1-1-2007

Scott's fiction and the Union of 1707

Dale K Griffith
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

SCOTT'S FICTION AND THE UNION OF 1707

By

Dale K. Griffith

Candidatus Theologiae
Institut de Theologie Orthodoxe (S Serge), Paris, France

Master of Arts
History
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1988

Master of Arts
English
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1996

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy Degree in English
Department of English
College of Liberal Arts

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
August 2007

UNLV
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA LAS VEGAS

Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

May 11, 20 07

The Dissertation prepared by

Dale Kevin Griffith

Entitled

Scott's Fiction and the Union of 1707

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in English

Mark A. Weinstein
Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

Graduate College Faculty Representative

ABSTRACT

Scott's Fiction and the Union of 1707

by

Dale K. Griffith

Dr. Mark Weinstein, Examination Committee Chair
Distinguished Professor of English
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This dissertation focuses on several of Sir Walter Scott's historical novels that deal with the question of the 1707 Act of Union that united Scotland with England. The following novels were studied: *Old Mortality, The Bride of Lammermoor, The Heart of Mid-Lothian, Waverley, Redgauntlet,* and *The Antiquarian*. The novels were considered for this dissertation in their chronological order within historical timelines and not according to their publication dates.

In all of the novels it is evident that Scott was a strong supporter of the Union and the commercial empowerment that it offered to Scotland; for him the Union represented moderation in government and liberalism in religion. All of the novels presented in this thesis have as their heroes or heroines those who espouse moderation in interpreting the main political and religious issues of their day. The novels deal with a traditional society vexed by religious and political fanaticism. It is obvious from the novels that Scott believed very much in the Enlightenment concepts of moderation and toleration in all things. It is also obvious that he strongly believed in the ideal of social and economic progress: that history was the study of the triumph of progress over barbarism.

Scott has often been considered as an early contributor to the Romantic Movement, but his political and social ideals are in contradiction to this tradition. The Romantics tended to reject the labored moderation that was the hallmark of the Enlightenment. Romanticism embraced an exhalation of individual passions; it also tended, in its more Gothic representations, to idealize the past and to see the present as lacking a more natural humanism that was closer to the soil. Scott, on the other hand, is very studied in his rejection of passion as a motivation in human development. For Scott it is not unbridled passion that should inspire a hero to be emulated. Scott instead upheld the hero of moderation; the proper, ideal gentleman that was so much a part of the 18th century concept of political improvement, progress, and liberality who points to the future. This is Scott's ideal. In truth, Scott considered the romantic hero who is motivated by passions to be dangerous.

In the novels that deal with Scottish history and the Union, those who embrace passion are also motivated mostly by hatred and bigotry; it is the man of moderation who prospers. Romanticism also had a love for the middle-ages, both in art, architecture, as well a political theory. Scott will have none of it; he fully embraces the modern world and the progress of individual freedom under the constitutional monarchy that replaced royal absolutism. For Scott moderation in religion and politics, coupled with economic progress, are the true gifts of the 1707 Act of Union.

In all of the novels studied those who most closely resemble the romantic concept of hero or heroine either dies, or retires to a monastic enclosure. They are perceived as sterile and old fashioned. Their ideas of romantic glory are simply antiquated. It is the upholders of constitutional government and commercial interests who survive and

prosper; those who are willing and able to enter into the modern world. For Scott, his native land needed to be lead by a progressive leadership that had escaped the snare of the historical forces of fanaticism, both religious and political. It was religious and political passions that had lead Scotland into years of civil wars and rebellion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of those who helped me persevere in finishing this work, but most especially Dr. Mark Weinstein my committee chair. Without his guidance and direction, not to mention prodding, this work would never have been completed. Dr. Weinstein gave much needed advice and encouragement over a long period of time, and it was he who first proposed the subject matter for this dissertation. His knowledge and expertise in the area was a guiding light throughout the whole process. I would also like to thank Dr. Sue Fawn Chung who has given guidance and direction to me throughout my academic studies at the University of Nevada. Dr. Chung's humor, intelligence, and intellectual vitality have been a strong motivation. She has given more than simply academic guidance; she has been a friend. I also owe a strong sense of gratitude to Drs. Becker-Leckrone and Erwin as well. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Jack Fink, a colleague of mine at the College of Micronesia. For as long as I have known Dr. Fink and his wife Pat they have encouraged me to continue writing. I would like to thank my son, Yestyn David, who has remained quiet when he did not wish to, left his father alone when he did not wish to, so that I could complete this dissertation. Finally, thanks are due to Mark Roe and Eric Woodman whose combined expertise in computer technology were instrumental in helping me format this document and without whose computer expertise would have left this dissertation simply a pile of disorganized ideas and notes.

CHRONOLOGY OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

1560	The Scottish Reformation. The struggle to decide whether the reformed Church of Scotland should be Presbyterian or Episcopal in church governance lasted until 1690.
1603	On the death of Queen Elizabeth of England, James VI became king of both countries, but ruled from England resulting in the union of the two Crowns of England and Scotland.
1638	The National Covenant, a manifesto opposing the religious innovations of Charles I won widespread support in Scotland.
1639-50	The period of Presbyterian rule, which is regarded by many as the great age of the Church of Scotland.
1643	The Solemn League and Covenant. A treaty between Scotland and England in which the Scottish Parliament promised military support to the English Parliamentarian forces against Charles I in return for England's adopting Presbyterian Church governance.
1649	Execution of Charles I.
1650	Charles II crowned by the Scots.
1651-51	Cromwell's conquest of Scotland. First Union of Scotland and England.
1658	Death of Cromwell.
1660	Restoration of Charles II as King of both Scotland and England. Cromwell's Union of the two kingdoms is rejected by the Scots.

1662	Charles II renounces the National Covenant and restores Episcopal forms of ecclesiastical governance and a new Book of Common Prayer with set the forms and order of services in Scotland. About 300 Presbyterian ministers refuse to accept liturgical and governance changes or to recognize Charles as 'supreme governor' of the Church and are ejected from their charges. Support for the removed clergy is strong amongst all classes in Scotland, especially in the South West and Border regions; the ministers and their supporters worship at open-air conventicles. The government ties to suppress such activity employing increasingly arbitrary and oppressive measures to do so, which generates armed resistance.
1679	A Covenanting army is defeated by government troops at Bothwell Bridge.
1681	The Test Act.
1684-85	The Killing Time when the summary execution of Covenanters in Scotland was at its height, but the name was often extended to the period of 1681-1685.
1685	The death of Charles II who was succeeded by his Roman Catholic brother James VII of Scotland and II of England. Rebellions in England lead by the Duke of Monmouth and in Scotland by the Earl of Argyll were suppressed and both leaders were executed.
1688	The "Glorious Revolution." James VII and II flees to France.
1689	William of Orange and his wife, Mary, the Protestant daughter of James VII and II are invited to accept the thrones of England and Scotland.

1690	Presbyterianism is established by law as the National religion of Scotland.
1696-99	The "dear years." Widespread famine in Scotland: the phrase is also applied to the years 1694-1701.
1701	Act of Settlement determines a Protestant succession in England and Scotland.
1702	Death of William and the accession of Queen Anne, the last Stuart to ascend the combined thrones of England and Scotland.
1704	Scotland was moving towards more independence rather than union while Anne and her English government were trying to bring the two countries closer together.
1705	The English moved first by putting pressure on Scotland with the Alien Act of 1705. In this Act the Scots were given until Christmas Day to accept the Hanoverian succession or they were to appoint commissioners to negotiate a union. If neither action was taken Scots would be treated as aliens in England, threatening property held by Scots there, and trade with England and her colonies would be destroyed. Money became available to Scottish Members of Parliament to support union. In a poorly attended Scottish Parliament it was decided to appoint the commissioners to negotiate a union.
1707	Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland. Subordinate legislation guaranteed Presbyterian governance of the National Church of Scotland. Although there were huge protests when the terms of the union were published it was passed by a large majority by the Scottish Parliament on

16th January 1707. On 28th April 1707 the last Scottish Parliament (until 1999) was dissolved by the last Scottish monarch. By the terms of the Act Scotland and England were to become one country. Anne became Queen of Great Britain and the throne passed to the House of Hanover on her death. There was also economic union with free trade on both sides of the border. Scotland was given only 45 seats in the House of Commons and 16 seats in the House of Lords.

1708 The agreements of the union were beginning to be broken by the English. The Scottish Privy Council was abolished which left Scotland with little in the way of national administration.

1712 Toleration and Patronage Acts was introduced allowing greater freedom to those Scottish Episcopalians who accepted the Hanoverian succession. The Patronage Act was also introduced in 1712 which reversed the abolition of patronage which had occurred in 1690. By this Act the selection of ministers to the Church was decided by the nobles and the Crown, in practice this Act caused a great deal of friction between the Church and the Crown.

1714 Death of Queen Anne and the accession of George I, Elector of Hanover.

1713 Excise Act on the production and sale of alcoholic beverages.

1715 The supporters of James VII and II (Jacobites) in Scotland and Northern England attempt to put his son on the throne. In Scotland a government army lead by the second Duke of Argyll prevented the Jacobite army from leaving the Highlands.

1725 Another Excise Act; Malt Tax riots in Glasgow.

1736 Porteous Riots in Edinburgh result of capture of smugglers Wilson and Robertson. Escape of Robertson arranged by Wilson, who was hanged. Mob fired on by Porteous in command of troops. Porteous lynched by mob subsequently when about to be reprieved. Smuggling very common and Excise officers, mainly English, strongly disliked by the general population.

1745 Jacobite Rising, followed by severe legislation to prevent repetition. For Highland culture it was a disaster. However, it was not an unmitigated disaster for the whole of Scotland. For the Lowland Presbyterians the defeat of the Jacobites was a cause for celebration. The Union and the Presbyterian system of church government were safe. In the south economic progress was increasingly viewed as the way forward, and if that future was not to be Scottish then it was to be through the British Union and access to the trade routes of its empire.

1750 Charles Edward, the Young Pretended, whilst in London, secretly received into the Church of England.

1754 Charles Edward once again in England risking his safety to hatch futile plots to regain the throne.

1760 Accession of George III, who terminated the systematic proscription of the remnants of the old Tory party. Ex-Jacobites began to be allowed to make their peace with the House of Hanover.

1784 The forfeited Jacobite estates are returned to their traditional owners on the grounds that no families had fought harder for George III in the recent American War of Independence. In Scotland the dominant landed class was no longer divided against itself on dynastic and religious issues. Episcopalian tenets were common amongst the aristocracy and gentry, but were no longer viewed as a challenge to the Presbyterian settlement of the Kirk.

1788 Charles Edward Stuart, the bonny prince, dies.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF SIR WALTER SCOTT

1771	15 August (?): born in the College Wynd, Edinburgh, the ninth child (fourth surviving) of Walter Scott, Writer to the Signet, and Anne Rutherford.
1773	Contracts poliomyelitis, which leaves him permanently lame. He is sent to the farm of his grandfather, Robert Scott, at Sandyknowe in the Borders.
1775	In January, his grandfather dies and Walter Scott returns briefly to Edinburgh to his father's new house at 25 George Square. In the summer, his aunt Janet Scott takes the boy south for a cure. He visits London and Bath.
1776	He returns to Edinburgh.
1779-83	Enters the High School in Edinburgh.
1783	"I left High School with a great quantity of general information, ill-arranged, indeed, and collected without system, yet deeply impressed upon my mind." Spends a year in Kelso with his Aunt Janet, and at Kelso Grammar School he meets and befriends the Ballantyne brothers.
1783	In November, he attends classes at Edinburgh University (Latin, Greek, Logic, Metaphysics, and Moral Philosophy).
1784-5	Ill again and sent to Kelso. All formal studies are now interrupted. All treatments, including electrical shocks, are unsuccessful; his lameness becomes worse.

1786 March 31st, apprenticed to his father's legal firm.

1786 Meets Burns who has just published his *Poems, Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect.*

1787 On business for his father, he sees the Highlands for the first time, including Loch Katrine and the Trossachs. In the Highlands he meets a client of his father's, Alexander Stewart of Invernahyle, who had fought a duel with Rob Roy and fought in both the '15 and the '45.

1788 The Revolutionary Society celebrates the centenary of the Glorious Revolution.

French States General summoned.

Charles Edward Stuart dies.

1789 The storming of the Bastille and the Declaration of the Rights of Man inaugurate revolution in France.

1798-92 Studies for the bar at Edinburgh University, taking classes in history, moral Philosophy, Scots Law, and Civil Law and ultimately qualifies.

1790 (?) Meets Williamina Belsches and falls in love.

1790 Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* published.

1791 Louis XVI's flight and capture at Varennes.

1792 The French royal family is imprisoned; September massacres in Paris; Paine publishes *The Rights of Man*, which is banned and Paine sentenced to death *in absentia* for high treason and sedition.

1792 July 6th: called to the Bar and makes his first appearance as counsel in a criminal court at Jedburgh, where he successfully defends a sheep-stealer and poacher.

1792 London Corresponding Society is formed; Friends of the People, a reform-minded society is formed in Scotland.

1792-6 Practices as an advocate in Edinburgh.

1793 Trial and execution of Lois XVI of France.

France declares war on Great Britain.

The Terror begins under the direction of Robespierre; execution of Marie Antoinette; royalist rising in the Vandee is ruthlessly crushed: Scottish treason trials of Muir, Margarot and Palmer, the leaders of the Edinburgh Corresponding Society, condemned for sedition; for being in league with the French; for being dangerous revolutionaries. Of the three men, one was a doctor and two were lawyers. They were moderate reformers who wanted some changes in the Constitution, not revolutionaries; Sentenced to transportation.

British Convention assembled in Edinburgh on the French model is broken up and its leaders arrested; the Aliens Act brought in which is designed to control the influx of refugees and with them those suspected of being French spies.

1795 Seditious Meetings Act and Treasonable Practices Act, restricting freedoms of speech, assembly, and the press.

1796 French attempted invasion of Ireland.

1797 French attempted invasion of Wales; naval mutinies.

1797 Williamina Belsches marries William Forbes of Pitsligo.

Helps form the Royal Edinburgh Volunteer Light Dragoons. Scott is made quartermaster.

Visits the Lake District and meets Charlotte Charpentier, whom he marries within three months on Christmas Eve in Carlisle Cathedral. He now regards himself as a Scottish Episcopalian.

1798 Scott writes *The Eve of Saint John*. Birth and death of first son.

1798 Rebellion in Ireland coincidental with a French landing.

1799 His father dies. Birth of his daughter, Charlotte Sophia.

16th December becomes Sheriff-Deputy for the County of Selkirk.

1799 Suppression of Corresponding Societies and other radical groups by the Combination Acts; in France Napoleon becomes First Council.

1800 Starts to collect material for *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, to be published by Ballantyne. *An Apology for Tales of Terror*, an anthology.

1801 Birth of son, Walter.

1802 First edition of the *Minstrelsy*.

1802 Peace of Amiens concluded with France.

1803 Expanded, three-volume edition of the *Minstrelsy* is published. Birth of daughter, Anne; begins career as a reviewer for the *Edinburgh Review*.

1803 War breaks out with France.

1804 Moves to Ashiestiel, where Wordsworth visits him; he writes *Lay of the Last Minstrel*.

1804 Napoleon made Emperor and prepares to invade Great Britain.

1805 Publication of the *Lay of the Last Minstrel* is an instant success. Scott becomes a Principal Clerk to the Court of Sessions in Edinburgh. He now no longer must practice law for an income. Enters into a partnership with the printers James Ballantyne & Co., which endures until the financial crash of 1826; birth of son, Charles; by his own accounts starts and lays aside his first novel, *Waverley*.

1805 Nelson's victory at Trafalgar.

1806 Appointed Principal Clerk of Session.

1808 Appointed secretary to the Parliamentary Commission to Inquire into the Administration of Justice in Scotland.

1809 Scott is involved with the foundation of the *Quarterly*, a Tory rival to the Whig *Edinburgh Review*.

1810 Makes a first visit to the Hebrides.

1811 Scott purchases the farm of Clarty Hole which he renames Abbotsford.

1812 Byron publishes the first two cantos of *Childe Harold*. Byron begins to supersede Scott as a popular poet.

1812 Napoleon's retreat from Moscow and defeat at Leipzig.

1813 Meets Byron. Scott is offered, but declines, the position of Poet Laureate; stating that he feels incapable of writing on a regular basis. Financial crisis at Ballantyne's is eventually resolved in 1817.

1814 Publishes *Waverley* anonymously becomes the most successful novel ever before published in English.

1814 Fall of Paris, abdication and exile of Napoleon and restoration of the Bourbons.

1815 Scott visits the field of Waterloo, Paris, where he meets the Tsar, who inquires if his lameness is a result of a war wound.

1815 Napoleon returns from exile in Elba (March), and is finally defeated at Waterloo (June), surrenders (July), and goes into exile on St. Helena; restoration of Louis XVIII.

1816 Inherits the fortune of his brother, Major Scott.

1816 Depression, discontent, and riots across Great Britain.

1817 Habeas Corpus is suspended.

1818 Accepts baronetcy.

1819 Seriously ill.

1819 Years of social and economic unrest results in the "Peterloo" massacre and the Six Acts restricting the right to hold meetings and the freedom of the press.

1820 Scott's eldest daughter marries John Gibson Lockhart who becomes his future biographer. Scott is elected president of the Royal Society of Edinburgh.

1821 Death of Napoleon.

1822 Scott helps to stage-manage the royal visit of George IV to Edinburgh, the first visit by a Hanoverian monarch to Scotland.

1823 Scott begins to show the first symptoms of apoplexy.

1824 Repeal of the Combination Acts.

1825 Visits Maria Edgeworth in Ireland. By December Scott is suffering from gallstones and fears financial ruin.

1826 Financial insolvency precipitated by the bankruptcy of Scott's publisher, Hurst, Robinson and Co., Constable, and Ballantyne's. Extent of his ruin becomes clear; his personal liability amounts to 130,000 pounds; resolves to pay his creditors by the work of his pen, all repaid by 1833.

May 15th his wife dies and is buried in Dryburgh Abbey.

1827 At a Theatrical Fund dinner, admits the authorship of his novels.

1828 Dr. Pusey, the famous Tractarian leader, breakfasts at Abbotsford and falls in the Tweed.

1829 Scott suffers from hemorrhages.

1829 Catholic Emancipation Act.

1830 Scott declines offer of Civil List pension and rank of Privy Councilor. While making a speech at Jedburgh opposing reform he was howled down

by mobs of angry laborers and artisans, whom he called "unwashed artificers."

1831 Scott pays for the erection of a memorial to Helen Walker the original Jeanie Deans.

He again made his way to Jedburgh to man an election speech in favor of the Tory candidate, his cousin Henry Scott. Weavers from Hawich shouted insults and pelted his carriage.

Scott has his first stroke.

In September visits Yarrow with Wordsworth.

Apoplectic paralysis. His son-in-law takes him to Italy.

1832 Scott returns from the Continent to die at Abbotsford on 21st September.

He is buried next to his wife.

1832 First Reform Act.

SCOTT'S NOVELS

Title and Date of Publication	Period and Locality
Waverley (1814)	1745 Scotland and England
The Antiquary (1816)	1795 Fifeshire
Old Mortality (1816)	1679 Scotland and Holland
The Heart of Mid-Lothian (1818)	1736 Edinburgh, London & Dumbartonshire
The Bride of Lammermoor (1819)	1695 East Lothian
Redgauntlet (1824)	1763 Scotland and Cumberland

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sir Walter Scott is considered to be the founder of the historical novel. Scott was born in Edinburgh in August 1771, or 1770, since it is highly probable that Scott may have been mistaken about his own date of birth since no official record exists. There could have been perhaps no better place or time for the founder of the historical novel to be born than Scotland of that epoch. Scotland was alive with its own sense of history. Intense feeling motivated history in Scotland. David Hume stated in reference to Scotland that, "This is the historical age and we are the historical people": and at the time of Scott's birth the people of Scotland had a sense of their special historical importance, "Edinburgh, Scotland's capital was a hotbed of historians" (Daiches *Sir Walter* 458). History was not a subject regulated simply to a university curriculum; it was a subject of fascination and passion, an interest common to every Scot.

Besides historical interests, the Edinburgh of that epoch was in fact remarkable for its progressive social and technological ideas. Two years before Scott's birth, James Watt had patented his first steam engine in Glasgow, and five years after this primary development of the technological age, Adam Smith, of Fifeshire, had published his *Wealth of Nations*. Edinburgh was a major centre of the European Enlightenment (Burroughs 74). During Scott's lifetime the Scottish lowlands became a leader in both the industrial as well as the agricultural revolutions; revolutions that were to have a

permanent effect upon the landscape of Great Britain and the rest of the world as well. According to Franklin Burroughs, "He [Scott] propagated the notion, which now seems obvious, that how people talked and dressed, their customs, diet, living arrangement, legal codes, and so forth profoundly influenced and reflected their individual and collective identities, and hence their fates" (76). Scott was not simply interested in the great movements of history or the men and women who appeared to be leaders of history, but of daily detail. His was the history of not how individuals changed history, but of how they were affected by it, and their responses.

History serves many different purposes. For the powerful it gives authority and right, and to the vanquished it gives a sense of past accomplishments that may yet come again; or of grievance. In our age, which has lost a sense of historical urgency, history is commonly assumed to be a given set of facts, and that such facts, if scientifically studied and quantified, can constitute historical reality. Richard Wasow, in his essay, *Story as Historiography in the Waverley Novels*, declared that, "The assumption is that history is not a given 'reality' or universally agreed-upon set of 'facts' that [it] is then simply dramatized or given rhetorical clothing by the artist, but rather the mode of dramatization or narration it constitutes the history" (304). Wasow goes on to explain that history exists as certain "versions" of the same story; hence, "Both the tale and the teller—constitute what I [Wasow] here refer to as 'story'" (305). The writer controls the destiny of his characters, but by so doing, also controls the resulting version of history that "reveals the extent to which what gains currency as 'fact' has been socially constructed as 'fiction'" (Wasow 305). Scott became a master storyteller, and Scott's tales took on a life independent of any perceived historical reality. Indeed, for many they

became the reality.

This understanding of the storyteller as forger of historical illusions of the past is further alluded to by James Kerr, who in his *Fiction Against History: Scott as Storyteller*, declared that as, "Storyteller and historiographer, Scott constructed his fictional project around the relationship between the language of fiction and historical reality" (1). Scott's storytelling, as inventor of the past, fulfilled an important social as well as political need in 19th century Scotland; a nation deeply steeped in its own historical process, but fearing the loss of national identity and purpose in a changing world. Scott had early conceived of the importance of history as not only a means to access the past, but also as a process in which to explain the present and to look to the future.

As a student, Scott had attended the lectures of Alexander Tyler on "Universal History." But it was the lectures of David Hume, nephew of the famous philosopher, on Scots' Law that were to open to Scott the very ideal of history as process of human development. Hume was concerned to show that the changes of law reflected changes in society; that the developing of a code of law and the development of social institutions were interrelated (Daiches *Sir Walter* 458). Scott was to leave his own impressions of Hume's lectures, declaring that:

> I copied over his lectures twice with my own hand, from notes taken in the class, and when I have had occasion to consult them, I can never sufficiently admire the penetration and clearness of conception which were necessary to the arrangement of the fabric of law, formed originally under the strictness influence of feudal principles, and innovated, altered, and broken in upon by the change of times, of habits, and manners, until it resembles some ancient castle, partly entire, partly

> ruinous, partly dilapidated, patched and altered during the succession of ages by a thousand additions and combinations, yet still exhibiting, with the marks of its antiquity, symptoms of the skill and wisdom of its founders, and capable of being analyzed and made the subject of a methodical plan by an architect who can understand the various styles of the different ages in which it was subjected to alteration. (qt. in Daiches *Sir Walter* 459)

Scott was to become one of the architects of the different layers of history that was to produce the modern Scottish nation and its national myth. As Hume had attempted a methodological approach to the study of law as it related to human institutions and progress, Scott would do the same with history; and the place of individuals, known and unknown, within historical context. His true calling was to be the development of historical fiction that served a greater national calling than simple entertainment.

Much like all educated men of his generation, Scott was profoundly influenced by the ideals of the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment concept of history was that history was a study of the progress of mankind, in which confidence in human goodness and in reason will eventually result in a future progress that would eliminate superstition, prejudice, intolerance, and tyranny; holding that history was the progress of man; that each succeeding generation improved upon the one that had come before. Finally, that mankind could, and indeed did improve. Scott was to use history not as a way to connect with the past, but as a means to connect with the present and the future by showing that history was a progression of Enlightenment principals. According to Daiches, "He [Scott] was not interested in painting static portraits of earlier ages, in order to emphasis their picturesqueness or quaintness: he was interested in how the past flows into the present, in

the ways in which earlier codes of honour cease to be viable and in the degree to which anything can be salvaged for the future from those earlier codes" (*Sir Walter* 459); hence, Scott used historical fiction to explain the present reality of Scotland. His interest in the past is secondary to showing how the progress of history has formed the present.

It is this relationship between tradition and progress that separates Scott from the earlier "Gothic" novelists for whom the past existed as something permanently behind them, to be viewed and used for its romantic difference from the present (Daiches *Sir Walter* 459). For Scott there was no break with the past, it extended and continued to influence the present, and could be used to lay the foundation of a better future.

Scott saw that the past could be used to confront important aspects of the social, economic, religious and economic realities of his own day. He used history, and the historical novel, as a response to the fate of his own country. D. R. Haggis noted,

> that the greatness of Scott is now seen to lie in the insight and understanding he shows in the interpretation of historical conflicts, in his ability to penetrate to the human reality underlying those conflicts and the opposition of historical forces, and in the way he contrives to fuse, in the creation of his fictional characters, their personal characteristics with features and qualities that make them figures representative of their times." (51)

Is Haggis completely correct in his assessment of Scott's characters? Are they really only relevant to a single epoch? Are they static to time and place? The reality of conflict in Scott's novels cannot be denied; all of the *Waverley* novels deal with conflict, and attempts at resolution, but are not the characters more universal in their appeal than to be staged for only one historical reality? His characters must have appealed as living flesh

and blood during the years of the first publication. As men and women of not only the 17th and 18th centuries, but of the 19th as well: otherwise, how can one explain their immense appeal to the reading public of Scott's own time? According to David Devlin Scott's novels "catch and dramatize history at a moment of critical change" (42). Devlin further states that,

> Scott deals with great crises in history and sees much of his own advantage as a historical novelist to lie in the fact that he is living in such a time of crisis himself. He writes his novels about turning points in history; he is not narrowly the historian of Jacobitism, or even of Scotland, but the historian of every historical crisis or crux and of men's reactions to such crisis...And all the Scottish novels dramatize historical crisis, a sudden great leap forward; but it is the crisis as much as the Scottishness that interests Scott and makes him far more than the novelist of manners he aimed to be. (42)

The central achievement of Sir Walter Scott is a series of novels that are conventionally designated by the title of the first of them, the *Waverley* novels. The range of these novels is impressive. Ivanhoe is set in twelfth century England whilst the *Talisman* in the Holy Land of the Third Crusade, *Quentine Durward* in fifteenth century France, *The Abbot* in the Scotland of Queen Mary, *Kenilworth* in the reign of Elizabeth I, and *The Fortunes of Nigel* in that of James I, but the best of his historical novels are those set in Scotland and with periods not too distant from his own life-time (Mayhead 6). In these Scottish novels Scott's sense of history is strong. Most of them are concerned with the conflict between the old and the new, between Jacobite and Hanoverian, between the heroic, traditional, feudal values of the Tory Highlands

and the progressive commercial interests of the Whig Lowlands, between stability and change. These Scottish novels present conflicts with particular insight and are able to convey the good, as well as the bad, that existed on both sides of the extremes of any conflict, but "what happens in Scotland is something inevitable in all history" (Devlin 43). So in many ways they are not limited to time, place, or locale, but have a more universal message of the benefits of progress and the need to overcome intolerance. Scott is able to view the difficult movement forward from a more primitive to a newer way of life within the context of Scotland, simply because of his "nearness to such crisis enables him to dramatize it in Scottish types and characters and their living language" (Devlin 43).

Scott's own attitudes towards the past of his native land appear to be ambivalent at best. He knew the value of the past, but he also recognized the inevitability of the future. Daiches suggests that Scott's appearance of an ambivalent attitude was actually an embrace of the new order that was quickly being established in Scotland, and his novels are not a mythological embrace of the past, but look towards the future: "For underlying most of these novels is a tragic sense of the inevitability of a drab but necessary progress, a sense of the impotence of the traditional kind of heroism, a passionately regretful awareness of the fact that the Good Old Cause was lost forever and the glory of Scotland must give way to her interest" (*Sir Walter* 84). Underlying the ideal of the historical novel was Scott's awareness of modern realities. He understood the value of historical, national myth, but he also sensed that myth must serve a higher contemporary purpose. The history of stories and myth, in Scott's hand, would be used as a vehicle, not simply for entertainment, but also as a rationale for the course that Scotland had chosen for

herself.

Scott's Scotland was a land in the process of rapid social and economic change. The old world, as well as the Old Cause of Jacobite Feudalism, was quickly passing away. The new world, the world of empires and mercantile advancement, would only benefit those countries willing to take advantage of the possibility of forging beyond the past. Scotland was poised to choose between modernity, or to remain a poverty-stricken backwater tied to a myth of a heroic past. Scott's own invention of the historical novel, as distinct from the Gothic tale, was a reflection of this tension:

> Scott's problem has subsequently been described as typifying the ambivalence of Scottish writers toward the transition between agrarian tradition and capitalist modernity, as thought his was a peculiarly Scottish phenomenon...If, however, Scotland was in advance of the times economically, it is not accident that Scott should have been in advance of this literary compeers in response to the new cultural forms. One of the reason, it may be concluded; that the historical novel begins with Scott is that the tension between tradition and modernity first achieved its definitive form in Scotland. (Fleishman 38)

Scott's interest in history was twofold. He had an interest in the old, oral traditions best represented in the Scottish Ballads, and this interest in folk traditions was so strong that his first significant literary work was a collection of Border ballads. For Scott the folk ballads represented past events preserved in popular memory in the present (Daiches *Sir Walter* 460). On the other hand, he had an interest in the relationship between tradition and progress. His historical novels attempt to bring these two seemingly opposing

contradictions together. Daiches claims that, "These strands were in themselves the product of history---of Scottish history in the two centuries before Scott's birth" (*Sir Walter* 460-461). Scott's interests were in the relationship between the past and present: between static tradition and progressive change.

For the generation of Scott's time the main thematic trend was the response to the Union of 1707, and this response to tradition and change became sources of inspiration to him; as mentioned earlier this interest first took the form of collecting or rediscovering the older Scottish culture that existed whilst Scotland was still an independent entity (Daiches *Sir Walter* 462). Like Scott, in his earlier period, many antiquarians took to collecting and editing folksongs and ballads. With the passing of independence they sought to rediscover a pre-Union tradition and Scott's own literary beginnings manifested themselves with his edition of *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Borders* published in three volumes between 1802 and 1803. His views of the texts available to him were the oral corruptions of original compositions led him to try and restore them to what he considered a closer rendition of their original form and meaning. Hence, even from the beginnings of his literary career his interests were concerned with the oral and folk history of his native land.

But there were other reactions to the Act of Union that were not isolated to popular nostalgia. According to Daiches:

> The historical interest in Scottish ballads, which the young Walter Scott developed so passionately was not an isolated phenomenon. It was part of one kind of eighteenth century Scottish reaction to the Union of 1707. The other kind of reaction – what I have called the "equal and opposite" reaction – produced not

> antiquarian collections of old songs of transcriptions of oral ballads or imitations of older Scottish popular modes, but works of philosophy, history and literary criticism written in elegant English and addressed to Europe as a whole...their aim was to assert their country's claim to greatness by operating in the van of European progress in order to show that Scotland, small and poor though she might be and chequered though her history might have been, could nevertheless represent Britain before the world at least as well as, and perhaps better than, any English writer...Scott, more than any other writer of his time, drew equal nourishment from both the two cultural movements in eighteenth century Scotland, form the nostalgic and the progressive...He believed with the literati that the Union of 1707 was a good thing, both culturally and economically. (*Sir Walter* 463)

The Act of Union was to bring about the very possibility of a Sir Walter Scott. The great change in Scotland was the country's change from feudalism to the tradition of the Enlightenment. The change was not only intellectual, but economic as well. A middle-class was quickly developing; a middle class with money, education and enough free time to enjoy literature. Scott's own family was beneficiaries of the new-found wealth and social advancement based upon merit that the Union offered to Scotland. The newly rising middle classes of Scotland with its strong Protestant character of hard work and social advancement rejoiced in the Union. There was also a sense that it had always been Scotland's need to understand England, but now it was time for England to discover Scotland, not as an old enemy, but as a equal member of the new, expanding British Empire: "It was Sir Walter Scott who first taught the English to admire Scotland, and

reconciled the two nations to a joyful pride in their partnership" (Trevelyan 359). Hence, as the Union benefited both England and Scotland, it was Scott who became a novelist to both countries as well. To the English he taught the glory of Scotland, to the Scots he extolled the Union between the two nations. Scott was truly the new Briton that the Union was capable of producing.

The historical tales of Scott may take place in many different eras, but they are concerned with the Scotland and England of his own time. He was a bridge builder between two former enemies, who had, by the Act of Union decided that their fates were to be intertwined. From two camps emerged the ideal of Great Britain and the British race. For Scott this was not something to be cast aside or rejected. The Union was beneficial to both sides. Many of his historical novels deal with the fundamental concept of the marriage, a marriage that produces the perfect union; reflecting the mutual, beneficial union of England and Scotland.

Although considered to be historical novels that appealed to a romantic interest in the past; they are historical fiction that fulfills an important relation to Scott's own time. Scott saw that the past could be used to confront important social, economic, religious and political forces that were still issues in the Scotland of the early 19th century. James Kerr stated that the "in the Waverley novels, the mixed the genre of historical romance becomes a field in which perceived contradictions in history can be recreated and resolved. It is a zone of freedom, a verbal realm apart from history" (*Fiction* 1); Kerr goes on to explain that "Scott's work is never simply identical with ideology. It is a work of transformation upon ideology, a self-conscious production of produced representations of the past" (3); Hence, whilst the immediate historical

context of many of the *Waverley* novels take place in the context of the Jacobite rebellion of the mid-eighteenth century or earlier, the larger historical subtext of the novel is the Anglicization of Scotland (Kerr *Fiction* 3); but for Scott this Anglicization brought with it many rewards, both social, religious, and political.

In the series of *Waverley* novels the historical conflict is not simply one of Jacobite verses Hanoverian, or commercial interest verses feudalism, or modern forms of government verses the tribal clan; it is fundamentally a question of order against chaos, civilization against lawlessness (Haggis 56). These were the same difficulties that were facing the Scotland of Scott's own generation; to embrace wholeheartedly the stability of good government, and the economic prosperity offered by peace and toleration; or to reject the benefits of modern civilization and to return to the barbarism of an earlier, albeit more romantic, time. Scott stood solidly for enlightenment and mercantile ideals. His choice was for good government, peace, and prosperity. If there was much that was to be lost in the Union, for Scott it was a loss that was worth the benefits that would be derived from the process.

Scott's historical novels had an immediate appeal to contemporary readers; his realistic detailed retelling of the past was successful on several different levels. For many the history was well known, especially amongst his Scottish readers, but added to this familiarity was Scott's ability to create elaborate worlds that found an appreciative audience. Carlyle commented that Scott's historical novels taught men the truth of history, perhaps more so than any non-fictional narrative could have ever done:

> These Historical Novels have taught all men this truth, which looks like a

> truism, and yet was as good as unknown to writers of history and others, till so taught: that the bygone ages of the world were actually filled by living men, not by protocols, state-papers, controversies and abstractions of men. Not abstractions were they, not diagrams and theorems; but men, in buffer other coats and breeches, with colour in their cheeks, with passions in their stomach, and the idioms, features and vitalities of very men. (qt. in Devlin 34)

Finally, Scott gave history flesh and blood.

An important factor that contributed to Scott's ability was the strong Scottish oral traditions to which Scott had access since early childhood. After an early bout with polio, which left him lame for the rest of his life, he was sent to his paternal grandfather's house at Sandyknowe in the border country, in the hope that the climate away from Edinburgh would improve his health. In the home of his own ancestors, he heard stories of Border raids, the Jacobite rising, and the only recently past religious struggles of Scotland from people for whom the past was still a living tradition. It was this living tradition of a past age that Scott was able to clothe in flesh and blood.

Scott knew the value of the past, but he also recognized the inevitability of the future and the changes that Scotland would have to accept in order to survive in the new age. But, like many of his contemporaries, Scott was torn between his love for a romantic, often failed past, and the new age that was dawning. The new age promised safety, and prosperity, but many cherished relics of the past would be swept away as the age progressed. Scott was a ready recipient of the new age, but sad nevertheless to see the old was go into the mist of time. David Daiches felt that,

> Scott's attitude to life was derived from his response to the fate of his own country: it was the complex of feelings with which he contemplated the phases of Scottish history immediately preceding his own time that provided the point of view which gave life - often a predominantly tragic life - to these novels. For underlying most of these novels is a tragic sense of the inevitability of a drab but necessary progress, a sense of the impotence of the traditional kind of heroism, a passionately regretful awareness of the fact that the Good Old Cause was lost forever and the glory of Scotland must give way to her interest. (*Sir Walter* 84)

Although Scott may have understood the great loss that the modem world had thrust upon Scotland, he brought most of his novels to a happy ending; hoping perhaps for the same sort of happy ending for Scotland herself. Although his most successful novels are placed within the historical reality of Scotland, the conflicts that are set in motion are universal and real. All societies are faced with longing for that which is familiar and traditional, whilst the fear of a changing world is very real for any society facing such agitation. Periods of transitions exist at all times and in all places; Avrom Fleishman observes that,

> Scott's problem has subsequently been described as typifying the ambivalence of Scottish writers toward the transition between agrarian tradition and capitalist modernity, as though this was a peculiarly Scottish phenomenon...If, however, Scotland was in advance of the times economically, it is not accident that Scott should have been in advance of this literary compeers in response to the new cultural forms. One of the reasons, it

may be concluded, that the historical novel begins with Scott is that the tension between tradition and modernity first achieved its definitive form in Scotland. (38)

Fleishman goes on to conclude that the advent of modernity in Scotland was an evolution that was in its very essence revolutionary in regards to all aspects of national life:

> The values of the past are those of the folk or *Gemeinshaft*, of ritualized religion and nuclear family ties, of the absolute ethics of relatively primitive societies, and of personal motivation by inherited mores - for the individual has not yet differentiated himself clearly from the group. On the other side stand the values of modem life, not moral pragmatism or economic improvement alone, but also the values of the Enlightenment: rational freedom, liberation from the dead weight of the past both intellectually and politically, a new world abuilding for the fulfillment of all members of society. Scott's inability to choose between them reflects not a vacillating temperament but a comprehensive vision, for both are absolute and eternal value-systems, like those which Coleridge found at work in Waverley -the instinct for conserving the past and the instinct for progress and freedom. Taken together, these universals structure the repeated historical drama of past and present in Scott's fiction, and give esthetic scope to his otherwise provincial absorption in the concrete details of national life. (38-39)

Often the modern understanding of the historical novel is divorced from any specific reality, and the historical novel is used either to reinforce myths or as a means of

escapism from the cares of modern complications of life, and even in the 19th century voices had been raised in opposition to the very idea of the historical novel. In 1850, Alessandro Manzoni, in his *On the Historical Novel*, had denounced the historical novel as misbegotten because he felt that the historical novel did not provide readers with knowledge about the actual world. Manzoni felt that only when the historical novel pointed to historical reality did it have any validity; only when it "it sets out to tell real facts" (73) does it have validity as an art form.

This is perhaps too narrow a view of the importance of history as an ongoing and reinvented process: one may posit that even scientific historical studies may indeed be tied only to place and time; that even history continues to reinvent itself according to the age. Georg Lukacs declared that Scott,

> [R]anks among those great writers whose depth is manifest mainly in their work, a depth which they often do not understand themselves, because it has sprung from a truly realistic mastery of their material in conflict with their personal views and prejudices. (31)

Seen in this light, Scott's historical sense may be more realistic than that of a more scientific historian. The 19th century had seen the advent of scientific historicism, and for many Victorians, any use of history, other than as an exact retelling of events as they happened, was, in all cases, to be considered erroneous; effectively, a lie. Early Victorian critics of Scott tended to discount his historical novels because they did not seem to follow accepted rules of historical, antiquarian study. But Carlyle, who voiced support for Scott as a historical writer, noted that "The bygone ages of the world were actually filled by living men, not by protocols, state-papers, controversies, and abstractions of men. Not

abstractions were they, not diagrams and theorems; but men" (qt. in Devlin 337). What Scott was able, as a writer, and not historian, to do, was to give life to people of a bygone age. His historical novels do not deal with how important personages affect history, but how simple individuals are affected by history: that the common man may also be a participant in the historical process, and not simply an observer. The real issues are how individuals react to historical forces that are usually beyond their control.

The first *Waverley* novel was published anonymously in 1814; it created great interest amongst readers who sought to learn the identity of its author. Scott himself claimed, in his preface to the 1829 edition, that he had published his work anonymously to avoid political discussion. Although the book was published sixty years after the great rebellion of 1745, the failure of the cause of Prince Charlie was still well remembered. Perhaps Scott had taken the best course for the time. It must also be remember that before the publication of *Waverley* Scott had been acclaimed as a poet, and his delving into prose was because his fame was being eclipsed by the advent of Byron, so perhaps he was afraid of failure.

In an endeavor to understand Scott's use of history it is necessary to understand the time and epoch in which it was written. The late 18th century, which saw Scott grow into early manhood and begin his writing career, was marked by the fact that France, in 1789, fell into revolution. Indeed,

> Scott became a student and advocate between the Revolution and 9 Thermidor, a translator and published poet between Directory and 18 Brumaire, a published anthologer and renowned poet between Consulate and Austerlitz, and an editor, laureate nominee and lauded historical

> novelist (and owner-builder of his country seat at Abbotsford) between then and St Helena. The twenty-five central years of his life thus spanned wars which, if not the bloodiest Europe had known, were unprecedented in their extent, territorial implications, institutional and social impact and sheer cost. (Humphrey 5-6)

This inaugurated a quarter of a century of social upheaval and war and exercised a profound and continuing influence on all who lived during this time (Perry 333). The ideas of the French Revolution were highly exportable and they took the form of a universal philosophy, proclaiming the rights of man regardless of time or place, or nation (351), and:

> In England the newly developing 'radicals,' men like Thomas Paine and Dr. Richard Price, who wished a thorough overhauling of Parliament and the established church, entered into correspondence with the [revolutionary] assembly in Paris. Business men of importance were pro-French since they had representation in the House of Commons. The Irish two were excited, and presently revolted. Everywhere the young men were aroused, the young Hegel in Germany, or in England Wordsworth, who later recalled the sense of new era that had captivated so many spirits in 1789, [was to declare] *Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive, But to be young was very heaven!* (Perry 352-253)

Needless to say, not everyone shared in this unabashed welcome of the winds of a great social change wrought by the French Revolution. Edmund Burke, who was allied with the Whigs and not the Tories, and with them often advocated liberal and reform causes,

the son of an Anglican priest and a Catholic mother, and an Irish member of Parliament for nearly thirty years and who urged the emancipation of Irish trade, the Irish Parliament, Irish Catholics, and endorsed the movement for the abolition of the slave trade, became the celebrated opponent of the French Revolution. He published, in 1790, his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* where he predicted anarchy and dictatorship; declaring that:

> You [revolutionaries] chose to act as if you had never been moulded into civil society, and had every thing to begin anew. You begin ill, because you began by despising every thing that belonged to you...If the last generations of your country appeared without much luster in your eyes, you might have passed them by, and derived your claims from a more early race of ancestors. Under a pious predication for those ancestors, your imaginations would have realized in them a standard of virtue and wisdom, beyond the vulgar practice of the hour: and you would have risen with the example to whose imitation you aspired. Respecting your forefathers, you would have been taught to respect yourselves. You would not have chosen to consider the French as a people of yesterday, as a nation of low-born servile wretches, until the emancipating year of 1789...by following the wise examples you would have given new examples of wisdom to the world. You would have rendered the cause of liberty venerable in the eyes of every worthy mind in every national...You would have had a free constitution; a potent monarchy; a disciplined army; a reformed and venerated clergy; a mitigated but spirited nobility, to lead your virtue. (144)

Burke expressed his fear of the Revolution after the arrest of Louis XVI and Marie

Antoinette, but before the Terror and their execution. For Burke, the future was to be found in searching the best of the past, not in destroying the existing social situation, but through modification of the existing power structures. That progress would come through understanding the strength of the past as well as its defects; progress could only exist if built upon ancient foundations; the Revolution attempted to destroy the old order completely. Burke felt that progress could only exist if built upon earlier foundations of liberty and freedom. He called for Great Britain to remain aloof from the radical movements sweeping across the continent of Europe. Burk advised Britain to accept slow adaptations of their own traditional liberties.

He further declared that every people must be shaped by their own national circumstances, national history and national character. He felt that any nation that rejected its past would, "despise all their predecessors, and all their contemporaries, and even to despise themselves, until the moment they became truly despicable" (145). Scott, as well many of his contemporaries, found Burke's conservatism very attractive. It was not a reactionary conservatism, but was very much part of an earlier enlightenment tradition that saw progress in the acceptance of toleration. Much of what Burke prophesied, the terror and dictatorship did become the logical outcome of a nation that had rejected its past. Wordsworth, who was horrified by the Terror, was to later praise the "Genius of Burke" (Damrosch 57). Burk's ideals were, "Championed throughout Europe for principled conservatism that revered an idealized past and historical continuity, and on this basis defended the moral authority of a nation's institutions: the monarchy, the aristocracy, the church, and the constitution that guaranteed their power" (57); all are things that Scott also revered, but only in a moderate form in his *Waverley* novels.

The political extremism that was unleashed by the French Revolution reminded many of the recent religious fanaticism that had produced the "Killing Time" in Scotland; a time that was still very much part of the Scottish landscape. Many feared that political extremism would be just as violent and bloody as former religious divisions had been in the not so distant past. Scott's sense of history was related to this fundamental fear of quick and drastic change; this fear informed his sense of the historical novel, and his political though:

> Seems to derive directly from Edmund Burke; like Burke, he is prepared to accept and defend the results of past revolutions, but he deplores all further change. Out of the conflicting fanaticisms of the past had emerged, in characteristically British fashion, a sensible middle way -- one often represented by Scott's heroes and institutionalized by the Glorious Revolution of 1688 which, for him, had achieved a final settlement of the political and social order. His essential conservatism is aptly illustrated by his attitude towards the French Revolution. Unlike all the other major romantic writers, Scott never indicated the least sympathy for the Revolution or its aims. (Lauber 136)

Much like Burke, the "outbreak of the French Revolution appalled Scott by its wholesale scrapping of tradition and ruthless break with the past, and when war with France developed he hailed enthusiastically the enrollment of volunteers, and in 1797 he eagerly joined the new cavalry corps, the Royal Edinburgh Volunteer Light Dragoons" (Lauber 80), so while Wordsworth and Coleridge were still enthusiastic supporters of the Revolution, the "young Scott was drilling with the Edinburgh Volunteers to repel any French invasion and to intimidate the lower classes" (Lauber 136).

Scott's reaction to the French Revolution shows that he was a cultural conservative, who believed in a slow change within the existing social structures of society. Also, he was more than a little afraid of enthusiasms of any sort: religious or political. Like Burke, he saw that wholesale destruction of any society would have grave implications for a nation's social life and development. His attitudes also mark him as a member of the Enlightenment of the previous generation, which believed above all things in moderation and tolerance. The fall of democratic ideals of the French Revolution into the Reign of Terror followed by the emotional attachment to the person of Napoleon could only have justified Scott's original apprehension of the support that so many literary intellectuals of the age had given to its call to arms and social destruction. In reaction, Scott remained a committed Tory, and in eighteenth century Edinburgh, this meant that he wrote as a man torn by irreducible tension; desirous of the settlement of the new constitution, welcoming the advances that Enlightenment philosophy and industrial and economic revolution brought to Scotland, but anxious to cling to the solidity of fixed moral principles, firm national identities and the kind of semi-feudal social structures which he promoted at Abbotsford. The home that he built upon his ideal of an enlightened laird; he had no wish to see the past destroyed, but to be modified through moderation and reason. His choice was for a constitutional monarchy as best represented by the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

When Scott wrote the first *Waverley* novel it was a time that Great Britain was at war with most of the continent of Europe lead by Napoleon. Richard Humphrey concludes that, "Napoleonic Europe is to the historical novel what ancient Greece is to tragic drama: both one of its enduring themes and its birthplace" (5). *Waverley,* the instigator of the

historical genre was begun in 1805, according to Scott, just weeks after Trafalgar and resumed in the fall of 1813, on the eve of the Battle of Nations at Leipzig and published in July of 1614 less than a year before Waterloo. "Indeed on its day of publication, Thursday, 7 July 1814, the British nation was officially --- if prematurely --- celebrating peace in Europe" (5).

Lukacs argues that the genre of the historical novel emerged not least because,

> The French Revolution, the revolutionary wars and the rise of Napoleon, which for the first time made history a *mass experience*, and moreover on a European scale. During the decades between 1789 and 1814 each nation of Europe underwent more upheavals than they had previously experienced in centuries. And the quick succession of these upheavals gives them a qualitatively distinct character; it makes their historical character far more visible than would be the case in isolated, individual instances: The masses no longer have the impression of a "natural occurrence"...with the knowledge that similar upheavals are taking place all over the world, this must enormously strengthen the feeling first that there is such a thing as history, that it is an uninterrupted process of changes and finally that it has a direct effect upon the life of every individual. (23)

Lukacs further suggests that this popular experience that enveloped the whole of Europe is fundamentally that wrought by *Levy en mass.* Until the time of the French Revolution wars had been fought by small, professional armies, and "they were conducted so as to isolate the army as sharply as possible from the civilian population...that war should be waged in such a manner that the civilian population simply would not notice it" (23). This system of waging warfare changed when the French Republic began to create mass

armies comprised of the whole nation: The *Levy en* mass declared that,

> Henceforth, until the enemies have been driven from the territory of the Republic, the French people are in permanent requisition for army service. The young men shall go to battle; the married men shall forge arms and transport provisions; the women shall make tents and clothes, and shall serve in the hospitals; the children shall turn old linen into lint; the old men shall repair to the public places, to stimulate the courage of the warriors and preach the unity of the Republic and hatred of kings. (*Levy en Mass* 108-109)

The involvement of the whole nation into a mass machine of warfare brought the common man into the sphere of history; no longer as spectators, but as participants. History was made not only made by kings and princes, but by the common man as well. The Revolution brought history to the common population of Europe.

Hence, many different forces contributed to the making of Sir Walter Scott's histories; the French Revolution, the growth of Enlightenment ideals in Scotland, and the search, not only in Scotland, but across much of Europe, for a national ideal that would supersede the attraction of revolutionary France. Scott contributed not only the history of his own country, but in many ways was the inventor of modern Scottish history and myth. Fitzroy Maclean, in his *Scotland: A Concise History*, gave Scott, and Robert Burns, a lasting tribute by declaring that,

> Robert Burns and Walter Scott... spread Scotland's fame abroad thought the civilized world. They helped to restore to the Scots themselves the self-confidence and self-respect which the events of the past century had done so much to destroy, to dispel the unhappy feeling of inferiority and lost identity which had followed

> the Union. In particular both writers helped to create a new, popular image of Scotland and the Scots, which, though not always very closely related to reality, certainly served to put our country and nation back on the map. To such an extent, that, from being regarded as uncouth barbarians inhabiting and insalubrious region north of the Tweed, the Scots soon became the popular imagination paragons of all the virtues, at once fearless heroes and shrewd, merry, honest, hospitable folk with their hearts in the right place and their heads screwed on the right way. (202)

Few, if any, authors have effected national development and sentiments in the manner of Scott. It is indeed hard to imagine Scotland, or the popular imagination of Scotland, without reference to Scott. England would still be England without either Dickens or Kipling, but it is doubtful Scotland would be Scotland without the literary influence of Scott. This is indeed high praise.

CHAPTER 2

THE UNION

Fareweel to a' our Scottish fame,

Fareweel our ancient glory!

Fareweel ev'n to the Scottish name.

Sae famed in martial story!

Now Sark rins over Salway sands,

An' Tweed rins to the ocean,

To mark where England's province stands --

Such a parcel of rogues in a nation!

What false Argyle could not subdue

Thro' many warlike ages

Is wrought now by a coward few

For hireling traitor's wages.

The English steel we could disdain,

Secure in valour's station;

But English gold has been our bane --

Such a parcel of rogues in a nation!

O, would, or I had seen the day

That Treason thus could sell us,

My auld grey head had lien in clay

Wi' Bruce and loyal Wallace!

But pith and power, till my last hour

I'll mak this declaration :-

'We're bought and sold for English gold'--

Such a parcel of rogues in a nation!

(Robert Burns)

The final Act of Union has a tangled history going back several centuries. For mediaeval Scotland the "auld enemy" had always been England. This fear of England had forced Scotland into frequent strife and had forced Scotland into an alliance with England's main foe, France. Medieval Scotland had maintained an uneasy alliance of English-speaking lowlands with Gaelic-speaking Highlands. This national identity was based not so much upon commonality of culture, but upon the fear of a common enemy: the threat of English domination. When the lowland Scots adopted the Protestantism of the Reformation, this caused a serious breach with their traditional ally, Catholic France. This breach was further exacerbated the relationship between the Protestant Lowlands with the Highlands, which remained Catholic. Thus, added to the linguistic division was now a religious one as well. The balancing act between two separate linguistic nations united by a common religion was destroyed Scottish Protestants turned towards Protestant England, whilst the conservative Catholic Highlands remained loyal to their old alliance with France. This irreparable divide between the Highlands and the

Lowlands was to plague post-Reformation Scotland until the 18th century.

In 1603, with the death of Queen Elizabeth I of England without a direct heir, the throne of England passed to King James VI of Scotland. James went south to become James I of England, never to return to Scotland again. This was a serious blow to Scotland. The king took with him his Court poets and musicians, thus depriving Scotland of its main source of patronage of the arts. There were now two supposedly independent kingdoms ruled by a single king, but finally this union of the crowns was to become the foundation of a closer relationship between the former enemies.

During the time of the Commonwealth, lead by Oliver Cromwell the leader of the Puritan forces, his military campaigns had established English rule in both Scotland and Ireland. The time of Cromwell's rule in Britain was that of a military dictatorship, but with the death of Cromwell and the royal restoration of Charles II in 1660 English control over Scotland did not come to an end. From 1660 to 1690 Scottish affairs continued to be influenced by revolutionary political changes in England (Trevelyan 353). Throughout the reign of Charles II, although Scotland was governed from Edinburgh by her own Privy Council, the Council was to beholden to English control and real power emanated from Whitehall the center of English political life at that time. Neither the Scottish Parliament nor the Church Assembly governed the land. With the Restoration of Charles II there was no real restoration of national independence in Scotland, except the loss of free trade with England and her colonial Empire. The Scottish Parliament was entirely subservient to the Privy Council. The council was answerable to London, not to the Scottish nation. The continued power of the Privy Council relied on the support of the Scottish aristocratic factions. This class represented the determination of the less fanatical

amongst the laity to prevent the old tyranny of the Kirk, which Cromwell had overthrown, from rising into a position of power again. This class preferred the tyranny of the Privy Council to that of the clergy and elders (Trevelyan 353-354). In Scotland, the Privy Council maintained the supremacy of State over Church. Unfortunately, the National Presbyterian Church of Scotland refused, unlike the English Church, to accept a subservient role to that of the state.

Upon the death of Charles II in 1685, and against the more moderate of English opinion, his brother became James II. He soon antagonized both conservatives as well as liberals in England. "Unlike his brother, King James II was not by any means a congenial or attractive figure. Impatient, bigoted, vain, and haughty, he exacted the last ounce out of the privileges of his office" (Ashley 167). Added to Kings James' personal repugnance was his conversion to Roman Catholicism. Only a few years earlier a majority of the House of Commons had voted to exclude him from the throne, but in 1685 the power of the Whigs, the strongest supporters of Parliament over king, lay broken, but even so the King was still unable to make complete his accession to power without gaining and soothing the Protestant pro-Parliamentarian faction of the English government. On the very morrow of his accession the King told his Privy Council the he would "make it his endeavour to preserve this government in Church and State as it is now established." The speech was at once published and commended (Ashley 167-168). Regardless of the promises he had made to preserve the Anglican establishment, King James immediately began a program to dismantle the special protections and privileges enjoyed by the Church of England. The Test Acts existed to insure that no non-Anglican could, on any level, participate in the government or the university system. These Acts existed to

protect the kingdom from not only the dangers of Roman Catholicism but from the dangers of Puritan fanaticism, which had only recently drawn England into a protracted civil war, a revolutionary government and regicide. The new King acted as if the he had the right to suspend the Test Acts by use of the royal prerogative without regard to Parliament. In England it was feared that he would use his power to enhance the power of the Roman Catholic Church, and the new King professed to offer,

> A program, of general religious toleration, to allow Protestant Dissenters as well as Roman Catholics to participate in public life. Such a program, whether frankly meant as a secularizing of politics or indirectly intended as favoritism to Catholics, was equally repugnant to the Church of England. Seven bishops refused to endorse it. They were prosecuted for disobedience to the king but were acquitted by the jury. James, by these actions, violated the liberties of the established church, threatened the Anglican monopoly of church and state, and aroused the popular terrors of "popery." (Palmer 152)

It was felt that behind all of this, "There swelled in the King's breast the hope that he might reconcile all his people to the old faith and heal the schism which had rent Christendom for so many generations" (Churchill 2:384). Many saw that toleration was the natural first to step to the revival of Catholicism. The King began to appoint Catholics to influential positions in the government; positions to which Catholics had previously been excluded by law. The fear of "Popery" was very much alive in England of King James I. Louis XIV, an active ally of King James, had revoked the tolerant Edict of Nantes, which resulted in the persecution of the Protestant Huguenots in France further contributing to anti-Catholic feelings in England and Scotland. England was flooded with

Protestant refuges from Catholic France, so "the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes prepared the mental and emotional background for the Revolution of 1688 and the long wars with France that followed. They raised to a height in England the hatred of 'Popery'" (Trevelyan 346). In England there was a terror that the Catholic system would be extended to England. This was not simply a fear of religious systems, but of political ones as well. Anglicanism meant the rule of Parliament, whilst a return to Roman Catholicism meant the return of royal supremacy and absolutism.

Since King James II received no support for his attempts to overturn the Test Acts, he was forced to take a position philosophically set forth by his grandfather James I, that a King of England could make and unmake the law by his own will without recourse to Parliament (Perry "James I" 21) . This united the political divisions of England in opposition to the King. Whilst James II had no male heir, the issue was not of supreme importance; he was elderly and it was felt that on his death the throne would devolve to a Protestant heir, but in 1688 a son was born to James II and baptized into the Roman Catholic Faith (Palmer 152). Adding to the fear of a Catholic takeover was the King's demand for a standing army with a strong officer corps composed mostly of Roman Catholics. Officers who had recently participated in suppressing, most cruelly, the Protestant rebellion of the Duke of Monmouth, the bastard son of King James' brother, Charles II (Churchill 2:388-389). With the prospects of an indefinite line of Catholic rulers in England, Parliament united in its opposition to the King and offered the throne to his grown daughter Mary, who had been born and bought up a Protestant before her father's conversion to Rome.

Mary was the wife of William of Orange. To William it would be a distraction to be

the husband of the Queen of England, unless he could use England for his own purposes. His interest in England was that it could help him to save Holland and help him ruin Holland's enemy, which was Catholic France. This suited Parliament well. Mary was in direct, albeit female, line to the thrown, thus preserving the Stuart line, whilst Holland and England both shared a common enemy, Louis XIV of France. William reached, without difficulty, an understanding with the English Parliament. Protected by a written invitation from prominent Englishmen, he invaded England with a considerable army. James II fled, and William was proclaimed co-ruler with Mary over England and Scotland (Palmer 152-153); with the accession of William and Mary as co-rulers, "The long and enervating rivalry of Crown and Parliament gave place to cooperation between the two powers, with Parliament as the leading partner" (Trevelyan 349). William had no interest in England, and spent as little time in England as possible; this gave Parliament a power that it had never experienced before:

> In 1689, Parliament enacted a Bill of Rights, stipulating that no law could be suspended by the king (as the Test Act had been), no taxes raised or army maintained except by Parliamentary consent, and no subject (however poor) could be arrested and detained without legal process. William III accepted these articles as conditions to receiving the crown. Thereafter the relation between king and people was a kind of contract. (Palmer 153)

With its newfound power, Parliament further decreed, by the Act of Settlement of 1701, that no Roman Catholic could be King of England. Ancient dynastic law had been overturned by the power of an elected body. Unfortunately, the English Parliament could make no such laws for Scotland. Louis XIV of France refused to recognize the right of

William and Mary to ascend to the English Throne. He maintained James II at the French court with all the honors due to the true King of England and Scotland. It was one of the principal war aims of the French Court to restore the Catholic and Stuart dynasty across the Channel (Palmer 152).

The revolution had a major effect in Scotland. Scotland was restored to a state of practical independence from England. "English statesmen, Tory as well as Whig, were fain to allow her to settle her ecclesiastical and other affairs to her own liking, provided only she would follow suit by choosing William and Mary as her sovereigns" (Trevelyan 355). Thus, the dynastic dispute became a lever in which Scotland won her own terms in things both spiritual and material. The Convention Parliament sat at Edinburgh in 1689 and disposed James VII of Scotland, choosing William and Mary as sovereigns of Scotland. The autocratic rule of the Privy Council came to an end and Presbyterianism was formally established as the state religion of Scotland (under both Charles II and James II Anglicanism had been established by law). The Parliament at Edinburgh was an independent force to be reckoned with. It stood for its own policies. Unfortunately, the feudal method of its election rendered it very indifferent to any true representation of the country (Trevelyan 357).

William's reign in Scotland was a troubled one where the Jacobite party (those who supported the disposed King James VII; hence the title Jacobite from the Latin for James, Jacobus) was much stronger than in England. Yet, William's government survived. It was more tolerant than the Stuart's government had been and its settlement of Church and State was in accordance with the spirit of the times. Although Presbyterianism remained established by law, it could no longer dictate to the State, and the aim of the

government was the "Gradual substitution of the secular for the theological in politics" (Trevelyan 356). This settling of the religious problems, outside of some fanatical fringes on both sides, allowed Scotland to turn their thoughts to material problems.

Trade and industry were still on a small scale. The majority of the population was poverty-stricken. The vast majority of the inhabitants of Scotland had no political rights and lived under social arrangements still largely feudal. The Highland clans were not even feudal as much as tribal. But the renewed independence that Scotland's Parliament received with the Revolution of 1688 came with a great price. Scotland was cut off from England's growing international markets. Scotland had no rights in the English East India Company, or in the English colonies, or within the English system of mercantilism and the Navigation Acts (Palmer 153). All attempts on the part of Scotland to overcome these disabilities ended in failure. Scotland continued poor and isolated. Her only value to continental Europe lay in her position as a starting point for the invasion of England and Louis XIV's continued interest in the cause of Stuart restoration.

Excluded from participating in England's economic expansion, Scotland, by the eighteen century, was a kingdom in crises. Scotland's economy had been severely weakened by a series of major harvest failures beginning in 1695. Throughout the 17th century the economy of Scotland continued to deteriorate. In an attempt to compete with English overseas mercantile expansion the Scots hoped to found a colony based upon the examples of English colonial expansion. Called the Darien Scheme[1], the attempt to

[1] As the seventeenth century drew to a close Scotland's isolation from international markets began to take its toll. Whilst England continued to prosper, owing to its overseas empire, Scotland grew more and more desperate. The end of the 17th century saw seven years of successive crop-failures, which brought famine to the land. In June 1695, the Scots Parliament passed an act authorizing the establishment of a Company of Scotland

establish a Scottish imperial outlet, the colony of Caledonia, in Central America was deliberately sabotaged by the combined efforts of the English East India Company, the international financial markets at Amsterdam and King William. It has been estimated that almost 25% of Scotland's total liquid capital was lost in this vain attempt at competing in the international market place. The hope of Scotland at this time was not a closer walk with England, but to further separate the two countries. If Scotland had an independent economy, no longer dependent upon the good graces of her richer neighbor to the south, she could afford to ignore the continued attempts by England to pull her

---

Trading to Africa and the Indies. The object was to make a Scottish East India Company. Surprisingly, William I gave his assent to this venture. On July 12th, 1698 five ships carrying 1,200 colonists left the Port of Leith in Scotland. All were brimming with enthusiasm. After a voyage of three months they landed on the coast of Panama. On November 3rd, they took formal possession of the new territory, naming it Caledonia.

The idea was to establish a colony, which would be opened to ships of all countries, and to carry cargoes of the Atlantic and the Pacific across the narrow Isthmus of Panama. Hence, the long sea voyage around Cape Horn would be circumvented. It was hoped that the colony would thus be able to control the mercantile traffic of both oceans. It was the hope of the Scottish Parliament as well as its backers that the colony would make Scotland one of the riches nations in the world. From the very beginning things went terribly wrong. The spot chosen was unhealthy; hundreds of colonists died of fever and dysentery. Twice the colonists had repulsed Spanish invaders, who also claimed the area, a claim that William had recognized. The English colonies of America and the Caribbean were ordered to give no help or aid. Eventually those who had survived lost courage and abandoned the huts, the fort and the bay. Relief ships from Scotland were welcomed by four hundred graves. Scotland assembled another expedition of four ships that had already been at sea before the failure of the first was known. It reached Caledonia in November 1699. Once again the Spaniards attacked. The Scots resisted for a month before surrendering on April 12, 1700. In May, three ships sighted the hills of Jamaica. Two hundred had died on the voyage to English Jamaica. In the following two months another hundred died. The Darien adventure had been a major defeat. The nation could not withstand the loss of money; the Scottish nation was broke. To the Scots it proved that they could not challenge the mercantile power of England. Nine ships were sunk, burnt or abandoned. Only three hundred colonists ever returned to Scotland. Two thousand men, women, and children had been sacrificed to a national cause that held no glory. The colonial adventure had, on the part of the Scots, been mishandled from the very beginning. No real provisions had been made to discover a healthier landing place, but the anger of the Scottish population was directed towards the English. Matters were not helped when the King declared that the venture had been a threat to peace.

further and further into the English orbit, but the terrible outcome of the Darien Scheme, a grandiose attempt to finance a rival to the East Indian Company, a scheme in which the whole of the Scottish nation had shown interest, showed how weak the Scottish ability to compete with England had become.

Much of the blame for the failure of the colony was cast upon "Dutch William" and his English advisors. The failure was of such an import that Scott in *The Bride* mentions that Sir William Ashton was one of the few who kept their wealth and that "the Darien matter lent him a left, for he had good intelligence and sound views, and sold out in time" (203). The final outcome was that Scottish mercantile interests were forced to find a workable solution by abandoning a separate and divergent economic policy in favor of a merger that would be of equal benefit to both Parliaments of England as well as of Scotland.

Regardless of the need for economic co-operation throughout the 17th century the relations between England and Scotland had continued to deteriorate, a state of crisis existed. Increased English political management in Scottish affairs had lead to a greater and greater criticism of England. The Glencoe Massacre[2] of 1692, approved and

---

[2] With the success of the Revolution of 1688 and the accession of William and Mary, the Clan Chiefs were ordered, under the pain of the full weight of the law, to present themselves before the nearest civil authority and submit to the new ruling dynasty before 1st of January 1692. The elderly Chief of the MacDonalds, MacIain, did not leave for Fort William until the day before the deadline. When he presented himself, the garrison commander who was there was not authorized to accept his submission, thus MacIain had to ride to Invarary, which took seven days. Although he was past the deadline his submission was accepted. Having signed the oath of submission, the MacDonalds were not suspicious when troops of Argyll's regiment arrived to billet themselves in the homes of the MacDonalds. Argyll, leader of the Campbells, had been an early supporter of King William and later of the Hanoverians. The troops stayed with the MacDonalds for two weeks. Then, in complete darkness, a massacre began. The elderly MacIain was shot trying to get out of his bed. His wife had her fingers bitten off for their rings and she

implemented by the Crown along with the approval by the Lowland Protestants further intensified the growing Highland-Lowland antagonism, which further added to the growing divisions within Scotland. The Protestant, English-speaking Lowlands moved to a closer and closer relationship with England, whilst the Catholic, Gaelic-speaking Highlands, continued to support the Catholic Pretender and France.

With the continued absence of a Scottish King the result was the growing power of the Scottish Parliament. The Glorious Revolution of 1688, with its accompanying triumph of the English Parliament, was mirrored in Scotland. The two most powerful periods of the Scottish Parliament can be defined as existing between 1639-1651 and 1689-1707. During this time Scotland's Parliament was one of the most powerful assemblies in Europe. With the Scottish Constitutional Settlement of 1640-41 and a program of constitutional reform renewed from 1689 onwards, the Scottish Parliament was not a weak institution when it was finally abolished in 1707. The Parliament may have been strong but, unfortunately, the country was poor and divided.

The structure of the Scottish Parliament was fundamentally different from that of England's. The English Parliament was based on a House of Commons and a House of Lords: the Scottish Parliament was a single-chamber institution. The three estates were represented in a single house, the nobility, and commissioners of the shires and commissioners of the burghs. These three divisions of the estates were essentially the representatives of the landed aristocracy and the mercantile elites. The Shire and burgh

---

froze to death stripped naked in the snow the following day. Thirty-eight died, one hundred and fifty managed to escape. The Campbells took the blame although few of the actual troops involved were members of that clan. It was King William who had signed and counter-signed the order for the slaughter. This massacre was to have an immediate affect in the Highlands. It reinforced a support for the exiled Stuarts and the Jacobite Cause.

representatives were elected, whilst the nobility could sit as a birthright. The Parliament was an elite institution in terms of representation. Unlike the English Parliament or the French Estates General, the clerical state was not represented. This representation had been abolished at the Glorious Revolution as part of the Scottish constitutional settlement of 1689-90. This was only natural given the theological leanings of the Scottish Kirk, which unlike both Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism, differentiated between Church and State. In Scotland Church and State were considered fully autonomous entities.

From 1702 to 1707, in regards to Scotland, the major feature of English politics was the necessity of securing the Hanoverian Succession. The death of King William in 1702 resulted in the succession of Queen Anne to the united crowns of England and Scotland. Queen Anne was James II's youngest daughter, but she produced no living heir to the crowns. Thus, there was no direct Protestant successor to the throne. The English Act of Settlement of 1701 passed the English Succession over to the Protestant Electress Sophia of Hanover, granddaughter of James I. What England feared was the possibility that Scotland might choose James Edward Stuart, Anne's exiled Catholic half-brother, instead of the Protestant king from Hanover. Had James been prepared to turn Protestant or had he and his supporters shown greater initiative, perhaps all would not have been lost for the Stuart cause. George I was not only personally little liked, but also he took very little real interest in his subjects, and "when, with James's permission, the Highland Chiefs generously sent him an address of acceptance, George promptly rejected it. It was scarcely a way to win their allegiance" (Maclean *Scotland* 156).

By 1703 the Anglo-Scottish dynastic union, the Union of the Crowns, was in deep crisis. The Scottish Parliament was forging ahead in an independent dynastic policy and

an independent foreign policy as well. King William, on his deathbed in 1702, recommended a union with Scotland as a way to safeguard England's future against the possibility of a Scottish invasion intent on the restoration of the House of Stuart.

William's fear was not baseless, and the Scottish Act of Security of 1703-04 allowed for the Scottish Parliament to choose a different monarch to succeed to the Scottish Throne independently from that of England. This Act meant that Scotland could also initiate an independent foreign policy during an era of major European warfare. England could ill afford a hostile country on her northern border, a country that had long been a difficult neighbor even in the best of times. From the viewpoint of the English, the Act of Security could easily be viewed as a direct attack against the continued safety of England. It opened up the possibility of a Jacobite restoration and a Franco-Scottish rapprochement. Such a political alignment could result in attacks from Scotland, France, and Ireland. For the survival of England, the situation had to be dealt with immediately.

The English response was the Alien Act of 1705. This Act declared that all Scottish estates held in England by non-residents were to be considered as alien property in law unless the Scottish Parliament entered into treaty negotiations by Christmas Day 1705. The Act also threatened all Scottish products being imported into England. It was estimated that almost 50% of Scottish imports were destined for English markets. What the English wanted from the Scots was an acceptance of the Hanoverian Succession; in return the Scots would enjoy the economic benefits that union with England would afford. The Scots were forced to acquiesce in order to gain the advantage of free trade with the British market and access to England's growing colonial empire. The main thrust of the future union and the gaining for Scottish support for a fundamentally unpopular

ideal was economic in nature.

All previous attempts at union had failed. Unions had been attempted in 1689 and 1702-03. The Aliens Act forced Scotland to reconsider. On 20 July 1705 a draft act for a treaty with England was moved in the Scottish Parliament. The next step was to determine who would represent Scotland in the negotiations. James, 4th Duke of Hamilton, leader of the opposition to the Union stood up in Parliament on the 1st of September 1705 and moved that the Scottish negotiating commissioners should be named by Queen Anne, thus assuring a judicious outcome for the proceedings. The opportunity to do so was seized on by the Court ministry, hence securing a positive vote. All but one of the Scottish commissioners nominated was pro-incorporation.

Negotiations began on 16th of April 1706. The principle of an incorporating union was accepted by the 25th of April. The Scots did attempt to secure the best deal possible for Scotland. Proposals for a federal union, which would have involved further constitutional reform in Scotland and which would have retained the Scottish Parliament were rejected by England. The only acceptable result for England was full incorporation. The treaty was agreed on by 23rd July. The treaty then went to the consideration of the Scottish Parliament, which reconvened on 3rd October 1706.

The final session of the Parliament of Scotland was one of intense public debate. The union was hotly debated, the Scottish Kirk thundered against union from the pulpit, and the general population was opposed. The treaty consisted of 25 articles, of which 15 were economic in character. In order to minimalize the opposition of the Kirk, an act was passed in order to secure the Presbyterian establishment after which the Church stopped its open opposition. On the 25th May 1707 at the end of the last session of the Scottish

Parliament, Commissioner Queensbury spoke to the assembled Estates, stating that he was,

> Persuaded that we and our Posterity will reap the benefit for the Union of the two Kingdoms, and I doubt not, that as this Parliament has had the honour to conclude it, you will in your several Stations recommend to the People of this Nation, a grateful Sense of Her Majesties Goodness and great Care for the welfare of Her Subjects, in bringing this important Affair to Perfection, and that you will promote an universal desire in this Kingdom to become one in Hearts and Affections, as we are inseparable joyn'd in Interest with our Neighbour Nation. (qt. in Maclean *Scotland* 162)

The treaty was finally ratified on 16th January 1707 by a majority of 110 votes to 67. Parliament was adjourned on the 25th of March and the Estates were ordered to reconvene on 22nd of April. No such meetings ever took place. The Treaty and Act of Union came into effect on the 1st of May 1707 after having passed without incident in both Houses of Parliament in England. Thus,

> In 1707 the Scottish Parliament, under strong pressure from English statesman, voted itself out of existence in agreeing to an "incorporating union" with England. Scotland was now "North Britain", and it was governed from London, the center of the United Kingdom of Great Britain. (Daiches *Sir Walter* 461)

The vast majority of Scotsmen were opposed to the Union. It had little popular support. Public opinion against the Treaty was expressed through petitions from all Scottish

localities. Anti-Union petitions were received from across Scotland, not one pro-incorporating petition was received.

Yet, many members of Parliament had invested heavily in the Darien Scheme and they believed that they would receive compensation for their losses. They were not to be disappointed. In article 14, almost 400'000 pounds was granted to Scotland to offset future liability towards the English national debt, in essence, it was also used as a means for compensation for the investors in the failed Darien Scheme. Bribery and financial persuasion were also used to influence the vote. The Earl of Glasgow dispatched 20'000 pounds sterling to Scotland for distribution. James Douglas, 2nd Duke of Queensbury, and the Queen's Commissioner in Parliament received 12'325 sterling, the majority of the funding: in truth, the independence of Scotland had been bought by English gold.

Scotland kept its legal system and the Presbyterian Kirk, but gave up its Parliament in exchange for 45 seats in the House of Commons and 16 seats in the House of Lords. The act proclaimed that there would be "one United Kingdom by the name of Great Britain" with one Protestant ruler, one legislature and one system of free trade. Union with England gave the Scots access to the colonial empire of England (Palmer 236). The Scots soon played a remarkable role in taking advantage of numerous commercial advantages that the Union afforded them.

Scott in his history which he published under the title *Tales of My Grandfather* has this to say about the Union of the two kingdoms:

> On the 1st of May 1707 the Union took place, amid the dejection and despair which attend on the downfall of an ancient state, and under the sullen expression of discontent that was far from promising the course of prosperity which the

> treaty finally produced. And here I must point out to you at some length, although there could never be a doubt that the Union in itself was a most desirable event, yet by the erroneous mode in which it was pushed on and opposed by all parties concerned, such obstacles were thrown in the way of the benefits it was calculated to produce as to interpose a longer interval of years betwixt the date of the treaty and the national advantages arising out of it, than the term spent by the Jews in the wilderness ere they attained the promised land. (qt. in Mayhead 9)

It must be noticed that although Scott has mixed emotions about the Union and although he appears sad at the demise and "the downfall of an ancient state" he welcomed the Union, and was ready to commit himself as a supporter of the Union in a time when it was still wildly unpopular amongst many of his fellow countrymen. He was willing to put the blame for the trouble upon "parties concerned," rather than on the idea of the Union itself (Mayhead 10). Those few who had supported the Union had done so for economic reasons and "believed at the time that they were acting in Scotland's best interest and saving her, if not from war, at any rate from economic disaster" (Maclean *Scotland* 157). Although not generally popular it did, in time, provide economic prosperity and political as well as religious stability. Scotland became, albeit unequal, a partner in the growing British Empire. The same could never be said for the other lands of the Celtic fringe such as Ireland, and Wales. Scott recognized this mutually beneficial relationship. Although Scott could recognize its economic advance for Scotland, in his novels he was more interested in the political and religious moderation that Union with a greater and more enlightened power provided for the future of Scotland.

CHAPTER 3

THE TALE OF OLD MORTALITY:

THE RELUCTANT HERO

There was such a taed (toad) wha thocht sae long

On sanctity and sin:

On what was richt, and what was wrang,

And what was in atween

That he gat naething dune

(William Soutar)

[Note: In this chapter Covenanter and Cameronian may be used interchangeably to denote those Presbyterians who advocated a forceful overthrow of the Stuart King, whilst Cavalier or Royalist both denotes those who supported the King and the Episcopal form of ecclesiastical governance.]

In December, 1816 Scott published *Old Mortality*. Scott's original intention had been to write four short novels, each a volume set in a different district of Scotland, but in the end *Old Mortality* was published in the customary three-volume set (Lauber 84), and the novel represented Scott's deepest delving into the past of any of his novels published to that date; its action covers the period of 1679 to 1689. When Scott began *Waverley* he had been dealing with events "sixty years since," and his own birth had been only twenty-five years after the 1745 Jacobite rebellion; thus, Scott had been able to get a general

sense of the period of the 1745 rebellion from stories he had heard from elderly survivors, but no such sources existed for *Old Mortality* (84). He was forced to rely on knowledge that he had gleaned from his own historical studies as well as seventeenth-century pamphlets he had edited. According to John Lauber, "to base a novel on such material is difficult, and represents a common cause of failure in historical fiction. Often the novel is barely furnished to provide the detailed realism necessary for the illusion of fiction, or at the opposite extreme it may be packed with undigested facts apparently transferred directly from the author's note cards" (84). Such was not the case in *Old Mortality* and, "Scott avoids both extremes; and the world he creates is solid and convincing" (84).

In *Old Mortality,* Scott's historical subject is the failed revolt of the Covenanters. The suppression of the revolt, unlike the rebellion found in *Waverley,* which is followed by a gradual and peaceful displacement of the traditional order by the modern, results instead in the destructive clashes of a protracted civil war and a futile struggle between Whig and Royalist. In the novel Scott, while restoring the crucial events of a violent past and placing the past at a distance, raises the ghost of a lower-class, religious inspired revolt so that it may be consigned to its final resting place. James Kerr stated that,

> By evoking the figure of Robert Paterson, a real historical personage, in his own [Scott's] preface, Scott sets before the reader a human token of Whig Fanaticism. Scott's Paterson is a rebel whom history has deprived of his cause, a belated revolutionary who expresses his commitment to the principles of the Covenant in his tireless efforts to restore the epitaphs on the graves of the martyrs. His presence in the prefatory chapters works both as a memorial and warning. Although by 1816 Old Mortality had long since joined the Whig's martyrs, the

spirit of revolt which he embodied was a vital force in Scott's time. (*Fiction* 41)

Waterloo had only happened the year before the publication of *Old Mortality*, the fear of revolution, which had come to be distrusted by the great majority of Britons, was still perceived as a force to be feared. Also, the religious issues that had been instrumental in the Covenanters' revolt of 1679 were still held by a sizable portion of the Scottish lower orders. Only recently had Napoleon's escape from Elba and his final defeat at Waterloo taken place, and revolution still seemed possible in Scotland. In 1815 thousands of workers, mainly textile, assembled on the battlefield of Loudon-hill, the scene of a Scottish victory over the English, to celebrate the victory of the Covenanters in 1679 against the established government. Hence, the specter of rebellion was still a possibility in the time that Scott was writing *Old Mortality*. The novel focuses on the bitter fight between Royalists and Covenanters whose conflicts tore Scotland apart and produced a polarization between extremes of attitudes which Scott believed was the most damaging thing that could happen to a nation (Daiches *Sir Walter* 471). Thus,

> As Scott well knew, if Scotland had not torn itself in pieces in these violent civil conflicts of the seventeenth century, the English might not have seen the Union of 1707 as the only way of ensuring that they would not be troubled by confusion in Scottish affairs and so a union between England and Scotland might have developed more gradually and with greater popular consent. (471)

It was the failure of a moderate party to mediate or lessen the hatred of the two opposing factions that was to be the real downfall of Scottish existence as an independent nation. Puritan fanaticism on the one side and Cavalier hedonism on the other worked hand-in-hand to produce the final polarization (471); a polarization that was to have drastic results

for Scottish history for generations to come. In the 17th century the only way that the lower orders could have influence upon the political situation or to effect political change was through religious concerns. This was as true in the 17th century has it had been for the Lollards in an earlier time in British history, but often the melding of politics and religion with class aspirations tended to result in fanaticism and bigotry.

Throughout most of the 16th century, Europe had been in turmoil over religious issues. Since 1517, when Martin Luther had nailed his Thesis to the church door at Wittenberg, the whole of Western Europe was split into two armed camps: Roman Catholic and Protestant. *Cujus region, ejus religio,* which declared that what was the religious choice of the ruler was adopted by his subjects, was the order of the day; hence, every sovereign sought to impose their own religious views upon both kingdom as well as subjects. Scotland was late in entering the religious divisions caused by the Reformation, but Scotland was crucial to preserving a status quo between continental religious divisions that had developed after the success of the Reformation in Northern Europe. Scotland's attempt to remain above the fray was complicated by England's adoption of a form of Protestantism during the reign of Henry VIII. While the Reformation came late to Scotland, nowhere in Europe was the Church more corrupt than in Scotland. Pope Eugenius IV had called the Scottish bishops "Pilates rather than Prelates" (qt. in Maclean "Scotland" 81). Slough and illiteracy plagued the clergy and immorality the bishops. Regardless, the reigning House of Stuart remained firmly committed to Roman Catholicism and the traditional alliance with Catholic France.

In Scotland the alliance with France was viewed as a way to balance the growing power of England to the south, which had always considered France as their traditional

enemy. Although the Scottish Parliament banned the importation of English Bibles, and though successive provincial councils attempted to remedy the situation by declaring that the root of the problem affecting the Church in Scotland was "the corruption of morals and profane lewdness of life in churchmen of almost all ranks, together with crass ignorance of literature of all the liberal arts," (qt. in MacLean *Scotland* 82) little was actually accomplished: translations of the Bible continued to be smuggled in from England, and Protestantism continued to gain support in Scotland.

Old Mortality deals with the inability of Scotland to find a *via media* and to cure herself of opposing fanaticisms caused by a major shift of the majority of the population from Roman Catholicism to Calvinism. Underlying this religious change was a dramatic change in how governments were viewed as well. The Calvinism of Scotland, albeit perhaps even more fanatical than the Roman Catholicism that it replaced, viewed the person of the King and his royal prerogatives very differently from either Roman Catholicism or Anglicanism. In the mediaeval religious settlement, it was royal prerogatives that held power over both church and state, whilst Calvinism, following the example of Geneva, considered the state subservient to the Church.

With the spread of the Reformation in Scotland, against the wishes of the royal-family, the direction of Scotland's international leanings changed drastically. Protestantism was given an enormous boost in Scotland by the suffocating political embrace of Catholic France. At the time of the Reformation, the threat to Scotland's independence seemed to come mostly from France; not England. With acceptance of Protestantism as the majority religion of the population, Scotland's international future lay in closer relations with Protestant England than Catholic France (Ditchburn and

MacDonald 175). As previously mentioned, the Reformation in Scotland was not lead by royal prerogative as in England, Germany, and Scandinavia, but as a popular movement of the people. By the end of the 17th century, a Protestant ministry was established and the new belief system had been widely adopted. The religious revolution which had been instigated in the 16th century went through a second phase of heightened activity in the 1640's. The emphasis of Protestantism in Scotland was that the Church was independent of royal authority; Keith Brown states that:

> Embedded in the Protestant Reformation of 1559-60 was a revolution against the crown...arguments were brought into the public sphere by John Knox, who advocated a limitation of royal authority as a means of resisting tyranny. Kings who abused their authority should, he argued, suffer 'according to Godis law, nocht as a king, but as an offender. (184-185)

Thus, throughout the history of post-Reformation Scotland, a resistance to kings and royal authority was spread throughout the social hierarchy. In England, with its state supported *via media* of Anglicanism, the ecclesiastical establishment was subservient to the state (as were the continental Lutheran bodies), but Scottish Presbyterianism, following Calvin's model, considered the state as an arm of the Church. In Scotland this religious ideology was further complicated because the ruling family had remained staunchly Catholic in religion, and wished to continue in its international relations with France, and not with the newly emerging Protestant powers of Europe.

From the very beginning Scottish Protestantism had political aspirations. Once power had been attained, Scottish Protestantism immediately went on the defensive. After the triumph of Protestantism in England with the accession of Elizabeth I, and with the

prospect of English support, the Scottish Protestants sacked all the Catholic churches in Perth and forbad the Mass on pain of death. 1560 marked a major turning point in the history of Scotland; on the religious as well as political spectrum. In July of that year the Treaty of Edinburgh recognized Elizabeth as Queen of England, rejecting the Pope's condemnation of Elizabeth as an illegitimate upstart. The treaty also provided for the withdrawal of all French as well as English troops from Scotland. This treaty put an end to the hopes of the Stuarts to preserve a strong Catholic presence in Scotland.

The old alliance with France was broken and the ultimate victory of Protestantism was assured (Maclean *Scotland* 92-93). But the revolution of 1559-60 did more than simply eject French support and Roman Catholic doctrine from Scotland; it also overturned the power of the crown, asserting the rights of subjects to resist the legitimate authority of their king (Brown and MacDonald *Reformation* 193). In England the Reformation had been a compromise of several different positions made to satisfy both Catholic as well as Protestant elements of the population; in Scotland the Reformation was far, far more radical. Although in Scotland the Reformation made very few martyrs with only seven Protestants suffering death by law before the Reformation and only two Catholics after the Reformation, and most clergy either joined the new movement or retired quietly on pensions, there remained hidden tension under the seemingly easy change of religion and the time for killing was to come later.

Besides replacing the traditional faith of the Scottish people, the Reformation further exacerbated the cultural and linguistic division between the Highlands and the Lowlands. Before the Reformation the two cultures had shared a common faith, after the Reformation, the Lowlands had become thoroughly Presbyterian whilst many in the

Highlands maintained their attachment to the Catholic faith of their ancestors. The two peoples in Scotland moved further away from one another. With the adoption of Calvinist Presbyterianism the Lowlands were also divided from England on religious matters, but because of the fear of Catholic forces on the continent, England and Scotland were forced, to some degree, to depend upon each other. But in an age that could not see a separation between religious belief and politics, trouble was brewing.

With the execution of Queen Mary by her cousin Elizabeth of England, the last Roman Catholic Stuart had been dispatched. Her son, the future James VI of Scotland, was raised to be a Presbyterian, but upon his accession to the Throne of England on the death of Elizabeth, he took himself to England and embraced Anglican ritual and doctrine, repudiating the Presbyterianism of his youth, so even in embracing Anglicanism the Scotland the monarch continued to hold a faith vastly different from the majority of his countrymen; Maclean declared that,

> James had a rod in pickle for the Presbyterians. For some years after 1603, the General Assembly [ruling body of the Scottish Kirk] was not allowed to meet. Then, in 1606 Andrew Melville, with seven other Ministers, was on some pretext summoned to England, rigorously interrogated, imprisoned for three years in the tower of London and then forbidden ever again to return to Scotland. Having thus removed the principal obstacle to his designs [which was to replace Scottish Presbyterianism with Anglicanism], James now increased the powers and numbers of the Scottish bishops. By 1610 there were eleven bishops and two archbishops...For a time the Kind did not seek to interfere with the prevailing forms of congregational worship, which was perhaps why the opposition to his

religious was not more widespread. (*Scotland* 110)

Unfortunately, the King made his first visit to Scotland in fourteen years and insisted that further Anglican ritual be adopted in the Scottish Kirk. The King sought to impose Five Articles: that Holy Communion was to be received Kneeling; that the festivals of the Christian year were to be observed; that confirmation be administered by bishops; that private baptism and private communion be allowed in case of serious illness (Mclean *Scotland* 110-111). These demands were met with serious opposition.

When James's son Charles I became king, the religious and political situation was further complicated by the demands made upon Scottish Presbyterians. Like his father, Charles was a devout high-church Anglican, and had very little respect for the Presbyterianism of Scotland, which he declared was no religion for a gentleman, but unlike his father, Charles had no real understanding of the Scottish temperament. Believing firmly in the divine right of kings, Charles proceeded to force the Scottish Kirk to accept an Anglican prayer-book and an Anglican devotional life. The new book of prayer was read for the first time in St. Giles Cathedral in Edinburgh, on 23 July 1637 amid scenes of violence and disorder that soon developed into a regular riot.

The Privy Council, who had ruled Scotland in the King's name, could not contain the rebellion against the use of the new prayer book, and the King, who was in London, far from the actual disturbances, failed to understand the seriousness of the situation. The final result was the Scottish Revolution of 1638-1651. In 1638 the National Covenant was signed. On the 28th of February and two days that followed several hundred representatives of all levels of Scottish society flocked to Greyfriars Kirk in Edinburgh to sign the National Covenant. This was considered as the great Marriage Day of the

Scottish Nation with God.

The Covenant was a skillfully drawn up document that attracted wide support. The document attacked specific catholic doctrines and pledged on the part of the signatories to maintain the true religion and "His majesty's authority." At this early date, the leaders did not wish to come out openly against the King. The people of Scotland considered that the National Covenant was akin to the ancient covenants between God and the people of Israel. Hence, in *Old Mortality* there are parallels between the experiences of the most radical Presbyterians and that of the people of Israel in the Old Testament, and most of the utterances of the supporters of the Covenant speak with the accents of the Old Testament rather than the new.

The response of the King was to attempt to raise an English army to invade Scotland. He hoped to force Scotland to conform to royal prerogatives in all things, but especially in religion. At the time, Charles' political problems were not limited to Scotland. He did not have enough support in England to raise an army, and in 1640 Scotland invaded England, which forced Charles to conclude a treaty with Scotland. One result was that Charles was forced to call a Parliament in England, which he had refused to do for several years. This Parliament became the focus of anti-royalist sentiment in England, resulting in the English civil war. The Scots clearly saw that a royal victory in the English civil war would result in the imposition of the King's will on Scotland. This forced the Scotts to enter into a Solemn League and Covenant with the English Parliament in 1643. According to the agreement England would institute Scottish religious traditions in England if the King were defeated. With Scottish help the King was defeated and beheaded. But a victorious English Parliament refused to honor their agreement with the

Solemn League and Covenant.

In Scotland the execution of their King filled the general population with horror; although it had been the Scots themselves who had delivered the King into English hands. The Covenanters had handed Charles I over to the English in return for a promise of 400,000 pounds payment (the same amount offered as the price for the Union in 1707). In reaction to King Charles I's execution his heir, Charles II, was immediately proclaimed King of Scotland. Scotland was from this point divided into three parties, the ruling Kirk Party of extreme Presbyterians lead by Argyll; the moderate Presbyterians lead by Hamilton; and the early Jacobites lead by Montrose. In *Old Mortality* these groupings are lead by the characters of Burley, Morton, and Claverhouse. Scottish support for Charles II led to an English invasion.

By subscribing to the Solemn League and Covenant, Charles II had won the support of the Scottish Presbyterians during his fight with the English Parliamentarian forces still lead by Oliver Cromwell. This Covenant provided for the establishment of Presbyterianism as the state religion in Scotland and in England and Ireland as well. The new leader of England, Cromwell, spent a year or so stamping out pockets of resistance in Scotland to his rule. In due course Scotland was united to England by a Treaty of Union and became part of Cromwell's Commonwealth. Thirty members of Scotland's Parliament represented Scotland in the Commons of Westminster. The result of the union was the "probably the most efficient and orderly the country had ever experienced [but] like so many efficient regimes, deeply unpopular" (Maclean *Scotland* 133).

The act of union instigated by Cromwell, much like his Commonwealth, did not live

long past his death, but the concept of union of the two countries had received its first impetus, and especially for the English, was found to be successful in dealing with a troublesome northern neighbor. In 1660 the English Parliament, to avoid further political and religious division that might lead to open warfare, called his son, Charles II, to become King in England. In Scotland the most diehard Covenanters feared the return of this King. Charles II wanted the warring to stop and cautioned mercy in dealing with his father's killers and those in Scotland who had taken up arms against the royalist forces. But the newly summoned Parliament of Scotland was controlled by nobles who wished to take vengeance upon the Covenanting leaders and followers.

After the Restoration, Charles reneged on his promise that he had made early to abide by the Solemn League and Covenant, and instead sought to impose episcopacy on Scotland. Under the new Parliament the Episcopal religion was restored and all actions of the Covenanting Parliaments were declared null and void. In 1662 the Privy Council required all ministers to take the oath of allegiance of supremacy and recognize holy days. Many protested and refused to take such oaths, leading their congregations into open disobedience to the law. Those Scots who refused to accept this state of affairs were persecuted by Charles II for their resistance. Fines and imprisonment were widely used, but with little effect. Later, the reaction of the Crown was to adopt a more conciliatory policy, but the effect was to swing from repression to conciliation and was a failure (Brown *Reformation* 255).

The most extreme Presbyterians refused to offer any compromise in issues that they felt were vital to their salvation. The countryside broke out in rebellion. On 3 May 1679 a party of the most militant Covenanters assassinated Archbishop Sharp, the former

moderate Presbyterian minister ordained an Anglican bishop in England to enforce the new religious demands of the king, outside St Andrews. This resulted in a widespread rebellion against royal authority in which the crown's principal military enforcer, John Graham of Claverhouse, was defeated in an engagement with a large, armed conventicler at Drumclog on 1st of June. The Covenanters were finally defeated at Bothwell Bridge on 22 June 1679, but in Scotland dissent did not disappear after Bothwell Bridge.

Old Mortality is concerned with revolution against duly constituted authority. As mentioned previously, Scott had a fear of revolution and massive social upheaval, as did many members of his same class and background in Europe of the period. In August 1815, just two months after the Duke of Wellington had defeated Napoleon on the killing-fields of Waterloo; Scott had visited the battle-site and was horrified by the gruesome accounts of carnage that his guides gave him. *Old Mortality*, written a year later (published in December 1816), betrays his morbid fascination with the savage ferocity of revolution and civil war. The novel's most sympathetic characters advocate justice, moderation and conciliation as ways of preventing war, and if forced into conflict try to effect compromise and just settlement of divisive issues. The more moderate characters in the novel take control to minimize casualties and to save lives from the bloodlust of the mob or individual zealots (Uglow *Old Mortality*).

Old Mortality was published not as a novel "by the author of *Waverley*," but as part of a series of stories gathered under the collective heading *Tales of My Landlord*. The rationale of this series was to divide Scotland into four quarters and to produce a story for each one. Scott began with two tales: *The Black Dwarf*, taking up one volume, and *Old Mortality*, filling out the remaining three volumes of the set. The novel is the story for the

Southwest part of Scotland, but later Scott would drop the strict geographical pattern as initially envisioned for the series.

This novel has as its time frame the time of Scotland just before the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which resulted in the expulsion of the Stuart family from the united thrones of Scotland and England. Scotland was a house divided between two fanatical camps; those who supported the King and his religious ideals of ordered liturgy and episcopal church government, and those, known as Covenanters or Cameronians, who were the supporters of the two Scottish covenants of 1638 and 1643 which called for the establishment of a presbyterian form of church government not only in Scotland, but in England as well; between these two opposing fanaticism stand the moderate Presbyterians, who are willing to make peace with the civil authorities to worship in peace and to be left alone to pursue life unfettered by revolution and bloodshed.

Old Mortality is a "highly dynamic portrait of a society convulsed by internal contradictions, by implacable antagonism, persecution and revolt" (Brown "Walter Scott" 68). It is a time in which the whole fabric of Scottish society is being torn asunder by international division; seemingly based upon religious dissension, but also by social unrest as the country throws off the last vestiges of its feudal past and enters a more modern, moderate age. Ancient dynastic ties are being broken. The questions, besides religious, are issues about form and substance of government and rulers as well as religious questions.

The novel itself opens in the near present, with the narrative of Peter Pattieson, a schoolmaster. Whilst visiting an old graveyard he ruminates that "Death has indeed

been here, and its traces are before us, but they are softened and deprived of their horror by our distance from the period when they have been first impressed." It is here that he meets an old man designated as Old Mortality by the local populace. Old Mortality visits the graves of those Covenanters who fell in opposition to the Crown during the rebellion of 1679 in opposition to King Charles II, Old Mortality maintains their immortality by "renewing" the "half-defaced inscriptions" of the old headstones. The place of the graveyard is a place where, "in returning from the battle of Pentland Hills, a party of the insurgents had been attacked in this glen by a small detachment of the King's troops, and three or four either killed in the skirmish, or shot after being made prisoners, as rebels taken with arms in their hands" (7), and the old man speaks movingly of the sacrifice made by these martyrs in such a way that "one would have almost have supposed he must have been their contemporary, and have actually beheld the passages which he related, so much had he identified his feelings and opinions with theirs, and so much had his narratives and circumstantiality of an eyewitness" (6). For many, the graves symbolize more than simply martyrs to a lost cause; they represent those who were willing to die not only for the Covenant between Scotland and God, but are representative that all should be ready to fight for their liberties. The Covenanters are remembered by Old Mortality as national heroes who fought against oppression, and,

> The peasantry continued to attach to the tombs of those victims of prelacy an honour which they do not render to more splendid mausoleums; and, when they point them out to their sons, and narrate the fate of the sufferers, usually conclude,

by exhorting them to be ready, should times call for it, to resist to the death in the cause of civil and religious liberty, like their brave forefathers. (7)

For Old Mortality, it is not enough to consider them simply as those willing to accept death for civil and religious liberties, he explains that any compromise of principals invalidates the truth, and the Covenanters are the only true Whigs. He goes on to attack the Whigs of a more modern time as false because they have given up the true Kirk:

> 'We,' he said, in a tone of exultation, -- 'we are the only true whigs. Carnal men have assumed that triumphant appellation, following him whose kingdom is of this world. Which of them would sit six hours on a wet hill-side to hear a godly sermon? I trow an hour o't wad staw them. They are ne'er a hair better than them that shamena to take upon themsells the persecuting name of bludethirsty tories. Self-seekers all of them, strivers after wealth, power, and worldly ambition, and forgetters alike of what has been dree'd and done by the mighty men who stood in the gap in the great day of wrath. Nae wonder they dread the accomplishment of what was spoken by the mouth of the worthy Mr Peden, (that precious servant of the Lord, none of whose words fell to the ground,). (11).

And although Old Mortality is a fanatic, his fanaticism, unlike that of the generation of the revolt of the Covenanters, is no longer dangerous. His opinions are merely, in a more modern and moderate age, simply quaint. An unreformed individual, such as Old Mortality, may now safely express opinions that in an earlier age would have resulted in his torture and death. Even Old Mortality's call for rebellion are comical when he declares that we "shall rise as fast in the glens of Ayr, and the kenns of Galloway, as ever the Highlandmen did in 1677. And now they are gripping to the bow and to the spear,

when they suld be mourning for a sinfu' land and a broken covenant" (11), is simply the bombastic ranting of and old, but interesting character: nothing more. It is Scott's hope that rebellion of fanatics, either religious or political, will remain in the past.

The burial ground, formerly a place of death, now is quiet and even charming. The charm of the old burial ground lies "in part, in the age of the graves and the absence of any mark of recent death, of 'new' mortality" (Kerr *Fiction* 42). Old Mortality is the last of his kind. The present inhabitants of Scotland are no longer swayed by a call to arms and revolution for the sake of religious ideology, he has been supplanted by modern man whose own present material needs are his sole command and for whom the here and now is everything, the past nothing (Uglow *Old Mortality*).

Scott, through the character of Mr. Pattieson, attempts to present an unbiased interpretation of history; of an epoch known as the "Killing Time" in the history of Scotland. "Against Old Mortality's partisan account, Pattieson offers a narrative in which the past appears as a conflict between two competing fanaticism, with this conflict resolved not by the victory of one party over the other, but by the gradual passing of time" (Kerr *Fiction* 43-44). As the tale unfolds it becomes clear that our historical figures effectively distribute themselves across a broad spectrum of character types. At one extreme there are those dangerous and harmful individuals who act blindly or mechanically according to a simple impulse or passion inspired by religion or politics; and at the other extreme there are those judicious figures that weigh up the pros and cons and are always ready to accept the responsibility for their ultimate decision.

The real conflict, therefore, is between the few, and mostly powerless principled realists, and fanatical zealots; "by mapping this graded spectrum of character types onto

the simple royalist/rebel divide, a range of nominal opponents are shown as all but identical figures" (Uglow *Old Mortality*). For the narrator the past is not alive in the same manner that it is for Old Mortality, he is even able to see, from a distance of time, that the old enemies in death, from both sides of the past civil war, must see the folly of their hatreds:

> "Upon the whole, I can hardly fear, that, at this time, in describing the operation which their opposite principles produced upon the good and bad men of both parties, I can be suspected of meaning insult or injustice to either. If recollection of former injuries, extra-loyalty, and contempt and hatred of their adversaries, produced rigour and tyranny in the one party, it will hardly be denied, on the other hand, that, if the zeal for God's house did not eat up the conventiclers, it devoured at least, to imitate the phrase of Dryden, no small portion of their loyalty, sober sense, and good breeding. We may safely hope, that the souls of the brave and sincere on either side have long looked down with surprise and pity upon the ill-appreciated motives which caused their mutual hatred and hostility, while in this valley of darkness, blood, and tears. Peace to their memory! Let us think of them as the heroine of our only Scottish tragedy entreats her lord to think of her departed sire: -- (12)

By the time that Old Mortality tells his tale the dangers of a resurgence of the fanaticism of an earlier time has past. The Scotland of Scott's time has overcome religious fanaticism, bigotry and hatred, but the road had been long and difficult. Now the past can be observed from the safe distance of time without a fear of revived religious

rebellion, but the tale is cautionary in that it sets an example of what was, and could be, if moderation is rejected for passions motivated by dangerous ideals.

The occasion of the "wappenschaw" opens the novel proper. The wappenschaw is a gathering of the local population to show support for the feudal system and to show their loyalty to the ruling house and its representatives; the local nobility and gentry. David Brown stated that during such gatherings,

> Scottish society of the period stands symbolically displayed to show loyalty to the ancient feudal order, and in theory, it is a gathering of the aristocratic hierarchy, supported by their retainers and vassals in the lower orders. Yet as the scene progresses it becomes clear that the assembly is actually a monumental facade, a ceremony reintroduced by the Stuart government long after any significance it has had as an actual expression of feudal relationships has disappeared, for the express purpose of intimidating the discontented, and impressing on them that the traditional order and authority are still in existence (69-70).

The local wappenschaw represents the imposition of an out-dated and autocratic power on a resistant social reality. The Presbyterians, who are the vast majority of the population, actively opposed the wappenschaw, but were obligated to send their sons, tenants, and vassals in accordance with the size of the estate (Kerr *Fiction* 70). In the popinjay, an archery contest, the vast majority of the spectators, in order to show their rebelliousness against participation, champion Henry Morton, a fellow Presbyterian against Lord Evandale, an Episcopal supporter of the King.

The whole fete is symptomatic of the failure of the political and religious system that the Stuarts wished to impose upon a reluctant people of Scotland; in the end, the tradition of the wappenschaw is an attempt to force the Presbyterians to pay homage to the traditions of the feudal order, and accept their vassalage to the Stuart House of Scotland; the problems of religious and political differences are only reinforced by the continuation of such traditions, as Scott stated:

> Under the reign of the last Stewarts, there was an anxious wish on the part of government to counteract, by every means in their power, the strict or puritanical spirit which had been the chief characteristic of the republican government, and to revive those feudal institutions which united the vassal to the liege lord, and both to the crown. Frequent musters and assemblies of the people, both for military exercise and for sports and pastimes, were appointed by authority. The interference, in the latter case, was impolitic, to say the least; for, as usual on such occasions, the consciences which were at first only scrupulous, became confirmed in their opinions, instead of giving way to the terrors of authority; and the youth of both sexes, to whom the pipe and tabor in England, or the bagpipe in Scotland, would have been in themselves an irresistible temptation, were enabled to set them at defiance, from the proud consciousness that they were, at the same time, resisting an act of council. To compel men to dance and be merry by authority has rarely succeeded even on board of slave-ships. (14)

Thus, the more insistent the demand that all participate in the wappenschaw, the stronger becomes the opposition; because of local opposition to the wappenschaw, the local royalist families cannot keep up their pretense to feudal power. Lady Margaret Bellenden,

the leader of Stuart interests, has a hard time filling her quota of tenants; and mass absenteeism had necessitated the conscription of,

> The fowler and the falconer, the footman and the ploughman, at the home farm, with an old drunken Cavaliering butler, who had served with the late Sir Richard under Montrose, and stunned the family nightly with his exploits at Kilsyth and Tippermuir, and who was the only man in the party that had the smallest zeal for the work in hand. (17)

The very dignity of the feudal tradition is made into a comical mockery by the antics of one of the Bellenden's vassals, Guse Gibbie, a graceless young man whose only ability is herding geese, yet he is made to take the place of a knight errant because no else will participate willingly in this show of royal support. Gibbie's antics make a laughing stock of the whole of the wappenschaw; and by implication, the King and his supporters. The Stuart cause has simply become a comical attempt at a failed pretense to power and loyalty.

There is really nothing the royalist supporters can do to prevent the lack of participation of the tenants. They are powerless against the countryside, "What was to be done? To punish the refractory tenants would have been easy enough. The privy council would readily have imposed fines, and sent a troop of horse to collect them. But this would have been calling the huntsman and hounds into the garden to kill the hare" (17). The whole system no longer works, but the failed wappenschaw goes on its comical and tragic way, and in the end only poisons an already tense situation between the two estranged communities, with "the licensed episcopalian bestowing on the recusants the

whole thunders of the commination, and receiving from them, in return, the denunciations of a Calvinistic excommunication" (17). The two communities grow further and further apart and withdraw into their mutual hatreds and fanaticisms.

It is during the wappenschaw that Henry Morton is introduced to the reader. In the popinjay he defeats Lord Evandale. Although Morton is a Presbyterian, he is a moderate in his religious principals and although his father had fought with Cromwell against the Stuart cause in the English civil war, his father had later supported the return of the Stuarts to the united thrones of England and Scotland. His family attends a legal Presbyterian parish and rejects the more fanatical demands of those who refuse to accept the authority of the government. Edith Bellenden was amongst the spectators. It is Morton's love for Edith that involves him in the popinjay. His love for Edith is complicated because she is the daughter of Lady Margaret Bellenden; who is a strong supporter of both the Stuart cause as well as the Episcopalian form of religion. Lady Margaret has lost her husband as well as her sons to the cause of the Stuart family and the episcopal religious establishment.

When Henry, who has defeated another champion of the Stuart cause, Lord Evandale, is declared the victor he bows his respects to Edith, who responds with embarrassment, since she is closely watched by her grandmother. Lady Bellenden and Colonel Grahame of Claverhouse are both supporters of the King and all of his policies; they still attempt to defend a feudal system that has few supporters in Lowland Scotland. The ridiculousness of their position is not only expressed through the comical attempt to force an unwilling populous to attend the gathering, but by Lady Bellenden's continual recounting of the time that the King had breakfasted at

her estate. Their attachment to an old order is fanatical in the extreme and cannot accept the possibility of compromise with those who would disagree, but without the institution of King and bishop, they have no social function to fulfill. They are unable to accept the reality of a changing world that has no place for them as a continuing institution.

Henry Morton does resemble Scott's hero of *Waverley* in some respects. Edward Waverley's education is defective because of his uncle's lack of interest; his attachment to the Jacobite Cause is a defect of this education. At the same time, Edward's attachment to the Cause was never strong, nor central to his existence. Henry Morton's lack of a proper formation is not caused by defective ideology, but by a miserly uncle who refuses to pay for proper schooling. "Morton of Milnwood [Henry's uncle], has depressed and had 'frozen' his abilities, not in the service of a repressive regime, but because he is a miser unwilling to support Morton as he should and could. Scott does not connect Milnwood's greed with politics" (Shaw "Forms" 194) and, "The base parsimony of his uncle had thrown many obstacles in the way of his education" (109). Although he made great progress, considering his lack of education, he still "suffered however, [since] the current of his soul was frozen by a sense of dependence, of poverty, above all, of an imperfect and limited education" (109). Morton represents, by birth and upbringing, the Presbyterian Cause, but like Edward Waverley, "Morton is committed by his family history to equivocation: his father, we learn, was a moderate in the Civil War, sustaining an upright but difficult course through the vicissitudes of that period" (Brown *Walter Scott* 75). Regardless of his faulty education, Morton

> Was one of those gifted characters, which possess a force of talent unsuspected by the owner himself. He had inherited from his father an undaunted courage, and a firm and uncompromising detestation of oppression, whether in politics or religion. But his enthusiasm was unsullied by fanatic zeal, and unleavened by the sourness of the puritanical spirit. From these his mind had been freed, partly by the active exertions of his own excellent understanding, partly by frequent and long visits at Major Bellenden's, where he had an opportunity of meeting with many guests whose conversation taught him, that goodness and worth were not limited to those of any single form of religious observance. (109)

Because of Morton's liberalism and moderation Brown intimates that that he "is an eighteenth-century liberal shoe-horned into a seventeenth-century context" (*Walter Scott* 75), but he points out that a "supplication similar to Morton's for freedom of worship, a free parliament and a free General Assembly of the kirk was actually drawn up by moderate Presbyterians prior to Bothwell Bridge" (83). There were men like Morton during the period in question. He represents a growing middle class of the time who were moderate in both religion as well as politics.

Morton is by ideology a moderate; he believes in a society based upon the rule of law, not by the feudal system of birth and personal loyalty, and his "moderation is grounded in his sense of a general law of natural humanity" (Hart 74). Morton declares that he "will resist any authority" that "invades tyrannically my chartered rights as a freeman" (Scott 65). Morton's celebratory drink for winning the popinjay is cut short by the unruly actions of some local royalist troops out searching for a fugitive rebel leader. Returning home, Morton meets John Burley of Balfour, a man who once saved his late father's life

and who is now on the run from the royalist forces following some crime he wishes to keep secret. Morton is obligated to help Burley because of Burley's previous relationship with his father. During their ride together Burley questions Morton upon his religious and political convictions: although there was something, "repulsive in the manner of the stranger, which prevented Morton from opening the conversation, and he himself seemed to have no desire to talk, until, on a sudden, he [Burley] abruptly demanded, 'What has your father's son to do with such profane mummeries as I find you this day engaged in?'" (34). It is obvious that Burley is offended by Morton's participation in the wappenschaw. It soon becomes apparent that Burley believes that Morton should join with the most extreme faction of the Presbyterian cause; the faction that wishes to rise up an army against the King and his religious policy, Burley declares to Morton that it,

> "Is it your duty, think you, or that of any Christian young man, to bear arms in their cause who have poured out the blood of God's saints in the wilderness as if it had been water? or is it a lawful recreation to waste time in shooting at a bunch of feathers, and close your evening with winebibbing in public-houses and market-towns, when He that is mighty is come into the land with his fan in his hand, to purge the wheat from the chaff?" (35)

Morton is not attracted to this call to arms against the state, and is worried that Burley, a man whom he only reluctantly has offered safety to is dangerous: "I suppose from your style of conversation," said Morton, "that you are one of those who have thought proper to stand out against the government. I must remind you that you are unnecessarily using dangerous language in the presence of a mere stranger and that the times do not render it safe for me to listen to it" (35). Morton also goes further to state that,

> I neither undertake to subscribe to or refute your complaints against the government. I have endeavoured to repay a debt due to the comrade of my father, by giving you shelter in your distress, but you will excuse me from engaging myself either in your cause, or in controversy. I will leave you to repose, and heartily wish it were in my power to render your condition more comfortable. (44)

Burley is a true fanatic and cannot understand Morton's refusal to be drawn into what he considers is a holy cause; at the same time, Morton is torn by a sense of loyalty to his father's memory and the dislike that he instinctively feels for Burley:

> A thousand recollections thronged on the mind of Morton at once. His father, whose memory he idolized, had often enlarged upon his obligations to this man, and regretted, that, after having been long comrades, they had parted in some unkindness at the time when the kingdom of Scotland was divided into Resolutioners and Protesters; the former of whom adhered to Charles II. after his father's death upon the scaffold, while the Protesters inclined rather to a union with the triumphant republicans. The stern fanaticism of Burley had attached him to this latter party, and the comrades had parted in displeasure, never, as it happened, to meet again. These circumstances the deceased Colonel Morton had often mentioned to his son, and always with an expression of deep regret, that he had never, in any manner, been enabled to repay the assistance, which, on more than one occasion, he had received from Burley. (37)

By giving Burley shelter Henry Morton is now able to repay the debt owed, but this payment of an old debt will involve him in a rebellion he would much rather avoid. Morton is drawn into the fight between these to forces by giving refuge to Burley;

Morton, though naturally cautious, agrees to hide Burley when his arrest seems imminent.

When the authorities come to the House of Milnwood, the home of the Mortons, to search for Burley, Morton is willing to admit that he hid the infamous outlaw, but he insists that the search of his uncle's home is illegal. The troops are lead by Bothwell, an illegitimate descendant of the Stuart line, who is a fanatical supporter of the rights of the King, but recognizes no law but his own. He is similar in his legal autonomy as are the followers of Burley are in their use of a law that is often of their own making. Morton, however, demands the rule of law, not of fanaticism or politics. He resents the intrusion into his uncle's home because he considers it to be illegal; and that without proper warrants it tramples upon his natural rights. He demands a rule by law in a difficult time; bigotry and fanaticism have excluded rule by anything but the sword: when Bothwell demands to know the whereabouts of Burley, Morton demands to know "what right you had to put the question." Bothwell's response is that the "right to examine you, sir (to Henry); my cockade and my broadsword are my commission, and a better one than ever Old Nol gave to his roundheads" (65). It is that rejection of the law that makes support of the authorities difficult for Morton; they are as fanatical as the covenanters. Both extremes refuse to accept any concept of rule by law.

It transpires that Balfour had assassinated Archbishop Sharpe. The religious fanaticism of the right-wing of the Presbyterians is best represented by Burley. For these fanatics, murder is allowable if it is in the interests of their cause; a cause they believe is mandated by God and his Holy Church. Burley was indeed "the actual commander of the band of assassins, who, in the fury of misguided zeal, had murdered the primate, whom

they accidentally met, as they were searching for another person against whom they bore enmity" (33). They are dangerous and want war, not peace. Historically, band was actually searching for Carmichael, sheriff-depute in Fife, who had been active in enforcing the penal measures against non-conformists. He was on the moors hunting, but receiving accidental information that a party was out in quest of him, he returned home, and escaped the fate designed for him, which befell his patron the Archbishop instead. The murderers of the Archbishop "in their excited imagination the casual rencounter had the appearance of a providential interference, and they put to death the archbishop, with circumstances of great and cold-blooded cruelty, under the belief, that the Lord, as they expressed it, "had delivered him into their hands" (33). Because Morton has hidden Burley from the authorities he is arrested as a rebel sympathizer and led away to the castle of Tillietudlem, home to Edith and Lady Bellenden.

Even after his arrest for harboring a criminal, Morton is still demonstratively a moderate declaring to the sergeant who guards him that he has no real interest in politics and has not supported either party: and that he had "hitherto meddled with no party in the state," and has "remained quietly at home"; adding that "sometimes I have had serious thoughts of joining one of our foreign regiments" (74). It is apparent that at the time of his arrest he considers supporting the government by serving in its armed forces. Morton's attitudes are ambivalent at best regarding the present authorities in power.

Morton's moderate principals lead him to condemn the murder of the elderly Archbishop in no uncertain terms: "I own I should strongly doubt the origin of any inspiration which seemed to dictate a line of conduct contrary to those feelings of natural humanity, which Heaven has assigned to us as the general law of our conduct" (43), for

Morton the murder of the elderly archbishop is outside the bounds of natural humanity and unacceptable regardless of the particulars of all parties involved. He also states "that the perpetrators of this assassination have committed, in my opinion, a rash and wicked action, which I regret the more, as I foresee it will be made the cause of proceedings against many who are both innocent of the deed, and as far from approving it as myself" (65-66), but he also deplores the King's oppression that provided it, remembering that, "Was not the cause of freedom, civil and religious, that for which my father fought"; he must ask of himself, "shall I do well to remain inactive, or to take the part of an oppressive government, if there should appear any rational prospect of redressing the insufferable wrongs to which my miserable countrymen are subjected?" (46). Even Lord Evandale, a strong supporter of the King's divine right to rule, is troubled by the harshness of the government, and admits that many of the problems that are contributing to the fermenting of rebellion are to be blamed on the actions of the government against the people of Scotland and their religious principals: Evandale declares that, "I have been for some time of opinion, that our politicians and prelates have driven matters to a painful extremity in this country, and have alienated, by violence of various kinds, not only the lower classes, but all those in the upper ranks, whom strong party-feeling, or a desire of court-interest, does not attach to their standard" (198). Hence, moderates are to be found in both camps, but unfortunately, the power rests in the hands of the fanatics on both sides.

Morton had seriously considers leaving Scotland before his arrest. He is divided in his loyalty, he can see the unjust actions of the government, and "his mind was... revolted by the tyrannical and oppressive conduct of the government, the misrule, license, and

brutality of the soldiery, the executions on the scaffold, the slaughters in the open field, the free quarters and exactions imposed by military law, which placed the lives and fortunes of a free people on a level with Asiatic slaves" (109). Although he sees the excesses of the King's party he also admits that as "excesses fell under his eyes, [he was] disgusted with the sight of evils which he had no means of alleviating, and hearing alternate complaints and exultations with which he could not sympathize," Morton feels powerless to change the situation in Scotland, and "would long ere this have left Scotland, had it not been for his attachment to Edith Bellenden" (110). But he is repelled by the religious fanaticism of the opposition as well; for Morton there is little common ground that he can find in the fanatical covenanters. A man with moderate opinions can find no place in Scotland. As fanaticism and hatred grow the only alternative may be to leave.

Although he has considered leaving Scotland his arrest and treatment by the troops under Bothwell cause him to ask, "Can I be a man, and a Scotchman, and look with indifference on that persecution which has made wise men mad?" The upheaval in the country is further complicated by his love for Edith Bellenden; Morton recognizes that a marriage cannot possibly be acceptable to all parties in the present political and religious strife that infects all of Scotland. He sees very little hope that any type of union between even the moderate Presbyterians and the Episcopalian supporters of the King is possible: and he is

> Sick of my country -- of myself -- of my dependent situation – of my repressed feelings -- of these woods -- of that river -- of that house -- of all but -- Edith, and she can never be mine! Why should I haunt her walks? -- Why encourage my own

> delusion, and perhaps hers? – She can never be mine. Her grandmother's pride -- the opposite principles of our families -- my wretched state of dependence -- a poor miserable slave, for I have not even the wages of a servant -- all circumstances give the lie to the vain hope that we can ever be united. Why then protract a delusion so painful? (46-47)

Everything seems lost in the mindless fanaticism which offers no middle ground. Both parties are entrenched in their respective positions and cannot see the damage that they do to the nation as a whole. Yet at the same, Morton realizes that a victory by the likes of Burley are not at all a guarantee of the triumph of either moderation or liberty, the two issues which are foremost in the mind of Morton: "And yet, who shall warrant me that these people, rendered wild by persecution, would not, in the hour of victory, be as cruel and as intolerant as those by whom they are now hunted down? What degree of moderation, or of mercy, can be expected from this Burley?" (46), and although Morton does later join the Covenanter's cause it is with little enthusiasm. That Morton joins the Covenanters for questionable reasons furthers Scott's rhetorical strategy in the novel - to examine the nature of and the justification for the Covenanters' rebellion, but also to disown it (Shaw *Forms* 195).

Upon his arrival at the castle Morton is condemned by Claverhouse, leader of the Stuart forces, to a quick death by execution. There is no trial or even a legal hearing, but even whilst facing certain execution Morton refuses to admit to the authority of Claverhouse to judge him, declaring "I will know whether I am in lawful custody, and before a civil magistrate, ere the charter of my country shall be forfeited in my person." Morton refuses to accept any authority except that of legally constituted authority: adding

that, "I desire to know what right he [Claverhouse] has to detain me without a legal warrant. Were he a civil officer of the law I should know my duty was submission." Claverhouse replies that Morton

> "is one of those scrupulous gentlemen, who, like the madman in the play, will not tie his cravat without the warrant of Mr Justice Overdo; but I will let him see, before we part, that my shoulder-knot is as legal a badge of authority as the mace of the Justiciary. So, waving this discussion, you will be pleased, young man, to tell me directly when you saw Balfour of Burley." Morton refuses to relinquish his rights to an authority he does not accept as valid, declaring, "As I know no right you have to ask such a question...I decline replying to it." Previously Morton had confessed to the sergeant that he had indeed hidden Burley, but refuses to confess to Claverhouse because "I presume you [Claverhouse] are, from education, taught to understand the rights upon which you seem disposed to trample; and I am willing you should be aware there are yet Scotsmen who can assert the liberties of Scotland" (114-115).

It is expected that Claverhouse would know, because of his education, the limits of his personal authority. Claverhouse is unimpressed with such sentiments, and condemns Morton to immediate death. In the end Morton is saved by the intervention of Lord Evandale and Edith.

Claverhouse is the hope of the King's supporters in Scotland, but he is as much a fanatic as is Burley: and just as bloodthirsty. Unlike Burley, Claverhouse is by breeding and education a gentleman, which perhaps makes his crimes more unpardonable. His

support for the King's good pleasure has blinded him to the horror of many of his deeds. He is a man,

> In the prime of life, rather low of stature, and slightly, though elegantly, formed; his gesture, language, and manners, were those of one whose life had been spent among the noble and the gay. His features exhibited even feminine regularity. An oval face, a straight and well-formed nose, dark hazel eyes, a complexion just sufficiently tinged with brown to save it from the charge of effeminacy, a short upper lip, curved upward like that of a Grecian statue, and slightly shaded by small mustachios of light brown, joined to a profusion of long curled locks of the same colour, which fell down on each side of his face, contributed to form such a countenance as limners love to paint and ladies to look upon. (100)

But this almost effeminate exterior hides the true "severity of his character, as well as the higher attributes of undaunted and enterprising valour which even his enemies were compelled to admit," and that, "under this soft exterior was hidden a spirit unbounded in daring and in aspiring, yet cautious and prudent as that of Machiavel himself." As a true aristocrat he had complete "disregard for individual rights"; as a leader he was "cool and collected in danger, fierce and ardent in pursuing success, careless of facing death himself, and ruthless in inflicting it upon others" (100-101). Claverhouse epitomizes the division within the nation: one side considering him to be a just and honorable upholder of the dynastic claims of the Stuarts, and others considering him an oppressor and a murderer: "whom one party honoured and extolled as a hero, and another execrated as a bloodthirsty oppressor" (94).

Reports that a rebel army has gathered at the nearby Loudon Hill compel Claverhouse to lead his troops to confront them, taking Morton and a few others as his prisoners. Before the battle, Lord Evandale convinces Claverhouse to try and make an offer a peace, but Burley, leader of the rebels, wishes for no peace and kills the messenger in cold blood. The rebel army, led by Balfour, wins a surprise victory. Amid the vicious and chaotic conflict, Morton manages to prove his honour by saving Lord Evandale's life, helping him escape from capture by Burley's forces when Claverhouse's troops run from the field of battle.

After the battle Morton is finally enlisted in the ranks of the army of the rebellion. Morton, like many of Scott's heroes is not a maker of history, but is caught up in the relentless movement of the historical process. He does not so much make choices are have the choices made for him by the historical reality of the time. Morton outlines his political reasons for joining the rebellion, and his reasons are moderate ones and primarily focus on the return of liberty and rights, for all Scots, not just for fanatical Presbyterians. Morton is not alone in seeing the rebellion against the King as a necessary movement towards freedom and moderation; support for the revolution is strong from the lower orders; not all of them are fanatics, but they demand their freedoms as true Scotsmen under the law:

> The towns, the villages, the farm-houses, the properties of small heritors, sent forth numerous recruits to the presbyterian interest. These men had been the principal sufferers during the oppression of the time. Their minds were fretted, soured, and driven to desperation, by the various exactions and cruelties to which they had been subjected; and, although by no means united among themselves,

> either concerning the purpose of this formidable insurrection, or the means by which that purpose was to be obtained, most of them considered it as a door opened by Providence to obtain the liberty of conscience of which they had been long deprived, and to shake themselves free of a tyranny, directed both against body and soul. Numbers of these men, therefore, took up arms; and, in the phrase of their time and party, prepared to cast in their lot with the victors of Loudon-hill. (169)

Morton is asked, by Burley, to join those who will plan and execute the continued war against the forces of the King, and Morton replies that, "I feel this mark of confidence, and it is not surprising that a natural sense of the injuries of my country, not to mention those I have sustained in my own person, should make me sufficiently willing to draw my sword for liberty and freedom of conscience," but he expresses reservations with the principals of the rebellion declaring, "I will own to you, that I must be better satisfied concerning the principles on which you bottom your cause ere I can agree to take a command amongst you." Morton is unwilling to participate in open rebellion unless it is for the triumph of political and religious moderation.

Morton is unmoved by references to Holy Scripture that are so prevalent amongst the Covenanters. He declares that he "revere[s] the Scriptures as deeply as you or any Christian can do. I look into them with humble hope of extracting a rule of conduct and a law of salvation. But I expect to find this by an examination of their general tenor, and of the spirit which they uniformly breathe, and not by wresting particular passages from their context, or by the application of Scriptural phrases to circumstances and events with which they have often very slender relation" (170). In this instance, Scott

is using the character of Morton to sound very much like a man who is moderate in all things, including manner of life, religion and politics. Morton will not support the fanatical demands of the Presbyterians: But he will aid in the emancipation of his country:

> "I am willing," he said, "to contribute ever thing within my limited power to aid the emancipation of my country. But do not mistake me. I disapprove, in the utmost degree, of the action in which this rising seems to have originated, and no arguments should induce me to join in it, if it is to be carried on by such measures as that with which it has commenced." (174)

In spite of the position given to him by the rebel Presbyterians, they distrust him.

Morton soon finds the Covenanters to be bigoted and fanatical. They are no more interested in moderation, or a rule of law, than are the forces of the King. And he quickly discovers that they are divided amongst themselves, and are lead by the most fanatical segment of their society.

The rebels cannot work together at all; their interests are too divergent, and their leadership has too many agendas to form common ground; they are more motivated by religious principals of purity and ultra-orthodoxy then in actual victory over their enemies. Their interests are contrary to those of those of Morton. They have little or no interest in liberty or freedom, and "they were, indeed, a doubtful and disunited body. The most active of their number were those concerned with Burley in the death of the Primate, four or five of whom had found their way to Loudon-hill, together with other men of the same relentless and uncompromising zeal, who had, in various ways, given desperate and unpardonable offence to the government" (177).

Much to his own surprise Morton soon discovers that Burley is not by any means the most fanatical of the Covenanter. This rare honor belongs to Habakkuk Mucklewrath, who is a complete fanatic. He wishes to see blood and death to all who oppose the Presbyterians: he has not interest at all in liberty for anyone; only death. He is not interested in victory: Morton is "surprised, shocked, and even startled, at this ghastly apparition, which looked more like the resurrection of some cannibal priest, or druid red from his human sacrifice, than like an earthly mortal." He is even more dismayed when Mucklewrath begins to speak. Mucklewrath attacks any who would dare to consider peace or mercy towards the enemies of the Covenant, exclaiming,

> "Who talks of peace and safe conduct? who speaks of mercy to the bloody house of the malignants? I say take the infants and dash them against the stones; take the daughters and the mothers of the house and hurl them from the battlements of their trust, that the dogs may fatten on their blood as they did on that of Jezabel, the spouse of Ahab, and that their carcasses may be dung to the face of the field even in the portion of their fathers!" (180-181)

Morton is shocked by such sentiments, but even more shocked that such opinions are supported by many members of the rebellion. What is even more difficult for Morton to accept is that the most fanatical members of the leadership actually hope for failure in their military campaign against the King's forces. They see themselves as a persecuted, martyr community, and wish to embrace martyrdom at the cost of victory.

Those who fought under the confused leadership of the Covenanters are composed almost entirely of members of the lower classes, and their early victory over the forces of the King shows that the days of the rule by aristocrats is passing; during the rebellion the

motivating spirit of the lower classes is religion; in the future their motivation will be different, but their tenacity will be the same. The feudal system is gone and will never return. The failure of the King and his supporters is their inability to understand that the world was changing. The rule by an autocratic king could no longer win support from the people of Scotland. The episcopal form of church government that the King had attempted to force upon the population was indicative of a hierarchical concept of society and power that was in direct conflict with Presbyterianism as well as the importance of the individual regardless of class or birth.

Whilst episcopalianism reinforced the autocracy of the person of the King and his divine right to rule as a God-given prerogative, Presbyterianism, in contrast, tended to exult the importance of the individual. Anglicanism, with its formal liturgy and mediatory priesthood necessary for direct contact with God helped to preserve the older system of feudalism and autocracy with its insistence upon hierarchy. The priestless and bishopless Presbyterianism of Scotland needed no mediation between God and man, and

> whatever may be thought of the extravagance or narrow-minded bigotry of many of their tenets, it is impossible to deny the praise of devoted courage to a few hundred peasants, who, without leaders, without money, without magazines, without any fixed plan of action, and almost without arms, borne out only by their innate zeal, and a detestation of the oppression of their rulers, ventured to declare open war against an established government, supported by a regular army and the whole force of three kingdoms. (153)

Unfortunately, the zeal and sacrifice made at Loudon Hill is spurned by their own Covenanting leaders. The rebellion is doomed from the onset. It becomes evident that

Scotland cannot be ruled by such extremists who cannot abide the very concept of compromise. Persecution has made them almost insane with hate and the need for revenge. They cannot have unity or peace amongst themselves; hence, they will never be able to offer Scotland anything other than further division, persecution and bloodshed.

Morton realizes that the war for liberty cannot be won by such as those who represent the leadership and ideals of the Covenanters, and that "no cause can prosper, so conducted. One party declares for the ravings of a bloodthirsty madman; another leader is an old scholastic pedant." Although he clearly sees that a further victory is perhaps impossible since he has now joined with the ranks of those in rebellion, he cannot turn back, but he has not joined their ranks for the advancement and establishment of a fanatical order, he sees that he may fall in their cause, but wants it known that:

> "If fall I must, my motives misconstrued, and my actions condemned, by those whose approbation is dearest to me. But the sword of liberty and patriotism is in my hand, and I will neither fall meanly nor unavenged. They may expose my body, and gibbet my limbs; but other days will come, when the sentence of infamy will recoil against those who may pronounce it. And that Heaven, whose name is so often profaned during this unnatural war, will bear witness to the purity of the motives by which I have been guided." (215)

After the initial victory at Loudon Hill and Edinburgh they suffer defeat. The main cause of the defeat of the rebellion is not lack of popular support or willingness on the part of the soldiers who have followed the banner of the Presbyterian Cause but because of the inability to stand united at the battle of Bothwell Bridge.

Before the actual battle at Bothwell Bridge, Morton attempts to broker a peace between the army of the Covenanters and the army of the King. He now sees the futility of continued bloodshed that will result if the battle takes place. A victory by the most extreme supporters of the Presbyterian cause may result in a Scotland even less tolerant than one under the King: as Morton says, "I wish to have free exercise of my own religion, without insulting any other"; this wish cannot be assured by a victory of the Covenanting forces. His attempt at reconciliation is viewed as treason by the more fanatical members of the Covenanter's forces; and his proposal for moderation is treated by Colonel Claverhouse and General Dalzell, leaders of the royalists, with as much disdain as it had been by the Covenanting leaders. In the royalist camp Morton discovers fanaticism and hatred as strong as any he has seen amongst the Cameronians. It is there that he meets with General Dalzell who is as fanatical as Habakkuk Mucklewrath; the more that moderation is needed, the more the call, on both sides, to fanaticism. Even in appearance the most fanatical leader of the royalist cause resembles Mucklewrath:

> His dress was of the antique fashion of Charles the First's time, and composed of shamoy leather, curiously slashed, and covered with antique lace and garniture. His boots and spurs might be referred to the same distant period. He wore a breastplate, over which descended a grey beard of venerable length, which he cherished as a mark of mourning for Charles the First, having never shaved since that monarch was brought to the scaffold. His head was uncovered, and almost perfectly bald. His high and wrinkled forehead, piercing grey eyes, and marked features, evinced age unbroken by infirmity, and stern resolution unsoftened by

humanity. Such is the outline, however feebly expressed, of the celebrated General Thomas Dalzell. (243)

Dalzell's zeal in persecuting Presbyterians was such that he was:

> A man more feared and hated by the whigs than even Claverhouse himself, and who executed the same violences against them out of a detestation of their persons, or perhaps an innate severity of temper, which Grahame only resorted to on political accounts, as the best means of intimidating the followers of presbytery, and of destroying that sect entirely. (243)

Honoring his promise to fight with the Cameronian forces, Morton returns to help organize the defense of the Covenanters at Bothwell Bridge, but experiences trouble imposing military order upon their fractious natures.

Even as the royalist troops line up in orderly formation, the Cameronians are still busy making Biblical speeches about vengeance and retribution. In the end, the blind fanaticism of the parties involved overrides all sense: no compromise or moderation is possible:

> The parties accused repelled the charge of criminal compliance and defection from the truth with scorn and indignation, and charged their accusers with breach of faith, as well as with wrong-headed and extravagant zeal in introducing such divisions into an army, the joint strength of which could not, by the most sanguine, be judged more than sufficient to face their enemies. Poundtext, [the moderate Presbyterian minister of Milnwood] and one or two others, made some faint efforts to stem the increasing fury of the factious, exclaiming to those of the other party, in the words of the Patriarch, -- "Let there be no strife, I pray thee,

> between me and thee, and between thy herdsmen and my herdsmen, for we be brethren." No pacific overture could possibly obtain audience. It was in vain that even Burley himself, when he saw the dissension proceed to such ruinous lengths, exerted his stern and deep voice, commanding silence and obedience to discipline. The spirit of insubordination had gone forth, and it seemed as if the exhortation of Habakkuk Mucklewrath had communicated a part of his frenzy to all who heard him. The wiser, or more timid part of the assembly, were already withdrawing themselves from the field, and giving up their cause as lost. Others were moderating a harmonious call, as they somewhat improperly termed it, to new officers, and dismissing those formerly chosen, and that with a tumult and clamour worthy of the deficiency of good sense and good order implied in the whole transaction. It was at this moment when Morton arrived in the field and joined the army, in total confusion, and on the point of dissolving itself. His arrival occasioned loud exclamations of applause on the one side, and of imprecation on the other. (252)

Despite the violent passion of the Cameronian forces and the natural advantage of defending rather than attacking the bridge, the royalists prevail. The battle is lost because no one in the rebel army has any trust in anyone not from their own narrow ideological camp.

In flight after the Covenanters' defeat at Bothwell Bridge, Morton stumbles upon a group of Covenanter leaders in an isolated farmhouse. They have been praying for guidance. Upon the arrival of Morton, whom they regard are the reason for their defeat, they are convinced that God has sent him to them as a sacrifice. They conduct

a trial, though the verdict is never in doubt, and condemn him to death. Morton, in his own defense, expresses his wish to have rule by law, for all, not simply the party in power: but his captors fail to heed his words and continue to call for Morton's death. Morton still tries to convince them of the need for moderation in religion, saying,

> "I may not, gentlemen," he said, "be fully able to go the lengths you desire, in assigning to those of my own religion the means of tyrannizing over others; but none shall go farther in asserting our own lawful freedom. And I must needs aver, that had others been of my mind in counsel, or disposed to stand by my side in battle, we should this evening, instead of being a defeated and discordant remnant, have sheathed our weapons in an useful and honourable peace, or brandished them triumphantly after a decisive victory." (262)

In the end, the leaders of the rebellion have no more interest in moderation or law than do the royalist forces. Scott refers to the fanatics as demons (a phrase later applied to Burley as well); the "executioners...seemed to alter their forms and features, like spectres in a feverish dream; their figures became larger, and their faces more disturbed...rather by a band of demons than of human beings; they have left all reason and humanity and become as beasts" (262). Although they are murdering an innocent man in cold blood, they will follow religious ritual and refuse to kill him on the Sabbath! But eventually, Habakkuk Mucklewrath declares that "as the sun went back of the dial ten degrees for intimating the recovery of holy Hesekiah, so shall it now for forward, that the wicked may be taken away from among the people, and the Covenant established in its purity." Even in an act of murder, the most fanatical of the Covenanters are more

worried about ritual law than justice, but they are also willing to make slight alterations in the law to suit them when they feel it is necessary.

This display of the Covenanter's fanaticism is the complement of the earlier trial before Claverhouse, in which Morton was threatened with the arbitrary cruelty on the Cavalier side;

> Yet there was a want of that eager and animating sense of right which supported him in similar circumstances, when in the power of Claverhouse. Then he was conscious, that, amid the spectators, were many who were lamenting his condition, and some who applauded his conduct. But now, among these pale-eyed and ferocious zealots, whose hardened brows were soon to be bent, not merely with indifference, but with triumph, upon his execution." (262)

In his captivity and sentence of death under Claverhouse there existed a clear right and wrong. Claverhouse, a supporter of supposed lawful authority was acting as an arbitrary agent; effectively, Claverhouse was supporting tyranny against a call for liberty. In the case of Morton's condemnation under Claverhouse, there were those royalists who were also unwilling to see a miscarriage of justice and who interceded on his behalf. The fanatical Cameronians had no such call to liberty or tyranny, only religious fanaticism, no one was willing to speak in Morton's behave amongst the Cameronians; in the presence of the Cameronians, Morton was "without a friend to speak a kindly word, or give a look either of sympathy or encouragement, -- awaiting till the sword destined to slay him crept out of the scabbard gradually." He could only have awaited his death by the hands of the Covenanters without a sense of purpose.

So hopeless was Morton when under the indictment of death by the Cameronians that in his preparation for death can only remember the prayers from the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, the book hated above all things by the Presbyterians: "he had, instinctively, recourse to the petition for deliverance and for composure of spirit which is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England" (262).

Fortunately, Claverhouse arrives shortly before midnight, and kills those who had condemned Morton to death. Mucklewrath was killed in the fighting, but rises from the dead to foretell the end of the House of Stuart:

> [Mucklewrath] stood upright before him [Claverhouse], and presented the wild person and hideous features of the maniac so often mentioned. His face, where it was not covered with blood-streaks, was ghastly pale, for the hand of death was on him. He bent upon Claverhouse eyes, in which the grey light of insanity still twinkled, though just about to flit for ever, and exclaimed, with his usual wildness of ejaculation, "Wilt thou trust in thy bow and in thy spear, in thy steed and in thy banner? And shall not God visit thee for innocent blood? -- Wilt thou glory in thy wisdom, and in thy courage, and in thy might? And shall not the Lord judge thee? -- Behold the princes, for whom thou hast sold thy soul to the destroyer, shall be removed from their place, and banished to other lands, and their names shall be a desolation, and an astonishment, and a hissing, and a curse. And thou, who hast partaken of the wine-cup of fury, and hast been drunken and mad because thereof, the wish of thy heart shall be granted to thy loss, and the hope of thine own pride shall destroy thee. I summon thee, John Grahame, to appear before the tribunal of

> God, to answer for this innocent blood, and the seas besides which thou hast shed." (268)

Being a gentleman, Claverhouse remains unperturbed by this ghostly appearance. He takes Morton to Edinburgh as his prisoner. It is ironic that it is Claverhouse who now saves Morton, a man who had previously declared him dangerous and demanded his death. It is also ironic that Morton must be saved by his enemy from those he had fought for as well.

Riding back to Edinburgh, Morton is divided between the horror of Claverhouse's cruelty and admiration for his culture and his valor. Morton, whilst riding beside Claverhouse, cannot but ponder the similarities that Claverhouse has with Burley; regardless of their differences in culture and breeding, they are united by their fanaticism:

> The gentleness and urbanity of that officer's general manners, the high and chivalrous sentiments of military devotion which he occasionally expressed, his deep and accurate insight into the human bosom, demanded at once the approbation and the wonder of those who conversed with him; while, on the other hand, his cold indifference to military violence and cruelty seemed altogether inconsistent with the social, and even admirable qualities which he displayed. Morton could not help, in his heart, contrasting him with Balfour of Burley; and so deeply did the idea impress him, that he dropped a hint of it as they rode together at some distance from the troop. (270-271)

Claverhouse freely admits that he is as much a fanatic as Burley, but he adds, "There is a difference, I trust, between the blood of learned and reverend prelates and scholars, of gallant soldiers and noble gentlemen, and the red puddle that stagnates in the beings of

psalm-singing mechanics, cracked-brained demagogues, and sullen boors." Claverhouse's attitude is based upon the feudal concept that rejects any sense of equality: men are simply not born equal, and they can never be equal; not in the sight of God or of men. Morton is unable to accept this explanation responding that, "God gives every spark of life -- that of the peasant as well as of the prince; and those who destroy his work recklessly or causelessly, must answer in either case." This finally represents Morton's true beliefs; that all men are created equal, and that one of their rights is the right to life. This echoes John Locke's phrase that certain natural rights are common to every man regardless of rank and these are the right to life, liberty and property. Morton has gone beyond simple moderation; he is rejecting the whole premises of the world-view of Claverhouse and the whole House of Stuart and its supporters, but his ideas are also a rejection of the hopes of the Covenanter's cause as well.

Although taken as a prisoner, and even as a member of the leadership of the rebels, Morton, because of birth and background, does not suffer the fates of other supporters of the rebellion, but is pardoned with banishment as his sentence:

> Morton felt an involuntary shudder at hearing words which implied a banishment from his native land; but ere he answered, Claverhouse proceeded to read, "Henry Morton, son of Silas Morton, Colonel of horse for the Scottish Parliament, nephew and apparent heir of Morton of Milnwood -- imperfectly educated, but with spirit beyond his years -- excellent at all exercises -- indifferent to forms of religion, but seems to incline to the presbyterian -- has high-flown and dangerous notions about liberty of thought and speech, and hovers between a latitudinarian and an enthusiast. Much admired and followed by the youth of his own age --

modest, quiet, and unassuming in manner, but in his heart peculiarly bold and intractable." (272)

Claverhouse, whatever his own prejudices, considers Morton a gentleman; hence, a member of Claverhouse's own class, and it is this class connection which saves Morton from death. Morton is not spared death because of his moderation, or because his cause may have value, he is spared based solely upon his status as a member of the gentry class; the only connection that Claverhouse and the other royalists can understand. Another leader of the rebellion, a peasant and a fanatic, McBriar, is tortured and killed in a horrible manner; refusing to divulge any information: thus proving that Claverhouse's dismissal of the Covenanter's bravery and courage, based upon their low birth, is false.

When Morton first met Burley he was aware of the danger that this man presented, but he also, even at that early stage, could see that the fanaticism of both groups, Royalist and Cameronian, were similar. Morton observed the behavior of both groups, discovering that,

> "In some moods of my mind, how dangerous would be the society of such a companion [Burley]! If I am unmoved by his zeal for abstract doctrines of faith, or rather for a peculiar mode of worship, (such was the purport of his reflections,) -- so distinguished as one of their principal champions, and who seems even now to be reeking from some recent deed of violence, and to feel stings of remorse, which even his enthusiasm cannot altogether stifle? I am weary of seeing nothing but violence and fury around me -- now assuming the mask of lawful authority, now taking that of religious zeal. (46)

Neither those assuming the mask of lawful authority or religious zeal have anything to offer Scotland. Their fanaticism has made them blind not only to compromise, but to the suffering that they have inflicted upon the populace of the nation. Claverhouse admits to Lady Margaret that both parties are controlled by fanatics, and that the civil war can only be stopped by bloodshed: "I should have, madam, were every whig as moderate as Morton, and every loyalist as disinterested as Major Bellenden. But such is the fanaticism and violent irritation of both parties, that I fear nothing will end this civil war save the edge of the sword" (233-234). As in the beginning of the novel, Morton is unable to fully support either camp: he plainly sees that those who profess to uphold the law do not do so, and those who would make Scotland into a theocracy have neither mercy nor hope.

Major Bellenden, Lady Margaret's brother-in-law, a moderate in religion and politics on the royalist side, is disturbed by the spectacle of civil war in Scotland, and finds the killing of fellow Scots to be distasteful, declaring that,

> Although I had my share of the civil war [English civil war of the 1640's which overthrew Charles I], I cannot say I had ever so much real pleasure in that sort of service as when I was employed on the Continent, and we were hacking at fellows with foreign faces and outlandish dialect. It's a hard thing to hear a hamely Scotch tongue cry quarter, and be obliged to cut him down just the same as if he called out miséricorde. -- So, there they come through the Netherwood haugh; upon my word, fine-looking fellows." (98)

The country cannot heal under the Stuarts; there is too much enmity between the differing groups in the country. Political change embracing compromise and moderation is the only hope for the nation.

The divisions that infect Scotland are not simply about religious observance or doctrine, but touch on the very fundamentals of political government and policy. Is the King divinely appointed? Can man, or Church, question the King's motives or decisions? For the Stuarts their royal prerogatives are complete and unassailable by any except God alone, whom they believe has appointed them to be rulers. The Covenanters assailed the very person of the King declaring that the,

> guilt and misery of the people on the awful negligence of their rulers, who had not only failed to establish presbytery as the national religion, but had tolerated sectaries of various descriptions, Papists, Prelatists, Erastians, assuming the name of Presbyterians, Independents, Socinians, and Quakers [and] that, instead of a nursing father to the Kirk, that monarch had been a nursing father to none but his own bastards. (152)

Charles II is condemned not only because he refuses to personally accept the perceived truth of the Presbyterian religion as understood by the Covenanters, but because he has allowed a limited freedom of religion in both Scotland and England. Previously, rebellion against the person of the King was viewed as rebellion against God, since the King was God's vassal, but this mediaeval concept of kingship is rejected, on opposing religious grounds, by the Covenanters. It is fundamentally a direct attack against the very foundation of feudal political polity; the attack is so direct that no room for compromise can ever be reached between the two opposing camps.

During Morton's ten years in exile, major changes take place on the political landscape. In 1688 the Glorious Revolution de-throned James II; the Stuarts had been

exiled to France, to be replaced by the far more politically moderate William and Mary, and

> Scotland had just begun to repose from the convulsion occasioned by a change of dynasty, and, through the prudent tolerance of King William, had narrowly escaped the horrors of a protracted civil war. Agriculture began to revive, and men, whose minds had been disturbed by the violent political concussions, and the general change of government in Church and State, had begun to recover their ordinary temper, and to give the usual attention to their own private affairs, in lieu of discussing those of the public. (284)

Now it is Claverhouse who is unable to adapt to the new political reality and remains a supporter of the exiled Stuarts, he becomes a rebel against lawful authority: "The Highlanders alone resisted the newly established order of things, and were in arms in a considerable body under the Viscount of Dundee, whom our readers have hitherto known by the name of Grahame of Claverhouse. But the usual state of the Highlands was so unruly that their being more or less disturbed was not supposed greatly to affect the general tranquility of the country," and in the lowlands those who had previously supported the King and the Episcopal religion are finding that now they are at odds with the change of government: "In the Lowlands, the Jacobites, now the undermost party, had ceased to expect any immediate advantage by open resistance, and were, in their turn, driven to hold private meetings, and form associations for mutual defense, which the government termed treason, while they cried out persecution." The tables had turned.

Although the new King establishes Presbyterianism as the national religion of Scotland, the new government is unwilling to accept the demands of the fanatical Covenanters; hence,

> The triumphant Whigs, while they re-established Presbytery as the national religion, and assigned to the General Assemblies of the Kirk their natural influence, were very far from going the lengths which the Cameronians and more extravagant portion of the nonconformists under Charles and James loudly demanded. They would listen to no proposal for re-establishing the Solemn League and Covenant; and those who had expected to find in King William a zealous Covenanted Monarch, were grievously disappointed when he intimated, with the phlegm peculiar to his country, his intention to tolerate all forms of religion which were consistent with the safety of the State. (286)

They refuse to accept the new government, rejecting it as they had the government of Charles II. Hence, they censured and condemned any measures by which the government appeared to show an inclination to interfere with the management of the Church, and they positively refused to take the oath of allegiance to King William and Queen Mary until they should, on their part, have sworn to the Solemn League and Covenant. Although the government is moderate, fanatics of the two opposing factions in Scottish society still refuse to accept moderation. They prepare to oppose the new government and its policy of toleration.

The fanaticism of the royalists for the Stuart line (Jacobites) and the Cameronians remained the two voices raised in opposition to the new government; and having always been united in their shared fanaticisms, "These men formed one violent party in the State;

and the Episcopalian and Jacobite interest, notwithstanding their ancient and national animosity, yet repeatedly endeavoured to intrigue among them, and avail themselves of their discontents, to obtain their assistance in recalling the Stewart family." The two opposing fanatics have united in their opposition to the moderate policies of the reign of William and Mary. Although professing diametrically opposed political and religious theories, they are united in their hatred and fanaticism.

The opposing fanatics begin to unite around the only cause they can understand: rejection of the new government. But the vast majority of the people of Scotland accept the new government and its policy of moderation, and

> The Revolutionary Government in the mean while was supported by the great bulk of the Lowland interest, who were chiefly disposed to a moderate Presbytery, and formed in a great measure the party who in the former oppressive reigns were stigmatized by the Cameronians for having exercised that form of worship under the declaration of Indulgence issued by Charles II. Such was the state of parties in Scotland immediately subsequent to the Revolution. (287)

The country is at peace, but the two opposing fanaticisms are now united against a government that has brought "the land, peace, liberty, and freedom of conscience" (340). But peace, liberty, and freedom of conscience were never what either the Cavaliers or the Covenanters wanted. They wanted an uncompromising implementation of their own agendas; even if it meant the ruin of the country. For the Royalist, the reign of William and Mary is illegitimate and allows too much freedom to the Presbyterians; for the Covenanters, the refusal of the new government to implement the Solemn League and

Covenant which demands that Presbyterianism be established as the National religion in England as well as Scotland makes them continue to fight against the new government.

The covenanters remained obdurate in their rejection of the state, but the policy of the new government was to simply ignore them, rather than to resort to persecutions:

> This party, therefore, remained grumbling and dissatisfied, and made repeated declarations against defections and causes of wrath, which, had they been prosecuted as in the two former reigns, would have led to the same consequence of open rebellion. But as the murmurers were allowed to hold their meetings uninterrupted, and to testify as much as they pleased against Socinianism, Erastianism, and all the compliances and defections of the time, their zeal, unfanned by persecution, died gradually away, their numbers became diminished, and they sunk into the scattered remnant of serious, scrupulous, and harmless enthusiasts, of whom Old Mortality, whose legends have afforded the groundwork of my tale, may be taken as no bad representative. (287)

Without an aggrieved sense of persecution feeding their religious mania, the Covenanters simply cease to have power over the population, who are now embracing the peace and prosperity that the new government and its policies brings to Scotland.

The character of Neil Blane, the tavern owner, best sums up the new outlook of the interests of the vast majority of the population; as a tavern keeper he has always tried to remain above politics, interested only in his business and personal comforts. He best represents the local business community, which is neither bound by feudal obligations nor the fanaticism of the covenanting Kirk. He simply wishes to make a profit and to be left in peace. During the time of the Stuarts, his life was made difficult because of the

fine line he had to walk to keep the two parties, Covenanter and Cavalier, happy as his customers. The local troops of Charles II harassed and misused him, and instead of providing protection which was the real vocation of the government under a rule of law, they had tyrannized and ruined his trade. Hence, he is a strong supporter of the new government of the Revolution of 1688, declaring that, "There's ae gude thing o' the change, or the Revolution, as they ca' it,—folks may speak out afore thae birkies now, and nae fear o' being hauled awa to the guard-house, or having the thumikins screwed on your finger-ends, just as I wad drive the screw through a cork" (324). Times are better, and safer.

Blane represents the new Scotland; not interested in fanaticism or tied to uncompromising positions in religion or politics; his is the voice of moderation in practice. The rising middle-classes, and lower gentry, best represented by Morton, are not interested in the two opposing fanaticism, they are interested in peace and prosperity.

Morton returns to Scotland a supporter of the new government of moderation, but he has been thought dead, and finds Edith betrothed to Lord Evandale. Lord Evandale is in the process of raising an army to fight the new government and seeks to marry her before joining a Scottish uprising against the new government. Evandale declares to Edith that,

> The Life Guards, with whom I served so long, although new-modelled and new-officered by the Prince of Orange, retain a predilection for the cause of their rightful master; and "—and here he whispered as if he feared even the walls of the apartment had ears—"when my foot is known to be in the stirrup, two regiments of cavalry have sworn to renounce the usurper's service, and fight under my orders. (300)

By this proposed action, Evandale has rejected the possibility of moderation. He will join with Claverhouse and continue the civil war that has wrecked havoc on Scotland. Edith, still in thrall to Morton's memory, is on the point of consenting when she glimpses Morton out of a window and collapses seriously ill.

Morton seeks out Balfour who now lives hidden in a cave, and in finding him he overhears of a plot to assassinate Lord Evandale. This is the plan of a distant Bellenden relative, Basil Olifant, a turncoat Covenanter, who wants to get rid of Evandale so he can marry Edith himself and thus lay claim to the entire estate. Olifant's men attack Evandale as he is leaving Tillietudlem castle. Morton attempts to save Lord Evandale from his impending murder, but this time Morton fails in the attempt to save Evandale's life; but with a dying gesture, Evandale confers his blessing upon his union with Edith. Thus the two moderate voices, Morton representing the Presbyterian, and Edith the Episcopalian are united in marriage (very much as Scott's own marriage was a union of Episcopal and Presbyterian). Basil Olifant is killed in the attempt to save Lord Evandale and the castle of Tillietudlem is saved and becomes the inheritance of the union of moderation.

Claverhouse raises an army in opposition to the new government, but he is killed in the battle of Killecrankie fighting for his exiled King. With the death of Claverhouse the Cavalier tradition is also killed. Claverhouse's death is followed by the death of Burley as well. Scotland is ready to advance beyond the fanaticism and extremes of both Covenanter and Cavalier and is now posed to embrace a government and policy of moderation.

Scotland, before the coming of William and Mary, has been fragmented into competing and equally violent factions. Daiches states that "Scott well knew, if

Scotland had not torn itself in pieces in these violent civil conflicts of the seventeenth century, the English might not have seen the Union of 1707 as the only way of ensuing that they should not be troubled by confusion in Scottish affairs and so a union between England and Scotland might have developed more gradually and with greater popular consent" (*Sir Walter* 471). Effectively, it was Scotland's own inability to control opposing fanaticism that resulted in a pre-mature union with England. Extremist groups, either Whit or Royalist, continued to splinter, and prepare for rebellion against the government. The coming of William and Mary resulted in the triumph of moderate forces, in both politics and religion. The marriage of moderate Presbyterian Morton with the equally moderate Royalist, Edith Bellenden, enacts compromise between opposing factions that history creates in 1688 (Shaw *Forms* 192). The marriage represents the victory and union of moderation.

Morton is a moderate constitutional monarchist, horrified at the near anarchy caused by the fighting of two fanatical forces. Morton's belief is in "chartered rights." According to David Brown, "men like Morton, who anticipated the compromise settlement of 1688, certainly existed in Scotland ten years previously. Nor is this entirely surprising, given that the liberal principles in religion and politics which Morton professes belonged historically to the growing Scottish middle class of which Morton, as a middling laird, is representative" (83). It is just this call of Morton that a, "free Parliament should be called for settling the affairs of Church and State," that becomes possible with the spirit of moderation that accompanies the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Morton, as well as the constitutional monarchy of William and Mary, represents the future. Feudalism, as well as fanatical religion,

belongs to the past. The danger lies in that not all members of Scotland are satisfied with the prosperity and freedom that have come with the new government. A moderate, mostly middle class is developing, but even as fanatical Presbyterianism loses its strength amongst the population, the Highlands, with their Jacobite sympathies, are waiting to erupt in open rebellion to support a return of the old order.

CHAPTER 4

THE BRIDE OF LAMMERMOOR: THE FAILURE OF UNION

The Bride of Lammermoor was written in the year 1819, which for Great Britain was a year of dark omens and apocalyptic events. Old King George III was dying, and the crops in the fields were failing in the face of severe weather; there was serious hunger and rioting in the streets. The passing of the old King was a troubling event for the whole nation. Although by 1819 the Hanoverian cause was finally won, there was still danger that the passing of a leader might precipitate. The peril to the stability of the nation was no longer the danger of a religious uprising as in early times, but the discontent of the lower-classes, who were becoming increasingly industrialized and politicized, was an ever present danger to a political system that was now seemingly safely in power. This was the historical background in which the novel was written. James Kerr, in his *Fiction Against History: Scott as Storyteller* declared that,

> *The Bride* is ideologically motivated. The use of archaic character types displaces the threat to social order from its real contemporary locus in a growing mass of industrial laborers to a much older and less potent enemy, to an aristocratic figure from the distant past. (6)

The historical frame of *Old Mortality* had been the Covenanting Rebellions of the time of Charles II in the 1670's. The historical epoch of *The Bride of Lammermoor*

takes place at a slightly later date, during the time of the last days of William and Mary and the accession of Queen Anne, the last of the Stuarts to occupy the united crowns of England and Scotland. The political and religious sensibilities of Scotland were still in turmoil. The dynastic and religious divisions that remained unresolved at the end of *Old Mortality* still plagued Scotland of the time of *The Bride.*

The divisions between Presbyterian Whigs, who supported the Dutch Calvinist, William of Orange, their new King, and the Tories, the Jacobite Episcopalians, who supported the exiled Stuarts, continued unabated in their hatred for one another; this religious/political division resulted in continual political intrigues on behalf of political favorites of each party. For Scott, one of the reasons for this continual division was the fact that the King of Scotland had long since departed, and remained resident in London with little real interest in Scottish affairs:

> The character of the times aggravated these suspicions. "In those days there was no king in Israel." Since the departure of James VI [to become James I of England] to assume the richer and more powerful crown of England, there had existed in Scotland contending parties, formed among the aristocracy, by whom, as their intrigues at the Court of St James's chanced to prevail, the delegated powers of sovereignty were alternately swayed. (16)

Since the departure of King James VI from Scotland the country had been effectively ruled in his name by a Privy Council. In principal the Council was answerable to the person of the King and responsible for good government in Scotland. The reality was quite different: the members of the Council tended to be concerned only in their personal self-interest. Without a strong central authority, the local aristocrats tended

to rule with only the interests of their own families and retainers as their prime motivation in governance. Lacking a strong centralized power that could look after the well-fare of the country, the aristocrats would continue to pursue a destructive self-aggrandizement that could only cause further harm to the country; Scott goes on to say that,

> The evils attending upon this system of government, resembled those which afflict the tenants of an Irish estate, owned by an absentee. There is no supereminent power, claiming and possessing a general interest with the community at large, to whom the oppressed might appeal from subordinate tyranny, either for justice or for mercy. Let a monarch be as indolent, as selfish, as much disposed to arbitrary power as he will, still, in a free country, his own interests are so closely connected with those of the public at large, and the evil consequences to his own authority are so obvious and imminent when a different course is pursued, that common policy, as well as common feeling, point to the equal distribution of justice, and to the establishment of the throne in righteousness. Thus, even sovereigns who were remarkable for usurpation and tyranny have been found rigorous in the administration of justice among their subjects, in cases where their own power and passions were not compromised. (16)

During the time of *The Bride* it was William of Orange who was the usurper to the Thrown of Scotland and England, but it was, according to Scott, better to have an illegal king, then no king at all.

The result of the lack of a powerful king was that a grasping aristocracy, who served no master other than themselves, had taken over the rule of Scotland. With a rule by aristocrats, according to Scott, there can be no political peace. Hence,

> It is very different [from rule of a king] when the powers of sovereignty are delegated to the head of an aristocratic faction, rivalled and pressed closely in the race of ambition by an adverse leader. His brief and precarious enjoyment of power must be employed in rewarding his partisans, in extending his influence, in oppressing and crushing his adversaries. Even Abon Hassan, the most disinterested in all viceroys, forgot not, during his caliphate of one day, to send a douceur of one thousand prices of gold to his own household; and the Scottish vicegerents, raised to power by the strength of their faction, failed not to embrace the same means of rewarding them. (16-17)

Under such a system of governance, there can be no stability or prosperity for the country at large. Each noble house will attempt to gain power over others. Old houses of distinction will fall to the rising fortunes of others. In the end, there can be no honor or openness, only power.

In *The Bride* the house of Ravenswood is representative of a decayed noble house that is in the process of being replaced by the upstart Ashtons, who support the new regime of William and Mary as well as the Presbyterian religion as established by law. The fall of the House of Ravenswood dates it decline to the exile of James II (and VII), and the novel suggests that the late Lord Ravenswood's espousal of the Stuart cause precipitated the fall. Much like the fall of the house of the Stuarts, there can be no return to former glory for this failing ancient family.

The Ashtons represent the new Whig interests in politics, and the Ravenswood the older Tory, high-church tradition of the Stuarts. The division is more severe than simply supporting respective dynastic claims, or religious traditions; the Whigs were allayed to the new commercial interests that become increasingly prominent during this epoch as well as a King ruling with Parliament within the framework of constitutional monarchy; whilst the Tory tradition hoped to preserve feudal traditions, strict hierarchical class divisions, and supported an absolutist role for the person of the King. The divisions were not superficial.

The final closing of the glory of a former great house, and perhaps all of the feudal system of Scotland, is represented by the death of the last Lord of Ravenswood. Instead of trying to accommodate his family to changed circumstances or the betterment of what was left to him, Allan Lord Ravenswood, "the late proprietor of that ancient mansion and the large estate annexed to it, continued for some time to wage ineffectual war against his successor" (19), but it was a war he could not win. The decline and fall of an ancient aristocratic family and the appropriation of its property by an upstart bourgeois antagonist (Kerr *Fiction* 86), is the final outcome; and "the demise of the traditional aristocratic order is an unfortunate, but necessary, concomitant of progress" (90). The last years of the former Lord Ravenswood had been spent in a broken-down, ruined tower, all that was left of his once great estates, and,

> The tower is a monumental relic from a bygone feudal age and its defiance of the winds of fortune is dramatic but hollow. Although it maintains a proud façade, its interior is dilapidated, being stripped of food, wine, warmth and

> vitality. Its connection with the bulk of the Ravenswood estate has been severed and even its own feudal village, Wolf's Hope, has declared its independence. (Uglow *The Bride*)

With the death of the last Lord Ravenswood his son, Edgar, Master of Ravenswood, was expected to carry on the family hatred and antagonism to the Ashton family who had supplemented the Ravenswood on their lost estate. Upon the death of Allan Lord Ravenswood his body was prepared that his "mortal remains might pass forward to an abode yet more dreary and lonely" (19) than had been his abode in life.

The funeral service of the last Lord Ravenswood had a pomp and dignity that his final years of life had been lacking:

> Banner after banner, with the various devices and coats of this ancient family and its connections, followed each other in mournful procession from under the low-browed archway of the court-yard. The principal gentry of the country attended in the deepest mourning, and tempered the pace oft heir long rain of horses to the solemn march befitting the occasion. Trumpets, with banners of crape attached to them, sent forth their long and lugubrious notes to regulate the movements of the procession. An immense train of inferior mourners and menials closed the rear, which hand not yet issued from the castle-gate, when the van had reached the chapel where body was to be deposited. (19)

The whole funeral and its solemnity rings false. The house of Ravenswood can ill afford payment for such mockeries, but it is done to fulfill a sense of pride and duty demanded by an authority and place in society that the family no longer actually

possesses. But even in death the new order intrudes. Being a supporter of the Jacobite cause, the dying Lord demanded that his funeral be conducted by a Scottish Episcopal priest, at a time when such services were illegal in Scotland. When the Presbyterian minister arrives, with armed escort to conduct the funeral, the Lord's only surviving son, Edgar, threatens him and his military escort, and "an hundred swords at once glittered in the air" (20) by other members of the funeral party; but it is a sad day when the Jacobite cause can only show its power by threatening a local minister come to celebrate a funeral, and the Episcopal priest, "affrighted at the scene, and trembling for his own safety, hastily rehearsed the solemn service of the church, and spoke dust to dust, and ashes to ashes, over the ruined pride and decayed posterity" (20).

The funeral is followed by a traditional wake, also forbidden by law in Scotland of the time, but, "it was the custom however, and on the present occasion it was fully observed" (20). Edgar, the Master of Ravenswood, having been deprived of the title "Lord" soon "listened to a thousand exclamations against the Lord Keeper [the title given to Sir William Ashton, who has taken the estate of the Ravenswood family], and passionate protestations of attachment to himself, and to the honour of his house" (21). These toasts of feudal loyalty are all false, the new order, under the Parliamentary rule of William and Mary, will no longer support the revival of the old feudal loyalties of Scotland, and Scott reminds us that, "When the last flask was emptied, they took their leave, with deep protestations --- to be forgotten on the morrow, if, indeed, those who made them should not think it necessary for their safety to make a more solemn retraction" (22). The whole funeral and protestations

of attachment to an old family are all fantasy. The feudal world which the family of Ravenswood represents has passed, and it will never return.

Allan Lord Ravenswood had less an interest in the Jacobite cause than in his personal vengeance against his enemy Sir William Ashton, and his son's Edgar's interest in the Jacobite cause is also only slight, and he refuses to make the Cause his life's ambition; Edgar declares that, "when I recollect the times of the first and second Charles and of the last James, truly, I see little reason, that, as a man or patriot, I should draw my sword for their descendants" (73). Hence, Edgar is not a fanatical Jacobite wishing for a rebellion against the existing social order. He shows that of all the characters in *The Bride*, his is the voice of moderation declaring that "I hope to see the day when justice shall be open to Whig and Tory, and when these nick-names shall only be used among coffee-house politicians" (73) It also shows, that most of the supposed support for the Jacobite cause is less one of true attachment to ancient principals as it is to petty personal vengeance.

It is this toleration that places even Edgar, the scion of one of the replaced ancient families, in the tradition of the Enlightenment that accompanied the accession of William and Mary to the throne. Unfortunately, the situation in Scotland precludes any such dawning of toleration in Scotland of the time of the story. His companion, Bucklaw, a Jacobite when it serves his purposes, declares in response to Edgar's statement of his lack of support for the Stuarts, "That it will not be in our days, Master --- the iron has entered too deeply into our sides and souls" (73). But Scott sees that only by embracing the words of the Master of Ravenswood can Scotland move beyond the Killing Times of *Old Mortality* and enter into a

progressive and stable future. Edgar represents the hopes for a more tolerant future, but he is also crippled by his upbringing.

Because he sees no future in remaining in Scotland, Edgar prepares to serve a foreign prince (much as did Morton in *Old Mortality*). His poverty makes it increasingly impossible for him to even keep up pretense in Wolf's Craig, the keep still left to his family, but before leaving to go to France, Edgar feels that he must confront Sir William Ashton, the man who by dubious legal means usurped the ancient Ravenswood heritage, estates, title, and his father's life. On his way to the former mansion of his family, Edgar comes across Sir William, and his daughter in the process of being attacked by a wild bull. The wild cattle were "the descendents of the savage herds which anciently roamed free in the Caledonian forests...They were degenerated from the ancient race in size and strength" (36); in some way these degenerated cattle are symbolic of the ancient feudal houses of Scotland, who were being removed to make way for a new and more mercantile class of upstarts. Edgar, to save his enemy from death, shoots the bull dead. Thus, by killing the bull, and saving the Ashtons, Edgar is in some sense killing the feudal order of which he is a last representative. Kerr has interpreted the "bull's attack as an expression of the hostility of the feudal estate, of which Ravenswood is the sole surviving representative, towards the interloper, a hostility which is then suppressed by the central feudal figure; by shooting the bull, Ravenswood subdues, for an instant, the threat of the past" (*Fiction* 92).

Whilst saving the Ashtons, Edgar meets and falls in love with the daughter of his father's enemy, Lucy. She, like Edgar, represents a liberal and open attitude towards

the differences between Whig and Tory, and unlike other members of her family, she is not attracted to monetary advance, and seems little interested in the social climbing that are the main focus of her parents and brothers, but unlike Edgar, she is very much swayed by her friends and tends to adopt prevailing opinion, and "in her exterior relations to things of this world, Lucy willingly received the ruling impulse from those around her" (25). She tended to avoid conflict because, "The alternative was, in general, too difficult to her to render resistance desirable, and she willingly found a motive for decision in the opinion of her friends" (25-26).

In all things Lucy appears to be modest, beautiful and in her appearance she was,

> Exquisitely beautiful, yet somewhat girlish features, were formed to express peace of mind, serenity, and indifference to the tinsel of worldly pleasure. Her locks, which were of shadowy gold, divided on a brow of exquisite whiteness, like a gleam of broken and pallid sunshine upon a hill of snow. The expression of the countenance was in the last degree gentle, soft, timid, and feminine, and seemed rather to shrink from the most casual look of a stranger, than to court his admiration. Something there was of a Madonna cast, perhaps the result of delicate health, and of residence in a family, where the dispositions of the inmates were fiercer, more active, and more energetic than her own. (25-26)

In her private interior world Lucy is not at all passive, but tends to live in a world of unreality, based on a love of ancient legends. She wishes to escape from the modern world of commerce and dissension; her private world is one of legends and knights

in shining armor. It is a romantic version of the feudal world that has already passed. And,

> Yet her passiveness of disposition was by no means owing to an indifferent or unfeeling mind. Left to the impulse of her own taste and feelings, Lucy Ashton was peculiarly accessible to those of a romantic cast. Her secret delight was in the old legendary tales of ardent devotion and unalterable affection, chequered as they so often are with strange adventures and supernatural horrors. This was her favoured fairly realm, and here she erected her aerial palaces. But it was only in secret that she laboured at this delusive, but delightful architecture. In her retired chamber, or in the woodland bower which she had chosen for her own, and called her name, she was in fancy distributing the prizes at the tournament, or raining down influence from her eyes on the valiant combatants, or she was wandering in the wilderness with Una, or she was identifying herself with the simple, yet noble-minded Miranda, in the isle of wonder and enchantment. (25)

Strangely, this world of imagination is the world of which Edgar is perhaps the last living representation, and can now only exist in the imagination. The ruined tower of Wolf's Craig cannot live up to the perceived romantic illusions of Lucy. The reality is simply tired and old; it is stagnant and cannot long last in the modern world that is changing Scotland permanently. Yet, it is easy to see why Edgar and Lucy would be so strongly attracted to each other, but outside of the world of romance, "in the social world of 'exterior relations,' Edgar is not much of a prize. Outside of Lucy's 'fairy

realm,' Ravenswood is an indigent and propertyless aristocrat, a feudal lord without land or vassals, the holder of a mere courtesy title" (Kerr *Fiction* 95).

Lucy's father, the Lord Keeper, Sir William, always the pliant, scheming politician and lawyer sees some advantage is encouraging an alliance between his daughter and the Master of Ravenswood. Although Edgar is in love with Lucy, and she with him, the relationship causes Edgar real difficulties, and to pursue this interest must force him to compromise and offer forgiveness to Sir William for all that he has done to his family, but by doing so entails the rejection of the feudal obligations that Edgar owes to his father's demand for vengeance.

The decision that confronts Edgar means that he is "torn between his sense of his family's fate and his modern instinct for social integration" (Robertson 218). If Edgar continues to pursue his stated path of vengeance, he will fulfill his feudal obligations, or in the words of Harry E. Shaw, he will "look despair in the face without flinching and [] persist in hopeless resistance" (*Forms* 215), but the world that Edgar actually inhabits no longer believes in such resistance or obligations. If he follows though with his love, and possible marriage with Lucy, Edgar will perhaps join the modern world, but only by rejecting his family's traditions and past history.

To further encourage the relationship between Edgar and his daughter, Sir William forces his company and his daughter's on Edgar by taking refuge in Edgar's ruinous castle home during a thunder storm. Sir William is aware that a coming change of political scene, the coming accession of Queen Anne, may well give the Master of Ravenswood power and influence. Sir William is aware that Edgar's relation, the Duke of A [tholl], a political rival, supports the return of the

Ravenswood estates to Edgar. King William is old and may die soon, and the question of dynastic change is one that will affect the political power struggle in Scotland.

King William was invited to come to England after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 not because of his own rights to the throne, but because his wife, Mary, was a daughter of James II, thus an attempt to preserve the appearance of legality through by maintaining the Stuart line. With the death of William, the next in line to the throne will be the second daughter of James II, Anne, who was a strong supporter of the Tory establishment and the Anglican high-church tradition. If Anne did indeed become queen of England and Scotland, many who had gained ascendancy during the time of the Calvinist William, such as the Ashtons, would be in danger of losing the gains they had made during the time of King William and Mary. On the other hand, semi-Jacobites, such as the Ravenswoods, would be once again in positions of power. Hence, Sir William wishes to encourage the new relation with Edgar to preserve the gains he has made under King William through marriage with a family that may soon have power over him. Needless to say, Edgar is unaware of Sir William's real interests in encouraging his friendship. But, Sir William is only interested in a binding of the two families if the change of monarch puts his own interests in danger.

During the meeting in the dark, ruined castle Lucy and Edgar met and, "Their cheeks touched and were withdrawn from each other" when suddenly,

> The apartment was suddenly illuminated by a flash of lightening, which seemed absolutely to swallow the darkness of the hall. Every object might

have been for an instant seen distinctly. The slight and half-sinking form of Lucy Ashton, the well-proportioned and stately figure of Ravenswood, his dark features, and the fiery, yet irresolute expression of his eye, the old arms, and scutcheons which hung on the walls of the apartment, were for a second distinctly visible to the Keeper [Sir William] by a strong red brilliant glare of light. Its disappearance was almost instantly followed by a burst of thunder, for the storm-cloud was very near the castle; and the peal was so sudden and dreadful, that the old tower rocked to its foundation, and every inmate concluded it was falling upon them. Soot, which had not been disturbed for centuries, showered down the huge tunneled chimnies --- lime and dust flew in clouds from the wall; and whether the lightning had actually struck the castle, or whether through the violent concussion of the air, several heavy stones were hurled from the mouldering battlements into the roaring sea beneath. (93)

The bolt of lightening and following thunderclap shows the reality of the castle, and the feudal world which it represents. It is all ruined and in the process of irretrievable decay. It is a world that has not been disturbed for centuries, much like the soot that the thunder clap sends tumbling down the chimneys. The modern world is not quietly overtaking the few feudal holdouts, such as Wolf's Craig, the modern world is a raging and rampaging thunder that cannot be stopped. The stones tumbling into the sea are an allegory for the fall of this old chivalric world that really no longer fulfills a function in the new age.

In Lucy's imaginary world, the feudal age is romantic and filled with shinning knights; the ruined tower of Edgar's represents the true remnants of this world in the quick light of thunder, and viewed only for a second. In the time of William and Mary the feudal age is not in the process of passing, it has already passed away; Edgar and his castle are simply holdouts to an age already long dead. The tower and the Master's attitudes are victims of a "vision of history as a powerful and destructive fatality" (Kerr *Fiction* 91): and it remains to be seen if Edgar can escape this destitution and grasp the "opportunity, difficult and dangerous, to gain a place within the new social order" (91).

The castle of Wolf's Craig is managed by the old family retainer, Caleb Balderstone, who seeks to create the impression that nothing has changed in the fortunes of the Ravenswood family. His attempts to hid the poverty and demise of the family is portrayed by Scott in a comical manner, and Victorian critics tended to find the comic portrayals of Caleb to hid the obvious as overdone and tiresome, but Scott often provided a low counterpoint to his high characters, and "Caleb's constant and willful denial of the present and his inability to face up to change represent a pathological attitude directly analogous to the anachronistic survival of the medieval Wolf's Craig into the modern world" (Uglow *The Bride*).

Caleb's relationship with the small village of Wolf's Hope is an important element in the portrayal of the end of the feudal system. Wolf's Hope,

> Was a little hamlet which straggled along the side of a creek formed by the discharge of a small creek formed by the discharge of a small brook into the sea, and was hidden from the castle, to which it had been in former times an

> appendage, by the intervention of the shoulder of a hill forming a projecting headland...the few inhabitants gained a precarious subsistence by manning two or three fishing boats in the herring season, and smuggle gin and brandy during the winter months. They paid a kind of hereditary respect to the lords of Ravenswood; but, in the difficulties of the family, most of the inhabitants of Wolfshope had contrived to get feu-rights to their possessions, their huts, kail-yards, and rights of commonty, so that they were emancipated from the chains of feudal dependency, and free from the various exactions with which, under every possible pretext, or without pretext at all, the Scottish landlords of the period, themselves in great poverty, were wont to harass their still poorer tenants at will. They might be, on the whole, termed independent. (101)

The age of feudalism has so passed that even the weakest members of the Scottish nation could declare their independence from ancient feudal dues. There is now no need for a feudal lord, or his protection. When Caleb attempts to remind the villagers of their ancient duties to the castle, he inwardly reminds himself that times have changed, and that "new times were not as old times" (103). It is Caleb who realizes that a lord is no longer needed for protection and that in the new Scotland, "they [the villagers] would apply to the government for protection of a corporal and four red-coats" (103). The feudal system no longer has a need for existence; as the feudal system is not needed for protection the ancient titles mean nothing to the hard-working villagers who declare to Caleb, when he mentions "the *Right* Honourable Edgar *Lord Ravenswood,*" that they "shall not quarrel [] about titles of courtesy ---

commonly called Lord Ravenswood, or Master of Ravenswood, heritable proprietor of the lands and barony of Wolfscraig, on the one part, and to John Whitefish and others, feuars in the town of Wolfshope, within the barony afore –said, on the other part" (103), it has now all become as comical as Caleb himself. It means nothing in the modern mercantile age.

In the new Scotland protection will come not from the lords, but from law and the government. When the villagers wished to overturn the tradition of giving to the Lord of Ravenswood, "the first stone of butter after the calving of every cow within the barony, and the first egg, thence called the Monday's egg, laid by every hen on every Monday in the year" (101), they resorted to hiring a lawyer! The new attitude of the villagers to the Monday's egg was that "their hens had cackled mony a day for the Lords of Ravenswood, and it was time that they suld cackle for those that gave them roosts and barley" (102). The peasants of the barony had become the new mercantile class of Scotland. They had no fear of their traditional leaders. The law and the government's troops would protect both them and their property.

The old order is gone. Balderstone can only lament the loss of the old ways, but there is no way that he, or Edgar, can turn the clock back. Caleb can only regale Lockhard, the servant of Sir William, concerning the ancient glory of the House of Ravenswood, and "the ancient grandeur of Wolfscraig, and the sway its Barons over the country in their neighbourhood" (115). He regrets the passing of the feudal order, and attacks the new freedoms, declaring that,

> 'A vassal scarce held a calf or a lamb was his ain, till he had first asked if the Lord of Ravenswood was pleased to accept it; and they were obliged to ask

> the lord's consent before they married in these days, and mony a merry tale they tell about that right as weel as others. And although,' said Caleb, 'these times are not like the gude auld times, when authority had its due, yet, true it is...that we of the House of Ravenswood do our devoir in keeping up, by all just and lawful exertion of our baronial authority, that due and fitting connection betwixt superior and vassal, whilk is in some danger of falling into desuetude, owing to the general license and misrule of these present unhappy times.' (115)

It is all pretension, and the villagers have so little fear of their former feudal lords that they laugh at this pretension. Secretly, Caleb himself realizes that it is all for naught as well, but his conditioning and training have not prepared him for any other way to perceive the world. In the end, to get what he needs to feed the guests at his master's castle, Caleb is forced to steal from those whom he considers to be vassals of the castle. Thus, in Caleb, Scott "shows the inevitable degradation of the feudal ideal in the modern age...Caleb's actions are motivated entirely by his desire to uphold the 'honour of the family' and the 'credit of the house.' Yet circumstances are unfavourable to Caleb, and it is an essential irony that Caleb should resort to measures which are completely dishonourable and discreditable in order to maintain a public façade of 'honour' and 'credit' (Brown *Walter Scott* 145).

Edgar admits to the changing orders and families. He is torn between the hatred that he should feel for Sir William, who has done his best to convince Edgar that all that he did was within the legal limits of the law and that he never meant personal harm to the late Allan Lord Ravenswood, saying, "It is necessary, and proper that

you should understand, that there are many points betwixt us, in which, although I judged it proper that there should be an exact ascertainment of my legal rights by the decree of a court of justice, yet it was never my intention to press them beyond the verge of equity" (119), and what Edgar is forced to admit that in ancient times his own family took what they had by sword. When contemplating his growing relationship with Sir William and his daughter, and how this contradicts his feudal obligations to his father's dying wishes to have vengeance upon the Ashtons, Edgar reflects that, "those from whom we won our ancient possessions fell under the sword of my ancestors, and left lands and livings to the conquerors. We sink under the force of the law, now too powerful for the Scottish chivalry" (120). He is forced to realize that now Sir William and the new leaders of Scotland take what they want by using political intrigue and the law. This convinces Edgar that he should "parley with the victors of the day, as if we had been besieged in our fortress and without hope of relief" (120).

Although Edgar has convinced himself to speak with Sir William, he is only able to interpret the situation within the ancient concepts of a parley within a besieged fortress. He still does not really understand the modern world; nor does he understand the machinations of a skilled lawyer and politician such as Sir William, a man without a real sense of honor, for whom everything that must be done to serve his own purposes for the moment is permissible. What Edgar arrives at by contemplating his own family's rise to power is a "condition of balance and moderation, a disposition toward part and present in which reconciliation with the

man who had been his father's 'mortal foe' becomes an acceptable course of action" (Kerr *Fiction* 92).

The only hope for the future is compromise, and Edgar, the last vestige of the old order appears willing to make this sacrifice of his ideals, and that settlement of quarrels may exclude the use of personal vengeance and violence. The new arbitrator will be the rule of law, not revenge. And the "poignancy of Edgar's predicament is that he is committed to the old world but feels impelled, in some way, to adjust to the new" (Brown *Walter Scott* 137). What Edgar does not realize is that Sir William's offer of peace between the two families in only motivated by personal ambition.

Although Edgar's feudal moorings are now no longer of value in the modern world of the 17th century, he is very much attached to these traditions, and he is culturally unable to understand someone such as Sir William, whose attachment to anything is only a question of personal enrichment. Edgar may resemble the stones of his castle that tumble into the ocean, but Sir William resembles a reed that blows with the change of wind:

> He [Sir William] had sailed long enough amid the contending tides and currents of the time to be sensible of their peril, and of the necessity of trimming his vessel to the prevailing wind, if he would have her escape suffering in the storm. The nature of his talents, and a timorousness of disposition connected with them, had made him assume the pliability of the versatile old Earl of Wiltshire, who explained the art by which he kept his ground during all the changes of state, from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of Elizabeth, by the frank avowal, that he had been born of the willow, not of the

> oak. It had accordingly been Sir William Ashton's policy on all occasions to watch the changes in the political horizon, and, ere yet the conflict was decided, to negotiate some interest for himself with the party most likely to prove victorious. (121)

Hence, one is tempted to ask if a union between these two disparately different outlooks is at all possible. At the time that Sir William insinuates himself into Edgar's home he is the pliable politician who sees some advantage in encouraging an alliance between his daughter and Edgar as "a hedge against any forthcoming change in the prevailing political climate" (Uglow *The Bride*).

Invited to the home of Sir William, the former seat of the House of Ravenswood, Edgar goes secretly hoping to continue his affair with Lucy. Caleb announces to the village that it is a distinct possibility that Edgar may marry Lucy Ashton, and receive as a dowry his father's former estates. This drastically changes the attitudes of the villagers that now see personal gain in renewing their friendship with the ancient House of Ravenswood. Much like the Ashtons, their interests are in personal advancement. Whilst attempting to curry favor with villagers, Caleb is personally opposed to his Master going to visit the Ashtons. It conflicts not only with the feudal obligation that Edgar owes to seek vengeance on the man who ruined his father, but Caleb fears an old prophesy that declares:

> *When the last Laird of Ravenswood to Ravenswood shall ride,*
> *And wooe a dead maiden to be his bride,*
> *He shall stable his stead on the Kelpie's flow,*
> *And his name shall be lost for evermoe!*

The only response of Edgar to such dire prophesies is to declare, "This is intolerable, Caleb --- I really must be gone" (141).

When Edgar arrives at his ancestral home, he finds it much modernized. Instead of the portraits of armed members of the House of Ravenswood are pictures of the usurper William and Mary, to whom the Ashtons owe their power and indeed their ability to have occupied the estates of an ancient, feudal family of Scotland. Instead of the old pictures of his ancestors hanging on the walls, he finds "The pictures of the lord Keeper's father and mother...the latter, sour, shrewish, and solemn, in her black hood and close pinners, with a book of devotion in her hand; the former, exhibiting beneath a black Geneva cowl, a scull-cap, which sate as close to the head as if it had been shave, a pinched, peevish, puritanical set of features, terminating in a hungry, reddish, peak beard, forming on the whole a countenance, in the expression of which the hypocritic seemed to contend with the miser or the knave" (144). Edgar is dismayed at the generation that gave birth to Sir William. Declaring to himself that "to make room for such as these...my ancestors have been torn from he walls which they erected" (144). It seems that at this time Edgar has become more fully aware of the change that has taken place not only in his own home, but across all of Scotland and England; for Edgar the absolutist monarchy of the Stuarts, supported by feudal nobility, has been superseded by small-minded, narrow businessmen who have taken advantage of the political changes to enrich themselves and their families. Effectively, Ravenswood has been appropriated of its property by an upstart bourgeois opportunist.

Regardless of this realization of the situation, Edgar is unable to shake himself free of his love for Lucy. He even goes so far as to make the decision to leave Ravenswood, but before departing is placed in the company of Lucy, and he proposes marriage. Unbeknownst to both Edgar, and Sir William, is the fact that Lucy has since meeting Edgar for the first time been in love with him or at least a romantic image that she has formed. Edgar and Lucy promise themselves to each other and exchange love tokens, a gold coin of which they both keep half.

For Edgar their secret engagement has forced him to turn his back upon the vengeance he had sworn to his father: declaring,

> Lucy...I have sacrificed to you projects of vengeance long nursed, and sworn to with ceremonies little better than heathen --- I sacrificed them to your image, ere I knew the worth which it represented. In the evening that succeeded my poor father's funeral, I cut a lock from my hair, and, as it consumed in the fire, I swore that my rage and revenge should pursue his enemies, until they shriveled before me like that scorched-up symbol of annihilation. (157)

This rejection of this sworn oath is the final death of feudalism. It cannot recover, and it will never return. The last upholder of the old ways has himself rejected the demands of the feudal system. He readily admits to Lucy that to have kept his promise made to his father is now impossible. He had also been warned, by the old, blind family retainer, Alice, that "if you remain here, her [Lucy] destruction, or yours, or that of both, will be the inevitable consequence[s]."

The possibility of marriage between Edgar and Lucy would be a marriage between Whig and Tory, between those who represent the old order and those who represent the new order that has come into power with the accession of William and Mary of Orange. But even taking into consideration Lady Ashton's rejection of this union, it soon becomes apparent that Edgar and Lucy may indeed be too distant in upbringing to bridge this gape. Lucy realizes that Edgar can never have respect for the person of her father for he is unable to move beyond his own prejudices and try to understand Sir William. The issue comes to a head when the Marquis of A--- plans a visit to Ravenswood, Sir William, being from modest family is intensely interested in all aspects of the up-coming noble visit, this character flaw in the person of Sir William is beyond Edgar's comprehension:

> "I could pardon Sir William," said Ravenswood one evening after he had left the room, "some general anxiety upon this occasion, for the Marquis's visit is an honour, and should be received as such. But I am worn out by these miserable minutiae of the butchery, and the larder, and the very hen-coop --- they drive me beyond my patience; I would rather endure the poverty of Wolfscraig, than be pestered with the wealth of Ravenswood Castle" (162-163).

This small detail of differences in personality, representative of class and upbringing of the two men, is only a small portion of the problem as,

> The lovers soon discovered that they differed upon other and no less important topics. Religion, the mother of peace, was, in those days of discord, so much misconstrued and mistaken, that her rites and forms were the subject

> of the most opposite opinions and the most hostile animosities. The Lord Keeper, being a whig, was, of course, a presbyterian, and had found it convenient, at different periods, to express greater zeal for the kirk, than perhaps he really felt. His family, equally of course, was trained under the same institution. Ravenswood, as we known, as a high-church man, or Episcopalian, and frequently objected to Lucy the fanaticism of some of her communion, while she intimated, rather than expressed, horror at the latitudinarian principles which she had been taught to think connected with the prelatical form of church-government. (163)

Compared to the division that exists between Edgar and Sir William over the running of a household, and the problems that exist between Edgar and Lucy over religious sensibilities are indeed serious; would Lucy and Edgar ever be able to overcome such serious differences? Only Edgar and Lucy have any attachment to ideals. All the other characters seem motivated by greed, but the ideals to which they are most attached are so plainly contrary that a union seems highly improbably. Also, their ideals are divorced from reality. Hence, according to Fiona Roberts, "the lovers from imaginative ideals which are insufficient to bring them happiness with the social world" and that "These imaginative ideals can only be expressed in the strained rhetoric of defiant love" (225).

All of the other parties in the story, both Whig and Tory, are motivated by self-preservation and power. The Jacobites are as self-serving as are the Whig supporters of King William. Bucklaw, the proposed husband for Lucy, had been a Jacobite when it served his purposes, but when he inherits his aunt's lands he quickly

converts to the Presbyterian faith and when his servant secretly declares a toast for "the King over the water," Bucklaw's response is to declare that, "I shall keep my mind to myself on these subjects, having too much respect for the memory of my venerable aunt Girnington to put her lands and tenements in the way of committing treason against established authority." Bucklaw is only willing to support the Jacobite cause if King James (exiled in France and Italy) was to return to Scotland, "with thirty thousand men at his back" (167-168). Even the old Marquis, a distant relative of Edgar's, is unwilling to truly compromise his position of power and authority and can only plan for the advent of the true King's Protestant daughter, Anne, to the throne.

The failure of the feudal order is best expressed when Edgar meets with an old family retainer who is sexton of the graveyard, Johnny Mortsleugh. The sexton did not know who Edgar was, so he told him of his service in the House of Ravenswood where he had been a musician and had served Edgar's father in the Jacobite cause, saying that:

> "When he [Edgar's father] raised his troop of militia to caper awa' to Bothwell Brigg agains thae wrang-headed wasteland whigs, I behuved, reason or nane, to munt on a horse and caper awa wi' them."
>
> "And very reasonable," said Ravenswood; "you were his servant and vassel."
>
> "Servitor, say ye?" replied the sexton "and so I was --- but it was to blaw folk to their warm dinner, or at the warst to a decent kirk-yard, and no to skreigh them awa' to a bluidy baei side, where there was de'il a bedral but the hooded craw." (197)

The feudal system has not only failed because it participated in a civil war, and lost, but because it failed to protect those who were its charges; the sexton goes on to explain that even after losing his ability to play the trumpet after the battle, he was given a home in the old system, but that Lord Ravenswood, by losing his family estate had also failed to protect those who had been his vassals: "For he loot his affairs gang to the dogs, and let in this Sir William on huz, that will gi'e naething for naething, and just ruined me and a' the puir creatures that had bite and soup at the castle, and hole to put our heads in, when things were in the auld way." In the end feudalism has failed in its primary duty, to protect. It soon dawns on Edgar that "the penalties of extravagance extend far beyond the prodigal's own suffering" (199).

The Ravenswood family is linked to the past and chivalric virtues that once linked society together, but these are virtues that are everywhere in decay. Even those who appear to profess such values by their support to the Jacobite Cause are not really representative of such virtues any longer and their support is only a lip service that is used to gain influence. Edgar himself is willing to reject his own chivalric formation to marry the daughter of the man whom he is duty bound to seek revenge upon, but, "Ravenswood's grand gestures, inspired alternatively by love and by haughty renunciation, suggests a world of absolutes which cannot co-exist in the cynical social worlds which [] Scott [] depict[s]" (Roberts 225).

The breakdown of the old social order is not limited to the upper class members of society. The sexton has no real interest in any cause that cannot advance his own interest. Alice, the old Ravenswood retainer, remains on the Ravenswood estate under the protection of Sir William after the fall of Lord Ravenswood as well. The

sexton later becomes a Presbyterian and joins with the up-and-coming Ashton family, receiving under their protection the home and comforts he had lost under Lord Ravenswood.

The possibility of marriage between Lucy and Edgar is bitterly contested by Lady Ashton, and although Sir William seems open, for selfish reasons, to entertain the possibility of the marriage of his daughter to Edgar, his wife is not. Lady Ashton feels that such a match would be poor indeed, and wishes to marry her daughter to someone with rising wealth and status; she does not wish Lucy to be united with a falling family that represents the past. Lady Ashton's determination for status and political influence is as strong as Edgar's is for revenge, and much of the final volume is taken up with the machinations of Lady Ashton to stop the marriage. She forces Lucy to accept Bucklaw, now a Presbyterian and landowner, as a suitor. Lady Ashton recognizes the impossibility of a union of her daughter with an aristocrat "lacking the financial and property qualifications for marriage into a wealthy family ambitious to improve its social and political position" (Kerr *Fiction* 95). Lucy does write to Edgar asking him to return and claim her as his wife, but she receives no replies to her letters as they are intercepted by her mother. Lady Ashton bribes the servants and even has Lucy's younger brother and favorite push her towards a marriage with Bucklaw. Under this relentless pressure, Lucy finally acquiesces to the marriage demanded by her mother. Unfortunately, Lady Ashton's relentless demands upon Lucy have unhinged her mind.

With the accession of Queen Anne Edgar's fortunes improve with the change of government and he is sent on protracted trip abroad for the new government. Soon

stories are circulated of his impending marriage "with a foreign lady of fortune and distinction" (236). And a such stories are "greedily caught up by both the political parties, who were at once struggling for power and for popular favour, and who seized, as usual, upon the most private circumstances in the lives of each other's partisans to convert them into subjects of political discussion" (236). Added to rumor was the willingness of the Marquis of A---, and kinsman of Ravenswood and supporter to declare that the report was "highly probable, and heartily wished it might be true. Such a match was fitter and far more creditable for a spirited young fellow, than a marriage with the daughter of an old whig lawyer, whose chicanery had so nearly ruined his father" (236). When Edgar does return to claim Lucy, he finds that the marriage between Lucy and Bucklaw has already been signed and sealed. He demands to know if Lucy had willingly consented to the marriage, but she is too mentally disturbed to speak out. Edgar accepts this as a rejection of their engagement. Because of Edgar's forcing himself into the house during the signing of the marriage contract and his drawing of weapons, Lucy elder brother, Colonel Ashton, demands a duel. Edgar consents.

Kerr considers that the breaking of the betrothal "is intended to show that the reconciliation of new money with old landed blood is a historical impossibility, a mere daydream with no more force in reality than Lucy Ashton's romancing" (*Fiction* 95). But in some ways it can be symbolically interpreted as the impossibility of a true marriage of the old Stuart absolutist monarchy with the rise of the Whig forces bent on developing a monarchy based upon constitutional rights and a free parliament.

During the marriage night a scream is heard from the wedding apartment, Bucklaw is found stabbed and Lucy is discovered, covered with blood, huddled in the fireplace. Lucy dies of shock and Bucklaw refuses to ever mention what had happened.

The novel concludes with Edgar making his preparations to met Colonel Ashton. Edgar rides to meet his dawn appointment and spurs his horse into quicksand and simply disappears, never to be found. He thus fulfills the ancient prophesy that the Ravenswood line would die out when their last representative stables his horse in "Kelpie's flow." Thus, the last representative of the old feudal system that had ruled Scotland for generations simply disappears.

Although Edgar had made attempts at integration, it was all for naught. Everything about the chivalric code that is fundamental to Edgar's very existence no longer has validity. Edgar inhabits a different reality than the other characters in the story, his world is "an allegorical one in which passions and duties are abstract and impersonal forces; Sir William's [as a representative of the modern world] is a world in which selfishness, individuality, and independence are (apparent) virtues" (Uglow *The Bride*). The novel depicts the end of the feudal order as demise, and disappearance, and not a defeat. Colonel Ashton does not kill Edgar in a duel, which would simply substitute them as the new chivalric heroes; "the Ravenswoods merely fulfill an old family prophecy" (Uglow *The Bride*).

Scott had declared that when power is delegated to the head of an aristocratic faction the country will suffer, it matters not if they are an old, feudal family or the newly risen rich with aristocratic pretensions, all are unfortunate rulers, always

owing their power to others and striving for the "bustle of politics and state affairs" (268). In the end the Ashtons do not take the positions of power once held by the Ravenswoods, and that,

> The family of Ashton did not long survive that of Ravenswood. Sir William Ashton survived his eldest son, the Colonel, who was slain in a duel in Flanders; and Henry, by whom he was succeeded, died unmarried. Lady Ashton lived to the verge of extreme old age, the only survivor of the group of unhappy persons. (268)

The demise of a traditional aristocratic order may be an unfortunate, but necessary concomitant of progress (Kerr *Fiction* 90). This death of aristocracy must involve not only the feudal world of the Ravenswood, but the mercantile world of an aristocracy of pretension as represented by Lady Ashton as well. David Brown has commented that, "The death of the traditional feudal world in the novel is not felt to be validated by the emergence of a new one, with its own values and sympathetically 'modern' attitudes" (129). For Scotland to progress it must be free of the tyranny of the arbitrary rule of aristocrats. The king must return.

The political changes of the return of a Stuart on the throne of England and Scotland, which should have advanced the House of Ravenswood, do not bring peace anymore than the marriage of Lucy and Edgar would have accomplished the union of Whig and Tory elements. Too many factions hoped for different things for peace and stability to return to Scotland. The divisions between Presbyterian Whig and Episcopal Tory continued unabated. In many of Scott's historical novels the moderate forces marry and their union promotes prosperity. In *The Bride* there is no

such union. All members of the aristocratic faction remain unmarried, it is mentioned that Henry, Lucy's younger brother dies unmarried and childless. Queen Anne, the hope for the Stuart faction in Scotland at this time, had fourteen children born to her, all of whom died in infancy. The Stuart line, much like feudalism, simply could not reproduce and prosper.

The Bride tends towards pessimism. The use of prophecy, witchcraft and omens color the story with a sense of foreboding that is not present in Scott's other novels. There seems to be no future that will not be one of further conflict and destruction. The passing of the old aristocratic order does not signify a move towards progress, but is this prognosis of tragedy all that the novel leaves to the reader? The future does not belong to the aristocrats, their time has passed into the twilight; but then to whom does the future belong? It may be that the future belongs to the new emerging middle classes which are best represented by the inhabitants of Wolf's Hope, the former vassals of the castle of Wolf's Craig who have freed themselves of their feudal obligations to their Lords, and in this,

> They resembled a man that has been long fettered, who, even at liberty, feels in imagination the grasp of the handcuffs still binding his writs. But the exercise of freedom is quickly followed with the natural consciousness of its immunities, as the enlarged prisoner, by the free use of his limbs, soon dispels, the cramped feeling they had acquired when bound. (101)

The villages are not bound by old hatreds of either vengeance or party loyalty. They are free to do business and to prosper as independent agents. The lower orders cannot prosper under the old forms; they can only have true progress under a new form of

government that will listen to their needs for commerce and protection based upon a rule of law. The same "liberal" characteristics was found in the person of Niel Blane in *Old Mortality*, as the tavern keeper, he had no interest in politics, dynastic struggles, or religion, only in making a profit. Theirs is a bourgeois ideology of ownership and independence unfettered by ideology.

When the Marquise of A--- must stay in the village of Craig's Hope, he does not do so as a feudal lord, but as a guest of the villagers. This more than anything else represents a vast social change, and signals the death of the old order. The villagers are no longer prisoners to an ancient political system. Lucy and Edgar belong to the past; the future belongs to the commercial interests represented by tavern keepers and coopers. But the future can only be their's if Scotland can escape from its ancient hatreds and religious enmity, the country must have peace and access to the modern commercial world. Only a true union of liberal principals will permit this to happen, and not the union of romantic ideals with a long dead feudalism. Hence, the Hope of Scotland no longer resides in the powerful ancient families of old, but in the small merchants of a new mercantile age that cannot afford to keep alive the old loyalties of a feudal world. The only true protection of this new world is a true union of the progressive and moderate forces of both kingdoms of Scotland and England, not a union of new aristocrats with the old.

CHAPTER 5

THE HEART OF MID-LOTHIAN: THE RISING LOWER CLASSES

After the Union of 1707 Scottish affairs had been handled in Whitehall by a separate Secretary for Scotland, but in 1725, under the very long premiership of Sir Robert Walpole, they passed into the province of the Home Secretary, but in actuality most power resided with Lord Argyll or Forbes of Culloden, friction between the two was constant. In Scotland there was growing resentment over the handling of Scottish affairs, especially with taxes imposed on malt and salt. This resentment led to various outbursts of rioting in the cities and smuggling was viewed as a patriotic duty. Scott points out that during this time:

> Contraband trade, though it strikes at the root of legitimate government, by encroaching The county of Fife, bounded by two firths on the south and north, and by the sea on the east, and having a number of small seaports, was long famed for maintaining successfully a contraband trade; and, as there were many seafaring men residing there, who had been pirates and buccaneers in their youth, there were not wanting a sufficient number of daring men to carry it on. (*The Bride* 22)

Smugglers were held up as heroes against what was perceived as the tyranny of England, and tax-collectors were considered as public enemies of the people (Maclean *Scotland* 168). The overall result was to breed a culture of violence against legally constituted

authority, and to blame the problems in Scotland upon England and the Union.

Walter Scott's sixth work of fiction, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* takes place during these times. It first appeared as *Tales of My Landlord*, second series, and comprised one novel, which was *The Heart of Mid-Lothian.* The work was published in July 1818, in four volumes. Scott's name did not appear on the title page; instead, the tale purported to have been left in manuscript form by Peter Pattieson, schoolmaster at Gandercleugh, to his superior Jedediah Cleishbotham, who had edited it into publishable form. Contemporary readers saw through this cover and attributed the novel to the same anonymous hand that had written the immensely popular Waverley novels which had appeared in quick succession since 1814. *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* itself was expected to be extraordinarily popular: its publisher Archibald Constable printed a first edition of 10,000 copies (the average print-runs of novels by other authors then ranging between 500 and 750 copies). *The Bride* is, according to Jane Millgate, "The one novel in whose revision Scott did allow play to 'the caprice of the author', or rather of the author transformed into his later role as editor" (*Scott* 74).

The original version of the novel had the action from a period early in the reign of Queen Anne, and the date was before the 1707 Act of Union and the abolition of the Scottish Parliament. The action was moved to a later period in history to after the Union and abolition of the Scottish Parliament. Millgate supposes that "the immediate motivation for these changes seems to have been uncertainty on Scott's part as to the exact situation with respect to appeals to parliament in the period before between the Claim of Right of 1689 and the Union of 1707" (*Scott* 74-75).

The novel interweaves two narratives. One is based on an incident described in an

unsigned letter which Scott received early in 1817. This letter reports how a certain orphan, Helen Walker, had traveled on foot from Edinburgh to London in the 1730s to obtain a pardon for her sister Isobel who had been condemned to death for child murder. Helen and Isobel became the prototypes for the characters Jeanie Deans and her sister Effie in the novel (Uglow *The Heart*).

The second narrative is based on the Porteous riot of 1736. John Porteous was captain of the Edinburgh City Guard, and had overseen the hanging of the smuggler Andrew Wilson. Porteous, in Scott's novel, was "the son of a citizen of Edinburgh, who endeavoured to breed him up to his own mechanical trade of a tailor. The youth, however, had a wild and irreclaimable propensity to dissipation, which finally sent him to serve in the corps long maintained in the service of the States of Holland, and called the Scotch Dutch." As a soldier in Holland he had "learned military discipline; and, returning afterwards, in the course of an idle and wandering life, to his native city, his services were required by the magistrates of Edinburgh in the disturbed year 1715, for disciplining their City Guard, in which he shortly afterwards received a captain's commission" (26). The City Guard was used to quell the riots that had been breaking out in the city over the newly imposed tax burdens, but the corps received little sympathy from the local population. Indeed, the majority of the corps was composed of,

> Highlanders, [who] neither by birth, education, nor former habits, trained to endure with much patience the insults of the rabble, or the provoking petulance of truant schoolboys, and idle debauchees of all descriptions, with whom their occupation brought them into contact. On the contrary, the tempers of the poor old fellows were soured by the indignities with which the mob distinguished them

on many occasions. (27)

Because the general unease over the coming execution of Wilson, coupled with a fear that there might be violence, "the magistrates took farther precautions [during the execution], which affected Porteous's pride very deeply. They requested the assistance of part of a regular infantry regiment, not to attend upon the execution, but to remain drawn up on the principal street of the city, during the time that it went forward, in order to intimidate the multitude, in case they should be disposed to be unruly, with a display of force which could not be resisted without desperation" (29). It was this calling out of other troops that had wounded Porteous' pride and caused him to treat Wilson with great brutality on the scaffold, because he "resented, as an indignity, the introducing the Welsh Fusileers within the city, and drawing them up in the street where no drums but his own were allowed to be sounded without the special command or permission of the magistrates."

It was this sense of wounded pride that "increased his indignation and his desire to be revenged on the unfortunate criminal Wilson, and all who favoured him." All who saw Porteous on that morning saw "these internal emotions of jealousy and rage wrought a change on the man's mien and bearing." Wilson, the man condemned to hang, was,

> Originally a baker in the village of Pathhead, was particularly obnoxious to the revenue officers. He was possessed of great personal strength, courage, and cunning,—was perfectly acquainted with the coast, and capable of conducting the most desperate enterprises. On several occasions he succeeded in baffling the pursuit and researches of the king's officers; but he became so much the object of their suspicions and watchful attention, that at length he was totally ruined by

repeated seizures. (22)

Even though Wilson was a condemned criminal he had excited the sympathy of the people not only by his smuggling, but also by selflessly helping his companion, George Robertson, to escape execution. Wilson became a smuggler because "he became desperate. He considered himself as robbed and plundered; and took it into his head that he had a right to make reprisals, as he could find opportunity. Where the heart is prepared for evil, opportunity is seldom long wanting" (22).

Because of the general rejection of the Union and what was felt to be English direction of Scottish affairs the people did not consider that Wilson had committed a crime that demanded a death sentence; he had only robbed a tax-collector. Also, the general population was upset with the new tax code instituted in Scotland since the Act of Union. Hence, Porteous treatment of the condemned prisoner is complicated by his own personal sense of humiliation coupled with the populous feeling of a national humiliation:

> To assuage his own sense of jealousy and hurt pride Porteous causes the mistreatment of a condemned prisoner, who is considered as a hero to many in the crowd, and, One part of his conduct was truly diabolical, if indeed it has not been exaggerated by the general prejudice entertained against his memory. When Wilson, the unhappy criminal, was delivered to him by the keeper of the prison, in order that he might be conducted to the place of execution, Porteous, not satisfied with the usual precautions to prevent escape, ordered him to be manacled. This might be justifiable from the character and bodily strength of the malefactor, as well as from the apprehensions so generally entertained of an expected rescue. But the handcuffs which were produced being found too small for the wrists of a

man so big-boned as Wilson, Porteous proceeded with his own hands, and by great exertion of strength, to force them till they clasped together, to the exquisite torture of the unhappy criminal. Wilson remonstrated against such barbarous usage, declaring that the pain distracted his thoughts from the subjects of meditation proper to his unhappy condition. "It signifies little," replied Captain Porteous; "your pain will soon be at an end." "Your cruelty is great," answered the sufferer. "You know not how soon you yourself may have occasion to ask the mercy which you are now refusing to a fellow-creature. May God forgive you!" (30)

At no time during the actual execution do the bystanders attempt to save Wilson from his fate, and "the multitude, in general, looked on with deeper interest than at ordinary executions; and there might be seen, on the countenances of many, a stern and indignant expression, like that with which the ancient Cameronians might be supposed to witness the execution of their brethren, who glorified the Covenant on the same occasion, and at the same spot. But there was no attempt at violence" (30). Only after Wilson is hung does the crowd move forward when "he had been suspended on the gibbet so long as to be totally deprived of life," then "at once, as if occasioned by some newly received impulse, there arose a tumult among the multitude.

Many stones were thrown at Porteous and his guards; some mischief was done; and the mob continued to press forward with whoops, shrieks, howls, and exclamations" to take him from the gibbet, it is during this movement that Porteous causes his troops to fire into the crowd killing several of them; forgetting that "it was his duty not to engage in hostilities with the misguided multitude, but to draw off his men as fast as possible"

(30).

In response to firing into the crowds the Edinburgh court condemns Porteous to death, only to see him reprieved at the last minute by the Queen herself. The people of Edinburgh, who had already assembled in the Grassmarket to "glut their sight with triumphant revenge" at the hanging of the hated man, take this royal intervention as an insult. It was rumored in Edinburgh that the pardoning of Porteous was not only an intervention in Scotland's legal tradition, but that it had been instigated by class favoritism as well, and that,

> The lower part of the rabble added one which was peculiarly well adapted to their comprehension. It was averred, in order to increase the odium against Porteous, that while he repressed with the utmost severity the slightest excesses of the poor, he not only overlooked the license of the young nobles and gentry, but was very willing to lend them the countenance of his official authority, in execution of such loose pranks as it was chiefly his duty to have restrained. (34)

This interpretation of the reprieve as based upon class was further strengthened when "several of the higher rank joined in a petition, recommending Porteous to the mercy of the Crown, it was generally supposed he owed their favour not to any conviction of the hardship of his case, but to the fear of losing a convenient accomplice in their debaucheries" (34). The populous was not surprised when,

> A reprieve from the Secretary of State's office, under the hand of his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, had arrived, intimating the pleasure of Queen Caroline (regent of the kingdom during the absence of George II. on the Continent), that the execution of the sentence of death pronounced against John Porteous, late

> Captain-Lieutenant of the City Guard of Edinburgh, present prisoner in the Tolbooth of that city, be respited for six weeks from the time appointed for his execution. (34-35)

This news is "spread among the spectators with a rapidity like lightning." There is great and growing popular anger over the granting of the pardon.

Scotland and England were uneasily united at this time; Scotland had lost its Parliament under the 1707 Union treaty and was now ruled by a government in far-away London, and with the departure of political power, Edinburgh lost some of its general significance and prosperity. However, Scotland kept its own jurisdiction after the Union; hence, the reprieve of Porteous therefore meant the overruling of a Scottish sentence by a distant monarch, which aggravated people's sense of injustice. And certainly the accusation of class discrimination also contributed to inflame the mob against the intervention of the Queen.

The mob is not only angry with the overturning of Scottish law, but the general feeling that times had been better before the Union, and it was felt that the imposition of taxes by a governing body with only limited Scottish representation was unfair. The general population in the novel has little to say that is positive about the present government; and there is a sense of loss and that before the Union, "Scotland was Scotland in these days." The popular feeling was that the Union has been a mistake and Scotland is the poorer for it and many shall, "Ne'er believe Scotland is Scotland ony mair, if our kindly Scots sit doun with the affront they hae gien us this day. It's not only the blude that *is* shed, but the blude that might hae been shed" (40). Popular resentment over the Union is expressed by individuals who declare that,

"I am judging," said Mr. Plumdamas, "that this reprieve wadna stand gude in the auld Scots law, when the kingdom was a kingdom."

"I dinna ken muckle about the law," answered Mrs. Howden; "but I ken, when we had a king, and a chancellor, and parliament men o' our ain, we could aye peeble them wi' stanes when they werena gude bairns—But naebody's nails can reach the length o' Lunnon." (37)

Added to this sense that the Union is a disability for Scotland is the feeling that the economic benefits promised have not come to the general population; that the new united government has "hae taen away our parliament, and they hae oppressed our trade. Our gentles will hardly allow that a Scots needle can sew ruffles on a sark, or lace on an owerlay" (37). The Union is viewed not only as a political mistake, but an economic one as well.

In reaction to the granting of the pardon a mob assembled, and stormed the Tolbooth, known as Heart of Mid-Lothian, the prison at the centre of the city, and dragged out Porteous and hung him; fulfilling Wilson's final words to Porteous on his way to the gibbet. The scenes depicting the mob, with its power and uncontainable anger, are the first of their kind in British fiction (Uglow *The Heart*). While Scott leaves no doubt about the barbarity of the riot, observing that, "The next object of these hardy insurgents was at once to disarm the City Guard, and to procure arms for themselves; for scarce any weapons but staves and bludgeons had been yet seen among them. The Guard-house was a long, low, ugly building (removed in 1787), which to a fanciful imagination might have suggested the idea of a long black snail crawling up the middle of the High Street, and deforming its beautiful esplanade" (52), and "uniformly callous, selfish and prejudiced

in their attitudes, while the legal authorities are socially insecure, and apparently happy to demote justice to an instrument of political manipulation of the Scots" (Brown *Walter Scott* 115).

Although Scott is repelled by the actions of the mob, he nevertheless sympathizes with its cause. The action of the novel are set not quite thirty years after the Union, and whilst knowing in theory that they are British, the people of Edinburgh, are still not quite convinced of their belonging to a greater nation than simply the Kingdom of Scotland. The reprieve of Porteous strikes them as "a step towards domination by indifferent aliens in a far-off city" (Mayhead 62-63). And for Scott, regardless of the revulsion he may have felt for the mob, 'he gives them their due for courteous treatment of innocents who chanced to be in the vicinity" (63), stating:

> And the mob without difficulty possessed themselves of the Guard-house, disarming and turning out of doors the rest of the men on duty. It was remarked, that, notwithstanding the city soldiers had been the instruments of the slaughter which this riot was designed to revenge, no ill usage or even insult was offered to them. It seemed as if the vengeance of the people disdained to stoop at any head meaner than that which they considered as the source and origin of their injuries. (52)

The mob considers itself to be protectors of the true legal judgment, made by a Scottish court, against Porteous; and that,

> The same vigilance was used to prevent everybody of the higher, and those which, in this case, might be deemed the more suspicious orders of society, from appearing in the street, and observing the movements, or distinguishing the

> persons, of the rioters. Every person in the garb of a gentleman was stopped by small parties of two or three of the mob, who partly exhorted, partly required of them, that they should return to the place from whence they came. Many a quadrille table was spoilt that memorable evening; for the sedan chairs of ladies; even of the highest rank, were interrupted in their passage from one point to another, in spite of the laced footmen and blazing flambeaux. This was uniformly done with a deference and attention to the feelings of the terrified females, which could hardly have been expected from the videttes of a mob so desperate. Those who stopped the chair usually made the excuse, that there was much disturbance on the streets, and that it was absolutely necessary for the lady's safety that the chair should turn back. They offered themselves to escort the vehicles which they had thus interrupted in their progress, from the apprehension, probably, that some of those who had casually united themselves to the riot might disgrace their systematic and determined plan of vengeance, by those acts of general insult and license which are common on similar occasions. (53)

When Porteous is found trying to hide in the chimney of his cell there are those who wish to murder him immediately, but are dissuaded from doing so by their leader who declares that, "would ye execute an act of justice as if it were a crime and a cruelty? This sacrifice will lose half its savour if we do not offer it at the very horns of the altar. We will have him die where a murderer should die, on the common gibbet—We will have him die where he spilled the blood of so many innocents!" (58). On their way to hang Porteous the mob forces the first clergyman that they come across, Reuben Butler, to accompany them so that the condemned man may make his peace before he is hung.

Butler asks of the mob to spare Porteous' life exclaiming to "remember it is the image of your Creator which you are about to deface in the person of this unfortunate man! Wretched as he is, and wicked as he may be, he has a share in every promise of Scripture, and you cannot destroy him in impenitence without blotting his name from the Book of Life—Do not destroy soul and body; give time for preparation" (62). The only response from the leader of the mob is to state that "he [Porteous] has been already judged and condemned by lawful authority. We are those whom Heaven, and our righteous anger, have stirred up to execute judgment, when a corrupt Government would have protected a murderer" (62). According to the leaders of the mob it is the government in London that is corrupt and has subverted justice not they. Although their anger seems directed against Porteous, it is the Union and the English government that is the real object of the mob.

The action of the mob after Porteous is hung is also different from a riot without form or control; they do not fall into general riot and looting. The hanging of Porteous being done there is a "sudden and total dispersion of the rioters, when their vindictive purpose was accomplished" (63). And that,

> They seemed completely satiated with the vengeance they had prosecuted with such stanch and sagacious activity. When they were fully satisfied that life had abandoned their victim, they dispersed in every direction, throwing down the weapons which they had only assumed to enable them to carry through their purpose. At daybreak there remained not the least token of the events of the night, excepting the corpse of Porteous, which still hung suspended in the place where he had suffered, and the arms of various kinds which the rioters had taken from

the city guard-house, which were found scattered about the streets as they had thrown them from their hands when the purpose for which they had seized them was accomplished. (63)

In the city of Edinburgh itself the mob left very little visible post-reaction to the hanging of Porteous, indeed "the ordinary magistrates of the city resumed their power, not without trembling at the late experience of the fragility of its tenure. To march troops into the city, and commence a severe inquiry into the transactions of the preceding night, were the first marks of returning energy which they displayed. But these events had been conducted on so secure and well-calculated a plan of safety and secrecy, that there was little or nothing learned to throw light upon the authors or principal actors in a scheme so audacious" (63). But the news was not so kindly received in London, for to Queen Caroline the killing of Porteous is seen as a barbarous challenge to her authority, for she is as much the queen of Scotland as she is queen of England, and her government is supposed to be that of one nation --- Britain.

Scott writes that the Queen, "considered her own authority as exposed to contempt by the success of this singular conspiracy. Nothing was spoke of for some time save the measure of vengeance which should be taken, not only on the actors of this tragedy, so soon as they should be discovered, but upon the magistrates who had suffered it to take place, and upon the city which had been the scene where it was exhibited" (64). In response to mob rule in Edinburgh, Queen Caroline responded with a Bill of Pains and Penalties. This required that the City Charter of Edinburgh be destroyed and the City Guard disbanded, the Netherbar Port demolished and the Provost imprisoned.

Scott observes that "On this occasion, it is still recorded in popular tradition, that

her Majesty, in the height of her displeasure, told the celebrated John Duke of Argyle, that, sooner than submit to such an insult, she would make Scotland a hunting-field. 'In that case, Madam,' answered that high-spirited nobleman, with a profound bow, 'I will take leave of your Majesty, and go down to my own country to get my hounds ready'" (64): a statement which shows his full support for the authority of the Union. In the end, it was the intervention of Argyll with the Queen that her will was not enforced; instead a heavy fine was extracted from the City (Maclean *Scotland* 168-169), and,

> The bill was gradually stripped of its most oppressive and obnoxious clauses, and at length ended in a fine upon the city of Edinburgh in favour of Porteous's widow. So that, as somebody observed at the time, the whole of these fierce debates ended in making the fortune of an old cook-maid, such having been the good woman's original capacity. (319)

Scott further relates "that most of the Scottish nobility and gentry seemed actuated by the same national spirit, the royal displeasure was necessarily checked in mid-volley, and milder courses were recommended and adopted, to some of which we may hereafter have occasion to advert" (64). It was a Scottish sense of shared nationality and cohesiveness that thwarted the Queen's displeasure after the riots. Although the stronger measures demanded by the Queen were not enforced, the general attitude of the population was that "the various steps adopted for punishing the city of Edinburgh, by taking away her charter and liberties, for what a violent and overmastering mob had done within her walls, were resented by many, who thought a pretext was too hastily taken for degrading the ancient metropolis of Scotland. In short, there was much heart-burning, discontent, and disaffection, occasioned by these ill-considered measures" (171), and that the general

tenure of the acts was "an attempt to trample upon the rights and independence of Scotland" (171).

The two narratives in the novel, that of the Porteous' riots and the plight of the girl accused of child murder, are combined when the mob attacks the Tolbooth to murder Porteous; here we also find that one of its inmates is Effie Deans, a beautiful country girl barely eighteen years old, who is accused of having murdered her illegitimate child. In Scott's version the mob was lead by George Robertson, who had been condemned to die with Wilson, except that Wilson made his escape possible during a church service that the two condemned prisoners had attended before their execution. Robertson had other reasons besides revenge on Porteous, because Effie Deans had been seduced by him and has borne his child. She is to stand trial under a statute that stipulates that if a woman conceals her pregnancy and then can neither produce the infant nor prove that it died a natural death; she shall be presumed to have murdered it and shall suffer the death penalty.

Although Robertson finds Effie in the prison, she refuses to escape, "faintly muttering, 'Better tyne life, since tint is gude fame,' she...remained, seemingly, unconscious as a statue of the noise and tumult which passed around her" (59). Robertson than summons Effie's sister Jeanie and tells her that the case can be removed from under the statute if Effie is found to have communicated her condition to anyone. Jeanie refuses to lie. When Effie is condemned to death, Jeanie travels on foot all the way from Edinburgh to London, and wins pardon from the Queen.

The Heart of Midlothian has for its heroine one of the common people, Jeanie Deans. Effie's and Jeanie's upbringing has been strictly Presbyterian and very much

within the Cameronian tradition; Jeanie is actually a cow herder on her father's small croft. Their father is the Covenanter David Deans, who represents one of the last remnants of seventeenth-century extreme Presbyterianism and views the more moderate form of worship of the Scottish Kirk as too lenient: Deans was "a stanch Presbyterian, of the most rigid and unbending adherence to what he conceived to be the only possible straight line, as he was wont to express himself, between right-hand heats and extremes and left-hand defections" (71). Scott's novel *The Tale of Old Mortality* had already dealt with the Covenanting rebellions against Charles II who had imposed episcopacy on the Scottish clergy. Though times have changed, and Presbyterianism had been restored in Scotland after the Glorious Revolution of 1688, David allows for no adjustments but continues in his rigid Presbyterianism that does not accept worldly authority; and,

> He was by no means pleased with the quiet and indifferent manner in which King William's government slurred over the errors of the times, when, far from restoring the Presbyterian kirk to its former supremacy, they passed an act of oblivion even to those who had been its persecutors, and bestowed on many of them titles, favours, and employments. When, in the first General Assembly which succeeded the Revolution, an overture was made for the revival of the League and Covenant, it was with horror that Douce David heard the proposal eluded by the men of carnal wit and policy, as he called them, as being inapplicable to the present times, and not falling under the modern model of the church. The reign of Queen Anne had increased his conviction, that the Revolution government was not one of the true Presbyterian complexion. (178-179)

Although David Deans has real difficulty in accepting the legality of the new government, and by implication the Union, he also realizes that the alternative, which is a return of the Stuarts, would be a disaster for Scotland: hence, "he did not confound the moderation and tolerance of these two reigns with the active tyranny and oppression exercised in those of Charles II. and James II" (179). Like many remaining supporters of the Covenant, Deans lived with a "horror for the revival of the Popish and prelatical faction [which] reconciled him greatly to the government of King George, although he grieved that that monarch might be suspected of a leaning unto Erastianism" (179). His beliefs are outdated, and in spite of his at times comical applications of them, he does not become a comical figure. What is important is that the original fanaticism of the original Cameronians has become slowly moderated over time, and over time will accept the need for the Union and the actual benefits that it brings to Scotland.

The first part of the novel is concerned with questions of the relation of law to justice and to mercy. Jeanie Deans becomes the spokesman of the peasantry as well as the voice of moral authority. Jeanie is like her father in that she is deeply religious, but in a far more moderate, humane, and warm-hearted way. Jeanie was raised by her father,

> from the time she could walk, upwards, [and] she was daily employed in some task or other, suitable to her age and capacity; a circumstance which, added to her father's daily instructions and lectures, tended to give her mind, even when a child, a grave, serious, firm, and reflecting cast. An uncommonly strong and healthy temperament, free from all nervous affection and every other irregularity, which, attacking the body in its more noble functions, so often influences the

> mind, tended greatly to establish this fortitude, simplicity, and decision of character. (72)

Jeanie, a simple peasant girl, is the heroine of *The Heart of Mid-Lothian.* Scott thereby goes against the fictional conventions of his time in his choice of the main character: *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* is the first of his novels to have a working-class protagonist, and one of the first in British fiction generally – after Defoe's *Moll Flanders* and Richardson's *Pamela* – to have a working-class woman at its center (Bautz *The Heart*). Jeanie is "no heroine of romance" since she is without striking beauty, rank, and sentimentality, but she has a dignity usually reserved for characters of higher rank in fiction. She possesses firmness of character, down-to-earthiness, and courage. Although it is her younger sister Effie who is beautiful, passionate, but erring, Scott contrives throughout to keep the reader's sympathies with Jeanie, the faultlessly good and pure as well as the more ordinary of the two sisters (Bautz *The Bride*). Effie the younger of the two sisters was raised by Jeanie and,

> under the tender and affectionate care of her sister, had now shot up into a beautiful and blooming girl. Her Grecian shaped head was profusely rich in waving ringlets of brown hair, which, confined by a blue snood of silk, and shading a laughing Hebe countenance, seemed the picture of health, pleasure, and contentment. Her brown russet short-gown set off a shape, which time, perhaps, might be expected to render too robust, the frequent objection to Scottish beauty, but which, in her present early age, was slender and taper, with that graceful and easy sweep of outline which at once indicates health and beautiful proportion of parts. 84

Because she is raised under the more moderate tutelage of her sister, Effie is distant from the strict upbringing that Jeanie has received. Added to this difference, is the fact that Effie was the daughter of Deans' old age and by a second wife. The younger daughter and the father they are separated not only by age, but religious feeling as well.

The first three volumes of the novel deal with the probing of the relation of law to justice and to mercy. Scott contrasts a number of characters, each of whom stands in a different relation to the law: Wilson is a criminal justly condemned for smuggling, but his last offense is the generous saving of a life by enabling his young accomplishes, George Robertson, to escape, and it wins him the support of the populous; Captain Porteous' excessive zeal and hatred of the lower orders, leads to the loss of life and earns him the hatred of the populous. Amongst the mob it is Robertson who is concerned to preserve order because he wishes to stress the justice of his action, yet in his own person he has much to fear from justice. Moreover he is moved more by revenge than by justice. Effie is the most misused by the legal system, since she is entirely innocent of the charge of murder. The midwife, who is the mother of another girl seduced by George Robertson, had stolen her child. This she cannot prove. She then must suffer for the guilt of others, even her father deserts her because she has broken with the strict religious principals of his faith, declaring upon hearing of her arrest for child murder that, "where is the vile harlot, that has disgraced the blood of an honest man?—Where is she, that has no place among us, but has come foul with her sins, like the Evil One, among the children of God?—Where is she, Jeanie?—Bring her before me, that I may kill her with a word and a look!" (94). Although Jeanie continues to support her sister she too is affected by Effie's

transgression. The two divergent attitudes of the father and elder daughter to Effie's plight are fundamental to the plot as developed by Scott when he writes:

> It is well known, that much, both of what is good and bad in the Scottish national character, arises out of the intimacy of their family connections. "To be come of honest folk," that is, of people who have borne a fair and unstained reputation, is an advantage as highly prized among the lower Scotch, as the emphatic counterpart, "to be of a good family," is valued among their gentry. The worth and respectability of one member of a peasant's family is always accounted by themselves and others, not only a matter of honest pride, but a guarantee for the good conduct of the whole. On the contrary, such a melancholy stain as was now flung on one of the children of Deans, extended its disgrace to all connected with him, and Jeanie felt herself lowered at once, in her own eyes, and in those of her lover. It was in vain that she repressed this feeling, as far subordinate and too selfish to be mingled with her sorrow for her sister's calamity. Nature prevailed; and while she shed tears for her sister's distress and danger, there mingled with them bitter drops of grief for her own degradation. 101

Because of this sense of family degradation and shame, Jeanie feels forced to break her long standing engagement with Reuben Butler, fearing that Effie's shame would endanger his possible advancement in the Church, and although the Deans family feels that Effie is innocent of child murder she has still committed fornication, which is a sin that cannot be easily forgiven by the strict standards of the father.

The government wishes Effie to be an example to others because of the increasing frequency of child murder, and she is suffering for George Robertson's

seduction of another. Also, because of the Queen's anger over the Porteous affair, put into place by George Robertson to save her, it would appear that a royal pardon would be unlikely.

Effie is linked with Wilson in that she and he have both sacrificed themselves for the benefit of George Robertson. Effie could have saved herself by disclosing who the father other child was, but this she refused to do. Effie stands trial under a statute that presumes child murder without having to prove it in cases where pregnancy has been concealed and the child cannot be found. Jeanie could therefore rescue her sister by telling the court that Effie had informed her about the pregnancy. But Effie had not, and Jeanie, with her uprightness and firm religious beliefs, cannot lie – in spite of knowing that Effie did not murder her child: "I wad ware the best blood in my body to keep her skaithless ... but I canna change right into wrang, or make that true which is false." The novel poses questions of morality, legality, and justice through Jeanie's dilemma of whether she should tell the truth when a lie would save her sister (Bautz *The Heart*). This inability to lie places Jeanie outside of the confines of normal humanity and exults her to a higher standard.

We soon lean that George Robertson real name is Staunton; he is the son of an English vicar and hails from an old and respectable family. He is estranged from his father, and has become a fallen member of the gentry. The whole of the aristocracy has become stupid and insipid. Scott's opinion of most of the aristocratic families of Scotland and England are that "the gentry were at once idle, haughty, fierce, divided by faction, and addicted to intemperance" (95). They have forgotten their duty to both

their inferiors and to their country. Even in his attempts to save Effie, Robertson wishes to protect himself.

It is Robertson that tries to convince Jeanie to lie for him, and to explain that she knew of Effie's pregnancy, but Jeanie cannot do this. For her truth is the only absolute consideration. In a Scotland that stands at the brink of moral destruction, truth becomes the only true ointment of healing, and the mob that hangs Porteous as an expression of anti-English feeling heightened by the Act of Union has "the suggestion that Scott is asking whether a Scottish identity in 1736 was only to be found in robbery, murder, and mob violence" (Brown *Walter Scott* 116). To avoid this extreme, it is necessary for Scotland to accept that there are true benefits to be gained by the Union, and *The Heart* attempts to show that moral certainty and an acceptance of the authority of the Union is a far better path than one that will lead to mob rule.

David Deans attempts to offer a moral alternative to the destructive powers that seem to overpower Scotland by a return to rigid Presbyterian principals, but these ideals have simply stagnated; they have nothing to offer. When confronted with the possibility of lying to save his daughter's life, he seems willing to acquiesce. The rigid doctrine of Calvinism does not contain the answer to the question of the problems besetting Scotland. The strict Presbyterianism of David Deans can only offer a rejection of the Union on religious grounds as he trumpets the rejection by,

> striving and testifying with uplifted hand and voice, crying aloud, and sparing not, against all great national snares, as the nation-wasting and church-sinking abomination of union, toleration, and patronage, imposed by the last woman of

that unhappy race of Stuarts; also against the infringements and invasions of the just powers of eldership. (103)

The fanaticism of a previous age has nothing but the verbiage of hatred to offer; it can offer no real solutions. The failure of religious fanaticism as a viable path to national redemption and renewal has already been dealt with in *Old Mortality*.

Because Jeannie refuses to lie to save her sister, Effie is condemned to death by the court. Before the court even comes to order, Effie's father was unwilling to hire a lawyer because none of them were narrow enough in their religious belief to suit him. David Deans is "thrawing his daughter's life awa," because, "to hear him speak in that daft gate. Where will he ever get a Cameronian advocate? Or wha ever heard of a lawyer's suffering either for ae religion or another? The lassie's life is clean flung awa" (114). It is only because of the good graces of Reuben Butler and the local laird that Effie receives any legal advice. In retrospect, for several generations the life of Scotland had been thrown away because of religious bigotry and intolerance, and here we see that Deans, for the same reasons, is willing to let his daughter die because his religious fanaticism.

It is during the trial that Reuben Butler is arrested because he had been forced by the mob to give spiritual succor to Porteous before they hung him; during the time that he is questioned he demands that "I have a right to know from you in return, what warrant you have for detaining me; that, I know, is the right of every British subject" (120). This is the first time that the term "British subject" is used in relationship to rights. In *The Bride* and *Old Mortality* any reference to rights and legal protection had pertained only to Scotland; never to Britain. It was the Union of the produced Britain as a united country with

specific rights to each subject, as well as the term "Briton" as a common designation to all subjects of the crown regardless of ethnicity.

Butler does not protest his imprisonment based upon any specific rights as a Scotsman, but upon his rights as a subject of a united Britain. The legal implication of a united kingdom is paramount to gaining legal redress for Effie. If she is to be held only under Scottish law, she must die. It is only with the possibility of a greater right guaranteed by the Union that she can hope for a pardon.

The same strength and purpose that kept Jeanie from lying now enables her heroism: although Scott tells us that, "She was no heroine of romance" (230), she decides to walk to London and obtain a pardon from the King himself. It is Jeannie's belief that "my sister shall come out in the face of the sun," said that "I will go to London, and beg her pardon from the king and queen. If they pardoned Porteous, they may pardon her; if a sister asks a sister's life on her bended knees, they will pardon her—they *shall* pardon her—and they will win a thousand hearts by it" (224). For Jeanie that pardon will not only gain public support for the monarchs, but in retrospect for the Union as well, since they are in the minds and hearts of the people of Scotland inseparable. Apart from the hazards of the journey and the difficulty of seeing the monarch, the pardon appears impossible to obtain: it would again mean overruling Scottish jurisdiction by a monarch who was incensed at the Scots not having honored her pardon of Porteous.

Reuben Butler tries to dissuade her from so dangerous an undertaking and offers to write to the King, but Jeanie is firms saying to him that, "I have that within me that will keep my heart from failing. Writing winna do it – a letter canna look, and pray, and beg, and beseech, as the human voice can do to the human heart." And that she is, "bound on a

lang journey—I am gaun to Lunnon to ask Effie's life of the king and of the queen" (245).

Jeannie sees that the King and Queen are human and will see the injustice done by the Scottish court to Effie. She says to Butler that, "it's but speaking to a mortal man and woman when a' is done. And their hearts maun be made o' flesh and blood like other folk's, and Effie's story wad melt them were they stane. Forby, I hae heard that they are no sic bad folk as what the Jacobites ca' them" (245). Accordingly, she sets out to walk to London.

Jeanie's pilgrimage to England is the reversal of the role of Edward Waverly. For Jeanie England is the foreign country with different social and religious traditions, but "She found the common people of England, although inferior in courtesy to strangers, such as was then practised in her own more unfrequented country, yet, upon the whole, by no means deficient in the real duties of hospitality," and that "She readily obtained food, and shelter, and protection at a very moderate rate" (249-250). She writes to her father that, "The folk here are civil, and, like the barbarians unto the holy apostle, hae shown me much kindness; and there are a sort of chosen people in the land, for they hae some kirks without organs that are like ours, and are called meeting-houses, where the minister preaches without a gown" (251).

This is a major realization for Jeanie that those from the South can be good people and that although the majority are prelatists (Episcopal) in religious polity, there are many English whose worship approximates that of Scotland. The Union is not between peoples that are that much different in outlook and needs. The strict religious upbringing of Jeanie undergoes some modification when she is made to attend Anglican worship and

she justifies this breach of her upbringing by understanding that, "The prophet, she thought, permitted Naaman the Syrian to bow even in the house of Rimmon. Surely if I, in this streight, worship the God of my fathers in mine own language, although the manner thereof be strange to me, the Lord will pardon me in this thing" (284). Hence, Jeannie's journey to England has modified not only her attitudes to the people, but has moderated her religious opinions as well. Jeanie appears to take to heart the admonishment of the Anglican vicar that, "the same divine grace dispenses its streams to other kingdoms as well as to Scotland. As it is as essential to our spiritual, as water to our earthly wants, its springs, various in character, yet alike efficacious in virtue, are to be found in abundance throughout the Christian world" (311). Unlike her father's bigotry and frozen dogma, Jeanie's moral principals become more and more in touch with reality (Brown *Walter Scott* 120).

After many hardships Jeanie reaches London and succeeds in gaining the good will of the Duke of Argyll. Impressed with her "worth, honesty, and affection," and he arranges for her to meet Queen Caroline. The place of the Queen Caroline and the Duke of Argyll in the novel becomes plain; they are not present merely for historical color, but play an essential part in the debate on nationality. According to Mayhead, "The duke can be taken as representing a position very like the author's. He too is loyal to Crown and government, yet his plain-plain spoken Scottishness has made him less than popular at Court" (63). The Duke of Argyll, leader of the Campbell clan, has been a very contentious character in Scottish history. He supported the Union of 1707, earning the moniker "False Argyle" from the poet Burns. He was a major military leader in the suppression of the Jacobite raising of 1715, and a Duke of Argyll "did the work of the

English" in the '45. But, the Duke as presented by Scott is overwhelmingly positive, Scott declares that:

> Few names deserve more honourable mention in the history of Scotland, during this period, than that of John, Duke of Argyle and Greenwich. His talents as a statesman and a soldier were generally admitted; he was not without ambition, but "without the illness that attends it"—without that irregularity of thought and aim, which often excites great men, in his peculiar situation, (for it was a very peculiar one), to grasp the means of raising themselves to power, at the risk of throwing a kingdom into confusion. Pope has distinguished him as Argyle, the state's whole thunder born to wield, And shake alike the senate and the field. He was alike free from the ordinary vices of statesmen, falsehood, namely, and dissimulation; and from those of warriors, inordinate and violent thirst after self-aggrandisement. (318)

For Argyll the Union was to be the salvation of Scotland; not only for economic and religious reasons, but as a means to unite the desperately divided country. Argyll insists that,

> Scotland...stood at this time in a very precarious and doubtful situation. She was indeed united to England, but the cement had not had time to acquire consistence. The irritation of ancient wrongs still subsisted, and betwixt the fretful jealousy of the Scottish, and the supercilious disdain of the English, quarrels repeatedly occurred, in the course of which the national league, so important to the safety of both, was in the utmost danger of being dissolved. Scotland had, besides, the

> disadvantage of being divided into intestine factions, which hated each other bitterly, and waited but a signal to break forth into action. (318)

For Scott, the Duke of Argyll is the embodiment of the Union. His high praise for the person of the Duke is actually high praise and support for the Union. Only the Union can assure that Scotland will not continue to fall into political and sectarian violence. Argyll represents the possibility not only of a united Kingdom of Scotland and England, but the joining of Scotland to a wider, and more moderate, world.

In Scotland it is the Duke who provides the union between Highland and Lowland, and that on his estates in Scotland and that the "mountaineers from the upper glen and adjacent hill, who spoke Gaelic, went about armed, and wore the Highland dress" (398), but "the strict commands of the Duke had established such good order in this part of his territories, that the Gael and Saxons lived upon the best possible terms of good neighbourhood" (398). Unlike those Scots who rejected Argyll as a true patriot because of his support for the Union, in the novel he is declared to be "a real Scotsman—a true friend to the country" (220).

Although the Duke was a supporter of the Union, he is, according to Scott, a true patriot as well. When the Queen wished to destroy the honor accorded to the city Edinburgh it is Argyll who protest declaring that,

> I have given my reasons for opposing this bill, and have made it appear that it is repugnant to the international treaty of union, to the liberty of Scotland, and, reflectively, to that of England, to common justice, to common sense, and to the public interest. Shall the metropolis of Scotland, the capital of an independent nation, the residence of a long line of monarchs, by whom that noble city was

> graced and dignified—shall such a city, for the fault of an obscure and unknown body of rioters, be deprived of its honours and its privileges—its gates and its guards?—and shall a native Scotsman tamely behold the havoc? I glory, my Lords, in opposing such unjust rigour, and reckon it my dearest pride and honour to stand up in defence of my native country while thus laid open to undeserved shame, and unjust spoliation." (319)

It is because he is such a supporter of the Union that he protests what he considers to be unjust actions taken against Scotland. Mayhead points out that in Scott's own complex make-up that,

> The fiercely patriotic Scotsman *does* feel enraged at slights to his native land, yet the equally patriotic British subject, upholder of Crown and government, has to find a way of reconciling his sense of *local* 'nationality' with his belief in post-Union Britain. In other words, just as his treatment justice shows him trying to suggest a middle course between purely emotional and purely reasoning justice, so *The Heart of Midlothian* imaginatively tries to work out a way in which he can come to terms with the problem of being loyally British while remaining unrepentantly Scots. (63)

In the novel it is the person of the Duke who represents just this combination of patriotic Scot with support for the Union. This union of the two almost opposing nationalisms finds its expression in the adulation that Scott gives to his hero the Duke of Argyll.

Scott also accepts the lawfulness of the Hanoverian succession to the thrones of England and Scotland. In the novel the Duke of Argyll declares to the Queen that,

> My sword, madam," replied the Duke, "like that of my fathers, has been always at the command of my lawful king, and of my native country—I trust it is impossible to separate their real rights and interests. But the present is a matter of more private concern, and respects the person of an obscure individual." (335)

Scott has no use for Jacobite debates over the legality of the Hanoverian succession to the Throne of Scotland. Those who truly support the rights of Scotland must also support the legality of the House of Hanover. Not to do so will result only in bloodshed and national division. Scott sees no problem with accepting the triumph of the House of Hanover; it is this triumph that will assure the rule of law in the land. The condemnation of Effie is "contrary to the genius of British law"; that no one should be condemned to death for a crime "which is not proved, or to punish with death for a crime, which, for aught the prosecutor has been able to show, may not have been committed at all" (323-324). If the legal independence of Scotland must be overturned, and the law of a united Britain is more just, than so be it. Scott's nationalism cannot overshadow his sense of truth and justice.

Jeanie's travels in the Kingdom of England allows Scott to point out something of prime importance to the future well being of Scotland, and that is that the Scots living outside of their homeland are united in their common heritage as Scotsmen. Scott points out that,

> As the famous Patrick Walker reporteth his words, that howbeit he thought Scotland was a Gehennah of wickedness when he was at home, yet when he was abroad, he accounted it ane paradise; for the evils of Scotland he found everywhere, and the good of Scotland he found nowhere. But we are to hold in

> remembrance that Scotland, though it be our native land, and the land of our fathers, is not like Goshen, in Egypt, on whilk the sun of the heavens and of the gospel shineth allenarly, and leaveth the rest of the world in utter darkness. (354)

It is this sense of positive nationalism, united into Great Britain, that Scott wishes to see come to Scotland; a nationalism that can overcome the hatred between Highland and Lowland and between the differing religious groups, but such moderate nationalism is only possible under the moderate leadership of Union supporters such as the Duke of Argyll. The Duke represents the best in aristocratic liberal leadership.

In the fourth volume of the book Scott arranges for Jeanie, her new husband Rueben Butler, and her father to remove to a remote part of Scotland, under the direct patronage of the Duke of Argyll. When Jeanie begins her return trip to Scotland she imagines the good life that awaits her in a pastoral Scotland. According to James Kerr, what Scott attempts to "create in Knocktariitie episodes is an image of Scotland as an agrarian nation guided by the firm but temperate Presbyterianism of its clergy and ruled by the benevolent aristocracy embodied in the figure of Argyle" (*Fiction* 63). Although Jeanie is firmly anchored in her father's Presbyterianism, she has a horror of any pretense or falsehood, and it is her generosity that enables her to accomplish what the rigidity of her father cannot accomplish, which is moral regeneration.

The pastoral chapters are concerned with this national moral regeneration. Jeanie's marriage to Reuben Butler is similar to the marriages of many of Scott's heroes; Butler stands for a middle-way that consolidates extremes. His is a modern, moderate kind of Presbyterianism that accommodates progress and change but also integrates old

David Deans into the new Scotland of the Union. David Deans is finally able to accept the fullness of the Union when he contemplates the fact that as a minister of the Duke of Argyll, Reuben must take an oath of loyalty to the Union,

> in which they acknowledge an Erastian king and parliament, and homologate the incorporating Union between England and Scotland, through which the latter kingdom had become part and portion of the former, wherein Prelacy, the sister of Popery, had made fast her throne, and elevated the horns of her mitre. These were symptoms of defection which had often made David cry out, "My bowels—my bowels!--I am pained at the very heart!" And he remembered that a godly Bow-head matron had been carried out of the Tolbooth church in a swoon, beyond the reach of brandy and burnt feathers, merely on hearing these fearful words, "It is enacted by the Lords spiritual and temporal," pronounced from a Scottish pulpit, in the proem to the Porteous Proclamation. These oaths were, therefore, a deep compliance and dire abomination--a sin and a snare, and a danger and a defection. But this shibboleth was not always exacted. Ministers had respect to their own tender consciences, and those of their brethren; and it was not till a later period that the reins of discipline were taken up tight by the General Assemblies and Presbyteries. The peacemaking particle came again to David's assistance. If an incumbent was not called upon to make such compliances, and if he got a right entry into the church without intrusion, and by orderly appointment, why, upon the whole, David Deans came to be of opinion, that the said incumbent might lawfully enjoy the spirituality and temporality of the cure of souls at Knocktarlitie, with stipend, manse, glebe, and all thereunto appertaining. (384)

Thus in the end, even the retractable David Deans is moved from his previous fanaticism and views the positive nature of the Union between England and Scotland. It must be also admitted that Deans also saw the economic advantages inherit in the Union. Previously, none of the characters in the novel had personally benefited from the Union until Effie is pardoned by the good graces of the Queen and both David and Reuben are rewarded by the Duke: and finally Reuben becomes a "favourite of the Duke of Argyle, and drawing a stipend of eight hundred punds Scots, and four chalders of victual. Here was a match, making up in David's mind, in a tenfold degree" (384). Finally, those of moderate opinion are rewarded.

The last chapters, with their pastoral images, are "Scott's effort to compose in *Midlothian* a romance of national regeneration. Scott sets against one another two opposed versions of history and then attempts through the artifice of the Knocktarlitie episodes to reconcile those visions by subsuming the world of British politics within a unified ahistorical vision" (Kerr *Fiction* 64). In the earlier chapters Scott is a realist mainly preoccupied with describing the tense relationship between Scotland and England represented by the authorities that hang Wilson, the mob that hangs Porteous, and the reaction of the government in London, so the first chapters give a convincing picture of a morally and political decadent Britain, but against this corrupt and oppressive society, Scott attempts to give a story of redemption accomplished by those who hold moderate views in all things.

This redemption centers on Jeanie Dean. With her simple voice and modesty, she becomes the voice of the true Scotland. Jeanie represents the voice of peasant Scotland, a voice that has not been emphasized in Scott's earlier works. According to

von Herder, in his book *Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* (1784), all true culture or civilization must arise from native roots. It must arise from the life of the common people, the Volk, not from the cosmopolitan and denatured life of the upper classes (Palmer 403). Accordingly, both the aristocracy and the middle-classes, because of their mimicking of foreign ways, have become decadent, no longer able to lead in the national regeneration. This can only come from the voice of the common people.

In *The Heart* the two moderates, Jeanie and Butler have a successful marriage with children who will continue to serve the cause of progress and the Union. In *The Bride* the marriage between the two moderates are doomed because the cause to which they are attached, aristocracy and feudalism, are doomed as well. Jeanie and Rueben represent the new leaders of Scotland; the rising middle classes. This class will be free of the weight of history that has doomed the feudal system.

While Scott's elevates the voice of the true peasant, Argyll cannot be neglected in any comprehensive discussion of the pastoral in Midlothian (Kerr *Fiction* 65). Juxtaposed to the voice of the peasant, is Scott's true aristocrat, Argyll. Argyll is the benevolent intermediary in Jeanie's attempt to rescue her sister, but he is soon elevated to a higher moral plane. In the daily workings of the pastoral estate, Argyll becomes the distant, but good landlord. All other landlords, and aristocrats in the novel, tend to be both decadent and incompetent. The whole country suffers from their mismanagement. Argyll becomes the new, redeemed aristocrat; he is not only a scion of an ancient family, he is a modern reformer and expert on agriculture:

> The Duke, besides his other patriotic qualities, was a distinguished agriculturist, and proud of his knowledge in that department. He entertained Jeanie with his observations of the different breeds of cattle in Scotland. (354)

The Duke is a knowledgeable patriot; Jeanie, and her family, are the new peasants, liberal, generous, honest and hard-working. Jeanie is able to exclaim that the Duke is, "his country's friend"; and further that he will "fight for the right, and speak for the right, and that there's nane like you in our present Israel" (321).

According to Brown, *The Heart of Midlothian* is concerned with the issue of the Union between England and Scotland. At the same time the preservation of Scottish national identity within what Scott perceived as the essentially beneficial strictures of the Union, becomes a fundamental question as well (*Walter Scott* 62). For Scott this balancing act of the Union is explained by the return to the tradition of a benevolent peasantry under the guidance of an enlightened aristocracy. That the aristocracy of the Union will not be feudalistic and "the Duke of Argyle [is] a noble and true-hearted nobleman, who pleads the cause of the poor, and those who have none to help them; verily his reward shall not be lacking unto him' (351). "What is expressed in Scott's treatment of British politics is not, however, a royalist nostalgia for the monarchical authority of past ages, but the longing of a bourgeois Tory for a moderate and merciful ruling authority in place of a government perceived as corrupt and oppressive" (Kerr *Fiction* 77). This is best signified by Jeanie's begging the Queen for a pardon for her sister, effectively throwing her sister's life upon the queen's good graces, but also the fact that it is because of the Union of 1707 that

Effie is allowed redress to the more humane laws of a United Kingdom, and is not hung under the legal demands of an independent Scotland.

Lastly, there is Scott's own call for Scottish unity:

> Perhaps one ought to be actually a Scotsman to conceive how ardently, under all distinctions of rank and situation, they feel their mutual connection with each other as natives of the same country. There are, I believe, more associations common to the inhabitants of a rude and wild, than of a well-cultivated and fertile country; their ancestors have more seldom changed their place of residence; their mutual recollection of remarkable objects is more accurate; the high and the low are more interested in each other's welfare; the feelings of kindred and relationship are more widely extended, and in a word, the bonds of patriotic affection, always honourable even when a little too exclusively strained, have more influence on men's feelings and actions. (347)

CHAPTER 6

WAVERLEY: THE TRIMPH OF MODERTATION

Cold winds on the moors blow.
Warm the enemy's fires glow.
Like the harvest of Culloden,
Pain and fear and death grow.
'Twas love of our prince drove us to Drumossie,
But in scarcely the time that it takes me to tell
The flower of our country lay scorched by an army
As ruthless and red as the embers of hell.
The Campbell and McFall did the work of the English.
McDonald in anger did no work at all.
'Twas musket and cannon against honour and courage.
Invading men stood while our clansmen did fall.
None other than children are left to the women,
With only the memory of father and son
Turned out of their homes to make shelter for strangers.
The blackest of hours on this land has begun.

(Culloden's Harvest)

In *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* the repressive demands of the Queen against the

Kingdom of Scotland are thwarted by the Duke of Argyll, but the did little to endear the coming Hanoverian rulers to their Scottish subjects. Beside the problems with their northern kingdom tensions for Great Britain were building up on the Continent, and Britain was soon to be involved with several wars; firstly, with Spain in 1739 and then the following year with France. By 1742 a British army, the newly raised Scottish Black Watch with it, was fighting in the Netherlands (Maclean *Scotland* 169). With Britain at war with the main Catholic powers of Europe the hopes of the Jacobites for a Stuart restoration seemed a distinct possibility.

The word Jacobite derives from "Jacobus," Latin for James, and became the moniker for supporters of the claim of King James II, and later his son, James Francis Edward, the "Old Pretender," and finally his grandson, Charles Edward, "The Young Pretender" or "Bonnie Prince Charlie." The Stuarts, having been excluded from the Throne because of James II conversion to Roman Catholicism, were in the 18th century very much underpinned by their familial inclination towards monarchical absolutism. Many of those who tended to Jacobitism and were inclined either to Roman Catholicism or high-church Anglicanism in religion and feudalism in government; they were opposed to advanced Protestantism as represented by Presbyterianism in Scotland and Puritanism in England. They also rejected modern capitalism which they saw as replacing a society of rank by one based upon merit and money. In Britain Jacobite tendencies were especially strong in the Highlands and islands of Scotland where Roman Catholicism was the predominant religion and the clan structure, with its concepts of personal loyalty, was still strong.

The Act of Union replaced the Scottish parliament with forty-five elected Scottish members in the London parliament at Westminster and was especially odious to Scottish

Jacobites; this rejection had several reason, but most offensive to the Catholics and Anglicans of the Highlands was that it established the Presbyterian Church as the National religion and the fact that it was supported by Scottish mercantilists, and was seen by the Highland clans as bringing Scotland under the rule of British merchants. Indeed, support for the Union had centered on sovereignty and trade, and most supporters of the Union had focused on the benefits of trade that would be encouraged by the union of the two kingdoms (Brown *Reformation* 265).

The fear that the Highlands felt towards the inevitable destruction of their way of life engendered by the Union stoked Jacobite inclinations towards open rebellion against the new system of government and the trade that it encouraged. All during the early part of the 18th century the Jacobites in Scotland had supported the return of the Stuarts to the throne of Scotland. Scottish Jacobite interests in Scotland had encouraged the invasion of Scotland by James Edward Stuart, who had been recognized as James III by Louis XIV of France in 1708, but when the French ships in which he was traveling saw a British naval squadron they fled and the invasion was aborted. In 1715, however, there was a sustained and indigenous rising of Scottish Jacobites, initially provoked by the arrival of the Hanoverian George I on the death of Queen Anne in 1714. The uprising was led by the Earl of Mar and found some support amongst Scottish and North English Catholics but, notwithstanding the late arrival of the Old Pretender to give it force, it had collapsed by early 1716. This abortive rebellion was the focus of Scott's novel *Rob Roy*. In this rebellion it was the Duke of Argyll who saved the Hanoverian succession by holding fast the key blocking position at Stirling (Lenman 321).

A Spanish attempt to encourage open rebellion on the behalf of Scottish Jacobites

received some support in the north-west Highlands in 1719, but was crushed at Glenshiel. This last attempt was a result of the Anglo-Spanish quarrel in the Mediterranean, and Cardinal Alberoni, first minister of Spain, was responsible for sponsoring the Jacobite uprising (Lenman 321). When the Pretender's marriage to the "neurotic Clementina Sobieska went very publicly on the rocks in the later 1720s, the public-relations damage was so massive that the principal Jacobite agent lost heart," and "helped by mediation by Argyll and others, the Pretender had by 1728 returned from a brief exiled in Holland to live quietly under a promise, which he kept, to abstain from all plotting" (321), thus for the time being the Jacobites remained quiet.

Following the rebellion of 1715 the British government had no choice but to proscribe Jacobitism, and espousing the Stuart cause was an act of treason. Regardless of law, Jacobitism remained an ideological rallying-point for some discontented high-church Tories and Roman Catholics throughout the land, and it remained popular in Scotland as a focus for those who did not support the Act of Union, but when the Porteous riots hit Edinburgh and was followed by the arrival of General Wade and the imposition of communal punishment, although not at all as severe as first demanded by the Queen, it seemed that all violent resistance to the London government "was as dead an option as the Stewart Dynasty" (Lenman 321).

All might have remained simply the call of an old song had not France revived its interest in the Stuart Cause towards the middle of the century. By 1745 there was an Anglo-French war and the French saw an advantage in a Highland rebellion against the government in London as front for a political invasion. Those who supported the Jacobite Cause had an asset in James's, the Old Pretender, elder son, Prince Charles Edward. He

was young, charming, had charisma and the French and the Scottish Jacobite leaders immediately perceived him as a potential leader. Besides being a young man of energy, breeding, personal magnetism, and courage he was more than ready to fight for his rights and those of his house (Maclean *Scotland* 169).

Charles Edward, the Young Pretender, was supposed to lead a major invasion of the south of England in 1744, but the plan was cancelled when it no longer served France's purposes. "Covertly, the French government, which made arms, cadets and a battleship available, Prince Charles headed for Scotland in the summer of 1745" (Lenman 322), and on 23 July 1745 – "Bonnie Prince Charlie" – landed on the island of Eriskay in the outer Hebrides and in the coming months rallied the Highlanders to his cause. The Highland chiefs had insisted that they would only rise if French troops and funds were committed, and Charles lied to the effect that they were (Lenman 322). For the French support for the invasion as only haphazard at best and they only had interest so long as it served French imperial interests.

Charles' hopes were that once he had taken over an unprotected Scotland, the French would then support him in his endeavors, and reactivate their invasion plans. In reality Charles' plan was feasible because of recent disturbances and the fact that many had not benefited from the Union as had been promised, and there was a general unrest concerning the British government. Where Charles had perhaps miscalculated was that simply because there was popular unhappiness with the present state of the government did not automatically mean that he would receive large popular support for what he and his tradition had to offer; hence, "the '45 was very much a minority *coup*. No major magnet adhered to it" (Lenman 322). Added to the small numbers who supported open

rebellion to the Hanoverian government "a high proportion of its leadership was either bankrupt or heading that way" (322-323), the leaders and followers of the Young Pretender were mostly from the smaller clans, except for the clan Cameron, and their real motivation was often the hatred of the clan Campbell, the clan of the Duke of Argyll, than any real support for the House of Stuart.

It is this period in Scottish history that forms the historical background for *Waverley: Or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since.* Scott describes the composition and publication of *Waverley* as a tale of happenstance turned to advantage, and accordingly the novel was begun in 1805, but abandoned after only six chapters, but finally in December 1813 he had completed the first of the novel's three volumes and settled on a March publication date. The printers quickly set to work, and it was published anonymously on July 7, 1814. The first printing sold slowly, perhaps because of the high price (1 guinea), but by the time Scott returned from a trip to the Orkneys a few months later, the worldwide craze for historical fiction had been discovered (Uglow *Waverley*).

The sense of history is of primary importance in this novel, as well as Scott's daring use of historical background. In Scott's most successful historical novels the Jacobite rebellions play a leading role, and according to T.F. Henderson, "One of the most marked features of the Scottish literary revival of the eighteenth century was the awakened interest in her secular past. This was further accentuated by the romantic, though futile, Jacobite risings" (Henderson 1). These Jacobite novels beckon back to a past not that far distant in time from Scott's own. The rebellions are a time of heroic deeds remembered both as a time of trouble in the Scotland, but as a heroic age as well. The average Scot fondly recall the rebellions as some of Scotland's greatest triumphs against England, and

although Scotland was the loser in these rebellions it was in this time and epoch that the best in Scottish heroism was evident according to the popular imagination. It was an epoch of chivalry and duty (Uglow *Waverley*), and a epoch that demanded the most of the individual.

According to common perceptions it was a time in which personal gain was cast aside for the call of duty. Whilst remembered as a time of troubles, they were also a time of great daring and heroic deeds. Lords and common folk gave up all that they had for the return of their true King. The background was both heroic and romantic. Modern life of nineteenth-century Scotland seemed pale in comparison. An age interested in commerce and interest rates had little to offer the imagination, and although the Scotland of Scott's time was both socially safer and economically sound, it lacked that sense of the romantic. Men no longer offered themselves as sacrifices upon the altar of idealism. The recent past was far more romantic and heroic than a present interest in economic and material advancement. Through the prism of time the period of the last great fight against England could be seen as the last great age of Scotland's independence.

The *Waverley* novels are concerned with the conflict between old and new, between feudal Jacobite and mercantile Hanoverian, and between those forces that supported Union with England and those that were opposed. In retrospect, and in myth, the Jacobite era seemed a great age. Its end after 1745 signaled the death of honour and the knightly code. No longer would clansmen and their chieftains roam the Highlands. All had become common and boring. A price tag appeared on all that had formerly been sacred. Scotland was now up for sale. Many truly felt that indeed English gold was truly the bane of heroic, Jacobite Scotland.

The sub-title '*Tis Sixty Years Since* is the true clarion call to the popularity of this novel in the time of Scott. The period of the Jacobite Rebellions had by that time acquired a glow of romantic twilight. It was not simply that now it was safe to write about such issues; it was also a reminder that it was only sixty years since great deeds were done on Scottish soil. It was also a reminder that all had changed. Scotland was no longer special or unique; she was now simply a part of Great Britain: an economic success story. All of the *Waverley* stories are in some sense sad. Issues that would have been dangerous sixty years earlier had now had a detachment of more than two generations. They could now, that they were in what appeared to be a far distant past, become the fodder of love stores and myth. The passage of time makes all things safe. The Stuart Cause was in the time of Scott only a memory with certain folkloristic interests generated by old ballads, but certainly something that no one was willing to make the supreme sacrifice for. The Jacobite Cause was certainly, in 1814, no longer a real danger to the peace and stability of Great Britain or to the House of Hanover, and D.R. Haggis suggests that,

> The greatness of Scott is now seen to lie in the insight and understanding he shows in the interpretation of historical conflicts, in his ability to penetrate to the human reality underlying those conflicts, and in the way he contrives to fuse, in the creation of his fictional characters, their personal characteristics with features and qualities that make them figures representative of their times. All this is displayed most finely --- though certainly not exclusively --- in his novels dealing with Scotland. (51)

This was a quality that was early appreciated in Scott; on December 8, 1806, Mr.

Surtees, the author of a *History of Durham*, himself an accomplished scholar, whose acquaintance Scott made shortly after the publication of the *Minstrelsy,* wrote to Scott, declaring, that: "It is in your power to do what no historian can, to bring us acquaintance with the very men themselves; to place us on the scene of action, and to perpetuate forever the characteristic traits of valor and generosity which must have distinguished the Highland Clans, assembled for the last time under their native chiefs...At this distance of time, we may surely feel for the spirit and loyalty of the Clans...without entering into the depth of Jacobitism" (Scott *Letters* 66).

At the time of publication, the Highland tribes were thought of as primitive but passed relic of an earlier age. The clans had been decimated by a unified England and Scotland, the width and length of the island of Great Britain was now safe for travel and investment, a situation that had not existed since the time of Cromwell's occupation. Following the failure of the rising of '45 the Highlands had been cleared of the danger of another possible uprising against law and order (Over 40,000 Highlanders had emigrated to America as well). The Highlands had ceased to exist as a threat, depopulation and immigration had done the final work of the Union. They could now be looked upon as a quaint and curious folkloristic society; exotic, but most certainly no longer dangerous.

Although Scott had begun work on *Waverley* in 1805, the declaration from Mr. Surtees was to have a profound effect upon Scott; in his reply to Surtees Scott declared that he was,

> Much obliged and interested by your long and curious letter. You flatter me very much by pointing out to my attention the feuds of 1715 and '45. The truth is that the subject has often and deeply interested me from my earliest youth. My great-

> grandfather was out, as the phrase goes, in Dundee's wars and in 1715, and had nearly the honor to be hanged for his pains, had it not been for the interest of Duchess Anne of Buccleuch and Monmouth, to whom I have attempted longo intervallo to pay a dept of gratitude. But besides this, my father, although a Borderer, transacted business for many Highland lairds, and particularly for one old man called Stuart of Invernahyle, who had been out both in 1715 and '45, and whose tales were the absolute delight of my childhood...I became a valiant Jacobite at the age of ten years, and ever since reason and reading came to my assistance I have never quite got rid of the impression which the gallantry of Prince Charles made on my imagination.
>
> Certainly I will not renounce the idea of doing something to preserve these stories, and the memory of times and manners which, though existing as it were yesterday, have so strangely vanished from our eyes. Whether this will be best done by collecting the old tales or by modernizing them as subjects of legendary poetry, I have never very seriously considered, but your kind encouragement confirms me in the resolution that something I must do, and that speedily. (*Letters* 66-67).

Scott recognized that the Jacobite rebellions were now only old history that would be preserved in ballads and song, but, like many Scotsmen of his epoch, he is proud of what little participation his own, very Presbyterian, family had done for the Jacobite Cause. His novels were a contribution to the preservation of that which was past and gone.

Scott had long been under the spell of the ancient Scottish past, but his earlier reconstruction and amendments of old ballads soon turned to a literary reconstruction of

Scotland's more recent past. In the General Preface to *Waverley* Scott declares that "My early recollections of the Highland scenery and customs made so favourable impression in the poem called the Lady of the lake, that I was induced to think of attempting something of the same kind in prose." He went on to explain that he "Had been a good deal in the Highlands at a time when they were much less accessible, and much less visited, than they have been of late years, and was acquainted with many of the old warriors of 1745, who were, like most veterans, easily induced to with their battles over again for the benefit of a willing listener' (xvii). Scott also felt that a prose work would "embody some traits of those characters and manners peculiar to Scotland, the last remnants of which vanished during my own youth, so that few or no traces remain" (*Letters* 324). In some way all of this is melancholy. Scott was well aware of this as past history. The glory was now gone. Scotland had become civilized and had joined with England to form a great and prosperous nation. At the same time he recognizes that perhaps much that was true and good had to be lost to accomplish this goal; Scott also realizes that history does not stand still, and that which was noble and proper in one age could not necessarily continue unchanged or have value in another more progressive one, and in all of Scott's works that deal with this period of Scottish history there is a sense of sorrow and loss.

Besides his wish to immortalize the memory of those who had fought and participated in the rising of '45, Scott wished to use his prose for another important more contemporary purpose. Scott professed to have derived at least part of the suggestion of his national novels from the works of Maria Edgeworth. Her novels dealt with Irish life; Edgeworth could not "touch her ancestral soil (it was not exactly her native, and one

might draw fanciful consequences from the relation) without at once acquiring that strange creative or mimetic strength which produces in the reader of fiction --- poetic, dramatic or prosaic alike --- a sudden, but quiet, undoubting conviction that these things and persons were so and not otherwise" (Saintsbury 329). Scott also had this facility. Scott stated that, "Miss Edgeworth, whose Irish characters have gone so far to make the English familiar with the character of their gay and kind-hearted neighbours of Ireland, that she may be truly said to have done more towards completing the Union than perhaps all the legislative enactments by which it has been followed up" (*Waverley* xix). By presenting Scottish characters within their natural and believable surroundings, Scott hoped to promote the 1707 Union between Scotland and England, much as Edgeworth's had promoted the Union between England and Ireland.

The novels were to serve a more important purpose than simple antiquarianism, preservation or even entertainment; they were to be a bridge between England and Scotland. They would be vehicle to dispel the myths and antagonisms that existed between the United Kingdoms of Scotland and England. Scott had embarked on a mammoth quest. The novel would be more than a literary agent of entertainment; they would also fulfill a propagandistic reality. It was the historical novel of Scott, which showed how powerful a tool the mass production of "light" literature could become in swaying public opinion. The power of literature was evident to Scott, and he was using it in a cause which he truly believed in; the union of Scotland and England.

Although Scott may have been attracted to the Romanticism of the Jacobite Cause as a boy, he had outgrown this early romantic mythological interpretation of the epoch, and the historical reality was that during the time that *Waverley* was set, "Scotland lacerated

itself, becoming increasingly torn between the Jacobite-sympathizing, Gaelic-speaking Highland clans," (Porter 49) and the Hanoverian Lowlands. This was the reality that Scott accepted and understood so he supported, "the Edinburgh-Glasgow axis of capitalist landlords, merchants, graduate lawyers, and clergy, who believed that Scotsmen's economic, cultural, and even religious future lay in throwing in their lot with England" (50). In truth it was the Union that contributed to the "post-Union free-trade, Scottish cattle-droving, linens, mining, and metal trades [that] thrived" (Porter 50) across Scotland during Scott's own time.

Waverley was the first significant novel to deal with mainland Britain's last civil war (Robertson 211). This uprising was the last attempt by the feudal Highlands to reassert tradition over progress in the eighteenth century, and in many ways it was an attempt to turn back the clock. Scott was not unaware of the primary motives behind Jacobitism. The attempt to restore, by this time, the long exiled House of Stuart was a romantic and dangerous anachronism.

In the summer of 1745 Prince Charles Edward, in Scotland commonly called "Bonnie Prince Charlie," rallied the Highland clans and with their support marched south where he hoped the English Jacobites would join his crusade to re-establish the House of Stuart. The English Jacobites were singularly uninterested in the plan, and tended to stay home. The whole idea was preposterous, and the defeat of the Highland army at Culloden not only dashed the hopes of the Jacobites, but virtually destroyed the Highland clans in the process. Effectively, the final act of the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 was the opening of the Highlands to southern influence and the modern world.

The lose of Scotland's independence in 1707 steadily produced, as time went on, an

association in Scottish minds between the House of Stuart and the lost glories of Scotland's independence. The Jacobite Cause was seen as perhaps the call to Scottish independence and pride; David Daiches points out that,

> This was historical nonsense, since once the Stuarts inherited the throne of England they neglected Scotland and devoted most of their energies to the southern kingdom. But a popular association of the Stuarts with the patriotic activities of Robert the Bruce, who had restored Scotland's independence in a successful struggle against England at the beginning of the fourteenth century, meant that there was in Scotland tremendous emotional capital on which the Jacobite movement could draw. (*Sir Walter Scott* 467)

As in much national myth, reality took second seat to the popularly received myth. The Stuarts, all of whom had happily deserted Scotland on the death of Elizabeth I, had now become in the popular imagination the national Saviors of Scotland and her historical destiny. For those who truly believed, the House of Stuart would be Scotland's national redeemer. The historical reality had been lost in the glory of myth.

Like many Scotsmen of his day, Scott recognized a certain latent loyalty to the Stuart Cause; in July 1813 he wrote to Miss Clephane that: "I am very glad I did not live in 1745 for though as a lawyer I could not have pleaded Charles's right and as a countryman I could not have prayed for him yet as a soldier I would I am sure against the conviction of my better reason have fought for him even to the bottom of the gallows." In most cases there was little real popular support for Bonny Prince Charlie. Certainly in the lowlands there was no support for the Catholic Stuarts. Scott had already admitted his attraction to the gallant Prince Charles, but he also understood that the attraction and loyalty was

based not upon reason, but emotion. Emotion may have told Scott that Scotland needed to reject the Union of 1707 and embrace independence, but reason told him that such a path would be folly. Scott recognized the emotional appeal of the Jacobite Cause, but that even in the "Highlands there was a welcome less warm than he (Prince Charles) had expected...who was after all a foreigner born and educated at Rome and very imperfectly acquainted with the realities of the situation in Scotland or for that matter in England" (Daiches *Sir Walter* 467). Hence, we have a historical novel written by an author who understands the romantic yearnings of the Scotsman of his day, but who also understands that the Stuart Cause was lost even before Bonnie Prince Charlie disembarked from his ship.

In the end, no one really wished to return to ancient Scotland, but the pull of old loyalties and myth were even hard for a lawyer such as Scott to resist. The ancient call of feudal obligations was very strong indeed. Throughout *Waverley* Scott's makes certain that the reader is aware of this emotional attraction, but that it would, if freely followed only lead to destruction. He also is explicit in outlining a fundamental difference between the Scots and the English Jacobites; the English feel no blood pull to support a lost cause, whilst the Scots, even against their better knowledge, cannot help themselves. This is the historical background of *Waverley*.

The novel's publication date is June of 1814, in the months during which Britain's long fought wars with Napoleon would soon be coming to a close, with a British victory. This helps to explain the novels emphasis on reconciliation. Yet, at the same time,

> Only the context of Scottish history fully accounts for its complex attitude towards cultural loss. The subtitle of the work (*Or, 'Tis sixty Years Since*) subtly

> indicates not just its historical setting, but also the importance of the relationship between past and present. *Waverley* does not attempt simply to reconstruct the past. Its complexity lies in the fact that the past, while still politically and morally contentious, has also become an aesthetic object, something to be gazed at from a distance. (Robertson 212)

Waverley deals with the conflict of a civil war fought over ideological, economic, and religious differences, but the final result will be reconciliation. This reconciliation exists not only on the personal level, but also within the national boundaries of Scotland as well. Not only is there a healing of wounds within Scotland, but reconciliation between England and Scotland, traditional enemies, is also necessary for the success of the state. For this reconciliation to take place it is necessary that the old order pass away. New loyalties must implement and supplement the ancient loyalties based upon feudal concepts of personality. The new citizen of Great Britain must have loyalties that are above the personal. The old order, and its fanatical attachment to clan or to geographical place, must be channeled into a loyalty to the greater state. For Scott only the triumph of those of moderate opinion shall be able to effect this rapprochement.

The technical innovation of *Waverley* is to tell a story of national history through the *Bildungsroman*. On the personal scale, the novel covers the events and education in the life of Edward Waverley, and the development of his character from early youth to manhood. On the national level, *Waverley* depicts the failure of the '45 Jacobite rebellion to reinstate in Britain an older political order and economic system. In order to investigate and come to terms with the '45, Scott invents a hero who, as his name indicates, is inclined to waver in his political and romantic loyalties, and Edward

Waverley is a story of a character formed by experience and education not simply blind obedience to tradition or hatred.

In the first six chapters of *Waverley* the unusual conditions of Edward's education are of primary consideration. Edward is the unwitting casualty of the disruption between two brothers. His father, Richard, who is the younger son of a wealthy English Jacobite family, abandons the high-church Tory principals of the family and embraces the Hanoverian Cause for political and economic advancement, and who,

> Saw no practicable road to independence save that of relying upon his own exertions, and adopting a political creed more consonant both to reason and his own interest than the hereditary faith of Sir Everard in High Church and in the house of Stuarts. He therefore read his recantation at the beginning of his career, and entered life as an avowed Whig and friend of the Hanover Succession. (15)

Sir Everard, as the eldest brother, and inheritor of the family seat, Waverley Honour, has no need to adopt his creed to reason or reality; he can safely isolate himself on his estate and reject the real world.

If Richard had remained a steadfast supporter of the Jacobite Cause, he would have been forced to remain a protégé of his brother for the duration of his life, passing "the greater part of his life as 'Master Richard at the Hall, the Baronet's brother," but Richard was unwilling to remain in this position; he felt that there would be no possibility of finally becoming "Sir Richard Waverley of Waverley Honour, successor to a princely estate." There was no reason that his brother, Sir Everard would not marry and have sons to inherit the estate; thus reducing even further Richard's portion. To avoid this future possibility Richard opted for reality, which including embracing the new order as

represented by the Hanoverian accession to the Throne of England and Scotland.

Edward's uncle is a picture of aristocratic impotence. He has opted out of not only reason but has refused to accept any of the other realities of life. He also opted out of marriage after an early disappointment, finding that "the labour of courtship did not quite suit the dignified indolence of his habits." He further distances himself from reality by resigning his seat in Parliament after the death of Queen Anne. On his estate he has managed to live in pleasant isolation; the world is passing Waverley Honour by, "Sir Everard had inherited from his sires the whole train of Tory or high-church predilections and prejudices which had distinguished the house of Waverley since the Great Civil War." Sir Everard could only look back to the past as the future held no promise for him. Most of the old Tory supporters had been coming more and more to accept the political reality of the House of Hanover, but the few holdouts remained firm:

> The Tory nobility, depending for their reflected luster upon the sunshine of a court, had for some tie been gradually reconciling them to the new dynasty. But the wealthy country gentlemen of England, a rank which retained, with much ancient manners and primitive integrity, a great proportion of obstinate and unyielding prejudice, stood aloof in haughty and sullen opposition, and cast many a look of mingled regret and hope to Boise le Duc, Avignon, and Italy. (15)

These holdouts for the old dynasty became more and more detached from modern realities; their world revolved around a polite, but non-active, support for the Old Pretender of the House of Stuart and "ancient manners." Their prime motivation was their "obstinate and unyielding prejudice." The "ancient manners" was the old feudal system and its rank of privileges that they saw eroding under the new administration. Because of

his wealth Sir Everard is effectively able to withdraw from the real world, preferring to preserve his chivalric ideals and political faith in isolation (Brown *Walter Scott* 6-7). Even marriage would be an intrusion into this world. The unmarried Sir Everard, his sister Rachel, also unmarried, and his chaplain, Mr. Pembroke, one presumes, also unmarried, become our introduction to the supporters of the Jacobite Cause. It is an isolated, sterile, lost Cause, peopled with failures.

The two brothers, Richard and Everard, represent the two extremes of party loyalty to be found in England of the period. Richard's support of the Whigs and the new dynasty has little to do with any real embrace of political or religious ideology; it is based firmly on opportunism. Had he been the elder son it is doubtful he would have taken this step. Sir Everard's loyalty to the old dynasty is also suspect as his support is such that it is doubtful he would ever openly support rebellion against the *status quo*, which might result in the loss of his estates. His support for a lost cause was a, "haughty and sullen opposition," but it was never active.

How is it that Edward, the son of the Whig younger son, comes to live and receive his education in the home of his Tory uncle? With Sir Everard's lack of issue, it is Edward, Richard's son, who will inherit the estate for,

> "Richard had married a young woman of rank, by whose family interest and private fortune he hoped to advance his career." His wife had an estate not far from that of Waverley Honour. When Edward was five years old, "it chanced that the infant with his maid had strayed one morning to a mile's distance from the avenue of Brere-wood Lodge, his father's seat," during this excursion the young Edward accidentally met his uncle for the first time and "In the round-faced rosy

> cherub before him, bearing his eye and his name, and vindicating a hereditary title to his family, affection, and patronage, by means of a tie which Sir Everard held as sacred...Providence seemed to have granted to him the very object best calculated to fill up the void in his hopes and affections." Richard had changed his political and religious opinions for advancement, he has also married for rank and money, and he was also ready to use his child to further his ambitions: For Richard Waverley, he beheld in the growing attachment between the uncle and nephew the means of securing his son's, if not his own, succession to the hereditary estate, which he felt would be rather endangered than promoted by any attempt on his own part towards a closer intimacy with a man of Sir Everard's habits and opinions...Thus, by a sort of tacit compromise, little Edward was permitted to pass the greater part of the year at the Hall: and appeared to stand in the same intimate relation to both families, although their mutual intercourse was otherwise limited to formal messages, and more formal visits. The education of the youth was regulated alternately by the taste and opinions of his uncle and his father. (22)

Faulty education is central to understanding Edward and the choices that he makes early in the novel: "The education of our hero, Edward Waverley, was of a nature somewhat desultory." This lack of Edward's formal education is compared with Scott's own educational background: "The vague and wild use which I made of this advantage I cannot describe better than by referring my reader to the desultory studies of Waverley in a similar situation; the passages concerning whose course of reading were imitated from recollections of my own" (xvi).

Edward was pulled between the Whig leanings of his father, who tended to be far more interested in his Parliamentary duties, and the Tory loyalties of his uncle. His tutor, Mr. Pembroke, his uncle's chaplain, was "an Oxonian, who had lost his fellowship for declining to take the oaths at the accession of George the First." Mr. Pembroke was an able scholar, but he was "however, old and indulgent" and too busy writing religious pamphlets to spend much time in the education of his young charge. Hence, the "youth was permitted, in a great measure to learn as he pleased, what he pleased, and when he pleased, and "Those who were supposed to guide the young man were sorely lacking in attendance and Mr. Pembroke with his Jacobite tracks, and Edward's aunt and uncle who both spent most of their time dwelling on the past." Edward's parents were actually not much better in providing a solid education:

> The occasional attention of his parents might indeed have been of service to prevent he dissipation of mind incidental to such a desultory course of reading. But his mother died in the seventh year after the reconciliation between the brothers; and Richard Waverley himself, who, after this event, resided more constantly in London, was too much interested in his own plans of wealth and ambition to notice more respecting Edward than that he was of a very bookish turn, and probably destined to be a bishop. (28)

Thus, formal education was severely lacking. Edward was left almost solely to his own devices as a child. This question of education, concerning what has been learnt and what must be unlearnt is central to the novel, and the whole movement of the book shows this re-education (Devlin 65).

For many critics this lack of formal education is indicative of a lack of formation. It is

just this lack of education that allows Edward to be dragged into the Jacobite confrontation, and to make several serious and misguided choices. But is this really true? Perhaps this lack of serious education has also permitted Edward to formulate his own opinions based upon experience and not to simply react based upon well-formulated biases? In *Waverley* the fanatical protagonists of the Jacobite as well as the Hanoverian cause are well educated; they know and have been well grounded in their respective principals, but they are also unable to move beyond narrow party principals. Their education has made them bigoted and narrow. The results of formal education have not broadened their outlooks; indeed it is their education that has made them narrow and fanatical.

Edward does not carry the hatreds and biases of either England or of Scotland; he has not learnt them. He is bound neither to the Whigs nor to the Tory party alliance. He is free to formulate his own opinions based solely upon experience. We are informed that although Edward lacked a formal and rigorist education, "[He] was warm in his feelings, wild and romantic in his ideas and in his taste of reading, with a strong disposition towards poetry," and we have also been further informed that,

> This slackness of rule might have been ruinous to a boy of slow understanding, who, feeling labour in the acquisition of knowledge, would have altogether neglected it, save for the command of a taskmaster; and it might have proved equally dangerous to a youth whose animal spirits were more powerful than his imagination or his feelings, and whom the irresistible influence of Alma would have engaged in field-sports form morning till night. But the character of Edward Waverley was remote from either of these. His powers of apprehension were so

> uncommonly quick, as almost to resemble intuition; and the chief care of his preceptor was to prevent him, as a sportsman would phrase it, from overrunning his game. (24)

Instead of being an impediment, Edward's lack of education is his hope. He will be able to see beyond traditional prejudice and hatred. He will be able to put the past beyond him and strive towards the future. What Edward has learnt through experience is that the sterile, lifeless Jacobitism of his uncle and the pandering Whiggism of his father are both defective ideologies. Both the Jacobitism of his uncle and the Whiggism of his father offer no real alternatives for Great Britain. Both systems are lost causes. The future must find a positive middle ground. The old education based upon hatred and long remembered bitterness can serve no purpose in the modern Britain that was coming into being.

The history of Edward Waverley is a story of character formed by experience, and not by early formation. Edward's wanderings are not gratuitous. In the first chapter of *Waverley* it is plainly stated that Edward is "like a maiden knight with his white shield," who carries an "uncontaminated name, bearing with its sound little of good or evil." Edward, free of the contamination of education, commences on his wanderings singularly lacking in guile as well as hatred and fanaticism, and his heart yearns for the romantic life that he has explored only in books.

Fearing that Edward would make a match not to expectations for his son's future advancement, his father purchases a commission for Edward in the dragoons. Edward becomes an officer in the army of George II. The reaction of his Jacobite aunt and uncle is most interesting. Neither seemed terribly upset that their nephew would be a captain

serving for a king whose legitimacy they reject. Yet, "Sir Everard's Jacobitism had been gradually decaying, like a fire which burns out for want of fuel" (39). As for his Aunt Rachel, that stalwart of the Stewart Cause, "Her mortification was diverted by the employment she found in fitting out her nephew for the campaign, and greatly consoled by the prospect of beholding him blaze in complete uniform" (40). There is a real seriousness lacking in their supposed Jacobitism.

Shortly afterwards he was ordered to Scotland to join the dragoons of Colonel Gardener, fully equipped with necessary articles of dress, accompanied by retinue of men who had been selected by Sir Everard, and weighed down by the dissenting theological tomes of Mr. Pembroke. Thus, Edward left Waverley-Honour in quixotic fashion to serve a king for whom his family professed not to recognize as legitimate.

Edward's father had elected to have him serve in the army to prove not only his loyalty to the Hanoverian Cause, but to save his son from the dangers of the Jacobite leanings of his brother. In order to have him removed from the dangers of a poor marital match it was first mentioned that he might make a grand European tour to advance his education, this was rejected by Edward's father because he viewed the continent as a place "where all manner of snares were spread by the Pretender and his sons." The King's army is chosen because it is considered the safest place for a promising young man with family connections in the Jacobite camp. Strangely, it is the safe place which represents the greatest danger to Edward.

Edward had been instructed by his uncle to visit an old family friend and fellow Jacobite, Sir Cosmo Comyne Bradwardine, whose estate was near the village of Tully-Veolan in the Scottish lowlands. Soon after Edward's arrival in Scotland he was granted

leave by his commanding officer, Colonel Gardiner, to do so. A few days in Scotland convinced Edward that Scotland was a far wilder and romantic land than England (Brown *Walter Scott* 7-8). For Edward Scotland appeared as an exotic embodiment of all of his early romantic yearnings. Edward's visit to Scotland was to have far reaching consequences for his development and education. It was this experience that was to make him the person he was to become in life. At the same time, Scotland was a place full of dangers. Edward's lack of guile was to leave him open to dangers that he really never understood. The comfortable, and safe, Jacobitism of his aunt and uncle had a far more sinister existence in Scotland, where it was compounded by a standard of national grievances against the English Crown and the Union.

His visit to the Scottish Lowlands was a pleasant introduction to Scotland. Sir Cosmo was indeed very similar to his own uncle Sir Everard. Both shared a comfortable and safe, not to mention socially acceptable, Jacobitism. Both were more interested in their personal prerogatives than in the modern reality of the world that surrounded them; compounding all of this was Sir Cosmos' pedantry which revolved around trying to preserve has estate's vestiges of a feudal past, "Rank and ancestry, sir, should be the last words in the mouths of us of unblemished race –vix ea nostra voco, as Naso saith." Also, with his political compatriot in England, Sir Cosmos shares the same religious attitudes as Sir Everard. Sir Everard's chaplain, Pembroke, whose ponderous and unreadable tome of religious justification for his nonjuring views, that Edward continues to transport about the country, represents those traditionalist clergy who refused to take the oath of loyalty to the new Hanoverian rulers; this action placed them outside the boundaries of the Established Church of England. This form of "nonjuring" caused them to be considered

as schismatic by the great majority of English Christians, but it also tended to make them fanatical and small-minded in both their religious as well as political views.

Sir Cosmos keeps a tally of every insult done by the new order to those who refuse to accept the new state of affairs, "There is, besides, a clergyman of the true (though suffering) Episcopal Church of Scotland. He was a confessor in her course after the year 1715, when a Whiggish mob destroyed his meeting house, tore his surplice, and plundered his dwelling-house of four silver spoons, intromitting also with his mart and his meal-ark, and with two barrels, one of single, and one of double ale, besides three bottles of brandy" (76). The Act of Union had disestablished the Scottish Episcopal Church, always a minority religious belief, and had permitted that law in its stead establish the church of the majority of the Lowlanders, Presbyterianism, in its place. Thus, in Scotland, Jacobitism had not only national implications, but religious as well. Sir Cosmos' support of Jacobitism was based not only upon his lost prerogatives, but also upon religious grounds, but the loss of spoons was far more important. His education is a collection of remembered insults and prejudices.

It was at the house of Sir Cosmos that Edward was to meet Rose, the Baron's daughter. Much like Edward, Rose's education has also been sorely neglected:

> The little labours in which she had been employed obviously showed a natural taste, which required only cultivation. Her father had taught her French and Italian, and a few of the ordinary authors in those languages ornamented her shelves. He had endevoured also to be her preceptor in music; but as he began with the most obtuse doctrines of the science, and was not perhaps master of them himself, she had made no proficiency farther than to be able to accompany her

> voice with the harpsichord; but even this was not very common in Scotland at that period. (100)

Rose Bradwardine shares much in common with Edward, she was raised by a father who was also a Jacobite and like Edward's uncle had managed to shut out the reality of political, social and cultural change. She had also been raised in the nonjuring ecclesiastical tradition. Her lack of formal education had also made her a moderate in all things. Much like Edward her politics seemed unimportant. Edward paid little attention to Rose; his romantic imagination was far more interested in the songs and dances of Davie Gellatley, the baron's servant. Rose seems too familiar, too safe. Edward is attracted to the exotic and the strange, and Rose is none of these things, and

> Besides, Rose Bradwardine, beautiful and amiable as we have described her, had not precisely the sort of beauty of merit, which captivates a romantic imagination in early youth. She was too frank, too confiding, too kind; amiable qualities, undoubtedly, but destructive of the marvelous, with which a youth of imagination delights to dress the empress of his affections. (111)

David Devlin points out that, "Scott's gently contemptuous irony is plain, and the total shape of the novel is the reversal of Waverley's romantic susceptibilities in all areas of his experience" (65), thus he rejects Rose in the beginning of the novel because she does not fulfill a romantic ideal, but it is this lacking of romanticism that finally becomes what he may find most attractive after his sojourn in the Highlands serving the Bonnie Prince.

At Tully-Veolan Edward finally comes into contact with fellow Jacobites. At home in Waverley Honour Jacobitism had remained a polite disagreement with the present state of political and ecclesiastical affairs, in Scotland this veneer of politeness is not very deep.

Jacobite loyalties are still strong and taken seriously. For many Scottish Jacobites the present government is seen as an illegitimate contract that must be overturned, by force if necessary, and the Hanoverian succession as a scourge to national and personal interests. Although Edward's family's traditional loyalty is also to the Jacobite Cause, Edward's position as an officer of the Hanoverian king and the son of a Whig supporter causes him to waver between his support for the present dynasty and his professed tradition of support for the Stuart Cause. It appears that Edward is not a fanatic for either side in the continuing bickering between Jacobite and Whig, and during the time that Edward spends in Scotland he is unable to separate danger from safety, and illusion from reality. He never realizes the danger that he is in; for him it is all a romantic illusion. He seems to be living a romantic dream.

During his time at Tully-Veolan an event occurs which is to change Edward's life and to begin his education in the world's reality. The arrival of Evan Dhu Maccombish, a Highlander in the service of Fergus Mac Ivor Vich Ian Vohr, a renowned chief and Jacobite loyalist arouses Edward's taste for romantic adventure. Soon Edward is pulled deeper and deeper into what is for him simply the romanticism of Scotland. He travels to the cave of the robber, Donald Bean Lean, and then to Glennaquoich, the Highland home of Fergus Mac Ivor, where Edward sees clan life as if time had stopped. For Edward all of this appears as if in a dream. Fiona Robertson contends that, "There are other stages in his journey; but these first three are enough to show Scott's technique of gradually drawing Waverley and the reader further from the cultural norms which it is assumed they share" (214).

The Highlands appear to have an independent existence unfettered by the reality of

the rest of the world. Scotland appears as a world that has been bypassed by modern progress. The Highlands are more ancient even than feudal England: they are tribal. Edward is transfixed. Here Jacobitism is not an illusion of a polite lost Cause, it is the Cause. Sir Everard's Jacobitism is his club, comfortable and above all, safe and respectable. The Jacobitism of Fergus and his sister, Flora, is not safe; it is a dangerous, dark, almost sinister political, religious belief that transcends both reality and moderation. They are fanatics.

Fergus Mac Ivor, the staunch supporter of the Jacobite Cause, is actually much like Edward's own father, and sees in Jacobitism a source of advancement,

> Fergus had a further object than merely being the great man of his neighbourhood and ruling despotically over a small clan. From his infancy upward, he had devoted himself to the cause of the exiled family, and had persuaded himself, not only that their restoration to the crown of Britain would be speedy, but that those who assisted them would be raised to honour and rank. It was with this view that he laboured to reconcile the Highlanders among themselves, and augmented his own force to the utmost, to be prepared for the first favourable opportunity of rising. With this purpose also he conciliated the favour of such Lowland gentlemen in the vicinity as were friends of the good cause...and a parchment, with a huge waxen seal appended, purporting to be an earl's patent, granted by no less a person than James the Third King of England, and Eighth King of Scotland, to his right feal, trusty, and well-beloved Fergus Mac-Ivor of Glennaquoich, in the county of Perth, and kingdom of Scotland.
>
> With this future coronet glittering before his eyes, Fergus plunged deeply into the

correspondence and plots of that unhappy period. (157)

Fergus is a dangerous man. He does not believe that the Cause of the Jacobites is lost; he sincerely knows that it can be won, and won speedily. He expects to soon reap the benefits of his loyalty. There is nothing that he will not do to gain his advantage,

> Accustomed to petty intrigue, and necessarily involved in a thousand paltry and selfish discussions, ambitious also by nature, his political faith was tinctured, at least, if not tainted, by the views of interest and advancement so easily combined with it; and at the moment he should unsheathe his claymore, it might be difficult to say whether it would be most with the view of making James Stewart a king, or Fergus Mac-Ivor an earl. (168)

This opportunism was a reality that Fergus would admit not even to himself, "This, indeed, was a mixture of feeling which he did not avow even to himself, but it existed, nevertheless, in a powerful degree" (168). Fergus is a man driven by opportunism; he is willing to anything necessary to achieve his goals of an earldom.

Edward's first meeting with Flora Mac Ivor has a sense that the material world has been left behind. It is more than a world of high romance; it is a world whose inhabitants are closer to the immaterial world of the spirit than of living flesh, or so it appears to Edward:

> It was up the course of this last stream that Waverley, like a knight of romance, was conducted by the fair Highland damsel, his silent guide...all was cold, bare, and desolate, yet tame even in desolation: but this narrow glen, at so short a distance, seemed to open into the land of romance. The rocks assumed a thousand

peculiar and varied forms. In one place a crag of huge size presented its gigantic bulk, as if to forbid the passenter's further progress...While gazing at this pass of peril, which crossed, like a single black line, the small portion of blue sky not intercepted by the projected rocks on either side, it was with a sensation of horror that Waverley beheld Flora and her attendant appear, like inhabitants of another region, propped, as it were, in mid air, upon this trembling structure. (190)

Edward is unaware of the danger that both Fergus and Flora represent. Fergus' opportunism will destroy anything that comes into contact with him. In his zeal for his advancement and for the Cause that will advance him to an earldom all is expendable; Flora is, for Edward, even more dangerous, for unlike Edward and Rose, Flora's education has not been haphazard; it is with Flora and Fergus that we first meet with a clear education resulting in a formed temperament:

> Her sentiments corresponded with the expression of her countenance. Early education had impressed upon her mind, as well as on that of the chieftain [Fergus] the most devoted attachment to the exiled family of Stewart. She believed it the duty of her brother, of his clan, of every man in Britain, at whatever personal hazard, to contribute to that restoration which the partisans of the Chevalier St. George had not ceased to hope for. (168)

This solid education, lacking in both Edward and Rose, is the foundation of the fanaticism of Flora and her brother Fergus, for "her loyalty, as it exceeded her brother's in fanaticism, excelled it also in purity" (168). Flora's Jacobitism is not tinged in the slightest with the zeal of opportunity; it is mystical and spiritual. She yearns for martyrdom. Her Jacobitism is a religious yearning. It is the very purity of Flora's

fanaticism that attracts Edward, "Like one in a dream, Waverley is drawn deeper and deeper into an unknown world as he moves farther and farther into the Highlands" (Orru 4).

Edward's lack of formal education has done nothing to prepare him for the dangers he is to meet. Edward falls in love with Flora, it is more than love; it is almost an irrational, bewitching passion:

> She was precisely the character to fascinate a youth of romantic imagination. Her manners, her language, her talents for poetry and music, gave additional and varied influence to her eminent personal charms. Even in her hours of gaiety, she was in his fancy exalted above the ordinary daughters of Eve, and seemed only to stoop for an instant to those topics of amusement and gallantry which others appear to live for. (189)

Fergus is willing to exploit Edward's infatuation with his sister in an attempt to win him to the Stuart Cause.

Edward falls quickly under the spell of "this enchantress, daily more delighted with his hospitable landlord, and more enamoured of his bewitching sister"; finally, not only the Highlands, but also the Jacobite Cause appeals to Edward's sense of the romantic. In the Highlands reality retreats further and further away from Edward. The tribal society of Fergus' retainers, the music, the songs all work to induce a hypnotic escape from reality. It becomes easy for Edward to forget his place as an officer of the Hanoverian Cause. According to Devlin, "It is not, of course, all Waverley's fault that he is so susceptible. His family has done great deeds in the past; and he has been fed from childhood on the heroic and romantic tales of his ancestors" (62). The fact that the Highlands are

preparing for rebellion against a king whom Edward has vowed to serve makes no impression upon him. Edward is unable to separate the political reality from literary romance. The longer he remains in the Highlands the weaker becomes his grasp on reality.

Finally Edward proposes marriage to Flora, but to this proposal Flora advises him to seek another woman who could attach herself to him, for she was already married to her Cause. Flora claims that she is unable to divide her attentions between the Jacobite Cause and marriage to someone who, as yet, was not totally committed to the Cause of the Stuarts. It is the person of Rose Bradwardine who is Flora's own estimate of the perfect wife. Accordingly, a wife must be fully attached to the man to whom she is wed. This is something that Flora knows she cannot do. Her heart is given to the Cause, and

> The amiable Rose was next mentioned, with the warmest encomium on her person, manners, and mind. 'that man,' said Flora, 'will find an inestimable treasure in the affections of Rose Bradwardine, who shall be so fortunate as to become their object. Her very soul is home, and in the discharge of all those quiet virtues of which home is the center. Her husband will be to her what her father now is, the object of all her care, solicitude, and affection. She will see nothing, and connect herself with nothing, but by him and through him. If he is a man of sense and virtue, she will sympathise in his sorrows, divert his fatigue and share his pleasures. If she becomes the property of a churlish or negligent husband, she will suit his taste also, for she will not long survive his unkindness. And, alas! How great is the chance that so such unworthy lot may be that of my poor friend! Oh that I were a queen this moment, and could command the most amiable and

> worthy youth of my kingdom to accept happiness with the hand of Rose Bradwardine!' (185)

But, Edward still has no interest in Rose Bradwardine. She is not the romantic enchantress that he has dreamt of, and during his Highland excursions, he is not interested in the safe and ordinary. It is the exotic that he craves.

The dreamlike quality of Edward's stay at the home of Fergus and his sister is finally interrupted by letters carried to him by Davie Gellatley from Tully-Veolan. The first was from Rose who advised him that the Lowlands were in a state of revolt, and she warned Edward not to return to Tully-Veolan. Although Edward was in the center of a growing revolt, he remained completely unaware of what was happening. The other letters that Edward received was news that his father had fallen from favour at court. Edward's father had attempted to use him to further advance his own career and in his downfall he again attempts to use his son for his own ends:

> Richard Waverley's letter to his son upon this occasion was a masterpiece of its kind. Aristides himself could not have made out a harder case. An unjust monarch, and an ungrateful country, were the burden of each rounded paragraph. He spoke of long services, and unrequited sacrifices; though the former had been overpaid by his salary, and nobody could guess in what the latter consisted, unless it were in his deserting, not from conviction, but for the lucre of gain, the Tory principles of his family. (203)

This letter was followed by one by his uncle in which the old man declared that his brother's misfortunes could be laid to blame at "as a new and enormous instance of the injustice of the existing government" (203).

His uncle demanded that Edward "take the fittest, and at the same time, the most speedy opportunity, of transmitting his resignation to the War Office, and hinted, moreover, that little ceremony was necessary where so little had been used to his father." The new found reinvigoration of the Jacobite feelings of the Waverley family was most strongly expressed in a letter from Aunt Rachel when she declared that "the disgrace of her brother Richard as the just reward of his forfeiting his allegiance to a lawful, though exiled sovereign, and taking the oaths to an alien." The last letter that Edward received was from his commanding officer, Colonel Gardiner, who had heard reports that Edward was associating with known traitors to the Crown and was hence relieving the young officer of his command. Rejected by Flora, and with his army career in ruins, Edward decides to return to the safety of Waverley Honour.

He is not yet willing to accept the reality of the political situation. Even after Fergus attempts to explain the dangers that await him, Edward still cannot realize where he has done anything amiss. Edward was also unwilling to accept any responsibility for his actions. He had indeed been missing for weeks from his military duties, yet "He had been accustomed from his very infancy to possess, in a great measure, the disposal of his own time, and thus acquired habits which rendered the rules of military discipline as unpleasing to him in this as there in some other aspects." He also believed that his actions "would not be enforced in a very rigid manner." He has not yet grown up and accepted that he has responsibilities.

Much to Edward's surprise when he leaves the Highlands he is arrested! All the past events of the last few weeks conspire against him. Even the unreadable tracks given him by Pembroke are perceived as dangerous sedition. His only defense is to declare, "I

never read six pages." It is during his imprisonment that the wavering of Edward becomes apparent. When Edward is accused of traitorous acts his defense is to declare, "'I assure you I am not only entirely guiltless of the plot you have laid to my charge, but I detest it from the very bottom of my soul, nor would I be guilty of such treachery to gain a throne, either for myself or any other man alive'" (258-259). Yet the very next day, after waking in prison, he was to declare to himself that, "'Why did not I...like other men of honour, take the earliest opportunity to welcome to Britain the descendant of her ancient kings, and lineal heir of her throne?'" He comes to the conclusion that all "that has been recorded of excellence and worth in the house of Waverley has been founded upon their loyal faith to the house of Stewart." Yet, he soon discovers that his captors Mr. Morton and Major Melville are proper gentlemen. He joins them in dinner and finds that they are much like him in attitudes and are both upholders of law and propriety, and that their political and religious opinions are moderate, as are his.

Mr. Morton is an upholder of the established order and is a minister of the official state church of Scotland, the Presbyterian. He represents the *via media* that so many of the Scottish characters in *Waverley* lack. He refuses to accept the two extremes of religious traditions represented in the novel. He supports neither the nonjuring tradition of Episcopalianism or the Roman Catholicism of Jacobitism, but he also rejects the opposite extremes of the Cameronians, which is represented by Gilfillan, a fanatic who fought against the Hanoverians as a Covenanter, who is summoned to take Edward to Stirling Castle to await judgment on the charges of treason.

For Mr. Morton it is the Hanoverians who represent moderation in both religion as well as politics. The two extremes, represented by the equal fanaticism of the Jacobite

followers or the Cameronians, are dangerous to good order and safety. Both wish to establish tyrannies in Scotland, one political the other religious. Jacobitism would overturn all the advances made by Parliamentary rule in the last two hundred years by re-establishing feudalism; whilst the Cameronians would demand implementation of the Solemn League and Covenant which would overturn all religious toleration advanced under the Hanoverian rulers. Both extremes, whilst wishing for different outcomes, were both opposed to the 1707 Act of Union; one on religious grounds, and the other on political and national. If the moderating power of the Hanoverian government were removed, Scotland would soon be enmeshed in a civil war between these opposing fanaticisms.

In some manner Edward's incarceration as a traitor signals the commencement of his real education. His sojourn thus far in the Lowlands and Highlands of Scotland has been a romantic interlude. His incarceration and the accusation against him of interpreting his romantic interlude as a traitorous act does, as of yet, only in a small measure, force Edward to begin his education in the world of realities and not romantic dreams. He cannot fathom that others can construe his actions as anything but innocent. Edward must learn that in times of danger and rebellion all actions have consequences. Edward shall soon learn that often the consequence of one's actions can have very serious consequences indeed. He must also learn to accept his responsibilities as a member of the governing class.

The Highlands, and their Jacobite Cause, becomes simply high romance for Edward in the beginning, where he can perceive of himself as a knight of ancient days. The past, as is the Jacobite Cause itself, is one of peril for Edward, a peril that he does not see, or

refuses to see; in addition, his passion for Flora and his obsession with the romantic image are exploited by Fergus Mac Ivor, to recruit him to the Jacobite cause (Brown *Walter Scott* 8). Added to his romantic interests, his whole tutelage in his uncle's house has convinced him of the rightness of the Stuart Cause; and "It is but too well known how many gentlemen of rank, education, and fortune took a concern in the ill-fated and desperate undertaking of 1745. The ladies, also, of Scotland very generally espoused the cause of the gallant and handsome young Prince, who threw himself upon the mercy of his countrymen rather like a hero of romance than a calculating politician" (337).

After many machinations on the part of Fergus Mac Ivor to free Edward from his captivity, Edward is finally introduced to the Prince; this introduction seals his fate, for, like many, Edward is impressed with the character and appearance of the leader of the Cause. The Prince was, "A young man, wearing his own fair hair, distinguished by the dignity of his mien and the noble expression of his well-formed and regular features, advanced out of a circle of military gentlemen and Highland chiefs by whom he was surrounded" (314). Edward is so impressed with the nobility of the Prince that he is certain that regardless of the "the star on his breast and the embroidered garter at his knee had not appeared as its indications" he would have been able to "have discovered his high birth and rank" simply by his very presence as leader. Edward, flattered by the attention paid to him by the Prince becomes an enthusiastic supporter of the Jacobite cause and, reunited with Fergus, he dons a Mac Ivor kilt and joins the rebel army in a march to confront the British redcoats.

Edward is introduced to the Prince as a "descendant of one of the most ancient and loyal families in England." After his arrest by the Hanoverian forces and accusations of

the disloyalty to the present King in London Edward is receptive to support the cause of the Pretender, and Edward's fate is sealed. He is enthralled with the Jacobite Cause and its romantic implications. Edward, in his naivety does not understand all of the implications of the Prince's need to have his support:

> The Prince (for, although unfortunate in the faults and follies of his forefathers, we shall here and elsewhere give him the title due to his birth) raised Waverley from the ground and embraced him with an expression of thanks too warm not to be genuine. He also thanked Fergus Mac–Ivor repeatedly for having brought him such an adherent, and presented Waverley to the various noblemen, chieftains, and officers who were about his person as a young gentleman of the highest hopes and prospects, in whose bold and enthusiastic avowal of his cause they might see an evidence of the sentiments of the English families of rank at this important crisis. Indeed, this was a point much doubted among the adherents of the house of Stuart; and as a well- founded disbelief in the cooperation of the English Jacobites kept many Scottish men of rank from his standard, and diminished the courage of those who had joined it, nothing could be more seasonable for the Chevalier than the open declaration in his favour of the representative of the house of Waverley–Honour, so long known as Cavaliers and Royalists. (316-317)

Edward continues to be manipulated by others. Mac Ivor had been using him from the very beginning to enhance his own prestige with the Prince; and it is later revealed that his whole capture, recapture, and regal audience was a strategy devised by Fergus and the Pretender to manipulate Edward's romantic imagination so as to gain his allegiance.

Although Edward has joined the forces of the Prince he is still uncertain as to the rightness of the Cause and danger that a civil war would inflict upon Great Britain. Even before volunteering for the Cause he has, under the more moderate influence of Rose, questioned the desirability of rebellion and the legality of the House of Stuart, and,

> Felt inexpressible repugnance at the idea of being accessory to the plague of civil war. Whatever were the original rights of the Stewarts, calm reflection told him that, omitting the question how far James the Second could forfeit those of his posterity, he had, according to the united voice of the whole nation, justly forfeited his own. Since that period, four monarchs had reigned in peace and glory over Britain, sustaining and exalting the character of the nation, abroad, and its liberties at home. Reason asked, was it worth while to disturbed a government so long settled and established, and to plunge a kingdom into all the miseries of civil war, for the purpose of replacing upon the throne the descendents of a monarch by whom it had been willfully forfeited? (230)

Removed from the influence of romanticism these reflections show the real gulf between Edward's true political opinions, which are that good government, is liberal and democratic, distinct from Jacobite principals, which are in contrast to these same principals (Brown *Walter Scott* 21). The Jacobites are not simply interested in returning the Stuarts to the combined crowns of England and Scotland; they also wish to turn the clock back on all political advances made under the Hanoverians. They wish to see a return to feudal governance and absolutism.

During the first battle that Edward participates in for the Stuart Cause he spends most of his time trying to save members of the opposing government forces. In this he

resembles Henry Morton. And Edward comes to regret his decision to serve the Prince. The battle of Prestonpans quickly puts a pathetic end to Edward's romantic illusions concerning the rightness of the Stuart Cause as well as the stated aims of the Jacobites. Before the battle even begins he finds a dying member of his former regiment,

> 'For the love of God,' said the wounded man, as he heard Waverley's step, 'give me a single drop of water!' 'You shall have it,' answered Waverley, at the same time raising him in his arms, bearing him to the door of the hut, and giving him some drink from his flask. 'I should know that voice,' said the man; but looking on Waverley's dress with a bewildered look — 'no, this is not the young squire!' This was the common phrase by which Edward was distinguished on the estate of Waverley–Honour, and the sound now thrilled to his heart with the thousand recollections which the well-known accents of his native country had already contributed to awaken. 'Houghton!' he said, gazing on the ghastly features which death was fast disfiguring, 'can this be you?' 'I never thought to hear an English voice again,' said the wounded man; 'they left me to live or die here as I could, when they found I would say nothing about the strength of the regiment. But, O squire! how could you stay from us so long? (355)

Thus, Edward learns that his actions do have consequences, and as his former family retainer died, "praying his young master, when he returned to Waverley–Honour, to be kind to old Job Houghton and his dame, and conjuring him not to fight with these wild petticoat-men against old England" (356). This horrible death of a man, who was dependent upon Edward, has a profound effect upon his sensibilities, forcing him to ponder his actions up to that time, reflecting that,

> 'I have indeed acted towards you with thoughtless cruelty. I brought you from your paternal fields, and the protection of a generous and kind landlord, and when I had subjected you to all the rigour of military discipline, I shunned to bear my own share of the burden, and wandered from the duties I had undertaken, leaving alike those whom it was my business to protect, and my own reputation, to suffer under the artifices of villainy. O, indolence and indecision of mind, if not in yourselves vices — to how much exquisite misery and mischief do you frequently prepare the way!' (358)

Edward's education has now begun in earnest, and during the actual battle his feelings of guilt, shame, and remorse worsen. The battle is a bloody one for the government forces who are routed by the Highlanders and, although Edward saves one British general from instant slaughter, he fails to save Colonel Gardiner, his former commander and a strong personal supporter.

During the battle Edward begins to further his education by questioning his participation in open rebellion against what he more and more firmly considers to be the better government to govern a united kingdom. He begins to lose all of his former romantic illusions concerning the Highlanders and their Cause:

> looking around him, he saw the wild dress and appearance of his Highland associates, heard their whispers in an uncouth and unknown language, looked upon his own dress, so unlike that which he had worn from his infancy, and wished to awake from what seemed at the moment a dream, strange, horrible, and unnatural. 'Good God!' he muttered, 'am I then a traitor to my country, a

renegade to my standard, and a foe, as that poor dying wretch expressed himself, to my native England!' (361-362)

During the battle Edward rescues Colonel Talbot, and though the influence of Talbot, he sees more and more clearly that the Jacobite Cause has already passed and has little but violence to offer. Colonel Talbot expresses his view of the whole of the rising, without any romantic illusions stating,

> 'I am not so inexperienced a soldier, sir,' answered the Englishman, 'as to complain of the fortune of war. I am only grieved to see those scenes acted in our own island which I have often witnessed elsewhere with comparative indifference.' 'Another such day as this,' said Waverley, 'and I trust the cause of your regrets will be removed, and all will again return to peace and order.' The officer smiled and shook his head. 'I must not forget my situation so far as to attempt a formal confutation of that opinion; but, notwithstanding your success and the valour which achieved it, you have undertaken a task to which your strength appears wholly inadequate.' (379)

Edward participates in the invasion of England and soon realizes that in England there is no popular support for the return of the Stuarts, and no English uprising accompanies the movement of the Prince and his armies into England. And Edward,

> Could not but observe that in those towns in which they proclaimed James the Third, 'no man cried, God bless him.' The mob stared and listened, heartless, stupefied, and dull, but gave few signs even of that boisterous spirit which induces them to shout upon all occasions for the mere exercise of their most sweet voices. The Jacobites had been taught to believe that the north-western counties

> abounded with wealthy squires and hardy yeomen, devoted to the cause of the White Rose. But of the wealthier Tories they saw little. Some fled from their houses, some feigned themselves sick, some surrendered themselves to the government as suspected persons. Of such as remained, the ignorant gazed with astonishment, mixed with horror and aversion, at the wild appearance, unknown language, and singular garb of the Scottish clans. And to the more prudent their scanty numbers, apparent deficiency in discipline, and poverty of equipment seemed certain tokens of the calamitous termination of their rash undertaking. Thus the few who joined them were such as bigotry of political principle blinded to consequences, or whose broken fortunes induced them to hazard all on a risk so desperate. (429)

The Cause has no support except for a few Highland chieftains and their followers who are not seen as restorers of a legal system but as an anachronistic collection of barbarians. The attitude of the English populace is to "Let them stay in their own barren mountains, and puff and swell, and hang their bonnets on the horns of the moon, if they have a mind; but what business have they to come where people wear breeches, and speak an intelligible language?" (426).

It is soon plain to Edward that even those who support the Prince are not doing so for anything other than self-gain. Fergus Mac Ivor, the most fanatical of Jacobites, has his own personal reasons for supporting the Stuart Cause, and is representative of the leadership of the Jacobite Cause. Fergus, mind was a,

> Perpetual workshop of scheme and intrigue, of every possible kind and description; while, like many a mechanic of more ingenuity than

> steadiness...would often unexpectedly, and without any apparent motive, abandon one plan and go earnestly to work upon another, which was either fresh from the forge of his imagination or had at some former period been flung aside half finished. It was therefore often difficult to guess what line of conduct he might finally adopt upon any given occasion" (404).

But having made his decision to follow the Prince it becomes impossible for Edward to desert those whom he has promised to support, but he remains now more aware of the reality of the Cause he now supports, he declares that Mac Ivor is "A petty chief of three or four hundred men! his pride might suffice for the Cham of Tartary — the Grand Seignior — the Great Mogul" (434).

Edward begins to see his true duty and finally assumes the initiative, by using his connections with the Prince, he secures a compassionate release for Talbot, who returns to London to tend his sick wife and to try to clear Edward's name. Edward's first truly generous act, politic and yet noble, will be amply rewarded in the future.

Edward now has few illusions left about the Pretender, the Highland Chieftains, and their cause: romantic they may be, but their mixture of Highland tribalism and French politicking makes them incapable of maintaining any collective authority, but having now learned what honour, duty and loyalty really mean, Edward refuses to switch to the more favorable side and abandon his colleagues. The foreignness of the Prince is emphasized by Talbot when he informs Edward, after having gotten him a reprieve, that King George is a true Englishman, saying "I do not pretend, indeed, that he confers a favour with all the foreign graces and compliments of your Chevalier errant; but he has a plain English manner, and the evident reluctance with which he grants your request indicates the

sacrifice which he makes of his own inclination to your wishes" (310). Previously, Talbot has accused Mac Ivor of being nothing more than,

> A Frenchified Scotchman, possessing all the cunning and plausibility of the nation where he was educated, with the proud, vindictive, and turbulent humour of that of his birth. 'If the devil,' he said, 'had sought out an agent expressly for the purpose of embroiling this miserable country, I do not think he could find a better than such a fellow as this, whose temper seems equally active, supple, and mischievous, and who is followed, and implicitly obeyed, by a gang of such cut-throats as those whom you are pleased to admire so much.' (401)

A restoration of the Stuarts would be to place foreigners on the united Thrones of England and Scotland, and more dangerous for Britain would be the power that France would have if such a restoration were to take place. During the epoch that the novel was written France was indeed considered the main enemy of Great Britain. This fear is echoed throughout the novel. Scott is also using his power of persuasion to dispel the belief, very popular amongst the Scots, that the Hanoverians represented a German dynasty with no rights to rule Great Britain.

The Highland Chiefs refuse to follow the Prince any further into England, and the decision to return to Scotland, and the Highlands means all is lost, "as on former occasions, the heading, hanging, and forfeiting will chiefly fall to the lot of the Lowland gentry; that they will be left secure in their poverty and their fastnesses, there, according to their proverb, 'to listen to the wind upon the hill till the waters abate'" (447). What the Highlanders do not understand, because they cannot understand the world has changed, is that this policy will no longer work for them, and that

> they will be disappointed; they have been too often troublesome to be so repeatedly passed over, and this time John Bull has been too heartily frightened to recover his good-humour for some time. The Hanoverian ministers always deserved to be hanged for rascals; but now, if they get the power in their hands, — as, sooner or later, they must, since there is neither rising in England nor assistance from France, — they will deserve the gallows as fools if they leave a single clan in the Highlands in a situation to be again troublesome to government. Ay, they will make root-and-branch-work" (447).

Scott has Fergus, the quintessential Highlander, prophesy the end of the Highlands; that it will pass into history.

Edward is cut off from Fergus and the rest of the main army allowing him an honorable escape from a lost cause (Lauber 64). Sheltered in a local farmhouse, Edward learns of his father's death and he sets off for London where the Talbot's come to his aid. In the end, Edward escapes the final routing of the Jacobite forces at Culloden. Edward is now tired of all war, and "that it might never again be his lot to draw his sword in civil conflict" (461). Colonel Talbot secures him safe passage to Scotland from whence he plans to escape abroad until some sort of pardon can be gained for him. With the total failure of the rising and the completion of Edward's education he is now finished with romanticism and is now ready for an unromantic life, reflecting, "that he acquired a more complete mastery of a spirit tamed by adversity than his former experience had given him; and that he felt himself entitled to say firmly, though perhaps with a sigh, that the romance of his life was ended, and that its real history had now commenced" (462). Thus, Scotland itself has learnt through the final defeat of the Jacobites that the time for

romanticism is past and it is time to commence with real life under the terms that the Act of Union offers. It is time to remember the heroics of a past age, but to advance into the modern world as a prosperous and moderate nation.

In Scotland the reaction of the government to the Jacobite threat is swift and severe. Fergus Mac Ivor is condemned to death and the Prince spends several months wondering the Highlands and islands of Scotland until safely removing to France and exile. Flora Mac Ivor, when she thinks of her brother's execution, cannot help but dwell upon her own inability to restrain him from the desperate attempt at a lost cause:

> There is a busy devil in my heart, that whispers, but were madness to listen to it, that the strength of mind on which Flora prided herself has murdered her bother!... Oh that I could recollect that I had but once said to him, 'He that striketh with the sword shall die by the sword'; that I had but once said. Remain at home; reserve yourself, your vassals, your life, for enterprises within the reach of man. But oh, Mr. Waverley, I spurred his fiery temper, and half of his ruin at least liest with his sister!'
>
> Edward... recalled to her the principles on which both thought it their duty to act, and in which they had been educated: 'Do you think I have forgotten them', she said, looking up with eager quickness; 'I do not regret his attempt, because it was wrong! Oh no! On that point I am armed; but because it was impossible it could end otherwise that thus.' (525-526)

Flora makes the point that the whole novel makes, "that Jacobism is not wrong; it is merely impossible. The clock cannot be put back" (Kerr *Fiction* 63). The cause is "splendid yet useless." Even amongst those Highlanders who so easily seemed to

embrace the Jacobite Cause based upon lineage and right, no longer truly believe. According to David Brown:

> As Charles [the Prince] says, his cause 'has little to recommend it but its justice' - his only claim to the throne is his lineage, and the celebrated philosophy of Stuart absolutism, which maintains that his family has the God-given right to rule. By manipulating the Prince, and especially by using him as a means to their own monetary advantage, his supporters show they no longer really believe in the ideology of their own cause, and that the values of the bourgeois Lowlands and England have in practice become their values. (17)

This is amply proved when Fergus himself, when balked in his attempt to have an earldom confirmed by the Prince declares: "I'll tell you what I could have done at that moment – sold myself to the Devil or the Elector, whichever offered the dearest revenge." The Cause was dead even amongst its heartiest supporters.

Throughout the novel Edward Waverley is seen to 'waver' in his support for either the Jacobite cause or the Hanoverian succession. This wavering is presented as the dichotomy that exists within his family; his father's support for the new order, and his uncle's mild support for the Pretender. Neither is really willing to make a bold move that would endanger their positions. His uncle never joins in any true support for the rebellion. Edward's support for the cause is purely romantic. The gulf separating the Stuart's absolutism with modern Britain is too great for Edward Waverley to cross.

Edward joins the Cause because of a series of minor slights and his attraction to Romanticism, when he puts on Highland dress for the first time, one of Fergus' followers remarks that he is, "majoring younder afore the mucle pier glass." The whole of the Jacobite cause has the feeling of unreality about it; much like a fancy dress ball that only mimics a past age, but has nothing in common with the historical reality of the epoch. Edward's commitment to the Prince's Cause is not based upon anything that is real to him. It offers no real alternative to the Hanoverian constitutional monarch of Great Britain. The Jacobite cause is effectively criminal. Edward is also suffering from culture shock as the reality of war overcomes his romantic notions of both the Highlanders and the Highlands. He suddenly considers that the Highlanders and their Jacobite cause may be the ruin of all he holds dear. In retrospect he is an English gentleman.

Edward shows a complete antipathy to the culture of the Highlanders, and by implication to the Jacobite cause. Flora Mac Ivor had always recognized this in him. As she comments to Rose that Edward's proper place is "in the quiet circle of domestic happiness, lettered indolence, and elegant enjoyments of Waverley-Honour." Waverley was never meant to be a "feudal aristocrat, [he] is far nearer to the way of life of Jan Austen's leisurely, upper-middle-class world" (Brown *Walter Scott* 22).

Edward proves inadequate as a romantic hero; his fascination with romance and heroism is proven to be fleeting. Edward's character is perfectly appropriate to one who will survive into the new age, an age in which heroic virtues have no place. In the end, Edward is cleared of any wrong doing, whilst the leaders of the rebellion

face their deaths. Fergus and his follower Evan Dhu are condemned to death. Evan Dhu offers his life and the lives of five others in exchange for his chieftain's freedom. As he volunteers to go and fetch the five others himself, laughter breaks out in the courtroom, this concept of feudal loyalty is simply misplaced in the modern world: it cannot be understood. In a speech Evan Dhu rebukes the audience and then proudly rejects the judge's invitation to plead for grace, preferring to share his chieftain's fate. This represents the death of feudalism and the personal loyalty that was its foundation. Such ancient concepts of the rights of kings are, in the modern age, comical. Commercial interests of the new Scotland have no place for the likes of Evan Dhu.

Throughout the novel Flora's strength of character, heroic bent, and intellectual ability coupled with striking beauty have been compared with the far less remarkable gifts of domesticated Rose. Flora, exotic, yet dangerous, represents the Old World, whilst Rose, placid and devoted to order and peace, represents the new one; thus, Rose has had no enthusiasm for rebellion; she is more interested in common sense. She also rejects her own incompetent father's notions of feudalism; writing to Edward early on that, "I hope God will protect you, and that you will get safe home to England, where you used to tell me there was no military violence nor fighting among clans permitted, but everything was done according to an equal law that protected all who were harmless and innocence." It is just this safety and rule of law that Scott wishes for Scotland. After the rebellion, and its failure, Edward's love interest moves from Flora to Rose. Edward has substituted the domesticated Rose for the romantic Flora. Common sense has overcome childish romanticism. Although

Rose did not have the qualities associated with romantic interest, she had an estate and ten thousand pounds. Scotland must also make the decision to reject the lure of the romantic past for the realities of the modern world, and the prosperity that membership in the growing British Empire can offer.

With Talbot's help, Edward escapes to Scotland using pass papers in the name of Talbot's nephew. In Scotland the news is bad, and he finds Baron Bradwardine has been proscribed and stripped of his property and possessions, and is currently being sheltered by one of his poor tenants where he is hiding in a cave from the King's troopers. Even though the Baron is lost and his estate taken from him he bares no ill-will to the victor and "there was no fruitless repining, no turbid melancholy; he bore his lot, and the hardships which it involved, with a good-humored, though serious composure, and used no violent language against the prevailing party" (494). Indeed his only wish is that the new master of Tully-Veolan will be a "wiser master, and as kind a one as I was." Besides finding the Baron hiding for his very life, Edward finds the estate of Tully-Veolan destroyed by the government's forces in retaliation for the Baron's support of the Prince, and

> Upon entering the court-yard, Edward saw the fears realised which these circumstances had excited. The place had been sacked by the King's troops, who, in wanton mischief, had even attempted to burn it; and though the thickness of the walls had resisted the fire, unless to a partial extent, the stables and out-houses were totally consumed. The towers and pinnacles of the main building were scorched and blackened; the pavement of the court broken and shattered, the doors torn down entirely, or hanging by a single hinge, the windows dashed in

and demolished, and the court strewed with articles of furniture broken into fragments. The accessaries of ancient distinction, to which the Baron, in the pride of his heart, had attached so much importance and veneration, were treated with peculiar contumely. The fountain was demolished, and the spring which had supplied it now flooded the court-yard. The stone basin seemed to be destined for a drinking-trough for cattle, from the manner in which it was arranged upon the ground. The whole tribe of bears, large and small, had experienced as little favour as those at the head of the avenue, and one or two of the family pictures, which seemed to have served as targets for the soldiers, lay on the ground in tatters. With an aching heart, as may well be imagined, Edward viewed this wreck of a mansion so respected. But his anxiety to learn the fate of the proprietors, and his fears as to what that fate might be, increased with every step. When he entered upon the terrace new scenes of desolation were visible. The balustrade was broken down, the walls destroyed, the borders overgrown with weeds, and the fruit-trees cut down or grubbed up. In one compartment of this old-fashioned garden were two immense horse-chestnut trees, of whose size the Baron was particularly vain; too lazy, perhaps, to cut them down, the spoilers, with malevolent ingenuity, had mined them and placed a quantity of gunpowder in the cavity. One had been shivered to pieces by the explosion, and the fragments lay scattered around, encumbering the ground it had so long shadowed. The other mine had been more partial in its effect. About one-fourth of the trunk of the tree was torn from the mass, which, mutilated and defaced on the one side, still spread on the other its ample and undiminished boughs. (483-848)

The destruction of the beautiful and ancient seat of Tully-Veolan is a metaphor for the destruction of Scotland that was the final result of the rebellion of '45. It was a destruction brought upon the estate by the actions of the Baron himself who could not progress into an age that was quickly shedding the feudalism that was so dear to his heart, but he is finally able to face this reality and accept the demise of the Cause, declaring to Edward that, "We poor Jacobites, are now like the conies in Holy Scripture (which the great traveller Pococke calleth Jerboa), a feeble people, that make our abode in the rocks" (495). Eventually, Talbot petitions George II on Edward's behalf and is soon able to send Edward papers securing his liberty.

The final chapters deal with the marriage of Rose and Edward. Edward retreats from the world of romance to a less exciting but far safer way of life. This change is figured by his choice of Rose for his wife. Together they restore the estate of Tully-Veolan, and receive pardon for the Baron. This was foretold to Rose by Flora long before the failure of the cause when she rightly understood the real Edward, stating that,

> I will tell you where he will be at home, my dear, and in his place — in the quiet circle of domestic happiness, lettered indolence, and elegant enjoyments of Waverley-Honour. And he will refit the old library in the most exquisite Gothic taste, and garnish its shelves with the rarest and most valuable volumes; and he will draw plans and landscapes, and write verses, and rear temples, and dig grottoes; and he will stand in a clear summer night in the colonnade before the hall, and gaze on the deer as they stray in the moonlight, or lie shadowed by the boughs of the huge old fantastic oaks; and he will repeat verses to his beautiful wife, who will hang upon his arm; — and he will be a happy man.' (406)

According to Harry E. Shaw in his *Forms of Historical Fiction*, Edward's marriage to Rose "prefigures the consolidation of Scotland and England, since he is English and his wife is Scottish" (179); hence, the novel creates a historical attitude that is expressive of a regretful acceptance of progress (Shaw 179). Edward does not return to England, but establishes himself in Scotland; his progress has been as an intermediary between Lowland and Highland, between change and stasis, the past and present, between the estates of Waverley-Honour, Tully-Veolan and Glennaquioch, which "can be seen also as states or stages of civilization. Yet, having rejected the old ways of Glennaquioch he opts not for the more modern ways of his English home but for a restored Tully-Veolan beside a pacified highland line," (Humphrey 57) thus accomplishing a synthesis between the two. Finally, Edward "having emerged from criminal involvement to redeem his own lineage, establishes 'Waverley-Honour' in a new land and in restoring Baron Bradwardine to freedom preserves or resurrects what is of permanent value in the 'lost Past'" (Hart 26). Edward Waverley has left romanticism behind and has taken his responsibility as a leader in the Union of the two kingdoms.

Sir Walter Scott uses the ideology in *Waverley* to further the ideological union of Scotland and England. Scott's account represents Jacobitism in chivalric, feudal and idealistic terms, but sees it failing to comprehend democracy, individualism and rationality – for him the main characteristics of modern societies. Although he is perhaps sorry to see the old ways die he also admits that,

> There is no European nation which, within the course of half a century or little more, has undergone so complete a change as this kingdom of Scotland. The effects of the insurrection of 1745, — the destruction of the patriarchal power of

> the Highland chiefs, — the abolition of the heritable jurisdictions of the Lowland nobility and barons, — the total eradication of the Jacobite party, which, averse to intermingle with the English, or adopt their customs, long continued to pride themselves upon maintaining ancient Scottish manners and customs, — commenced this innovation. The gradual influx of wealth and extension of commerce have since united to render the present people of Scotland a class of beings as different from their grandfathers as the existing English are from those of Queen Elizabeth's time. (553)

Jacobitism is fundamentally misguided and historically doomed. Although Scott considers that Jacobite sympathies are now without foundation in modern Scotland, he muses that there are still in his own day "'folks of the old leaven,' who still cherished a lingering, though hopeless, attachment to the house of Stuart," but that it is a small and unimportant minority. The reader's emotion, much like Scott's own, inevitably goes with the Jacobites, even though common sense may reluctantly prefer the political policies of the Hanoverians (Lauber 66). This may also be so because even though Scott's common sense was solidly behind the Union and the peace and prosperity that it brought Scotland there is still a sadness that, "this race has now almost entirely vanished from the land, and with it, doubtless, much absurd political prejudice; but also many living examples of singular and disinterested attachment to the principles of loyalty which they received from their fathers, and of old Scottish faith, hospitality, worth, and honour" (554) has receded into history.

In retrospect perhaps the Highland support for the Prince was not as shortsighted as Scott seems to intimate. In the end, the rightness of Jacobite resistance was proved in the

Highland clearances (1763-1775) when the consolidation of farms, modernization of leases, and introduction of new kinds of sheep-farming by Lowland capitalists led to thousands of Highlanders being forced to emigrate to British colonies overseas. The '45 may have been simply the last desperate act of a dying society to survive.

CHAPTER 7

REDGAUNTLET AND THE *ANTIQUARIAN:* NATIONAL UNITY

Published in 1824 *Redgauntlet* was the last of Walter Scott's great novels about the ill-fated Jacobite cause. John Lockhart, Scott's bibliographer, comments that the novel had "made considerable progress at press before Constable and Ballantyne could persuade him [Scott] to substitute that title [*Redgauntlet*] for *Herries*" (431). Lockhart further observes that the novel was received somewhat coldly at its publication.

Moray McLaren maintains that *Redgauntlet* was "in many ways...the most remarkable product of Walter Scott's imagination" (168). It begins as an epistolary tale as an exchange of letters between Alan Fairford and Darsie Latimer; later, when the Fairford joins his friend in the south west of Scotland, it takes a more narrative style. McLaren claims that the novel is personal in that:

> The two young men though whose eyes and pens and mouths the novel is begun and carried forward are based on himself [Alan Fairford] and his friend Will Clerk [Darsie Latimer]; there is also a sympathetic and likeable portrait of Scott's own father. (168)

in *Redgauntlet* Scott presents us with a final attempt for the supporters of the Jacobite cause to triumph in overturning the Hanoverian succession to the Throne; this time in the Lowlands near the Solway Firth. Scott does not give an exact date for this final rebellion,

but since the now middle-aged Prince Charles Edward is addressed by his followers as "King," it must be soon after the death of the Old Pretender in 1766 (McLaren 168). *Redgauntlet* presents the final phase of the Jacobite movement; since during the twenty years or so after 1745, Jacobitism had entered its final decline; "and would soon be no more than a sentimental or antiquarian affection" (Lauber 67). Scott represents the Jacobite cause as a noble futility, not because its supporters lacked courage, skill, or just grievance, but because their leaders, the Stuart dynasty and followers, were representatives of a bygone feudal age that, by 1688, the world had left behind (Uglow *Redgauntlet*).

By the 1760's the Stuart Cause simply made no sense, and had no real support even in Scotland, and most certainly not in England. Scotland had grown beyond its previous divisions based upon religion and political adherence, and had begun to enter fully into the age not only of the Enlightenment, but also into commercial success; this was the new reality of Scotland. Jacobitism and its political fixation on divinely appointed kingship, vassalage, and pre-reformation religious practices no longer had anything to offer even a dissatisfied population, much less a growing nation of middle-class entrepreneurs. Popular sentiment may still have chafed under the concept of Union, but going back to the feudal past was not seriously considered by anyone but cranks and fanatics.

Scott's *Redgauntlet* explores the reality of the rapid social and economic changes that had overtaken post-Culloden Scotland. Scott sees Jacobitism not as a political faith, but as an older way of life; a different culture. Scott realized that the gradual influx of wealth and the extension of commerce have killed the old order (Devlin 115). The implication is that it was not the defeat of the Battle of Culloden that

caused the demise of feudal Scotland; it would have died a natural death anyway. The fact that the action of *Redgauntlet* takes place in 1760's, about twenty years after the rising of 1745, shows the drastic changes that had overtaken Scotland. Jacobitism is no longer a real alternative. Scott noted this in his postscript to *Waverley* when he wrote:

> There is no European nation, which, within the course of half a century, or little more, has undergone so complete a change as this kingdom of Scotland. The effects of the Insurrection of 1745, the destruction of the patriarchal power of the Highland chiefs, the abolition of the heritable jurisdictions of the Lowland nobility and barons, the total eradication of the Jacobite party, which averse to intermingle with the English, or adopt their customs, long continued to pride themselves upon maintaining ancient Scottish manners and customs, commenced this innovation. The gradual influx of wealth, and the extension of commerce, has since united to render the present people of Scotland a class of beings as different from their grandfathers, as the existing English are from those of Queen Elizabeth's time.

This transformation of Scotland from a land of feudal chiefs, to a land integrated into modern Europe is completed in *Redgauntlet.* The story centers on another abortive attempt to revive Jacobitism, but in this tale of Scotland very near to Scott's own time, there is no Evan Maccombich who offered to die in place of his chief; indeed, the servant of the leader of the rebellion, Cristal Nixon, betrays the rebellion even before it gets started. No one now supports the pretensions of the "Young Pretender"; his time has passed. No one even really knows who the Pretender is;

much less be willing to follow him to death as had their fathers in the previous failed rebellion of '45:

> The Pretender is no more remembered in the Highlands than if the poor gentleman were gathered to his hundred and eight fathers, whose portraits adorn the ancient walls of Holyrood; the broadswords have passed into other hands; the targets are used to cover the butter churns; and the race has sunk, or is fast sinking, from ruffling bullies into tame cheaters. (16)

More importantly, Scotland is now at peace and enjoying prosperity, and the Pretender is no longer the attractive young man that he was in the '45: "He was a man of middle life, about forty or upwards; but either care, or fatigue, or indulgence, had brought on the appearance of premature old age, and given to his fine features a cast of seriousness or even sadness" (276), and that he had,

> Wrinkles stamped upon his brow in many a melancholy fold, still the lofty forehead, the full and well-opened eye, and the well-formed nose, showed how handsome in better days he must have been. He was tall, but lost the advantage of his height by stooping; and the cane which he wore always in his hand, and occasionally used, as well as his slow though majestic gait, seemed to intimate that his form and limbs felt already some touch of infirmity. (276)

The handsome and generous prince that had been so attractive to Edward Waverley is no more; he has passed into history, just as surely as has his cause. Those who now follow the Prince are simply "Every One That Was In Distress, And Every One That Was In Debt, And Every One That Was Discontented, Gathered Themselves Together Unto Him, And He Became A Captain Over Them" (250).

The few remaining Jacobites have become a comedy of errors, a lost cause that does not even know that it is lost. Not only is the general population of Scotland not interested in the pretensions of the House of Stuart to regain their lost crown, but even the Hanoverians no longer regard them as a threat, and "the government would scarce, at this time of day, be likely to proceed against any one even of the most obnoxious rebels. Many years have passed away" (60).

In the novel Darsie Latimer, the novel's hero, has abandoned his studies in preference for a life of leisure and adventure. He has been warned by his London guardian, Samuel Griffiths, to not enter England, but he goes as close to England's northern border as possible. Darsie's parentage has been kept a secret from him, yet regardless of this he is open and kindly by nature, which is reinforced by knowing that he is destined to wealth. He makes this trip with the understanding that he is not to inquire about his family until he completes his twenty-fifth year, but like Edward Waverley, the wild Romanticism of Scotland smites Darsie, and his description of his adventures in Solway sands in letters that he writes to his friend Alan Fairford resembles Waverley's transformation by the Scottish landscape on his approach to Tully-Veolan.

Darsie is drawn to the forbidden border, much as Waverley was drawn to the Highlands, and has gone down to the Solway Firth supposedly for fishing, but is hoping for adventures. When he wanders too near the tides underestimating the speed and power of the Solway tides he had to be rescued by a spear-fisherman of a very gruff manner. He is taken to the fisherman's dwelling where he is not received openly, but where he meets the beautiful Lilias, whom later in the novel he discovers is his long lost sister.

The lost Cause of Jacobitism is best summed up in the person of Redgauntlet, the fisherman who rescues Darsie. Redgauntlet is a fanatic who leads "plotters, that can make no plot to better purpose than their own hanging; and incendiaries, that are snapping the flint upon wet tinder" (261). Scott observes that even the '45 was an "unfortunate relics of a ruined cause" (182): how much more inane would be a rebellion for a lost cause years after the '45? Outside of Redgauntlet, by the 1760's, most Jacobites were harmless "Old ladies of family over their hyson, and grey- haired lairds over their punch, [who] utter a little harmless treason; while the former remembered having led down a dance with the Chevalier, and the latter recounted the feats they had performed at Preston, Clifton, and Falkirk" (187). In Scotland of the 1760's one would have more luck to "raise the dead as raise the Highlands...as soon get a grunt from a dead sow as any comfort from Wales or Cheshire" (261) in support of the lost Cause of the Pretender; no one of substance will follow another rebellion against the House of Hanover.

Even the first appearance of Redgauntlet as leader of the Cause symbolizes the past. He has become a professional leader of lost causes, and to emphasis his inability to accept the modern world, Scott mentions that even his clothes were "not in the present taste, and though it had once been magnificent, was now antiquated and unfashionable"; his clothes are a reflection the out-of-date political attitudes of the few followers of the Pretender. In his support and attempt to initiate another rising in Scotland and England, Redgauntlet simply shows himself a disgruntled reactionary for refusing to accept reality. He had participated in every previous attempt to restore the Stuarts, and had learnt nothing:

> He was out wi' the Hielandmen in Montrose's time; and again he was in the hills wi' Glencairn in the saxteen hundred and fifty-twa; and sae when King Charles the Second came in, wha was in sic favour as the Laird of Redgauntlet? He was knighted at Lonon court, wi' the king's ain sword; and being a redhot prelatist, he came down here, rampauging like a lion, with commissions of lieutenancy (and of lunacy, for what I ken) to put down a' the Whigs and Covenanters in the country. Wild wark they made of it; for the Whigs were as dour as the Cavaliers were fierce, and it was which should first tire the other. Redgauntlet was ay for the strong hand; and his name is kend as wide in the country as Claverhouse's or Tam Dalyell's. Glen, nor dargle, nor mountain, nor cave, could hide the puir hill-folk when Redgauntlet was out with bugle and bloodhound after them, as if they had been sae mony deer. And troth when they fand them, they didna mak muckle mair ceremony than a Hielandman wi' a roebuck -- it was just, 'Will ye tak the test?' -- if not, 'Make ready -- present -- fire!' -- and there lay the recusant. (87)

His personal fortitude and strength have held the Jacobite movement together, but his inability to control his own temper or to control his use of force and violence is a serious weakness; Lauber suggests that a "more serious weakness still [was] his inability to recognize, or admit, reality" (68). He cannot admit or accept the fact that Scotland has changed drastically in the last twenty years since the last rising.

After his rescue from the tide by Redgauntlet, Darsie is given rest and comfort in the home of the local Quaker, Joshua Geddes. Geddes is the opposite of Redgauntlet. He is quiet in his mannerisms and unlike Redgauntlet, who insists on fishing in the old manner, he is open to new ideas. Redgauntlet's fish-spearing is a further indication of

his attachment to the past whilst Geddes more efficient fish-traps are reflective of the new commercial attitudes that Scotland is developing. Joshua Geddes best exemplifies the New World of modern commercial Scotland. James Kerr has remarked that "Geddes appears initially to represent plain speech, the ideal of a natural language against the artificial languages spoken by the novel's principal characters" (*Fiction* 114).

Geddes proves a good friend to Darsie. The Quaker has derived his surname from an old family of Jacobites, which had, until recent times, engaged wholeheartedly in the political adventures of the Stuart cause, and Geddes informs Darsie, that his ancestors were renowned among the ravenous and bloodthirsty men who then dwelt in this vexed country; and so much were they famed for successful free-booting, robbery, and bloodshed that they are said to have been called Geddes, as likening them to the fish called a Jack, Pike, or Luce for their greed and aggression. Joshua Geddes had so distanced himself from the past of his family, that he has defaced his family crest, keeping only the motto, "Trust in God." Like Geddes, Darsie shall also have to reject his family's former political persuasion and embrace the new order to survive (Kerr *Fiction* 114-115). Geddes also represents a Scotland that has moved beyond its past.

Scott uses the Quaker and Hugh Redgauntlet to dramatize the social and economic changes that have overtaken Scotland since the '45. In the new Scotland military courage is outdated and anachronistic (Devlin 121). The quarrel between Redgauntlet and Geddes appears to be over fishing traditions, but the underlying theme is a different world outlook. As previously mentioned, Redgauntlet and his

supporters use the traditional method of fishing, whilst Geddes uses the newer method of stake-nets. For Redgauntlet fishing is the pastime of gentry and a source of free food, for Geddes it is a commercial undertaking. Devlin concludes that, "in the character of Geddes we can see the passing of power from the hereditary chieftains to new merchants" (122). Even in so small a question as fishing rights, the old ways are now judged according to law, not tradition or birthright.

However, the calm peaceable existence found at the Quaker's home soon leaves Darsie looking for more excitement, and he finds means to further it by helping out a blind fiddler by playing as his second at a local inn. In return for his help 'Wandering Willie' tells him the curse of the Redgauntlet family, which is "to be powerful amid the changes of future times; but that, in detestation of his unrelenting cruelty to his own issue, Heaven had decreed that the valour of his race should always be fruitless, and that the cause which they espoused should never prosper" (192). The failure of the Redgauntlet family represents the failure of the Stuarts to rule Scotland, and their return will never happen. It is a lost cause that can never return to power.

Redgauntlet instigates a mob action against Geddes and his fish-traps in order to kidnap Darsie who is in reality his nephew. He does so because of Darsie's supposed power over the tenants of the Redgauntlet's estates, which had been confiscated after Darsie's father's participation in the '45 rebellion. The whole idea is ludicrous because the former feudal ties binding tenant to lord had all been annulled by the Hanoverian government, but for Redgauntlet the modern concept of individual freedom and action is simply contrary to his outdated concept of hierarchy, he declares that, 'The privilege of free action belongs to no mortal -- we are tied down by the fetters of duty -- our mortal

path is limited by the regulations of honour -- our most indifferent actions are but meshes of the web of destiny by which we are all surrounded" (193). Redgauntlet, as a true aristocrat, despises the commercial land that Scotland is fast becoming, a land where the up-and-coming middle-classes can now compete with the old nobility. He is especially appalled at the Fairfords who are now maintainers of the laws that will end the privilege of the feudal rights of the old families, declaring to Darsie:

> 'The laws!' he said; 'and what, stripling, do you know of the laws of your country? Could you learn jurisprudence under a base-born blotter of parchment, such as Saunders Fairford; or from the empty pedantic coxcomb, his son, who now, forsooth, writer himself advocate? When Scotland was herself, and had her own king and legislature, such plebeian cubs, instead of being called to the bar of her supreme courts, would scarce have been admitted to the honour of bearing a sheepskin process-bag.' (195)

Both Geddes as a commercial agent and the Fairfords as lowly-born members of the modern legal profession are rightly seen as the main agents of change. Redgauntlet also refuses to accept the reality of Darsie's support for the House of Hanover even after he openly declares to his uncle that he is "a loyal subject of King George."

A conversation between Darsie and his sister Lilias reveals the reality of the present situation in Scotland; that the feudal ties are now gone and no one will heed the call to a failed cause based upon ancient obligations. Lilias declares to her brother that, "My uncle has been doing all in his power, of late, to conciliate the affections of those wild communities that dwell on the Solway, over whom our family possessed a seignorial interest before the forfeiture, and amongst whom, on the occasion of 1745,

our unhappy father's interest, with his own, raised a considerable body of men. But they are no longer willing to obey his summons" (309); and that it is for the binding of the tenants to their feudal obligations that Redgauntlet "has increased his desire to obtain possession of your person [Darsie], and, if he possibly can, to influence your mind, so as to obtain your authority to his proceedings." But Darsie has no intention of doing the bidding of his uncle, declaring that his "principles and my prudence alike forbid such a step." Besides, "it would be totally unavailing to his purpose. Whatever these people may pretend, to evade your uncle's importunities, they cannot, at this time of day, think of subjecting their necks again to the feudal yoke, which was effectually broken by the act of 1748, abolishing vassalage and hereditary jurisdictions" (309). Unfortunately, regardless of the historical and legal reality of the demise of feudalism, Redgauntlet simply considers it "as the act of a usurping government." He cannot fathom that Scotland has become a nation of laws, and not of personal loyalty and obligations.

Lilias Redgauntlet and Flora Mac Ivor share many characteristics; they have both been raised in Catholic convent schools and both have been raised as strong supporters of the Jacobite Cause, but here the resemblance ends. Flora was the strength behind her brother's support for the Pretender; she rejected Edward Waverley because she doubted his true attachment to the Cause, and in the end retired to a convent in grief over her brother's execution for his participation in the rebellion; support that had received its main personal impetus from her. Lilias, on the other hand, had rejected her convent-bred Jacobitism and rejected reactionary Catholicism as well, and as she informs her brother:

'By a singular chance...in the nunnery where my uncle placed me. Although the abbess was a person exactly after his own heart, my education as a pensioner devolved much on an excellent old mother who had adopted the tenets of the Jansenists, with perhaps a still further tendency towards the reformed doctrines, than those of Port Royal. The mysterious secrecy with which she inculcated these tenets, gave them charms to my young mind, and I embraced them the rather that they were in direct opposition to the doctrines of the abbess, whom I hated so much for her severity, that I felt a childish delight in setting her control at defiance, and contradicting in my secret soul all that I was openly obliged to listen to with reverence. Freedom of religious opinion brings on, I suppose, freedom of political creed; for I had no sooner renounced the Pope's infallibility, than I began to question the doctrine of hereditary and indefeasible right. In short, strange as it may seem, I came out of a Parisian convent, not indeed an instructed Whig and Protestant, but with as much inclination to be so as if I had been bred up, like you, within the Presbyterian sound of Saint Giles's chimes.' (302-303)

Her rejection of Roman Catholicism also signals her rejection of the Jacobitism of her family as well as support for autocratic rule. Unlike Flora, who goads her brother further and further into the rebellion of 1745, Lilias does all she can to point out the defects of their uncle's cause and warns Darsie of the dangers inherent in Jacobitism. Darsie has learnt his support for the Hanoverians and their policy of moderation by upbringing; Lilias from common-sense.

The events of *Redgauntlet* mark the family's struggle to break clear of its past in order to confront the future. After the execution of Darsie's father in the '45, his mother

had taken him from his uncle and the rest of the family, and given him over to Mr. Saunders Fairford, a Writer to the Signet; a position in the law courts, to be raised according to the ethics of middle-class professionalism. Mr. Saunders Fairford,

> was a man of business of the old school, moderate in his charges, economical and even niggardly in his expenditure, strictly honest in conducting his own affairs and those of his clients, but taught by long experience to be wary and suspicious in observing the motions of others. Punctual as the clock of Saint Giles tolled nine, the neat dapper form of the little hale old gentleman was seen at the threshold of the court hall, or at farthest, at the head of the Back Stairs, trimly dressed in a complete suit of snuff-coloured brown, with stockings of silk or woolen as, suited the weather; a bob-wig, and a small cocked hat; shoes blacked as Warren would have blacked them; silver shoe-buckles, and a gold stock-buckle. A nosegay in summer, and a sprig of holly in winter, completed his well-known dress and appearance. His manners corresponded with his attire, for they were scrupulously civil, and not a little formal. He was an elder of the kirk, and, of course, zealous for King George and the Government even to slaying, as he had showed by taking up arms in their cause. (126)

Darsie is raised to be a supporter of the new Scotland. A Scotland founded on middle-class ideals of hard work, merit, prosperity, and personal liberty. Avrom Fleishman suggests, "It is part of Scott's plan to raise Darsie into the image of a new aristocratic hero. Darsie will emerge as Sir Arthur Darsie Redgauntlet, a spirited aristocrat, to be sure, but one who has freed himself from the illusions of an outdated heritage" (74). This is the new hero of modern Scotland.

A new personage of power in the commercially successful Scotland of Scott's own time is the lawyer; the vocation of Darsie's friend Allan Fairford. The importance of family is not the primary focal point of the new order. When Allan meets the King, Charles Stuart, masquerading as a Father Buonaventure, the Prince interviews Allan to discern his family's ties and background:

> 'Your name, sir, I am informed, is Fairford? said the father.
>
> Alan answered by a bow. 'Called to the Scottish bar,' continued the visitor, 'There is, I believe, in the West, a family of birth and rank called Fairford of Fairford.' Alan though this a strange observation from a foreign ecclesiastic, as his name intimated Father Buonaventure to be; but only answered, he believed there was such a family. 'Do you count kindred with them, Mr. Fairford?' continued the inquirer. 'I have not the honour to lay such a claim,' said Fairford. 'My father's industry has raised his family from a low and obscure situation; I have no hereditary claim to distinction of any kind' (277)

The Fairfords, father and son, manifest the growing confidence of the new middle classes in Scotland; Fairford Senior as Writer to the Signet, Alan as a more prestigious Advocate (Brown *Fiction* 152). The Fairfords' command of the legal machinery is symbolically important, as the law is the process whereby the new class's economic and political values are made legitimate (Brown *Fiction* 152); they represent the class that will destroy the older social system.

Throughout the novel, Darsie is removed from any real attachment to his uncle's attempt to rollback time, and considers that his uncle "has chosen an antiquated and desperate line of politics" (198). Darsie is completely wedded to the House of

Hanover and to political and commercial progress permissible by the Union of 1707. Unlike Edward Waverley, Edgar Ravenswood, or even Henry Morton, the past has no real pull on him. He refuses to become involved in rebellion; he is part of the modern world.

The Jacobite conspirators meet in Joe Crackenthrop's public house and are chiefly worried about saving themselves and that the Pretender has brought his mistress with him, a woman with contacts in the Hanoverian government. As in most of Scott's novels dealing with the Jacobite Cause, they are splintered by internal dissension, and at this late date, do not really wish to participate in open rebellion at all. The Pretender refuses to even consider their request to leave his mistress, declaring to Redgauntlet that:

> 'You were mistaken, sir...entirely mistaken -- as much so as you are at this moment, when you think in your heart my refusal to comply with this insolent proposition is dictated by a childish and romantic passion for an individual, I tell you, sir, I could part with that person to-morrow, without an instant's regret -- that I have had thoughts of dismissing her from my court, for reasons known to myself; but that I will never betray my rights as a sovereign and a man, by taking this step to secure the favour of any one, or to purchase that allegiance which, if you owe it to me at all, is due to me as my birthright.' (356-57)

The Pretender refuses to comply with any one's wishes, since that would be to abjure the prerogatives of his position as anointed King! The mere fact that the supporters of his Cause would ask this of him tells how much even they have been influenced by the concepts of participatory government and constitutional monarchy.

While the pathetic group of Jacobites is in conversation with their King over his mistress, their plot has already been reported to the legal authorities and troops are on their way. The ending of the rebellion is humdrum, if not comical. One unarmed man destroys all of the delusions. General Campbell, a kinsman to the Duke of Argyll, simply walks in to their meeting and promises to make no arrests if all conspirators, including the Pretender, will simply and quietly depart. General Campbell speaks to them all, saying:

> 'Exaggerated accounts of your purpose have been laid before government by the information of a traitor in your own councils; and I was sent down post to take the command of a sufficient number of troops, in case these calumnies should be found to have any real foundation. I have come here, of course, sufficiently supported both with cavalry and infantry to do whatever might be necessary; but my commands are - and I am sure they agree with my inclination - to make no arrests, nay, to make no further inquiries of any kind, if this good assembly will consider their own interest so far as to give up their own immediate purpose, and return quietly home to their own houses.' (372)

The Prince departs, with his mistress. The others also depart. No one, including the present King of Great Britain, can take a Jacobite rebellion seriously: "He [King George] cannot even believe of his kinsman [the Pretender was a cousin], that he would engage brave and generous though mistaken men, in an attempt which must ruin all who have escaped former calamities; and he is convinced, that, did curiosity or any other motive lead that person to visit this country, he would soon see it was his wisest course to return to the continent; and his Majesty compassionates his situation too

much to offer any obstacle to his doing so" (373). Redgauntlet has been defeated by something more formidable than force of arms - the passage of time. "The Cause is lost forever," it is lost because it is now an anachronism (Devlin 131).

Whilst Redgauntlet's cause is thwarted, another Redgauntlet, Darsie, survives the novel's crisis on the winning side. Darsie returns now shed of his romantic illusions to the "real" world from which he had set out. He is discovered to be the lost heir to the Redgauntlet title. He assumes the title of Sir Arthur Darsie Redgauntlet. The Redgauntlet family has now assumed its position in modern Scotland as supporters of the new Hanoverian order and the Union.

In earlier days Vich lan Vohr was beaten in battle and hung; Redgauntlet, the leader of the attempted rebellion, is beaten by the passage of time and is dismissed in anti-climax. "In the last scene he stands as the representative of the older Scotland, and we see him as glamorous, heroic, selfless and futile - an anachronism in 1763" (Devlin 117). No one is listening. Redgauntlet is a failed man. His lack of success is defined as an inability to live in the present; he spends his time trying to resuscitate a lost and hopeless cause. It is Redgauntlet, the last true supporter of a lost cause, who finally realizes the inevitable march of time declaring: "the cause is lost for ever!" (373). He then tells his nephew Darsie to accept the new reality, saying: "I tell you, that though to breed you up in my own political opinions has been for many years my anxious wish, I am now glad that it could not be accomplished. You pass under the service of the reigning monarch without the necessity of changing your allegiance" (376),

The novel also deals with the question of romanticism and reason; in the end it is reason that will triumph. The novel begins with certain similarities to *Waverley*, Darsie

Latimer travels to the border country soon have him embroiled in the intrigues of the Jacobites, but unlike Edward Waverley he has no inclination to join their cause because by upbringing, and common sense, he rejects the claims of the Jacobites. The story of the *Redgauntlet* is typical of aristocrats moving, after the Glorious Revolution, from feudal indolence to economically pinched harshness, and finally to temperate adherence to the new order of modern life (Fleishman 73).

The possibility of a Jacobite success is unimaginable, the person of the Prince, for whom so many had died in the '45 is no longer even known in most of Scotland. The age of the Jacobites has long passed. Twenty years of Highland clearances and subjugation has forced the rule of law upon the whole of Scotland. Darsie cannot take Jacobitism seriously. Darsie's attitudes are modern; he implicitly repudiates the feudal past, this spells doom to Redgauntlet's attempt to involve his nephew in the old cause (Brown *Fiction* 154). Redgauntlet's ambition is to reverse all historical developments and progress, but his cause is hopeless. All of his strategies are undermined by changes which have occurred gradually in the two decades since the last Jacobite uprising. For a brief moment he finally succeeds in bringing together most of the remaining prominent Jacobites in the country with the Stuart heir, but Bonnie Prince Charley is no longer quite so bonny, and Redgauntlet had failed to discern the alteration in the minds of his former comrades-in-arms. There is really little interest in rebellion. All of Redgauntlet's plans had long been betrayed, something unthinkable a mere twenty years earlier.

Although Darsie is the focus of the novel, he remains in the background and during the action of the novel he is always a pawn in someone else's game. While he does

acquire some insights he never has the chance to act upon them. The real heroes are the lesser characters of Alan Fairford, whose honesty, and clear-sightedness pierce through sham illusion that he encounters whilst trying to rescue his friend from danger, and Lilias Redgauntlet, who alone has the courage and fortitude to reject a false upbringing. It comes as no surprise that:

> A marriage-contract in the family repositories, that Miss Lilias Redgauntlet of Redgauntlet, about eighteen months after the transactions you have commemorated, intermarried with Alan Fairford, Esq., Advocate, of Clinkdollar, who, I think, we may not unreasonably conclude to be the same person whose name occurs so frequently in the pages of your narration. (378)

As in all of the novels dealing with the Jacobites, the marriage has metaphorical implications. The marriage between Edward Waverley and Rose represents the Union of England and Scotland, whilst the marriage of Alan Fairford with Lilias Redgauntlet represents the marriage of formerly opposed forces within Scotland itself: Jacobite Catholic with Presbyterian Whig.

Redgauntlet himself, like many of the failed characters in Scott's Jacobite novels, enters the religious life: "he remained for two or three years in the family of the Chevalier and only left it at last in consequence of some discords in that melancholy household...exchanged his residence for the cloister" (379).

The final note of *Redgauntlet* is to remind the reader that not only is the Jacobite Cause lost, but that the present King is a true Briton, unlike the Pretender, who was born and raised on the Continent, and that it is the strength of the Union of Scotland

and England that has protected Great Britain from the dangers of French aggression. It is Darsie who argues that:

> I look around me, and I see a settled government -- an established authority -- a born Briton on the throne -- the very Highland mountaineers, upon whom alone the trust of the exiled family reposed, assembled into regiments which act under the orders of the existing dynasty. [The Highland regiments were first employed by the celebrated Earl of Chatham, who assumed to himself no small degree of praise for having called forth to the support of the country and the government, the valour which had been too often directed against both.] France has been utterly dismayed by the tremendous lessons of the last war, and will hardly provoke another. All without and within the kingdom is adverse to encountering a hopeless struggle, and you alone, sir, seem willing to undertake a desperate enterprise.' (317)

These sentiments are more strongly emphasis in the next chronological novel, *The Antiquary*, which brings the Waverley novels up to the time of Scott's own life.

The Antiquary was written in late September of 1815, only a few short months after the final fall of Napoleon at Waterloo in June of the same year. The image and danger that Napoleon presented to the British Empire was still very much in the forefront of British national consciousness when the novel was first published. The action of the novel ostensibly takes place in 1794 at which time the Great Britain was at war with revolutionary France.

Previously when France and Great Britain had been at war both were monarchies founded upon familiar principals, but with drastically different approaches: one

constitutional the other autocratic. The French Revolution was to change the conflict from competing royal dynasties to one of competing political ideologies: one traditional and the other radical. Previously, the French had supported Jacobite claims to the Thrones of Scotland and England in an attempt to replace the anti-French, Protestant Hanoverian rulers with one that would be more pliable to French interests. The Revolutionary government had no such interests in the claims of any Stuart pretenders, and had committed regicide upon their own king. Also, with the death of Charles Edward Stuart in 1788, the claims and pretensions of the Stuart Cause ceased to have any further real validity. Hence, what had been a confrontation between absolutist-monarchy along the French model, or constitutional monarchy along the British, no longer was at stake:

> All the early Waverley novels deal covertly with what is foregrounded in The Antiquary --- the implications of the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Empire, and the Bourbon restoration for ways of imagining the nation (Watson xiv-xv)

The very existence of monarchy or any traditional form of government and the radical agenda of the French government was now the issue.

The novel has as its main character a middle-aged amateur historian, archaeologist and collector of items of dubious antiquity. Scotland, under the Hanoverians and politically united with England, has now entered into a period of peace and prosperity. The past, even the recent past of the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745, is seen only through the prism of history; not as a present danger or threat to the *status quo* of the standing government. The antiquarian, Mr. Oldbuck, of Monkbarns, provides a central

figure because in "this particular specimen of historical fiction...instead of thriving on the personal dangers of a hero caught up to his astonishment and terror in great decisive public crisis, The Antiquary takes a mature, even middle-aged, pleasure in the desultory and the loitering as a way of managing anxiety and melancholy" (Watson viii).

The Antiquarian ends when a mistake causes the national warning system - a series of towers with fires that can be lit to warn of invasion - to be lit. Everyone believes the French are invading, and concludes with "the whole country rising in patriotic haste from Baronet to beggar to fight the French on the lighting of the warning fires" (Watson xv). What echoes through the town is that "the French are coming to murder us" (421). Oldbuck dons his sword, declaring "Give me...the sword which my father wore in the year forty-five" (422); hence, the very sword that was used in the civil wars fought between Jacobite and Hanoverian will now be raised against a foreign invader in defense of a united England and Scotland.

The defense of the nation of Great Britain is composed of all classes of Scottish society with the "Yeomanry, pouring from their different glens, galloped through the streets" (423) in answer to the call, and the new social class of merchants who "have made ourselves wealthy under a free and paternal government, and now is the time to show we know its value" (423) showing their support for the united nation as well. Scott has in almost all of his novels dealing with the rejection of the traditional feudalism of the Stuarts, from the peasants of Craig's Hope in *The Bride* to Geddes in *Redgauntlet*, shows that these two classes above all others owes its very existence and prosperity to the Act of Union and the Hanoverians, and now it is their time to repay

their loyalty; indeed, "the substance of the wealthy, with persons of those of all ranks, were unanimously devoted to the defense of the country" (423), there are no segments of Scottish society who do not support the defense of their country against French aggression. The gentry are represented by the local Earl who comes in leading both Lowland and Highland tenants in defense of the nation:

> They formed a very handsome and well-mounted squadron, for entirely out of the Earl's Lowland tenants, and were followed by a regiment of five hundred men, completely equipped in the Highland dress, whom he had brought down form the upland glens, with their pipes playing in the van. (424)

The Scotland of 1794, Scott's own time, was now united behind the Hanoverian King and the Union, all segments of society, but mostly the new commercial interests were ready to fight for Great Britain against the French who had, since ancient times, been the traditional friends of Scotland, but the traditional enemies of the British Empire, of which Scotland was now an important component. The division between Highland and Lowland was healed, and they were now comrades-in-arms fighting a common enemy that threatened their way of life. A way of life made possible by the accession of the House of Hanover and the stability that the Union provided. The historical reality was that since the wars with revolutionary France and the Napoleonic Empire had commenced more than fifty thousand Highlanders were enrolled in the Hanoverian forces.

By 1794 the Jacobite Cause was not only forgotten, it was as if it had never mattered. Scotland had moved on in history. The past was now a past-time for the likes of Mr. Oldbuck, and the new Scotland was one of rising prosperity and commercial

success. The older, perhaps darker days, of the Stuarts had no supporters and even less were those who remembered, or cared, about the claims of a now dead Pretender. Scotland and England were now truly united.

CHAPTER 8

THE CONCLUSION

In a sense all of Scott's main Scottish novels deal with the Union. The Jacobite sympathies that are so well expressed in *Waverley* were at variance with the new Great Britain that was emerging with the union of the two Kingdoms in 1707. In the last decade of the 18th century the Jacobites, their cause, and their political opinions were fading out of history as a living memory, but at the moment that they began to become a shadow, especially with the death of Henry Stuart, the last clamant to the united thrones, they began to reenter man's consciousness when Scott began, in 1805, to work on *Waverley: or 'Tis Sixty Years Since.*

Lockhart in his biography of Scott points out that Scott did himself harbor certain Jacobite sympathies throughout his life observing that:

> He declines to write a bibliography of Queen Mary, "because his opinion was contrary to his feelings!" But he [Scott] confesses the same of his Jacobitism; and yet how eagerly does he seem to have grasped at the shadow, however false and futile, under which he chose to see the means of reconciling his Jacobitism with loyalty to the reigning monarch who befriended him? We find him, over and over again, alluding to George IV. as acquiring a title de jure on the death of the poor Cardinal of York [Henry]. (611-612)

Scott was often divided between his sentimental, or romantic, loyalties and his ability to discern political and economic reality. His heart may have been in the Highlands, but his mind and pocketbook were was most certainly in the South. He may have preserved a romantic attachment to the old Jacobite Cause, even joining the Scottish Episcopal Church at a time when it was a "shadow of a shadow" with a lingering sentimental longing for the Stuarts, which must have been in some sense a safe acceptance of some of the tenets of Jacobitism during his own lifetime, but he never forgot that Scotland's future belonged with the Union and the British Empire.

By the time that Scott began to publish his Scottish novels, Jacobitism, other than as a fondly remembered anachronism, and perhaps not always so fondly remembered by some, was no longer a danger. It had become a safe historical past-time. By the time that his novels were published the last pretender to the united Thrones, Henry, had died, but not before receiving a British pension of four thousand pounds a year from George III, and the Stuart royal tomb in St. Peter's, Rome, had been paid for by the same king. The old enemies had become reconciled in a more enlightened and perhaps kinder age.

It was revolution and radical politics that most frightened British gentlemen of Scott's era, and Scott "had a horror of revolutions, and even applauded the Peterloo 'massacre'" (Wilson 57). Hence, underlying much of the emphasis in the novels is the need for moderation and unity against a greater danger, which was revolutionary France. For Great Britain of Scott's own time the common enemy of progress and safety had always been considered to be the French. The French had been the traditional friends of Scotland, but with the advent of Protestantism this old alliance

had broken down. If Scotland's future was to be tied up in the Union with England, then it was also necessary that France be Scotland's enemy as well as England's. Scott never forgot that the danger was not the Prince's landing in Scotland in 1745 to raise the Highlands for the Stuart Cause, but that the French were at the same moment planning to invade England with a sizable fleet and an army of ten thousand men assembled at Dunkirk under the famous Marshal Saxe. For Scott this was the real fear. The planned invasion was only given up when the invasion fleet was dispersed by storms. Throughout much of Scott's adult life the fear of a French invasion was real threat. Great Britain needed to stand united as one people or they would fall. The final real action in *The Antiquary* with Scotland united against revolutionary France was one of the things that Scott hoped for in the Union.

Scott also recognized his own position in modern British society. His was not from a noble family, and hence, under the Stuarts he would have found very little chance for advancement in the reestablishment of feudalism that was the Jacobite dream. This is well brought out in *Redgauntlet* when Alan Fairford is questioned about his lineage by the Pretender. If we are to accept Fairford as a representation of a young Scott, it becomes obvious that he realizes that his position under a restored Stuart dynasty would end. For Scott the new Scotland was to be lead by enlightened noblemen much like his characterization of the Duke of Argyll in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*; kind, progressive and supportive of a growing middle class represented by his tenants. Scott did indeed attempt to create this imagine of an agrarian society, lead by a benevolent laird, as a reality on his farm at Abbotsford.

As much as Scott may have in some ways contributed directly to the rise of the Romantic Movement in Great Britain:

> It should not obscure the fact that much of the message in his Scottish historical novels such as *Waverley, Old Mortality* and *The Heart of Midlothian* were a hard-headed restatement of the conservative rationalism of the Scottish enlightenment. Extremes such as Jacobite and Whig, Presbyterian and Episcopalian, Unionist or anti-Unionist, Improver of Traditionalist, had to be reconciled by working together, sobered by experience towards a better future which would not basically upset the existing social and political structure. (McCaffey 18)

This feeling that moderation in all things was what was best for Scotland is almost belabored in this Scottish novels The real heroes and heroines are not those consumed with passion by antiquated ideology, but those who remain above the fray, preaching not hatred or division, but moderation, rule by law, and tranquility. For Scott these are the only ideals that have any validity for a modern nation. He may sentimentally mourn the passing of the old order, but he does not miss it. In many of these novels those who are motivated by passion, fanaticism and who cannot accept the demands of a changing world will die, or if death does not take the supporters of the Old Cause, their inability to function in the modern world usually results in the finding of changeless sanctuary in monasticism. Flora and Effie both enter convents because they are unable to change. Redgauntlet also enters a monastic house. They cannot change the world by a return to the past, so they retire from the world altogether. This was a form of suicide; it could not be the call of a whole nation to reject reality: to enter

into a political monastic enclosure. Scotland needed to embrace the Union and take advantage of the prosperity it would offer.

In the *Waverley* novels Scott attempts to deal, through fiction, with the changing reality that produced modern Scotland. Scott's prime focus in his Scottish novels is to show the dangers inherit in fanaticism; either from the left or the right. Scott does not glorify the past; he is no friend of feudalism. It is plain to him that the old order must pass. It had been remarked that the Stuarts never learnt anything, and never forgot anything. The Jacobite Cause wished to re-introduce the absolute rule of a divinely anointed King, indeed James I had written a book. *The True Law of Free Monarch*, by which he meant a King free from control of Parliament; he had also declared that the King, by his divine appointment was like a god in his kingdom, and could not be questioned. This was the form of government that the Jacobites wished to establish in Britain. Scott was not blind to his reality. Scotland, with a reestablished Stuart King, would have had no future. The society of the Highlands, with its rejection of individualism and freedom, could not be the foundation on which to build a progressive, free, commercial nation.

For Scott, the modern world does not belong to the fanatic, or the narrow minded. It is the provenire of those who can embrace moderation. In *Waverley,* the supporters of the Old Cause are political fanatics; they do not respect a rule by law. In *Old Mortality* the fanaticism of both the Jacobites and the Covenanters must make way for the coming of moderation, at the same time the feudal concepts that kept Scotland in the dark-ages must fall to make way for commercial interests. For Scotland to enter into this new age, union with England was necessary.

Scott felt, that Scotland, if freed of violence and political and religious fanaticism, could compete on an equal footing with English commerce; that Scotland had as much to offer England as England had to offer Scotland. The new age was to be an age of law and constitutional monarchy, fueled by economic expansion. The new age is not an age of the hero, the aristocrat, or a divine kingship; it belongs to the hardworking middle-classes. Many of the characters that people Scott's novels are drawn from this new class; they are peasants, obscure countrymen, lawyers' clerks, and the bourgeoisie of the cities and so on (McLaren 230). The new Scotland will comprise all segments of society, not just the nobility.

Although Scott was a strong supporter of the Union he also realized that equality must exist between Scotland and England for it to be truly successful. Scott mentions in *Redgauntlet* the unfair trading practices set-up by England and,

> that the excise laws had occasioned an active contraband trade betwixt Scotland and England, which then, as now, existed, and will continue to exist until the utter abolition of the wretched system which establishes an inequality of duties betwixt the different parts of the same kingdom; a system, be it said in passing, mightily resembling the conduct of a pugilist, who should tie up one arm that he might fight the better with the other. (241)

Scott's novels remained popular in 19th century Europe because a progressive view of history was essential to societies bent on wholesale economic transformation, whether at home or in the colonies. In the end it was Scott, the reviver of the Jacobite past, and inventor of modern, folkloristic Scotland who in 1822 orchestrated the visit of George IV to Scotland. George IV was the first member of his family to visit

Scotland since his great-great-uncle William Duke of Cumberland had laid waste to the Highlands after the battle of Culloden. He was greeted with great enthusiasm by the population and he had draped his "plump limbs in what he had been told was the Royal Stuart tartan" (Maclean *Scotland* 186). Scott, for the occasion, had worn the Campbell tartan to show his support for the Duke of Argyll; the great supporter of the Union. Thus, this orchestrated visit attempted to drape the new commercial world of the Hanoverian constitutional monarch in the old tartans of a now tame past.

Scotland's complete attachment to the Union is evident in Edinburgh's New Town. The architecture is of the most modern of the period symbolizing Scotland's involvement in European culture and demonstrated the North Britons' desire to play a central role in the British Empire. The idea for a New Town in Edinburgh emerged after the defeat of the 1745 Jacobite Rising. The architect in charge, James Craig, initially envisaged a street plan in the shape of a Union Jack, but this was soon abandoned; however, Scotland's new British identity is reflected in its very, very British street names: Cumberland Street, after the Duke of Cumberland; Hanover Street, after the House of Hanover; Frederick Street, after George III's father; with Thistle Street and Rose Street symbolizing the Union of 1707. Scott's Scottish novels bridged the gape between the new Scotland and the old, but Scott never was mistaken in his wholehearted support for the new.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, James. "Sir Walter Scott as Historical Novelist." *Studies in Scottish Literature.* (1966), 68-70.

Ashley, Maurice. *England in the Seventeenth Century*. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1961.

Bautz, Annika. "The Heart of Mid-Lothian." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 28 Jul. 2005. The Literary Dictionary Company. 25 January 2007. <http://www.litencyc.com/php/sworks.php?rec=true&UID=625>

Beiderwell, Bruce. "Death and Disappearance in *The Bride of Lammermoor*." *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott.* Ed. Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996. 194-201.

Broadie, Alexander. *The Scottish Enlightenment: The Historical Age of the Historical Nation*. Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited, 2001.

Brown, David. *Walter Scott and the Historical Imagination*. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1979.

Brown, Keith. "Reformation to Union, 1560-1707." *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the earliest Times to the Present Day.* Eds. R.A. Houston and W.W.J. Knox. London: The Penguin Press, 2001. 182-275.

Burke, Edmund. "Reflections on the Revolution in France." *Sources of the Western Tradition*. 4th ed. Vol.II. Eds. Marvin Perry, Joseph R. Peden, and Theodore H. Von Laue. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996. 143-145.

Burroughs, Franklin. "Lost Causes and Gallantry." *American Scholar* 72.4 (2003): 73-92.

Butterfield, Herbert. *The Historical Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924.

Churchill, Winston S. *A History of the English Speaking Peoples*. 4 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1959.

Clancy, Thomas Owen, and Barbara E. Crawford. "The Formation of the Scottish Kingdom." *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the earliest Times to the Present Day*. Eds. R.A. Houston and W.W.J. Knox. London: The Penguin Press, 2001. 28-95.

Clark, Robert. "Jacobite, Jacobitism." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 25 Mar. 2004. The Literary Dictionary Company. 2 March 2007. http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1400

Cockshut, A.O.J. *The Achievement of Walter Scott*. London: Collins, 1969.

Cruickshanks, Eveline, ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982.

Craig, David. *Scottish Literature and the Scottish People: 1680-1830*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1961.

Cusac, Marian H. *Narrative Structure in the Novels of Sir Walter Scott*. The Hague: Mouton, 1969.

Daiches, David. "Scott's *Redgauntlet*." *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott*. Ed. Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996. 137-148.

---. "Sir Walter Scott and History." *Etudes Anglaises* XXIV.4 (1971): 458-477.

Daly, Kristen. "'Return No More!': Highland Emigration and Romantic Nostalgia." *Literature and History* 9.1 (Third Series): 24-42.

Devlin, David. *The Author of Waverley: A Critical Study of Sir Walter Scott.* Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1971.

Ditchburn, David, and Alastair J. MacDonald. "Medieval Scotland, 1100-1560." *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the earliest Times to the Present Day.* Eds. R.A. Houston and W.W.J. Knox. London: The Penguin Press, 2001. 96-181.

Ferguson, William. *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: An Historic Quest.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Fleishman, Avrom. *The Author of Waverley: Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

Forbes, Duncan. "The Rationalism of Sir Walter Scott." *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott.* Ed. Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996. 83-97.

Garside, Peter. "Old Mortality's Silent Majority." *Scottish Literary Journal.* 7 (1980). 127-144.

Goldie, Mark. "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy." *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759.* Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982. 15-35.

Goodin, George. *The English Novel in the Nineteenth Century.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972.

Gordon, Robert C. *Under Which King?* Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969.

Haggis, D.R. "Scott, Balzac, and the Historical Novel as Social and Political Analysis: 'Waverley' and 'Les Chouans.'" *The Modern Language Review* 69.1 (1973): 51-68.

Hart, Francis, *Scott's Novels: the Plotting of Historic Survival*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1966.

Hayden, John O., ed. *Walter Scott: the Critical Heritage*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.

Henderson, T.F. "Sir Walter Scott." *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Vol. XII. Eds. A.W. Ward and A.R. Waller. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1933. 1-33.

Hillhouse, James T. *The Waverly Novels and their Critics*. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1968.

Hobbes, Thomas. "Leviathan." *Sources of the Western Tradition*. 4th ed. Vol.II. Eds. Marvin Perry, Joseph R. Peden, and Theodore H. Von Laue. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996. 22-25.

Homan, Hugh C. *A Handbook to Literature*. 3rd ed. Indianapolis: The Odyssey Press, 1972.

Houston, R.A., and W.W.J. Knox, eds. *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. London: The Penguin Press, 2001.

Humphrey, Richard. *Walter Scott: Waverley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

James I. "True Laws of Free Monarchies." *Sources of the Western Tradition*. 4th ed. Vol. II. Eds. Marvin Perry, Joseph R. Peden, and Theodore H. Von Laue. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996. 20-22.

Kant, Immanuel. "What is Englightenment?" *Sources of the Western Tradition*. 4th ed. Vol. II. Eds. Marvin Perry, Joseph R. Peden, and Theodore H. Von Laue. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996. 55-57.

Kerr, James. *Fiction Against History: Scott as Storyteller*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

---. "Scott's Dreams of the Past: *The Bride of Lammermoor* as Political Fantasy." *Studies in the Novel* 18.2 (19869): 125-142.

Lauber, John. *Sir Walter Scott*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966.

Leerssen, Joep. "Literary Historicism: Romanticism, Philologists, and the Presence of the Past." *Modern Language Quarterly* 65.2 (2004): 221-243.

Lenman, Bruce P. "From the Union of 1707 to the Franchise Reform of 1832." *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the earliest Times to the Present Day* . Eds.R.A. Houston and W.W.J. Knox. London: The Penguin Press, 2001. 276-354.

---. "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism." *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*. Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982. 36-48.

Leslie, Esther. "Georg Lukács." *The Literary Encyclopedia*. 2 Feb. 2003. The Lterary Dictionary Company. 1 March 2007. <http://www.litencyc.com/php/speople.php?rec=true&UID=2816>

"Levy en Mass." *Sources of the Western Tradition*. 4th ed. Vol. II. Eds. Marvin Perry, Joseph R. Peden, and Theodore H. Von Laue. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996. 108-109.

Luckhurst, Tim. "Scotland Returns to the Dark Ages." *New Statesman* 21 May 2001: 29-31.

Lukacs, George. *The Historical Novel.* Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. London: Merlin, 1962.

Maclean, Fitzroy. *Bonnie Prince Charlie.* New York: Atheneum. 1989.

---. *Scotland: A Concise History.* New York: Thames & Hudson, 2000.

Maitzen, Rohan. "By No Means an Improbable Fiction." *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott.* Ed. Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996. 121-13.

Manzoni, Alessandro. *On the Historical Novel* (1850). Trans. Sandra Bermann. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Mayhead, Robin. *Walter Scott.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

McCaffey, John F. *Scotland in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1998.

McLaren, Moray. *Sir Walter Scott: The Man and Patriot.* London: Heinemann, 1970.

McLynn, Frank. *The Jacobites.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

McMaster, Graham. *Scott and Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Medcalf, J.E. "Lukacs on Scott." *Notes and Queries* ccvii (1962): 402.

Millgate, Jane. *Walter Scott: The Making of the Novelist.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

---. *Scott's Last Edition: A Study in Publishing History.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1987.

Monod, Paul Kleber. *Jacobitism and the English People: 1688-1788.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Morton, Graeme, and R.J. Morris. "Civil Society, Governance and Nation, 1832-1914." *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the earliest Times to the Present Day.* Eds. R.A. Houston and W.W.J. Knox. London: The Penguin Press, 2001. 355-416.

Orel, Harold. *The Historical Novel from Scott to Sabatini.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Orru, M. "Real and Narrative Time: *Waverley* and the Education of Memory." *Studies in English Literature* 31.4 (1991): 715-735.

Palmer, R.R. and Joel Colton. *A History of the Modern World.* 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Parker, W.M. Preface. *Old Mortality.* By Sir Walter Scott. London: Dent, 1964. v-xvii.

Perry, Marvin, Joseph R. Peden, and Theodore H. Von Laue, eds. *Sources of the Western Tradition.* 4th ed. Vol. II. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996.

Pittock, Murray G. H. *Jacobitism.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Porter, Roy. *English Society in the Eighteenth Century.* Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1984.

Raleigh, John Henry. "What Scott Meant to the Victorians." *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott.* Ed. Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996. 47-69.

Rigney, Ann. *Imperfect Histories: The Elusive Past and the Legacy of Romantic Historicism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Robertson, Fiona. *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

---. "Walter Scott, *Waverly.*" *A Companion to Romanticism.* Ed. Duncan Wu. Malden Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1998. 211-218.

Saintsbury, George. "The Growth of the Later Novel." *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Vol. XI. Eds. A.W. Ward and A.R. Waller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933. 315-343.

Schmidgen, Wolfram. "Picturing Property: *Waverley* and the Common Law." *Studies in the Novel* 29.2 (1997): 191-214.

Schmidt, Peter. "Walter Scott: Postcolonial Theory, and New South Literature." *Mississippi Quarterly* 56.1 (2003): 545-554.

Scott, Walter. *The Antiquary*. Nicola J. Watson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

---. *The Bride of Lammermoor*. Ed. J. H. Alexander. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995.

---. *Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott*. Cambridge Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1893.

---. *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*. Eds. David Hewitt and Alison Lumsden. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.Boston:

---. *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott*. Ed. W.E.K. Anderson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

---. *Redgauntlet*. Eds. G.A. M. Wood with David Hewitt. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.

---. *The Tale of Old Mortality*. Ed. Douglas Mack. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 1993.

---. *Waverley*. Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1893.

Shaw, Harry E. *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott: The Waverley Novels*. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996.

---. *The Forms of Historical Fiction: Sir Walter Scott and His Successors*.

London and Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

---. "Is There a Problem with Historical Fiction (or With Scott's *Redgauntlet*)?" *Rethinking History* 9.2/3 (2005): 173-195.

---. "Scott, Mackenzie, and Structure in *The Bride of Lammermoor*." *Studies in the Novel* 13.4 (1981): 349-366.

Stomberg, Roland. *European Intellectual History since 1789*. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Szechi, Daniel. *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe 1688-1788*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. *A Shortened History of England*. Baltimore Maryland: Penguin Books, 1960.

Turner, Joseph. "Kinds of Historical Fiction: An Essay in Definition and Methodology." *Genre* 12 (1979): 333-355.

Uglow, Nathan. "Historical Novel (British)." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 21 Mar. 2002. The Literary Dictionary Company. 25 January 2007. http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1213

---. "Old Mortality." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 20 Mar. 2002. The Literary Dictionary Company. 25 January 2007. http://www.litencyc.com/php/printer_format_works.php?UID=3177

---. "Redgauntlet." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 18 Jun. 2002. The Literary Dictionary Company. 25 January 2007. http://www.litencyc.com/php/sworks.php?rec=true&UID=2441

---. "Sir Walter Scott." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 27 Mar. 2002. The Literary Dictionary Company. 25 January 2007. http://www.litencyc.com/php/speople.php?rec=true&UID=5094

---. "Waverley, Or, Tis Sixty Years Since." *The Literary Encyclopedia* 18 Jun. 2002. The Literary Dictionary Company. 25 January 2007. http://www.litencyc.com/php/sworks.php?rec=true&UID=9046>

Van Ghent, Dorothy. "On the Heart of Mid-Lothian." *The English Novel: Form and Function*. New York: Harper, 1961.

Walker, Marshall. *Scottish Literature since 1707*. London: Longman, 1996.

Ward, Ian. "Scott and the Waverley Constitution: A Study in Literary Constitutionalism." *English Studies* 3 (1998): 193-211.

Waswo, Richard. "Scott and the Really Great Tradition." *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott*. Ed. Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1996.

---. "Story as Historiography in the Waverley Novels." *ELH* 47.2 (1980): 304-330.

Watson, Nicola J. ed. Introduction. *The Antiquary*. By Sir Walter Scott. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. vii-xxix.

Weinstein, Mark. *The Prefaces to the Waverley Novels*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Welsh, Alexander. *The Hero of the Waverley Novels*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Whatley, Christopher A. *Scottish Society 1707-1830: Beyond Jacobitism, Towards Industrialization*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Wilson, Andrew Norman. *The Laird of Abbotsford: A Review of Sir Walter Scott*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Wu, Duncan, ed. *A Companion to Romanticism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.

VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dale K. Griffith

Address:
5920 E Santovito Street
Pahrump, Nevada 89061

Degrees:

Candidatus Theologiae, 1978
Institut de Theologie Orthodoxe (S Serge), Paris

Master of Arts, 1988
History
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Master of Arts, 1996
English
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dissertation Title: Scott's Fiction and the Union of 1707

Dissertation Examination Committee:
Chair, Dr. Mark Weinstein, Ph.D.
Committee Member, Dr. Megan Becker-Leckrone, Ph.D.
Committee Member, Dr. Sue Fawn Chung, Ph.D.
Committee Member, Dr. Timothy Erwin, Ph.D.