Writing ‘by advice’: Ivanhoe and The Three Perils of Man
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The idea of bringing together The Three Perils of Man and Ivanhoe is not a new one. Douglas Mack, for instance, has suggested The Three Perils of Man ‘can be read as a text that partly celebrates and partly subverts Scott’s fictions, particularly Ivanhoe’ while Ian Duncan writing of the ‘sadistic excess’ of the violence threatened against Lady Jane Howard notes that Hogg here presses to extremes the ironical thematics of sexual conquest and sacrifice Scott had featured in his own ‘perilous castle’ romance, Ivanhoe and, with Ivanhoe at least partly in mind, he has described The Three Perils of Man as ‘Hogg’s more aggressive “homage” to Scott.’ These comments have helped our understanding of both novels. However, the recent reappearance of the manuscript of The Three Perils of Man opens up some new and fruitful avenues of comparison which were not available before. With manuscripts of both novels now before us, there is much we can learn about each writer’s mode of composition and revision, the situation each writer found himself in as he wrote, and the impact that this then had on the sort of novel each produced. David Hewitt has claimed that ‘Hogg criticism is currently obsessed with Walter Scott. This is a pity for far from establishing Hogg’s stature it demeans him by perpetually considering him in the light of another.’ There is some justification in this despite the fact that some of these comparisons have been productive. In this paper, however, I hope to avoid this potential pitfall by beginning, not with a thematic comparison, but with a comparison of the two authors’ modes of composition and revision. In this way we can approach a situation where we can treat them on more equal terms and both see Hogg in the light of Scott and Scott in the light of Hogg.

Of course the most obvious Scott text to compare with The Three Perils of Man is not Ivanhoe but Castle Dangerous. The germ of Scott’s novel is, after all, the same as that of the Roxburgh section of The Three Perils of Man—as Hogg himself pointed out, claiming indeed that Scott ‘copied the whole of the main plot into his tale of Castle Dangerous’ and as was implied by the original title for the novel The Perilous Castle or Castles (both names seem to have been considered). However this comparison will be better undertaken once we have the benefit of J. H. Alexander’s forthcoming edition of Castle Dangerous. In the meantime the strong thematic overlap between Ivanhoe and The Three Perils of Man makes them, as others have already shown, a natural pair for comparison. Both writers deal with the difficult subjects of sexuality and violence within the context of a portrayal of chivalry. Examining the process of composition and revision in each novel helps us understand how the freedoms and constraints under which they operated affected their presentation of these subjects.

To begin then with the details of the composition. The first mention of Ivanhoe is on 8 June 1819 when John Ballantyne bargained with Constables for its publication. We do not know if Scott had already started the novel but probably he had not, since the first half was dictated and as late as 14 June he was writing to William Laidlaw to get pens ready to take down the dictated text. On 2 July he was dictating to John Ballantyne and by 13 August he had reached what he thought of as the end of the second volume although in the printed book Volume II actually extends for another three chapters. However at this point there was a gap. Scott began work on The Monastery and, although he returned to work on Ivanhoe by 23 August, he may well have continued to work on The Monastery at intervals. By mid-October a printed copy of the first volume was available for Robert Cadell to take to London for his negotiations with Hurst, Robinson and Co., the text having been set up as Scott wrote it. Ivanhoe was finally finished on 10 November but the process of printing was also advancing so that Scott would have been checking the proofs as he continued to write the novel. By as early as 19 November the second volume and part of the third had been printed and, after some further delays caused by lack of paper, the final sheet was in the press by 7 December with the book being published late in that month.

As for The Three Perils of Man, the recently rediscovered manuscript, written as it is on a variety of different kinds of paper, has the potential to throw some further light on what we already knew of Hogg’s progress. Gillian Hughes suggests that he may well have begun the novel in mid 1818 since the first fourteen pages of the surviving manuscript are written on paper Hogg used in letters of June and July of that year. He was certainly working on it in 1819 and, on 16 November, he wrote to Blackwood about his plans to publish what was at this stage projected as a two-volume novel. He says he has ‘not much more than one vol[ume] written.’ It is not entirely clear which parts of the surviving manuscript could derive from Hogg’s first composition of the novel but, for what it is worth, pages 65–76 of the total 445 pages are written on paper Hogg also used in writing to Blackwood on 30 November. These particular pages do not appear to be part of a written-up copy so perhaps Hogg had
not got quite as far as he was claiming. There was then a big gap: little was written till at least October 1820 and the novel was not completed until the end of May 1821. In the course of this long period of gestation Hogg, like Scott, worked on another text, in his case the Jacobite Relics. In April 1820, for instance, he writes to Blackwood: ‘You are quite mistaken in thinking I am anything flurried at present. I take a speel every day at Jacobite airs [...] or a certain romance.’

Like Scott, Hogg also had problems with the process of publication. In Scott’s case lack of suitable paper delayed the publication of the book till late December 1819. Hogg’s delays were more serious. Completed in May 1821, The Three Perils of Man was rejected in June by Oliver and Boyd (who had seen only the first two volumes), accepted in October by Longmans, changed in December by Hogg at Scott’s request after he had been shown the proofs of the opening of the novel, and finally published in June 1822.

To summarise all this—Scott began Ivanhoe in June 1819 and completed it by 10 November; it was published in late December. Hogg perhaps began writing a year earlier than Scott and claimed to have written a volume by mid-November 1819 (when Scott completed Ivanhoe) but did not finish his novel till May 1821 and had to wait until June 1822 for its publication.

On the surface there are some interesting parallels here. Both were writing their novels in 1819, both worked on other texts at the same time, both experienced delays. The differences are however more interesting. While both were writing in 1819, it is Scott’s novel that is more clearly influenced by the traumatic political events of the year. Scott’s picture of a king and his subjects at harmony in the Robin Hood sections of the novel reads very much like a plea for similar harmony in England in 1819. Certainly he revealed a mental connection between the novel and the historical events when he used the initials of the supposed writer of Ivanhoe, Laurence Templeton, in writing a letter to the Edinburgh Weekly Journal of 8 September 1819 defending the actions of the authorities in the so-called Peterloo Massacre of 16 August in which troops killed eleven people when they fired on a crowd calling for parliamentary reform. Hogg, writing in any case over a longer period, seems less concerned with politics. On the other hand his personal life in the period—including his marriage in April 1820—may have been more of an influence: The Three Perils of Man is certainly very concerned with male-female relations, in particular with contrasting female roles in the princess and Lady Jane on the one hand and Mary Chisholm on the other.

As regards simultaneous work on other texts, neither novel seems to have been fundamentally affected by the author’s other work. Hogg uses a few lines from the Jacobite Relics as chapter mottoes and the greater concentration on monastic religion in the third volume of Ivanhoe may owe something to The Monastery but these influences are slight. Curiously, though Hogg was actually working on Jacobite material while writing The Three Perils of Man, it is Scott who shows the greater influence of Jacobite themes. I have suggested before that Ivanhoe can be viewed as a Jacobite novel where, in contrast to the historical outcome, the rightful king is actually restored and I believe Jacobite issues were strongly in Scott’s mind as he wrote it. By contrast, Jacobite themes do not seem important in The Three Perils of Man. However, the long gestation of each novel, longer in Hogg’s case, allowed for new texts to influence the authors apart from the ones that they were working on. In the early part of his novel Scott seems to have been using other sources of information on the Templars but by the third volume he has clearly been studying the Templar Rule as presented in the work by André Favine translated into English as Theatrer of Honour and Knight-Hood in 1623. He used it magnificently in creating Lucas de Beaumanoir, the fanatical Grand Master. For Hogg the relevant text could well be Ivanhoe. On 10 January 1820 he writes to Blackwood: ‘Send me Ivanhoe I am wearying terribly for it [...] Send Ivanhoe this week.’ But if, as Gillian Hughes suggests, Scott’s influence on The Three Perils of Man is undeniable and inescapable with much of that influence coming from Ivanhoe, this manifests itself indirectly in the themes of the novel rather than showing in the obvious way that the Templar Rule influences Ivanhoe: Scott incorporated chunks of the Templar Rule into Ivanhoe but Hogg did not incorporate chunks of Ivanhoe into The Three Perils of Man.

It is when we turn to the actual process of composition that the differences become most significant and instructive. Of this the changes made in the course of writing and printing the text are an important aspect. These fall into three broad categories: changes made within the manuscript, changes made when the manuscript is first set up in print, and changes made in the proofs. Within the manuscript, except when the author writes something, crosses it out, and continues on the same line (thus showing the change was made at the very moment of composition), we often cannot be sure when the changes were made. However, because Scott sent off his manuscript to the printer in batches, we know that he had only a short period in which to make changes. Hogg on the other hand sent the complete manuscript to the publisher (or at least two of the three volumes in the case of Oliver and Boyd) so that he could have made some of the changes at the very end, sometimes by preparing a
new final copy for the printer. (Indeed Hogg's manuscript as we have it today, which may not have been the only copy made, starts with what seems to be written-up final copy prepared in Hogg's clearest handwriting). Taking into account the different times at which the changes might have been made, it is nevertheless clear that both writers made substantial corrections in the manuscript. Some of these are quite minor (such as the substitution of a different word or slight reshaping of the structure of the sentence)—others are more substantial. Some of Hogg's most interesting changes take the form of bowdlerisation or at least the toning down of sexual references. Perhaps the most striking instance is that where Lady Jane Howard is threatened by Douglas with public serial rape if Musgrave does not give up the castle, a case discussed by Gillian Hughes in her Hugh McNaughtan lecture.\(^\text{15}\) As Hogg revised this passage in the manuscript, instead of being 'exhibited naked' and 'compelled to yield her body to the conquest of [Douglas's] grooms' she is to be 'exhibited in a state not to be named' and 'compelled to yield to that disgrace which barbarians only could have conceived'.\(^\text{16}\) What is remarkable here is not so much that Hogg made the change as that the new wording only very slightly veils the meaning. By contrast, in the manuscript of *Ravnae* Scott does not include such explicit sexual references and consequently does not amend them.

When we move on to compare the manuscript and the first edition we immediately notice that the differences page by page between manuscript and first edition are much more widespread in Scott. There is in fact a large amount of change on every page between corrected manuscript and first edition for Scott while the changes in Hogg are on most pages much fewer and are instead concentrated on a few particular passages. There is an obvious reason for this. Scott's process of composition was a collaborative one. He did not bother to provide full punctuation; he knew this would be provided in the printing house which he owned anyway. The printer (or perhaps, even earlier, the transcriber who was always used with Scott's anonymously-published novels except when he had dictated the text to an amanuensis) would tidy up the text, even change words where they were repeated too close to each other. Most significant of all, Scott sent off his manuscript in batches as it was written. He got immediate feedback from James Ballantyne who sent him proofs of each section as it was set up along with his own comments. Scott thus had many responses from Ballantyne to the style and content while still in the process of writing the novel. One instance of Ballantyne's successful intervention on such grounds is well documented. Although on the whole Scott avoids the explicit representation of violence, he had originally intended to introduce one dramatic piece of violence into *Ivanhoe*. In the manuscript he had Athelstan die in the taking of Torquilstone when Bois-Guilbert's blow to his head 'fairly cleft it in twain' yet, even as he was still in the process of writing the novel, Scott was obliged to yield to James Ballantyne's 'vehement entreaties' to bring Athelstan back to life so that this passage was changed: the first edition merely records that the Templar's stroke 'levelled him with the earth' (and Athelstan comically reappears in the third volume, very much alive and happily cured of any pretensions to kingship).\(^\text{17}\) Ballantyne may also have been responsible for another significant variation between manuscript and first edition, the change (in relation to Ulrica) from describing Front-de-Bœuf as 'her seducer' to the less loaded 'her tyrant'\(^\text{18}\) even though an earlier and less damning reference to Front-de-Bœuf's *father* as her 'ravisher' is retained.\(^\text{19}\) Alternatively, however, it could be that Scott decided, at proofs stage, that it was inappropriate, in the description of Ulrica's final moments, to confirm the earlier implication that Ulrica was the paramour of both father and son.\(^\text{20}\) Whoever was responsible, one thing is clear: if it was not done by Ballantyne himself, it happened under his watchful eye.

Although with Hogg there are far fewer line-by-line changes, there are nevertheless significant differences between manuscript and first edition. He was, as we know, forced to make changes after he showed the proofs of the first section of the novel to Scott. Most notably he had to change a central character's name from Sir Walter Scott to Sir Ringan Redhough in order to avoid offending the Duke of Buccleuch and perhaps Scott himself. This change was partly made in proofs after Scott had read the proofs of the early part of the novel and partly in a revised form of the manuscript (not, for the most part, it would seem, the Fales MS which has the original name uncorrected until the very last section).\(^\text{21}\) Scott, as it happens, also changed his hero's name at proofs stage—from Harold to Wilfrid—(because, as he put it, 'Harold is over-scratched in this our generation').\(^\text{22}\) We are able to trace Scott's changes in the proofs for the part of the novel where the proofs survive (which unfortunately does not coincide with the surviving section of the manuscript). From this we know that Scott's other changes at proofs stage do not involve the removal or addition of any sexual references.

Both writers, then, made significant revisions between the original act of composition and the final printed text. However the revisions were made in different circumstances and beginning from a different starting point. Scott was writing for an immediate audience and that audience was a prudish one or rather someone who acted on behalf of an assumed prudish audience. Scott had the final say since he saw the proofs, perhaps
more than once, but he was presumably, even as he wrote, already internalising the constraints and to some extent adjusting his text to fit James Ballantyne's expectations. Furthermore, if internalised constraints were not enough, Ballantyne was always there, returning the proofs with his comments and often leading Scott to go back and change what he had originally written.

It could be argued that, in the end, Scott was temperamentally less interested in portraying sexuality and violence than Hogg and that this, rather than the supervision of Ballantyne, is why there is less violence and explicit sexuality in Scott's manuscripts than in Hogg's. This is certainly part of the explanation; Scott generally, for instance, makes his point without portraying violence directly so that the few violent scenes in the novels (such as the death of Morris in *Rob Roy*) are all the more shocking for their rarity. Nevertheless the Athelstane episode suggests that there would have been more violence in Scott's novels if he had not been continually watched over by Ballantyne. In many cases Scott was willing to accept Ballantyne's advice but sometimes he dug his heels in and insisted on abiding by his choice of a violent scene. When James objected to the death of Oliver Proudfoot by 'a blow from behind against which his head-piece was no defence' in *The Fair Maid of Perth* Scott, while protesting that 'I value your criticism as much as ever', replied that 'I cannot afford to be merciful'. It seems clear that Scott's natural inclination was to include more violence than James approved of and at time went on he seems to have been more and more willing to yield to this inclination. When this growing willingness to follow this inclination was combined with distance from James Ballantyne and his other censors, Lockhart and Cadell, as happened with *The Siege of Malta* and *Biazzo*, the two stories he wrote after leaving Britain for his trip to Malta and Italy, the level of violence is noticeably higher than in earlier works—both of these texts have shocking scenes of violence. Similarly Scott was clearly inclined on certain occasions to be more explicit about sexual matters than suited Ballantyne. In a well-known case somewhat inaccurately recorded by Lockhart, Scott gave in to Ballantyne's alarm about undisguised references to the past sexual relationship of Clara and Tyrel in *Saint Ronan's Well* and revised an unambiguous passage in proofs although he left more indirect indications in other parts of the novel. Once again Scott was obliged to concede to Ballantyne's scruples even though he believed, as reported by Lockhart, that the changes acted 'to perplex and weaken the course of his narrative, and the dark effect of its catastrophe'. While this particular change apparently took place after the novel was completed and while it was being set up in print, it relates to the same kind of pressure as Scott elsewhere felt when he was in the actual course of composition. Apart from when he wrote *The Siege of Malta* and *Biazzo*, Scott was always writing, as it were, under supervision. His natural inclinations were always under some kind of curb.

By contrast, as he actually wrote the novel, Hogg was a free agent. He did not send off his manuscript in batches and consequently did not have a printer at his elbow continually offering advice and criticism. Even though Hogg made the significant change of his hero's name of his own volition while Hogg changed it under pressure, it could paradoxically be argued that Hogg was, in the end, more in control of his text. Hogg did call in Scott at the end and was forced to make some changes but he did this, probably, less from a desire for collaboration with Scott than because it would help him with the publishers. As he wrote to George Boyd on 27 June 1821, 'That the firm of Oliver and Boyd should refuse to publish a work with my name at it was what I had no conception of, especially as Sir W. Scott had kindly undertaken to correct the proofs in my absence."

In the end, though, Hogg wrote by himself under his own rules and conceptions and even the published version very largely reflects this.

This is not to say that Hogg was immune from the effects of a real or assumed prudish audience. As we have seen, Hogg appears to have bowdlerised his text in some places in the manuscript before it was printed and Sharon Ragas has demonstrated similar bowdlerisation in *The Brownie of Bodbeck*. Furthermore he was not always able to use a printer of his own choice, as he did with *The Three Perils of Man*, and, as Douglas Mack has shown, when he used Ballantyne as a printer for *Queen Hynde* the printed text suffers from several excisions of material that might be considered indecent which are very probably the work of Ballantyne rather than Hogg himself. Nevertheless, in the particular case of *The Three Perils of Man*, it would appear that Hogg writes as he wishes according to his own standards and then makes changes, sometimes of his own free will during the process of composition or later, sometimes under pressure after the text is completed, but always starting from his original unconstrained text. Even where he changes the text as he goes along it is not under prompting from someone else and he is rather more likely to soften explicit sexual references than to remove them entirely. Where, later on, he makes changes on the advice of Scott and others he does this to a text which he has written without immediate and continually present constraints. In other words Hogg's starting point is higher and the end point is also therefore usually higher. This is very much evident when we compare the two novels' handling of violence. Hogg not only has a good deal more violence throughout his text but in particular includes a
grisly scene in which a group of five horsemen are joined by a mysterious sixth who proves to be 'a dead warrior, whose head was cleft asunder, and his whole body, both within and without the harness, encrusted in blood'. Thus Hogg's more gruesome head-seeing scene is retained (complete with appreciative comments from the others on the force of Charlie Scott's killing blow) while Scott's far more restrained description is removed, with Scott obliged to rewrite the passage and provide a resuscitation of Athelstane before the novel is even completed.

What effect, then, does all of this have on the two novels? I suggest that it relates strongly to the fact that The Three Perils of Man is, with respect to the handling of sexuality and violence, by some distance the more adventurous of the two works. Of course Scott was adventurous too: having gained an audience with novels which were located in Scotland and set no earlier than the seventeenth century, he wanted to try a new tack but was well aware of the danger in going back to the twelfth century and adopting an English location in Ivanhoe. Nor were these the only innovations for Scott in the novel. But, in terms of pushing the limits of what an audience might accept, The Three Perils of Man is definitely the more adventurous of the two. Where Scott hints at the possibility of rape for Rowena and Rebecca, Hogg brings it into explicit focus with the steward's attack on Delany. Where Scott has Isaac under threat of being roasted to extract money from him (thus providing an approach to cannibalism without actually raising the issue), Hogg brings cannibalism into full view, although it does not actually take place. Where Scott largely excludes violence from his pages, even though he describes the period as one in which the populace were 'subjected to every species of subordinate oppression', Hogg confronts us with violence on a large and horrific scale. The same applies also to the supernatural, where Scott has Rebecca accused unjustly of being a witch with a full rational explanation of how such charges could arise in a superstitious society, Hogg gives us witchcraft in full operation and without challenge to its reality on the part of the author. And we only need to compare the fearsome Devil in The Three Perils of Man with the polite horseman who escorts Steenie in 'Wandering Willie's Tale' to see how much further Hogg was willing to go in portraying the most frightening aspects of supernatural figures. By contrast with the boundary-pushing exhibited by Hogg, Scott can seem comparatively tame.

But then his achievement lay in another direction: the creation of the first seriously historical novel with a medieval setting.

This difference of approach has a significant impact on their treatment of common themes. Take, for example, chivalry, an important theme in both novels. By its nature chivalry institutionalises a threat to women.

The role of the chivalric knight is to protect the weak, especially women, but the knight can only genuinely take on this role of defender if the threat to women is real. Rape, as the ultimate physical attack on a woman, is thus a necessary other side of the chivalric system. Not surprisingly, therefore, a significant theme in both novels is rape, or rather the threat of rape. Under the disguising language of courtly love, both Rowena and Rebecca face the prospect of forced sex—so much so that Rebecca is willing to sell herself to escape it. In The Three Perils of Man the threat is undisguised when Delany is seized by the steward who tries to drag her off to his cell and, even though, as we have seen, Hogg modified in his manuscript the language of the scene where Lady Jane Howard is threatened by Douglas with public serial rape if Musgrave does not give up the castle, the nature of the threat remains utterly unmistakable. In both novels the threat of rape, the dark other side of chivalry, remains unfulfilled but it seems to be much more dangerously close to fulfilment in The Three Perils of Man where the threat is presented so much more explicitly and where there is already so much violence of male against male that violence of male against female seems entirely possible.

Perhaps because of the greater urgency of the threat, the women in Hogg are compelled to take a more proactive role in defending themselves. In Ivanhoe the women never escape from their position of vulnerable dependency. Rowena is simply passive; Rebecca can only protect herself by threatening to commit suicide and though she brings all her intelligence to bear in her trial for witchcraft, she can only escape death through the intervention of Ivanhoe. Ultimately she is forced to leave the country and, as a kind of Jewish nun, to rely on another one of the institutionalised bulwarks against male sexual aggression, refuge in a convent. In The Three Perils of Man we find a similar pair of central women characters but rather than simply reacting to violence as it threatens them they go on the offensive: indeed they try to turn their position of vulnerability into a position of strength by forcing men to play the chivalric game on their behalf even if, in the end, marriage controls and contains them. Rather than killing herself Lady Jane leads her lover instead to kill himself to avoid her rape. Furthermore, unlike the mild suggestion of rivalry between Rebecca and Rowena in Ivanhoe which is defused by Rebecca's generosity, the rivalry of Hogg's women is open, fierce, and potentially violent. Hogg confronts both Douglas and the reader with the princess's appalling demand that the Douglas destroy Lady Jane's attractiveness: 'I'll have [sic] her nose cut off; and two of her fore teeth drawn; and her cheeks and brow scolloped'.

In the context of this threatened violence against women, both novels...
offer a critique of chivalry. If there is one word that sums up Scott’s view of chivalry it is ‘fantastic’—not used, of course, as a term of approval—and Hogg takes a similar attitude. However, of the two, Scott’s view is the more complex and ambivalent. The two-sided description of Richard at the end of the novel as ‘that generous, but rash and romantic monarch’ (p. 401) sums up this ambivalence. The key discussion of chivalry in the novel—the debate between Rebecca and Ivanhoe—leaves us poised between two views. Ivanhoe praises chivalry as ‘the nurse of pure and high affection—the stay of the oppressed, the redresser of grievances, the curb of the power of the tyrant’ (p. 249) but Rebecca, who has the last word, speaks still of ‘the fantastic chivalry of the Nazarene’ (p. 250). In the end what does chivalry achieve? Richard dies in an obscure siege and Ivanhoe only prevails in his combat with Bois-Guilbert because the latter has a timely heart attack, although we are surely expected to admire the wounded Ivanhoe’s chivalric willingness to risk his life in the defence of Rebecca.

On the other hand in The Three Perils of Man we find much less ambivalence and far more concentration on the fantastic and extreme side of chivalry. This is in part made possible by the greater capacity to describe violent acts which Hogg’s process of composition and revision allowed. The determination of the English to defend Roxburgh, literally at any cost of life, is revealed as sheer madness. Musgrave is driven to kill himself and, perhaps most shocking of all, the princess laments that no one has killed himself for her. (Contrast this with the suggestion of potential jealousy on the part of Rowena towards Rebecca at the end of Ivanhoe when the narrator wonders ‘whether the recollection of Rebecca’s beauty and magnanimity did not recur to his mind more frequently than the fair descendant of Alfred might altogether have approved.’)34 Similarly, the extreme side of chivalry is highlighted in Hogg’s novel by the much more explicit threat of sexual and other violence against women.

Scott said somewhat harshly of Hogg in a letter to Lord Montagu that he was ‘profoundly ignorant of history’.35 By contrast he saw himself as very knowledgeable about chivalry, having written a whole long essay on the topic. However, I do not think the difference in the treatment of chivalry in the two novels really rests primarily on knowledge or lack of it. Hogg simply had too great a love of the extravagant and absurd and too great a delight in presenting it for him to take chivalry very seriously as a noble ideal particularly in its more extreme manifestations. Scott, is, typically, more measured even if he ultimately saw more of the fantastic than the noble in chivalric behaviour. Nevertheless the circumstances of composition also play an important part in determining how the two authors present chivalry in the two texts.

Another issue which arises when we compare the process of composition and revision of the two novels is structure. The three-volume physical format of novels of the time was dictated by non-literary considerations of the market but writers could make use of it in planning the narrative structures of their novels. Scott as he wrote the novel was already planning the division into three volumes and, although he originally thought to end the second volume earlier than the point at which it ends in the first edition, the three-volume structure of the novel does bear a relation to the narrative structure, with the second volume dominated by events at Coningsburgh which bring all the central characters together. On the other hand Hogg simply numbered the chapters of the novel through in one sequence. Originally he thought that the novel would extend to only two volumes but it was finally long enough to fill the standard three volume format. In part this was no doubt due to the different relationship with the printer: because Scott’s novel was set progressively in print as he sent batches off to the printer, he could see clearly when he was approaching the normal number of pages for a volume. There was little point in Hogg marking volume divisions when he was unsure whether what he had written would fill a printed volume. Yet, despite this, Hogg’s structure of plot and setting does align somewhat with the volume structure, perhaps even slightly more so than Scott’s. In Three Perils the travellers arrive at Aikwood in the last sentence of the first volume and the setting remains at Aikwood throughout the second volume (although it must be said that more than half is occupied with stories narrated at Aikwood but set elsewhere). The setting continues at or around Aikwood for the first five chapters of the third volume before moving to Roxburgh but the last chapter returns to events at Aikwood. In Ivanhoe the setting does not move to Torquilstone till Chapter 7 of Volume 2. It stays there until the end of Chapter 13 (Scott’s original ending to the volume) and then reverts to Ashby for a chapter before returning to Torquilstone for the last two chapters of the volume and the first of the next volume. While events at Torquilstone dominate the second volume they do not fully occupy it. Altogether Hogg’s thematic structure is slightly better supported by both setting and volume division: the basic Roxburgh–Aikwood–Roxburgh–Aikwood movement is partly aligned with the volumes and allows a nice balancing of the differing thematic concerns associated with the two main settings. Scott, on the other hand, has less coincidence of volume and setting and has no such clearly-defined connection between theme and setting although the sporting combat of Ashby is set against the judicial combat at Templestowe and there are some interesting contrasts between the Saxon and Norman settings and
the greenwood.

It would seem then that the differing mode of composition (Scott dividing into volumes as he goes along and Hogg not doing so) is not responsible for the differing alignment of settings and volumes in the two works. It may, however, have affected the way in which Hogg came to view his novel. He was no doubt influenced also by Scott’s criticism of the novel, as he recalls it, that ‘it is always the same with you just hurrying on from one vagary to another’, a criticism which he was more liable to accept as valid when he knew he had not originally planned the novel in volumes. He became unduly sensitive to the idea that the structure of his novel might be open to criticism and he acknowledged this sensitivity in formulating a plan to break it up into ‘seven distinct tales’, as Douglas Mack has recorded. The plan was partly carried into effect: Hogg extracted the Roxburghe part for his collected Tales and Sketches and published two of the stories from the second volume separately. He evidently intended to publish the rest as separate tales along with the remainder of the Aikwood section to make up the seven. In his later writing about the novel he treats its structure as a huge mistake. In his Memoir of the Author’s Life he writes, ‘I dashed on, and mixed up with what might have been one of the best historical tales our country ever produced, such a mass of diablerie as retarded the main story, and rendered the whole perfectly ludicrous.’ Modern critical opinion would suggest he was wrong though understandably he wanted to find an explanation for the novel’s critical failure. In fact, the original title, rejected, so Hogg told Scott, because it was ‘a title that a lady would give’, was really much more helpful, especially in the plural form, The Perilous Castles. The Perilous Castles points us towards the essential structure of the novel in which the events at Roxburgh Castle, where the highest in the land play out their deadly serious games of chivalry, contrast with the events at Aikwood, where the much more down-to-earth Charlie Scott and his companions face the almost equally deadly game of magic and witchcraft. Hogg’s decision to break up the second volume into multiple parts implies that the structural defect lies particularly in that volume, the one dealing with the diablerie of Aikwood Castle. This was no doubt reinforced by his belief that the diablerie itself was a mistake. But the second volume does not in reality fall apart. It and the first part of the next volume are held together both by their contrast with the rest of the text and by the extraordinary way in which various characters turn out, all unknown to them, to be telling stories about each other.

If we adopt Hogg’s later view that The Three Perils of Man falls apart we will not see many similarities with a more tightly-structured Ivanhoe but if we take the hint of ‘the perilous castles’ we can see that Ivanhoe is very similar. It, too, has a second volume dominated by one, separate locale—the perilous castle of Coningsburgh—even if the match of settings and volumes is not so complete. What is more, if we look at Ivanhoe we see that it likewise has a structure of connected episodes. Scott has planned the volume around three encounters: Rebecca and Bois-Guilbert, Rowena and De Bracy, and Isaac and Front-de-Boeuf. While these are pursued as separate stories they are interlinked. And at the end Ulrica, who has been Front-de-Boeuf’s mistress, brings Ivanhoe (already linked to Rowena) together with Rebecca. The separate stories intertwine as they do in The Three Perils of Man although by a different mechanism. Just as the Aikwood episodes set the evil magic and devilry of Michael Scott against the good forces represented by the friar so at Torquinstone the inherent weakness of feudalism and chivalry, its tendency to disintegrate into violence, is set against the one thing that can oppose that evil, the presence of a powerful king acting in concert with the people.

Another aspect of the two novels that is affected by their differing modes of composition is the amount and nature of historical detail. Later in the century Scott was severely criticised by Edward Freeman, the historian of the Norman Conquest, for his anachronisms in Ivanhoe. Yet Scott is quite explicit and open about this in the Dedicatory Epistle of Ivanhoe. He confesses that ‘it is extremely probable I may have confused the manners of two or three centuries—if we expand that to ‘five or six’ we might be closer to the mark. Why did he do this when he had generally aimed at greater, though not complete, chronological accuracy in his previous novels? Partly it is perspective—as we look back further and further into the past so we assimilate together larger and larger blocks of time. What Scott presents us with is a generalised picture of the whole Middle Ages in England in which, for example, the tournaments of the fifteenth century sit alongside the lifestyle of tenth-century Anglo-Saxons. Within this, however, we do see a process of change so that it is not a purely static picture. We are made aware of the way in which the Saxons and Normans eventually merged together to form the English race. Moreover Scott did introduce a lot of detail which was specific to the reign of Richard I; despite the presence of some anachronisms the novel is not simply free-floating in a medieval ether. He made use of contemporary chronicles both directly and through the modern historians who drew on them. At various points it becomes clear that Scott was consulting such authoritative sources while he wrote and that he was even willing to revise details in the light of his further reading. For instance it seems that, after he began using Pavine (see above) as a source of
information on the Templars, he went back to an earlier part of the novel and changed the colour of Bois-Guilbert’s cloak from red to the more historically accurate white. Yet, for all that he was trying to give a historically accurate picture of the twelfth-century Templars by using a text that would have been well known to them (in its original Latin version), some of the other details about them (such as the scepticism about Christianity exhibited by Bois-Guilbert) derive from the charges that were levelled at them at the time of the suppression of the order more than one hundred years later. These charges may or may not have been true but they had not surfaced at the time the novel is set. Other details, too, belong to a later period: the elaborately staged and confined tournament at Ashby, one of the great set scenes of the novel, belongs to the later Middle Ages and is far from the free and easy ranging over a large tract of land which would have been characteristic of twelfth-century England. Thus Scott mixes the historically accurate with the anachronistic in a generalised picture which has proved so appealing and which still provides the main features of the popular image of England in the Middle Ages.

Hogg, of course, is doing something similar—but he is doing it for Scotland. He has altogether less historical detail than Scott but he does draw on more than one century. The opening of the story makes clear his generalised setting: ‘There were once a noble King and Queen of Scotland, as many in that land have been.’ We are soon told that the king is the later thirteenth-century Robert II but the generalised setting has already been established. Hogg in fact transfers to Robert II features belonging to his son Robert III, his picture of the Border raids owes much to fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Scotland, and his implication that the Howards and Tudors are closely connected to the English royal family is likewise appropriate to a later period.

But if the two writers both produce a generalised picture of England or Scotland, there are still substantial differences between them. For one thing Hogg’s picture is static rather than dynamic—history is not so much seen as a process of change as a series of cyclically-recurring events in which individuals have to face a full range of circumstances within their lives. That is not to say that Hogg thought the past was the same as the present but rather that he is not as interested as Scott in connecting past and present through a process of change. More importantly in the context of this paper, Hogg’s text lacks the depth of historical information that so enriches the texture of Ivanhoe. Whereas the constant references to numerous historical sources in the notes to a modern edition of Ivanhoe show just how much Scott was drawing on printed material as he actually wrote the novel, the notes to Hogg’s novel are as likely to refer to the

Scotland of his own time as to the actual period in which the novel is set. Indeed parts of the novel read as if they are set in Hogg’s own time, most notably the two stories told of the earlier life of the Deil’s Tam. While Scott gives every sign of composing his novel with constant reference to written sources of information, Hogg’s text contains few such indications. In part this no doubt arises from Hogg’s desire to see himself as the custodian of oral history and thus to claim a kind of authority for his writing which was not available to Scott (at least as he saw it). But it must also arise simply from a different mode of composition in which Hogg relied much more on his own baroque imagination (a key element in his elaboration of the Aikwood scenes) and on the everyday realities of life in Scotland in his own time rather than on continual reference to books. In this context Scott’s comment to Lord Montagu, already quoted in part, that Hogg was ‘profundely ignorant of history and it is an awkward thing to read in order that you may write’ may strike one as somewhat disingenuous since Scott was himself reading in order to write. However, the comment makes sense in relation to Scott’s personal practice if we remember his huge background knowledge. Much of the time he could rely on his existing knowledge even if he was obliged to turn to books for specific pieces of information.

Similarly, while both authors tend to mythologise the past, they do it in different ways. Scott’s reading of the philosophical historians of the Scottish Enlightenment led him to see the process of historical change as one of progress. Consequently in Ivanhoe he creates a national myth for the English which sees them progressing from arbitrary exercise of power towards the rule of law, from feudal anarchy and despotism towards the supremacy of parliament, and from a race divided between conquered Saxons and conquering Normans towards a unified race with a single language in which ‘the hostile distinction between Norman and Saxon seems entirely to have disappeared’. By contrast Hogg tends to pick on moments of the past as moments of glory, a mythological golden age. Just as he had exalted Beregovium to the role of a great city in Queen Hynde, so in The Three Perils of Man he heightens the role of Roxburgh, describing it as ‘the richest city in the realm’. Scott’s mythologising of historical change relies heavily on his careful research into the details of history while Hogg’s mythologising of a golden age (strong on feeling but short on detail) sits more easily against the kind of timeless present in which so much of the novel seems to exist and for which Hogg did not need to undertake any reading while he was writing the novel.

A prominent part of the historical detail in Ivanhoe lies in the appropriate use of biblical quotation. Both writers were, of course, deeply versed in
the English Bible and able to quote its language from memory. However, Scott also brings into play other kinds of biblical quotation, some of which required reading and research rather than memory. While Scott may have quoted the Latin Bible from memory one significant use of biblical quotation relies on his research: in having the Grand Master constantly quote the Bible in support of his fanatical devotion to the Templars, Scott draws continually on the the biblical quotation embedded in the Templar Rule which, as I have already noted, he was reading in the English translation of Favine. It is a measure of Scott's genius that he was able to insert so much of the Rule into the novel while making it seem both natural and historical by creating the fanatical and obsessed Grand Master as the vehicle for it. Nevertheless Scott was constrained by his desire to present a historical picture and this keeps the amount of biblical language in proportion. By contrast Hogg was clearly relying on memory in creating the biblical language of the friar. Furthermore his constraints are artistic rather than historical. It is highly unlikely that a friar of the Middle Ages would have spoken all the time in biblical language in the way that Hogg's friar does but Hogg is more interested in creating an interesting character than in historical accuracy. Without the constraints of historical accuracy Hogg was free to use biblical language for all of the friar's speech and, in particular, in the friar's tale to show all the dexterity in the use of biblical language as a narrative mode which he had already exhibited in the Chaldee MS. It would seem, however, that Hogg's initial readers were not so happy with the friar's language and he informed Blackwood with some exaggeration that 'I have by advice taken out all the friar's part save some acts'. The manuscript confirms the removal or compression of some of the friar's speeches but, it seems, with some reluctance on Hogg's part. The relevant speeches are scored through with vertical lines but not obliterated as if Hogg wanted to keep a record of them. In this case Hogg had evidently been pushed into changes he did not like but what applies elsewhere in the novel applies here: Hogg may have been forced to remove some of the biblical language but he had made such unconstrained and extensive use of it in the manuscript that he could easily afford to remove some passages without fundamentally affecting his portrayal of the friar.

To conclude, though Hogg was forced in the end to accept some significant revisions to his text, the relatively unconstrained circumstances in which it was originally composed played to one of his special strengths, his ability to push the boundaries of accepted early nineteenth-century taste, especially in an explicit depiction of sexuality and violence. Because he had written in relative freedom he was able to produce a text which could be revised without too much weakening of this particular strength. On the other hand Scott's relatively constrained circumstances of composition produced a text which is perhaps less explicit about sexuality and violence than he might have wished but they did not interfere with his astounding ability to assimilate large amounts of historical research into his text in an entirely natural way. It would be wrong to ascribe every difference between these two novels to the differing processes of composition and revision but, by examining those processes, we can understand some of the reasons for their quite different treatment of similar themes and further identify some of the particular strengths of each work.
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James Hogg and the Theatre

Gillian Hughes

Hogg's relations with the theatre have hitherto been considered of little account. There has been well-merited praise for his posthumously-published pastoral drama, 'The Bush Aboon Traquair' but his anonymous Dramatic Tales of 1817, and its precursor The Hunting of Badylen, have generally been dismissed as idiosyncratic examples of closet drama. In the general opinion, Hogg (like so many of his contemporaries) suffered from a Shakespearean fixation and wrote plays suited more to reading than to performance. Robin MacLachlan's forthcoming edition of Dramatic Tales will, no doubt, focus critical attention on this neglected area of Hogg's literary output and allow it to be seen in a much wider context. It seems significant, however, that in recent years it is Judy Steel, the leader of a theatre group, who has perhaps devoted most attention to and seen most merit in this neglected area of Hogg's writing.1 Writers and actors may be more conscious than literary critics of the theatre as performance, spectacle, and as a focus for social commentary and local or national feeling.

Hogg's earliest education was predominantly oral and he was a fine mimic, so perhaps it is hardly surprising that some of his earliest compositions were plays.2 These have not survived, and the many performances he witnessed or participated in at the theatre during his Edinburgh years are also evanescent, leaving only dry traces in the shape of advertisements, reviews, and reminiscence.

A link between Hogg's song-writing and the theatre may be suspected in the choice of James Dewar as the composer to set Hogg's words in the later song-collection The Border Garland (c. 1828). Dewar, like Hogg, played the violin and for a number of years was the leader of the orchestra at the Edinburgh Theatre Royal. His predecessor as orchestra leader, W. Penson, may have been connected with the music-publishing firm of Penson, Robertson and Co who had advertised Hogg's 'O Lady Dear' from The Queen's Wake as a single song in July 1813.3 Music (especially singing), seems to have been far more prominent even in spoken drama than it is nowadays. This was partly the result of the legal situation whereby the patent theatres enjoyed a monopoly of the spoken drama. The unlicensed theatres were in the habit of adding songs to straight plays in