Journal of Juvenilia Studies

Published by the International Society for Literary Juvenilia

CONTENTS

Volume 3, number 1 (December 2020)

Cover image: Marbled paper, creator unknown. Germany, c. 1847. Wikimedia Commons (https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Marbled_paper_from_back_cover_of_Stolle,_Gedichte_(Grimma_1847).jpg)

GROWING UP BURNEY AND THE ROLE OF A COMMONPLACE BOOK

Lorna J. Clark
Research Adjunct Professor, Department of English, Carleton University

"THE FAMILY of the Burneys are a very surprizing Set of People; their Esteem & Fondness for the Dr seems to inspire them all with a desire not to disgrace him; & so every individual of it must write and read & be literary." So wrote Hester Thrale in August 1779 (399).[1] A friend to both Charles and Frances Burney, and an astute observer, she is essentially making three observations within the same sentence: she notes the depth of family feeling and loyalty; the weight of expectations and the need to live up to them; and the primacy of literary activity in the Burney household as a way to win approval. Clearly, Thrale notices the importance of writing to a sense of family identity.

Charles Burney's high valuation of literary ability is perhaps not surprising. A musician with little formal training or education, he was enabled to rise above his humble circumstances, acquire an international reputation, and win acceptance in elevated social circles through a combination of hard work, social charm, and several well-received publications (notably his two musical tours[2] and *A General History of Music*).[3] He was often full of writing plans and likely to have a huge project on the go[4]—which would frequently involve his female relatives serving as his assistants.[5] In savouring his success, he managed to inculcate a sense of the winning formula in his progeny: diligence, a course of reading as a means to self-improvement, and especially, the practice of writing, as a means to get ahead.[6] The underlying assumption—that authorship was a key component of social advancement—became part of the family ethos.

These values were imbibed by several of his children. Of Charles Burney's three sons, two were prolific authors: Captain James Burney, who sailed with James Cook, whiled away his forced retirement by penning multivolume histories of the sea (and also kept private journals); Charles Burney, Jr., a clergyman, schoolmaster, and classical scholar, authored many learned tracts and publications.[7] On the female side, two of his five daughters (Frances and Sarah Harriet Burney)[8] and one step-daughter, Elizabeth Meeke,[9] were successful and unusually prolific novelists, joining the small

Journal of Juvenilia Studies 3.1 (2020–21), pp. 3–20. DOI: 10.29173/jjs52

percentage of novelists who published multiple novels;[10] at least three kept journals and letters,[11] one wrote reviews. Furthermore, the urge to "read and write and be literary" passed down to subsequent generations; over a period of 100 years, a number of published authors can be traced in this family, who dabbled in a variety of genres—travel writing, fiction, religious tracts, children's literature, diaries—not to mention creative works left in manuscript, such as musical compositions, art works, and other creations (Clark, "Hidden Talents" 148).[12]

That writing is a key to the Burneys' sense of identity is a phenomenon noted by others. Sophie Coulombeau emphasises the trait in her introduction to a special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life*, which is comprised of essays on the family circle. In it, she draws in part on the work of Catherine Gallagher, who herself draws on Pierre Bourdieu to describe the Burneys as "the holders and producers of 'cultural capital,'" arguing that their "accretion of cultural capital and the development of relationships that would make it grow was bound up with their most intimate sentiments and deepest sense of identity." For this reason, Gallagher argues, the Burneys conceived of their writings "as contributing to a collective property, a corporate fame. … The writings of other families might have been imagined as second-order realities, as accomplishments indicating a (past or present) economic independence, but the writings of the Burneys were the business of their lives" (216–17). This characterization of the Burneys is, as Coulombeau argues, an important "touchstone" deserving of further study. Through archival work and the discovery of non-canonical texts, especially those of juvenile writers, we can broaden our understanding of this and other literary families whose texts are, in Coulombeau's terms, "stimulated by and produced from within a network of intellectual, professional, and social relationships" (5). Of these family-produced texts, the work I shall be exploring in this article is a prime example, which shows the importance of literary activity to the sense of family identity and in shaping the values of the Burney children.

The abundance of texts produced by family members suggests that the experience of growing up Burney was an intensely stimulating one. The family provided a context in which creative play of all kinds, particularly literary activity, was encouraged in the young, which might explain why several examples of juvenilia created by young Burneys have been discovered in various archives.[13] Supported by the adults in their lives (who must have provided paper, time, space, and—probably—an audience), their youthful efforts were evidently valued highly enough to ensure their preservation.

The youthful works preserved (outside this manuscript collection) all originate in the same family: that of Frances's elder sister, Esther Burney, who married her first cousin, Charles Rousseau Burney, on 20 September 1770. Both talented musicians, they created a quintessentially Burneyan household which Joyce Hemlow has described as full of "sportiveness and gaiety" as well as "music, musical instruments, books, and drawings" (*History* 403, 415). Located in London, Esther's children grew up close to the home of their grandfather, Charles Burney, and enjoyed the undivided attention of numerous aunts and uncles, as the only children to be born in the family for at least a decade. The five eldest, born in quick succession within five years, were thus in a position to enjoy the stimulation of a large extended family actively engaged

in art, music, or literature on a professional level, and to have their own early efforts indulged and appreciated.

The importance of literary expression in the extended family network is made especially clear in a commonplace book owned by Charlotte Anne Hester Burney, a sister of Frances Burney, preserved in the Houghton Library at Harvard,[14] in which the poetic effusions of various family members over several decades are preserved. Juvenile productions are not all that the little book contains, but they do make up a fair proportion of the whole. This unique collection may contribute to our understanding of this and other literary families—as well as to our understanding of the purpose served by commonplace books more generally. While the juvenilia of other family groups are well known (the Brontë or Alcott children, for example), the literary productions of the Burney children are relatively unknown, belong to a much earlier period, and have not been looked at in detail by other scholars.

In 2018, the Children's Museum of Edinburgh (in collaboration with the Scotland's Early Literature for Children Initiative [SELCIE]) mounted a special exhibition, *Growing Up with Books*, that included examples of commonplace books, scrapbooks, and family-created magazines. The commentary printed on the cards beside these exhibits (written by Danielle Howarth) emphasised the materiality of these handmade books that were created either by early readers or by family members for them; their spatiality was an important dimension, in that "they offered a place in which to keep items of value to the owner,"[15] an insight that applies to other examples of the genre, including Charlotte Burney's. In her small manuscript volume, bound in vellum, the items of value consist of works of poetry, as it is the only genre represented; in all, more than one hundred poems have been preserved within its pages.

The youngest child of Charles Burney's first marriage, born in 1761, Charlotte Anne Burney grew up in a mixed family household with a stepmother (Charles Burney having married for the second time in 1767). Besides her five siblings, she had three step-siblings (from Elizabeth [*née* Allen] Burney's first marriage) and two half-siblings (born of the second marriage). On 11 February 1786, she married the surgeon Clement Francis and bore three children, the youngest, a son, just weeks old when Francis died suddenly on 19 October 1792. Six years later, on 28 February 1798, she married Ralph Broome, a political pamphleteer and satirical poet. The couple had one child; their union lasted seven years before Broome, too, passed away. After his death in 1805, Charlotte remained a widow until her own death in 1838, at the age of 77.

Charlotte Burney (as I'll call her throughout to avoid confusion) filled this volume's 168 manuscript pages with poems composed for the most part by both adult and juvenile members of the Burney family and their most intimate friends. But it also includes some excerpts of published works (particularly towards the end, when she seems to have run out of original material). Since no mention of this compilation has yet been found in any of the Burney family correspondence, all that we can know with certainty of the history of its creation, purpose, function, or readership must be inferred from textual evidence; though this evidence may also be helpfully illuminated by scholarly studies of other examples of the miscellany and commonplace book (two closely related genres).

Some of the functions Charlotte Burney's book was intended to serve are immediately evident: keeping a record of important family events (births, deaths, marriages) by marking them with a poem; and celebrating the creative achievements of several family members by preserving representative samples of their work. Because this compilation does include excerpts from published poetry, it can be considered a type of commonplace book, a genre still popular in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in which significant passages from published works were copied, sometimes with added commentary on their significance or implications. And as David Allan argues, commonplace books are valuable objects of study since they give "the most revealing insights into the nature and consequences of reading" (19). Some critics have underscored the agency and self-fashioning of the compiler; Thomas Koenig, for instance, defines the genre in terms of "reflections of the self, defined in relation to [literary] materials (459). William St Clair similarly emphasises the commonplace book's expression of "readerly autonomy" in the Romantic period, pointing out that these compilations are the result of readers choosing to record those texts that suited their own "needs, desires or whims" (5)[16]

One need evident in Charlotte Burney's commonplace book is the memorialization of people who are no longer part of her life; Amanda Watson notes a similar element in nineteenth-century American commonplace books containing "contributions from loved ones," which can function as "monuments to the past, commemorating never-to-be-seen-again friends and dead relatives" (103). A closely related element also evident in Charlotte Burney's book is the desire to celebrate the talents of those she considered family—a different kind of commemoration.

To celebrate a young writer's talent is also to encourage it; this, I would argue, was yet another important function of Charlotte Burney's collection. Even the act of gathering these original compositions together confers importance on those examples chosen, since they are copied into a book which in its form mimics publication. The miscellany reinforces the practice of manuscript-sharing in literary circles and emphasises the importance of the act of writing itself. Whereas a compilation of published excerpts involves the power of choice as evidence of a principle of selection (which must be inferred), the example presented here displays its creativity more directly. As Stephen Colclough notes, the practice of collecting and transcribing original poetic compositions "written by the friends, families and owners of these books" was fairly common in the eighteenth century, and generally reflects a "group activity," which shows that "reading and writing are very closely associated in the reading communities in which these books were kept." The resulting collection, or miscellany, was "designed to be read by the compilers, or by others in their social circle, who may have made their own contributions to the compilations" (13–14). In her study of miscellanies compiled by women, Victoria Burke also sees them as the product of social activity; more specifically, she argues that "the most common context for the production of women's miscellanies" was the extended family (317). Such research may prompt us to consider the possibility that Charlotte's book was shared or copied from other sources. Given the preponderance of contributions from the children of Esther Burney here, and given that so many of Esther Burney's children's writings have been preserved elsewhere as well, the strong likelihood is that

Esther Burney kept a similar collection of her own, even though no examples of miscellanies kept by her or any other of Charlotte's Burney sibling survive today.

In any case, this compilation is likely to have served to foster a belief in the importance of active participation in literary activities in the lives of Charlotte Burney's own children and the children of her extended family. The juvenile writers who contribute are seen experimenting playfully with different literary conventions, or (in a more serious vein) depicting and thus coming to terms with moments of loss, rupture, or trauma in their lives by clothing them in literary form. The miscellany reflects the kind of environment and influences that surrounded those children who were growing up Burney.

WHAT CHARLOTTE Burney created, then, is a space in which the unpublished poetry written by herself, her father, sisters, brothers, children, nephews, nieces, and friends was collected, preserved, enjoyed, and shared. Pinpointing the date of the creation of this compilation is a challenge. Since the book is signed "Charlotte Anne Hester Francis" on the inside cover, it seems fair to date the ownership of the book (at least) to the period of her marriage to Clement Francis (1786–92) and six-year widowhood (1792–98). A surgeon who had, before his marriage, served in the East India Company and acted as private secretary to Warren Hastings (the Governor-General of Bengal from 1772 to 1785), Francis took his wife to live near his family in Aylsham, Norfolk. It seems tempting to infer that the copying of poems was started soon afterwards, to compensate, perhaps, for Charlotte's evident feelings of homesickness in her new marital abode (for she frequently complained of the misery of being banished to the provinces).[17] Other, similar compilations, such as those Watson examined in her study of "the function of commonplacing in antebellum America," could serve the purpose "of maintaining family ties by extending the communal reading that typically took place at home—one person reading aloud as other family members listened while working at domestic tasks—across the dimensions of space and time." The compilers typically "read together, copied again and again, and handed on to later generations" (103). Based on these findings, it would be easy to assume that Charlotte Burney was motivated to begin her collection by a wish to reach back into the past, to a period of childhood that she had lost, or outwards to those relatives who once formed part of her inner circle but from whom she was separated by distance after her marriage and move to the provinces.

But it is wise to be wary of assumptions, for the date that Charlotte signed the inside front cover of the book does not necessarily correspond to the date the poems were composed, or even copied.[18] The natural assumption that her compilation began soon after the date of acquisition of the little leather-bound book, and that she began to fill its pages almost immediately, during the six years of her first marriage, is directly challenged by the evidence of the varied dates of the first eight poems—keeping in mind that the date of the copying of a poem is not identical with the date of its composition, and those written years beforehand may be included at any point. (Yet it is at least certain that a poem cannot be copied before it is written.) It does seem significant that the first eight poems copied were ones from her family of origin (written by or about her father, sisters, or cousins). This may tempt us to infer that

she chose these entries at a time when she was looking back with nostalgia upon first leaving home, but the first poem in the collection does not fit this theory (in terms of dating, at least): written by her father, Charles Burney, "On his daughter Esther's recovery after a dangerous illness," it was probably composed on 28 September 1789, which was three years after Charlotte's wedding.[19]

The opening poem is followed by some written years earlier: a rhyming letter composed by Charlotte's sister, Frances Burney, which jauntily describes a visit she paid while staying as a guest at Hester Thrale's house at Streatham; it dates from the period of Frances Burney's intimacy there, and was probably written in October 1781.[20] The fourth poem, Charles Burney's "Epitaph" to a close friend, Samuel Crisp, must post-date Crisp's death of 24 April 1783 (Hopkins 137); the date of his verses on the marriage of his daughter Susanna Burney (fifth poem) can be pinpointed by the date of her wedding, 10 January 1782. Another two poems (seventh and eighth) memorialise talented cousins who died young: the artist, Thomas Frederick Burney, who died aged 19, in August 1784; and the musician, Richard Gustavus Burney, who is eulogised after his death on 13 November 1791.[21] But confounding the hypothesis that the first poems in the book (which form a natural group of eight) precede 1798 (the year that Charlotte remarried and changed her last name), is one placed in the midst of this group that commemorates Susanna Burney's tragic death, which took place on 6 January 1800. This poem stands sixth in the sequence of eight, and thus makes it impossible to conclude that the book was begun some time during Charlotte's first marriage, or even during her first widowhood—for by 1800 she had married again, and her surname had become Broome.

If the dating seems a little puzzling, the purpose or function of the book seems clear, at least at the outset: that of memorializing important family events, which prompted the writing of poems. Charlotte Burney, it should be recalled, was close to her father and had been for several years before her marriage (from at least 1783 to 1786) "employed" (as Charles Burney described it) as his librarian, copyist, and amanuensis, while he toiled on his *General History of Music*. The value of her services is indicated by the poem he wrote for her on the occasion of her marriage, in which he apostrophises the bride as "Chaos's dingy Empire Queen," commends her "diligence & order," and expresses reluctance at losing her to marriage: "This loss of limb by which I feel / In crippled state, from head to heel" (98). Apparently intended to amuse, the fond father's poem laid so much emphasis on his own loss that it caused some offense, and he had to write to her afterwards to apologise.[22] Having served an "*apprenticeship*," as her father put it, and having been in the habit of organising his books and papers, Charlotte might well have seen herself as carrying on her role as record-keeper in her commonplacing activities, occupying herself in what Watson describes as "memorializing the past" (103). It is possible, therefore, that the early pages of Charlotte Burney's commonplace book, which contain the record of major life events (births, marriages, deaths), were meant to be a sourcebook of important family events, preserving them for herself, her children, and for future generations and clothing them (as seems appropriate for a Burney) in literary form, that is, lines of verse. In the absence of any explicit statement of purpose recorded by Charlotte Burney, such analysis must remain somewhat speculative; nevertheless, the very act

of keeping the book shows its importance to Charlotte Burney and her pride in the writing abilities of Burneys of all ages.

However, the particular purpose of the collection, like the dates of composition, seems to vary in different sections, as the practice of copying worthy examples apparently extended over a period of some years. The earliest poem included, one that pays tribute to Charles Burney's first wife, is dated 1763 (when Charlotte herself was two), and the latest date given is on a poem dated 26 September 1806. Towards the end of the book, the dates of composition are given more regularly (they range between 1804 and 1806), and rather than family members, the contributors tend to be friends or acquaintances, writing on varied subjects. The final entry, a fragment about the Battle of Trafalgar, is marked with the date of the battle, 21 October 1805. This was also the year that Charlotte's second husband, Ralph Broome, died, which raises the possibility that the task of copying the later poems, at least, might belong to the period of grief and retrospection that ensued. Although the compilation probably reflects different periods of active copying, then, the closing, at least, can be said with fair certainty to reflect a time soon after her husband's death, a loss that might naturally lead to a period of reminiscence, a wish to memorialise and capture the past.

This theory gains credence when the sheer quantity of poems by Ralph Broome is considered. Of the more than one hundred poems collected, roughly one quarter (twenty-seven) are composed by him, their numbers dominating the second half. Their quality and warmth are noteworthy. One of the earliest, "Lines on the marriage of CB" (Charlotte Burney), contains an avowal of his love (though perhaps with rather dry humour, as the compliment is somewhat left-handed):

> If permitted the fairest to chuse
> Of all God intended for man
> Wit, beauty & wealth I'd refuse
> And adhere to my own Charlotte Anne. (68)

The message is repeated in other poems, such as the equally ardent "Three weeks after marriage" 90–91:

> But Charlotte's charms, deep rooted in affection
> Shall daily flourish like the spreading vine
> Whilst all her virtues shall afford Protection
> And everlasting happiness be mine. (90)

Broome's warm expressions of affection appear again in a celebratory poem written on their first anniversary, which conclude:

> One year intire has gently slip't away
> Since March the first, last year our wedding day
> And true it is th'experimental space
> Has given affection durable increase,

> What was at first but untried admiration
> Derives from knowledge steadfast approbation. (92)

This evidence of Broome's abilities and character is revealing, given that he was not greatly admired by his Burney in-laws who wondered at Charlotte's desire to marry "so disgusting a being."[23]

Besides his feelings for Charlotte, the depth and sincerity of Broome's paternal affection is evident in the many poems addressed to his step-children. Their presence in this collection also suggests that Charlotte Burney may have expected her children to be aware of her commonplacing activity, that she was not only recording the poems for herself but using the act of recording as a way of encouraging the children in their own literary activities, fostering the kind of active participation that Colclough and Burke describe. Broome's "Lines addressed to Charlotte Francis on her 13th birthday" (66–67), for instance, are full of a parent's "fond solicitude," as is a complimentary acrostic in which the first letter of each line spells her name (although I quote only the first four lines here). The poem opens with a complimentary nod to the family's literary heritage in the first line, which references Frances Burney's heroine:

> Camilla like in gentle disposition,[24]
> Happy in Talents framed for erudition,
> Active in spirit far beyond her age,
> Retentive memory like the written page.

Broome's verses, lovingly preserved by his wife, provide a salutary corrective to the negative portrayal we find in the journals of Frances Burney (which often dominate and distort the family annals), and allow him to express his own identity. While these poems are not written by children, they were often written for children, and their attempts to encourage and express affection through literary play demonstrates the kind of learning environment in which the young Burneys thrived: an environment to which this compilation may well have contributed.

Given the number of poems addressed to Charlotte and Clement Francis's three children, and given the aptitude of the Francis children, as evidenced by the flowering of their talents later in life, it seems surprising that so few of their own poems are recorded, unless we consider the larger family dynamic. An "epic poem" by the eldest, Charlotte Francis, aged 7 (*c.* 1793) and a hymn written by the devout Marianne Francis, aged 10 (*c.* 1800) comprise the lot (120, 135) whereas literally dozens of those of their cousins are preserved, dating from the early 1790s. Yet the record of the achievements of the Francises in adulthood seems a clear indication of their love of reading and writing. Charlotte and Clement Francis's only son, Clement Francis, Jr., was studiously inclined: he stood high in his class at Cambridge, was awarded a Fellowship, and took holy orders. His promising career was cut short by his early death.[25] His older sister, Marianne Francis, would have well merited a college fellowship herself; she was considered a prodigy and viewed with some alarm for her command of several languages (including Latin, Greek, Arabic, and Hebrew), her mastery of geometry and algebra, and her ambitious course of reading.[26] She later

taught at charity schools and composed several hymns.[27] The accomplishments of the eldest, Charlotte Francis (later Barrett), are better known. Chosen as executor by her aunt Frances, she inherited her "immense Mass of Manuscripts" with permission to publish;[28] she culled a creditable selection from a large mass of material, and published it as *The Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay,* in seven volumes (London, 1842–46), which established the image of Frances Burney (as one of England's great diarists) that lasted for more than a century. Charlotte may also have dabbled in other literary ventures, such as translations,[29] and she wrote the first memoir of her aunt in the introduction to her edition.

With literary and academic tendencies of this kind, Charlotte Burney's children seem likely to have produced more examples of juvenilia than are included. Yet the pages of their mother's commonplace book do not preserve their effusions but rather those of the offspring of her elder sister Esther; this preference strongly suggests that those children held a special place in the extended family group, and were widely viewed as talented prodigies.[30]

By far the greatest number of the poems recorded are those of the young Frances Burney, niece to the novelist (and to Charlotte herself), who ranks second only to Ralph Broome within this collection, with her twenty-two titles, roughly one-fifth of the total. The range and variety of genres she employs (in this and other family collections) reflect her ambitions as a writer as well as the benefits of what little formal schooling she is known to have received (demonstrating that those who keep or contribute to such commonplace books were likely to be well educated). She was later involved in teaching the young herself, serving as a governess, and she died fairly young, at fifty-two. While it might seem as though her early promise was never entirely fulfilled, her next of kin were startled, when sorting her effects, by evidence of the breadth of her reading, the number of languages that she knew, and the extent of her forays into different arts, as she left behind original compositions in music, poetry, and drama ("Memoranda" 86–87).

Several of her contributions to the commonplace book were written between the ages of fifteen and seventeen. (Those which appear in other collections will not be discussed here.) The first of her works continues the Eastern tale of "Alcanzor & Zayda" by Thomas Percy (14–18), with a clever pastiche that successfully imitates the style and rhythm of the quatrains (19–25); she introduces violent action, ending in a bloodbath, with all the principals weltering in either blood or grief, which is typical of the taste of the young Burneys, who revelled in tragic drama.[31] She also contributes an elegiac poem and a cycle of five sonnets—"To Solitude," "To Melancholy," "To Despondency," "Written at Midnight," and "Written during a Storm"—each of which experiments with a different form but all of which clearly, from their titles alone, show the Romantic influence at work (27–31).

Frances's aunt Charlotte also preserved a set of pastorals (45–49) written by Frances based on the four seasons (in imitation of Thomson's influential poem); her final contribution, a fragment entitled "The Maniac"(142–45), is definitely Byronic, evoking a landscape of "rugged crags," the ocean's "roar," and the "tumultuous rage" of a storm, or the solitude of "darkling woods" and "trackless wilds," to match the "souls' despondency." The speaker ultimately claims to go mad. So competent do the

verses seem that it is not until the very end when the occasion of the poem is revealed that the youthfulness of the poet becomes evident: written by "Frances Burney / . . . after her friend *Rose* de Kiernier went to live in France—." The contrast between the powerful impact of the verses and the comparative slightness of the occasion which prompted them is quite striking, but her skill in crafting the verses, and the versatility and sophistication of her entire oeuvre, is undeniable.

Interestingly, there are few contributions by Frances's younger sister Sophia, although the two were often collaborators: here, they are said to be co-authors of a medieval-style ballad, "Egbert and Ellen," which in another juvenile collection was attributed to Sophia alone.[32] Sophia's writing often evokes black humour, displayed here in a poem that appears to be playfully teasing one of her cousins—a jeu d'esprit that she probably shared with him. At first reading, the poem appears to be rather aggressive:

> Dear Charles, I've thought you ever from a Child
> Illnatured, frightful, vulgar & illbred,
> A Genius rare, blest with a temper mild
> You'd fain appear by vain ambition led ….

But the lines are cleverly constructed, as the author explains in the closing lines:

> If you read the above quite thro' I believe
> Your humble opinion of yourself you'll perceive
> The second time skip ev'ry other rude line
> See who makes a smitten Incognita pine! (83–84)

When every second line only is read, the poem reveals a second meaning, a complimentary tribute.

A pastoral poem penned by another sibling, "Colin & Sylvia" (written *c.* 1789), is also striking, though for extra-literary reasons (49–53). In an Arcadian setting, the faithful shepherd Colin persistently woos the beautiful Sylvia who is caring for her aged mother; finally "She named a day which was to make for Life / A happy husband and a happy wife." His suit won at last, the faithful swain goes to town to buy the wedding gown. Upon his return, as he approaches Sylvia's hut, he has an eerie moment of premonition that sounds Wordsworthian but in fact anticipates the Lucy poems by roughly ten years:

> The night was dark, & dreary was the Road!
> As he approached to her still abode
> The Moon behind a cloud withdrew her light
> as of this sad Event t'avoid the Sight
> . . . . . .
> These dreadful omens noting something bad
> Froze his warm blood & him in terrors clad
> For from the shocking tokens he had heard

> Some accident to Sylvia he feared[.][33]

Colin's premonitions prove to be apt: during his three days' absence, Sylvia had died suddenly ("He fear'd not vainly; for a sad disease / Did in his absence lovely Sylvia seize") and "Poor luckless Colin … worn by grief" sinks lifeless on her grave. The moral is then drawn:

> Then let us, from their sad untimely fate
> This lesson learn before it is too late,
> On earthly happiness not to depend
> For no one knows the hour of his end[.]

The name of the author below these lines renders them doubly effective: Charles Crisp, aged 15. This high-spirited lad, Esther's younger son, was himself destined for an early death. Repeatedly parcelled off to relatives, he ran away more than once, and finally disappeared without a trace in February 1791.

It was not until years later that his family learned his fate: penniless and desperate, afraid to go home, he had joined the East India Company, sailed to India, caught dysentery, and died in Calcutta on Christmas Eve 1791, at seventeen.[34] The terrible irony and poignancy of these lines, then, are inescapable, and may well explain the inclusion of this poem in Charlotte's collection. The apotheosis in the closing lines may even have afforded some consolation to his grieving kin:

> But Joys immortal to our Souls secure
> That shall through all eternity endure
> A place in our Redeemer's sight to gain
> And leave forever, misery & pain
> To Joys like these, let us with hope aspire
> And leave the world to join the heavenly choir. (53)

Significantly, this is the only one of his poems known to have been preserved.

The last examples of juvenilia are contributed by Charles's younger sister, Cecilia: a suite of poems, one composed in every year from the ages of eight through twelve—which suggests some kind of manuscript sharing: perhaps Charlotte Burney was drawing from another family compilation that has not survived from which she chose a handful of representative poems. Esther Burney's sixth child, Cecilia, was, like Charles Crisp, farmed out to wealthy relatives and adopted by a childless aunt and uncle in 1794, the year she turned six.[35] Although apparently successful, the transition must have been traumatic for a young child, suddenly banished from her home, her parents, and siblings. Signs of an early experience of rupture and loss, and a subsequent period of mourning, can be traced in some of her verses.

In a heartfelt poem, a versified tale of "The Travels of Orlando" (78–81), knowledge of the back story gives added resonance to such lines as these:

> Torn from those friends that were the most Sincere

I wandered far, in every wood & wild
Torn from the arms of those I loved most dear
I wandered far, hard fate's unhappy child. (78)

The speaker is wrenched from his happy life because his cupidinous father ("But gold was what my father valued most") had barred him from marrying his true love for lack of fortune. The beautiful Amelia whom he loses (and who marries someone else) is suggestively named after Cecilia's youngest sister. "I fled my native home, Sad was the day / Alas, I own, I fled." Thence begins a life of desolate wandering.

In a kind of nightmare sequence, the speaker enters a "dark, gloomy wood," finds a cottage and Amelia beside it on the ground, apparently deserted, but feels he cannot stay to help her. Instead he "Journeyed on, full many a day," until at last, "Worn out with hunger, weariness & care," he decides to try to find his way back. "Who'd think I should return the way I came?" Retracing his steps to the cottage, led by the hand of an innocent child, he finds Amelia again, abandoned by the "faithful spouse" she had married. He "hastily" proposes, is met with blushing silence, and blissfully regains Amelia forever. The happiness of the ending seems rather fragile, curiously shaded by the unresolved fate of the absent spouse. The stanzas which powerfully describe the speaker's dazed wanderings, haunted by grief, overshadow the brief scene of reunion, as the poem wraps up quickly. In these and other juvenile contributions, the events that form part of the family saga can be seen refracted through the eyes of a child.

There are other entries of interest which should be mentioned, not only in order to provide a fuller description of the collection but also because of the information they provide about the overall purpose of the collection: some satirical poems by the painfully shy artist Edward F. Burney, which show that (like many Burneys) he was skilled in more than one genre; one by Charles Burney, Jr., entitled "Sonnet written in a blank leaf of *Evelina*";[36] others by a handful of friends, including the Wesleys, Warren Hastings, and Hester Thrale. Preserving in this way the poems not only of the extended Burney family but also of their circle, Charlotte Burney's compilation recalls Colclough's description of the typical miscellany, the product of a "group activity" within a "reading community" in which "reading and writing are very closely associated" (13–14). Strengthening the bonds between family members and the bonds between family members and their friends, the compilation richly represents the many dimensions of the collective sense of Burney family identity that was defined by and focused around writing.

I'd like to close with some lines from a poem by Ralph Broome addressed to his step-daughter Marianne Francis (82–83):

Marianne aloft shall rise
Till her fame shall reach the Skies.
Taking her poetic Journey
All shall know her for a Burney
Should her own maternal Aunt,
Chance to meet her in her jaunt,

She will greet her with a kiss,
Crying Oh I'm glad of this
My own fame shall never die,
Whilst my nieces vivify
And my Name resuscitate
I resist the Poet's fate. (109)

These lines encapsulate perfectly the writerly urge observed by Hester Thrale in the Burney clan, which she believed was based on their desire to live up to the expectations of Charles Burney, and, implicitly, to match the literary reputation of Frances Burney. This compilation of poems of the Burney circle written over a forty-year period, by both children and adults, belongs to the writing collective; as Burke writes, "Commonplacing" was "a shared activity in which family members participated as a collective expression of family sociability and authorship" (55–56).

While the compiler, Charlotte Burney, may have been motivated to preserve and celebrate her family's poetic achievements, particularly those of the young Burneys who showed early signs of potential, she may also have used the book to shape her own children's experiences as they were "growing up Burney" by memorializing people who were important within their family circle and by promoting the values that they shared (like the importance of writing, and of productive enterprise). Her leather-bound book, lovingly preserved, contains the work of several generations and ages; it captures and at the same time—through its very existence—promotes the literary talent at which her family excelled, fostering their sense of a collective identity.

NOTES

[1] In the same passage, Thrale also expressed her surprise that Dr. Burney, a man of modest means, should be as much beloved by his family as if he were rich: "I sh[d] expect a rich Linen-draper to be better beloved in his own house—and nobody is so much beloved" (1: 399).

[2] Charles Burney's two musical tours are *The Present State of Music in France and Italy*, 1771; and *The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands and the United Provinces,* 1773, 2 vols.

[3] Frances Burney (Mme d'Arblay), who effectively wrote the first biography of her father in her *Memoirs of Doctor Burney*, focused her work on the trajectory of his rise: "tracing the progress of a nearly abandoned Child, from a small village of Shropshire, to a Man allowed throughout Europe to have risen to the head of his profession" (1: ix). Roger Lonsdale, his modern biographer, follows the same pattern, stressing that at the end of his life, Charles Burney's "happiness lay in looking to the past, in measuring the distance he had travelled from the Shropshire village in which he had spent his childhood" (463).

[4] Lonsdale remarks that "the restless energy that drove Burney to success also deprived him of the capacity to enjoy it. ... Unremitting industry became so much a habit that … he was uneasy without some large undertaking on his hands, and yet was depressed by the task as long as it remained unfinished" (483).

[5] A long line of female relatives was provided with a kind of professional training by assisting with Charles Burney's publications: these include four daughters, "four grand-

daughters, [and] a niece," who "passed through Charles Burney's study" (Clark, "Hidden Talents" 149).

[6]. The biographers of Frances Burney recognise the importance of the literary element in Charles's ambitions. For instance, Margaret Anne Doody writes, "he wanted to be a 'man of letters' because men of letters were given a place in society denied to the music teacher or musician." Doody had strong views on Charles Burney and his social climbing, to which she anticipated some opposition in her preface: "It may be objected that I have made Charles Burney the villain of the piece." But she also noted that he would have "his own biographers and defenders" (12, 5). When the six-volume edition of *The Letters of Dr. Charles Burney*, now underway, is completed, his achievements may come to be viewed more sympathetically.

[7] Besides his published works, the journals James Burney kept while on two exploratory voyages with Cook have recently attracted interest: the National Library of Australia's beautifully produced edition of the first in Suzanne Rickard's *Sailing with Cook: Inside the Private Journal of James Burney RN* (National Library of Australia, 2015), will soon be followed by an edition of the second. Charles Burney, Jr., was, in his lifetime, respected as one of the foremost classical scholars in the United Kingdom; many of his learned works are preserved in the British Library.

[8] Sarah Harriet Burney published five works of fiction between 1796 and 1839, one of which has been published in a modern edition in the Chawton Library Series. The trajectory of the writing careers of both [**the]** sisters have been compared in Clark, "Frances and Sarah Harriet Burney."

[9] See Simon Macdonald for the identification of the prolific Minerva Press author, Mrs. Meeke, as Charles Burney's step-daughter, Elizabeth Allen (who married Samuel Meeke); see Anthony Mandel on the implications of this discovery for the history of the Minerva Press

[10] A large majority of women writers between 1700 and 1829 produced no more than one or two novels, so those publishing multiple works were highly unusual (see, e.g., Turner 37; Garside 63).

[11] A scholarly edition of Frances Burney's voluminous journals (twenty-five volumes in all) has recently been completed, the last eight volumes under the general editorship of Peter Sabor, Director of the Burney Centre at McGill University. Another daughter, Susanna Elizabeth Burney, also kept journals (later sent as letters), the highlights of which have been published in *The Journals and Letters of Susan Burney,* edited by Philip Olleson, Ashgate, 2012. Fragments of the journal kept by Charlotte Anne Hester Burney have been included in Frances Burney's *Early Diary* [vol. 2] (2: 277–320).

[12] Burney family manuscripts can be found in archives around the world, though primarily concentrated in the British Library, New York Public Library, and the Beinecke Library at Yale University. Joyce Hemlow catalogued their whereabouts after a worldwide search made in the 1960s (*Catalogue*), though more have come to light since.

[13] Some have already been published, for instance, my edition of Sophia Elizabeth Burney's *"Works" and "Novels, Plays, and Poems*" by the Juvenilia Press (2016).

[14] I am grateful to the Houghton Library for permission to see and to quote from the manuscript.

[15] This insightful remark appeared on a card in a display case in the part of the exhibition curated by Danielle Howarth, "The Lives of Children's Books Part One: Owners and Readers." See also the exhibition catalogue, *Growing Up with Books: A Little History of Children's Literature as Seen through the Collection at Edinburgh's Museum of Childhood*, edited by Sarah Dunnigan and Howarth (University of Edinburgh / SELCIE, 2018).

[16] Also useful to this discussion is Deborah Lynn Pfuntner's PhD dissertation, *Romantic Women Writers and Their Commonplace Books* (Texas A&M, 2016).

[17] Charlotte's unhappiness in Norfolk is mentioned in a letter of Frances Burney to Charles Burney (*Court Journals* 2: 264; [15 October 1787]).

[18] This kind of misleading dating in the headings of journals, structured as a record of events kept daily, happens elsewhere in the Burney Papers. My research on Frances Burney's *Court Journals* proved that she was frequently writing up her apparently up-to-the-minute accounts a full twelve to eighteen months after the events described. See Clark, "Dating the Undated." Similarly, Claire Harman has commented on Burney's retroactive writing and reading habits, using the phrase "super-retroactive," for the liberties she took with both the narrative and the dating. All Burney editors rely on Hemlow's pioneering work on the family manuscripts, described in the introduction to vol. 1 of her edition of *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*.

[19]. The poem has been dated by Barbara Hopkins (256).

[20] The date is given by Betty Rizzo in her edition of *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney* (2: 543–44).

[21]. The dates are given in the "Memoranda of the Burney Family. 1603–1845," a compilation of important family events drawn up in the mid-nineteenth century, of which several typescripts exist, including one in the Bodleian library (86–87).

[22] Charles Burney's apology is contained in a letter to Charlotte Burney (now Francis), dated 25 February 1786, in which he writes, "We will henceforth, my dear Charlotte, make no serious complaints of missing you in the Spidery & elsewhere—I meant not to be serious ab^{t} it in my *Varses*—w^{ch} were made in Hudibrastic Dogrel measure, & *punical*, on purpose to avoid the consequen{ce} of those that I gave to Susan. And if an air of regret & sorrow at losing you now & then appears, it *came so* without my intending it. As I told you before, 'you have fairly served your *apprenticeship*, & are entitled to your freedom, & the liberty of setting up for yourself{'}."

[23] The phrase appears in a letter from Charlotte's step-sister, Maria Rishton, to Frances (Burney) d'Arblay, 12 January 1803.

[24] A reference to the eponymous heroine of Frances Burney's third novel, *Camilla; or A Picture of Youth* (1796).

[25] A brief biography can be found in J. A. Venn (562). Robert Southey composed his epitaph.

[26] See Alexander d'Arblay in a letter written jointly with his mother, to his father, Alexandre d'Arblay, [27 September 1812]. Frances Burney, *Journals and Letters* 7: 32.

[27] See Mascha Hansen.

[28] The phrase occurs in Frances (Burney) d'Arblay's will, published in *Journals and Letters* (12: 980).

[29] Sarah Harriet Burney to Charlotte (Francis) Barrett (*Letters of Sarah Harriet Burney*, 107, 110–11; [29 December 1809], [6 January 1810]).

[30] I have considered the possibility that Charlotte's own family writings were kept in another commonplace book, but the inclusion of so many poems written by her husband seems to militate against that idea.

[31] See Clark, Introduction (xxix–xxx).

[32] The juvenile works of Sophia Burney, and of the young Frances Burney, are discussed in Clark, "'Teaching the Young Idea.'"

[33] Compare the situation to the last five stanzas of Wordsworth's poem, "Strange Fits of Passion Have I Known":

Upon the moon I fixed my eye,
All over the wide lea;
With quickening pace my horse drew nigh
Those paths so dear to me.

And now we reached the orchard-plot,
And, as we climbed the hill,
The sinking moon to Lucy's cot
Came near, and nearer still.

In one of those sweet dreams I slept,
Kind Nature's greatest boon!
And all the time my eyes I kept
On the descending moon.

My horse moved on; hoof after hoof
He raised, and never stopped;
When down behind the cottage roof
At once the bright moon dropped.

What fond and wayward thoughts will slide
Into a Lover's head!
"O mercy!" to myself I cried
"If Lucy should be dead!" (86)

[34] The story, whose source is the "Memoranda of the Burney Family," is told in full in Clark (Introduction xxvii-xxix).

[35] The story emerges in the "Memoranda of the Burney Family" (67–68), and two letters of Frances Burney to her sister Esther Burney which refer to it: one written on 9 January 1794 (*Journals and Letters* 3: 35); the other on 2 May 1794 (*Journals and Letters* 3: 60).

[36] Another version of the same poem with a slightly different ending, signed "Charles Burney. DD. October, 1778" (the year he turned twenty-one), is extant in the Osborn Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University. The commonplace version has been published in Appendix 2 of the *Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney* (3: 460).

WORKS CITED

Unpublished Texts

Burney, Charles. Letter to Charlotte Ann Burney (later Francis), 25 February 1786, British Library Egerton MS 3700A, ff. 2-3^{v}.

[Burney, Charlotte Anne, compiler]. Commonplace book. Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS Eng 926.

"Memoranda of the Burney Family. 1603–1845." Bodleian Library. Typescript.

Rishton, Maria. Letter to Frances (Burney) d'Arblay. 12 January 1803. The Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection, New York Public Library.

Published Texts

Allan, David. *Commonplace Books and Reading in Georgian England*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Burke, Victoria. "Contexts for Women's Manuscript Miscellanies: The Case of Elizabeth Lyttelton and Sir Thomas Browne." *Medieval and Early Modern Miscellanies and Anthologies*. Special issue of *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 33, 2003, pp. 316–28.

Burney, Frances. *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*. Edited by Stewart J. Cooke, vol. 2: 1787, Oxford UP, 2011.

———. *The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768–1778*. Edited by Annie Raine Ellis, G. Bell, 1913. 2 vols.

———. *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney*. General editor Lars E. Troide, McGill-Queen's UP, 1988–2012. 5 vols.

———. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay) 1791–1840*. Edited by Joyce Hemlow, et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972–84. 12 vols.

———. *Memoirs of Doctor Burney … by His Daughter, Madame d'Arblay*. Vol. 1, London, 1832. 3 vols.

Burney, Sarah Harriet. *Letters of Sarah Harriet Burney*. Edited by Lorna J. Clark, Georgia UP, 1998.

Clark, Lorna J. "Dating the Undated: Layers of Narrative in Frances Burney's Court Journals." *Lifewriting Annual*, vol. 3, 2012, 121–42.

———. "Frances and Sarah Harriet Burney: The Novels in the Family and the Family in the Novels." *A Celebration of Frances Burney*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007, pp. 38–56.

———. "Hidden Talents: Women Writers in the Burney Family." *Women, Gender, and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Essays in Memory of Betty Rizzo*. Lehigh UP, 2013, pp. 145–66.

———. Introduction. *"Works" and "Novels, Plays, and Poems*." By Sophia Elizabeth Burney. Juvenilia Press, 2016, xiv-xlvi.

———. ""Teaching the young idea how to shoot': The Juvenilia of the Burney Family." *Journal of Juvenilia Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 20–36.

Colclough, Stephen. "Recovering the Reader: Commonplace Books and Diaries as Sources of Reading Experience." *Publishing History*, no. 44, 1 January 1998, pp. 5–33.

Coulombeau, Sophie. Introduction. *New Perspectives on the Burney Family, 1750–1850*. Special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life*, vol. 24, no. 2, April 2018, pp. 1–11.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works*. Rutgers UP, 1986.

Gallagher, Catherine. *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670–1820*. U of California P, 1995.

Garside, Peter. "The English Novel in the Romantic Era: Consolidation and Dispersal." *The English Novel 1770–1829; A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*, edited by Garside and Rainer Schöwerling, vol. 2: 1800–1829, Oxford UP, 2004, pp. 15–103.

Hansen, Mascha. "A Bluestocking Friendship: The Correspondence between Marianne Francis and Hester Lynch Piozzi." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2018, pp. 170–186. *Duke UP*, doi:10.1215/00982601-4384615.

Harman, Claire. "'My immense Mass of manuscripts': Fanny Burney as Archivist, Biographer and Autobiographer." *Writ From the Heart?: Women's Life Writing in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Special issue of *Bulletin of The John Rylands Library*, vol. 90, no. 2, 2014, pp. 15–26.

Hemlow, Joyce. *A Catalogue of the Burney Family Correspondence, 1749- 1878*. With Jeanne M. Burgess and Althea Douglas, New York Public Library / McGill-Queen's UP, 1971.

———. *The History of Fanny Burney*. Clarendon Press, 1958.

———. Introduction. *The Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame D'Arblay)*, by Frances [Fanny] Burney, edited by Hemlow, vol. 1, Clarendon Press, 1972, pp. xxi–lix.

Hopkins, Barbara, editor. *The Occasional Verses of Dr. Charles Burney: A Selection*. McGill University, 1978. MA thesis.

Koenigs, Thomas. "The Commonplace Walden." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance*, vol. 59, no. 3, 2013, 439–80.

Locke, John. "A New Method of a Common-Place Book, Translated out of French from the Second Volume of the Bibliotheque Universelle." *The Posthumous Works of Mr. John Locke*, London, 1706, pp. 311–36.

Lonsdale, Roger. *Dr. Charles Burney: A Literary Biography*. Clarendon Press, 1965.

Macdonald, Simon. "Identifying Mrs. Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist." *Review of English Studies*, vol. 64, no. 265, June 2013, pp. 367–68.

Mandel, Anthony. "Mrs. Meeke and Minerva: The Mystery of the Marketplace." *New Perspectives on the Burney Family, 1750–1850*. Special issue of *Eighteenth Century Life*, vol. 24, no. 2, April 2018, pp. 131–51.

St. Clair, William. *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge UP, 2007.

Thrale, Hester. *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi), 1776–1809*. Edited by Katharine C. Balderston, vol. 1, Clarendon Press, 1951.

Turner, Cheryl. *Living by the Pen: Women Writers in the Eighteenth Century*. Routledge, 1992.

Venn, J. A. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. Part 2, vol. 2, Cambridge UP, 1944.

Watson, Amanda. "Shared Reading at a Distance: The Commonplace Books of the Stockton Family, 1812–40." *Book History*, vol. 18, 2015, pp. 103–33.

Wordsworth, William. *Wordsworth's Poetical Works*. Edited by Thomas Hutchinson, revised edition by Ernest de Selincourt, Oxford UP, 1969.

YOUNG ENGLAND: PART TWO

Laurie Langbauer
Professor, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

"YOUNG England"—this short-lived and curious Conservative Parliamentary offshoot of the 1840s announces in the name it adopted for itself that *youth* matters, though scholars for most of the movement's history have largely discounted or ignored the centrality of youth to its meaning: "young" too obvious, or trivial, it seems, to mean anything at all. In Part One of this essay I argued that the new field of juvenilia studies provides the explanatory framework that allows us to read what *Young* England does signify, and to indicate how the term "young" signified in its time. More specifically, the recovery by juvenilia studies of the cultural presence of young people in Britain in the generation before Young England—its recovery of an active juvenile tradition of writers, simultaneous with and related to Romanticism—puts into context the self-fashioning and reception of this next post-Romantic generation: ambitious Young Englanders George Smythe (1818–57), John Manners (1818–1906), and Andrew Baillie-Cochrane (1816–90) in particular. Friends from boyhood, schoolmates at Eton and Cambridge, born into families of rank or on their way to titles, they looked to other bold young nobles who had made a splash before them—George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788–1824) and Percy Shelley (1792–1822). Those Romantics' prior precocious fame provided the justification for believing that Young Englanders could make a splash too, and gave them the script for how to do so. In Part Two I focus on Benjamin Disraeli (1804–1881), their political mentor, who used this script explicitly in his Coningsby novels about Young England, fusing the movement's personalities with the characters of their meteoric Romantic predecessors.

Vital to Young Englanders' understanding of this prior generation was their sense of the shaping power of the past. Within Young England's Conservative platform, a return to a romanticized feudal past was meant to redeem England's future, in their view reuniting aristocrats and working folk in loyalties that would heal the nation by dispelling the alienation of modern industrialism. Understanding Young Englanders' theory of history through their relation to earlier juvenile predecessors, however, reveals a much more complicated sense of the past than the wishfulness and sentimentality with which their critics tasked them: instead, they saw history as explicitly manufactured—a necessarily imaginative fiat predicated on an understanding of the past as uncertain and ultimately hollow.

In joining literary studies, then, juvenilia studies changes that field. To recover the concurrent juvenile tradition that informed Young England is to rewrite Romanticism and transform literary history. Moreover, the very idea of history must change too. If juvenilia matter in themselves, if what

Journal of Juvenilia Studies 3.1 (2020–21), pp. 21–32. DOI: 10.29173/77253

comes first is not simply a rung left behind on a ladder of developmental progression, then how we imagine and explain history must find new verbs besides "progress" and "advance" and "evolve" and "unfold." Young England epitomizes this radical reformulation because it rewrites succession: for it, the past is already the future. It theorizes relation to youthful predecessors as simultaneously coincident and discontinuous, but never merely imagines itself just in the wake of them. A consideration of Young England's example also provides the field of nineteenth-century literary juvenilia with one answer to the question of what comes next for its own studies. Youthful writing, so alive and noticeable at the beginning of the century, continued to inform after the rest of the century, but it did so by rethinking priority and subsequence. Young England performs the new model of tradition that dispenses with old assumptions of origins and development, just as the stars above act out the experiments of theoretical physics—though in this case the stars themselves brook the hypothesis.

Part One of this essay focused on the recovery work central to juvenilia studies. It demonstrated the influence of Byron and Shelley on Young Englanders' understanding of themselves—in Smythe's case, it charted a direct connection to Byron through Smythe's father, Percy (Sixth Lord Strangford). It recovered the importance of the prior generation even more directly through that father, revealing the importance of his 1803 translation *Poems from the Portuguese of Luis de Camoëns* to the juvenile tradition at that time. His text was an important influence on Byron among others. Part Two continues that work by demonstrating a similar direct link to Byron through Disraeli's father. And other young writers would matter to Young England too—in Part Two I briefly consider the influence of Frederick Faber as representative of the Oxford movement, another faux medievalism that passionately moved youth at the time. Shelley is a remnant of the past that haunts Disraeli, but Disraeli's own popular novels about it demonstrate that Young England established itself through contemporary literature too, also alluding to other blockbusters such as J. B. Buckstone's play *Jack Sheppard* (a dramatization of William Harrison Ainsworth's novel by the same name about that swashbuckling criminal).

Part One also recovered the now unknown juvenile poetry of the teenaged George Smythe. Both Strangfords, father and son, wrote to make history by joining other youth who wrote to make their imprint on the future. Locating the Strangfords' writing within this larger youth movement (that is, locating their own early careers within the juvenile tradition) also demonstrates how their writing theorized about and performed youth. It thereby reveals the ways the juvenile tradition reflected on and constituted itself.

That early juvenile tradition changes literary history when we consider what its youth movement looked like at the time, but even more so when we consider why it mattered, why it *continued* to matter to writers and events that came after and were influenced by it. This afterlife is the focus of Part Two, which explores Disraeli's role in Young England's continued literary existence. Disraeli used the movement's reconsideration of history to rethink literary genealogies by repositioning Shelley and Byron as leading directly to Disraeli and Young England. In self-fashioning learned from Byron, this future Prime Minister presents his trilogy of Young England novels as a strategy—to mobilize multimedia showmanship in politics, asserting style over substance. Part Two situates the performances (of history and politics) of "Disraeli the adventurer," as he called himself, within a sense of identity as absence. Only by ignoring our own belatedness can critics today claim for postmodernism alone the recognition that writing whelms from lack. Disraeli's personification of Young England grows out of a tradition of young writers that rethinks juvenile writing as more than outworn and rethinks literary history as more than advancement—that presents tradition as dynamic, flashing back and flashing forward, to define generation otherwise.

Fake, Young England, Fake Away

WHEN HE was preparing for university, the undergraduate-to-be George Smythe chid his father for trying to please him with talk of dances and pantomimes, of ices and "smart white gloves and white waistcoats" (de Fonblanque 206). Those, the teenaged Smythe argued, were the everyday amusements of his younger brother and of ordinary youth—uninteresting to one "who reads in the past the history of the future" (206). Later, of course, its critics would lampoon Young England precisely in terms of those youthful vanities that Smythe had rejected—ridiculing it expressly as "the White Waistcoat Party" (Shelton 40; Champlin 553). Smythe and his young aristocratic friends had vowed to sit together in Parliament to represent their union, and wore white fronts to represent their purity and iconoclasm. "The wearing of white waistcoats in the House was one of" Young England's "peculiar signs" (Jennings 317).[1] Almost a decade later, *Punch* was still having fun with display it considered sophomoric: "for no Young Englander is to the heart a Young Englander, unless his heart beats against a spotless White Waistcoat" ("Duties" 163).[2]

Critics of Young England relentlessly homed in on the "Young." *Punch* drew cartoons of its members as babies ("Young England and" 118). "There is no more formidable symptom in the aspect of these times than the increasing influence and sway of the babies of England," the *New Monthly Magazine* agreed in mock alarm. "It is observable that the phrase '*old* England' is almost obsolete. Nothing but '*young* England' will *go down* now" ("Young England or" 174). "None now are geniuses but Puppies" (Catellus 74), another review chimed in: "did we not possess first-rate Puppy authority in Byron" (77) already, it asked, and it argued that Young England simply continued this attitude and promised to remain "thus for ever young—or younger" (70).

But in sophomorically asserting that he read in the past the history of the future, Smythe characteristically was both right and wrong about what his youth meant. "For men like Mr. Smythe, the present is not all-sufficient," chroniclers of Young England agreed; the understanding that he saw things "through an historical … medium" captures "Young England more faithfully" than knowing the specific quarrels of the time ("Literary Legislators No. V" 536). Such reviews associated with unproven and empty "early genius" the way Young England looked "upon the past as a vast collection of facts" (536–37) to be picked over—a precocity they considered all glitter and show based on nothing. Early genius involved "a sufficient perception of the beauties of style … which is pleasing to a popular assembly by providing short cuts to important conclusions without requiring the labour of reasoning" (536). Smythe's speeches seem to *promise* more than "mere ornament or display" (536), but actually only "please the taste, like a perfect sonnet, a fine strain of music, a beautiful sculpture" (537). Whether or not Young England was all style instead of any substance devoted to real political debate was a question it entertained of itself. In his reminiscences of Young England fifty years afterwards, erstwhile Young Englander Baillie-Cochrane could still recall the words of a ballad spoofing the movement—especially its repeated refrain: "Fake, Young England, fake away" (Lamington 149–50). This pasquinade was based on a blockbuster song from Buckston's *Jack Sheppard*. The ballad, sung by a pack of thieves, had put into common parlance a sense of "fake away" to mean "carry on"—but used as a pack of thieves might use it to encourage one another, with all the lying, thieving, swindling, shamming, and contrivance necessary to their carrying on.[3]

The context was telling. Worried cultural gatekeepers saw Ainsworth's highwayman novel *Jack Sheppard* as romanticizing criminals into heroes; they took its runaway success as symbol of its dire effect on youth, fostering juvenile delinquency.[4] Placed in these terms, the smoke and mirrors that critics then and now charged against Young England—how can one possibly translate their romanticisations into any real politics?—actually seem to have constituted its appeal at the time and its identity for its founding young members. As Baillie-Cochrane's fond memories of this ballad show,

the sense of pretend was generative. They were playing at glamorized bad guys, *enfants terribles*, pretend troublemakers gleefully vandalizing the status quo. (Smythe and Manners had taken active part in the riots customary at Eton in their time [Millar 40–41, 49].) Smythe himself defended the political inconsistencies in Young England by regarding them as youthful hijinks. To explain his own attack on his leader Robert Peele in 1847, Smythe quoted Robert Southey's defense of his revolutionary *Wat Tyler*, a juvenile play brought out (twenty years after Southey had written it) by political enemies hoping to undercut the conservative views into which he had aged: "'I am no more ashamed of having been a republican,' said Mr. Southey, 'than of having been a boy;' and I," Smythe continued, "am no more ashamed of having used strong language against the Minister than I am of having been young" (E. Strangford xxvi). Far from being ashamed, he was actually proud to take Southey-as-young-scamp as his model; Manners said that Smythe credited Southey "as a founder of Young England" (Whibley 1: 260). Southey was also a lynchpin of the juvenile tradition, first as a contributor and later as its mentor (Langbauer 110–28). Defining itself through such juvenile predecessors, then, Young England flaunted its sense of youthful rebellion.

And spoke to other youth through this stance. "Young England was a party of youth" (Faber 45) aware of itself as directly allied to other important forces of youth at the time, such as the Oxford movement. "The seminal event of the Young England movement" came during a holiday in the Lake country in 1838—the meeting with the Reverend Frederick Faber (Speck 199), that charismatic preacher who ultimately went over to Rome. O'Kell sees the attraction of the Oxford movement for Young England in the Oxford Movement's similar stress on "lofty ideals of chivalry and divine kingship" and "noble views of feudalism" (207). Manners and Smythe were passionately inspired by Faber, and they all wrote poems to one another. In excusing his own youthful poetry, Faber wrote that its faults are "such as must inevitably adhere to all young publications, and the question is whether it has been well to publish so young …. I don't repent. I am in a desperate hurry" (qtd. in Faber 47).

Inspired by Faber's appeal to their youth, Young Englanders used their own writing expressly to draw other youth. Manners calculated their success by declaring that "all, or nearly all, the enthusiasm of the young spirits of Britain is with us" (Whibley 1: 66). What those young spirits celebrated was in part their own place within a juvenile literary tradition: a self-styled "Young Englishman," in a "Letter to Benjamin Disraeli" (1844), writes "we of the provinces, rejoice to see so many of our young authors identify themselves with this movement" (41).[5]

For Young England, their writing merged with the past through Romanticism—Young England was understood, and understood itself, as "a parliamentary experiment in romanticism" (Kegel 691). George Saintsbury asserts Young England as "the most striking political effect among us of the vast Romantic revival" (269). Romanticism constituted a glorious past for Young England, and not just because, for the Victorians, the Romantic era symbolised when the century had been young. Their nostalgia reimagined the past through romantic feudalism, claiming it for aristocracy's turf just as Horace Walpole (1717–97), Fourth Earl of Orford, had originated the Gothic by simulating a past-that-never-was in his faux-Gothic Strawberry Hill. For Young England, Romanticism equaled such self-fashioning.

Not the past itself, but the act of treating the past as imaginative creation—of simulating the past, as Walpole had done—was what *actually* inspired Young England. The criticism of Young England by Richard Monckton Milnes, later first Baron Houghton (a hanger-on of Young England, who sniped at it from his remove) that "Young England, crusading against the unreality of Conservatism, must have some better arms than those of historical etymology to fight with" (605), missed the point but captured the spirit: their history explored origins to point them up as manufactured fantasy. Marx and Engels recognized these contradictions, seeing the vogue for romantic feudalism of the time as "half lamentation, half lampoon, half echo of the past, half menace of the future" (qtd. in Ward 127). Engels

took Young England expressly as "a satire on all historic development": while he found the "romantic feudalism" of their views ridiculous, he saw in them some "good intentions," and saw as well a courage to resist "existing prejudices" and "recognize the vileness of our present condition" (294n).

An appreciation for the past as an act of the imagination, then, rather than a set of political principles, is what tied Young England together. Adam Gopnik sees a "strong sense of self-irony" underlying Disraeli's manufactured "English history … served up to his none-too-bright acolytes" (par. 18).[6] But Disraeli's followers had gotten their history out of books long before they met him—most signally out of Kenelm Digby's *Broad Stone of Honour* (1822). A fabricated account of medieval times and a cult classic among Cambridge undergraduates, it equated youth with chivalry (Smith 431). Digby, who "as an undergraduate … resolved to be a knight" (Holland 9), rode around Europe researching this book before he was twenty-one. A kind of society-of-one for creative anachronism, Digby kept nightly vigils in chapels and held tournaments "with ponies for steeds and hop-poles for spears" (10). Like Faber, he ultimately converted to Catholicism. His book not only "had much to do" with that "romantic young Cambridge enterprise" called Young England (12) but also inspired other youth enterprises such as Baden-Powell's Boy Scouts (Jeal 422, 583). From such traditions as these came their critics' sense that "perhaps 'Young England' amounted simply to a figment of boyish imaginations" (Ward 127). In such imaginations, however, lay Young England's appeal and its explanatory power.

Disraeli, Historian of Young England's Albeit School

TO SUBORDINATE individual identity to succession was a habit of mind ingrained in young men of title. Brilliant outsiders like Disraeli aspired to join this exclusive circle through the juvenile tradition's different patrilineage. Disraeli's father Isaac too had been a juvenile author; he was a distinguished man of letters, admired by Southey and Walter Scott, and part of John Murray's circle (Byron's publisher at the time). Escott writes, "It is customary to speak of" Disraeli's "exceptionally disadvantageous circumstances," but "the distinction of his father, and the reputation which he had himself won as a novelist, had already combined to secure him recognition in society" (2). Disraeli knew the elder Strangford, for instance, called him a friend (and characteristically put him into a book: *Contarini Fleming* [Millar 36–37]). Isaac D'Israeli had known Byron; they exchanged letters on the topic of juvenile genius. The younger Disraeli started recording his father's reminiscences about Byron when he was eighteen. Because of his father's direct connection, "Byron had been an inspiration and a model" to Disraeli (Monypenny 361), who worked to cast himself as "a latter-day Byron" (Jerman 72). In short, "Byron's influence over Disraeli is a well-recognized literary and historical fact" (Lansdown 106).

Disraeli especially learned from Byron how to affect a pose, impersonating refinement, breeding, and exclusivity in his writing (and increasingly in his life) because, lacking the peer's "blue blood, … unlike Byron, Disraeli had nothing except poses to rely on" (Elfenbein, "Silver" 81). More than just the "fashionable affectation of youth which was prevalent in the generation which followed Byron," Disraeli's homage was expressly for the "insecure twenty-one-year-old [Byron] of 1809" who set off on world travels that Disraeli deliberately traced in 1830–31 when stuck at the same crossroads at the end of his own juvenile writing (Lansdown 106, 107). Murray used to ask for literary advice from his friend's son when Disraeli was just a teenager (attesting to the boy's literary acumen), but such attentions also encouraged his posturing—so much so that, when Murray rejected his first novel, Disraeli imitated the confidence of the peer by pointedly scorning Murray: "as you have some small experience in burning MSS you will perhaps be so kind as to consign it to the flames" (Disraeli, *Letters*

1: 9)—a reference to Murray's part in the scandal of burning Byron's memoirs (1824): "it was an astounding taunt for a nineteen-year-old to make" (Ridley 27).

Identifying with Byron gave Disraeli's literary self-fashioning its self-conscious cheek. The youthful Disraeli blazed onto the scene as a writer with his silver-fork novel *Vivian Grey* (1826)—claiming he'd written it "before he was twenty-one" (Rosa 100)—about a "smart and precocious youth" who draws his "colossal assurance" from Byron (102, 105). Its publisher carefully puffed this anonymous novel of fashionable life as "after the manner of Lord Byron's celebrated work," terming it "a sort of Don Juan in prose" by a new author similarly placed in society ("Literary Report" 173). Yet, in its knowing self-consciousness, the novel also trumpets the spuriousness of that claim. Grey forges an autograph for a young lady and boldly asks, "Shall I write any more? … Mr. Disraeli's? or shall I sprawl a Byron?" (Disraeli, *Vivian* 50).

Even to Young England, Disraeli's alignment with them could seem an open performance. Early on, as they constituted their movement together, Lord John Manners wrote of Disraeli in his diary: "His historical views are quite mine, but does he believe them?" (qtd. in O'Kell 211). Disraeli blatantly lampoons Young England's historical pretensions, having one of his dandies in *Coningsby* complain "It has got hold of all the young fellows who have just come out … but it requires a devilish deal of history, I believe, and all that sort of thing" (391). *Fraser's* even picks up Disraeli's spoofing language to critique Smythe's *Historic Fancies* as "*all that sort of thing*" because it certainly does not represent anything like history proper ("*Historic*" 311). Yet Disraeli in no way rejected or censured pretense. It was part of his political strategy. "I am Disraeli the adventurer," he supposedly told Lord Derby (Millar 237). Though he understood that Young England's historical vision was largely imaginary, Disraeli did not therefore condemn it; rather, his "political career" instead took "on the character of a fiction" (O'Kell 211). After Smythe died, Disraeli wrote, "Poor dear Smythe! Had he lived, after all, he would have succeeded. Alas! He has gone—& within the last five years—all that I cared for in this world. I am an actor without an audience" (Disraeli, *Letters* 8: 143).

In Part One, I read George Smythe's juvenile poetry as depicting youth to be tragically hollow, a haunted emptiness, an imposture prompting poetry through the very absence of a stable self that the young writing self seeks to fill. The open fraudulence of identity is reminiscent of Smythe's (and Byron's) recognition of youth's manufacture in the first place. As the "achievement" by "a minor whose only security was his own audacity" (Jerman 44), Disraeli's performance occupies that empty subject position boldly. In this, Shelley was his model. Monypenny argues that Disraeli "was one of the first who had the courage to attempt to do [Shelley] justice … in defiance of popular prejudice" (363); he was drawn to Shelley because Shelley offered the audacity to locate meaning in nothingness. In his 1821 "Sonnet to Byron," which Duerksen says Disraeli knew (78), Shelley write that he is "like a worm whose life may share / A portion of the unapproachable" (577). To approach the unapproachable, Shelley "dares these words" (577) to Byron. He writes, precisely *because* he has no real ground from which to speak. Disraeli's critics, such as Richard Monckton Milnes, found his turn to Shelley revealed Disraeli's revisionary history as all lies: "Shelley was called mad at Eton, and treated as a criminal at Oxford, because he opposed the 'Old England' of his time with a childish heroism … whereas neither at school nor at college is Coningsby ever persecuted or misunderstood" ([Milnes] 602). But Sichel argues that Disraeli's "inmost soul is embodied in the 'Young England' which he organized and encouraged" (28); I would argue this is precisely *because* Young England redefined any supposedly inmost essence into show and performance.

Disraeli's poses had everything to do with youth, including his own early experience: "from early childhood … I had imbibed on some subjects conclusions different from those which generally prevail, and especially with reference to the history of our own country" ("General" ix). "Born in a

library" (ix), an outsider—middle-class, Jewish—Disraeli had to manufacture knowledge of the upper echelons of fashionable life—"What does Ben know of dukes?" his father wondered (Monypenny 128). So little, it turns out, that one biographer complains "there are expressions [in *Vivan Grey*] which almost remind one of *The Young Visiters*" (Blake 42). In a backhanded way this allusion to nine-year-old Daisy Ashford's juvenile novel nevertheless suggests the shared realm of simulacra among youth. Once Disraeli's identity became known, he was brutally denounced (in anti-Semitic terms) for his class pretensions, as well as for his youth, and he came to regard this first book as one of his "juvenile indiscretions" (Monypenny 85). But juvenile indiscretion was also the going pose for the Sheppard-like swagger of Young England. After years of trying "to suppress the novel" (Rosa 102), when Disraeli finally reissued *Vivian Grey*, he chose juvenile writing as its most defensible identity: one of those "books written by boys" ("General" xx).

In his novel *Venetia* (1837), Disraeli made sure his readers understood Shelley and Byron as symbols of youth—the models for his characters, real-life silver-fork antecedents, who actually enjoyed the rank, celebrity, and personal attractions that fueled the fantasies of the silver-fork (and Disraeli's own fantasies of himself: "There is more than a little of himself in the portrait" of these youthful heroes, as Hesketh Pearson suggests [61]). In *Venetia*, Disraeli took these young dead poets as models for charismatic statesmen, leaders of political movements: *acknowledged* legislators. *The Critic* later called Shelley's "Defence of Poetry" "the philosophy of Young England put into expressive shape" ("Essays" 214). The Byron character extols "Youth, Glittering Youth!" (*Venetia* 417) and asks, "What is manhood, and what is fame, without the charm of my infancy and my youth" (305). Disraeli means this character's steadfastness to his childhood love to redeem him from political cynicism, just as he means youthful idealism to guide the initially wayward Shelley character to become "a great poet, and an illustrious philosopher. His writings became fashionable, especially among the young," so much so that he "was not only now openly read, and enthusiastically admired, but had founded a school" (223–24), forging another juvenile tradition.

Disraeli ultimately critiqued (by killing off) the Shelley and Byron characters in that novel. For this reason, Tom Mole suggests that "Disraeli depicts the Romantic inheritance as a source of fascination for the younger generation, but no longer a potent force in Britain's cultural or political life" (34). Nevertheless, depicting "Romantic poets increasingly … in need of renovation" (32) this way let Disraeli imagine and call up the subject position of contemporary youth who might achieve that renovation—continue, regenerate, and supplant, accomplishing the necessary political and cultural work he felt only youth could carry off.

Disraeli turned to those prior juvenile celebrities as part of "the larger project by early Victorian novelists to use the silver-fork novel to demarcate what was distinctive about their era from the one that had immediately preceded it" (Elfenbein, "Silver" 82). That turn was also part of the reimagination of history that understands the conditions of its possibility through other youth, a genealogy that paradoxically and retrospectively transforms forefathers into age-mates, rethinking ideas of precedence. When Disraeli wrote that "it is the past alone that can explain the present, and it is youth that alone can mould the remedial future" (*Sybil* 488), he offered youth as the yardstick by which to measure history and England's success. His Coningsby trilogy—*Coningsby* (1844), *Sybil* (1845), and *Tancred* (1847)—foregrounds what *Coningsby*'s subtitle called *The New Generation* and the "new and … better mind of England" (Disraeli, *Coningsby* v).

Disraeli defined and promoted Young England in these books, through *roman-à-clef* allusions to Smythe and Manners and Cochrane. The future England his trilogy imagined could only be a "Young England"—it could "only be brought about by the energy and devotion of our youth" because "the Youth of a Nation are the trustees of Posterity" (*Sybil* 489). O'Kell finds *Coningsby* "imaginatively autobiographical": "a frivolous and adolescent romance" with a "close affinity" to Disraeli's own

juvenile novel *Vivien Grey* (212). The "adolescent power fantasy" (208) in his novels connects them all, consoling their author with "a fantasy of acceptance … [a] compensatory alternative to his adolescent alienation" (210). Disraeli, no longer young when writing his political novels, nevertheless wrote out through them a statement of the history and possibilities of juvenility—as he imagined it for England and for himself. Looking back in 1860, he considered this trilogy an extension of his youthful imagination: "I thought then I had seen a great deal of the world—after what has occurred since it appears to me to be a nursery dream" (Ridley 275).

The aspirations of the young politicians in the Coningsby trilogy also lay in nursery dreams. By the time he wrote *Tancred*, Young England had disbanded. Disraeli showed his disenchantment with the movement by having his characters stray from such early idealism. He has Coningsby abandon the juvenile aspiration of his writing at Eton, though at the time his character felt: "What fame of after days equals the rapture of celebrity that thrills the youthful poet, as in tones of rare emotion he recites his triumphant verses amid the devoted plaudits of the flower of England?" (*Coningsby* 104–05).

Through these characters who had lost their way, Disraeli depicted in *Coningsby* what he and his circle feared: had Young England wasted the promise of the juvenility inspiring it? But Disraeli countered that fear by defining juvenility as conditional—provisionality was always part of Young England's identity and the understanding by Young Englanders of their relation to the juvenile tradition. When Smythe and Manners were twenty, and they were all writing poetry, Faber, their hero at that time, deemed them "the *albeit* school." He lists all the reasons why, moving from "free from Rome *albeit* near to antiquity" in a dizzying slide that culminates in: "boys in heart *albeit* men in years; lakers *albeit* not of the lake school" (Whibley 1: 112–13). The conjunction "albeit" applies to juvenile writing (boys/men) as much as Romanticism (lakers/Lake School). We might extend the albeit school in young writers such as Smythe and Disraeli to add to the list: radical *albeit* conservative; dispossessed *albeit* part of a movement. Albeit means "although" or "notwithstanding." Like the "might-have-been" by which (I argued in Part One) Smythe summed up his life, albeit's logic of connection is conditional, a "both/and" that tries to yoke incommensurables to add up to something bigger than its parts—this is Young England's hope for history.

Might-Have-Beens

APOLOGIZING to his father for his wasted life, George Smythe wrote: "Were I to die to morrow, I should occupy three lines in a biographical dictionary as a 'might have been'" (de Fonblanque 237–38).Young England seemed a "might-have-been" in the same way: its political contradictions added up to only a year or two of political action and may have muddled the real reforms its adherents actually conscientiously desired. Young Englanders' uncertain position was as members of a ruling class who substituted the metonymic slide of tradition for what each feared was the fraudulence of his individual identity. Such instabilities and denials paradoxically lay bare the ways a marginalised tradition such as the juvenile one calls its writers into being—and asks us to revise our ideas of literary traditions in general. The nobs were the ones who got noticed, but, in taking identity from this assailed and multivalent tradition, they revealed the room in its succession not just for an adventurer like Disraeli but for a sizar like Byron's gadfly, classmate, and critic whom I discussed in Part One, the juvenile writer Hewson Clarke. Byron is the metonym for the juvenile tradition's conditional practice because, as Marshall McLuhan recognized long ago, Byronism "was able to project those symbols of alienation and inner conflict" that foregrounded "the split-man and the split-civilization" (30, 31). In joining "the great Byronic tradition … of the aristocratic rebel fighting for human values in a sub-human chaos of indiscriminate appetite" (25), the writers of Young England indulged a wounded narcissism but also expressed the condition of youth as prevenient absence. As Oxford-Movement-inspired, they must

also have seen such lack in terms of prevenient grace—what allows agency when none exists, the ability to write out of naught.

Young England collapses its stress on history into the history of juvenile writers. The resulting historiography is one that critics such as James Livingston, charting cultural revolutions, have explored: "this historical context, this unfolding relation between here and there, now and then, actual and potential," is what "the self constructs, *or rather becomes*, in time" (293–94). Young England's was a self-confirming prophecy of its own irrelevance. Like the history Smythe told of his times and of his own life in his fragmentary novel *Angela Pisani*, Young England ultimately reveals history to be "a romance without a hero, and a story without a plot" (Escott 10).

We now regard such an indeterminate dismantled sense of self as very (post) modern. Before Livingston, McLuhan had defined that indeterminacy as in effect political—though a politics involving an identity produced from structures of authority and power that are in excess of the governance, state, or partisanship that make up conventional politics. Young England personifies politics in both senses; it shows the splits within their meaning to be in effect generational, the afterlife of the juvenile tradition a generation before. As Mole writes, "the idea of a break between two generations with different attitudes and concerns emerges in the first half of the nineteenth century, and the first historical shift to be described in those terms is the shift from Romantic to Victorian generations" (38). Young England marks but also redefines this advent of generational thinking by rethinking temporal succession or causality altogether. The logical extension of a prior juvenile heritage which remakes identity, Young England plays out how this sustained attention to youth even transforms the political into the performative spectacle of the self we consider it today. Posterity would try to appropriate, to redefine, and to exploit its understanding of what youth might mean, but no one has been able yet to exhaust its importance, as modern readers continue to understand more and more the extent of its tradition's effects to redefine or open up what literary histories and traditions can allow.

NOTES

[1] Disraeli supposedly wore a white waistcoat—"a bottle-green frock coat, a white waistcoat, no collar, and a needless display of gold chain"—for his maiden speech on the floor in 1837; the speech was supposedly not successful, in part because the members were so distracted by his appearance (Sanderson, Lamberton, and McGovern 332).

[2] Such waistcoats were a stylized part of any evening wear, and worn at Eton to mark various celebrations, but wearing them during the day professionally made a statement. Reed argues that though white waistcoats would have been in the wardrobe of any gentleman, they were nevertheless an important marker of wealth: in Dickens's *Oliver Twist*, "the gentleman in the white waistcoat is a counter for a whole class … indicating that only a gentleman comfortably well off could afford such a fashionable item that would require expensive laundering and so forth. White gloves similarly indicated station through the implication that they would have to be changed during the day and many of them laundered over time. Thus articles of clothing encode a certain social attitude and even ideology" (421). Farina argues that Sir Leicester's white waistcoat in *Bleak House* "personifies the tragic backwardness of Disraeli's "Young England," which imagined that recovering paternalistic, feudal values would somehow produce a different future" (Farina note i).

[3] Slang dictionaries of the time look to that original ballad to explain "fake" as "a very ancient cant word, possibly from *facere*, used in the honest sense of to do, to make, originally but afterwards in the dishonest one" (Barrère 350). The myriad of those dishonest meanings cited include "to cheat, swindle …. Also invention, contrivance …. In conjuring, any mechanical contrivance for the conjuring of a trick" (351).

[4] They worried that Ainsworth's especially, like other Newgate novels, might contribute to "juvenile delinquency"; see mention of that novel throughout "Appendix 2, Juvenile Delinquency, Liverpool," to the 1852–53 collection of *Reports from the … House of Commons: Criminal and Destitute Juveniles* (especially 414–26). Painting identifies Disraeli as an early adopter, if not coiner, of the phrase "juvenile delinquency" in an 1851 note planning *Sybil* (Painting 456). Disraeli clearly was familiar with the phrase from its Parliamentary use at this time, but that juvenile delinquency was a political topic helps deepen this lampoon of Young England. England was so worried about "the Sheppard craze" (the twenty-something valet Benjamin Courvoisier confessed that Ainsworth's novel gave him the idea to murder his employer) that for forty years after that the Lord Chamberlain withheld license for any play with Jack Sheppard in its title; see Stephens 3. Buckstone's adaptation escaped the embargo.

[5] In his note to a 9 October 1844 letter to Benjamin Disraeli, the editor cites his source as "Hughenden Mss, 15/2/fos 135-6" (that is, it is from the collection of papers originally found at Disraeli's Hughenden estate, now housed in the Bodleian Library at Oxford) and adds "this letter was written shortly after the widely publicized opening of the Manchester Athenaeum Institute by members of Young England" (44n18).

[6] See Brantlinger for Disraeli's (and Byron's) knowing self-irony, and "the importance of image-making" and "undecidability" in their imagined imperial milieus (96, 103).

WORKS CITED

"Appendix No. 2: Juvenile Delinquency, Liverpool." *Reports from the Select Committees of the House of Commons: Criminal and Destitute Juveniles*, pp. 406–27. *The Sessional Papers … 1852–53*, vol. 47, House of Lords, [1853]. *Google Books*.

Barrère, Albert, and Charles Godfrey Leland. *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant: Embracing English, American, and Anglo-Indian Slang, Pidgin English, Gypsies' Jargon and Other Irregular Phraseology*. Ballantyne Press, 1889. *Google Books*.

Blake, Robert. *Disraeli*. Prion, 1966. Reprinted 1998.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Disraeli and Orientalism." *The Self Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818–1851*, edited by Charles Richmond and Paul Smith, Cambridge UP, 1998, pp. 90–105.

Catellus. "A Discourse of Puppies." *New Monthly Magazine*, vol. 73, no. 289, Jan. 1845, pp. 69–80. *ProQuest*.

Champlin, John Denison. *The Young Folks' Cyclopædia of Literature and Art*. H. Holt, 1901. *Google Books*.

Disraeli, Benjamin. *Benjamin Disraeli Letters*: 1815–1834. vol. 1, edited by John Alexander Wilson Gunn and M. G. Weibe. U of Toronto P, 1982.

———. *Benjamin Disraeli Letters: 1860–1864*, vol. 8, edited by M.G. Wiebe, Mary S. Millar, Ann P. Robson, Ellen L. Hawman. U of Toronto P, 2009.

———. *Coningsby: or the New Generation. Novels and Tales by the Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. 9, Longmans, Green, 1881. *Google Books*.

———. "General Preface." *Lothair. Novels and Tales by the Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. 10, Longmans, Green, 1881, pp. vii–xx. *Google Books*.

———. *Sybil, or the Two Nations. Novels and Tales by the Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. 7, Longmans, Green, 1881. *Google Books*.

———. *Venetia. Novels and Tales by the Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. 6, Longmans, Green, 1881, *Google Books*.

———. *Vivian Grey. Novels and Tales by the Earl of Beaconsfield,* vol. 1, Longmans, Green, 1881, *Google Books*.

Duerksen, Roland A. *Shelleyan Ideas in Victorian Literature*. De Gruyter,1966.
"The Duties of a White Waistcoat." *Punch*, vol. 22, 1852, pp. 163. *Google Books*.
Escott, T. H. S. "A Young England Novel." *Macmillan's*, vol. 32, no. 187, May 1875, pp. 1–10. *Google Books*.
Elfenbein, Andrew. "Silver-Fork Byron and the Image of Regency England." *Byromania: Portraits of the Artist in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Culture*, edited Frances Wilson. St. Martin's Press, 1999, pp. 77–92.
Engels, Friedrich. *The Condition of the Working-class in England in 1844*. G. Allen & Unwin, 1892. *Google Books*.
"*Essays, Letters from Abroad, Translations, and Fragments*, by Percy Bysshe Shelley." *Critic*, vol. 2, no. 28, 12 Jul 1845, pp. 214–15. *ProQuest*.
Faber, Richard. *Young England*. Faber and Faber, 1987.
Farina, Jonathan.: On the Genealogy of "Deportment": Being Present in *Bleak House." b2o*, www.boundary2.org/2016/10/jonathan-farina-on-the-genealogy-of-deportment-being-present-in-bleak-house/.
de Fonblanque, Edward Barrington. *Lives of the Lords Strangford: With Their Ancestors and Contemporaries Through Ten Generations*. Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1877.
Gopnik, Adam. "Life of the Party: Benjamin Disraeli and the Politics of Performance." *New Yorker*, June 25, 2006, www.newyorker.com/magazine/2006/07/03/life-of-the-party-2.
"*Historic Fancies*, by the Hon. Sydney Smythe." *Fraser's*, vol. 30, no. 177, September 1844, pp. 310–21, *Google Books*.
Holland, Bernard Henry. *Memoir of Kenelm Henry Digby*. Longmans, Green, 1919, *Archive.org*.
Jeal, Tim. *Baden-Powell. Founder of the Boy Scouts*. Yale UP, 2001 Hutchinson, 1989.
Jennings, George Henry. *An Anecdotal History of the British Parliament: From the Earliest Periods to the Present Time. With Notices of Eminent Parliamentary Men, and Examples of Their Oratory*. Horace Cox, 1892. *Google Books*.
Jerman, B. R. *The Young Disraeli*. Princeton UP, 1960.
Kegel, Charles. "Lord John Manners and the Young England Movement: Romanticism in Politics." *Western Political Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 3, Sept 1961, pp. 691–97. *JSTOR*. doi: 10.2307/444286.
Lamington, Lord, Alexander [Cochrane-Baillie]. *In the Days of the Dandies*. Eveleigh-Nash, 1906. *Google Books*.
Langbauer, Laurie. *The Juvenile Tradition: Young Writers and Prolepsis in Britain, 1750–1832*. Oxford UP, 2016.
Lansdown, Richard and W. A. Speck. "Byron and Disraeli: The Mediterranean Tours." *Wordsworth Circle*, vol. 43, no. 2, Spring 2012, pp. 106–13. *University of Chicago Press Journals*. doi.org/10.1086/TWC24043975.
"Literary Legislators: No. V. Mr Smythe, Mr. Poulett Scrope." *Frasers,* vol. 35. no. 5, 1847, pp. 529–44. *British Periodicals*, ProQuest.
"Literary Report." *New Monthly Magazine*, vol. 18, April 1826, p. 173. *Hathi Trust*.
Livingston, James. *Pragmatism and the Political Economy of Cultural Revolution, 1850–1940*. U of North Carolina P, 1994, 1997.
McLuhan, Herbert Marshall. "Edgar Poe's Tradition." *Sewanee Review*, vol. 52, no. 1, Winter, 1944, pp. 24–33. *JSTOR*.
Millar, Mary. *Disraeli's Disciple: The Scandalous Life of George Smythe*. U of Toronto P, 2006.
[Milnes, Richard Monckton]. "A Few Remarks on Coningsby, by Real England." *Hood's Magazine,* vol. 1 no. 6, June 1844, pp. 601–06. *ProQuest*.

Mole, Tom. *What the Victorians Made of Romanticism: Material Artifacts, Cultural Practices, and Reception History*. Princeton UP, 2017.

Monypenny, William Flavelle. *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*. Vol. 1 1804–37, Macmillan, 1913, *Google Books*.

O'Kell, Robert. *Disraeli: The Romance of Politics*. U of Toronto P, 2013.

Painting, David. "'Juvenile Delinquency' and 'Banausic'; Young England Coinage?" *Notes and Queries,* vol. 252. no. 4, December 1960, p. 456. *Oxford Academic.*

Pearson, Hesketh. *Dizzy: The Life and Personality of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*. Harper, 1951.

Ridley, Jane. *The Young Disraeli*. Sinclair-Stevenson, 1995.

Rosa, Matthew Whiting. *The Silver-Fork School: Novels of Fashion Preceding Vanity Fair*. Columbia UP, 1936.

Saintsbury, George. "The Young England Movement." *The Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury, 1875-1920*, vol. 3 *Miscellaneous Essays*, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1923, pp. 254–69. *Google Books.*

Sanderson, Edgar, J. P. Lamberton, and John McGovern. "Lord Beaconsfield." *Six Thousand Years of History*, vol. 7 *Famous Foreign Statesmen*. E. R. Dumont, 1899, pp. 326–43. *Google Books*. 10 vols.

Shelton, Edward. *The Historical Finger-Post: A Handy Book of Terms, Phrases, Epithets, Cognomens, Allusions, etc. in Connection with Universal History…,* London: Lockwood, 1865. *Google Books.*

Sichel, Walter. "The Young England Movement." *Anglo-Saxon Review*, vol. 9, June 1901, pp.15–28. *Google Books.*

Smith, G. C. Moore. "Review—*Memoir of Kenelm Henry Digby* by Bernard Holland." *Modern Language Review,* vol. 14, no. 4, October 1919, pp. 429–35. *ProQuest.*

Speck, W. A. "Robert Southey, Benjamin Disraeli and Young England." *History*, vol. 95, no. 318, April 2010, pp. 194–206. *Wiley Online Library*, doi:10.1111/j.1468-229X.2009.00479.x.

Stephens, J. R. "'Jack Sheppard' and the Licensers: The Case against Newgate Plays." *Nineteenth-Century Theatre Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, Spring 1973, pp. 1–13. *ProQuest.*

Strangford, E[mily Ann Beaufort Smythe, Lady]. "George Sydney-Smythe: A Sketch." *Angela Pisani*, by George Sydney Smythe, vol. 1, Richard Bentley and Son, 1875, pp. v–xxxi. *Google Books.*

Ward, J. T. "Young England." *History Today*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 120–28. *ProQuest.*

Whibley, Charles. *Lord John Manners and His Friends*. Vol 1, William Blackwood and Sons, 1925. 2 vols.

"Young England and Young France." *Punch*, vol. 5, July–December 1843, p. 118. *Google Books.*

"Young England, or, The Peril of Crisis." *New Monthly Magazine*, vol. 70, no. 278, February 1844, pp. 174-181. *ProQuest.*

Young Englishman. "Letter to Benjamin Disraeli." *Young England: The New Generation; A Selection of Primary Texts*, edited by John Morrow, Leicester UP, 1999, pp. 41–42.

Reviews

Gerri Kimber. *Katherine Mansfield: The Early Years*. Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

xxiv + 272 pages. Hardback/ USD 39.95.
ISBN 9780748681457 (hbk); 9780748681471 (ePub).

MANY YEARS ago, I had the pleasure of meeting Gerri Kimber and discussing our mutual admiration for the writings of Katherine Mansfield. I felt sad at the time that Gerri had not visited New Zealand, birthplace of Katherine Mansfield and setting for many of her finest stories. Since our meeting, she has been able to make that journey, thanks to a research grant from the Friends of the Turnbull Library. *Katherine Mansfield: The Early Years* proves that she made excellent use of her time there.

This biography covers a period often skated over by Mansfield biographers—the time from her birth in 1888 until, twenty years later, she left New Zealand's shores for ever. Mansfield's husband John Middleton Murry, her first biographer and editor of her letters and journals, had a sentimentalised view of his wife's childhood and had himself never been to New Zealand. He was keen to emphasise the time in her life when she was connected to himself. Claire Tomalin had also never visited, and her biography covers Mansfield's time there in less than forty pages. Kimber has redressed this imbalance.

She was born Kathleen Mansfield Beauchamp, though she experimented with many different names and identities throughout her short life, including the simple initials "KM," which Kimber aptly chooses to call her. Dividing up her book into sections according to the homes in which she lived, she gives us KM's story thoroughly and clearly, giving each location its due, starting with KM's birthplace, 11 Tinakori Road in the Wellington suburb of Thorndon (now the Katherine Mansfield House and Garden Museum), site of her formative early years. The little school in Karori, where the family moved in 1893, would be the setting for scenes in Mansfield's finest story "The Doll's House"; 75 Tinakori Road was KM's home from

1898 to 1903, when she attended Wellington Girls' High School, saw her first story in print in the school magazine, and received her very first review. It was at high school that she formed intense friendships and told fibs—the lines between fact and fiction were always blurred for KM.

The biography leaves New Zealand in chapter 6 when the Beauchamp family took their daughters to London, where they became pupils at Queen's College. Kimber describes these as wonderful years for KM, when she discovered Oscar Wilde's writings, developed her skills as a cellist, poured out her sexual longings in an early unfinished novel named *Juliet*, and met Ida Baker, who remained an important friend throughout her life. I was amused to read that KM received a grade of "disappointing" in English literature during this time. In the final chapter, Kimber describes KM's brief return to New Zealand (1906–08), when her resistance to her family's plans for her to play the role of nice young lady in the capital's social scene ended with her father's reluctant permission to return to England. Kimber describes the ways in which KM shocked Wellingtonians with her behaviour and manners during this time but also describes her camping holiday in the Urewera district of the North Island, during which she learned to see the beauty of the New Zealand bush and found subject matter for later stories.

Throughout, Kimber makes the young Katherine Mansfield come vividly alive. To achieve this, she makes skilled use of extracts from early diaries, letters and poems, and she examines such juvenile stories as "A Fairy Story," "The Tiredness of Rosabel," "She," "Die Einsame," "Your Birthday," and "About Pat." Kimber explores KM's developing fascination with windows, death, isolation, trees, and birds, all things which first emerge in her youthful writing and also appear in her mature works. We see KM experimenting even as an adolescent writer with different voices and techniques; we see the literary influence of Wilde and other "Decadent" writers who inspired her to write in a distinctly modernist way, and we see her extraordinary eye for miniaturist detail, such a feature of her adult style. In the early works that Kimber describes so fully, we also see KM's frustrations with her parents: "The mother was a slight pale little woman. She had been delicate and ailing before her marriage and she never could forget it" (from *Juliet*).

This biography gives an insightful analysis of KM's development, both as a woman and as a writer. The text is well illustrated with maps and many photos, some never before published, of KM, her homes, the buildings she knew, and her friends and relations. Kimber writes lucidly and entertainingly in an accessible style, sharing her own knowledge of Mansfield's stories with enthusiasm and perception. Her book is the first biography of KM that "concentrates solely on her childhood and adolescence" (Kimber 3). Kimber provides an important, detailed look at KM's early creativity and her juvenilia, revealing how many of the images and themes from these early years carried through to her adult work. This book fills a gap in the world of Katherine Mansfield scholarship and is a most welcome addition.

Susannah Fullerton, OAM, FRSN
President, Jane Austen Society of Australia

John Goodby. *Discovering Dylan Thomas: A Companion to the Collected Poems and Notebook Poems*. University of Wales Press, 2017.

xi + 284 pages. Paperback, GBP 24.99.
ISBN: 9781783169634.

Discovering Dylan Thomas aims to provide a companion to Dylan Thomas's published poems and notebooks, including the fifth notebook, which was rediscovered in 2014. Composed by the foremost expert on Dylan Thomas, John Goodby (Sheffield Hallam University), the text contains previously unpublished material—including three examples of juvenilia ("Forest picture," "Idyll of unforgetfulness" and "In borrowed plumes")—and provides a meticulous overview of Thomas's poetry.

As Goodby suggests, while this text is in some senses best seen as a guide to *The Collected Poems of Dylan Thomas* (2014), the volume's scope and aims go beyond that. It is a rigorous and revealing volume, including both new material and a sophisticated yet accessible scholarly apparatus detailing Thomas's poems. The volume consists of a thorough introduction and three parts. The "Supplementary Poems" are a selection of ten poems which were not included in the 2014 centenary edition of Thomas's poetry (edited by Goodby). The second section, "Annotations, Versions, and Drafts," comprises the bulk of the volume, and includes details of allusions and references on a poem-by-poem basis, as well as critical histories, overviews of variations, and publication details. The volume is rounded out by a section containing three appendices, which provide publication details for Thomas's main poetry collections, a description of the fifth notebook, and errata for the 2014 hardback edition of Thomas's collected poems.

The most noteworthy new material, from the point of view of either a Thomas scholar or a juvenilia scholar, naturally relates to the fifth notebook, discovered during Thomas's centenary in 2014 and purchased by Swansea University. Goodby's initial research has identified this as "a successor to the four [notebooks] covering the period April 1930–April 1934" (2). Goodby reveals that this fifth notebook contains sixteen poems, six of which appeared in Thomas's debut *18 Poems* (published in 1934, the year he turned twenty) and a further ten which were published in *Twenty-Five Poems* (1936, the year he turned twenty-two), including "several of Thomas's finest and most original poems" (2). While this volume only presents Goodby's initial research on the notebook, he does put forward three notable arguments which demonstrate the significance of this find. First, this notebook gives us a clearer idea of the order in which Thomas composed his poems across 1934–35. Second, it disproves critical

assertions that Thomas did little work when he first arrived in London in 1935. Finally, the notebook contains several poems for which there previously existed no autograph manuscripts or drafts. Therefore, the fifth notebook ultimately provides us with a deeper understanding of Thomas's development as a poet in the mid-1930s.

More broadly, Goodby's text advances two main aims. First, Goodby aims to encourage movement "towards a properly informed critical conversation about his [Thomas's] poetry" (6). To achieve this, Goodby offers a wide variety of empirical evidence for the sources of Thomas's poetry, including evidence of Thomas's reading, as well as critical and compositional histories of the individual poems. This information frequently illuminates Thomas's poems without reducing the interpretive scope of the poetry. Second, Goodby argues that Thomas's modernism is an event of major significance in English-language poetry, and that appropriate recognition of Thomas's achievement reveals and corrects two failings of existing scholarship: the ways in which the complex and accomplished poetry of the 1940s is overlooked and undervalued, and the Anglo-centric emphasis of literary histories, especially those of modernism. Goodby's argument on both fronts is persuasive, and it is a valuable contribution to current scholarship not only on Thomas, but to our broader discussions of modernism and mid–twentieth-century poetics. Goodby's inclusion of three examples of unpublished juvenilia, and his consequent discussion of them, sheds some light on "the role of mimicry in [Thomas's] work" (4). Goodby's blunt suggestion that "too much fuss" has been made of Thomas's juvenilia by readers who are perhaps "unwilling or unable to get to grips with the infinitely better mature poetry" (5) is therefore somewhat undercut by the fact that Goodby's own analysis of the juvenilia in this volume illuminates aspects of Thomas's later work.

The "Annotations, Versions and Drafts" which comprise the bulk of the volume offer both welcome interventions in outdated scholarly appraisals of Thomas and a multitude of concise insights which scholars, students, and the general reader will appreciate. For example, Goodby recasts Thomas's "If the lady from the casino" as a potential attempt at Surrealist automatic writing, drawing a sharp contrast with Ralph Maud's suggestion that Thomas wrote the poem whilst drunk (52). This is a microcosmic example of the way in which Goodby's annotations overcome the older critical tendency to exaggerate Thomas's personal habits whilst simultaneously simplifying—and sometimes denigrating—the sophistication of Thomas's writing. Instead of being another example of Thomas's supposedly louche lifestyle and a reflection of the odd, beer-swilling Welshman, "If the lady from the casino" is instead one more aspect of Thomas's multi-faceted modernist poetics. Across this volume, Goodby convincingly depicts Thomas as a socio-cultural hybrid and a voracious reader, adept at creating his own mystique and obscuring the dense allusions of his poetry, who persistently engaged with the international arts and multimedia of his time. Impressively, Goodby traces critical interpretations, compositional histories, and details of revisions in his annotations, while also offering readers potential connections between the emotional tone of the poems and the socio-political climate in which they were written. The annotations vary between concise, short entries, to lengthier engagements which offer revelatory analysis of such iconic poems as 'The force that through the green fuse'. Repeatedly, the complex interfaces between

Thomas's multitudinous influences and his own poetics, whether it is a Lawrentian aversion to masturbation or shades of Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* (1927), are laid bare.

Goodby is successful in providing his readers with the tools and information that will allow more "informed critical conversations" about Thomas's poetry. The juvenilia and notebook poems here demonstrate the complex relationship between invention and imitation, between plagiarism and parody, that formed part of Thomas's development as a poet. Both erudite and accessible, *Discovering Dylan Thomas* is a welcome companion for scholars, students, and admirers of Thomas's poetry.

Daniel Hughes
Independent Scholar