

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

Bell & Howell Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600



**Growing Up In Glass Town:  
An Investigation of Charlotte Brontë's Individuation  
Through her Juvenilia**

by

Robin St. John Conover  
A.B., Smith College 1991  
M.A., University of Victoria 1992

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Department of English

We accept this dissertation as conforming  
to the required standard

---

Dr. Margot K. Louis, Supervisor (Department of English)

---

Dr. Lisa A. Surridge, Departmental Member (Department of English)

---

Dr. Nelson C. Smith, Departmental Member (Department of English)

---

Dr. Peter G. Liddell, Outside Member (Department of Germanic Studies)

---

Dr. Juliet McMaster, External Examiner (Department of English, University of Alberta)

© Robin St. John Conover, 1999  
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This dissertation may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopying or other means, without the permission of the author.

**GROWING UP IN GLASS TOWN:  
AN INVESTIGATION OF CHARLOTTE BRONTË'S INDIVIDUATION  
THROUGH HER JUVENILIA**

Supervisor: Dr. Margot K. Louis

**ABSTRACT**

The writings of Charlotte Brontë are often thought by critics to be psychologically revealing of the author; certainly her juvenilia, read in chronological order, illuminate several stages in Charlotte's psychic maturation, both as a writer and as a young woman. They also anticipate, in large part, Carl Jung's system of individuation, deviating from his dialectic at those points so often raised by Jung's feminist critics. Hence, the juvenilia offer a test case which generally supports Jung's theories on development, while at the same time indicating the need for a feminist corrective to those theories. Adopting a male persona at thirteen, Charlotte joins in collaboration with her brother, Branwell, in the creation of the African kingdom, Angria. Both siblings then fashion daemonic, swashbuckling archetypes, which undergo a demonic modulation, and threaten to engulf and possess their creators' young psyches. Charlotte's dark side, personified by Zamorna, King of Angria, embodies all that Charlotte yearns to express, but finds, as a young nineteenth-century woman, she must sublimate. Zamorna represents Charlotte's rebellious, passionate spirit, her suppressed anger, and her libidinal urges—all of which are incompatible with her role as dutiful daughter, expected to set aside such proclivities in order to promote her brother's career in the world. In time, filled with much self-conflict, Charlotte finds herself possessed by this "inflated archetype," this shadow side, prompting her spiritual crisis of 1836, when she must test herself against this demonic agency, and synthesize these colliding worlds. In learning how to confront, then integrate this dark side of herself, Charlotte initiates a reconciliation with her gender and her straitened circumstances as a woman without means or social standing, obligated—as the eldest surviving child—to sacrifice her own destiny for that of her younger siblings. She leaves the decade-long collaborative partnership and begins creating stories of her own making. These novelettes are imbued with a new realism and more viable personae who serve as her future role models and become her lifeline in this individuation process, anticipating those strong-willed heroines found in the adult novels, and allowing

Zamorna to take his more rightful place as Charlotte's positive animus, a muse-like role he will play for the remainder of her writing life.

A number of noted critics—Sally Shuttleworth and Helene Moglen among them—have explored the culture of selfhood in Charlotte's writings, though none but the Jungian Barbara Hannah have studied her work through a Jungian lens, nor have any concentrated solely on a detailed analysis of Charlotte's juvenilia, where the process of individuation begins. By examining this psychological journey through the childhood works, taking into account the biographical information of Charlotte's life, as well as her correspondence and journal entries composed during her formative years, we can better understand the motivation and mechanisms which lie behind her adult work. In the juvenilia, and later, in the published novels, we find Charlotte was documenting her own interiority and maturation process, making of them works of art, like an *Entwicklungsroman*. In viewing her narratives as a psychic map, we discover them opening up to us in entirely new ways, allowing us to perceive the artist undergoing individuation as no other body of work does. Moreover, we begin to appreciate the importance of reading the juvenilia alongside the adult work. Without them, we are reading only half a life. The juvenilia, like a cipher, contain the key to the psychological meaning of the dream-like narratives, the dense imagery, and the complex symbolism found in Charlotte's later novels.

### **Examiners:**

---

Dr. Margot K. Louis, Supervisor (Department of English)

---

Dr. Lisa A. Surridge, Departmental Member (Department of English)

---

Dr. Nelson C. Smith, Departmental Member (Department of English)

---

Dr. Peter G. Liddell, Outside Member (Department of Germanic Studies)

---

Dr. Juliet McMaster, External Examiner (Department of English, University of Alberta)

**Growing Up in Glass Town:  
An Investigation of Charlotte Brontë's Individuation Through her Juvenilia**

---

<b>Title Page</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations and Symbols</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>Dedication</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Notes .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Chapter One: The Narrative Voice and the Telling of the Tale: Charlotte's</b>	
<b>Persona and Story-telling Techniques</b> .....	<b>25</b>
1. Charlotte's Early Projection on to Her Persona .....	<b>27</b>
2. Charlotte's Use of the Male Persona .....	<b>33</b>
3. Theatricality in Charlotte's Narrative Persona .....	<b>42</b>
4. Charlotte's Creative Uses of Narrative Devices .....	<b>46</b>
Notes .....	<b>51</b>
<b>Chapter Two: The Demonization of Zamorna: Charlotte's Shadow Self</b> .....	<b>59</b>
1. The Genesis of Zamorna's Demonism .....	<b>62</b>
2. Racism and Bestiality as Elements of the Demonic .....	<b>70</b>

3. Charlotte's and Zamorna's Emerging Shadows . . . . .	83
4. Alexander Percy as Demonic Foil and Demonic Twin to Zamorna . . . . .	87
Notes . . . . .	94
<b>Chapter Three: The Origins and Signifiers of Demonic Behavior . . . . .</b>	<b>103</b>
1. Sources of Insanity as a Literary Thematic Device . . . . .	106
2. Issues of Susceptibility to Insanity in Charlotte's Own Life . . . . .	112
3. Theological Debates in the Juvenilia . . . . .	118
4. Charlotte's "Spiritual Crisis" . . . . .	124
Notes . . . . .	135
<b>Chapter Four: Charlotte's Animus and Zamorna's Anima: Confronting Misogyny, Homoeroticism and Idolatry. . . . .</b>	<b>139</b>
1. The Demon Shadow vs. the Domestic Angel . . . . .	141
2. A Psychic Civil War and Revolutionary Change . . . . .	147
3. Early Effeminacy and Homoeroticism in the Juvenilia . . . . .	155
4. Misogyny in the Juvenilia . . . . .	162
Notes . . . . .	173
<b>Chapter Five: The Road Back Toward Individuation . . . . .</b>	<b>180</b>
1. Charlotte's "Imaginative Break" . . . . .	182
2. The Nucleus of a New Role Model: Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings .	187
3. A Last Look at the Woman and the Demon: Caroline Vernon and Zamorna . . . . .	195

4. The Significance of Charlotte's Earlier Imaginative Break .....	205
Notes .....	208
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>214</b>
1. Repression in Charlotte's Adult Fiction .....	216
2. Similarities and Differences in the Individuation Process .....	222
Notes .....	230
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>235</b>
<b>Appendices:</b>	
<b>Appendix A:</b> A Chronological List of Those Works from Charlotte Brontë's Juvenilia Discussed Herein .....	245
<b>Appendix B:</b> Cast of Characters in Charlotte Brontë's Juvenilia .....	249

## List of Abbreviations and Symbols

### Abbreviations:

BC	Bonnell Collection, Brontë Parsonage Museum.
BPM	Original manuscripts held at the Brontë Parsonage Museum.
CA	<u>An Edition of The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë</u> , Christine Alexander, editor. Vols.1 & 2.
Gérin FN	<u>Five Novelettes</u> , Winifred Gérin, editor.
Hatfield Museum	The papers of the late C.W. Hatfield held at the Brontë Parsonage.
Neufeldt PCB	<u>The Poems of Charlotte Brontë</u> .
Neufeldt WPBB	<u>The Works of Patrick Branwell Brontë</u> , Vols.1 & 2.
SHB LLC	<u>The Brontës: Their Lives, Friendships, and Correspondence</u> (The Shakespeare Head Edition), Vols. 2 & 3.
SHB Misc	<u>The Miscellaneous and Unpublished Writings of Charlotte and Patrick Branwell Brontë</u> (The Shakespeare Head Edition).
UN	<u>Charlotte Brontë: Unfinished Novels</u> , with Introduction by Tom Winnifrith.

### Symbols:

< >	Deleted in ms by author
‘ ’	Added to ms by author
[ ]	Added to ms by editor (also \ / )
?	Word in ms questioned by editor

## Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to the Brontë Parsonage Museum for providing copies of original manuscripts for several of Charlotte Brontë's unpublished tales, as well as to Victor Neufeldt for permitting pre-publication access to his work-in-progress, the manuscripts of Branwell Brontë.

For their willingness to read an earlier draft of this work and offer not just encouragement, but valuable advice about its structure and argument, I want to acknowledge with gratitude my committee members, particularly Nelson Smith, who truly possesses the editor's gift of perceptive sight. Lisa Surridge deserves a thank you for an interesting, fast-paced tutorial on the Brontës, which, unlike most courses on this topic, focused for a time on the juvenilia. I also want to acknowledge Peter Liddell and Juliet McMaster for their ongoing interest in my work.

To my supervisor, Margot Louis, I owe far more than mere acknowledgements and gratitude. I will be forever indebted to her for seeing me through both this study, from its earliest inception, and my special topics examination, from which this work emanated. Future students fortunate enough to have Margot in their camp will know what I mean when I say that she is without peer and deserves the greatest of respect. With a gentle guiding hand and infinite patience, she prods the dullest thinker to find the Rosetta Stone, decipher its inscription, and inscribe its meaning as lucidly as possible.

**-Dedication-**

**“You come back, wavering shapes, out of the past  
In which you first appeared to clouded eyes.  
Should I attempt this time to hold you fast?  
Does this old dream still thrill a heart so wise?  
You crowd? You press? Have, then, your way at last.  
As from the mist around me you arise;  
My breast is stirred and feels with youthful pain  
The magic breath that hovers round your train.**

**“With you return pictures of joyous days,  
Shadows that I once loved again draw near;  
Like a primeval tale, half lost in haze,  
First love and friendship also reappear;  
Grief is renewed, laments retrace the maze  
Of Life’s strange labyrinthian career,  
Recalling dear ones who, by fortune’s treason  
Robbed of fair hours, passed before my season.”**

**— From Dedication to Goethe’s Faust**

**Growing Up in Glass Town:  
An Investigation of Charlotte Brontë's Individuation Through her Juvenilia**

*"Individuation means becoming a single, homogeneous being, and, in so far as 'in-dividuality' embraces our innermost, last, and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one's own self. We could therefore translate individuation as 'coming to selfhood' or self-realization."*  
(C.G. Jung, *The Essential Jung* 418)

In the conclusion to her theological text, The Origin of Satan, Elaine Pagels states that the Apostle Paul subscribed to the traditional Jewish belief that "Satan acts as God's agent not to corrupt people but to test them" (183). Acting as an agency of temptation, Satan—which, in Hebrew, means the Adversary or the Enemy—functions as a means through which strength of character can be gauged. In a complementary role, Satan also acts as a conductor of change. In the first epistle of Corinthians, Paul suggests that an errant member of a Christian group be delivered to Satan, "not in order to consign him to hell, but in the hope that he will repent and change" (Pagels 183).<sup>1</sup> Hence, the ancient view of Satan was that of a testing and salvational device.

Moral and religious testing are precisely what Charlotte Brontë underwent during those formative years she spent exploring her imagination and composing her prodigious body of juvenilia. Without conscious purpose, she created, in concert with her younger brother, Branwell, what evolved into a satanic archetype,<sup>2</sup> which operated as her own vehicle of temptation, and compelled her to experience what critics call her "religious" or "spiritual crisis," subsequently emerging a more mature, yet chastened, writer of fiction. Through learning about the darkness residing in her own soul, she determined, if only instinctively, how to accept and integrate this aspect of the self, ending up transmuting it into the raw resource for her later work, which continued to be largely preoccupied with the dissection of the psyche. This confrontation with the self further helped Charlotte to expose and analyze her own marginalized status as a nineteenth-century woman without the privileges of social standing or wealth, and all her future writing addressed issues of gender relations and a woman's place in a rigidly patriarchal world. In measuring her maturation through her writing and looking at both from a Jungian perspective,<sup>3</sup> one sees

how the juvenilia enabled Charlotte to access her unconscious self, to formulate her identity as a woman and a writer, and to achieve, in Jungian terminology, a state of 'individuation.' In this respect, her archetype, Zamorna (as he is best known),<sup>4</sup> operates as both Charlotte's instrument of temptation and vehicle of crucial change as she comes of age, revealing for us in the process a psychic portrait of the artist as a young girl.

When Charlotte and Branwell first took up their pens in 1826<sup>5</sup> to record the plays they were then acting out, they had little notion of the potency of their chosen archetypes. Nor, certainly, would either have had any idea what part those daemonic characters would eventually come to play in their psychic lives. Drawing inspiration from their father's gift of a dozen toy soldiers, Charlotte and Branwell promptly gave their chosen wooden heroes real-life identities. It was entirely appropriate that they selected a pair of historic antagonists: the Duke of Wellington and Napoleon Bonaparte. The warring opposition of these archetypes would characterize the sibling rivalry, which frames the collaborative and extensive body of juvenilia, numbering hundreds of fragments, poems, completed stories, and novellas or adventure series. While their choice of contemporary heroes illustrates the influence early nineteenth-century political events had on Charlotte's and Branwell's everyday play, their readings of Milton, Blake, Bunyan, Hogg, Scott, Byron, and the Bible proved equally inspiring. Soon the siblings moved these heroic figures into the realm of fictional fantasy, stylistically drawing from such masters and scripture and liberating themselves from the constraints of writing within an historical context. At the same time, moving into a fictional domain freed the imaginative potential for a far more demonic milieu.

For the next decade, from 1827 to 1837, particularly after younger siblings Emily and Anne left the four-way collaboration in 1832 to form their own writing partnership, Charlotte and Branwell so immersed themselves in this fabricated enterprise that it became more real to them than the corporeal world. This plunge into "the world below," as both variously referred to it,<sup>6</sup> would soon prove to be an addictive activity for the siblings, and hold special hazards for each. Like their sister, Emily, Charlotte and Branwell were particularly susceptible to retreating to a shared life inside their imaginations and identifying with these fictitious personages. Consciously or not, both would have viewed the act of creating worlds (to substitute for worlds lost to them at

early ages through the deaths of their mother and two older sisters) as heroic. Both also shared a common fascination with the Romantic hero/villain. In her biography of Charlotte (Charlotte Brontë: A Passionate Life), Lyndall Gordon writes:

Branwell took on the Byronic role of the ‘wandering outlaw of his dark mind’ who pierces ‘the depths of life’; for Charlotte, the outlaw was a shade less compelling, but she shared with Branwell the Byronic drama of dark genius—the idea of living more intensely through creative acts.<sup>7</sup>  
(Gordon 30-31)

Mutually inspired by one another, despite Charlotte’s periodic absences while at Roe Head school, brother and sister acted as each other’s creative muse, so that by 1834, their work becomes virtually interchangeable, the shared imaginative vision utterly symbiotic.<sup>8</sup> Lacking the conscious awareness of the mutation that often takes place in the ego with daemonic creations, however, neither sibling was as yet cognizant of the implications inherent in such play. While the young authors were evolving, their creations were busy devolving, growing increasingly demonic in their thoughts and behavior.<sup>9</sup> Tellingly, each sibling selected an archetype that seemed to be larger than life, with over-reaching, even omnipotent qualities. Unknowingly, brother and sister were also delineating their own innate duality. In creating Zamorna, Charlotte may have felt she was fashioning an admirable hero worthy of her adulation, but subconsciously she was forming a means of accessing her own unconscious self.<sup>10</sup> In Jung and Feminism: Liberating Archetypes, Demaris Wehr contends that archetypal images, or one’s inner cast of characters—which might be viewed as gods, good and bad angels, or even satanic types—reveal themselves in “dreams, fantasies, projections, and possessions” (56), underscoring Carl Gustav Jung’s thesis that creating archetypes is an unconscious act. Wehr explains that in naming these inner characters, “one gains conscious access to the energy and emotions they contain” (56). In so doing, brother and sister simultaneously generated a series of internecine struggles with these creations, with one another, and with themselves. As both fictional characters and young authors evolved, Charlotte and Branwell would find themselves locked into relationships with their protagonists—on both textual and psychological levels—which had to be severed if they were not to destroy their own selves.

Thus, Charlotte's juvenilia become for her a means of self-exploration and self-interrogation, a moral testing ground for her adult character. Carolyn Heilbrun observes in *Writing A Woman's Life* that "Women come to writing . . . simultaneously with self-creation" (117). Certainly this hypothesis proves accurate in Charlotte's own development. These childhood scribbles created in collaboration with her brother function as the medium through which Charlotte matured and came to know herself, working through fictive problem relationships, and coming to terms with the demonic archetype and her own shadow.<sup>11</sup> In unwittingly creating a superman who in fact embodied an extension of herself, or her shadow side—the ambitious, creative, prideful and sexual self which lay dormant within her own psyche and which she kept hidden from view—she could decipher her own identity and liberate these aspects of herself within the safe confines of a fictional venue. Given this, one can better understand how Charlotte, even at a precociously young age, was plumbing her own depths by constructing such an archetype, though it would be some time before she recognized that Zamorna was a wholly self-reflexive device who incorporated her darker urges. In projecting the subconscious self onto a fictive archetype, one avoids confronting the truth of one's own nature, until that subliminal spirit comes to possess a person. Wehr argues that the more unconscious one is of these qualities one possesses, the more exaggerated the projection or possession process becomes (58). Not until Charlotte realizes that she must consciously integrate this shadow side of herself does she become aware of how much she has come to be ruled by Zamorna and come to regard him as her God. As an embodiment of the unconscious, the created archetype, in time, tyrannically controls the conscious self. Zamorna's psychic grip on Charlotte eventually compels her to summon the strength within herself to transcend him so she can shed her idolatry, along with her apostasy, and function in the corporeal world—a first step toward individuation.

On a similarly unconscious level, the duality, even multiplicity, which existed within Charlotte's character, intensified during those years when she was engaged with her juvenilia. A disparity between the public and private self was evident in Charlotte (as it was in her sisters) even as a very young girl. The anecdote of Patrick Brontë's outfitting his children with a mask in order to discern their hidden selves is by now well-known. As their father recognized, not until their faces were covered with a mask would

Charlotte and her sisters be able to speak out clearly and convincingly about their convictions. The secret play-acting, therefore, followed by the production of innumerable tiny books filled with crabbed, nearly indecipherable writing, metonymically operated as yet another mask for those hidden, divided, multiple selves. Later correspondence, particularly that of 1836 between Charlotte and Ellen Nussey, divulges this same incongruity between Charlotte's public and private selves. Thus, we come to know that an inherent polarity existed between these two sides of Charlotte: her adopted persona (or conscious self) and her more authentic subliminal (unconscious) or shadow self. The persona, which is the antithesis of the shadow, traditionally operates as an ethical mask donned in public, much like an actor's mask,<sup>12</sup> functioning, according to Jung, as

a complicated system of relations between individual consciousness and society, fittingly enough a kind of mask, designed on the one hand to make a definite impression upon others, and, on the other, to conceal the true nature of the individual.

(from "The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious,"  
Essential Jung 94)

Wehr adds that the one stabilizes the other, the shadow compensating for the lack of an adequate persona, and vice versa (57). Hence, we see that Charlotte, whose public self in early childhood is consistently presented as painfully shy and retiring, compensates for this timid persona with an extraordinarily active, even swashbuckling, shadow self. And until she was able to acknowledge and amalgamate these opposing sides of herself, she largely lived within her well-peopled imagination, which also served to counterbalance the loss the family had incurred and the social isolation the Brontës endured living in Haworth.

This imaginative realm captivated all the surviving Brontë children well into their adolescence and beyond, retarding their maturation process.<sup>13</sup> At the same time, Charlotte would achieve a measure of self-illumination through such fantasizing. Although roaming through this fictive world would delay and impede her development, she would come to realize herself here, and the accrued rewards of spending a third of her life in Angria would profit her for the rest of her writing career. Nonetheless, Charlotte was twenty by the time she became aware of the split within herself,<sup>14</sup> and it was not until she was twenty-three that she was able to extricate herself from her juvenilia and begin

writing on a more adult level.<sup>15</sup> For years she avoided serious introspection and counteracted her dark urges by transferring them on to her shadow self. Through various means—initially through her narrator, who also operated as her persona, and later by projecting herself on to her heroines—Charlotte effectively distanced herself from this archetypal figure. Wehr remarks that by projecting the shadow self, which is “hypnotic, compelling, spellbinding,” on to another so as to avoid seeing it inside oneself, one perpetuates the “self-deception of the unintegrated, archetypal shadow” (62). Furthermore, as the persona’s opposite, the shadow self becomes the receptacle of all childhood taboos, a particularly appropriate function when one considers the doctrinal environment of the Brontë household:

Christianity, as well as other religions, associates ‘dark qualities’ with evil, and we are taught to despise them . . . Christian perfectionism is a main factor in the creation of our individual shadows. Having been brought up to deny anger, greed, envy, sexual desires, and the like, [we thrust such feelings into the shadow]. (Wehr 60)

Integration of the shadow self—a crucial step in the process of achieving full maturity—means openly acknowledging this side of oneself and incorporating it, re-shaping it so it operates as a positive, rather than a negative force within one’s character. This process, known as individuation, can be “humbling,” claims Wehr, “especially if one’s ego-ideal is harshly perfectionist” (63), and Charlotte’s harsh perfectionism persistently reveals itself in the self-deprecating letters she writes to Ellen Nussey during the years 1834 to 1837. In these missives, she demonstrates that she has lost her moral bearings and repeatedly expresses concern for her spiritual salvation, deeply anxious that God has abandoned her.<sup>16</sup> The secret writing activity becomes wholly comprehensible, then, when one realizes this is where Charlotte’s full identity resided. It was within the private act of writing that she could freely and imaginatively experience life as well as explore the workings of the mind. A letter of Charlotte’s written to Ellen in June of 1834 discloses her intense interest in the business of unmasking others, while illustrating, despite her claims to the contrary, the lack of insight she then still had with regard to her own complex self:

I am slow very slow to believe the protestations of another; I know my own sentiments, because I can read my own mind, but the minds of the rest of man and woman-kind are to me as sealed volumes, hieroglyphical scrolls, which I can not easily either unseal or decipher. Yet time, careful study, long acquaintance overcome most difficulties; and in your case, I think they have succeeded well in bringing to light, and construing that hidden language, whose turnings, windings inconsistencies and obscurities so frequently baffle the researches of the honest observer of human nature.  
(Smith, Letters 128, emphasis Brontë's)

Charlotte, at eighteen, had not yet acceded to her darker side and was busy sublimating it, so her declaration of self-knowledge here is premature. Indeed her lack of self-knowledge helps explain why she was then having difficulty reading the minds of others.

When one considers the intricacies of the imaginative force—much of which is unconsciously inspired—it is hardly any wonder that Charlotte had not yet confronted the complexities of her full self. Jung theorizes that the artist is used as a medium for archetypes to spring forth, and acts as a creative or “reacting subject,” who is not at all conscious of this process (The Portable Jung 311). In his essay, “Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry,” Jung claims that when the poet speaks as part of the creative impetus that moves him, he believes his work is his own, and that he invents “of his own free will without the slightest feeling of compulsion. He may even be fully convinced of his freedom of action and refuse to admit that his work could be anything else than the expression of his will and ability” (Portable Jung 311-12). The poet may in fact be so carried away by the creative impulse, he is no longer aware of an “alien” will, although “this is manifestly the voice of his own self” (Portable Jung 312). Jung refers to this possession of the self by an alien will as an “autonomous complex,” or a divided part of the psyche which leads its own existence outside the hierarchy of consciousness, explaining:

Analysis of artists consistently shows not only the strength of the creative impulse arising from the unconscious, but also its capricious and wilful character. The biographies of great artists make it abundantly clear that the creative urge is often so imperious that it battens on their humanity and yokes everything to the service of the work, even at the cost of health and ordinary human happiness. The unborn work in the psyche of the artist is a force of nature that achieves its end either with tyrannical might or with the subtle cunning of nature herself, quite regardless of the personal fate of

the man who is its vehicle. The creative urge lives and grows in him like a tree in the earth from which it draws its nourishment. We would do well, therefore, to think of the creative process as a living thing implanted in the human psyche. (Portable Jung 312-13)

Jung differentiates between two types of poets: those who recognize this creative process and acquiesce to it from the start in contrast to those who see it as an alien force, and, unable to acquiesce, are thus caught unawares (Portable Jung 313). Both Charlotte and Branwell appear to have had no notion of this impetus until they were wholly caught up by it. Not until 1836 does Charlotte become fully cognizant of a tyrannical force which has insinuated itself into her conscious, everyday, involuntary thoughts, causing her to see visions, hear voices, and engage in a form of automatic writing.<sup>17</sup> When she recognizes this shadow self as inherently hers, Charlotte initially undergoes a severe form of self-loathing, leading to doubts about her own moral goodness and eventual salvation. After much psychic struggle, she reconciles herself to her “dark side,” allowing her positive animus (which shall be discussed shortly, but also at greater length later in this work) to emerge, prompting her individuation process. By 1838, Charlotte shows her awareness of these dual aspects of herself—not only her dark side, but also the public mask that effectively disguises the true character underneath. A fragment commenced that year begins, “But it is not in Society that the real character is revealed . . .” (BC 113/7), spelling out her cognizance of the dissembling role the persona plays in larger society. A letter written to Ellen in October of that same year also illustrates her knowledge of the existence of the shadow self residing beneath that public persona:

Ellen depend upon it—all people have their dark side—though some possess the power of throwing a fair veil over the defects—close acquaintance slowly removes the screen and one by one the blots appear; till at length we sometimes see the pattern of perfection all slurred with blots that even partial affection cannot efface. (Smith 182-83)

It was this view of herself that Charlotte needed to acknowledge and even embrace before she could regain a measure of self-respect and begin writing about the psyche in a more detached, mature manner.

Yet another contradiction exists within Charlotte at this early stage. According to Jungian psychology, such duality in the self conforms to a similar paradigm: the principle

that archetypal imagery operates on the tension of opposites (Wehr 55). Along with the separate selves (the persona and the shadow), the anima—*i.e.*, man's image of the feminine—and the animus, or its polar opposite—*i.e.*, woman's image of the masculine—also need to be successfully integrated in order to achieve individuation. Both the anima and animus exemplify an “innate, unconscious, genetically based contrasexuality in each person” explains Wehr (64), which emanates from one's own personal experience of the opposite sex as well as from archetypal images. Such icons represent “a collective, inherited image of the opposite sex, transmitted through mythology, fairy tales, art history, religious history” (Wehr 64), and incorporate “common symbols, images, motifs, and themes portraying universal human experiences” (Wehr 55).<sup>18</sup> These images of the opposite sex possess, in turn, their own extreme polarities—from the dark and threatening to the angelic and pure—and originate in early childhood experiences. Wehr asserts that the earlier the experience occurs, “the more influence it has on the contrasexual image and the more likely it will become part of the personal unconscious” (63). In her earliest work, Charlotte consistently produces polarized images of men in her attempt to investigate the male mind and to explore the patriarchal world in order to find her place in it. A few years later, she begins examining the world of women as well, and with both, she repeatedly sets up in her stories contrasting pairs of characters. Within these oppositional paradigms, she frequently creates figures who themselves cross gender lines, disclosing a deeply ambivalent reaction to societal expectations of the roles played by each gender. Initially, rather than critiquing and condemning patriarchal norms, Charlotte acquiesces to them, empowering herself through the act of adopting a male pseudonym, and indulging in more misogynistic-driven text than her brother.<sup>19</sup> As she progresses through puberty and adolescence, however, fewer hapless heroines and more resolute women begin appearing in her work, some venturing out of the domestic sphere and bearing what might be considered distinctly masculine traits. At the same time, some of Charlotte's male characters reveal effeminate sides. All this cross-gendering, even cross-dressing, upsets given power relations between the sexes, as it does Jung's observation that the shadow self, unlike the contrasexual animus and anima, is always the same sex as the subject. Until she experiences a critical self-evaluation and comes to terms with her inborn

gender, Charlotte identifies more with the male sex than with her own. Having endowed herself with male privilege as an author/narrator for years, she grows increasingly aware of her less entitled status as a woman. Consequently, much of her adult writing concerns itself with the inequality and power imbalance contained within gender relations, and attempts to redress that disparity.

By 1836, Charlotte recognizes further dangers inherent in subsuming her identity in this collaboratively created parallel realm. She sees that, like many of her fictional heroines, she takes enormous risks in allowing herself to be mastered by a manifestation of her own shadow self, or her repressed unconscious—that negative part of herself which operates as the repository for her sexuality, her pride, her aggression, her attraction to domineering men, even her misogyny. Perhaps unconsciously, Charlotte realizes the only way she would be able to disengage herself, or at least correct the imbalance of power, is to create more resolute and tenacious heroines to function as her future role models. Thus, having defined herself against a continuous stream of Zamorna's submissive wives, mistresses and wards, Charlotte attempts to re-create the necessary distance she had earlier achieved through identifying with her satiric narrator, by fashioning more willful heroines capable of resisting the temptation to capitulate to the satanic Zamorna. Moreover, by shifting the focus of her identification on to her female characters, she grows more aware of the reality of her actual existence as a disenfranchised young woman in early nineteenth-century England. At the same time, she literally brings the narrative home, moving the locale of these stories from its former exotic position in her imaginative central Africa to a Yorkshire setting in northern England. In this more authentic, familiar environment, her work moves toward a new realism and Charlotte is finally able to gain much-needed critical perspective and make long-delayed strides toward a new maturity, better equipped now to survive in a patriarchal world.

The catalyst for these changes was seemingly brought about through Charlotte's psychic revolution in 1836, followed by her ending the collaborative relationship with her brother. No doubt, Charlotte was growing increasingly aware of the need to detach herself from Branwell's progressive identification with this demonic world and his own shadow self. Ultimately, Branwell would self-destruct, his perceptions of fantasy and

reality fatally conflated, while Charlotte would consciously extricate herself from a similar fate. Branwell may well have served as a living example to Charlotte of the consequences of the failure to bridge the separate selves, and without him, Charlotte might never have seen the potential hazards of excessive indulgence in fantasy in time to save herself. Helene Moglen (Charlotte Brontë: The Self Conceived) sees Charlotte, like her character Elizabeth Hastings (sister to the disreputable Henry Hastings), as freed by Branwell's deterioration (Moglen 56n64):

Branwell's disintegration was essential to Charlotte's discovery of herself . . . her separation from him, begun at this point in her life, expressed at this stage of her work, allowed her to begin to reject as well the universe of mythic values which had locked her into the artistic and personal infantilism by which Branwell had been trapped.<sup>20</sup> (Moglen 58)

Rejecting the "universe of mythic values" allowed Charlotte to break out of the male mold. Before ending the collaborative partnership with Branwell in 1837, Charlotte clearly fit the Jungian classification of 'father's daughters' (Wehr 105), or women who derive their sense of self-worth from men, in this case from Charlotte's identification with her male archetype. For such women, the integration process poses a singular challenge, and, according to Wehr, they must "'die' to something before a new self can be born," needing "to die to the false self system that patriarchy has imposed on them" (103). Wehr's allegation not only helps explain what Charlotte undergoes during her 'religious crisis' of 1836, but also accounts for the subsequent emergence of more stalwart heroines in her work. She needs to integrate her shadow self and allow her animus to emerge before she can begin to re-create her own female identity, though this formation of a female identity ends up becoming something of a life-long endeavor. Her maturation, then, can be seen as a work-in-progress through the later fashioning of such heroines as Frances Henri, Jane Eyre, Shirley Keeldar and Lucy Snowe.<sup>21</sup>

Certainly this process clarifies later periods in Charlotte's life, which biographers often have difficulty explaining: the depression (or at least her depressive personality), the rage Charlotte often felt, the numerous illnesses she experienced, even what some term the hypochondria and hysteria she underwent. Lyndall Gordon views her biographical subject in a contemporary critical light, depicting a stranger creature than we

have heretofore been accustomed to viewing. Gordon writes that Charlotte became “[a] determinedly professional writer who was impatient, sarcastic, strong in spirit, with an unquenchable fire” (4). The biographer points to the dichotomy which existed between the public and private selves of Charlotte: “This ‘home’ character, at odds with her public image, drove her life in a volcanic way beneath the still, gray crust” (Gordon 4). During those periods of depression and rage Charlotte underwent, she is referred to by Gordon as “mad” (51), possessing a “restless fury,” and existing on the “psychic edge” (59). Evidence exists to show that, during such spells, Charlotte was attempting to integrate her separate selves, knowing now that successful amalgamation was entirely necessary for her mental health. In the end, we come to understand what Jung meant by the positive nature of a neurosis and how critical its manifestation is in this rite of passage. To Jung, a neurosis is a gift, given to the chosen few, to enable them to work through a self-cure. Jung seems to feel that without a “neurotic episode,” individuation is impossible. The integration process for Charlotte would take years, and would take its psychic toll. In addition, Jung claims the act of individuation exerts a deeply ambivalent pull on both sexes, and is especially difficult—not only with the anima and animus, since they are “much further away from consciousness . . . [and] are seldom if ever realized” (Essential Jung 93)—but also with the shadow self when it appears as an archetype:

With a little self-criticism one can see through the shadow—so far as its nature is personal. But when it appears as an archetype, one encounters the same difficulties as with anima and animus. In other words, it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognize the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil. (Essential Jung 93)

If one agrees that in her early work Charlotte was creating what Northrop Frye would refer to as romance fiction containing stylized figures, rather than ‘real people,’ then it becomes relatively easy to understand how these characters “expanded into psychological archetypes” (Frye, Anatomy of Criticism 304). Moreover, if the juvenilia, with all their attendant metaphors and symbols, are seen as dream-like or allegories of the psyche, it becomes clear that such narratives set the stage for “something nihilistic or untamable” to come forth, taking control of the text and/or the author (Frye, Anatomy of Criticism

305).<sup>22</sup> Thus, we can more fully appreciate what Charlotte experienced when she encountered her dark side and became aware of the critical need to achieve an amalgamated selfhood. Obtaining some measure of objectivity so that she could detach herself from Zamorna and remove his archetypal trappings required a ruthless self-examination on Charlotte's part, and a resolute, even heroic, will to transcend her own inflated unconscious.

As mentioned, before integration or individuation takes place, one either projects an image or is possessed by it. Projection, a wholly unconscious act according to Jung, allows individuals to acquaint themselves with a facet of their personality, recognizing that part of themselves before learning how to synthesize it within their larger character. Projection is "the perceptual 'trick' by which we perceive in others what are actually characteristics in ourselves [and] the degree of emotion we feel about the other person is a clue as to whether or not we are projecting" (Wehr 57). By contrast, possession means literally being taken mastery of by a "subpersonality," one of which we are utterly unaware (Wehr 57), and according to Jung, one which bears "an obsessive" or "possessive quality" (from "The Shadow," Essential Jung 91). This subpersonality thrusts its voice in our mouths, so that it 'acts out' in our voice, without our conscious knowledge or choice. "Possession," claims Wehr, "can make people act in ways their conscious sense of themselves would never permit" (57). Integration of these facets of the personality, therefore, is crucial or the results can be "catastrophic" (Wehr 58). Anthony Stevens, in Archetype: A natural history of the self, discusses the possible outcome of an unsuccessful synthesis:

If one is to come to terms with the Shadow, a conscious orientation with a firm ethical foundation is indispensable; otherwise Dr Jekyll becomes Mr Hyde. Those whose moral priorities are less than clear should not flirt with the Shadow, for 'possession' is the likely result, whence little can preserve them from the slide into barbarism. (Stevens 221)

Jung imparts the same admonition in his essay "The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious": "Possession by an archetype turns a man into a flat collective figure, a mask behind which he can no longer develop as a human being, but becomes increasingly stunted" (Essential Jung 124). Charlotte herself later speaks of the ease with which

possession can take place, having become aware by then of its plausibility. In a letter to one of her publishers, W.S. Williams, dated 1848, Charlotte refers to Bertha Mason and the unusual attic drama played out in Jane Eyre as a moral madness which confounds the possessed mind: “all that is good or even human seems to disappear from the mind and a fiend-nature replaces it. All seems demonized” (SHB, LFC 2:173). That same year, she responds to the critic, George Henry Lewes, who expressed concern about the melodramatic nature of Jane Eyre. She describes the writing experience itself as an act of possession, showing Charlotte’s familiarity with what Jung termed an “autonomous complex”:

When authors write best, or, at least, when they write most fluently, an influence seems to waken in them, which becomes their master—which will have its own way—putting out of view all behests but its own, dictating certain words, and insisting on their being used, whether vehement or measure[d] in their nature; new-moulding characters, giving unthought-of turns to incidents, rejecting carefully elaborated old ideas, and suddenly creating and adopting new ones. (SHB, LFC 2:179-80)

Two years later, Charlotte expressed a similar sentiment in a half-apologetic preface to a re-printing of Emily’s novel, Wuthering Heights, following her sister’s death.<sup>23</sup>

Contained in this preface is this same revelatory and cautionary caveat, again illustrating Charlotte’s awareness of how easily the personification of one’s creative talent can take possession of a writer:

Whether it is right or advisable to create things like Heathcliff, I do not know: I scarcely think it is. But this I know; the writer who possesses the creative gift owns something of which he is not always master—something that at times strangely wills and works for itself.

(Charlotte Brontë, 1850 Preface, Wuthering Heights 40)

This might be viewed as a Romantic surrender to one’s muse, but by then Charlotte had already witnessed her brother’s progressive depravity and death and her sister Emily’s willing transcendence from the material world to a more spiritual realm, and deeply felt the absence of both siblings, as well as the loss of her only remaining sibling, Anne. Moreover, Charlotte may well have been mourning the forfeiture of the impassioned and unbridled imagination, which held so many attractions as well as dangers for her.

Certainly she continued to treat immoderate behavior in both the real and fictional worlds with great caution, as conscious of its pitfalls as its allure, after saving herself from the deepest abyss of all—possession by the shadow self and certain moral and irreligious insanity.

A number of critics have produced psychoanalytical studies of the Brontës' work. Helene Moglen's text adopts a Freudian approach towards Charlotte's juvenilia and adult novels. Barbara Hannah, a Jungian psychologist, investigates the entire family, on both biographical and literary levels. Having had it pointed out to her that "the individuation process evidently appeared in an unusually clear form in the writings of the Brontës" (ix), Hannah undertakes, with Jung's blessing, a psychological study of all four siblings, focusing particularly on Emily and Wuthering Heights, since she sees in this novel "an image of the process of individuation, carried, as far, I think, as possible in its *projected form*" (Striving Towards Wholeness 210, emphasis Hannah's).<sup>24</sup> Sally Shuttleworth's psychoanalytical study, Charlotte Brontë and Victorian Psychology, while not Jungian in its explication, explores Charlotte's preoccupation with selfhood, how "conflicting models of selfhood, of mental control and physiological instability are played out in Brontë's fiction, heightening and intensifying the erotic struggles for control" (4), as well as her keen interest in penetrating the hidden selves of others. Like other critics, but in greater detail, Shuttleworth shows how, in the juvenilia, Charlotte lays "the groundwork for the psychological concerns of her later fiction," and it is here that we find "the same sense of embattled selfhood . . . the same concerns with the instabilities of psychological and gender identity, which fuel the later work" (101). Within the juvenilia lie the nuclei of issues with which Charlotte remains engrossed for the rest of her writing life:

Throughout the early writing Brontë addresses themes and issues that are to re-emerge in altered form in her later works. Her questioning of psychological and gender identity goes hand in hand with her interrogation of literary conventions of representation. These early texts repeatedly and defiantly break taboos, with reference both to content and to form . . . As in the novels, the central concern lies with the workings of power: the operations of sexual, class, and racial power and their intricate intertwinings, all come under scrutiny. Amidst all the drama of industrial unrest, racial uprisings and sexual excess one image of the workings of power remains paramount: the unveiling of the hidden secrets of selfhood.<sup>25</sup> (Shuttleworth 123)

Hence, the significance of the juvenilia becomes evident particularly if we are to understand Charlotte's adult novels, as well as the author herself. Through the act of unveiling the selfhood, Charlotte becomes acquainted with the hazards inherent in dramatizing shadow selves. She comes to know first-hand the convulsive grip possession takes of the conscious mind. She also becomes entirely cognizant of the problems of possessing a divided psyche, which demands leading a kind of double life, forcing one to don a public mask or persona, which might be at odds with the authentic self. All this and more makes itself manifest in the juvenilia, which, when read in a Jungian light, reveal themselves as an *Entwicklungsroman*, bringing to the surface developing aspects of Charlotte Brontë's character which have not yet been addressed. Moreover, understanding these facets of Charlotte's evolution and maturation not only help us to read and understand her adult fiction on even deeper levels, but also to learn more about the individuation process itself. In turn, this investigation illuminates the way in which the creative process works, particularly in the case of a young nineteenth-century woman coming of age on the threshold of the Victorian era.

Although Moglen, Hannah and Shuttleworth all point to the juvenilia as the place of origin for the birth of Charlotte's conscious self and the arena in which she discovers her darker subliminal being, none examine this body of work in great detail, instead moving on to focus in equal part on Charlotte's adult fiction. Moreover, Hannah is the only critic to trace Charlotte's individuation from a Jungian perspective, though here again, her investigation is slight, and her conclusions and my own diverge greatly. Hence, there appeared to be room here to undertake a more exacting study, using more recent feminist arguments concerning fallacies in Jung's theories. In the next five chapters, I shall look at Charlotte's juvenilia in more or less chronological fashion, showing how, through these childhood writings, a pattern emerges which largely exemplifies Jung's system of individuation, yet challenges it in some respects, so that they become a test case for Jung's dialectic. Charlotte, of course, could not be conscious of such a psychic process, and though I use Jungian terminology throughout to explain the stages through which she was progressing, if only intuitively, the reader should be reminded that such nomenclature was unknown in the Brontës' time.<sup>26</sup> In Chapter One, I show how Charlotte's selection of a male persona (Charles Wellesley) and chief chronicler

empowered her in ways she would not otherwise have enjoyed as a young female writer, particularly while in collaborative partnership with her adventuresome brother. In Chapter Two, we see Charlotte's shadow self (Zamorna) emerge, his demonic characteristics coming to the fore. Zamorna's demonism poses distinct threats to Charlotte's mental stability, prompting the concerns outlined in Chapter Three: her fears for her sanity and spiritual salvation, as her shadow threatens to take possession of her psyche. Chapter Four discusses the role the anima and animus play in individuation, and Charlotte's struggles to retain mastery over her own soul, relegating Zamorna to a more positive role as her future animus. Chapter Five focuses on the psychic healing which takes place as Charlotte integrates her shadow and comes to terms with her gendered circumstances, creating new, more viable personae which anticipate those found in her adult novels. In taking this psychological journey through Charlotte's juvenilia, we can appreciate the impulses operating within much of the mature fiction, which is discussed from time to time throughout this work. Through the juvenilia, which serve as young Charlotte's mindscape, we better understand the psychological meaning of the dream-like narratives, the dense imagery, and the complex symbolism found in her later novels.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> “To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (1Cor.5:5, King James Version).

<sup>2</sup> I refer here to Jung’s definition of an archetype, as discussed in his essay, “On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry,” from The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature: “The primordial image, or archetype, is a figure—be it a daemon, a human being, or a process—that constantly recurs in the course of history and appears wherever creative fantasy is freely expressed. Essentially, therefore, it is a mythological figure . . . [Such archetypes] present a picture of psychic life in the average, divided up and projected into the manifold figures of the mythological pantheon” (Portable Jung 319-20).

<sup>3</sup> I use Jungian psychology to help illuminate Charlotte’s inner life primarily because her fantasy life was largely dominated by archetypes, and also because in composing her juvenilia, Charlotte was undertaking a maturation process which, eventually, culminated in individuation. Through her early fictional writing and correspondence, we can trace Charlotte’s “psychic birth,” followed, in Jung’s words, by the “physiological change [which] is attended by a psychic revolution” (“The Stages of Life,” from The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, Portable Jung 7). More specifically, Anthony Storr writes in his introduction to The Essential Jung that facets of the self are revealed through art—music, verse, and prose, as well as painting, drawing and sculpting: “Jung encouraged his patients to draw and paint their fantasies, finding that this technique both helped the patient to rediscover hidden parts of himself and also portrayed the psychological journey upon which he was embarked” (21). Charlotte had to give up her drawing pursuits as a result of failing eyesight, instead expressing her vivid imagination in prose and poetry. In this same vein, Barbara Hannah, in Striving Towards Wholeness, remarks that “Experience shows us again and again that the way in which a creative work develops has a strong effect on its creator. One sees this particularly clearly in ‘active imagination.’ If someone is able to work out a problem in active imagination, it changes him and makes him capable of meeting the problems of his own individual life” (48-49).

<sup>4</sup> Zamorna is variously known in the juvenilia as Arthur Wellesley Wellington, Albion, the Marquis of Douro, Duke of Zamorna, King Adrian, and finally Emperor of Angria. Each name change generally signifies a transformation in his character. In considering Zamorna as Charlotte’s instrument of change, it would be well to keep in mind that Hannah points out that alchemists often referred to the Devil as the principle of individuation, the impetus responsible for prompting the process (227).

<sup>5</sup> From what we have of the juvenilia, we can determine only that the plays began to be documented in June of 1826.

<sup>6</sup> As late as 1843, while in Brussels, Charlotte would make reference in a letter to Branwell to the collaborative realm as “the old scenes in the world below” (Smith 317).

---

<sup>7</sup> Hannah comments that Branwell tended to be more negative than his sisters (150), playing “dangerously with evil” in these early games (151).

<sup>8</sup> The collaboration shared by Charlotte and Branwell—and earlier by all four siblings—was not, in the strictest sense, a partnered writing project. Each produced his or her own stories, but they utilized one another’s characters and followed a generally agreed-upon plot line, intervening individually to alter or take control of that serial plot only in unusual circumstances, such as when Branwell would annihilate primary characters belonging to his sisters. Because each sibling was given a separate territory over which to rule, and his or her own hero to use as a protagonist, the Brontë children generally worked in harmony for those initial years of this collaborative partnership. Later, Charlotte and Branwell, in their own separate affiliation, would find they worked particularly well together because each was interested in exploring separate facets of this imagined life—Branwell in the realm of the battlefield, and Charlotte in the atmosphere of the drawing-room. Hence, they impinged very little on one another’s territory until later, when, during one of Charlotte’s absences while at school, Branwell destroyed a character beloved by both. For a fuller examination of the writing partnership shared by Charlotte and Branwell, see my essay, “Creating Angria: Charlotte and Branwell Brontë’s Collaboration,” *Brontë Society Transactions* 24:1 (April 1999): 16-32.

<sup>9</sup> This transformation from benign to malevolent, or daemonic to demonic, proves to be a predictable regression in literary characters modeled on certain mythological archetypes. The mutating shift, which occurs in the imaginative, ambitious, creative, even heroic impulse, is inscribed repeatedly in scripture, myth and legend. The all but inevitable surrender of the imagination to the power of evil is seen in the literary development of legendary prototypes. Each age favors certain archetypes, which, in turn, become a symbolic *Zeitgeist*, modulating according to the cultural vicissitudes of that particular era. We see such demonic modulations occur in god-defying prototypes like Prometheus, Cain, Don Juan, and Doctor Faustus, who appear at various times to express in myth, scripture and literature the theological, moral or ethical conflicts inherent in the age into which each are re-born. In the aftermath of the French Revolution, for instance, much English literature pre-occupied itself with the subject of hero-worship, and the paradoxes presented by alienation and extreme individualism, which inevitably degenerate into a state of self-absorption, self-delusion, tyrannical and demonic behavior (Goethe’s *Faust*, and Byron’s *Manfred*, *Don Juan*, and *Cain* provide a few such examples). The term “demonic modulation” originates with Northrop Frye: “The simplest of such [displacement] techniques is the phenomenon that we may call ‘demonic modulation,’ or the deliberate reversal of the customary moral associations of archetypes . . . In the nineteenth century, with demonic myth approaching, this kind of reversed symbolism is organized into all the patterns of the ‘Romantic agony,’ chiefly sadism, Prometheanism, and diabolism. . . .” (Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 156-57). For more on archetypal imagery in the Romantic and Victorian ages, see Morse Peckham’s *Romanticism: The Culture of the Nineteenth Century* and *Victorian Revolutionaries*, and Mario Praz’s *The Romantic Agony*.

<sup>10</sup> This process was not unlike that posited by Richmond Lattimore in *The Iliad of Homer*, when he claims that the ancient citizens of Greece, in protesting to the gods, were, in actuality, talking to themselves, addressing that susceptibility which makes them behave in the way they do (54).

<sup>11</sup> Helene Moglen asserts in the preface to her psychoanalytical study, Charlotte Brontë: The Self Conceived, that some lives “promise to reveal the barely submerged secrets of the relationship between art and personality” (13), and that “from her childhood, Charlotte’s fantasies organized themselves into stories which revealed both the shape of a personality struggling for definition and the nature of those forces which conspired to thwart and even to destroy it” (14). In The Colonial Rise of the Novel, Firdous Azim claims that the juvenilia offer a double advantage: “Lying prior to the published and mature work, the juvenilia throws up, most startlingly, the question of origins; on the one hand it provides an example of the development of an individual instance of writing (the growth of an author) and on the other, by its sheer heterogeneity and density, it provides the historian or biographer with a laboratory – a work in progress – from which different strands have to be untangled for the finished product to emerge. There is rich material here for the biographical critic exploring Brontëana, or for developmental theorists of childhood to look for growth patterns” (Azim 109; Azim consistently uses “juvenilia” as a singular noun).

<sup>12</sup> Jung explains that the *persona* or *personae* were the names for the masks worn by actors in antiquity (Essential Jung 98).

<sup>13</sup> Hannah conjectures that the death of Maria, the siblings’ elder sister and “second mother” may have made it more difficult for the girls to grow up as women, and drove them inward, “into the region of the archetypal mother and the Self” (220, 224). In fact, Hannah marks Maria’s death as the most likely catalyst for the individuation process of all four surviving siblings, equating it with that moment in Wuthering Heights when Heathcliff is introduced. “It was probably not only Emily’s soul that was invaded by Heathcliff,” writes Hannah, “but the souls of them all. From that moment on, none of them was able to avoid the problem of evil for it had invaded their innermost lives as the dark Heathcliff invaded first the Earnshaw family and later the Lintons” (224).

<sup>14</sup> Evidence of Charlotte’s awareness of this division between her public and private selves is manifested throughout her correspondence of late 1836 and 1837 with Ellen Nussey. At one point Charlotte tells Ellen: “I have some qualities that make me very miserable some feelings that you can have no participation in—that few very few people in the world at all understand I don’t pride myself on these peculiarities, I strive to conceal and suppress them as much as I can” (c. October 1836; Smith 153).

<sup>15</sup> If Charlotte is the best judge of her own writing, this age could be advanced several more years. In a letter dated March 18, 1850, addressed in response to Miss Alexander of Wakefield shortly after the publication of Shirley, Charlotte writes, “I am happy if my works have given you pleasure. As to the little book of rhymes, it has no other title than ‘Poems by Currer, Ellis and Acton Bell’ published by Smith Elder & Co., 65 Cornhill. Let me warn you that it is scarcely worth your while to send for it. It is a collection of short fugitive pieces; my own share are chiefly juvenile productions written several years ago, before taste was chastened or judgment matured—accordingly they now appear to me very crude” (SHB LLC 3:86). Later that same year, she voiced the same disdain for her early writing in a letter to Elizabeth Gaskell. In speaking of the ‘Poems,’ she says she does not care for her share of the work: “Mine are chiefly juvenile productions, the restless effervescence of a mind that would not be still. In those days the sea too

often ‘wrought and was tempestuous’ and weed, sand, shingle—all turned up in the tumult” (Gérin, *Charlotte Brontë* 451). Consequently, she may have felt that her work hadn’t fully matured until she came to write *The Professor*, completed in 1846 at the age of thirty. As she wrote in a preface to that novel, after the publication of *Shirley*, “I had not indeed published anything before I commenced *The Professor*, but in many a crude effort, destroyed almost as soon as composed, I had got over any such taste as I might once have had for ornamented and redundant composition, and come to prefer what was plain and homely” (Preface, *The Professor* 37). She soon found, however, as she proceeds to say, that publishers disdained such an approach and she learned “something more imaginative and poetical – something more consonant with a highly wrought fancy, with a taste for pathos, with sentiments more tender, elevated, unworldly” was what “Men in business” preferred (Preface, *The Professor* 37).

<sup>16</sup> A number of these letters have been excerpted in Chapter Three, Section 4.

<sup>17</sup> In those scraps of writing which Charlotte kept more or less as a journal while at Roe Head, she documents a vision she has of Zamorna, which transports her into this imaginative realm: “I was quite gone. I had really utterly forgot where I was and all the gloom and cheerlessness of my situation” (CA 2.2:385). These “disturbed but fascinating spell[s]” are trance- and dream-like, writes Winifred Gérin in *The Brontës: The Formative Years* (49), and graphically reveal a “far and bright continent” which shows itself “almost in the vivid light of reality the ongoings of the infernal world” (48). Charlotte also reports hearing voices: “it is the still small voices alone that comes [sic] to me at eventide . . . it is that which wakes my spirit & engrosses all my living feelings all my energies which are not merely mechanical & like Haworth & home wakes [sic] sensations which lie dormant elsewhere” (Barker 249). The voices Charlotte heard were almost better known to her than those of her siblings, and frequently combined themselves with visions: “As I saw them stately and handsome, gliding through these salons, where many well known forms crossed my sight, where there were faces looking up, eyes smiling and lips moving in audible speech, that I knew better almost than my brother and sister. . . .” (Ratchford, *Legends of Angria* xxviii). At times music could be heard as well: “Never shall I, Charlotte Brontë, forget what a voice of wild and wailing music now came thrillingly to my mind’s, almost to my body’s, ear, nor how distinctly I, sitting in the schoolroom at Roe Head, saw the Duke of Zamorna leaning against that obelisk with the mute marble Victory above him, the fern waving at his feet, his black horse turned loose grazing among the heather, the moonlight so mild, so exquisitely tranquil, sleeping upon the vast and vacant road, and the African sky quivering and shaking with stars, expanded above all” (Ratchford, *Legends* xxxv-xxxvi). Mary Taylor recalled Charlotte claiming to hear a voice reciting brief lines of poetry: “She told me that one night, sitting alone, about this time, she heard a voice repeat these lines [from Cowper’s “The Castaway”]: ‘Come thou high and holy feeling,/Shine o’er mountain, flit o’er wave./Gleam like light o’er dome and shieling.-’ There were eight or ten more lines which I forget. She insisted that she had not made them, that she had heard a voice repeat them” (Gaskell 580n4). Perhaps because such imaginings were inevitably interrupted in such surroundings, Charlotte’s need to record them grew nearly compulsive while she was at Roe Head, and the urge came unbidden. Mary Taylor’s testimony confirms that Charlotte became an involuntary, even unwilling observer of her fantasy world, according to Elizabeth Gaskell (161).

<sup>18</sup> These concepts of archetypal male and female roles have met with opposition from a number of contemporary feminists who view such gendered stereotyping as patriarchal in nature. As pointed

---

out in Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary, a more moderate group of feminist theorists has attempted to contextualize the archetype, Demaris Wehr among them. I have used Wehr's theoretical commentary throughout for that reason. Wehr explains: "rather than understanding the archetype as in any way an 'eternal and static form' producing 'eternal images', [these critics] show that whatever is 'archetypal' (numinous, awe-inspiring) in human life is dependent on its context for its being perceived that way—a reading that seems entirely congruent with much of Jung's own, especially later, attempts at understanding the 'archetype' and its effects" (Wehr, Feminism and Psychoanalysis 189).

<sup>19</sup> That Charlotte took a more ambiguously gendered, even androgynous, pen name for her adult fiction shows a decided later shift in her sympathies.

<sup>20</sup> Moglen accurately summarizes the dilemma created by Charlotte and Branwell in subsuming themselves into this commonly derived fantasy world. She argues: "As children, Charlotte and Branwell participated in Byron's mass romantic dream-wish. Identifying with the striving, they were unaware of the contradictions. They adored the hero and never tried to analyze the man. For them, the heroic fantasy of romantic love concretized in their writing was particularly powerful. They were not able to recognize its dangers because they had minimal contact with a reality that could offer a corrective perspective. To disengage themselves from delusion, they would have had to understand and control in their own lives the social and psychosexual forces, which were acting through them. For Branwell, this was impossible. His identification with the romantic hero was immediate, total, and ultimately fatal. His self-destruction of course assumed a parodic form: he was a pitiable Manfred. But although his conflict was domesticated, its outlines were familiar and its end predictable. He was trapped in the mythological mode as Byron had been himself. Charlotte's problem was more complex. Because she was female, her identification with their beloved, Byronic Zamorna was equivocal. She could not, after all, *be* the fantasized hero. She was, in fact, 'the other.' The dream by which she was fascinated could not contain her. The need for psychic expression propelled her from the paralysis of myth into the surging reality of history and the complexities of society. For her, the creation of Angria initiated a long and painful process of self-investigation which did finally yield to discovery and knowledge: to a true if tragic freedom" (Moglen 33, emphasis Moglen's). In short, Moglen views Charlotte as ultimately exempt, because of her gender, from becoming "trapped" in the same identification process as her brother. I hope here to refute Moglen's assertions and show that despite being somewhat more detached from this fantasy world because of her obligations at Roe Head—first as a student, then as a teacher—Charlotte was as deeply immersed in the psychological cross-identification with her characters as Branwell. Charlotte's efforts, therefore, to extricate herself were no less heroic than Branwell's would have been, had he undergone individuation.

<sup>21</sup> Moglen states: "[Charlotte's] compulsive reworking of the same themes [throughout all four of her adult novels] demonstrates the degree of difficulty she experienced in resolving the conflict with Heger" (83). These themes, however, had their genesis in the juvenilia, long before Charlotte's trips to Brussels and her acquaintance with her teacher, M. Heger. Moglen remarks on the repetitive structure of Jane Eyre: "As in fairy tale or the quest-romance, characters, situations and symbols must be rehearsed again and again, the heroine experiencing with each new revolution an increment of pressure and intensity, until the ultimate resolution of conflict is achieved" (108). Charlotte's writing, like Jane's life, is patterned on such repetitive re-learning. Moglen observes about Jane, "Like Christian in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, she finds that a

temptation overcome is not overcome forever. A capacity achieved must be tested against more formidable obstacles. It is the obsessive movement of dream: the spiraling cycle of allegory” (112). This, too, proves to be a repetitive pattern found in Charlotte’s life. It is not enough that she has triumphed over Zamorna in the 1830s; she must encounter him again in the person of M. Heger, then again in such characters as Edward Crimsworth, Edward Rochester, Robert Moore, and M. Paul. Hence, one can see the entire corpus of Charlotte’s work as obsessively allegorical in nature, although all the while, she is making strides in her ongoing individuation.

<sup>22</sup> “The essential difference between novel and romance lies in the conception of characterization. The romancer does not attempt to create ‘real people’ so much as stylized figures which expand into psychological archetypes. It is in the romance that we find Jung’s libido, anima, and shadow reflected in the hero, heroine, and villain respectively. That is why the romance so often radiates a glow of subjective intensity that the novel lacks, and why a suggestion of allegory is constantly creeping in around its fringes. Certain elements of character are released in the romance which make it naturally a more revolutionary form than the novel. The novelist deals with personality, with characters wearing their *personae* or social masks . . . The romancer deals with individuality, with characters in *vacuo* idealized by revery, and, however conservative he may be, something nihilistic and untamable is likely to keep breaking out of his pages” (Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 304-05). In an earlier essay, Frye investigates the psychological derivation of the quest-romance, which might well help explain Charlotte’s inducement to write consistently in this genre for more than twenty years: “The quest-romance has analogies to both rituals and dreams, and the rituals examined by Frazer and the dreams examined by Jung show the remarkable similarity in form that we should expect of two symbolic structures analogous to the same thing. Translated into dream terms, the quest-romance is the search of the libido or desiring self for a fulfilment that will deliver it from the anxieties of reality but will still contain that reality. The antagonists of the quest are often sinister figures, giants, ogres, witches and magicians, that clearly have a parental origin; and yet redeemed and emancipated paternal figures are involved too, as they are in the psychological quests of both Freud and Jung” (193). Finally, what M.H. Abrams has to say in defining the prose romance genre rather succinctly conveys the nature of Charlotte’s oeuvre, invoking themes and genres which will be touched upon in future chapters: “The prose romance has as its ancestors the *chivalric romance* of the Middle Ages and the *Gothic novel* of the latter eighteenth century. It often deploys characters who are sharply discriminated as heroes and villains, masters and victims; the protagonist is often solitary, and relatively isolated from a social context; it is often set in the historical past, and the *atmosphere* is such as to suspend our expectations based on everyday experience; the plot emphasizes adventure, and is frequently cast in the form of the quest for an ideal, or the pursuit of an enemy; and the nonrealistic and occasionally melodramatic events are sometimes claimed to project in symbolic form the primal desires, hopes, and terrors in the depths of the human mind, and to be therefore analogous to the materials of dream, myth, ritual and folklore” (119).

<sup>23</sup> In his essay, “Emily Brontë and the Responsible Imagination,” Victor Neufeldt argues that Emily used her imagination differently, moving away from escapism and toward a means through which she could come to terms with a detestable world. Charlotte’s reading of Emily’s imagination, he asserts, was misconceived.

<sup>24</sup> Hannah spends proportionately little time on the juvenilia, giving no attention to the role Zamorna plays. She often arrives at different conclusions about both this body of work and

---

Charlotte's individuation process. Where it is relevant, I shall point out where Hannah's views and my own diverge.

<sup>25</sup> Moglen says much the same thing, explaining in the preface to her psychoanalytical study how she came to use Charlotte's work as the basis for her investigative examination of the development of the self: "An almost unique opportunity for the perception of psychological and artistic formation was afforded. I discovered that to diagram the process of Brontë's growth was also to explore explicitly formations of the modern female psyche. It was to indicate the nature of the feminist struggle through which men and women today define themselves—both in support and opposition . . . And as we too strive for autonomous definition, we see ourselves reflected in different aspects of Brontë's struggle" (14).

<sup>26</sup> However, terms such as "ego," "alter-ego," and even "shadow" and "persona," had been in circulation for some time, and indeed are used on occasion by Charlotte in her fiction. She was also aware of the process of some force arising from within and taking possession of a writer, as pointed out in her correspondence with Lewes and her 1850 preface to Emily's Wuthering Heights. What she could not know, however, were Jung's later theories (many of which were conceived in the twentieth century) about the process of individuation, wherein all these aspects of the self come into play in the formation of the individual personality.

## Chapter One

### The Narrative Voice and the Telling of the Tale: Charlotte's Persona and Story-Telling Techniques

*"The persona . . . is the individual's system of adaptation to, or the manner he assumed in dealing with, the world . . . One could say, with a little exaggeration, that the persona is that which in reality one is not, but which oneself as well as others think one is."  
(C.G. Jung, The Essential Jung 420-21)*

An author's persona traditionally functions as the tale's narrator, but, as in Charlotte Brontë's case, also can operate as an author's public mask. Charlotte found such need of a persona both in the telling of her tales, and, at times, in the living of her life. In public, Charlotte's extreme shyness and sensitivity required her to hide behind the persona's mask. In private, she appropriated the mask of a male persona in order to expropriate patriarchal privilege. Adopting a patriarchal persona granted her the freedom to create imaginatively on an equal basis in collaboration with her brother, the license to scrutinize and report on the actions of others within this fictive realm, and the liberty to satirize those she scrutinized. As with her later character, Shirley Keeldar, Charlotte found playing roles and adopting a male persona permitted her liberties she did not otherwise possess. Carolyn Heilbrun comments that her own impulse to write anonymously was identical to Charlotte's; that it offered her a means "to create an individual whose destiny offered more possibility than she could imagine for herself" (114). Becoming Charles, then, in this world of patriarchal play endowed Charlotte with rights of full membership and privilege.<sup>1</sup> In this respect, Charles Wellesley/Townsend/Townshend, second son to the Duke of Wellington and younger brother to Zamorna, served Charlotte well as her narrator and persona for most of her early years as a young author, just as writing under an androgynous pen name would for her later published work.<sup>2</sup> She invested Charles with aspects of her own self, so that speaking through this male mask was not as alien a gesture as it might first appear to be. Helene Moglen remarks that Charles becomes, in time, "disenfranchized, powerless, a cynical victim of the circumstances of his birth and of Zamorna's heedless cruelty" (48). Here, too, one can see that Charles's status reflects Charlotte's own less privileged position in the Brontë family, and her sense of having to sacrifice her own destiny for the

sake of her brother's future. Like Charles, Charlotte undoubtedly found that her latent powers lay within the authority invested in her pen and the force of the words she wrote, and both serve as a means of self-empowerment. Through her fiction, Charlotte writes a broader destiny for herself, enlarging her own vision and allowing her to escape her subordinate standing in the family and in society.<sup>3</sup>

In time, as the primary chronicler of Angria, Charles Wellesley learns that he possesses far greater sovereignty than his older brother does, since Charles can sway the reading public against the King through his words. Charles makes full use of these powers; it is within his writings that he finds his remedial forum and most freely criticizes Zamorna. Such criticism was wholly self-reflexive on Charlotte's part, however, since both brothers exemplify her, though this fact remained unknown to her for a number of years. In effect, one side of Charlotte operated as the constant critic of the other. Fannie Ratchford points out that the rift between brothers established a fundamental conflict within Charlotte's psyche:

The increasing antagonism between the two [brothers] reflects a growing conflict within Charlotte herself, as her conscience condemns while her romantic imagination rejoices in the moral lapses of her hero. To satisfy conscience she shaped Lord Charles into a yet more precise instrument of censure through which she roundly denounces the sins that made her hero glorious. (Ratchford, Web of Childhood 71)

Hence, the self was set to warring with itself—the persona versus the shadow.<sup>4</sup> This opposition set the stage for Charlotte's breakdown in 1836, when she began to perceive that these fictional personages were in actuality projections of her own divided self, and that they had to be reconciled if she was to survive.

Viewed in this light, we begin to understand why Charlotte fashioned a character like Charles to serve as her early persona and embodiment of her conscience. Charles—at least initially—closely approximates Charlotte's ideal hero, the Duke of Wellington, an exemplar of such nineteenth-century values as duty, integrity, and conscience.<sup>5</sup> With Charles in place as her public mask, that other side of Charlotte—her shadow self—was then able to emerge and fully engage her imagination. Although Zamorna embodied an aspect of herself she did not yet recognize, for years Charlotte treated him as other than herself, particularly as he grew increasingly demonic.<sup>6</sup> Her inability to understand or her

refusal to concede the significance of Zamorna's role in her own psyche may be linked with Charlotte's love, from a very early age, of disguise and theatrical imagery. For most of her young life, she saw masquerade and drama as entertaining rather than enlightening, though later that opinion will change as she comes to view theatricality as simultaneously educative and enjoyable. As long as such play was considered strictly play-acting, she could, if only unconsciously, feel safely removed from any psychological implications that might be unmasked in the process. Perhaps, too, Charlotte donned a persona's mask not only to compensate for her shyness, but also to conceal herself from herself, until such self-disguise critically impeded her further growth. Finally, if we see Charles as an intervening device preventing Charlotte from knowing the full truth about herself, her love of mystification in her narration likewise becomes more comprehensible. While the narrator withholds, deceives, and eludes—keeping the truth of a character and his function at bay—both the reader and, indeed, the author remain unaware of the fuller ramifications contained within the text. Only over time do we, and the author, become conscious of how both brothers serve as projections of Charlotte's own psyche, their opposing natures emblematic of conflicting forces within herself which she would later need to confront and amalgamate in order to achieve individuation.

### **1. Charlotte's Early Projection on to Her Persona**

Early in Charlotte's juvenilia, the young author encounters an aspect of herself which she does not yet appear to recognize as a literal projection of her own personality.<sup>7</sup> Her narrator, however, more perceptively identifies the psychic affiliation between them. In a story entitled "Strange Events," written as part of the fifth number of the Second Series of the *Young Men's Magazine* and dated August 1830, Charles Wellesley detects Charlotte's presence and perceives himself to be a figment of her imagination. He concludes that she is his creator. This striking metaphysical passage discloses that Charles (a masculinization of her own name) functions as a projection of Charlotte's conscious mind. At this stage, Charlotte, then fourteen, does not seem aware of this mental process she had unconsciously set in motion.<sup>8</sup> Instead, she simply treats Charles

as a means by which she could both vicariously participate in and operate as detached observer of early Glass Town adventures. Jung informs us the act of projection is an unconscious one: “Hence one meets with projections, one does not make them” (Essential Jung 92). Consequently, it is Charles, blessed with psychic powers or second sight, who describes sensing a symbiotic link with this detected presence and questions his own actuality.<sup>9</sup> He struggles with the discovery of this new level of self-consciousness, and examines the reality of his essence, in the end determining that he, his brother and his father were real enough within that imaginative realm:

It seemed as if I was a non-existent shadow, that I neither spoke, eat [sic], imagined or lived of myself, but I was the mere idea of some other creature's brain. The Glass Town seemed so likewise. My father, Arthur and everyone with whom I am acquainted, passed into a state of annihilation; but suddenly I thought again that I and my relatives did exist, and yet not us but our minds and our bodies without ourselves. Then this supposition—the oddest of any—followed the former quickly, namely, that WE without US were shadows; also, but at the end of a long vista, as it were, appeared dimly and indistinctly, beings that really lived in a tangible shape, that were called by our names and were US from whom WE had been copied by something - I could not tell what. (CA 1:257)

Charles is also able to hear Charlotte’s voice, as well as that of Branwell, and recognize it as an amplification of his own: “Voices, one like my own but larger and dimmer (if sound may be characterized by such epithets) and another which sounded familiar, yet I had never, that I could remember, heard it before, murmuring unceasingly in my ears” (CA 1:258). Charles even gains a glimpse of his Brobdingnagian creator’s eyes as she gazes upon him: “I felt myself raised suddenly to the ceiling, and ere I was aware, behold two immense, sparkling, bright blue globes within a few yards of me” (CA 1:258). He remarks on the disparity in size between creator and creation, noting the enormous hand which holds him: “I was in [a] hand wide enough almost to grasp the Tower of Nations, and when it lowered me to the floor I saw a huge personification of myself - hundreds of feet high - standing against the great Oriel” (CA 1:258).

What is extraordinary about this passage is that Charles not only perceives his creator and the separate, yet collusive, realities in which each exist, he also comprehends that he is the embodiment of an idea which has taken on its own life. This ability to

objectify oneself, to move beyond the confines of one's own body to understand the relationship between creator and fictive creation, sets the stage for an eventual cross-identification between author and character/narrator.<sup>10</sup> Realizing he does not exist as a separate, autonomous being with a will, or even a self, of his own, Charles instead views his existence as wholly dependent upon the recognition and will of another. He says: "I was now perfectly convinced of my non-existence except in another corporeal frame which dwelt in the real world, for ours, I thought, was nothing but idea" (CA 1:258). What is remarkable about this incident, then, is that it marks the initial stage of forging a decisive link in Charlotte's consciousness between fiction and reality. At the same time, it reveals the identification Charlotte makes with her narrator, the first such projection of her early conscious self on to a fictitious entity. The encounter also signifies the initial instinctive step Charlotte was making toward integrating the multiple selves within her psyche. Demaris Wehr explains that the integration of the persona and the shadow self is effected by carrying on a dialogue with the unconscious, an inner figure, which might emanate from either dream or fantasy. In so doing, one suspends "rational judgment, getting back into the mood of the dream or fantasy, and inviting the dream or fantasy figure to speak" (Wehr 58). Such a dialogue between all these "'little people' in the psyche generates self-acceptance" and promotes a less judgmental, less tyrannical attitude toward others, diminishing future possibilities of projection and possession (Wehr 58). However, for Charlotte, this integrative process would take years, and much dialogic activity would need to ensue before individuation could begin.

The year before, in her story, "A Romantic Tale," written during April 1829, Charlotte had introduced the concept of the Genii, supernal entities personifying the Brontë children's roles as creators and manipulators of this imaginary world. This action, too, was a male prerogative, Genii traditionally acting as tutelary spirits for men only.<sup>11</sup> As amplifications of the authorial role, the Genii make it clear that they are positioned behind and above their work, rather than contained within it, though they frequently speak directly to the characters whom they call "Mortals," which accounts for Charles recognizing Charlotte's voice and finding Branwell's familiar. Furthermore, the Genii possess the power to dictate the fate of these characters, their lives and deaths, even resurrection after death. The role of the Genii, then, was not unlike that of the Greek

gods, although Branwell, in 1832, took pains to differentiate them from such, as if to distinguish himself and his sisters from anything of an exalted, mythical nature.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, the Genii are described as godlike, hugely dramatic, even threatening, in appearance; they possess both omniscient and omnipotent powers, and sometimes act as capriciously as do those gods of antiquity. The hierarchical nature of this relationship between puppet and manipulator accentuates the correspondence between fictive character and author, while simultaneously maintaining the distance that exists between them. By controlling her characters in a god-like manner, Charlotte was effectively treating them as other than herself. When, in 1833, she eliminated the Genii from her writing, she removed that distinction, bringing her in greater propinquity to these creations of hers, and blurring that line of demarcation between author and character.<sup>13</sup>

Charlotte also endowed her characters with a will of their own, unlike Branwell, whose Genius acts far more autocratically.<sup>14</sup> She has Charles explain in “An Extraordinary Dream” (September 1830) that the Genii function as a “supernatural interference with the affairs of men” (CA 1:269), but stresses, in this same story, that mortals retain a measure of free will. In this narrative, Charles relates a dream within a dream or, as he calls it, “a vision within a vision” (CA 1:271), in which he experiences a dream-death, only to awaken and have the same chain of events begin to occur in reality. Given the prophetic nature of his dream, Charles is able to save himself, showing that mortals retain the liberty to alter events in their destinies, but also making evident how such characters are an integral part of their creator—experiencing the conceptual dream, then the fictive dream. Eve Sedgwick points to the relationship which exists between dreams and the larger world outside, or the reality which is separate from dream life, and refers to it as another form of Gothic doubling. Dreams, she explains in The Coherence of Gothic Conventions, “recreate parallel representations at a distance from the original, subject to more or less frightening distortions” (Sedgwick 63). The use of prophetic or allegorical dreams in the Gothic also demonstrates that “the helplessness of the ego . . . can be expressed by adding immobilization to the language of dream and depth” (Sedgwick 38). Charles’s dream of death exhibits his helplessness and temporary loss of free will (though he is able to save himself in time). In turn, this dream of death could well represent Charlotte’s own projected sense of her marginalized and powerless

position in the larger corporeal world. Only in this imaginative realm does she maintain full control of life, death, destiny and the ability to assert her own will. Yet even in this fictive world, Charlotte's will is far from absolute. One can find alternating contradictions of individual responsibility versus helplessness throughout Charlotte's fiction, claims Sally Shuttleworth: "fierce assertions of self-determination are followed by statements of powerlessness, where the self is projected as a mere product of uncontrollable energies" (54). Shuttleworth adds:

[Charlotte's] first-person narrators in particular employ the rhetoric of psychological discourse in their explanations of act and impulse, shifting the ground of analysis as it suits their purposes. The self is projected variously as a unified, self-determining agent, and as a fragmented site of conflicting forces. (Shuttleworth 56)

Charles's prophetic dream emphasizes this contradictory shift or conflict of wills; his paralytic perception that he is not master of himself is soon superseded by his taking control of his destiny to reverse a series of fateful events. In effect, he is expropriating authorial rights by doing so, accentuating the symbiotic nature of creator and creation—subtly exchanging roles in the narrative act. Charles may be modeling for Charlotte the possibility that even a marginalized figure such as herself can become the mistress of her own fate. As with Charles's dream, a script has been pre-written for women. But the outcome of Charles's story presents the possibility that women, too, once they've seen the script, can write themselves out of it or through it, as Charlotte later attempts to do. Using Charles as a conduit, then, Charlotte may well have been unconsciously testing the limits of her own free will.<sup>15</sup> Here, though, he appears to be testing the limits of his own self-will against the script written for him by his creator.

In "'That Kingdom of Gloom': Charlotte Brontë, the Annuals, and the Gothic," Christine Alexander remarks that there exists in the juvenilia "a constant awareness of the tension between the various levels of narrative authority in the stories" (para. 22). Not only does the shifting ground between author and narrator attest to that, but so too do the frequent confrontations between the characters and the Genii. At one point in the tale "The Bridal" (1832), Zamorna is admonished to avoid "the madness of self-will" and to capitulate to "fate and inexorable destiny" (CA 1:347); this warning reveals to him for the

first time the machinery at work behind this fantasy world. Here again, a character takes advantage of his free will to advance his own causes. Zamorna invalidates the vows he makes to obey the will of the gods, and instead aligns himself with “the evil genius, Danhasch” (CA 1:347).<sup>16</sup> Alexander cites the story “The Foundling” (1833), the last of Charlotte’s in which the Genii appear, as yet another example of the intercession of these Genii in what is considered a mortal’s presumptuous behavior. Alexander contends that otherwise the Genii play such an insubstantial role that the characters assume a hyper-realism, emphasizing the strength of their free will:

The whole of the Glass Town saga can be seen as an elaborate game created by Brontë and her siblings, who become demi-gods, the controlling genii who, like Thackeray, pull the puppet strings. But the Glass Town puppets have a habit of upsetting the convention: narrators like Brontë’s Lord Charles Wellesley assume a reality of their own so that the original, real creators, the Brontë children, become subsumed into insubstantial genii who must intervene in the story as supernatural powers if they are to control narrative events.

(CA, “That Kingdom of Gloom” para. 22)

In time, it becomes evident that the will of these characters has overtaken the will of their creators and manipulators, Charlotte attesting to acting merely as an observer of Angrian events, much like a spectator of theater.<sup>17</sup> At this juncture, she may have been aware only on an intuitive level of the psychological dynamics of authorship, though later she would learn the consequences awaiting an author who gives virtual free rein to her characters. For now, this was mere play, but Charlotte was unwittingly initiating a psychological drama, which would have great consequences for her psychic growth as an adult author. In a discussion of The Professor, Charlotte’s first full-length novel, completed in 1846, for instance, Moglen observes that by projecting herself into her story, Charlotte “becomes a force for fragmentation rather than synthesis” (87), dividing herself among the three central figures. This inadequate conceptualization of character, opines Moglen, accounts for the faulty plotting in the novel: “She cannot create a persona with whom she identifies her own point of view nor can she adopt an ironic stance without knowing who she is or what she wishes to represent” (87).<sup>18</sup> Moglen’s analysis, however, aptly illustrates a process that had begun seventeen years earlier, if not before. Almost from the beginning, Charlotte’s writing proved to be highly subjective, since, unbeknownst to her,

she was attributing parts of her psyche to different characters. In the original inception and development of the Wellesley brothers, and the creation of the Genii, all in the same year, Charlotte was unknowingly projecting her own conscience on to one brother, allowing the other to evolve into a figure which represented her darker, unconscious self. At the same time, she looked on as an omnipotent presence. The writing process helped initiate fragmentation and division within the young author, then, while simultaneously allowing her access to the divided self. If such fragmentation served Charlotte ill in her adulthood when she attempted “to synthesize an image of her potential self” (Moglen 87), it nonetheless handily provided an early framework for her in fashioning a working persona, while exploring the self kept under wraps, even if the genus of both was conceived as masculine. Had she not undertaken such a hazardous psychological journey, she might never have achieved the synthesis and completion of the self.

## **2. Charlotte’s Use of the Male Persona**

Helene Moglen analyzes the reasons why Charlotte would have chosen a contrasexual narrator to tell her tales, and concludes that the author, bound up in the “attitudes of adolescence . . . accepts automatically the male point of view as the ‘official’ perspective” (88). Moglen also introduces another point often overlooked by other critics: “never having encountered a ‘heroine’ in her personal, cultural or political experience—or, for that matter, in literature—it was difficult for her to conceive of any woman as the focus of a work of fiction” (88). Carolyn Heilbrun reiterates this same rationale, speaking of women “having no context or form for writing a woman’s life. Nothing to respond to, be inspired by or draw energy from” (39). The reading material available to Charlotte as a young girl illuminates this vacuum.<sup>19</sup> Her imagination, when it took flight, was fueled by the adventures of men. Although, as we shall later see, Charlotte attempted to create strong heroines in the youthful novelettes, she may well have felt some trepidation in doing so when it came to writing a novel for publication. In her first attempt, she fell back on using not only a male protagonist, but also a male—or at least, an androgynous—pseudonym, no doubt viewing the stratagem as endowing her with greater

license than she would otherwise have as a woman writer.<sup>20</sup> Using an ambiguously gendered pseudonym was to become, for her, a life-long habit, even when her identity became known in 1849, shortly after the publication of Shirley. Elaine Showalter states in A Literature of Their Own that by utilizing a male pseudonym, women writers in the nineteenth century could “represent everything in their personalities that transcended the cramping feminine ideal” (58). Charlotte would later exploit this “cramping feminine ideal” to undermine Victorian sentiments about a woman’s place in a man’s world. Until that occurred, however, she employed the male persona for those transcendent qualities it proffered—the right “to dissect, know, speak with authority and assertion” (Heilbrun 96).<sup>21</sup> Showalter later adds that “Critics have been rather slow to perceive that much of the wish-fulfillment in the feminine novel comes from women wishing they were men, with the greater freedom and range masculinity confers. Their heroes are not so much their ideal lovers as their projected egos” (136). Showalter’s assertion serves as an important and useful point in considering the reasons why Charlotte chose to write as a man. The act, however, served to meet more immediate needs for Charlotte. Writing as a man gave her a voice that was equal to Branwell’s, allowing Charlotte to hold her own in this early competitive alliance, and granting her the freedom to take as much satiric license as her sibling when each critiqued the other’s rhetoric. Further, taking control of the patriarchal voice permitted her the advantage of a privileged view into the workings of the male mind, presumably one of Charlotte’s early objectives.

Initially, Charlotte took a good deal of license with this male prerogative, expressing a host of misogynist views and indulging in some male conceit, creating a multitude of hapless heroines for which her early writing is frequently faulted.<sup>22</sup> Sally Shuttleworth sees this act as freighted with authorial criticism: “Brontë’s representations of femininity in her early writings dramatize in uncompromising form, the negative and constraining implications of cultural constructions of the feminine in Victorian culture” (109). Using the male persona contributed “to the tales’ interrogation of masculinity and the male *abuse* of power and privilege,” claims Shuttleworth (106, emphasis Shuttleworth’s). Much of Charlotte’s adult fiction remedies this masculine abuse in that she empowers, then champions, the very same type of victimized women portrayed in the juvenilia. Using, even identifying with, the male persona, thus allowed her to work

through the misogyny which growing up in a patriarchal society almost inevitably fosters in women as well as men. Having seen the world through the eyes of the oppressor, she later modulated that view, focusing instead on the disenfranchised and engaging in her mature works with embattled power relations between the sexes. The significant point to make here, however, is that Charlotte had to *invent* these strong heroines in her work. She had, as Moglen comments, no models to imitate, or as Heilbrun remarks, no context in which to write a woman's life. When she and her sister Anne fashioned women like Frances Henri, Jane Eyre, Shirley Keeldar, Lucy Snowe, Agnes Grey and Helen Huntingdon, they might well have thought they were creating a new breed of being. Certainly the sisters were then writing at a time when strong, independent-minded female figures ceased to be such oddities in literature and were beginning to appear with more regularity in novels by Gaskell, Dickens, Thackeray, or to become the subjects of biographical and autobiographical works such as that of Harriet Martineau. But Charlotte's early reading material contained few such women, a point which one has to factor into the reasons why she readily enlisted the male point of view from the beginning, not even introducing women into her juvenilia as other than background characters without voices until 1830.<sup>23</sup>

Selecting a male persona endowed Charlotte with another patriarchal perquisite normally denied Victorian women: that of the hegemonic authority of the gaze, which we see at work in the earlier-mentioned metaphysical encounter between Charlotte and Charles. The issue of theatricality, which plays a crucial part in the juvenilia and about which more will be said shortly, is necessarily raised when we examine the role of the active gazer. As Charlotte's persona, Charles traditionally positions himself in the background of any given scenario, residing on the perimeter—often literally behind the curtain—in order to better scrutinize his brother's activities and report back to his readers. This conduct, observes Joseph Litvak in Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth Century English Novel, is in keeping with Charlotte's behind-the-scenes role, which bears its own particular theatrical signification:

Charlotte Brontë's own wish for a sheltering shadow betokens not an anti-theatrical posture, but indeed an intensely theatrical penchant for disguise and dissimulation. If she refuses to make a spectacle of herself, Brontë

merely ends up exchanging theatrical self-display for theatrical self-concealment. (Litvak 87)

Such self-concealment is invested with a specific sovereignty, enabling Charlotte “to eye the public with redoubled efficacy,” remarks Litvak, emphasizing Charlotte’s “predilection for the trappings of patriarchal power—the power to objectify and scrutinize others while exempting oneself from similar treatment” (88). Self-concealment and objectification neatly coincide with Charlotte’s shy and diffident nature. Mary Taylor, a lifelong friend of Charlotte, describes the reticent fifteen-year-old as being pushed aside by classmates at Roe Head school, happier in solitary musing than in general play (as cited by Juliet Barker, *The Brontës* 137). Ellen Nussey, too, reports that she perceived Charlotte as a “shrinking little figure” upon first meeting her, one “who wished to hide both herself and her grief [or homesickness]” (Smith 589). Thus, even at an early age, Charlotte eschews the more social role for that of solitary observer. Ellen later qualifies Charlotte’s shyness, claiming it arose from a sense of estrangement, rather than self-consciousness: “She felt herself apart from others, they did not understand her, and she keenly felt the distance” (Smith 596, emphasis Nussey’s). However, even if she herself was not understood, Charlotte was a quick reader of others. She soon discovered that studying people provided her with a clandestine means of power. While they might not be able to read her, she found it easy to read them. As she told Ellen, she had been an analyzer of character since the age of five (Smith 593), and character analysis is largely what Charlotte concerns herself with in her juvenilia. Sally Shuttleworth discusses the power inherent in reading others while maintaining one’s own illegibility, asserting that in Charlotte’s fiction, a new structure of the psyche becomes evident:

The self does not exist prior to social interaction, but is actually *constituted* in the social struggle to baffle penetration. The desire of the other to read the self, brings to the subject of surveillance a reassuring sense of self-‘possession’: a sense of selfhood is actively produced through the experience of the power to withhold.

(Shuttleworth 46, emphasis Shuttleworth’s)

Hence, in successfully baffling the penetration of others—both in real life and in her fiction—Charlotte maintained a sense of self-empowerment. Heilbrun, who addresses both Charlotte’s predilections for anonymity (111) and secrecy (112), claims that within

such reticence resides the power to write about alternate destinies, freeing a woman from those anxieties revolving around the issue of acting appropriately feminine. Women writers, Heilbrun continues, traditionally had two means of escape:

One was to hide her identity as an author within the shelter of anonymity, the safety of secrecy, to write while protecting the quotidian self leading her appropriate life. The other way was to create in her writings women characters, and sometimes male characters, who might openly enact the dangerous adventures of a woman's life, unconstrained by female propriety. Some, like Charlotte Brontë, did both. (Heilbrun 112)

Even in her own writing, for reasons other than those which a nineteenth-century woman might have, Heilbrun sought the anonymity of a pseudonym, claiming “secrecy is power” (116). She asserts that “secrecy gave me a sense of control over my destiny” (Heilbrun 117). Charlotte undoubtedly viewed the act in the same way, readily recognizing these same advantages to the act of self-concealment.

Jung tends to look at such self-concealment as a form of neurosis, and indeed, it might well be said that repressing the self can be considered unhealthy behavior. In elucidating Jung's thoughts as expressed in his essay, “Problems of Modern Psychotherapy,” Frieda Fordham explains, in her Introduction to Jung's Psychology, that what is concealed tends to be the dark and imperfect within the self, and can become damaging if such concealment, particularly that of emotion, is practiced as a virtue. The end result often leads to a false air of superiority, among other ills (Fordham 90).<sup>24</sup> Charlotte clearly exploits this sense of superiority through concealment in the juvenilia by bestowing on Charles gifts which elevate him and give him a distinct advantage. By having Charles adopt the role of the distanced and all-but-invisible spy in this fictional world, gifted with prescience or second sight—thought to be divinely bestowed on select individuals—she invests her narrator with powerful properties usually belonging to the omniscient author. At the same time, undertaking this act of appointing Charles as her surrogate offers Charlotte invisibility in that she doubly removes herself from the action at hand. Charles, disengaged from and unperceived by the actors he spies on, reports back to the author/creator, who is even more undetectable than her imperceptible persona/voyeur. In twice distancing herself in this way, she effectively cuts us off from her reactions to this ongoing drama, assuring herself a position of double immunity.

Thus, Charlotte remains unknowable to the reader, except through her persona/narrator, particularly after the Genii disappear from her writing and she begins to introduce double-layered narratives, as discussed later in this chapter. Through the act of withholding, and in keeping with the contention that the self is conceived through the act of self-concealment, Charlotte develops her sense of self-possession and selfhood. Later, when that selfhood is formed, she will no longer feel the need for such repression.<sup>25</sup>

What is even more deeply disguised here is the function Zamorna plays in this psychodrama. As the embodiment of her shadow self, Zamorna poses numerous hazards for Charlotte of which she initially remains unaware. Instinctively, she holds him at bay, scrutinizing him from Charles's vantage point. In projecting her persona on to the second son who is all but eclipsed by his elder sibling, she succeeds for a while in constructing crucial space between herself and this dark, brooding, Byronic archetype who emerges from the early juvenilia. The young Charles is animated, spirited, and vivacious, possessing a charming disposition and appearance. Three years younger than Zamorna and not yet suffused with cynicism, he seems to have a brighter outlook on the world than his elder brother does. Thus, he appears to be at a safe remove from Zamorna's influence; yet at the same time, he enjoys the advantage of an intimate position from which to study and analyze his dark-browed sibling. John Maynard asserts in Charlotte Brontë and Sexuality that Charlotte's recurring use of the fraternal motif, employed well into her adult fiction, usually posits the younger sibling as "an uncorrupted outsider" (161), in keeping with scriptural motifs from the Old Testament.<sup>26</sup> This motif is underscored, as are all such relational equations, by Charlotte's frequent use of doubling, mirroring, and chiasmically constructed narrative devices. Other sets of brothers, twins and alter egos crop up in the juvenilia, invariably depicted as contrasting foils to one another. In "High Life in Verdopolis" (1834), for instance, we learn that Charles, who so openly disapproves of his reprobate brother, has been placed by Zamorna under the guardianship of General Thornton Sneachie, himself a part of an adversarial fraternal relationship. These chiasmic correlations permit Charlotte the freedom to work both ways in her characterizations, not only by emphasizing a characteristic in the doubling and mirroring of it, but also in illustrating obverse sides of any given alliance, an aspect of Charlotte's writing which will be examined in greater detail in the following chapter.

In exploiting her characters' predilection for turning a circumstance on its head, Charlotte gives herself license to interrogate the significance of mask-wearing. A year later, for example, she seemingly reverses the demonic modulation Zamorna makes, showing him, as King, cloaking himself in messianic robes in an exercise of self-deification. As we soon see, the more demonic Zamorna grows, the more saintly become his masks and masquerade—an obvious effort to deceive others by projecting antithetical imagery. Charlotte habitually employs such chiasmic devices, both in the juvenilia and in her later novels. "Chiasmus, after all, is the rhetorical schematization of exchange," observes Litvak. "The intermediary can be both a protective barrier and a dangerously effective conductor of 'antithetical' meanings" (72). Presumably, Charlotte is investigating an even more sophisticated means of self-concealment, that of masquerading one image to hide another. Such schematic writing serves to obfuscate the self from the reader as well as from other characters. Shuttleworth, whose entire thesis revolves around "Brontë's pre-occupation with surveillance and the interiorized space of selfhood" (6), states that Charlotte's fiction is likewise "pre-occupied, both thematically and methodologically, with the relationship between the visible and the invisible," her characters intent on baffling penetration, and the text itself challenging "such will to knowledge" (17). Hence, not only are the characters masked, so too is the text.

To explain Zamorna's motive for placing his younger brother under another's perfidious guardianship, Christine Alexander remarks that "it appears that Zamorna could no longer tolerate his younger brother's watchful eye and the subsequent literary reports on his behaviour" (CA 2.2:6n14). Certainly Zamorna finds Charles's proximity and second sight unnerving. As a family member, Charles is hardly neutral, so his voice possesses a particular sensibility, and he draws from an arcane fund of knowledge, telling tales that disclose the gap between the public and private self. Curiously, however, Charles gradually loses his clairvoyant gifts, and instead, inexplicably, begins to reveal omniscient powers. Suddenly, like an all-knowing author, he is able to gain access to the minds as well as the private rooms of others without being detected. In "My Angria and the Angrians" (1834), he shares his older brother's self-reflective thoughts, telling us that Zamorna is secretly displeased with himself, though Zamorna never had such sentiments before. This occurs again, in 1837, when Charles abruptly begins reading Percy's

thoughts in the story Four Years Ago, and once more in 1838, when Charles renders himself invisible and steals into a hotel room to eavesdrop on a cloistered scene between Zamorna and his wife (“Stancliffe’s Hotel”). Granting Charles omniscience reinforces Charlotte’s affinity with her persona.<sup>27</sup> But these eruptions in the text—the revealing of a mind’s thoughts or a private dialogue in a hotel room—also show Charlotte inadvertently disclosing her own mind, particularly since Zamorna’s unhappiness with himself coincides with Charlotte’s professed thoughts sixteen months earlier.<sup>28</sup>

In 1836, Charles changes his name to Townshend or Townsend, in a gesture that only can be interpreted as the retaliatory act of disowning his birthright. Remaining the indefatigable optimist despite his outsider status, the following year Charles trumpets the advantages of his new life-style, his ability to remain disconnected and disentangled from the scenes he describes, coolly gazing on and feeling untouched by the panorama of life which encircles him (Four Years Ago 1837). He even claims to feel no remorse when transitory players—full of pain, anger, disillusionment and disappointment—vanish from the stage. His role as disaffected spectator appears enviable when contrasted with the roles of the self-tortured participants. No doubt this heralds Charlotte’s own intention of exercising a new detachment from the Angrian world. In addition, the name change signifies Charlotte’s dissociation from Charles. She begins to use William Percy as an alternate narrator, and in one of her novelettes (Mina Laurry 1838), she employs no narrator at all, trying her hand at the anonymous omniscient point of view, rather than the more limited scope afforded by one of the play’s participants. She also begins to adopt a female persona in 1839, one which more closely and realistically allies with Charlotte as a young woman of twenty-three years of age. Thus Charles’s act of disowning his family may have been, by extension, Charlotte’s effort at detaching herself from the darker dramatic characters here, while sustaining her continuing interest in the conjured drama.

By 1837, Charlotte also appears to have recognized that Zamorna personified her own darker urges, if not that he was emblematic of her shadow self. She seems to have found this fact both fascinating and repellent at the same time. In intensifying Charles’s cynicism and criticism, Charlotte openly expresses the self-condemnation and anger she feels, which had previously been obscured by projecting it on to fictive characters. Most of the tales from then on no longer place Zamorna on an idolatrous pedestal, but rather

depict him as a malevolent force with which to be reckoned.<sup>29</sup> In Mina Laury, Zamorna is viewed as both diabolical and reprehensible. In time, though, he is treated either scornfully or indifferently, or he is tempered by characterizing him as less threatening. In Caroline Vernon, he is even characterized comically. It is noteworthy that no woman in this continuous narration is able to govern Zamorna. Only another male can curb and restrain him. Hence, aside from her narrator-less novelette, Mina Laury, writing as a male now endowed Charlotte with the power to disenfranchise her dark archetype, permitting her to examine and begin the process of ameliorating and integrating that less savory side of herself. Finally, in enabling and emboldening her heroines, she becomes capable at last of expressing anger and scorn toward Zamorna, even if only indirectly on occasion. Heilbrun states that if a person is not permitted to express anger or even recognize it within oneself, then that person is refused both empowerment and self-control, and this assertion quite succinctly depicts the situation for Charlotte. “Forbidden anger,” writes Heilbrun, “women could find no voice in which publicly to complain; they took refuge in depression or madness” (15). Certainly Charlotte, who suffered from severe bouts of depression for much of her life, concerned herself a good deal with the issue of insanity, particularly before she was able to weaken Zamorna’s stranglehold on her (as will be discussed in Chapter Three). In recognizing and acknowledging this aspect of herself, albeit in anger, she ultimately avoided madness, unlike her brother, suffering what might be called ‘a neurotic episode,’<sup>30</sup> but escaping the more perilous hazards of insanity. Through the act of writing, Charlotte opened a door on to her own psyche and was able to gain access to herself, allowing her to assert control over her fragmented and divisive self. Had she not written, she might never have discovered this divided self nor come to terms with her duality or her inborn gender. Heilbrun makes reference to Mary Mason (“The Other Voice: Autobiographies of Women Writers”), who remarks on how self-disclosure leads to a figurative unshackling for women writers: “the self-discovery of female identity seems to acknowledge the real presence and recognition of another consciousness, and the disclosure of female self is linked to the identification of some ‘other’ and grounding the identity through this ‘other’ enables women to write openly about themselves” (210). Ultimately, in writing a script of self-examination, however unwittingly, Charlotte was empowering herself. Again, Heilbrun remarks:

Women of accomplishment, in unconsciously writing their future lived lives . . . have had to confront power and control. Because this has been declared unwomanly, and because many women would prefer (or think they would prefer) a world without evident power or control, women have been deprived of the narratives, or the texts, plots, or examples, by which they might assume power over—take control of—their own lives.

(Heilbrun 16-17)

In order to embark on such a voyage of self-discovery, then, to seize power and control for herself in her future life, Charlotte was compelled to write as a man, or with an androgynous pen name. Later, in 1849, when her identity was publicly unmasked, she asserted to her publisher, “To [my critics] I am neither a man nor woman—I come before [them] as an author only” (SHB, LFC 3:11). Heilbrun might say Charlotte was well on her way toward “creating an alternative, autonomous, powerful self” (96).

### **3. Theatricality in Charlotte’s Narrative Persona**

Although Charles claims to feel disengaged from the ongoing play surrounding him, this is not to say that he is exempt from participation in the drama at hand. The younger, banished brother gradually drops all aristocratic pretence and blends into middle-class society, consistently remaining his brother’s foil, despite their estrangement. As Zamorna grows in demonic stature, cloaking himself in both despotic and divine finery, Charles falls in corresponding fashion, anonymously tramping about the countryside, befriending other outcasts, marginalizing himself and writing now out of dire economic necessity. Increasingly, Charles represents that human society from which Zamorna isolates himself.<sup>31</sup> Having suffered both economic and social setbacks, Charles eventually allies himself with a restless mob made up of the angry, oppressed, and outspoken working class, which threatens to revolt against the aristocratic rule of Zamorna’s monarchy (as seen in Passing Events in 1836). Hence, Charles’s narrative role evolves to become that of the defiant critic of the tragic action consuming Zamorna. He emblemizes the social norm against which Zamorna’s hubris can be measured, functioning much like the Choragos of the chorus in a Greek tragedy. Northrop Frye’s remarks about the role of the classic Greek chorus emphasize Charles’s (and, by

association, Charlotte's) detachment from the tragic hero—merely observing and commenting on the unfolding action—which stresses the isolation of that hero. At the same time, Charles's distance from the tragic action is accentuated by his comic or satiric reaction to it:

The chorus is not the voice of the hero's conscience by any means, but very seldom does it encourage him in his hybris or prompt him to disastrous action. The chorus or chorus character is, so to speak, the embryonic germ of comedy in tragedy, just as the refuser of festivity, the melancholy Jaques or Alceste, is a tragic germ in comedy.

(Frye, Anatomy of Criticism 218)

Charles, who often plays the fool, falling out of windows in the act of spying on his brother, frequently parodies Zamorna's Romantic posturing and morbidity, mimicking his inflated language and the hyperbolic imagery typical of archetypes. There are echoes here of those early satiric thrusts Charlotte makes at Branwell, as when Charles and Zamorna ridicule the poetic excesses of Henry Rhymer, a.k.a. Young Sault, in "The Poetaster" and "Conversations" (1830).<sup>32</sup> However, as Zamorna's demonic modulation progresses, Charles's own antipathy grows by proportion, and his barometric readings of Zamorna become increasingly disapproving and disparaging, reflecting Charlotte's own alarm about Zamorna's inflation and her determined attempt to dissociate herself from all that he embodies.

There is an inherent theatricality in all this, Charles (and Charlotte) intent on unmasking his older brother in order both to read and reveal the face behind the mask. As Joseph Litvak observes, "the central imperative of truth-telling" insists on the satirical voice (31). Spying, argues Litvak, consists of "a certain will to demystify" (30) or desire to debunk, just as the comic tone of voice subverts the Gothic. Litvak explains that the act of scrutinizing or exposing may be an act which in itself is "impelled surreptitiously by something like a desire for theatricality" (36), rather than an anti-theatrical act. Thus, we see the inherent dichotomy here: while Charles uses the satirical voice to betray his brother's pretentious theatricality, such histrionics are implicitly part of the surveyor's role as well. Theatricality creates an unstable tension within a text, a slippage which signifies "a set of shifting, contradictory energies" and works against "the coherent,

stable subjectivity that the nineteenth-century novel supposedly secures for both its protagonists and its readers” (Litvak xii). In the end, theatricality subverts patriarchal narrative linearity for “the antilinear counterpressure of a feminist or gay spectacle or masquerade” (Litvak xiii). It follows, then, that Charlotte exploits theatrical tropes not only to debunk and analytically probe her characters, but also to mask some of her own penchants for disguising herself as male in order to subvert the patriarchal narrative. Rather than mimic her brother’s war epics or her father’s overtly didactic prose, she creates a bit of burlesque wherein she can prick the pomposity of melodramatic or pontifical characters. In keeping with her tradition of writing in multiple layers, the author herself was riveted by the spectacle playing itself out on the stage; while at the same time she disdains the very hi-jinks she creates. As with so much else in her life, Charlotte conducts a love-hate relationship with the theater (the public self once again at odds with the private self), remaining fascinated with it, knowing her father strongly disapproved of it. Perhaps she developed an even stronger fascination with the theatrical world precisely because of her father’s views.<sup>33</sup>

Litvak contends that Charlotte cloaks some of her adult fiction in decidedly anti-theatrical language. However, she appears to be less disingenuous in the juvenilia, disclosing theatrical trappings and spectacle throughout, which correspondingly communicate her own desire for theatricality. At various points, Charles appears as master of ceremonies, introducing the acts that follow: as stage manager, raising and lowering the curtain on the action; and as both audience and critic, observing and commenting on the action. Even speaking as narrator in the first-person voice is considered by Litvak to be a dramaturgical device, and most of the juvenilia—not just those tales told by Charles—are conveyed in this manner. Moreover, the narrative is fraught with mistaken identities; everyone here seemingly wears a mask of disguise, particularly “great people,” who, according to Charles, “will not reveal their emotions to the eyes of common man” (“Stancliffe’s Hotel,” BPM 114/28). Percy is constantly in the act of re-inventing himself, taking on different guises, identities and personae in an effort to elevate his social stature or distance himself from his latest fall from grace. Zamorna, also known to disguise his identity, as when he masquerades as Colonel Percival in “The Secret and Lily Hart” (1833), attempts to deceive others about his basic nature, often

through borrowed imagery, and in the process, deludes himself, forcing Charles to keep a watchful eye on him. Zamorna, as we learn in “High Life in Verdopolis” (1834), claims to hate acting, finding it a tortuous chore, and a sacrificial duty. We already know, however, how enthralled Zamorna (like Charlotte) is with the theater; he consistently employs the props and trappings of theatricality to further his own ends, in an effort to convince himself and others of his omnipotence. Consequently, Zamorna’s, like Charlotte’s, professed views of theatricality, are extraordinarily ironic.

In Charlotte’s inimitable way of inverting a trope, we also find in “High Life in Verdopolis” that truth is learned through disguise, which parallels that moment when Patrick Brontë placed a mask over each of the faces of his daughters in order to decipher their true character.<sup>34</sup> At times in Charlotte’s work, a mask serves to unmask the authentic, if not more exaggerated, self. Such an example exists in the masque that concludes this tale, each of the players projecting his or her self-image through disguise.<sup>35</sup> As a result, one learns more about others through the employment of masks and theater, and theatrical devices can be seen as a medium for educating oneself. Zamorna’s habitual theater-going, then, becomes his schooling, his lessons in learning how to read others, as well as discovering the art of role-playing, lessons Charlotte was learning as well. Litvak observes this use of theater as school in Charlotte’s adult fiction, noting that in Villette, the theater resembles the classroom:

Lucy’s visits to the theater tend to have a didactic, rather heavily allegorical character; in the epistemologically anxious world of the novel, the theater becomes a meaning-fraught arena where one goes to Learn Lessons. (Litvak 84)

Theater-going not only schools the observer in the art of reading others, it also informs the self about itself, which is no doubt why it possessed such an allure for Charlotte. Three years later, in Four Years Ago (1837), Charlotte again plays with this inverted trope. In this tale, Zamorna masquerades as the devil, and stands outside himself to recognize his mirror image as “the exact shadow of myself” (Hatfield 4/91). He finds the image startling, however. Deciding he does not care for this debauched reflection, Zamorna adroitly twists the courtroom drama that follows so that it serves as both his public confessional and personal means to salvation. Charles wryly closes the story by

referring to Zamorna as “Saint Adrian,” remarking that now he can lay his “saintly head” down and sleep as well as only the good and conscience-free can (Hatfield 4/92). The gesture transparently discloses Charlotte’s unease with her newly unveiled shadow self and the means she uses to reconcile herself with her dark side.

#### **4. Charlotte’s Creative Uses of Narrative Devices**

Joseph Litvak claims that the plots of Charlotte’s adult novels “notoriously refuse the comforts of linearity, intensifying the demand for demystification precisely by frustrating it” (31). Mystification is Charlotte’s favored narrative contrivance from the start.<sup>36</sup> As readers, we are frequently kept in the dark, well into any number of Charlotte’s early stories, not only about the true nature of a particular character, but about that character’s, or even that narrator’s, identity. This gesture has both overtly Gothic and theatrical attributes, and forces us, as readers, to maintain a vigilance about these figures. The Gothic genre is frequently enlisted by Charlotte to probe the psyche of her characters, and she tends to use it rather forthrightly, since it allows her to explore the power of the interrogatory gaze with its ability to ferret out secrets about another. Then, too, the Gothic permits her to exploit anti-Catholic sentiments, and to investigate the shadow, all of which are staples of the genre. In her habitual manner, however, while employing the genre, Charlotte simultaneously debunks it through the satirical, cynical voice of her narrator.<sup>37</sup> Additionally, as Sally Shuttleworth avers, Charlotte is not content to transgress the usual conventions of character representation and upset principles of narrative continuity; she makes use of other Gothic devices to disrupt conventional characterization:

She also subjects her characters to synchronic dispersion: overt doublings, baffling contradictions, and eruptions of insanity all disturb the psychological principles of linear, unified identity upon which literary realism is grounded. (Shuttleworth 102)

Moreover, Shuttleworth argues that Charlotte fashions an imaginative landscape not to create “an escapist realm,” but to grant her “the imaginative licence to move outside the

constraints of realism to explore, in heightened form, the social and psychological figurations of Victorian England” (101-02). Charlotte openly flaunts a story’s “unconventionality with dramatic shifts in tone and genre” (119), according to Shuttleworth, both in her juvenilia and in her adult fiction.

One might imagine, then, that Charlotte felt paradoxically drawn to and repelled by what she saw through the slits of the persona’s mask and alternately exercised forms of discourse and genre which allowed her to study her subject in varying lights. By 1834, Charlotte’s surveillance of her archetype and his arch-rival bordered on the obsessive. Even in 1838, Charles—by then an utter recluse from society and effectively removed from his brother’s world—can not, as he confesses in “The Duke of Zamorna,” leave the subject alone. Charles has watched and studied his brother for a very long time. He claims to know, in 1834, nearly as much about Zamorna as himself, telling their father in “The Spell” that through such severe surveillance, not more than two or three incidents about Zamorna’s life are unknown to him. One of these incidents, he says, may have occurred before Charles was born, which gives him license to create a piece of historical fiction. In this tale, entitled “The Spell,” he produces multiple contrary images of fraternal relationships: that of Charles and Zamorna juxtaposed with that of Zamorna and his own hitherto unknown shadow self.<sup>38</sup> This confrontation with the hidden part of the self could well mirror, even at this early stage, Charlotte’s discovery of her own secret recesses, and her concern with keeping that shadow self at bay. No doubt, she was fearful of what might lie in store for an author who permits that darker side to take complete dominance, as happens in “The Spell.” The divided self, always a subliminal threat in so much of Charlotte’s juvenilia, is persistently alluded to in all of her later published works: Jane Eyre, Shirley, and Villette. Lyndall Gordon sees the condemning passages about the actress Vashti in Villette as referentially connecting with Charlotte’s “own divided self,” her fears of emotional excess and “the potency of evil in rage unbridled by reason” (263). “Behind this fear,” claims Gordon, “lay Charlotte’s reading of Heathcliff as demon, and behind Heathcliff, Branwell, and that part of Branwell she had shared” (263). Thus, Charles, as her persona, acts as the brake to that impetus, that fascination with the demonic she shared with her brother, and which is Branwell’s eventual undoing.<sup>39</sup> As her brother became more profoundly engaged with his own shadow self,

Charlotte increasingly distanced herself from him, breaking off their partnership in 1837, and retreating from the path Branwell continued to follow until his death in 1848, by which time brother and sister were deeply estranged.

The narrator's removal from the events in Charlotte's stories along with his invented history in "The Spell" might well put Charles's veracity in question. How much truth is told here? How much can we trust this satirical voice? How prejudicial are these reports of his, particularly those he manufactures to make a cautionary point? Although Shuttleworth claims "a whole host of unreliable narrators are employed in [Charlotte's] first stories to cloud and obfuscate interpretation and challenge realism" (17), an opposing argument can be mounted as well. Over the course of a decade, from 1829 to 1839, Charlotte primarily utilizes three narrators: Captain Tree, Charles Wellesley, who later becomes Charles Townsend or Townshend, and William Percy.<sup>40</sup> Some overlapping occurs, each taking charge of narrative duties according to his proximity to Zamorna. Although Charlotte effectively creates a triangular rivalry among the narrators, any arguments that arise over the manner in which a tale is told originate with Zamorna, rather than with any chronicler. Moreover, any discrepancy or deception in the tale-telling would soon be revealed by one of the alternate recorders. All three are in agreement about the degeneration of Zamorna's character; neither Captain Tree nor William Percy disputes Charles's evaluation of his elder brother. Even the testimony of young Percy, while he serves as a self-described "ambitious courtier" to Zamorna ("The Duke of Zamorna," SHB Misc. 393), is in alignment with Charles's judgment. William Percy's narrative from the frontlines is related third-hand to us through a series of letters posted to Charles. Numerous testimonials are given to the reader in the same manner—in the form of doctor's narratives, letters, journals or diaries, story-telling, old newspaper clippings, picture books, in addition to visual portraiture.<sup>41</sup> Other disaffected acquaintances of Zamorna's also enlist Charles as a spy, endorsing his powers of observation, his knowledge of his subject, and the integrity in the picture he paints of a devolving Zamorna.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, Charles's disaffection with Zamorna is by no means his alone. Numerous characters, outside this trio of narrators, chime in to confirm the general perception of Zamorna's dissolution and dissipation, including John Sneachie, and the Duke of Fidena, childhood friend to Zamorna and perhaps the steadiest fellow in

Charlotte's juvenilia. The collective voice amounts to a resoundingly censorious one. Such Gothic devices of written attestation lend credence and verisimilitude to otherwise unbelievable circumstances and characterizations.<sup>43</sup> With so much unanimous testimony, and with so many opportunities for conflicting documentation, we must assume all three narrators—most particularly Charles—function as reasonably reliable commentators, in spite of their cynicism, and despite the distance Charles progressively puts between himself and his demonic brother.<sup>44</sup>

Such layering of narrative devices, through means of letters, doctor's reports, diaries and the like, produces a greater aura of realism in the stories, even as the tales become more surreal. But so too does the synchronization of narrative time with real time, which first occurs in February 1834 with the story "High Life in Verdopolis." As previously pointed out, this is the same year in which Charles first gains omniscient powers, a distinctly authorial privilege, underscoring the sense that the two realms are coming into sync. By 1838, when Charlotte drops all narrative pretences to undertake telling a story (Mina Laury) herself for the first time, without the benefit of a persona, she is the same age (twenty-two) as Charles. Just as significantly, she claims in this tale to have known Zamorna for the same number of years (ten) as Mina Laury, which again argues for the coalescing of two distinct worlds. Even the locale for Mina Laury, although not declared as such, is decidedly English rather than African.<sup>45</sup> All of this demonstrates Charlotte's gradual move toward a greater realism in her work. Numerous critics say that by 1839, with the novella Captain Henry Hastings, we begin to see the 'real' Charlotte emerge. Winifred Gérin calls this work "biographically revealing" (Gérin FN 173), claiming that the passages involving the siblings, Elizabeth and Henry, reflect real, as opposed to dream, experience. Lyndall Gordon and Fannie Ratchford concur, the latter contending that "for the first time Charlotte projects herself, her outward self and circumstances and her inner emotions, into her Angrian stories, and thus, in the person of Elizabeth Hastings" (Ratchford, Web of Childhood 147).<sup>46</sup> But few critics, if any, recognize that Charlotte had been projecting herself into her work almost from the start, as had Branwell.<sup>47</sup> Through such role-playing, she had, years before, engaged with those emerging parts of herself, which she found so difficult to confront, and which filled her with such self-loathing. Although the merging of fantasy and real worlds initially posed

distinct dangers for Charlotte—as will be more fully addressed in Chapter Four—eventually she was able to write her way out of this ‘web of childhood’<sup>48</sup> to become, if not a harsh self-critic, then at least a wholly objective narrator in her own right, cognizant that she had learned more fully about herself through such role-playing and the creation of such a continuous narrative.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> This sense of “play” cannot be stressed strongly enough. Ellen Nussey notes that Charlotte liked being playfully addressed as “Charles,” for instance, while visiting the Nussey home. According to Ellen, Charlotte also occasionally signed herself “Charles Thunder” in her personal correspondence, Brontë meaning “thunder” in Greek (Smith 609).

<sup>2</sup> Charlotte’s habit of creating a male protagonist continued into her mature writing. She uses William Crimsworth, for instance, as her narrator and protagonist in her first novel, The Professor. Crimsworth was modeled on William Percy, an occasional narrator and frequent protagonist in the novelettes of the late 1830s. Heilbrun remarks that this was a fairly common practice amongst female authors: “Many women writers used a male protagonist in their first novels: George Eliot, Charlotte Brontë, Willa Cather, May Sarton, to name a few. . . .” (114). No doubt such women thought it more plausible to cast a male, rather than a female, in an adventurous life. Heilbrun also views the gesture of creating a pseudonym as synonymous with that of creating an alter ego, stating that there are layers within layers of significance to a woman’s decision to write under a pseudonym, “but the most important reason for her doing so is that the woman author is, consciously or not, creating an alter ego as she writes, another possibility of female destiny” (110).

<sup>3</sup> As Moglen observes about the transformation which takes place with the protagonists in Charlotte’s mature novels: “Crimsworth’s psychological development from alienated younger brother to successful ‘maitre’ establishes a pattern which is faithfully followed by the heroines of the next three novels: most faithfully by Lucy Snowe” (91).

<sup>4</sup> Using a Freudian approach to Charlotte’s work, Moglen views Charles as the conscience or superego and Zamorna as Charlotte’s libido, as well as her portrayal of Branwell: “Charles is a part of herself, the superego cast as a man (a woman in this mythology would be merely the shadow of powerlessness). Zamorna is identified with her own deepest desires while also representing Branwell. Her bondage and her unsuccessful attempt at liberation are, in this way, simultaneously expressed. While the chronological relation to Branwell is inverted, the affective relationship is maintained, *i.e.*, although cast as a male, she is—as the *younger* brother—completely vulnerable” (Moglen 49, emphasis Moglen’s).

<sup>5</sup> Later in the juvenilia, Warner Howard Warner assumes this role.

<sup>6</sup> Indeed, numerous critics claim that Zamorna was first created as a representation of Branwell (one instance is noted in note 4 above), and many of Charlotte’s early satirical thrusts at Zamorna were criticisms aimed indirectly at her brother’s excesses.

<sup>7</sup> Sally Shuttleworth relates this encounter with part of the self to the act of writing: “In one tale, Brontë suggests that writing is an act of self-instantiation” (270n34).

---

<sup>8</sup> Jung repeatedly stresses the unconscious nature of projection, no matter how obvious it may appear to others.

<sup>9</sup> Barbara Hannah views Charles and Charlotte in this story as the “earthly man” and the “eternal man” respectively, the earthly man having been copied from the eternal man, and the pair existing in separate, non-corresponding realities (112-15). This fictive concept, she says, mirrors Jung’s dream of encountering a yogi with his face. The yogi, Jung realized, was meditating or dreaming him, prompting Jung’s fear that when the yogi awoke, Jung would cease to be (Hannah 114).

<sup>10</sup> Later, the situation reverses itself and Charlotte experiences very much the same phenomenon at Roe Head, telling Mary Taylor (according to Elizabeth Gaskell) that she heard a voice reciting lines of poetry which urged on a “high and holy feeling” (Gaskell 580n4). During the year 1836, Charlotte also wrote of seeing visions of Zamorna (see Introduction, note 17). All of this illustrates not only the state of being possessed by one’s inflated shadow self, and no longer being master of oneself, about which more will be said later, but also the deep correspondence between author and fictive creation.

<sup>11</sup> The following definition of “Genii” can be found in Brewer’s Dictionary: “In Roman mythology the tutelary spirit that attended a man from cradle to grave, governed his fortunes, determined his character. The *Genius* wished a man to enjoy pleasure in this life, thus to *indulge one’s Genius* was to enjoy pleasure. The *Genius* only existed for man, the woman had her JUNO. Another belief was that a man had two *genii*, one good and one evil, and bad luck was due to his *evil genius*. The Roman *genii* were somewhat similar to the guardian angels spoken of in *Matt.* xviii, 10. The word is from the Lat. *gignere*, to beget (Gr. *gignesthai*, to be born), from the notion that birth and life were due to these *dii genitales*. Thus it is used for birth-wit or innate talent: hence propensity, nature, inner man. The Eastern *genii* (sing. *Genie*) were JINNS, who were not attendant spirits but fallen angels under the dominion of EBLIS” (Brewer’s Dictionary of Phrase & Fable 454).

<sup>12</sup> Branwell wrote: “These are not the Golden Deities of Greece/These are the powers that rule our Land” (Neufeldt, WPBB 1:225). Branwell may have carefully differentiated the Genii from Greek gods because, for several years, he had been busy demonizing these supernatural entities, calling them “bloodthirsty” “tyrants” (Neufeldt, WPBB 1:32, 34). This served Branwell’s purposes well, since it not only set up multitudinous battles between mortals, but it allowed him to act out his own dark urges. The instance mentioned marks the first time he demonized characters in the juvenilia, a habit of Branwell’s that extends to a great number of personages in these works—his own, as well as those of his sisters. The first such instance of rendering the Genii satanic occurs in Branwell’s November 1829 poem, “On Seeing the Garden of a Genius.” “Geni” is one of the ways in which the Brontë children spelled the singular form of Genii. In referring to a specific spirit form, however, they generally used the more traditional appellation of “Genius.”

<sup>13</sup> Hannah believes the act of possession and inflation occurred with the Brontë children as a result of the invention of the Genii, theorizing that the presence of such supernal figures proved to be very powerful influences manifesting themselves in the children’s lives and having far-

---

reaching effects on all of them: “It was very dangerous . . . for the children to identify with these supernatural figures. That such figures should appear as helpers and guides, or, on the negative side, as misleaders or even destroyers, would be a relatively normal state of affairs with introverted and lonely children. But calling the Genii by their own names, and as is recorded again and again, performing supernatural actions in their own persons is . . . a dangerous weakening of the boundaries between the human mortal side of man and his immortal counterpart . . . Such identification usually leads to inflation and to a corresponding deflation, to a swing between megalomania and perilous feelings of inferiority” (109-10).

<sup>14</sup> Branwell’s Chief Genius Branni also bore no resemblance to himself, instead appearing as an “Immense and terrible [sic] monster,” whose head is ringed with a halo of fire, whose nostrils breathe fire and smoke, and who flies on dragon wings (Neufeldt, WPBB 1:150). Largely concerned with descriptions of endless battles and political conflict in the colonization and settlement of these African countries, Branwell’s early narratives lack the nuances of self-conscious and reflective thought that Charlotte was exploring.

<sup>15</sup> Significantly, Heilbrun states that one of the four ways in which to write a woman’s life is to inscribe it before living it, almost as an instinctive act: “[T]he woman may write her own life in advance of living it, unconsciously, and without recognizing or naming the process” (11). If this is what Charlotte was undertaking, then granting Charles second sight was akin to Charlotte’s own unconscious act of writing her life story before engaging herself in that life. A certain amount of wish-fulfillment had to be at work here, as well, Charlotte trusting that the strength of her own will would override any obstacles society might place in her way.

<sup>16</sup> A direct allusion to the son of the genius, Schemhourasch, from the *Arabian Nights*, who rebels against God (CA 1:347n17).

<sup>17</sup> Hannah remarks that “The fact that the images moved of their own volition indicates that it was the unconscious itself which was to give [Charlotte] the spiritual motivation for her books” (116). She explains that Jung divided works of literature into two classes—psychological and visionary, the first emanating from the conscious, the second from the unconscious, and that most of Charlotte’s works belong to the latter (117).

<sup>18</sup> Charles Burkhardt concurs with this view in his text, Charlotte Brontë: A Psychosexual Study of Her Novels. Burkhardt argues that Frances Henri, William Crimsworth and Hunsden are all based on Charlotte: “They are all Charlotte, though incomplete, unrealised; and also they are all one another” (50). He claims the author was not yet detaching herself sufficiently from her creations, not thoroughly becoming any one of the characters as she later did with Jane Eyre, Lucy Snowe, and intermittently, Caroline Helstone.

<sup>19</sup> One single exception we know of are the works of Hannah More, one of which Patrick Brontë owned (“Moral Sketches”). Another, a play designed to be performed by young ladies in boarding schools, provided the inspirational title for Charlotte’s early tale, “The Search After Happiness.” The objective of this little verse-drama as stated in the play’s preface was to promote “a regard to

---

religion and virtue in the minds of young persons,” in an effort to offset some of the bawdier fare of the day. One of the play’s speeches cautions young women against excessive fantasizing, especially that which awakens the passions and infects the heart.

<sup>20</sup> At the end of 1840, Charlotte responded to a critique solicited from Hartley Coleridge, friend to Branwell, of her unfinished three-part novel, Ashworth. She was particularly pleased that she had so successfully hidden her identity and gender from Coleridge, though she apologizes for the mystification she persists in using, adding that she finds it pleasurable to have something in one’s power, to look wise and important, through the withholding of such information: “I am pleased that you cannot quite decide whether I belong to the soft or the hard sex—and though at first I had no intention of being enigmatical on the subject—yet as I accidentally omitted to give the clue at first, I will venture purposely to withhold it now—as to my handwriting, or the ladylike tricks you mention in my style and imagery—you must not draw any conclusion from those—Several young gentleman curl their hair and wear corsets—Richardson and Rousseau—often write exactly like old women—and Bulwer and Cooper and Dickens and Warren like boarding-school misses. Seriously Sir, I am very <very> much obliged to you for your kind and candid letter—and on the whole I wonder you took the trouble to read and notice the demi-semi novelette of an anonymous scribe who had not even the manners to tell you whether he was a man or woman or whether his common-place “CT” meant Charles Tims or Charlotte Tomkins” (Smith 240-41).

<sup>21</sup> Heilbrun outlines these aspects of writing as a man while discussing Willa Cather, who identified the powerful with the masculine.

<sup>22</sup> Some critics also fault Charlotte for her misogynist views in her adult work. Burkhart writes of The Professor that “Charlotte’s chauvinism is as irritating as her hatred of Roman Catholicism” (54).

<sup>23</sup> The first extended passage focusing on any woman as a major character is contained in the first volume of Charlotte’s verse-drama, “The Poetaster.” Marian Hume appears in one of Charles’s dreams, malevolently cutting and lacerating Zamorna’s heart, which has been delivered up to her by Cupid. The dream foreshadows Zamorna’s many troubled relationships with women and illustrates Charles’s gift for prescience. Marian has yet to appear as a flesh and blood character in the juvenilia, however, instead remaining, for the time being, a peripheral dream presence. When, in the second chapter, fourth volume of this drama, Charles attempts to direct Zamorna’s attention to Marian—who has musically responded to a mournful air Zamorna strums on the guitar—Zamorna lets the strains die without comment and instead urges his brother to tell one of his stories, which always lift him from melancholy moods. Male company, it seems, is all Zamorna seeks for now.

<sup>24</sup> In this same discussion of Jung’s essay, “Problems of Modern Psychotherapy,” Fordham addresses the importance of confession in analytical treatment, the unclinking and discovery of the secreted self. Quoting from Jung, she writes: “The first beginnings of all analytical treatment of the soul [says Jung] are to be found in its prototype, the confessional. Since, however, the two have no direct causal connexion, but rather grow from a common irrational psychic root, it is

---

difficult for an outsider to see at once the relation between the groundwork of psychoanalysis and the religious institution of the confessional” (from “Problems of Modern Psychotherapy,” as cited by Fordham 89). Later, in Chapter Three, we shall look at Charlotte’s attraction to the act of confession, along with her own secret confession conducted while she was in Brussels, and its depiction in her last published novel, Villette.

<sup>25</sup> Repression in Charlotte’s adult fiction is discussed at greater length in the Conclusion, as is Jung’s view of neurosis as a necessary element in the individuation process.

<sup>26</sup> *E.g.* Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, Joseph and Benjamin, Isaac and Ishmael.

<sup>27</sup> Shuttleworth claims that Charlotte uses the omniscient third person narrator nowhere else in her work except in Shirley (although Charlotte first employs it in her 1838 novella, Mina Laury): “Suspicion of interpretative authority is embedded methodologically in the narrative form of Brontë’s works. In all her works except Shirley Brontë eschews the omniscient third person, with its authoritative claims to lay bare the hidden workings of the inner self...” (17).

<sup>28</sup> In a letter to Ellen Nussey dated June 10, 1833, Charlotte writes: “Your last letter Ellen revealed a ?st[ate] of mind which seemed to promise much [?As] I read it I could not help wishing, that [my own] feelings more nearly resembled yours: but [un]happily all the good thoughts that enter [my mind] evaporate almost before I have had time [to as]certain their existence, every right resolution <that> ‘which’ I form is so transient, so fragile, and so easily broken that I sometimes fear I shall never be what I ought” (Smith 122). Margaret Smith notes here that tears in the paper or by the mounting strip account for some loss of text here. The unhappiness Charlotte expresses about herself will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Three, Section 4.

<sup>29</sup> This signals the phase when Charlotte encounters her animus for the first time, since the animus is always viewed negatively in the beginning. Chapter Four will investigate the role of Charlotte’s animus in greater depth.

<sup>30</sup> A discussion of this ‘neurotic episode’ appears later in this work. Suffice it to say in the meantime that what Jung refers to here is not a neurosis in the modern sense of the word, but rather a necessary and inevitable stage in the individuation process, as mentioned above in note 25.

<sup>31</sup> The symbolism implicit in the act of exiling the self comes under discussion in the following chapter.

<sup>32</sup> When, in Branwell’s tale, “The Liar Detected,” he calls Charles a venomous self-important puppy, Charlotte has Charles and Zamorna counter by ridiculing the excesses of Henry Rhymer or Young Sould, Branwell’s versifying pseudonym. Zamorna warns him that his authorial

---

immoderation “exposes you more to ridicule than admiration” (CA 1:237), to which Young Sout freely admits his feelings “carry me utterly beyond the control of reason and politeness” (CA 1:311).

<sup>33</sup> According to Annette Hopkins (*The Father of the Brontës*), Patrick Brontë was an eminently “practical” man with a “pedestrian imagination”: “Unlike his more gifted children, he could create a world no different from the one in which he lived” (8). Hopkins says Patrick Brontë makes it clear in his little book, *The Maid* (1818), that the theater is “frowned upon as a ready path to a life of sin. Indeed this was a prejudice the author never seems to have outgrown” (55).

<sup>34</sup> Branwell, too, participated in this truth-telling activity, but Patrick seemed more intent on learning the true nature of his daughters, rather than his son, whom he regularly tutored.

<sup>35</sup> Percy, Montmorency and Zenobia all choose to project their secret self-images at this masquerade. Percy poses as a pirate sporting a scarlet badge that announces the name of his outlaw ship, the Red Rover, and Charles is appalled that Percy would openly boast of his crimes. Montmorency wears a counsellor’s wig and gown, a doubly ironic statement given his evil machinations, and we are prompted to question what kind of justice reigns in this kingdom. Zenobia masquerades as Zamorna—highly appropriate since she is characterized as his female double. She is also the only woman present to disguise herself as a man, though her manliness is stressed throughout the juvenilia.

<sup>36</sup> Charlotte’s love of mystification is only commented on by critics with regard to her later novelettes: “The plot of *Captain Hastings* is not as desultory as appears at first sight; there is a link binding the separate episodes in the pursuit, capture and trial of Hastings, and in his sister’s intervention on his behalf. Only the author’s love of mystification at this period of her writing, makes a secret of Elizabeth’s identity as the unknown female passenger in the coach, whose journey to the city of Zamorna to plead for her brother’s life opens the narrative” (Gérin FN 175).

<sup>37</sup> Christine Alexander argues that Charlotte was undercutting the Gothic, assuming an anti-Gothic stance, and in this respect, “her revisionist methodology is not far removed from Jane Austen’s parody” (“That Kingdom of Gloom” para. 24). Alexander also contends that the Gothic served a dual purpose for Charlotte, allowing her “to indulge in her love of the exotic, the licentious, and the mysterious, and increasingly to indulge in her fascination with the darker recesses of the mind and its relationship to natural phenomena” (“That Kingdom of Gloom” para. 24).

<sup>38</sup> Charles informs us this story is an imaginative fantasy of his, written out of vindictiveness. Nonetheless, it bears premonitory warning flags. In creating the stuff of fiction, he subtly warns Zamorna of his precarious state of mind. “The Spell” will be studied more fully in Chapter Two.

<sup>39</sup> Gérin stresses the divided nature of Branwell, as well, in her biography of him: “For there was very early a dual nature in Branwell, the one as guileless as the other was crooked” (Gérin,

Branwell Brontë 23). Gérin also sees Branwell as subsuming his identity in that of his own hero, “endowing him even with his own physical characteristics, [and allowing Percy] so to possess his mind and emotions as finally to suggest and direct his actions” (67). At various times, Gérin subsequently refers to Percy as Branwell’s “Doppelgänger” (67) and “alter ego” (85). In her biography of Charlotte, Gérin asserts that Charles was fashioned after Branwell, as a means by which the older sister could safely parody her younger brother: “In her development as a writer [Branwell’s] influence was paramount, shaping as it did, consciously or unconsciously, the second self to which she gave a masculine name and which she endowed with Branwellian characteristics . . . she assumed the ‘Thersites’-type of character, the cynical onlooker at the social scene, malicious, vain, cowardly, small-minded, inquisitive, and withal deliciously comic, in whom she burlesqued the multiple aspects of Branwell’s variable nature” (Charlotte Brontë: The Evolution of Genius 82). As previously mentioned, it is more likely that Zamorna, rather than Charles, was modeled initially on Branwell. In the early years, Zamorna’s voice is much like Branwell’s. Both are given to high-flown, flowery rhetoric and grandiloquent political oratory—typical, apparently, of unconscious archetypes, according to Hannah (134)—and Charlotte may well have seen Zamorna as embodying all of her brother’s excesses. But gradually she came to realize that Zamorna represented her own unconscious self, or at least that part of both siblings that symbiotically connected them. Moreover, the influence each sibling exerted over the other in the collaboration of the early juvenilia was coequal (see my article, “Creating Angria: Charlotte and Branwell Brontë’s Collaboration”).

<sup>40</sup> Captain Tree is eventually revealed to be none other than Captain Bud, Branwell’s pseudonym, which may be why Charlotte soon drops him as an alternate anecdotist.

<sup>41</sup> “Portraiture is conceived as a system of espionage, capturing the ‘true’ self by reading against the social mask,” writes Shuttleworth (41), paraphrasing Thomas Woolnoth, a nineteenth-century engraver (Thomas Woolnoth, Facts and Faces: or the Mutual Connexion between Linear and Mental Portraiture Morally Considered). Charlotte was known to use portraiture to represent the inward psychological states or as a means of comparing and contrasting characters in both the juvenilia and her mature works. Not only did such visual images amplify a character’s particular circumstances or dilemma, the author could utilize it as a form of shorthand to convey plot, both past and future, avoiding the necessity of complex, prolonged exposition, or to provide some coded foreshadowing for the astute reader (see my article, “Jane Eyre’s Triptych and Milton’s Paradise Lost: An Artistic Vision of Revisionist Mythmaking” *Victorian Review* 22.2 (1996): 171-189).

<sup>42</sup> In 1834, Percy enlists Charles to observe and report Zamorna’s actions, as does the Marquis of Ardrah, Lord Parry.

<sup>43</sup> Shuttleworth maintains that Charlotte employed Gothic mechanisms strictly to investigate the properties of selfhood: “Gothic mechanisms are here brought into play to define, not the workings of plot, in outlandish and extreme guise, but rather the domain of ordinary selfhood” (244). If this is the case, then such damning testimony must be considered to be self-reflexive. Again, the accuracy of the narrator’s judgment is not in question here.

---

<sup>44</sup> It is also noteworthy that the year after Charles changes his surname and begins distancing himself from his brother, Charlotte breaks off the collaborative alliance with Branwell. However, it is Charles who starts to disappear from view, not Zamorna.

<sup>45</sup> The opening lines of Mina Laury (1838) describe a chilly winter morning with the cheery fire within contrasted with the “snow careering through [the dim air] in wild whirls” without; the trees bear frozen branches and the dreary sky is described as “one mass of congealed tempest—heavy wan & icy” (Gérin FN 127). Zamorna comments on the drifting snow, and remarks to Zenobia that if the weather were less boisterous, he would propose a snowball match.

<sup>46</sup> Not everyone is in agreement that Henry Hastings personifies Branwell, however. Juliet Barker, for one, opposes Gérin’s “repeated assertion” of this view (894n45). For a closer examination of the autobiographical elements contained in Captain Henry Hastings, see Chapter Five, Section 2.

<sup>47</sup> Branwell habitually wrote himself into his own text, beginning with a threatening letter (dated 1827 and included in the “History of the Rebellion”) which was addressed to himself.

<sup>48</sup> I refer here to Charlotte’s poem of 1835, “We wove a web in childhood,” which reviews the childhood collaboration in the undertaking of the juvenilia.

## Chapter Two

### The Demonization of Zamorna: Charlotte's Shadow Self

*"The shadow personifies everything that the subject refuses to acknowledge about himself and yet is always thrusting itself upon him directly or indirectly—for instance, inferior traits of character and other incompatible tendencies." (C.G. Jung, The Essential Jung 422)*

As discussed in the Introduction, when Charlotte began populating her sector of this imaginary African territory, she modeled her first protagonist on the nineteenth-century hero, the Duke of Wellington. But she soon shifted her focus to the second generation of this family, which allowed her to write outside an historical context and to play more freely within a fictional realm. Initially both sons of the Duke are portrayed as nearly interchangeable; however, Charlotte soon deviated from this twinning device, concentrating on the elder son and endowing him with Byronic traits in contrast to the virtuous rectitude exemplified by the real-life Duke. Unconsciously, Charlotte was mapping out the double-sided nature of her own psyche: countering those dutiful, honorable, pious features of her public hero, the Duke of Wellington, with the dark, brooding, rebellious aspects of the Byronic Romantic archetype.<sup>1</sup> Something of a rift inevitably develops between father and son—the Duke of Wellington and Zamorna—in these early stories of Charlotte's. And, as Zamorna becomes increasingly demonic, a second rupture, as mentioned in the previous chapter, ensues, between the two brothers—Charles and Zamorna. Each brother begins his separate odyssey: one to become a social cynic and critic, the other to become the tyrannical leader of a new country. Although it was Branwell who ultimately demonized Zamorna in Charlotte's absence while she was at Roe Head school, the seeds for this character modulation already had been planted by her. In his habitual manner of demonizing almost every character featured in his tales—even his Chief Genius Branii—Branwell was merely nudging Zamorna toward an inevitable character development, one that increasingly alarms Charles.

As the breach between brothers deepens and widens, so too does the conflict between Charlotte's persona (Charles) and her shadow self (Zamorna). In time, this division will exemplify the tragic split within Charlotte herself, the conflict she experiences between two irreconcilable drives: her sense of obligation, reason, and duty

versus her need to express her insurgent passionate side. Watching Zamorna devolve into an increasingly reprobate character, Charles grows more harshly censorious—a development symbolic perhaps of the manner in which Charlotte's conscience scolds her inner self for its willful excesses and ominous propensities. Charles creates stories now as cautionary devices, seeing no good end in sight for his brother. A second character (Warner Howard Warner) is even brought onstage to take over the role of Zamorna's conscience, and to inherit the second sight Charles gradually loses. Warner Howard Warner operates as something of a governor over the new monarch. The gesture is noteworthy in that Charlotte seemingly, and perhaps unconsciously, recognizes the need for two separate figures—an active conscience (Warner) and a critical persona (Charles)—to act as watchdogs over this emerging shadow self (Zamorna). The juvenilia become permeated with contradictory imagery, as Zamorna grows ever more demonic, alternately exhibiting virtuous and immoral characteristics. His demonic tendencies initially are treated in extraordinarily ambivalent language. Zamorna begins to take on darker, more bestial,<sup>2</sup> dehumanized qualities, a development which suggests that in the act of making him monstrous, Charlotte might have been abdicating ownership of any representational link he might have with her own secret self.

As Zamorna devolves, Percy, Branwell's older, more demonic archetype, comes to play a more significant role in Charlotte's juvenilia. Initially, he appears as Zamorna's foil, presumably allowing Charlotte to present, by contrast, her young hero in a better, purer light. At the same time, the suggestion repeatedly is made in these stories that Percy is Zamorna's corrupter, and at various times in the juvenilia, Percy exemplifies Zamorna's own shadow. Percy's increasing influence over Zamorna and his corruption of the younger, purer archetype would implicate Branwell in his role as demonizer, while simultaneously absolving Charlotte of the responsibility for Zamorna's villainy. Viewed in this light, Percy can be seen as representative of Branwell's power in Charlotte's life. During these early years, she may have been blaming her brother for his malignant influence over her, to avoid self-blame. She might even have projected her shadow qualities on to Branwell, again in an effort to avoid seeing them in herself. Nonetheless, she seems unable to escape self-reproach. While Zamorna acknowledges his increasing darkness and decay, Charlotte expresses her own self-loathing in confessional letters to

Ellen Nussey,<sup>3</sup> so that the correspondence between Charlotte's conscious and unconscious minds becomes unmistakable. Zamorna's vacillation between self-deification and self-abnegation, then, reflects Charlotte's own conflict, and in the wake of Zamorna's demonization, she works hard to suppress her shadow self. The writing of this time is filled with equivocation about Zamorna's dark qualities, and endless interrogations of the genesis of demonism. One of her tales—"The Spell"—graphically illuminates Charlotte's awareness of the dangers of such repression, literally spelling out the hazards of the unwanted eruption of one's "alter ego," as she calls it. Moreover, she appears disinclined to leave the subject alone, writing at length during every opportunity about the alluring Zamorna so that he becomes something of an *idée fixe* for Charlotte, while she seemingly knows this compulsion could lead to a bad end for her.

Helene Moglen repeatedly stresses that Charlotte's writing was an exercise in the confrontation with the self, and an acceptance of those separate parts of herself personified by Wellington (self-control and reason) and Byron (passion and feeling). She states:

As in her childhood, the sexual power of Byron was more compelling than the sober virtues of Wellington. It was not until *Jane Eyre* . . . that she would begin to explore the ways in which the conflicting demands of passion and personal integrity could be recognized and answered.

(Moglen 99)

Moglen accurately detects the internal conflicts with which Charlotte was wrestling even into her adulthood. Like other critics, though, she overlooks Charlotte's earlier struggles with her growing self-awareness, her youthful cognizance of her darker urges, and her reluctance to acknowledge fully the fact that this was a projection of her own unconscious self. Part of Charlotte's developing idolatry for Zamorna concerns itself with her desire to act out some of her sublimated sexual energies and anger, and to act on some of her own precocious conceit. In the process, she discovers aspects of herself which cause her great mental distress, a full decade before the writing of *Jane Eyre*. Hence, Charlotte was much younger than critics acknowledge when she perceived this inner schism within herself, which had to be resolved if she was to integrate successfully a shadow self she found alternately entrancing and disquieting. One needs to appreciate

the powerful properties (including the eroticism) of the shadow, to see how difficult individuation would prove to be for Charlotte, and how prolonged a process this would become for her.

### **1. The Genesis of Zamorna's Demonism**

The origins of Zamorna's demonic modulation are found in Charlotte's earliest juvenilia, so the later metamorphosis is not wholly unexpected. Charlotte experiments with the literary device of setting up opposing brothers in stories composed as early as 1829, introducing the vehicle of antagonistic siblings, and combining it with the literary convention of doubling, on both literal and figurative levels.<sup>4</sup> For the first five months of their fictive life, the Wellesley brothers—Charles and Zamorna (then known as Arthur)—are portrayed as nearly interchangeable. They even look “so much alike that it would have been difficult to distinguish the one from the other, were it not for a shade of thought which occasionally passed over the features of the elder” (“A True Story,” CA 1:55). The only early distinction in personalities is Charles's timidity as opposed to Zamorna's tendency to be more authoritative, reflecting Charlotte's own inconsistencies in character, but also the early contrasts between the two collaborating siblings, Charlotte and Branwell. The strength of the fraternal bond is such that Charles and Zamorna appear to act in concert with one another, carrying out their tasks and adventures in synchronous fashion, even, at one point, speaking with one voice while relating a story contained in The Tales of the Islanders (Chapter 5, Vol. 2). By December 1829, however, they begin to exhibit contrasting characteristics, and from that point on, the brothers evolve into very different people. Charlotte, then thirteen, stands poised on the threshold of forging her own adolescent identity, and the divergent roles emblemize her own developing self-conflict, the disclosure of her own light and dark sides.

Anne Robinson Taylor (Male Novelists and Their Female Voices) contends that the literature of the early nineteenth century is predominantly concerned with such opposing distinctions in developing characterization: “There are a number of novels of the time that present the good and bad twin moving side by side through a novel—one

moving ever upward, the other down” (99). Charlotte may have been modeling these brothers on such timely tropes. Zamorna expresses a liking for extremes in climate, while Charles prefers the more temperate seasons (“Conversations”), and the elder brother “delights to dwell among pensive thoughts and ideas rather than to roam in the bright regions of fancy” (“Characters of the Celebrated Men of the Present Time,” CA 1:125). Zamorna’s indulgence in a solitary communion with a sublime nature also signals the beginning of his departure from his earlier, gentler incarnation when his character resembled that of his mother: mild, humane, forgiving and selfless. At the same time, Zamorna’s alteration signifies his increasing dissimilarity to Charles, with whom he once shared a common disdain for wickedness. Other Romantic tendencies, strikingly Byronic in character, surface in Zamorna, as well. The following description of Zamorna not only resonates with scriptural, Miltonic and Byronic echoes, but also subtly alludes to Charlotte herself:

The meditations of a lonely traveller in the wilderness or the mournful song of a solitary exile are the themes in which he most delights and which he chiefly indulges in, though often his songs consist of grand and vivid descriptions of storms and tempests: of the wild roaring of the ocean mingling with the tremendous voice of thunder, when the flashing lightning gleams in unison with the bright lamp of some wicked spirit striding over the face of the troubled waters, or sending forth his cry from the bosom of a dark and terrible cloud.

(“Characters of the Celebrated Men,” CA 1:125)

Zamorna’s identification with this awesome picture of nature is reflective of Charlotte’s own affinity with her surroundings. Note the mention of “the tremendous voice of thunder,” which may represent the Brontë voice, since Charlotte knew the name in Greek meant ‘thunder.’<sup>5</sup> Also contained in this description is a distinctly paradoxical vision—that of a “wicked spirit” emanating from a dark cloud, striding across troubled waters like a horrific Satan, yet appearing as a “bright lamp,” implying an inner illuminating power arising in Charlotte, expressing and revealing to her characteristics of her repressed self. This is one of the earliest of any such passages (December 1829) which disclose Charlotte’s darker recesses, with their foreboding aspects threatening to burst forth, undoubtedly both exciting and unnerving her.

Through the move to exile the self, setting himself apart from his brother and the general run of humanity, Zamorna initiates the creation of an individual entity.<sup>6</sup> In a parallel move, Charlotte sequesters herself, mentally retreating into her imagination to engage in her study of this newly emergent darker self. The sequestering of the self marks the first step in the individuation process. Self-exile, in Jungian terms, is answering to one's "vocation," that is, "an irrational factor that destines a man to emancipate himself from the herd and from its well-worn paths" (Essential Jung 199). As Anthony Storr explains:

Jung believed that only exceptional individuals reached the peaks of individual development. Individuation means parting company with the crowd; and this at first accentuates loneliness, and may seem alarming. Most human beings are content to remain safely with the majority, conforming to the conventions and beliefs shared by members of their family, church or political party. But exceptional individuals are impelled by their inner nature to seek their own path. . . . (Essential Jung 20)

Isolation, however, has its drawbacks. For some archetypes, isolation leads toward "inflation," or the tendency to adopt a "mana-personality," a form of megalomania, wherein they begin to view themselves as god-like. Others begin to view them in this way as well. These legendary heroes or archetypes, according to Jung, are "the very ones who are looked up to, loved, and worshipped" (Essential Jung 198), establishing a hierarchical distance between such archetypes and the rest of humanity, and fostering an inevitable otherness about them. It follows, then, that this construct has some inescapable consequences, so often leading to demonic modulation:

[Legendary heroes] towered up like mountain peaks above the mass that still clung to its collective fears, its beliefs, laws, and systems, and boldly chose their own way . . . Hence it was always believed that such a man, if not actually crazy, was possessed by a daemon or a god; for the miracle of a man being able to act otherwise than as humanity has always acted could only be explained by the gift of daemonic power or divine spirit . . . From the beginning, therefore, the heroes were endowed with godlike attributes. According to the Nordic view they had snake's eyes, and there was something peculiar about their birth or descent; certain heroes of ancient Greece were snake-souled, others had a personal daemon, were magicians or the elect of God. All these attributes, which could be multiplied at will, show that for the ordinary man the outstanding personality is something

*supernatural*, a phenomenon that can only be explained by the intervention of some daemonic factor.<sup>7</sup>

(*Essential Jung* 199, emphasis Jung's)

Zamorna had not commenced life as a god-like being, however. There was nothing peculiar about his birth or descent. Instead, he gradually evolved from his original patterning as a Byronic hero. When Charlotte returned from Roe Head in 1833, she noted that a transformation had taken place in Zamorna during her absence. While she was at school, Branwell, in developing his own character, Alexander Percy, used Zamorna as a foil for Percy, demonizing him as he had his own archetype.<sup>8</sup> Initially Charles expresses surprise at Zamorna's reputed alteration, perhaps exemplifying Charlotte's own reaction, though she ought not to have found this demonic modulation startling, given her own inadvertent foreshadowing. Charles claims to find Captain Flower's report implausible, until he tests his brother for himself and discovers "To what a hopeless depth he had sunk in the black gulphs of sin and dissipation" ("The Post Office" 1833, CA 2.1:209). Once convinced, Charles applauds Captain Flower (Branwell's pseudonym) for exposing Zamorna in Flower's novel "Real Life in Verdopolis," revealing "the iniquities of those proud ones who sit in high places" (CA 2.1:209). Charles then sets out to create a retrospective outline of Zamorna's character modification for himself, beginning with the story, "Something about Arthur." In taking stock of various characters in "Corner Dishes: A Peep into a Picture Book" (1834), he investigates his brother's demonic modulation, attempting to trace the origins of this transformation. Gradually recognizing that Zamorna's predilection for immoderation<sup>9</sup> and his anti-social tendencies are what have led to the iniquity Charles now perceives in him, he recalls:

As my brother grew up, dispositions matured, which in earlier life had never made their appearance: he showed a vein of something most intensely and appallingly dark, blent with the general brightness of his character. He grew secret and followed paths in which he would have no journeyer save himself. He had ever pursued knowledge in its loftiest and purest forms with the most absorbing and passionate eagerness, but now he hunted after sin also with nearly the same degree of avidity.

(CA 2.2:130-31)

This propensity of Zamorna's to pervert a virtue and make of it a vice, coupled with his inconsistent nature, his ambitious drive, and his inclination to take things to extremes, has been remarked on before by Captain Flower, much to Zamorna's dismay. The thin-skinned,<sup>10</sup> vengeful Zamorna, who once claimed that "A life stained by dishonour is but a protracted species of death" ("Something about Arthur," CA 2.1:17), has distorted the notion of honor so that it has developed into a form of hubris. A short while later, in "The Tragedy and the Essay," Zamorna declares, "It is part of my creed that there is no wound too deep to receive relief from the divine balsam of revenge" (CA 2.1:239). Thus, Zamorna has taken a noble, heroic virtue—standing up for the integrity of one's reputation, one's essential pride—and twisted it to have it function as a justification for a vindictive nature. This self-contradicting quality of Zamorna's—taking a moral principle and turning it into pernicious impropriety—is later commented on in the 1838 novelette, Mina Laury: "Miss Laury shuddered, but so dark and profound are the mysteries of human nature[,] ever allying vice with virtue[,] that I fear this bloody proof of her master's love brought to her heart more rapture than horror" (Gérin FN 165). Of course, this brief excerpt also exhibits the appeal of a wildly unpredictable nature to a woman like Mina (and correspondingly, Charlotte), who would find it an onerous duty to serve a more reliable character.

Such duality is intrinsic in demonic behavior,<sup>11</sup> and the juvenilia are filled with a good deal of this metaphorical trickery. For example, The Elysium,<sup>12</sup> a men's club jointly founded and presided over by Zamorna and Percy, proves to be a Temple of Sin despite its name, accentuating the dichotomy between outward appearances and internal actualities that runs like a recurring motif throughout the whole of Charlotte's oeuvre. Inevitably, the inner decay in Zamorna becomes outwardly apparent, and numerous characters are grieved to note this alteration in him. Charles tells us, "John [Sneachie, Duke of Fidena] saw all this and it touched him more with sorrow than anger" (CA 2.2:130-31). Fidena, a childhood friend of Zamorna's, always loved him for his generosity, bright genius and warm, ardent nature, and even looked with affection on Zamorna's headstrong impetuosity. But Fidena grows progressively disturbed by Zamorna's demonic development. Warner Howard Warner, too, has witnessed Zamorna's mutation, viewing it, in Passing Events (1836), as a kind of internal rot which

contradicts Zamorna's evident outer beauty, again illustrating the contradictory and antithetical nature of evil: "But notwithstanding all this outside shew of rich vigorous health, Warner felt with startling force at the moment a conviction he had long entertained, that in the timber of this stately tree there was a flaw which would eat ere the lapse of many years to its heart" (Gérin FN 67). The imagery is seen to work both ways here: a fatal flaw worming its way inward while simultaneously manifesting itself outwardly, until it can no longer be kept secret. This discrepancy between Zamorna's outer and inner selves depicts his divided self, and mirrors Charlotte's own self-conflict. Some of her self-disparagement begins to emerge in her correspondence of 1834 with Ellen Nussey, as when she refers to herself as "so obscure a person as myself," and as a "Conceited, Dogmatical, Hypocritical little Humbug" (Smith 128, 130).

Jung addresses the oppositional paradigm which operates between the persona and the shadow self in "The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious," claiming they act in direct relation to each other, following some obscure law of inner influences:

To the degree that the world invites the individual to identify with the mask, he is delivered over to influences from within. 'High rests on low,' says Lao-tzu. An opposite forces its way up from inside; it is exactly as though the unconscious suppressed the ego with the very same power which drew the ego into the persona. The absence of resistance outwardly against the lure of the persona means a similar weakness inwardly against the influence of the unconscious. (Essential Jung 96)

Hence, Jung reasons, the more appealing the mask—however artificially constructed—the more backsliding occurs behind that mask (Essential Jung 95).

In the formation of this African colony, Zamorna has been compelled to fashion a persona, or public mask, as he ages and enters the political arena. He has been forced to do battle with his enemies and to charm his compatriots, and in so doing, he lifts himself out of his former solitude and brings himself into contact with others, moving from a contemplative life of solitude to a more active, public existence. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the cultivated appeal of Zamorna's persona gives rise to his secret demonic nature. The same might be said to have occurred with Charlotte, as she left her private shell to take her part in the more public social sphere of Roe Head. As a student she no doubt measured herself against her classmates, particularly her friends, Mary Taylor and

Ellen Nussey. As her own worst critic, she might well have started judging herself harshly as early as 1831. When she undertook teaching duties at Roe Head in 1835, she would have felt the need of adopting a persona antithetical to her basic, reticent nature. Having to don the mask of the patient, pleasant mistress/teacher/future governess could have accelerated her own private backsliding, leading to her crisis of 1836.

Charles begins to contextualize Zamorna's demonic modulation with the anamnestic story, "Something about Arthur" (1833). It becomes his primary task to account for the early daemonic traits<sup>13</sup> that once manifested themselves in the young Zamorna, sifting past evidence for clues to his brother's transformation. Charles claims much has been forgotten about his brother during their shared aristocratic upbringing. Zamorna's tutor, for instance, fails to recall his charge's boyhood delinquency, so Charles offers an anecdote for his readers' edification. At fifteen, he says, Zamorna was defiant, fiery, extremely sensitive, and given to fits,<sup>14</sup> for which he was chastised by their father, the Duke. One such censure aroused Zamorna's strong sense of injustice, and the boy claimed he was "prepared to move heaven and earth for vengeance!" (CA 2.1:25). Even at this young age, Zamorna, who is his "father's own son" (CA 2.1:25), could brook neither obstacles nor contrariness. He insists on leadership in any shared venture, refusing to take a subordinate position: "I cannot submit," he declares firmly, "to act an under part in any enterprise" (CA 2.1:26). This description of his youthful, vengeful nature directly undercuts Charlotte's previous portrayal of Zamorna. Consistently compared with Apollo in the earliest works, Zamorna is more often linked now with the bellicose Hercules or Miletus (the latter a son of Apollo, suspected of attempting to usurp the throne of King Minos). But then, just as abruptly, Zamorna sheds his Herculean image and re-adopts his Apollonian role. Such shifting allusions emphasize Zamorna's contrary and mercurial nature.<sup>15</sup> His duality is continually stressed by Charles, the balance of good and evil in his brother never appearing in harmonious equilibrium. Charlotte plays with this fluctuating imbalance in many of her nascent tales, obviously unsure of which model she favored, or how to ameliorate Zamorna's developing demonic tendencies. In this same narrative, for instance, Zamorna's vengeful sentiments are shown to be virtuously Promethean in spirit. Here he wreaks vengeance on a treacherous tyrant in an effort to rescue the oppressed populace. In love with the worshipful Mina Laury—who views him "in the light of a

superior being, as an angel, an archangel” (CA 2.1:38)—Zamorna declares he is willing to relinquish rank and wealth for marriage with this peasant girl. The demonization of Zamorna is being treated very equivocally here, particularly when we see Charles subverting his own dark intentions by exciting the reader’s admiration and pity for this pair of lovers who are thwarted in their determination to marry. He does a better job of demonizing his brother in subsequent stories, placing Zamorna in a less flattering light. Both tales, “Something about Arthur” and “The Foundling,” were commenced within the same month, May of 1833, but in the latter tale, Charles declares that Zamorna now enjoys “nearly despotic power” (CA 2.1:57), others fearful of his reprisals, disclosing, with some irony, the fact that Zamorna already has become the same kind of tyrant he opposed in the previous tale. We are also introduced in “The Foundling” to the malevolent, mute, dwarf servant, Finic, who, it is later revealed, is Zamorna’s first-born son by his former black mistress, Sofala. On her deathbed, Sofala prayed that someday her son would “shame his false father” (CA 2.1:60n29), and Finic fulfills this wish by haunting Zamorna, assuming the role of his literal shadow. The reader, however, along with all the other characters in Glass Town, is initially unaware of Finic’s relation to his master.<sup>16</sup> We are also, as yet, uncertain of Zamorna’s true temperament, given such conflicting testimony. Edward Sydney remarks that Zamorna’s character is not yet fully developed, and Bravey, Branwell’s character, agrees, while adding that enough is known of Zamorna’s talents to “assure the world that no man ever possessed in a more eminent degree the inestimable gift of genius” (CA 2.1:66). Bravey is unable to determine whether Zamorna’s temper is good or bad, deciding that “it’s half and half I think. To the objects of his regard he’s an angel, but to those of his hatred, a very Lucifer” (CA 2.1:66), re-emphasizing the divided nature of Charlotte’s hero, and, by extension, her own extraordinarily ambivalent explication of his demonic behavior. At this stage, then, Zamorna is treated as an archetype very much in flux, undoubtedly mirroring Charlotte’s own equivocal approach to the light and dark aspects of herself.

## **2. Racism and Bestiality as Elements of the Demonic**

The tales of 1835 are fraught with struggle and political turmoil—both in the Angrian arena and in Charlotte’s psyche. A fight for domination and supremacy between Charlotte’s persona and her shadow self manifests itself in the narratives of this time. The depiction of characters engaged in power plays is laced with racial and bestial imagery, and signifies what Charlotte was seeing in her mind’s eye, as her shadow self in all its grotesquerie flooded her consciousness. For years, Zamorna worked hard to keep his public mask in place, but inevitably, his persona begins to erode and his dark side emerges. In the private sphere, he makes periodic admissions that he is an archfiend (CA 2.2:355), the Prince of Darkness, a toad, a serpent, a wolf (CA 2.2:371), or a leper who has polluted himself with the slander of those who hate him, namely the Ethiopians (CA 2.2:367). By 1835, the Angrian citizenry has grown antipathetic to its ruler, and Zamorna faces a possible *coup d’état* by Percy. In a political ploy, Zamorna attempts to reverse this course of action by enlisting his archenemy as a sub-lieutenant for the better good of the nation. In so doing, Zamorna shifts the antagonistic focus on to a larger, more formidable enemy—one common to both. The nationalistic Percy has already exploited the public’s xenophobic sentiments, inducing Angrians “to murmur against any partiality to foreigners” (CA 2.2:297), forcing the King to defend his patriotism. Percy has attacked Zamorna for consorting with the French, compelling Zamorna to remind the Angrian constituency that he, too, has battled against the French and “the god Napoleon” (CA 2.2:299) as diligently as Percy. The French, Zamorna points out, are no longer their enemy. Instead, their foes are closer at hand, and include the Ethiops (more specifically, the Ashantees), a visibly ‘outcast group.’ When Zamorna senses he has successfully displaced the focus of blame, he swiftly proposes a scorched-earth policy in the imminent war ahead. The climax of Zamorna’s speech gives it the quality of a veritable call to arms: “I shall not account our work done there till every drop of Ethiopian blood be shed and dried up in the sun that first scorched it. We must leave none to darken our own hereafter! Root and branch must they be cut off! Utterly and forever must they be done away with!” (CA 2.2:308). The Marquis of Ardrah, Lord Parry, condemns this political

move, claiming the King is about to plunge the country into a pointless war for selfish, personal motives, “merely because Quashia thrashed him when a boy and so he has taken a dislike to him ever after” (CA 2.2:314), a charge denied by Zamorna. Quashia Quamina, chief of the Ashantees, was adopted as a youth by the Duke of Wellington, creating for Zamorna an older stepbrother. The racial and fraternal associations here anticipate the antagonistic relationship between step-brothers Hindley and Heathcliff in Wuthering Heights, and echo the earlier struggle for supremacy between Zamorna and his older, darker alter-ego, Valdacella, in “The Spell.” As King, Zamorna must continuously assert his omnipotence against all comers who make claim to rights of primogeniture. Zamorna’s struggle to retain his supremacy translates into a battle against a darker self threatening to take domination and (as in “The Spell”) precisely outlines the internal struggle Charlotte was then experiencing with her own shadow. Even Zamorna’s command to annihilate and eradicate the dark race in their midst seems self-referential.

Zamorna’s private concessions that he is less pure and virtuous than his public mask also express Charlotte’s evolving self-conflict. At the same time, his confessions recall Jung’s encounter with his own shadow self. Jung’s account of his confrontation with his unconscious relates a recurring fantasy, which bears a striking resemblance to Charlotte’s juvenilia of this period. Jung came to recognize that the embodiment of the primitive shadow he kept encountering in this fantasy—a small, brown-skinned savage—was a common shadow archetype in the dreams of Europeans. In Charlotte’s tales, Zamorna battles not only a black stepbrother and a dark alter ego, he is also dogged by his first-born, half-black dwarf son, Finic. When the mute Finic is moved to plead for himself in the futuristic tale, “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume,” Zamorna, even at this late age in his life, refuses to concede that this “hideous monster,” this “misshapen abortion,” and “dumb dog” (CA 2.2:375-76) is his own issue. He thought he had killed Finic years before, yet he cannot shake the dwarf’s presence: “That miserable being Finic was a thing of which I had a particular and constant aversion, a disgust whose intensity was unaccountable even to myself. Yet, notwithstanding this, he stuck to me with a strange tenacity for several years and as if we had been fated not to part” (CA 2.2:364). Finic grows dark with hatred and attaches himself to the white tyrant as a haunting metaphor of Zamorna’s own inner darkness, even embodying Zamorna’s emotions.<sup>17</sup> He

serves as a dual reminder that Zamorna's battle with the Ashantees is no more than a battle with himself, a fact which Zamorna eventually comes to realize when he calls himself as dark as those he wants to eradicate. Hence, the Ashantees represent an outward manifestation of Zamorna's shadow self, and his proposed annihilation of them suggests a form of self-destruction. Charlotte, too, may have been considering the viability of eradicating her dark impulses, eliminating her shadow self, but through these tales, she began to understand how intrinsic and inseparable such aspects of the self were. Just as Finic stalks his father for seven long years, Zamorna shadows Charlotte for the same length of time (between 1829 and 1836) before she recognizes that he personifies her own unconscious and cannot be obliterated.

Finic, though portrayed in the juvenilia as dark, was not always so. When he was born, he was as fair as Ernest. His metamorphosis from fair to dark, even black, is explained by Shungaron, the palace gardener and brother to the deceased Sofala. Shungaron says that Sofala taught her son to hate his father, and to haunt and molest him. The curse laid upon Zamorna, then, can be read as a racist gesture: the literal embodiment of the shame and dishonor a white, aristocratic, colonist father might feel in that day and age, being dogged by a black, misshapen, mute dwarf claiming to be his son. Susan Meyer ("Colonialism and the Figurative Strategy of *Jane Eyre*") contends that Charlotte uses race in her fiction for conflicting purposes, arguing that "The figurative use of race relations in Brontë's fiction reveals a conflict between sympathy for the oppressed and racism" (250). Meyer cites the example of Matilda Fitzgibbon, Charlotte's character, who—in a fragment of 1853, known as "Emma"—suddenly turns black, suggesting this transformation from fair to dark comes about as a result of Matilda's "social disenfranchisement due to her gender, age, and social class" (249). In addition to proposing that such signifiers are indicative of the rage felt by the oppressed,<sup>18</sup> Meyer reads this darkness as an indicator of injured pride and a sense of revenge, at one point comparing the enslaved Bertha Mason to Quashia, the African revolutionary: "Like the rebellious Quashia, the Jamaican Bertha-become-black is the novel's incarnation of the desire for revenge on the part of the colonized races" (254). Sally Shuttleworth also addresses the insurgent streak linking Bertha Rochester and Quashia Quamina, remarking that both are related to rebelliousness in Victorian adolescent girls:

Characters' responses to such 'ungrateful' and unreasonable behaviour mirror Victorian psychiatric discussions of what was deemed to be wilful hysteria and unwarranted aggression to their families by adolescent girls. The figure of Bertha in *Jane Eyre* can be seen as a rewriting of Quashia: as a member of a subordinate and subjected group and race, she is taken into the heart of the familial structures of white patriarchy, but rebels in defiant form against its constraints. (Shuttleworth 111)

Certainly both Quashia and Bertha incarnate those forces that threaten the overthrow of their oppressors. Integrated into white paternalistic families, which, in turn, subjugate them, both may also represent Charlotte's own seditious stimulus toward the larger paternalistic British society, which she finds so oppressive. Pride, then, which mutates into anger, and the desire to avenge oneself on one's perceived enemies, can be seen as demonizing idiosyncrasies which contaminate both oppressor and oppressed. Such demonic distinctions are instigated by struggles of power, and transcend the domain of colonizer and colonized, or master and slave, to include gender inequality, and a disparity in class or social standing in a class-based society. Consequently, Matilda Fitzgibbon's blackness, like Finic's, and Bertha Mason's, can be viewed as a manifestation of the fury over one's powerlessness, and a determination to avenge oneself for such perceived wrongs.

Charlotte habitually makes such symbolism work both ways. The dark qualities seen in her oppressors also connote injured pride or self-esteem, perhaps even fear of the threat to one's honor or position in society. One needs to understand the intrinsic hierarchy embedded in Charlotte's fictionalized gender relations to appreciate how color—or what some critics view as racism—operates in her work. Helene Moglen, while not specifically addressing blackness or racism in Charlotte's novels, uses color as a means of deconstructing this hierarchy. Status, according to Moglen, more precisely determines what color, even gender, is signified in Charlotte's characterizations: "For Brontë, gender seems quite astonishingly—if only half-consciously—to be a semantic symbol denoting power in much the same way as 'blackness' is, in Jean Genet's play, *The Blacks*, a matter of relative position rather than a color" (89). Characters change color according to their movement and equivalent standing on the hierarchical scale, Moglen explains, adding that in Genet's drama, "the black man who achieves ascendancy

is no longer ‘black’ but ‘white,’ and his victim, or his subordinate, is ‘black’ whatever his ‘real,’ apparent color” (89n7). Likewise, in Charlotte’s fiction, one can become black simply through the act of recognizing one’s social disenfranchisement, and perceiving the resultant injury to one’s pride. So those at the top of this hierarchical scale also have the propensity to turn black when their status is threatened or their pride is injured. Should the ‘victim’ possess an outsized ego, a disproportionate amount of false pride, or a lack of self-restraint, coupled with a range of excessive emotions, then demonic modulation seems an inevitable outcome. Certainly, a life bent on retaliation leads to inflation, megalomania, and demonic possession.

With her artistic eye, Charlotte often creates a full spectrum of shading in her cast of characters, from demonic darkness to virtuous light. Such gradations divulge where, at any given time, her archetypes appear on the satanic scale. Moreover, by fashioning secondary, one-dimensional foils of a darker or lighter hue, she could more precisely delineate character, bringing her archetypes into sharper relief through the use of contrasting light and shadow, like a detailed *chiaroscuro*. The gesture resembles the manner in which Charlotte evokes characterization through portraiture, again emphasizing the visual nature of her imagination. Percy, for example, is literally shadowed by an even more sinister character, S’death. His presence endorses Charles’s estimation of Percy as “not yet altogether a monster” (“The Foundling,” CA 2.1:88). In juxtaposing Percy with S’death—who acts as an amplification of Percy’s base side, personifying all of Percy’s dark qualities in one flat, unchanging dimension—Charlotte makes visible Percy’s more insouciant traits. Zamorna, too, is given a second foil in this same story: the gallant knight and future prince, Edward Sydney. Here, however, the imagery is inverted. By contrasting Zamorna with a virtuous, purer, more moral character, Charlotte forces us (and herself) to regard the darker aspects of Zamorna. All four characters, when set in alignment, represent the full spectrum of shading, from black to white, vice to virtue. This literary device is employed repetitively throughout Charlotte’s juvenilia, grouping characters to illustrate degrees of evil and goodness.

Charlotte also plays with combining such opposing imagery within one individual, as we have already seen in her depictions of Zamorna. Because these archetypes are constantly mutating as rounded—rather than flat—characters, the

aforementioned shadings never remain static, but rather vary and change continuously. Zamorna grows increasingly dark as the juvenilia progress. In “The Scrap Book: A Brace of . . . Characters” Zamorna is described as a “wandering star which only gathers blackness” (CA 2.2:332), and later in *Mina Laury*, General Thornton comments that Zamorna grows darker each day. As evidence of this mutation, he is seen suffering a rare case of jealousy, every vein boiling: “Dark blush after dark blush deepened the hue of his cheek, as one faded, another of darker crimson followed (this variation of colour resulting from strong emotion has been his wonted peculiarity from childhood)” (Gérin FN 154). Normally, this darkness manifests itself in the forehead, both archetypes exhibiting a shading of that region when crossed, perturbed, made envious or jealous. In “The Scrap Book,” Mary Percy asks Zamorna about the alternating aspects of his forehead: “Sire, what is that strange shade which seems to grow over your forehead sometimes? It does not pass away when you smile, but always steals on more darkly and rapidly when you suddenly knit your brows to a frown” (CA 2.2:332). Paradoxically, Mary reveals her own mark of anger on occasion, but she persists in miscomprehending signs in herself which represent those “dark qualities” Christianity associates with evil (Wehr 60).<sup>19</sup> Charlotte makes this reference specific in “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume,” the tale composed in 1834 which is set in the Angrian future. Charles describes Zamorna at forty-two, in the prime of his life. By now Emperor of Angria, Zamorna has sired nine children, yet he still is considered “the standard of masculine perfection” (CA 2.1:361). Referred to as both “god-like” and “the incarnate deity” (CA 2.1:361), Zamorna nonetheless continues to manifest a dark side:

A swarthy hue, the effect of martial toil and warlike hardship, darkened his broad brow and deeply embrowned the complexion which in youth had been almost of feminine delicacy. There was in [his] aspect an awful majesty, a stern decision and a superhuman pride which proclaimed the imperial despot. [David] Hume, the most celebrated of the historians [alluded to previously], say[s] that the superb mould of his form, the withering keenness of his glance, the high soarings of his unsatiable [sic] ambition and the dark yet deep and exhaustless genius which looked out through all his thoughts, words and actions gave those who saw him the idea of something more than mortal. It looked, observes he, as if heaven, being wrath [sic] with mankind, had sent Lucifer to reign on earth in the flesh. (CA 2.1:361)

The foregoing serves as just one of many examples in the juvenilia which illustrates Charlotte's intention to convey satanic implications in these dark character portraits. Here, more significantly, she conflates Zamorna's god-like and Luciferian aspects. This ambivalent confounding of pious and profane imagery becomes habitual with Charlotte for the next two years, disclosing her anxieties and struggles with religious skepticism, and her deep concerns about this emerging shadow self.

All this is not to say that racism does not exist in Charlotte Brontë's writing. Her early work is rife with it, presumably borrowed from what she read and heard, since it is unlikely she ever met any African, Ethiopian, Middle Eastern, East Asian or Caribbean natives during her sheltered childhood and adolescence. Racist viewpoints, often cloaked as xenophobic sentiments, were common currency in this colonizing age, and Charlotte would have encountered them frequently in her reading.<sup>20</sup> However, she tended to treat racism forthrightly, rather than camouflage it in satanic iconography, although one could conjecture that Charlotte viewed some races, religions and nationalities as containing satanic qualities. Unquestionably, certain national traits are demonized in the juvenilia (as is the Roman Catholic Church, about which more will be said in Chapter Three), and the exotic appears to actualize dark, even exciting, elements for Charlotte. For instance, Charles describes Zamorna's son, Adrian, as having a glance that possesses some less than admirable Mediterranean and East Asian features: "A slumbering principle of Italian hatred and Indian revenge which seemed as if it could be roused to startling life by the stimulus of provocation, but while that was averted would sleep there undisturbed and permit other and gentler feelings to hold quiet sway" (CA 2.1:337). Two other of Zamorna's sons, the Princes Frederic and Julius, have inherited "the mark,"<sup>21</sup> and in them it appears "as a slight gipsy-like wildness about the eyes" (CA 2.2:332). The French, too, take a serious drubbing in the juvenilia, presumably due to some leftover sentiment from the Napoleonic Wars. In *Caroline Vernon*, Zamorna instructs his ward on the eve of her leaving for Paris not to imitate the manners of Frenchwomen nor marry a Frenchman. He is even more censorious of Italians, cautioning her to avoid contact with either gender of that nationality. Other allegiances and races fare even less well in Charlotte's infernal world. Although Lord Hartford is a member of the Anglo-aristocracy, he, like most others, is not exempt from adopting a racist tinge during particular moments in the

juvenilia. He is called “The Great Creole” by Zamorna in Captain Henry Hastings (Gérin FN 215), and is pictured as “dark,” “swarthy,” “a man of savage, hirsute aspect[,] unwashed[,] uncombed[,] unshaven-,” as well as most likely suffering from gout or colic (Gérin FN 231). Henry Hastings, described as having “very dark skin” with strong black hair and a dissipated profligate look with a branded brow, curses Zamorna, calling him “that d-nd Turk in the east” (Gérin FN 196). Zamorna is frequently cast in an Oriental light, and Mary, his wife and Queen of Angria, is heard to remark that she feels like a stranger in a strange land, claiming in “Stancliffe’s Hotel” that she is looked on as “arabic” (BPM 114/33). The ingenuous Charlotte is attempting to romanticize the Angrian royal family, but she only succeeds in placing them at odds with the general populace, positioning them as other by inscribing them as either gypsy, Arabic, Turkish, or Ethiopian.

Unquestionably, blacks are thoroughly demonized in the juvenilia, particularly in the later novelettes such as Julia, Captain Henry Hastings, and Caroline Vernon. Lord Hartford concurs with young Julia Wellesley when she remarks, “what Demons those Negroes are!” (Gérin FN 96). Zamorna rides a horse named “Black Afrite,”<sup>22</sup> and he calls his slavish dogs “sons of Satan” and “savage and swarthy negros [sic]” as they “instantly grovelled to his feet with... servility” (“The Foundling,” CA 2.2:53). In spelling out his scorched-earth policy to Zenobia and familiarizing her with his guerilla war plans, Zamorna resolves that “not a black piccaninny will be left to cheep between this & Tunis-” (Gérin FN 260). Like The Marquis of Ardrah, Lord Parry, Percy knows just which barbs will sting Zamorna the most, and brings up racial and fraternal associations between Zamorna and Quashia Quamina, prompting Zamorna to challenge such a belief that the same blood runs in his veins as in those of his adopted African stepbrother. Both, claims Percy, were nursed by the same foster-mother, but Zamorna rebuts this assertion: “Quashia, before I was born, was a great squab picanniny of ten” (Four Years Ago, Hatfield 4/105). In Caroline Vernon, the novelette’s namesake plays “Jim Crow” on the piano to irritate her mother, Louisa, and fantasizes about the day when, as sultana to some world conqueror and mystic Oriental, she will have more than a hundred slaves to do her bidding. Henry Hastings harbors similar fantasies, doting on the thought of setting up his own little slave kingdom on an isolated island off Africa.

Blacks not only are exploited, debased, demonized and distanced as other in the Angrian world, they are rumored to possess bestial qualities. William Percy is enlisted during a war campaign to penetrate further into the African interior than any before him, and an aristocratic woman deems this region hot and horrid, a land “where the rivers are haunted by amphibious blacks instead of alligators” (SHB Misc. 385). But blacks are not the exclusive recipients of such denigrating bestial comparisons. Again, the French come under fire in this regard. In addition to being called a demonic Creole, Lord Hartford is also relegated to the ape world. When Hartford acts hateful, he is said to bear “the air of a gigantic Ourang-Outang-” (Gérin FN 239). And Zamorna, with his “John Bullish sort of prejudice” against the French, likens their behavior to the antics of monkeys in a menagerie (Four Years Ago, Hatfield 4/96). Zamorna fails to escape such racist and bestial designations himself. He has become demonized, in part, by his own hatred of the dark tribes, among others. As he concedes in “The Scrap Book: Duke of Z and E Percy” (1835):

[I am] polluted with the slander of those who hate me; have I not a touch of the Ethiopian slander of those who hate me; have I not a touch of the Ethiopian about me in your eyes? Speak truth: it must be so, for the varnish of that patent blacking manufactured by Northangerland, Ardrah, Montmorenci, etc. has been accumulating in successive layers over my whole character during the last three months. (CA 2.2:367)

Characteristically, Zamorna, in his persecution, aligns himself with the oppressed and the shunned, as does Charlotte (as pointed out earlier by Susan Meyer). No doubt, this gesture is politically motivated on Zamorna’s part, though something deeper appears to be at work here. The images he projects of himself fluctuate wildly, disclosing his (and Charlotte’s) precarious self-esteem. At one point he glorifies himself, proclaiming he is both “priest and monarch,” even going so far as to say he is Melchizedek, the scriptural hero and king of Salem.<sup>23</sup> In citing a particularly dark chapter from Isaiah (34:6), enumerating the sacrifices made by a vengeful God, Zamorna inflates the already heightened imagery, positing himself as messianic and justifying his vengefulness by defining himself as a martyred deity. Then, in the same breath, Zamorna calls himself a “leper” in need of cleansing (CA 2.2:367), polluted with the slander of others. The twinned imaging is not as oxymoronic as may first appear. Sir James George Frazer cites

historic connections in The Golden Bough between animals and leprosy, and leprosy and sacred objects, pointing out that such superstitions extend back to the era of the ancient Egyptians. Some tribal savages, according to Frazer, thought man was descended from animals, and that if he ate the animal from which he was descended, he would become a leper (621). Others held that touching sacred objects would cause leprosy. “In short,” writes Frazer, “primitive man believes that what is sacred is dangerous” (622), and here Zamorna exploits such legendary beliefs, inspiring awe—both magnificent and horrible—amongst his followers, taking the sublime to an extreme. G.S. Kirk points out in The Nature of Greek Myths that a great many early religions linked animals with gods, “particularly the ancient Egyptians who worshipped gods in animal shape almost exclusively in the pre-dynastic period before about 3,000 B.C., and right down to classical times their gods had animal heads or other animal characteristics” (51). Certain eyewitness accounts have already endowed Zamorna with bestial qualities. An Angrian newcomer describes the King while attending a pageant, saying Zamorna possesses

a very strange and exotic appearance. His figure is cast in a different mould to ours . . . His shape is Asiatic . . . He is full and high-chested like a war-horse, thin-flanked, like a greyhound, long and gracefully limbed, with the small, light, elastic foot of an antelope. His head and the expression of his face is between that of an elk and a gamecock . . . Taking him on the whole he resembles nothing so much as an uncommonly large tortoise-shell tom-cat. (CA 2.2:366)

This same newcomer also recalls a favorite feline which “killed rats as ferociously as Adrian [Zamorna] does Negroes” (CA 2.2:366), further extending the bestial simile. Such passages allude to the contagion or moral corruption the imperialist colonizer suffers by oppressing or decimating races other than his own—leprosy serving as an appropriate metonymic device. The disease attacks the skin and the nerves, knows no class distinctions, and was often suffered by those who colonized this part of the world.<sup>24</sup> Zamorna, who confesses he is “filled with wounds and bruises and putrifying sores” (CA 2.2: 368), announces he will be retreating into exile, effectively shunning himself before he can be sacrificed, an habitual ritual with lepers.<sup>25</sup> But before he slips off into a self-canceling existence, Zamorna reasserts his ownership of his subjects, claiming that “that mass of living beings, god-like men, earth’s first and highest children” are his (CA

2.2:368). Thus, while damning and exiling himself, Zamorna simultaneously asseverates his status as patriarchal savior of his people, compelling them to view his self-exile as an act of supreme self-sacrifice—a means for saving mankind and Angria, now portrayed as the Holy Land. Again, such confounding of sacred and profane imagery reflects the inflation of the shadow self, the alternating megalomania coupled with a withering sense of self-esteem.

Hirsuteness, too, becomes as much a distinguishing feature of the demonic and the bestial as blackness in Charlotte's juvenilia. Marina Warner, in a study of the iconography found in fairy tales (*From the Beast to the Blonde: On fairy tales and their tellers*), says of the ubiquitous hirsute demon lover that beards were the mark of the goat and the goat's lustful, diabolical character, which, in turn, was united in a kinship with satyrs, the lusty god Pan, and even the devil himself. In time, "beards came increasingly to define the male in a priapic mode" (Warner 242). Warner further clarifies such signifiers in her chapter, "The Language of Hair": "Animal hairiness, tails and beards identify the phallic satyrs of Greek myth, embodiments of lust; they lent their features, their donkey-like and goatish parts, to conventional Christian representations of the Devil" (355). Moreover, Warner cites Erasmus, who claimed that the Devil's beard was emblematic of his inherent contrariness and represented a patriarchal ornament, a devilish goatee (246). She concurs with this reading, observing: "The motif of bestial hairiness characterizes the Devil himself" (Warner 358). Hirsuteness is frequently associated in Charlotte's juvenilia with barbarity and the green-eyed monster, jealousy. As previously noted, Lord Hartford is pictured in *Henry Hastings* as hairy, bearded and uncombed. When Zamorna, who duels with him in *Mina Laury*, experiences the uncommon feeling of jealousy, his hair acts as an indicator of this demonic turn: "his whiskers twined & writhed & even the very curls seemed to stir on his brow—" as he questioned Hartford's right "to dare to look at anything which belonged to me" (Gérin FN 154). The narrative then reads: "The Demon of Zamorna's nature was now completely roused—Growling out his words in a deep & hoarse tone almost like the smothered roar of a Lion—he savagely told Hartford to measure out his ground" (Gérin FN 154). The simile harks back to the bestial implications inherent in hirsuteness, but it also recalls how injured pride and anger provoke demonism.

As with darkness and light, hirsuteness and its contrary image of clean, smooth skin are frequently played against one another in the juvenilia, Charlotte's use of such imagery divulging her own apprehension about sexuality and the loss of innocence. A scene chronicled by Charles in "Stancliffe's Hotel" (1838) illustrates the use of these opposing motifs. The Duke and Duchess of Zamorna have retired to a suite in the hotel following an ugly confrontation with the Angrian citizenry. Mary is recovering from this harrowing episode, having reportedly become sick upon reaching the hotel, and helped to her room. She now appears to Charles to be "all but dead" (BPM 114/31). Charles, with his inexplicably omniscient powers, witnesses this intimate scene, watching Zamorna, as he is about to waken his convalescing wife in their private hotel room. He comments, "Pity there is not another living soul in the room to beg him to stand away & let her sleep" (BPM 114/32). Charles wonders what Zamorna finds amusing in the image of that "marble face & the saintly folding of those little fairy hands," as well as the "open brow" which gleams fair "like that of a sculptured Virgin Mary" (BPM 114/32). He calls Zamorna a "Villain" and says his brother is "not fit Guardian for that shrine" (BPM 114/32). The religious iconography contained in this scene accumulates and builds in intensity as the language correspondingly heightens and becomes overblown. Charles likens Mary to "a saint" and the room to "a consecrated chapel" defiled by the presence of a fellow with "so much hair," who is "not old enough to be a priest" (BPM 114/32). As if to underscore his sadistic satyr image, Zamorna then awakens Mary, against her wishes, and laughs at her disturbed reaction. Once woken, Mary wants to fall back to sleep, but Zamorna will have none of this: "he was come for his evening's amusement & his evening's amusement he would have—whether she was fit to yield it or not" (BPM 114/33). He urges her to fasten up her disheveled hair, saying it hangs on her neck like a mermaid's, and wordlessly, Mary obeys.

In this short passage, Zamorna has taken a consecrated image and projected his own sexuality on it, impugning Mary by implying that she is acting the temptress—the fallen Eve—rather than the virginal, virtuous innocent. As the hirsute partner, Zamorna reproaches his wife for her disobedience and her disheveled hair, not unlike Milton's Adam when he chastised Eve.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, Zamorna, in claiming Mary's hair hangs on her neck like a mermaid's, associates her innocent image with the impure mythological

icon, the tempting Siren.<sup>27</sup> This is an early example of a technique Charlotte would come to exploit in her adult fiction—that of introducing mythological archetypes to delineate the use and misuse of such iconography in patriarchal literature.<sup>28</sup> Here, Zamorna conflates goddess with *femme fatale*, not recognizing that he is projecting on to Mary archetypal images which embody his own repressed feminine qualities, his own anima. In casting a demonic signifier of his own on to his angelic wife, Zamorna perverts her image to reflect more clearly his own. This, in turn, causes his emotional outburst—another expression, explains Frieda Fordham, of a man’s anima, which will be discussed at further length in Chapter Four.

Sally Shuttleworth argues that medical discussions of the female mind and body categorized early Victorian women with “a whole series of unruly social ‘others’: infants, savages, and the working classes” (87). As her archetype inflates and intensifies his power over her, Charlotte tends to portray him as mythically monstrous, alternately deifying and bestializing him, revealing her increasing uneasiness with the strength of the shadow. Either way, at opposite ends of the continuum, he eludes her grasp by transmuting himself into extremist and even dangerous caricatures of himself—such disparate imagery being synonymous with inflation—while threatening to take possession of both her and the script. His evil spirit must have appalled Charlotte. That she was even capable of conceiving of such a fiend undoubtedly contributed to her diminishing sense of self-esteem, and those moments when Zamorna accuses Mary of corrupting him ought to be read as self-reflexive. Charlotte could well have been blaming herself at this point for Zamorna’s demonism, consciously recognizing that he represented her own emerging shadow self. She might even have been indirectly blaming herself for what was simultaneously occurring to Branwell, as he gradually subsumed his own identity into that of his shadow, Percy. Moreover, she could, in her misogyny, be taking women to task here for representing that corrupting principle which brings about men’s downfall. Certainly at this critical juncture, Charlotte was beginning to perceive herself as impure, diseased and damned beyond the point of spiritual salvation, suffering the consequences of having become obsessed with and idolizing a demon-lover, and, in effect, turning her face from God.

### 3. Charlotte's and Zamorna's Emerging Shadows

The curious tale, “The Spell, An Extravaganza,” which Charlotte composed during the summer of 1834, questions Zamorna’s sanity, and stresses his dual demeanor, accentuating and intensifying the Janus-faced imagery by literally splitting the character in two. The tale presumably articulates some of Charlotte’s own unconscious fears about her divided self. “The Spell,” a piece of fiction fabricated by Charles to retaliate against his removal from Wellesley House,<sup>29</sup> introduces Zamorna’s own shadow self, Valdacella, who appears long enough to wreak havoc with his persona. Unbeknownst to everyone, Zamorna is conducting a literal double life as both his persona and his shadow, engaged in a struggle for political and personal supremacy. Undoubtedly the tale delineates Charlotte’s own unexpressed concerns about what might occur to her, should she allow her own shadow self to emerge, and as such, it proves to be a revealing psychological study. In a postscript that dispels all previous mystification and discloses what has transpired, Charles calls the shadow, or evil twin, an “alter ego,” borrowing the concept of a diabolical double used by James Hogg in 1824 in The Private Memoirs and Confessions of Justified Sinner, a book with which both Charlotte and Branwell were familiar:<sup>30</sup>

If the young King of Angria has no alter ego he ought to have such a convenient representative, for no single man, having one corporeal and one spiritual nature... should, in right reason and in the ordinance of common sense and decency, speak and act in that capricious, double-dealing, unfathomable, incomprehensible, torturing, sphinx-like manner which he constantly assumes for reasons known only to himself.

(CA 2.2:237)

Charles here means to criticize Zamorna’s tendency toward mystification and masquerade, as well as to emphasize his brother’s diabolical duplicity. He is rendering the figurative literal by reaching deep into Zamorna’s psyche and drawing out those well-hidden aspects of his brother’s character: the destructive shadow self normally concealed from view by the beautiful, charming, and immensely appealing persona. The exposure of these irreconcilable sides of Zamorna, which he otherwise attempts to keep under

control, very nearly kills him, and results in his insanity. Hence, the story is meant to be a cautionary tale, for both protagonist and author.

Zamorna's *Doppelgänger* appears following the death of his son Julius, and the battle, which ensues between the persona and the shadow for the supremacy of the self, threatens to destroy not only the king, but the entire kingdom of Angria. In this tale of self-reckoning, the shadow gains, for a time, ascendancy over the persona, and Zamorna's wife, Mary Percy, comments: "I begin to think that you have a double existence . . . Yet what am I talking about? There cannot be two Zamornas on this earth; it would not hold them!" (CA 2.2:210). However, two Zamornas are precisely what she has known, and the split becomes definitive here. Zamorna lies on his death-bed, his brow "blanched, whitened with sickness" (CA 2.2:207), Charlotte using, for the first time, a metaphorical process of purification through illness which she will come to employ in much of her adult fiction.<sup>31</sup> Meanwhile, the shadow self—a wholly dark, unambiguously demonic, sadistic, misogynist personification—attempts to usurp his twin's political and social standing and very nearly succeeds. Part of the fascination of "The Spell" lies in the manner with which Charlotte plays once again with the dichotomy between outside appearances and internal states of mind, not only in Zamorna, but with virtually every other character in the story. According to the attending doctor, Mary also possesses a dual demeanor: "Perhaps under her sweet gentle semblance there might be as much passion pent as in the burning veins of her proud haughty stepmother. . . ." (CA 2.2:191). Mary has already confessed to the doctor that she inherited from her father "a way of looking very quiet without, when I am furious within" (CA 2.2:191). This paradoxical nature mirrors her husband's condition; he burns with fever within, while on the surface, his body remains cold as ice. Such parallel imagery, common in her adult work, allows Charlotte to amplify a character's state of mind through the act of refracting and multiplying it. As Janice Carlisle observes in her essay, "The Face in the Mirror: *Villette* and the Conventions of Autobiography," *Villette* is less a narrative in which other characters are granted an autonomous existence than a hall of mirrors in which they are allowed to appear because they serve as facets reflecting the affective truth of Lucy's life (146). "The Spell" contains one of the first such uses of repetitive, mirroring imagery, the captured reflections seeming continuous and infinite: Zamorna with his twin brother or

shadow self, Valdacella; Mary Percy with Mary Queen of Scots, as well as with her father, Alexander Percy; Ernest with Emily, along with their father, Zamorna; and Finic with Valdacella's servant, Pinic, a shadow's shadow, if you will. Such mirroring expands and contracts to suggest not only sickness pervading the individual mind, but pervasive disease invading the entire kingdom of Angria.<sup>32</sup> The repetition also stresses the contagion of infectious madness, as well as the inheritability of insanity, a subject that will be discussed in the next chapter. Implicit in these tales is Charlotte's act of projecting her own fears and desires on to refracted reflections in "a hall of mirrors." In so doing, she learns more about her own divided nature and the contraries existing between her own persona and shadow self. Consequently, for Charlotte, the business of writing is not unlike the act of peering into a looking-glass.

In the tale's conclusion, when Zamorna recovers and appears with "his wraith," Valdacella, Charles informs us that "none could tell which was the substance, which the shadow," and they are named "the flesh and spirit" to differentiate them (CA 2.2:227). The Duke of Wellington explains the phenomenon, saying the night the pair were born, they wrestled "with an unnatural energy that made them appear possessed, each to strangle his brother" (CA 2.2:233). Even now, they resume their sparring, but it soon dissolves into laughter, reducing the wrestling match to a charade, or a parody of Esau and Jacob, as well as Cain and Abel, if not Satan and Christ. The Duke informs us Zamorna is the younger twin, in keeping with the scriptural trope of the favored second son—the son who is kept, versus the son who is shunned, exiled, or sacrificed as a 'first fruit' to God. As the visible persona, Zamorna appears to be the emancipated victor in this wrestling match, ultimately overpowering his normally less visible shadow self. The point of this cautionary tale, though, is to illustrate how dominant a role that shadow self plays in Zamorna's development—the strength of that which lurks beneath his charming façade—and the fact that all this contrariness is contained in one psyche, wrestling for supremacy of that single personage. Again, this psychic wrestling match mirrors Charlotte's own early struggles with her emerging shadow, which she sought to repress. Charles intends to have the work represent a piece of imminent foreshadowing, adding in an anomalous postscript or coda-like caveat that Zamorna dies insane, at the age of twenty-two, in a private mad-house—Zamorna's actual age at the time of the writing of

this tale. The story marks the first such indicator that Charlotte, then eighteen, may have been fearing for her own future sanity, as well.

Although Zamorna may be second in rank to his more powerful and slightly older shadow self, he is, in the everyday Angrian world, still a first-born son, elder brother to Charles. One wonders, if, in this realm, first-place rank-placement signifies the propensity to become possessed by one's evil self. As rightful heir in the tradition of primogeniture, Zamorna may be doomed to fall, as did that long line of antecedent elder sons Cain, Ishmael, Esau, Saul, even Lucifer, who had all been treated as Romantic heroes in the literature Charlotte read as a child. If Charlotte is imitating scriptural and Romantic themes, then she may also be picking up on the contemporaneous nostalgia for the aristocratic notion of the rejected rightful heir, the passed-over firstborn child, which, as Northrop Frye points out, functions as a recurring theme in the early books of the Bible.<sup>33</sup> In addition, she might have been sensing her own degree of disenfranchisement, as the eldest child in the Brontë household, expected to make sacrifices for her younger brother and his ambitious plans for an artistic career. By 1835, it had become clear to her that she would have to go to work to help support not only her brother, but her sisters—a move she was not happy to make, but one dictated by “Duty—Necessity,” as she explains to Ellen Nussey. She adds: “Papa would have enough to do with his limited income should Branwell be placed at the Royal Academy, and Emily at Roe-Head” (Smith 140), a statement which demonstrates Charlotte's conflict between her sense of duty and her desire to follow her passion. We are made aware of Charlotte's bitterness about her fate through her correspondence and in her journal entries, but whether Zamorna feels robbed of his rightful inheritance to his father's throne is never made clear in Charlotte's juvenilia. Branwell's recently retrieved body of juvenilia,<sup>34</sup> however, reveals that it is Alexander Percy, not the Duke, who makes it possible for Zamorna to be granted sovereignty over the newly created kingdom of Angria. In Branwell's tales, it soon becomes evident that Percy acts as more of a father figure to Zamorna than the Duke of Wellington, and Zamorna's growing demonism signifies the developing affinity between these two archetypes.

#### 4. Alexander Percy as Demonic Foil and Demonic Twin to Zamorna

Branwell first created the character of Alexander Percy in 1829, though Percy was largely ignored by him until he was briefly brought back to center stage in 1831 to function as a foil to Charlotte's Zamorna. Branwell's archetype does not play a major role in Charlotte's juvenilia, however, until his return from years in exile in 1833. In "The Foundling" (May-June 1833), Charlotte re-introduces Percy; then she provides some background for him in "The Green Dwarf" (September 1833). In the early years of the collaborative partnership, Charlotte usually performed the role of historian of this imagined realm, filling in necessary detail so as to contextualize characters as they appeared on this African world stage. Upon her return from school that year, it became necessary for her to develop both arch-rivals simultaneously, building on their past deeds, explaining demonic transformations, and making these characterizations—often overlooked by her brother—more precise. Consequently, Zamorna and Percy frequently define themselves in juxtaposition with one another. Although initially pitted against each other as arch-rivals, in contrasting imagery of fire and ice, the original paradigm evolves to become a far more complex matrix. Publicly, Zamorna and Percy are viewed as antithetical and antagonistic, in continuous rivalry for political dominance of the Angrian kingdom. Privately, however—their relationship fostered by their less well-known liaison as pupil and mentor—they operate as one another's *Doppelgänger*, illustrating obverse routes to the same progressively demonic end. Both possess a contradictory nature—a disparity between the private versus the public self—which, in turn, reflects Charlotte's own divided self, and produces a remarkably functional symmetry in the Angrian world, establishing a working equilibrium between the pair. As narcissistic, despotic doubles, neither Percy nor Zamorna gains the villainous political upper hand for long, nor is either in danger of becoming wholly tyrannical. The vacillating nature of the public relationship, then, offers up a system of checks and balances so that Angria never falls into chaos, as is often threatened. Moglen views this fluctuating relationship as emblematic of that shared by Charlotte and Branwell:

To a limited extent, Charlotte explored the confusion of her own feelings about Branwell by developing further, in these stories, Zamorna's relationship with Northangerland, the persona and alter ego which Branwell had adopted in earlier tales . . . Charlotte emphasizes the tensions of the Zamorna-Northangerland relationship, bending them to her own purpose. She underlines the attraction and repulsion which bind the two men in a reciprocal erosion. She explores the way in which the desire of each for power is thwarted—particularly in Zamorna's case—by a desire for the approval and love of the other. (Moglen 48)

Curiously, when Moglen describes the relationship shared by William Crimsworth and Hunsden in The Professor, portraying them as locked in a “struggle for power involving two loving antagonists, imprisoned in mutual fascination” (100), she could be depicting the alliance between Zamorna and Percy, or that shared by Charlotte and Branwell. Indeed, she posits that Charlotte drew on the Zamorna-Percy relationship for “her conception of the ambiguous interaction” between these two figures in her first novel (Moglen 100). Like Charlotte and Branwell—and Zamorna and Percy—each seeks wholeness in the other, and until they are able to separate, grow and change, they find themselves imprisoned within a kind of “reciprocal erosion,” unable to break free to become independent, self-authenticated and empowered individuals.<sup>35</sup> Later, we will see the fusing between two “loving antagonists” bring about the final completion of each individual, rather than a kind of mutual despoliation. But this fusion can be accomplished only after both parties have undergone the individuation process, so that they can approach one another on an equal basis, sure of the completeness of their own selves through the act of self-recognition and self-realization. By means of these two archetypes, who possess such parity in the work of this time, Charlotte in effect rehearses her own process of self-recognition and self-realization. Not until she is able to break free of her collaborative relationship with Branwell is Charlotte able to begin taking steps toward her own completion, and when she does, Percy appears with less and less frequency in her writing.

In keeping with their separate debuts in the juvenilia, Zamorna and Percy symbolize contrasting aspects of English society. Although both are well-born, Zamorna, who arrives first in these tales, emblemizes the established Anglo-aristocratic power structure handed down from generation to generation. Percy, on the other hand, having

been disowned by his family, represents the upstart underclass, which rebels against the status quo, in search of a more democratic landscape, in the end becoming the aristocratic egalitarian. The constantly shifting power base keeps the pair in constant and continuous rivalry and Angria in a perennial state of tension and imperiled imbalance. Further, Zamorna and Percy frequently take on one another's qualities, always counterbalancing each other in degrees of villainy. Both are misanthropic and narcissistic; both are despotic, dualistic, and self-deceiving. But because both generally work in public opposition to one another, rather than in concert, the national equilibrium is maintained. Meanwhile, without the knowledge of their constituents, this demonic duo confer and conspire in private, often sneaking through the garden gate like lovers to gain intimate access to one another. Some of the tenderest scenes in the juvenilia feature Percy and Zamorna humoring one another out of their famous sulks or pompous posturings. Women, who appear relatively late in Charlotte's juvenilia, and who lack a voice in the ongoing narrative until 1830, are often used as instruments through which these two men express their deep affection and esteem for one another. The bond they share is far more powerful than that which either man enjoys with any woman. The third and final marriage for each, for instance, appropriately pairs them with women who are literally or figuratively related to the other, so that they co-exist in a state of metaphorical matrimony, giving rise to the strong recurrent themes in the juvenilia of incest and homoeroticism. Such pairing is also shown to be narcissistically driven, disclosing the depth of their hubris, and reinforcing the attraction in the recognition of themselves in the other. Later, when they become estranged, they use these women as the means by which to exact retaliatory revenge, each attempting to gain ascendancy over the other by either abusing, or protecting and withholding from such exploitation, one another's paramours. Later still, Charlotte will bring women center stage and give them more active roles in their own destinies. But until that occurs, women are generally utilized as pawns and booty in this match of wills, and this remains a decidedly masculine world.<sup>36</sup>

As Zamorna's elder and former mentor, Percy is more fully developed as a demonic character and at times provides less of a foil for his arch-rival than an amplification of his diabolical nature, a portentous specter of what the younger Zamorna will someday become. In this respect, they are demonic twins. Charlotte's story, "The

Green Dwarf,” contains a psychological study of Percy, which bears mention. She begins by describing Percy’s physiognomy,<sup>37</sup> always paramount in her reading of character:

The countenance of this gentleman was, as I have said, handsome. His features were regularly formed. His forehead was lofty, though not very open. But there was in the expression of his blue, sparkling, but sinister, eyes and of the smile that ever played round his deceitful-looking mouth, a spirit of deep, restless villainy which warned the penetrating observer that all was not as fair within as without, while his pallid cheek and somewhat haggard air bespoke at once the profligate, the gambler and perhaps the drunkard. (CA 2.1:146)

The marks of villainy inscribed on Percy’s visage are seen, in 1833, only fleetingly in Zamorna, and then only by certain characters. What we read as signs of malignant character in Percy’s features—like the marks of Cain—are a mere foreshadowing of what soon will be impressed on Zamorna’s countenance. Eve Sedgwick discusses the significance of the image of the human face in the Gothic novel, claiming it “tyrannizes” the genre by its “very freight of meaning” (158), which translates into a code or language of its own. Sedgwick asserts that “the depth of the inscription . . . does not show that the graphic character is private to, original with, or intrinsic in the bearer” even when it spells “villain” (153). Instead, “its depth merely shows the mutilation caused by the attrition of experience” (Sedgwick 153). It would seem here that demons are not born, but evolve. A full generation older than Zamorna,<sup>38</sup> Percy, further along in the demonic modulation process, is a miscreant, a misanthrope, and a wholly reprobate and wasted character. What Percy recognizes and cultivates in Zamorna, then, is his own self in the making, and Percy’s mentoring may well reflect Branwell’s influence over Charlotte, or Charlotte’s attempt to incriminate her brother, as their diabolical characteristics—or shadow selves—begin to make themselves manifest.<sup>39</sup>

Percy is called the “consummate master in the art of overreaching” (CA 2.1:149), which conforms with some of the Faustian imagery contained in “The Green Dwarf.” We also learn here, through the perceptive Emily Charlesworth, of the full intensity of Percy’s narcissism and dissolution. Unlike Zamorna, Percy “openly renounces the dominion of honour and declares that he has given himself up to the blind guidance of his own depraved inclinations” (CA 2.1:177). Unconcerned with masking his darker, shadow

self, or pretending to subscribe to a sense of duty, he takes no pains to hide the transformation that has occurred in his character during his exile: “Few now can recognize in that seditious demagogue, that worn-out and faded debauchée Alexander Rogue, Viscount Ellrington, the once brilliant and handsome young soldier Colonel Augustus Percy” (CA 2.1:206). Although Percy claims the world sees him as a villain (CA 2.1:177), this view is not yet entirely accurate, and only reveals a bit of posturing on Percy’s part. Only those who play authentically heroic roles are able to perceive Percy for what he actually is, since he is constantly re-inventing himself, frequently obfuscating his true character. The Duke of Wellington, for instance, needs to don a disguise in order to gain access to Percy and confirm his suspicions that the villain is sinister, malevolent, and wholly bent on revenge.

Like Zamorna, Percy is also multi-dimensional in character, possessing a dualistic demeanor, a contrasting persona and shadow self, each archetype mirroring the psyche of its creator. Charles describes the enigmatic Percy, for example, as being perfectly refined and graceful in his courtly manner and lofty politeness. The narrator has trouble, though, squaring this posture with Percy’s known background, which is “steeped in outer darkness; the parricide, the pirate, the land-robber, the rebel, the solvent” (CA 2:2:29). Percy’s aristocratic mien clashes with “his sneering and sarcastic expression of countenance, his treacherous eye and the wild expletives; the horrifying piratical oaths” (CA 2.2:30). Although Percy’s anger, like Zamorna’s, is characteristically vengeful, he is sadistically icy in his rage and retribution, rather than hot-tempered like Zamorna. Still, his villainy is not altogether absolute, primarily because he is shadowed by an even darker figure, S’death (also known as Montmorency, or Montmorenci), his own corrupting mentor. S’death, the reincarnation of Chief Genius Brannii, authentically fulfills the role of foil, claiming Percy is guilty of folly only, adding that he is merely “a wildish young man” (CA 2.1:189), or, as Charles calls him, a “demi-fiend” (CA 2.1:185). The inference here is that S’death, in his darker villainy, functions as a manifestation of Percy’s shadow self. S’death also serves as an excellent example of Branwell’s tendency to endow his demonic archetype with more authority than Charlotte’s, since Percy is mentored and guided by a former Genii who represented Branwell.<sup>40</sup> In so doing, Branwell takes full responsibility for demonizing his shadow self, heedlessly plunging

forward into still darker realms. Percy may recognize S' death as his own internal demon, his *Doppelgänger*, when he unsuccessfully attempts to kill him and is struck by his own bullet on the rebound, recalling the contest scene found in Carl Maria von Weber's 1821 German Romantic opera *Der Freischütz*. Not only does S' death, as a devil figure, control this magic bullet,<sup>41</sup> he figures as that part of Percy's character which cannot be annihilated by him without extirpating himself, and it may be that Branwell enjoyed his dark side so much, he was loathe to neutralize it. But the scene would hold later lessons for Charlotte, too, when she found that shadow selves could not be eradicated, but rather had to be integrated.

Returning in 1833 from his years in exile as a pirate and world-wanderer, Percy finds he has been disowned by his relatives. Consequently, he drops his family name and attempts to redeem himself, following this fall from grace, once again re-making himself in a new image. Branwell had recently changed Percy's name from Rogue, in order, according to Christine Alexander, "to create an heroic lineage for his hero" (CA 2.1:146n47).<sup>42</sup> In keeping with his propensity to disguise his prior identity and true self, Percy, says Emily Charlesworth, is a mere "dependent hanger-on of a noble relative" (CA 2.1:176). Emily implies that Percy borrows his nobility—as he does his new identity—rather than inheriting it rightfully like Zamorna. Part of the mythos of demonic archetypes includes their aristocratic breeding, recalling Satan's original relationship with God, before his own fall from grace. Given Percy's ambitious villainy, we now appreciate his eagerness, following his disinheritance, to take a titled woman as his wife and re-invent himself in the aristocratic mold. In "The Tea Party" (1833), we learn that Percy's father, Edward Senior, was a man concerned with maintaining aristocratic bearing, marrying titles, if necessary, to maintain that peerage (CA 2.1:264n125); so Percy, too, comes by his own birthright naturally.

Percy's prominent role in Charlotte's juvenilia as both foil and twin to Zamorna appears to have served multiple purposes for Charlotte. He handily provides her with a device through which she could compare and contrast her own archetype, discovering degrees of darkness and treachery. He also represents another form of demonic behavior, a contrasting means toward the same end, helping Charlotte better understand how such proclivities manifest themselves in such variable ways—how an icy exterior, for instance,

can provide as much of a dangerous omen as a hotheaded temperament.<sup>43</sup> At the same time, those traits Percy shares in common with Zamorna are equally instructive for Charlotte, carving out a telltale trail of iniquity, leading to unadulterated demonism. In the following chapter, we will see how Percy's atheism functions as a vehicle for some of Charlotte's theological debates in the juvenilia. And in Chapter Four, we will see how the symbiotic relationship between Zamorna and Percy—which represents the interplay between Charlotte and Branwell's shadow selves—develops into a homoerotic bond, encouraging Charlotte's misogyny. Once she breaks off the collaborative relationship with her brother, and sheds some of this misogyny, creating and identifying with stronger heroines, Charlotte no longer has need of Percy and relegates his part in the juvenilia to that of a secondary character. However, while assuming a less primary role in Charlotte's subsequent work, Percy becomes, as Northangerland, Branwell's sole focus for all of his future writings.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Charles Burkhart observes that Victorians liked to set up pairs of concepts—parallel or opposite plots, characters and settings (57). Charlotte’s juvenilia are densely populated with such contrasting pairs, and this antithetical pairing of heroic figures—the paragon of virtue coupled with the errant Romantic hero—would serve as a repetitive pattern in all of her later work. Helene Moglen remarks: “Byron, the second hero who dominated the imaginative lives at Haworth, expressed deeper aspirations; the repressed needs and feared passions of her ‘other’ self. The two men [Byron and the Duke of Wellington] established the polar possibilities of definition for her and for the heroines of her novels, serving functions not unlike those served by Rochester and St. John Rivers for Jane Eyre” (26).

<sup>2</sup> One needs to remember that animals, in ancient religions, often represented gods, and some of these bestial signifiers have erotic associations.

<sup>3</sup> Charlotte’s ‘confessions’ conveying her sense of spiritual and moral unworthiness are expressed in numerous letters to Ellen, particularly during 1836. Some of these letters are examined in Chapter Three, Section 4.

<sup>4</sup> Examples are found in *Two Romantic Tales* (1829) and *Tales of the Islanders* (1829-30), more specifically “A Romantic Tale” (April 1829), “The Search After Happiness” (July-August 1829), and “A True Story” (August 1829).

<sup>5</sup> Parallels exist between this description of the young Zamorna and the second of Jane Eyre’s three early paintings, selected for closer scrutiny by Rochester on his first evening with the young governess. This portrait is often considered emblematic of Jane’s fragmentation and dual nature, wherein Jane is viewed collaterally as both divine and demonic. The references to lightning in both descriptions recall the expulsion of Satan from Heaven in Book 6 of *Paradise Lost*. See my article, “Jane Eyre’s Triptych and Milton’s *Paradise Lost*: An Artistic Vision of Revisionist Mythmaking.” Also see note 1 in Chapter One.

<sup>6</sup> Earlier, in “The Search After Happiness,” Charlotte had investigated the question of whether happiness could be found in exile, putting the wicked O’Donnell brother, Henry, to the test. Henry soon laments his estrangement and returns to his homeland. Exile, both literal and metaphoric, proves to be a recurring theme in Charlotte’s juvenilia, and often signals a time of transformation and/or growth. Charlotte might have viewed her own isolation—particularly as a student and later a teacher at Roe Head school—as a form of exile and hoped to turn such isolating periods into exercises in growth and maturation. Much of this early work of Charlotte’s is derivative of Byron, and here she has obviously drawn inspiration from *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage*, which involves itself wholly with issues of self-exile and individualism. Verse XII of the third Canto throws a particularly interesting light on the motivation to separate oneself from the rest of humanity and go one’s own way: “But soon he knew himself the most unfit/Of men to herd with Man; with whom he held/Little in common; untaught to submit/His thoughts to others, though his soul was quell’d/In youth by his own thoughts; still uncompell’d,/He would not yield dominion of his mind/To spirits against whom his own rebell’d;/Proud though in desolation; which could find/A life within itself, to breathe without mankind” (*The Poetical Works of Byron* 211).

<sup>7</sup> There are numerous serpentine references made to both Percy and Zamorna in the juvenilia. In one of his more insightful narratives about the nature of his brother, Charles writes: “My brother has nothing of the stern Bashaw about him in private life. When he has ceased to care much about those with whom he has to do ‘he whistles them *softly* down the wind’. On such times as he has occasion to see and speak to them he does it as kindly as ever. Thus, like people in a consumption, they flatter themselves that their case is not desperate, that his affection is reviving, and that in time perfect happiness will dawn on them again. Ere long the sickness of hope deferred comes over them. His visits become fewer, briefer and briefer, intervals of months perhaps elapse, and neither sight, sound, nor token is heard from him or of him. Meantime the poison of the deadly and venomous serpent begins to work rapidly. There is a lingering period of uttermost despair; it may be a final gleam of light when the still idolized tyrant comes to close the dying eyes of his infatuated victims and wake a smile on the cheek of death as he whispers in those syren tones, that all along served to lure down the broad way of destruction, that he still loves them and only them. Dissolution then closes the scene and all is over” (“High Life in Verdopolis,” 1834, CA 2.2:57-8, emphasis Brontë’s). In 1835, in “From the Verdopolitan Intelligencer,” Zamorna acknowledges his flaws, viewing himself as leprous and preparing himself for a period of self-exile. While slandering others for his imputed darkness and iniquities, declaring that he has been persecuted, Zamorna simultaneously takes responsibility for this attack, seeing it as ultimately self-inflicted, revealing his self-hatred: “Now mind, thus surrounded I do not represent myself as a dove in the midst of serpents, as a lamb compassed by wolves. No, I, too, am a serpent, and it was the infliction of my own venomous fang, the utterance of my own threatening hiss, which called all my brother dragons about me. I, too, am a wolf, and it was my own ravening and insatiable ferocity which made the whole horde of wolves single me out as the centre of combined attack” (CA 2.2:371).

<sup>8</sup> Charlotte may well have been subtly imparting Branwell’s instrumental role in the demonizing process in a later story, “Well, Ety” (1834). She has Charles describe a newly discovered painting that Zamorna had secretly commissioned by William Ety. The painting depicts S’ death, another of Branwell’s pseudonyms, mentoring a young Percy. The work parallels Percy’s mentoring relationship with Zamorna. As Percy claims: “if he had not whispered in the Marquis of Douro’s ear the Duke of Zamorna would be now a nonentity” (Extract from the last number of the *Northern Review*, 1834, CA 2.2:313). Charlotte, as mentioned, was known for using portraiture as representational of the inward psychological states of her characters, and the juxtapositioning of these two stories with their parallel imagery invites the interpretation that S’ death served as the primordial demonic instigator who corrupts Percy, who, in turn, corrupts Zamorna. In implicating Branwell as the fomentor of Zamorna’s demonism, Charlotte absolves herself of any blame which might be imputed to her character’s devolution, if not deflecting responsibility for her growing obsession with her hero at this stage, according to Christine Alexander (CA 2.1:xv).

<sup>9</sup> Immoderation is Percy’s eventual undoing. In *Mina Laury* (1838), Warner Howard Warner, with his second sight, can see Percy as a dying man, suffering from premature decay brought on by excessive behavior and appetites. He warns Zamorna to stay aloof from him “who has lived the slave of vice” and let him “die the victim of Disease” (Gérin FN 136).

<sup>10</sup> Charlotte, too, had difficulty accepting criticism. As she conceded to Ellen Nussey in

September, 1836: “You have been very kind to me of late, and gentle and you have spared me those little sallies of ridicule which owing to my miserable and wretched touchiness of character used formerly to make me wince as if I had been touched with a hot iron: things that nobody else cares for enter into my mind and rankle there like venom. I know these feelings are absurd and therefore I try to hide them but they only sting the deeper for concealment. I’m an idiot!-” (Smith 152).

<sup>11</sup> Storr writes in his introduction to Part 8 (“Self and Opposites: God and the Problem of Evil”) of The Essential Jung that if integration consists of the uniting of opposites, “it follows that the most obvious pair of opposites, good and evil, are to be found in the self” (299). Since, as Jung posits, the self is supposed to be a “God-image,” the conventional Christian view of God, then, is dualistic—God being entirely good and Satan containing all of the evil. Storr then remarks that Jung cites an earlier Christian belief which was monotheistic in nature: “Clement of Rome taught that God rules the world with a right and a left hand, the right being Christ, the left Satan” (from Jung’s prefatory note to his essay “Answer to Job,” Essential Jung 299). For more on this theological debate, see Jung’s essay, “Christ, A Symbol of the Self.” Throughout literature, Satan is characterized as possessing powers of transmutation, taking on myriad metaphoric shapes, cloaking himself in virtuous clothing and in so doing, deceiving even the most discerning eye. Protean behavior by satanic characters appears in some of the earliest Renaissance dramas we have, and became a common trope centered around the figure of the trickster in subsequent verse, opera, and ballet. In a letter dated 1851, Heinrich Heine says devils assume the shape and design of man’s most secret thoughts (Letter to Lumley, Esq., Doktor Faust: A Dance Poem 19). In Heine’s dance poem Doktor Faust (1847), the devil is ordered to appear in his most horrible shape, and emerges from a basket of flowers as a smiling ballerina. In both Christopher Marlowe’s The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus (1590)—considered by Heine to be the prototype from which the modern Faust emanated—and in William Mountfort’s The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus (1697), when a wife is requested, a she-devil appears, much like the succuba image of Helen of Troy in the Faustbuch (1587). Mountfort’s Lucifer even owns an instruction manual for metamorphosing oneself into different guises, and he orders Doctor Faustus to study this primer. Gounod’s figure of Mephistopheles precisely mimics the doctor in his 1859 lyric opera, Faust, so the audience recognizes that Satan is an aspect of oneself. For most of Arrigo Boito’s opera, Mefistofele (1868), the devil appears as a friar. Faust is not the only legend to contain such transformative satanic imagery. In Tirso de Molina’s “The Trickster of Seville and the Stone Guest” (c. 1630), Don Pedro claims that the devil takes human form in the person of Don Juan, or as a giant or monster who dares assault the heavens. In Milton’s Paradise Lost, the fallen archangel assumes the configuration of the tempting serpent, an association alluded to in later operas such as Mozart’s Don Giovanni. In numerous nineteenth-century and most twentieth-century treatments of the corrupting power of Satan, a mystical comingling of sin and grace emerges. The concept that sin does not come without grace, that sin provokes and creates grace, is a very old idea, of course. But in the aftermath of the French Revolution, man was increasingly viewed as his own shaper, and the notion of the artist as creator began to take hold along with the thought that sin might in fact be identical with grace.

<sup>12</sup> ‘*Elysium*,’ Latin from the Greek ‘*Elyision*,’ refers to an earthly paradise to which are admitted, through strict selection, purified, upright souls.

---

<sup>13</sup> See p. 3 of the Introduction, particularly note 9. As mentioned, the movement from daemonic to demonic can be succinctly characterized as the transformative shift from benign to malevolent. Elaine Pagels, in *The Origin of Satan*, calls “Daimones” “spirit energies” (120), later explaining that such spirits are the forces that energize all natural processes (143). Such energies then exert themselves in one direction or another—a movement toward the demonic denoting a negative turn, or a reversal. Northrop Frye, in explicating his term “demonic modulation” in *Anatomy of Criticism*, describes a cultural displacement in myths and archetypes from the moral and conventional to the obscene, sinister, subversive or blasphemous (157).

<sup>14</sup> See further discussion about Zamorna’s and Byron’s fits and those of Branwell in the following chapter, section 2.

<sup>15</sup> The following year, in “My Angria and the Angrians” (1834), Zamorna is linked with Mars, the god of war, rather than Apollo.

<sup>16</sup> Finic’s true relationship to Zamorna will be revealed in the 1834 story “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume.”

<sup>17</sup> Shuttleworth conjectures that Finic “clearly operates as yet another alter ego for our hero, a darker self signalled by both racial and gender otherness” (115).

<sup>18</sup> Meyer’s premise asserts that Charlotte employs figurative and literal slavery motifs in her works as signifiers for economic, societal and gender oppression, a condition with which Charlotte sympathizes. However, Meyer has trouble sustaining the claims of racism and oppression in her argument when she looks at such characters in *Jane Eyre* as Mrs. Reed and Blanche Ingram, who—like Bertha Mason—also are said to possess dark qualities. (Meyer points out that Blanche Ingram’s face, like that of Bertha, is “‘inflated and darkened’—with pride” (261), quoting from *Jane Eyre* (Penguin ed.) 201.) To explain this, Meyer equates such darkness with the subversion of oppression, claiming that “Brontë suggests that imperialism brings out both these undesirable qualities in Europeans—that the British have been sullied, ‘darkened,’ and made ‘imperious’ or oppressive by contact with the racial ‘other’ . . .” (260). Zamorna makes this same point when he says he has polluted himself with his own hatred of the black races, as does Warner Howard Warner when he admonishes the impulse toward retaliation, explaining in *Passing Events* that vengeance enslaves the avenger. Through such passages, we see that Charlotte recognized the repercussions of imperialistic behavior. But Meyer fails to carry this argument through, ignoring other, more implicitly colonialist figures in *Jane Eyre*, excluding from her debate such characters such as Rochester, who enslaves his ‘mad’ wife, Bertha and whose time in the West Indies is inextricably linked to issues of slavery. Other background figures also connected to issues of slavery in the novel, such as Bertha’s brother and Jane’s uncle, are not mentioned by Meyer, either. In addition, she disregards St. John Rivers, a classic nineteenth-century imperialist who means to show dark-skinned people the glory of his own race, and convert them to Christianity. Similarly, Brocklehurst, who tyrannizes helpless children, is absent in Meyer’s discussion. Certainly Jane, one of many oppressed characters in this novel kept busy resisting the oppression of others, should be included in this argument, as well as the martyred, saintly Helen Burns. Since Meyer theorizes that both colonizer and colonized are

---

darkened by one another's presence, the absence of these characters in her argument renders it less than convincing, and one must assume that some—like Helen Burns—were omitted by Meyer from her discussion because no darkness could be found there, invalidating her syllogism.

<sup>19</sup> Charles describes Mary Percy as possessing a “beautiful and spotless forehead” (CA 2.2:17), which, after a time of sitting alone in sorrow, becomes transformed: “the ample Percy forehead grew dark... with anger” (CA 2.2:15). Unlike Mary, Charlotte shows an obvious recognition of how melancholy and depression metamorphose into anger, knowing such anger can then lead to catastrophic consequences.

<sup>20</sup> See “Race” by David K. Van Keuren in Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia, ed. by Sally Mitchell, pp. 657-58.

<sup>21</sup> No doubt this is meant to refer to the mark of Cain, warning anyone against avenging Abel's death, and here possibly representing God's sign for a man marked with the sin of vengeance.

<sup>22</sup> In a footnote, Christine Alexander explains this is borrowed from Byron's Giaour and The Corsair (CA 2.2:53n83). Significantly, the Afrites mentioned in Byron's poetic works refer to demonic creatures.

<sup>23</sup> In the Epistle of Hebrews in the New Testament, Melchizedek is called the “King of righteousness” and “King of peace” (Hebrews 7:2), and is exalted and sanctified as a prototypical Jesus Christ, a high priest and son of God.

<sup>24</sup> In Branwell's manuscript of 1834 entitled “The Wool is Rising,” one of his characters remarks that all cutaneous diseases like leprosy, once they are introduced into a family, become, like Scottish tempers, hereditary and cannot be eradicated (Chapter 4, “The Wool is Rising, or the Angrian Adventurers,” Neufeldt WPBB, Vol. 2).

<sup>25</sup> Annual human sacrifices to prevent crop failure were not unknown in the primitive world, according to Frazer. Mexicans, at the festival of the Goddess of the White Maize, routinely sacrificed lepers (The Golden Bough 583).

<sup>26</sup> See Book 9, ll. 1067-1098, 1134-1142, and 1163-1186, in Paradise Lost.

<sup>27</sup> In her chapter “The Glass Paving and the Secret Foot,” Marina Warner links the double-tailed mermaid with the seductive siren in a discussion of “complementary female symbolisms” which are “rooted in biblical and classical mythical metonymy” (113). “Sirens and mermaids,” she writes, “with biblical warrant, entered the bestiary of heterogeneous monsters on medieval capitals, ivory caskets, misericords, and mosaic floors, as one variation among so many of the demonic temptations in circulation” (Warner 115).

<sup>28</sup> Charlotte frequently employed images of mermaids in her adult fiction, often to show how such mythology was patriarchal in nature, but also, as Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar hypothesize, to illustrate the destructiveness of female rage, generated by such male stereotyping. The mermaid, “[l]ocked into her unnatural, desexed body . . . works her cold enchantment in order to destroy the men who have enslaved such pure women . . . the mermaid is also a revisionary avatar of Sin, Eve’s precursor. . . .” (Gilbert and Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic* 387). Charlotte may have begun using such imagery after reading Thackeray—one of her favorite authors. In *Woman and the Demon*, Nina Auerbach opines that Thackeray, unlike many of his contemporaries, avoided making direct demonic allusions: “His stock euphemism for ‘demon’ is ‘siren’ or ‘mermaid’” (90). Auerbach argues that the mermaid icon represents a serpent woman who assumes a “hybrid form” (93) in Victorian mythology, “Her hybrid nature, her ambiguous status as creature, typify the mysterious, broadly and evocatively demonic powers of womanhood in general” (94). Through such mutations, this icon retains hidden powers of disruption that Zamorna sees as potentially threatening and destructive.

<sup>29</sup> By 1834, Charles openly disapproves of Zamorna, and Zamorna expels him from his family home. He calls Zamorna a “reprobate ne’er-do-well” (CA 2.2:9). Significantly, he uses contrasting images of Wellesley House and Zamorna Palace to describe the mutation Zamorna has undergone: “Aye, the Zamorna Palace contrasted with Wellesley House shews well how the lord of both has changed and risen. Once he was the man of taste, learning, genius, science, at once the Homer and the Maecenas of his age: now - but I will not waste time and temper by writing what he now is” (“My Angria and the Angrians” 1834, CA 2.2:266). In that same year, Charles will use a similar metaphorical device to render an image of the aging Percy (by then known as Northangerland) in “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume.” Northangerland House is described as roofless and in decay but still impressing the beholder with awe and wonder, not unlike Northangerland (Percy) himself, sixty years of age in this story.

<sup>30</sup> Juliet Barker finds the whole concept of an alter ego for Charlotte’s story is borrowed from Hogg: “The story [“The Spell”] is a reversion to the old world of magic, omens and mysterious strangers. Zamorna nearly dies as the result of a curse put on him at birth and it is revealed that he has an identical twin brother, Valdacella, who is really responsible for all the arbitrary and cruel deeds and the sudden change in character of Charlotte’s great hero. Here again, the influence of James Hogg’s *Confessions of a Justified Sinner* is very evident, the devil-like figure of Valdacella assuming Zamorna’s persona” (204).

<sup>31</sup> Both Charlotte and Emily use such imagery in their adult fiction. Illness, sometimes brought on by a dog-bite, leads to exorcism, purification or even a cross-gender modification in *The Professor*, *Wuthering Heights*, *Shirley*, and *Villette*, just as fire and maiming do in *Jane Eyre*. Helen Burns undergoes a spiritual cleansing during her final illness in this latter novel, and it can be argued that Jane does as well, during that period when she is nursed back to health by the Rivers family at Moor House. The year before Charlotte composed “The Spell,” Emily had been very ill with the after-effects of a dog-bite, which she had cauterized herself. Barker writes that it is pure speculation, but tempting nonetheless to connect this childhood incident with the dog-bite and illness Shirley suffers in Charlotte’s later novel (198). Likewise, it is speculative to link any of these fictional instances of illness with Emily’s early experience, though such imagery appears to have been originally inspired by Emily’s bout with erysipelas.

---

<sup>32</sup> Much in the same way, Shakespeare implies, on literal and figurative levels, illness in the body politic when depicting a titular royal head suffering from sickness.

<sup>33</sup> “[T]here is one theme that recurs frequently in the early books of the Bible: the passing over of the firstborn son, who normally has the legal right of primogeniture, in favor of a younger one. The firstborn son of Adam, Cain, is sent into exile, and the line of descent goes through Seth. Ham, the rejected son of Noah, is not said to be his eldest son, but the same pattern recurs. Abraham is told to reject his son Ishmael because a younger son (Isaac) is to be born to him. Isaac’s eldest son Esau loses his birthright to Jacob through some rather dubious maneuvers on Jacob’s part, some of them backed by his mother. Jacob’s eldest son Reuben loses his inheritance for the reason given in Genesis 49:4. Joseph’s younger son Ephraim takes precedence over the elder Manasseh. The same theme is extended, though not essentially changed, in the story of the founding of the monarchy, where the first chosen king, Saul, is rejected and his line passed over in favor of David, who is practically his adopted son (I Samuel 18:2). In later literature the theme is carried much farther back: if we look at the fifth book of *Paradise Lost*, for instance, we see an archetype of the jealousy of an older son, Lucifer or Satan, at the preference shown to the younger Christ” (Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* 180-81).

<sup>34</sup> Some of this unpublished work, then being compiled and edited by Victor Neufeldt, was made available to me for my own edification and use in this study of Charlotte’s juvenilia.

<sup>35</sup> Moglen elaborates on the relationship shared by Crimsworth and Hunsden, and again, could well have been discussing the liaison between Charlotte and Branwell or Zamorna and Percy: “But in its progress can also be traced the romantic quest for the ‘other’: the brother-friend, who is necessary to complete the self, but who, because of the element of opposition he represents, is extremely threatening. The two patterns of behavior are not mutually exclusive. The first implies the second. Together they represent the ambivalent interaction of siblings, lovers, parents, and children. The contradictory needs for union and separation are commandingly expressed in Crimsworth’s and Hunsden’s interdependence and compulsive assertions of pride, in their fierce protection of their vulnerable egos, in their readiness to experience themselves as threatened and in the capacity of each to cruelly attack and manipulate the other” (Moglen 100).

<sup>36</sup> The subject of homoeroticism and related misogyny will be treated at greater length in Chapter Four, in the discussion of the animus/a.

<sup>37</sup> Sally Shuttleworth writes about the rise of interest in phrenology and physiognomy in the mid-nineteenth century: “A new interiorized notion of selfhood arose and, concomitantly, new techniques of power designed to penetrate the inner secrets of this hidden domain. Psychiatry and phrenology emerged as sciences, dedicated to decoding the external signs of the body in order to reveal the concealed inner play of forces which constitute individual subjectivity. Brontë’s novels operate within this paradigm”(3). Shuttleworth explains in a later chapter that phrenology was considered a learned science, while physiognomy was based on intuitive understanding, thereby rendering it accessible to all: “Physiognomy was essentialist, idealist and open of access; phrenology was relational, materialist, and closed of access to the uninitiated”(61). Shuttleworth claims that critics have conflated phrenology with physiognomy in discussing Charlotte’s interest

---

in the former, failing to consider its social functions and thus emptying the terms of social and political relevance (3).

<sup>38</sup> At various times, they are eighteen or more years apart. In “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume,” Percy is said to be sixty and Zamorna forty-two. But in “The Green Dwarf,” we understand Percy to be returning from sixteen years in exile at the moment when Zamorna is born, which, implausibly, would mean Percy stood trial for his crimes at the age of two.

<sup>39</sup> It ought to be pointed out that Charlotte exerted as much influence over Branwell in this writing partnership as he did over her, despite many biographers’ assertions to the contrary, and this becomes more apparent now that Branwell’s juvenilia has been re-assembled and is in the process of being published. See Chapter One, n39.

<sup>40</sup> As a reincarnation of Branwell’s Genius, S’s death is also as inwardly monstrous as the outward manifestation of Chief Genius Branni was, and this reinforces that sense that Branwell had entirely different motives in mind from those of his sisters when he created a Genius to oversee his characters. As pointed out in Chapter One, Branwell’s Genius was quickly demonized and became intent on destroying—rather than resurrecting—life. The sisters, by contrast, used their Genii to resuscitate those characters annihilated by their brother in the collaborative narrative. See notes 12 and 14 to Chapter One.

<sup>41</sup> In *Der Freischütz*, it is said that according to traditional folklore, the first six out of seven bullets belong to the marksman, while the final, seventh one, belongs to the devil: “Six find their mark,” explains Kilian, the champion marksman, of magic bullets, “but the seventh belongs to the Devil and he can guide it where he will” (*Der Freischütz*, Friedrich Kind, librettist). The Faustian imagery in “The Green Dwarf” is re-introduced through Andrew—who is none other than Captain Tree, Charlotte’s earlier pseudonym—when he reports that he dreamed he has sold his soul to the devil.

<sup>42</sup> Christine Alexander also claims the character and career of Percy are closely modeled on Lord Byron’s hero from *The Corsair* and *Lara* (CA 2.1:263n123). Some similarity exists here, certainly: both have plied their trade as pirates; both tend to be misanthropic, often living in self-exile. Byron’s Conrad retains a love for others, but fights against this impulse and succeeds in the later tale of *Lara*. As Lara, he is seen to be democratically inclined, and claims to be a courteous knight who wears no mask and blames fate, rather than himself, for his stormy life. Percy bears a greater resemblance, however, to Otho, Lara’s antagonist. A champion of the lower classes, Otho wields a great deal of regional power and acts as spokesman for the malcontents who reside in Lara’s kingdom. He also avenges himself for his injured pride on the aristocratic Lara. All this parallels Percy’s role in the Angrian world and his frequent public function as antagonist to Zamorna. Conrad/Lara, widely recognized to be a self-portrait of Byron, more closely resembles Zamorna, with his aloof demeanor, his aristocratic roots and his love of Orientalism. Nonetheless, over the course of the next six years, both Percy and Zamorna undergo numerous mutations, and in time, as we see in “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume,” Percy takes on increasingly more of Lara’s attributes.

---

<sup>43</sup> This image of Percy's icy exterior may have prepared the way for the later fashioning of Lucy Snowe—earlier named Lucy Frost—in *Villette*. As Charlotte explained in a letter to Smith Williams in 1852: “A cold name [Lucy] must have – partly – perhaps – on the ‘lucus a non lucendo’ – principle – partly on that of the ‘fitness of things’ – for she has about her an external coldness” (Barker 706, emphasis Brontë's). Likewise, the metaphorical marriage between the hotheaded Zamorna and the icy, austere Percy anticipates the later relationship between M. Paul and Lucy.

## Chapter Three

### The Origins and Signifiers of Demonic Behavior

*“Once the exploration of the unconscious has led the conscious mind to an experience of the archetype, the individual is confronted with the abysmal contradictions of human nature, and this confrontation in turn leads to the possibility of a direct experience of light and darkness, of Christ and the devil.”*  
*(C.G. Jung, Essential Jung 269)*

The demonization of the siblings’ archetypes gave Charlotte and Branwell access to a wealth of linking material associated with such imagery, accompanied by its varied and freighted meanings. Brother and sister drew from a virtual treasure house of mythological and scriptural iconography, as well as more contemporary sources, and they played with thematic devices found in works from Shakespeare and Milton to Byron and Hogg. They explored every facet of such resonant archetypal figures, investigating the misanthropic mind, the misogynist bent, the implications of the mark of Cain. As embodiments of the shadow self, Zamorna and Percy represent contrasting aspects of the dark temperament, twinned foils who personify fire and ice, posing respectively as messianic and atheistic. Like satyrs, they are frequently viewed as bestial, licentious and hirsute. At times, Zamorna, who is declared insane by his own press and parliament, sees himself as corrupted by his own hand—primitive and black, like those he seeks to annihilate. Both men exist in a state of constant unrest and turmoil, which, in turn, is mirrored in the continuous political uprisings and revolts plaguing the kingdom of Angria—the body politic reflecting the disturbances of the diseased minds of the heads of state.

As Charlotte comes to recognize that the monstrous, malignant, and mad Zamorna is intrinsically part of her own psyche, much of her work correspondingly becomes preoccupied with the disturbed mind. In her tales, she interrogates the sources of insanity, revealing her own apprehensions on the subject. The origins of deviant behavior are searched for and investigated throughout the juvenilia, her narrator busily reading the phrenologic signs down through the generations. Charlotte discloses in her fiction—as her father did in his marginalia in the family reference book on health and medicine—anxieties about the stability of her own mind, and those of her family. All the while, the

act of constant writing undoubtedly serves as a form of continual vigilance needed to keep the hellions at bay and the self concealed. A passage in one of Charlotte's retrospective tales describes a similar burden for Zamorna and Percy, once they open their men's club, implausibly named The Elysium:

That was one of the curses which this monument of their own guilt entailed upon them. It exacted a constant attendance, an incessant surveillance; neglect would have been followed by ruin; the bands of Hell were not so easily kept in subordination. There would have been fierce disputes, then a blow up, then an exposure, all laid open to the glaring light of day, a revelation which the matter would not bear any more than the human heart will bear a disclosure of all its secret thoughts and motives. (Four Years Ago 1837, Hatfield 4/87)

As with The Elysium, the juvenilia and Charlotte's very active imagination prove to need her constant management. Sally Shuttleworth points to the irony implicit in Charlotte's reversal of "the customary image of writing as the surveillance and exposure of others," commenting that the author, instead, was "enchained to her own creation, never able to cease surveillance in case the release of unruly meanings should lead to her exposure" (112). In the same manner in which Zamorna and Percy were "kept chained to the oar like galley slaves" (Hatfield 4/87), Charlotte was keeping continuous vigil over the shadow self, disguising and only obliquely alluding to it in private correspondence with Ellen Nussey.<sup>1</sup>

Predictably, in the act of suppressing her shadow, Charlotte becomes even more obsessed with it and the power it wielded over her everyday life, as Zamorna bursts forth in all his demonic splendor. Her realization of her shadow self elicits contradictory passions in Charlotte, which she continues to sublimate until they powerfully erupt in 1836, generating both a literal and figurative revolution in her mind. This psychic war is actualized in the juvenilia, instigating profound changes in both the author and in Angria, which will be discussed in Chapter Four. For now, we shall look at Charlotte's apprehensions about insanity, which are inscribed in the juvenilia, and her theological concerns, which were expressed in her letters to Ellen Nussey and illustrated in the vacillation of her archetype between self-deification and self-abnegation. Such fluctuations are characteristic of the inflation process and here appear to reflect

Charlotte's own doubts about her moral goodness. It is crucial to understand that Charlotte's concerns about her moral virtue would have been united with her theological beliefs. In coming to recognize that Zamorna embodied her own sublimated self, she undoubtedly would have seen herself as beyond redemption. God, too, would no longer find her worthy of salvation. At the same time, since contemporary belief held that insanity emanated from moral causes—particularly excessive, dissipated, and antisocial behavior—Charlotte may reasonably have wondered if acknowledging Zamorna as part of her intrinsic self meant admitting that she might be predisposed to insanity. Were she and her brother foreordained to be both doomed and damned? Had indulging themselves in this fantasy world prompted the emergence of their dark sides? And did she possess the free will and the spiritual belief to save herself from such alienation? Certainly her demonic archetype had the capacity to eclipse God in her mind. As she acquiesces to a form of idolatry of this shadow self, allowing herself to be ruled by her developing libido, she appears increasingly concerned about placing false idols before God. Constructing and worshipping a “mental King,” as she phrases it, to the exclusion of God, signified, in Charlotte's world, certain damnation. Such considerations so pervade the juvenilia of 1836, that it appears Charlotte's mind was singularly preoccupied with the subject of spiritual salvation and sanity during this critical year in her development, and these issues appear to have been crucially interrelated. For that reason, they are being treated together in this chapter.

We begin, then, to understand the significance of Warner Howard Warner's dictum that as long as Zamorna believes in a God, he is capable of being saved, meaning Zamorna's inflation of himself has not yet obliterated his view of God and God's hierarchical position in the spiritual realm. Charlotte needs to believe that she, too, is capable of salvation, that God will not turn his face from her, despite her increasing apostasy. Simultaneously, she seems to be questioning the existence of a higher being, using the atheistic Percy as a vehicle through which to interrogate such ideology. Throughout, Charlotte continues to search for the sources of derangement, deeply anxious that Zamorna—in his fluctuation between the pious and the impure—characterizes her own duality.

### **1. Sources of Insanity as a Literary Thematic Device**

In tracing the demonic modulation of two contrasting archetypes who alternately mirror and oppose one another, Charlotte examines the genesis of demonic behavior: where it originates, how it manifests itself, and where it ultimately leads. The issue never is fully resolved, however, instead looming as the unanswered question throughout her juvenilia: is demonic behavior learned or innate, embedded in schooling by satanic mentors, or inherited genetically from satanic parents? This inquisition illustrates Charlotte's ongoing preoccupations and unstated fears, which reflect the growing public sentiments during this era on the etiology of a deranged mind. Marilyn J. Kurata reports on this increasing public interest in the issue of insanity in Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia, observing that "Public interest in insanity reached epidemic proportions during the nineteenth century" (397). She then recapitulates the changes which took place with regard to the diagnosis and treatment of mental illness after 1755, following increased public awareness of the condition. Kurata attributes the rise of public madhouses, public revelations about the madness of King George III, and Thomas Arnold's 1782 book on the subject, as contributing factors to this enlarging interest. A flood of information ensued in the form of clinical studies, statistics and treatises, which led to legislative reform and parliamentary acts, reinforcing social fears on the subject. Much of this medical debate revolved around the sources of insanity, which were categorized as physical or moral in origin, instigated by genetic predisposition or physical exciting causes, and often a combination of both. Kurata lists among physical predisposing causes "hereditary madness" and "female gender," and among physical exciting causes "alcoholism" and "phases of the moon" (398). Moral predisposing causes

included dissipation, debauchery, and excesses of one kind or another. For example, both overindulgence and excessive asceticism could lead to madness. The Victorian public was warned about the especial dangers of gluttony and overindulgence in working, studying, and novel-reading. Moral exciting causes included nervous shocks, disappointments in love, rape, and masturbation. (Kurata 398)

According to Kurata, ‘moral insanity’ was a term coined by Dr. James Cowles Prichard in 1833, and meant “a perversion of the moral sense . . . characterized by antisocial behavior and a lack of self-control” (398). In time, this view changed, the Lunacy Act of 1845 acknowledging growing recognition that insanity was primarily a medical, rather than moral, problem. But during the period when Charlotte was coming of age and was fully immersed in her juvenilia, it was still widely assumed that insanity arose from moral causes. This accepted opinion certainly must have contributed to her despair over her spiritual worthiness and her resolution to exercise strict self-discipline and a strong sense of self-control for the rest of her life.<sup>2</sup>

Although Charlotte may have determined how moral insanity manifested itself and to where it led, she was still unsure of how one came to be predisposed to insanity. Both archetypes, as fashioned over time by Charlotte and Branwell, appear to have been destined to become demonic—either genetically or in their inclination to separate themselves from the general herd of mankind and follow their own passionate will. Such traits are fostered in these men by others with questionable motives, and by the time each archetype has reached his manhood, he has developed into a fully demonic being. Because Charlotte was largely concerned with character analysis, and because for a time she served as historian of the Angrian chronicles, she concentrated more fully on investigating the origins of such behavior than Branwell, who was more inclined to demonize characters without explanation. A number of Charlotte’s early tales indirectly assert the theory that insanity is hereditary. In “The Fresh Arrival” (1833), Charles witnesses the birth of Zamorna’s son, Ernest “Fitzarthur,” and initially feels that fatherhood will be redemptive for Zamorna, saying that when his brother gazes at his infant son, he bears “a smile of such unutterable fondness as I never saw beaming on his countenance either before or since” (CA 2.1:247). He adds, “It seemed as if the metamorphosis into a father had imparted to my brother some touch of human feeling” (CA 2.1:248). What Charles does not yet realize is that Zamorna has already fathered another son, Finic, who has inherited and provoked all of Zamorna’s fiendish traits. Unable to acknowledge that this first-born son embodies his own dark spirit or shadow self, Zamorna disinherits Finic on the basis that he bears no physical resemblance to himself, little realizing how accurately Finic personifies his unconscious self. Zamorna,

then, is not transformed by fatherhood but rather by the sight of his own self-image in this newborn son, who is named for him, underscoring the narcissism that is so central to the juvenilia. Ernest is looked upon with favor because of his fairness, while Finic is shunned for his darkness. But both sons reflect their father's double-sided nature, and Ernest's outward fairness will soon be belied by his genetically derived demonic predisposition. With his second sight, Charles soon perceives this fateful link between Zamorna and Ernest, the remarkable and "mysterious" (CA 2.1:248) resemblance between father and son, and in particular, the inherited eyes. He feels the child will closely follow his father's steps, becoming "a perfect copy of what my brother was in boyhood," with those early characteristics of a "vengeful, passionate and highly irritable" nature (CA 2.1:249). So despite Ernest's evident excellence at birth, Charles rues what the boy will become. The infant bears "in his spirit the fatal seeds of that pride and those bad passions which, inherited from his father and fostered by him in infancy, will e'er long when exposed to the corrupt atmosphere of our mighty city expand into vast and baleful Upas-trees" (CA 2.1:249). Finic, as the physical representation of Zamorna's shadow self, already embodies that corruption in his dark skin and his deformed, stunted frame.

Such mirroring between father and offspring develops into another major thematic device in Charlotte's later juvenilia, giving readers the opportunity to witness repetitive demonic behavior down through the generations, and leading us to believe the author saw it as a cyclical, if not inevitable process. Inherited demonism even becomes a topic of discussion between two of the Percy children in Charlotte's 1839 novella, Captain Henry Hastings. As offspring of Alexander Percy, William and Mary debate the issue of "Satanic parentage" (Gérin FN 228), weighing the possibilities of inheriting such a trait. William says that if he believed all male children born to him were to be devils, he would never marry (Gérin FN 227). He is convinced their father had the same notion, which is what prompted him to disown both sons at birth. As William deduces out loud: "in his hypochondria dread he must have concluded that he himself was not altogether human—but a something with a cross of the fiend in it—that's just the lunatic's idea[,] & he thinks his sons take after their Demon father—" (Gérin FN 228). Mary disagrees with this hypothesis, but is warned by her brother that her own sons may inherit such a

predilection, since they were sired by the demonic Zamorna. Through such literary devices, Charlotte is exploiting some then current beliefs about the nature of insanity, its genetic predisposition, and its moral implications. In her fictionalized portrait of the Duke of Wellington (which here seems to take on a Napoleonic cast), she hints at the seeds of such demonic behavior, which are handed down to Zamorna, and thence to his own male offspring. This continual repetitive cycle even begins to accelerate—demonic modulation recurring at an increasingly rapid pace in the tales—as if the author were impatient to illustrate these transformations in her characters. One of Zamorna’s sons, the Archduke Arthur Julius, Lord Almeida, is seemingly born demonic, possessing at birth all those characteristics inherent in both Zamorna and Percy, precociously evolving into a composite of the worst of both men. At the same time, these traits become more exaggerated with subsequent generations, Julius appearing even more sinister than his father: “It was strange to see the same proud mould of feature, the same loftiness of stature, the same haughtiness of mien, yet on Julius’s countenance there dwelt a more chilling expression of reserve” (“A Leaf from an Unopened Volume,” CA 2.1:368). Julius dies prematurely as a child, not long after his mother’s death, so his demonism may have manifested itself right from the start in order to present this aspect of his character before his demise. Charlotte may have intended to imply that demonism not only insinuates itself at increasingly younger stages, but also to suggest that without a conscience, one could not live long. In his short life, Julius shows no remorse for any of his wicked deeds, and exhibits little humanity, unlike his father, who increasingly displays a merciful tenderness toward others as he approaches old age. Zamorna’s remaining sons evince equally alarming gradations of demonic behavior, each upstart threatening to take center stage, perpetuating the satanic cycle sustained through continuous inter-marriage between the Wellesley and Percy clans.

Women are not immune to this genetic predisposition, either, although most remain impervious to becoming fully demonic themselves. A scene with his daughter, Mary, discloses the boiling temper residing beneath Percy’s calm, cool exterior, further emphasizing the inheritability of this temperament. In “The Spell,” Mary sneers like her father, and laughs scornfully when her “blood is up” (CA 2.2:176). When condescended to by another woman, she feels “all the Percy rise in my soul” (CA 2.2:179). She

becomes “the true image of her father” (CA 2.2:206). When crossed by Rosier, the family’s young servant: “there was absolute malignity in the bitterness and scorn of the look she flung on her presumptuous page” (CA 2.2: 206). With ever-greater frequency, Mary grows hotheaded, the volcanic Percy temper erupting to belie the family’s trademark inert, icy exterior. Marie-Louise von Franz theorizes in Shadow and Evil in Fairy Tales that hot anger, as opposed to cold evil, tends to be highly infectious and destroys families and nations alike (181). Von Franz speaks of this pernicious type of evil as being devastating, like a subterranean firestorm taking hold in the soul:

As soon as somebody gets emotional, it does not matter which side that person takes, the fire has taken hold and the situation is dangerous . . . Emotion gets the person from underneath. The affect gets him and objectiveness and the human attitude goes. [Once one’s sense of humor disappears] one can be sure that an emotional fire has caught one somewhere and then one is in danger of falling for the principle of evil.  
(von Franz 181-82)

This contagion might help explain the narrative belief in the hereditary aspect of the demonic principle, and may account, in part, for Charlotte’s decision to leave the collaborative partnership with her brother in 1837.

Percy and Zamorna are not the only characters in Charlotte’s juvenilia to undergo this demonic modulation.<sup>3</sup> In fact, any character exhibiting a hotheaded, vengeful or misanthropic nature, and bearing the mark of Cain—even for a passing moment—is a likely candidate. Those who seem immune to the process include Charles, despite his own gradual dissoluteness and fall from grace,<sup>4</sup> and William Percy, in spite of his occasional flashes of darkness. Both Charles and William, younger brothers to demonic types, have studied their siblings and are cognizant of the diagnostic signs, which may help them remain exempt from such corruption, much in the same way that Branwell functioned as a bellwether figure for Charlotte. More likely, however, Charlotte kept these characters from becoming fully tainted with the demonic curse because they alternately served as her narrators and public personae. Likewise, as mentioned, her heroines maintain immunity toward such contamination. Even Mary Percy’s brief displays of the famous Percy temperament and Zenobia’s momentary madness never fully consume them. In fact, all women, unless they are aberrantly masculine or

vampirish in behavior,<sup>5</sup> remain innocent bystanders to the demonic process, again perhaps revealing Charlotte's own wish to save herself from such demonic possession and to remain redeemable in God's eyes. Hence, in persistently characterizing her heroines as feckless martyrs, Charlotte may have been self-consciously granting herself double immunity. Constrained as they are—like Charlotte—by ideas of ladylike decorum, these women are generally characterized as hapless, feckless victims of the demonic process, not one of them—even the self-sacrificing Mina Laury—able to alter the course of events. Only sorceresses like Augusta di Segovia, a character invented by Branwell, are allowed to play fully demonic roles in this drama,<sup>6</sup> suffering hideous deaths as a consequence.

Percy's demonic behavior seems to have been fostered in part by Augusta, as well as S's death. Here Charlotte appears to be exploring the possibility that demonic behavior is learned, rather than inherited, while Branwell exploits this concept as a given, allowing him to populate his stories with characters who make sometimes inexplicable dark transformations, leaving such explanations up to Charlotte. We are told in a retrospective work ("The Duke of Zamorna") written by Charlotte in 1838 that Percy was reportedly a wild, sentimental and beautiful youth, who was schooled in his demonic ways as a "pupil" (SHB Misc. 354) to the satanic S's death. Percy claims S's death was his first love, securing a place in the heart usually reserved for one's first amorous encounter. Thus, S's death usurps the position which ought to be occupied by Percy's first wife, Augusta, a demonic figure in her own right. The moral perversion cultivated by S's death was subsequently fertilized by Augusta, a woman whom Charles compares with Clytemnestra, and who possesses an "almost masculine vigour" (SHB Misc. 373) and "vicious nature" (SHB Misc. 374). Calling herself Percy's "protectress," the older, imperious Augusta proceeds to corrupt the "young debauchee" (SHB Misc. 351), refining the dissipation fomented by S's death. Augusta dies a tormented death, her many vices and crimes coming to crowd "black by her dying bed" (SHB Misc. 374), causing her to shriek in horror and blasphemy before she expires.

Percy's second wife, the much-admired Maria Henrietta Wharton, proves to be Augusta's antithesis. Victimized and martyred by Percy, she, too, expires prematurely, but not before exhibiting "a high religious melancholy" wherein she contemplates

primarily the hereafter (SHB Misc. 359), in sharp contrast to Augusta's demise. This death, Charles later tells us, forever changed Percy's fate and "the destiny of Africa" (SHB Misc. 359). Percy grows disconsolate and embittered, his "life and motives utterly perverted . . . a torrent turned from its original channel" (SHB Misc. 359). For seventeen years, he gives himself up to extravagant vice, drowning his "recollection of that soft spirit which had once charmed him to alienation from his evil genius" (SHB Misc. 359). Having disowned his sons by Maria—a contributing factor to her demise—Percy now has been shunned by his own family, the demonic cycle playing itself out in endless circularity.

In the treatment of both archetypes, as we have seen, Charlotte has undertaken various investigations of the origins of insanity, yet without reaching any real resolution. Instead, several causes are explored and each seems as plausible as the next. At the same time, Charlotte was almost certainly seeking clues to such predilections toward mental illness in her own life and family.

## **2. Issues of Susceptibility to Insanity in Charlotte's Own Life**

Since so many of her tales revolve around issues of insanity, and the eventual outcome of a life lived without boundaries or self-restraint, it seems likely that Charlotte sensed these innate urges in herself or saw them manifested in her family and wondered what ramifications they might hold for her in her own life.<sup>7</sup> We do know that she suffered from plummeting self-esteem as she increasingly indulged herself in this world below, fearing the instability of her own mind and the salvation of her own soul. Concerns that she had gone beyond the point at which she could be saved periodically erupt in her correspondence with Ellen Nussey, particularly in the year 1836, when she so frequently confessed spiritual despair, possibly convinced the downward course was irreversible. Much of Charlotte's anxiety, as we have seen, is written into the text, as she pertinaciously searches for the causes of abnormal behavior as exhibited by her shadow self.

Allusions to Zamorna's incipient insanity commence with "The Spell" in 1834, and begin cropping up in subsequent stories with greater frequency, Zamorna displaying signs of dementia and monomania and, as we shall see, epilepsy. In "My Angria and the Angrians," which follows "The Spell," it is revealed that Zamorna suffers from convulsive fits.<sup>8</sup> Beside himself with anger, Zamorna falls into a bewitched state, and Charles describes the strange sight:

There he stood with the red firelight flashing over him, one foot advanced, his head proudly raised, his kindled eyes fixed on the opposite wall and filled with a most inspired glory. That tinge of insanity which certainly mingles with his blood was looking through their fierce dilated zones, as if it glared out at visions which itself had poured through the air.  
(CA 2.2:271)

The Duke also witnesses this paroxysm, remarking that his son looks like a possessed corpse or a real demon. Mary and a servant testify that Zamorna has been in this state before, particularly when troubled, sometimes by the specter of Lady Victorine, his first wife. Mary is convinced her husband has revelations at these times, and that during such moments, "his imagination is burning as a hot coal" (CA 2.2:272).<sup>9</sup> Zamorna admits he has been suffering from these episodes for some time, though his memory fails him during these fits and he cannot recall their frequency. When they come on, his will, he confesses, is not his own, embarrassing him deeply.<sup>10</sup>

Historically, much superstition surrounded the mysteries of epilepsy, popular belief for a long time holding with the assumption that those who suffered from convulsive or epileptic fits were insane or periodically possessed by the devil. Certainly, the will of the victim was seemingly surrendered to another's power during such episodes, and Charlotte undoubtedly recognized the irony implicit in Zamorna's involuntary relinquishment of his tenacious, domineering will. Losing one's self-control at a time when there was an increased emphasis on public self-restraint must have been an alarming concept for Charlotte, and her anxieties might have been fueled and heightened by witnessing her brother's frequent convulsive fits, which are invariably mentioned in biographies of Branwell. Daphne du Maurier reports in The Infernal World of Branwell Brontë, that an illness known at the time as "brain-fever" attacked Branwell without notice: "The boy was highly-strung and very excitable. When too enthusiastic he

seemed to reach a pitch of delight that was near to hysteria, and then as suddenly he would collapse, for no rhyme or reason, and there would be shivers and tears” (39). Winifred Gérin cites these nervous fits of Branwell, and alludes to the violence linked with them: “[Whether] Branwell manifested symptoms of an acute nervous instability before the death of Maria is not certain, but he was still very young when the incidence of his violent rages was first observed” (Gérin, *Branwell Brontë* 19). Katherine Frank, author of a more recent biography of Emily (*A Chainless Soul: A Life of Emily Brontë*), focuses on the impact Branwell’s episodes had on the rest of the family:

Yet there was a dark, frightening underside to Branwell’s personality. His exuberance, charm and good will could, at a moment’s notice, give way to raving anger and violence, culminating in uncontrollable fits. These may have been epileptic seizures, rather than emotional outbursts, but whatever their cause, they quite naturally terrified his family, with the result that his father and aunt and sisters all took pains not to excite or cross Branwell for fear of inadvertently sparking off a fit.<sup>11</sup> (Frank 102)

Undoubtedly, Charlotte felt deep apprehension about the physical origin and genetic nature of what she saw as fits of madness,<sup>12</sup> concerned that she, too, would develop what her father would see as a similar mental illness. Patrick, certainly, left behind much evidence to make known his own continuing concern with some of the symptoms of ill health manifested by his children:

His fascination with medical science, and with the inter-relations between the body and mind, went far beyond the bounds of professional duty, however, leading him to impose a rigorous regime on his entire family. Every symptom, whether of mental or physical ill-health, was closely scrutinized, and checked against the near-infallible word of his secular Bible, Graham’s *Domestic Medicine*, which was in turn then checked against the wisdom of other medical texts. Virtually every page of the Graham is covered with annotations, noting the success of remedies, disputing interpretations, and recording alternative theories from other medical experts. (Shuttleworth 27)

Shuttleworth maintains that the proliferation of marginalia produced by Patrick Brontë divulges an anxiety not just for the various afflictions of his children, but also for those he himself suffered, disclosing an underlying belief in the genetic nature of physical and mental illness. “Under ‘Causes of Insanity,’” remarks Shuttleworth, “the Reverend

Brontë carefully underlines *hereditary disposition*, thus unveiling the double layer of anxiety which lay behind his concerns with his own nervous complaints” (32). Along with those records he kept of his own ill health and that of Branwell, Patrick Brontë registered some of Charlotte’s disturbing symptoms in his much annotated volume of Graham’s. Among the family ailments Patrick listed in Graham’s Domestic Medicine, cited by Shuttleworth, was “Charlotte’s tic douloureux” (27). Shuttleworth parenthetically remarks that Patrick consulted other medical accounts as well, which “attributed the complaint less to physical than to mental causes, aligning it with hysteria and insanity. The medical term, Patrick notes, signifies a ‘convulsive fit’” (27). So Charlotte had reason to be anxious about the genetic nature of Branwell’s fits. Certainly she inherited Patrick’s apprehensions about ill health, which plagued her and her family. Most critics accede that hypochondria and hysteria, along with a persistent depression, would trouble Charlotte for most of her adult life, though she would work diligently to keep much of it from public view.

In the early decades of the nineteenth century, according to Shuttleworth, categories of insanity moved from previous social divisions—madness originally having been thought to affect only a hierarchically created ‘outcast’ group of sub-human species—to include all individuals, particularly women. Instead, such divisions came to designate an internal psychological divide:

The border to be policed was not so much between self and other, as between the conscious and unconscious self. If all individuals were liable to eruptions of insanity, the only visible sign one could cling to that one was not insane would be one’s capacity to exert self-control. Social conformity thus became an index of sanity; the only measure available to the individual fearful of his or her own normality would be a willing obedience to designated social roles. (Shuttleworth 35)

Charlotte, then, undoubtedly kept a public mask in place to conform to the expectations of the outside world. In the meantime, through her powers of reflection, introspection and steady self-discipline, she merely skirted the edges of serious emotional illness, all the while watching her brother—who possessed no such self-control—succumb to a life lived almost wholly within his imagination. The dangers of a hyperactive imagination had already been introduced and discussed in the juvenilia. When Zamorna’s convulsive

fits are discovered by his family, his wife, Mary, attributes them, as mentioned, to his overwrought imagination. Charlotte may have then thought that epileptic seizures were not only a by-product of an uncontrollable temper, but also of an imagination gone out of control, which itself posed special hazards.

Von Franz, in addition to speaking of anger as possibly leading to the principle of evil, also argues for the possibility that one might become possessed by one's unconscious proclivities as a consequence of physical, spiritual or mental loneliness, arguing that long periods of solitude encourage the imagination, which can then work for good or ill on the psyche:

You can say that loneliness invites the powers of the Beyond, either evil or good. The natural explanation would be that the amount of energy normally used in relating to one's surroundings is dammed back into oneself and activates the unconscious, loads up the unconscious part of the psyche, so that if for a long time one is alone, one's unconscious will come alive, and then you are caught for better or worse; either the devil will get you or you will find greater inner realization. (von Franz 150-51)

Socially, economically, and temperamentally sequestered in their Yorkshire home, brother and sister, in their early childhood, had kept one another company in a form of joint exile, retreating to a co-existence inside their shared fantasy world, yet not able to participate fully in either realm. Here, with the unconscious part of the psyche coming alive for them, both then became caught, "for better or worse." And both suffered for it, the Brontës' anxiety about inheritable insanity contributing to this sense of societal displacement.

Ironically, however, Charlotte's sojourns at Roe Head school may have assisted her in escaping from the perils of being fully consumed by an overheated imagination. The Brontë daughters were shipped off to school at early ages, while Branwell was kept at home to be educated by his father. As unhappy as those years away from the Haworth home were for Charlotte, first at Cowan Bridge,<sup>13</sup> and then at Roe Head, the experience may have saved her from succumbing to total possession by her shadow self. As a result of her numerous absences from the collaboration while attending and later teaching at Roe Head school, Charlotte possessed a certain detachment from this fabricated, gauzy world, which would give her a crucial perspective on both its appeal and its addictive

nature. In being forced to compartmentalize that imaginative part of her existence while at school, Charlotte indirectly rescued herself from becoming irretrievably entrapped by its enticements, though, as discussed later in this work, the struggle to resist losing her identity in this Angrian world was not without its price. Nor should it be thought that while at Roe Head, Charlotte was wholly objective or able to refrain from indulging in her fantasies. Her journal entries composed while she was employed as a teacher show that she was having difficulty separating the real world from the imaginary realm. Even earlier, as documented by Fannie Ratchford, Charlotte often secluded herself—in a form of self-exile—from her classmates, in order to retreat into her fantasies:

Her ‘otherworldliness’ and her tendency to withdraw herself from companionship were noted by those about her and discussed as ‘ill health,’ ‘despondency,’ and ‘irritability.’ Mary Taylor writes in a letter to Mrs Gaskell that Charlotte used to sit alone and ‘make out’ [meaning to indulge in fantasizing]. (Ratchford, Legends of Angria xxxi)

But even as a young girl, Charlotte indirectly saved herself through accepting those friendships proffered by both Mary Taylor and Ellen Nussey. Moreover, in maintaining those friendships long after her Roe Head days, Charlotte, unlike Branwell, managed to achieve a perspective about her position in the corporeal world and create a footing on solid ground to which she could retreat in times of great temptation.<sup>14</sup> Branwell, on the other hand, often found companionship in the local tavern; this only encouraged some of his intemperate habits and his tendency to act out.

From what she later wrote—both in correspondence and in fiction—we know that Charlotte felt such traits in her brother ought to have been eradicated, rather than indulged. Charlotte would depict the Branwellian temperament in the conclusion to her first novel, The Professor, describing the young Victor’s temper as “a kind of electrical ardour and power—which emits, now and then, ominous sparks” (The Professor 289). She then wrote: “I call it the leaven of the offending Adam, and consider that it should be, if not whipped out of [Victor], at least soundly disciplined; and that he will be cheap of any amount of either bodily or mental suffering which will ground him radically in the art of self-control” (The Professor 289). At the time of this writing, Branwell was still alive, though hardly thriving. Despite having published over twenty poems in regional

newspapers, most under the pseudonym of ‘Northangerland,’ and having completed the first installment of a three-part novel (“And the Weary are at Rest”), he told Joseph Leyland, in a letter thought to have been composed early in 1846, that he now viewed breaking the barriers of literary circles as a hopeless ambition. The exertions depressed him, he claims, and “make me disheartened and indifferent; for I cannot write what would be thrown, unread in to a library fire” (Smith 468). Branwell failed rapidly during the next two years, his dissolute habits exacerbated by opium and alcohol. Charlotte expresses her discouragement with Branwell, even her hopelessness about his fate, in letters to friends during this time.<sup>15</sup> While a certain resentment is evident in these letters, Charlotte no doubt sensed that she had been narrowly spared the same outcome. By this time, Charlotte fully recognized the dangers of an overheated imagination and immoderate behavior, having reined in her own tendencies in this direction. But it proved to be a lifelong struggle, despite having witnessed the haunting end of her brother’s life.

### **3. Theological Debates in the Juvenilia**

In addition to her apprehension about her mental health, Charlotte’s fears for her spiritual salvation became, for her, another overriding concern, one which, as previously explained, was in itself linked to issues of demonic possession and insanity. For several years, her desire to believe in a divine power greater than her own wrestled with the tendency toward skepticism to which she frequently fell prey. This spiritual debate is voiced in the juvenilia, the atheistic Percy<sup>16</sup> and the devout Zamorna embodying Charlotte’s confused and conflicting theological thinking—the continuous questioning of the value and validity of subscribing to an orthodox faith. Percy actualizes Charlotte’s doubts about the existence of a benevolent God ruling over an orderly universe, assuring to dutiful, conscientious souls the promise of a rewarding afterlife. He signifies for Charlotte the existentialist interrogation of one’s existence and personifies the demonic tendency to invalidate God’s actuality. At the opposite end of the spectrum, Zamorna represents Charlotte’s incarnate desire to believe in a higher, better—if not more moral—order, though this, too, is an ambivalent gesture. Zamorna’s gesticulative self-deification,

while it mimics God's hierarchical position, also usurps that higher authority, and occurs in direct proportion to Charlotte's crisis in faith and self-confidence. It remains entirely possible that she yet hoped to create in Zamorna a redeemable character—one not wholly reprobate, such as Percy or S's death—in order to save herself. Just as Charlotte created *Doppelgängers* and foils for her archetype, she also endowed Zamorna with a living, breathing conscience, with which she could then construct animated debates. Warner Howard Warner serves as just such a personification, not only representing Zamorna's conscience,<sup>17</sup> but also functioning as the voice of reason, morality and moderation in the juvenilia, just when the steady Fidenia falls away from his long-standing friendship with Zamorna. Warner also acquires the God-given gift of second sight just as Charles appears to lose it. Warner saw possible salvation for Zamorna, so long as he continued to believe in a higher being, and his caveat to Zamorna becomes Charlotte's own, as she moves increasingly toward embracing a forgiving God, despite the blasphemous challenges in the juvenilia to the existence of such a God. Hence, Warner's dictums become Charlotte's precepts.

Highly Christian in temperament, Warner continually cautions against taking vengeful retribution. In 1836, when Charlotte undergoes her religious crisis, Warner admonishes a group of men bent on retaliation against Percy, saying their talk exhibits a "most unchristian spirit" (Gérin FN 66). He points out how vengeance destroys the avenger, advising them to leave such acts to God:

This blood-thirsty conversation will do much more harm to yourselves than to the sinful & miserable man against whom it is directed. The Arbiter of Heaven punishes Northangerland's [Percy's] vices by his own mind. The blighted Traitor's thoughts are the continual scourge of his actions. (Passing Events, Gérin FN 66)

Warner instead instructs the men to take heed of what happens to such demonic types, using Percy as an example of a man tormented by a conscience he denies possessing: "It would become you[,] instead of anticipating revenge with the same kind of animal joy that your dogs feel when they are upon the traces of a deer: to take warning in silence from the unhappy criminal" (Gérin FN 66). Percy, as we already know, rarely lets others know of this inner torment. As an irreligious creature and an avowed atheist, Alexander

Percy claims he remains impervious to any qualms of conscience, saying if he ever had a conscience, “it has been long seared.” He adds, “Immortality finds no place in my creed, and death is with me but an abbreviated term for lasting sleep” (CA 2.1:177). Zamorna publicly pities Percy for such views, saying his arch-rival envisions mankind as involved in nothing more than “aimless ongoings—aimless indeed if there be no hereafter” (CA 2.2:308). However, Zamorna’s pity is a political ploy. He persistently uses Percy’s atheism for his own gain amongst his Christian subjects. But again, the rhetoric may reflect Charlotte’s own uncertainties about promised rewards for leading a pious, dutiful life, and probably mirrors the contrasting religious beliefs of both siblings, as Branwell becomes increasingly heretical, co-opting Percy’s heterodoxy for himself. In time, we find that Percy indeed possesses a conscience, but has merely hidden it well. In “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume,” Percy and Zamorna, as relatively old men, are described as conceding to one another virtuous past acts which demonstrate a humanity inherent in both men, though once again, each treats this aspect of his self differently. Percy assiduously keeps his virtue shrouded, while Zamorna attempts to make political capital of his, in order to curry favor with his subjects. In refraining from becoming as fully misanthropic as Percy, Zamorna avoids becoming as fully demonic as Percy, since a demonic demeanor often expresses a misanthropic disposition.

Both archetypes attempt to keep the agonies of their conscience from public view. Zamorna is shown to be a haunted man in “High Life in Verdopolis” (1834), suffering pangs of guilt over the demise of his wife, Marian. Sharing his torment with Warner, Zamorna says the specter of Marian’s ghost is almost too much to bear: “the idea of her spirit, which was so pure and sinless, being unable to rest burdens me more than I can express” (CA 2.2:59). He also feels remorse for the ill treatment of his first wife, Lady Victorine Gordon, and later, for that of his third wife, Mary. Mary’s death, utterly unanticipated by Zamorna or by Charlotte—since the death is effected by Branwell in late 1836 while she is at school—comes as a sudden blow, and Zamorna sounds like a prototypical Heathcliff in his response. Although Zamorna, like Percy, thinks he has mastered his conscience, ghosts persistently trouble him: “But long since I have learned the pangs to quell/Their memories brought, and now again, again,/Torture is wakened by reviving pain,” he confesses in “Zamorna’s Exile, Cantos I and II” (SHB Misc. 329).

Percy, too, morosely concedes that he has unwanted recollections of the past, and is bedeviled by the death of his wife, Maria. On this particular evening, described in “Corner Dishes: A Day Abroad,” Percy recalls a murder he once committed for which he was never caught. The memory adds to his general feeling that all men are idiots, averring his misanthropic sentiments. Percy harbors an “unutterable hatred of earth and its inhabitants” (CA 2.2:130), a natural outgrowth of the demonic mind which is rooted in self-hatred, but also appears to emanate from atheism.

The cyclical configuration of such a mind, then, originates from self-loathing, which is then projected on to others, transmuting itself into a form of misanthropy. This misanthropic sentiment helps harden the criminal mind, and in so doing, seemingly nullifies an active conscience. Finally, this hardening of the mind translates to an underlying sense of self-loathing, bringing the thought process full circle, and contributing to the creation of a dual personality or divided self. Charlotte allows us the occasional glimpse into each man to show that both individuals maintain some redeeming qualities, a conscience serving as a barometer of one’s basic humanity, but she also unwittingly reveals the torment occurring in her own mind—the cyclical movement it too was undergoing, as she questioned her own theological beliefs and confronted her own moral ambiguity and self-loathing. She could well have been describing not only her own torment, but also that of her brother. The pity Zamorna expresses for the atheistic Percy might have been Charlotte’s, as she became increasingly aware of Branwell’s devolution and resolved that his degeneration must not be her own.

The vacillating nature of the relationship between these arch-rivals decrees that the pair not only act in opposition, but also function as antithetical aspects of one another. While one’s star ascends, the other’s descends; but again, this perception is often deceptive. One such instance of coeval ascent and descent occurs in the story, “A Mingling of Many Things Compiled” from “The Scrap Book” (1834-35). Zamorna, now King of Angria, rules a distrustful anti-aristocratic populace, and is forced to justify his every political move to his subjects, and to bolster his sagging popularity (a situation which incidentally parallels the decline of the aristocratic class in England). He does so by deifying himself and demonizing his arch-rival. Percy has been interfering in state matters from his place of self-exile, prompting his own political star to rise steadily

amidst such democratized times. Percy plans a well-timed re-entry into Angrian politics with a rare Parliamentary appearance. Hence, Zamorna discovers he is faced with the task of defending his own patriotism, which comes under attack, and preventing a possible *coup d'état*. He promises to take Angria to new heights, even pledging to sacrifice his only son, Ernest, “now in his unripe childhood, on the altar of Angrian supremacy” (CA 2.2:301). Cloaking himself in the image of Abraham—the first of the great Old Testament patriarchs, founder of the Hebrew nations, and father of Isaac, whom God ordered to be sacrificed—Zamorna elevates and canonizes himself in preparation for his next move. In comparing Percy to Satan, Zamorna characterizes his arch-rival as “a deadly dangerous man whose gigantic genius, if united with virtue, might have made him the benefactor of his kind” (CA 2.2:302). Like God, Zamorna cannot do without Percy’s talents; he must conduct business with the devil to achieve his own ends, hazarding “the evils his wickedness might possibly accomplish in order to secure the success his abilities were certain to achieve” (CA 2.2:305). In a sanctimonious gesture, Zamorna then seeks strength from above, drawing an obvious distinction between himself and the atheistic Percy. He urges his countrymen to tolerate Percy’s sins and endure individual wrongs for the sake of his much-needed talents, “and trust that this suffering shall work out for you a far more exceeding and eternal good” (CA 2.2:307). Thus, Zamorna is manipulating public sentiment to serve his own ends.

Zamorna is taking a distinctly Goethian theological stance here, recalling the debate between the Lord and Mephistopheles, which takes place in “The Prologue in Heaven” in Part One of *Faust*.<sup>18</sup> The passage also provides an interesting analogue to the Blakean devil who, in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, embodies man’s creative energies, an active opposing force working for the good of mankind. Blake argues that without contraries such as attraction and repulsion, reason and energy, love and hate, there can be no progression. Human thought and life need the stimulus of active opposing forces to give them creative movement. Blake maintains the history of such thought is written in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, and Satan’s speech found in Book One of Milton’s epic verse is evoked in Zamorna’s speech as well.<sup>19</sup> Recognizing the political necessity to have Percy working with him, rather than against him, Zamorna cautions his constituents to keep in mind both the good and evil aspects of the man. Zamorna consistently

introduces black and white configurations here, playing one against the other for political gain. He also may be privately rationalizing his continuing relationship with Percy. Moreover, he might be conceding to himself his own duality. As Jung argues, the self is manifested through “the Christian tension of opposites” (Essential Jung 273): “The Self is a union of opposites *par excellence*” and the self is “absolutely paradoxical in that it represents in every respect thesis and antithesis, and at the same time synthesis” (Essential Jung 269). Hence, it seems plausible that Charlotte was beginning to acknowledge these polarities residing within her own psyche.

In pitting her shadow self against Branwell’s, not only was Charlotte comparing and contrasting dark sides for their degrees of iniquity, but she was also considering Zamorna’s role in her own life, coming to terms with her shadow, learning how to accept and incorporate it within her conscious self. The debates contained within these Parliamentary speeches, therefore, can be seen to be wholly self-referential, Charlotte reasoning with her dark side, sublimating it to work for her own purposes. Through this process, she continued to learn about herself and to seek a self-acceptance within that self-knowledge. At the same time, she was comparing herself to her brother, as he became more deeply engaged with his own shadow. Zamorna’s parliamentary debate about Percy’s usefulness might reflect Charlotte’s rationalization over a continuing collaboration with an increasingly disturbed sibling. By using Percy/Branwell as a darker foil, she portrays Zamorna/herself in a more benevolent light. As well, in endowing her archetype with glamorizing accessories, Charlotte makes her shadow more palatable and acceptable in her eyes. In the act, she begins the process of adopting her own dark side, rendering it tolerable enough so she can eventually embrace these less savory aspects of herself. When Warner Howard Warner says that Zamorna can yet be saved because of his belief in God, Charlotte is expressing her own hope that she also remains redeemable, spiritually worthy in spite of her dark impulses, since religious belief was absolutely essential for a sense of being morally worthy. By recalling God’s debate in “The Prologue in Heaven,” she recalls for us and possibly imagines for herself the manner in which God resolved the moral issue of working with an active force of opposition, attempting to find a new code of behavior for herself. This new concept of God incarnated a deity composed of the same duality Charlotte was confronting in herself, and

she appears to view it with much ambivalence. Her religious beliefs, then, were coming under a form of critical interrogation—marking the beginning of a lifetime of such questioning of theological dogma—as seen in all of her adult work, particularly in her last full-length novel, *Villette*.

#### **4. Charlotte's "Spiritual Crisis"**

As Sally Shuttleworth remarks, “only the ever-vigilant maintenance of self-control demarcated the boundaries of insanity,” particularly for nineteenth-century women (35). By giving supremacy to reason, and sublimating one’s passion, one could keep within the bounds of sanity and socially acceptable behavior. Thus one projected this passionate, rebellious, ungovernable nature, rather than claim it as one’s own, and thereby exerted control over that part of one’s character. Elaine Showalter makes much the same case for female novelists of the nineteenth century when she argues that “the conventions of the novel and of womanhood made it all but impossible for the heroines to exhibit sexuality and power, [thus] feminine novelists projected these aspects of themselves on their heroes” (143), often writing under male pseudonyms for this same reason.<sup>20</sup> Although Showalter is discussing Emily Brontë among others here, not Charlotte, the critic sees the “descendants of Rochester as representing the passionate and angry qualities in their creators”(143), and these heroes as the female novelists’ “projected egos” (136). Charlotte makes use of Zamorna in this same manner, projecting her anger and passion on to him, having him operate as a means through which she could express her rebellious, passionate side, her wish for self-empowerment, and her desire to act on her libidinous impulses. At the same time, Zamorna voices Charlotte’s own concerns for self-control, as well as her inability to measure up to the pious Ellen Nussey. He concedes that he falls short in his self-estimation when comparing himself to his best friend, the virtuous John Fidenza. Zamorna claims Fidenza stands morally above the order of most men and possesses a quality that he, like Charlotte, finds elusive:

Since the greatest man is he who has the strongest control over his rebellious passions, who can best separate his mortal from his immortal

part, his corruptible body from his incorruptible spirit . . . and keep a more exalted order of feeling than belonged to him by nature. Such a man is higher than humanity.

(“From the Verdopolitan Intelligencer” 1835, CA 2.2:373-74)

Presumably concerned with Zamorna’s growing darkness, Charlotte kept investing him with such insights, while inflating him with god-like properties and self-mandated powers. By enlarging and heightening Zamorna’s persona, however, she unwittingly intensifies her own susceptibility and attraction to him, inventing an idealized fetish for which she came to feel a form of apostolic worship. Dangerously conflating religiosity with eroticism during this period, she, like the devoted acolyte Mina Laury, mistakenly views her love for Zamorna as a means to her salvation.<sup>21</sup>

By 1836, though, Charlotte was beginning to realize that such idolatry was leading her instead to theological damnation. Charlotte recognized that she could not subscribe to strict Calvinist doctrine, and knew such tenets would have undoubtedly already listed her among the condemned. This predicament led to her deep despair, her Calvinist paroxysms of conscience, and her fears for her spiritual worthiness. As she wrote to Ellen in May of that year, confessing her diminishing sense of self-esteem:

Don’t deceive yourself by imagining that I have a bit of real goodness about me. My Darling if I were like you I should have my face Zion-ward though prejudice and error might occasionally fling a mist over the glorious vision before me. for with all your single hearted sincerity you have your faults. but I am not like you. If you knew my thoughts; the dreams that absorb me; and the fiery imagination that at times eats me up and makes me feel Society as it is, wretchedly insipid you would pity and I dare say despise me. But Ellen I know the treasures of the Bible I love and adore them. I can see the Well of Life in all its clearness and brightness; but when I stoop down to drink of the pure waters they fly from my lips as if I were Tantalus. I have written like a fool.

(Smith 143-44, emphasis Brontë’s)

Other letters to Ellen during this time disclose more of Charlotte’s distress and severe self-disparagement, though she was necessarily elliptical in expressing the reasons for this state of mind to her friend. In October, she again compares herself unfavorably to Ellen, writing, “It is from religion that you derive your chief charm and may its influence always preserve you as pure, as unassuming and as benevolent in thought and deed as

you are now. What am I compared to you I feel my own utter worthlessness when I make the comparison. I'm a very coarse common-place wretch!" (Smith 153). A few months later, in December, Charlotte cautions Ellen: "I am not good enough for you, and you must be kept from the contamination of too intimate society" (Smith 159). Again, in that same month, Charlotte openly expresses her doubts about her own salvation:

I know not how to pray—I cannot bend my life to the grand end of doing good I go on constantly seeking my own pleasure pursuing the Gratification of my own desires, I forget God and will not God forget me? And meantime I know the Greatness of Jehovah I acknowledge the truth the perfection of his word, I adore the purity of the Christian faith, my theory is right, my Practice—horribly wrong. (Smith 156)

These same sentiments are echoed in the juvenilia of that period, Warner Howard Warner haunted by his "certain knowledge" that Zamorna's fate was preordained ("Long before the foundations of the world were laid you were numbered with the everlastingly condemned, all your thoughts & your words[,] the whole bent of your mind[,] prove it" Gérin FN 68). Warner, too, is fearful that Zamorna has worn out God's patience: "God will veil his face from you for-ever—remember[,] men may so tempt the Holy Spirit that it will finally leave us" (Gérin FN 68). It was this Calvinist doctrine with which Charlotte was mentally wrestling, rebelling against its narrow and repressive dictates, while at the same time condemning herself for not being able to conform to its tenets as admirably as Ellen. Two additional letters to her friend, composed in the fall of 1836 and sounding like religious confessions, further illustrate Charlotte's apprehension and moral conflict. She pleads with Ellen to be tolerant of her intractable habits:

I keep trying to do right, checking wrong feelings, repressing wrong thoughts—but still—every instant I find—myself going astray—I have a constant tendency to scorn people who are far better than I am—A horror at the i[dea] of becoming one of a certain set—a dread lest if I made the slightest profession, I should sink at once into Phariseeism, merge wholly into the ranks of the self-righteous. In writing at this moment I feel an irksome disgust at the idea of using a single phrase that sounds like religious cant—I abhor myself—I despise myself—if the Doctrine of Calvin be true I am already an outcast—You cannot imagine how hard rebellious and intractable all my feelings are—When I begin to study on the subject I almost grow blasphemous, atheistical in my sentiments, don't desert me—don't be horrified at me, you know what I am— (Smith 154)

The second missive, written not long afterward, discloses the guilt and anguish Charlotte was experiencing over this self-conflict:

I hope, I trust, I might one day become better, far better, than my evil wandering thoughts, my corrupt heart, cold to the spirit, and warm to the flesh will now permit me to be. I often plan the pleasant life which we might lead together, strengthening each other in that power of self-denial, that hallowed and glowing devotion, which the first Saints of God often attained to—My eyes fill with tears when I contrast the bliss of such a state brightened by hopes of the future with the melancholy state I now live in, uncertain that I have ever felt true contrition, wandering in thought and deed, longing for holiness which I shall never, never obtain—smitten at times to the heart with the conviction that [?] your Ghastly Calvinistic doctrines are true<sup>22</sup>—darkened in short by the very shadows of Spiritual Death! If Christian perfection be necessary to Salvation I shall never be saved, my heart is a real hot-bed for sinful thoughts and as to practice when I decide on an action I scarcely remember to look to my Redeemer for direction. (Smith 156, emphasis Brontë's)

Juliet Barker remarks that as a result of this prolonged spiritual crisis, Charlotte, like her sister Anne, ended up doubting the prospect of her own salvation, and this uncertainty further eroded her self-worth (283), making her feel like a religious outcast, recalling the cyclical demonic configuration found in the juvenilia.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, as Barbara Hannah points out, “very often when people begin to learn that they are not so harmless and well-meaning as they have always naively assumed, they go much too far in attributing negative qualities to themselves, even to the extent of identifying with the Devil himself” (269). Barker contends that Ellen Nussey aided and abetted this crisis through her own piety, which the biographer reads as “an unusually masochistic turn of mind” (283), providing an unattainable and unrealistic ideal for Charlotte. Nonetheless, for a number of years, Charlotte used Ellen as a gauge by which to measure her spiritual unworthiness, repeatedly and compulsively returning to the subject and indulging in these outbreaks of self-flagellation.

In fusing her erotic fantasies with scriptural tropes, and thereby deifying her shadow self, Charlotte grants Zamorna a place of supremacy in her mind. She appears aware of this, crediting Zamorna in her verse of 1836 with being her divine muse or prime mover:

And he has been a mental King.  
 That ruled my thoughts right regally  
 And he has given me a <steady> spring  
 To what I had of poetry . . .  
 He's not the temple but the god  
 The idol in his marble shrine  
 Our grand dream is his wide abode  
 And there for me he dwells divine  
 (from Charlotte's poem dated 1836, known as "But once again, but once  
 again," Neufeldt PCB 187-88)

At the same time, Charlotte undoubtedly recognized that giving Zamorna this position of supremacy would have been considered a profane and punishable act, since she was creating a false idol. These concerns are conveyed to Ellen the following year, Charlotte wondering if earthly love for another could impede the spiritual love she might receive from God. Disheartened by the distance separating her from Ellen, Charlotte writes: "Why are we to be divided? Surely, Ellen, it must be because we are in danger of loving each other too well; of losing sight of the Creator in idolatry of the creature" (Smith 164, emphasis Brontë's).<sup>24</sup> Christine Alexander, among others, reads a profound despair in the works of this time.<sup>25</sup> Victor Neufeldt perceives that Charlotte had become keenly aware "that she was ensnared in a web of idolatry," which brought her "to the brink of apostasy, and so shattered her, that she was finally unable to find consolation in either imagination or religion," the "conflict between duty and dream (God and Zamorna)" growing intensely acute, if not grossly conflated ("The Idolatrous Web: Charlotte Brontë's Crisis of Conscience" 1, 2, 7). Neufeldt points to a *quid pro quo* equation at work here. While appropriating the God-like function of Creator in giving her creations life, Charlotte proceeds to step down from her role as Genie/creator to worship these creations of hers as gods ("The Idolatrous Web" 15-16). Having given birth to an aspect of herself, then, which she comes to idolize, Charlotte advances full circle in her poetry of this period, suggesting that the creature has created his creator, fashioning a hermeneutic cycle of creation—idolatry—creation. Zamorna becomes the "Prime Mover" of Charlotte's juvenilia (Neufeldt, "The Idolatrous Web" 17), as well as the impetus in the re-invention of herself. Hence, Charlotte recognizes that she has been propelled by her shadow self, for good or ill. Neutralizing this demon-muse would invalidate her own creative impetus,

or annihilate her muse, and no doubt this act contributed to her despair. But Charlotte's despondency also had to have been aggravated by the thought that her idolatry might have caused her true savior, God, to turn his face from her, prompting a sense of hopelessness, possibly even fears of madness at the prospect of her eternal damnation.

As mentioned, Charlotte's dilemma created a life-long debate in her mind, one that did not end with those theological interrogations undertaken in her letters to Ellen Nussey. Very possibly, a secret sense of damnation remained with Charlotte for years, causing her to feel like a religious outcast. *Villette* imparts a profound yearning by the author to embrace the more seductive aspects of religious ritual, to be reclaimed as a lost sinner, while it discloses her deep ambivalence about the Church. Charlotte's public views on Catholicism are well known. She not only made those thoughts manifest in the juvenilia, and later in *Villette*, but also in private conversation. As she said about Catholics to Harriet Martineau in 1851, "Their good deeds I don't dispute; but I regard them as the hectic bloom on the cheek of disease. I believe the Catholics, in short, to be always doing evil that good may come, or doing good that evil may come" (Martineau 2:65). This remark, while appearing to be critical of Catholicism, might well reflect the manner in which Charlotte earlier determined to integrate her dark side, hoping good would come from the act. She might even have viewed those years when she confronted her shadow as 'diseased,' or mad in some way, and this self-evaluation may have created in her a secret affinity with the Church. Catholicism acknowledges this dark side in people, and encourages its own forms of idolatry. In short, the Church extended a means by which Charlotte could yet be saved. Hence, the Catholic faith, like the theater, held for her the same antithetical appeal she found in the polarities of her shadow self, though she continued to criticize publicly both institutions in spite of the strong hold each exerted over her.

Throughout the juvenilia, numerous characters voice Charlotte's equivocal attitude toward the Catholic Church. In "The Spell," both Zamorna and his son, Ernest, resist the efforts of Lady Victorine Gordon (here called Inez Emily Wellesley) to convert them. Ernest instinctively shuns his mother not only because his father has advised him to remain emotionally independent of women (CA 2.2:178), but also because he senses that his mother possesses threatening powers of an even more potent kind. While she is

observing religious rituals, Ernest remarks: “I should not like to be a Roman Catholic and papa says I am not to be” (CA 2.2:213). In this tale, Inez appears as a resurrected ghostly image of the remote, self-sacrificing, morally superior martyr, the supreme mother-nun, a seductive image for both men. Charlotte will use such imagery again in *Villette*, though in this later work, the ghostly nun proves to be a ludicrous masquerade, an empty, deflated icon. Even in these early writings, however, while Charlotte was constructing idols of the Catholic faith, she was simultaneously de-constructing them. In “The Spell,” Inez is compared with that archetypal Catholic, Mary, Queen of Scots, to illustrate her treachery. In an unfinished poem (known as “The Lament”) composed that same year, 1834, Charlotte refers to Maria Stuart as an “accursed woman” and a “fiend,” possessing as an “eternal soul a venomed worm” (CA 2.2:326). Stuart—a vampirish woman, monstrous in her appetites—is “most dazzling in her crimes” as well as “seductive in her treachery,” having “kissed her lord to death/And possessed him with kindness’ breath” (CA 2.2:326). This verse graphically illuminates how the Church seemed to Charlotte at once odious and fascinating.

Young Ernest is less ambivalent in his reaction, harboring a special antipathy toward the act of confession, the implication being that in confessing, one surrenders power to a higher authority. Even in 1834, Charlotte instinctively knew implicit hazards existed for her in the acts of worship and confession. As Shuttleworth remarks,

Confession, which for men was merely a threat to virile self-containment, becomes for women the inevitable prelude to sexual fall. To enter into the hidden secrets of another is to rob them of control: knowledge becomes absolute power. (Shuttleworth 41)

Charlotte remained wary of a force that threatened to suck the very marrow out of her spirit,<sup>26</sup> as cannibalistic in its systemic methodology as Mary, Queen of Scots, was in her behavior with her consorts. Like those consorts to the queen, Charlotte perceives the Church to be “seductive in [its] treachery.” A.S. Byatt and Ignês Sodr  consider the role the Catholic Church plays in *Villette* and the enticements the Church offers the reticent protagonist. Byatt observes that confession confers on to Lucy Snowe a much-needed voice:

A structure within which there would have been room for her to speak.  
Whereas her Protestantism is a completely suppressed religious structure  
in which all she can do is keep silent and be respectable.  
(Byatt and Sodr  59)

The opportunity to speak goes beyond the act of confession and becomes therapy, adds Sodr : “The reader identifies with Lucy’s need for somebody who will listen (it is not really a ‘confession’), the need not to be alone with her madness” (59). However, the ambivalent treatment the Church receives in the novel becomes a mitigating factor, interfering with Lucy’s full embrace of such a talking cure. “Catholicism is identified with an atmosphere of creeping and spying,” claims Byatt (59). In Lucy’s mind, as in Charlotte’s, Catholicism functions by gaining power over its adherents through the amassing of knowledge about them, primarily through the act of confession. Hence, Lucy Snowe’s general equivocacy about the Church and Ernest’s dislike of confession express Charlotte’s own need to keep the self intact, despite the enticement to possess a voice and speak. Nonetheless, Charlotte, like Lucy Snowe, once sought sanctuary and redemption in the act of confession, illustrating again the love-hate relationship she shared with Catholicism. While in Brussels in 1843, she engaged in confession in one of the city’s churches, later telling Emily about the experience in a letter, dated September 2, 1843:

An odd whim came into my head . . . I felt as if I did not care what I did, provided it was not absolutely wrong, and that it served to vary my life and yield a moment’s interest. I took a fancy to change myself into a Catholic and go and make a real confession to see what it was like. Knowing me as you do, you will think this odd, but when people are by themselves they have singular fancies. (Smith 329)

Charlotte’s admission shows the degree of attraction she felt for the Church’s rituals, but it also communicates the theatricality of the act, as if, like an actress in a drama, Charlotte donned other clothes and a different identity for a while to “see what it was like.” Thus, she equates it with harmless play-acting, though she ought, by then, to have been aware of the risks involved with such game-playing. After all, the juvenilia had begun in the same way, through seemingly game-playing and harmless acting out with her siblings.

Sensing the hold the Church had on her, Charlotte later took a very strong, outspoken stand against Catholicism. In remarking on Charlotte’s divided sentiments,

Lyndall Gordon explains her contradictory stance in part by placing it in its historical context:

Eighteen-fifty was the year of the so-called ‘papal aggression’, when the Pope’s establishment of territorial bishoprics in England, and his appointment of Wiseman as Archbishop, led to fierce anti-Catholic outbursts in which Charlotte participated with an intolerance which may have derived, in part, from fear of her own susceptibility. (Gordon 226)

Juliet Barker makes a similar deduction about Charlotte’s anti-Catholic sentiments of this time: “Charlotte’s loathing of Catholicism, which had been deepened by her own susceptibility to it in Brussels, was fanned to a white heat by these events” (662).

Following a lecture of Cardinal Wiseman’s in London, which she attended in June of 1851, Charlotte describes the Cardinal’s appearance to her father, reporting that he was a “big portly man” dressed in scarlet and black, possessing a “quadruple” chin and “a very large mouth with oily lips,” connoting an Epicurean of eminent proportions who no doubt indulged in a “good dinner with a bottle of wine after it” (SHB LL 3:248-49). Charlotte is especially damning in her portrayal of Wiseman’s entrance into the room and the audience’s reaction to his presence:

He came swimming into the room smiling, simpering, and bowing like a fat old lady, and sat down very demure in his chair, and looked the picture of a sleek hypocrite . . . The Cardinal spoke in a smooth whining manner, just like a canting Methodist preacher. The audience seemed to look up to him as a god. (SHB LL 3:249)

Barker thinks it surprising that, given Charlotte’s reaction, she later attended a confirmation presided over by Wiseman, though this gesture may be illustrative of Charlotte’s ambivalence toward both the Church and theater at that point in her life. While she sounds derisively dismissive of the theatricality of the event, we know what attraction the stage continued to have for Charlotte. The fact that her description of Wiseman is delivered in the same breath as a dramatic account of the actress, Rachel, in another letter to Ellen Nussey, informs us how enthralled Charlotte was with her weekend of satanic sights, and shows us that she was still struggling with such temptations:

On Saturday I went to hear and see Rachel—a wonderful sight—‘terrible as if the earth had cracked deep at your feet and revealed a glimpse of hell’—I shall never forget it—she made me shudder to the marrow of my bones: in her some fiend has certainly taken up an incarnate home. She is not a woman—she is a snake—she is the ----- . On Sunday I went to the Spanish Ambassador’s Chapel—where Cardinal Wiseman in his Archiepiscopal robes and mitre held a Confirmation—The whole scene was impiously theatrical. (SHB LL 3:251)

The parallels between the pious and impious are unmistakable here, Charlotte’s pivotal weekend providing continuous theater. She later tells a correspondent that Rachel was a point of attraction she will never forget, and one which will haunt her in future sleepless nights. Rather than feel repelled by such sights, then, Charlotte exhibits an appetite for them, saying if she could tolerate “the high mental stimulus” for long, she “would go every night for three months to watch and study its manifestations” (SHB LL 3:253). Even at this late stage in her life, Charlotte finds the demonic alluring, despite the lessons she has learned in the past about the seductiveness of the shadow. She will continue to write about such figures, Rachel playing a significant role as the actress Vashti in Villette. Wiseman, too, with his “bevy of inferior priests,” who are described as “very dark-looking and sinister men” (SHB LL 3:248-49), prove to be both a reanimation of Alexander Percy and his retinue and an anticipation of the sinister Catholic schemers in Villette, though in this work, Charlotte has toned down the caricature. In a letter to her father, however, she tars the real-life villain as darkly unctuous and repellant, as if to distance herself from him and all he represents, though by now we understand the inexorable pull Charlotte felt toward whatever she pointedly tried to place at some remove from herself. Then, too, she was telling Patrick what, undoubtedly, she knew he wanted to hear, fulfilling the role of dutiful daughter.<sup>27</sup>

As with her more forthright later missives about her encounters with the Church, the letters Charlotte composes to Ellen Nussey in 1836 sound like little confessionals in themselves. Her periodic outbursts in these letters to Ellen about the contamination of her soul allow us to see the struggles taking place that year within Charlotte’s psyche, the temptations which preyed upon her and which she continually resisted. When Charlotte projects herself on to the figure of Mina Laury, particularly in the 1836 novella, Passing Events, we can appreciate the depth of her libidinous attraction to the dark hero with the

demonic qualities, and how she remained forcefully subjugated and entrapped by her shadow in a game of dominance and submission. Charlotte's efforts to detach herself from what had become a false idol obviously contributed to her religious skepticism and her later attraction to the Catholic Church. Certainly her increasing awareness of "the ideological distinction between male self-control and female powerlessness" (Shuttleworth 87) is expressed in the characterization of the asymmetrical relationship shared by Zamorna and Mina. In time Charlotte would recognize her own complicity in that paradigm and consciously attempt to turn that equation around, creating female role models who refuse to capitulate to such hierarchical couplings which rendered a woman powerless. In allowing herself for a time to be possessed by her shadow, she became aware of those suppressed qualities contained within herself: her sexual energy, her pride, and the anger she felt about her constricted place as a woman in the early half of the nineteenth century. Ultimately Charlotte recognized this intrinsic part of herself had to be assimilated, not annihilated, leading to her taking ownership of the shadow, allowing her animus to emerge. This, in turn, released those suppressed energies and that anger, which then freed her to start healing through the individuation process. Until that occurred, however, Charlotte would suffer through a tumultuous period when she felt her susceptibility to the demonic impulse had forever damned her spiritually. For a time, this drove her to the brink of madness. The experience was deeply humbling and would leave its mark—like that of Cain—on not just her, but all of her future writing.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Charlotte may have hinted at the emergence of her shadow self in her correspondence with Mary Taylor, but those letters from Charlotte were destroyed by Taylor. Only Charlotte's correspondence with Ellen Nussey, which is not believed to be complete, survives.

<sup>2</sup> Charlotte would later use the theme of moral insanity in *Jane Eyre* with the character of Bertha Mason Rochester. Rochester tells Jane, following her discovery of Bertha's existence, that his wife's madness was generated by excess. He calls Bertha's nature "intemperate and unchaste," as well as "gross, impure, depraved," saying doctors discovered that she was mad, and that "her excesses had prematurely developed the germs of insanity" (*Jane Eyre*, Oxford ed. 310-11).

<sup>3</sup> Henry Hastings, said by many critics to be a caricature of Branwell, is one such example. Colonel Hartford, and Edward Percy are others. None are as fully realized as Zamorna and Percy, and none show the kind of satanic charm exuded by this pair of archetypes.

<sup>4</sup> A fall from grace is not to be equated with a demonic modulation. On the contrary, a fall from grace, or the undergoing of a public disgrace, is often treated as a rite of passage from which the subject, as well as the onlookers, learn lessons about behavior and self-control.

<sup>5</sup> Augusta di Segovia is persistently characterized as mannish, or at least unsexed, and Inez Emily Wellesley/Lady Helen Victorine Gordon is depicted at various times as vampirish, particularly in her Roman Catholicism, preying on the souls of men. Both are first wives of Percy and Zamorna, respectively, though later, in *Four Years Ago*, Percy contests the legitimacy of Zamorna's marriage, calling it a "sham" (CA 2.2:340n134).

<sup>6</sup> Although all this is alluded to in Charlotte's juvenilia, it is much more specifically detailed in Branwell's early writings, particularly the lengthy history of Alexander Percy he composed in 1835 ("The Life of Feild [sic] Marshal the Right Honourable Alexander Percy"). Augusta di Segovia operates against the early nineteenth-century belief that women were not likely to be demonic.

<sup>7</sup> Barbara Hannah seems to feel that writing was Charlotte's salvation, saving her from insanity: "Writing was her only way of dealing with the strange phenomena that appeared from the unconscious, phenomena which might easily have led to insanity had she been without a creative medium to lend them form" (116).

<sup>8</sup> This tale ends on an ominous note, Charles announcing the birth of Zamorna's twin boys immediately following one of these fits of Zamorna's. In juxtaposing the birth announcement with the disclosure of Zamorna's malady, Charlotte subtly suggests that the twins are destined to inherit these same disorders of the mind (as they were then considered), while at the same time metonymically illustrating the divided nature of her suffering hero by producing twin demons who will always be at odds with each other.

---

<sup>9</sup> Christine Alexander notes here that Byron also suffered from convulsive fits (CA 2.2:273n92).

<sup>10</sup> In a letter addressed to the Marquis of Ardrah, Zamorna makes a public admission about these attacks of his. Though he disputes claims made about his insanity, he concedes that if he has ever suffered insane moments, it has been when he has been overwhelmed with anger, confessing that at such times his mind has “sometimes lost its balance” and he has suffered a whirling brain and boiling blood (“Letter to the right honourable Arthur . . . Marquis of Ardrah” 1834, CA 2.2:321).

<sup>11</sup> Later, Emily makes the same connection between anger and seizures in Wuthering Heights, writing that “serious threats of a fit . . . often attended Catherine’s rages” and as a result, she was overindulged in order to avoid “aggravating her fiery temper” (128).

<sup>12</sup> Marlene Arieno, in her text, Victorian Lunatics: A Social Epidemiology of Mental Illness in Mid-19<sup>th</sup>-Century England, cites prevailing views of epilepsy during this period: “It was recognized that epilepsy had a strongly physical cause” (88). Arieno divides many of the classified mental disorders into two categories: those which emanate from physical causes (biogenic, organic, or somatogenic) versus moral causes (environmental, or psychogenic) (86). Each disease, including epilepsy, is then sub-divided into its own complementary component, by means of Arieno’s compilation of statistics taken from asylum records of that era. Within this same study, Arieno looks at nineteenth-century statistics for neuroses and psychoses—the latter including dementia, mania and monomania, which today are associated with schizophrenia (89-90)—then (and now) felt to be primarily physical in origin.

<sup>13</sup> The unhealthy conditions at Cowan Bridge school proved to be fatal to Charlotte’s two older sisters, Maria and Elizabeth, and Charlotte and Emily were quickly brought home to avoid a similar fate. Charlotte later wrote scathingly about the experience in her first published novel, Jane Eyre. As she conceded to her publishers in 1847, the first part of that novel was true, though some of the details were withheld to avoid making the account that much more painful (Smith 539-40).

<sup>14</sup> Both Fannie Ratchford, in The Brontë’s Web of Childhood, and Barbara Hannah feel Emily, too, surrendered herself to the creative spirit (Ratchford x; Hannah 126), while Charlotte struggled against such complete capitulation, whether through fear or as a result of her conscience or both. In speaking of the deaths in rapid succession of the three younger siblings in 1848 and 1849, Hannah remarks: “The fact that Charlotte was able to survive must have been due not only to her valiant efforts to make roots in the outer world, but also to the probability that she alone of the family to some extent realized the danger that was constantly threatening them from within” (127).

<sup>15</sup> In virtually every extant letter which Charlotte wrote to Ellen Nussey between July 1845 and October 1847, she voices discouragement and irritation with Branwell. She repeatedly complains that no one in the Brontë household can get rest, declaring that the peace of the home has been destroyed. All the sisters are prevented from having company during Branwell’s more intemperate periods, which Charlotte refers to as “illnesses,” and the idea of starting a school for

---

young women in the Brontë home is given up. In making reference to the illness of Ellen's brother, Joseph, also "in CB's view, as a consequence of his errors" (Smith 413n5), Charlotte's resentment flares as she remarks in December 1845, "it seems grievous indeed that those who have not sinned should suffer so largely" (Smith 442). She also responds to Margaret Wooller in January 1846, saying: "You ask about Branwell; he never thinks of seeking employment and I begin to fear that he has rendered himself incapable of filling any respectable station in life, besides, if money were at his disposal he would use it only to his own injury—the faculty of self-government is, I fear almost destroyed in him" (Smith 447-48).

<sup>16</sup> Percy was not always atheistic. According to Branwell's manuscripts, Percy was, as a child, an avid reader of the Bible, and an enthusiastic believer. He is later perverted from these beliefs by his tutor, S's death.

<sup>17</sup> Winifred Gérin, in her description of people and places in the *Angrian Chronicles*, says Warner, as one of Zamorna's most faithful adherents, "frequently acts as his conscience and, because he always advocates what is right, is often repulsed" (Gérin FN 28).

<sup>18</sup> "The Lord: 'I never hated those who were like you:/ Of all the spirits that negate./The knavish jester gives me least to do./ For man's activity can easily abate,/He soon prefers uninterrupted rest:/ To give him this companion hence seems best/Who roils and must as Devil help create'" (Goethe, *Faust*, Part 1, ll. 337-343).

<sup>19</sup> "Fallen cherub, to be weak is miserable,/Doing or suffering: but of this be sure,/ To do aught good never will be our task,/But ever to do ill our sole delight,/As being the contrary to his high will/Whom we resist. If then his providence/Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,/Our labor must be to pervert that end,/And out of good still to find means of evil" (Book 1, ll. 157-165, *Paradise Lost*).

<sup>20</sup> In her essay, "Male pseudonyms and female authority in Victorian England," Catherine A. Judd posits that "the 'veiling' of the female writer's identity by a male pseudonym, exceptional as it was, helped a certain group of Victorian women writers establish important claims of possessing a moral and social authority within the context of the ideological separation of the public and the domestic realms and the Romantic notions of creativity and genius that separation supported" (252). Judd later claims that what readers of the late 1840s found so exhilarating or threatening about Charlotte Brontë was "Jane Eyre's giving voice to a previously unarticulated realm of feminine desire"(258).

<sup>21</sup> Significantly, much of the literature Charlotte had been exposed to—including Goethe's *Faust*—takes the opposite route, employing women as a means to redeem fallen men. If, however, as depicted here, the feminine principle is unable to overturn the relentless course of events—and no heroine appears strong enough to save or redeem these demonic males for long—then some other force must act as a damper or a brake to the demonic impulse, illustrating the dilemma for Charlotte.

---

<sup>22</sup> In a footnote, Margaret Smith explains that “your” in this sentence is meant to be understood in its conjectural sense, a “generalized” rather than “personal” doctrine of Ellen’s. See Smith 155n5.

<sup>23</sup> Charlotte’s own sense of feeling like a religious outcast also parallels Zamorna’s dual reference to himself as a priest and a leper, as mentioned in the previous chapter.

<sup>24</sup> Charlotte later wrote about such false idolatry in her novel, *Jane Eyre*. Jane realizes that she has worshipped Rochester to the exclusion of God: “My future husband was becoming to me my whole world; and, more than the world: almost my hope of heaven. He stood between me and every thought of religion, as an eclipse intervenes between man and the broad sun. I could not, in those days, see God for his creature: of whom I had made an idol” (*Jane Eyre*, Oxford ed. 277). Later, while residing with the Rivers family, Jane speaks of her “concealed and racking regrets for my broken idol and lost elysium—regrets to which I have latterly avoided referring; but which possessed me and tyrannized over me ruthlessly” (*Jane Eyre*, Oxford ed. 357). Charlotte may here be expressing her grief over the toppling of Zamorna as an idol in her own young mind.

<sup>25</sup> Alexander writes, “a kind of despair . . . seeps through all her writing at this time” (*Early Writings* 141), and Victor Neufeldt observes that: “This conflict [the inability to believe these characters in her imagination are unreal], with its concomitant agony and despair, is the main theme of Charlotte’s poems throughout 1836” (“The Idolatrous Web” 13).

<sup>26</sup> Shuttleworth quotes, in part, from the *Leeds Intelligencer* of January 26, 1826, which, in reaction to the proposal for Catholic Emancipation, then seen as a threat to national independence, “speaks in disgust of the ‘*slavish dependence*, destructive of all mental vigor’ which resulted from confession to these ‘Scavengers of the Conscience’” (40, emphasis Shuttleworth’s).

<sup>27</sup> This tone may have been stressed for her father’s benefit. In the previously cited admission to Emily that she had taken confession at a Catholic church in Brussels, Charlotte specifically requests that her sister not mention this incident to their father: “I think you had better not tell papa of this. He will not understand that it was only a freak, and will perhaps think I am going to turn Catholic” (Smith 330).

## Chapter Four

### Charlotte's Animus and Zamorna's Anima: Confronting Misogyny, Homoeroticism and Idolatry

*“[T]he character of the anima . . . is, by and large, complementary to the character of the persona. The anima usually contains all those common human qualities which the conscious attitude lacks . . . The complementary character of the anima also affects the sexual character . . . A very feminine woman has a masculine soul, and a very masculine man has a feminine soul . . . If, therefore, we speak of the **anima** of a man, we must logically speak of the **animus** of a woman. . . .”*  
(C.G. Jung, *Essential Jung* 101-02)

To comprehend fully the nature of Zamorna's relationship with women, as well as Charlotte's view of herself in relation to both men and women, we must understand the essence and function of the anima and the animus. Jung hypothesizes that the anima and animus represent “the inner attitude,” “the inward face,” or the obverse side of the “outer attitude, the outward face” of the persona (*Essential Jung* 100-01). These psychic entities are specific soul-images contained in the unconscious, and become transferred on to others, normally those of the opposite sex. Jung explains: “With men the anima is usually personified by the unconscious as a woman; with women the animus is personified as a man” (*Essential Jung* 103). Frieda Fordham further clarifies Jung's theory, pointing out that the anima/us complements a same-sex shadow:

[E]ach sex has equally a persona and a shadow, the only difference being that a man's shadow is personified by another man, a woman's shadow by another woman. It has already been said that the unconscious complements the conscious standpoint; to carry this farther, the unconscious of a man contains a complementary feminine element, that of a woman a male element. These Jung calls respectively the *anima* and the *animus*. (Fordham 52)

The psychologist makes a single exception to this rule, however, stating that if one's personality remains unconscious, the anima or animus then has the character of the same sex.<sup>1</sup> Jung posits that this creates the foundation for homosexuality, and father-transferences in men or mother-transferences in women.<sup>2</sup> This marks another point where Charlotte's individuation seems to deviate from Jung's system, since her animus initially appears undifferentiated from her shadow and both were male (as was her early persona).

But rather than go so far in this analysis of Charlotte's emerging and developing character as to say that she may have had homosexual proclivities because aspects of her conscious and unconscious self were personified as male, rather than female, it seems far more plausible to argue that the manifestation of Charlotte's animus is problematical, and more useful to show how the fact that her shadow was male contributed to her crisis of 1836.<sup>3</sup>

As stated, the anima/us—as the unconscious aspect of the self—operates as a complementary component to a persona, or the conscious aspect of the self. It exists as the inward face of the contrasting outward mask. Just as the persona is represented in dreams, the anima/us, or inner attitude, is represented in the unconscious—first drawn from the collective unconscious, and later formulated from one's specific individual unconscious. Those images initially emanating from the collective unconscious are sometimes of unknown or mythological figures. In time and with increased contact with the opposite sex, the images become specific and personal to the carrier, and are projected on to real men and women, precisely because they possess the attributes of the unconscious soul image.<sup>4</sup> This projection proves to be anything but objective; its influence, says Jung, is “immediate and absolutely compelling,” the person becoming “the object of intense love or equally intense hate (or fear)” (*Essential Jung* 103). Finally, three functions and manifestations of the anima/us need to be understood: the anima/us acts as a bridge between the conscious and unconscious minds; at first, it is usually experienced negatively; and it is through the recognition of the anima/us that one comes to confront the shadow.<sup>5</sup> According to Fordham, “Both the animus and the anima are mediators between the conscious and the unconscious mind, and when they become personified in fantasies, dreams, or visions they present an opportunity to understand something of what has hitherto been unconscious” (58). Thus it follows that until Charlotte's animus emerged, she would have been unable to perceive that Zamorna was a projection of her own psyche or her shadow self. Once that process occurred, the way was opened to integrating the shadow and formulating a positive animus, which works in more harmonious balance with the conscious ego.<sup>6</sup>

As mentioned, Charlotte's individuation process deviates from the Jungian model in that both her persona and her shadow self were male, and indeed, this may not have

been atypical for a nineteenth-century female attempting to forge a sense of self-identity in an exclusively male-constructed world. However, tracing Charlotte's progress is further complicated by the fact that both her animus and her shadow appear to have been personified by a single entity: Zamorna. Hence, her initial encounter with her animus remains indistinct from her confrontation with her shadow. It becomes apparent, though, that by 1837, Charlotte had acknowledged her dark side—probably a combination of both her shadow and her animus. This confrontation and subsequent acceptance of her dark unconscious prepared the way for the emergence of a female persona and a more positive and personal animus. First, however, Charlotte had to overcome a number of psychic obstacles before these subsequent actions could take place. Her growing awareness of the tyranny of her dark side initially led to a psychic revolution which is played out in her fiction, in the 1836 novelette, Passing Events. The role this inflated shadow and negative animus perform in this crisis forced Charlotte to meet her demonized shadow head on and to come to terms with her own misogyny. Only then could she begin the process of reconciling herself to her inborn gender and realistically envision a viable future as a woman in a patriarchal world.

### **1. The Demon Shadow vs. the Domestic Angel**

As mentioned, both Charlotte Brontë's shadow self and persona emerged as male, deviating from Jung's dialectic, and showing how deeply Charlotte identified with the patriarchal world, on both conscious and unconscious levels. Moreover, Charlotte's male shadow threatened to envelop and engulf her own ego, or, more accurately, that vacuum of egolessness that may have existed within her as a result of repressive societal constraints.<sup>7</sup> Until Charlotte died to the false self system imposed by patriarchal constructs—a step which precedes the birth of the true self (Wehr 103)—her unconscious perceived and defined itself as male. Wehr's claim, if viewed with the genders reversed, reiterates that famous assertion made by Virginia Woolf that the 'Angel in the House' must be annihilated before women can write. Otherwise, Woolf claims, in her essay, "Professions for Women" (based on a speech she gave in 1931), the self-

ensorious angel hovers over the writing desk, killing the potency of the author's words, and threatening even greater catastrophe. Charlotte's self-censorious angel had taken on a masculine identity and appeared as a demon shadow, but the result was the same, in that she presumably felt she had no right to write as a woman, nor to cast women as protagonists in her tales. Such adventures were a male prerogative, which Charlotte clearly understood from a very young age. Adopting a male persona at the age of twelve might well have evolved out of the necessity to hold her own with Branwell, coupled with the desire to explore, in a man's guise, the male mind and the patriarchal world. Certainly imagining a man's existence for herself in a patriarchal culture afforded Charlotte liberties she otherwise could not enjoy. But by 1836, it could well have occurred to her that the male guise was no longer suitable. At the age of twenty, it was high time Charlotte found her own bearings as the heroine of her fictional, if not the real, world, rather than as one of its swashbuckling heroes. Then too, her male shadow had wrestled her into a helpless position of utter submissiveness, a role Charlotte found alien to her basic nature. She would need to reverse her misogynist tendencies, empower her heroines, and learn to embrace and celebrate the feminine principle within herself in order to accept and integrate her shadow self, as well as receive her animus so that it became a positive, rather than a negative influence. The difficulties Charlotte experienced in coming to terms with the unmasked self and her gendered circumstances are found throughout the writings of this time, both in the correspondence and in the fiction. Not only was she struggling to rid herself of the misogyny she had absorbed and cultivated, but she was engaged in a battle with her demonic shadow for dominance over her very identity, not unlike Woolf's later battle with the iconographic angel for supremacy over her essential agency.

Caught in a conundrum not of her making, then, Charlotte appears to be attempting to transcend the strict paradigms containing Victorian women, while retaining, even expressing, her libidinal energies, all in the act of making the transition to becoming a woman in a man's world. It is hardly any wonder that traces of residual anger find their way into her adult writing, as later remarked on by Woolf. In "A Room of One's Own," Woolf compares Charlotte with Jane Austen, laying Jane Eyre alongside Pride and Prejudice, and detecting an anger evident in the former, which was lacking in the latter:

One might say, I continued, laying the book down beside *Pride and Prejudice*, that the woman who wrote those pages had more genius in her than Jane Austen; but if one reads them over and marks that jerk in them, that indignation, one sees that she will never get her genius expressed whole and entire. Her books will be deformed and twisted. She will write in a rage where she should write calmly. She will write foolishly where she should write wisely. She will write of herself where she should write of her characters. She is at war with her lot. How could she help but die young, cramped and thwarted? (Woolf, "A Room of One's Own" 90)

Woolf is of the opinion that Charlotte's anger interfered with her integrity as a novelist, and she cites a scene in *Jane Eyre* as evidence—that moment when the narrator deviates from the narrative to engage in a feminist tirade on the rooftop of Thornfield Hall. Woolf claims this pause in the narrative serves as an opportunity for the author to give vent to "some personal grievance" ("A Room of One's Own" 95), saying, "[Charlotte] remembered that she had been starved of her proper due of experience—she had been made to stagnate in a parsonage mending stockings when she wanted to wander free over the world. Her imagination swerved from indignation and we feel it swerve" ("A Room of One's Own" 95). The anger Woolf reads had its origins in those critical years when Charlotte experienced a reckoning—if not a reconciliation—with her lot in life, a realization of the limitations of her gender and the subsequent diminishment of the future she had imagined for herself. But Woolf overstates Charlotte's circumstances and the degree to which any residual anger colored the author's later work. Charlotte spent two years prior to writing *Jane Eyre* studying in Brussels. Once she launched that first published novel and created a name—albeit a pen-name—for herself, Charlotte was no longer compelled to remain in the parsonage nor to devote her life either to domestic duties or governessing. It is quite clear that she lived on in Haworth by choice for the next half dozen years, particularly following the deaths in rapid succession of her last surviving siblings. It should also be remembered that until her marriage to Arthur Bell Nichols, Charlotte's existence was, for those half dozen years, filled with trips to London or to the homes of various friends. And when she was in residence at the parsonage with her father, she was deeply engaged with her writing, reading and correspondence with acquaintances in the literary world rather than mending stockings.

Adrienne Rich, in her essay “Jane Eyre: The Temptations of a Motherless Woman,” wonders if Virginia Woolf really read Jane Eyre, countering this view of Charlotte’s writing as “deformed and twisted” and the author as being “cramped and thwarted” (101). Rich stresses the intrepid bravery in Jane’s rooftop tirade, a speech so controversial yet so critically central to that novel, that even now, the protagonist/narrator’s sentiments meet with resistance from many. In the England of the 1840s, claims Rich, “Jane’s sense of herself as a woman—as equal to and with the same needs as a man—is next-door to insanity” (98). Jane’s restless yearning to liberate and realize herself certainly typifies Charlotte’s own ambitious spirit, which works as the stimulus behind the writing of the juvenilia:

Who blames me? Many no doubt; and I shall be called discontented. I could not help it: the restlessness was in my nature; it agitated me to pain sometimes. Then my sole relief was to walk along the corridor of the third story, backwards and forwards, safe in the silence and solitude of the spot, and allow my mind’s eye to dwell on whatever bright visions rose before it—and certainly they were many and glowing; to let my heart be heaved by the exultant movement which, while it swelled it in trouble, expanded it with life; and, best of all, to open my inward ear to a tale that was never ended—a tale my imagination created, and narrated continuously; quickened with all of incident, life, fire, feeling, that I desired and had not in my actual existence. (Jane Eyre, Oxford ed. 110)

Charlotte might as well have been describing the impetus for the production of so many tiny books during her childhood. Safe and secure within her silence and solitude, she could give vent and flight to her imagination through her writing, compensating in small part for the limitations of her actual circumscribed existence. By the time she wrote Jane Eyre, a decade later, the agitation and discontent had been given to another character—Bertha. Displacing this madness on to another reveals Charlotte’s own growth during those ten years. As Rich observes:

Jane never feels herself to be going mad, but there is a madwoman in the house who exists as her opposite, her image horribly distorted in a warped mirror, a threat to her happiness. Just as her instinct for self-preservation saves her from earlier temptations, so it must save her from becoming this woman by curbing her imagination at the limits of what is bearable for a powerless woman in the England of the 1840s. (Rich 98-99)

Rich's comments uncannily trace Charlotte's own development during that ten-year period. Having saved herself from her earliest temptation—that of succumbing to possession by her shadow self—Charlotte realized that she must curb her imagination in future work to more nearly represent her own circumscribed rank. In *Bertha*, Charlotte examines what she might have become, had she not acted on that instinct for self-preservation. That act of saving herself further strengthened and enabled her. Through *Jane*, Charlotte makes known how much power she now possesses and can continue to act on, saving not only herself, but Rochester, as her animus.

If Charlotte seemed determined to avoid madness and the destiny her brother was blindly following, she was equally resolved not to live a life like that of one of her passive, enfeebled heroines, who so often expired through ennui and despair. As a voyeur, gazing through male eyes, she had witnessed the demise of some of these women, many of whom personified Zamorna's own anima—his archetypal soul-images of the opposite sex. Zamorna's aversion toward these martyred women expresses Charlotte's antipathy toward her own sex, and she allows him to torment them, just as she permits him to renounce his own early effeminacy. As seen in her letters of this period, Charlotte's inability to embrace the feminine sphere as readily as Ellen Nussey leads to her self-abnegation. Unlike Ellen, she cannot be high-mindedly reverent, nor, she soon finds, can she adopt the extreme masochism of a Mina Laury. Neither are suitable role models for Charlotte, and for a time, she is lost, unable to find the middle ground she later occupies. All this is played out against the backdrop of civil war, symbolizing the internal division and conflict taking place in her mind. What arises in the aftermath are the presence of stronger, more resolute women, and a tamer, even more comic Zamorna, as Charlotte begins the real process of individuation. Taming Zamorna, then, provides the foundation for the emergence of a positive animus, which will help support Charlotte as she begins the self-actualization of herself as a mature young woman. With his stranglehold as a dark shadow on Charlotte weakened, Zamorna drops his archetypal/mythological incarnation and begins to take on the characteristics of actual people in Charlotte's life, a step toward the new realism found in her later writings.<sup>8</sup>

The image of the daemonic male, originally so appealing to Charlotte, will persistently remain with her, however, making appearances in various mutations in all of

her future work, though taking on much more human qualities. Likewise, her female role models—women like Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings—evolve to render far more viable examples of behavior for Charlotte to follow. Once she begins identifying with these women, Charlotte is able to assimilate Zamorna, so that he functions more properly as her positive animus, while also playing a critical part in the rest of her life. He appears periodically in so many of her adult novels, while also lurking around the edges of her life like ‘the dark side of the moon,’<sup>9</sup> continuing to operate as her male muse. Jung hypothesizes that the animus, once evolved, can never be completely integrated into the consciousness in the individuation process, instead remaining an elusive, not always recognized component of the personality. “[S]omething of [the anima and animus] remains always shrouded in mystery in the dark realm of the collective unconscious,” and is not fully possessed by or subject to the will of the ego, says Fordham (59). This elusiveness helps explain Charlotte’s continuing fascination with and lifelong attraction to this type of male, both in life and in fiction. It also helps us appreciate the potent emotions which attached themselves to such male images. Woolf senses fear and rancor in Charlotte’s depiction of Rochester:

The portrait of Rochester is drawn in the dark. We feel the influence of fear in it; just as we constantly feel an acidity which is the result of oppression, a buried suffering smouldering beneath her passion, a rancour which contracts those books, splendid as they are, with a spasm of pain.  
(Woolf, “A Room of One’s Own” 95)

Woolf might detect residual fear in Charlotte’s narrative, centered around the potency of the shadow. But by the time Charlotte undertook the writing of *Jane Eyre*, she had already undergone the transformation of the ego and the integration of that shadow self,<sup>10</sup> knowing well the temptations which led to the act of possession. Although Zamorna continues to haunt and attract Charlotte, reincarnating himself in part in many of her later male protagonists, Jane’s journey through temptation charts Charlotte’s own. Like Charlotte, Jane resists oppression, enduring further suffering before reuniting with Rochester/Zamorna as his equal. Woolf fails to read the triumphant tone in this final journey homeward and perceive that Charlotte now gazes at this compelling male image through grown-up eyes, repeatedly re-constructing new parameters of power in future

relationships with him.<sup>11</sup> In fact, what Charlotte depicts in these final scenes at Ferndean is the creation of a new *détente* with her animus and her shadow self, which will serve her well in all her future writings. She has made peace with her demons and silenced “the Angel in the House,” enabling her to reconstruct her harrowing psychic journey to the role of a woman writer, well on her way toward the completion of herself.

## 2. A Psychic Civil War and Revolutionary Change

Winifred Gérin observes in her preface to *Passing Events* (1836) that this work marks the transition period between Charlotte’s earlier juvenilia, her direct collaboration with her brother, and her more mature works, written just a few years later in independent authorship. Gérin also points out that this work was written “at a time of acute religious crisis in Charlotte Brontë’s own development, and is singular among all her juvenile writings for its references to religious themes—conspicuous by their absence elsewhere” (Gérin FN 34). Religious themes and iconography appear elsewhere in Charlotte’s writing, but they suffuse this particular work, reflecting the inflation of her shadow self as Zamorna comes to regard himself as Angria’s spiritual savior. The story’s interrogations are Charlotte’s own; the rebelliousness of the warring archetypes against each other and the insurgency of the populace against the status quo is hers. Both the despair and the self-disparagement found here are hers, as well. At this stage in her life, Charlotte was no longer merely “making out” fantasies; she was “working out” larger questions looming in her mind: how to cope with the guilt she felt over this false idolatry; how to improve herself spiritually and morally so that she would one day be worthy of salvation; how to rectify her erotic stimulus with her sense of religious duty; and how to come to terms with her shadow self without subsuming her conscious identity in the process. This spiritual interrogation is coterminous with Jung’s treatises on the role religion plays in individuation. In an exegetic chapter (“Religion and the Individuation Process”) clarifying Jung’s thoughts on this subject, Fordham specifies that unconscious archetypes correspond to all the known religious ideas (70), and that the history of religion in its widest sense—which includes mythology and folklore—provides a treasure house of

archetypal forms (80).<sup>12</sup> Hence, the profusion of sacred imagery contained in this novelette ratifies the role religion plays in the individuation process, and shows Charlotte's self-conflict reaching a critical stage, which must soon be resolved.

During the year 1836, the gap between Charlotte's exterior and interior worlds narrows considerably—the parallel realms now corresponding and contending directly with one another. Charlotte's mind was undergoing a kind of civil war and revolutionary change, which is symbolically recreated on the Angrian stage—the imminent battle inscribed on these pages tracing the psychic warring occurring within Charlotte. Of course, as previously cited in note 3 of the Introduction, Jung asserts that physiological change is attended by a “psychic revolution” (Portable Jung 7). This is not the first time revolutionary insurrection has been threatened in the juvenilia. In the 1832 story, “The Bridal,” Charlotte couples intimations of madness with another impending civil war—then called the “Great Rebellion.” Four years later, however, the implications are far weightier and more consequential. What is involved now is a confrontation with her shadow self, a coming to terms with her attraction to the darker temptations residing within her soul, and a reckoning with her conscience and her theological beliefs. Consequently, Passing Events brings to light not only civil strife in Angria, but an internalized psychological battle taking place as well. Christine Alexander notes that Charlotte existed in two conflicting worlds during the writing of this story, the intrusion of one upon the other while she was at Roe Head culminating in physical pain (Early Writings 143). Such corporeal pain was a manifestation of the psychic pain she was then experiencing, the boundary between exterior and interior worlds having become blurred. The civil war about to break out in Angria, then, precisely reflected the warring conflicts within Charlotte's own disturbed mind, now an occupied battlefield.

The tense atmosphere in Angria and the mental turmoil taking place in Charlotte's mind are also evident in her letters to Ellen Nussey and her journal entries, such ephemera functioning as an unintentional subtext.<sup>13</sup> In fact, the journal entries, or autobiographical fragments, which open and close those Angrian narratives, illustrate how closely parallel these realms were in Charlotte's mind that year, the fragments and narratives seamlessly flowing into one another. In Passing Events, Charlotte characterizes a country in anguish, in effect evoking her own ill state of mind:

What a queer disjointed world this is. No man can for a moment say how things will turn. All the body politic of Africa seems delirious with raging fever, the members war against each other. Parties are confounded, mutual wrath increases. (Gérin FN 49)

At the same time, Charlotte appears ironically disengaged from this turmoil, depicting her own detached self in her portrait of Mary, who is distanced from the civil strife, kept safe from harm back in Verdopolis. There, in Wellesley House, like so many other city houses with “their veiled windows” (Gérin FN 54), the Queen of Angria languishes. She sits in the west drawing-room, one of her little books having dropped from her hand to lie by the footstool at her feet:

[S]he was leaning back with her eyes closed & her thoughts wandering in day-dreams either of bliss or mourning. The opening of the door and the approach of Miss Clifton did not rouse her. “This will never do[.]” said that lady in an undertone, looking anxiously at her royal mistress’s relaxed form supported by sofa cushions, & at her features whose expression or rather whose want of expression intimated that her mind had slid into a voluntary syncope of exertion. She shook her gently. The Duchess unclosed her eyes & said with a faint smile “I was not asleep[.]” “But you were unconscious my lady[.]” answered Miss Clifton. “Nearly so[,] but Amelia what time is it[?]” (Gérin FN 55)

The scene conjures images of Charlotte at Roe Head, indulging in one of her many secret trances, when she could escape in odd moments to her imaginative world. The script also closely parallels a specific journal entry of February 4, 1836, known as “Well, here I am at Roe-Head”:

[L]ast night I did indeed <hav> lean upon the thunder-wakening wings of such a stormy blast as I have seldom heard blow & it <whirl> wirlled me away like heath in the wilderness for five seconds of ecstasy, & as I sat by <myself in> myself in the dining-room while all the rest were at tea the trance seemed to descend on a sudden & verily this foot trod the war – shaken shores of the Calabar & these <light> eyes saw the defiled & violated Adrianopolis shedding its lights on the river from lattices whence the invader looked out & was not darkened; . . . while this apparition was before me the dining-room door opened and Miss W[ooler] came in with a plate of butter in her hand. ‘A very stormy night my dear!’ said she ‘it is ma’am’. said I[.] (Barker 249)

Both scenes are removed from the Angrian action, yet in both scenes the wish to be mentally transported back to that realm is conveyed. Gérin points out that the first six pages of Passing Events clearly reveal the visual nature of Charlotte's imagination, "dependent on images—not on ideas—to stir it to life," and resemble "the nature of dreams rather than observed reality" (Gérin FN 33).<sup>14</sup> Charlotte frequently wrote with her eyes closed,<sup>15</sup> particularly at Roe Head, "which she did to preserve the inward vision from interference from without" (Gérin FN 33). The picture of Mary, then, simulates a self-portrait, the book at her feet representing both the source of Charlotte's musings and her own writing, the "veiled windows" emphasizing Charlotte's habit of composing with her eyes closed while allowing images from the unconscious to float through her mind.<sup>16</sup>

In Passing Events, the willful queen insists on being taken to the front, moving the narrative back to Angria. Charles describes Adrianopolis as "the holy city," "the ecclesiastical city" (Gérin FN 60), yet it more closely resembles a giant military barracks, another example of Charlotte's commingling of religious and warring imagery. Zamorna and Percy, at odds with each other, are both slightly tinged with insanity, having undergone some degree of character transformation. Zamorna, who has always strenuously practiced temperance, is now imbibing on a regular basis, and, according to General Thornton, grows blacker by the day. The press and the populace of Angria have turned against the King, declaring him of unsound mind, pronouncing him *non compos mentis*. The press has determined that Zamorna's "tendency to insanity" has "finally merged into idiocy" (Gérin FN 74), and he is considered unfit for his position as the country's monarch. Zamorna is roundly criticized for having put a nation's welfare at risk in order "to satisfy the puerile ambition of a silly and inconsiderate boy who wished to play at Alexander," proving to be an "impious fool who aimed at Heaven, slipped and fell into Hell!" (Gérin FN 76), which might possibly be a self-disparaging remark on Charlotte's part. General Lord Hartford, meanwhile, remarks on Percy's speech to Parliament, in which he "furiously & insanelly assaulted men of high birth" (Gérin FN 65). Percy has thrown off his former title and reverted to his old rebellious self in order to align himself with the peasantry and to help bring down aristocratic rule in Angria. Warner Howard Warner observes that Percy is being punished for his vices by the torment of his own mind, taking the opportunity to deliver another admonition about

living a life of revenge. Warner has also begun to see the fatal flaws beneath the outward beauty of Zamorna, fearing God has lost patience with Zamorna and will turn from him forever. Undoubtedly, Charlotte is questioning her own grim fate here, fearful that she has become estranged from God. Initially she seems to be attempting to nullify the strength of her archetype, literally neutralizing her shadow self through fictional revolutionary insurrection, though the gesture appears half-hearted and equivocal. Even while the Constitutionals demand death for Zamorna, Charles tells us men's minds are still moved by the name Zamorna, that "they still remember how the clouded sun once shone—", and that some continued to possess "a lingering partiality for the Rebel like that of an indulgent father for a prodigal son" (Gérin FN 81, 82), divulging Charlotte's own attachment to her demonic shadow as he is brought down in disgrace, disclosing how difficult this process will be for her. Indeed, nullifying or negating the shadow self is contrary to Jung's ideal of individuation. The psychologist would say it was an impossible task, like stuffing the genie back into the bottle. At some point, Charlotte, too, must have recognized the folly of attempting to eradicate her dark side. Eventually one must acknowledge the shadow, and even embrace it, while integrating it, in order to weaken its stranglehold.

Charlotte's futile efforts to dissociate herself from her shadow, are, in part, revealed through Charles's altered attitude to this scene of chaos. Charles claims to enjoy the expectant sense of change in the air, declaring that he has nothing to lose, and laughing at the concerns of moneyed, titled men. Unburdened by the cares his brother shoulders, Charles finds a new sense of freedom in the act of breaking loose from the Wellesley clan, and takes pleasure from the liberty enjoyed by the disenfranchised: "I'd as soon be a shoe-black in a merry jovial servants hall as heir-apparent to Wellingtonsland" (Gérin FN 81). In this deconstruction of the hierarchical shape of her mind, Charlotte's persona—while shedding himself of the privileges of the aristocracy and allying himself with the soon-to-be-emancipated peasant class—unwittingly provides an avenue of escape for her. By cutting himself down to Charlotte's size, her persona now more nearly represents the private self it has been masking. In renaming Charles a short time later (he becomes Charles Townsend or Townshend, dropping the Wellesley name), Charlotte has not only disowned Zamorna, she has begun the process of

disengaging herself from Charles, so she can then explore fictional worlds through other narrative eyes and voices. It is, perhaps, at this moment that Charlotte first comes to terms with her true self, on numerous levels. In subsequent stories, she will place most of her heroes and heroines in the middle classes, more closely mirroring Charlotte's own circumstances.<sup>17</sup> Their triumphs and will to power are displayed on a smaller, less grandiose, and more subjective scale, which is reflected in the new realism found in the juvenilia of the late 1830s.

Passing Events is followed by "Zamorna's Exile,"<sup>18</sup> an epic verse poem set in post-Revolutionary times. Zamorna, aboard the ship *Rover*, sails off to self-exile on Ascension Island. Aside from the obvious Napoleonic allusions, the imagery here appears borrowed from a number of different sources: that iconography found in the myth of Prometheus, in Byron's Don Juan (particularly in the structure of the verse), in Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, and that of Satan in Book One of Milton's Paradise Lost.<sup>19</sup> The predominant picture is of a man anxious for redemption, rendering a soliloquy in the form of a confessional, addressed, in absentia, to Percy. Zamorna's arrival at Ascension Island coincides with Charlotte's return to Roe Head, where she composes a journal passage which reveals itself to be in close alignment with Zamorna's state of mind. In this entry, which begins "All this day I have been in a dream," Charlotte admits to feeling mental exhaustion, frustration and anger at her sense of imprisonment and her lack of freedom to compose full-time, whenever the images manifest themselves:

I sat sinking from irritation & weariness into a kind of lethargy. The thought came over me am I to spend all the best part of my life in this wretched bondage, forcibly suppressing my rage . . .? must I from day to day sit chained to this chair prisoned with in these four bare-walls, . . . \the time I am losing/<it> will never come again? Stung to the heart with this reflection I started up & mechanically walked to the window-- . . . Then came on me, rushing impetuously. all the mighty phantasm [sic] that this had conjured from nothing from nothing [sic] to a system strong as some religious creed. I felt as if I could <have> written gloriously—I longed to write. (Barker 254-55)

Another such journal entry, thought to have been written that same fall, again illustrates Charlotte's extreme irritation with her surroundings, compounded now by a sense of impending loss. It is as if she is in the process of annihilating some part of herself in

order to summon the strength to survive, while mourning that loss and knowing nothing quite like it can ever take its place. A gust of wind reminds her of Percy, and re-awakens feelings of despair: “O it has wakened a feeling that I cannot satisfy – a thousand wishes rose at its call which must die with me for they will never be fulfilled. now I should be agonized if I had not the dream to repose on., [sic] its existences, its forms its scenes do fill a little of the craving vacancy” (Barker 255-56). Mary Taylor was aware of the angst Charlotte was suffering during this time, and later wrote to Elizabeth Gaskell of Charlotte’s frightful imaginations which “she could not help . . . nor help thinking. She could not forget the gloom, could not sleep at night, nor attend in the day” (Gaskell 161). Much of Charlotte’s resentment and rage seem to have been generated by the sharp contrasts existing between one world and the other, the inability to indulge at will in her fantasies, and the inescapable presence of dimwitted students who were hardly a match for the *glitterati* of Angria and Verdopolis. Nonetheless, Charlotte did her best to repress her true feelings, noting at one point, “if those girls knew how I loathe their company they would not seek mine as much as they do” (Barker 255). Her efforts to conceal her imaginative life while at Roe Head in 1836 are attested to the very next year in a letter sent to Robert Southey, in which Charlotte says that she takes pains to “carefully avoid any appearance of pre-occupation and eccentricity, which might lead those I live amongst to suspect the nature of my pursuits” (Ratchford, *Legends of Angria* xlii). Southey had cautioned her in his Easter Monday 1837 missive against the dangers of an overworked imagination:

The day dreams in which you habitually indulge are likely to induce a distempered state of mind and, in proportion as the ordinary uses of the world seem to you flat and unprofitable, you will be unfitted for them without becoming fitted for anything else. . . .

(Gérin, *The Formative Years* 52-3)

According to her journal of 1836, Charlotte is even incapable of becoming aroused by the company of her employer, Margaret Wooler. In a letter written a decade later to Miss Wooler, Charlotte refers to the year 1838 (after the Roe Head school had been moved to Dewsbury Moor), when she suffered from hypochondria (Charlotte’s term for depression, according to Margaret Smith 506n7). She writes:

I endured it but a year—and assuredly I can never forget the concentrated anguish of certain insufferable moments and the heavy gloom of many long hours—besides the preternatural horror which seemed to clothe existence and Nature—and which made Life a continual waking Nightmare—Under such circumstances the morbid Nerves can know neither peace nor enjoyment—whatever touches—pierces them—sensation for them is all suffering—A weary burden nervous patients consequently become to those about them—they know this and it infuses a new gall—corrosive in its extreme acritude, into their bitter cup—When I was at Dewsbury-Moor—I could have been no better company for you than a stalking ghost—and I remember I felt my incapacity to impart pleasure fully as much as my powerlessness to receive it—

(Smith 505-06, emphasis Brontë's)

Charlotte acknowledges having suffered from depression for only a year in this letter, but her earlier correspondence with Ellen and her journal entries belie that estimation. From 1836 to 1838—at least two years, and very probably longer—Charlotte struggled with her grief, her hypochondria, and her unexpressed rage, all the while attempting, not always successfully, to keep these emotions from erupting in her everyday life.

The concealment of the self mirrors Zamorna's repression of his younger, more effeminate self. Both acts of concealment—Charlotte's of her animus, and Zamorna's of his anima—are exercises in the denial of a part of the intrinsic self, which needs to emerge so the shadow self can be acknowledged and integrated. Subjugation of the self results in "a new gall—corrosive in its extreme acritude," as Charlotte so aptly phrases it. In repressing his feminine aspects, Zamorna keeps the dark side of his own anima dominant. As Frieda Fordham explains: "It is when a man has repressed his feminine nature, when he under-values feminine qualities or treats women with contempt or neglect, that this dark aspect is most likely to present itself" (54). Fordham also points out that possession by the anima, which occurs if it is not consciously acknowledged, elicits a man's passions: "The anima is expressed in a man's life not only in projection upon women and in creative activity, but in fantasies, moods, presentiments, and emotional outbursts . . . a man possessed by his anima is a prey to uncontrollable emotion" (55).<sup>20</sup> Zamorna's failure to integrate his anima, then, results in his misogyny, and provokes his sadistic streak. He takes what affection and love he might have for a woman, and in a dual narcissistic gesture turns it both inward and outward, simultaneously harboring a

grandiose self-love and projecting it outward toward Percy—the man who made Zamorna over in his own image. Significantly, both gestures are symbolically Charlotte's, as she turns inward at Roe Head, sublimating the corrosive gall she feels while submerging herself in the idolatry of her shadow self, refusing to acknowledge and integrate her animus, so that it remains a negative force during this period. She, too, had unconsciously created this shadow in her own image, impeding her relationship with the outside world, fueling her misogyny, and for a time, provoking her masochism. Not until she feels free enough to confront her animus will she be able to encounter the shadow head on.

### **3. Early Effeminacy and Homoeroticism in the Juvenilia**

Male misogyny in the juvenilia seems to have self-reflexive roots, beginning with a general disdain for one's own early effeminacy. Both Zamorna and Percy are described by Charlotte and Branwell as being extraordinarily sentimental and effeminate in their youth.<sup>21</sup> Both men greatly sentimentalize their mothers and the early benevolent influences these women exerted over them. As mentioned in a previous chapter, Zamorna originally possessed many of his mother's qualities, which were seen as humanizing. While young, he subscribed to a code of justice based on benevolent mercy, in stark contrast to his later vengeful nature. Many in the juvenilia refer to Zamorna's early effeminacy, but it is Charles who delineates Zamorna's womanish qualities in some detail. In "The Scrap Book . . . A Brace of Characters" (1834), Charles recalls the dual role Zamorna, at the age of fifteen, played at a close friend's wedding. Zamorna acts first as bridesman to his friend, John, the Duke of Fidena, then serves as bridesmaid to John's bride, Lily Hart. Charles writes: "He well beseemed both characters: the masculine dress suited one and the feminine countenance the other" (CA 2.2: 328). Charles is amazed that Fidena remained so trusting of and loyal to Zamorna, given his brother's bizarre act of cross-dressing and the gender split it exemplifies. This same story focuses for a time on Ernest, Zamorna's son, who also exhibits effeminate traits in his youthful character. Ernest is frequently called "Miss Wellesley" by another young boy, and is asked to be the boy's partner in a quadrille. Through this description of his son, we learn how Zamorna

viewed these aspects of his own young self: “Ernest could not stand that it nettled him as similar insinuations used to do Lord Arthur in the days of his girlhood,” comments Charles (CA 2.2:339).<sup>22</sup> Charlotte’s novelette Julia, composed three years later (1837), indicates that Zamorna’s early effeminacy continues to irritate him. Reminded of those days when he sported long hair over his shoulders, Zamorna counters defensively with, “I was a man,” while his confidante remarks that he was a “beardless one—rather different to what I see before me now—your Grace has gathered strength like a Giant” (Gérin FN 112). Zamorna’s third wife, Mary, also makes a comparison between her husband at the age of twenty-two and his aspect before twenty, between the ages of sixteen and nineteen:

There was no grandeur in his form till that time, no martial majesty in his features. He looked elegant and effeminate and contemplative, and more like an extremely tall and beautiful girl than a bold, blustering man. Yes, hear it, ye ladies of Africa, the Duke of Zamorna was once like a girl!  
(CA 2.2:211)

Zamorna now shuns any aspects of his earlier effeminate self, claiming to hate feminine weakness, just as he fears sentimentality and artfulness in women.<sup>23</sup>

Here we see an example of how the persona compensates for the anima, functioning as its complementary opposite. According to Jung (though here Jung uses unfortunate sexual stereotyping), an outward show of strength makes up for a hidden effeminate weakness: “The persona, the ideal picture of a man as he should be, is inwardly compensated by feminine weakness, and as the individual outwardly plays the strong man, so he becomes inwardly a woman, i.e., the anima, for it is the anima that reacts to the persona” (Essential Jung 96). Zamorna’s virility and outward show of strength, then, are obviously developed to counterbalance that effeminate side he tries to disown, and even at times, demonize. Jung would say that Zamorna was spurning his anima, loading it with negative connotations, reflecting Charlotte’s inability for a time to assimilate contraries residing within her own psyche. Zamorna’s rejection of his anima also emblemizes Charlotte’s denial of her own feminine traits, not only because as a writer, she preferred living out the more enterprising male destiny, but also perhaps because she knew that what was expected of her far exceeded that of most women her

age. From Ellen Nussey, we know that Charlotte found early on that she had little in common with her female classmates at Roe Head school. Having had little practice with the rather frivolous activities of young girls, she knew of none of the popular childhood games of the time. Instead, she exhibited a seriousness and precocity beyond her years, though in fact, she matured at a slower pace than many of her contemporaries.

Nonetheless, Charlotte seemed conscious of being burdened with obligations to her family that would normally fall to men. Ellen recalls: “She always seemed to feel that a deep responsibility rested upon her; that she was an object of expense to those at home, and that she must use every moment to attain the purpose for which she was sent to school, *i.e.*, to fit herself for governess life” (Smith 591). Charlotte’s existence at Roe Head was so diligently sedate, so dutifully devoted to work, that Ellen was moved to cite an unusual moment which occurred on the last day of school when Charlotte suddenly exclaimed, “I should for once like to feel out and out a school girl” (Smith 595). From this picture, we can assume that Charlotte saw herself fulfilling the role of any of England’s nineteenth-century second sons—expected to earn his own way in deference to the privileged status of the eldest son. Indeed, Charlotte’s obligations were even larger than most. She was looked to and expected to make sacrifices not only to help that eldest son, but to assist in supporting her younger siblings—Emily and Anne—as well. Herein, no doubt, lay the seeds of rage Charlotte felt against the rigid gender constructs laid out for her. Unlike her brother, she would not be encouraged to spend her life following her talents. Instead, she was expected to ignore them in the name of duty, forfeiting her dreams for a life of service.

Knowing that living out the destiny of an emancipated female was not possible for her, Charlotte instead fantasized such an existence for herself. Some of her earliest Angrian role models personify such women: the independent-minded Zenobia Ellrington, for instance, who is mirrored again in her daughter, Hermione Marcella, and also in Ellen Grenville, Zenobia’s protégé. However, concerns about the consequences of inappropriate behavior arise here, fears of the repercussions one might suffer as a result of sexually aberrant conduct. Both Zamorna and Zenobia experience moments of madness when they cross gender lines, as seen in “The Spell” and “The Bridal.” “Insanity,” writes Shuttleworth, “significantly, is not solely the province of the female in

the early writings, but operates as a constant undertow of both masculine and feminine identity” (104). The issue of gender-appropriate behavior would engross Charlotte throughout the juvenilia,<sup>24</sup> and Shuttleworth shows just how autobiographical some of the young author’s investigations of gender trespassing were:

Alone of the female characters in the early writings [Zenobia] trespasses on the male sphere of power and privilege, daring, like her creator, to write. Male judgments on Zenobia hence become part of Brontë’s self-reflexive preoccupation with her own role as female author, as she wrestles with contemporary beliefs that such self-exposure constitutes a violation of femininity. (Shuttleworth 106-07)

This interrogation of gender roles begins not long after women are introduced in the juvenilia. As young men, both Zamorna and Percy are initially attracted to rather masculine women who are older than they are. Percy is not yet man enough to be master of himself, and Augusta di Segovia nurtures his manhood, supervising his demonic transformation in a marriage that more closely resembles a mentoring relationship. Zamorna is attracted to Zenobia, his contrasexual double, admiring and respecting this woman with whom he shares a unique symbiosis and defending her when she comes under attack by other men. Zenobia and Zamorna are presented as matching archetypes of opposite genders, combining to make one whole androgynous daemonic being, and are often likened to brother and sister; though when it is time to pick a second wife, Zamorna chooses not Zenobia, but the less astute child-bride Marian Hume, to whom he reveals only one side of himself.<sup>25</sup> By keeping his true nature hidden, he can more easily manipulate, control, and abuse his wives, treating them as true chattel, while, in the same gesture, repressing his feminine side, or his anima.<sup>26</sup> This maneuver proves double-sided on Zamorna’s part, however, since both men are inclined to take wives or paramours solely for the purpose of gaining ascendancy over one another—stealing one another’s power base or women who are near and dear to the other. In “The Green Dwarf,” for example, Percy takes Zenobia as his third wife not only to acquire a title, but also to avenge himself on Zamorna. The latter then retaliates by taking Percy’s daughter, Mary, as his third wife, and proceeds to abuse her through neglect, causing her death and the deep anguish of her father.

It soon becomes apparent that the true love affair here is that which exists between these two archetypes—Zamorna and Percy. The deep feelings shared by this pair are expressed through the twofold act of taking as wives or lovers women who are spiritually or genetically linked to the other—sometimes for political purposes, but more often to intensify that homoerotic bond. In these third marriages, each man has wedded a female version of the other. Zenobia is Zamorna's female double, his kindred spirit, while Mary increasingly proves to be her father's daughter, very like Percy in temperament, and the only child he has chosen to acknowledge and keep. These are not happy unions, of course, because the motives for them were impure. Each man marries out of retaliatory impulses, and each suffers for it: Percy unable to tame Zenobia, and Zamorna finding the melancholy Mary tiresome. Zamorna and Percy are seen to yearn repeatedly after one another's wives, daughters, wards and mistresses, yet the greatest intimacy is that between the two men. An incestuous theme thus weaves its way throughout the work. At one point, Percy wants to swap wives ("The Post Office"); at another, a plot ensues to swap babies ("The Secret"). In subsequent stories, children and grandchildren of each family consistently intermarry, further cementing the filial bond. Women, then, become the instrument of each man's homoerotic desire for the other, and this causes these women a good deal of grief, since they are loved not for themselves but for symbolically representing a further conjunction between the two men.

In Four Years Ago (1837), Charlotte studies the love/hate relationship between this pair of synchronous beings who embody the interrelation of opposites, cohering with patterns of antithesis found throughout Charlotte's writing. Zamorna and Percy are, at different times, portrayed as heads of opposing political parties; as metaphorical astrological bodies positioned in heavenly opposition, "the former Star of the West" versus the "future Sun of the East" (Hatfield 4/94); and as contrary earthly elements: fire and ice. Traditionally, each has publicly maligned and abused the other, while privately, they meet like secret lovers and co-conspirators. The relationship they share is extraordinarily intimate. This pair of "anti-types" (SHB Misc. 241) are each acutely aware of one another's secret, sensitive sides—each man's well-hidden anima—as seen in "Zamorna's Exile" (1836). Though they take pains to keep these aspects of themselves concealed from the rest of the world, including their women, they let that guard down

with each other. Zamorna, Charles points out, has never shared himself in public, keeping his private side to himself: “Very much of him is under the surface. What swims above looks very bright, very gorgeous. I would not trust a bark upon that tide: it is a sheet of gold in calm, and in storm it turns up billows very like pitch” (Hatfield 4/99). Only with Percy does Zamorna expose this dark underside. In private, they listen to each other for hours, placing unlimited confidence in one another, finding they are alike in their unlikeness to others. In league with one another, they link their arms and speak of themselves as an elite “we,”<sup>27</sup> earning the enmity of others. Charles relates the time that Zamorna tended Percy while he was ill. During the latter’s convalescence, they conversed, and “soul was flowing unto soul” (Hatfield 4/103), Percy sharing his history with Zamorna as he had with no other man. Even during their skirmishes, Zamorna finds he enjoys the game, the resultant boyish gaiety and youthful frolic that bubble up in him. He feels himself yielding to an ardor he harbors for Percy, struggling to keep these sentiments repressed:

He . . . knew that indeed he was the only man who could appreciate the mighty Percy . . . his eyelids closed over the quivering tears that gushed beneath them, tears which I warn no man to deride for they were the result of smothered but most intensely felt emotions, as, I say, his burning nature sought relief thus, against his will and despite his control . . .

the colour was fleeting and changing like clouds [on Zamorna’s face]. His emotions had mastered him for the moment, and he dared not unclose his lips lest what he felt should rush forth too wildly in words.

(Hatfield 4/105)

The intimacy shared by this pair never lasts long, though, the romance turning to rivalry as quickly as it reverts to romance. But because of their frequent conferences, they cease to hate or envy one another for any length of time. As with their boxing matches, they refrain from hitting where the blow would be fatal, instead attempting to mortify the other’s vanity through disfigurement. For years, the pair cavort like young lovers—baring their souls in high intimacy one moment, and hurling insults and slamming doors in each other’s faces the next—entering one another’s houses through cloistered accesses, metaphorically signaling the special quality of this relationship. Zamorna uses a private entrance to let himself into Percy’s domain—the same entry later employed to court

Mary—while Percy uses a garden door leading to the personal rooms of the marquis and marchioness.

A deeper correspondence, however, exists between the pair than mere camaraderie. When, in “Zamorna’s Exile,” Zamorna fails to meet Percy for their habitual rendezvous, we learn that Percy’s expectant anticipation comes not from “tender affection and friendship,” but rather because Zamorna’s presence brings “a reality, a vividness into life” which is otherwise absent in Percy’s existence (Hatfield 4/109).<sup>28</sup> To exact revenge for this insult, Percy proceeds, like a serpent through the “moonlight garden full of dew” to that private garden door “shaded round with flowers,” which he “gently uncloses” (Hatfield 4/110). Slowly ascending to the gallery, he opens “one of those shrine-like doors” (Hatfield 4/111) to slither in and do his damage to the child-like innocence of Marian Hume (Zamorna’s second wife and Percy’s former daughter-in-law), irrevocably destroying the marriage. This is but one scene which graphically illustrates the primacy of this homoerotic relationship: all others are sacrificed to the love this demonic duo has for one another. The intensity of this alliance, of course, dooms it, and through the inside knowledge they have gained, they inevitably destroy one another, as lamented by Zamorna in his epic verse. Even as he watches his wife (Percy’s daughter, Mary) die, Zamorna espouses a love for Percy which is far deeper than that which he felt for any of his wives: “Now, Percy, whom in spite of blood and crime/I loved intensely...” (SHB Misc. 330), grieving over the loss of his relationship with Percy, rather than the death of his wife. Ultimately, for Zamorna, homoerotic love is an expression of self-love—that reflection of himself in the mirror, as well as a love of his own sex—and depicts his inability to acknowledge his own anima. The exclusivity of this male bonding might seemingly exclude Charlotte, as it does other women. The close camaraderie enjoyed by Zamorna and Percy, though, is, in effect, what Charlotte enjoyed with her brother, Branwell, and parallels her inability to concede her own femininity and create room for the existence of an animus. Not until her collaboration with Branwell ends is Charlotte able to continue the individuation process. Significantly, the break-up of the relationship between Zamorna and Percy coincides with the dissolution of the writing partnership shared by Charlotte and Branwell, and marks the moment when Charlotte begins searching for a means to connect with her hero as a young woman, rather than as a

fellow comrade. Hence, the focus of the stories after 1837 becomes less homoerotic and more heterosexual in nature, signifying the break-up of a psychic stalemate.

Leaving behind the homoerotic relationship shared by Zamorna and Percy, and the collaborative writing partnership with her brother, Charlotte at last was at liberty to begin identifying with female role models. First, however, she would need to confront her self-cultivated misogyny, which had become deeply ingrained in her thinking and her writing. Such misogynistic thinking, while it may have initially empowered her to write as a male adventurer, and to identify with her brother on a true peer-level, had engendered much psychic damage to Charlotte. Her identification with a male world had not only blocked access to the emergence of a positive animus, it had virtually allowed both her negative animus and shadow to possess her, instigating her crisis of 1836.

#### **4. Misogyny in the Juvenilia**

For as long as she remained in a man's world, identifying with men, Charlotte unconsciously permitted both her shadow and her animus to become 'inflated' with a "feeling of godlikeness, of being a superman" (Fordham 61). Inflation clearly plays a harmful role in Charlotte's development. This destructive form of megalomania which either the shadow self or the animus/a (or both) undertakes plays on and preys upon the weaknesses of others to maintain its dilated state of being. The inflated conscious agent must enslave the other in order to serve its own need for self-recognition, which, in the juvenilia, means the enslavement of Mina Laury, and in reality, means the domination and possession of Charlotte.<sup>29</sup> Zamorna's inflation results in Charlotte's inability for a time to come to terms with her female self and to allow Zamorna to take his place as her positive animus. Her liberal use of religious iconography, particularly in Passing Events, which exaggerates Zamorna's inflation epitomizes a blasphemous gesture, suggesting a kind of warped worship of Satan or the Antichrist. Victor Neufeldt comments on a poem which Charlotte composed in 1837 and later re-worked, eventually publishing it under the title of "Apostasy." He writes:

The speaker, a female, is Angrian, but it is not difficult to see the sentiments as belonging to Charlotte. On her deathbed, the speaker confesses to the “solemn priest” that she has “sold” her “early truth” for the “encircling ring” of marriage . . . She denies both God and heaven and states that she will die an infidel; her only bliss and rest are in her husband’s arms, and in his love. She completes the awful blasphemy by kissing the priest’s cross, employing the sacred sign in a profane act of worship of her own earthly heaven—her husband. Significantly, the priest, after her death, comments: “A sad farewell to thee/An awful God will not forgive/Such dark apostasy[.]” (Neufeldt, “The Idolatrous Web” 20)

This idolatry and apostasy, of course, contribute to Zamorna’s messianic sense of himself and his awareness of his godlike domination over such women. Coupled with his fear and loathing of his anima, Zamorna’s behavior results in a sadism which itself becomes perversely attractive to Charlotte. Sadism feeds into her negative self-image, and the invalidating vision of this bevy of passive women in her stories. Hence, identifying with these victimized women poses distinct dangers not only for Charlotte’s psyche, but her life. One of the few exceptions here proves to be Zenobia, who is not fearful of Zamorna’s dark character. As “a Western woman” (Gérin FN 40),<sup>30</sup> Zenobia refuses to be insulted, intimidated or enslaved by men, including her husband, Percy. Zenobia excites Zamorna’s admiration—a narcissistic gesture, as so much else is here—since she is depicted as his female double.<sup>31</sup> Zamorna’s wife, Mary, by contrast, merely grows more saintly and purely white, retreating from life, as her husband devolves into a more darkly corrupt and demonic figure. Zamorna becomes increasingly critical of women and fiercely indifferent to the pain he causes them, perhaps unconsciously recognizing his own feminine characteristics as weaknesses or insecurities within himself which have yet to be expunged. This self-derision is repeatedly re-stated in a barrage of derisive remarks directed at Mary, who absorbs all criticism, rather than deflecting it, as Zenobia does. In time, Mary is portrayed as an exalted martyr, forfeiting herself at the altar of this infidel, and Charlotte was inspired for a brief time to emulate her (as alluded to in Victor Neufeldt’s comments above). Later, however, she satirizes such posturing in *Villette*, deflating the icon of the ghostly nun by showing that it was nothing more than empty parodic imagery—a costume finally to be folded up and put away, like some childish memento. By then, Charlotte had long outgrown her early misogyny, though it had once been a destructive force and had left its mark on her.

A woman's place is often the subject of debate in this pre- and early Victorian world. The Duke of Wellington claims "the proper and native element of woman is home. That is her kingdom, her undisputed and rightful possession" ("Visits in Verreopolis" 1830, CA 1:314). Three years later, many of the men in the juvenilia are humming the same tune. A tutor and antiquarian comments in "The Green Dwarf" that all women value marriage over education: "That's the way of all women. They think of nothing but being married, while learning is as dust in the balance" (CA 2.1:137). In this same tale, Captain Bud (Branwell's pseudonym) asserts that "Ladies look more to external than internal qualifications in their husbands elect" (CA 2.1:138), stressing what is seen as a woman's superficial, unthinking nature. Until this time, Zamorna has been a defender and admirer of women, but in 1833, the same year he starts to rise in the world and becomes demonized by Branwell, he begins to exhibit misogynist traits as well. Now Zamorna talks of keeping women in their place, and in thrall to him, which shocks even his father.<sup>32</sup> The Duke is taken aback by his eldest son's new penchant for Orientalism. In "The Post Office," Zamorna speaks of his desire to keep a harem, and by 1834, in "High Life in Verdopolis," he is depicted by his brother as being "on a par with the Grand Sultan of Turkey surrounded by his seraglio" (CA 2.2:30). Although he humors women, is generous with them, understands and influences them, Zamorna, unlike Percy, does not defer to them, and he means to dominate them fully. As Charles observes, "I rather believe that, in his secret heart of hearts, a casket which none have ever unlocked save himself, he thinks them far inferior to the lords of creation and imagines that they were created only to furnish him with amusement and to do his pleasure" (CA 2.2:30). In "The Tragedy and the Essay," Zamorna displays contempt for those who are dependent upon him and his favors; he expresses the same disdain for husbands who are timid or henpecked (e.g., Percy, in his inability to govern Zenobia). No doubt, this is why Zamorna marries Marian, rather than Zenobia, whom he keeps as a friend and confidant. Zamorna seems to want his wives to be obedient, even child-like, and his paramours tantalizingly independent, even like *femmes fatales*—a rather contrary, even contradictory, view of women, and one which reveals Charlotte's rather ambivalent views of her own sex.

In purging himself of his effeminacy and thereby demonizing his anima, Zamorna grows increasingly misogynist and abusive toward women. Gradually, he detests all that is weak about them, and correspondingly, all that is weak about himself. He loathes women's tears and trembling, scorns their sensitivity and sentimentality, and distrusts them, convinced they plot against him. Like Adam, he curses the "prying weakness" which is born with their sex, their "impulse of malignant curiosity," and claims women "have always overthrown the greatest fabrics of man's construction" (CA 2.2:187-88). He remarks to his wife Mary, "I cannot help smiling at the whole female character, so finely epitomized in you: weakness, errors, repentance" (CA 2.2:188). In a fragment entitled "A Late Occurrence" (1835), Zamorna speaks derisively of "the artfulness of a female mind [which is grounded in] coquetry, indecision and petty cunning" (CA 2.2:347). In "Stancliffe's Hotel" (1838), he meditates on "the sorcery of female charms & the peril of doating [sic] on them too fondly, being guided by them too implicitly—" (BPM 114/32). In Zamorna's opinion, women are capricious and inconsistent, and he has no patience with their martyr-like suffering, though such behavior is usually instigated by his own cold indifference.

Charlotte keeps re-making and refining these women, seemingly searching for the perfect equation—even erotic component—between master and mistress. So, too, does Zamorna. He is always looking for a woman whom he can control utterly, yet who will not wither under his touch and command.<sup>33</sup> Such a relationship is not fully realized until Charlotte comes to write the novelettes and more closely examines the long-term alliance between Zamorna and Mina Laury. Charlotte's 1838 novelette Mina Laury (also known as Mina Laury II) proves to be an unusually interesting piece of work for all that it brings out about Charlotte's enthrallment with Zamorna, and her futile attempt to relate to him as a disenfranchised young woman. She soon finds Mina Laury presents an impractical model of exaggerated piety, much like the impossible ideal posited by Ellen Nussey.<sup>34</sup> Mina's masochistic servitude merely triggers Zamorna's misogyny and sadistic cruelty, just as Ellen's exemplary character results in Charlotte's self-loathing. In Mina, Zamorna finds the willingness to subjugate the ego in order to serve him. Such sacrifice of the self was, for a time, erotically attractive for Charlotte, and she explored this and other carnal correspondences in the writings of that period, attempting to reconcile her spiritual guilt

with her sexual yearnings. John Maynard asserts that in the juvenilia, one can see “Brontë’s own rapid discovery of the force of mature sexual desire once she had begun to turn the child’s stories to the relation of the sexes” (43). He believes that Charlotte’s reading of Byron and others who subscribed to a freer sexual license stimulated her and allowed her to expand and develop in ways other writers weren’t able to do in their own work: “Brontë is able to look on the way of the world, the way of all flesh even, with keen curiosity and considerable distance and with a freedom she would never have in published work” (Maynard 42). Maynard maintains that the novelettes investigate sexual relations on two levels, perhaps in order to explore their implications. While focusing on the religious eroticism which manifested itself in a sexless passion shared by Zamorna and Mina, Charlotte examines “a worldly, comic society dedicated in its vulgar way to sexual license and mutual exploitation” (Maynard 52), and this double-level investigation is often seen in the juxtapositioning of contrasting episodes. In so doing, Charlotte was setting up a sexual dialectic, perhaps in hopes of eventually synthesizing elements from both extremes—the comic and the passionate—to achieve an eventual balance and truth about sexuality and erotic relationships.

Those scenes between Zamorna and Mina, which are played off against contrasting sequences depicting the licentious mores of urbane sophisticates, center on the idolatry of a passionate young peasant girl for the unworthy demi-god who only becomes more disdainful of Mina as her adoration intensifies. Mina is regarded by Maynard as “a totalitarian in love” (53). The drama inherent in this matrix of dominance and submission is set against that same backdrop of civil war portrayed in Passing Events,<sup>35</sup> heightening the eroticism contained within it, and conflating sexuality and religiosity, as well as the sexual with the political. Mina is kept sequestered, like the wife of an outlaw monarch, at Hawkscliffe (also known as the Cross of Rivaulx), Zamorna’s war headquarters. A surfeit of Christian iconography embroiders these quarters and this secret mistress, as if to stress the concept that Zamorna is fighting a Holy war, with Mina as his self-abnegating, dutiful acolyte. Mina’s selfless loyalty to her messianic leader is absolute. “His land is my land,” she insists when Warner Howard Warner tries to convince her that she must leave war-torn Angria (Gérin FN 44). Her rhetoric resonates with scriptural echoes from the Book of Ruth, in effect saying, ‘His life is my life,’ or

‘His self is my self.’<sup>36</sup> “I’ve nothing else to exist for,” adds Mina, “I’ve no other interest in life” (Gérin FN 44). Mina is without self or ego, having no actuality beyond that which she shares with Zamorna, precisely mirroring each stage of his development in the juvenilia. Helene Moglen elaborates on Mina’s role in this novelette:

In fascinating ways, Mina combines spiritual strength with emotional weakness: independence of mind with psychic submission . . . But despite the fact that Mina achieves a position of her own, she does not experience herself as an independent entity. She accepts the role she plays as a duty: . . . She defines herself as Zamorna’s property. She sees herself as his object. She exists only as she exists for him: denying her own capacities, her potential, her integrity: . . . She accepts even embraces humiliation . . . She lives in a state of thralldom: a woman obsessed. (Moglen 52-53)

Hence, Mina can be viewed as duty incarnate, taking a virtue to its extreme, like Zamorna, and corrupting it. And yet, Mina’s excessive self-sacrifice and subservience—seeing herself as living out a destiny she was born to, vowing she will be “Obedient till Death” (Gérin FN 48)—is often equivocal, her expression and thought counteracting her oath. She accepts Zamorna’s occasional embraces as an obligation: “She took it as a slave ought to take the caress of a Sultan. . . .” (Gérin FN 46). She often tries to countermand Zamorna’s orders, and frequently speaks her mind in an insubordinate manner. Moreover, during those moments when Zamorna reminds her of her position in his life—as a concubine, rather than a wife—Mina shrinks into herself and grows silent, wishing herself “dead & buried & insensible to the shame that overwhelmed her” (Gérin FN 47), or awash in “bitter humiliation & self-abasement” (Gérin FN 48). Mina’s self-loathing, instigated by timely reminders of her role as exploited mistress and governess, exemplify Charlotte’s own concerns for her future as a woman without property or social status, in thrall to a demon and equally vulnerable to a similar kind of exploitation. At the same time, Mina’s insubordination reflects Charlotte’s independent spirit, demonstrating the unsuitability of such a role model for her. Eventually Charlotte needed to outgrow such adolescent thralldom and self-abasement to find her own strength regardless of her straitened circumstances.

As a model of pious zealotry, Mina Laury exceeds all other of Zamorna’s wives and lovers in her selfless devotion. In an earlier story (“The Spell”), she engages Mary

Percy in a debate over the kind of woman most suitable for Zamorna, and here we begin to see Charlotte overtly insinuating herself into her stories as a female consciousness, exploring her own status in the larger world. Mina's argument that a man like Zamorna is best served by a woman who is not of the aristocratic class—while it serves as a rationale for Charlotte's romantically allying herself with her archetype—illustrates Charlotte's own coming to terms with her middle-class roots. The passage also anticipates Jane Eyre's thoughts—never expressed—about Blanche Ingram's unsuitability as a possible wife to Rochester. Mina tells Mary Percy that Zamorna requires a woman with fortitude and strength borne of adversity and labor—a governess, perhaps, not an aristocratic hothouse flower, who

may please and entertain him and blossom brightly in his smiles, but when adversity saddens him, when there are hard duties to perform, when his brow grows dark and his voice becomes stern and sounds only in command, I warn you, he will call for another handmaid. . . . (CA 2.2:177)

One needs endurance to see Zamorna through his trials, according to Mina, but also a selfless servitude, a willingness “to live for him after he cease[s] to live for her” (CA 2.2:177). Mina is justifying a life of pious discipline, even a dogma of extreme masochism, but in service to a demonic mortal rather than a Supreme Being, religiosity and duty becoming confused with erotic attachment. Robert Polhemus (*Erotic Faith: Being in Love from Jane Austen to D.H. Lawrence*) investigates the fusing of religious faith with secular love in *Villette*, claiming everything in the novel “exists in a double context: Christian and erotic,” arguing that “the intention of the text is to reconcile human love and Christian faith” (110). Combining pious and secular love seems to be Charlotte's objective in some of these early novelettes as well.<sup>37</sup> Polhemus views Charlotte as “a Calvinist of the heart,” with some saved and some damned by love (109). Even in tales written more than a decade before *Villette*, Charlotte appears to subvert erotic love to make it both more acceptable and salvational. Like Mina, Charlotte attempts to repress her infatuation for Zamorna, and this creates a vision of “erotic enchantment” and works “to idealize love” (Polhemus 113). By curbing “hopeless erotic desire” (111), explains Polhemus, Charlotte is presenting “a small-scale version of the way Victorian sexual repression was ideally supposed to work” (113), love transforming

itself into energy, which results in good, constructive works. “Erotic faith might not bring happiness,” remarks Polhemus, “but it could offer a reason for being and an incarnation . . . of meaning” (136), even if, as he posits earlier, “your being and self-image may be wholly inscribed in your lover” (118). Hence, repression seems one way in which Charlotte can reconcile, for now, her erotic drive with her Calvinist conscience, burying her libidinous impulses in a form of sacred, sensual worship: “Love, dangerous as it is, is the only way to salvation” (Polhemus 124). It is a delusion which works for Mina, but not so well, we soon find, for Charlotte.<sup>38</sup>

The eroticism contained in the relationship between Mina and Zamorna is heightened through the threat of insurrection by revolutionary forces, and this, too, can be read on more than one level. Charlotte may have hoped to create in Mina the eternal feminine savior for Zamorna—ultimately sacrificing herself for the salvation of her country and her leader, who views himself as the embodiment of Angria. The undermining of Zamorna’s tyrannical authority by rebellious forces of insurrection also can be interpreted as Charlotte’s toppling of her negative anima and shadow from his former position of supremacy. Shuttleworth observes that in the juvenilia

the virile suppression of working-class discontent only leads, it seems, to renewed convulsions in the female sphere, where the marks of excessive adoration are indistinguishable from political revolt. Passionate excess, both political and sexual, is set in opposition to dominant, patriarchal order. (Shuttleworth 104)

Zamorna’s oppression, resisted by the populace, transfers itself instead to the private realm and to his relationship to Mina. While he outwardly represents the dominant patriarchal order, inwardly his reaction mimics that of women. His demeanor is extreme and contradictory at this juncture—his behavior in public excessively restrained, while in private exceedingly emotional, mirroring the polarity found in female decorum at the time, and indeed, perhaps impersonating Charlotte’s own demeanor in that year. Shuttleworth contends that femininity for Victorian women was “predicated on a condition of concealment, on a disjunction between surface control and inner sexuality” (72).<sup>39</sup> Yet it is in private that patriarchal abuse manifests itself. Whenever Mina exhibits any signs of self-will and self-determination, Zamorna exerts his own supremacy over

her, to which she then capitulates. In commenting on such hegemonic relations between the sexes, Shuttleworth observes that while power accrued to Victorian women in direct proportion to their willingness to subordinate themselves to men, it also placed them in a double-bind, since it elicited a contempt by the men who ruled them:

Critical embarrassment in relation to the early writings possibly stems from the fact that it reveals all too plainly the social causes and production of female masochism. Taught to value themselves only as objects of male desire, women actively contribute to their own enslavement, channelling all their energies into a devotion toward the masculine source of their own perceived value, and thus locking themselves into a vicious cycle where the more they attempt to affirm their worth, the more they actively devalue themselves in the eyes of their chosen master. (Shuttleworth 121)

That Charlotte was exploring her own response to such tyranny is indisputable. We already understand the nature of her struggle against the supremacy of her shadow. As Zamorna gained ascendancy in Charlotte's mind, her own sense of self-worth correspondingly fell in value, as evidenced in her letters to Ellen. Both figures—Zamorna and Mina—locked in this sadomasochistic stranglehold emanate from Charlotte's own psyche. In worshipping this idol whom she had made a god in her mind and whom she was only beginning to recognize as part of her essential agency, Charlotte suffers self-recrimination and risks further oppressive possession by that negative animus and shadow. The temptation to capitulate to such idolatry is so strong, she must consciously and continuously resist this urge, knowing surrender will only generate further self-hatred. Instead, she must acknowledge her animus so it will work for, rather than against, her, and re-conceive and reframe the shadow self and her relation to it, in order to emerge whole.

This inner struggle, this "vicious cycle" Shuttleworth speaks of, prompted by Charlotte's burgeoning sexuality and the erogenous thoughts which were being played out in her tales, generated a guilt which only exacerbated Charlotte's religious contrition, and initially led her astray. Mina embodies that exaggerated ideal of excessive self-restraint to which Charlotte initially aspired in the forging of her self-will, but in Mina, the focus and motive for such rigorous discipline was misdirected. The negative consequences of allying herself as penitent to the demonic Zamorna are clear from the

start, Mina paying a very heavy price for this lopsided liaison. In order to remain loyal to him, she has made a clean break with her family and hardened herself to societal views of Zamorna. A willful character, she surrenders that will to her master, which results in “a total loss of self-determination” (Maynard 53). Further, she “avoids the torments of jealousy by giving herself to Zamorna on whatever terms he wishes” (Maynard 53). One begins to see the parallels with the Church here: the appeal to Charlotte of the surrender of the self in service to an omnipotent God, severing all earthly ties and becoming a symbolic bride of Christ. Although the worship depicted here is heretic, not Holy, “the archetypes of the unconscious can be shown empirically to be the equivalents of religious dogmas,” claims Fordham, corresponding to all known religious ideas (70). One also begins to comprehend why Charlotte consistently employs orphans in her tales. In relinquishing all other human ties—or in having those ties severed involuntarily—one can wholly focus on the beloved idol, without concern for familial or social consequences. As well, in order to serve such a demanding and complex figure as Zamorna, she would need to be liberated from the confines of the role of dutiful daughter. In surrendering the selfhood, then, one sheds earthly obligations and wholly subsumes one’s own identity in that of the beloved. However, we also sense how inappropriate such an existence would be for someone like Charlotte. Her dependency upon Zamorna to define herself, then, comes under serious question. Moglen makes the following observation about Mina, though she could be discussing Charlotte: “In fact, it is because [Mina] is alienated from herself that she so dreads alienation from [Zamorna]. It is because she experiences herself as incomplete and unworthy that she looks to him to fill her emptiness. She is a completely male-identified woman—” (54). Both Passing Events (1836) and Mina Laury (1838) illustrate the impossibility of such a fantasized ideal for Charlotte and outline the nature of her struggle with the shadow for supremacy over her essential self. Certainly there was no mutuality or equality contained in this relationship, no room for a young woman to express herself or her self-will, nor to maintain her self-integrity or her self-agency as an individual in her own right. Therefore, the overthrow of Zamorna as ruler of Angria emblemizes the necessary displacement of Zamorna as Charlotte’s negative animus and shadow so that she can psychically develop as she should.

Soon enough, Charlotte would realize the rigidly hierarchical love relationship shared by Zamorna and Mina was an unworkable model for her, how it continued to give her animus and shadow self a dangerous supremacy over her. A description of Mina Laury in the 1838 novelette of the same name proves eminently self-revealing:

Strong-minded beyond her sex—active[,] energetic & accomplished in all other points of view—here she was as weak as a child—she lost her identity—her very way of life was swallowed up in that of another—  
(Gérin FN 165)

Once Charlotte could see the dichotomy of such an asymmetrical co-existence, its inappropriateness for a woman such as herself, she drops Mina Laury from her cast of characters in the ongoing Angrian narrative. From then on, Charlotte concentrated on creating heroines with a sense of self-worth, who would reject the role of submissive mistress, elevate the station of independent governess, and become active agents in their own destinies, engaging themselves with the world, rather than operating as mere observers and critics of it, as Charlotte and Charles had thus far done. These female role models more suitably expressed her need to become a self-sufficient woman of less than aristocratic class, less susceptible to the tyranny of the dark forces in her psyche. These women open up new venues for greater equality in male-female relationships, and prove to be more viable vehicles for Charlotte's future correspondence with her positive animus. She is now free to shift her aggression and ambition, as well as her libidinous impulses, on to her conscious self, or her new persona, and out of the realm of the shadow. At the same time, Charlotte's religious concerns approach resolution, since she has shed her former apostasy. All these developments combine to create a conducive environment for taking the bold step of integrating her shadow, making room for Zamorna to function as her positive animus, facilitating Charlotte's eventual individuation.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> In “Definitions,” Jung makes the following exception to his own rule about the anima/us: “In every case where the individuality is unconscious, and therefore associated with the soul, the soul-image has the character of the same sex” (Essential Jung 103).

<sup>2</sup> Jung writes: “Such cases are always persons with defective external adaptation and comparative unrelatedness, because the identification with the soul begets an attitude with a predominant orientation toward the inner processes, whereby the object is deprived of its determining influence” (Psychological Types 598). Such remarks reveal Jung’s own homophobic sentiments, which are not shared by me.

<sup>3</sup> It ought to be mentioned here that Charlotte’s deviation from Jung’s dialectic is characteristic of the differences between the ways in which men and women—particularly women who grow up in a patriarchal environment—undergo individuation, as pointed out by Demaris Wehr (99). These distinctions will be discussed at greater length in the Conclusion.

<sup>4</sup> This area, in particular, is where numerous feminists deviate from Jung’s stated theories about the nature of each gender. Wehr addresses this more specifically in Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary, saying that, “some contemporary feminist theologians have found Jung’s theories to be part of the continuing problem of patriarchy, reifying an illusory and romantic conception of women” (189). Wehr adds that a “more moderate group of feminist theorists,” while acknowledging Jung’s sexism, has attempted to “retain helpful aspects of his theory,” counting herself amongst this group of feminists (189). These theorists, rather than view archetypes in a static form, instead try to contextualize such images, conceptualizing them as constantly mutating in accordance with societal changes. They are of the opinion that this mutation does not diverge fundamentally from Jung’s own position, since, as Wehr opines, this is “a reading that seems entirely congruent with much of Jung’s own, especially later, attempts at understanding the ‘archetype’ and its effects” (189). (See note 18 to Introduction.) Wehr defines these assumptions of difference more specifically in Jung and Feminism, explaining that Jung differentiates between men’s and women’s consciousness, calling that of women’s “diffuse” and closer to the principle of Eros (relatedness), and that of men’s “focused,” conforming to the principle of Logos (analysis). According to Wehr, Jung views Eros and Logos as natural—even as archetypal principles—rather than as culturally created tendencies in women and men. This is where Jung’s views are so crucially at variance with those of most feminists, according to Wehr (102).

<sup>5</sup> This process is enucleated slightly differently by Barbara Hannah, who outlines the progression as follows: “After the personal shadow has been sufficiently realized to prevent [the] anima—or, in women, animus—figure from hiding behind it, the *Auseinandersetzung* [an untranslatable German word meaning having it out with, discussing, or analyzing] with the anima or animus can begin, for ‘she’ or ‘he’ now represents the whole unconscious” (24). Hannah then explains that this internal discussion in many cases begins during work on the shadow, the first figure to be encountered. Should the shadow be contaminated with the Devil as an archetype, according to Hannah, then this inner debate can remain a burning problem for years, usually ending in a deadlock, “unless the figure of the anima or animus is discovered, or reveals itself in time” (25).

---

Presumably this is what occurred with Branwell, who remained at an impasse with his shadow for the rest of his life. Hannah writes: “The struggle between ego and shadow—although it is the first manifestation of the opposites—can seldom or never be solved without the intervention of the following phase, the struggle between the human being and the animus or anima, just as the latter can never be solved without the intervention of the self” (55). Having it out with the anima, comments Hannah, remains the most difficult task of all for men (70).

<sup>6</sup> Charlotte’s animus continues to evolve in her adult fiction—serving as both her muse and her chief male protagonist. In Holy Ghosts: the male muses of Emily and Charlotte Brontë, Irene Tayler examines the role the male muse plays in the imagination and fiction of Charlotte and Emily. Later mutations of the Zamorna-figure as Charlotte’s positive animus range from Rochester, who relies on the strengths of *Jane Eyre*, to M. Paul, who empowers Lucy Snowe by teaching her to believe in herself, then providing her with a school of her own in Villette.

<sup>7</sup> This apparent lack of ego in women comes under discussion in Wehr’s Jung and Feminism. She points out that, particularly in patriarchal societies, males have a far stronger sense of self and identity than do women—who are encouraged to be self-less, to exist in service to others. See pp.100 ff.

<sup>8</sup> In Caroline Vernon, for instance, Zamorna resembles Mr. Sidgwick. Charlotte served as a governess in the Sidgwick home of Stonegappe in 1839, just prior to the composition of this novelette.

<sup>9</sup> Winifred Gérin claims that Zamorna remains omnipresent in all of Charlotte’s adult fiction, though invisibly so, like “the dark side of the moon” (Gérin FN 22), creating an apt metaphor for Charlotte’s animus.

<sup>10</sup> As mentioned, the anima or animus acts as the mediator between the conscious and unconscious selves. Without a properly functioning animus, Charlotte could not make the definitive link with her shadow self, which would then lead to the eventual individuation of her personality.

<sup>11</sup> Winifred Gérin sees this fresh mature outlook as occurring much earlier, saying of the novelettes which follow this period of crisis: “The analysis of character, of motive, of feeling, while still Byronic in substance, show a new ability in the author to *observe* people and portray them with truth. Gone are the dream-figures of her earlier fantasies; gone too is the almost reverend approach to her heroes and heroines; she sees them now as faulty and suffering mortals . . . able now to stand aside compassioning [sic] with their folly” (The Formative Years 53-54).

<sup>12</sup> Frieda Fordham makes reference here to Jung’s essay “Psychology and Alchemy.”

---

<sup>13</sup> Juliet Barker objects to the term “Roe Head Journals,” used by most biographers. She says this is “misleading and inappropriate as it implies a consistent set of dated entries in a bound volume. In fact, the ‘Journal’ is composed of the autobiographical passages with which Charlotte introduced or ended Angrian fragments she wrote at Roe Head, some of which are undated” (Barker 886n100).

<sup>14</sup> Back in Haworth at Christmas, in 1836, Charlotte recalls her reaction while at Roe Head upon seeing a vision of Zamorna: “I was quite gone. I had really utterly forgot where I was and all the gloom and cheerlessness of my situation” (CA 2.2:385). Christine Alexander notes that during this year, Charlotte’s visions “vie with reality,” having “a life of their own” (Early Writings 142).

<sup>15</sup> Barker cites another journal entry, thought to have been written in October of 1836, in which Charlotte has such a compulsion to write, she is willing to undergo the stares of her Philistine students: “I’m just going to write because I cannot help it Wiggins [another pseudonym of Branwell’s] might indeed talk of scribblemania [sic] if he were to see me just now encompassed by the bulls (query calves of Bashan) all wondering why I write with my eyes shut—staring, gaping hang their astonishment—” (255).

<sup>16</sup> This act of writing with the eyes closed might also be viewed as a form of automatic writing wherein the thoughts flow unimpeded from the unconscious.

<sup>17</sup> The change in class status here more closely reflects Charlotte’s own disenfranchised state, as characterized by Sally Shuttleworth: “Her social status . . . was decidedly marginal: middle-class and educated, but with few surrounding social peers, and constantly under the threat of genteel poverty, she had, as a woman, no legitimate social outlet for her talents . . . Her second-class status was reinforced by the favouritism shown toward her pampered brother, Branwell, whose extravagance forced her to become, for a time, a governess – a social role which, in placing her in a limbo between employer and servant, further reinforced her sense of social liminality” (65-66).

<sup>18</sup> This manuscript, dated July 1836, is alternately referred to as “And, when you left me. . . .”

<sup>19</sup> Christine Alexander observes that at this stage, Charlotte’s creative imagination fully possessed her to such a degree that she no longer draws inspiration from the works of others, which the style of “Zamorna’s Exile” would refute. In the same statement, Alexander posits that, at this stage, Charlotte became “not only creator but actor—sharing vicariously the life of her characters” (Early Writings 141). The theatricality inherent in this concept is borne out by Charlotte’s description of her reveries. She writes that it is as if “a curtain seemed to rise” on this nether-world, demonstrating the appeal of its power to transport her fully, lifting her out of the prison-world of Roe Head (from a journal entry c. October 1836, as cited by Ratchford, Legends of Angria xxx).

<sup>20</sup> Again, this description of the consequences of the repression of the anima reflects gendered stereotyping by Jung, though here, inexplicably, it fits.

<sup>21</sup> In Branwell's long biographical history of Percy, first undertaken in 1834, his narrator, Captain Bud, describes a child of seraphic sweetness and light golden hair, who sobbed and trembled at the sound of music, let out cheerful screams at the sight of flowers, and claimed to see angels. Acquaintances remark on his "effeminacy and girlishness" (The life of feild [sic] Marshall the Right Honorable Alexander Percy, Chapter 2, Vol. 1, Neufeldt, WPBB, Vol. 2). While his first wife, Augusta di Segovia is courting him, Percy is compared to a deer and she to a huntress (Chapter 3), much in the same way that Zenobia is endowed with Diana-like properties and Zamorna with those of Apollo. Nina Auerbach remarks that Milton's and Blake's angels were, like their devils, males with bi-sexual potential (Woman and the Demon 74), and both Branwell and Charlotte may have been borrowing such imagery for their archetypes.

<sup>22</sup> Interestingly, Ernest has been instructed by Zamorna to distance himself from women, including his own mother and his guardian, Mina. He discloses in "The Spell" that his father told him "boys should never think it impossible to do without a woman or to part with her" (CA 2.2:178).

<sup>23</sup> In The Duke of Zamorna (1838), we are told that Zamorna is frightened by Louisa Vernon's sentimentality (SHB Misc. 366).

<sup>24</sup> Indeed, the subject was one that arose in Charlotte's adult fiction as well, most notably in the gender transformations that take place in Shirley. When, in her mature novels, Charlotte has her characters engage in cross-dressing, the act becomes self-empowering. Rochester masquerades as a gypsy fortune-teller in order to find out more about Jane. When Lucy Snowe reluctantly takes the role of a man in an amateur theatrical production, she unexpectedly learns more about her own hidden strengths and her ability to imitate, satirize, and even improve upon the everyday performances of her acquaintances, of either sex.

<sup>25</sup> As Zamorna tells Zenobia, "Marian knows only one side of my character. I am not often provoked by her, and therefore she is quite ignorant of the lengths to which I can go when passion prompts. But you, Zenobia, know me better" (CA 2.1:81).

<sup>26</sup> Had Zamorna selected Zenobia as his mate, he would have been acknowledging his feminine counterpart, or his personalized—rather than archetypal—anima.

<sup>27</sup> Some of the signatures on Charlotte and Branwell's early manuscripts bear the marks "WT" for "We Two" or "UT" for "Us Two."

<sup>28</sup> This admission by Percy also discloses what Zamorna meant to Charlotte, and why she was loath to undo the spell he had created.

<sup>29</sup> In The Colonial Rise of the Novel, Fidour Azim observes that: "[Mina's and Zamorna's] relationship is portrayed in terms of enslavement and devotion . . . Sexual enthrallment is

expressed through the metaphor of sultan/slave relationship. Sexual submission to a man is compared to the submission of a peasant girl to her master. His power is described as similar to the power an Oriental potentate exercises over his slaves" (142). Azim sees this sexuality as the "replacing of the savage Other with that of woman as Other" and feels it "has unsettling implications for the status both of the narrating subject and of the Other which it eradicates and removes in the process" (142), underscoring the masochistic motif found by most critics in the figure of Mina. Northrop Frye would see a tragic irony implicit in Charlotte's work of this period. The parody of religious symbols here exemplifies Frye's theories that much tragic action revolves around pride of race and birthright, which endorses Azim's views on classism and colonialist thinking in these scenes between Zamorna and Mina. However, as Azim points out, "a variegated terrain of sexual pleasure is created through these contrasting figures" (139), and he goes on to explain that Mina's position is a contradictory one—existing as both lover and servant, rival to Zamorna's wife, yet "almost . . . a sort of governess" (139). Charlotte appears to be attempting to create a heroine more in keeping with her own status. "The contrasts between Mary Henrietta [Percy] and Mina Laury focus on class differences," writes Azim (139). "Mina Laury, daughter of a woodsman, is strong, independent and actively asserts her undying love for Zamorna. Mary Henrietta's love, in contrast, is of the more passive, languishing variety" (Azim 139). Hence, Mina provides an initial means by which Charlotte can move out of roles of passivity into more active parts, even if, such a role is, mistakenly, that of one in total enthrallment to Zamorna.

<sup>30</sup> The Western provinces within the original Verdopolitan Confederation, populated by a people of fiery, passionate temperament, suggest Ireland. When Charlotte compares and contrasts Eastern with Western women in the juvenilia, she is purportedly speaking of the cultural differences between the English and the Irish, and may be examining her own divided cultural roots—alluding to her divided loyalties, and perhaps even that fundamental psychic split within herself.

<sup>31</sup> Helene Moglen says those for whom integration with another was primarily an erotic gesture, as it was for both Byron and Charlotte, found it was based in narcissism (29).

<sup>32</sup> The tendency of both archetypes to hold their women in thrall first appears in the manuscripts of 1833. Charlotte would have then been seventeen, beginning to examine love and marital relationships in her writing. Several stories composed in the fall of that year ("The Post Office," "The Secret," "Lily Hart") largely concern themselves with sexual politics. Percy has trouble controlling Zenobia and wishes he were married instead to Zamorna's meek, gentle Marian, who is without contradiction. At one point, he forces Marian to kneel before him, and praises her for her deference, adding that if he had "the management" of her, she "would soon arrive at the perfection of feminine meekness and humility" (CA 2.1:290). Zamorna, on the other hand, patronizes the obedient Marian, and openly admires Zenobia's strong, independent character. However, Zamorna expects unquestioned loyalty from his wife, telling her there is no room for a "counteracting influence to my own in that heart and family where I ought to reign paramount" (CA 2.1:276), and declaring that "I cannot love a disobedient wife" (CA 2.1:294). This occurs when the usually docile Marian has taken the rare step of disregarding her husband's orders. Normally, Marian, as she tells Mina Laury, is honored "to attend the beck of her lord and master" (CA 2.1:293). Her extreme sensitivity, though, puts both men off. Percy (illustrating his own contradictions) thinks Zamorna should discipline Marian to rid her of this trait.

<sup>33</sup> Zamorna consistently uses floral metaphors for women, and at one point, Percy all too accurately accuses Zamorna of possessing a black thumb: “You have a strange power of withering every flower you touch” (*Four Years Ago*, Hatfield 4/106). The narrator of *Caroline Vernon*, Charles Townshend, makes another such sally, in high-flown diction, observing how Zamorna considers women war booty, the rewards for his ambitious climb to become King of Angria: “It is his creed that all things bright and fair live for him — by him they are to be gathered & worn as the flowers of his Laurel Crown — The green leaves are victory in battle — they never fade[,] the roses are conquest in Love — they decay & drop off — Fresh ones blow round him, are plucked & woven with the withered stem of their predecessors — such a wreath he deems a glory about his temples[,] he may in the end find it rather like the snaky fillet which compressed Calchas’s brows, steeped in blue venom” (Gérin FN 352). John Maynard reads explicit sexuality in such floral metaphors: “Growing things, trees and flowers, with their common and obvious sexual qualities, offer a continuous frame of reference in which all that is juicy, budding, or fruitful is preferred to what is juiceless, detached, barren” (Maynard 115). Of course, such metaphorical language has its Christian implications as well.

<sup>34</sup> Later this same impossible ideal will be portrayed for Jane Eyre in the model of Helen Burns.

<sup>35</sup> Winifred Gérin separates these conjoined stories in *Five Novelettes*, explaining a quarter of the way through *Passing Events* that this is where C.W. Hatfield’s extract (published in *The Twelve Adventurers*) ends. That extract, usually referred to by critics as *Mina Laury I*, precedes the main novelette, *Mina Laury*, or *Mina Laury II* (Gérin FN 48). In her edition of selected stories from Charlotte’s juvenilia, Frances Beer notes that this tale is a conflation of two episodes, written over a two-year period. The first section was written in April 1836, and is part of the *History of Angria* (Beer 385n1).

<sup>36</sup> “And Ruth said, Intreat me not to leave thee, *or* to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people *shall be* my people, and thy God my God: Where thou diest, will I die, and there I will be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also, *if ought* but death part thee and me” (Ruth 1:16-17).

<sup>37</sup> Jung would point to the “natural religious function” at work here, the acknowledgement that one’s psychic health and stability depend on the proper expression of belief in a form of religious dogma, claiming this influenced man as powerfully as sexual or aggressive instincts (Fordham 70).

<sup>38</sup> In this respect, *Villette* seems more of a retrospective study, a reiteration of the dangers linked with and damage caused by repression. The novel’s resolution amends this, with M. Paul emerging as Lucy Snowe’s positive animus. See the Conclusion for my argument against one critic’s contention that Charlotte’s adult novels were suffused with repression.

<sup>39</sup> This disjunction, too, is very much in keeping with Maynard’s point that Zamorna’s religiosity creates an inward tension in its extremism. Rather than group Zamorna with his opposite, as Charlotte habitually does “to distinguish them by comparison” (105), we now see two opposing

---

forces contained in one person, “contrasting versions of excessive restraint and excessive, uncontrolled emotions” (107) existing, as Maynard posits earlier as “mere faces of one coin” (106). Such conflict has been visible in the primary figures of the juvenilia from their inception. However, by 1836, it reaches the breaking point, threatening the eruption of insanity in both public and private spheres, and consequently, the tales of this year are filled with great tension.

## Chapter Five

### The Road Back Toward Individuation

*“Just as the great personality acts upon society to liberate, to redeem, to transform, and to heal, so the birth of personality in oneself has a therapeutic effect. It is as if a river that had run to waste in sluggish side-streams and marshes suddenly found its way back to its proper bed, or as if a stone lying on a germinating seed were lifted away so that the shoot could begin its natural growth.”*  
(C.G. Jung, *Essential Jung* 208)

In 1837, Charlotte eased herself out of her collaborative relationship with her brother, following his unilateral annihilation of one of her favorite characters—Mary Percy, Zamorna’s wife, and the Queen of Angria. During the Christmas holidays of 1836, Charlotte had returned from Roe Head to find that without consultation, Branwell had taken political occupation of Angria and written Mary out of the script in a long death scene. Rather than negotiate the character’s revival as before, she used tactful restraint in rationalizing the pre-emptive act undertaken by her brother, and resurrected Mary long enough to fashion a proper dénouement for her in “The Return of Zamorna” (December 1836).<sup>1</sup> From then on, Charlotte’s stories were entirely those of her own making, though she continued to employ characters invented by her brother. The timing was auspicious; during this phase, Charlotte was taking a more clinical and dispassionate view of her shadow self, and starting to identify more with the women in her fantasy life, signifying the first step toward reclaiming mastery of herself and beginning the individuation process. Charlotte’s leap from identifying with the male psyche to that of a female was not a smooth, seamless one. Initially, she appears to have taken a wrong step in shifting her focus to that asymmetrical relationship shared by Mina Laury and Zamorna. Charlotte’s enthrallment with her shadow self provoked a momentary slip into a masochistic stance with respect to Zamorna, during which she made an idol of a demon. Mina becomes, for Charlotte, not only a figure who represents her own socially disenfranchised, passionate, talented self, she emblemizes that feminine ideal of her time—the pure, passive and selfless woman willing to live for and through a man, subsuming her identity in his. Charlotte would need to outgrow this circumscribed fate and begin identifying with stronger women before she could yield to the concept that Zamorna was part of her own intrinsic self. Only then would she be able to wrestle

control from her shadow through means of empowered, enabled heroines of her own making.

For the next two years, Charlotte creates a series of Angrian tales in which she mocks her former Romanticism, voicing a new disdain for, even comedic treatment of Zamorna. She begins to fashion strong-minded heroines impervious to Zamorna's satanic charms, though she continues to study women (specifically Mina Laury and Caroline Vernon) who are in thrall to him, seemingly now in an effort to analyze her own idolatry. She learns to disengage herself from her previously vulnerable, masochistic role, and the stories Charlotte constructs around these devoted love-slaves disclose a new ironic detachment. In the analysis of these victimized women, the reader can find both humor and pathos, absent in Charlotte's earlier scripts. Her shifting focus on to heroines such as the plain governess, Miss West, or the disaffected sister of the dissolute villain, Elizabeth Hastings, heralds an important transformation in Charlotte. Such women—prototypes of Frances Henri, Jane Eyre, Shirley Keeldar, and Lucy Snowe—foreshadow the resolute female characters found in her adult fiction, and act as a testament to Charlotte's own growth. Hence, we see Charlotte making what critics refer to as an “imaginative break” not long after terminating the collaborative partnership with Branwell. She learns to create plots on her own and launch what would become a career as a solitary writer, healing herself through the individuation process. By turning flaws into virtues rather than vice versa, Charlotte reaps rewards for herself, her negative animus becoming, in the integrative procedure, transformed as a positive force, who would compel her to write, to publish, and to realize herself and her talents fully. Now, rather than finding herself repressing her animus and in thrall to her shadow, Charlotte discovers her animus inspiring her to express and fulfill herself. She did so by fashioning female embodiments of the fully realized self, each of whom reaches that stage by undertaking allegorical journeys of individuation. All of her adult novels feature female protagonists who break free of confining, oppressive roles to achieve integral selfhood, enabling them to empower others, and insist on relationships of parity. In creating relationships established on an equal power base, Charlotte constructs a fluctuating equilibrium between those societal and gendered divisions which still posed obstacles for Victorian women. In so doing, she formulates happier resolutions for herself, as well as for her heroines.

### 1. Charlotte's "Imaginative Break"

John Kucich (Repression in Victorian Fiction: Charlotte Brontë, George Eliot, and Charles Dickens), like a number of other critics, views Charlotte's mature work as neurotically driven, contending that her adult fiction is largely concerned with the repressed personality. Kucich asserts that Charlotte underwent her "imaginative break" sometime between 1840 and 1844, and claims this is an opinion "usually agreed" upon by other scholars (34). Characters such as Zamorna, Caroline Vernon, and Mina Laury "give way abruptly to a series of protagonists divided against themselves by conscience" (Kucich 35). Most critics, Kucich argues, particularly those who undertake a psychoanalytic approach toward Charlotte's work, sense that the mature novels exhibit a tragic shift, and view the repressive forces in these works as "fundamentally unhealthy" (35). Kucich elaborates:

As a point of self-definition freely avowed both by Charlotte Brontë as writer and by all of her major characters, the refusal of self-expression appears to us as a martyrdom of creative potential, a regrettable psychic compromise, a fall into self-conflict rather than a sign of personal and artistic growth. Repression in Brontë's world, no matter what the exigencies enforcing it, always appears to smother the world of authentic feeling in her heroines, or else to distort personality into "nothing but hunger, rebellion and rage," as Matthew Arnold charged.<sup>2</sup> (Kucich 35)

In making this judgment, however, Kucich ignores the full significance of earlier characters such as Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings, conceding only that Charlotte formulated a heroine in the tale Captain Henry Hastings who enjoys independence, autonomy, and a strong free will of her own. Kucich also fails to take historical context into account in his argument, disregarding the dictates of the times, the narrow channels into which Victorian women were forced by increasingly rigid societal doctrines. Indeed, the women in Charlotte's adult fiction—descendants of Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings—were considered by her contemporaneous critics to be too coarse, too passionate, too ensnared in love interests, not repressed enough for the average reading audience. Charlotte took such criticism to heart, and, as Kucich accurately perceives, she

attempted to distance herself from the heroine of her last full-length novel by taking a cooler, more impartial view of Lucy Snowe,<sup>3</sup> although even this last published work of Charlotte's met with the same censure from Harriet Martineau, and ended the friendship once enjoyed between the two women.<sup>4</sup>

Kucich is correct in assessing the neurotic flavor of Brontë's adult work, but he fails to take into account the tenor of the times, and thus misdirects the blame for this repressive quality in her novels. The dilemma for Victorian women writers, particularly those who possessed independent minds and autonomous spirits, was the difficulty in creating in their work sympathetic women of strength and passion. If their fiction featured such female characters, these women writers were often condemned for it, which is why so many wrote under male pseudonyms. Hence, women were not only discouraged from writing for employment, but also from celebrating their own sex in their work. Instead, the women of England, as idealized by Sarah Stickney Ellis in her 1839 manual of proper conduct and decorum, were expected to undertake a form of self-erasure, and were encouraged to refrain from expressing their own feelings, no matter how at odds those sentiments might be with accepted social dictates.<sup>5</sup> Robin Sheets succinctly synthesizes Ellis's doctrine: "Ellis advocates acceptance of one's sphere, accommodation to the needs of others, and obliteration of self" (*Victorian Britain* 260). In writing against the tenor of such oppressive times, Charlotte resisted the self-sacrificing imperatives Ellis expresses, and the close reader perceives a subversive quality at work here—in both her heroines and her discourse. Sally Shuttleworth observes that Charlotte's heroines "relentlessly pursue their quest for self-definition and identity. Although they invoke a rhetoric of freedom, their language and categories of thought are nonetheless inevitably caught up within the contradictions of Victorian discourse on femininity" (71). Consequently, in ignoring the cultural context, Kucich erroneously imputes such self-division to the author herself. Instead, social dictates impose identical predicaments on any Victorian woman like Charlotte—full of conflict, espousing free will and too often finding herself strictly compassed and unable to exercise that will. A remark Shuttleworth makes about the women in Charlotte's juvenilia draws an accurate analogy of this dilemma. She states that these women can be divided into two camps, either releasing their energies and being "branded immodest and insane," or containing

those energies and becoming “subject to a form of self-consuming insanity. The double bind in Victorian prescriptions for femininity is starkly depicted; whichever course of action the women pursue it seems to end in insanity” (Shuttleworth 108). Thus, Kucich accurately assesses the difficulties outlined by Charlotte for women in her mature novels, but ignores the social climate in which she was writing, thereby misreading her, and misapprehending her psychology as well as her motives.

This misapprehension is most clearly manifested in Kucich’s assertion that Charlotte undertakes her imaginative break—the shift from the passionate heroes and heroines of her youth to the sobered and restrained figures of her mature work—later, rather than earlier, in her work. Rather than occurring between 1840 and 1844, as he claims, this shift happens sooner, not long after her crisis of 1836, and her break from the collaborative partnership with her brother in 1837. These fully developed stories of her own invention, full of pathos and disillusionment, take on a new analytical quality. While the men in these tales become increasingly dissolute, despotic, misanthropic, and sadistic, many of the women are seen to be wasting away, dying from despair or immolating their own self-esteem at the altar of their demonic idol. At times, this mutual debilitation is treated with comedic and satiric touches, but more often, the tone is one of poignant compassion. Moreover, the sense of these stories is that they are composed as predicaments to confront, problems to solve. The relationships are investigated and examined, the author seemingly intent on discovering what works and what doesn’t work in her increasingly realistic fictional world. Helene Moglen states that the last five Angrian stories (Passing Events, Julia, Mina Laury, Captain Henry Hastings, and Caroline Vernon) are crucial to an understanding of Brontë’s personal and artistic development. The significance of the stories, she says, lies in their

bridging as they do the fantasies of the child-woman and the conscious, self-exploring art of the adult. All are responses to the increased pressure she felt to free herself from her paralyzing relationship with Branwell and to overcome the deeply disturbing effects of her sexual fantasies. All are exercises in confrontation, keyed at different levels, employing varieties of technique. They suggest a new, if painfully achieved, mastery.

(Moglen 47-48)

Passing Events (1836), as previously discussed, marks Charlotte's spiritual crisis when she acknowledges the conflict within herself. The novelette Julia, composed in June of 1837, is permeated with cynicism, particularly on the subject of relationships, and brings to center stage those figures which Charlotte will focus on more intently in Caroline Vernon. Four Years Ago (July 1837) discloses how the tragic Marian Hume lost her innocence during her marriage to Zamorna and was mastered by her emotions, dying of a too vivid imagination and a morbid nervous system. Mina Laury, begun in January of 1838, treats the eponymous masochistic character with pathos, as does the story "Stancliffe's Hotel" (June 1838), in which the martyred Mary Percy suffers from Zamorna's abuse and neglect. The fragment "But it is not in Society that the real character is revealed. . . ." (late 1838) and the novelette Captain Henry Hastings (February-March 1839) mark the moment when Charlotte first brings onstage the sobered, restrained women these critics see as not appearing until six years later. Already, though, Charlotte is beginning to investigate and work with themes that will reappear in her adult work. Captain Henry Hastings, for example, is all about marriage: what makes a good mate, a good marriage, and how to judge the true quality of character. Love and marriage were very much on Charlotte's mind during the writing of this story, since she received her first proposal of marriage halfway through its composition.<sup>6</sup> In Caroline Vernon (July-December 1839), Charlotte appears to be analyzing the condition of enthrallment to a fully demonized Zamorna, and the tale seems uncannily self-analytical, a look back at her younger self through an older lens. These half-dozen works compile a veritable survey of the carnage wrought by the destructive force of such idolatry, and show that Charlotte had begun disengaging herself from her childhood tableaux well before the 1840s.

Moglen fails to give full credit to Charlotte for those aforementioned signs of detachment in these works, and like Kucich and others, views Charlotte's fundamental change as occurring later than evidenced, despite her argument that the last five novelettes demonstrate Charlotte's artistic and personal development. Moglen writes that "the concept of romantic love which informs these late stories is traditionally Byronic. The relationships described are conventionally sadomasochistic," the woman "deriving

pleasure from the pain of an unequal attachment” (Moglen 50), enduring much agony at the hands of a man who is

possessive, tyrannical, capable of casual, defensive cruelty . . . Brontë still identifies with her heroine’s ‘intense idolatry’ and is [attracted] by the selfish domination of the male. But she has begun to struggle against the force of that appeal. She has started to question the desirability of that identification. (Moglen 50)

The late juvenilia, however, shows that Charlotte has progressed well beyond this point of experiencing an “intense idolatry” of her shadow self. As previously argued, Charlotte had commenced her “struggle against the force of that appeal” before critics credit her with this struggle. She has already started the process of fashioning a wholly new breed of women with whom she can more closely identify, and these heroines are already in evidence here. Her new role model—first called Miss West and later more fully conceived as Elizabeth Hastings—deserves special study, particularly as she appears to be a positive prototype for Jane Eyre, who in turn serves as something of a model for Charlotte’s subsequent heroines. As well, the author’s changing perspective on Zamorna bears looking at in the novelette Caroline Vernon. Caroline Vernon is one of those figures whom, as Moglen claims, Charlotte looked at with “mute sympathy” while psychologically analyzing her (51). Caroline anticipates both Jane Eyre and Adèle Varens, and illustrates for Charlotte the hazards and consequences of giving in to temptation. The story, therefore, becomes, for the author, a cautionary tale. Hence, we see, particularly in the revisions which still exist for Caroline Vernon, Charlotte allying herself in sympathy with the last of these hapless victims, and in opposition to those tactics employed by the Byronic Zamorna. In examining and laying bare the dynamics of Zamorna’s appeal, Charlotte prepares herself for a lifetime of reconstructed relationships in her adult fiction, leveling the field for her players so more equitable alliances could be forged. Thus, she was not falling into self-conflict, as Kucich asseverates, nor just beginning the struggle against the force of the shadow’s appeal, as opined by Moglen, but instead was emerging from such self-division and possession, already undertaking that critical paradigm shift which Kucich argues did not occur until the 1840s.<sup>7</sup>

## **2. The Nucleus of a New Role Model: Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings**

In late 1838, Charlotte invented a character that was clearly a prototype for Jane Eyre. In a fragment from that time, she introduces a young governess named Miss West, who retreats behind a mask of plainness so as not to attract envious glances or admiration. Instead, the young governess sits like a shadow in the presence of “that splendid image” of her charge, Mary Lonsdale, “voluntarily presenting [her] own little dusk figure as the foil” (BC 113/7). The fresh disguise closely parallels Charlotte’s shy, retiring public persona and effectively conceals the passionate, rebellious spirit—also like Charlotte’s—which resides beneath this mask. Miss West, writes Charlotte, made use of this persona whenever she went out into society.<sup>8</sup> As if to assure herself that others could read Miss West at another truer level, however, Charlotte makes certain that a select few possess a sagacious eye and the hieroglyphic code to unlock those stunning secrets: “Skilfully [sic] as the disguise was adjusted a penetrating eye could still see through it” to the more legitimate self which lay beneath, perhaps to the “Adventuress,” as she is called here (BC 113/7). In short, one would need to be as shrewd a judge of character as Charlotte estimated herself to be to read the authentic self. Indeed, “one or two cool observers [sic] – people of strong mind fixed principles & acute sagacity whom she shunned as if by instinct” had already penetrated that façade of reserve (BC 113/7). One particular male who fathoms those hidden depths in Miss West is William Percy. Young Percy embodies many of those aspects found in his father and in Zamorna, either of whom are capable of penetrating public masks and comprehending the art of performance. The knowledge that certain males could perceive that such a plain, unassuming reserve operated as a cover to the more passionate self beneath was both titillating and irksome to Miss West:

She was aware that those moments of awakened feeling those sudden, flashing fits of excitement which she could not always control – had betrayed her real disposition to one individual at [least?] who was as capa[ble] of estimating character as herself – & she knew that there must appear to his eyes something sinister in [the] constant mask which hid & smoothed her nature features [.]. (BC 113/7)

That Miss West thought others might find the mask “sinister” divulges Charlotte’s own ambivalence about adopting such a guise, possibly resentful that women were forced to play roles in society. Hiding her real nature would seem a duplicitous but obligatory act. Though Charlotte felt compelled to conform to collective expectations of ladylike decorum, she needed to satisfy herself that certain individuals could read her correctly, despite such a dissembling disguise. Hence, many of the novelettes in the late juvenilia concern themselves with determining the proper mask to wear, a dress rehearsal for Charlotte’s own social behavior in the adult world.

All these concerns are delineated in greater detail a few months later in a lengthy three-part work (of which Part Two is missing) known as Captain Henry Hastings, which most biographers view as largely autobiographical in nature.<sup>9</sup> Freed from her teaching duties at last, Charlotte had for a spell the leisure to write full-time. The novelette was undertaken during the late winter of 1839, the earlier fragment functioning as a quick preliminary sketch from which she then drew the more completely developed character of Elizabeth Hastings, sister to the corrupt and treasonous Captain Henry. Winifred Gérin asserts that this work is not only “biographically revealing” (Gérin FN 173), but that there can be no doubt that Henry Hastings is none other than Branwell, and that these sibling passages are the first to reflect real, as opposed to dream, experience.<sup>10</sup> Ratchford, too, considers Charlotte’s psychic participation in these Angrian chronicles as a recent development, contending that “for the first time Charlotte projects herself, her outward self and circumstances and her inner emotions, into her Angrian stories, and thus, in the person of Elizabeth Hastings” (Web of Childhood 147). As we have seen, however, Charlotte had been projecting, even consciously inserting, herself into her juvenilia as far back as 1829, ten years earlier. The parallels between Charlotte and Elizabeth Hastings are merely more overt and more obvious than in much of her earlier work. She imbues the character with many of her own actual, if not hoped-for, qualities, playing with fact to create a fictional personage in which she can try on a more adult female role for herself. Charlotte includes information from her own life, drawing a portrait of a father to Elizabeth and Henry who is similar in many respects to Patrick Brontë. She reunites brother and sister after a separation of two years, which approximates the amount of time since Charlotte’s break from her collaborative liaison

with Branwell. Both Captain Henry Hastings and its fragmented predecessor are placed in a decidedly English setting, like Mina Laury before them. Miss West successfully hides the disdain she secretly feels for her charges, as had Charlotte while teaching at Roe Head. Elizabeth Hastings suffers great homesickness when away from home, as did Charlotte, for the “rough, wild country” with “no good society” (Gérin FN 210), and for her family, who are described here as “passionate” (Gérin FN 211). Elizabeth, too, like Charlotte, is passionate, but she conceals this characteristic from public view, instead exuding a silent self-containment, seen here as a sign of strength.

As the tale commences, we become immediately aware of Charles Townshend’s displacement as Charlotte’s persona. He no longer possesses his former powers of perception, instead exhibiting a distinct obtuseness about Charlotte’s new heroine. The opening scene contains a symbolic transfer of the persona. While occupying the same coach as Elizabeth, Charles shares with the reader the fact that “while I had been thinking of her[,] she[,] I found[,] had also been thinking of me” (Gérin FN 180). He concludes that Elizabeth could not be a person of any consequence, since she is quiet, dresses plainly and demurely, and has little aristocratic bearing. Charles ought to have paid closer attention to Elizabeth’s refusal to “speak in raptures” (Gérin FN 181), particularly on the subject of Zamorna, as Elizabeth’s deportment marks a new departure for Charlotte’s heroines. Charles’s dim powers of observation about Elizabeth referentially reflect his own peripheral status. He is not shrewd enough to penetrate her self-effacing exterior, to see to the true character beneath. Those powers of judgment are left to others, like William Percy, who soon takes charge of the narrative, usurping Charles in this and so many other future tales, including Charlotte’s first novel, The Professor. Ironically, as it turns out, it is Charles who has now become a person of no real consequence.

One can understand why Miss West earlier felt the constant wearing of a mask might seem sinister to someone like William Percy. In this follow-up story, William, who once competed with Charles for the attention and affection of Jane Moore, “the Rose of Zamorna,” has grown disillusioned with this coquette. He thinks Jane is a knave who “puts on character and acts a part at will,” concealing her passions “by the curtain of an indifferent demeanor” (“The Duke of Zamorna,” SHB Misc. 379). Indeed, William, like Zamorna, feels that, in general, “women are such deep dissemblers” (SHB Misc. 378). He

vows never to marry until he has found a woman who has endured the same sufferings he has experienced in life, echoing Mina Laury's contention that this type of man will turn to a different handmaid when there are hard duties to perform. "Beauty is given to dolls," declares William, "majesty to haughty vixens – but mind, feeling, passion, and the crowning grace of fortitude are the attributes of an angel" (SHB Misc. 390), outlining Charlotte's newly idealized image of womanhood. Like William Percy, Charlotte has come to distrust an outward showiness in both men and women, which conceals a dissembling, fickle, or corrupt spirit. It instead becomes her objective to create a heroine who will be unsusceptible to Zamorna's conspicuous charms, and who radiates an inner, rather than outer, beauty, so as not to draw unwanted attention or undesired admirers. In order to display these virtuous characteristics of her new female paragon, she juxtaposes Elizabeth with empty-headed dolls, vixens, and viragos, and brings to the fore a male protagonist/narrator who, with his "quick hawk's eye" (Gérin FN 244), will see those attributes of hers contained beneath the surface. All the while, Charlotte fashions a new, more workable identity for herself, and in coming to terms with her own sex, finds redemption in the plain heroine who possesses quiet strength of character and moral fortitude. Such a model provides a context for her process of individuation. Through self-containment, she avoids vulnerability and exploitation by others. Through disguise, she finds she can locate new strategies of power.

Like Miss West, Elizabeth Hastings supports herself as a tutor, appearing—by contrast to her charge, the coquettish Jane Moore—as a "pale undersized young woman dressed as plainly as a Quakeress in grey—" (Gérin FN 206). She refrains from looking directly at men, hoping to avoid their attention, yet managing to study them astutely nonetheless. Elizabeth, like Charlotte, is a keen observer of others. In remaining silent and unassuming, she co-opts the power and authority reserved for the gazer, while never openly observing people.<sup>11</sup> Possessing a refined mind, Elizabeth shows a keen ability to penetrate the minds of others. Despite her concerns about masking herself with an expression foreign to the opposite sex, she is read by Sir William, "a careful gleaner [who] finds corn of good grain where a fool passes by & sees only stubble" (Gérin FN 209). In fashioning this tale, then, Charlotte assures herself that in donning a drab disguise, she need not fear being misread or misjudged by those whose opinion of her

would count for something.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the eroticism of knowing that only a select few possessed the key to one's secret nature and passion could be both titillating and exalting—giving one a sense of surreptitious superiority and singularity. This sense of possessing a unique gift might have helped foster a covert condescension toward others, allowing Charlotte to maintain privately a secret scorn for the general run of her own sex, which could account for some of the leftover misogyny critics find in her adult novels.

Elizabeth provides a new model for Charlotte in additional ways as well. In this tale, she sets about establishing an independent life for herself, assembling a class of pupils in order to support her living. She is determined to be responsible to and dependent upon no one, a radical concept for a young Victorian lady. Soon, this “little dignified Governess” becomes “as prosperous as any little woman of five feet high & not twenty years old need wish to be” (Gérin FN 243), illustrating the importance of economic independence to Charlotte. Fortunately, Elizabeth's students are bright and motivated, since Elizabeth, who has a sharp irritable temper, secretly confesses she would not have been successful teaching yawning, obstinate children, recalling Charlotte's own difficulties with teaching at Roe Head. Here, Charlotte seems to be attempting to come to terms with her future as a teacher, painting a brighter, more hopeful picture of such a life. She also appears to be constructing a character with peculiarities and idiosyncrasies not unlike her own, placing this new persona in a contemporary and realistic setting to determine how others receive and react to her, as well as testing this character against her previous heroines. In Part Three of *Captain Henry Hastings*, Elizabeth pays a visit to the Queen of Angria, Mary, to plead the case for her brother, Henry (who has been imprisoned and sentenced to death for making an attempt on Zamorna's life). Mary turns to her own brother, William, after Elizabeth's departure and expresses an instant dislike for their visitor, claiming she is odd and abrupt. The comment is intended to draw a distinction between Elizabeth and Mary, who lacks any such compassion for either of her brothers. Despite her oddities and directness, then, Elizabeth again is shown to advantage—this time by contrasting her with the venerated Mary Percy. Once more, a major character of the juvenilia is shifted to a secondary, ineffectual position in the ongoing narrative, demonstrating Charlotte's developing maturity as she outgrows her former persona and finds ways around those confining ideals of femininity.

Despite embodying Charlotte's new ideal of womanhood, Elizabeth Hastings feels something is missing in her life. She yearns for a warm close attachment, disclosing some remaining concerns of Charlotte's—whether such strong-mindedness might prove to be an affront to men, and whether she would find her equal in the opposite sex: “[S]till the exclusive proud being thought she had not met with a single individual equal to herself in mind[,] & therefore not one whom she could love” (Gérin FN 243). Elizabeth daydreams of William Percy, but dismisses such fantasies as folly, conceding to “her ‘morbid propensity for castle-building’” (Gérin FN 246). William, meanwhile, has been biding his time, hoping Elizabeth would falter on her own and need his help, and when she learns this, it provokes all of Elizabeth's pride. She has no need of a man's assistance, nor will she accept William's costly gift of a jeweled cross (marking a distinct departure from Mina Laury, who proudly wears a crucifix). Elizabeth's refusal of William's gift anticipates those moments in Jane Eyre when the heroine asseverates her independence and rejects Rochester's efforts to drape her in jewels and showy clothing. An abashed William confesses that he once dreamed

of some nameless being – whom I invested with the species of mind & face & figure that I imagined I could love – I used to wish for some existence with finer feelings and a warmer heart than what I saw round me – I had a kind of idea that I could be a very impassioned lover – if I met with a woman who was young & elegant & had a mind above the grade of an animal. (Gérin FN 250)

Rochester later echoes many of these same sentiments in Jane Eyre, despite his inappropriate gestures of love. Sounding much like William in his earlier speech about beauty being given to dolls and majesty to vixens, Rochester tells Jane he is not capricious except with women who only please him with their faces: “I am the very devil when I find out they have neither souls nor hearts – when they open to me a perspective of flatness, triviality, and perhaps imbecility, coarseness, and ill-temper” (Jane Eyre, Oxford ed. 263). Both William and Rochester need to be taught that women like Elizabeth and Jane (and by extension, Charlotte) are not dolls or vixens, but females with autonomous minds and independent spirits, not unlike their own. Both learn that each woman possesses a strong sense of pride that ought not to be provoked.

During a walk together, Elizabeth and William reach a secluded chapel (Scar-Chapel) whose churchyard contains a solitary gravestone engraved with the single word “Resurgam,” again, prefiguring Jane Eyre in the brief description of Helen Burns’ gravesite, but here marking the burial site of Rosamund Wellesley, cousin to and mistress of Zamorna. According to William, Rosamund died of grief and mortification, “Because she was ashamed of having loved his majesty not wisely but too well” (Gérin FN 254). William relates her history, telling Elizabeth that Zamorna had taken guardianship of Rosamund, tutoring her for about a year, “till she could construe the Art of Love at any rate” (Gérin FN 254). Kept in hiding and out of reach of her concerned relatives, Rosamund began pining away. “Shame & Horror[,] I suppose [,] had worked her feelings into Delirium,” remarks William, “& she died very suddenly – whether fairly or not Heaven knows” (Gérin FN 254). Rosamund also figures in Charlotte’s next novelette, Caroline Vernon, as a foreboding totem for that tale’s heroine as well. Rosamund’s destiny, along with Caroline’s, allegorizes Charlotte’s imagined experience, had she allowed herself to become fully possessed by her shadow. Rosamund’s shattered sanity, destroyed by loving Zamorna too well, represents the imagined consequences of Charlotte’s own obsessive idolatry. We never meet Rosamund in the juvenilia. Instead, she functions as a memento of Charlotte’s struggle with her shadow self, and her fears for her sanity during that conflict. Rosamund’s sequestration from her family during this indoctrination might well obliquely express the isolation Charlotte felt while undergoing that psychic war alone at Roe Head. In interesting ways, the buried Rosamund signifies Charlotte’s buried love for Zamorna, the tombstone serving as an admonition never to forget that psychic struggle, lest temptation present itself again. At the same time, the stone’s epigraph celebrates Charlotte’s triumph over her divided spirit and the eventual synthesis of her intrinsic being.

The story of Rosamund also operates as a cautionary tale for Elizabeth, who dismisses Zamorna as “a sort of scoundrel from all that I ever heard of him” (Gérin FN 255). She shows she has mastered the vicarious lesson when she refuses William’s request to become his mistress, explaining that “I could not without incurring the miseries of self-hatred” (Gérin FN 256). Again, the words and the sentiment anticipate those of Jane Eyre, who resolves never to become Rochester’s mistress, for—among other

reasons—the sake of her own self-respect. Jane Eyre has no family to consider, whereas Elizabeth does. Elizabeth—unlike Mina Laury, who accepts the role of mistress to Zamorna—claims the opinions of her brother, her father and Mr. Warner mean more to her than life itself. Her father and Warner are proud of Elizabeth's independence and behavior, which is above reproach, though they might call her "obstinate & resentful" (Gérin FN 256). And she knows her brother would "blow his brains out if he heard of his sister adding to the pile of disgrace he had heaped so thickly on the name of Hastings" (Gérin FN 256). In motivating Jane Eyre to spurn the role of mistress to Rochester, Charlotte turns this vision of a disgraced family on its head. It is precisely because Jane has no family to care for her that she must care more for herself: "I care for myself. The more solitary, the more friendless, the more unsustained I am, the more I will respect myself," she resolves silently (*Jane Eyre*, Oxford ed. 321, emphasis Brontë's). In this later novel, Conscience and Reason (ironically, the very characteristics Warner Howard Warner embodies in the juvenilia) attempt to impel Jane to remain, when she is faced with temptation, so that Jane resists emotion, conscience and reason by leaving rather than staying.<sup>13</sup> What enables her to flee Thornfield is simply the self-respect and self-regard she has so assiduously generated. However, family, despite her orphan status, provides the final impetus for Jane, as well. In the end, when Jane walks away from temptation, she is encouraged to do so and sustained by a vision of her mother incarnated in the moon. Both women, then—Elizabeth and Jane—are principally motivated to resist temptation not only for the sake of their cultivated self-regard, but also through filial respect, showing a decided progression from Mina Laury.

Charlotte, too, in the process of growing up, walks away from temptation, gradually sheds her romantic idealism and recognizes the duties and obligations inherent in being the eldest daughter. Her story-telling now serves a purpose more significant than mere daydreaming. She is knowingly using her narrative and her characters to achieve a path toward self-completion (or individuation, as Jung would call it). She also uses her fiction as a gauge by which to measure and test her behavior against that of others, as well as in the imaginatively conceived public arena. Charlotte is creating a model for her future life, one in which she empowers herself in an age when women were customarily fettered and disenfranchised. She is seeking gendered relationships that contradict and

transcend the societal norm of separate spheres. Spurning the role of enthralled mistress, she outlines the only kind of marriage she could imagine for herself. She is also honing her skills as an apprentice novelist, and this talent will serve to sustain her economically later in life. Most important, she is, for now, attempting to find her way in the world as a poor clergyman's daughter, forced to earn her living in modes which she finds disagreeable.

### **3. A Last Look at the Woman and the Demon: Caroline Vernon and Zamorna**

Although the domestic scenes in Captain Henry Hastings contain a plethora of disloyal husbands and marital discord, along with much talk of separation and divorce, Charlotte's writing does not disclose serious disillusionment with gender relationships until she returns from a brief, unsatisfying job as a governess in the Sidgwick home in the summer of 1839. In Caroline Vernon, a retrospective tale in which Charlotte appears to be taking a hypothetical look at what might have occurred, had she given in to temptation, Zamorna is presented to us, for the first time, with all his flaws visible. Here, it seems, Charlotte sets out to study her own seduction by her shadow self. "It is no longer the heroes who occupy her attention," writes Helene Moglen, "It is the appeal itself" (51). In Moglen's opinion, Charlotte is attempting to understand the nature of infatuation, investigating the significance of her own femininity and sexuality. What binds Zamorna to his women is the tie that has bound Charlotte to her archetype for so long. In this novelette, she appears determined to learn what it was that so possessed her, like her hapless heroines; what it was that made it so difficult to extricate herself from the satanic web in which she had become ensnared. In examining Zamorna, she studies herself, and through such scrutiny, she rises above his previous grasp, able now to channel constructively the intensity of her infatuation. The act of acknowledging her shadow self collapses Zamorna's inflated mythical status and allows him to acquire more human qualities, making way for the emergence of the positive animus. "It is the birth of a consciousness which will stunningly dominate the process of the mature novels," observes Moglen (51). In the course of writing those mature novels, Charlotte's animus

will help her achieve the completion of herself and attain success in her writing life, just as M. Paul fosters Lucy Snowe in her maturation process and facilitates the opening of her own school.

In order to render Zamorna's flaws visible, Charlotte, in Caroline Vernon, has his mistresses speak of his tyrannical cruelty. The act enables Charlotte to examine and criticize her own shadow and her relationship to it. The former actress, Louisa Vernon, at various times courtesan to both Zamorna and Percy, claims Zamorna regards women as slaves. Their beauty entertains him for an instant, she says, then he abandons them. Louisa fancies ghoulish revenge on Zamorna, taking down his pride, and turning him into her dependent. According to her daughter, Caroline, Louisa has actually made a few such attempts on Zamorna's life, flying at him with a knife, or undertaking to poison him. "She's always contriving to get laudanum & prussic acid & such trash—," Caroline informs her father, Percy, "[S]he says she'll murder either him or herself—& I'm afraid if she's left quite alone[,] she'll really do some harm" (Gérin FN 314). This behavior anticipates that of Bertha, who makes periodic attempts on Rochester's life. Both Louisa and Bertha are kept virtual prisoners in their own homes, Zamorna claiming Louisa is unfit for society, and confining her as Rochester later does Bertha. Clearly, Zamorna elicits extremes in behavior from his women, most of them turning mad, murderous, or growing so despondent they die of their vapours.<sup>14</sup> Zamorna knows he enjoys full possession of his women. "Female identity in the early writings is shown to reside, in a very literal sense, in the hands of men," remarks Shuttleworth (121). No matter how Zamorna ill-treats his paramours, they will not leave him. His third wife, Mary, repeatedly complains of his neglect and indifference, and when Zamorna, in Captain Henry Hastings, tells her that every day he fully expected her to make formal application to dissolve the conjugal tie, she counters with a smile, claiming he had no such ideas at all. For six long years, she concedes, her husband has known that he wields all the power in the relationship. There is little point in resisting it. Armed with such assurances, such certainty leading to further treachery, Zamorna continues to abuse Mary, despite Percy's protestations. Charlotte, too, for six long years, surrendered all power to her shadow self, offering little resistance, which led, for a time, to possession. Thus, Mary's complaints

are Charlotte's, and Zamorna's mistresses' entrapment and victimization have been hers as well.

As with portions of Captain Henry Hastings, Caroline Vernon is imbued with a new sense of verisimilitude, Charlotte drawing from real-life experience, chronicling her own personal account so as to study it. By rendering these characters as life-like, she is better able to analyze them. Rebecca Fraser observes that in this tale, Zamorna "bears a greater resemblance to Mr Sidgwick [Charlotte's recent employer] than the Corsair" (127). Here, Zamorna appears as a gentleman farmer, still with an eye for young girls, attractively toiling in the fields of Hawkscliffe, which he has transformed into an agrarian estate, and appalling Percy, who needles his daughter Mary about her reduced status as farmwife. Zamorna at various times also resembles a "well-dressed clergyman," a schoolmaster, or someone looking "grave as a judge," saddled with the responsibilities of a large family (Gérin FN 297). Charlotte seems to be mocking many of her Romantic enthusiasms here, particularly in these early chapters. But they also set up the narrative for later ironic and lamentable twists when such satiric traces disappear, and the emphasis shifts to focus on the tragic nature of Caroline Vernon's destiny. In the vein of the late Romantic school of sentimentalists, Caroline Vernon is as much a reaction to the exploitation of feeling as a protest against the narrowing roles for women dictated by Victorian society. Hence, the pathos evident in this novelette—Charlotte's efforts to portray Caroline Vernon as an innocent, on the verge of being despoiled by her guardian<sup>15</sup>—is clearly Charlotte's objective here. She means to reveal the full ignominy of her shadow self in this tale. It is as if, for a brief time, Charlotte is possessed by her negative animus, determined to expose the full dereliction of her dark side. Those extant revisions of two essential sections of this story emphasize the techniques Zamorna employs to tempt, then trap his young prey, and exploit her passionate feelings. The fact that Charlotte revised these critical passages communicates their significance, as does the tale's opening paragraph, which declares that the author had resolved to compose nothing more until she had something important to convey. She had fully expected that would be years away. Instead, scarcely three months have passed since she concluded Captain Henry Hastings.

Caroline Vernon, whom we met as a child in Julia (she was first mentioned in Passing Events), sounds suspiciously like a young Charlotte at fifteen (psychologically, if not physically; Charlotte is, by now, twenty-three), and the early passages appear to be self-parodic. Like Charlotte at that age, she is a clever, imaginative and interesting girl, but also a careless and unreflective one, her feelings mixed up with her passions. While she has “the bashfulness of a raw school-girl unused to society” (Gérin FN 305), Caroline aspires to enter urban social circles, live an unusual, rather than commonplace, life, and be widely admired by others. She yearns to be beautiful, tall, slender and fair, though for now she feels she possesses none of these qualities, instead thinking herself fat and swarthy.<sup>16</sup> Echoing Elizabeth Hastings, she confesses that “I build Castles in the air,” wishing she were rich, beautiful, and adventurous (Gérin FN 309). Zamorna, she says, thinks “reading Lord Byron has half-turned my head” (Gérin FN 309). But she has read others, among them Harriet Martineau, whom she greatly admires for being the cleverest woman, travelling like a man in order to learn the best way to govern a country.<sup>17</sup> Caroline, according to the narrator, is “raw, flighty & romantic” but something “original & peculiar” exists in her as well, something “stronger than fancy or romance” (Gérin FN 311). In other words, she is full of contradictions, much like Charlotte. On the one hand, she is politically anarchistic, rebellious and democratic; on the other, she harbors fantasies which are paternalistic, even imperialist in design, dreaming of becoming a sultana to a mystic oriental being/colonist/world-conqueror who establishes a Moorish city like Babylon. This conflict in her nature drives the tragic destiny of Caroline Vernon, no doubt providing for Charlotte an illustration of the fate she had fortuitously escaped, as well as a cautionary exemplar for the future.<sup>18</sup>

Although Caroline is Percy’s child by Louisa, she has been largely ignored by her father, and the responsibility for her welfare has fallen to Zamorna, who, with much irony, claims she is a “half-grown school-girl” who should not be exposed to “dazzling temptation,” lest she later turn into “one of your Syrens” (Gérin FN 296). “Indulgence,” he points out, “would foster all her defects” (Gérin FN 296).<sup>19</sup> The narrator informs us that unlike other women, Caroline does not perceive Zamorna as handsome, charming or even intimidating: “the idea as to whether he is a God of perfection or a Demon of Defects has not crossed her intellect once” (Gérin FN 315). Instead, his ward thinks of

him as “a kind of Abstract isolated Being,” possessing none of the qualities of her mystic Oriental fantasy figure (Gérin FN 315). Certainly thus far, she has never considered her guardian in any erotic or romantic way. So Caroline is taken by surprise when she joins Zamorna in the moonlit garden to bid him goodbye, and suddenly realizes she cares intensely for him. Not unlike Jane Eyre, when the young governess thinks she must leave Rochester’s employ, Caroline becomes abruptly aware that she doesn’t want to part from him. The garden scene described here is Charlotte’s revision. In her first draft, the correspondence between the pair is treated far more openly, Caroline in love with Zamorna all along, even as a young child, not unlike Charlotte. However, Charlotte rewrites fact here to fictionalize actualities, the better to correspond with the tragic outcome for Caroline. A comically satirical scene between Zamorna and Percy is also cut from the first version, which, had it been left in, would have conflicted with the estrangement which occurs between these two men at the end of the tale. These revisions eliminate all such comic touches, instead stressing and sustaining the suspense of Caroline’s loss of innocence and erotic awakening. Not only does Charlotte introduce a new tension in the work through such means, she cleverly maintains Caroline’s ingenuousness by illustrating her obtuse naïveté about Zamorna, thus eliciting the sympathy of the reader. As Winifred Gérin says about this revision, which she, too, finds superior to the original version:

Had Zamorna and Caroline bared their feelings for each other in this scene, as in the first draft, there would have been no innocence left in their relationship, and Caroline could not have retained her illusions about her guardian which made her pursuit of him in Part II a guileless gesture and consequently a forgivable one. The drama of Part II, which leads to Caroline’s ruin, would not have existed if Zamorna had already shown himself in his true colours. (Gérin FN 274)

Hence, we learn by comparing these twin versions of this critical scene that through the author’s obfuscation and mystification, Charlotte more clearly conveys Caroline’s blindness about her guardian’s true character, and how Zamorna is able to intrigue, then captivate, his young ward. She would later employ such techniques to great effect in Jane Eyre in the relationship between Rochester and Jane. Rochester misleads Jane about his amorous intentions, thus arousing her erotic interest and her latent sense of jealousy,

while the author successfully maintains her heroine's nescience until that moment when Jane is confronted with the mad Bertha. Both narratives then—particularly in this rewritten scene—allegorize Charlotte's view of her own experience with her shadow self. Not until it is almost too late to save herself does she become aware of her shadow's complicity in the imprisonment of female energies and contribution toward the consequent insanity which Charlotte narrowly escapes. To a degree, Charlotte is maintaining her own innocence in the real-life script by rewriting this retrospective scenario.

During her stay in Paris, Caroline's innocence begins to fall away, and she comes to see Zamorna as others do:

[I]n his real light – no longer as a Philosopher & Apostle – but as . . . a man vicious like other men . . . perhaps . . . more than other men – with passions that sometimes controlled him – with propensities that were often stronger than his reason – with feelings that could be reached by beauty – with a corruption that could be roused by opposition – (Gérin FN 323)

Despite this new awareness, Caroline is unable to break those ties with her guardian, and recognize that she is as much a victim of her passions as Zamorna. The one person who appears truly enlightened by all this is the author herself, appreciating the self-referential aspects of such observations, along with the problems inherent in possessing a passionate nature. Charlotte, too, in recognizing herself as a victim of her passions, was unable to break the ties which bound her to her shadow. Passion is treated as if it were a fatal flaw in these late stories, and it will be some time before Charlotte learns how to curb such a temperament, much in the same way she was forced to temper an overheated imagination. When Caroline grows weary of Paris and returns home, Percy is wary of subjecting his daughter to temptation, and sequesters her in the remote "Eden-Cottage" in the north, an allusion to Caroline's continuing purity and innocence. Feeling persecuted and banished, she endlessly replays fantasies of meeting Zamorna as a newly grown-up woman of the world, ruminating over her feelings for him, not sure why she likes him as much as she does, and feeling very wicked for her thoughts. Growing increasingly impatient as she awaits rescue, Caroline wishes for magical powers with which to entice Zamorna, and devises wild schemes, one of which is to dress as a boy in order to slip

away to see him.<sup>20</sup> A response from her guardian finally arrives, and two versions of this critical letter show Charlotte's increasing sophistication with conveying eroticism through the written word. The first draft of this missive sounds very businesslike, a guardian condescendingly addressing a child. The tone of the revised letter proves to be more enticing, Zamorna addressing Caroline as he might one of his mistresses. In this second version of his letter, Zamorna has included an invitation, and Caroline immediately makes haste to join him, the narrator intruding into the tale to comment critically on Caroline's willful impetuosity. Here, though, she is following the volition of another, responding, like *Jane Eyre*, to a disembodied voice, which wills her to come, and she heeds it.<sup>21</sup>

The narrator's description of Caroline's conflicting emotions about Zamorna articulate Charlotte's own dual reactions to her shadow self. Caroline prides herself on concealing her sentiments for Zamorna, as she does her identity upon arrival, convinced she has been able to keep secret that "restless devouring feeling" which accompanies her thoughts of him (Gérin FN 349). Although she vows to crush that feeling, never letting Zamorna know of its existence, it continues to preoccupy her, filling her with alternating emotions of thrill and dread. She also struggles with her conscience, feeling it sinful to be in love with a married man. However, such concealment is soon exposed, when the pair are finally alone together. As soon as the game-playing concludes, so too does the innocence. The guardian-ward relationship has been violated; Caroline's secret passion has been revealed, and she now feels shame as a consequence. She is like a young, unpracticed Eve who has unwittingly escaped from Eden, to put herself at the mercy of a more knowing and demonic Adam, who then leads her into even greater temptation. Undoubtedly, this unveiling parallels a moment in Charlotte's own fantasies when she, too, realized this was no longer an innocent game. Instead, Charlotte recognized that she, like Caroline, had moved into treacherous territory with significant consequences for her own destiny. The perception of emotional shelter offered by Zamorna, who manipulates his voice when he speaks with Caroline to emit a tone expressing pity and "something protecting & sheltering about it as though he were calling her home" (Gérin FN 352), conflicts with the girl's sense that their relationship would come to no good end: "She darkly saw or rather felt the end to which all this tended, but all was fever & delirium

round her” (Gérin FN 352-53). Caroline’s response may closely imitate that of Charlotte when she courageously confronted her own shadow: “Here he was – the man that Montmorency had described to her – all at once she knew him – Her guardian was gone – Something terrible sat in his place” (Gérin FN 353). The narrator fully exploits the Gothic trappings contained in this scene, even making direct reference to the genre. The young innocent is innocent no more, fully cognizant now of the dangers lurking behind Zamorna’s custodial mask. When Caroline begs in a whispering voice to be released and attempts to rise, finding she is restrained by her captor, she casts a piteous expression of appeal, eliciting a chilling gesture in return: “He[,] Satan’s eldest Son[,] smiled at the mute prayer” (Gérin FN 353). The moment which exposes Caroline’s secret passion marks the instant when Zamorna comes to know the mastery he exerts over her, giving him license to possess her, revealing the sadomasochistic nexus of this shadow-ego relationship, the former threatening to take possession of the latter.<sup>22</sup>

This abstraction of the surrender of self-agency through the exposure of the self to a greater, darker force delineates the nature of the inner struggle Charlotte undertakes with her shadow. The eroticism contained in the battle to reign over her soul illustrates her reluctance to break free of it. At the same time, surrendering supremacy to her shadow would mean relinquishing her will and self-agency, an anathema to a woman like Charlotte. As such, this tale specifically outlines Charlotte’s quandary, and shows why Elizabeth Hastings proved to be a viable role model, while Caroline did not, although in the figure of Jane Eyre, we find aspects of both characters. Moglen observes a conjunction of Brontë and Byron here: “The myth of romantic love [was] articulated” both in Byron’s life and in Brontë’s fiction (30). Therefore, it is in keeping with this Byronic tale that when Caroline asks Zamorna what she must do, he responds by paraphrasing Byron: “Crede Zamorna[!]” (Gérin FN 353).<sup>23</sup> Zamorna intends to lodge Caroline in his “treasure-house” near the heart of his kingdom, and out of reach of the rest of the world. What he has deposited there in the past, namely Rosamund Wellesley, has always remained safe, he claims, from human violence and living forces. Zamorna does not recognize that such violent forces can emanate from within. Through extreme self-disparagement, an enslaved woman might be moved to take her own life, as is implied with Rosamund. Thus, Zamorna cannot save women from the destructive power

he exerts over them, nor even from themselves, which stresses the jeopardy inherent in the shadow, should it take possession of a soul.

Caroline should have read her Byron more closely. In his relationships with women and those that Byron created for his heroes, “the poet expressed the complex destructive and self-destructive attitudes which define romantic love” (Moglen 31). “For all his rebelliousness,” Moglen continues, Byron “was the product of his society—prey to its patriarchal neuroticism. He was open in his disdain of women. He not only avowed his dislike of them, he acted out that dislike in sadistic behavior that ranged from the subtle to the absurd” (31). Moglen cites Leslie Marchand’s remark, in his biography of Byron, that in his amorous adventures, the poet was most successful with young girls below his intellectual level who viewed him with awe.<sup>24</sup> Such adulation only incurred Byron’s scorn: “His vanity was fed by [women’s] admiration, but the more they admired, the more he despised them for the weakness they betrayed” (Moglen 31), conjuring repetitive images of Zamorna’s relationships with women. “The eroticism they offered,” Moglen adds, “was not desired because it yielded knowledge of ‘the other,’ thereby expanding the limits of the self, but because, in the stimulation of his own sensibilities, [Byron] was better able to feel himself feeling” (31). In this same way, the vicious narcissistic circle plays itself out endlessly in the juvenilia: Zamorna taking possession of a woman only to come to know her fully, at which point he loses interest, moving on to pluck more flowers in an effort to keep himself stimulated and amused. In his wake lie his conquests, stripped of their selfhood and self-respect, most of them dead, dying, or insane, many of them cursing him and hoping to haunt him in the next life. Moglen argues that the unhappiness of these heroines, which permeates these stories, is caused not only by Zamorna’s disloyalty and capriciousness, but more important, by their dependence upon him to define and affirm themselves. “Deprived of sense of self, they cannot accept responsibility; moral choice is impossible” (Moglen 51). This orbicular pattern depicts the destructive circularity of the masochistic personality, to which, for a time, Charlotte fell prey, but which she went to great lengths to avoid, following her prolonged study of Mina Laury. Such victims—especially those who sit like enchanted princesses in the castles in which Zamorna has deposited them—are victimizing themselves, observes Moglen, “since they alone can unlock their castle doors to enter a world of mature

responsibility. Charlotte perceives their dilemma but she does not yet know where they can find the requisite keys” (52). But here, Moglen, like Kucich, aptly describes Charlotte at an earlier juncture, before the creation of role models like Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings. This pair of women becomes Charlotte’s set of keys to a more autonomous selfhood. The study of Caroline Vernon, then, serves as Charlotte’s retrospective look at what might have occurred, had she not acted in time to take charge of her own self-agency. Once she sees and understands that, Charlotte is free to begin transforming her animus into a more positive influence for her future life.

This is the last glimpse we have of Caroline Vernon. Zamorna sequesters her for life in his treasure house, living out the fate of a Victorian housewife, or an individual possessed by its shadow self. The act prompts a huge rift between Zamorna and Percy, the latter calling the former a “coarse Voluptuary” for treating both his daughters as if they were Zamorna’s “purchased slaves” (Gérin FN 356), and for ruining and destroying Caroline, his “last & only comfort” (Gérin FN 358). Percy curses Zamorna, wishing him maimed and crippled, sounding like one of Zamorna’s wounded heroines, but also predicting Rochester’s eventual fate. Percy reminds him of their long friendship, those moments when Zamorna “assumed enthusiasm... blushed almost like a woman & even wearied me out with your boyish ardour” (Gérin FN 357), and of the sacrifice of his first daughter, Mary. He draws on the parable of Nathan and David as told in the Second Book of Samuel<sup>25</sup> to emphasize the gravity of Zamorna’s iniquity, threatening him with exposure in court and the newspapers. Zamorna, however, views himself as omnipotent and indestructible, and calmly remarks: “In nature there is no such thing as annihilation – blow me up & I shall live again” (Gérin FN 358). The words are prophetic. Zamorna continues to live on in Charlotte’s imagination, despite her claim a short while later that she had exhausted her subject. She writes, in her brief treatise known as “A Farewell to Angria” (c. December 1839), that she has studied the subject matter in every light, every season over the past thirteen years, looking at it in profile, full face, both in outline and finished form, illustrating once again the visual nature of her imagination. True to his word, Zamorna remains immortal and continues to manifest himself in one incarnation or another in much of Charlotte’s adult fiction, all of which bears an Angrian imprint. As she admits, it is not easy to dismiss a subject that has occupied her for so long, and she

cautions her readers not to rush her. These characters “peopled my thoughts by day, and not seldom stole strangely even into my dreams by night” (Beer 366). Leaving them behind is like leaving home, she claims. Still, she longs to put behind her “that burning clime where we have sojourned too long” (Beer 366), sensing the mind needs to “cease from excitement” (Beer 367), to subdue itself and exist in cooler, soberer regions. It will not be long, though, before Charlotte picks up her pen again and makes her first attempt at writing a three-volume novel (Ashworth) using these same characters, albeit with new identities, unmindful of the elusive, yet ever-present role the animus plays in the consciousness.

#### **4. The Significance of Charlotte’s Earlier Imaginative Break**

Caroline Vernon records not only the end of an intimate and powerful relationship shared by a pair of enduring male archetypes in Charlotte’s fiction, but also the death of the victimized heroine. Even more significantly, however, Captain Henry Hastings and the fragment which precedes it record the emergence of Charlotte’s autonomous female protagonists and equitable relationships in Charlotte’s adult novels. All three published narratives—Jane Eyre, Shirley, and Villette—feature women of strength and resolve who evolve from the prototypes, Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings. Charlotte’s future heroines are the central forces around which her plots and the male antagonists revolve. In these later works—even in The Professor—the men are usually depicted as strangely enervated: in conflict with a brother, rendered powerless by birth order, physical injury, or through a cross-gendered identity (as with Louis Moore). Those few men in the adult fiction who forcefully oppress others are either treated negatively (Edward Crimsworth) or ironically (M. Paul), shown as coming to no good end, or having to learn their lessons, or to prove their worth to the female protagonists. Often they are forced to undergo tests of character or transformations (William Crimsworth, Rochester, Robert and Louis Moore, Dr. John Graham), as are the women, illustrating the equity inscribed in this adult world. All these men represent, in one protean incarnation or another, the taming and transformation of Charlotte’s animus into a positive force, so that these remade heroes

can further enable and empower the heroines. Only then are those who are found deserving rewarded with the women in these tales, who have been undergoing their own process of growth and self-completion. The genesis for this reversal in power relations in Charlotte's narratives can be found in Captain Henry Hastings, which is what lends such significance to this novelette and marks the moment when Charlotte truly made her 'imaginative break.'

Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings symbolize Charlotte's emerging adult female self, as she took stock of her circumstances and studied various ways in which she might, in the future, more fruitfully interact with men, her family and society.<sup>26</sup> Through these women, Charlotte reads Zamorna more realistically, in effect reducing his power over her, so that future relationships with his likeness will be rendered more equitably. Charlotte is also able to study herself more clearly through these women, understanding the unsuitability of identifying with flirtatious coquettes and society girls, despairing queens, or dependent, even masochistic mistresses, finding such representations of female figures foreign to her intrinsic character. Finally, through Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings, Charlotte sees the desirability of seeking a position of autonomy for herself in the outside world, dependent upon no one, free to investigate and profit by her innate talents. Aware that she must earn her own keep, resolved not to become enslaved in a powerless post, and equally determined not to marry unless she were fully and deeply in love with a man,<sup>27</sup> Charlotte recognized that she might need to follow the career trajectory of teacher or governess. In these tales, she reconciles herself to that destiny, finding rewards, however small, in such situations,<sup>28</sup> assuring herself that she would not be misread by those who, like her, are shrewd judges of others. Certain authority is made implicit in Charlotte's portrayal of the role of governess, particularly when juxtaposed with the shallow society girl who is her charge. For the rest of her writing career, Charlotte will bestow consequential weight to the position of teacher, giving such significant duties to Frances Henri, then *Jane Eyre*, followed by Louis Moore and M. Paul, the latter teaching Lucy Snowe how to fulfill the role of master or mistress of one's own fate. In Captain Henry Hastings, Charlotte also begins dreaming of starting her own school. The ambition is almost realized in Jane Eyre and is successfully attained in both

The Professor and Villette, although in the corporeal world, Charlotte's plans for such a school were thwarted by the dissolute habits of her brother.

Through Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings, then, Charlotte made her imaginative break from that of a long line of disenfranchised, suffering heroines. Both these women emblemize her liberation from her previous enthrallment with Zamorna. Zamorna's displacement to a minor role in this novelette and the transfer in focus to more suitable male protagonists ratifies that shift. As well, Charlotte's adoption of a new persona—one which more closely conforms with her maturing inner psyche, her outward self and her gender, one more adaptable to the actual world in which she lived—represents a radical modification. Moreover, that world she now describes conforms to the world in which Charlotte actually lives: the English—even Yorkshire—environment, rather than the exotic African climes of the early juvenilia. Charlotte's two worlds have at last merged, symbolizing a psychic fusion taking place within her.

She now views the world through the eyes of plain young women of limited means, but strong character, rather than by the intermediacy of the dissolute cynic of aristocratic birth, Charles Wellesley Townsend/Townshend. This new persona, who heeded her head before following her heart, was better equipped to judge an attractive reprobate for what he truly was by unmasking such demons and revealing them as comic, enfeebled, even pathetically vain actors and coxcombs, rather than demonic monsters. She would think twice now before accepting a jeweled cross from a misguided protagonist, who himself has lessons to learn, since, through painful experience, she knew the hazards of *naïveté* and misplaced idolatry. By means of such level-headed women as Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings, Charlotte was at last using her astute powers of character examination, and purposely avoiding falling into old bad habits. Through such self-possessed role models, Charlotte had come into possession of her true self, overthrowing and invalidating those forceful images that had ruled her psyche during her formative years. Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings, therefore, symbolize Charlotte's psychic break-through, her passage out of the paralysis of possession so her growth could take its natural course.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Mary Percy actually figures in most of Charlotte's stories following "The Return of Zamorna," since so many of these later tales are set in the past.

<sup>2</sup> In a letter to his sister dated April 14, 1853, Matthew Arnold writes: "Why is Villette disagreeable? Because the writer's mind contains nothing but Hunger, rebellion, and rage, and therefore that is all she can, in fact, put into her book. No fine writing can hide this thoroughly, and it will be fatal to her in the long run" (Letters of Matthew Arnold 1:34). The previous month, on March 21, Arnold wrote to Arthur Hugh Clough, saying, "Miss B[rontë] has written a hideous undelightful convulsed constricted novel . . . It is one of the most utterly disagreeable books I ever read – and having seen her makes it more so. She is so entirely – what Margaret Fuller was partially – a fire without aliment – one of the most distressing barren sights one can witness. Religion or devotion or whatever it is to be called may be impossible for such people now: but they have at any rate not found a substitute for it and it was better for the world when they comforted themselves with it" (Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough 132).

<sup>3</sup> Kucich quotes from Charlotte's letter of March 22, 1853 to Ellen Nussey here: "As to the character of 'Lucy Snowe' my intention from the first was that she should not occupy the pedestal to which 'Jane Eyre' was raised by some injudicious admirers. She is where I meant her to be, and where no charge of self-laudation can touch her" (SHB LL 4:52-3).

<sup>4</sup> Following Charlotte's death, Harriet Martineau told Elizabeth Gaskell that Charlotte had sought an evaluation of her work. Martineau had not, she writes, seen the reviews of Jane Eyre, which so confounded Charlotte, but concedes that "I had heard 'Jane Eyre' called 'coarse.' I told her that love was treated with unusual breadth, and that the kind of intercourse was uncommon and uncommonly described, but that I did *not* consider the book a coarse one. . . ." In January 1853, Martineau, in response to Charlotte's request, shared her thoughts on Villette. In part she writes: "I do not like the love, either the kind or the degree of it; and its prevalence in the book, and effect on the action of it. . . ." and "All the female characters, in all their thoughts and lives, are full of one thing, or are regarded by the reader in the light of that one thought, – love" (Gaskell 618-19n6).

<sup>5</sup> Ellis writes in The Women of England: Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits: "I still cling fondly to the hope that some system of female instruction will be discovered, by which the young women of England may be sent from school to the homes of their parents, habituated to be on the watch for every opportunity of doing good to others; making it the first and the last inquiry of every day, 'What can I do to make my parents, my brothers, or my sisters, more happy? I am but a feeble instrument in the hands of Providence, but as He will give me strength, I hope to pursue the plan to which I have been accustomed, of seeking my own happiness only in the happiness of others'" (Norton Anthology of English Literature 2:1640).

<sup>6</sup> Halfway through the composition of this novelette, Charlotte received her first proposal of marriage from Ellen Nussey's brother, Henry, whom she decided to refuse. Like her narrator, Charles, who advertises for a wife in the opening chapter of Captain Henry Hastings, she ultimately decides the solitary job of writing for a living is a more suitable route for her to pursue.

<sup>7</sup> Some critics view fundamental changes taking place in Charlotte and her work earlier than Kucich does, though not as early as I do when I argue that such change is evident in the formation of the character of Miss West/Elizabeth Hastings. Moglen claims the three novelettes Mina Laury, Caroline Vernon, and Captain Henry Hastings “are marked by a maturing consciousness which attempts to bring chaotic emotionality under moral and psychological control” (51). She also points out that Winifred Gérin observes such a change taking place in these works, as cited in her 1966 article, “Byron’s Influence on the Brontës” (9), as I mention in note 11 of Chapter Four. In the introduction to Caroline Vernon, Gérin writes: “the author’s advance in self-analysis makes it possible for her to detach herself from her heroine’s situation, as she could *not* do in the earlier tale [Mina Laury], and to see it whole” (Gérin FN 274, emphasis Gérin’s).

<sup>8</sup> The fragment begins with the following appropriately worded phrase: “But it is not in Society that the real character is revealed. . . .”

<sup>9</sup> Typical of such comments is Moglen’s remark: “This is the first of her stories in which Brontë models her heroine upon herself. In this respect, ‘Henry Hastings’ is the forerunner of the mature novels. Elizabeth is—like Brontë, like Jane Eyre, like Lucy Snowe—‘plain and undersized’” (55).

<sup>10</sup> Lyndall Gordon concurs, and Fannie Ratchford is even more emphatic about the autobiographical allegation, claiming that Branwell acknowledged Hastings as himself and represented him as “an ugly character indeed under his pen, without an appealing quality,” while Charlotte “raises him to the status of a tragic hero” (Web of Childhood 148). Juliet Barker disagrees with the critical consensus that Branwell served as a model for Henry Hastings, saying: “Gérin’s repeated assertion . . . that Henry Hastings is a portrait of a debauched Branwell now being loyally supported by his loving sister, is not supported by the facts” (894n45). Helene Moglen states that this story marks the point at which Charlotte turned dream-like fantasy into art, contrary to Gérin’s contention that it reflects reality, rather than fantasy: “In her presentation of Elizabeth’s situation, Brontë places fantasy at the service of analysis, beginning to transmute the dream into art” (Moglen 56). Rather than view this shift as simply a move from fantasy to reality, Moglen credits Charlotte for the analytical skills which she brings to bear on this and other stories in these latter years of the juvenilia. The critic assesses this as a time when the author learned from her fantasies as well as reality. As she astutely comments, “The family romance, we find, has many levels” (Moglen 56).

<sup>11</sup> John Stores Smith reports the following about a day’s visit he had in 1850 with Charlotte: “Her age I took to be about five-and-thirty. But when you saw and felt her eyes, the spirit that created ‘Jane Eyre’ was revealed at once to you. They were rather small, but of a very peculiar colour, and had a strange lustre and intensity. They were chameleon-like, a blending of various brown and olive tints. But they looked you through and through – and you felt they were forming an opinion of you, not by mere acute noting of Lavaterish physiognomical peculiarities, but by a subtle penetration into the very marrow of your mind, and the innermost core of your soul. Taking my hand again she apologised for her enforced absence, and, as she did so, she looked right through me. There was no boldness in the gaze, but an intense, direct, searching look, as of one who had the gift to read hidden mysteries, and the right to read them. I had a feeling that I never experienced before or since, as though I was being mesmerised. It was almost a relief when the look was removed, and we sat down together to table. During dinner I had always a feeling

that those eyes were on me, when I was looking down myself, and when I looked at her, her gaze was on her plate, I still could not divest myself of the sensation that those eyes could see one through their lids” (“Personal Reminiscences: A Day with Charlotte Brontë” 166-67).

<sup>12</sup> Charlotte appears to have concerned herself with such misapprehensions of her character. Ellen Nussey writes of a visit Charlotte once made, while a student at Roe Head, to a family who knew only her father, not her. Ellen reports that Charlotte felt seriously misjudged by them: “During one of our brief holidays Charlotte was guest in a family who had known her father when he was curate in their parish. They were naturally inclined to show kindness to his daughter, but the kindness here took a form which was little agreeable. They had had no opportunity of knowing her abilities or disposition, and they took her shyness and smallness as indications of extreme youth. She was slow, very slow, to express anything that bordered on ingratitude, but here she was mortified and hurt. ‘They took me for a child, and treated me just like one,’ she said” (Smith 594).

<sup>13</sup> Just as the concept of duty was turned on its head in *Mina Laury*, conscience and reason undergo a similar inversion here.

<sup>14</sup> Lady Victorine Gordon, Marian Hume, Mary Percy, and Rosamund Wellesley die prematurely from despair. Similar spoliation occurred with Sofala, the spurned mistress and mother of Finic. Shungaron, her brother, accuses Zamorna of neglect, which caused her death: “Her soul, her life, her whole existence were bound up in thee, thou treacherous white man, and when thou didst coldly and cruelly forsake her, decay began to fade her cheek and dim her eye” (CA 2.1:376). Only *Mina Laury* survives this abuse, seeing it as her duty to do so, as discussed in the previous chapter. Such resolutions, then, map out the difficulty Charlotte experienced in defining an ideal female role model for herself.

<sup>15</sup> Ten years later, Charlotte will create another *Caroline* in her novel, *Shirley*, and many of the social diatribes about relationships between men and women contained in that work are anticipated in this earlier tale.

<sup>16</sup> There are numerous references in this tale to *Caroline*’s resemblance to a Negro or a mulatto, stressing her otherness. *Caroline* says her mother finds her neck very brown, declaring she’s “quite a negro” (Gérin FN 309). The young girl envies the Duchess’ fairness, claiming, “I’m all dark like a mulatto[,] mama says” (Gérin FN 362).

<sup>17</sup> Harriet Martineau’s early feminism may well have influenced the young Charlotte. Although we do not know when Charlotte began reading Martineau’s published work, no doubt this remark is made in reference to a daring and well-publicized trip Martineau made to the United States in 1834, slipping into the country dressed as a man, and remaining there for two years, boldly speaking out and writing on contentious issues of slavery and emancipation. By 1839, the year when *Caroline Vernon* was composed, Martineau had become what she would refer to as one of London’s Literary Lions. The Brontës were acquainted with the Martineau family, though when this acquaintance began is not clear. In a letter to Francis Grundy dated 1842, Patrick Brontë

speaks of Harriet's brother, the Reverend James Martineau (Smith 294). Margaret Smith notes that Branwell knew of James Martineau as a writer and reviewer and had "evidently asked for his opinion on some of his work" (Smith 295n4). Branwell also sought the opinion of Harriet, according to Barker (401). Charlotte first met Harriet in 1849, after sending a copy of *Shirley* to her, and the two shared a friendship until their disagreement over Martineau's assessment of *Villette*. Of Harriet's work, we know Charlotte read *Deerbrook* and had told her she benefited from the ideas and views of life expressed therein. Charlotte also read "Household Education," and commented that it was uncannily like *Jane Eyre*, which many thought Martineau had written or supplied the facts for, since her childhood so closely paralleled that of the heroine.

<sup>18</sup> In this last tale in the juvenilia then, before Charlotte bid farewell to Angria, she is presenting the third prototype for her adult life. All three are brought together in *Jane Eyre*: the mad Bertha, the flighty Adèle, and the plain Jane.

<sup>19</sup> Rochester expresses some of the same concerns for young Adèle Varens, Jane Eyre's charge, who appears to be a throwback to Caroline Vernon.

<sup>20</sup> Charlotte may have been drawing here on the famous portrait of Byron's illicit love, Lady Caroline Lamb. "Caroline was diminutive and epicene, her nickname was 'Ariel,' and she has been described as looking like a fourteen-year-old boy," Louis Crompton writes. "Her most famous portrait shows her dressed as a page . . . Occasionally she herself adopted this disguise for clandestine visits to Byron" (197). According to Crompton, Caroline Lamb also conspired to deceive Byron into thinking she was a boy, "and then revealing herself, [which] has an air of erotic fantasy about it" (198), presaging Caroline Vernon's act of disguising herself as her cousin, waiting to reveal herself to Zamorna until they are later alone.

<sup>21</sup> This disembodied call and response was first used by Charlotte in 1830, in her tale "Albion and Marina." Elizabeth Gaskell reports in her biography of Charlotte that when a reader of *Jane Eyre* objected to the viability of such an incident actually occurring, Charlotte drew in her breath and replied in a low voice, "But it is a true thing; it really happened" (Gaskell 401).

<sup>22</sup> Moglen argues that such a vinculum is entirely in keeping with the patriarchal constructs of the time, and the view of women as chattel. Moglen elaborates on the prevalent view of how marriage functioned during this time: "The advent of industrialization and the growth of the middle class was accompanied by a more diffuse yet more virulent form of patriarchy than any that had existed before. As men became uniquely responsible for the support of the family, women became 'possessions,' identified with their 'masters' wealth. The status of the male owner derived from the extent of his woman's leisure time and the degree of her emotional and physical dependence upon him. Sexual relationships followed a similar pattern of dominance and submission. Male power was affirmed through an egoistic, aggressive, even violent sexuality. Female sexuality was passive and self-denying. The woman, by wilfully defining herself as 'the exploited,' as 'victim,' by seeing herself as she was reflected in the male's perception of her, achieved the only kind of control available to her. Mutuality was extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, to achieve" (Moglen 30).

---

<sup>23</sup> See Gérin's footnote: "A paraphrase of Byron's motto" (Gérin FN 353).

<sup>24</sup> Leslie Marchand observes in his biography of Byron: "In all the philandering of his dissipated youth and during his foreign travels he had never conceived a romantic attachment to any woman of his own rank and intellect . . . [H]e had always been most successful with girls below his intellectual level, with those who had flattered his ego and looked up with awe at his title, and he had come to have a kind of Oriental scorn of women as creatures in no way capable of sharing a man's thoughts or feelings" (*Byron: A Biography* 1:330). In another work on Byron, Marchand quotes from one of the poet's journal entries of January 1821, which reads, in part: "[Women] ought to mind home—and be well fed and clothed—but not mixed in society. Well educated, too, in religion—but to read neither poetry nor politics—nothing but books of piety and cookery. Music—drawing—dancing—also a little gardening and ploughing now and then. I have seen them mending the roads in Epirus with good success. Why not, as well as hay-making and milking?" (*Byron's Letters and Journals* 8:15). According to Louis Crompton, Byron felt he had been badly victimized by women. "Yet his antifeminism, like many prejudices, would probably have existed independently of his unfortunate experiences. It was partly a fashionable posture among cynical radicals of his age, partly an expression of the domineering side of his temperament" (240-41). Crompton notes that critics looking for pro-feminist passages in Byron usually cite Julia's letter in *Don Juan* (Canto I, stanzas 192-97), which "dramatizes the double standard that shut 'fallen' women up in convents but allowed their lovers to travel and enjoy themselves. But I doubt if protest or reform was Byron's purpose, poignantly as he renders Julia's plight" (241n3).

<sup>25</sup> 2 Samuel 12. Here again, what begins comically in the juvenilia, ends on a note of pathos, like the modulation from major to minor key. Shuttleworth comments that Charlotte, while "clearly fascinated by these male power struggles . . . does not idealize them; her heroes are increasingly depicted as ridiculous at times" (120-21). In the late juvenilia, this is true enough, but this final story concludes on a far more sorrowful note, recalling all the tenderness and homoeroticism once enjoyed between these two men, while tallying the losses.

<sup>26</sup> Although Elizabeth Hastings saves her reprobate brother, Henry, from a death sentence in this novelette, Charlotte is unable to effect any such rescue of Branwell in real life. Perhaps the novelette served to act out a deep-seated wish of hers, however.

<sup>27</sup> After refusing Henry Nussey's proposal of marriage, Charlotte tells Ellen in March of 1839 that although she esteems Ellen's brother, she does not have, nor thought she could have "that intense attachment which would make me willing to die for him—and if I ever marry it must be in that light of adoration that I will regard my Husband" (Smith 187). This condition Charlotte sets on marriage is soon tempered, however. A year later, in another letter to Ellen, dated May of 1840, Charlotte writes: "Do not be over-persuaded to marry a man you can never respect—I do not say love because, I think, if you can respect a person before marriage, moderate love at least will come after; and as to intense passion, I am convinced that is no desirable feeling. In the first place, it seldom or never meets with a requital; and, in the second place, if it did, the feeling would be only temporary; it would last the honeymoon, and then, perhaps, give place to disgust or indifference, worse, perhaps, than disgust. Certainly this would be the case on the man's part;

---

and on the woman's—God help her, if she is left to love passionately and alone" (Smith 217-18, emphasis Brontë's).

<sup>28</sup> However, Charlotte soon found her temperament ill-suited to governessing as a result of a position with the Sidgwick family. Her letters of June 1839 to Ellen and Emily conveyed her deep unhappiness while in the Sidgwick's employ, and later missives to Ellen reinforce Charlotte's sense that governesses were, in effect, slaves. Not long after concluding Caroline Vernon, Charlotte began work on her first attempt at a three-volume novel, Ashworth, intent on either making a living as an author or as mistress of a school with her sisters, though she was forced to take one more position as governess to the White family in 1841.

## Conclusion

*“I am not altogether pessimistic about neurosis. In many cases we have to say: ‘Thank heaven he could make up his mind to be neurotic.’ Neurosis is really an attempt at self-cure, just as any physical disease is in part an attempt at self-cure. We cannot understand a disease as an ens per se any more, as something detached which not so long ago it was believed to be. Modern medicine – internal medicine, for instance – conceives of disease as a system composed of a harmful factor and a healing factor. It is exactly the same with neurosis. It is an attempt of the self-regulating psychic system to restore the balance, in no way different from the function of dreams – only rather more forceful and drastic.” (C.W. Jung, Essential Jung 167)*

For a long time, the Brontës’ work was not considered worthy of serious academic attention. Their novels were often dismissed by critics as “Gothic romances.” Biographers frequently viewed their lives as peculiar and neurotic. The family was thought to be strange, full of odd characters, good for a sidelong view, but not serious scholarly study. To make matters worse, for well over a century, much of the juvenilia, as well as the unfinished novels, and the Brontë correspondence were scattered across five continents, secreted in private collections and numerous libraries, so that what was available to scholars were mere fragments, often inaccurately transcribed. Only in the last few decades have reputable academics begun to give the family more critical notice and recognize that some of this work might even be considered pioneering in many respects. As a result, would-be Brontë scholars now have the benefit of working with recovered texts which are as complete as they can be, more thorough and reliable assemblages of correspondence, and better researched and authenticated biographies, allowing academicians to make more informed judgments about both these works and their authors. In a sense, the Brontës’ oeuvre has now been legitimized as a result of this latterly documentation, and respected critics are having their say in essays and books, creating ongoing debates, and a whole ‘school’ of analytical commentary from which we all profit. One might say that so much Brontëana did not “come of age” until quite recently, then, since much of what was written about them prior to this recent undertaking was often based on questionable hearsay, biased reports, or incomplete primary material.

We can never really know an author without having read all of his or her work. Studying the entire corpus of an author allows one to perceive patterns and recurring themes, as well as alterations in those designs, which helps the critic come to understand the full depth of an artist. Reading the collected works provides insight into the twists and

turns of an author's mind, what gave an author the impetus to create in the first place, what initially interested a writer in the act of creating, and what sustained that interest. At the same time, we cannot truly know an author without knowing something of the times in which he or she lived. Without a proper contextual milieu, we judge by an untrue standard. Consequently, to appreciate adequately an author's voice—particularly that of a woman writer—her gender, cultural background, economic status, social standing, childhood and family environment must be taken into consideration as well. Too often, critical analysis has ignored one or more of these elements, even in so unusual a family as the Brontës. Despite possessing the best evidence we have had to date, some critics still make questionable or erroneous assumptions about the work or the motives of the Brontës.

In the same vein, working with Jungian psychology proves problematic, because the esteemed psychologist insists on a stereotypical assessment of the sexes, making generalized assumptions how each gender progresses through the individuation process which can not be consistently applied to Charlotte, nor, perhaps, to any woman. Since the 1970s, a number of feminist critics and psychologists have developed a more flexible Jungianism, exposing the inadequacies in Jung's gendered concepts of psychological process. I, too, have deviated from Jung's model here, as pointed out in some detail in Chapters Four and Five. An overview of this feminist approach to Jungian psychology, then, as articulated by Demaris Wehr, is also contained in this Conclusion, as the differences here need to be accentuated. Despite the numerous similarities found in the biographical detail of Jung's and Charlotte Brontë's early lives, the manner in which Jung and Brontë achieved individuation varies greatly, disclosing the fallacy of creating narrow categories of inevitability in the conscious or unconscious growth process. It has been my contention that the juvenilia offer something of a test case for Jung's vision of individuation. Therefore, this study of Charlotte's maturation, while generally supporting Jung's theories on development and validating much of his system of individuation, divulges the need for a corrective to those theories as they apply to women.

### **I. Repression in Charlotte's Adult Fiction**

John Kucich's thesis that Charlotte's adult fiction is suffused with repression is representative of a strain of critical response to Charlotte's literature as neurotic or narcissistic.<sup>1</sup> Kucich's contention, which revolves around strategies of power, confounds repression with reserve, and performance with deceit, failing, as mentioned in the previous chapter, to take into account the context of the times for young Victorian women. Instead he views Charlotte's struggle to find and express herself in a repressive age as obsessively inward, full of self-conflict, and outwardly combative. It is almost as if Kucich has taken on the role of one of those mis-readers of Miss West's social mask. Both men and women in Charlotte's novels, he claims, use silence, as well as masks, theatricality or performance, to conceal desire, arguing that throughout the juvenilia, Charlotte's heroines learn how to perform, and through performance, learn how to gain an advantage otherwise lost to them in male-female relationships. He says of her adult novels that "Brontë is insistent about the spontaneity of combat among her characters," and that "[t]hrough the proliferation of such struggles, a solitary, indiscriminating pleasure in combat—rather than simple sensitivity—is made to seem a crucial characteristic of all Brontë's protagonists" (Kucich 58-59). Arguing that Brontëan desire leads toward self-disruption, Kucich dismisses any possibility that Charlotte might have been working toward individuation: "For to call Brontëan desire self-reflexive is not at all to say that its function is to develop an autonomous psyche as a stable form of identity, or as the object of desire of others" (59). Instead, the critic views this impulse toward emotional disruption in Charlotte and her work as continuous and without resolve, culminating in the figure of Vashti, "Brontë's exalted idealization of female desire . . . a precise instance of glorified self-division, the internalization of endless emotional strife" (Kucich 59).

Kucich's assertion argues against the resolutions found in all four adult novels. Not only did Charlotte realize, through exploring positions of vulnerability and exploitation in such tales as Mina Laury and Caroline Vernon, that such positions led to a distortion, rather than an enlargement, of the self, she could see that this distortion or

diminution of the self led to a static form of the master-slave nexus—a subjugation of the revealed self by the internalized or hidden self. In contrast to Mina Laury and Caroline Vernon, when Elizabeth Hastings expresses herself, she puts herself on common ground with her exploiter, which gives her a position of equity, as we see in the scene with William Percy when she spurns temptation and refuses the jeweled cross. Charlotte means, then, to achieve a union between two selves that might promise equilibrium and a fulfillment or completion of the self, ultimately alleviating loss.<sup>2</sup> In order to accomplish this self-completion, she had to create an arena of combat with a level playing field occupied by a pair of evenly matched contenders, the balance of power being traded back and forth. Such a scenario is enjoyed by Zamorna and Percy for much of the early juvenilia, and later, when Charlotte reaches her own sexual maturity, is illustrated in the kind of relationship men more often encounter with women. These are projections of Charlotte's own psychic wrestling match with her shadow self, whom she cannot allow to master or tyrannize over her. So when Kucich states that it is tragic that Charlotte's sense of repression is enormously overdeveloped (113), he might more accurately state that the tragedy lies in the fact that Charlotte allowed her shadow self (the personification of her libidinal self, upon whom she had projected her adolescent ideas of desire) to become enormously overdeveloped, prompting her anxiety and leading, for a time, to the repression of her passions. In the novelettes, she successfully emerged from this battle for mastery over the self to re-establish the crucial balance needed to achieve individuation, and Vashti and the ghostly nun emblemize extremes of female behavior that Charlotte and Lucy Snowe refuse to imitate.

Although Kucich argues that Charlotte sought not union or fusion with the other, but rather isolation and strength in the solitary self, all of the mature novels contradict his contention. Instead, their plots work toward a merger of separate but equal entities who are themselves fully realized. When he speaks of the "surrender of the self" being "antiaphrodisiac" to Charlotte (49), Kucich unfortunately points to those instances in Charlotte's novels where exploitation follows confession, Charlotte disclosing the hazards of dispersing the self indiscriminately, before it has become fully formed and individuated. Fortright expression, as seen in so many of Jane Eyre's little speeches where she asserts the boundaries of selfhood to Rochester, is not to be confused with the

surrender of self-agency, nor with the desire to intensify one's isolation. Instead, such boundary-setting re-asserts the self and maintains that sense of itself, earning the respect of the other, and setting the stage for a more effective and equitable fusion with that other. Kucich, for instance, perceives great significance in Mrs. Pryor's speech in Shirley against the illusions of romance and the unfeasibility of happy marriages,<sup>3</sup> but again, all the resolutions in the adult novels argue against such sentiments. Instead, Mrs. Pryor exists as a straw figure to be knocked down. It seems more probable that in these early years, unable to effect in the juvenilia the kind of idealized fusion she envisioned, Charlotte attempted to develop an inner strength which she could then bring to the arena of contested power relationships, so that she would find a more even footing in such alliances. In these novelettes, particularly in the figures of Miss West and Elizabeth Hastings, Charlotte appears to be moving toward what she later achieves in Jane Eyre, and then, even more splendidly, in Villette. In her mature novels, the plots resolve to effect non-hierarchical unions, which she was undoubtedly anticipating in the late juvenilia, as when Elizabeth Hastings yearns for a relationship with a man who has tired of coquettish dolls, and would regard her as his equal. Rather than view the mature Charlotte as trapped in a "rigidly solipsistic circle" in which "Brontëan desire becomes locked in a circular dynamic which reflects the contradictions of self negation within autonomy" (Kucich 111), a more plausible analysis perceives an insistence on self-empowerment, followed by a search for an effective fusion. In other words, Charlotte was working toward the realization and actualization of the self, not its negation.

This is not to say, however, that Charlotte leaves behind all traces of earlier relationship dynamics. She utilizes the master/slave and master/pupil matrix in all her adult novels to illustrate the abuses of power and the static and untenable nature of such liaisons. She then contrasts these alliances with more democratically envisioned coalitions, which promote growth and development in the individual, the marriage, the schoolroom or the factory mill. Rather than also instruct men in the art of self-negation, as Kucich claims,<sup>4</sup> Charlotte's heroines instead enable men in ways which allow them to more fully realize themselves—Rochester in confessing his vulnerability, his desire to be wooed, and his rescue fantasies; Robert Moore in learning how to unlock himself from his social isolation to become part of the wider community; and his brother Louis in

acknowledging his strengths as a man, empowering himself through his union with Shirley, to mention only a few examples. Hence, the men in Charlotte's adult fiction come to achieve higher self-completion, much like the women. No one is actually mastered in such relationships, but instead both become enlarged in relation to one another. Charlotte viewed such unions as a means of enhancing and encouraging growth in both individuals. In dissolving previous notions about herself as well as hierarchical dictates imposed upon her gender, she managed to integrate and augment herself through individuation, incorporating her "dark side," and her more masculine instincts, along with her sense of the intrinsic worthiness of her soul. The characters in her later novels take the same journey, so that such societal ideals are destabilized, making room for the evolution of healthier relationships between men and women, although for her time such concepts were radical and invited harsh criticism. Charlotte inscribes this new gendered correspondence and resolution in the fusion of Jane Eyre and Rochester, bringing together and merging seeming opposites who create an intricate balance of, as Kucich phrases it, their "reversible polarities" (Kucich 101), their "mixture of dominant and submissive impulses—a conjunction of extremes" (Kucich 102). Such a fusion precisely typifies Charlotte's own individuated self.

This fusing of the self's duality to achieve self-completion is illustrated in such pairings in all her mature novels. It is impossible, of course, to determine whether this metaphorical portrayal of wholeness was consciously or unconsciously self-reflexive on Charlotte's part. Hannah claims the process of individuation (or the quest for wholeness) can only come into reality in those who are conscious of it. Otherwise, she says, "it will appear in projection in the creative work . . . and there it will reveal a great deal of the potentiality for wholeness of that particular individual" (210-11).<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, when William Crimsworth speaks of the changes which Frances Henri undergoes following their marriage, her literal blossoming, and the way in which marriage both broadens and augments her personality, it sounds like the rewards Charlotte hoped for and possibly even experienced as a result of her ongoing individuation:

As to this same Mrs Crimsworth, in one sense she was become another woman, though in another she remained unchanged. So different was she under different circumstances, I seemed to possess two wives. The

faculties of her nature, already disclosed when I married her, remained fresh and fair; but other faculties shot up strong, branched out broad, and quite altered the external character of the plant. (The Professor 273-74)

In this respect, marriage in Charlotte's adult novels can be seen not only as an idealized state between two fully realized people, but also as a way of representing the successful merging and integration of the disparate selves within the single individual. Jane Eyre's description of her decade-long marriage to Rochester, for instance, posits an idyllic coalescence of two partners, initially such opposites, becoming one whole being, enhanced and enfranchised by one another:

I am my husband's life as fully as he is mine. No woman was ever nearer to her mate than I am: ever more absolutely bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. I know no weariness of my Edward's society: he knows none of mine, any more than we each do of the pulsation of the heart that beats in our separate bosoms; consequently, we are ever together. To be together is for us to be at once as free as in solitude, as gay as in company.

(Jane Eyre, Oxford ed. 456)

Louis Moore's diary reveals his thoughts about the kind of marriage that would sustain and amplify him, acknowledging his need to be paired with his foil rather than his familiar, which argues for the coalescing of the dark and light sides of the self:

*My wife, if I ever marry, must stir my great frame with a sting now and then: she must furnish use to her husband's vast mass of patience. I was not made so enduring to be mated with a lamb: I should find more congenial responsibility in the charge of a young lioness or leopardess. I like few things sweet, but what are likewise pungent; few things bright, but what are likewise hot. I like the summer-day, whose sun makes fruit blush and corn blanch. Beauty is never so beautiful as when, if I tease it, it wreathes back on me with spirit. Fascination is never so imperial as when, roused and half-ireful, she threatens transformation to fierceness. I fear I should tire of the mute, monotonous innocence of the lamb; I should ere long feel as burdensome the nestling dove which never stirred in my bosom; but my patience would exult in stilling the flutterings and training the energies of the restless merlin. In managing the wild instincts of the scarce manageable "bête fauve," my powers would revel. (Shirley 490)*

In Villette, M. Paul speaks to Lucy Snowe of their polarity and affinity, the inevitability of their intertwining fates, and the corresponding congruity found in antithetical relationships. Again, the pairing of opposites here alludes to the uniting of the dual self:

I was conscious of rapport between you and myself. You are patient, and I am choleric; you are quiet and pale, and I am tanned and fiery; you are a strict Protestant, and I am a sort of lay Jesuit: but we are alike – there is affinity. Do you see it, mademoiselle, when you look in the glass? Do you observe that your forehead is shaped like mine – that your eyes are cut like mine? Do you hear that you have some of my tones of voice? Do you know that you have many of my looks? I perceive all this, and believe that you were born under my star. Yes, you were born under my star! Tremble! for where that is the case with mortals, the threads of their destinies are difficult to disentangle; knottings and catchings occur – sudden breaks leave damage in the web. (Villette 457)

This acknowledgement, incorporation, even embracing of the other, while it often becomes mistaken for lovelorn prose, is, whether consciously depicted as such or not, Charlotte's description of her own process of individuation—how she came to achieve a higher potential through the integration of her shadow and the amelioration of her animus, along with the subsequent enhancement of herself through the recognition of one's innate duality. In these works, then, we see duality personified by pairs of characters who are subsequently and repeatedly drawn to amalgamate and further complete one another through fusion and synthesis.

Finally, Kucich contends that the narratives of Brontë's juvenilia are fundamentally anticlosural (60). So, too, are Charlotte's mature novels, as was her own life. Rather than precluding resolution, however, such endings—like beginnings—avoid stasis and promise sustainable and unending growth and change through the other. Charlotte's life was still evolving, when—not long before her thirty-ninth birthday, married to Arthur Bell Nichols, pregnant with her first child, and partway into her fifth novel<sup>6</sup>—she died in 1855. Right up to the year of her death, Charlotte's own evolution continued, the psyche constantly and imaginatively remaking itself, in its further definition and development. Like Zamorna, Charlotte shows that she was a woman who was unsatisfied by any conventional resolution of desire (Kucich 61). Instead, she sought to retain the integrity of the intact self, bringing it to a relationship, which would also

continue to reinvent itself, allowing for continuous growth and evolution between a man and a woman.

## **2. Similarities and Differences in the Individuation Process**

The early lives of Carl Jung and Charlotte Brontë bear striking parallels, and a review of that biographical data conveys the sense that, despite contextual differences, profound similarities can be found in the early maturation of both individuals. Although Jung and Brontë ultimately undertook different routes in the individuation process, just as they used their artistic and psychoanalytical gifts to dissimilar ends, many correspondences exist. Before deciding to devote his life to the study of psychology, Jung, like Charlotte, considered becoming an artist. Frieda Fordham reports that writing came naturally to him, and he easily took to the task of writing his autobiography. She also describes how “he could feel himself to be almost mystically one with the countryside and how his isolated childhood and somewhat unhappy home had affected him in ways that were to last throughout life” (Fordham 122). Cognizant of internal polarities from the moment his memories began, Jung was torn between a clergyman father, who was full of contradictions and struggled with his beliefs, and an extraverted mother. Jung’s father, described as “irritable, moody and hypochondriacal” (Fordham 125) exerted a strong influence over the boy’s life, often filling a maternal role, particularly during a time when Jung was about four years old and his mother was hospitalized, her absence “convinc[ing] Jung of her unreliability” (Fordham 125). Jung was significantly influenced, as well, by numerous relatives, also in the clergy. Because of the location of the family home, he was prematurely exposed to a great deal of death (his father officiating over burials). The young boy consequently came to feel an ambivalence about Christ and an imperfect world. In this environment, everything for Jung began to be referentially linked with God, sometimes causing a moral quandary for him. He questioned theological contradictions found in the stories of Genesis, and “in his childhood they formed part of the stuff of his dreams, fantasies and solitary games” (Fordham 124). Possessing a rich imagination, Jung created whole miniature villages as a

boy, and later wrote that he had “an inner certainty that I was on the way to discovering my own myth. For the building game was only a beginning. It released a stream of fantasies which I later carefully wrote down” (Essential Jung 76). This became a lifelong habit with him, a way of working out whatever was lodged in his unconscious, which he recognized early on as a separate personality.<sup>7</sup>

Jung hated school and was considered “an oddity” by his classmates (Fordham 125). Meeting with indifferent teachers, he conducted his own research in his father’s modest library, becoming “informed on subjects which were quite outside [his schoolmates’] sphere of interest” (Fordham 125). He felt painfully conscious of “his parents’ poverty, for which Jung felt personally responsible,” and this economic deprivation also served to separate him from his peers (Fordham 125). He preferred his solitude, enjoying his excused absence from school following a head injury, and immersing himself in nature, finding an order and meaning in the sky, the wind, and the clouds. Fordham explains that Jung sensed that most people were similarly alienated from the world, and “because he could not communicate his own feelings to them[,] people made him feel lonely” (128). But after overhearing his father speak of the boy’s dim prospects due to fainting spells (which Fordham calls a “neurotic episode”) bought on by the aforementioned head injury, Jung summoned the will to battle against and conquer his ill health. Fordham observes: “This reality startled Jung sufficiently to initiate a struggle against the attacks, which he soon cured, and he returned to school with new earnestness” (128). As a grown man, Fordham tells us, Jung continued to have problems with socialization, which he himself recognized, conceding “that he needed other people both more and less than most” (144). Jung also suffered periods of despair when he thought no one understood him. He found criticism intolerable and was often overcome with loneliness, despite the admiration and devotion of many friends.

Much of this we find in the various biographies of Charlotte Brontë: the loss of the mother as an influential figure and in her place the figure of the irascible, hypochondriacal clergyman father; the clergy as a pervasive element in the childhood home; frequent images of death and burials at an early age; the sense of being an outsider, of not fitting in at school, the discovery there that one is considered “odd” for one’s knowledge and interests; and the burdensome sense of premature responsibility for

the family's welfare, even while still a child. Charlotte, too, had difficulties with socialization outside the family and felt a close affinity to nature, finding a numinous presence contained within it. In collaboration with her siblings, she created fantasy worlds, first acting them out, then representing them in drawings, followed by writing about them, and in so doing, discovering, like Jung, her psychic map and the polarities which resided within herself. Like Jung, she talked to the dream images and archetypes that were unlocked from her unconscious. And also like Jung, she called on deep resources of will power to overcome a 'neurotic episode' when she recognized it as such, saving herself from the fate that befell her brother.<sup>8</sup>

Jung regarded a neurosis as a gift bestowed on the chosen in that it causes enough psychic suffering to inform the subject that a conflict exists between the conscious and unconscious self, forcing the person to deal with it.<sup>9</sup> Fordham discusses at length Jung's assumptions regarding the root causes of neuroses, explaining that repression or psychic concealment is often at work, the mind secreting all that is dark and imperfect about itself. Hence, repression, or the silencing of the psychic voice which tries to speak to the conscious mind and direct it toward wholeness, is in effect the neurosis—a developmental disturbance which acts as a defense against that inner voice.<sup>10</sup> Jung uses the temptation of Christ and the Mara episode in the Buddha legend as examples of the dangers lurking within this inner voice—one that most elect not to hear. In elaborating on the nature of this inner voice, he writes:

What the inner voice whispers to us is generally something negative, if not actually evil. This must be so, first of all because we are usually not as unconscious of our virtues as of our vices, and then because we suffer less from the good than from the bad in us. The inner voice . . . makes us conscious of the evil from which the whole community is suffering, whether it be the nation or the whole human race. But it presents this evil in an individual form, so that one might at first suppose it to be only an individual characteristic. The inner voice brings the evil before us in a very tempting and convincing way in order to make us succumb. If we do not partially succumb, nothing of this apparent evil enters into us, and no regeneration or healing can take place . . . If we succumb completely, then the contents expressed by the inner voice act as so many devils, and a catastrophe ensues. (*Essential Jung* 209)

Only confession, *i.e.*, allowing that inner voice to speak, succeeds in releasing these dark energies, otherwise known as the shadow.<sup>11</sup> Charlotte's neurosis, then, worked to alert her to her own dual nature, and the dangers of possession by her inflated shadow. The pain she experienced—as acknowledged in her journals and correspondence—prompted her to confront this hidden self and work through this crisis, generating a new self-awareness. In essence, Charlotte followed, if only instinctively, a path of self-regulation necessary to re-establish an inner equilibrium and a neoteric wholeness. Again, as Jung says, “if we can succumb only in part, and if by self-assertion the ego can save itself from being completely swallowed, then it can assimilate the voice [which is] in reality a bringer of healing and illumination” (Essential Jung 208-09).<sup>12</sup> In his essay on the shadow, Jung writes about the hazards of not recognizing the act of projection. He might as well have been speaking about Charlotte's brother and the fate Branwell came to experience:

It is often tragic to see how blatantly a man bungles his own life and the lives of others yet remains totally incapable of seeing how much the whole tragedy originates in himself, and how he continually feeds it and keeps it going. Not *consciously*, of course—for consciously he is engaged in bewailing and cursing a faithless world that recedes further and further into the distance. Rather, it is an unconscious factor which spins the illusions that veil his world. And what is being spun is a cocoon, which in the end will completely envelop him. (Jung on Evil 96, emphasis Jung's)

Had Charlotte allowed her shadow to take full possession of her, as did Branwell, and as she was tempted to do, it is quite probable that she would have experienced the same catastrophic outcome. Instead, recognizing that her shadow self had overtaken her consciousness, she struggled to right the balance and re-gain supremacy over her mind, while reconciling with and integrating this dark aspect of herself. This will to power with which she was engaged set the parameters for a life-long protean coupling with her animus, subsequently enlarging and deepening her and making her whole, though it was not without its psychic price.<sup>13</sup>

What becomes apparent in reading the whole of Charlotte's work in chronological fashion is not only a delineation of the individual undergoing individuation, but how different the individuation process is for women, particularly those women growing up in

a male-dominated environment. Demaris Wehr asserts that the process may be skewed for women (99), arguing that in a patriarchy, males possess a stronger sense of self, and that male agency and authority are constantly validated; whereas in this same sexual culture, women's egos are not validated by their context (100-01). As we have seen, Charlotte veered from Jung's dialectic in fashioning a male, rather than female, persona. When the shadow self emerged, it too was male. In the course of separating herself from those inner compulsions and voices which unconsciously operate on one, Charlotte gained the perspective to confront that hypnotic, compelling, and spellbinding shadow, and recognize it as part of her own unconscious. Through integrating this contrasexual archetypal image with whom she had fallen in love, and from whom she could not wholly separate herself,<sup>14</sup> Charlotte realized she had to acclimatize to her own gender. She had hitherto sensed she lacked agency as a woman. Mina Laury's self-abnegation reflects this stage of Charlotte's ego-annihilation, which, in Wehr's words, is unhealthy, and comes close to a form of "socially prescribed masochism" (102). Fashioning emboldened women, then, became Charlotte's means of creating a sense of self-acceptance as a woman. Through these women's eyes, Charlotte could view her demonic shadow with a new detachment. Stripped of his previous mythical powers, he is gradually transformed to serve as her positive animus in her adult fiction.<sup>15</sup> This acquaintance with her animus assists Charlotte further in her individuation, as the perspective of the animus and that contrasexual influence help achieve a wholeness in the same way the integration of the shadow expands and broadens a personality (Wehr 63).<sup>16</sup>

Wehr addresses Jung's assumption of natural balance achieved through opposition and compensation, particularly in a patriarchal culture, arguing that the animus plays an important and powerful role for a woman in such a social milieu. She points out that Jung and Jungians have largely ignored this gender imbalance in their writings. Hence, in examining Charlotte's individuation, one recognizes the difficulty a woman would have in fully realizing and defining herself against a patriarchal culture. Charlotte had to overcome that "voice of internalized oppression, personified as the self-hater" and summon the conviction that she had a right to exist as a woman with a resolute sense of self, her animus intact (Wehr 103). She had "to 'die' to something" before that new self could be born (Wehr 103). In creating such carriers of strength as Miss West,

Elizabeth Hastings, Frances Henri, Jane Eyre, Shirley Keeldar, and Lucy Snowe, Charlotte was transcending those patriarchal limits, overcoming her own misogyny, and redeeming the sensual, spirited and spiritual woman contained within her. Wehr observes that Jung's goal in the individuation process incorporates both gendered aspects of ourselves: "What Jung intends is that the drive toward wholeness consist in uniting the 'masculine' and 'feminine' sides of the personality. Following the process through, a new state is achieved" (Wehr 72). As pointed out earlier here, we see such symbolic couplings in all of Charlotte's adult work. These couplings illustrate how such simultaneously polarized and symmetrical pairings both conjoin and liberate opposing aspects of the self—masculine and feminine.<sup>17</sup> Such fictional figures—Frances and William, Jane and Rochester, Shirley and Louis, Lucy and M. Paul—in fact personify both sides of the author, those facets of herself which had come to work in conjunction with rather than at adversarial odds to each other. In these stories of courtship, Charlotte indirectly shows that she is no longer at the mercy of her dark side, but rather has made fruitful use of it, creating a dynamic in which both sides of herself are now given equal play. In so doing, Charlotte undergoes the double movement which Jung theorizes takes place during individuation—the claiming of the unconscious as part of oneself, while at the same time becoming distinct and separate from it so as not to be claimed by it (Wehr 50). None of this is evident, however, without reading the juvenilia, nor without knowing something of the biographical information about its creator. Only in reading both does the careful reader detect the psychic subtext—the literal unconscious—at work here.

Attempting to link an author's work with an author's life is considered risky academic business. In reading autobiographical elements into the interpretation of a text, we run the chance of reading too much between the lines of that text, since we have no way of knowing for certain that an author has been writing in a self-reflexive mode. Applying psychoanalytical theory to an author's character through his or her work compounds the violation, particularly if the approach to begin with is wrong-headed. However, for a long time, it has been accepted in psychoanalytical circles that close study of an individual's fantasy life reveals much about that person's psyche.<sup>18</sup> Even Charlotte Brontë's contemporaneous critics, editors, and reviewers theorized that she was composing an interiorized text, and indeed, as she told her publisher in 1847, she wrote

out of her own instinct and imagination, since at that time both her knowledge of the world and her reading were limited.<sup>19</sup> Critics since Elizabeth Gaskell have continued to approach Charlotte's novels as if they were written out of her own core experience, arguing that the author, narrator and character cannot be separated. Further, Charlotte's persona serves as her narrator, and some critics go so far as to contend that distinctions between author/narrator and character become blurred in Charlotte's work.<sup>20</sup> They reason that corroboration for such assertions exists in the novels, and, as seen, evidence can be found in the juvenilia, as well. Further proof resides in the ephemera of her chronicled life, particularly in her journals and correspondence, to show that Charlotte was in effect documenting, through her creative work, her own interiority and maturation process, making of it works of art, and that her psychic temperament informs all of her writing. Finally, Barbara Hannah, in her own study of the individuation of a number of authors, including the Brontës, states that in using examples from literature, we see fictional characters as projections of the figures in the author's own unconscious—one representing the conscious ego, another the shadow, with other figures coming from a deeper layer of that unconscious. If the process of individuation is clearly present, four of these figures, remarks Hannah, will be the cornerstones around which the others will find their places (20). She later adds, "the unconscious is always present in any piece of writing, however unaware of it the working conscious may be. . . ." (177).<sup>21</sup> If we accept this paradigm, then, looking at Charlotte's life work as a psychic map, it opens up to us in an entirely new way, allowing us to perceive the artist undergoing the individuation process as no other body of work does.<sup>22</sup> In reading Charlotte's writing as an *Entwicklungsroman*, however, the work must be read, as we have it, in its entirety. Otherwise, we are merely reading half a life. The reader who reads the novels and nothing else is left with the difficult task of decoding the meaning contained in the dream-like narratives, the dense imagery and symbolism found in these adult works. The cipher's key lies secreted in the juvenilia, buried like the letters in *Villette*.

What also comes to light in examining Charlotte's juvenilia through a Jungian lens is the remarkable amount of inner strength and will power she was able to summon to extricate herself from the same inflation and possession which overtook her brother. Having nothing but instinct to guide her, Charlotte managed to experience the pain of

confronting her dark side, recognize it as a manifestation of her own unconscious, and muster the energy to write her way through the conflict, rather than surrender to it.<sup>23</sup> She would always perceive this critical stage in her growth as her circumstance of temptation where the mettle of her character was tested and forged. It became a scene that she repeatedly replayed in all of her subsequent fiction, forcing her heroines through similar tests to show the reader the sacrificial fortitude of these women. She would also sense the irony in the fact that young women were protected from temptation, while young men were left to fend for themselves.<sup>24</sup> In making reference to Branwell less than two years before his death in a letter addressed to Margaret Wooler and dated January, 1846, Charlotte writes:

You ask me if I do not think that men are strange beings—I do indeed, I have often thought so—and I think too that the mode of bringing them up I[s] strange, they are not half sufficiently guarded from temptation—Girls are protected as if they were something very frail and silly indeed while boys are turned loose on the world as if they—of all beings in existence, were the wisest and the least liable to be led astray. (Smith 448)

Charlotte Brontë's fictional women were her lifeline—her means to a successful individuation—and in struggling to reclaim her feminine self, she came to consider her own gender with a renewed sense of respect, rewarding the strongest women characters in her mature novels with either good marriages or fulfilling vocations, but always with an enviable sense of wholeness and completed selfhood. Like her, they had tested and defined themselves against the demonic agency, and profited by it.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> I select Kucich as representative of a long line of critics, dating back to such contemporaries of Charlotte's as Matthew Arnold, Elizabeth Rigby, and Harriet Martineau, and incorporating more modern critics, like Harold Bloom, Margaret Howard Blom, and Robert Polhemus. (Many more exist, of course, than are mentioned here.) Kucich, who has written prolifically on repression and transgression in the nineteenth-century novel, diligently debates at some length what he views as a rage turning in on itself in Charlotte's fiction. By contrast, Tony Tanner, in his insightful introduction to *Villette*, more closely represents my argument that Charlotte depicts such repression as the expected norm for women of her era against which she ultimately rebels.

<sup>2</sup> Kucich asserts: "At its highest pitch, Brontëan desire never seeks to achieve union between two selves—union that might promise equilibrium and rest, or a plenitude of feeling that might alleviate loss. Rather, desire always seeks to intensify isolation. Brontë's characters certainly need others to help instigate and confirm the intensity of their inward feeling, and the indifference of others is intolerable. But the anger and rage this indifference provokes often becomes only another medium of concentrated interiority, and a protection against fusional tendencies. Brontë's characters use others only as the friction necessary to a heightened inward dynamic of feeling" (52). This last statement recalls Moglen's argument that Byron sought erotic relationships for the sole purpose of stimulating his own sensibilities, so he could better feel himself feeling. See p. 203, Chapter Five.

<sup>3</sup> Kucich quotes from Chapter 21 of *Shirley*, when Mrs. Pryor, a marginalized governess whom Charlotte depicts as a model of repressed womanhood, tells Caroline Helstone that: "Two people can never literally be as one" (366).

<sup>4</sup> In his argument, Kucich goes so far as to say that women in Charlotte's mature work instruct men in self-negation (91).

<sup>5</sup> Hannah would say these fictional portrayals were an unconscious gesture on Charlotte's part, as Hannah is of the opinion that Charlotte never achieved full individuation during her lifetime.

<sup>6</sup> This fragment is now known as "Emma."

<sup>7</sup> In discussing Jung's maturation, Fordham writes: "Briefly, the method he evolved depended on the acceptance of irrational impulses and the careful observation and recording of every fantasy, vision, dream, and thought, however odd. This was carried a stage further by painting pictures of the visions and dream images and working on the content of the emotions until they too could be crystallized in the form of imagery. Jung also played with children's bricks and stones he collected, building houses, churches, bridges, and eventually small towns; this 'building' later evolved into carving in stone, an activity he found very satisfying and one which usually opened the door to new ideas and intellectual discoveries. Many of the dream figures recurred; Jung gave them names and talked to them even when awake, because he thought that a new aspect of his personality was trying to form itself and become part of his conscious life and he tried to assist the process in this way" (135).

---

<sup>8</sup> Previously, I have referred to the years 1835-37 as the time when Charlotte suffered a “spiritual” or “religious crisis,” even as a “breakdown.” A neurotic element is integrated with this crisis, however, in that she was undergoing a psychic struggle and transition. Anthony Storr defines Jung’s concept of “Neurosis” as the “State of being at odds with oneself, caused by the conflict between instinctive drives and the demands of one’s society, between infantile obstinacy and the desire to conform, between collective and individual obligations. Neurosis is a stop sign marking a wrong turning, a summons to be cured” (Essential Jung 420). In keeping with Jung’s view that the process of individuation necessarily involves a neurotic element that works to the good, effecting a self-cure, I here refer to this stage in Charlotte’s development as her “neurotic episode,” meaning that point at which Charlotte fell into both a disunion with herself and God, allowing her unconscious to override her conscious mind, leading her to question the existence of God and instead to worship false idols. As Jung writes in “Psychology and Alchemy”: “The psychological elucidation of these images, which cannot be passed over in silence or blindly ignored, leads logically into the depths of religious phenomenology” (Fordham 80). Therefore, I do not mean to distinguish the two terms in this case; instead, a ‘religious crisis’ and a ‘neurotic episode’ are meant here to be synonymous. Indeed, Jung conflates spirituality and neuroses throughout his work. Anthony Storr explains: “Individuation, in Jung’s view, is a spiritual journey; and the person embarking upon it, although he might not subscribe to any recognized creed, was nonetheless pursuing a religious quest” (Essential Jung 229).

<sup>9</sup> Nathan Schwartz-Salant writes: “Jung’s general attitude toward neuroses was that in the long run they have a positive purpose. He believed that those who become neurotic are also in a sense chosen—because they are then forced to deal with the unconscious” (Narcissism and Character Transformation: The Psychology of Narcissistic Character Disorders 70).

<sup>10</sup> See Jung’s essay, “The Development of Personality.”

<sup>11</sup> Jung’s concepts, extracted from his essay, “Problems of Modern Psychotherapy,” are contained in Frieda Fordham’s chapter entitled “Psychotherapy,” specifically pp. 88-90.

<sup>12</sup> “In fact, the inner voice is a ‘Lucifer’ in the strictest and most unequivocal sense of the word, and it faces people with ultimate moral decisions without which they can never achieve full consciousness and become personalities. The highest and the lowest, the best and the vilest, the truest and the most deceptive things are often blended together in the inner voice in the most baffling way, thus opening up in us an abyss of confusion, falsehood, and despair” (Essential Jung 209).

<sup>13</sup> Fordham comments: “The individuation process is sometimes described as a psychological journey; it can be a tortuous and slippery path, and can at times simply seem to lead round in circles; experience has shown, however, that a truer description would be that of a spiral. In this journey the traveller must first meet with his shadow, and learn to live with this formidable and often terrifying aspect of himself: there is no wholeness without a recognition of opposites. He will meet, too, with the archetypes of the collective unconscious, and face the danger of succumbing to their peculiar fascination. If he is fortunate he will in the end find ‘the treasure

---

hard to attain', the diamond body, the Golden Flower, the lapis, or whatever name and guise have been chosen to designate the archetype of wholeness, the self" (79).

<sup>14</sup> "Projection of the contrasexual archetypal images is usually experienced as falling in love, with the prerequisite of someday withdrawing the projection" (Wehr 65).

<sup>15</sup> Wehr points out that acquaintance with one's anima or animus usually follows the integration of the shadow (63).

<sup>16</sup> Possession, on the other hand, diminishes a personality in summoning all of what Jung terms the inferior aspects of men and women (Wehr 65). This process is exemplified in Branwell's life.

<sup>17</sup> In speaking of the polarized imagery of the animus, Wehr says, "a woman's only healthy alternative is to 'befriend' this voice and to make 'his' insights her own, thus 'taming him' somewhat" (124). Charlotte's act of 'befriending' her animus is evident in the 'taming' of Zamorna in the novelettes. Moreover, many of the resolutions in Charlotte's mature novels, which perhaps unwittingly outline her own individuation, reveal the "taming" of the animus—which must occur before integration takes place. We see this happening in the subduing of Edward Rochester and Shirley Keeldar, for instance. Only after they are stripped of their hierarchical trappings, their gender-and-class-privileged status, are Rochester and Shirley free to merge with and marry Jane Eyre and Louis Moore respectively. It should be understood that in the novel *Shirley*, Charlotte created a masculine image for Shirley Keeldar and a feminized one for Louis Moore. In order to achieve a parity between the two and set the stage for a happy marriage, Louis must be emboldened and Shirley domesticated. Most modern critics, it should also be noted, have difficulty visualizing these contrasexual images for Shirley and Louis and find the novel's resolution decidedly anti-feminist. In this same manner, they decry the maiming of Rochester prior to his marriage to Jane. Both novels' endings are often viewed as compromising, and have met with much contemporary criticism. Again, it should be mentioned that Charlotte was writing in the late Romantic-early Victorian sentimentalist tradition, as well as the sentimentalist vein, where such male-female couplings to create one whole autonomous being would have been seen as a customary resolution to such novels. Nonetheless, the correspondence with the individuation process is conspicuous enough to make mention of its analogies.

<sup>18</sup> "Close study of a person's fantasy life would tell us a great deal about his personality. If we could open a door and observe the free streaming of his reverie, we would be rewarded by many insights that could never be obtained through conversation or by observing his behavior from the outside. We would see his private world and learn the personal meaning of events in his life. For this very reason most people are unwilling to disclose what goes on in their reveries. They prefer that the private world should stay private" (Robert W. White, *The Abnormal Personality* 183).

<sup>19</sup> Charlotte offers the following comment about her muse while making reference to George Lewes, one of her critics, in a letter to W.S. Williams: "I am afraid if [Lewes] knew how much I write from intuition, how little from actual knowledge, he would think me presumptuous ever to

---

have written at all. I am sure such would be his opinion – if he knew the narrow bounds of my attainments – the limited scope of my reading” (Smith 571).

<sup>20</sup> In her study of *Villette*, Kathryn Bond Stockton makes a cogent case for determining that a slippage exists between narrator and character: “Crucial reasons exist why, in the case of *Villette*, we cannot be too quick to condemn the impetus to psychoanalyze Lucy Snowe—nor, more importantly, can we escape it . . . *Villette* is Lucy Snowe and only Lucy Snowe. The clue, then, rests with *Villette*’s narration. What gets rendered as the unconscious of the character Lucy Snowe cannot be separated from whatever this novel knows on other terms than its narrator’s stated understandings. What Brontë, along with her culture, cannot say or speak directly—either because she knows it unconsciously or because it would be too risky to say—becomes *visible* in *Villette* as the unconscious of Lucy Snowe as narrator. *Villette*, then, begs a psychoanalysis of the narrating character because of the way it foregrounds Lucy’s seductive disjunctions, her reluctance in telling, as the tale that is being told” (*God Between Their Lips: Desire Between Women in Irigaray, Brontë, and Eliot* 102-03, emphasis Stockton’s). Stockton adds in a footnote: “*Villette* has long been subjected to psychoanalytic ponderings of various shades—in fact, long before critical theorists began to pore over Brontë’s novel. At first, attention was focused on psychoanalyzing the author, whose life seemed ripe for interpretations of sexual repression and the ill effects of a missing mother. Later, Lucy Snowe herself became a figure for repressed sexuality and emotional reticence. Since psychoanalyzing both authors and characters has in recent years come under attack, current criticism has taken for its focus the marked reticence, yet strange eruptions, of the text itself. Although there are good reasons for critical shifts away from psychoanalyzing authors and characters—since such attempts rarely take into account the constructedness of the author’s life and the character’s ‘existence’—I am trying to show why, in the case of *Villette*, we cannot make clean cuts between character, narrator, and author” (103).

<sup>21</sup> However, I fundamentally disagree with Hannah’s dismissal of Charlotte’s juvenilia as “not *humanly* interesting,” and as having been “written almost entirely by the animus;” Hannah goes so far as to claim that it was not until Charlotte met her animus projected onto M. Heger that she “was able to write as a woman and allow her genius to develop” (287, emphasis Hannah’s).

<sup>22</sup> In the same way, Branwell’s life work can be read as a deviant route away from individuation, a case study of what transpires when the artist allows himself to be possessed by an inflated shadow self.

<sup>23</sup> Jung reports in his essay “Confrontation with the Unconscious” (here quoted from *The Essential Jung*) that he, too, responded intuitively when he felt “there was some psychic disturbance in myself” (75). He realized he would need to return to his youth and his childish games. Through a “drama of death and renewal” (81), wherein he recreated a whole small village, he was able to release “a stream of fantasies” which he could then analyze (76). From then on, Jung found painting pictures or creating stone sculptures “proved to be a *rite d’entrée*” into the unconscious (77). He wrote down these fantasies during “his building game” so as to “probe the depths of my own psyche” (78). Deciding he was “menaced by a psychosis,” Jung had to summon “brute strength,” a kind of “demonic strength” to endure the storms which then broke loose, in order to remain unshattered by them (78). “When I endured these assaults of the unconscious I had an unswerving conviction that I was obeying a higher will, and that feeling

---

continued to uphold me until I had mastered the task” (79). Jung’s experience precisely echoes Charlotte’s. Significantly, both initially project the shadow on to a figure, which signifies the other, in opposition to themselves.

<sup>24</sup> In Ashworth, an unfinished work in three parts, which Charlotte undertook during 1839-41, she issues a corrective to this tradition. The godfather of the Zamorna-like Arthur Ripley objects to thrusting such an unsteady boy into temptation’s way. But Ripley’s father, General West, sees no use in putting guards and limitations on someone like Ripley, though he concedes he would feel differently about subjecting a daughter to the same temptations. “Ripley must see the world for himself, look it boldly in the face,” he responds. “If he has any true ore in him, it will stand the ordeal. If he is all dross, he must perish” (UN 53).

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

Blake, William. "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell." Romantic Poetry and Prose. Eds. Harold Bloom and Lionel Trilling. New York: Oxford UP, 1973. 33-44.

Brontë, Charlotte. The Brontës: Their Lives, Friendships, and Correspondence. The Shakespeare Head Edition. 4 vols. Eds. Thomas J. Wise and John Alexander Symington. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1932.

---. "But it is not in Society. . . ." Unpublished fragment. Bonnell Collection 113. Brontë Parsonage Museum. Haworth, England.

---. Charlotte Brontë: Five Novelettes. Ed. Winifred Gérin. London: Folio Press, 1971.

---. An Edition of The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. 3 vols. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987-91.

---. Four Years Ago. Unpublished novelette. Hatfield Transcripts Collection 4 (87). Brontë Parsonage Museum. Haworth, England.

---. Jane Eyre. 1847. Ed. with introduction by Margaret Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

---. Jane Eyre. 1847. London: Penguin, 1984.

---. The Juvenilia of Jane Austen and Charlotte Brontë. Ed. Frances Beer. London: Penguin, 1986.

---. Legends of Angria: Compiled from the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. Eds. Fannie E. Ratchford and William Clyde De Vane. New York: Yale UP, 1933.

- . The Letters of Charlotte Brontë, with a selection of letters by family and friends. Vol. I. 1829-1847. Ed. Margaret Smith. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995.
- . The Miscellaneous and Unpublished Writings of Charlotte and Patrick Branwell Brontë. The Shakespeare Head Edition. 2 vols. Eds. Thomas J. Wise and John Alexander Symington. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936 and 1938.
- . The Poems of Charlotte Brontë: A New Text and Commentary. Ed. Victor A. Neufeldt. New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.
- . The Professor. 1857. Ed. Heather Glen. London: Penguin, 1989.
- . Selected Brontë Poems. Eds. Edward Chitham and Tom Winnifrith. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- . Shirley. 1849. Eds. Andrew and Judith Hook. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1974.
- . "Stancliffe's Hotel." Unpublished ms. 114. Brontë Parsonage Museum. Haworth, England.
- . Villette. 1853. Ed. Mark Lilly, with Introduction by Tony Tanner. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1985.
- . "Editor's Preface to the New [1850] Edition of Wuthering Heights." Wuthering Heights. By Emily Brontë. 1847. London: Penguin, 1965.
- . Unfinished Novels. Introduction by Tom Winnifrith. Dover, NH: Alan Sutton, 1993.
- Brontë, Emily. Wuthering Heights. 1847. London: Penguin, 1965.

Byron's Letters and Journals. Ed. Leslie A. Marchand. Vol. 8 (1921). London: John Murray, 1978.

Byron, Lord George Gordon. The Poetical Works of Lord Byron. 1904. London: Oxford UP, 1952.

Ellis, Sarah Stickney, The Women of England: Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits. Norton Anthology of English Literature. 5th ed. Vol. 2. Eds. M.H. Abrams et al. New York: W.W. Norton, 1986. 1638-40.

Heine, Heinrich. Letter to Lumley, Esq., Director of the Theatre of Her Majesty the Queen. (1851). Doktor Faust: A Dance Poem. 1851. Trans. and edited by Basil Ashmore. London: Peter Nevill, 1952. 13-38.

Holy Bible, The Authorized King James Version. London: Wm. Collins Sons, 1957.

Kind, Friedrich. Libretto. Der Freischütz. Music by Carl Maria von Weber. First performed 1821, Berlin.

Lattimore, Richmond. Introduction. The Iliad of Homer. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1951. 11-54.

Lowry, Howard Foster, ed. Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Martineau, Harriet. Autobiography. 2 vols. 1855. Ed. Maria Weston Chapman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885.

Milton, John. "Paradise Lost." The Complete Poetical Works of John Milton. Ed. Douglas Bush. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965. 201-459.

- More, Hannah. The Search After Happiness: A Pastoral Drama. 12<sup>th</sup> ed. London: T. Cadell, Jr. and W. Davies, 1800.
- Neufeldt, Victor A., ed. The Works of Patrick Branwell Brontë. Vol. I. 1827-33. New York: Garland Publishing, 1997.
- , ed. The Works of Patrick Branwell Brontë. Vol. II. 1834-37. New York: Garland Publishing, 1998.
- Russell, George W.E., ed. Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1848-1888. Vol. I. New York: MacMillan, 1895.
- Smith, John Stores. "Personal Reminiscences: A Day with Charlotte Brontë." 1850. The Brontës: Interviews and Recollections. Ed. Harold Orel. Houndmills, England: MacMillan Press, 1997. 161-70.
- von Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. Faust. Trans. Walter Kaufman. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1963.
- Woolf, Virginia. "Professions for Women." 1942. Women and Writing. Ed. with introduction by Michèle Barrett. San Diego: Harvest/HBJ Books, 1980. 57-63.
- . "A Room of One's Own." 1929. A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas. Ed. with introduction by Morag Shiach. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Woolnoth, Thomas. Facts and Faces: or the Mutual Connexion between Linear and Mental Portraiture Morally Considered. London: published by the author, 1852, as cited by Sally Shuttleworth, Charlotte Brontë and Victorian Psychology.

**Secondary Sources**

Abrams, M.H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 5th ed. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1988.

Alexander, Christine. The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

---. "'That Kingdom of Gloom': Charlotte Brontë, the Annuals, and the Gothic." May 1996. Online posting. University of California, Journals Division. Berkeley: U of California.

Arieno, Marlene A. Victorian Lunatics: A Social Epidemiology of Mental Illness in Mid-19th-Century England. London: Associated UP, 1989.

Auerbach, Nina. Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1982.

Azim, Firdous. The Colonial Rise of the Novel. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Barker, Juliet. The Brontës. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1994.

Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase & Fable. Centenary Edition. Revised by Ivor H. Evans. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Burkhart, Charles. Charlotte Brontë: A Psychosexual Study of Her Novels. London: Victor Gollancz, 1973.

Byatt, A.S., and Ignês Sodr . Imagining Characters: Six Conversations about Women Writers. London: Vintage, 1995.

- Carlisle, Janice. "The Face in the Mirror: *Villette* and the Conventions of Autobiography." Modern Critical Views: The Brontës. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 131-54.
- Crompton, Louis. Byron and Greek Love: Homophobia in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century England. Berkeley: U of Calif., 1985.
- du Maurier, Daphne. The Infernal World of Branwell Brontë. New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- Fordham, Frieda. An Introduction to Jung's Psychology. 1953. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1991.
- Frank, Katherine. A Chainless Soul: A Life of Emily Brontë. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1990.
- Fraser, Rebecca. Charlotte Brontë. London: Methuen, 1988.
- Frazer, Sir James George. The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. 1922. London: MacMillan, 1976.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.
- . The Great Code: The Bible and Literature. 1983. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Gaskell, Elizabeth C. The Life of Charlotte Brontë. 1857. London: Penguin, 1985.
- Gérin, Winifred. Branwell Brontë. London: Thomas Nelson, 1961.
- . The Brontës: The Formative Years. Ed. Ian Scott-Kilvert. Essex, England: Longman Group, 1973.

- . Charlotte Brontë: The Evolution of Genius. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967.
- , ed. Charlotte Brontë: Five Novelettes. London: Folio Press, 1971.
- . "Byron's Influence on the Brontës." *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin* 17 (1966): 1-19.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
- Gordon, Lyndall. Charlotte Brontë: A Passionate Life. London: Chatto & Windus, 1994.
- Hannah, Barbara. Striving Towards Wholeness. New York: G.P Putnam's Sons, 1971.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G. Writing a Woman's Life. New York: W.W. Norton, 1988.
- Hopkins, Annette B. The Father of the Brontës. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1958.
- Judd, Catherine A. "Male Pseudonyms and female authority in Victorian England." Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-century British publishing and reading practices. Eds. John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1995. 250-68.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. The Essential Jung. Selected and introduced by Anthony Storr. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983.
- . Jung on Evil. Selected and introduced by Murray Stein. Encountering Jung Series II. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1996.
- . The Portable Jung. Ed. with introduction by Joseph Campbell. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 1971. New York: Penguin USA, 1976.

---. Psychological Types: or, The Psychology of Individuation. Trans. H. Godwin Baynes. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1923.

Kirk, G.S. The Nature of Greek Myths. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1982.

Kucich, John. Repression in Victorian Fiction: Charlotte Brontë, George Eliot, and Charles Dickens. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.

Kurata, Marilyn J. "Insanity." Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia. Ed. Sally Mitchell. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988. 397-400.

Litvak, Joseph. Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

Marchand, Leslie. Byron: A Biography. 3 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

Mason, Mary G. "The Other Voice: Autobiographies of Women Writers." Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical. Ed. James Olney. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980. 207-35.

Maynard, John. Charlotte Brontë and Sexuality. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Meyer, Susan L. "Colonialism and the Figurative Strategy of *Jane Eyre*." *Victorian Studies* 22 (Winter 1990): 247-268.

Moglen, Helene. Charlotte Brontë: The Self Conceived. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976.

Neufeldt, Victor. "Emily Brontë and the Responsible Imagination." *Victorian Newsletter* 43 (Spring 1973):15-21.

---. "The Idolatrous Web: Charlotte Brontë's Crisis of Conscience." The Brontë Conference. Pace University, New York, August 1986.

Pagels, Elaine. The Origin of Satan. 1995. New York: Vintage Books, 1996.

Polhemus, Robert M. Erotic Faith: Being in Love from Jane Austen to D.H. Lawrence. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990.

Ratchford, Fannie E. The Brontës' Web of Childhood. New York: Columbia UP, 1941.

Rich, Adrienne. "Jane Eyre: The Temptations of a Motherless Woman (1973)." On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978. New York: W.W. Norton, 1979. 89-106.

Schwartz-Salant, Nathan. Narcissism and Character Transformation: The Psychology of Narcissistic Character Disorders. Toronto: Inner City Books, 1982.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. The Coherence of Gothic Conventions. New York: Methuen, 1986.

Sheets, Robin. "Sarah Stickney Ellis." Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia. Ed. Sally Mitchell. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988. 260.

Showalter, Elaine. A Literature of Their Own: British Novelists From Brontë to Lessing. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977.

Shuttleworth, Sally. Charlotte Brontë and Victorian Psychology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Smith, Margaret, ed. The Letters of Charlotte Brontë, with a selection of letters by family and friends. Vol. I. 1829-1847. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995.

- Stevens, Anthony. Archetype: A natural history of the self. London: Routledge and Paul, 1982.
- Stockton, Kathryn Bond. God Between Their Lips: Desire Between Women in Irigaray, Brontë, and Eliot. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994.
- Taylor, Anne Robinson. Male Novelists and Their Female Voices. Troy, NY: Witston Publishing, 1981.
- von Franz, Marie-Louise. Shadow and Evil in Fairy Tales. Zurich: Spring Publications, 1974.
- Warner, Marina. From the Beast to the Blonde: On fairy tales and their tellers. London: Vintage, 1995.
- Wehr, Demaris. Jung and Feminism: Liberating Archetypes. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.
- . "Carl Gustav Jung." Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary. Ed. Elizabeth Wright. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992. 188-90.
- White, Robert W. The Abnormal Personality. 3rd ed. New York: Ronald Press, 1964.

**Appendix A:****A Chronological List of Those Works from  
Charlotte Brontë's Juvenilia Discussed Herein**

Tales of the Islanders, March 1829-July 1830

Two Romantic Tales, "A Romantic Tale," April 1829

"The Search After Happiness A Tale by C Brontë," July-August 1829

"A True Story by CB," August 1829

"Military Conversations," August-September 1829

"Characters of the Celebrated Men of the Present Time. By Captain Tree," December 1829

"The Poetaster A Drama In Two Volumes By Lord Charles Wellesley," July 1830

"Conversations," August 1830

"Strange Events by L Wellesley," August 1830

"An Extraordinary Dream by lord Charles Wellesley," September 1830

"Albion and Marina: A Tale by Lord Charles Wellesley," October 1830

"Visits in Verreopolis. By Lord Charles Wellesley. In Two Volumes. Volume First," December  
1830

Young Men's Magazine. Second Series. No. 5, December 1830

[The Bridal] "In the autumn of the year 1832 being weary of study," July-August 1832

"Something about Arthur Written by Charles Albert Florian Wellesley," May 1833

“The Foundling A Tale of Our Own Times By Captain Tree,” May-June 1833

“The Green Dwarf A Tale Of The Perfect Tense By Lord Charles Albert Florian Wellesley,”  
September 1833

“The Post Office,” September 1833

“The Tragedy and The Essay,” October 1833

“The Fresh Arrival,” October 1833

“The Tea Party,” October 1833

“The Secret and Lily Hart. Two Tales by Lord Charles Wellesley Verdopolis,” November 1833

“A Leaf from an Unopened Volume Or The Manuscript of An Unfortunate Author. Edited by  
Lord Charles Albert Florian Wellesley,” January 1834.

“Corner Dishes: A Peep into a Picture Book,” May 1834

“High Life In Verdopolis or The difficulties of annexing a suitable title to a work practically  
illustrated in Six Chapters. By Lord C A F Wellesley,” February-March 1834

“Corner Dishes: A Day Abroad,” June 1834

“The Spell, An Extravaganza by Lord Charles Albert Florian Wellesley,” June-July 1834

The Scrap Book. A Mingling of Many things Compiled by Lord C A F Wellesley, September  
1834-March 1835

“The Scrap Book: Speech of His Grace The Duke of Zamorna At the Opening of the First  
Angrian Parliament,” September 1834

“The Scrap Book: A Brace of Characters. John Augustus Sneachie E E G Wellesley,” October 1834

“My Angria and the Angrians by Lord Charles Albert Florian Wellesley,” October 1834

“Lament,” November 1834

“‘Well Etty’ said I,” December 1834

“Extracted from the last number of the *Northern Review*,” December 1834

“Letter to the right honourable Arthur Marquis of Ardrah,” December 1834

“The Scrap Book: Duke of Z and E Percy,” June 1835

“The Scrap Book: Adress [sic] to The Angrians,” September 1835

“A Late Occurrence” c. January 1835

“But once again, but once again,” January 1836

Passing Events, April 1836. (A portion of this novella is alternately known as Mina Laury I, or part of the History of Angria.)

“Zamorna’s Exile,” Cantos I and II, July 1836 [“And when you left me. . . .”]

“Apostacy,” May 1837

Julia By Charles Townshend, June 1837

[Four Years Ago] “A day or two ago, in cleaning out an old rubbish drawer,” July 1837

[Mina Laury] [Mina Laury II] “The last scene in my last book,” January 1838

[“Stancliffe's Hotel”] “‘Amen! Such was the sound given in a short shout which closed the evening Service at Ebenezer-Chapel’,” June 1838

“The Duke of Zamorna,” July 1838

“But it is not in Society that the real character is revealed. . . .” c. late 1838

[Captain Henry Hastings. By Charles Townshend] “A young man of captivating exterior, elegant dress,” February-March 1839

[Caroline Vernon] “‘When I concluded my last book I made a solemn resolve’,” July-December 1839

[Farewell to Angria] “I have now written a great many books,” c. late 1839

[Ashworth] c. late 1839-c.1841.

**Appendix B**

**Cast of Characters in Charlotte Brontë's *Juvenilia***

**Members of the Wellesley family:**

Duke of Wellington, General West (father of Arthur and Charles; adoptive father of Quashia)
Lady Catherine Pakenham (once the ward of the Duke of Wellington, mother of Zamorna and Charles)
Arthur Augustus Wellesley, Marquis of Douro, Duke of Zamorna, Emperor Adrian, King of Angria, Albion, Colonel Percival, Ernest Julius Mornington Wellesley, Duke of Valdacella (Zamorna's alter-ego), Marquis of Athama, Arthur Ripley West
Lord Charles Florian Wellesley, Cornelius, Charles Towns(h)end (pseudonym of Charlotte)
Quashia Quamina Kashna (orphaned son of the King of the Ashantees, later adopted by the Duke of Wellington; African revolutionary; rebels against the Duke and becomes Zamorna's enemy and an ally of Percy's)
Sof(f)ala (Mooress mistress of Zamorna; mother of Finic(k))
Finic(k) (child of Sofala and Zamorna; dwarf servant of Zamorna), Pinic (Finic's alter-ego; servant to Valdacella)
Lady Helen Victorine Gordon, Emily Inez Wellesley (Zamorna's first wife, though the marriage may not have been legitimate, according to Percy)
Ernest Edward "Fitzarthur" Wellesley, Lord Rosendale, young Emily (child of Lady Helen Gordon and Zamorna; raised by Mina Laury)
Marian Hume, Marina (first cousin and second wife of Zamorna; once engaged to Henry Percy)
Arthur Julius Wellesley, Lord Almeida, Archduke Julius (child of Marian Hume and Zamorna)
Mary Henrietta Percy (Zamorna's third wife, daughter of Alexander Percy)
Victor Frederic(k) Percy Wellesley, Marquis of Arno, Alexander Ravenswood Wellesley (child of Mary Percy and Zamorna; twin brother of Julius)
Julius Warner di Enara Wellesley, Earl of Saldanha, Adrian Percy (child of Mary Percy and Zamorna; twin brother of Victor)
Charles Seymour Wellesley (child of Mary Percy and Zamorna)
Edward Mornington Wellesley (child of Mary Percy and Zamorna)
Augustus Stanley Wellesley (child of Marcy Percy and Zamorna)

Wellesley, Julia (Zamorna's cousin and part of his harem; married first to Edward Sydney, then General Thornton)
Wellesley, Lady Maria (Percy) (Zamorna's cousin)
Wellesley, Rosamund (Zamorna's cousin, ward, later his mistress)

### Members of the Percy family:

Edward Percy Sr., Alexander Percy (father of Percy)
Lady Helen Beresford Percy (mother of Percy)
Alexander Percy, Alexander Rogue, Colonel Augustus Percy, Earl of Northangerland, Viscount Ellrington, Alexander Ashworth (pseudonym of Branwell's)
Lady Augusta (Maria) Romana di Segovia (first wife of Percy, orphaned child of the Earl of Jordan, guardian to her younger brother, native of Florence, Italy)
Maria/Mary Henrietta Wharton, Harriet MacShane (second wife of Percy, only child of widowed invalid Lord George Wharton)
Edward Percy, Sir William Etty, Edward Ashworth (child of Maria Henrietta Wharton and Percy; painter; then mill-owner; marries Maria Sneachie (aka Julia Montmorency while Edward is William Etty)
Zorayada (daughter of Sir William Etty and Julia Montmorency; marries Adrian Percy Wellesley)
Colonel William Percy, 'Young Rogue,' William Ashworth (child of Maria Henrietta Wharton and Percy; friend and alter-ego of Charles Wellesley; political ally and courtier to Zamorna)
Henry Percy (child of Maria Henrietta Wharton and Percy; dies prematurely at sea)
Mary Henrietta Percy, Mary Ashworth, Duchess, Queen, then Empress of Angria (child of Maria Henrietta Wharton and Percy; third wife of Zamorna)
Lady Zenobia Ellrington, Zelzia (third wife of Percy)
Hermione Marcella Percy (child of Zenobia Ellrington and Percy, marries Archduke Arthur Julius, heir to Zamorna's throne)
Louisa Dance/i Vernon, Marchioness Wellesley (sister to the Duke of Wellington; actress; opera singer; ballet dancer; thrice married—once to Marcara Lofty; mistress of Percy; later supported by Zamorna)
Caroline Vernon (illegitimate child of Louisa Vernon and Percy; ward and mistress of Zamorna)

**Other Assorted Characters in Charlotte Brontë's Juvenilia:**

Adrah, Lord Arthur Parry, Marquis of: (political rival of Zamorna; heir to Parrisland/Parry's Land)
Bravey, William (Branwell's soldier)
Bud, Captain John (contemporary of Zamorna; political writer; pseudonym of Branwell; aka Captain Tree—one of Charlotte's earliest narrators)
Castlereigh/Castlereagh, Earl of Stuartville (political ally of Zamorna)
Charlesworth, Lady Emily (reluctant fiancée of Percy—an arrangement made by her uncle, the Marquis of Charlesworth)
Crashie/Crashey (brother of Manfred; Zeus-like ruler of Verdopolis)
DeLisle, Frederick/Sir Edward (eminent portrait painter)
Ellrington, Surena (probable brother to Zenobia)
Enara, Henry Fernando di (Angrian soldier; political ally of Zamorna)
Fidena, John Sneachie, Duke of, Mr. Seymour (heir to Sneak/chiesland; brother to General Thornton Sneachie; childhood friend of Zamorna; Constitutionalist leader in Verdopolis; Angrian supporter; secret beau and husband of Lily Hart)
Flower, Sir John, Viscount Richton (contemporary of the Duke of Wellington; scholar, ambassador, and later pseudonym of Branwell)
Genii (tyrannical rulers of all destinies; personified by the Brontë children)
Grenville, Ellen (student protégé of Zenobia Ellrington; marries Warner Howard Warner; daughter of General Gre(n)ville, eminent mill-owner)
Hart, Lily, Marchioness of Fidena (married to John Fidena)
Hartford, General Edward, Lord (aristocrat; political associate of Zamorna; courts Mina Laury, then Jane Moore)
Hastings, Elizabeth, Miss West (sister of Captain Henry Hastings; tutor to Jane Moore and Mary Lonsdale as Miss West; courted by William Percy)
Hastings, Captain Henry, Mr. Wilson (brother to Elizabeth; soldier; poet; becomes a drunken turncoat and fugitive; avowed enemy of Zamorna; pseudonym and invention of Branwell in later juvenilia)

Laury, Mina (daughter of Ned Laury, the retainer to the Duke of Wellington; former waiting-maid to Zamorna's mother, the Duchess of Wellington, then to Marian Hume; loyal mistress of Zamorna and guardian to his child, Ernest, by Lady Helen Gordon)
Lofty, Lord Macara (friend of Charles Wellesley/Townshend; younger brother of Earl of Arundel; early political associate of Percy; married to Louisa Vernon; addicted to opium; an invention of Branwell's)
Manfred (brother of Crashie; ruler of Philosopher's Island; university president; researcher; magician)
Montmorency/Montmorenci, Hector Matthias Mirabeau, S'death, Robert King (contemporary of the duke of Wellington; mentor to Alexander Percy and an enemy of Zamorna; father to Julia who marries Castlereagh, then Sir William Ety; treated by Branwell as two separate people—S'death and Montmorency, the latter the son of William Daniel Henry Montmorency, Esq., MP, lawyer to Edward Percy, Sr. S'death is a dwarf and an older confidante of Percy, Sr. and "common Father" of young Percy and Montmorency)
Moore, Jane, 'The Rose of Zamorna' (youngest daughter of George Moore, lawyer to Lord Hartford, whom Jane intends to marry; Elizabeth Hasting's charge)
Pelham, Sir Robert (former fiancée of Mary Percy)
Richton, Lord (ally of Zamorna; pseudonym of Branwell)
Shungaron (brother of Sofala; uncle to Finic; palace gardener)
Sneachi(e), General Thornton (younger brother of the Duke of Fidena; disowned by his family; one-time guardian of Charles Wellesley)
Sneachie, John Augustus (son of John Fidena; childhood rival of Ernest "Fitzarthur" Wellesley)
Sneachie, Lady Mary/Maria (youngest child of Alexander King of Sneachiesland; sister to General Thornton and the Duke of Fidena)
Soult, Alexander, Marquis of Marseilles, "The Rhymer," "Henry Rhymer" (well-known poet; patronized by Zamorna in the early juvenilia; an early pseudonym of Branwell)
Sydney, Edward, Earl St. Clair (gallant green knight; becomes a prince; marries Julia Wellesley)
Tree, Captain, Andrew (novelist, rival of Capt. Bud and Charles Wellesley, early pseudonym of Charlotte)
Warner, Warner Howard (faithful ally of Zamorna; known to have 'second sight'; acts as Zamorna's home secretary and conscience)

Acknowledgements are due to Christine Alexander, Juliet Barker, Winifred Gérin, Victor Neufeldt and Fannie Ratchford in compiling this list.