903. Elsewhere in Headington, 42 St Anne’s Road, Kimber’s last home, has been provided with a blue plaque,\(^{68}\) whilst in the nearby churchyard of Holy Trinity is Kimber’s wonderful morris-inspired gravestone (Figure 9). There are also other sites that, although unmarked, are closely associated with Kimber and the Headington side, for example the other Kimber family homes and places such as the Chequers Inn, where a series of significant early photographs of the side were taken in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by the important Thames Valley photographer Henry Taunt.

Figure 8: Dancing at the inauguration of William Kimber Crescent, Headington Quarry on 19th October 1958 (photograph © The Morris Ring Archive, reproduced with permission).

Together this creates a rather interesting and well marked commemorative landscape relating to Kimber. This is perhaps not surprising close to Oxford, where key moments and figures in morris history coincide with the presence of an engaged (official and amateur) scholarly community with an active interest in recording and commemorating them. The only remotely comparable morris-related memorial landscape is in Norwich, where there is a series of places tied in with Will Kemp – which seem to have put in place around 2000 on the four-hundredth anniversary of his ‘nine days’ wonder’. Here there is a plaque near the Maddermarket Theatre in St John’s Alley, marking the place Kemp completed his journey and leapt over the church wall of St John Maddermarket. A nearby pas sageway has been named Will Kemp Way and a sculpture by the art-

ist Mark Goldsworthy depicting Kemp was erected in nearby Chapelfield Garden. In addition to the naming of roads after Will Kemp and William Kimber, there was also an attempt to name a road in King’s Cross Esperance Street in remembrance of Mary Neal; although the name was shortlisted it was ultimately unsuccessful. 70

When it comes to this kind of commemorative practice, the ‘cult of ancestors’ is strong within the folk revival, a series of key figures associated with collection of material and the first revival being marked by blue plaques. Not surprisingly, these are most widely spread in Oxfordshire, where the Oxfordshire Blue Plaques scheme has been proactive in commemorating such figures. In addition to the plaque commemorating Kimber in Headington, there is a plaque for Reginald Tiddy, the collector of folk plays and morris dance, on the side of Tiddy Hall (the village hall) in Ascot-under-Wychwood (unveiled in 2011) (Figure 10),71 one for the collector Janet Blunt at her former home Le Hall Place in Adderbury (Figure 11)72 and one for Percy Manning, antiquary and collector at 300 Banbury Road, Summertown (Figure 12).73


Outside Oxfordshire, there are also plaques to Enid Porter, an important figure in collecting folk traditions, including material relating to molly dancing in Cambridgeshire; the composer, collector and morris dancer George Butterworth in York (does not mention his dance involvement), and now also at Radley College and one to Mary Neal in Littlehampton.

Not surprisingly, commemoration of revival sides rather than collectors is less common; perhaps the exception is the rapper side the Newcastle Kingsmen, who achieve the distinction of having not one, but three memorial plaques in the quad at Newcastle University, celebrating the thirtieth, fiftieth and sixtieth anniversaries of their foundation. The practice of commemorative plaques has also recently been taken up with Lucy Wright’s ‘Pink Plaques’ project marking key figures in the North-west carnival morris tradition, which in

a break with other ‘blue plaque’ traditions has marked the houses of key figures who are still alive (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Elsie Maddock and the Pink Plaque recording her involvement in North-west carnival morris dancing in Cheshire (photograph © Lucy Wright).

A final place that needs to be considered as key site associated with the morris (and folk) revival is of course Cecil Sharp House itself, the ultimate manifestation of an engagement with folk dance and song made physical. The building is protected as a Grade II Listed Building. Its very name, of course, serves to memorialize the key role of Sharp in the revival. Designed by Godfrey Pinkerton (1858-1937) and H.M. Fletcher (1870-1953), a former president of the Architectural Association, and opened in 1930, it was subsequently damaged during the Blitz and refurbished in the late 1940s by the architects John Eastwick-Field and Hugh Pite. Its construction and reconstruction are recorded in a series of memorial slabs. There is also another plaque recording William Kimber, who had helped lay the initial foundation stone and then used his skills as a bricklayer to lay a course of the building. Other key individuals were memorialized through the structure: the Trefusis Room and the Kennedy Hall named after past Presidents of the Society, the Vaughan Williams Memorial Library named after the composer, whilst Winifred Shuldham-Shaw, an important donor, is recorded on a sign on the bookcases in the Library. The opportunity to refurbish the building
after the war also saw new design features added, as well as major structural extensions. Shallow incised images with folkloric connections (a jester, a hobby horse, a player of the pipe-and-tabor), based on iconography from the well-known stained-glass window panel from Betley (Staffordshire) were added to the main porch in the early 1950s (Figure 14). The major feature of the Kennedy Hall, the huge Ivon Hitchens murals, were commissioned by Duncan Kennedy to replace a musicians’ gallery destroyed by the bombing. The scheme depicted in a relatively abstract form a series of folk dances: a ring dance, a morris dance, the Abbots Bromley Horn Dance and the Padstow ‘oss’.

Places and Things in Morris History: A Prospect for the Future?

It has been shown that traditional dance, particularly morris, is being recorded, collected, commemorated and embedded within landscapes in a variety of ways: key individuals are being remembered, important moments in morris history, and in the history of sides are being marked, with a range of place-making strategies being deployed, including blue plaques, street names, memorial tablets and public art. Crucially, some of this commemorative infrastructure is itself now of some considerable age; for example, the
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tablets referring to Cecil Sharp’s encounters with the folk tradition at Headington and Hambridge are themselves over 50 years old and have become heritage in their own right; and in the case of the Headington plaque, it has been curated and maintained despite the demolition of its original location. In addition to the case studies put forward in this paper there are myriad other ways in which traditional dance is materialized, presented and repackaged, ranging from tea-towels and biscuit tins to pub signs (e.g., the Morris Clown, Bampton), public art (e.g., the wall mural marking the Green Man Festival in Hastings) and village signs (e.g., Thaxted).

There is also a huge output of dance costumes, regalia and ephemera (badges; programmes etc.) related to revival sides and events which are being produced and of which just a fraction are being actively collected and curated. Obviously there are some individuals, such as Chloe Middleton (English Folk Costume Archive\(^{81}\)) and Doc Rowe\(^ {82}\) who are archiving material; and organizations such as the Morris Ring\(^ {83}\) Morris Federation\(^ {84}\) and the Museum of British Folklore\(^ {85}\) who are also engaged in similar activity; but there is also a problem that little is known about what is already held in existing museums, where lack of specialist knowledge often means that extant collections are not always well recorded or catalogued. The Traditional Drama Research Group did produce a very useful annotated list of folk play artefacts;\(^ {86}\) this obviously focuses on traditional drama rather than dance, though there is obviously an overlap. However, it is out of date in some places (museums have shut or been amalgamated) and does not include some key information, such as museum accession numbers.

To turn toward the future, it is useful to think about strategies for recording what historic material is held in existing hands as well as

\(^{81}\) <http://www.englishfolkcostumes.co.uk/> [accessed 23 November 2017].
\(^{82}\) <http://www.docrowe.org.uk/> [accessed 23 November 2017].
thinking about other ways in which we might engage with the material and built dimensions of traditional-dance history. Starting with the level of basic resource assessment, there is a need to carry out a basic audit of what relevant material relating to pre-revival and revival traditional dance is in public and private collections, noting core metadata including accession numbers, dates, origins and condition, with a view to further targeted study of particular important or vulnerable material. This is perhaps more easily said than done: there are over 2,500 museums in the UK, of which around 1,800 are formally accredited, with many other smaller, unregistered public collections. Despite the move to digitize collections, registers and accession lists, many are not online, and any such audit would require direct contact with curators. In addition, key information that would allow a particular piece of clothing or regalia to be identified as relating to folk dance is not always recorded in a format searchable with keywords. Any such audit also needs to include a proactive engagement with material potentially in private hands – the appearance of a horse skull connected with mumming from Hooton Pagnell (South Yorkshire) as part of a house sale auction at Bonhams in 2015 is a reminder of the potential of other material to be still surviving in private hands.87

Identifying material held in private hands is an even bigger challenge. Whilst some collections are relatively well known (Doc Rowe Archive; Museum of British Folklore) and are effectively archived and catalogued, in many cases there is less formal recording. For example, it is only recently I have been able to identify a small collection of folkloric material, including costumes from revival sides and mumming regalia, in the private Fred Mead Theatrical Memorabilia Performing Arts Collection. This material includes the recently purchased Hooton Pagnell mummers horse skull, a Derby Tup and horse from the Comberbach mummers and costumes from Danegeld Morris, Kits Coty Morris and Boston Morris Stumpers.88

One useful starting point would be a formal survey of existing morris sides via the various umbrella organizations, simply to ascertain the state of the existing resource in terms of paper, photographic and material archives. Informally developed and curated archives themselves often face serious issues concerning sustainability, access and conservation.\(^9\) The first stage in addressing these issues, is by necessity trying to understand the extent of the problem. Yet if achieving a benchmark assessment of what is already held in collections forms a challenge; so does the next step, the proactive rather than reactive acquisition of traditional dance related material, particularly from active dance sides. Most museums have carefully targeted collection policies, as well as limited budgets. Pressingly, many also face constraints on storage space and financial limitations on all the associated on-costs of acquiring new material.\(^9\)

Moving from the engagement with objects to places, there has obviously been a wider attempt to address what might be termed the 'built heritage' of the popular music scene,\(^9\) by formally and informally spatially mapping the intersection of popular music and urban landscapes in certain cities, such as Liverpool and London.\(^9\) As well as these more discursive explorations, curatorial bodies have also taken a more formal approach by enhancing key datasets, such as English Heritage’s National Monuments Record (NMR) (now Historic
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England’s Pastscape) with entries relating to clubs and venues for popular music from the 1950s and 60s, as well as earlier jazz clubs. However, there has been no attempt to bring in sites related to folk music.

Indeed, with one or two notable exceptions, there have been no attempts to map folk heritage in this way, although there are some key locations (e.g. Abingdon Ock Street; Bampton; Adderbury; Padstow; Abbot’s Bromley) that might prove interesting case studies to explore how methodologies used for mapping cultural landscapes related to popular music might be developed to map the landscapes of traditional music and dance. Recent work within the growing field of contemporary archaeology might also present ways in which transient sites of performance such as folk festivals might also be interrogated spatially and mapped.

There are also other strategies for lining local knowledge, expertise and memories of morris, folk dance and folk traditions into specific sites and locations. Engagement with local ‘blue plaque’ schemes is clearly one approach that has a successful track record. However, one noticeable aspect of this approach is that the individuals commemorated tend to be the collectors and those responsible for the early revival (Blunt; Butterworth; Manning; Neal, Sharp, Tiddy) rather than actual dancers themselves. This is partly because the plaque schemes often have formal requirements of regional or national importance that those commemorated have to meet. More generally, these plaques tend to focus on sites where key figures lived, rather than where dance took place. The notable exception to both these tendencies is William Kimber, who was both an original
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dancer and a figure in the revival and is the only pre-revival dancer to have his house marked with a plaque. Lucy Wright’s Pink Plaques scheme partially addresses this by exploring and marking homes related to living members of an existing tradition, rather than those who have died.  

Another practical way in which this issue might be addressed is through concerted attempts to get information relating key places with connections to folk dance and related tradition embedded into formal public records. A current scheme with a lot of potential is Historic England’s ‘Enriching the List’ project, which is crowdsourcing public knowledge about Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments to enhance and extend the existing information held by Historic England, with the public encouraged to ‘share images, insights and secrets of England’s special places, and capture them for future generations’. It allows people to submit images and supply supplementary information to the curated information sources managed by Historic England. Concerted engagement with this scheme by the folk dance community would be a golden opportunity to place accrued knowledge about key places in tradition into the wider public domain.

There are also lurking here bigger issues about how morris and other forms of traditional dance have been received in wider public culture. They have often been taken as an index of Englishness *par excellence*, but have also been embedded within alternative discourses and counter-narratives. For example, morris has a long tradition of intersecting with ‘New Age’ and pagan revivalism, which goes back to the earliest days of the revival, but can be seen emerging in popular culture, particularly in television from the 1970s, such as in ‘The Daemons’ episode of Doctor Who (1971; Series 8; Episode 5) or in ‘Children of the Stones’, the classic 1977 uncanny children’s drama set around a fictional version of the Avebury stone circle. The way in
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which artists have responded to folk dance has also often centred on reworking the material dimensions of the tradition, particularly costume, rather than the dance itself. This can be seen in the photographs of Faye Claridge\textsuperscript{100} and the ‘Conversation Hats’ created by Lucy Wright\textsuperscript{101}.

To conclude, morris and other forms of traditional dance, despite being vibrant and popular practices with an extensive body of contemporary practitioners, were embedded within a narrative of heritage, survival and recovery from the earliest years of the revival in the late nineteenth century. The collecting of artefacts, costume and regalia took place alongside the recording and recovery of dance tradition themselves, although this collection initially took the form of a quasi-ethnographic practice. The move towards creating sites, rather than objects, of memory emerged with the construction of Cecil Sharp House in the interwar years, partly reflecting the fact that this was a period of consolidation of key institutions such as the EFD(S), and a period when the first generation of collectors and revivalists was dying, providing a sense of generational shift and perhaps provoking a period of self-reflection. Collection of material from the second post-war revival has been more \textit{ad hoc}, but still widespread; and the expansion of place-making and marking activities has gone alongside this. The last hundred years have seen traditional dance emerge as a reflective movement aware of its pre- and post-revival history and aware of the need to mark it. Hopefully this paper has laid out the broad landscape of how this has happened and offered some possible ways in which the folk-dance world might continue to engage with its material heritage in the future.
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