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I. Introduction
Sir Walter Scott is separated in time from contemporary Scotland by little less than two-hundred years; born in 1771 and deceased in 1832, this poet and novelist shared in regional acclaim as Scotland’s de facto national author, likewise enjoying international success that succeeds to this date. As the innovator of the historical novel, Scott prompted the evolution of the novel—from sensationalist literature to politically relevant national tales—, while still retaining fictive elements. Seeking solace from the poetic sensation that was Byron in the first decade of the 19th century, Scott ascribed his talents to the novel, in turn, producing *Waverley or ‘Tis Sixty Years Since* in 1814. The generic innovation behind this novel upset other fiction and thus produced the ‘Age of Waverley’ that would survive until the Victorian era of literature.

*Waverley’s* success was part novelty, part genius. In the early years of the 19th century, the national tale as a genre was heavily populated by female readers and writers. Maria Edgeworth (1767-1849) and Lady Morgan (1776-1859) represented Ireland in their national tales; they focused on class-struggle, the morals of religion and secular family life, and of course, nationalism. Yet, according to Katie Trumpener in “The Novel in the Age of Waverley,” these texts were “politically unstable and deeply ambivalent” in terms of their radicalism, their tone often wavering between “formulaic and formal experimentation” with no intermediate success (690). But the highly Enlightened mind of Walter Scott was fond of such national renderings, adding these women’s stories to his encyclopedic knowledge of Scottish minstrelsy, histories, and myths. His first published piece, *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (1802) was a collection of regional ballads recorded and improved upon during his wanderings. Due to infirmary, Scott’s youth was oft spent outside the city and in the greener Lowlands or traveling northwestward for healing waters and other pseudo-science remedies (“Famous Authors Series”). In this time, his appreciation and collection of lyrics both in Lowland Scot or Gaelic supplemented his already fervent nationalism; following the success of *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, Scott localized his poetry in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* (1805).
and the widely popular *The Lady of the Lake* (1810). Reader interest in Scotland as an ancient, enchanted tangle of lochs and mountains soon poetry collections not longer sufficed to due over-demand, and it meeting the exigency for both innovation and interest, Scott produced *Waverley*, a novel set in the primitive scenery of 1745.

The year 1745 manifested itself the Anglo-version of the French and American Revolutions that would unfold later in the century; both the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 and subsequent Revolutions engaged politics and national narratives on a polemic, often violent level. Applying the Enlightenment ideals of the 18th century to actual practice, the social conditions of humans—entrenched in class, gender, and political skirmishes—found voice in these national tales by tightening the link between abstract political theory and punditry via the novel. Suddenly allowed a voice, history multiplies unto itself and becomes impetus for contemporary sentiments. So it is that Scott’s 1745, though growingly overshadowed by 19th century modernity, is revived as a national narrative through *Waverley*; the Jacobite Rebellion becomes nascent again and readers of both genders form an eager audience to this new historical novel.

The history is thorny. After the 1707 Union between Scotland and England that disbanded the Scottish Parliament, the skirmishes and dramas related to the British crown never subsided, but rather continued with increasingly violent means. Without transgressing too far into historical studies, the immediate concern to *Waverley* is the Second Jacobite Rebellion, often called the ’45, that occurred in 1745. The term “Jacobite” is derived from the Latin word for “James,” being “Jacobus.” After the Glorious Revolution of 1688 that successfully dethroned the Scottish monarch, King James II of England and instated a Protestant William of Orange, those Catholic adherents to the descendants of James II both in Ireland and in the Highlands of Scotland sought *coup d’état* over the unscrupulous Protestant throne-mongers. In 1745, the natural heir to the throne in the Jacobites’ eyes was Bonny Prince Charlie (Charles Edward Stuart); insomuch the clansmen of the Highlands
and their sympathizers brought war to their English neighbors for their rightful king. After a series of successful battles, the Jacobites ultimately fell at the Battle of Culloden after an ill-planned march onto London; they were resoundingly destroyed and the Jacobite rebellion subsequently quieted.

Scott takes this moment in history and breathes life into the players of this bygone drama. *Waverley* follows the journey of a young Englishman, Edward Waverley, as he struggles between his father’s Whiggish politics and his uncle’s Tory sentiments. Assigned a military post in Dundee, Scotland, Waverley takes leave to pay respect to his uncle’s dearest friend, the Baron of Bradwardine, a gentleman monitored by the English for his part in the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715. After weeks of resting in the ancient manor, a minor, humorous incident over stolen livestock sets the story in motion, prompting Edward to travel into the Highlands. From there, the spectacle of untouched nature and political intrigue interweave to create the historical narrative behind 1745, as young Edward joins the Jacobite cause, being led by the Highland Chief, Fergus Mac-Ivor, and the Pretender to the throne himself, Bonny Prince Charlie. Though the story ends in Mac-Ivor’s execution, Edward’s emotional journey out of his English identity and into a new hybrid, oft confused, Scottish one marks the fiction with exquisite poetics that feed into a more grave national tale.

It is the purpose of this paper to discern the various currents of national identity as it occurs in this landmark novel. With a large cast of characters that claim unique identities to differing geopolitical conceptions of the British Empire—be it specifically English, Scottish, or British—the undulations of native classifications are multiple and problematic in the novel. This paper assumes that the milieu of civil war best illuminates the amazing contours of identity within Scott’s characters. Upon further investigation of the writing of abstract nationhood in literature, the paper will evaluate the critical heritage of Waverley’s 1814 release, and how readership across the British Isles offered different sets of interpretation. Once fully introduced to the national implications of
the novel, a close-reading of the text itself will issue unique character analyses, focusing on significant characters’ national identity and their relationships with others of the same or antagonistic regional communities. Lastly, the study will apply Scott’s historical realism to contemporary Scottish fiction, providing a clear link between Scott as a 19th century writer and the development of Scottish literature in the late 20th century.

II. Imagining the Nation in Literature

The purport behind the conception of nationhood is prodigious, marked largely by contestations in time and space. How to denote the customs, events, costume, and history behind a nation is a problematical process, an examination long monopolized by historians, political scientists, and anthropologists. Defining a fluid, often atypical sense of belonging with fellow man is a luxury words alone cannot afford. Yet, the poetics and machinations of language do allow for an accessible scene to be created. By emphasizing the scenery of a particular nation’s pageant of identity, we need not capture the whole of the nation—past, present, and future—in gaining a sense of the entire picture. In this sense, a literary work tolerates a given inadequacy to achieve a grand expose of the minute; a work of fiction captures nationhood in a series of pages, while historiographers do the same with stacked and shelved tomes.

In exploring the importance of literature in conceiving nationhood, much attention is directed to Benedict Anderson and his critical text, *Imagined Communities* (1983). While this theory falls under the larger mast of ‘political science,’ his executive command of nation-making stems from the humble means of language. By admitting the unsolvable paradox between the conceptions that nation states are both new and yet historical, Anderson nearly prefaces his study with an intellectual ‘hazard sign’ (10). This incongruity in representation—acknowledging ‘newness’ out of
history—was part and parcel to the lexicographic revolution Anderson draws attention to later in his study. By looking at the specificity of language in addressing imagined communities, Anderson points to the nouveau ideology of the late 18th and 19th century that language should by right belong to the nation, not their executive branch. Most imperial thrones at this point were at odds with their dynastic past (84). For indeed, who was ruling England over the last few centuries? With pleasure, Anderson charges the Welsh Tudors, the German Hanoverians, the Scottish Stuarts, and the Norman Plantagenets with “squat[ting] on the imperial throne [of England]” (83). Indeed, while antiquated Latin had been on the up and out years prior, the 19th century sought a rational coupling of nation and vernacular. The enlightened idea of language as “personal property of quite specific groups—their daily speakers and readers” in part gave rise to a horizontal representation of all men within a given nation (84). While this discussion essentially underlies the unbraiding of purely administrative erudition in lexographical terms, it does bode a necessary connection between literature and statehood.

As a more normalized version of speech began to run through the presses, the lower classes began to see their own speech reflected on paper. Literature began to descend from the pinnacle of religious dogma and classicism, and for those that could read, their lives were suddenly wrapped up in the state: “The new middle-class intelligentsia of nationalism had to invite the masses into history; and the invitation-card had to be written in a language they understood” (Nairn qtd. in Anderson 80). This language was best mirrored in the novel and the newspaper. Speaking to the novel, Anderson looks at El Periquillo Sarniento (1816) by Jose Joaquin Ferdenadezs de Lizardi. The protagonist in the novel suffers extended travel, giving the fiction the narrative movement of a “solitary hero through a sociological landscape of fixity that fuses the world inside the novel with the world outside” (30). How familiar does this paradigm sound! Scott forces Edward out of his native

---

1 Anderson notes that this linguistic turn was exceptional to Britain and France in the earlier 19th century, as it took other countries with more divided colonial histories to effectively catch-up (78).
group and into the self-contained communities of the northernmost regions. The counter-ideological forces he meets there—so disparate in their customs, manners, and history than to his modern English society—forces him to both define himself, define others, and ultimately re-instate himself as a member of civil society. The generic device of a travel-plot, as de Lizardi and Scott use, are in the very vein of the Greek epic and produce similarly grand imaginings of different nations and the identities embedded therein. As gods mired the travels of Odysseus with supernatural monsters, beasts, and deities, so too does the cast of Waverley complicate Edward's own journey into the foreign world of Scotland.

Ian Duncan picks up on this literary style and expounds upon it further in his study of “Primitive Inventions.” Citing Anderson, Duncan concedes that the novel “synchronizes the subjectivity of its readers with secular history and a calendrical order of ‘homogenous, empty time,’ by representing a temporal simultaneity across the diverse spaces and population of the national territory” (81). Speaking to a majority of Romantic writings, the nationalist histories and tropes often subside within the framework of the “imperializing, globalizing domain of modernization” (82). The ‘foreign’ in novels is often a direct account of colonization and the space between the poles of nativism and imperialism; of extending the ‘familiar’ to the increasingly foreign world. Like Charlotte Bronte’s Bertha Rochester locked in the attic, the colonial ‘other’ exists on a plane far removed from the formal bearings of native house and hearth, though still lingers unceasingly.

With Scott—undoubtedly one of the forbearers of the historical novel—the internal colonization of Scotland by English mores and politics is markedly expressed in the polemics of modernity and historicism. While many theorists accuse Scott of placing Scotland on an anachronistic axiom by fixating on outdated fashions and traditions, it can still be argued, as Duncan does, that Scott’s purpose in doing so creates a “luxurious, aestheticized melancholy” of colonial representation (83). As Kenneth McNeil argues in Scotland, Britain, Empire (2007), Scott’s relationship
with his writing and the state allows for a “[conflation of] Scottish traditions with those of the primitive and anachronistic Highlands” (52). What McNeil ignores in his abuse of Scott is the very definition of national identity in Scott’s literature, which I understand, as Anderson does, to be the “imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” under the auspicious generalization that members of any community, “will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6). Nationalism, therefore, is the expression of an identity, horizontal amongst a specific group of peoples. The content of such definitions are most apparent when faced with antagonistic communities and even in oppositions encountered within space and time, as McNeil so derides. The very ability of Scott’s to reproduce bygone dramas and mold realistic personalities within them is tribute to the malleability of national identity.

And yet, while the use of the historical, the sensationalizing of the past, is certainly anachronistic—for it relies on a collective memory not unique to Scott’s fancies, nor immediately accessible to contemporary critics—realism still abounds amongst the fiction. McNeil’s accusation that Scott “severed the link between the nation’s present and its past” with his exposition of Highland traditions is fraught with ideological overkill (52). By supposing that an author of fiction has access to objective historiography, critics of Scott void his contributions to a collective imagination. Rather, Duncan sees Scott’s strengths in his sense of empire and colonization that “becomes the frame for intuited drastic temporal and horizontal disjunctions within the interior fields of domesticity and the psyche” (86). Scott himself claims a pleasure in the historical but not without keeping a strict eye on the principle figure of fictionalized plot: “I must not let the background eclipse the principle figures—the frame overpower the picture,” writes Scott in his personal journal (245).
In detailing at length the belief that the enterprises of literature can strive to produce an “imagined community,” I find it necessary to, like Anderson, preface a warning to my work. Literature undoubtedly presents the world veluti in speculo, but that mirror is held up by the hand of a single man, one who says that others writing historical fiction, may do their fooling with better grace but I like Sir Andrew Aquecheek do it more naturally. They have to read old books and consult antiquarian collections to get their information—I write because I have long since read such works and possess thanks to a strong memory the information which they have to seek for. (Journal 244-245)

Scott boasts in his letters to friends of a more organic understanding of history that manifests itself in his own fiction, finding itself to be a “tolerably faithful portrait of Scottish manners and has been recognized as such in Edinburgh” (478). What makes this account in Waverley tolerable is not only its instantaneous success and sales of thousands, but rather the subjective understanding Scott has within it. His account of Scotland in 1745 is particular to his understanding of history, suspended in the plane between subjective fiction and objective history. Just as Shakespeare’s Sir Andrew Aquecheek plays the natural fool to Sir Toby Belch’s more eloquent fooling, so does Scott toy with his interest in Scottish history and customs, bringing to life Waverley in the most natural manner; fret not with “old books and [...] antiquarian collections,” but rather a genuine interest in the field.

Scott contends that his portrait of Scotland is “recognized” in Edinburgh, the cultural capital of Scotland. Thus, a further investigation into the means of toleration and success need to be sought in evaluating this personal claim. While the sales were certainly staggering for a work of fiction, and the demographics of readership pushed far out, the content of Waverley and its political implications covers a large tract of space between his London readers and his Edinburgh ones.

---

2 Twelfth Night by William Shakespeare
III. Critical Reception in 1814

The 1814 release of *Waverley* was an reputed prelude to the forthcoming golden age of literature across Europe. The success of Waverley is best summed by the Scott historian, James Hillhouse: “*Waverley* and its successors came to [readers] like manna from heaven to starving travelers in the desert” (7). The numbers behind the novel’s reception further this claim; in 1839, *The Gentlemen’s Magazine* published the figure of 1,200,000 copies sold for the three editions published before his death; the original (1814), the revised *Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley* (1823), and the *The Magnum Opus Edition* of his complete works (1829) (416). Likewise, on the first day of *Waverley*’s American tour, 8,000 of the total 9,000 sent were hurried off the shelves by eager readers (Critics 10). Such figures not only sky-rocketed Scott into international fame, but also allowed for greater notice and interest to be given to his native-country; for you cannot write of Sir Walter Scott and forget the Scots.

*The Edinburgh Review*

Francis Jeffrey, the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, actively sought out an authoritative legacy for his periodical: “If [The Edinburgh Review] ever sink into the state of an ordinary bookseller’s journal,’ Jeffery declared, “I have done with it” (Ferris 21). The state of literary criticism at the close of the 18th century was often bemused by varying tropes of modernization; confused by the excesses of the French Revolution, and disjoined by the industrial output of the new nineteenth century (21). So it is that Jeffery sought a cultural moment for Scotland in this disarray. By chastising the sensationalist hullabaloo, Jeffery and his fellow originators brought *The Edinburgh Review* to the fore of literary criticism and soon became one of the most widely read, and surely the most influential, of all literary journals. Once again recalling Anderson’s study of a national language in *Imagined Communities*, Jeffrey recognized the budding market for literature; believing that a new “reading public” was being created out of “the growing multitudes” (22). Thusly, the praise Jeffrey allows
Scott’s first attempt at prose is not insignificant, as his reviews of contemporary literature set the mark for readership throughout the British Isles.

Jeffrey quickly prefaces his November 1814 review of *Waverley*—still with its anonymous author—with praise, while still aware of its relative flaws. In the first two sentences the label of the writer’s “genius” is balanced by the mal-apposition of its historical framework; a history “too recent to be romantic, and to far gone by to be familiar” (Hayden 79). But the writing—sometimes substandard, sometimes great—falls asunder to the more potent “nature and truth” the novel exhibits (79). Jeffrey spends much of his review speaking to this literary abstraction—that of something “more firm, impressive, and engaging” than any other novel; having yielded “instructive exposition of human actions and energies, and of all the singular modifications which our plastic nature receives from the circumstances with which it is surrounded” (80).

The temperaments of both man and nature are clearly communicated in this novel, according to Jeffrey. Particularly, the Scottish characters are emboldened with such humanity that their national character is fastidiously exposed as the plot unfolds, from which Jeffrey picks lengthy quotations to summarize. Indeed, as a Scotsmen himself, he recognizes a contrast of principles between each Scotch character—notwithstanding class or gender—that preserves the difficult Scotch identity. The vulgarity of the lower classes in the Lowlands are at odds still with its relative classes in the clannish Highlands; the Tully-Veolan majors are caricatured portraits of some historical personage, yet still readily available to modern readers; the valor of Fergus Mac Ivor is yet upset by the heroism of Evan Dhu Maccombich (81-82). In these sketches, Jeffrey sees much of Scotland, as the “genius” of the artist is on the same level as “truth [is] to nature” (83).

In contrast, the lengthy exposition of Volume I is derided as “laborious, tardy, and obscure,” while the author’s own breaking of the narrative to make use of a witticism is similarly “strange and humiliating” (84). These two counter-arguments to his previous praise are revealed lastly, and in but
a singular paragraph. Quickly maneuvering back to commendation, Jeffrey quietly agrees with the rumor concerning *Waverley’s* authorship, allowing that it might very well be the work of the great Walter Scott. Humorously, Jeffrey concludes his review as he apostrophizes Scott, warning him that “Scott would do well to look to his laurels, and to rouse himself for a sturdier competitor than any he has yet had to encounter” (84). Indeed, Scott had risen to that challenge by reassigning his divine verse to prose, a task Jeffrey concludes may have been fumbled from time to time, but ultimately reaches a level of genius hereto undiscovered.

*The British Critic*

The unnamed reviewer of the August 1814 edition of *The British Critic* arrives at his praise earlier in the year than Jeffrey does, though in a markedly different manner. Praising similar tropes that have been previously described, it is more important to our study to dwell on the unique rhetoric of the review. While both reviews were written in the first person plural, as reviews were of the time, the contrast between a “we, the English” and a “they, the Scottish” is pronounced in this London publication.

After supposing the writing to be Scott’s, *The British Critic* holds steadfast to the complex historical allusion to 1745, a time in which “no Briton can look back without the strongest emotions, and the most anxious interest” (Hayden 68). The review takes this anxiety and instead of apostrophizing Scott, pays homage to a divine Province that has “secure[ed] [Britain] from the invasions of foreign foes, but to preserve it from the still more fearful and deadly scenes of civil commotion” (68). What is interesting in this statement is the pairing of both the foreign and the civilian, forcing the reader to decide what groups inhabit these ambiguous categories. In comparison to *The Edinburgh Review*, the reviewer here allows for history and contemporary politics a monopoly of column-space. While celebrating the “renowned portion of the inhabitants of these islands,” the
reviewer feels compelled to follow with the Scots’ ‘demise’: “of a race, who, within these few years, have vanished from the face of their native land” (69). The use of a “their” in this statement clearly postulates a divide of identity between the reviewer and the principle agents of the novel, going as far to call them “a departed race” (69). The “inhabitants,” “the civil commotion,” and “that race” are clearly set apart from the London-specific framework from which The British Critic writes from. The reviewer anticipates that Waverley will provide a great service of “warning” off any other nationalistic “recurrences” akin to that tragic 1745 (68-69).

If the foremost purpose of this historical fiction is to solemnly remind the Scot’s of their tragic downfall, so does the Critic viewer gloss hazardously over the fictive elements and focus fanatically on the political applications. Tellingly, only one character is analyzed formally—Davie Gellatley. It is his foreignness that is singular to the reviewer, as he remarks that,

“[…] this sort of personage is but little known in England, yet in Scotland it is by no means uncommon. In almost every small town there is a sort of public idiot, bearing the proportion, as we conceive, of about two of knave to three of fool, who is considered so necessary an appendage to the dignity of the place, that when he grows old, there is generally a young one in training as his successor.” (69-70)

That a man like Davie Gellatley only resides in the northern regions according the reviewer espouses a similar sense of “us” and “them” in his application of history. With Davy’s imbecility noted, he is prescribed his place in Scotland as the Scottish foil of Shakespeare’s Fool in King Lear. And so it is that Scott’s fool is forcefully proscribed from the term Briton and is left singular to the Scots.

Ending the review, The Critic warns not Walter Scott of any literary competition in his homeland, but rather forewarns Maria Edgeworth, author of such contemporary successes as Castle Rackrent (1802) and The Absentee (1812). Edgeworth is warned in the Critic that the national manners of the Scotch are, “all founded on fact, and the historical parts are related with much accuracy” (70-
71), whilst Edgeworth carries on, “wearing the patience or disgusting the credulity of the reader” with her Irish-Anglo novels (71). It is the female version of Walter Scott that is warned against the author of Waverley, extolling in high manners the likeability of *Waverley* and the “powerful advantage,” this anonymous man (if it be not Scott) has over Edgeworth (71).

*The Quarterly Review*

W. Gifford of *The Quarterly Review* continues the discourse directed at Edgeworth in his July 1814 review of *Waverley*. Asking but little of the plot, Gifford rather rails on the plight of the novel as a political platform, which has been rushed from a general examination of a common “man” to troublesome national delineations of such in the works of Edgeworth and the anonymous author of *Waverley*; this evolution has become “less comprehensive and less sublime” due to the loss of a common man to excite “exalted feelings, giving none of those higher views of the human soul which delight and exalt the mind of the spectator” (Johnson 88). Gifford then compares *Waverley* to Edgeworth’s *Castle Rackrent*, preferring the former over the latter. But in both cases—being stories of Irish and Scottish nationalism—the reader becomes periphery tools, according to the English reviewer; due to the nonsense of historical romance and the persistent nationalism inherent within, non-Scotch readers will surely disinherit the novel within a few years time, according to Gifford.

The abjection of Gifford stems from the very issues of time and space within the novel. Having no imagination to correspond with the Scotch characters, Gifford is afforded little enjoyment out of the story, as the merits of the author’s style carry the English reader only so far without identification vis-à-vis reader and national story. The most odious review concerning *Waverley* thus stems from the very nature of the national tale, and it is useful to observe the difference of place within Great Britain in reviewing this Scottish novel; in that strain, an Irish review might offer balance to this English-specific discontent.

*Monthly Museum*
Another contemporary nation bound tight in a struggle with England is Ireland, having just made their Union in 1800 with their imperial suitors. Thus, though far removed from the immediate space of the novel’s plot and its contention between critics felt from the two capital poles, it proves fruitful to access the literary discourse in Dublin on the *Waverley* phenomenon. *The Monthly Museum*, Ireland’s premiere journal on all things from agriculture to population survey to the high arts, commends the novel with perhaps the highest form of praise—that of the novel’s own words. The review spans over four months of printing, each month offering a new lengthy outline of the events within the novel. The reason behind this is given by the writer: “The length of the previous sketch, which perhaps is the best species of review to be given to a work like this, precludes any further strictures. One observation only we shall make, which is, though Waverley be the name, Mac Ivor is the hero—” (*MM* 416).

Mac-Ivor’s characterization is the only subjective discourse drawn aside the plot summary as it is presented in the review. The Irish reviewer, feeling kinship with the noble struggler, asserts that it is in his character (and all of his countrymen) to be drawn to the energetic Mac-Ivor, who “embraced an almost hopeless cause through principle,” and that he cannot help but admire him for this reason (*Monthly* 416). The word “martyr” is applied to Mac-Ivor, a first in the reviews thus far.

No comments on Scotch manners or English prejudices are allowed space in the review. Rather, the titular author of *Waverley*—Sir Walter Scott—is praised for his composition of this singular character. Allowing a discursive voice for those under the heel of England, Mac-Ivor is not a man of Scotland alone, but rather the man of “principle,” a principle which Ireland’s nationalists subscribe to most heartedly in their continual agitation under the recent Union. The review contains more than twenty pages of plot sketch, and the few paragraphs left for opinion give Mac-Ivor the blessings of Ireland.
These analyses of *Waverley* were readily available to the reading public and granted the novel both intrigue and ubiquitous praise. By keeping his name off the title-page, Scott ensured a right scandal within the literati that was successfully transferred into their reviews, and thus to the masses. The ‘author of *Waverley,*’ as he was known, prolonged the temporal notice given to the phenomenon of new publications by keeping the novel in the journals and papers for years to come both in its own merits as a heretofore unseen product of genius, as well as a generic phenomenon. The hybrid interpretations of reviewers reflect the greater power of the novel to incite unique readings contingent upon personal world-view. Though the history may be common, the interpretation is anything but.

IV. Edward Waverley as Intermediary

Scott wrote in a letter to his friend, John B. S. Morritt in the summer of 1814, that his newest title character Edward Waverley is “a sneaking piece of imbecility” (Letters 478). The author’s sentiments seem laughable, but upon further study, the reader confirms this antipathy. Indeed, Edward gives the novel a title promising the heroics of a single-man. Alas, the heroics are nearly exclusive of Edward. What might read as shoddy writing, a nervous authorship and an unpromising narrative, in actually, is a reoccurring trope in Scott’s works: the protagonist as a negative in appropriating the positives of a large, secondary cast of characters.

Little is said in most reviews of Edward and his lack of character; for it is often that the reviewers were so struck by the secondary characters that their reviews could not afford space for the mundane. The magnetism and valor of Fergus intimidates the cautious Edward; the passionate rebellion of Flora soars high above Edward’s hesitant arming; and the loyalty of Evan Dhu supersedes even Edward’s friendship with the Highland chieftain. The motive behind this dispassionate title character is aptly used by Scott in such a spiraling tale. By shading the protagonist,
the men and women that make up the Scotland that Scott so wishes to accurately convey, shine all
the brighter.

For indeed, Edward is every bit as neutral as Scott is in his personal politics. Having been
raised in a politically-divided family—his father, the Whig; his uncle, the Tory—he is automatically
cast as an intermediary character. The reader is first introduced to Edward as a bargaining chip
between the disjoined brothers. As Edward’s father, Richard Waverley, swiftly climbs the ranks in
the Hanoverian government, he actively seeks a vanguard against Evervard’s, his elder brother’s,
turncoat politics: “Richard knew enough of the world, and of his brother’s temper, to believe that by
any ill-considered or precipitate advances on his part, he might turn passive dislike into a more
active principle” (93). The Tory-inspired revolution that Evervard champions is but a dying
sentiment in England in the year 1745, as most Tories have acquiesced to the King George legacy,
falling ever farther from the Stuart cause. But Waverley’s uncle is a stout man—constantly reading
family genealogies and tales of lore to his nephew—and so it is that reconciliation is essential
between both brothers. This gift of reconciliation is Edward himself, given as token to the
Evervard’s Waverley-Hall and his sentiments in hopes of “securing [Richard’s] son’s, if not his own,
succession to the hereditary estate” in a move the narrator describes as a “tacit compromise” (94).

“Tacit compromise” is a worthwhile description of our novel’s protagonist. Most everything
about him is a “compromise” written intentionally by Scott. Growing up at Waverley-Hall, Edward’s
education is flimsy and erratic. Indeed, the narrator goes to lengths to detail his wavering intellect—
scant on convictions, but great in general learning—as shown by his “desultory course of reading” as
he leapt from Milton to the French medievalist, Froissart, forward to Shakespeare before falling
back to the historian, Brantome, without any consideration to organization. In this disarray,
Waverley was suffering not only intellectually, but also in personal development:
“Alas! While he was thus permitted to read only for the gratification of his amusement, he foresaw not that he was losing forever the opportunity of acquiring the habits of firm and assiduous application, of gaining the art of controlling, directing, and concentrating the powers of the mind for earnest investigation—an art far more essential than even the intimate acquaintance with classical learning which is the primary object of study [emphasis added].”

(96)

This curious tutelage is an unremitting trait in the development of Edward throughout the novel. While most of the situations, and peoples therein, he encounters offer much for serious investigation and analysis, he cannot focus on being subjective in his conduct—he is a void for others to fill. Similarly, for the reader, he is exceedingly malleable, allowing Scott to place him in any which way without protest. The novel is sprinkled with little asides such as “Waverley complied so far with the custom of the country” or “[Fortune] seemed to delight in placing him at the disposal of others” (216; 300). Such notices from the narrator reflect his education in his formative years; he is a man without the concentration of the mind.

Just as he is a “tacit compromise” between the two brothers, so is he a political representative of Scott’s own neutral sentiments. Scott pledged faithful to the Union and considered the Jacobite Revolution to be somewhat farcical. In one of his more telling letters, Scott remarks that,

Seriously I am very glad I did not live in 1745, for though as a lawyer I could not have pleaded Charles right and as a clergy-man I could not have prayed for him yet as a soldier I would I am sure against the convictions of my better reason have fought for him even to the bottom of the gallows. But I am not the least afraid nowadays of making my feelings walk
hand in hand with my judgment though the former are Jacobitical the latter inclined for public weal to the present succession— (Letters 302)

Despite Scott’s endorsement of the Union and King George II’s right to rule, his native inclinations hold strong, walking “hand in hand” with one another. So too in his journal does Scott lament over the paradox of his political position as both a Scottish citizen and a conservative politician:

It is difficult to steer betwixt the natural impulse of one’s National feelings setting in one direction and the prudent regard to the interests of the empire and its internal peace and quiet recommending less vehement expression. I will endeavor to keep sight of both. But were my own interest alone concern’d, d—n me but I wa’d give it them hot! (Journal 115)

Such telling proclamations from the author are again freely boasted through Edward. Having a character so fixed in his country’s Whiggity would render such confrontations with the Scots as precarious and violent; on the other hand, if he were cast as a bastard Englishman with greater affinity towards Scotland, then little would be of seditious wonder and excitement in the same travels. Hence, Scott uses his own neutral habits—and his want of pleasing both English and Scottish critics—as literary trope. Waverley is a skillfully mastered character who allows for less instigation and more imitation throughout his travels.

Point in fact is Waverley’s naïve excitement in joining the Jacobite under Mac Ivor’s firm encouragement coupled with compunction as spurred by the incarcerated Englishmen, Colonel Talbot. In conversations with both secondary characters, the reader finds their words clouding the mind and impelling the tongue of Waverley. After meeting the Chevalier in Chapter XI, Waverley is awestricken, now claiming he is a man to “live and die under” (312). Mac-Ivor’s answer to this is not of surprise or excitement, but rather in satisfaction at having known it already: “I knew you would think so when you saw [Charles], and I intended you should have met earlier, but was prevented by your sprain” (312). It has thus been concluded that no further accident—the ankle sprain in the stag-
hunt—shall hinder Waverley’s full support of the cause, and within minutes after giving his verbal assent to the Prince, Waverley is outfitted in Mac-Ivor plaids, sashes, and trews (313). He has been fully costumed by Fergus, making Waverley an apprentice to the Mac-Ivor tradition.

But few chapters after Waverley’s enthusiasm in joining the cause, he begins to regret such hastiness. Only this compunction is not self-motivated. Rather, he feels as such after meeting Colonel Talbot, the Englishmen kept prisoner after the battle of Prestonpans. In Chapter XXIV, Waverley is no more the romantic hero in the Mac-Ivor vein, but indeed doubting the Chevalier’s cause: “Waverley, had, indeed, as he looked closer into the state of the Chevalier’s court, less reason to be satisfied with it” (373). This doubt is constantly prompted by the Colonel who speaks abusively of all Scotchmen, singing that they are all “barren, barren, beggars all, beggars all” and commanding Waverley “unplaid himself” (387; 388). But a page later, after such taunts, Waverley sees the cause he has hereto committed himself to be less noble, and far less romantic: “Edward’s views were very different. He 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 […]” (389). The tone has undergone a dramatic shift; far from the battle-cries of the Battle of Prestonpans where Waverley slain his own countrymen, is this new point of view. The “beggar” personification voiced by Colonel Talbot lingers with Waverley, disallowing him to see the proud and strong Scotsmen he had so far wondered at. Now, they are all but “heartless, stupefied, and dull.”

Waverley’s “wavering” attitudes are complements of the secondary characters. Yet, Humphrey claims this to be a more “active passiveness” that can be attributed to Waverley’s talents in the un-heroic qualities of reading, poetry, and fanciful imagination. Indeed, he stands for “the superiority of civil society” (qtd. in Humphrey 52) and so begets the perfect anti-hero to peddle to his both his English and Scottish readers. Be it Scotch independence or an English commitment to
empire, Scott’s conception of Waverley as the supreme compatriot of civil society as a whole makes both the novel and the author neutral entities in literary circles, as seen in the reviews analyzed prior. Despite the sensitive material of 1745, Scott remains both respectful and respected in his portrayal of the two warring nations.

Lukacs best confirms these sentiments in his study of Scott’s historical novels. Similarly seeing mediocrity in the principle actor, he nonetheless attributes a strategic value to such men. However, Lukacs points out that Waverley is, despite his conjunction with civil society as a whole, the prime representation of a narrow-minded Englishmen from the middle-class (35). In choosing the specific national title for Waverley, Lukacs betrays his analysis of Scott’s heroes as “living human embodiment to historical-social types […] never before had this kind of portrayal been consciously set at the centre of the representation of reality” (35). But prefacing this statement with Waverley as a typical Englishmen, Lukacs risks his objectivity in the study of historical-subject matter of Waverley. For indeed, it is no chance that Waverley is an Englishmen.

Giving more credit to Scott than even Lukac’s dappled praise can, a closer analysis confirms the theory of Russian critic, Belinsky who states most effectively that,

The chief character serves merely as an external hub round which the events unfold and where he may distinguish himself merely by general human qualities which earn our human humpty; for the hero of the epic is life itself and not the individual. In epic, the individual, so to speak, subject to the event; the event over-shadows the human personality by its magnitude and importance, drawing our attention away from him by the interestingness, diversity and multiplicity of its images [emphasis added]. (qtd. in Lukacs 35)

The very process of taking an Englishmen like Edward Waverley and adjusting him in such an epic adventure that his Englishness falls way to the event itself is advantageous apropos the national schism the 1745 setting presents. The reader is reminded, in the subtle fashion of losing a specific
national identity, that the world outside the protagonist is of prime importance, effecting the
negative persona of the character and allowing him to successfully fall in suit with all—Lowlander,
Highlander, Englishmen, Whig, Tory, and so on and so forth. Waverley is everything but himself,
and Scott draws Lukac’s “narrow-minded Englishmen” out, allowing readers to observe the
progression from Englishmen to everyman, effectively fulfilling his purpose as intermediary between
the national tensions present in *Waverley*.

Now with a void to be filled in our protagonist, we must cast our analysis on those
secondary characters that do remain static throughout the narrative, as indeed, they provide the
interesting raw material for the epic. We must draw out the *English* from this Englishmen and see
who controls this well-dressed marionette.

V. The Lowlanders

Waverley begins his northern travels with a military post in Dundee, a seaport on the
periphery of the Central Belt region. His central location, however, is quickly substituted for one
even more precarious—the manor of Baron Bradwardine, a friend of his uncle—in the village
Tully-Veolan. On the periphery of Perthshire, this small village is on the brink of the Highland
Boundary Fault, a physical barrier between two dissimilar Scotlands. However, Scott eases both
Waverley and the reader into the new world by beginning the travel-narrative in the Lowlands,
allowing for the sensation that “all was beautiful because all was new,” in a gentle, careful way (117).

The antiquarian, romantic Scotland of Waverley’s imagination falls asunder at the hamlet
scene of Tully-Veolan. Entering the burg, Waverley soon discovers that the romanticized peasantry
of the Scots is nothing but a depressing display of “stagnation of industry” (121). Immediately,

---

3 The Central Belt is the region stretching from Glasgow in the west to Edinburgh in the east. It houses the majority
of the country’s population.
Waverley organizes the scene as a comparison between the “smiling neatness of the English cottages” and the poverty of Tully-Veolan. Therefore, the reader is checked by Scott, reminding us that Waverley’s journey is still yet begun, despite the seventh chapter that is underway. The scene disgusts our protagonist as he wonders at the dunghill gardens kept by the villagers and the naked children sprawled amongst them (120-122).

Quick to neutralize such antagonistic sentiments, Scott introduces the Scottish lassies Aunt Rachel had warned of but pages prior. He is struck at once with the intelligent brow of the people and the classical physique of their ladies, despite their tatters:

Yet the physiognomy of the people, when more closely examined, was far from exhibiting the indifference of stupidity; their features were rough, but remarkably intelligent; grave, but the very reverse of stupid; and from among the young women an artist might have chosen more than one model whose features and form resembled those of Minerva. (121)

Thus, the impoverished locale is compensated by the curious, intelligent people that inhabit the dunghills and scattered huts. Indeed, it is the people that represent the Lowland identity far more than the land, itself; quite contradictory to the emphasis on nature infused in the Highland character.

Strangely enough, the first Scottish character Scott introduces to the reader is that of Davie Gellately, the hamlet’s fool; the first Scottish dialogue we read is that of an “old Scottish ditty” sung by this clownish figure (126). His accent is thick and his movements erratic. But at once, Waverley constructs another comparison with his native country: “‘A strange guide this’, thought Edward, ‘and not much unlike one of Shakespeare’s roynish clowns’” (127). So it is that Davie is the Scottish version of the Bard’s English caper, and he reflects further on his two English-Scottish comparisons when acknowledging that “in Scotland, a single house was called a town, and a natural

---

4 “Aunt Rachel’s farewell was brief and affectionate. She only cautioned her dear Edward, whom she probably deemed somewhat susceptible, against the fascination of Scottish beauty” (116).
5 Scott remarks in a footnote that Davie’s song is “a genuine ancient fragment, with some alteration in the last two lines” (126).
fool an *innocent* [original emphasis]” (129). By proactively citing the knowledge gained by Waverley thus far in his journey, Scott forces the reader to make contrasts, being as explicit as possible in his descriptions.

With the fool as his guide, Waverley is led to the principal Lowland figure in the novel—Baron Cosmo Comyde Bradwardine. Yet the *ethos* of the Scottish Lowlander is confused in paradoxes—just as the beautiful peasants inhabit the squalid town and a Shakespearean sophistication blesses the idiot—further figuring the conflicting divides in Lowland geography and culture. On the edge of the Highlands, yet steeped with English mores, the Lowland gentleman exhibits an imbalance of national character. The first description of Baron Bradwardine is a pathological caricature of the confused society of Tully-Veolan:

At his first address to Waverley, it would seem that the hearty pleasure he felt to behold the nephew of his friend had somewhat discomposed the stiff and upright dignity of the Baron of Bradwardine’s demeanor, for the tears stood in the old gentleman’s eyes, when, having first shaken Edward heartily by the hand in the English fashion, he embraced him a la mode Françoise, and kissed him on both sides of his face; while the hardness of his grip, and the quantity of Scotch snuff which his allocate communicated, called corresponding drops of moisture to the eyes of his guest. (131)

In this singular description we are presented with three national greetings; 1) the English handshake; 2) the French kisses; and 3) the Scotch grip and air of whiskey. Sentiments on this caricature are mixed across the ages, with Wordsworth finding Bradwardine “too peculiar and outré,” (qtd. in Hillhouse 144) while Mary Russell Mitford⁶ favored the character as a “moveable Babel” (qtd. in Hillhouse 112). All the same, Michael Simpson in “Wavering on Empire” contests that Bradwardine is a hodgepodge of characters—a legal mind paired with a historic pedantry; a Lowland aristocracy

---

⁶ Mary Russell Mitford (1787-1855) was an English author, having penned the novel *Our Village* (1824-1832) and *Recollections of a Literary Life* (1852), amongst various verse and theatre dramas, meeting with mild success.
with the Highland appreciation of Scottish traditions; a zealous Tory with the yet the “ideal integration of French, English, and Gaelic” sentiments (131). The exterior confusion of character is, as Simpson best supposes, an “expression of [the Baron’s] interior, but that interior is itself a product of his larger exterior, which is Scotland. Just as Scotland is a ‘heterogeneous’ canvas of fantasies, so Bradwardine is an incoherent embodiment of several cultures” (134). He is an unstable character, a heteroglossia7 of consciousness (134). But the many contrasts of Bradwardine’s character fulfill the purpose of characterizing the schizophrenia of the Lowland culture. Unlike its Highland counterpart, Lowlanders are landed gentry of the English model, yet audience to a more fantastical Gaelic history. With both Edinburgh and Glasgow in its territory, the Lowlands are situated firmly on outposts of higher cultural milieu—more likely to absorb immigrant refinements into their native cities.

However, Edward’s journey does not lead for much in the way of description and criticism of these larger urban centers. Though time is spent in Edinburgh in the later course of the novel, the sketch is sparse: “[Waverley] could view Edinburgh stretching along the ridge hill which slopes eastward from the Castle,” with the description ending there abruptly (306). During a second sojourn in the same city, the description wants for any adjective, for “in Edinburgh they soon arrived” is its whole description in Chapter XXII (363). Scott continues to devote his Lowland attentions to the smaller hamlets and the schizophrenia therein.

The village of Cairnvreckan is given much space for description, as Scott chooses to open up his second volume with this domestic scenery. Seeking a blacksmith, Waverley and his Lowland guide, Cruickshankes, enter the village to find a drama already playing out:

As they entered the village of Cairnvreckan, they speedily distinguished the smith’s house.

Being also a public, it was two stories high, and proudly reared its crest, covered with grey

---

7 A term coined by Russian literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin in “Discourse in the Novel” (1934).
slate, above the thatched hovels by which it surrounded […]. The open shed, containing the forge, was crowded with persons who came and went as if receiving and communicating important news […]. Ere Waverly could ask particulars, a strong, large-boned, hard-featured woman, about forty, dressed as if her clothes had been flung on with a pitchfork, her cheeks flushed scarlet red where they were not smutted with soot and lamp-black, jostled through the crowd, and, brandishing high a child of two years old, which she danced in her arms without regard to its screams of terror, sang forth with all her might […]. (258)

This woman, the wife of the blacksmith John Mucklewrath, is described as a “Jacobite heroine” by Scott; she dances and sings the glories of Bonny Prince Charlie in front of the unsympathetic crowd. In the conversation to follow, the dialect of the blacksmith and his Tory wife is heavily Scottish, with such insults thrown back at one another as, “ye cut-lugged, graning carles!” [you crop-eared old man!] and “Deil be in me but I’ll put thi rod down her throat!” [Devil be in me but I’ll put this rod down her throat!]⁸ (259-260).

The importance given to these periphery villages—both Tully-Veolan and Cairnvreckan—is relatively stronger than that of Edinburgh. Simpson gives significance to this quirk of Scott’s writing when supposing that “to be allowed to suppose one’s place within a nation, however peripheral, is the very centre of a bigger imagine community” factoring into a more “mobile metropolis” that pervades Waverley, effectively overshadowing Edinburgh (129-130). The marginality of Scotland in the British context is attributed to the Scottish Lowlands in peripheralization to its own capital.

As a cultural republic, the milieu of the Lowlands is decidedly more hamlet than metropolis, more periphery than center. The character of Baron Bradwardine is someone who exists on this confused plane, and both man and location is continually at odds with something external, be it Edinburgh, England, or the European continent (as seen in Bradwardine’s French learning). Just

⁸ Translation mine.
north of Tully-Veolan, farther still from Cairnvreckan, are the Highlands, lofted over its humbled, kneeling Lowland. Such hyperbolic description is in the very vein of Scott, as he gives one of the most telling descriptions of the Scottish landscape:

The next day, traversing an open and unenclosed country, Edward gradually approached the Highlands of Perthshire, which at first had appeared as a blue outline in the horizon, but now swelled into huge gigantic masses, which frowned defiance over the more level country that lay beneath them. (119)

And so as Edward is carried beyond this horizon, our attention turns to the disposition of the Highland scenes and whether or not a fixed identity can be produced in order to curb the erratic behavior of the Lowland chapters.

VI. The Highlanders

After weeks of domestication at Tully-Veolan, a criminal act habituated by decades of tension between the Highland clans and the Lowland gentry forces all eyes to turn northward. Looking to this direction, the novel is initiated into the barbaric beyond with the introduction of the first Highland character, Evan Dhu Maccombich, principle secretary of clan-leader Fergus Mac-Ivor. The description Scott gives of this singular man sets the tone for the preceding chapters of ascent and discovery:

The individual Gael was a stout, dark, young man, of low stature, the ample folds of whose plaid added to the appearance of strength which his person exhibited. The short kilt, or petticoat, showed his sinewy and clean-made limbs; the goatskin purse, flanked by the usual defense, a dirk and a steel-wrought pistol, hung before him; his bonnet had a short feather, which indicated his claim to be treated as a duinhe-wassel, or sort of gentleman […]. (168)
The tone of this characterization pervades the rest of the journey north, as Edward bounds over the pass that “afford[s] communication between the high and low country” and climbs up the “extremely steep and rugged” path (171). Just as Evan Dhu is “stout, dark […] [and] str[o]ng,” so is the terrain on their journey hard and bound in a primitive nature (171).

Yet this nature is by far more set and static than its Lowland counterpart. Just as steady as Evan is in his manner, language, and “springing step” (172), so is the landscape continually majestic in its simplicity, unlike the squalor of the Lowland hamlets. This exalted sense of being—both in nature and in personalities—is twofold in the opposing Highland “chiefs;” Donald Bean Lean, the brazen robber and leader of outlaws, and Fergus Mac-Ivor, the acclaimed Highland chief of the Glennaquoich clan come at odds with one another over influence in the region. Indeed, both men are stately in persona, and live, as presented by Scott’s enthusiastic descriptions, in mountain palaces fit for kings.

The reader is acquainted with Donald Bean Lean first, the more impecunious of the two. Upon being led by Evan Dhu for a night’s rest in the bandit’s hide-out, the last of Edward’s familiarity with the environment is removed from him as the English-speaking Evan leaves him in the company of a Gael, effectively leveling any previous comfort and support both Edward and the reader had relied on when traveling upward. With this strange company, Edward is led to the hold of the robber, aptly titled “Uaimh an Ri or the King’s Cavern”, and the description of his cove is grand compared to the parsimonious description of Edinburgh and the indigent hamlets of the Lowlands: “The interior of the cave which here rose very high, was illuminated by torches made of pine tree, which emitted a bright and bickering light;” and upon leaving the ensuing morning, Edward remarks that “Looking back to the place from which he came, he could not help but admiring the address which had adopted a retreat of such seclusion and secrecy” (175-179).
Comparable to his meager kingdom, is Donald Bean Lean, with the air of a king, though a more treacherous and laughable one than the subsequent Fergus Mac-Ivor; here is the Highland mirror of the multi-faceted Baron of Bradwardine. Both these men, as they hug close to the Lowland-Highland divide, are divided in themselves. Reminiscent of the first description given of Bradwardine, Donald Bean Lean also emits a confusion of identity in his mixed costume and odd manners:

[Donald] appeared on the whole, rather a diminutive and insignificant figure. He had service in some inferior capacity in the French army, and in order to receive his English visitor in great form, and probably meaning, in his way, to pay him a compliment, he had laid aside the Highland dress for the time, to put on an old blue and red uniform and a feathered hat, in which he was far from showing to advantage, and indeed looked so incongruous, compared with all around him, that Waverley would have been tempted to laugh, had laughter been either civil or safe. The robber received Captain Waverley with a profusion of French politeness and Scottish hospitality […]. (176)

The title-holder of King's Cavern is foolish in costume, though fearful in dialogue and tone. The conversation between the two men continually revolve around what Bean Lean knows, which is very much, concerning Edward's history and station at Dundee. Such details are said with “a very significant manner” and “mysterious language” (177). So it is that Donald Bean Lean is the Baron of Bradwardine of the Highlands; for his patchwork character is coupled with extensive knowledge that preludes inherent power in the region, and his shelter, though of heath and rock, takes on the nature of a castle.

Attended once again by Evan Dhu, Edward quits the company of Donald Bean Lean, and travels northward to meet the second of the Highland kings—Fergus Mac-Ivor. The cultural shift that occurs but ten miles northward is indicative of the vanishing border, and herein the reader
enters into a specific national history that is alone Highlander—with little meddling of the English, French, or even Lowland spheres. Any cultural imperialism is hindered by the static identity of Fergus and his followers. Such intensity of description is afforded with a coexistence of compatible manners, dress, and ideologies, as opposed to a more disparate variety. The description of the Highland Chief is unlike that of the Bradwardine or Bean Lean. With no mention to any other culture, he is “decidedly Scottish:”

When Fergus and Waverley met, the latter was struck with the peculiar grace and dignity of the Chieftain’s figure. Above the middle size and finely proportioned, the Highland dress, which he wore in its simplest mode, set off his person to great advantage. He wore the trews, or close trousers, made of tartan, checked scarlet and white’ [...] His countenance was decidedly Scottish, with all the peculiarities of the northern physiognomy, but yet had so little of its harshness and exaggeration that it would have been pronounce in any country extremely handsome [...] (186)

There are no French feathers, English handshakes, or other flourishes of mismatched identity; Edward is greeted with “the utmost expression of kindness and obligation for the visit” (187). The company he commands is a rigid hierarch, reaching back to a faded feudal history. This feudal organization has survived the modernization of the Lowlands, as it lay untouched by English industrialization. Fergus is a symbol of the core of Scotland, as the changing 18th century continually erodes its outer shell.

The fervent Jacobitism of Fergus and his followers are part and parcel of Fergus’s past as an individual and the whole of “Sliochd nan Ivor, the race of Ivor” (189). Having been born with his sister to a Scotchman expelled after participation in the 1715 uprising9 and a French mother, both Mac-Ivor children returned to Scotland in hope fortifying the Mac-Ivor name in the Highlands. This
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9 1715: First Jacobite Rising took arms against the new Hanoverian government and was put down after wavering support from sympathetic Tories
mission is fitting for both siblings, as Fergus was a “character of uncommon acuteness, fire, and ambition,” and in Flora’s bosom a “zeal of loyalty burned pure and unmixed with any selfish feelings” (189-199). With these familial dynad—one of ambition and the other of selflessness—the Mac-Ivors devote their energies to the crowning of the young Stuart, and in turn, to the reordering and stabilization of the Highland clans.

The sudden adjectival turn of Scott’s pen is laid upon these two Highland characters. Indeed, in a singular paragraph, the following adjectives and attributes alone are employed in relation to Fergus: “independent,” “vigor,” “spirit,” “great order,” “military discipline,” “great,” “rigorously,” “gently,” and the condition that “nothing was more certain” for these attributes and drives (190). Flora’s vocabulary is of a more effeminate quality, though just as lavish in a second paragraph—“soft,” “sweet,” “natural,” “persuasive,” “gentle,” “duty,” “loyalty,” “purity,” and “powerful” (199).

The profusion of description given to these two characters is indicative of Scott’s attachment for similar descriptions to the whole of the Highlands—the nature, the sky, the men and women on its “high and heathy” hills (192). The pages that are spent throughout the Highlands are indicative of the complex nature inherited in its geopolitical position and the relative “otherness” of these characters.

Organizing a comparison of the Lowland and Highland characters, it is necessary to turn-up the hedge that separates the two. Scott allows for such a judgment as he chooses his Davie Gellately, the innocent of Tully-Veolan, to mirror the intermediary Edward. Bearing a letter from Rose, the daughter of the Baron of Bradwardine, concerning the forced seizure of the manor, Davie springs lightly onto the Highland stage. Edward is awoken in one morning in Glennaquoich by a jingle almost immediately attributed to Davie, as the fool sprightly sings a Highland tune:

My heart’s in the Highlands, my heart is not here,

My heart’s in the Highlands, a-chasing the dear;
A-chasing the wild deer, and following the roe,

My heart's in the Highlands wherever I go. (241)

Here Davie operates on alternating planes—singing of his heart’s place in the Highland per the condition of physical severance; the song assumes the speaker is separated from such regions, thus composing a ballad wanting of stability in character and location. Before Edward can find the reason behind Davie’s “excursion of such unwonted extent,” the tune turns about-face and speaks with a tragic subversiveness of the previous sentiments:

There’s naught in the Highlands but syboes [onions] and leeks,
And lang-leggit [long-legged] callants [boys] gaun [gone] wanting the breeks [pants],
Wanting the breeks, and without hose and shoon [shoe],
But we’ll a’win the breeks when King Jamie [James I of England] comes hame [home].

(241)¹⁰

This song is ripe of Robert Burn’s poetry, the last line closing mirroring the lines “we’ll never hae [have] peace till Jamie comes hame [home]” from Burn’s poem of the same name (ft 241). Here, Davie turns his tune from airy praise to a more corrosive mood—speaking of the Highland’s primitive nature, as the boys run around without britches and shoes, but still awaiting the day of the Stuart line to reinvent itself in England. The Highland tartans are not symbols of national pride, as in other poetry of Burns, but something that shows off the legs of little boys who depend on a meager diet; not the masculine warriors and noblemen of other works¹¹. The poem trails off with an air of tragedy, as James I is dead and his descendent, Charles Edward Stuart, laments the crown of England while excommunicated in Rome. This song is aptly delivered on the eve of the Jacobite uprising that Edward will soon find himself entrenched in.

¹⁰ Translation mine.
¹¹ See “Our Thrissles Flourished Fresh and Fair” (238); The Battle of Sheriff-Muir” (240); and “The Highland Laddie” (269) for some examples of tartan (or plaids) in Burn’s poetry.
But why Davie? How does this simpleton gain passage across the cultural hedge? Here is a fool who with no words but song, allows himself to be favored by the Glennaquoich guards and coerces them into dance, gathering “young and old […] while busily employed in setting, whooping all the while, and snapping his fingers of his head […]” in this Scotch “foursome reel” (241). Gellately then “thrusts a letter into our hero’s hand” and “continued his salutation without pause or intermission” (241). How easily he slips into the Highland drama and reassumes his role as fool in this different locale is a merit to his ability to traverse plane, time, and culture in the novel; an ability closed off to the other characters except for Waverley, himself, as we have discussed his role as a mannequin for regional costuming.

Davie is thus the only universal Scottish character in the whole of the novel, as he is not confined to a particular region, and indeed exists “outside the norms of [his] community” (Reed 100). Within him there is a myriad of culture, and despite his imbecility, he plays the part of oral historian as well as Mac-Murrough, the hired Mac-Ivor bhaird (bard) that formally entertains the Glennaquoich clan. Davie, like Mac-Murrough possesses a near interminable memory for song, poetry, and history; Mac-Murrough’s expertise lies in the specifically Gaelic, while Davie interchanges English, Lowlander, and Highlander dialects with ease. Despite his fooling, he contrasts the regional specificity the novel garners from chapter-to-chapter, and like Edward, traverses both the physical and cultural boundaries of Scotland and, in turn, receives a Scottish identity unique to him, despite being a simple town innocent.

Turning from the Highlands—full of feast, song, hunting, and military exercise all under the tight control of Fergus’s fanatical leadership—the novel re-introduces the English as a distinct cultural group. Being so affected by the ardent nationalism of the Mac-Ivors, Edward declares war on his native country. Now apart of the Jacobite forces, Edward and the Highland clans and
Lowland Tories like Bradwardine meet their antagonists at the Battle of Prestonpans, just east of Edinburgh.

VII. The English

Prior to this section, the stuff of Scotland—wild and raw, with a sophistication seen through the characters rather than sprawling urban arenas—has filled the pages of *Waverley*. For indeed, the first Volume of the novel focuses on the particular movement of Edward away from his native England into the “land of military and romantic adventures, and it only remains to see what will be [Edward’s] own share in them” (166). The movement from the 19th century estate novel (as the first few chapters detail birth, education, romance, and such with a Victorian air) to a fairy-tale is further as Waverley travels ever farther northwest. Though in thoroughly transposing the fantastical onto the more serious historical stage—as seen with the attention to detail when describing the Highlands—the basis of the novel, a historical fiction, is soon revived after Edward domesticates himself somewhat in the previously alien environments of Tully-Veolan and Glennaquoich. Rather then allowing for another jaunt into the poetic landscape to rescue the foreign tincture of the narrative, he brings Edward back down to the Border and Central Lowlands for the final two Volumes; Scott restores modernity to the tale as readers are marched out of the time-journey with Edward by their side.

The exercise of constructing a national fiction allowed for Scott to toy with his own perceptions of the modernizing world and fuel his novel with the dreams of such. James Reed in *Landscape and Locality* explains that having exhausted the use of poetry to demarcate the “natural physical environment and is associations to increase the reader’s awareness not only of […] the rich potential of his own locality” (24), Scott focuses much more acutely on the English presence in the
latter two Volumes; he reminds the reader that “the old, feudal, heroic but primitive Scotland was being transformed by a new English dynamic in politics, technology, economics and social progress” (151). So it is that the entrance of English characters signals a shift in the narrative as Edward begins to doubt his passionate undertaking of the sentimental Jacobite cause; Scott expands his catalogue of conflicting national identities when introducing Colonel Talbot and later forcing Edward to don disguise in penetrating London for his family’s sake.

Colonel Talbot is the English prototype in the novel. Whereas Sir Everard, Waverley’s uncle, was a rare Tory supporter and Richard Waverley absent from the whole of the tale’s immediate action, Talbot is an Englishmen who mimics Edward’s northern travels though loses none of his English identity. Humphrey in *Scott: Waverley* charges Talbot with the role of Fergus’s double; both in how they stay attached to their political and national notions, risk their lives for such sentiments, and the effect these heroics impress upon Edward (46). In using Talbot as a shrine for Hanoverian conservatism, Scott valorizes this natural antagonist of the Jacobite cause as he hails Fergus for his heroics—both men are proud of their respective causes.

Talbot is the conductor of the “countermarch of the romantic impulses of [Edward’s] mind” from his imprisonment during the Battle of Prestopans, for whom Waverley seeks and has pardon granted to, and the subsequent dramas of Edinburgh and the southward march into England (Humphrey 41). Waverley immediately finds Talbot a dignified gentleman, full of “military pride and manly sorrow [and] […] so deep a tone of feeling” (357). Despite Fergus’s antipathy to the Englishman, Edward takes Talbot under his personal guard; Humphrey argues this is one of the few scenes of Edward’s facility of initiative that had hereto been absent in the portrayal of the hero. Yet, by saving Talbot on the battle-field and, in turn, taking his person in his stead, Edward falls prey once again to earlier simplicities of character: “‘Nay, I cannot tell what to make of you,’ answered the Chief of Mac-Ivor, ‘you are blown about with every wind of doctrine [emphasis added]’” (358); for even
the brief conference with Talbot has impressed upon Waverley the outstanding character of the English Colonel and allowed Talbot’s “prejudices which are peculiarly English” to be amenable to Edward’s previously defiant spirit (369). Talbot’s knowledge is “strongly tinged” and Edward resists not the persuasive rhetoric of this tasteful, cultivated Englishmen, just as he sways with every blow of Fergus’s own breath.

Prior to the battle of Prestonpans, and his Humphrey “initiative”, Edward encounters another English character that affects the course of his identity development in the briefest and most succinct manner. In a tragic encounter on the march towards the battleground, Waverley is drawn out of the line by a painful howl and in searching for its source, finds an English soldier downed in and left naked in a small hovel. Edward instantly recognizes the man’s nationality by the “voice, in the provincial English of his native country,” and the sound of such a dialect in the last throes of life pains Edward. Likewise, the English prisoner now identified as a previous tenant of the Waverley-Honour estate, replies in the same: “I never though to hear an English voice again,” said the wounded man” (337). The importance of dialect in this passage is crucial to the inherent brotherhood of these two disparate Englishmen. Even as a soldier of the opposing force, Edward still retains his “native country,” as he so identifies England, within his deepest sentiments. Further upsetting Edward’s foray into an adopted Scottish identity is the tenant’s remorse over Edward’s disappearance from his military post at Dundee, exclaiming in the deepest despair of death’s approach, “But, O squire! How could you stay from us so long [emphasis added]” (337). The curious use of the pronoun “we” reaches out to Edward and draws him back into the fold of an English identity. So it is that Edward’s actions on the battle-field a day later is not by a sudden chance of uncharacteristic initiative as Humphrey would have it, but rather by this affecting scene’s impact on our hero’s commitment to the Jacobite cause.
Further discussing Edward’s own Englishness, and that of his family’s, is the matter of his return to London, after being separated from the defeated Highland army. With Bonnie Prince Charlie retreating back to Scotland and Fergus and Evan Dhu in the hands of the English authorities, the added rumor of his father’s death and his uncle’s detainment in London forces the disparaged Edward back to the heart of his native country. Interestingly enough, the danger of his Jacobite association gives cause to don a disguise of “plain and simple” country-ware and play the role of one of the Dundee dragoons he had so deserted. The crisis of his identity is at an apex, falling on one side of spending a “happy day” in London (421) and his urgent need to return north.12

Upon confirming the safety of the Baron of Bradwardine and his daughter, Rose, Edward meets Colonel Talbot in Edinburgh, hoping to encourage pardon for Fergus Mac-Ivor and Evan Dhu. Despite the friendly manner the Colonel receives him with, he remains “inexorable” concerning Fergus’s pardon and appeals to the higher spirit of justice in advancing Mac-Ivor’s fate. He faults Mac-Ivor with “wrapping the whole nation in fear and in mourning,” personifying the British isle (451); furthermore, he claims that the Highland clans have “broken the peace of the country” (451), and it is for the country that he must die. Here Scott intercedes upon the Colonel’s character, calling attention to its brutality despite the “brave and humane m[a]n” that voiced them. With a melancholic air, Scott closes the chapter with a heartfelt supplication that such (mis)conceptions of justice, “we shall never see” again (451). The vigor the Colonel has towards the preservation of “nation,” of “country,” is ambiguous in its target, for he has never censured himself against voicing damaging opinions against the Scots, even disgracing the Border country as an uncultivated society: “for even the Lowlanders talk a kind of English little better than the Negroes in Jamaica” (387). In speaking so poorly against the country as a whole—his contempt for the Lowland

---

12 “‘To Scotland,’ said Waverley. ‘To Scotland?’ said the Colonel; ‘with what purpose? Not to engage again with the rebels, I hope.’ ‘No; I considered my campaigned ended when, after all my efforts, I could not rejoin them […]’” (419).
shambles only surpassed by sheer disgust of Highland culture—it is safe to assume that the repeated apostrophes to an ambiguous country for which he prides in honor, justice, and peace, conveniently capitulates Scotland from the idea of the British crown.

However the imperfect Englishman follows Waverley to the end of the novel, replacing the void left by Fergus after his execution. In Tully-Veolan, Edward and the newly betrothed Rose Waverley take up residence after having sold the old Waverley-Honor property to Colonel Talbot. In surrendering ties to England, Edward exchanges his family estate for Tully-Veolan, adding another knot to the tangle of national identities at the conclusion of the novel. In the end, however, it is Talbot who is toasted at Tully-Veolan, for in efforts to bestow Edward and his friends pardon from London authorities. Having the last word of the novel, the Baron praises the Colonel’s kindness and toasts the “Prosperity of the united Houses of Waverley-Honor and Bradwardine” (474). The marital union between Edward and Rose, the Lowland feminine ideal, issues a compelling reference to the Union of 1707 which united both Scotland and England under one crown.

Yet the only remaining Englishmen in the novel, as Uncle Evervard is nowhere to be seen, is Colonel Talbot and even he is residing in foreign Scotland at the time of the toast. Edward has exchanged his Englishness for a place in Scotland, allowing for a portrait of him and Mac-Ivor to hand in the gallery. Edward, beside his late friend, is dressed as a mannequin in Highland dress; he views the piece with “admiration and deeper feelings” (472). So it is that Talbot, representing England, loses the draw for Edward’s national affiliation, as Mac-Ivor succeeds, after death, in bringing Edward into the Scottish fold.

VIII. Sir Walter Scott and Contemporary Scottish Literature
The history of the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion is an enduring one; a history that was brought from the umbrage of years gone-by and reinstated in the cultural text of the Scots by Scott himself. Echoing Robert Burns’ verse, Scott and his first Waverley novel succeeded in promoting the generic means of affirming the Scottish nation through words alone. There are no visuals to accompany the text of *Waverley*; not even the author of the tremendous novel was first released to the public. So it is that the text is allowed to speak for itself and engage history in a temporal and spatial struggle, in the end producing the first historic novel and a lasting emblem of Scottish culture.

Due to its immense historical catalogue and the often confusing prose, *Waverley* effectively isolates itself in modern literature studies and pleasure-reading of recent years. The Victorian realists, with their numerous characters and knotty, dramatic plots, have edged past Scott in accruing contemporary readership. The nation-state as a political entity, such a juvenile concept in Scott’s day, no longer excites readers as the politics of an increasing international system have given states the primary means of directing their peoples. The age of kings and dynasts are now past and the modern-nation, with both domestic and international policies and agendas, has led to greater concern for local cultures and identities.

Despite an expanding international system due to multilateral politics and cross-boundary governments like the European Union (EU), pressures of a colonial past still exist in the United Kingdom to this day. After a relatively weak performance during the first half of the 20th century, Scotland has overturned any cultural and economic stagnation within the last few decades, producing its own Cultural Revolution in the early 1980s. The ripples of this heightened artistic scene in Edinburgh have affected Scots both in the country and those abroad; both Englishmen and Irishmen have felt the effects of a rebirth in Scottish culture.

After a failed referendum for a parliament independent of England in 1979, the idea of a “divided-self” played highly in the foundations of the Cultural Revolution. Cain Craig in his study
The Modern Scottish Novel: Narrative and the National Imagination (1999) considers the idea of a self-conscious Scotland that works directly from Benedict Anderson’s paradigm of an “imagined community,” as previously discussed. According to Craig, the “agency of human groups” behind a nation seeks solace in some intermediary between tradition and mass forgetting, as a collective national imagination must navigate between a “construction of the past according to the dictates of the present;” tradition is not inherited, but a continual element of dialogue and debate between members in a specific community (32). Thus the debate that centered around the 1979 referendum on independence, which failed, and the later successful 1999 parliamentary devolution that occurred in Scotland is a continuation of the historical text Scott himself was working from. The elements of the Jacobite rebellions in the 18th century closely mirror the polemics of the contemporary independence movement being hosted by the Scottish National Party (SNP), a majority in the Scottish Parliament this very day.

If historical and contemporaneous issues of a Scottish national identity are products of an ongoing dialogue, then it is just as applicable to study Scott in light of the modern independence movement as it was two centuries ago in understanding the Jacobite revolution. For example, a statement made by Alex Salmond, president of the SNP, uses Walter Scott’s words to poetize the struggles between Scotland and England; Mr. Salmond was quoted as saying, “Sir Walter Scott famously coined the phrase, 'Oh, what a tangled web we weave, when first we practise to deceive' last century13, but it perfectly encapsulates Blair's position over Iraq today” (Salmond). In speaking to the Iraq war and the divides between Salmond and the late British PM, quoting the national writer of Scotland does much to undo any claim that Scott’s influence in Scotland has been fully erased, as the SNP leader is using Scott as a purposeful evocation of a Scottish identity. The citation of the national author appeals to the persuasive rhetoric of Salmond’s remark.

13 Mr. Salmond errs in his speech. It has been two centuries since Scott’s first publication.
Looking to literature, it is worthwhile to assume that Scott played a role in the 1980’s Cultural Revolution and still remains a prominent figure in contemporary literary discourse. In the previous survey of the characters in *Waverley* it is appropriate to attribute a myriad of different national identities within Scotland, with geography playing a large factor. The Highland clan of Fergus Mac-Ivor is relatively untouched by the English mores that transgressed the Border between the two countries (hence Scott’s disinterest in Edinburgh within the novel). Likewise, the lower class characters—such as Davie Gellately and the blacksmith from Crainvrecken—represent a lower class Scottish identity, unsullied by the intellectual milieu of the bi-national relationship. In this vein, Craig centers contemporary strongholds of Scottish identity and cultural flourishing within the “classes which are least touched by English values: lower class and working class culture has thus come to be the repository of all that has been elided by the Scottish bourgeoisie’s mimicry of English values” (qtd. in Petrie 18). Duncan Petrie in *Contemporary Scottish Fictions* (2004) pursues this idea of an untouched Scotland in the idea of cultural Clydesideism—“in recognition of [Scotland’s] emblematic association with the heavily populated, industrialized and proletarian West of Scotland” (17). Such examples associated with this literary period are strongly tied to the work of Scott, as Petrie discusses the theatrical mini-series “Blood Red Roses” that aired in 1986 and its connection to the romantic tradition perpetuated by Scott in *Waverley* (36). On par with Clydesideism as a whole, the mini-series appealed to ‘the cultural production of the lower-classes” by featuring “working-class solidarity” in the face of political Thatcherism—or the *laissez-faire* market economy of ‘80s MP, Margaret Thatcher—that threatened to close the characters’ factories and disrupt their unions. But, as Petrie explains, the protagonist of this mini-series, Bessie, draws from her “Highland heritage [that] provides her with an innate sense of justice and an irrepressible spirit, directly connecting her to the romantic tradition of Jacobite resistance perpetrated by Sir Walter Scott” (36). Margaret Thatcher plays the southern antagonist in this decade, whilst Scott crafted Edward’s enemy to be the same
London political *intelligentsia* that killed his father, arrested his uncle, and ultimately ended the Rebellion with his friend’s execution.

In another example from Petrie’s study is that of the Scottish-Gothic connection, which was of great interest in Scott. His journals are replete with discussions of Gothic architecture, literature, and its relationship to the Celts. Indeed, Scott often speaks of imparting the “Gothick question” on his native-culture (Journal 605). While there are actual links between the Celts and the German Goths in terms of historical migration, it is in the literary-sense that Scott often invokes the “Gothick question,” whilst employing its generic conventions in *Waverley*. These range from Fergus’ second-sight and his meetings with the ghastly specter—the Bodach Glas\(^\text{14}\)—to Gothic architecture of Carlyle Castle. Cairn lists a catalogue of recent 20\(^\text{th}\) century fictions that play with the idea of supernaturalism and the confrontation “between the two poles of fear—the fearful and the fear inspiring” that works such as Muriel Spark’s *The Comforters* (1957) to Alasdair Gray’s *Poor Things* (1992) have prescribed to their narratives. Looking at Scott, we see elements of Gothic fear in *Waverley*; be it the isolated, wind-swept valleys or the head of Fergus Mac-Ivor that hangs from a gate after his execution at Carlisle Castle. Even the victory of the English over the Scots in the novel suggests a “hostile environment [that] is not an isolated moment in its existence but the very essence of the whole pattern of its life” (Craig 48).

The “hostile environment” is a national wasteland having survived centuries of industrialization, modernization, and international politics; Scotland remains every bit a schizophrenic hodgepodge of cultural identities as it did in Scott’s Jacobite histories. When apostrophizing Scott in discussions of contemporary Scottish fiction, the historical connection

\(^{14}\) The Bodach Glas is a curse on the Mac-Ivor family, portending doom for those it haunts. According to Juliet Feibel’s “Highland histories: Jacobitism and second sight”, it appears as an “English enemy slain by Fergus’s ancestor years ago.” In the last instance, it appears to Fergus, portending his capture and execution, and in this sense the ghostly Englishmen is victorious and upon Fergus’s death has the last laugh as “second sight [now] has lost its status in history” (17).
serves to promote this difficult Scottish-British question. McCracken-Flescher writes her novel
*Possible Scotlands* (2005) but six years after Scotland regained limited-rule through a devolved
parliament, and calls into question the future of Scottish cultural identity. Calling Scott the “architect
of cultural Scottishness,” she argues that Scott’s contested position in Scottish culture to this day is,
in actuality, “producing the nation” (3-5). If labeling the nation as a narrative, then Scott is surely the
author of the manners, geography, and politics of the bonny country; as the national author, he
appears “to be everywhere, and involved in everything” despite the bi-centennial gap between his
death and the present day (McCracken-Flescher 11). The absence of the author does not constitute
erasure but rather a specter that has exceeded its time, and with the rewriting of 1745 in *Waverley*,
Scott suggests that “history will happen and value stand evident—only tomorrow” (qtd. in
McCracken-Flescher 25). She classifies this statement by looking at the novels that go beyond and
through history: “this is why we find authors from Hogg to Pittock formally reinterring Sir Walter at
the start of their various projects” whenever they dare discuss anything from history (185). And the
very malleability of Scott’s own identity—“Tory laird, Borders bourgeois, over-Enlightened
historian, Jacobite manqué, or any other possible Scot”—adds to the schizophrenia of it all (185).
From Iain Bank’s *The Wasp Factory* (1984)—a “specifically Scottish variant of the Gothic”—to a
nihilistic, Scottish junkie-culture of *Trainspotting* (1993) by Irvine Welsh, the various fictions that have
been producing these last few decades shrewdly reflect the confusion between political radicalism
and Union, tradition and derision for tartanry, the Gothic and the realist, and the various other
subterfuges of any true, definite Scottish identity (Petrie 119). In line with all these themes, having
previously been discussed in our close-reading of the novel, so it is that Scott’s *Waverley* provided the
framework for a national narrative.
X. Conclusion

It has been the purpose of this paper to flesh out the various national identities within the novel; some, so exact as to serve as prototype—like Colonel Talbot—, while others knot so as to form a difficult hybrid in the vein of Bradwardine. Scott’s success in *Waverley* is found in these national contrasts, which are as striking as the Highland Boundary Fault and the English-Scottish border. With so many geo-political boundaries present in the makeup of Scotland, is it no wonder that a good many of its inhabitants experience a schizophrenic self-consciousness. Lukacs considers this personalization of characters to be one centered on “objective, social-historical” purposes which serves well Scott’s new genre of historical fiction (38).

The genesis of history as read through Edward’s travels is a realism in literature hereto undiscovered. Prior to *Waverley*, the national tales of Edgeworth and company focused little on actual historical situations and facts; they were sentimental fictions. In his first novel, Scott dictated the sentimentality to his wavering protagonist, whilst still preserving dates and circumstances important to the development of Scotland. In doing so, Scott pens nation-building at its most critical hour. It is not the Pretender that stirs the readers’ passions for war and peace, but rather the undetermined characterization of Edward. At the novel’s close he stands viewing the portrait of him and Fergus, clad in plaid, all the while hosting his friend’s executer—Colonel Talbot—in his home. The bizarre close to the novel signals that Edward’s own foray into cultural schizophrenia is yet nascent, still ready to develop exponentially. Indeed, Scott has shaken the English from this Englishman and left him to grow in his role as the new Baron of Bradwardine—an assortment of national identities arranged in the most cosmopolitan fashion.

Scott details the cultural encounters between Scots—both Lowland and Highland—and Englishmen with great vivacity. In doing so, he effectively transplants Benedict Anderson’s *imagined*
communities from theory to page, fitting an antagonistic history into complementary appropriations of identity. The Highland Scots, though often cited as primitive, romantic and based on “superstition” (217), occupied the same space in time as the landed gentry of the Lowlands; in turn, their development was all together transfigured by the imperial and modern impetus of England. The horizontal brotherhood felt within all three regions—England, Lowland Scotland, and Highland Scotland—hereby overlap with one another. As Anderson says, imagined communities are “merged with a correspondingly wide variety of political and ideological constellations” (4).

Fergus Mac-Ivor, the invariable Highland chieftain, claims that national-identity is community-orientated and devoid of cross-cultural interference: “everything will keep after its kind, whether it be a hawk or a Highlander” (195). Analyzing this statement, Tom Nairn would declare the Highland chief as carrying the pathology of “modern developmental history, as inescapable as neurosis in the individual, with much the same essential ambiguity attaching to it, a similar built-in capacity for decent into dementia” (5). Indeed, such exclusive memberships to particular groups make face-to-face contact with disparate groups a source of contention. More often than not, history’s wars and civil skirmishes have been based on this imagined community—an “indefinitely stretchable net of kinship and clientship” (Anderson 6). What makes Waverley a compelling historical fiction in light of state sovereignty and her citizens within is the instances of those men and women who somehow manage to wiggle free from the “net” and subsume multiple national identities. Edward Waverley, Scott’s “wavering” protagonist, is continually drawn from the English to the Scottish community, finding such a “strangeness of his fortune” in being “plac[ed] at the disposal of others, without the power of his directing his own motions” (300). While nations do not share the same boundaries of a prototypical emblem of “mankind,” Edward Waverley as a singular man acts as our civil everyman, allowing for the intense identities of the England-Scotland relationship to
burn all the brighter, catching fire in Scott’s *Waverley* and successfully bringing the year 1745 out of the shadows.
Bibliography

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

Print Material


Feibel, Juliet. “Highland histories: Jacobitism and second sight.” Fall 200. Vol 30, Iss. 1; pg 51.


Video