THE USES OF JUVENILIA: ERNEST JONES'S *EFFUSIONS*

Rob Breton
Professor, Department of English Studies, Nipissing University

COMMON to the study of young writers who go on to literary fame is comparative work, examining continuities and discontinuities between juvenile and mature writing. The early efforts of the Brontës or Austen can undoubtedly be read beside the later novels to the benefit of both. But the relationship between early and mature writings is always one that has to be interpreted and specified, not assumed. In this paper I examine the juvenilia of the Chartist Ernest Jones (1819–1869) and, more specifically, the *use* of his juvenilia—and of his childhood more generally--in order to comment on a potentially dangerous though understandable temptation to read juvenile works solely for comparison to and usually as a confirmation of the mature work of the author. In Jones's case, the relationship is fraught with complications mainly because Jones, born into wealth, so radically reinvented himself as an adult. As Christine Alexander notes, "an understanding of the literary juvenilia of an established author requires some comparison with the later work" (73); however, she is also quick to point out that, for some artists, "to say 'farewell' to one's early writings … embodies the recognition of the need for a new direction and a new audience" (74). In my view, Jones scholars have not always given his early work this necessary "recognition."

Because Jones became a radical and an outsider, his childhood was not shaped by biographers against a standard image of childhood; to enhance the adult's identity, the young Jones all too easily became merely the radical adult-in-waiting. The study of Jones's juvenilia and its critical history gives us a very clear case of how childhood and childhood art can be constructed in the image of the adult artist. Specifically, through an examination of Jones's juvenilia—which consists of one collection of poems and a short story—I reconsider the relationship between the child and adult writer in order to argue, in part, that the child writer's minor voice has been constructed as an imitation of the mature voice of the adult Chartist. The mature man, the Chartist, and his writings have been similarly constructed as a minor voice imitating a mature voice, though here, the Chartist or working-class voice is often considered to be imitating a middle-class one. That is, critics of Victorian working-class writing have tended to see it, and Jones's work especially, as derivative, merely the same middle-class social-problem story however re-accented. By demonstrating

Journal of Juvenilia Studies 2.1 (2019), pp. 14–27. doi: 10.29173/jjs20

the ways in which Jones's early works were either conscripted into a campaign to romanticise or naturalise Jones's transition to the cause of the people or, more recently, used to support a thesis that his conversion was calculated and inauthentic, I want to challenge the reading of juvenilia *in toto* that reduces it to an introduction of the mature works and insist, instead, that an established writer's early works have to be attended to as something more than a pre-echo of the material that matters. When we give such attention to Jones's juvenilia, we may discover exactly what Jones the Chartist thought he *could* keep in his poetry and fiction from his early years as a kind of minority writer, and what he thought he could *not* keep when he became a different kind of minority writer.

Nineteenth-century biographers of Ernest Jones relished in detailing the radical's privileged childhood. The more emphasis on his inherent social advantages, the more glorious his rejection of that world to fight for the people's cause. Frederick Leary begins his 1887 biography by observing that "Jones was born at Berlin on the 25th of January, 1819. His father was Major Charles Jones, of the 15th Hussars, Equerry to the Duke of Cumberland, who was the uncle of Queen Victoria, and was King of Hanover under the title of Ernest I" (1). Moving through the early years, Leary notes that Jones attended the "College of St. Michael, Luneburgh, the exclusively aristocratic institution to which the sons of the local nobility alone had access, a foreigner being admitted only by what was in Hanover called a 'letter patent' from the King." He then comments, "We dwell on these otherwise unimportant particulars of his early years, as rendering more remarkable by their contrast that democratic spirit for which he afterwards became so noted" (2). Similarly, George Jacob Holyoake states in his own biography, *Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life* (1892), that Jones "was reared under circumstances which did not render it necessary that he should have any sympathy with the people" (249). In 1897, David P. Davies drew upon Jones's privileged childhood to help overthrow "charges of insincerity" and claim that Jones is one of the few "who, by might and right have insisted upon right being 'wisdom in the scorn of consequence'" (20). G. D. H. Cole carried this line of discourse into the twentieth century, beginning his portrait of Jones by stating first that "There was in Ernest Jones's beginnings nothing to foreshadow his career" (339), but then adding that he learned to speak for the people in a way that was "not studied, but natural," for he "believed in them with all the faith of the converted aristocrat" (341).

The conversion narrative of selfless sacrifice crystallising in these biographies was initiated by Jones himself in his essays and novels. As Miles Taylor states, "Sacrifice was … the central motif of Jones's version of his life" (22). By 1845 Jones had become a hugely popular political orator and radical publisher, one of Chartism's most prominent leaders, sworn never to take a penny for the work he would do on behalf of the working classes, and writing profusely about history's great martyrs.[1] Though his turn to radical politics has been seen by others as a response to personal financial difficulties verging on bankruptcy (Rennie 6), Jones preferred to emphasise that he had forsaken a promising career as a lawyer to advocate for Chartism, abandoning both the money his talents would have generated as a poet or novelist of leisure and, more directly, the £2,000 a year offered to him by his uncle, Holton

Annesley, on condition that he abort his political cause. Perhaps in consequence of such self-representation, sacrifice became a large part of the legend surrounding Jones. Leary, for instance, says he "voluntarily resigned a large fortune" (82) to serve the people. In *Men of the Reign: A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Persons*, Thomas Humphrey Ward conspicuously uses the same phrase—"he voluntarily resigned a fortune" (479)—to underline the financial loss Jones endured to fight for democracy, in his entry on Jones that was reproduced five years later (1890) in *Chambers's Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge* (353). In a number of his novels, Jones himself seems to reflect on this sacrifice, crafting heroic figures who cast off riches to join a revolutionary cause, rejecting at one and the same time tyrannical regimes and worse fathers. In the same stories, such as *The Maid of Warsaw* (1854) or *De Brassier* (1851–52), the heroes of authentic conversion are juxtaposed with corrupt charlatans who claim to convert to the cause but in fact join it only for self-aggrandisement, for money, or to sabotage it. A number of Chartism's leaders—who were frequently at odds with each other—were not of the working classes,[2] making the conversion narrative critical to Jones and others like him, not merely as a way to prove their own authenticity, but to cast doubts on their rivals as well.

The conversion narratives picked up by Jones's first biographers generally highlight his early wealth so as to stress what Jones gave up, but they also insist that the young Jones had all along the seeds of the democrat naturally within. This is where the biographers, and Jones himself, make use of the juvenilia. In a pamphlet written in 1868 titled "Ernest Jones: Who Is He? What Has He Done?" purportedly written by James Crossley for the radical publisher Abel Haywood, but most likely ghost-written or dictated a forty-nine-year old Jones a year before his death, Jones's youthful effusions are presented as a sign that he was by nature a precocious friend of the people, whose "poetic spirit ... has since borne fruit in his mature years" (quoted in Taylor 19). Cole repeats this argument when he claims that "it is possible to trace," in Jones's youthful writings and adventures, "the forces which were making him into a Chartist—a deep sympathy with suffering, a sense of the hollowness of the society in which he had hitherto moved, and a passion against social injustice" (340).

The early writings to which both Crossley and Cole refer may be found in *Infantine Effusions*, a collection of Jones's poems that his parents had printed in 1830 when Jones was ten, and in the short story "The Invalid's Pipe", published that same year, again with his father bringing it to the publishers. *Infantine Effusions* is a sixty-eight-page collection of fourteen poems, though not all of them original: they include a twenty-page translation of Voltaire's *Henriade* and an extract from Rodolski. "The Invalid's Pipe" was published in *Ackermann's Juvenile Forget Me Not* (where it follows a story by an eighteen-year-old Geraldine Jewsbury); it was then reprinted, again in 1830 but this time as an extract, in a positive review of the *Forget Me Not* published in *The Mirror*, where Jones's story is singled out as "almost a literary curiosity," presumably because it is aesthetically mature but written by a ten-year-old. It was published, again as an extract, in a positive periodical review in the *Liberal* the same year; it was later republished with enthusiasm in *Youth's Keepsake, A Christmas and New Year's Gift for Young People*, coming out of Boston in 1836, and in 1849 in *The Hyincyth*, an American annual published in Philadelphia. In other words, the story was a success, giving the

young Jones his first taste of literary popularity. The review of the *Forget Me Not* in *La Belle Assemblée* says, "particularly we have been struck with the Invalid's Pipe …. The construction of this piece is perfect; and altogether it is full of promise" (203).

Crossley's pamphlet also makes a great deal of the eleven-year-old boy, after his early literary productions, running away to join the Poles in their November Uprising against Russia in 1830. Jones's Chartist biographers would do the same. Holyoake comments that, "His father having an estate in Holstein, on the border of the Black Forest, Ernest Jones passed his boyhood there, and in 1830, when eleven years old, he set out across the Black Forest, with a bundle under his arm, to 'help the Poles.' With similar precarious equipment, he in after years set out to help the Chartists" (248). Early critics, that is, read the adventure as they read the early writings, as a sign of the radical things to come. Besides Cole's claim that Jones's early poems contained such signs of "the forces which were making him into a Chartist," Robert Gammage, Chartism's first historian, uses the early poetry to draw a connection between the child and the mature politician. After pointing out Jones's aristocratic lineage, including Jones's own claim to be "descended from the great Emperor Charlemagne," he says of the poems that "[o]f course these productions were sufficiently puerile, but they indicated the existence of a genius that would be more fully manifested at no distant day" (281).

Miles Taylor's more recent biography of Jones, by contrast, attempts to disabuse readers of the romantic myth surrounding Jones by characterizing him as a self-interested, dishonest populist. It is a devastating biography because Taylor sets out to show how Jones "invented and re-told his own life-story for political and literary effect" but was in fact a selfish opportunist (24). In order to lay the groundwork for his argument that Jones was a mere imitator, inauthentic, and really a fraud taking advantage of a people's movement so as to achieve riches and fame, Taylor goes after Jones's juvenilia. He begins by speaking politely of Jones's early collection, but then doubts the claim made by his parents in their preface to this collection that the poems in *Infantine Effusions* "are precisely as they came from the pen of the child, without any correction or alteration whatever" (4).[3] Taylor argues that an unfinished, unpublished fragment of a poem written when Jones was fourteen proves that his parents must have "altered and improved their son's poetry on the first occasion, but not on the second" (37). He draws attention to what he calls "the laboured and predictable poetic manner" of the later poem (37):

> Three flowers bloom so fresh and fair
> Beneath the tall oaks favouring share
> And many a blossom buddeth there,
> That decks the earth and scents the air.
>
> They bloom upon the mountain high,
> Or open in the lowly glade.
> And many a tempest sweeping by,

> Left them blooming fresh and fair
> As first the Summer saw them there
> (Draft of an incomplete poem titled "Alboin of Lombardy,"
> December 1833 [when Jones was 14], qtd. in Taylor 37)

Taylor notes that the "inconsistent stanzas" of this fragment, "the rather desperate choice of rhyming couplet, and the excessive piling-up of naturalistic imagery suggest an amateurish adolescent and certainly not one who had won his literary spurs several years earlier" (37). Yet this is an impossible line of criticism: the fragment that Taylor uses to compare Jones at fourteen with the younger poet who wrote *Effusions* at ten is an unfinished first draft that neither Jones nor his parents thought enough about to bring to a publisher.

Going after Jones's reputation in the first place is a bit strange—Jones is hardly a household name standing in for all that is good and noble in the world—but Taylor's biography is a necessary antidote to the myths surrounding Jones's conversion to the cause, at least as it is represented in many of the early biographies, though Jones certainly had his detractors before Taylor. However, whether or not Jones was a sincere Chartist is not the subject of this paper; the use of his juvenilia to make a point about the adult man is. What has to be stressed here, accordingly, is the way that Taylor uses the juvenilia to frame his argument that Jones and his family were natural-born fraudsters. A comparison of this poem to the earlier ones proves absolutely nothing about whether the first poems were really written solely by the young Ernest Jones. The accusations of fraud that surrounded Opal Whiteley after the publication of her diary, though far from proven, were at least argued to be based on scientific evidence.[4]

Not only is Jones's later poem no more than first-draft scribbles in a notebook but the earlier published poems also demonstrate a somewhat "laboured and predictable poetic manner," and with reason. The early poems are clear, explicit imitations of Shakespeare, Byron, Scott, Shelley, and others. Several are subtitled "An Imitation." The imitative qualities of Jones's early poetry might be seen to bring out the way that Jones as both child and adult modelled his verses on the Romantics, or the way he continued to engage in strategies of passing or identification and even in forms of cultural appropriation. But the voices that the child writer attempted to imitate are very different from the ones that the mature Jones attempted to cultivate: the early Jones attempted to sound like a sophisticated and established, individualistic poet in tune with nature, whereas the mature Jones wished to sound like an emotional, authentic, revolutionary member of the working classes. Taylor does not provide readers with any of the poems from *Infantine Effusions* to compare to "Alboin of Lombardy," though it is clear that many of them pile up naturalistic imagery or force rhymes in precisely the same way that may be said to characterise the later fragment In any case, that children's writing would be subject to this kind of suspicion needs correction in itself, for it assumes, or implies, or at least feeds off or feeds into the idea that accomplished work by children warrants suspicion, and first and foremost must be inspected for authenticity just because it is good.

Though both the mature man and the child author write about nature, the nature they describe and what it represents differs radically. The poems in *Infantine Effusions* are mostly about nature's comfort and muses, sometimes about comforting nature as a muse. Sun and moon imagery dominate as do descriptions of birds singing, merry bees, and sylvan landscapes with multiple zephyrs. The poems often read as performances of poetic diction: the word "zephyr" appears eleven times in the collection; "Phoebus" appears in four poems. Dashes are everywhere, as if the boy were also practising poetic phrasing:

> To see the shepherd lead his flock,
> Guarded by his faithful Shock,
> See, how he bounds around—and hark!
> How cheerful sounds his rural bark.
> To hear the rousers of the dawn—
> The cock's shrill voice announcing morn,
> To hear the birds begin their song—
> Melodious—and with accents strong,
> When through the air they wing their way—
> Those sweet proclaimers of the day;
> To hear the hunter's winding horn
> Pursuing the all-fearful fawn,—
> These are the sounds,—to me most dear—
> That faithful mark—the rolling year.
>
> ("Emblems of Morning. Written in 1827" [when Jones was eight], *Infantine Effusions* 17)

Though a number of the poems relate, as this one does, the bucolic observations of a boy wandering through nature, they are rarely personal in any distinct way. Nor are the poems topical, as are the mature poems in general, though some seem more occasional than others, such as "Lines Seeing a Vessel" (14). Aside from the translation of Voltaire and a poem dedicated to an uncle who died fighting for Greek independence, they show little sign of a radical political consciousness, even in an embryonic form. In one poem called "Lines on England," Jones describes his parents' homeland, a place he had not seen yet, as being "Where the spirit of man soars proudly unbroken" and where "liberty's reign has for ages endured," which is exactly the opposite to what the mature poet-politician would later write (25). The older Jones writes of an England marked by misery and injustice, most notably in "The Factory Town" or "A Song for the People." As Timothy Randall has noted, the mature Jones includes a good deal of nature imagery, but it is nearly always compounded with revolutionary imagery, "especially storms gathering" (178). Mike Sanders demonstrates the mature man's preference for "urgent, concise contemporary language" (181). John Saville, by contrast, describes Jones's post-juvenile, pre-Chartist poetry and general way of thinking as "patriotic, conservative, religious and intensely romantic" (14).

For the most part the early poems are very accomplished idylls but clearly imitative, such as "Lines Written When 8 Years of Age":

> In a valley-rural place,
> I this day, did guide my pace,
> Where the river purls along
> Rolling with a current strong.
> Flowers, wav'd by zephyr's breath—
> Its borders were bestudded with;
> Mountains—at some distance were—
> With mist-crown'd tops which kiss'd th'air;
> Majestic frowning on their brow—
> Ancient Elms—and Beeches grow.
> Hark!—the Hunter's winding horns
> The sylvan race of danger warns;—
> Methinks I see the frighten' d deer—
> Motionless—transfix'd—with fear—
> Here let me rest in this retreat—
> Listening—to the Linnet sweet—
> Where the river purls along—
> —Far from the loud—unthinking throng. (*Infantine Effusions* 31)

Jones was likely a sensitive boy who deeply felt the beauty of Wordsworthian nature against the "unthinking throng." Still, it does seem that Wordsworth's verse itself is also inspiring and teaching him, not just nature.

In the 1830s, imitation, speaking in the voice of another, was understood as the primary way to learn, and reading and writing were not seen as disparate experiences. Education, in both the monitorial system and the tutor system, was heavily based on the principles of rote learning and discipline (Simon 262). Upper-class boys at this time were especially expected to learn through imitation (Brownstein 124), and the lengthy translation of Voltaire is a clear example of how Jones (or his father) expected readers to view evidence of having mastered the language and style of another as an accomplishment. Aside from the Voltaire, the longest poem in the collection is called "Rodriguo. A Canto Imitated from a Celebrated Author." It is *Othello* in thirteen pages, told in the style and meter of Byron's *Don Juan*, and the poem does not attempt to fool the reader into understanding that it is anything but that. "The Minstrel. A Ballad" is both a tribute to Walter's Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel* and a reproduction of it. Three of the poems are identified as "Extracts from a small poem written by the Author called Rodolski" (p. 18; though in the index they are identified as "Extracts from a small poem called Rodolski"), again demonstrating that originality and the poet's subjectivity or personal voice are hardly stressed.

In the two poems that break this pattern, "Lines on the Land of my Birth" and "Lines Written on the Death of my Godfather, the Late Lord Charles Murray in Greece," Jones speaks of personal things he knows of but not in such a way as to abandon what might be called poetic decorum:

And thou!—fair star in Prussia's crown,
  Thou pure and polish'd gem,
Who gleam'd more bright in fortune's frown,
  Its torrent sought to stem. ("Lines on the Land of my Birth" 66)

The murky storm he'd kept behind
  (Unbent, without controul)
Roll'd swiftly on the wings of wind
  Yet peaceful—rests his soul.
("Lines Written on the Death of my Godfather," *Infantine Effusions* 63)

Jones, not unlike the young Ruskin writing at the same time, is imitating authors and scenes or ideas and styles beyond his years, and any extraordinary quality in the verse can better be attributed to this than to the assumption that his parents are ghost-writing the poems.

This is not to say that these exercises in imitation cannot inform an understanding of the mature works. It is possible to see continuities between the child and the adult writer in that both desire to re-imagine or reinvent an identity-as-is. In other words, instead of judging Jones, both the child writer and the Chartist writer alike, as pandering to an audience, pretending to be what he is not, or cheating his way into recognition, we might begin to see the continuation of a Romantic imaginary begun in childhood. As we have seen, the Victorian conversion narrative was popular, especially among Chartists, whose writings tend to focus on well-off young men converting to radical politics. Though the mature Jones, like a number of other Chartist leaders who were not born into the working class, can be understood as showing self-conscious anxiety over his conversion to the people's cause, it is easier to see him wearing it proudly as a badge—he does include the conversion narrative as part of all his major works. Gregory Vargo's argument is relevant here: complicating Andrew Tate's description of Victorian conversion narratives as creating a space for "a new, more authentic state of selfhood" to emerge, Vargo points out that this process relies on a "radical discontinuity of self" (105). The young Jones learns by doing, imitates what he reads; the older Jones has this same defiant confidence in an ability to speak not just for others but as other, relating experiences such as dire poverty that he would not have experienced at first hand. His conversion narrative, then, is also a narrative of self-fashioning, equally familiar, with origins in Romanticism.

Whether or not the ten-year-old Jones anticipated conversion, this narrative of self-fashioning was most certainly something he did rehearse as a child. Rachel M. Brownstein notes that, "Written with one eye on the model and one eye on the reader, imitations are a particularly social literary form, calculated to create a sense of complicity by casting their authors as readers (as well)" (123). This might be applied equally to both Jones the boy writer and Jones the Chartist writer. Still, even though the child and the mature man might be considered as doing the same thing by adopting or imitating voices, and re-creating the self by doing so, the voices that they are imitating are significantly different. This makes any scholarly use of the juvenilia

to understand the mature man's work a complicated matter of interpretation, and not simply a matter of folding one into the other.

For Jones and the Chartist leadership without working-class roots, Romanticism's promotion of imaginative self-fashioning, of breaking from the strictures of a received environment—something the young Jones learns to do by fashioning himself into a poet—must also have proven valuable in the conversion to Chartism. The relationship to Romantic poets that the young Jones began with his imitation of them can also be interpreted as having lasted into his mature years. Certainly, Romantic self-fashioning comes with added anxieties for the older Jones and for other Chartist leaders who did not come from the working classes. Jones's claim to have written his prison poetry in blood or Feargus O'Connor's dressing in working-class fustians suggests anxiety that identification with working people had to be proven or earned. Jones's stories with two converts to a revolutionary cause, one authentic and one selfish, might lead us to think that Jones himself was doubting the motives of his own conversion. But the juvenilia remind us of the deep connection between Chartism and poetry, especially Romantic poetry.

Engels was one of the first to notice this bond, saying "it is the workers who are most familiar with the poetry of Shelley and Byron. Shelley's prophetic genius has caught their imagination, while Byron attracts their sympathy by his sensuous fire and by the virulence of his satire against the existing social order" (qtd. in Rutherford 368). Looking at the way that massive amounts of Romantic poetry were reproduced in Chartist papers and recited at meetings, Peter Scheckner has more recently argued that the Chartists "modeled themselves on such poets as Milton, Marvell, Pope, Burns, Shelley, Byron, Scott, Southey, and Longfellow" (29). Shelley's "Queen Mab" was known as "the Chartist Bible," and Byron's *Don Juan* was praised in the flagship Chartist paper *The Northern Star* as "a record of free thought and an eloquent vindication of democracy which every publican, every lover of his species, should have in his library" (qtd. in Scheckner 29). Jones's mature poem "Bonnivard" (composed July 1848) is clearly and explicitly indebted to Byron's "The Prisoner of Chillon." Other critics such as Bouthaina Shaaban convincingly argue that it was more than anything else Shelley's belief that poetry itself was the principle means of moving, radicalising people, and bringing about social change that endeared Shelley and the Romantics to Chartists. As Michael Sanders and others have argued, poetry was not just an appendage to Chartism, it was central to it, helping to define the movement. Part of this importance can be understood as an extension of what Jones learned as a child from his lessons in Romanticism, that *doing* can be *being*.

But again, that both the young and mature man turned to the Romantic poets should neither surprise nor be taken as evidence of an embryonic radicalism in the younger self, as the early and late poems have more uncommon features between them than common ones, sharing mostly the vague connection of a high idealism. It might just as well be argued that the young Jones could have imitated the defiant, daringly imaginative current of Romantic poetry but instead adopted only its high individualism. The short story that Jones wrote when ten further demonstrates the tenuous connections between the writings of the boy and man. "The Invalid's Pipe" is a three-page story with a military theme. The Baron of Furstenstein meets an old,

maimed soldier, travelling to Berlin to claim a pension. The old soldier is poor and homeless but in possession of an elaborate, beautiful pipe. The Baron makes him an offer for his pipe because he feels "an insurmountable wish to possess it" (190). The soldier will not sell it and tells his story to explain why. On the battlefield, the soldier had attempted to rescue his Captain, who had in his turn rescued the soldier in a previous battle. But the Captain's wounds were too great, and on his passing he gave the soldier his purse and his pipe. The purse the soldier gave to the landlord where they had been surrounded by the enemy, and who had been plundered by the enemy, and the pipe, he tells us tearfully, he refuses to part with, just as he refused to sell it earlier after his leg was blown off in another battle. The Baron, himself driven to tears by the "affecting" story, asks for the name of the Captain, so he too can "honor and respect his memory" (192). The Captain was the Baron's father. The Baron then invites the soldier to live with him on his estate, and the soldier gives the Baron the pipe. In *Ackermann's Juvenile Forget Me Not*, where the story first appeared, the editors include a note: "This story has been transmitted to the editor as the genuine production of the son of a British military officer, only nine years of age, and composed from a circumstance that actually occurred in a noble German family" (189). Jones may in fact have loosely modelled the story on an episode from his father's military background: Major Jones had fought in the Peninsular War between 1808 and 1814 under Sir John Moore, and was standing by his side when Moore was killed in battle. The possible familial aspect of the story, however, should not lead to the assumption that it too was ghost-written.

In some sense, the plot of the story is essentially retold again and again by Jones in his mature work, though with the happy ending of the story entirely reversed, arguably making for a more oppositional than symmetrical story. Stories such as "The London Doorstep" are deliberately affective in Jones's work, not entirely unlike the appeal to heartstrings in "The Invalid's Pipe." Affect is thematic in Chartist fiction; that is, the question of who feels—the poor feel for the poor—and who does not—the privileged classes do not feel for the poor—is in fact a staple in working-class fiction. Accordingly, Jones's mature stories tend also to represent a down-trodden, destitute and helpless person living on the street, or in a doorway, in need of alms and some common decency from the passers-by (who frequently have a conspicuous past connection to the outcast), but who does not get any aid and almost invariably dies. The poor are always written as generous, kind, and decent: often invalids or hapless victims. As a Chartist, Jones is making the point with such narratives that without the Charter the common people, noble as they are, will not receive the justice that they need, that charity and sympathy do not work because the respectable classes are not charitable or sympathetic. Again, the Charter is needed in order to bring about a comforting resolution. The structure of the childhood story lingers in the mature works; the radical Jones, however, rejects the narrative expectations that the child indulges in, the happy-ever-after. Furthermore, though the appeal to emotion has not changed, there is very little specific content connecting this story to the ones the mature man would write, and instead of seeing connections one could very well see the later narratives as reversals, even corrections to the assumptions surrounding class and charity that the young Jones adopts. For all these reasons, then, the early story is

fundamentally different from the mature ones: it honours military culture, paints a picture of interclass harmony, celebrates the easy charity of the titled, and promises happy resolution for the patient, good, and decent lower classes through a narrowly individualistic and providential solution to the problems of poverty and social disparity. The mature stories do the very opposite of this.

Comparing the early and later work in this way demonstrates how Jones's childhood was constructed by the mature Jones and by his sympathetic biographers based on scraps of evidence that prove virtually nothing. But Jones's detractors who use his juvenilia to claim that it shows early signs of fraud or counterfeiting are in fact indulging in exactly the same kind of misconstruction, merely using the juvenilia to promote or reinforce a reading of the mature man's image. Jones's story tells us that he was sensitive as a boy to the plight of the poor, granted. But more importantly, perhaps, the success of the story seems to have shown Jones a way to generate popular appeal. Jones would later attempt to justify the combination of politics and romance in his preface to *De Brassier*, by defending popular writing: "I do not see why Truth should always be dressed in a stern and repulsive garb. The more attractive you can make her, the more easily she will progress" (*Notes to the People* 20).

A relationship between the child and the adult writer, that is, can be found or inferred. But it cannot be forced or predicated on a simplistic notion that allows for a ready-made reading of child writing as an embryonic warm-up to mature writing: this notion is itself a form of Wordsworthian Romanticism, that the "child is father of the man." What might be wrested from a comparison in Jones's case is that the boy wrote in part to please his parents, in part to meet adult and generic expectations, and that the adult Jones largely rejected those expectations while trying to write from the position of a different kind of minority writer, from the position of the working classes. The relationship between the child and the successful adult writer is one of the central areas in the study of juvenilia; Juliet McMaster asserts that "we can recognize in a canonical adult work the impress of the less polished but always suggestive early work" (xi), and this is certainly the case with Jones's work, where the form of the early story remains intact in the later ones. But the relationship in this case is complicated by the fact that Jones attempted to recreate himself as an adult, from the privileged man to the man of the people. Jones and his biographers have largely settled on re-accenting the juvenilia to match the image they have of him as mature man. But another way of looking at the relationship between the early and mature writing in this case is to see them as ideologically different and to read in the difference an existential and Romantic, but also conscious, development that, in fact, entailed leaving the child behind. I am arguing, in other words, that the relationship between child and adult, in Jones's case, can be understood not as a matter of re-accenting but really as a matter of rejection.

The childhood excursion to fight the invading Russians in Poland also gets adult treatment in Jones's mature work. *The Maid of Warsaw, or the Tyrant Czar: A Tale of the Last Polish Insurrection* is a novel he wrote about the Polish Uprising of 1830. Here a young, aristocratic Polish hero, Wladimir, is press-ganged into fighting against his own people by the Russians, but when the rebellion breaks out, he defects to the insurgent cause, dying nobly in a battle protecting the Polish people. Again, the later

story does not really add to our understanding of the boy's objective in going to Poland to fight for justice, however noble it seems to have been, because the story is full of Chartist objectives underlining how true converts to the cause will sacrifice all for it. As said, a number of Jones's stories, including his most famous one, *De Brassier*, depict true converts to democracy juxtaposed against false conversions and demagoguery. Jones in fact wrote several melodramas that recast the boy democrat rejecting the advantages of birth, developing the image of a martyr that would become so important to the leadership of the Chartist movement. In "Pride and Prejudice: or the Martyr of Society," for instance, an aristocratic family who had never worked for anything have a son who strangely has democratic sensibilities. Carl, the son, and the name that Jones's relatives used for him, is disinherited and remains ostracised, the outsider, despised by the aristocracy he rejects. Jones himself, the point is, made efforts to construct his own biography and childhood. These efforts were adopted by sympathetic critics without much scepticism because the narrative of the boy democrat martyring himself for the people fitted into an ongoing narrative. The later re-imagining of his journey to fight the Russians,[5] as with the proleptic readings of the juvenilia, can be read as part of the campaign to insist that one of the most prominent Chartist leaders was of the people, instinctually martyring himself for the people.

It is easy to overlook the differences between "The Invalid's Pipe" and, say, "The London Doorstep" as they are structurally similar and ostensibly have a similar moral or message: the importance of charity, sympathy, caritas, or Christian decency. But glossing over the differences in order to demonstrate lifelong continuity is problematic. This rubbing out of differences is exactly what has happened to working-class writing over the last 150 years. Critics have looked for connections between canonical and working-class literature, found some of course, ignored major differences (such as sympathy working in one story and not in the other, leading to a happy-ever-after ending for one story and not for the other) and then argued that working-class writing is a mere re-accenting, a mere—and pale—imitation of the more complex, central middle-class *stuff*. This is what happens too frequently with child writing. Jones as a youth was finding a voice, undoubtedly, but in some ways it was a voice he later rejected, not, interestingly, because it was a minority voice, but because it was the majority voice. We can understand Jones's juvenilia in terms of artistic development, for it certainly did have an impact on the development of his literary and perhaps his radical voice. We must be alert, however, not just to the pre-echoes but to what he rejects in his youthful writing, just as we must do with other minority voices.

NOTES

[1] See, for example, "Mirabeau" (*Labourer* 4: 153) or "Curran, the Orator" (*National Instructor*, 19 April 1851).

[2] Quoting Patrick Joyce, Sally Ledger explains that "Men such as Jones, his contemporary and rival G. W. M Reynolds, and Feargus O'Connor before them, lived out their political careers 'as

romantic heroes,' 'exiled and spurned by their own sort, doing battle in the cause of their similarly exiled but poor fellow man'" (37).

[3] In a letter to Dr. Y. Weeren dated 2 April 1830, Major Jones states that Ernest had never received any instruction in writing poetry: "On the contrary I have made use of every means in my power to repress his genius in that respect, without effect, and at last I have suffered myself to be prevailed upon to publish (out of a mass of others) these little poems" (qtd. in E. Jones, "Diary" 5).

[4] In *Opal: A Life of Enchantment, Mystery, and Madness*, Kathrine Beck presents both sides of the case.

[5] Though the story is reproduced in most biographies, its source is Crossley's "Ernest Jones: Who Is He? What Has He Done?", frequently considered to be from Jones's own hand.

WORKS CITED

Alexander, Christine. "Defining and Representing Literary Juvenilia." *The Child Writer from Austen to Woolf*, edited by Alexander and Juliet McMaster, Cambridge UP, 2005, pp. 70–97.

Brownstein, Rachel M. "Endless Imitation: Austen and Byron's Juvenilia." *The Child Writer from Austen to Woolf*, edited by Christine Alexander and Juliet McMaster, Cambridge UP, 2005, pp. 122–37.

Chambers, William, and Robert Chambers, editors. *Chambers's Encyclopaedia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*. Vol. 6, London, William and Robert Chambers, 1890.

Cole, G. D. H. *Chartist Portraits*. Macmillan, 1965.

Davies, David P. *A Short Sketch of the Life and Labours of Ernest Jones, Chartist, Barrister, and Poet*. Liverpool, "Journal of Commerce" Printing Works, 1897.

Gammage, R. G. *History of the Chartist Movement, 1837–1854*. Newcastle-on-Tyne, Browne & Browne, 1894.

Holyoake, George Jacob. *Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life*. London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1892.

[Jones, Charles, and Charlotte Jones]. Preface. *Infantine Effusions*, by Ernest Jones, pp. 3–4.

Jones, Ernest. "Alboin of Lombardy." Taylor, p. 37.

———. "Bonnivard." *Notes to the People*, vol. 1, London, J. Pavey, 1851, p. 63.

———. *Diary of Ernest Jones, 1839–1847*. Communist Party of Great Britain, Spring, 1961. Pamphlet No. 21.

———. "The Factory Town." *Northern Star*, 13 February 1847.

———. *Infantine Effusions: Written by Him, Between the Eighth and Tenth Years of His Age*. Hamburg, F. H. Nestler, 1830.

———. "The Invalid's Pipe." *Ackermann's Juvenile Forget Me Not*. London, Ackermann, 1830, pp. 1989–92.

———. "The London Doorstep." *Labourer: A Monthly Magazine of Politics, Poetry etc.*

———. *The Maid of Warsaw, or the Tyrant Czar: A Tale of the Last Polish Insurrection*. London, J. Pavey, 1854.

———. *Notes to the People*. London, J. Pavey, 1851–52. 2 vols.

———. "Pride and Prejudice: Or the Martyr of Society." *Labourer: A Monthly Magazine of Politics, Literature, Poetry etc.* n.d.
———. "A Song for the People." *Northern Star*, 4 March 1848.
La Belle Assemblée: or, Court and Fashionable Magazine. Vol. 10. London, Shackell and Baylis, 1829–30.
Leary, Frederick. *The Life of Ernest Jones*. London, "Democrat" Publishing Office, 1887.
Ledger, Sally. "Chartist Aesthetics in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: Ernest Jones, a Novelist of the People." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 57, no. 1, June 2002, pp. 31–63.
McMaster, Juliet. *Jane Austen, Young Author*. Routledge, 2016.
Randall, Timothy. "Chartist Poetry and Song." *The Chartist Legacy*. Merlin Press, 1999.
Rennie, Simon. *The Poetry of Ernest Jones: Myth, Song, and the "Mighty Mind."* Legenda, 2016.
Rutherford, Andrew, editor. *Lord Byron: The Critical Heritage*. Routledge, 1970.
Sanders, Mike. *The Poetry of Chartism: Aesthetics, Politics, History*. Cambridge UP, 2009.
Saville, John. *Ernest Jones: Chartist*. Lawrence and Wishart, 1952.
Simon, Brian. *The Two Nations and the Educational Structure, 1780–1857*. Lawrence and Wishart, 1960. Studies in the History of Education 1.
Scheckner, Peter. editor. *An Anthology of Chartist Poetry: Poetry of the British Working Class, 1830s–1850s*. Rutherford, Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1989.
Shaaban, Bouthaina. "Shelley in the Chartist Press." *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin*, vol. 34, 1983, pp. 41–60.
Taylor, Miles. *Ernest Jones, Chartism, and the Romance of Politics 1819–1869*. Oxford UP, 2003.
Vargo, Gregory. *An Underground History of Early Victorian Fiction: Chartism, Radical Print Culture, and the Social Problem Novel*. Cambridge UP, 2018.
Ward, Thomas Humphrey. *Men of the Reign: A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Persons of British and Colonial Birth Who Have Died during the Reign of Queen Victoria*. London, George Routledge and Sons, 1885.