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Abstract

This thesis investigates the influence that James Hogg (1770-1835) had over the works of the Brontës. There has been an understanding amongst scholars since the early twentieth century that Hogg’s poetry, novels and periodical contributions had been read and discussed within the Brontë household. However, despite references to this relationship between Hogg and the literary education of the young Brontës, there has been no comprehensive study which fully examines the ways in which Hogg’s works were transposed into the juvenilia, and eventually into the published works. This study aims to examine the specific mechanisms that establish the foundational presence of Hogg within the Brontë canon. By initially exploring Hogg’s situation within the early nineteenth-century literary marketplace, the thesis presents an examination of the variety of personas which the Brontë children consumed and digested during their early reading, and specifically through their dedication to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine. Through understanding the ways in which Hogg was constructed and manipulated during his literary career, we can further understand how the Brontës understood, acquired and developed the writerly methods of Hogg as a way of establishing their own distinct literary voices. The three most prominent examples of consciously transposing Hogg’s literary techniques into their own understanding and conception of the literary marketplace are Charlotte (1816-55), (Patrick) Branwell (1817-48), and Emily (1818-48). This study will ultimately reveal the importance of Hogg not only in relation to the Brontës, but to the nineteenth-century publishing industry as a whole.
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Introduction: ‘[A] man of most extraordinary genius’: James Hogg and the creation of the Brontës’ infernal world

‘I do not give his words but merely the sense attired in the garb that I conceive fittest’

The works of the Brontës have come to be regarded as emblems of Victorian culture. The iconographic image of the three individual Brontë sisters - Charlotte (1816-55), Emily (1818-48), and Anne (1820-49) - has been integrated into popular culture, compressing them into this singular functioning body. Collectively, they have come to represent the social and cultural developments within the Victorian publishing industry. Christine Alexander remarks that the sisters, along with their brother Branwell, had an ‘[u]nconventional Victorian childhood’. Like many other scholars before her, Alexander justifies their ‘[u]nconventional[ity]’ through emphasising their ‘[u]nconventional’ family circumstances. Indeed, by 1825 the four Brontë siblings had already experienced the deaths of their mother, as well as their two elder sisters, Maria and Elizabeth. The impact of these deaths go beyond emotional trauma: the traditional family unit becomes disrupted, and consequently the social structure within the Brontë household presents a unique model. It is the ways in which

---


2 The terminology which I use in referring to the ‘Brontës’ evokes this precise image of the three author sisters. Recent productions within film and theatre which reinforce this societal conception are ‘We Are Three Sisters’, a play by Professor Blake Morrison which toured the United Kingdom in 2011, alongside the 2016 biopic written and directed by Sally Wainwright: ‘To Walk Invisible’. Both examples are marketed on the iconic image of the three Brontë sisters and their singular organismic presentation, in contrast to the outlandish presence of their brother (Patrick) Branwell (1817-48). Moreover, throughout this thesis, each of the Brontës will be referred to solely by their first name. This method of referencing will be used to limit any confusion about which member of the family is being discussed. I will use the more commonly acknowledged name of ‘Branwell’ instead of the full name: ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë’.

3 Maria Brontë, née Branwell, died in September 1821 from suspected stomach cancer; the youngest of the children, Anne, was only a year old. Maria and Elizabeth died after what was summarily noted as periods of ‘consumption’ whilst attending boarding school. For full accounts of the deaths, see: Juliet Barker, The Brontës, 2nd revised edn. (London: Abacus, 2010), p.120 and p.159-164. All further references will be to this edition of the text. Another brief account of the impact which these deaths had on the Brontës is outlined in, Lyndall Gordon, Charlotte Brontë: A Passionate Life, 2nd revised edn. (London: Virago Press, 2008).

4 The family now comprised their father, the Reverend Patrick Brontë, as head of the family; the four remaining Brontë children; their Aunt Branwell, who had come to nurse their mother in her final illness; and, a few female servants who initially acted as nursery maids during the early years of the children’s lives. For a comprehensive account of the structure of the Brontë family, and the ways in which they interacted with each other, see: Juliet Barker, The Brontës, p.119-129.
this familial structure functioned that produced the environment which would garner the specific writerly community between the four surviving Brontë children.

Indeed, scholars have commented upon the distinctive social environment in which the children grew up. For instance, Juliet Barker states that, ‘they had no need to seek friends of their own age in the town when they had companions with the same tastes and enthusiasm in their own home’. Likewise, Alexander states that as all of the Brontë children were ‘[c]lose in age, intelligent and active, they naturally formed what their father called “a little society amongst themselves”’. Through the development of this ‘little society’, the Brontës were able to create a self-contained and intense creative community. However, this compact intellectual environment must not be confused for the myth of their complete isolation from social and cultural progress. Recent studies have revealed that the Brontë children were very much aware of the contemporary literary sphere they were growing up in. Barker, for instance, argues that previous biographies have reinforced the Brontë mythology of their physical seclusion. She asserts that, ““Isolated”, “solitary”, “lonely” are the epithets on every page [of texts concerning the Brontës]. But in reality, Haworth was a busy, industrial township”. Previous assessments of the Brontës have largely overlooked just how connected they were to this progressive ‘industrial’ world, which would have been up-to-date with the newest literary materials.

Their father played a key role in establishing the channels by which his children would access the materials and resources that would govern their intellectual development. It is through their father’s ‘unusually liberal views’ that they were exposed to texts outside the normal societal codes, especially for the education of the female sex at this time. These ‘liberal views’ are most prominently illustrated through his encouragement of his children to read broadly, and without the conscious fears of social etiquette. For instance, in

---

9 It was not until much later in life, when Charlotte started to enter society as a professional, that the Brontës learnt how different their literary education, and preferences, were to that of their peers. For
1829, an almost thirteen-year-old Charlotte recorded in her diary entry, ‘The History of the Year’, the variety of literary materials which were coming into the Brontë household on a regular basis. She writes that,

We take 2 and see three newspapers a week. We take the Leeds Intelligencer, party Tory, and the Leeds Mercury, Whig, edited by Mr Baines and his brother, son in law and his 2 sons, Edward and Talbot. We see the John Bull; it is a High Tory, very violent. Mr Driver lens us it, as likewise Blackwood’s Magazine, the most able periodical there is. The editor is Mr Christopher North, an old man, 74 years of age. The 1st of April is his birthday. His company are Timothy Tickler, Morgan O’Doherty, Macrabin, Mordecai Mullion, Warrell, and James Hogg, a man of most extraordinary genius, a Scottish Shepherd.10

This passage illustrates the Brontë family’s communal awareness of the progressive literary marketplace developing within the early nineteenth century, and their active participation with it. For instance, Charlotte references a variety of newspapers and periodicals, which she is already able to situate within their social and political contexts. This awareness of how these texts function, and the parameters within which they were operating, emphasises the broader social and cultural knowledge the Brontës had acquired through these channels. Furthermore, it is Charlotte’s emphasis on Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine which highlights their alliance with progressive literary communities. Alexander states that it is through their dedication to Blackwood’s that they developed their own social and creative discourses: ‘the Brontës imitated and “played at” the lively publishing scene of the early nineteenth century.’11 In this way, their own literary productions were formed in conjunction, not only with the political and historical content of this periodical, but with the narrative structures which were a specific product of the Blackwood’s literary sphere.

The immersion of the Brontës within these narrative power systems is explicitly illustrated through Charlotte’s references to the Blackwood’s ‘company’. The names which she states are the forces behind the ‘most able periodical there is’, are the highly-crafted public, literary personas which were further Information regarding their unusual literary education, see: Lyndall Gordon, Charlotte Brontë: A Passionate Life, p.40-47.

projected into the general reading public. It is the way in which these constructed literary figures are able to transgress the boundary between the fictional and real worlds of the publishing industry, that is transposed within the Brontë children’s own formulation of their literary creations. For example, it is stated that, ‘[t]he young writers carry on a continual verbal battle in editorial notes, prefaces, afterwords, and the actual texts of the stories.’\textsuperscript{12} They mimic the dialogical responses between the authors, editors, and fictionalised literary presences within this literary marketplace. It is their unlimited creation of the various forms of texts - ‘prefaces, afterwords’ and the ‘stories’ themselves - and their ability to transcend the boundaries between them to emphasise their literary personas, which grounds the Brontës within this early nineteenth century tradition. Indeed, despite Alexander’s assertion that they had a ‘Victorian childhood’, they are certainly products of the early nineteenth-century publishing industry, and romantic educational values.

It is therefore by understanding the ways in which these narrative power systems within the publishing industry were used and manipulated, that allows us to re-evaluate how the Brontës produced their own fictional creations. Jon P. Klancher argues that, ‘[a]udiences are not simply aggregates of readers’, instead ‘[t]hey are complicated social and textual foundations; they have interpretative tendencies and ideological contours’.\textsuperscript{13} The unique case of the Brontë children, encased within this ‘little society’ of their own, enables us to observe within their microcosmic environment the ways in which the wider ‘social and textual foundations’ were being received. Charlotte describes the \textit{Blackwood’s} ‘company’ in detail, however, it is the fictionalised literati of the ‘\textit{Noctes Ambrosianae}’ contributions which she is citing. There is only one exception to this rule: ‘James Hogg, a man of most extraordinary genius, a Scottish shepherd’.

‘James Hogg’ (1770-1835), otherwise known as ‘The Ettrick Shepherd’, is the only one of the \textit{Blackwood’s} ‘company’ that Charlotte refers to by his own name. Hogg occupied a peculiar position within the Edinburgh literati during the early nineteenth century. He grew up in a rural lowland area of Scotland, and it

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p.xx.
was not until 1810 at the age of 40, that he decided to become a full-time man of letters.\textsuperscript{14} It is this simultaneity, between Hogg the writer and Hogg the ‘Scottish shepherd’, that allowed him to inhabit multiple spaces within the publishing industry. Sharon Alker and Holly Faith Nelson have asserted that,

Working-class writers, particularly those who threatened to disturb moral and stylistic standards, were being carefully monitored by the literati at the very moment that Scottish literary authority was increasing, the marketplace was gradually shaking off the chains of patronage, and new audiences were becoming more receptive to a wider variety of literary genres.\textsuperscript{15}

Hogg symbolises this threat of the ‘working-class’ writer, whilst \textit{Blackwood’s} encompasses this idea of the power of the ‘Scottish literary authority’. It is the progression of these positions of power, and the changes within the operations of the ‘marketplace’ itself, which can be examined through the ‘new audiences’ and their ‘receptive[ness]’ to these developments. The Brontës, as part of this ‘new audience’, are ideal candidates to examine. They are situated within the exact time frame of these shifts within the industry, and the fluctuations which occurred between the positions of power. Within the literary marketplace, these distinctions of power are allocated between the author, editor and reader of a text. Through evaluating how the Brontës consumed and digested Hogg, within this context of the ever-evolving literary marketplace, we can critique how each individual interpreted the construction of this system of ‘literary authority’.

In the first chapter, ‘James Hogg and the Early Nineteenth-Century Literary Marketplace’, we will observe the broader literary environment which the Brontës were consuming through \textit{Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine}. By examining this context, we can comprehend the ways in which Hogg was presented to the general reading public, and furthermore, how these vignettes of ‘James Hogg’ contribute towards the multiple personae which is still acknowledged as integral to understanding his character. This is an important aspect to re-evaluate in direct relation to the ways in which the Brontë children

\textsuperscript{14} For a full account of the circumstances which led to Hogg’s decision, see: Gillian Hughes, \textit{James Hogg: A Life} (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), p.80-82.

would have understood the public and private characterisations of ‘James Hogg’. The thesis as a whole explores, in-depth, the aspects which the Brontës selected from Hogg’s oeuvre, and questions why they chose these specific Hoggian characteristics for their own fictional creations.

The integration of these methods is firstly explored in chapter two, ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s The Private Memoirs and Confession of a Justified Sinner (1824)’. This chapter presents an examination of the relationship which Branwell had to the works of Hogg through a new and original approach to Hogg’s most well-known novel. Branwell’s ambitions and obsession with his own position within the literary marketplace is directly influenced by the role(s) that Hogg played within the Blackwood’s sphere. This chapter examines how Branwell attempts to use this knowledge of how an individual functions within the industry in relation to his own position as an aspiring writer. This will be demonstrated through the ways in which Branwell accommodates specific Hoggian literary techniques within his own works, and is more precisely examined within his short story: ‘The Life of Field Marshal the Right Honorable Alexander Percy, Earl of Northangerland, Lord Viscount Elrington, Lord Lieutenant of Northangerland, Premier of Angria, Major General of the Verdopolitan Service’ (1836).

The development of these writerly techniques is further explored in chapter three, ‘Charlotte Brontë and James Hogg’s Later Periodical Works’. There is a discussion of Charlotte’s awareness of literary power structures, in relation to the publication of her own work. This will also reveal how she manipulates Hogg’s influence within her fiction. The figure of Hogg looms large over her juvenilia as well as her later works, notably through their mutual conceptions of ‘the double’. Charlotte’s youthful imitations and reactions to Hogg’s ‘double’ personas form something of the character of her own mechanization in the distinctly Victorian literary marketplace.

Finally, chapter four ‘Emily Brontë’s Wuthering Heights (1848), James Hogg and Voicing the Female’, will revisit the Brontë text most commonly associated with Hogg’s influence. However, instead of examining this singular novel through the traditionally masculine perspective that has been the distinguishing method in recent criticism, I will re-evaluate the importance of
the female presence. I therefore intend to invert the traditional conception of
the predominantly masculine literary marketplace during the early nineteenth
century. Through using this lens to examine the relationship between Hogg’s and
Emily’s writerly techniques, we can further unveil the ways in which they
understood the distribution of power within their social systems.

My argument will ultimately focus on the ways in which the broader
techniques of Hogg are used by the Brontës to self-consciously critique the
publishing industry. Moreover, I will establish the exact ways in which these
writerly methods were transposed into the Brontës own ‘garb’, and in what
specific ways they ‘conceive[d]’ them to be appropriate for their own selective
purposes. The Brontës had an active relationship with Hogg and the literary
marketplace, which brought them to a higher awareness of their own potential
within the publishing industry. It is through this understanding that we can
comprehensively re-evaluate the full extent to which Hogg had an influence over
the conception of the Brontë canon, and a hand in developing the literary
marketplace of the later nineteenth century. In this way, we must first examine
Hogg’s multiple positions within the publishing industry, and how he was
consciously constructed in relation to the editors of this exclusive Blackwoodian
sphere.
Chapter One: James Hogg and the Early Nineteenth-Century Literary Marketplace

‘I have no connection with it; but as my funds are mostly in Blackwoods hands and as he has so much in his power regarding the success of my works I am obliged for my own interest to keep on fair terms there knowing they can do me no harm’

‘James Hogg’ was a name which was circulated widely during the early nineteenth century. Although he had published several poetry collections, and had gained some public prominence through his friendship with Sir Walter Scott; it was not until 1817, with the official founding of Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine, that the name of ‘James Hogg’ began to be employed within the literary marketplace. Hogg was a prominent factor in establishing the newly revived periodical, alongside William Blackwood as the over-arching authoritative power figure, with the two devilishly evoked editorial figures, John Wilson and John Gibson Lockhart. It is through Hogg’s inclusion within this continually evolving sphere, which began the simultaneous construction and destruction of the ‘James Hogg’ public/private identity. It is also this resource which the Brontë children drew so heavily from in their early literary careers. In order to examine the relationship between Hogg and the Brontës in more depth, it is important to understand Hogg’s location and his manifestations within this literary marketplace, particularly in relation to Blackwood’s. This was the periodical which would aid in re-structuring the late eighteenth-century conceptions of the publishing industry, and by extension, the socio-cultural frameworks of the nineteenth century.

In the first comprehensive collection of essays discussing Hogg and his place within this literary marketplace, Sharon Alker and Holly Faith-Nelson state that, ‘Hogg’s negotiation of an authorial identity was both eased and complicated by the particular strains of the nascent Scottish literary

---

17 Two foundational biographies which give comprehensive accounts of the life and position of James Hogg within the literary sphere of Edinburgh: Karl Miller, Electric Shepherd: A Likeness of James Hogg (London: Faber & Faber, 2003), and Gillian Hughes, James Hogg: A Life (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007).
This topic might initially be explored through the opening quotation to this chapter, taken from a letter written by Hogg in 1820 and sent to his future wife, Margaret Philips. Hogg intends to give a brief explanation of his public treatment in the latest edition of *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, and the ways this treatment is aligned with his financial situation. The original intention of the sentence is to assure Margaret of his reliability through highlighting his regular income as well as his personal and authorial integrity. However, this sentence instead comes to signify the complete integration of Hogg’s private and public identity literally within the ‘hands’ of *Blackwood’s*, including its editors - and by extension - the literary marketplace. In this way, Hogg’s ‘authorial identity’ was ‘eased’ by his acceptance into this sphere of the literary elite, whilst ‘complicated’ by his obvious financial, and social reliance on them. Hogg was correct in understanding the ‘power’ which *Blackwood’s* had regarding the ‘success of [his] works’, whilst he simultaneously underestimated the ‘power’ which they had over his actual self: ‘knowing they can do me no harm’.

Hogg reinforces how he has ‘no connection with’ a selection of texts which have appeared in the latest edition of *Blackwood’s*. In doing so, he is emphasising his distance from the literary production, and we can see the first understandings of the ways in which Hogg’s (multiple) public identities were being formed. Indeed, Hogg’s nonchalant attitude in describing this practice to Margaret suggests that this was the way in which *Blackwood’s* regularly operated, both with Hogg and with other select contributors as well. As we will see, *Blackwood’s* was the defining mechanism for the early nineteenth-century breaking of - and conscious manipulation of - public character. The periodical worked upon the foundations of the previous centuries’ creation of audience, which put an explicit trust in the morality and truthfulness of what was being conveyed to the reader. However, *Blackwood’s* consciously - and some might argue over-dramatically - manipulated this process, to produce new ways in which to operate among the collective audiences. Jon P. Klancher, commenting on the ways in which audiences were being formed during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, asserts that,

---

What ultimately must circulate [through the productions of the publishing industry] is a discourse that can create patterns of reception in the minds of its social readers. By such special acts of circulating repeated acts of certain kinds of writing and reading - a public is shaped to read discourses in deliberate, directed ways. For readers are made.\(^{19}\)

Klancher highlights the connection between the calculated ‘circulat[ion]’ of specific ‘kinds of writing and reading’ to the development of mental, emotional and even physical, ‘deliberate’ and ‘directed ways’ of reading. These repeated ‘patterns’ of the tailored socio-cultural ‘discourses’, distinctly shape the reading public into a singular unit: ‘For readers are made’ and so is a collective consciousness. This collective consciousness is the foundation of the communal reading public. It enables the publishing industry to manipulate the ideas which the audience unconsciously relies upon in their ‘directed ways’ of reading ‘discourses’. *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* was arguably the central body in overtly creating, and more importantly manipulating, these editorial parameters.\(^{20}\) However, Blackwood’s ambiguous drawing of ‘discourses’, between the real and the fictional, extended even into the reality and mythology of the magazine itself. The prime example of this transgressive, and ambiguous, fluidity between the real and fictional is illustrated through the conception of ‘James Hogg’.

The formation of Hogg’s public identity is multiple and duplicitous. Silvia Mergenthal asserts that,

then as now, the reading public cannot ever encounter the real James Hogg, but is confronted with a series of portraits of the artist which may or may not be true to life.\(^{21}\)

---


The reference to these ‘series of portraits’ is the result of the editorial system creating multiple, and yet distinctly individual authorial identities. This method allows for the editors and publishers to pursue potentially conflicting audiences, and consequently attract a broader reading public. Klancher’s theory resonates with Mergenthal’s assertion by highlighting how ‘the reading public cannot ever encounter the real’ individual body behind the variety of ‘discourses’ which were repeatedly circulated, most often without Hogg’s approval or knowledge. Indeed, Valentina Bold and Suzanne Gilbert have remarked on the ways in which Hogg has ‘entered into the traditional culture of Scotland’ through both ‘his (active and passive) inclusion in the “Noctes Ambrosianae” series of Blackwood’s, and into the oral traditions of Selkirkshire’. It is this distinction of the ‘active and passive’ ‘inclusion’ through the creations within the ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’ which policed both Hogg’s public and private character. The ambiguity created by this fictional representation, which blurred the boundary between the real Hogg, the authorial Hogg and Hogg as ‘the Ettrick Shepherd’ meant that the literary marketplace during this time had multiple Hogg voices all simultaneously being consumed and digested by the public reading audience. Blackwood’s did not attempt to conceal this fracturing and manipulation of Hogg’s character. The anonymous review (which is now known to be written by editor, and apparent friend to Hogg: John Wilson) that appeared in 1823, concerning the recent publication of Hogg’s The Three Perils of Woman: Love, leasing and Jealousy, explicitly outlines the contrasting depictions of the public persona of ‘James Hogg’:

Hogg is coarse, but potent; hairy, but headlong; flattering, but not always flatulent; no doubt a gay deceiver, but then is certainly, if not a handsome, at least a well-built man [...] In one page [of The Three Perils of Woman], we listen to the song of the nightingale, and in another, to the grunt of the boar. 

---


[23] James Hogg, The Three Perils of Woman: Love, Leasing and Jealousy, ed. Antony Hasler and Douglas S. Mack (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002). This text is part of the Stirling/South Carolina editions of Hogg’s works. For more information regarding how this text was significant to the manipulation of Hogg’s public and private personas in the literary marketplace see, ‘introduction’ by Antony Hasler, pp. xi-xliii.

This explicit depiction of the multiple-Hogg conception illustrates how *Blackwood’s* could directly present the ways in which they were manipulating an individual’s image, whilst still having the approval from the public audience. Klancher’s argument that it is the repeated use of ‘deliberate, directed ways’ of reading ‘discourses’, is presented here by Wilson’s clear invoking of Hogg the ‘nightingale’ and Hogg ‘the boar’ as equally valid ways of consuming and interpreting the character of ‘James Hogg’. The distinction between Hogg ‘the nightingale’ and ‘the boar’ is perhaps better viewed through two of Hogg’s key public personas: James Hogg, the genius ‘peasant-poet’, who is aligned with the traditions created by Robert Burns, versus that of ‘James Hogg’ the shepherd - or ‘Ettrick Shepherd’ - most dramatically and comically portrayed within the ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’.25 *Blackwood’s* validates both of these ‘discourses’ through repeatedly directing their focus towards Hogg’s public and personal character, rather than analyzing the relevance which the actual text has to his authorial role. In this way, the multiple ‘discourses’ are ‘shaped’ to fit an image of Hogg which is directly integrated with his public, private and authorial value specifically through his relationship with the periodical and its editors. This use of power is illustrated through the initial split within Hogg the rural shepherd writer. Hogg was well-known by his pseudonym, ‘The Ettrick Shepherd’, with which he introduced himself to the literary marketplace. However, this conception became problematized through the Blackwoodian manipulation of ‘the shepherd’. The pseudonym was not only used as the foundation of his authorial image, but became grotesquely manipulated, and ultimately integrated into the public conception of his private character. Indeed, Gillian Hughes has noted that, ‘[t]he Noctean Shepherd became rather better known than Hogg the writer, a curious situation which Hogg alternately welcomed for

[accessed 31 March 2017]. We will return to the significance of this review in, ‘Chapter Four: James Hogg, Emily Brontë and Voicing the Female’.

publicity purposes and deplored as a misrepresentation’. The ‘Noctean Shepherd’ is the image which the general reading public, including the young Brontës, came to unconsciously assume as the way in which to read ‘James Hogg’ the writer.

The fact that Hogg simultaneously ‘welcomed the publicity’ whilst he ‘deplored’ the ‘misrepresentation’ of his true, writerly and personal characters, illustrates that he developed the understanding of how his public image was being used, and controlled, by Blackwood’s. This dilemma between the positives and negatives of developing this kind of public multiple personality, is examined within David Finkelstein’s study, ‘Selling Blackwood’s Magazine, 1817-1834’. He focuses upon the ways in which Blackwood’s shifted the social and cultural parameters of what was acceptable within the public and private spheres of the publishing industry. Finkelstein initially outlines how previous to the founding of the periodical in 1817,

[I]t was common to claim that properly conducted critical journals were able to police the border between literature and personality, regulating their own conduct in order to restrict discussion to the work under review, and not the private character of the author who wrote it.  

This practice created a distinct separation between reality and the fictional spheres, enabling a clear division between the role of the text, and the place of the author as an individual. It appears that the ‘critical journals’ were the main power structures to reinforce, or ‘police’, the moral and ethical boundaries which aided in protecting the ‘private character’. This power system is consequently inverted when Blackwood’s is founded, and its popularity manifests the new structures by which the rest of the early nineteenth-century periodical market would come to adapt themselves. For instance, Finkelstein further states that,

Blackwood’s argued that literature was a special kind of public discourse, a separate jurisdiction, in which the distinction between public and private character on which the protocols governing personalities rested

became functionally meaningless [...] speculation about the private character of literary authors was thereby naturalized as a function of the peculiarly personal character of literary writing.  

It is through these parameters that Hogg became characterized by multiple personas. The popularity of the manipulated and multiple ‘Hoggs’ subsequently aided in validating this practice throughout the Blackwoodian ‘public discourse’, and eventually to the publishing industry as a whole. The ‘peculiarly personal character of literary writing’ became established through the ambiguity of the ‘public and private character’ being directly aligned, if not assimilated into, the texts the authors produced themselves. In this way, the authors - and especially Hogg - become trapped behind the ‘public discourses’ of the governing power bodies in the publishing industry. Consequently, their place within the literary marketplace becomes reliant upon, not their own authorial intent, but the wider interpretations and manipulations made in the ‘public discourse’ systems, which ‘shaped’ the ways in which the collective audiences consumed these works. Meiko O’Halloran remarks that Hogg’s high awareness of his own situation can be aligned to the gothic mechanisms he uses throughout his opus. She argues that,

Trapped behind his Ettrick Shepherd Noctes persona, Hogg is all too aware of his reductive, comic image as a target for mimicry and mock beatings [...] He evokes with remarkable intensity the sensations of an essential life spark incarcerated within a foreign body, which it is unable to co-ordinate. This image of the ‘life spark’ which is trapped within a ‘foreign body’ which it cannot ‘co-ordinate’ is the foundation of many of Hogg’s more gothic supernatural tales. These types of tales grew in popularity over time, however, it is at the turning point of 1823 when Hogg starts to purposefully attempt to regain and undermine his own public and private image.  

---

28 Ibid., p.95.
30 By 1823, Hogg has already been subjected to six years of Blackwood’s ‘mimicry and mock beatings’ given to his works and public/private character. The most prominent early example being the treatment of Hogg’s Chaldee Manuscript work, which evolved into a heightened version of the original work through the intervention of Blackwood, Wilson and Lockhart extending the piece without Hogg’s full consent. Later on, when Hogg had claimed that this controversial - but successfully implemented work - was actually his, the Blackwood’s editors managed to dissuade the reading public of Hogg’s authorship through the precise
fully comprehend and acknowledge the ways in which he can manipulate the editorial frameworks, precisely by understanding the ways in which he himself was being functionally manipulated. This is through aligning this image of the ‘incarcerated’ ‘life’ being unconsciously forced into the ‘co-ordinations’ of a much larger, ‘foreign’, invading system. Moreover, this imagery of the ‘foreign body’ and the separation it has from the original ‘life spark’ is most clearly illustrated through the recurring motif of the alive/dead body throughout Hogg’s opus. For instance, the publication of ‘A Scots Mummy’ (1823) in Blackwood’s is the precursor to the more comprehensive exploration of identity and editorial power in the literary marketplace depicted in The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner (1824). The text outlines Hogg’s awareness of the multiple construction of his identity, and implements a variety of Hoggs within the brief narrative. It is therefore apt that the context of the narrative discusses the unusual aspects of a suicide’s grave. The story highlights the ways in which other people’s views and personal motives interfere with the exploration of the corpse, and the character which once lived within it.

The text is composed in the form of a letter to John Wilson’s fictional alter-ego, Sir Christopher North, the central figure who dominates, and quite literally dictates the ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’. Indeed, by situating the letter within this distinct fictional sphere, he is attempting to manipulate Wilson’s characterisation by using the same position of power he had manifested to dictate Hogg’s image. We see Hogg’s perceptions of how his public/private persona is being created, through the overly-dramatic dialogue given to Christopher North. North attempts to project the stereotypes connected with the Hogg as genius peasant-poet, and consequently attempts to contain him within these rigidly ‘shaped’ ‘discourses’:

control over his character which had established Hogg’s literary fame. Consequently, it was not until much later that the idea for the Chaldee Manuscript was fully attributed to Hogg, along with his true literary capabilities and success. For further information regarding the handling of the Chaldee Manuscript, see: Thomas C. Richardson, ‘introduction’, in Contributions to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine vol. 1, 1817-1828, ed. Thomas C. Richardson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), p.xviii- xxv.

31 Confessions forms out of this initial submission to Blackwood’s and the response which it evoked by the public reading audience. Moreover, the novel itself concludes by a direct reduplication of this submission. I will discuss the significance of the Confessions further in, ‘Chapter Two: Patrick Branwell Brontë and The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner’. 
By all means, Hogg. I insist on it. Something of the phenomena of nature. I beseech you. You should look less at lambs and rams, and he-goats, Hogg, and more at the grand phenomena of nature. You should drink less out of the toddy-jug, shepherd, and more at the perennial spring.32

This first ‘discourse’ of Hogg as the genius peasant-poet is grounded in the reference to ‘Hogg’ the author who must write on ‘the phenomena of nature’. This language positions Hogg within the romantic ideologies of the sublime, and reinforces his position within this poetic society. The language is further evocative of another remark, made within one of John Wilson’s ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’ submissions. This version of Christopher North comments to his most established formation of the ‘Noctean shepherd’ that, ‘I wish, my dear Shepherd, that you would follow Mr. Wordsworth’s example, and confine yourself to poetry’.33 By ‘confin[ing]’ himself to ‘poetry’, Hogg would be ‘confine[d]’ within the expected limitations for his class and society, as the conventional peasant-poet. It is this mould which enables Hogg to both inhabit the only acceptable space as a working-class writer, whilst also creating a clear division between himself and the other members of the Edinburgh literati, who could participate and move between all genres of writing without fear of societal disapproval. Therefore, North enforces Hogg’s position within the literary marketplace through simultaneously ‘confin[ing]’ him to the tradition of ‘poetry’ and thus excluding him further from the literary elite by his over-dramatic portrayal as the ‘shepherd’. Hogg locates his own sense of self in the literal references to his life as a shepherd who needs to ‘look at lambs and rams, and he-goats’. Through re-situating the characterization of the shepherd version of Hogg within the original and most explicit contexts of ‘lambs and rams’, Hogg undermines the fictionalized conception of his character. By Hogg himself constructing this image of the shepherd, he removes the frameworks which have been built up around this characterization, and therefore removes the power that North/Wilson has over the dictation of this persona. In this way, Hogg reinforces that he will not be ‘confined’ within the power structures which attempt to manipulate, not only his public representation and acceptability, but


the very personal writerly choices which should be solely held within the jurisdiction of the author. However, Hogg proceeds to close this dialogue with an explicit reference to Hogg as the ‘Noctean shepherd’. North shifts from naming him as ‘Hogg’ - a more ambiguous gesturing to his characterization - and finalizes the conversation by naming him as merely the ‘shepherd’. This ‘shepherd’ is more concerned with ‘the toddy-jug’, and thus Hogg recedes back into this fictional sphere dominated by the Blackwoodian public conception of his character, manifested through the ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’ tavern transactions.

Ultimately, through this singular piece of dialogue, we can observe how Hogg is able to fluidly inhabit, and personally manipulate, each separate construction of himself which has been presented. It is precisely his ability, in this letter, to simultaneously adopt and undermine these Hoggian characters, which allows for his own independent voice to become more prominent. After this initial transaction between ‘the shepherd’ Hogg and North, the letter presents both the internal and external dialogues in parallel. The narratorial Hogg, who is presumably the version of his character which he himself authorises, dictates that, ‘[i]n the meantime I was thinking to myself, what the devil can this phenomena of nature be’. Firstly, by amplifying his own internal thoughts during this conversation, Hogg allows for his own authorised voice to be present within this fictionalised world intended to silence his independent construction of character. Indeed, by highlighting that he was actively ‘thinking’ to ‘himself’, he comically and overtly acknowledges the multiple forms of ‘[him]self’. This notion is reinforced through the contrast to the ‘Noctean shepherd’ conception of Hogg physically talking back to North. His language shifts from a more traditional and standardized version of English in his ‘thinking’ internal dialogue, to the written version of Scots which is used predominantly for Hogg throughout the entire ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’ series.

Certainly, it could be argued that the presence of the broad Scots dialect within the established Blackwood’s series, is the key signifier of ‘James Hogg’, the outsider within the collection of the Edinburgh literati. It is his interactions through dialogue with the rest of the Noctean characters which, by visual and
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conceptual contrasts, enforces his position as the working-class shepherd, in contrast to the figure of social gentility we see with Christopher North. For example, when the narratorial Hogg states that he has not submitted anything, due to having no subject to write about, Christopher North responds with: ‘“Nothing to write about? For Shame! How can you say so? Have you not the boundless phenomena of nature constantly before your eyes?”’.\(^{35}\) It is the assumption that his manifestation of Hogg ‘constantly’ has the ‘phenomena of nature’ held ‘before his eyes’, which forcefully situates Hogg within the initial ‘confine[s]’ of both the peasant-poet writer and the rural working-class subject. This rhetoric implies that this characterisation of Hogg cannot see anything other than the topic of ‘nature’. This technique covertly highlights North’s constructed disapproval of Hogg’s broader career into novels and essays, which more importantly concern topics which were considered to be the property of the upper classes: for instance, Hogg’s exploration and criticism of social and political matters, religion, and new developments in the sciences and psychology.\(^{36}\)

In this way, ‘A Scots Mummy’ enacts Hogg’s Noctean re-writing of his own character, as a way to explicitly demonstrate his understanding of the ways in which his public character is being manipulated, whilst also undermining the techniques used by John Wilson, through subtly mocking his conception of ‘Sir Christy’.\(^{37}\) For instance, this Hogg responds to North’s requests for ‘the phenomena of nature’ by declaring that, ‘I maunna pretend no to understand him, for fear he get intil a rage’.\(^{38}\) This remark combines the associations of the ‘Noctean shepherd’, through using the scots dialect, yet explicitly undermines its associations. By stating that he ‘maunna pretend no to understand him’, Hogg

\(^{35}\) Ibid. p.139.
\(^{36}\) One such example is Hogg’s The Three Perils of Woman: Love, Leasing and Jealousy, which is discussed in more detail in chapter four, ‘Emily Brontë’s Wuthering Heights, James Hogg and Voicing the Female’. The chapter examines the ways in which Hogg depicted the female experience within this, his third published novel. Moreover, the ways in which it was heavily criticised for the very depiction of these experiences, with a direct concern for the readerly safety of the female audiences. Cf. p.73-74.
\(^{37}\) James Hogg, ‘A Scots Mummy’ (1823), Contributions to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine Volume 1 1817-1828, p.139. Hogg addresses the entire letter to ‘Sir Christy’ otherwise known as ‘Sir Christopher North’, the fictional incarnation of the dominating editor of Blackwood’s: John Wilson. In this way, we see Hogg directly addressing and critiquing the editorial preferences and practices of Wilson upon Hogg’s public and private character. By writing within and through this fictional sphere of the ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’, Hogg attempts to undermine the editorial power Wilson has over his own character, through employing the very systems which were being used upon him.
\(^{38}\) Ibid. p.139.
infers that he does not agree with the Christopher North conceptions of the ‘phenomena of nature’, indeed, he cannot ‘understand’ ‘what the devil’ it is. This therefore establishes Hogg, as the true authorial persona, as outside of the ‘confine[s]’ of the ‘shepherd’ who is limited by the mould of the peasant-poet which is conveyed through the writerly parameters outlined within North’s request for the ‘phenomena of nature’. It is by stating that he ‘fear[s]’ North will ‘get intil a rage’, that Hogg conveys the dominant editorial figure as a tyrannical one. However, this phrase further illustrates Hogg’s direct awareness of his characterisation, and the ways in which he must ‘pretend’ to consciously inhabit this space if he is to exist within the literary marketplace.

The formation of Hogg explored within the construct of the authoritative narrator remarks that, ‘it never once occurred to me as an object of curiosity, to dig up the mouldering bones of the culprit, which I considered as the most revolting of all objects’. By highlighting that it ‘never once occurred to [him]’ to excavate the suicide’s grave, we see the reluctance which Hogg takes in the uncovering of the private, and quite literally concealed, body. The treatment of the alive/dead corpse appears as an overt metaphor for the treatment of the editorial system on the bodies/characters of the authors. For instance, it is crucial that Hogg places the excavation of the corpse through the eyes and the literary preferences, of ‘Sir Christy’. In contrast, we see Hogg position himself against this excavation of the concealed character symbolised through the ‘mouldering bones of the culprit, which [he] considered as the most revolting of all objects’. Hogg’s position within this literary marketplace is further revealed by the ‘mouldering bones of the culprit’, in relation to the ways in which he treats the characters of other writers. Hogg wrote only two biographies of other writers in his lifetime. The one which most fully highlights his own editorial

41 Both of these biographies were initially written in 1832, on Sir Walter Scott and Robert Burns, arguably highlighting Hogg’s position in furthering the creation of the Scottish canonical legend which these two writers would come to embody. Hogg would write and publish his memoir of Sir Walter Scott to a high level of criticism which was aimed at Hogg’s seemingly too revelatory depictions of Scott and his family. For the full account, see: James Hogg, Anecdotes of Scott, ed. Jill Rubenstein and Douglas S. Mack (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999).
and writerly position is his ‘Memoirs of Burns’. Despite being originally composed in 1832, the memoir would not appear in print until just after his death in 1836.\(^4\) Hogg once again positions himself against the editorial practices of *Blackwood’s* by asserting that,

> I wish from my soul that as many lives of that singular man had been written during his life time as have been of myself and then we should have known all of the bard and the man that behoved us to know for really this everlasting raking up of the ashes of the illustrious dead in search of collateral evidences relating to things about which we have no concern and ought not to know never will do.\(^4\)

Hogg states that by having had Burns write many biographies of himself, future generations of audiences would ‘have known all of the bard and man that behoved us to know’. From his perspective, Hogg argues that the construction of the public identity of an author should be grounded upon their own conceptions, rather than those purposefully selected for production by an editor. Hogg returns to his idea of the re-writing process in ‘lives’ and biographies as a form of violence on the alive/dead body. He asserts that the treatment is like the ‘raking up of the ashes’ left behind of a once whole and functioning body. In this way, the ‘ashes’ are only fragments of the story, and furthermore, ones which might not have been authorised by the living ‘man’ himself: ‘evidences relating to things about which we have no concern and ought not to know never will do’. Hogg utilises his original, arguably late-eighteenth-century conception of the right of the author over his own biography, through fashioning and controlling the publication of his ‘many lives’ himself.\(^4\) In doing so, he attempts to control the ‘collateral evidences’ which are, and could be, shared once he has become part of the ‘illustrious dead’. Indeed, Gillian Hughes remarks on this practice

---


\(^4\) This excerpt is taken from a resource of the original manuscript version for the memoirs of Burns, as it is currently not outlined anywhere else in published criticism. The reference to this manuscript is taken from: James Hogg, ‘Extract from Hogg’s MS Memoir of Burns’, in *The Collected Letters of James Hogg Volume 2 1820-1831*, p.xiii.

\(^4\) He published three distinct versions of this biography during his lifetime. The first appearing in 1807, and then two following in 1821 and 1832. There are explicit differences between each of these versions of Hogg’s life, which engages with the notion that he was aware of the way in which his characterisation was developing over time. Therefore, he consciously constructs his own idea of his character to either suit or counteract the assertions which were overlaying his personal identity. For more information regarding the ways in which these biographies interacted with each other, see: Suzanne Gilbert, ‘Hogg’s Reception and Reputation’, in *The Edinburgh Companion to James Hogg*, pp. 37-45 (p.39-40).
which Hogg attempted to implement, to redefine his own public and private characterisation. Hughes states that,

What Hogg wishes his readership to know about his life he fashioned into an autobiography at different times [...] This was his own interpretation of his life and literary career, the way in which he chose towards the end of his life to present himself to his readers and to posterity. Hughes emphasizes that Hogg controls what and when is revealed to his ‘readership’ at ‘different times’, depending on his own development alongside the current social and political conceptions of his character within the literary marketplace. However, although he ‘chose’ to ‘present himself to his readers and to posterity’ through this direct mechanization of autobiographical writing, it was still the direct dialogue of the ‘Noctean shepherd’ who dominated the historical interpretations of Hogg for many years after his death. This dynamic illustrates the larger frameworks of the early literary marketplace, by which the direct autobiographical accounts are valued less in interpreting the character of an author, than the overtly fictionalized accounts created within Blackwood’s. It is Hogg’s acknowledgement of this power imbalance concerning the legacy of his public and private character which he refers to in his letter to William Blackwood. On the 3rd of July in 1834, Hogg remarked to Blackwood that he had once again been trying to write a submission for the next ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’. However, he was struggling to define his own writing within the framework which had been established by John Wilson. He concludes that, ‘I cannot imitate [Wilson] and what is far more extraordinary I cannot imitate myself’. It is the remark which recognises that he ‘cannot imitate [him]self’ which demonstrates how Hogg, especially near the end of his life, understood that the construction of his ‘self’ was defined through the manifestations from others, rather than directly from ‘[him]self’.

The concluding remark to his letter reinforces the idea that Hogg was aware that he was being manufactured within the power structures of the literary marketplace; and, he did not have the ability to override or re-structure

---

these parameters through being effectively ‘confine[d]’ to the ‘Noctean shepherd’, and/or within the working-class rank. He could not ever fully access the levers of the literary marketplace machine, as he could not create nor truly embody a character appropriate to these powers: a socially-accepted writer of genteel status. Hogg’s private and public character became too entrenched within the ‘confine[s]’ of the ‘shepherd’ or the peasant-poet narrative, which meant that even though he assumed the powerful editorial identities within a variety of his texts, he could never escape the construction of ‘[him]self’ which had been conditioned into the general reading public. It is this identification of Hogg’s interest in the portrayal of editorial figures, and the likewise obvious distrust of the way in which the literary marketplace was constructed by them, which is thus initially explored within ‘A Scots Mummy’.

Hogg’s direct remarks to the almost parodic figure of ‘Sir Christy’ within his own Noctean-inspired story attempts to relocate the power of the editor through his perception as the writer. Hogg presents a section of speech which is balanced between his recognizably Scots dialect persona of the ‘shepherd’, with the standard English of Hogg the writer/editor: his true authorization of ‘[him]self’. For instance, in this concluding section of the letter he explicitly directs his criticism to ‘Sir Christy’:

Well, you will be saying, that, excepting the small ornamental part of the devil and the hay-rope, there is nothing at all of what you wanted in this ugly traditional tale. Stop a wee bit, my dear Sir Christy. Dinna just out afore the point. Ye ken auld fools an’ young bairns shouldn’a see things that are half done. Stop just a wee bit, ye auld crusty, crippled, crabbit, editor body, an I’ll bet ye see that the grand phenomena of nature a’ to come yet.47

Hogg recognises that he is categorised within this ‘ugly traditional tale’ genre through being the ‘shepherd’. This phrase further evokes the array of responses which were given to Hogg and his works, which depicted them both as being too ‘coarse’ for general consumption.48 However, he counteracts this

---


48 In the previously mentioned review by John Wilson concerning The Three Perils of Woman: Love, Leasing and Jealousy, we see the use of the word ‘coarse’ used repeatedly, even within a single sentence. For further information which illustrates Hogg’s characterisation as ‘coarse’, refer to chapter two, ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner (1824)’, Cf. p.37.
‘confine[ment]’ within the ‘coarse’ mould which the original ‘Sir Christy’ (and the Blackwoodian sphere) had built around him, through directly - and somewhat ‘coarse[ly]’ - addressing the ‘editor body’. It is the significance of Hogg identifying this colloquial term, of the ‘editor body’, which gestures towards the larger editorial ‘body’ with which he was continually coming into conflict. Yet, Hogg proceeds to undermine the power of this ‘editor body’, by associating it with ‘auld fools an’ young bairns’, alongside the alliterative claims of being ‘crusty, crippled, [and] crabbit’. In this way, he uses the same types of language which were implemented as a part of his ‘Noctean shepherd’ characterisation to additionally undercut the power of the ‘editor body’. Certainly, it is significant that Hogg uses the Scots dialect to reassert his own authority over this narrative. He thus attempts to redefine his image as the ‘Noctean shepherd’ through the re-assertion of the Scots dialect. The Scots dialect here, is used as a signifier of power over the ‘crabbit’ ‘editor body’, who - Hogg appears to imply - cannot truly understand the real concept of the ‘grand phenomena of nature’. It is these ‘repeated’ ‘discourses’ which had been ingrained within the literary marketplace that attempted to marginalise his public, and consequently private, image. In this remark, we can see that Hogg not only mocks and undermines the position of the ‘editor body’, but further re-locates his own character within this inverted construction of the literary marketplace: a literary marketplace where Hogg could hold power over the construction of his narrative, and his own characterisation.

This same styled dialogue appears again in Hogg’s later personal letter to William Blackwood, on the 10\textsuperscript{th} of March 1829. This period saw the beginning of the end for the tension created between the author and editor, alongside their personal friendship. It is arguably this fluctuating relationship of power with Blackwood - and with the other editors of \textit{Blackwood’s} itself - which would culminate in Hogg’s complete separation from the magazine in 1831. One of Hogg’s opening assertions to this letter reinforces his awareness within the Blackwoodian construction of the literary marketplace. He declares,
In the first place you are the crabbest cappernautyest worst tempered devil I ever saw. What kind of a letter was your last to write to a poet? And such a poet too in whom you have all the bards of the nation in one?49

It is Hogg’s return to this type of language in 1829 which further highlights his on-going attempts to re-dress the power between the roles of editor and the writer. Hogg situates Blackwood as this same construction of the ‘editor body’, which is evoked through the previously highlighted alliterative pattern: the ‘crusty, crippled, crabbit’ Christopher North consequently aligned with the ‘crabbest cappernautyest’ William Blackwood. As well as a clear parallel emerging between Hogg’s manifestation of the intervening ‘editor body’ in ‘The Scots Mummy’ with that of his real-life relationship with Blackwood, we can moreover observe the connection between the ‘editor body’ and Hogg’s idea of the ‘devil’. Hogg’s exclamation that Blackwood is the ‘worst tempered devil [he] ever saw’ insinuates that the intervening ‘editor body’ becomes even further manifested through different types of editorial ‘devil[ish]’ behaviour. This relationship between Hogg’s conception of the editorial sphere - and especially the Blackwoodian editorial sphere- as literary embodiments of the ‘devil’, will be further explored throughout the rest of this thesis.

Therefore, we return to the development of ‘The Scots Mummy’ into the more complex, and most well-known text, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824). The initial identification of the ‘devil’ and ‘the hay-rope’ in Hogg’s narrative of the ‘ugly traditional tale’ expands into this multi-layered, and multifunctioning organism, critically testing the parameters of the literary marketplace. In ‘The Scots Mummy’, Hogg concludes his narrative by suggesting that North ‘try the experiment on [him]self’.50 This insinuation to North that he should attempt to hang himself, is followed by the argument that Hogg ‘ventures to predict that’ North will ‘repose there for ages an inmate of [his] mossy cell, of the cloud, and the storm, [when he will eventually] set up [his] head at the last day as fresh as the Moorcock’.51 This imagery appears to present a double function: to firstly insinuate that North, like the suggested
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51 Ibid., p.143.
sinner, would survive his ‘mossy cell’ and hundred year ‘repose’ in the earth because he is in affiliation with supernatural or ‘devil[ish]’ powers. On the other hand, the imagery depicts the containment and confinement of the corpse in the ‘mossy cell’, creating a parallel containment of the real, personal ‘James Hogg’. This alive/dead corpse being manipulated and fragmented - excavated and re-excavated - by the editors, and the general reading public. In this way, we see the ambiguity of Hogg’s place within the literary marketplace as simultaneously within and outside of the suicide’s grave.

This position of Hogg within the literary marketplace illustrates his complexity by operating both within the power structures which he was forcefully subjected to, whilst simultaneously undermining the process by which his multiple characterisation was being presented to the reading audiences. The multitude of voices, all claiming the authenticity of Hogg in a variety of guises, collectively represent the wide variety of factors explored in the development of the Brontë children’s literary education. It is thus important to recognize the arena within which the character, and public/private personas of ‘James Hogg’, were continually evolving. The Brontë siblings all encountered Hogg’s source texts, such as his poetry collections and his novels. However, these texts were ‘mostly in [the power of] Blackwoods hands’, where he determines the ‘success of [his] works’, and therefore had his ‘hands’ within the continual construction and alteration of the texts to suit his personal preference. Arguably the most influential literary resource on the Brontës was their regular, and comprehensive reading of Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine. It is not only by understanding Hogg’s place within the Blackwoodian sphere which is essential in examining their exploration of his ideas. Indeed, it is more significant to understand the many forms in which the Brontës would have encountered and consumed the multiple identity of ‘James Hogg’. The first examination of the Brontë siblings actively discussing and debating Hogg’s works will be in relation to the literary
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52 Some examples of scholars who have addressed this topic of the young Brontës’ reading materials include: Juliet Barker, The Brontës, p.169-173; Clifford Whone, ‘Where the Brontës borrowed books: The Keighley Mechanics’ Institute’, Brontë Society Transactions, 11 (1950), pp.344-358; Bob Duckett, ‘Where did the Brontës get their books?’, Brontë Studies, 32 (2007), pp.193-206; and, Christine Alexander, ‘Readers and Writers: Blackwood’s and the Brontë’s’, The Gaskell Society Journal, 8 (1994), pp.54-70. These articles and their significance will be referred to throughout the complete thesis. It is important to acknowledge the direct foundations of the literary and readerly relationship between Hogg and the Brontës, and the ways in which this has progressed throughout contemporary scholarship.
development of (Patrick) Branwell Brontë. Branwell uses his interpretation of Confessions as a foundation for his fictional creations. He uses Hogg’s concepts as a way of evaluating and performing his own unique literary style. This process is most prominently observed through his exploration of the literary marketplace, the role and significance of editorship, and the ways in which the power structures operate within the novel itself.
Chapter Two: Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*

‘the arch-sinner whom they had fostered for their own temporary purposes into such a lasting power.’

James Hogg’s influence within the Brontë canon is arguably nowhere more visible, or more direct, than in the works of Branwell Brontë. Daphne du Maurier, in her comprehensive study *The Infernal World of Branwell Brontë* (1960), continually references how James Hogg was a central factor in Branwell’s education, and personal development. Du Maurier states that Hogg’s more fantastical elements of ‘ghosts’ rising from the dead and ‘bleeding bodies’ left to rot ‘in ditches’ were the particular topics of discussion between Branwell, Emily, as well as his close friend, the famous sculptor, Joseph Leyland. Though present across much of Hogg’s opus, these motifs of supernatural beings, alive/dead bodies and other uncanny elements are most thoroughly explored through Hogg’s seminal novel, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824). Marianne Thormählen states that the novel was ‘a Brontë favourite’ amongst the young household members at the parsonage, and consequently we can assume that each of the Brontës would have in turn been influenced by this seminal text. However, several scholars have focused solely on the argument which highlights the *Confessions’* impact on the portrayal of Branwell’s eponymous anti-hero, Alexander Percy.

Juliet Barker scrutinises one of Branwell’s early narratives, which depicts a middle-aged and well-established Alexander Percy, in ‘The Pirate’ (1833). This...

---


54 For further biographical information regarding Patrick Branwell Brontë’s life, refer back to the introduction of this thesis.


short story illustrates Branwell’s initial understanding of Hogg’s concept of demonic possession; the idea that the devil can be physically embodied as an external corrupting force, whilst simultaneously being present within the internal psychology of the character. For instance, Branwell’s exploration of the physically embodied devil is conveyed through the figure of ‘Robert Patrick ‘Sdeath’, whose supernatural characterisation is signified by his ‘decrepid [sic.]’ yet seemingly indestructible body. Barker examines this ambiguous affinity, arguing that it is a ‘symbiotic relationship’ which combines the transgressive ‘evil genius’ of ‘Sdeath and Percy. This specific construction of the characters, Barker asserts, ‘draws heavily on the story of Robert Wringhim and his association with the devil’ in the Confessions. These scholarly arguments intently focus on the evident connection between the sinner, and the manifest ‘evil’ portrayed by the satanic-inspired associates. Certainly, Alexander Percy is the ‘arch-sinner’ which, through the similarities in titles, naturally aligns him with the ‘justified sinner’ of Hogg’s Confessions. However, the ‘arch’ which the public persona of Percy provides as a framework for editor, John Bud’s, exposé narrative, evokes the question of editorial authenticity. The idea of symbiosis between Percy and ‘Sdeath is more interestingly applied to the multiple ‘symbiotic’ relationships between the editor and his subject matter. The ‘symbiotic relationship’ between John Bud as editor, John Bud as character and the various public and private manifestations of Alexander Percy, one might argue, illustrates the true contention between the ‘sinner’ and the ‘devil’. Exploring this text from the perspective of editorial unreliability clearly demonstrates the influence of Hogg on Branwell Brontë.

James Hogg is renowned for having been manipulated by the editors and periodicals of the early nineteenth century. Indeed, Regina B. Oost asserts that ‘Hogg’s sense that the publishers were combined in a body against him dogged him his entire life’. Through highlighting the ‘combined’ editorial ‘body’, Oost
evokes the ‘combined’ ‘body’ of demonic characters within the *Confessions*, who effectively haunt Robert Wringhim until his final suicidal destruction, and thereafter. Oost reinforces her argument by stating that although the novel concerns ‘Robert Wringhim and the abuses of religion, it is also about James Hogg and the abuses of authorship’. It is this concept of uncertainty between ‘authorship’ and ‘editorship’ which crafts the direction of the Alexander Percy texts. Branwell’s ambition to become a professional writer is highlighted by his final letter to *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, instigated by the death of Hogg in 1835. The conclusion to this assertive letter is the statement: ‘you have lost an able writer in James Hogg and God grant you may gain one in [...] Patrick Branwell Brontë’. Branwell’s desire to inhabit the authorial position of James Hogg is not only portrayed through his creative adaptations, but goes so far as desiring to physically occupy the space, crucially within the *Blackwood’s* editorial sphere, which Hogg had left vacant. *Blackwood’s* would not ‘gain’ another Hogg, but certainly Branwell would attempt to be the ‘assumed persona’ of the *Blackwood’s* contributor through his ‘voluminous early manuscripts’ which are specifically ‘derived from his role as a reader’ of the periodical.

In order to explore these connections in more detail, this chapter will compare Hogg’s *Confessions* with Branwell’s short story ‘The Life of Field Marshal the Right Honorable Alexander Percy, Earl of Northangerland, Lord Viscount Elrington, Lord Lieutenant of Northangerland, Premier of Angria, Major General of the Verdopolitan Service’ (1836). This critical case-study will closely critique the relationship between Hogg’s exploration of the literary marketplace and the periodical industry, and the active response which Branwell produces through his creation of a parallel, imagined, and colonial publishing industry. Certainly, Karen Fang argues that the *Confessions* ‘alludes to Hogg’s experience of the upper classes as well as ‘an over-reliance of publishers on literary advisers’. Cited in *The Edinburgh Companion to James Hogg*, p.26.

61 Ibid., p.87.
participating in commercial print culture’.\textsuperscript{64} Fang usefully highlights that Hogg uses the \textit{Confessions} as a means to depict his own experience of being manipulated through ‘participating in commercial print culture’. In Branwell’s short story, this idea is transposed onto his imagined literary community and the specific ways in which he constructs and defines the roles allocated to the key players in the publishing industry. Branwell therefore not only attempts to insert himself within the literary marketplace by emulating Hogg, but tries to assert his individual power by becoming his own manifestation of Hogg within this imagined colonial community. In this way, we are able to observe how Branwell received and digested the parameters of the early nineteenth-century literary marketplace, through re-evaluating the way he puts them into practice.

Robert G. Collins, in his introduction to \textit{The Hand of the Arch-Sinner: Two Angrian Chronicles of Branwell Brontë} (1993), states that through reading the \textit{Confessions}, Branwell and his sisters were vividly shown how the devil could overcome the boundaries distinguished between the body and the soul. It is the idea ‘that Satan could usurp one’s body and thus carry out any excess, any evil, of which the soul of the self could be supposedly innocent’ which reinforces the Romantic thought which debated the relationship between the body and the soul.\textsuperscript{65} Throughout the Brontës’ juvenilia there is a focus on the permeability of the human body and an individual’s spiritual autonomy: They question who exactly can possess the body? Who is able to manipulate and alter the soul? Collins’ argument uses this perspective of demonic invasion as a way of exploring Alexander Percy’s development into ‘the arch-sinner’. Percy is simultaneously a child who is corrupted, through being ‘fostered’ into the company of semi-demonic characters, whilst also becoming self-consciously possessed. For example, in one of Alexander Percy’s personal letters, which Bud purposefully incorporates into the narrative, Percy proclaims that ‘the fiend within [him] drives [him] over all such feeble barriers and tramples upon [them]’.\textsuperscript{66}


\textsuperscript{66} Patrick Branwell Brontë, ‘The Life of Field Marshal the Right Honorable Alexander Percy [etc]’, in \textit{The Hand of the Arch-Sinner: Two Angrian Chronicles of Branwell Brontë}, p.56.
statement reinforces Branwell’s perception of the ‘fiend within’ who is separate from Percy’s bodily existence. Through exploring this concept, Branwell signifies to his hypothetical reader the distinction between Percy’s private identity, which Bud is forcefully exposing, and his all-encompassing public reputation, as the tyrannical demagogue. This is demonstrated by Percy’s inability to be constrained by societal rules, and instead ‘tramples’ over the ‘feeble barriers’ which both society, and religion, have dictated to him. 67

However, it is Branwell’s distinction between the ‘fiend within’ and the outside world which responds to Hogg’s questions: in what ways can the identity of an individual be divided? And how can its presentation to the public become affected by the different social and cultural perceptions created by the editorial bodies? It is crucial to consider these questions not just from the perspective of the sinner-devil coalescence, but by examining these concepts through the written mediums with which they are presented. Ian Duncan argues that through the space of ‘the Romantic-era novel’, the process of writing undergoes a ‘naturalization’ which presents the production of texts as ‘an organic extension or function of human life’. 68 This perspective of writing establishes a platform for us to question the ‘fiend within’ as a response to the issues of literary production; a physical manifestation of the tension between private and public identity. Although Hogg, and ultimately Branwell, explores this relationship between the internal and external embodiment of the ‘fiend within’ as a form of psychological expression, it may be more relevantly applied to the relationship between author and editor. If Duncan is indeed correct in asserting that writing became an ‘extension’ of ‘life’, as almost an additional limb to the ‘human’ body during the establishment of the ‘Romantic-era novel’, then Hogg, and

67 The later exploration of the ‘fiend within’ who - quite literally - ‘tramples’ over ‘barriers’ is depicted in Robert Louis Stevenson’s, Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. The first descriptions of Mr Hyde are produced by the collision between himself and a young girl. The spectator narrates that Hyde ‘trampled calmly over the child’s body and left her screaming on the ground’ not ‘like a man’ but like ‘some damned Juggernaut’. This allusion physically depicts the ‘fiend within’ the outwardly civilized man, vividly and brutally ‘tram[ling]’ over an image of societal innocence. The late nineteenth century text, which is further suggested to be a re-working of Hogg’s Confessions, highlights the scientific developments which aided in the shaping of nineteenth century thought on the psychological multiplicity within the human body. Branwell’s tale can thus be used as a bridge between the early nineteenth conception of demonic possession, asserted by Hogg, and the later, modern developments of internal psychological division, explored by Stevenson. Robert Louis Stevenson, The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde and Other Tales of Terror, ed. Robert Mighall (London & New York: Penguin, 2002), p.7.
consequently Branwell, are evaluating the extent of the control over the authorial body when it is publicly subjected to the power of the editorial ‘fiends’. These ‘fiends[s] within’ the authorial body symbolically represent the possession of the writing by the editors, and therefore their ability to ‘drive’ the text/body ‘over all’ the ‘barriers’ which have been constructed between the individual identity of the author, and his consumption by the general reading public.

By the time Hogg had started work on the *Confessions*, Blackwood’s had thoroughly established its claim on Hogg’s public persona, ‘the Ettrick Shepherd’.\(^{69}\) A variety of Blackwood’s contributors, alongside the editors themselves, freely appropriated Hogg’s signature to sign their, often mocking, works. This manifestation of Hogg as ‘the Ettrick Shepherd’ inherently invokes the parameters of the rural, working class poet.\(^{70}\) The mockery of such works included the exaggerated use of the scots language applied throughout the *Noctes* series, as well as forming works which grotesquely parodied Hogg’s supposedly uneducated and uncivilised characteristics. The editors completely dismissed the conditions which Hogg had tried to establish to retain some form of authority over his identity.\(^{71}\) In a letter to William Blackwood on the 20\(^{th}\) of November 1820, Hogg addresses him in language evocative of Robert Wringhim in the *Confessions* at the climactic moments where he realises that Gil-Martin has become the torment, rather than saviour, of his life. In reference to Blackwood’s ‘intermeddle’ in his ‘bargains’ with other publishers, Hogg declares that ‘I am almost ruing the day that I ever saw you’.\(^{72}\) Hogg’s repeated use of ‘intermeddle’ within the letter, demonstrates Blackwood’s ‘inter’ relationship with Hogg and the manifestations of himself within his work.

---

\(^{69}\) Peter Garside (ed.), states that ‘[l]ittle direct information relating to the composition of *Confessions* is now available, though most probably it was written and printed between Autumn 1823 and Spring 1824’. This is further evidenced by the publication of ‘A Scots Mummy’ in *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* in August 1823. ‘Introduction’, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, p.liv.

\(^{70}\) For further information on the editors’ attempts to restrict Hogg and his works through the implementation of class specific language see, chapter one: ‘James Hogg and the Early Nineteenth-Century Literary Marketplace’. Cf. p.22-24.

\(^{71}\) The conditions which Hogg refers to are highlighted by his letter to William Blackwood written on the 19\(^{th}\)/20\(^{th}\) of August 1821. He implores that Blackwood should ‘recollect that I have a written promise from you most absolutely given that my name should never once be mentioned nor alluded to in your work without my own consent’. This sentence illustrates Hogg’s contractual relationship with Blackwood being purposefully ignored and - quite literally - over-written. The letter is cited in *The Collected Letters of James Hogg Volume 2, 1820-1831*, ed. Gillian Hughes (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006) p.105.

\(^{72}\) Ibid., p.59-60.
Hogg attempts to reclaim his authorial autonomy through these other ‘bargains’ within the vast publishing industry, Blackwood becomes overly possessive and allows articles which slander Hogg’s name to be published.\(^{73}\) Blackwood’s possessive nature over Hogg’s public identity is depicted through Hogg’s frustrated comment that ‘[i]f it is a maxim with the trade to monopolise every authors [sic.] whole works whom they once befriend’ then the publishers ‘ought all to be damned to hell’.\(^{74}\) This direct connection between the editor’s ability to possess the name and identity of the author, and the editorial policy which Blackwood was attempting to implement as a monopoly over individuals, reinforces the portrayal of editorial transgressive behaviour as demonic possessive behaviour.

Branwell explores this symbolic relationship between editorial behaviour and demonic possession through the allusions Bud makes towards the procurement of his physical, primary resources. Bud states that he ‘possess[es] at hand a great variety of papers and manuscripts’ written by Percy ‘which no other person even knows of’, and more specifically that they ‘were not obtained from’ Percy directly.\(^{75}\) By using the word ‘possess’, Branwell immediately evokes the parallel between editorial possession, through his ‘obtain[ing]’ of the ‘papers and manuscripts’, alongside the concept of demonic possession. Through his possession of these private ‘manuscripts’, Bud overtly declares his power over Percy’s identity, and by extension, the perception of Percy’s external persona: his body. He asserts his physical control over the body of the text, and consequently Percy’s text as a body, by stating that ‘no other person’ has seen this part of him before. This language collectively suggests that Bud is forcefully penetrating beneath Percy’s exterior, beneath the metaphorical clothing which makes up his identity, and fully exposes his private bodily identity. However,

\(^{73}\) One such example is portrayed in the review of Hogg’s work, *The Three Perils of Woman: Love, Leasing and Jealousy* (1823), by the anonymous reviewer and editor, John Wilson. This review, amongst others, reinforces Hogg’s public identity as the naturally ‘coarse’ and ‘unmannerly’ shepherd. It is by the framing of this figure, especially in referencing the ‘Ambrose’ Tavern depicted in the fictionalized *Noctes* series, which emphasises Hogg’s public, but fictional identity. He is overtly characterised as the unrefined and almost beastly working-class ‘shepherd’, which is contrasted by the mocking image of the ‘fine gentleman’ that Wilson sarcastically remarks he ‘would fain to be’. John Wilson, ‘Hogg’s Three Perils of Woman’, *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, 14 (1823), pp.427-437, *British Periodicals*, <http://ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/6517361?accountid=14540>, [accessed 31 March 2017].


Bud covertly reveals that it is not just the possession of Percy’s body, his physical movements and identity, which he has the power to convey, but the ability to ‘possess’ his mind. The ‘papers and manuscripts’ of Alexander Percy are used by Bud as an access point to his private thoughts, and accordingly his internal psychological state. By ‘possess[ing]’ the ‘manuscripts’, Bud ultimately ‘possess[es]’ the power to determine how Percy’s personal identity will be constructed for the consumption of the public. Therefore, it is not only the power to ‘possess’ both Percy’s external and internal spaces, but furthermore his ability to re-construct and manipulate these aspects which reinforces Branwell’s perceptions of the editor as the over-arching demonic figure. Indeed, Branwell unknowingly mimics the treatment of Hogg by the Blackwood’s editors, not only by imitating Hogg’s exploration of editorial power as demonic possessive behaviour, but through replicating the broader devils, the participation of the audience. Bud states that ‘no other person’ but himself ‘knows’ of the existence of the personal ‘papers and manuscripts’. In this way, Bud invites the reader to participate in the possession of Percy, through reading both his bodily and mental identities. He uses his power over Percy’s narrative as a way to further increase his power over the public; he creates an exclusive space, seemingly only able to be accessed by the reader through the meta-textual figure of the editor. By controlling the ways in which the readers can access the public and private identities of Percy, Bud subtly presents himself as the ‘arch’ devil as a counterpart with Percy’s ‘arch-sinner’.

Hogg’s framing editor originally embodies this devil-inspired editor, not just by his ‘obtain[ing]’ of the sinner’s manuscripts through the grotesque grave excavation, or perhaps even grave robbery, but further through his manipulation of the content of the text itself. The editor asserts his authority over the sinner, and ultimately the reader, through subtly crafting the lens within which the manuscript will be read. He argues that the manuscript ‘corresponds so minutely with traditionary facts, that it could scarcely have missed to have been received as authentic’. 76 The editor, through drawing attention to the manuscript’s ambiguity regarding solid ‘facts’, illustrates the central contention between the past and the present; the enlightened and the traditional; and furthermore, the

---

transgressive devil and the entrapped sinner. Indeed, the presentation of the ‘traditionary’ culture of Robert Wringhim’s era is juxtaposed by the editor’s own self-assertions, which are grounded within the post-Enlightenment education of late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century Scotland. The editor subtly alludes to the manuscript’s authenticity yet immediately undermines the statement by proclaiming that ‘in this day, and with the present generation, it will not go down, that a man should be daily tempted by the devil, in the semblance of a fellow-creature’. Oost asserts that the editor ‘does not insist upon his own particular version of truth, but collects for the reader’s consideration a range of anecdotes and opinions’. However, the editor’s assertion of the authority of the ‘present generation’, consequently validates the manipulation of the ‘traditionary’ manuscript. This clearly depicts the editor’s bias and his self-justification of power, not only over the physical manuscript, but over the narrative history which it contains. By eluding both the reader, and the sinner, concerning his position on the text, he is able to move fluidly between the different spheres of literary production: authorship, editorship and audience. By constructing this movement, the editor is able to possess both the author’s intent, exemplified by the manuscript itself, as well as the audience’s perceptions. It is through the justification of the ‘the present generation’ and their views, which means the editor can manipulate the original manuscript, and consequently ‘possess’ the power to produce, and validate, his own narrative.

Branwell responds to the demonic transgressive behaviour of this editorial figure, and the ways in which he simultaneously manipulates the text/author and the audience, through justifying his authority over the Percy narrative. He declares that Percy’s ‘life and character, though he is one of the leading men of Verdopolis, is so uncertainly known to her citizens’ that he ‘deem[s] it the duty of the man who has it to produce the key and to unlock the casket’. Through justifying his exposure of Percy’s ‘life and character’ to the ‘citizens’, Bud

---

79 Regina B. Oost, ‘”False Friends, Squeamish Readers, and Foolish Critics”*: The Subtext of Authorship in Hogg’s Justified Sinner*, p.90.
situates himself as the bridge between the private and the public spheres. Through highlighting the importance of the public in defining the social ‘character’ of Alexander Percy, Branwell subtly alludes back to the importance of the public’s treatment of the various manuscripts within both the *Confessions*, and by association, *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* itself. For example, Robert Morrison and Daniel Sanjir Roberts state that the ‘story’ of *Blackwood’s* ‘is also the story of the emergence of mass-media and the relationship this bore to all the major literary, political, economic, and cultural forces that shaped the era’. The authority which the editors had over the reading public dominated the supposed public power of the writer. The writer therefore becomes reduced to another symbol, which is able to be manipulated for the benefit of the over-arching semiotic system embodied by the *Blackwood’s* editors. They were able to dictate to the writers on what they should, or could, submit whilst channelling select extracts to the public. This method of editorship was able to change the meaning, and overall reception, of a text, and consequently the public opinion of its alleged author. Hogg was regimentally subjected to this process, not only by the ‘caricatural’ appearances of ‘the Ettrick Shepherd’ in the *Noctes* series, but also through the literal appropriation of his name and works. For instance, the controversy surrounding the handling of the ‘Chaldee Manuscript’, originally by Hogg, was re-directed by the editors: John Wilson, John Gibson Lockhart, and William Blackwood himself. Philip Flynn asserts how although ‘Hogg produced the main body of the text’, the editors proceeded to add ‘ever-more grotesque creatures’, and thus drastically increased its provocativeness. It is important to note that Branwell would have read the ‘Chaldee Manuscript’, not knowing that it was originally Hogg’s work that had been appropriated and manipulated by the editors, but had nonetheless ingested the controversial editorial policy which the publication of the manuscript had accordingly validated.

---

82 For further information regarding the treatment of Hogg by the *Blackwood’s* editors see, chapter one: ‘James Hogg and the Early Nineteenth-Century Literary Marketplace’.
Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine was at the forefront of the literary marketplace during the early nineteenth century which ‘promoted the ideal of a national culture based on literary production and aesthetic reception’, developing the values which would be used for the periodical industry in the Victorian age.84 The validation of Blackwood’s procedures is therefore intrinsic to understanding Hogg’s manifestation of this editorial web, as well as Branwell’s subsequent justification of the methods Bud uses in attaining and exposing Percy’s ‘life and character’. One example of how the magazine manipulated the established editorial policy is highlighted by the Blackwood’s editors’ approach to the lawsuits made against them. These lawsuits tried to prevent the openly controversial claims proclaimed by the magazine, regarding the exposure of the private lives of public figures. To retain the level of controversy which interested the public, Blackwood’s set up a fund specifically for the payment of libel suits. Fang remarks how ‘these payments rendered in settlement for arrogated personalities tacitly endorsed the promotion of such controversy as editorial policy’, and accordingly such payments came to be viewed as ‘similar to the salaries and commissions that enable a magazine to retain the work of contributors and staff workers’.85 The editors, through their social, political and economic privilege, were able to override the social etiquette, and by extension the law which foregrounded it. By authorising these types of procedure, the editors of Blackwood’s validated the exposure, and manipulation, of an individual’s identity in the name of public knowledge. Branwell expresses this particular type of editorial procedure through Bud’s remark that it was his ‘duty’ ‘to produce the key and to unlock’ the private life of Percy. The distinction between the public and the private therefore becomes further obscured through the dictation of the editor.

The exploration of the duplicitous editorial policy instigated by Blackwood’s is further examined through Hogg’s evaluation of how his editorial figure constructs an exclusive readership, between himself and his intended audience. The editor, during the conclusion of the opening narrative, states that

---
he has ‘the pleasure of presenting my readers with an original document’. By using the pronoun ‘my’, the editor defines the ‘readers’ as a singular audience who collectively belong to him. In this way, the editor creates a possessive relationship over his audience, and almost without their consent, enforces his power over them through their continuation to read his ‘original document’. By using his control to group the reader and himself together, as the collective audience to the manuscript, he strengthens his identity as the editor, and reinforces the inherent trust and authenticity which is placed upon him by the reader. This is critical in understanding how the editorial figure is conceived as simultaneously an unbiased and completely biased presence within the multi-voiced narrative. Therefore, it is ironic that he goes on to assert that he ‘offer[s] no remarks on’ the document and ‘make[s] as few additions to it, leaving everyone to judge for himself’. This unreliability of the editor’s word is illustrated by the ambiguous language surrounding his own editorial process. Initially, he justifies himself in giving ‘no remarks’ regarding the manuscript, whilst asserting that the text ‘will not go down’ with the ‘present generation’. He reinforces his authoritative position by stating that there is ‘a curse pronounced on’ the document, which declares ‘cursed be he who trieth to alter or amend!’. It has already been stated multiple times that he has made these editorial decisions when ‘presenting’ the document through select ‘additions’. However, the editor repeatedly insists to his ‘readers’ that he has ‘let it stand as it is’. It is this unreliability of the editorial process which Hogg addresses as dangerous. The reading public are persuaded into overlooking the duplicity of the editor, through the all-encompassing power to construct, and re-construct, ‘the major literary, political, economic, and cultural forces’ that ‘shaped’ the ways in which the audience read.

It is therefore even more imperative to consider the ways in which the ‘papers and manuscripts’, of both Hogg’s and Branwell’s texts, are ‘obtained’ and then presented to the public. Indeed, both manuscripts are depicted as corpse-like material which has been locked away, purposefully, from the public.

---

87 Ibid., p.64.
88 Ibid., p.174, and p.165.
89 Ibid., p.174.
(readership). It is through excavating the physical objects, as well as the materials’ contents, which allows Branwell to reinforce the underlying image of the text as a body/corpse, through using the word ‘casket’. The use of the term ‘casket’ incites the gothic language which was popular with the young Brontës, whilst alluding back to a variety of Hogg’s texts depicting burials and excavations.\(^{90}\) The term can apply to ‘a small box or chest’ for valuables, but is most popularly associated with being another phrase for ‘a coffin’.\(^{91}\) Branwell is metaphorically mimicking the excavation of the suicide’s corpse by the framing editor, and using his own power over the ‘manuscripts’ as a way of justifying his exposure of the literary corpse. He further mimics Hogg’s framing editor by asserting that these ‘papers and manuscripts’ which ‘were not obtained’ directly from Percy, were given into his hands as a way to ‘save’ the documents ‘from the eyes of the public’.\(^{92}\) It is through this lens that we can observe the dangerous methods of Bud; his forceful exposure of the ‘papers’ which were supposed to be ‘save[d]’ from ‘public’ judgement evokes the idea that Bud is performing the act of not only an excavation of the corpse, but a form of grave robbing. He lets the ‘eyes of the public’ consume what they shouldn’t have been able to touch, and consequently violates the personal ‘character’ held within the ‘papers and manuscripts’: a violation of the internal ‘life’, the very soul, of Alexander Percy. Meiko O’Halloran suggests, in consideration of the Confessions, that it is through ‘the auspices of print technology’ that ‘a dead man’s writing’ is ‘offered up as a cultural relic’ for the ‘consumption of the literary marketplace’.\(^{93}\) This concept of ‘consumption’ by the ravenous ‘eyes of the public’ illustrates how personal ‘writing’ is offered up as an equivalent for the internal ‘character’, or soul, of the ‘dead’. The editor disregards the ‘curse’, much as Bud disregards the instructions to ‘save’ the ‘manuscripts’ from public judgement, as a way to ‘lay before the public’ the internal soul as an objectified ‘cultural relic’.\(^{94}\)

---

\(^{90}\) For further information regarding the popularity of corpses, burials and excavations in the works of Blackwood’s, see: Sarah Sharp, ‘Digging up the Kirkyard: Death, Readership and Nation in the Writings of the Blackwood’s Group, 1817-1839’, (Unpublished PhD, Edinburgh University, 2016).


\(^{92}\) Patrick Branwell Brontë, The Hand of the Arch-Sinner: Two Angrian Chronicles of Branwell Brontë, p.4


Both Branwell and Hogg participate in this system of ‘consumption’ which is a way of imitating the editorial process within their text. This process is significantly embodied through the physical reactions which Gil-Martin has through reading bodies as texts. His character description is never stable. It is through the fluidity of his body, the instability of his individual character, that Hogg demonstrates how ideas and concepts can be appropriated, ‘altered’, and put back into place. Gil-Martin states that his ability to assume the ‘likeness’ of a character means that he is consequently able to ‘attain the very same ideas’ and the ‘same mode[s] of arranging them’.\textsuperscript{95} One such example of the effects of this editorial process is depicted through Robert Wringhim’s ‘sinful doubting’s [sic.]’ on approaching Arthur’s seat, where he intends to murder his brother.\textsuperscript{96} Gil-Martin has already assumed the physical appearance of Robert, and therefore when Robert’s ‘sinful doubting’s’ begin to make him repent of his actions, he knows just how to arrange the ‘same ideas’ in a way that will convince Robert that the words have the opposite meaning. Robert ‘recited [the] words’ of the angelic messenger to Gil-Martin, which he responds to by stating that Robert ‘had been in a state of sinful doubting at the time, and it was to these doubting’s she had adverted’.\textsuperscript{97} The repetition of the word ‘doubting’ within the same explanatory sentence illustrates Gil-Martin’s ability to use the same word for two opposing purposes. He takes the warning of Robert’s ‘sinful doubting’s’, and through re-reciting the words back to Robert, is able to use his ‘same modes’ of thinking to construct a justification of his ‘sinful’ actions. In this way, we can argue that Gil-Martin physically demonstrates the act of a mirror. Not only does he mirror Robert’s ‘likeness’, but through that very ‘likeness’ he is able to create an inverse image. This inverse image - the reflection in the mirror - creates a physical confusion between the self and the other. Consequently, Gil-Martin is able to convince Robert that by looking at this inverse image of himself, his mirror image, he is actually looking at his own construction of his identity. In this way, Gil-Martin enacts the role of the Blackwood’s editors, who took Hogg’s words and likewise his identity of the celebrated ‘Ettrick Shepherd’, and manifested the inverse image of him as the ‘Ettrick boar’, which the public

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid, p.86.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid. p.108.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., p.110.
so ferociously digested. Therefore, Gil-Martin is able to embody the mass production of the publishing industry as a whole.

Through examining Gil-Martin as an editor we can further see how Branwell responded to the critique of editorship and the literary marketplace. Branwell never addresses Bud’s appearance within the text, however he does repeatedly refer to his ability to consume the words of the Percy household, and thus to expose them to the ‘eyes of the public’. For example, Bud remarks that ‘amid such high company [his] business was rather to hear than speak’ wherewith he ‘employed’ himself ‘chiefly in noting the character of the turbulent spirits who sat before [him]’. His ‘noting’ of these ‘turbulent spirits’ is aligned with the ‘consumption’ process which Gil-Martin uses to acquire information. His position to ‘hear’ rather than to ‘speak’ has enabled him to consume the dialogue within the private space of the Percy household. He is ‘employed’ within the editorial process of ‘noting’ the characters of each ‘spirit’, and therefore consciously acknowledging his intention to process and publish them later on. The process of consuming the dialogue of the distinctly domestic sphere, and particularly with reference to Alexander Percy, means that he is able to alter and amend the events into a narrative which he thinks appropriate for his readership. John Bud, in his introductory section justifying his exposure of Percy’s affairs, which targets his ‘life and [public] character’ questions: ‘[i]s it not vital that we, whose every public action is influenced by the actions of another, should know the tenor of those actions and the source from where they spring?’.

Firstly, by including himself within the collective ‘we’ of the reading ‘public’, Bud is able to be situated simultaneously within the immediate narrative as an active editor, as well as reinforcing his position as a distanced reader. This editorial technique which closes the space between the editor and the audience emphasises the influence that the editor has in determining his own reality, which subsequently becomes the ‘actual reality’ received by the audience. Hogg’s Blackwood’s-styled editor, as previously

---

98 William Blackwood writes to John Murray in September 1814, referring to James Hogg as the ‘Ettrick boar’. A new variation on the ‘Caledonian boar’ reference which will become one of the many degrading nicknames within the Blackwood’s literary company, and throughout the periodical itself. This letter is referenced to in Margaret Oliphant, Annals of a Publishing House: William Blackwood and his Sons, their magazine and friends (Edinburgh: Blackwood’s and sons, 1897), p.34.
100 Ibid., p.3.
argued, uses this technique of connecting the editor and the readership into one body to impose his own views and opinions upon the audience. Branwell’s imitation of this method reinforces the editorial policy which placed the public, or economic value, of the periodical above that of the individual private identity. Therefore, Branwell situates himself in this position of power, held by the creation of John Bud, as a way to inhabit the ‘we’ of the editorial sphere, and not only the ‘we’ of the general reading public. This active implementation of Blackwood’s editorial policy is underlined through Branwell’s creation of Bud as an exaggerated representative of ‘respectable conservatism’. Indeed, it is this high dramatization of mimicking the process which most strongly illustrates Hogg’s influence over Branwell. The narrative has a self-awareness at all times that Bud is both within and without the text, and his statements concerning how he has obtained and exposed the manuscripts without consent further enforce his biased position as editor. This statement, which attempts to amalgamate the editor and the audience, ultimately and purposefully fails.

The dichotomy within the editorial figures emphasises their ambiguous social and physical positioning within the texts. The unstable place of the editor’s body is explored through the relationship which Bud and Gil-Martin have with their subject matter, or human-texts: Alexander and Robert. Bud, like Gil-Martin, is used as a bridge between the private and public realm, and in so doing is able to justify exposing the personal, ‘actions’ of Alexander Percy. Bud possesses Gil-Martin’s characteristic of being included within the public, judgemental body, as well as being internally included in the personal sphere. In the same way in which Gil-Martin physically reads Robert, whilst being the key corrupting factor in his mental and social downfall, Bud inhabits the space outside the narrative as editor whilst also recounting his former self’s interactions with the Percy household private sphere by being ‘employed’ as tutor. This double positioning creates a fluctuating power dynamic, whereby the texts must contain both the editorial powers of Gil-Martin and Bud, and their over-arching power to alter and amend, whilst also recognising their lack of authority in the present domain through being social and physical outsiders. Branwell interprets this power dynamic through the portrayal of Bud’s experience as the obsessive observer of the aristocratic family, and the ways in which he is both incorporated, yet still ultimately refused entry into the inner
circle of this corrupt domestic space. For instance, Bud states that his ‘interest in [the] fate’ of Alexander Percy and his family is kept constantly under his ‘gaze’. However, he refuses to participate in the private dialogue, and assumes to merely be the editor of the events which are to come. Through this process he demonstrates his almost voyeuristic presence throughout the text. By situating himself outside the company, he becomes the bridge between the external world of the ‘public’ and the private, domesticated sphere of the Percy household.

This emphasis on the societal fluidity of the editor figures and their ability to transition between the public and private spheres is representative of Gil-Martin’s editorial performance through possessing an individual’s ‘ideas’, and consequently attaining control over the bodily ‘likeness’. Alasdair Thanisch and Peter Thanisch assert that the ‘role we assign to Gil-Martin is more that of the external diabolical influencer than that of a mere manifestation of Robert’s darker self’. However, he simultaneously enacts both of these characters; the ‘external’ editorial machine which manipulates the body as text to be ‘[laid] before the public’, as well as the ‘manifestation of Robert’s darker self’ through assuming the ‘likeness’ of his ‘ideas’. It is this ability to transition between, as well as hold a space within, both spheres of the external and the internal which likewise determines Bud’s position as a counterpart editor to Percy’s works whilst also being the ‘employed’, and therefore lower-class tutor who Percy openly despises in his youth. The importance of this simultaneous, and transgressive, existence reinforces both Hogg and Branwell re-creating, and thus exposing, the corrupt validation of the Blackwoodian editorial policy. Through the creation of Gil-Martin, and likewise the characteristics of John Bud, the authors use their power to fashion a physical embodiment of the editorial system, and thus although both characters are depicted as individual bodies, their presence is further extended into the meta-physical realm of the texts.

Fang argues that ‘Hogg’s affiliation with the collective organ of the magazine also sponsored an anonymity that absolved him of personal

101 Ibid., p.75.
accountability for the legal suits levelled against Blackwood’s’. Fang’s argument intends to highlight the positive aspects of Hogg’s submersion in the Blackwood’s editorial system. Initially, she appears to merely align this ‘anonymity’ within the magazine, particularly in reference to the ‘Chaldee Manuscript’, with the constructive prospect of retaining his relatively respectable public image, whilst also enabling an economic loop-hole through the magazine covertly dealing with any claims made against him. However, Fang not only endorses the public and economic restriction which this imposes on Hogg through being within the ‘collective organ’ but further validates the freely used, possessive power which Blackwood’s subsequently had over Hogg’s sense of the self. In this way, Branwell interprets Hogg’s disjuncture between the editor and the author as the conflict between two independent power structures, each one striving to encompass the other. Bud, as editor, is in direct conflict with both the youthful image, and then the public formation, of Alexander Percy. Bud subtly references his own dictation of this private to public conception through highlighting that ‘[n]ot a line, save of a political character, that ever dropped from his pen did the Earl ever of his own consent cause to transpire’. It is important to note here that Bud highlights Percy’s ‘pen’ as constructing his own public image, apparently in the shape of the ‘political character’ which he has defined himself. This is therefore reinforcing the concept that the writing of a text, and specifically the use of these texts in circulation within the ‘collective organ’ of the public, determines how far an author and an editor can strive for power over an individual’s identity. Indeed, Bud emphasises the lack of ‘consent’ in which he has authority over Percy’s manuscript, and ultimately his identity. He instead establishes his own identity as the all-encompassing, trustworthy and authoritative editor, who publicly appears to sacrifice his own sense of autonomy in favour of providing private information for the judgement of ‘the eyes of the public’.

It is thus the power invested in the ‘eyes of the public’ which determines how far the positions of both author and editor can be constructed. The author may write for an imagined, collective audience, and likewise an editor may

---

manipulate the structure and perceptions of this collective public space, but it is the managed response of the readership which empowers these specific structures of the literary marketplace. Therefore, the relationship between authorship and editorship, and particularly the ways in which these concepts are explored, manipulated and re-established by Hogg and Branwell, is what ultimately emphasises the importance of the reader. It is the investment in these critical, ravenous ‘eyes’ of the ‘public’ and their apparent ability to continually consume and divulge the exposed contents of the corpse-like texts which result in the manufacturing of new bodies of material. It is then imperative to re-assert that Branwell was only able to publicly occupy the position of the reader, and was never able to integrate himself into the higher sphere of editorial power which he continually aspired to through his prose works. Indeed, to return to Branwell’s declaration to the Blackwood’s editors that ‘God grant you may gain [another writer] in [...] Patrick Branwell Brontë’, one can observe that he singularly relies on the image of a heaven-sent writerly successor. He attempts to occupy the ‘lost’-Hoggian space through re-visioning himself as the next in line to Hogg’s seat of literary power. However, he cannot succeed precisely because of his position as the reader. Branwell, through imitating the literary methods which Hogg uses to explore the authorial and editorial positions, attempts to appropriate them for his own, individual use. We can perceive the direct transposition of the editorial influence of Hogg’s Enlightenment editor, and the editorial-like presence of Gil-Martin, directly reconfigured in Branwell’s manifestation of John Bud. Yet by agreeing to these exact terms of authorship and editorship which Hogg re-imagined for himself, Branwell consequently cannot imagine, or even has the capacity to dictate, his own individual authorial/editorial persona. This finally confines Branwell to his imagined, colonial community version of the early nineteenth-century publishing industry. He can re-enact Hogg’s editorial power, but cannot physically claim the rights to the real space left behind. The influence of James Hogg on Branwell Brontë’s prose works and creative education is substantial, however, it is the restrictiveness of duplicating Hogg’s exact principles which aids in limiting Branwell to his readerly persona, rather than encouraging his own authorial autonomy. Therefore, it is critical to further understand the ways in which the Brontës responded to Hogg’s literary techniques, and critiques, whilst simultaneously embodying it within their own subjective explorations of
authorship. Charlotte Brontë was likewise influenced by Hogg’s works, but in what ways was Charlotte able to develop beyond the initial reaction to Hogg’s principles, and consequently become integrated within the nineteenth-century literary marketplace?
Chapter Three: Charlotte Brontë and James Hogg’s Later Periodical Works

‘he will know there-by that there is one person at least in Verdopolis thoroughly acquainted with all the depths, false or true, of his double-dealing, hypocritical, close, dark, secret, half-insane character.’

Charlotte Brontë, as the eldest surviving child of the household, was arguably the most influential in directing the production of the early literary creations. One example is the quintessential anecdote of the Brontë siblings and their characterizations of a set of toy soldiers, which has come to epitomize the myth of the isolated child geniuses. The tableau of the four Brontë children claiming and then bringing to life each of their soldiers is established as the first critical step in the later creations of their more mature writings. More importantly, it is the narrative of this particular event which initially establishes how Charlotte took the lead in crafting the directions of the literary creations. By situating Charlotte within this context of leadership, we can re-consider her youthful relationships with the works of James Hogg, and the importance of Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine to her own literary creations, both juvenile and published. To better understand the impact the writings of Hogg and Blackwood’s had on the Brontës, we must first return to, and re-consider, the collaborative relationship that Charlotte and Branwell had with one another.

As Robin St John Conover remarks, ‘[a]cquainting oneself solely with one side of a collaborative partnership hinders even the best scholarship about the nature of collaborative partnership hinders even the best scholarship about the nature of
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106 The story of the toy soldiers is a foundational stone in the large body of academic scholarship surrounding the Brontës. The original narrative is written by Charlotte herself on the 12th March 1829, named ‘The History of the Year’. She dictates that ‘papa bought Branwell some soldiers at Leeds’ and enthusiastically recalls how she ‘jumped out of Bed’ and ‘snat[c]hed up one and exclaimed this is the Duke of Wellington it shall be mine!!’. Charlotte Brontë, in The Brontës: A Life in Letters, p.12. For a fuller account of the significance of this story for the Brontës and their literary education, see Juliet Barker, The Brontës, pp.179-182.
107 Although Emily and Anne both had key roles in establishing the early juvenile, imagined world; it was the competitive and collaborative writerly relationship between Charlotte and Branwell which turned the childish imaginary worlds into an established and structured imitation of the literary marketplace. For example, Branwell physically creates miniature versions of Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine, and mimics the articles from a variety of real volumes. Charlotte aids in the creation and conceptualization of these miniature periodicals within their imaginary marketplace, whilst they also take turns playing the role of the omniscient and sarcastic editor.
that alliance and its inherent dynamics’. It is the ‘inherent dynamics’ of their competitive literary relationship which gave birth to the multi-faceted and multi-dimensional re-interpretations of Hogg’s works. The creative ‘alliance’ with Branwell in this shared, imagined literary marketplace, meant that the siblings were able to create a dialogue in which to actively debate and mimic the ideas and opinions displayed in Blackwood’s. More importantly, these ideas are conceptualized within the parallel - and competing - characters of the microcosmic community: Branwell’s revolutionary demagogue, Alexander Percy, otherwise referred to as Northangerland, versus Charlotte’s own anti-protagonist, Arthur Wellesley, who eventually becomes the infamous figurehead of the juvenilia: The Duke of Zamorna. It is essential to understand these two characters as central to the evolving identities of the two young writers, whereby Branwell will come to use the pseudonym ‘Northangerland’ to publish his poetry, and Charlotte will attempt to grasp the male voice of Zamorna, portrayed most starkly by Mr. Rochester in Jane Eyre (1847). Moreover, Conover claims that both characters ‘operate as one another’s doppelgänger, illustrating obverse routes to the same increasingly demonic end’. It is this ‘obverse’ route that addresses my exploration of the ‘demonic’, that enables further examination of the influence that James Hogg had over the Brontë canon.

As we have observed in the previous chapter, Branwell reactively imitated Hogg’s critique of the authorial-editorial relationship, and the importance of the all-consuming ‘eyes of the public’. The exploration of this editorial unreliability, emphasized by the evolving parameters of the early nineteenth-century publishing press, aligned editorial possession with ‘demonic’ possession. Through Branwell’s response to the Confessions, one can observe the idea of the editorial

---

109 During his lifetime, Branwell published a total of thirteen poems within the Halifax Guardian. All but two of these poems were signed with his alter-egos title, as pseudonym: ‘Northangerland’. Information cited from Juliet Barker, The Brontës, p.436-437. Moreover, Charlotte is known to have substituted her male narrative voice to gain success with Jane Eyre by garnering the female first-person- and more intimate and insightful- narrative mode. However, it is still apparent that she does not relinquish her early narrative voice, and instead situates the third-person overly-aggressive rhetorical speech within the Byronic anti-hero, Mr. Rochester. It is the development, or rather the reversion, to the male dominated voice in Shirley which singles out her use of the literary double.
‘fiend within’ as a reaction to the textual manipulation of the individual (and ultimately, authorial) bodies. Conversely, Charlotte’s examination of the ‘demonic’ publishing framework moves from focusing on this internal subjectivity to a more concrete and physical exploration. It is through a physically divisive method that Charlotte attempts to express the concerns surrounding the authorial-editorial relationship, portrayed through her depiction of the double. This literary concept of the double is most commonly associated with Hogg’s Confessions, illustrated by the broad range of scholarship focusing upon Barker’s ‘symbiotic relationship’ between Robert Wringhim and the ‘demonic’, metamorphic Gil-Martin. Likewise, a variety of scholars have noted the novel’s allusions to Hogg’s own editorial/‘demonic’ doubling experiences within the Blackwoodian sphere. However, it has never been acknowledged that Hogg’s conceptualization of the double is developed more fully, and more frequently, during his later periodical contributions.

Thomas C. Richardson has highlighted that Hogg’s most successful and frequent years of prose submission to Blackwood’s - and also eventually to Fraser’s Magazine - was during the period of 1829-1831. It is imperative to consider that a higher volume of contributions to the magazine must have consequently resulted in a more frequent engagement with the mechanism of the editorial and publishing industries. This is reinforced by the knowledge that at the end of this highly successful period in 1831, the professional - and ultimately personal - relationship broke down between James Hogg and William

---

111 A number of critical articles to understanding the Confessions is centred on this depiction of the double and its relevance to the novel: Scottish literary studies; Scottish identity studies; the gothic; and romanticism. Some key examples include: Magdalene Redekop, ‘Beyond Closure: Buried Alive with Hogg’s Justified Sinner’, ELH, 52 (1985), pp.159-184, and Scott Brewster, ‘Borderline experience: madness, mimicry and Scottish gothic’, Gothic Studies, 7 (2005), pp.79-86.

112 As noted within the previous chapter, this argument is reinforced by Regina B. Oost’s claim that the novel is also about the ‘abuse of authorship’ (p. 87), which is reviewed alongside Karen Fang’s assertion that The Private Memoirs alludes to Hogg’s experience with Blackwood’s Magazine by depicting the compromises an author makes by participating in commercial print culture’ (p. 171).

113 Thomas C. Richardson, ‘introduction’, James Hogg: Contributions to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine vol.2, 1829-1835, p. xi-xii. By reading, and comparing, Richardson’s two volumes of Contributions by Hogg, I have found that within the first volume, 3 out of the 58 included contributions were concerned with an aspect of the double or doppelgänger, in contrast to the second volume which contained 10 examples out of the total 37 contributions. Moreover, the publication of The Shepherd’s Calendar by Blackwood’s in 1829 included key stories such as ‘Mary Burnet’, ‘The Laird of Cassaway’ and ‘Mr Adamson of Laverhope’, which were all directly concerned with characters being – or distinctly interacting with the idea of – the double.
Blackwood.\textsuperscript{114} The higher volume of published contributions, the resulting disintegration of the editorial and personal relationship, and the increasing presence of the double within Hogg’s published works, is no coincidence. It is the later, more varied and intensive, developments of Hogg’s literary double that are consequently re-examined via Charlotte’s juvenilia, and eventually culminates in her published novels. Two popular contributions of the period to Hogg’s oeuvre were ‘Some Remarkable Passages in the Remarkable Life of the Baron St. Gio’ (1830) and ‘The Strange Letter of a Lunatic’ (1830).\textsuperscript{115} These two texts exemplify both the overt as well as covert writings of the double, which are crucial in understanding the large body of material; the key factors which contribute to Hogg’s understanding of how the figure is physically embodied and psychologically expressed. These two stories are foundational texts to Charlotte’s implementation of the double in her juvenile experimentations. This principle is primarily illustrated by Charlotte’s explorations within ‘The Spell, an extravaganza’ (1834). Moreover, we can then briefly observe how these juvenile explorations came to fruition in her published work: Shirley (1849).\textsuperscript{116}

Hogg’s manifestations of the double, like the initial comprehensive exploration of the figure depicted in the Confessions, still relies upon the idea of the unreliability of the authorial-editorial relationship. However, Hogg’s later periodical submissions focus upon a wider spectrum of ideas to characterize this figure, creating a more dynamic response to the ways in which editorial control tries to penetrate the authorial body-conscience. It is therefore the distinctly

\textsuperscript{114} The final breakdown of both the professional and personal relationship is most prominently illustrated within Hogg’s letter to Blackwood of the 6\textsuperscript{th} of December 1831. He asserts, ‘I request that this end of all literary connection may not interfere with our personal regard for each other but with regard to the other [publishing] the oath is sworn which shall never be broken’. Cited from The Collected Letters of James Hogg Volume 2, 1820-1831, p.470.

\textsuperscript{115} James Hogg, ‘Some Remarkable Passages in the Remarkable Life of the Baron St. Gio’, James Hogg: Contributions to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine vol. 2, 1829-1835, pp.90-112. James Hogg, ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’, Fraser’s Magazine, 2 (1830), <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/docview/2616751/fulltextPDF/FC0EA48814FD4859PQ/7?accountid=14540> [accessed 26 April 2017]. D. M. Moir’s ‘rare enthusiasm’ expressed in his feedback to Blackwood concerning the proposal for publication of ‘Baron St. Gio’ stated that ‘I have just finished the perusal of Hogg’s tale which is one of the strangest and most striking he has ever written. [...] Certainly there are many absurdities and improbabilities in it, but the force of the narrative makes us swallow these, without any particular wryness of mouth, - and as a whole it will be read with almost as much interest as any thing Hogg has ever written.’, cited from Thomas C. Richardson, ‘Introduction’, James Hogg: Contributions to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine vol. 2, 1829-1835, p. xix.

authorial exploration of the double which attempts to separate itself, and thus undermine, this editorial power. Hogg uses this markedly physical separation to not simply divide, but to literally categorize the separate aspects of the personal and authorial persona, from the version which is forcefully deposited by the editors. Hogg’s construction of the double is reinforced by defining the current arguments surrounding the literary double. The central concept of ‘duality’ is explored through an examination of Karl Miller’s inclusive study: *Doubles: Studies in Literary History* (2008). Miller initially summarizes that the term ‘duality’ in its basic form ‘means that there are two of something, and which has also meant that some one thing or person is to be perceived as two’.\(^\text{117}\) This definition aligns with the argument of the double as a physical separation of ‘one thing’ into ‘two’ as a way of categorizing - and subsequently holding power over - the ways in which each separate body is interpreted. It is then crucial to note that it is the perception of ‘one thing’ as simultaneously ‘one’ and ‘two’ by the collective audience which allows for the double to be fully embodied. It does not specify that the literary double, so commonly misinterpreted as simply an aesthetic duplicate is only to be recognized through this two-dimensional bodily state. Certainly, its manifestation is emphasized by the bodily duplication, and the uncanny effect which this has upon a reader. However, the physical duplication is arguably only an external signifier used to amplify the broader social, psychological, metaphorical and metaphysical issues which are being re-examined through the familiarity of this trope. This is further facilitated by Miller’s more complex explanation that the ‘component parts’ of duality ‘may complete, resemble or repel one another. Such parts are partners, or enemies. But in most circumstances, whether of conflict or accord, part and counterpart are both perceived to be true’.\(^\text{118}\) Although the ‘parts’ of this body, which is simultaneously ‘one’ and ‘two’, can both ‘repel’ or ‘accord’ with one another, they are nonetheless ‘component[s]’ to the over-arching singular narrative. Miller argues that these ‘part and counterpart[s]’ are ‘perceived as true’ yet the ‘intrusive self’ - the ‘intrusive’ figure of the double - is perceived as ‘false’.\(^\text{119}\) Hogg’s idea of the double gives weight to this assertion, whereby the ‘intrusive self’, or the ‘fiend within’ which has been externalized, is the ‘false’

\(^{\text{118}}\) Ibid., p.21.
\(^{\text{119}}\) Ibid., p.21.
characterisation of the authorial body. The texts analysed in this chapter, however, illustrate that this ‘intrusive self’ should be substituted for the idea of the extrusive ‘self’. It is not the ‘intrusive’-ness of the ‘fiend within’ which Hogg’s later periodicals and Charlotte’s works focuses upon, but the ways in which this ‘intrusive’ force can be re-evaluated through a physical, and forceful, extrusion of the ‘self’ through the body(ies).

The extrusive self, in its more explicit form, is portrayed through Hogg’s ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’. The doubles conception is physically distinguished by the stereotypical form of the mirror-image. Mr. James Beatman, after taking some tobacco from ‘a strange looking figure of an old man’, becomes hallucinatory and begins to perceive a ‘body’ - his ‘own likeness’ - ‘peering’ out from the ‘shady place in the rock’ whilst walking through Edinburgh. However, it is the protagonist’s repetitive rhetoric outburst which ultimately embody the contention between the ‘intrusive’ and extrusive self. He sways between claiming he is the right James Beatman’ to questioning his very name and being: ‘for I am either become two people, else I am not the right James Beatman’. Hogg’s critique establishes that there must be a ‘right’ and correct form of the ‘self’, in opposition to a presumably false, imitative version. The ‘self’ is vocally established through the assertion of his full name: ‘James Beatman’. By drawing attention to the naming of the ‘self’ and the other, Hogg is highlighting the ambiguity between the naming of the personal self, and the public self: ‘James Beatman’ is simultaneously the individual, asserting his own ‘right’ and status, as well as the public interpretation of ‘James Beatman’, which is perceived through the other character’s reactions of the ‘two’-ness of the seemingly ‘one’ person. Hogg is therefore categorizing the ‘right’ body from the imposter body, and locating the anxiety of the ‘right’ of personal and public ownership of identity, through literally questioning the name itself.

120 The Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘extrusive’ as the adjectival form of ‘extrude’. The full definition for ‘extrude’, as a verb: ‘To thrust (a person) out or forth; to urge or force out; to expel’. It is specifically this idea of ‘expelling’ the editorial presence, which creates Hogg – and Charlotte’s – manifestations of the physical double. Oxford English Dictionary, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/67201?redirectedFrom=extrude#eid> [accessed 20 May 2017].
121 James Hogg, ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’, p. 526. Hogg uses this same phrase of his ‘own likeness’ as a subtle allusion to the Confessions, whereby Robert and Gil-Martin explicitly discuss Gil-Martin’s obvious talent for appearing in any one person’s ‘own likeness’.
122 Ibid., p.526-527.
It is the inclusion of the phrase ‘I am either become two people’ in opposition to the following ‘or I am not the right James Beatman’ which amplifies this concept of the extrusive ‘self’, with the critique of forming both a personal and public identity. In Hogg’s *Confessions*, Robert Wringhim also claims that he feels as if he has become ‘two persons’ yet neither one of them is himself. This is the disembodiment of the self, and the more traditional perspective of the ‘intrusive self’ taking parasitic control over the authorial body. In this case study of ‘the right James Beatman’, Hogg underscores the character’s self-assurance at his own identity, whilst also highlighting there could be another version of the ‘self’/identity. Therefore, he is never in any doubt that his self does not exist, but merely that it has been transformed externally, by forces outside of his own individual control. By highlighting the ‘two people’ as being ‘one’ clear and structured identity, exemplified through the solidity of the individual and public name, Hogg undercuts the editorial parasites - or ‘demonic’ possessive behaviour - in favour of attempting to define the authorial self from the editorial self. This notion creates a parallel with Hogg’s increasing popularity, and the increasingly obnoxious treatment which he was dealt at the hands of the Blackwood’s editors. A parallel can be drawn with Hogg’s letter to Blackwood of the 6th of December 1831, which appears to have initiated the break between author and editor. Hogg requests of Blackwood that he ‘return every M. S. article’ of his so that he may publish them ‘elsewhere’, and asserting that ‘this night finishes the term of our publication while your name is William Blackwood and mine James Hogg’. Hogg’s choice of stating the position of editor and author by re-asserting their names - and specifically the precursory statements of ‘your name’ versus ‘mine’ - creates a clear division between Hogg’s individual self, who is able to publish independently, and that of
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123 This phrase appears to be a pre-cursor to Robert Louis Stevenson’s, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, where Dr. Jekyll proclaims his argument ‘that man is not truly one, but truly two’. p.55.

124 James Hogg, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, p. 106. Robert Wringhim remarks that ‘[t]he most perverse part of it was, that I rarely conceived myself to be any of the two persons. I thought for the most part that my companion was one of them, and my brother the other’. This highlights his distance from the events of the ‘two persons’ involved. This double is a psychologically, if not also somewhat physically, disconnected one. A direct relation to the ‘intrusive self’ being a ‘demonic’ or parasitic body which overcomes the internal, and consequently external, actions of the individual. However, it is by consistently reasserting his selfhood, which solidly places this double as a direct production of the self, not a forceful invasion into the interior.

the editorial power Blackwood had derived over his name. In this way, we can observe how Hogg felt the distinct need to categorize his authorial and editorial selves. He undercuts the editorial possession by asserting his name - his personal 'self' - as a 'right' to his public self's actions: 'I have a right to do with it [the manuscripts] as I chuse [sic.] and publish [them] where and when I please'.

Hogg reclaims his authorial self by splitting from the possession of William Blackwood’s version of ‘James Hogg’, and proceeds to re-position him back within the confines of his own name: ‘William Blackwood’. This form of breaking the authorial-editorial relationship caused tension between these two personal, individual identities. Hogg wished to ‘remain the same as ever’ they had been ‘save with regard to publishing in which [he would] never...submit to be treated with such absolute contempt again’. The remark reinforces the idea that Hogg himself could in fact separate his personal self from his ‘publishing’ self; one identity which has ‘remain[ed] the same’ whilst the other holds all of the ‘contempt’ for the editorial presence of Blackwood. However, Blackwood himself either could not - or would not - distinguish between the personal relationship he had built with Hogg, and that of his possessive relationship over the established, public and literary creation, which ultimately resulted in the complete break between them. It is through the exploration of the extrusive self in ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’ that this disjunction between the personal and the public authorial-editorial relationship manifests itself. For instance, the conclusion to the ‘letter’ emphasises the inability to truly return to a singular self, once the events have transpired. Beatman - now the ‘lunatic’ - remarks that ‘I fell...but which of the I’s it was that fell I never knew till this day, nor ever can’. He ‘never’ will be able to distinguish which of the ‘I’s’ ‘fell’ and therefore ‘never’ will be able to return to a state of certainty regarding his

---

126 Ibid., p.469.
128 This contribution is particularly prevalent, due to the time and nature of its publication. The original version of ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’ was written for Blackwood’s, and can be viewed in volume two of Thomas C. Richardson’s edition of the contributions. This version places the fictional editor, John Wilson’s pseudonym of Christopher North, as the main recipient of the letter. With the contributions rejection and the break with Blackwood himself, Hogg re-wrote the piece and situated himself as the over-arching editorial figure in power, and submitted it to Fraser’s. The significance of this text then lies in its re-positioning of Hogg as a singular author, with evident control and power over what is done, and how a text is handled.
sense of self. Although Hogg uses the double as a way to extricate the editorial self from the authorial self, he also acknowledges, through the treatment of Beatman, that he can never fully be distinguished as a separate and individual ‘I’ again within the literary marketplace. The ‘I’ that ‘fell’ when Hogg and Blackwood split cannot be distinguished as either the fictional ‘I’ of the ‘Ettrick Shepherd’/ ‘Ettrick Boar’, or the authorial body, embodied within the ‘name’ of ‘James Hogg’.

Charlotte explores Hogg’s idea of the double through the examination of the figure as the product of the extrusive - not merely the ‘intrusive’- self. This method is firstly re-evaluated through her burlesque portrayal of the editor-narrator persona. Charlotte transposes this conception of the double through exploring the frameworks of editorial narratives as the mode of power. Her editor-narrator, who is akin to the construction of John Bud in Branwell’s works, consciously and purposefully cultivates the trope of the double. It is through this ‘self’-consciousness of the literary figure that the reader is able to observe Charlotte actively acknowledging, and debating, Hogg’s assessment of the motif; she addresses how it is used as a narrative technique for re-gaining authorial, and ‘self’, control. For instance, this text is a self-conscious piece, which emphasises its own creation through its explicit dramatization of language. The editor-narrator, Charles Wellesley, opens the narrative by declaring that ‘[t]he Duke of Zamorna should not have excluded me from Wellesley House, for the following pages have been the result of that exclusion.’ He explicitly states that the apparent exposure of Zamorna’s ‘half-insane character’ is a direct retaliation against his ‘exclusion’ from the internal, private and domestic sphere. The editor-narrator explicitly conjures this construction of the double as a way of ascertaining control over the name, and hence the public ‘character’, of Zamorna. Through openly acknowledging that the use of the double is a mechanism for altering the perceptions of Zamorna’s identity, Charlotte is using Charles to mimic the idea which James Beatman puts forward: whether the ‘right’ identity can be truly conveyed through these narrative constructs.

Tom Mole examines these narrative systems through his exploration of ‘personalities’ in the early nineteenth-century periodical press, by using the example of Blackwood’s controversial methods. He examines how Blackwood’s re-defined the way in which the public persona was handled, and self-consciously crafted, stating: ‘Blackwood’s argued that literature was a special kind of public discourse, a separate jurisdiction, in which the distinction between the public and private character on which the protocols governing personalities rested become functionally meaningless’.  

Blackwood’s approach in their relationships with their authors therefore conceived the ‘public’ and ‘private’ selves to be one and the same thing. Through writing Hogg’s identity as the ‘Ettrick Shepherd’/’Ettrick Boar’, his personal life thus became free for appropriation, and subsequently free for open ‘discourse’ by the general reading public. This ‘separate jurisdiction’ of ‘public discourse’, which is seated within the literary marketplace, is therefore undermined through Hogg’s forceful separation of the ‘public and private character[s]’ which Blackwood’s wished to amalgamate. The double enacts the undermining of the structures of the periodical press system, by not only embodying the violent anxieties which come with the over-writing of identity, but the schismatic disruption which results from their attempts at separation. Charlotte can be seen to be reacting to this narrative perception through Charles’s concluding remarks that, ‘if there is no [physical double for Zamorna then] there ought to be one. If the young King of Angria has no alter ego he ought to have such a convenient representative’. Charles thus openly concludes that he has purposefully manifested this ‘alter ego’ through his literary creation as a way to re-position Zamorna’s identity within the collective perceptions of his audience. The use of the phrase ‘convenient representative’ recalls the position of James Beatman, whose ‘convenient representative’ comes to embody his explicitly public and social persona, coming into conflict with his private and propitious one. In this way, the separation of the self-identities questions whether it is for the author or the editor that the ‘convenient representative’ comes into existence.

---

131 Tom Mole, ‘Blackwood’s “Personalities”’, p.95.
132 For a comprehensive examination of Hogg’s public/private personas, their place within the early nineteenth century publishing industry, and how this affected the ‘public discourses’, see chapter one ‘James Hogg and the Early Nineteenth-Century Literary Marketplace’.
Hogg further develops his question addressing the influence that editorial narrative power has over creating private and public identities by exploring the subversive representation of the double in the ‘Baron St. Gio’. The editorial figure is an underlying presence throughout the narrative, and yet like Charlotte’s Charles Wellesley, is seemingly transparent about how he is crafting the perceptions of the narrative for the readership to consume. It is his specifically constructed interpretation of this recited manuscript which infers the presence of the double. It is thus important to acknowledge that the ‘Baron St. Gio’ is not an explicit example of the double. Instead, the characterisation of the protagonist - ‘Jasper Kendale’ who by the end of the narrative has become the eponymous ‘Baron St. Gio’ - is examined in constant relation to the ambiguous identity of the antagonist. For example, the text itself is handled through the editor’s opening remarks, which ultimately construct the rest of the narrative. The self-assumed editor states:

I have often wondered if it was possible that a person could exist without a conscience. I think not, if he be a reasonable being. Yet there certainly are many of whom you would judge by their actions that they had none; or, if they have, that conscience is not a mirror to be trusted. In such cases we may suppose that conscience exists in the soul of such a man as well as others, but that it is an erroneous one, not being rightly informed of what sin is, and consequently unable to judge fairly of his actions, by comparing them with the law of God.

This opening reverberates throughout the rest of the text, defining the manuscript in terms of how a ‘person’ is constructed by, and through, the ‘conscience’. The ‘conscience’ is defined separately from the ‘person’, and is located within the subsequent ‘actions’. This definition distinguishes between the physical ‘being’ of the ‘person’, and the ‘actions’ which ‘mirror’, and gives shape to, the ‘conscience’. Hogg’s idea of the ‘person’ is therefore equated

---

134 ‘Some Remarkable Passages in the Remarkable Life of the Baron St. Gio’ is a similar narrative style to that of Confessions. The editor has been given a manuscript from a third-hand source to edit and publish for the eyes of the public. The original narrator, Jasper Kendale, recites his story of how as a young man he witnessed an act of horrific brutality, leading to the murder of two young nobles. He is then kidnapped by the murderer and taken to the colonies (America), where he spends his time serving his kidnapper. Years later, he escapes and returns to Scotland to reveal the true narrative of the disappearances - and then spends the rest of his time pursuing the murderer through Europe. This leads to a dramatic scene where the murderer and Jasper encounter each other again, leading to the murderer’s death. However, it is crucial to understand the various narrative perspectives all simultaneously operating within this one story, and so should not be considered a wholly reliable narrative.

with the basic, bodily presence, whereas the ‘conscience’ operates on a higher plane, which can be ‘mirror[ed]’ to form this disembodied, metaphysical identity of the ‘person’. By defining these concepts as two distinct and separate components, Hogg highlights the parameters of the extrusive self as the literary double: each of the components can be categorized, and singularly analysed, to determine the full construction of the combined personal and public identity. This opening ‘mirror’ reflects throughout ‘Baron St Gio’, through the physical embodiment of Jasper alongside his counterpart in Mr Southman. In this confluent dichotomy, Jasper overtly personifies the role of the ‘conscience’, which is emphasised through his position as the original narrator of the manuscript. In this position, Jasper is able to manipulate the perception of the events. This method is directly aligned with that of the editor who is re-writing the manuscript in compliant English prose, rather than the traditional Scots dialect the manuscript is said to have been originally distinguished by.\textsuperscript{136}

The conception of the manuscript by both author and editor is thus doubly misleading. The protagonist, as the narrator, is conceived through the broader imposed framework of this editor. Even if the manuscript is said to be a true account, the editor ultimately compresses its original reality in-between his own constructed narrative. David Higgins’s exploration of the literary double figure complements Mole’s argument, by asserting that ‘where personalities were understood to transgress the boundary between an individual’s public statements and his private life, Blackwood’s argued that literature was a realm in which that boundary could not be drawn’.\textsuperscript{137} In this way, Hogg acknowledges that Blackwood’s has blurred the ‘boundary’ between the public and private life of a subject, through overtly addressing the ways in which an account is treated

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., p.90. The assumed editor notes that the original document is ‘manifestly Scottish, and in the same style the best parts of the narrative are written; but for the sake of shortening it two thirds at least, I must take a style more concise’. The editor physically doubles the narrative, whereby there is an original, more primitive text based within the traditional and ‘manifestly Scottish’ dialect, versus the editor’s version, appropriated and manipulated for the purpose of conforming to the literary marketplace. By highlighting this difference between an original manuscript and the editor’s re-written version, Hogg enforces the concept of the extrusive self as double.

The implied difference between the two manuscripts physical highlights two clear categorizations of the self, one in which the author takes precedence as both subject and powerful narrator, in comparison to the editor’s version which imposes his own perceptions onto the narrative, forcing the original narrator into the definitive role of the subject.

by an editorial hand. By invoking this method, Hogg further amplifies his creation of the double, as both a metaphorical and distinctly physical image, as a way to undermine this ambiguous blurring of the ‘boundary’. Through physically embodying and re-imagining the illusory ‘conscience’ versus bodily ‘being’ argument, Hogg is able to re-gain control over the precise mechanisms which have re-written his own authorial/personal and public sense of identity. Likewise, Charlotte examines this same declaration that percolates throughout ‘Baron St. Gio’. Indeed, a very similar editorial framework is found in the narrative structure of her story, ‘The Spell’. Charlotte concludes this story by defining the same parameters mechanized between the idea of the ‘conscience’ and the physical ‘person’:

no single man, having one corporeal & one spiritual nature, if there [sic.] were rightly compounded without any mixture of pestilential ingredients, should, in right reason & in the ordinance of common sense & decency, speak & act in that capricious, double-dealing, unfathomable, incomprehensible, torturing, sphinx-like manner.\(^{138}\)

Charlotte uses Hogg’s formula of language to distinguish between a ‘corporeal’ - a distinctly bodily and material depiction - in opposition to the ‘spiritual nature’. It is again the way in which these two ‘nature[s]’ are ‘compounded’ which results in the cohesive or separatist identities of a ‘single’ person. By using this collective language of ‘person’/’corporeal’ versus ‘conscience’/’spiritual’, both Hogg and Charlotte are actively separating and redefining the ambiguous space between the public and private constructions of the ‘self’. By separating the singularly ‘erroneous’ and ‘double-dealing’ character into two distinctive bodies, Hogg and Charlotte are not only depicting the issues which form within the transient ‘boundary’ constructed by a fluid public/private identity, but further demonstrate how difficult it is to return to a complete, stable state of identity beyond these editorial constructs.\(^{139}\)

This idea is most clearly examined through the language of the ‘lunatic’. Hogg’s initial construction of the double in the ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’


\(^{139}\) ‘The Spell’ is a self-conscious narrative. It must be understood through its narrator – Charles Wellesley – openly declaring that he is essentially constructing what is supposed to be a true account. The story itself focuses upon revealing the character of his older brother: The Duke of Zamorna. Instead of presenting this to the readers as one person, he instead comically constructs two separate characters, and produces the apparently logical explanation of secret twin brothers under the power of a curse.
ultimately focuses around the idea of lunacy. Likewise, Charlotte uses this same explanation of mental instability to resolve the conflicts within her own self-consciously ‘double-dealing’ narrative. Indeed, Charles emphasizes the supposed perception of Zamorna’s ‘half-insane’ and ‘incomprehensible’ character by stating that they are the characteristics of ‘possessed lunatics’.\textsuperscript{140} It is crucial to compare how both Hogg and Charlotte integrate this language within the subject of the literary double. For instance, Hogg overtly signals the conclusion of the manuscript through its published title: ‘Strange Letter of a Lunatic’. It is the editor’s published, and subsequently finalized, interpretation which comes to define ‘the right James Beatman’: the compression of the two identities produces the socially familiar identity of the ‘Lunatic’. This concept of the ‘Lunatic’, although defined by its incongruity to social norms, provides a confined and constricting container within which the conflicting identities can be socially and culturally understood. Moreover, by appropriating the narrative, the editor is likewise able to frame the conflicting identities within his own constructed narrative. In one way, Beatman invites this redefining of his identity through the opening remark that ‘[a]n explanation of the circumstances from you would give me great satisfaction’.\textsuperscript{141} However, ‘James Beatman’, as the original narrator/protagonist, does not refer to himself as a ‘lunatic’, nor does he characterize himself as mentally unstable; he further reinforces his position by arguing that he was ‘driven to it’ by his ‘wound, and by having been turned into two men, acting on various and distinct principles, yet still conscious of an idiosyncracy [sic.]’.\textsuperscript{142} The position of James Beatman symbolically aligns with the position of the author within the authorial/editorial relationship. Beatman can acknowledge that there are ‘two’ distinct ‘men’, and is aware of the ‘idiosyncracy [sic.]’ between his personal self, and that of the public conception. It is the editorial ambiguity regarding the space in-between, alongside his final repositioning as the ‘lunatic’, which illustrates the way in which the double can never truly be returned to a singular, individual identity.

Moreover, Hogg uses both the physical setting of the asylum in collaboration with the metatextual dialogue of lunacy and madness to forcefully

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., p.67.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., p.531.
confine the ‘various and distinct principles’ of the separate identities. Charlotte mirrors this language through her similar implementation of the editorial power over the narrative, invoking the language of mental - and subsequently physical - instability. For example, Charles Wellesley as the framing editor-narrator, uses his concluding remarks to directly involve the ‘eyes of the public’ to establish this collective image of Zamorna. He asks, ‘[r]eader, what say you to the image of a crowned maniac, dying dethroned, forsaken, desolate, in the shrieking gloom of a mad-house.’\textsuperscript{143} This imposing of the ‘image’ of the ‘mad-house’, within Hogg and Charlotte’s works, uses these overtly physical boundaries as a way to symbolize the social constraints which come to confine a singular identity at the conclusion. The ‘mad-house’ overtly acts as the physical retainer of the otherwise socially unstable identity of the imagined ‘maniac’, however, it is the direct implication of the ‘image’ which truly constrains this conflicting identity.

Zamorna is imagined through the stereotypically ‘mad’ characteristics: he is described as ‘desolate’ and ‘shrieking’. Through imposing these characteristics onto Zamorna, the collective audience who consume this ‘image’ are enabled to creatively justify it. For instance, this suggested ‘image’ is implemented through re-asserting the imagery as a finalized and conclusive fact: ‘[h]e attempted, however, more than he could perform; his affairs grew embarrassed & perplexed; he became insane & died in a private mad-house at the early age of twenty-two.’\textsuperscript{144} Charlotte further emphasizes Zamorna’s containment through aligning his ‘insane’ nature and consequent death with that of the ‘private mad-house’. This particular use of the word ‘private’ reinforces the ‘image’ of the ‘mad-house’ as the ultimate forced containment of identity, reverting back into the ‘private’ space. The ‘private’ space attempts to resituate the ‘insane’, socially unacceptable identity back within the ‘private’, personal identity of the singular character. Therefore, this language of madness which frames and concludes both texts comes from the conflict between the two incongruous identities being outwardly perceived as simultaneously ‘one’ and ‘two’. Both endings try to re-establish a singular, stable identity, which is feasibly impossible due to the ‘erroneous’ combination of the ‘person’/‘corporeal’ nature with the ‘conscience’/‘spiritual’ one.

\textsuperscript{143}Charlotte Brontë, ‘The Spell’, p.150.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., p.150.
Charlotte understood this early analysis of the literary double as a platform on which to control the public and private states of identity. This is particularly important to consider in relation to the specific choices which she made in progressing this framework within the distinctively Victorian literary marketplace. Unfortunately, we cannot fully explore the extent to which Shirley succeeds in illustrating this argument. Another examination should be considered for future in-depth analysis to emphasise the presence of Hogg and his writerly framework, and his influence within the latter half of the nineteenth century. However, it is essential to draw attention to the way in which Charlotte has developed her juvenile interpretations of Hogg’s extrusive double, and her conscious implementation of it within this select period of the publishing industry. Indeed, within Shirley, Charlotte has been charged with ‘reverting to an earlier style of writing, and an earlier type of fictional mask’. Lucasta Miller argues that this reversion to the ‘earlier’ ‘fictional mask’ is a direct product of ‘the robust style’ which she has appropriated from the volumes of ‘Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine’ specifically from the ‘1820s and 1830s’. Although Miller identifies the reversion to this juvenile ‘style’ of writing, distinctively depicted through the strong parallels between ‘The Spell’ and the novel, the construction of this ‘mask’, or ‘robust’ narrative voice, is more aware of the ‘eyes of the public’. This awareness is illustrated through Charlotte’s removal of the overtly demanding and explicit editorial framework, in favour of a more subversive control which focuses more pointedly on each individual character’s voice.

The construction of the two Moore brothers within the events of the narrative typify this perspective. For example, Charlotte still situates this literary figure of the double within Hogg’s initial parameters of ‘two men, acting on various and distinct principles’. However, the awareness of the ‘idiosyncracy [sic.]’ between these ‘two’ conflicting identities is legitimized by the

145 Lucasta Miller, ‘Introduction’, Shirley, p.xvii. During the writing of Shirley Charlotte lost all her remaining siblings, and therefore the novel is a product of this grief. Thus, the return to the juvenile style of writing is a way to retain this sense of her siblings. Although the tone and style revert to a narrative closely aligned with the techniques in ‘The Spell’, it is obvious that she has manipulated these methods to be more palatable to the Victorian literary marketplace. Charlotte’s balancing between Hogg’s ‘1820’s and 1830’s’ periodical influence, and the need to conform somewhat to Victorian publishing ideals, underscores the development of this novel.

146 Ibid., p.xv.
biologically - and socially - acceptable explanation of brothers. The two brothers enact the ‘distinct principles’ of a singular, familial identity, which often transgresses social norms. For instance, the initial focus on Robert Moore situates these ‘various and distinct principles’ within this familiar context of the ‘private’ versus the public realm. This conflict is firstly manifested through Robert as the sole male lead in the narrative, whilst Louis is only briefly referred to as a vague, secondary figure, who is acknowledged but not yet developed beyond the state of ‘brother’. It is the initial conflicting depiction of Robert’s ‘two natures’ which again invokes the idea of the literary double: Robert asserts that he has one identity suited for the ‘world and business’ whilst the other is a manifestation of ‘home and leisure’.¹⁴⁷ Hogg’s separation of the distinctly religious, or metaphysical, allusions to the ‘components’ of an individual’s identity as ‘conscience’ versus the bodily state of ‘being’, is replaced by the solid boundaries within the social system. These two separate ‘natures’ are explicitly the public world in contrast to the private, domestic sphere. By re-imagining the figure of the double through the distinctive Victorian societal structures, Charlotte creates a channel in which she can develop Hogg’s earlier critique of public/private identity and the ways in which it is handled, in a way which is compatible and understandable to the emerging Victorian audience.

The creative choice to revert to this concept of the double and the extrusive self is underlined through Charlotte’s growing awareness, and complicated presence, within the literary marketplace. _Shirley_ was written and published during the widespread success and consequent critical reception of _Jane Eyre_. It is a result of this environment which cultivated the structure and response depicted throughout the second novel. The reception of _Jane Eyre_, which was quickly put within the context of the sisters’ other novels, created a vivid dialogue between critics. These reviews subjected Charlotte to the same high level of personal and public critique that Hogg’s character received - and was central in developing within the early nineteenth-century publishing industry. The parallel between her treatment and Hogg’s is further reinforced

through the pseudonym Charlotte published under: ‘Currer Bell’.

The identity of the author was continually questioned, and the politics surrounding the gender of this personality was frequently the central subject of the reviews, rather than the content of *Jane Eyre* itself. The subsequent distortions and attempted invasions of ‘Currer Bell’ gave Charlotte her first full submersion within the literary marketplace. However, her response to these penetrative reviews demonstrates her awareness of these power structures, and her ability to purposefully and consciously manoeuvre them. Indeed, the preface which she wrote for *Shirley* actively engages with the techniques which Hogg outlined within his own narrative perspective of the editors and critics.

The preface was ultimately rejected by Charlotte’s own editors during the final stages of publication. They deemed it to be too aggressive a response for this developing literary marketplace, and especially Charlotte’s progressing position within it. However, some conclusions may be drawn from this subjection, whereby the editors were more concerned with the consequences of Charlotte’s real gender being made public. This is through the overtly masculine emphasis of the preface itself: the dramatic embodiment of the male-editorial persona which Charlotte had frequently practised throughout her juvenilia, and particularly within the voice of Charles Wellesley.

The premise of the preface is a direct letter of address to the critic of one of these reviews, and is heightened further through this critic being one Elizabeth Rigby. Charlotte uses the femininity of her addressee to overly-emphasise, and mockingly depict, the overt masculinity of her authorial persona. This is illustrated through one passage in particular, which uses crude language and innuendo to amplify Currer Bell’s overwhelming masculine physicality, and consequently, to undoubtedly embody the position of masculine authority.

The passage states,

---

148 All three sisters initially published under pseudonyms. These were: Currer (Charlotte), Ellis (Emily), and Acton (Anne) Bell. For further information regarding the circumstances which led to the specific creation of these personas, refer to: Juliet Barker, *The Brontës*, p.574-577.

149 The significance of this passage was first brought to my attention, and influenced by a paper at the Brontë society conference: ‘The Coarseness of the Brontës: A Reappraisal’. Amber Regis, ’Through a glass, coarsely. Reading Brontë Prefaces’ (unpublished conference paper, Durham University, 11 August 2017).
You should see – Ma’am, the figure Currer Bell can cut at a small party: you should watch him assisting at a tea-table; you should behold him holding skeins of silk or Berlin wool for the young ladies about whom he innocuously philanders, and who, in return, knit him comforters for winter-wear, or work him slippers for his invalid-<foot> [member] (he considers that rather an elegant expression - a nice substitute for - gouty foot; it was manufactured exp[ressly for your refinement)\textsuperscript{150}

Charlotte demonstrates through this passage her awareness of how a public persona can be manifested and manipulated within the literary marketplace. She draws from her knowledge of Hogg’s treatment and complicity within this sphere to market herself to her own audience. For example, Charlotte’s language is evocative of the types of transactions depicted within the ‘Noctes Ambrosianae’. By focusing upon the hyper awareness of ‘the figure’ of Currer Bell, in direct contrast to the female audiences, both within the text (‘the young ladies’) and outside it (the supposed recipient of the address: Elizabeth Rigby), Charlotte locates her authority as the masculine author through overly-amplifying the functions of the public persona. This is then underlined by the conscious cultivation of an audience: an addressed and incorporated distinctively female sphere, to deliberately separate the power systems. In this way, we can observe how Charlotte’s wider perceptions and understanding of the literary marketplace, accumulated through her consumption of Hogg’s practices, allowed her to locate (and manipulate) her own position of power within the mid-nineteenth-century publishing industry.

\textsuperscript{150} Charlotte Brontë, \textit{Shirley}, p.610.
Chapter Four: Emily Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights* (1847), James Hogg and Voicing the Female

‘I am determined that my bairn’s music shall be all inherent, and depend on the tones of her own voice, of which all artificial tones are but mean imitations’

Of all the Brontë siblings to have been examined in comparison with Hogg’s literary influence, it is Emily Brontë and her singular work, *Wuthering Heights* (1847), which has incited the largest amount of critical attention. These admittedly brief explorations into the relationship between Emily and Hogg have been limited to her childhood fascination with Scottish culture, and the ways it became an integral part of her early literary education. Monica Germana in her critical article, ‘The Ghost and the Brownie: Scottish Influences on Emily Brontë’, emphasises this cultural context to try and re-situate *Wuthering Heights* within the Scottish folkloric traditions of storytelling. She argues that Emily’s attraction to a distinctly ‘Scottish landscape, a land she never saw, could only have an intellectual origin, likely to have sprung from her reading of Scott’s novels and Hogg’s articles in *Blackwood’s*’. Although Germana does indeed draw important comparisons between Hogg’s works and *Wuthering Heights*, her arguments are positioned within this notion of the ‘landscape’ of the novel. The ‘intellectual’, and creative, ‘origin[s]’ of Hogg’s influence on the text are therefore restricted to this topographical narrative. This analytical lens disregards the broader, and more critically subversive structures present within the writing itself.

---


153 When developing the play of the ‘Islanders’, each of the siblings chose a leading man and one of the British islands to establish their growing kingdoms. It is recounted that Emily chose ‘Sir Walter Scott’ and the ‘Isle of Arran’ as the starting point for her fictional creations. It is thus out of this distinctly Scottish influence which Emily is most closely aligned to the traditional Scottish writing practices. For a comprehensive account of the siblings and the creation of the ‘Islanders’ play-stories, see Juliet Barker, *The Brontës*, pp. 176-178.

Two other foundational examinations of the Emily-Hogg relationship are presented by Douglas S. Mack and Douglas Gifford. Both scholars go beyond this thematic argument by evaluating the characterization and significance of Heathcliff. However, these arguments closely - and somewhat restrictively - analyse Hogg’s influence over Emily’s work through the stereotypical lens of the male-orientated gaze.\(^{155}\) They establish the literary marketplace through examining the distinctly masculine motifs, with the most prominent example being Hogg’s manifestation of ‘the Brownie’. This supernatural being has been drawn out from established Scottish folklore, and likewise developed throughout Hogg interpretations as inherently male.\(^{156}\) It is by comparing this construction of the folkloric ‘Brownie’ figure with Emily’s descriptions of Heathcliff which attempts to situate her within the distinctly Scottish parameters of writing. However, I contend that Emily’s reaction and relationship to Hogg is situated outside this male-orientated literary marketplace. Instead, I intend to explore Hogg’s and Emily’s construction, and location, of the female (voice). *Wuthering Heights* is filled with multiple female voices. The central example of the independent female voice is that of Catherine Earnshaw/Linton, and through understanding Hogg’s critique of both the author-editor relationship, as well as his choices in constructing female narratives, we can further re-evaluate the integral narrative structure Emily constructs within *Wuthering Heights*. Unlike Branwell and Charlotte, Emily not only reacts to Hogg’s literary frameworks, but consciously and independently manipulates them for her own female-orientated gaze. I therefore assert that this is why *Wuthering Heights*, as a text within the broader literary marketplace, produced such a strong effect upon the general

---


\(^{156}\) Two key examples of this Hoggian ‘Brownie’, which would have most likely been available and read by the Brontë siblings are: *The Brownie of Bodsbeck* (1818), which consistently referenced as Hogg’s first published novel, and ‘The Brownie of the Black Hags’ (1828), a popular short story in *Blackwood’s* which has been the most prominently used text in studies examining the relationship between Hogg’s works and *Wuthering Heights*. For the full texts, with further information, see: James Hogg, *The Brownie of Bodsbeck*, ed. Douglas S. Mack (Edinburgh & London: Scottish Academic Press, 1976); James Hogg, ‘The Brownie of the Black Hags’, *James Hogg: Contributions to Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine vol. 1, 1817-1828*, ed. Thomas C. Richardson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), pp.242-255.
reading public. The text has been accused of being unnecessarily aggressive, unusually violent, and overwhelmingly passionate, especially from the authorship of an isolated, but well-educated, reverend’s daughter.\textsuperscript{157} It is precisely from these initial accusations that we can observe how the text is simultaneously a product of, and situated manifestly within, the female domain of power.

As we have previously seen in consideration of Hogg’s influence in Branwell’s work, Daphne Du Maurier has highlighted the close literary relationship between Branwell and Emily. Certainly, they are said to have discussed the aspects of Hogg’s grotesque and supernatural tales as part of their childhood fictional explorations.\textsuperscript{158} We first examined how Branwell integrated Hogg’s understanding of the early nineteenth-century literary marketplace into his own creative explorations. This concept revolved around the spaces of contention when attempting to understand the distinctions between the roles of the ‘author’ and ‘editor’. Following on from this principle, Emily illustrates a similar need to debate and react to Hogg’s perceptions of these literary power structures. We can observe the broader and more covert examples of Hogg’s writerly framework as portrayed through Emily’s imitations of embedded narratives. These embedded narratives are a vital part of \textit{Wuthering Heights}’s structural ‘landscape’, both inside and outside the text. The especial significance of the variety of diaries and letters amplify the kaleidoscope of voices, which are further reminiscent of Hogg’s own kaleidoscopic collisions within narratives.\textsuperscript{159} However, it is more revealing to understand the multitudes

\textsuperscript{157} One example of an initial response to the novel is in \textit{The Spectator}, dated 18\textsuperscript{th} December 1847. The anonymous critic asserts: ‘The success is not equal to the abilities of the writer; chiefly because the incidents and persons are too coarse and disagreeable to be attractive, the very best being improbable, with a moral taint about them, and the villany [sic] not leading to results sufficient to justify the elaborate pains taken in depicting it.’, \url{http://archive.spectator.co.uk/article/18th-december-1847/17/publications-received}, [Accessed 5 July 2017]. This critical response - which was stated before there was any notion that the three Bell brothers were in fact Brontë sisters - emphasizes the still ‘coarse and disagreeable’ content which the general reading public perceived to be too far beyond the acceptable experimental boundaries, even for that of a man.

\textsuperscript{158} For the full exploration of this information, see chapter two: ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s \textit{The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner} (1824)’, Cf. p.31.

\textsuperscript{159} The importance of having control over physical texts, and the effects which this can have over the portrayal of a character is argued in chapter two of this thesis. It concerns the relationship between the author and editor, and demonic possession. For further examples of critical work on the significance of having power over, and intrusively reading, physical texts within \textit{Wuthering Heights}, see: Rebecca Steinitz, ‘Diaries and Displacement in “Wuthering Heights”’, \textit{Studies in the Novel}, 32 (2000), pp.407-419; Deborah Lutz, ‘Relics and Death Culture in \textit{Wuthering Heights}’, \textit{Novel}, 45 (2012), pp.389-408. For a full analysis of
of voices through the reader’s handling of, and consequent response to, the physical texts themselves. This is demonstrated through re-evaluating Hogg’s, and subsequently Emily’s, interactive relationship when reproducing the editorial practices and structures within their own works. Hogg and Emily critique the established literary power structures through their own imitations of editorial procedures. These editorial standards are reminiscent of the Blackwood’s publishing style, and illustrate their engagement with the contemporary movements of the developing publishing industry. Through their interpretations of these over-arching structures, Hogg and Emily are able to unveil and further manipulate the power structures which determine the reception of a text by the general reading public. They are therefore able to use these unveiled practices to move ostracized narratives, such as that of the female experience, into the popular domain. It is the exploration of these ambiguous dynamics between established literary and social orders, with the more marginal voices, which underpins the relationship between Hogg and Emily’s explorations of the female voice.

The introductory quote to this chapter is taken from Hogg’s novel, The Three Perils of Woman: Love, Leasing, and Jealousy (1823), and it is this piece of dialogue which embodies the disjunction between the male established literary structures, and the integration of the independent female voice. The speech is given by Daniel Bell, who refers to his daughter’s ability to sing rather than to be accomplished through ‘artificial’ musical instruments. However, this phrase also gestures towards Hogg’s depictions of the female narrative which are especially integral to the formation of this text. The novel self-consciously declares itself as inherently female, overtly established by its direct concern with ‘the three perils’ which Hogg presents as the threats most fundamental to the female experience. In this way, the text itself is enclosed within this paradigm of the female-voiced narrative, despite still referring heavily to the narrative opinions of a variety of male characters. The novel received a broad range of criticism from Hogg’s contemporaries. They focused most intently on his either conscious or unconscious descriptions of female-ness, which acted against the established collective ideal of ‘the woman’. One prime example of

the public outrage which ensued from Hogg’s foray into the portrayal of the female sphere is highlighted by the anonymous reviewer in the 1823 August edition of, *The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences &c*. Their remarks about the publication of *The Three Perils of Woman*, address the relationship between the author, the covert editorial practices, and the subconscious structuring of the collective audience:

> it is to be regretted [that Hogg] had no friend to consult who would have prevailed on him to strike out several very indecent and reprehensible passages; assuring him that no author ought to write what no gentleman could say in respectable, far less female, society.\(^{160}\)

The reviewer establishes their appraisal of the text through highlighting the lack of editorial intervention which would have prevented the ‘several indecent and reprehensible passages’. This argument, that the supposedly controversial ‘passages’ should be deleted, is ironically grounded within the necessity of preserving the ‘female’ ‘society’ from any infectious ‘indecent[cy]’. Indeed, the reviewer positions the ‘female’ ‘society’ as the central priority of limiting the ‘passages’, even though the exact nature of these ‘passages’ are directly concerned with the female experience. It is by positioning the ‘female’ ‘society’ as removed from these ‘indecent’ ‘passages’ that re-instates this male-defined, societal position of the female narrative. Hogg’s text addresses female voices, and distinctly female concerns, yet they must not be voiced within the reviewer’s world of the male-established literary marketplace. It is by understanding Hogg’s independent construction of the female-centred text that we are able to observe Emily’s *Wuthering Heights* as his conscious successor.

The ‘indecent’ ‘passages’ within Hogg’s *Three Perils of Woman* most explicitly refer to the allusions of overt female sexuality. Hogg controversially makes reference to the widespread - and thriving industry - of prostitution in Edinburgh during the early nineteenth century.\(^{161}\) These public portrayals of the

---


\(^{161}\) An on-going critical discussion of Hogg’s references, and use, when citing the Edinburgh prostitution scene, started in the late 1980’s. Both David Groves and Barbara Bloedé have commented upon the extent to which Hogg used the narratives of prostitutes, and the ways in which this effected the reception of his
female sex go against the societal construction of femininity and consequently challenge the narrative structures themselves. Although the explicitness of these allusions to prostitution would be categorised as ‘indecent’ for the general reading public, it is actually the transgressive depictions of violence enacted on the representatives of the female ideals which positions Hogg’s portrayals of women as ‘indecent’ for this male-orientated literary marketplace. The violence enacted on, and through, the female body itself comes to signify the broader female narrative voice.¹⁶² For instance, O’Halloran suggests that,

what we are encouraged to respond to and celebrate [within The Three Perils of Woman] is what the women once were, with all their human faults. We are to pity and lament the suffering beings they become [...] Hogg’s attention to their suffering is deeply sympathetic, and the tendency of each Peril is not to set up a strict moral and social code for female behaviour, but to impress readers with the varied, complex and mysterious elements and influences under which human identities may be changed and broken down.¹⁶³

Hogg’s central transgressive body within The Three Perils of Woman is that of Gatty (Agatha) Bell. It is the grotesque manipulation and symbolic examination of her body as simultaneously alive and dead which explores the ways in which the female narrative is located and re-located within the societal systems. Gatty, as the central protagonist of Peril First, most prominently embodies ‘youthful love’, and consequently the language which revolves around this concept invokes the female ideal of the virgin.¹⁶⁴ It is therefore significant that Gatty becomes the perverse alive/dead corpse through the attempts made to sexualise her body. This is initially illustrated through her marriage to M’Ion,

works. It is the ways in which these portrayals have been categorized which enables us to observe how the construction of the female body, within a larger early nineteenth century narrative, has transposed itself into contemporary critical studies. For further information, see: David Groves, ‘James Hogg’s “Confessions and The Three Perils of Woman” and the Edinburgh Prostitution Scandal of 1823’, The Wordsworth Circle, 18 (1987), pp.127-131; Barbara Bloedé, “Hogg and the Edinburgh Prostitution Scandal,” Newsletter of the James Hogg Society, 8 (1989), pp.15-18.

¹⁶² In this way, we return to the idea of the physical body being read as a literal text through its incorporation within a larger power structure. For further analysis on this concept, see: chapter one, ‘James Hogg and the Early Nineteenth-Century Literary Marketplace’, and chapter two, ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner (1824)’.


¹⁶⁴ James Hogg, The Three Perils of Woman, p. 258. Hogg summarises the narrative of ‘Peril First’ under this warning that ‘youthful love’ can imperil the life and soul of the female.
and eventually her pregnancy, where she gives birth to a new heir. However, by undermining the female narrative (voice) - where the expected social roles and identities are ‘changed and broken down’ - Hogg amplifies the manipulative power of the male narrative (voice). As Antony Hasler remarks, ‘[w]ithin the narrative, [Gatty’s] condition is interpreted as demonic possession, a nervous disease, a just God’s punitive reply to importunate petitions, or a supernatural ravishment in spirit’. It is the emphasis on her condition as a form of ‘demonic possession’, a ‘supernatural ravishment’ which invades her body that parallels the ideas surrounding Branwell’s mechanisms of the author-editor relationship. Hogg’s recognition of the editorial powers infiltrating the authorial body evokes this ‘demonic’ and ‘supernatural’ imagery. This image is made even more grotesque and ‘indecent’ through imposing it upon the (almost) virginal female body. By observing this violent treatment of the female body, we come to understand how the male narrative (voice) is functioning within the societal systems.

This is depicted through the invasive, and editorial-like influence, which Gatty’s husband M’Ion has over her voice, and subsequently her body. Indeed, it is his intervention with his own voice which is suggested as ‘altogether incompatible with human submission’, and therefore is the presumed source of the unnatural alive/dead body. The suggestion that M’Ion appears to believe that he has more power over the matters of life and death, rather than the ‘human submission’ to this inevitable narrative end, locates him as another inherently masculine editorial voice. This is further reinforced through the

165 Although we cannot fully examine the extent to which this pregnancy is significant in enough in-depth detail here, it is important to draw a brief parallel between the automaton mother within both Hogg and Emily’s texts. Both Hogg and Emily gesture towards the birth of a child through a perverse motherly body. Hogg identifies this as Gatty’s alive/dead body, which has been possessed and mechanically gives birth within the confines of the asylum. Emily mirrors this sequence in _Wuthering Heights_, where she briefly mentions the birth of the young Catherine, whilst overly-emphasising the death of the mother. Indeed, Catherine also gives birth in a state both alive/dead: a space inhabited by the automaton mother between life and death/ societal constrictions and freedom of narrative. It is therefore significant that both the mothers, and the children they give birth to, remain in silence; pregnancy and labour are effectively silenced and over-written through this male-dominated gaze. For further information on the automaton mother and its importance, see: Katherine Inglis, ‘Maternity, Madness and Mechanization: The Ghastly Automaton in James Hogg’s The Three Perils of Woman’, in _Minds, Bodies, Machines: 1770-1930_, ed. D. Coleman & H. Fraser (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
167 For further analysis surrounding this theme, see the full extent of chapter two: ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s _The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner_ (1824)’.
168 James Hogg, _The Three Perils of Woman_, p.194.
subsequent descriptions of how the corpse-like body reacts when he is in close proximity to it. Hogg describes how the alive/dead body of Gatty is animated through ‘a power resembling that produced by electricity’, which initially evokes the body as a product of ‘human’ creation, rather than of natural means.\textsuperscript{169} Moreover, he describes how the body ‘start[s] with a muscular motion so violent that it seemed like one attempting to rise’.\textsuperscript{170} The body becomes reduced to ‘muscular motion’ which is underlined by its unnaturally ‘violent’ nature. The erasure of the female voice leaves us with the mechanical ‘muscular motion[s]’ infused by the narrative of the male editor. Indeed, the female body becomes reduced to a vacant vehicle of the male establishment, whereby the dominant male narrative - that of M’Iion as the husband and instigator of this line - is able to confine and manipulate the body.

The treatment of the body as a physical vessel to be penetrated and manipulated further illustrates the importance of boundaries to the author-editor relationship. It is, more specifically, the ways in which these boundaries are critiqued - often by their transgression - that enable both Hogg and Emily to develop the experience of the distinctive female narrative voice. Penny Fielding has asserted that ‘Hogg’s interest in psychic spaces is not easily separated from the more specific topographical places in which his stories take place’. Likewise, Pauline Nestor, in her introduction to the 2003 edition of \textit{Wuthering Heights}, argues that, ‘[b]oundaries [within the novel]... serve the attempt to regulate psychic space, but, as the novel demonstrates, these figurative barriers are just as vulnerable as physical ones’.\textsuperscript{171} This focus upon internal and external boundaries, alongside the construction and portrayal of the female body, is doubly portrayed through Emily’s description of the ghostly body: Catherine. For example, Lockwood states that when he reaches through the window to stop the noise, he instead encounters a distinctly solid, human body. He declares that, ‘[his] fingers closed on the fingers of a little, ice-cold hand!’\textsuperscript{172} The ‘ice-cold’ image depicts the female body as an external counterpart. The duplication of the word ‘fingers’ within such a close proximity evokes the notion of a literal

\textsuperscript{169} Ibid., p.200.  
\textsuperscript{170} Ibid., p.199.  
\textsuperscript{172} Emily Brontë, \textit{Wuthering Heights}, p.25.
mirror image, where the ‘fingers’ reflect the body of each parallel narrative. The breeching of this very physical boundary, between the internal and external, enacts the metaphysical boundaries of the societal system. This ultimately cannot prevent the fluidity of the female body-narrative, both within Hogg and Emily’s texts. Catherine’s ghost is literally able to bridge the gap between the outside and inside, graphically coming into contact with the male body. However, it is the distinctive sound of the female voice which initially instigates the breaching of this physical - social, and textual - boundary. For example, her voice carries the power of her repeated words: ‘Let me in- let me in!’.

When Lockwood returns to trying to reassemble an impenetrable, physical boundary between himself and the loud female narrative, he symbolically attempts to repair the breach by the books themselves. Lockwood describes how he ‘snatched [his fingers] through the hole, [and] hurriedly piled the books up in a pyramid against it’. The phrasing of Lockwood’s account remains ambiguous to whether the ‘it’ is the female, bodily ghost, or the very ‘hole’ itself. This idea of the ‘hole’, is evocative of the distinctive images of female orifices, and their biological associations. By examining Lockwood, as the inherently masculine editorial figure, through this imagery of the female orifices and breeching physical boundaries, we can observe how the Heights itself is constructed as inherently female. More importantly, it is highlighted how Lockwood, as the representative of the male-power systems in the text, reacts to the encapsulation within this arena. Indeed, his violent treatment of the female ghostly body - another alive/dead body being over-written by the masculine figure of power - situates his behaviour as rapacious, in his attempt to disrupt and over-power the structures of the female body/boundaries.

This critique of the male and female structures, analysed through the depictions of rapacious imagery, is explored in-depth within Hogg’s novel. The language of physical violation occurring on the female subject is depicted through the conclusive episode of the *Three Perils of Woman*. In the bleak final circle of the novel, set in the aftermath of the 1745 uprising and the consequent highland clearances, the gravedigger Davie Duff encounters his old acquaintance - and central protagonist of the final circle - Sally. The horror of violence
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enacted on Scotland during this period in history is embodied through Hogg’s portrayal of Davie looting what appears to be the corpse of Sally: ‘[he] began a-loosing her bodice and fumbling about her breast’ in search of the money she had possessed.\textsuperscript{175} It is prominent that here, the female narrative becomes perversely embodied through the ambiguous perception of the (female) body. The already ghastly action of ‘loosing’ and ‘fumbling’ the presumed corpse is further heightened when it appears to re-animate: ‘In a moment the dead woman seized him by the hand with a frightened and convulsive grasp, setting her nails into his wrist’.\textsuperscript{176} Hogg situates Sally within this ambiguous space whereby she is simultaneously the ‘dead woman’, whilst also enacting the ‘convulsive’ violence onto the male narrator. In this case, the rapacious imagery depicted through Davie becomes further symbolic of the power which the male narrative attempts to have over the seemingly-dead female voice. By ‘loosing her bodice’ and ‘fumbling’ about her body, he tries to take from and gain power over the conclusion to Sally’s own narrative. Her supposed resurrection re-enacts the violence of the male narrative back onto the signifier of this very concept. It is this portrayal of the violent resurrection of the female body/narrative, and likewise the articulating of the distinctively female voice, which is imitated in \textit{Wuthering Heights}. Emily resurrects Catherine - and Catherine’s independent female voice - through a multitude of mediums: by the birth of a daughter in her name; by the literal presence of her fleshly/ghostly body; and, through the presence she has physically within the Heights, as a structure, itself.

Emily reinforces our understanding of \textit{Wuthering Heights} as inherently female through depicting the antagonising of the substitute, framing editorial figure: Mr. Lockwood. By presenting and over-dramatizing this role, Emily undermines the power of the male-established literary marketplace: the dominant sphere which is conveyed through agents like the reviewer stated above. Emily’s cultivation of the editorial figure is reminiscent of Hogg’s critique of the editorial practices examined within the \textit{Confessions}. The satirical perception of Hogg’s framing editor is most fully characterised through Lockwood’s inability to correctly evaluate the bodily-texts presented before

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., p.406.
\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., p.406.
him. In this way, Lockwood becomes a parodic extension of the anonymous editor in the *Confessions*, who as we have already seen, understands the ways in which the bodily-texts represented by, and within, the manuscript can be manipulated. Lockwood demonstrates the ways in which he consciously attempts to manipulate the language and societal frameworks. However, he ultimately fails to recognise that the language and systems functioning within the microcosm of the Heights are outside the parameters of his societal knowledge. The multiple incidents of misinterpretations, which devalue Lockwood’s position as editor, is most obviously portrayed in his first encounter with the young Catherine. It is important to note that this opening interaction illustrates the contrast between the editorial, female ideal, against that of the contrasting construction within *Wuthering Heights*.

Lockwood makes immediate assumptions concerning Catherine’s role within the house. He positions her within the typical confines of the female domestic sphere, and attempts to operate solely by this standard view of the societal system. This is illustrated by their initial encounter where, ‘[Lockwood] bowed and waited, thinking she would bid [him] take a seat. She looked at [him], leaning back in her chair, and remained motionless and mute’. The emphasis that he conforms to societal norms is evident in this physical performance, where he ‘bowed and waited’ in return for the expected response to ‘take a seat’. The expectation of this encounter is to reinforce the roles which each individual enacts within the societal system: Lockwood as the male-signifier of the patriarchal system who should be treated in a manner considerate of this, in opposition to Catherine as the female-signifier of the domestic sphere who must respond to these societal dictates and fulfil the role of the woman. This is reinforced through the consequent interaction surrounding the performative social etiquette of taking tea. Lockwood attempts to further state his position as this male-power figure through physically and verbally imposing his societal expectations onto the domestic task: ‘you are the proper person to ask me’. Lockwood’s expectation that Catherine will act according to his own narrative framework is encapsulated through the physical and societal performativity this task is supposed to ensure. However, Catherine positions
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herself completely outside of his narrative jurisdiction by repeatedly asking him ‘were you asked to tea?’\textsuperscript{179} By counteracting his overt expectations, Catherine attempts to reinstate her own narrative independence over the one which Lockwood is forcing upon her socially, and through the physical act itself, her very body.

This critique therefore views Lockwood and Catherine through the double lens of male/female societal codes, which can likewise be extended to the power relations between editor and author. Hogg’s overt explorations of the editor-author relationship in regard to public/private persona is here situated within the narrative practices physically encased within the social order. Catherine’s position as the female within the domestic space is considerably heightened through this theory of the female voice and its treatment by the male-embodied editorial power. This is emphasised through Lockwood’s language which focuses largely upon Catherine’s ‘motionless and mute’ state. Indeed, the descriptions of her silent character at this meeting, where ‘she never opened her mouth’, doubly-emphasises her disconnection from the traditional societal modes.\textsuperscript{180} This lack of speech and refusal to participate within the physical and verbal constructs of the patriarchal power system translates into the concept of the body-as-text. Not only is Lockwood unable to read many of the physical and verbal signifiers of the Heights’ own power structures, but Catherine also provides the ultimate example of the literal rejection of Lockwood as editor. Catherine refuses to be passively read by Lockwood, and instead inverts the traditional male-gaze back onto the patriarchal figure himself. Lockwood describes how, ‘she kept her eyes on [him], in a cool, regardless manner, exceedingly embarrassing and disagreeable’.\textsuperscript{181} This ‘cool, regardless manner’ rebuffs the power of the editor who is attempting to read, and ultimately over-write, this individual narrative within his own framework.

Lockwood’s assertion of these social and gendered power structures is ultimately undermined through his clear inability as the editorial figure to retain
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his definition over the narrative. For example, when attempting to enforce this image of the domestic female over Catherine, he remarks on a collection of objects which he initially perceives to be ‘something like cats’. His interpretation of the ‘like cats [italics my emphasis]’ illustrates the way in which he understands the societal formation of the domestic female role. The imagery of the supposed ‘cats’ represents the femininity which Lockwood is attempting to impose onto this space. A sense of domesticity is implied simultaneously through the stereotypically domestic nature of ‘cats’ within this traditionally female sphere, alongside the inference that young Catherine must be the pseudo-mother to these kittens, and thus reinforces the expected societal codes of the female as guardian of the house, and as the ultimate ideal of the nurturing, maternal figure. However, Emily bluntly destabilises the editor’s social construction by revealing that the supposed kittens - the representatives of the stereotypical expectations of nineteenth century femininity: innocence, youthfulness, and domestic containment - is actually ‘a heap of dead rabbits’. 182 It is this symbolic interaction which establishes the broader tension between the patriarchal expectations - present within the early nineteenth century construction of the publishing industry - and the female (voice).

This transgression of the boundaries imposed by the societal power systems, and in this instance highlighted through the editorial frameworks, is further explored through Lockwood’s physical containment. When contained within the distinctly female-held space of Cathy’s ‘large oak case’ bed, Lockwood is not only physically invading the distinctly female held space, but further proceeds to penetrate the psychic spaces. 183 This is reinforced through the depiction of the inside of the ‘oak case’, which Lockwood notes was ‘covered with writing scratched on the paint’. 184 By receding into this overt psychic space, Lockwood becomes overwhelmed by the ‘name repeated in all kinds of characters, large and small’. 185 It is the variation of the name - ‘Catherine Earnshaw’, ‘Catherine Linton’, and ‘Catherine Heathcliff’ - which physically and mentally encases the editorial figure: the societal fluidity of the
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female identity proves incapable of being easily possessed, and overpowered, by this model of the male-led literary marketplace. Moreover, the structure of the ‘large oak case’ not only physically enacts Lockwood’s intrusion into the realm of the broader female sphere, but also becomes synonymous with a rapacious penetration into both the body and mind of the female. The rapacious perspective of the editor is initially depicted through his attitude to handling ‘Catherine’s library’. He describes how he opened one book, then ‘shut it, and took up another, and another, till [he] had examined all’ of them. Despite his knowledge that he should not be within the room, or ‘large oak case’, he appears to have no apprehensions of rapidly ingesting the personal texts. He notes that ‘[s]ome were detached sentences; other parts took the form of a regular diary, scrawled in an unformed, childish hand’, mimicking the psychic thought processes of the young Catherine, whilst also highlighting Lockwood’s critical observance as the caricatured editor. It is this process of emboldening Lockwood as the male critical reader, who physically intrudes upon the female writing process, which situates Wuthering Heights as inherently female. By examining how the leading female representative of this text both physically and spiritually appears to re-work the male-defined parameters, we can further examine how Emily acknowledges Hogg’s understanding of the literary marketplace, whilst re-writing it through a distinctly female gaze.

The invasive power of the editor is underlined by Lockwood’s need to try to possess Catherine’s personal texts for himself. This is demonstrated by Lockwood’s ‘interest’ which has been ‘kindled within [him] for the unknown Catherine’ and so decides that he must ‘decipher her faded hieroglyphics’. This explicit ‘interest’ which ‘kindled within’ Lockwood is reminiscent of the rapacious language previously mentioned. Lockwood associates the decoding of ‘the unknown Catherine[‘s] narrative in the terms of sexual desire: a ‘kindled’ passion. Lockwood attempts to portray these emotions in the position of the editor, who amalgamates with the text itself, as a way of answering and re-presenting the original text: the ambiguous boundary - and relationship -
between the editor and author. However, it is the force used to ‘shut’ one book
and to take up ‘another, and another’, which re-frames his original ‘desire’ to
unlock ‘Catherine’ through the broader situated language of violence. The
allusion to decoding Catherine’s narrative is amplified by the significance of the
word ‘hieroglyphics’. The use of the term reinforces the idea that Lockwood has
positioned himself as the editor who must ‘decipher’ the true meaning behind
the ‘unknown Catherine’. Indeed, the term ‘hieroglyphics’ itself is reminiscent
of an exotic and marginal narrative. The term sets the language of Catherine’s
text as being outside the acceptable modern narrative which Lockwood is
socially attuned to. In this way, the ‘hieroglyphics’ themselves forebode the
ghostly-invasion scene to come, where the marginal voice can only be
understood through Lockwood very closely, and physically, encountering it.
These parameters can also be understood in reference to the argument of the
text as inherently female. However, the ‘unknown’ within and surrounding
‘Catherine’ which is depicted through Lockwood’s assumed editorial
perspective, allows for his position of power to manipulate the words, and
consequently the creative construction and presentation of Catherine’s
individual narrative. By treating Catherine as a part of, or even a literary
mechanism within the text, he attempts to possess power over the ways in which
these ‘hieroglyphics’ will further be represented and publicly interpreted. This is
particularly crucial to the broader involvement of the public critical gaze, and
the extent to which the audience are aware of these structures of
interpretation, before it meets their own personal examinations. Emily overly-
emphasizes these structures as a way of undermining the editorial re-
presentation of the narratives, by revealing Lockwood’s inability to fully
comprehend and convey the true meaning of these ‘hieroglyphics’ to his
audience. Instead, she brings forward the ‘real’ voice of the narrative: the
tangibility of the female voice(s).190

This process is materially mimicked through the way in which Lockwood
initially reacts to the sounds, and actions, of Catherine’s assumed ghostly body.

190 This technique is reminiscent of Branwell’s creation of the editor encompassed by John Bud. For a more
in-depth analysis on the way in which Bud handles, manufactures and disseminates Alexander Percy’s
manuscripts, see chapter two: ‘Patrick Branwell Brontë and Hogg’s The Private Memoirs and Confessions of
a Justified Sinner (1824)’, Cf. p37-40.
He states how he heard the ‘repeat[ed]’ ‘teasing sound’ outside the window, and decided that ‘it annoyed [him] so much, that [he] resolved to silence it’. This initial ‘teasing sound’ is a smaller precursor to the obtrusive ‘lamentable prayer’ which terrifies Lockwood. By contrasting these two states of ‘the horror of nightmare’, we see the symbolic impact of the unequivocal female voice on the male editor, and likewise, the state of ‘horror’ which the literary marketplace holds against these narrative perspectives. This is initiated itself by Lockwood’s literal crossing of the threshold: he aggressively disrupts the boundary, not only between the inside and outside, but also the hypothetical space between the living world and that of the world supernaturally beyond.

Emily reminds us that the language of the editor, attempting to reinforce the traditional ideological structures, is adrift in the physical environment of the Heights. Heathcliff’s response illustrates the disconnection between the societally ingrained notions represented through Lockwood, and the obvious contrast to the isolated power systems operating within the domain of Wuthering Heights: ‘What can you mean by talking in this way to me!...[h]ow dare you, under my roof- God! he’s mad to speak so!’ Through questioning Lockwood’s language, specifically its use of ‘under [his] roof’, we can observe how Emily further reinforces Hogg’s critique of the editorial practice, and physically manifests it within this alienated microcosm. More specifically, Heathcliff not only emphasises Lockwood’s use of language as inappropriate for the structures of his domain, but also refers to the language of ‘mad[ness]’. Emily therefore not only reverses the supernatural concept, which brings the ghost forward as fleshly human, but also completely overturns the societal structures through the reversal of the discourse on madness. Through these examples, we have been able to examine how Emily further critiqued Hogg’s awareness of the societal frameworks, particularly within the literary marketplace, through directly undermining the power of the editor by drawing out the marginal voice of the female narrative.
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To return to this foundational concept of the publishing industry and the literary marketplace, we can observe how Emily draws very physical and literal comparisons between these frameworks, and the structuring of the encapsulated sphere of the Heights itself. This is demonstrated through the multiple descriptions of the physical texts, and more importantly, the way in which they are visually used and handled. In this way, Emily is growing out of a similar vein of thought to that of Branwell, and his critique of the Confessions. For instance, the central signifier of this idea is illustrated when Robert is unable to interpret Gil-Martin’s personally altered version of the Bible. The altered Bible is more ‘topographically’ represented through the space of disjunction between the physical, personal and textual misinterpretations: Hogg highlights how Robert observes ‘a young man sitting in a devout posture, reading on a Bible’, yet, he cannot fully recognize who, or what, Gil-Martin is. The misinterpretation of the ‘devout posture’ means that Robert proceeds to use assumptions related to his own sense of self as a way of defining Gil-Martin’s identity, and consequently defining the purpose of the altered Bible. Robert describes the Bible itself, recognizing - yet misinterpreting - the ways in which it is significant to the identity of Gil-Martin. He states that, although it ‘still...seemed a Bible, having columns, chapters, and verses’ it was also ‘in a language of which I was wholly ignorant, and all intersected with red lines, and verses’. Gil-Martin has overwritten the print of the Bible, and Hogg appears to imply to the general reading public that this destruction of the text is aligned to the demonic figure. It is the significance of these ‘intersected’ ‘red lines’ and ‘verses’ throughout the original print which emphasizes how Gil-Martin is able to over-write, possess and manipulate the text for his own purpose: the text does indeed enact the physical metamorphosing of his body. However, it is Robert’s inability to fully read, interpret and take control of this independent text which consequently leads to his misinterpretations of Gil-Martin, and further moves towards his own self-destruction.

This critique of the altered text is transposed into the physical description of Catherine’s books, when Lockwood both physically and psychically invades her ‘space’. When he inhabits the ‘topographical’ and ‘psychic[ally]’ significant

'space' of Catherine’s room, he remarks how, ‘[he] began to nod drowsily over the page’ where he ‘wandered from manuscript to print’ and ‘saw a red ornamented title’: ‘A Pious Discourse’. The physical description locates the importance of this book in the double narrative of the text itself; Catherine has scribbled her thoughts between the print of the ‘Pious Discourse’, creating a situation where the reader truly must ‘read between the lines’. He further comments on how all of the books in ‘Catherine’s library’ have been used, yet not for ‘a legitimate purpose’, whereby ‘scarcely one chapter had escaped a pen-and-ink commentary - at least, the appearance of one - covering every morsel of blank that the printer had left’. By highlighting that the books have been over-written ‘[il]legitimately’, Lockwood reinforces the typical parameters of the publishing industry; the ingrained values of the printed word, especially in this form of the book, are situated as stable and inherently truthful. This notion is heightened by the knowledge that both examples of re-inscribed books - Gil-Martin’s and Catherine’s - are religious works, and subsequently are held higher up in value of sacred importance. By altering, amending and writing over these texts, the characters infringe upon their material and metaphysical authority. But, more importantly, they infringe upon the hierarchical, power systems embodied by the very emblematic nature of these texts as physical works.

Both examples - Gil-Martin and Catherine - as marginal yet powerful narrative voices, transgress the societal power systems literally through their own mechanization of the publishing industry framework. Indeed, this is further depicted in the Confessions, where Hogg uses the obviously blasphemous nature of Gil-Martin’s book -he declares to Robert that, ‘it is my Bible, sir’ - to emphasize his position as the ‘other’. His characterization as the external threat is portrayed through his ability to go against the societal code, and against the values of the established print market. He physically, and consequently socially, is able to write his own narrative over that of the seemingly sacred, and established text. However, Catherine’s situation as the external threat is not just assumed through her controversial personal narrative. Lockwood’s remark on Catherine’s writing, which covered ‘every morsel of blank
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that the printer left’, visually illustrates the location of the female voice. Catherine’s words literally and conceptually intrude upon the ‘blank’ space left by the printing procedure. Like Gil-Martin, Catherine disrupts the authority of the printing press structures by inserting herself into the very physical representatives which outline the boundaries themselves: the female voice assumes authority by *over* writing the boundaries.
Conclusion

Throughout all three explorations of Hogg’s influence on the Brontë’s works, the emphasis on their understanding of the editorial frameworks is the most prominent. Hogg’s overt critiques of the publishing industry unveiled the ways in which the literary marketplace was changing. The various depictions of editors and authors mark out the relationship which Hogg had with the early nineteenth-century literary marketplace. Consequently, the early education of the Brontë children ingests this high awareness of how and why these figures of power function. However, it is ultimately Hogg’s obvious awareness of audiences, and the readerships which he was consciously crafting throughout his oeuvre, that influences the Brontës later in their literary careers.

Blackwood died in September 1834, and Hogg followed exactly a year after his friend and editor’s death in the September of 1835. These deaths provide an appropriate milestone for the establishment of the Blackwood’s legacy. The movement had founded the ‘second-generation of Romantic writers and critics’ who, with the official start of the Victorian period in 1837, would go on to define the specific structures of the Victorian ideology, which would come to be integrated into our own modern practices today. Unfortunately for Hogg, it was to be the overwhelming weight which Blackwood’s had in defining the machinery by which the publishing industry produced their perspectives, which retained Hogg’s characterisation as the ‘Noctean shepherd’. For example, Douglas S. Mack remarks that,

[A] few years before [Hogg’s] death he quarrelled with John Gibson Lockhart. As a result, Hogg is memorably portrayed as a boor and buffoon in Lockhart’s Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart., a vastly influential book in the Victorian period. Thanks largely to Lockhart’s vivid and animosity-driven portrait, Hogg ceased to be regarded as a rough diamond and came to be regarded as a clown.
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The influence which Hogg had over the Brontës was to effectively act as teacher: an access point into the high functioning and complex machinery of the early nineteenth-century literary marketplace. It is the effect that the literary training of Hogg had on the later lives and perspectives of Charlotte, Branwell and Emily, which distinguishes their own interactions with the Victorian publishing industry. Alexander comments that, ‘the Brontës were colonizers - both literally and imaginatively - imitating and reconfiguring the political and social world of nineteenth-century England that they encountered in their extensive reading.’\(^{201}\) This early education allowed them to imitate and reconfigure the image of Hogg to build a platform from which to integrate themselves within the literary sphere. However, this was only successful, or partly successful, for the three Brontë sisters.

The ambitions of the eighteen-year-old-boy who wrote so overly confidently to Blackwood’s in 1835 was not to come to fruition. Charlotte’s letter to her friend and publisher, William Smith Williams, remarks on the death of her brother that she only feels pity ‘for the wreck of talent, the ruin of promise, the untimely dreary extinction of what might have been a burning and a shining light’.\(^{202}\) The ‘shining light’ which was visible throughout Branwell’s evocative writing is limited by his deep immersion within the imaginary literary marketplace he so vividly created. His ability to understand the mechanisms and personas of the Blackwood’s ‘company’, outlined in Charlotte’s ‘The History of the Year’, is undermined through his inability to distinguish between the reality and fiction of this precise literary technique.

Emily’s attempt to gain literary independence was undermined through her own relationship with the publishing industry. Her choice of publisher, a Mr. Newby, limited her integration within the marketplace, largely through his neglect and greed. It was Emily’s inability to garner the power necessary to force her work into the literary marketplace, which allowed for the editor and


publisher to manipulate its reception for their own personal gain. Indeed, Barker states that,

Newby had only begun to give serious attention to the publication of [Emily and Anne’s] novels when he realized that there was glory - not to mention money - to be made from the magical name of Bell. The mystery surrounding the sex and identity of Currer Bell would fuel interest in his own publication of works by Ellis and Acton Bell and, as circumstances would swiftly prove, he was not averse to manipulating the truth in order to gain maximum publicity and sales.  

Barker’s emphasis on the ‘magical name of Bell’ reinforces the relationship between the initial treatment of Hogg, and his multiple literary personas crafted by the editors and publishers, and the continuing tradition which would eventually force the Brontë sisters to relinquish their masculine pseudonyms. The literary marketplace attached to this formula of masked identity, and manifested their multiple interpretations through situating the Brontës against one another: ‘The reviewers, aided by Newby’s judicious advertising, were not slow to realize the connection between the three Bells and to draw comparisons between their works.’ Indeed, this idea that the works of the Brontës are always to be judged in relation to one another, within their singular microcosmic unit, has survived into contemporary literary criticism.

It is ultimately Charlotte who is able to most fully cultivate and grow from Hogg’s influence. Unlike Branwell and Emily, Charlotte situates her appreciation of Hogg within the continual evolution of the publishing industry. It is Charlotte’s understanding of the power structures that Hogg revealed most notably here through his progressive portrayals of ‘the double’, which allowed Charlotte to further understand her own position when thrust into the literary marketplace herself. Her knowledge of the industry is perceptible through her ability to inhabit the multiple personas which she was given by the reviewers of *Jane Eyre*. This is likewise demonstrated through her self-conscious manipulation of the public/private identity she was garnering to protect her true identity, and most importantly within the societal codes and values of the mid-nineteenth century: her real gender. Her awareness of how these frameworks operated can
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be seen in the way she attempts to craft a specific audience, illustrated once again by the opening of her unpublished preface to *Shirley*. The first sentence directly addresses the presumed audience: ‘[t]he Public is respectfully informed that with this Preface it has no manner of concern’.  

Charlotte emphasises the audience as the general reading ‘Public’, whilst ironically contradicting the purpose of a ‘Preface’ by dictating that they have ‘no manner of concern’ with it. Instead, she situates her ‘Preface’ within an intimate environment, stating that it is actually ‘a private and confidential letter to a friend’, where she ‘merely wish[es] to have a little quiet chat with <you> [them]’. Charlotte’s creative choice to clearly transgress the boundary between public and private conclusively illustrates the pattern of how Hogg influenced the Brontë siblings as a whole: he not only advanced their knowledge and awareness within these literary frameworks, but also encouraged their creativity within their writerly techniques to quite literal break down the boundaries within these systems of power. In this way, the Brontës - and Charlotte in particular - were able to acquire a position of power within their own distinctive literary voices.

As a variety of contemporary scholars have already highlighted, there is little doubt that James Hogg was an influence on the broader ideas and creative outputs of the Brontës. However, what this thesis has illustrated is the nature of Hogg’s influence at the deepest literary levels. Hogg’s creative panoply of ideas, and his own hyper awareness of the literary marketplace, bore significant fruits for the Brontës, but at a deeper level than critics have so far acknowledged and explored. His influence informed, at the most basic levels, the siblings’ understanding of their roles as authors in an increasingly competitive and malleable literary marketplace.
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