

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

GOTHIC DIMENSIONS OF CAPITALISM
IN SIR WALTER SCOTT'S HISTORICAL FICTION

CLAIRE O'LEARY SLAGIS
Spring 2010

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in English
with honors in English

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Robert L. Caserio
Professor of English
Thesis Supervisor

Janet Lyon
Associate Professor of English
Honors Adviser

Robert Lougy
Professor of English
Faculty Reader

*Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This thesis traces Sir Walter Scott's development across five novels that are each set in a different stage of an historical revolution from pre-capitalist to capitalist society: *The Monastery* (1820), *Kenilworth* (1821), *Old Mortality* (1816), *Chronicles of the Cannongate* (1827), and *Waverley* (1814). My intention is to prove that Scott defines the revolution as not only one with religious foundations but also as one with economic foundations. In *The Historical Novel* (English translation, 1962), György Lukács introduces the fact that "we must admire... Scott's extraordinary realistic presentation of history, his ability to translate these new elements of economic and social change into human fates." My thesis explains how economic change is the driving force of Scott's historical novels, deciding the fates of the characters and shaping how Scott judges the country's present. Scott uses characteristics of the Gothic literary genre (in alliance with romance) to represent the economic change as a force which, as Marx and Engels would say, "[sweeps away] all fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices" and, more importantly, "[melts] all that is solid... into air."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
<i>The Monastery</i>	9
<i>Kenilworth</i>	18
<i>Old Mortality</i>	28
<i>Chronicles of the Cannongate</i>	37
<i>Waverley: A Beginning and a Conclusion</i>	45
Bibliography.....	56

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Eternal thanks to Professor Robert Caserio: without his constant advice, support, encouragement, guidance, patience, and good humor, I could never have completed this project.

I would also like to thank my family for their support—my parents for putting me through school and believing that I could do this, and Ben for just being Ben.

Introduction

Sir Walter Scott is often hailed as the inventor of historical fiction. His novels are marked by their examinations of past social and political events, their gothic elements, their plot-twists, and their feel for the evolution of Scottish identity; as Judith Wilt so aptly puts, “Scott [supplies] the element of political conflict, of the history of national ideas, missing from the Edenic epics of private conscience which constituted the “history” of the protagonists of eighteenth-century novels” (Wilt 8). Scott’s major works effectively dramatize the conflict-driven, darker elements of the history of his native Scotland, considering the effects of the country’s many social upheavals on character and national identity. Like no other author of his time, Scott characterizes the clash between past and present as he documents the changes made to Scotland during the Reformation period.

Though many critics examine the political and religious revolutions Scott portrays, they too often neglect the most important revolution he illustrates: the movement of Scotland from a pre-capitalist society to the modern, capitalist society it is today. In *The Historical Novel* (English translation, 1962), György Lukács introduces the fact that “we must admire... Scott’s extraordinary realistic presentation of history, his ability to translate these new elements of economic and social change into human fates” (Lukács 58). The “economic” side of Scott’s depiction of Scotland’s metamorphosis into a modern society deserves further exploration, for it has largely been ignored by scholars of Scott. A close reading of Scott’s novels *The Monastery* (1820), *Kenilworth* (1821), *Old Mortality* (1816), *Chronicles of the Canongate* (1827), and *Waverley* (1814), reveals characters shaped not by only the social, but by the economic, revolutions of their country. Indeed, this often-overlooked economic change is the driving force

of Scott's historical novels, deciding the fates of his characters and shaping how Scott judges the country's present.

A look at Scott's personal history makes the author's focus on economics logical: his own life was shaped by the ebb and flow of the monetary tide his pen provided him. Though Scott's first professional calling was the law, Donald Carswell notes Scott came to realize that "for the first time in the long history of literature, there was money to be made in the making of books." (Carswell 42). This was certainly true. Scott's novels provided him with large profits, which he promptly spent, and then borrowed even more. A man who should have been very wealthy found himself heavily in debt by 1826, "[chiefly to] to bank of Scotland . . . [which] rested content with Scott's binding himself to be its slave until every penny owing should be paid" (Carswell 137). Rather than accept one of his many "offers of financial assistance," Scott determined to write himself out of debt, turning his mind away from spending and focusing on his novels as a way out of his dire financial straits (Carswell 137). Carswell suggests that Scott made "himself into a writing machine concerning which the only question was how long it would last and how much could be got out of it before it broke down" (Carswell 146).

Interestingly, Scott, who had earned no more than £12,000 a year through his writing at the height of his prosperity, earned almost double after his bankruptcy, bringing in £20,000 a year (Carswell 141). More man than machine, though, his health suffered from this constant productivity. The prolific author died at sixty-two, exhausted, not quite clear of debt, and paralyzed by a series of strokes. Scott's authorship, motivated by both capitalism and a love of the written word, can arguably be pointed to as the source of his financial ruin. The author quickly rose to what is historically very rare—literary stardom in his own age—but due to his

own financial ineptitude and penchant for making extravagant purchases, the security that Scott should have known as the most popular writer of his day sadly eluded him.

That a man whose life was characterized by a series of economic revolutions would choose to write about the same is unsurprising; a close reader can find economic principles and conditions operating throughout Scott's works. Placing Scott's novels in chronological order, not from the date in which they were written, but from the time period they each respectively portray, reveals Scotland's progression from a pre-capitalist to a capitalist society. *The Monastery* portrays the pre-capitalist period of Scotland when the Scottish Reformation was just beginning to stir. *Kenilworth* is set almost twenty-five years later, in pre-capitalist 1575, and focuses on the repercussions that spring from a secret marriage that violates the economic order of the period. *Old Mortality* is set in 1679 and dramatizes an uprising of Presbyterian Covenanters whose defeat at the Battle of Bothwell Bridge plants the seeds for Scotland's capitalist future. *Waverley* portrays an English soldier in 1745 who bears witness to the Jacobite Rising, a rebellion against the newly established economic order. Finally, in *Chronicles of the Canongate*, Scott creates a narrator who bears a remarkable resemblance to himself, Crystal Croftangry, who bankrupts himself in his youth. Crystal struggles, like Scott, to use writing to re-establish himself in the capitalist order of the day. From his perch in the capitalist era, Crystal looks back on Scotland's pre-capitalist past; the characters of Crystal's writings struggle to come to terms with their changing realities.

Marx and Engels note in their *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848) that capitalistic economic change is a force which "[sweeps away] all fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudice, and more importantly, [melts] all that is solid... into air" (Marx and Engels 101). This phenomenon is present in Scott's novels in terms of their gothic

and romantic elements. Recent studies of Scott have overlooked the economic changes the author documents and their relation to the gothic in his novels. In *Secret Leaves: the Novels of Walter Scott* (1985), Judith Wilt studies how Scott's novels enable the form of the novels of the nineteenth century. Wilt includes an economic aspect of this enabling in her argument, asserting that in the proto-bourgeois world Scott creates the only place where the "ancient kings of honor. . . [and] the new kings of money" can empower each other is in the figure of the outlaw king (Wilt 17). However, she does not consider how the gothic could be a factor in the two competing powers she describes, and how such consideration would favor an examination of the mystical and romantic nature of Scott's works. In *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction* (1994), Fiona Robertson focuses on the Waverley novels, examining Scott in terms of how his texts relate to the established function of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century Gothic. Robertson uses this examination to show the narrative complexities of Scott's Waverley novels including their narratorial and historical authority. Additionally, Robertson discusses how the Waverley novels create their own vocabularies by suggesting and redefining the generic vocabularies of the period. Though her study focuses on the gothic in Scott's novels, her arguments do not consider how the gothic reflects and expresses the changing economic conditions that Scott depicts. Ian Duncan's *Scott's Shadow: the Novel in Romantic Edinburgh* (2007) argues that Scott's Waverley novels provided the technical realization for the claim that fiction is a medium for representing reality, a theory that he believes developed during the Scottish Enlightenment. Further, Duncan examines Scott in terms of his influence (which he calls "Scott's Shadow") on other authors of the period.

While critics have examined Scott's use of the gothic in his historical fictions; what they have not examined, and what is deserving of further exploration, is how the gothic elements

Scott employs are a beacon for the more subtle aspects of the author's feelings on Scotland's path to capitalism. This type of reading can justify Scott's most critically maligned character, the White Lady of Avenel, a specter in *The Monastery* whom critics designate as the reason for Scott's first failure as a novelist. Interpretation of the White Lady benefits from a reassessment of his novels from an economic perspective. A careful reader will note that the gothic serves multiple purposes in Scott's documentation of economic change. In his novels, the past eras are depicted as pre-capitalist, and Scott uses the gothic to dramatize pre-capitalism. He also uses gothic detail to paint pictures of characters who hold beliefs that are becoming outdated as capitalism streaks across Scotland.

Gothic elements serve multi-functioning purposes in Scott's novels; Scott also puts them to use in his descriptions of characters who are advancing the capitalist regime too quickly, whether they are conscious of this fact or not. Marx and Engels can help us understand this characterization. They write "modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that had conjured up such a gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells" (Marx and Engels 103). Characters who push for progress too quickly, who leave the past behind them entirely, are like the sorcerer Marx and Engels describe and are thus characterized in gothic terms. John Balfour, called Burley, in *Old Mortality*, is defined by a religious enthusiasm that takes over his entire being. His speech, and that of other Covenanters, is derived from biblical speech, but it suffuses him sublimely with dark, gothic romance because of its extreme elevation in comparison with the speech of the other characters. Balfour says to Morton, who is hiding Balfour in his Uncle's barn, "Think you not it is a sore trial for flesh and blood, to be called upon to execute the righteous judgments of Heaven

while we are yet in the body, and continue to retain that blinded sense and sympathy for carnal suffering, which makes our own flesh thrill when we strike a gash upon the body of another?” (Scott 96). Characterization of Balfour as both sublime and gothic fits with the character’s intentions. But he presses towards his goal of sweeping away the established economic and social order too quickly. Ultimately, Balfour fails, entirely too “swept away” by his own zeal.

The White Lady and Balfour are important but secondary characters. Scott’s protagonists do not have gothic characteristics. As many critics have described them, these are men who move towards progress carefully, without forgetting the values of the past. Judith Wilt describes two of Scott’s protagonists: “Halbert Glendinning [of *The Monastery*] and Roland Graeme [of *The Abbott*], two generations of protagonists who turn the chivalric Catholic world upside down, were born Catholic and become Protestant. But their change is less a conversion than an accommodation to rational, or bourgeois, politics.” (Wilt 108). They are men who work towards a middle ground between change and tradition—though at the beginnings of their respective novels they may waver between the values of the past and the bourgeois values of the future, throughout their plots they are forced to weigh the merits of both sides. The men move towards economic progress slowly but undeniably steadily, as their morals and own self-interest compel them to move towards a capitalist future.

But if Scott’s progressive figures are less likely to be associated with gothic elements, they are more likely to be associated with romance and they are caught up, at the least, in a dialogue with romance elements. And this gives them a significant indirect relation to the gothic, for gothic and romance overlap. Previous critical examinations of the romantic in Scott are understandable, for the romantic and the gothic share distinctive characteristics. The romantic is connected to the gothic because both genres are involved with each other. Each genre is an

imaginative extravagance. The two genres are adjacent to the sublime, a genre that mixes pain and pleasure, terror and elation, suffering and ecstasy, and grand natural beauty. Scott utilizes all three throughout his historical novels. The romantic pageantry in *Kenilworth*, the sublime battle between Morton and Balfour high upon a precipice over an abyss in *Old Mortality*, and the gothic specter of the White Lady of Avenel of *The Monastery* each embody Scott's intermingled usage of the genres. One aim of this study is to show areas where the romantic and gothic overlap as well as areas where one genre takes precedence over the other. In this thesis, although I examine Scott's novels in the order of the period they portray, from the earliest period depicted in *The Monastery* through *Chronicles of the Cannongate*, I will examine *Waverley* last, placing discussion of *Waverley* after *Chronicles of the Cannongate*. I have made this decision because *Chronicles of the Cannongate* details more than one period; Crystal is a figure of the fully-capitalized Scotland but the narratives he embeds in his text depict Scotland's past. It is my intention with this order to reveal, as I have stated before, Scott's depiction of the capitalization of Scotland. However, I also intend to show how the gothic plays a greater role in Scott's novels depicting the earlier periods and gradually begins to fade into romance depicting in the later ones. *The Monastery*, the starting place of my study, is deeply enmeshed in the gothic, whereas *Waverley*, the end point of my study, emphasizes romance more than gothic. Gothic fades as the periods Scott writes about become more modern, though the imprint of the gothic remains.

The rest of this thesis will examine the aforementioned five novels in greater detail, with an eye to how Scott depicts Scotland's move from a pre-capitalist society to a capitalist society through the struggles of his characters and his use of the gothic. It is my intention to argue that Scott defines the Scottish Reformation as not only comprised of a series of religious upheavals but also as comprised of a series of economic upheavals. The Reformation will become crucial to

Scotland's definition of itself as the capitalist society Scott depicts in *Chronicles of the Cannongate*, a novel whose frame narrative is a study of the author's own time period.

The Monastery

An understanding of how the gothic mechanisms Scott enlists in his depiction of Scotland's economic revolution work can establish the value of his much-maligned novel *The Monastery* (1820). Called a "failure," a "violation of historical plausibility," and a "faulty" novel by critics, a reading of the work through an economic lens can reestablish its value (Hart 182, Anderson 92, Hart 189). Read through an economic lens, the novel becomes a study of several characters' struggles to find their balance in the shifting economic and social systems of their society. Some are more successful than others, but in the end, their struggle as a whole becomes a metaphor for the country-wide struggles going on in the period. As he has done in previous works, Scott depicts the failing nobility, the rise of the middle class, and the slow death of the Catholic Church and the rise of Protestantism in the novel's pages; however, this work has an added complication. A supernatural character wreaks havoc among the other characters, impacting their lives in ways they do not understand.

This supernatural character, The White Lady of Avenel, draws ire from critics and is often pointed to as the sole reason for *The Monastery's* poor reception in its own time period. The White Lady, a spirit who attempts to protect the interests of the house of Avenel, has been singled out as a violation of the novel's historical probability. Duncan describes her as "an ambiguous use of supernatural machinery" and interprets her as an "all-too-active spook," but her role in the novel makes sense when understood through an economic lens (Duncan 194).

The White Lady should be read as a token of the feudal system who does her best to further the interests of House of Avenel in a capitalist economic age she does not entirely understand. Accordingly, she drives her family, represented by the widowed Lady Avenel, who has been uprooted from its ancestral home by Julian Avenel, whose lack of clear allegiance to

either Church and whose opportunism is proto-capitalistic. The White Lady does not want her mistress to marry a man who is not noble, but she nonetheless encourages her family's drift towards Protestantism, providing a forbidden English-language bible to her mistress. The English-language bible is a symbol of the family's transition to a new age: though the family is Catholic and of noble birth—a dying feudal breed—it will be permitted to exist in the new society, and re-established in its ancestral home because Halbert, a middle-class, Protestant convert, moves to protect its interests. The White Lady, with her old prejudices, is dismayed by the fact that means a “Churl is Lord” (Scott 353). If the White Lady had her way, the House of Avenel would remain a noble line, but the fact that she drives her mistress to Halbert's home allows the House of Avenel to continue for the time being and gives it the possibility of moving into the historical future.

Readers can also understand Scott's use of the White Lady as a response to Mathew G. Lewis' *The Monk*, a novel whose supernatural mechanisms also play a pivotal role in the fates of the characters. *The Monk* details the extraordinarily violent downfall of Ambrosio, a highly regarded Spanish priest. In Lewis' novel, Ambrosio's life of seclusion and repressed sexuality in a monastery allows one of the devil's instruments to reach him and initiate his undoing. Ambrosio thinks, “who but myself has passed the ordeal of Youth, yet sees no single stain upon his conscience? Who else has subdued the violence of strong passions and an impetuous temperament, and submitted even from the dawn of life to voluntary retirement?” (Lewis 22). It is Ambrosio's haughtiness and spirit of voluntary repression, enforced by the monastery's confining walls, that Satan's colleague, Matilda, will exploit by disguising herself as a monk and seducing him. Though Ambrosio bears partial blame for his own undoing, blame can also be placed on the patriarchal order of society that has driven him to the monastery in the first place.

At two years old, Ambrosio was taken from his family by his father's father and abandoned at the convent in order to eliminate the baby's ties to the family's fortune; though many other elements conspired to bring about Ambrosio's fall, readers can trace its origin to this patriarchal dictatorial intervention.

Scott's response to this can be seen in his employment of similar elements of clausturation and the supernatural in *The Monastery*. Societal discord has led to a form of isolation similar to the isolation Ambrosio experiences in his convent for three of Scott's characters. In turbulent times, Simon Glendinning, the father of Halbert and Edward, has been killed defending the Scottish Catholic church, leaving his wife Elspet to raise their two sons alone. The three of them now live in a Tower, which serves the same isolating function as Ambrosio's convent in that it is geographically separated from the rest of society. Scott writes, "To come at the Tower, it was necessary to travel three miles up the glen, crossing about twenty times into the little stream, which, twinning through the narrow river valley, encountered at every hundred yards the opposition of a rock or precipitous bank on one side" (Scott 36). This isolation, and the gothic nature of the geography, makes it an ideal place for the supernatural to step in: the White Lady guides the Lady of Avenel and her small daughter Mary to the sheltering Tower when they have been driven from their house by the fall of Sir Walter of Avenel. The isolation also leads to a repressed sexual tension between the two boys and Mary: though they know they must think of her as a sister, because they are not exposed to other females their own age, they experience complicated feelings of territoriality and desire towards her. One afternoon Halbert is left out as he watches Edward and Mary study together and his sexually driven jealousy overcomes him. The narrator states, "feeling most acutely, yet ignorant of the nature and source of his own emotion, Halbert could no longer endure to look upon this quiet scene, but starting up, dashed his

book from him” (Scott 110). It is jealousy and lust—of a more muted nature than Ambrosio’s but there nonetheless—that provides a unique opening for the White Lady. When Halbert summons her, looking for a vehicle to exorcise his jealousy and prove him the better choice for Mary over his brother, the White Lady in turn uses Halbert as a vehicle to bring Mary back to her mother’s Protestantism, placing the Lady of Avenel’s Protestant bible in Halbert’s care. She takes Halbert on a fantastical journey through the Earth, and the trials she puts him through can be seen as his conversion to the Protestant religion. Halbert journeys to seek the White Lady a jealous boy and emerges from his visit “with the air of a pilgrim” (Scott 120). As in *The Monk* the environment Scott creates allows his supernatural mechanism to be successful; however, whereas Matilda capitalizes on Ambrosio’s temptation by leading him away from religion and into sin, The White Lady tempers Halbert’s temptation by providing him the will to win his beloved.

The sexual repression that is brought on by the isolation of the gothic tower’s location will drive Halbert to the White Lady, Protestantism, love, and eventual fortune. The same sexual repression, coupled with the White Lady’s premonitions, will propel Edward’s decision to join a Catholic monastery and accept a life of poverty. Edward must combat his feelings for Mary just as his brother does. When the White Lady’s tricks make Edward believe that Halbert has been killed, Edward rejoices; but when news reaches Edward that Halbert is still alive, he feels deeply remorseful for wishing his brother dead. Edward comments: “it was rivalry—it was jealous rage—it was the love of Mary Avenel that rendered me the unnatural wretch I confess myself” (Scott 296). Devastated by himself and by the loss of Mary to his brother, Edward is driven more deeply into the Catholic Church, where he feels he can repress his sinful mind and do penance as an Abbott. The White Lady reinforces Edward’s decision when she tells him to

“seek the convent’s vaulted room,
Prayer and Vigil be thy doom;

Doff the green, and don the gray,
To the cloister hence away!"
(Scott 300)

In the White Lady's actions, we can see a shadow of Lewis' gothic creature Matilda. Matilda strips the joy out of religion for Ambrosio by upending his value system when she successfully tempts him to violate the codes of chastity that he has heretofore lived by. As Ambrosio tells her after their first act of intercourse, "Wretched Matilda, you have destroyed my quiet forever!" (Lewis 116). In encouraging Edward to join the Church for the wrong reasons, the White Lady similarly takes the joy out of his religious experience. The novel finishes with the image of a discontented and disconsolate Edward confronting the White Lady. Edward says, "I will face this mystic being . . . She foretold the fate which has wrapped me in this dress, —I will know whether she has ought else to tell me of a life which cannot but be miserable" (Scott 353). The novel's finale shows both Edward, a disconsolate Catholic, and the White Lady, a disconsolate figure of the feudal system, contemplating the future of Halbert and the bride of Avenel. The White Lady laments, "Fall'n is lofty Avenel" (Scott 353). Readers are left with the impression that Edward and the White Lady are fallen as well.

A third reading of the White Lady is also possible; readers might see her as a character who is arguably not part of any economy, but who disregards monetary systems altogether in an extreme response to her economic climate. In *Specters of Marx: The State of Debt, the Work of Mourning, & the New International* (English translation, 1994) Jacques Derrida is interested in connecting the theories of Marx with ghosts. He complicates the assumption that Marx is a historical materialist and believes that Marx cannot let go of ghostly phenomenon, of specters. He writes "now. . . I have just remembered what is haunting my memory: the *first noun* of the *Manifesto* . . . is 'specter'" (Derrida 4). Just as Derrida sees Marx's historical materialism as

mixed up with specters, so Scott's historical fiction is mixed up with specters. Read through Derrida, Scott—one might argue—is compelled to create the White Lady because the change he documents in *The Monastery* of a change from a feudal society to a bourgeois capitalist society makes magic out of what is material. As Marx and Engels state in their *Manifesto*, this change to capitalism makes “all that is solid [melt] into air” (Marx and Engels 101).

Derrida introduces the concept of the “New International,” an antagonistic response to late capitalism, and an idea of an alliance of:

affinity, suffering, and hope, a still discreet, almost secret link. . . an untimely link, without status, without title, and without name, barely public even if it is not clandestine, without contract, “out of joint,” without coordination, without party, without country, without national community. . . without co-citizenship, without common belonging to a class. The name here is given to what calls to the friendship of an alliance among those who. . . continue to be inspired by at least one of the spirits of Marx. . . and in order to ally themselves in a new, concrete, and real way, even if this alliance no longer takes the form of a party . . . but rather a kind of counter-conjuration, in the (theoretical and practical) critique of international law. . . in order to renew this critique, and especially to radicalize it. (Derrida 86)

The White Lady certainly fits the first part of Derrida's description. She is almost a secret; the few who know of her are not willing to acknowledge her existence. She is without status and title, for she does not fit in the established systems of the time. She is without name, for no one knows her true identity. She exists without a clear contracted alliance, for she answers to no one. She moves among the classes with fluidity, addressing the middle class, the religious affiliates, and men of noble birth. She is “out of joint” with all of them, even though she serves the Avenel family. But even her service is unreliable and capricious— she is “out of joint” in that she does not answer to time. She is without coordination, for she works alone. She is without country and national community. The White Lady's description of herself confirms this. She describes herself as:

That which is neither ill nor well

That which belongs not to Heaven nor to hell
A wreath of the mist, a bubble of the stream
'Twi'x a waking thought and a sleeping dream;
 A form that men spy
 With the half shut eye,
In the beams of the setting sun am I.
(Scott 93)

One of the Avenel family's servants describes the White Lady as a Saint who serves the family, waiting on them and performing "Mony brow services . . . to the boot of that, and has dune in the auld histories" (Scott 46). However, the novel demonstrates that the White Lady does not answer to the Avenel family but rather pursues her own agenda for the family. Hence, when Mary faces the White Lady she is deeply afraid of her. Mary also follows the White Lady's directions and not vice-versa; when the White Lady instructs Mary to look under her floorboards where Halbert has hidden Mary's mother's Protestant bible, Mary does so in spite of her deep-seated fear of the White Lady.

The White Lady is a literal representation of what Derrida calls a counter-conjuration to the established economic and legal systems of the society Scott depicts; additionally, in her embodiment of the counter-conjuration, she provides a radicalized critique of the systems that shakes them to their core. The White Lady, on multiple occasions, upends both the old-established economic systems of society (the rule of the Catholic Church) and she also upends the rising bourgeoisie class. When the monastery's Sub-Prior removes a Protestant bible from the possession of the Lady of Avenel, the White Lady unseats him from his horse. The White Lady does not limit her unseating of order and persons to the Catholic Church. When Sir Piercie Shafton, an upstart nobleman allied with Elizabeth I's Protestant economic rule, becomes too problematic, the White Lady gives Halbert the tools to expose his humble origins. The White Lady says: "When Piercie Shafton boasteth high, / Let this token meet his eye" (Scott 169). She

pulls from her hair a silver bodkin that reveals Sir Percie's humble origins as the grandson of a tailor—he is not a true nobleman, but a bourgeois man who has self-contradictorily exploited the feudal system by taking on its airs and posing as a convincing nobleman. When Halbert shows the bodkin to him, he almost loses his mind. “He started up, every limb quivering with rage, and his features so inflamed and agitated by passion, that he more resembled a demoniac, than a man under the regulation of reason” (Scott 181).

The White Lady's critiques and her interventions in the plot fundamentally alter it: she terrorizes the novel's characters, shaking them out of their traditional roles, until they bend to her bidding. Her unreliability has its effects: she makes Halbert believe that he has killed Sir Percie Shafton, and she makes Sir Percie Shafton and Halbert's family believe that Sir Percie Shafton has killed Halbert, when the truth of the matter is that both are alive. The trials the White Lady puts Halbert through (leading him on a terrifying journey through the layers of the Earth) change his character; she engenders his change from a dispirited boy into a strong-willed man. Without her intervention, Halbert would most likely have joined the Catholic Church like his brother, albeit in the role of “bow-bearer and ranger” (Scott 179). The White Lady also forces Edward to choose an extreme: to remove himself from society and into the monastery when he otherwise might have impeded Halbert's forward progress. The White Lady's insertion into the plot is necessary to counter-balance the narrative forces that drive it forward; she changes the plot in ways that make both the story and the workings of the economy less predictable to her readers. Though Scott's narratives are ruled by the story of progress, just as the path of a feudal society to capitalism is a story of “progress,” the White Lady, and Scott, shakes up the progress of the narrative by gothicizing its forward movement and by shadowing economic developments with a specter that melts their material solidity. The critics of the White Lady have not noticed that

Scott prefigures Marx and Derrida's account of the spectral side of historical materialism and historical progress.

Kenilworth

Economics are undeniably the driving force of Scott's novel *Kenilworth* (1821), set in the heart of Queen Elizabeth I's reign of England. As I have stated in the introduction, Scott uses *Kenilworth* to illustrate the repercussions of a secret marriage that violates the economic and social orders of the Elizabethan period: the plot is driven by the Earl of Leicester's choice to marry Amy Robsart without his monarch's consent, a violation of the feudal tradition of a nobleman's receiving his monarch's permission before marriage. Though the Elizabethan Era is often viewed as a settled time due Queen Elizabeth's I's well-known and more tolerant policies regarding religion compared with preceding English monarchs', Scott dramatizes the economic turmoil he sees in the period. In *Kenilworth*, readers can spot the tensions resulting from nascent capitalism in the rise of the middle class (whose businesses play an important role in the novel), the emergence of a powerful female economic figure, and in tensions in master-servant dynamics. And where there is capitalism, there is also the gothic: the introduction of alchemy and the gruesome death of one of the novel's characters are just some of the mechanisms Scott uses to bring the gothic and capitalism into a shared relation.

The rise of the bourgeois class and economic struggles resulting from the same become central to the novel by chapter one. The narrator concedes that it is no coincidence he has chosen to open his tale in an inn, for "it is the privilege of tale-tellers to open their story in an inn, the free rendezvous of all travelers, and where the humor of each displays itself without ceremony or restraint" (Scott 1). This particular inn is a model capitalist market, foreshadowing the capitalist society of Scotland's future. (We will see the inn as such a model again, in *Old Mortality*). It is presided over by Giles Gosling, a Protestant man "of a goodly person and of somewhat round belly, fifty years of age and upwards, moderate in his reckonings, prompt in is payments, having

a cellar of sound liquor, a ready wit, and a pretty daughter” (Scott 1). Max Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1958) can help us understand Giles as not just any capitalist, but as the *ideal* capitalist. Weber argues that the rise of European capitalism was influenced by the Protestant religion; he outlines how the Protestant ethic influenced Europeans to interact with the world through investment and trade. Giles can be viewed as the model capitalist, for he is “calculating and daring at the same time, above all temperate and reliable, shrewd, and completely devoted to [his] business, with strictly bourgeois opinions and principles” (Weber 69). Weber notes that it is “neither dare-devil and unscrupulous speculators, economic adventurers such as we meet at all periods of economic history, nor simply great financiers who have carried through this change [from pre-capitalism to capitalism],” but men like Scott’s Giles, who “avoids ostentation and unnecessary expenditure” (Weber 69, 71).

Each guest at Giles’ inn begins as an equal in his eyes and advances in standing not by virtue of his birth and marriages (as the traditional feudal system would have it) but by virtue of his swift payment; those who pay on time and pay more are of greater value to Giles than those who are of highest rank. The economics of the tavern are part not only of Scott’s introduction to the world of *Kenilworth* but also to the economics of the future, where men are not judged by their religion but by their ability to make money. Giles is even willing to tolerate a guest who he suspects practices the Catholic religion, or worse, is a Jesuit priest (“of whom Rome and Spain sent at this time so many to grace the gallows in England”), because the guest “gave so little trouble, paid his reckoning so regularly, and who proposed, as it seemed to make a considerable stay at [the inn]” (Scott 9, 10). Giles chooses to ask no questions—the danger the guest might present the inn is overridden by the profits that the guest brings him.

In such a modern environment, is it any surprise that the subject of the guests' conversation turns to the New World, a land where the elusive promise of free trade is being established? Giles' nephew, Michael Lamborne, claims he has recently returned from a voyage there. He describes the New World as a utopia where "urchins play at cherry-pit with diamonds, and country wenches thread rubies for necklaces, instead of rowan-tree berries; where the pantiles are made of pure gold, and the paving-stones of virgin silver" (Scott 6). The New World is a future capitalist's haven, where "the profit [is] unutterable" (Scott 7). Lamborne describes that it takes only "a little touch of alchemy to decoct thy house and land into ready money, and that ready money into a tall ship. . . and so hoist topsails, and hey for the New World!" (Scott 7). His statement marks what Marx and Engels describe as the beginnings of an attitude that will destroy "all old-established national industries" by creating

industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. (Marx and Engels 102)

In the introduction of Lamborne and the idea of the New World, however exaggerated the character's descriptions are, Scott shows the beginnings of globalization and the principles of self-advancement and self-interest that go against the feudal system, in which there is no class mobility. The characters' self-interest, as well as Lamborne's invocation of the term alchemy, prefigures the author's use of the gothic later in the novel.

The rise of the bourgeois middle class is almost overshadowed in *Kenilworth* by the rise of the woman as a powerful economic figure. Scott displays the traditional gender roles of the feudal order; however, he also portrays an emerging gender economics. Amy Robsart, the Earl of Leicester's secret bride and a representation of the traditional gender economics of the feudal

order, serves as a double for Queen Elizabeth I, a representative of the new economic order coming to birth. As a representative of the traditional feudal order, Amy Robsart wields no economic power. She is treated as an object and is entirely dependent on her husband and on his servants to provide for her. She is obedient even when it is not in her best interest to be so. Against her better judgment, Amy is forced to pose as the wife of one of the Earl's servants in order to preserve the Earl's status at court. Amy is expressly different from Queen Elizabeth I, who controls not only her own fate but the economic fate of her entire kingdom. Though the Queen is a traditionally feudal figure, by virtue of her ruling without a husband, she is also a representation of life in the new order. Unlike Amy, she is not ruled by men; she rules men. The narrator notes that "Elizabeth. . . was fond of governing by factions, so as to balance two opposing interests, and reserve in her own hand the power of making either predominant" (Scott 150). Her unique position allows her to deftly resolve conflicts between the old and the new economic order. When the Queen is tricked into believing that Amy, who is of noble birth, has married one of the Earl's servants, a man of lower status, she resolves the tense situation, proclaiming, "For this dame's father, we can make his grief the less by advancing his son-in-law to such station as may enable him to give an honorable support to his bride" (Scott 186). Not fully capitalist, she balances her own self-interest with the interest of the kingdom. When she finds out that the Earl of Leicester has betrayed her, and married Amy without her permission, the narrator notes that Elizabeth "suppressing her extreme resentment. . . was still more moved by fear that her passion should betray to the public the affront and the disappointment which, alike as a woman and a queen, she was so anxious to conceal" (Scott 428).

More than one character in *Kenilworth* is openly governed by his own self-interest, one of the basic qualities of the bourgeoisie as defined by Marx and Engels. The most note-worthy of

these are Anthony Foster and the Earl's Master of Horse, Richard Varney. These men are hired as servants: they work for a man who should, by virtue of his rank, be more powerful than themselves. However, the two men reverse the power dynamic of the feudal system by utilizing their role as servants to control their master; though they are working to better themselves by raising their master's, the Earl of Leicester's, status, they control him through trickery and by forcing his reliance on them. The Earl relies on Foster to hide the Earl's secret bride in his house. Varney, who has engendered Foster's service to Leicester, operates solely for his own profits. He is instrumental in the workings of the plot: he has introduced Amy Robsart to the Earl of Leicester in order to secure the Earl of Leicester a wife who will be "bound [to him] by all the ties which can secure her to one who has been the means of gratifying both her love and ambition" (Scott 49). Now Varney keeps the Earl's wife a secret, for he also realizes that his fate is tied with his master's. Indeed, when Varney fears that the Earl, through his "own silly scruples," will reveal his secret wife and ruin his reputation, he goes so far as to hire an alchemist to pose as an astrologist and trick the Earl into believing that his wife should be kept a secret (Scott 216). Though he is in control of the Earl, Varney realizes that he can rise only if Leicester does, and will fall if his master falls. Varney says to himself, "my Lord's interest [is] . . . mine own, for if he sinks I fall in his train" (Scott 51). He moves to increase the Earl's fortune and by so doing, increase his own fortune. The narrator discloses Varney's thoughts about the Earl: "For as you climb the hill, my lord, you must drag Richard Varney up with you; and if he can urge you to the ascent he means to profit by, believe me he will spare neither whip nor spur. . . [the Earl of Leicester] shall make me great" (Scott 74).

In addition to showing the cracks in the feudal system by reversing its power dynamic, Varney and Foster also reveal the economic revolution in Scotland that has resulted from the

disestablishment of the Roman Catholic Church. A discussion between Varney and Foster unveils the complex relationship that lies between the overthrow of the monasteries, spiritual realignments, and economics. Foster has changed his religion in response to the changing times. He is a Catholic-turned-Protestant, as more than one character notes. Giles comments that he “was one of Queen Mary’s Papists, and now he is one of Queen Elizabeth’s Protestants. . . above all, he was poor and is rich” (Scott 21). Foster has achieved what Max Weber describes as “the ability to free oneself from the common tradition” by divorcing himself from the past religion and attaching himself to the more economically profitable religion of the future (Weber 70). As Protestant, he is now able to work for one of Queen Elizabeth’s favored Protestant courtiers. Both Varney and Foster have profited from the economic revolution that occurred when the Catholic Church fell; Foster now lives in a property that used to be owned by the Church, and Varney has risen in favor with the rise of his Protestant master. However, Foster feels unease about how tentative his hold over his new wealth is; should the Catholic Church come back into power, or he fall out of favor with his new Protestant master, he will lose his new home and standing. Foster exclaims to Varney: “Here have you, Master Varney, secured a good freehold estate out of this old superstitious foundation; and I have but a poor lease of this mansion under you, voidable at your honor’s pleasure” (Scott 46). Additionally, Foster is uncomfortable with the sudden change in religious attitude; though he himself has changed religions, he is not happy to be surrounded by men that care only for their wealth and not for their religious well-being. He asks Varney, “is not our good lord and master’s turn better served . . . with decent, God-fearing men, who will work his will and their own profit quietly, and without worldly scandal, than that he should be manned. . .by such open debauchers. . . as. . . Lambourne . . . who are . . . a scandal to my lord’s service?” (Scott 47). Though Foster has openly divorced himself from his old faith

for monetary gain, he is not partial to the idea of modern capitalism, where, as Weber states, “the capitalist system so needs this devotion to the calling of making money. . . [that] it no longer needs the support of any religious forces” (Weber 72).

Varney dismisses Foster’s concerns about the spirituality of his fellow servants with an important argument; one that could very well serve as a foundation for Marx and Engels critique of capitalism. Varney asserts that Leicester

must have his lawyers—deep, subtle pioneers—to draw his contracts, his pre-contracts, and his post-contracts, and to find the way to make the most of grants of church lands, and commons, and licenses for monopoly. And he must have physicians who can spice a cup or a caudle. And he must have his cabalists, like Dee and Allan, for conjuring up the devil. And he must have ruffling swordsmen, who would fight the devil when he is raised and at the wildest. And above all, without prejudice to others, he must have such godly, innocent, Puritanic souls as thou, honest Anthony, who defy Satan, and do his work at the same time. (Scott 48)

Varney here links two facets of capitalism: the law, which he uses to exploit the material system, and cabalists, who make magic out of the material system. Varney has turned each occupation, even religion, into a commodity that can be utilized for his master’s, and in turn, his own personal gain. In doing so, he marks the beginnings of a phenomenon that Marx and Engels document. “The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage labourers” (Marx and Engels 101).

The master-servant dynamic exemplified by Varney and Foster is twinned with the gothic in the novel. Scott exemplifies the repercussions of their actions through his enlistment of gothic elements in the form of alchemy. As a result of Varney and Foster’s plotting, alchemy is introduced into the plot: Varney must consult an alchemist (the same man whom he has hired to pose as an astrologist in order to trick the Earl) named Alasco to create a poison that will subdue Leicester’s bride. In *Scott’s Novels: The Plotting of Historical Survival* (1966), Francis R. Hart

explains the use of alchemy in the novel: he states that “from the outset, when Mike Lambourne. . . returns with a diminishing gold supply to find a new master who ‘may prove the philosopher’s stone to me, and convert my groats into fair rose nobles again,’ we are continually aware of alchemic aspiration and metaphor, and of master-servant relationships built on the quicksand of chemical fraud” (Hart 206). Hart has not explored what the economics of the practice of alchemy might mean for the novel. The formula for alchemy, designed to turn ordinary objects into gold, if discovered, would flood the market, completely overturning both budding capitalism and the feudal system. Foster invests forty pounds in Alasco for that precise reason; and he says, “I deemed them as surely a thousand times multiplied” (Scott 444). Alchemy is also intrinsically linked to the gothic. In enlisting an alchemist, Varney is hiring a man who he thinks dabbles in the dark arts. After conversing with Alasco, Varney says to himself, “Worse than thee, thou poisoning quacksalver and witch-monger, who, if thou art not a bounden slave to the devil, it is only because he disdains such an apprentice! I am a mortal man, and seek by mortal means the gratification of my passions and advancement of my prospects. Thou art a vassal of hell itself” (Scott 221). Though Varney is aware that Alasco’s dealings have the potential to upend the system of “mortal means” of gratification that he values, he is dependent on Alasco and his dark arts to keep his hold over the Earl of Leicester and the Earl’s wife. Scott links the dependence of budding capitalism and alchemical magic together just as Varney does: he shows how the capitalist system that melts “all that is solid. . . into air” is in itself a form of alchemical magic (Marx and Engels 101). Alasco’s involvement with Varney is one of the factors that lead to both his and Foster’s undoing.

As Varney’s plans to have power over the Earl of Leicester increasingly escape his control, gothic elements are progressively more present in the novel. When Amy Robsart escapes

Foster's home, she makes her way to Kenilworth Castle, where Queen Elizabeth is staying "on progress." Amy is caught and confined to Meryvn's Tower, which is said to be "haunted by the spirit of Arthur ap Mervyn... and murdered, in that same tower that bears his name" (Scott 317). Though she is almost raped by Lambourne, she is able to make her escape when her jailer comes to her rescue. Paralyzed with fear, she stays outside until she is found by Elizabeth, who coaxes her to talk by asking her whether she is "spell-bound and struck with dumbness by the charms of a wicked enchanter?" (Scott 363). If Amy were to speak and "break the charms" by confessing her circumstances, the three men would be disgraced and financially ruined. However, quick thinking on Varney's part gets Amy taken for a mad woman, and she is ferreted back to Cumnor Place.

Varney's deception and Leicester's secret marriage can only hold for so long, and so Varney endeavors to get rid of the secret bride; in fact, he is scornful when Leicester weeps for Amy, asserting that Leicester has "no eye to value things as they deserve, and that nature has given to Varney" (Scott 390). In Varney's eyes, the danger Amy places on his master's reputation now outweighs the woman's value. Varney concocts a diabolical end for the woman; she will fall from a great height through a trap door outside of her prison if she tries to escape. The Lady's gothic end is tied to economics: she is imprisoned in "the stronghold where [Foster] keeps [his] gold" (Scott 442). Unfortunately for Varney, his plan to murder Amy is successful; that is to say, rather than ridding himself of the problem, Amy's fall cements Leicester's fall from grace and ensures that Varney will never rise to the fortune he desires. In the end, the truth will out, and the men are condemned in a gothic finale: Leicester is banished from court, Varney takes his own life, and Foster, who flees before he is caught, is discovered years later, a skeleton

stretched over a pile of gold, after inadvertently trapping himself in a one of his secret strongholds.

In *Kenilworth* Scott ends on a cautious note by demonstrating, through his use of the gothic, the perils of pushing too quickly for economic change: all characters who exhibit zealous capitalist ambition are punished for it. However, those characters who keep the middle ground, like Wayland Smith, Alasco's former apprentice, and Giles Gosling, who are guided by their ethic and have ambitions tempered by reality, all profit from it. Wayland Smith is given Foster's property through marriage to his daughter and a place in Elizabeth's court. Giles, presumably, keeps running his inn economically and to his own profit. Tressilian, Amy's lover before Leicester, is given both the promise of favor in Elizabeth's court, Amy's father's estate, and a voyage with Sir Walter Raleigh.

Old Mortality

Old Mortality (1816) begins with two introductions that serve as distinctive economic counterpoints to each other: the first, an introduction to the first edition by Scott's alias, Jedediah Cleishbotham, who narrates how the novel came to be, and the second, the novel's introduction, a description of Robert Paterson, nicknamed "Old Mortality." The narrator's introduction serves as a disclaimer: Jedediah announces that he cannot be held accountable for contents of the novel he introduces, for he is "not the writer, redactor, or compiler, of the Tales of my Landlord" (Scott 9). He claims that he has received the tales from his landlord Peter Pattieson, who left the papers in Jedediah's care before his death. Jedediah therefore "conceived himself entitled to dispose of one parcel thereof, entitled, "Tales of my Landlord" to one cunning in the trade (as it is called) of bookselling" (Scott 13). Jedediah is unabashedly profiting from his friend's death: he will take the praise given to the work (if there is any) and reap the profits, but if readers are unhappy with the novel, he puts the blame on his dead friend.

The character of Robert Paterson, introduced in the following section and discussed in the novel's first chapter, is in sharp contrast with Jedediah. Old Mortality, as Paterson is known, has devoted his life to the business of preserving memories: the narrator explains in the novel's first chapter, "to talk of the exploits of the Covenanters was the delight, as to repair their monuments was the business of his life" (Scott 38). Unlike Jedediah, Old Mortality is selfless and does not profit from the memory of the Covenanters as Jedediah profits from his friend's passing; the narrator remarks that "the religious wanderer [was noted to] have been very poor in his old age; but he was so more by choice than through necessity" (Scott 23). Old Mortality devotes over forty years of his life to the martyrs of the Whig cause, neglecting his family and forgoing worldly pleasures to the day of his death.

The two separate introductions frame the economic statement that the novel makes: it is through the combined efforts of an unabashed, albeit presumably moderate, capitalist, and a zealous man who has rejected all economic systems that the tale has been made available for its readers. In the end, the Covenanter legacy lives on not through Old Mortality's efforts, for Old Mortality will eventually die and the graves he has worked so hard to preserve will fall into disrepair, but through the work of a capitalist. Though Old Mortality shuns profits and Jedediah presumably revels in them, without Jedediah, Old Mortality's ultimate goal of preservation of the Covenanter memory will fail. The remainder of the novel must be read with this mind. Though the Covenanters will lose the battle of Bothwell Bridge, and the truly zealous of their rank will live out their lives on their society's fringes, the Covenanters' goals of freedom from the economic constraints imposed upon them in the period and freedom of worship will be met in part with the help of the moderates among them who profit from the strides the Covenanters make in their rebellion. In that way, though it is not their ultimate intention, the truly zealous Covenanters aid more moderate Protestants in ushering a new age of capitalism into Scotland.

The novel's hero, Morton, fittingly, is not a Covenanter but a moderate; he is a man who has been pushed to rebellion by the injustices he has viewed committed against him and others in his society. Though Morton's father was a famous rebel, young Morton has not followed in his father's footsteps but has lived in relative subordination under his uncle. Morton's first personal rebellion is not of a religious but of an economic nature: Morton's move to break away from the miserly tyranny of his Uncle is not only motivated by his own need for independence and his love for Edith, the woman he perceives he cannot have, but also by a need for economic independence from his uncle. Morton's uncle's "sordid parsimony" impedes his capitalist intentions; Morton cannot make money because his uncle hoards all of the family's capital (Scott

88). Morton determines to break free from his uncle, telling him that he “[intends] to leave this country, and serve abroad, as [his] father did before these unhappy troubles broke out at home. . . [his father’s] name . . . will procure his son at least the opportunity of trying his fortune as a soldier” (Scott 106). When a series of circumstances lead Morton not to serve as a soldier abroad but rather to be taken prisoner by English forces, he takes on some of the selfless attributes and zeal of Old Mortality. Revolted by the insults to his person, he broods on the injustices he feels are being committed against his fellow Scotsmen on the basis of their religion. Scott writes that Morton’s “mind was still more revolted by the tyrannical and oppressive conduct of the Government—the misrule, license, and the brutality of the soldiery—the executions on the scaffold, the slaughters in the open field, the free quarters and exactions imposed by military law, which placed the lives and fortunes of a free people on a level with Asiatic slaves” (Scott 209). Second only to the murders he believes are being committed by the government in the form of executions, Morton’s list of reasons to rebel includes the “free quarters and extractions” imposed by the government on its own people. These are both economic impositions; Morton thinks that the government is working to make citizens economically disadvantaged by forcing them to house soldiers and pay unfair taxes. It is important to note that Morton is not motivated to rebel by religious zeal but by a passionate desire to be treated as an equal by his fellow men and to see his fellow men treated equally economically. In this way, Morton’s goals are similar to those of John Balfour of Burley, the Covenanter leader, because they share in the Protestantism that abets the anti-authoritarianism of capitalism.

Even during Morton’s most zealous moments in the pursuit of equality he cannot match the zeal of John Balfour of Burley. It is Balfour’s grave that Old Mortality would work to preserve, if he could, for Balfour is the incarnation of all the qualities Old Mortality believes the

Covenanters possessed. Balfour is austere and devoted to his cause to the point where he has given up the trappings of his previous life in the pursuit of his cause. The narrator notes that Balfour “was a gentleman of some fortune, and of good family . . . in the younger part of his life he had been wild and licentious, but had early laid aside open profligacy, and embraced the strictest tenets of Calvinism” (Scott 316). Balfour has given up a life of relative leisure for the difficult life of a rebel. Old Mortality has taken the same road in his religious devotion; he has abandoned his family and economic fortune for a life of preserving memories of men like Balfour. And so Balfour’s rebellion is not for the same reasons as Morton—it is not founded in economics and a sense of equality but because of “his own fierce enthusiasm, joined, as some say, with motives of private revenge” (Scott 316). He is characterized by his zealotry and by going “to the very extremity of the most rigid recusancy” (Scott 316). Though Morton and Balfour rebel for different reasons, their affinity suggests that their revolution is multifaceted. They represent both sides of the revolution: Balfour, the spiritual side, rebels because he wants spiritual change in Scotland, and Morton, the economic side, rebels because he wants economic change in the country. Together, they show that Protestantism is allied with the spirit of capitalism, for they go hand in hand.

Balfour blazes a path to his goals in a way that Morton does not, and it is his part in an assassination of the Primate of Scotland that draws Morton into supporting his cause after “the violent measures adopted by Government to revenge this deed, not on the perpetrators only, but on the whole professors of the religion to which they belonged” (Scott 316). This blazing desire to wipe out, to destroy, is how readers can reconcile Balfour with the capitalism his efforts will further in his country and Morton. Though Balfour does not support any economic system that separates worshipers from adhering to the “Covenant between God and the kingdom of

Scotland,” he is especially against the current pre-capitalist economic system that keeps him and his fellow worshippers from practicing their religion freely (Scott 99). Even when things are settled at the end of the novel, when Protestants can worship freely (as Morton notes, “the land has peace, liberty, and freedom of conscience”) Balfour thirsts to destroy the fragile peace that has been established (Scott 283). He tells Morton that his sword “has yet more to do—to weed out the base and pestilential heresy of Erastianism” (Scott 284). It is Balfour’s desire to subvert all established hierarchies which allows readers to reconcile him with the capitalism his efforts have helped to establish in his country, for Balfour’s aim is similar to the phenomenon that Marx and Engels describe is the ultimate effect of the capitalist system. Marx and Engels write, “constant revolutionizing . . . uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations . . . are swept away” (Marx and Engels 101). Balfour can be seen as a manifestation of this drive to keep things in a state of upheaval.

Balfour’s zeal, and the zeal of the most devoted Covenanters, is characterized by Scott’s use of gothic, here supplemented by elements of romance and the sublime. As in *Kenilworth* (1821), Scott uses the gothic to characterize those who push too quickly to change the status quo; Balfour’s zeal to annihilate is illustrated with gothic suggestions. Morton meets Balfour after he has assassinated a holy man—the Archbishop of St. Andrews—an act Balfour takes sinister, satanic pride in and the narrator calls “great and cold-blooded cruelty” (Scott 79). However, romance also comes into play to demonstrate the intensity of Balfour’s religious devotion. In one of the defining scenes of the novel, Morton battles Balfour in a cavern where he has taken refuge, a place that Morton’s “imagination had never exactly figured out” (Scott 279). In this cavern, the gothic shades into the romantic and the sublime. The battle takes place high above

the ground, over an abyss, in a location unreachable except via perilous navigation of a large oak tree bridge. Morton is surprised “how the strange and romantic scene” is (Scott 278). It is comparable to the romantic setting in *Waverley* (1814), in which Edward Waverley, the novel’s hero, meets Flora Mac-Ivor, the sister of a Highland clan leader, in a romantic glen. The narrator states

this narrow glen. . . seemed open to the land of romance. The rocks assumed a thousand peculiar and varied forms. . . the projecting rocks from the opposite side of the chasm had approached so near to each other, that two pine-trees laid across, and covered with turf, formed a rustic bridge at the height of at least one hundred and fifty feet. . . while gazing at this pass of peril. . . . It was with a sense of horror that Waverley beheld Flora and her attendant appear (Scott 175).

However, whereas the romantic setting in *Waverley* is used to showcase Edward and Flora’s growing relationship, the unusual setting in *Old Mortality* is used to showcase two battles: Balfour’s private, gothic battle with the devil, and Balfour’s battle with Morton. Scott writes, “all alone, and in a place of almost unapproachable seclusion, [Balfour’s] demeanor was that of a man who strives for life and death with a mortal enemy” (Scott 279). Balfour’s inward struggles are projected in his mind to the point where he believes he is actually in a swordfight with Satan—neither Morton nor the little girl who guides Morton to Balfour can see Balfour’s opponent. This is a gothic battle, because it suggests either satanic interference, if what Balfour sees is real, or the character’s delusion. A similar phenomenon occurs in the novel during an earlier battle: the Covenanters project the devil outwards on their opponents to the point where they believe they are not fighting with the English and Scotchmen but rather with a supernatural being. Colonel John Grahame of Claverhorse is viewed by the Covenanters as “a man gifted by the Evil Spirit with supernatural means of defense” and the narrator notes that “the awe on the insurgents’ minds was such, that they gave way before Claverhorse as a supernatural being” (Scott 262, 263). But unlike his fellow Covenanters, Balfour is able to control his impulse to

fight with the unseen; as soon as Balfour notices Morton, he “[exerts] that mastership over his heated and enthusiastic imagination, the power of enforcing which was a most striking part of his extraordinary character” (Scott 280). This gothic, romantic and even sublime characterization of Balfour’s worship and the worship of his fellow Covenanters fits with his position on the economic spectrum: though Balfour battles with himself, he also pushes for extreme measures of economic and social change.

Morton, on the other hand, is rarely characterized by gothic attributes, and it is he who will survive Balfour and flourish in his changing society. After he witnesses Balfour’s battle with the devil, Morton challenges Balfour over the title of the estates of Morton’s beloved, a title Balfour stole during the Covenanter uprising. The battle is a sublime one: it evokes principle suspense and pleasurable excitement in the reader.

Morton loses in hand-to-hand combat with Balfour, but ultimately he will advance in station and wealth whereas Balfour will perish as a result of his excessive zeal. The novel’s final action forecasts a new social order: Lord Evandale, a reminder of Scotland’s feudal past, is shot by Balfour. But Balfour is ahead of his time, perhaps. He is killed after fatally wounding Evandale; though his efforts have changed society, he will not live to see them. Only Morton, the moderate protestant, remains unscathed: he will be rewarded with a new fortune and a bride. Morton, whose goals were for a more equitable economic order in Scotland, where capitalism’s new men can pursue their individual prosperity and practice their religion without fear of persecution, is successful.

Though Morton will have a happy life after the novel’s drama concludes, it is important to note another character who has been instrumental in the workings of the plot. As in *Kenilworth*, a capitalist innkeeper plays an important role in the drama: Niel Blane, a man

indifferent to religion who was once married to a Presbyterian, runs an inn and cares solely for profits. Scott notes “the character of the new landlord, indeed, was that of the accommodating kind... [he was] indifferent alike to disputes about church and state, and only anxious to secure the good-will of customers of every description” (Scott 67). Niel, like Giles Gosling of *Kenilworth*, is a modern man and a herald of Scotland’s capitalist future. He does not discriminate against his customers on the basis of their religion; in fact, he learns to profit from the men’s differences, instructing his daughter to keep the sectarians separate and drunk in order to maximize his revenue from them. And as with Giles in *Kenilworth*, the action of the tale is sparked by what happens in Niel’s inn: Morton meets Balfour in the establishment; and news of the assassination of the Primate of Scotland reaches soldiers drinking there. Additionally, it is to Niel’s inn that Morton returns after having been abroad to search for Balfour. Niel’s information about Balfour remains as cautiously impartial as it was in the beginning of the novel. The narrator notes that he speaks of “the births, deaths, and marriages—the change of property—the downfall of old families, and the rise of the new. But politics. . . mine host did not care to mingle in his theme” (Scott 255).

It would be easy to label Niel as a minor character, for he shows up at irregular intervals in the narrative; however, his status as one of the novel’s most important figures is cemented when he is revisited by the narrator after the story of Morton has concluded. The narrator notes that Niel “lived to a good age, drank ale and brandy with guests of all persuasions. . . and died worth as much money as married Jenny [his daughter] to a . . . laird” (Scott 306). Goose-Gibbie, the only other character the narrator discusses after Niel, is ignored, for the narrator “is not quite positive as to [his fate],” and so the novel ends with Niel in mind (Scott 306). Here the curious double-introduction of the novel must be revisited. Just as in the beginning of the novel, where

the Covenanter legacy lives on through the efforts of a capitalist, at the novel's end, Balfour's desire to "sweep away" all facets of his society will be forwarded by capitalists like Niel, who will, over time, transform Scottish society into something that for Balfour would have been unrecognizable. Niel appears to divorce capitalist energies from gothic and romance associations. But, as the next section will show, even in capitalist economies, the gothic shows its face.

Chronicles of the Canongate

In *Chronicles of the Canongate* (1827), the present, the year 1826, is constructed as historical reality. The behaviors of characters in the present are held up as norms against which the behaviors of the people in the past are judged. The main narrative, the real life of Chrystal Croftangry, the narrator, is brought gradually into the present. Chrystal lives in a fully-capitalist society: he is bankrupt, having lost his inheritance, and turns to creating literature to make a profit. Chrystal decides to publish a periodical that will include stories about Scotland's pre-capitalist past to which Chrystal claims he can add "gloss" (Scott 67). He is ambitious that his writings,

having their origin in this Valley of Holyrood, should not only be extended into those exalted regions I have mentioned, but also that they should cross the Forth, astonish the Long Town of Kirkaldy, enchant the skippers and coalliers of the East of Fife, venture into the classic arcades of St Andrews, and travel as much farther to the north as the breath of applause will carry them (Scott 52).

To legitimize himself as a writer, Crystal calls himself "the border between two generations" who "can point out more perhaps than others of those fading traces of antiquity which are daily vanishing; and many a modern instance and many an old tradition" (Scott 50). Chrystal becomes a writer for profit, but he does it to exercise his own imagination in the context of his historical reality. He uses the facts of his reality in the present as a baseline whereby to measure the reality of the stories he creates. Chrystal says, "the object of the whole publication is to throw some light on the manners of Scotland as they were, and to contrast them...with such as now are fashionable in the same country. For my own serious opinion, it is in favour of the present age in many respects" (Scott 53). Although Crystal favors the historical present in his writing, a contrasting gothic imagination drives the two tales that he writes in order to present a society haunted by and intermingled with the past. In "The Two Drovers," the gothic takes the form of

the witchcraft of Robin Oig's aunt, and in "the Highland Widow," the gothic element lies in Elspat's glorified vision of her past and in the description of her reaction to changing economic times. Besides these more obvious forms of the gothic in Chrystal's two tales, the behavior and principles of his characters become in Chrystal's view another instance of the gothic imagination at work, for when compared to the behavior and principles of modern, capitalist Scotland, they go against the grain of capitalist characteristics of his society that have become normative.

In Chrystal readers can see Scott's portrayal of himself. Chrystal uses the reality he writes of as a standard against which to define his society and himself as a writer. He is a narrator who is not always the same because of historical changes that his own life exemplifies. Chrystal has undergone an enormous personal revolution—from a wild youth to someone who wants to be respected—just as, in 1826, Scott underwent an enormous personal revolution, from a wealthy man and famous author to a bankrupt debtor. It is significant that this novel is both the first work of prose fiction that Scott published under his own name and the first work Scott wrote after his economic crash. Coming to terms with the upheaval in his own life, Scott creates a character whose past and present are the result of revolutionary discontinuities. John Sutherland's biography of the author describes this parallel. Sutherland writes: "At one period of his early manhood, Crystal was obliged to retreat to the Canongate . . . to find sanctuary from his creditors. This, of course, is what . . . Scott feared in the early months of 1826 might happen to him as well" (Sutherland 312). The pressures of Scott's world become the pressures of Crystal's. Where Scott felt the weight of his publisher's and creditor's demands for his fiction, writing *Chronicles of the Canongate* between May and July of 1826, Chrystal also feels the demands of his hungry publisher. Crystal describes a man from the printing office who has come

to collect pages he has not yet written as “neither more nor less than an imp of the devil, come to torment me for *copy*, for so they call a supply of manuscript for the press” (Scott 123).

The Chrystal whom readers listen to by chapter five of the narrative is not the same as the one in the past—he inhabits the same body, but the changes he has been through have rendered him different. His identity has become fractured as a result of his personal revolutions (the first one against his family in his youth, the second one as an attempt to rectify his past), so he creates a new one for himself. His literary undertakings become the undertakings of a man who not only wants to amuse himself in “an interval of time which most old bachelors find heavy on their hands” but are also motivated by an author who also wants to be respected by a wider audience, and to have his personal revolutions recognized (Scott 50). Scott’s literary undertakings, in the writing of Crystal, are similar. They are motivated both financially, for of course Scott was attempting to use his fiction to pay off of his debts, and they are his first return to fiction after venturing to write a biography of Napoleon Bonaparte (Sutherland 311). Where Crystal is motivated to create literature in order to gain respect from a wider audience, Scott is motivated in this novel to regain respect from his wide audience after his public economic fall. Carswell writes in his biography of the author that on January 14, 1826, “All that concerned [Scott] was that the topic of the day in Parliament Square—and so in all Edinburgh—should be the amazing revelation that Sir Walter Scott, Bt., of Abbotsford, Sherriff of Selkirk, Principal Clerk of the Court of Session, man of letters . . . had for more than twenty years been a petty tradesman in the Canongate and now could not even pay his debts” (Carswell 133).

Now that Scott and Crystal have each been through a revolution, their respective circumstances give them the ability to look at the revolutions of others and judge them with some authority. It is not hard to draw parallels between the young male characters in his stories, the

young Chrystal, and Walter Scott. Hamish MacTavish, of “The Highland Widow,” the first story that Chrystal uses in his periodical, has a relation to his past that is similar to the one Chrystal has to his— it is not by any means a hard and fast likeness, but one can see circumstances in this narrative that are similar to the personal change that Chrystal underwent. Like Chrystal, Hamish has more than one identity—as the dutiful son and the young man who wants to escape his family. Hamish is expected by his mother Elspat to fill the role of his late-father, a Highland Chieftan shot in the battle of Culloden in 1745. As Hamish grows up, he comes to realize the Highland traditions of his parents can no longer operate in the evolving society.

Chrystal defines himself as an historian of these revolutions by setting himself up as an author who can judge them. In Scott’s novel, Chrystal judges the characters inside his own writings based on their reversion to habits he views as outdated. Though his character’s actions are primarily used for coping with the changing economic realities he creates for them, he describes the characters in gothic terms when their behaviors do not fit with the social standards of the present. The characters of the stories “The Two Drovers” and “The Highland Widow” revert to ways that are not normative for Chrystal’s society—the present— in order to come to terms with their own current realities. For example, Robin Oig McCombich, a Highland cattle drover and the main character of the former tale, comes to feel that he has been dishonored by his friend, Harry Wakefield, a Yorkshire cattle drover. The two have gotten into a dispute about where to put their cattle to pasture while staying at an inn: to settle the dispute, Harry challenges Robin to an English fist-fight. Robin will only fight with the traditional highland broadsword; rather than waiting for Robin to fetch one, Harry hits him. This action causes Robin to feel that his “treasured ideas of self-importance and self-opinion... had become more precious to him... because he could only enjoy them in secret. But that hoard was pillaged... nothing was left to

him—nothing but revenge” (Scott 139). He recalls the gothic prophecy of his aunt, who before Robin set out on his journey to drive his cattle to England, had warned him not leave because she saw that there was “blood on his hand” (Scott 127). The prophecy serves as an appropriate symbol of everything Chrystal thinks modern society has moved away from, and this prophecy “[confirms] the deadly intention which [springs] up in [Robin’s] mind” (Scott 138). Later, as I will show, capitalism itself is spooky. But in pre-capitalist clan society, irrational forces—rather than rational calculation—rule. Robin cannot stand the fact that he has been slighted, and he reverts to ways which seem outdated to Chrystal’s society in order to face his own historical present. This reversion to the past is fatal. Robin murders Harry in cold blood. When it comes time for him to be judged for the murder, Chrystal tells how the English Judge has a divided mind about the sentence that he passes. The Judge declares that Robin “ought personally to be the object rather of our pity than our abhorrence, for he failed in his ignorance [of the ways of modern society], and from mistaken notions of honor [according to the standards of modern society]” (Scott 146). In the end, though, the Judge sides with the order of the present and has Robin executed. He weeps at his sentence but ultimately he conforms to the present—standards that Chrystal favors.

In “The Highland Widow,” another story Chrystal makes available to his readers, Hamish MacTavish momentarily reverts to the behaviors of the past in a time of stress. In his present, he is dealing with a situation in which soldiers (some of whom he knows personally) are coming to punish him for deserting the English army. Hamish has given up his mother’s dream for him—to be a leader of their clan—an existence that he feels is not in keeping with the emerging capitalist order of the time. He feels that the way to best make “an estate” in the new capitalist order for his mother and him is to enlist in the English army and earn money for the family (Scott 88).

Elspat is against the idea, and does her best to thwart Hamish's enlistment. Elspat's behaviors and ideologies represent everything of the pre-capitalist past Chrystal feels has been broken with. She drugs Hamish so that he becomes away without leave and a deserter from the army. He reverts to her old ways, to "untamed and angry passions," as he faces the present, and "the restraint under which [the old passions] were held by his sober judgment, [begins] gradually to give way" (Scott 109). When he loses all of his restraint, he fires on a soldier who has come to arrest him, an act of murder for which he is condemned to die. One can see Chrystal's opinion about this act of murder inserted into the commentary of the narrator of his story. When a clergyman is given the task of bringing the news of her son's execution to Elspat, he sees the mother, and the narrator comments that "it seemed for an instant, as if the Evil Being, whose existence he had disowned, was about to appear" (Scott 118). In aligning Elspat, a living symbol of the thinking of the past, with Satan, Chrystal is not only painting the past in Gothic terms, but he is also painting the past as something that should be learned from and not repeated. It is also apparent that he does not hold with the past way of thinking in that he makes Elspat perpetually repentant for her deeds. She herself is forced to view them as wrong because of the untimely death of her only child; Elspat feels guilty about holding the old ways in esteem every moment for the rest of her days. Elspat will live out the remainder of her days impoverished and alone, forced to come to terms with the fact that her outdated beliefs have caused the loss of her only child.

Scott takes unique, individual characters and simultaneously presents them as being in charge of their own realities and completely at a loss in them. Chrystal and Scott together represent the novelistic project of historical realism in terms of how difficult it is to fit all the pieces of our history together. The self-division Scott presents in Chrystal's narrative and that

Chrystal presents in his embedded narratives is another form of the gothic. Chrystal, Hamish, Elspat, and Robin are all haunted by the past as they attempt to move forward in the present. Scott's contemporary, James Hogg, employed a similar technique three years earlier in *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824). Hogg more overtly uses the technique for gothic ends. In his novel, a father has two sons, the elder of which he raises and educates "partly at the parish school, and partly at home," while the younger son, Robert, whom the father suspects has been conceived by his wife with another man, is given to the Calvinist Reverend Robert Wringhim to raise (Hogg 18). Robert is brought up in an austere environment and "early inured to all the sternness and severity of his pastor's arbitrary and unyielding creed" (Hogg 18). The father's rash decision—the narrator judges that "it is more probable that [Robert] was [George's true] brother in reality"—will allow Hogg to introduce the gothic into the work (Hogg 18). Robert's personality is a product of his new environment. He is raised to believe in the Calvinist principle of predestination: either he is one of the elect, and predestined for salvation, or he is a reprobate, and predestined for damnation. This religious tenet causes a self-division in Robert. He constantly questions himself in order to decipher whether he is one of the elect or a reprobate. A demon, called Gil-Martin, exploits this self-division. He presents himself as a test of Robert's status as one of the elect, and convinces Robert that it is in his best interest to commit murder. After speaking with Gil-Martin, Robert asserts that he "saw and was convinced that the elect of God would be happier, and purer, were the wicked and unbelievers all cut off from troubling and misleading them" (Hogg 125). These murders and Robert's relationship with Gil-Martin will lead Robert to his own death, a spiral of destruction set off by the father's decision to separate his two children. Like Hamish, whose internal split is caused by his mother, Robert is doomed by a self-division caused by external forces.

Being able to define himself and others against his imaginative reality helps Crystal and Scott to make sense of their true, sometimes messy, realities. Through their imaginations, Scott and Crystal are attempting to reach a sense of order in spite of the volatile boom-to-bust disorganization of the capitalist reality they are living. Though Chrystal claims to be “in favour of the present age” he cannot forgo his alliance with the past (Scott 53). He is haunted by the past—both by his own past, where decisions in his youth caused his bankruptcy, and by the past of his country, on which he focuses his writing. The present is of less interest to him than Scotland’s history: he admits that he is “glad to be a writer or a reader in 1826, but I would be most interested in reading what happened from a half century before. We have the best of it. Scenes in which our ancestors thought deeply, acted fiercely, and died fiercely, are to us tales to divert the tedium of a winter’s evening” (Scott 54). In his writings, though, he shows characters who are not merely diverted, but are agonized by their inability to let go of their past traditions in the modern age. Chrystal does not fault them for that. In “The Tale of the Two Drovers,” the judge’s weeping at the sentence he has to pass represents the tears of Chrystal the judge. Chrystal is unsure of the alliance that he has with the present. In this way, Chrystal is an amalgamation of two characters from Scott’s bi-partite introduction of *Old Mortality* (1816). He is like Jedediah Cleishbothan, of *Old Mortality*’s first introduction, for he is in the business of profiting from literature; but he is also like Robert Paterson, of the novel’s second introduction, who was in the business of preserving memories by repairing Covenanter monuments. Chrystal preserves the memories of the past by circulating them in his tales. The gothic elements in the tales show how the past still informs the present, despite the revolutionary chasm that divides *now* from *then*.

Waverley: A Beginning and a Conclusion

Waverley (1814), Scott's first novel, is an exercise in doubling. Each major character has an equally powerful counter-character, a character who invites comparisons to the first through his or her drastically different religious, political, and economic perspectives. The novel's second chapter introduces two brothers, Sir Everard Waverley and Richard Waverley, whose differing political opinions and economic perspectives have caused a rift between them. "Sir Everard had inherited from his sires the whole train of Tory or High-Church predilections and prejudices, which had distinguished the house of Waverley since the Great Civil War. Richard, on the contrary, who was ten years younger, beheld himself born to the fortune of a second brother, and anticipated neither dignity nor entertainment in sustaining the character of Will Wimble" (Scott 37). Richard's position in the line of inheritance causes him to split politically from his elder brother, "adopting a political creed more consonant both to reason and to his own interest than the hereditary faith of Sir Everard in High-Church and in the house of Stewart. He therefore... entered life as an avowed Whig, and a friend of the Hanover succession" (Scott 38). Later, readers meet Rose Barwardine and Flora Mac-Ivor Vich Ian Vor, two women who admire each other and yet represent differing perspectives—where the former is a mild and moderate woman, the latter is a romantic, politically-driven dreamer. The doubling of the novel invites readers to examine the difference between political and economic states, as the novel invites comparisons between different characters' economic principles and between the Jacobites and Hanoverians.

Positioned in the middle of these contrasting characters and viewpoints is Scott's hero, Edward Waverley, a character who is notable precisely because of his mutability and lack of affiliations. He is Richard's son but is raised from a young age by Sir Everard, for his father sees "the growing attachment between the uncle and nephew the means of securing his son's, if not

his own, succession to the hereditary estate” (Scott 44). Edward therefore represents neither the traditional economic values of his uncle nor the more self-motivated, capitalist economic order (if-self contradictory: though he has modern economic values, Richard still wants the propertied endowment of the traditional, feudal economic system for his son) values of his father. In a way that fits his unsettled background and economic position, Edward spends his youth in the dream-world of his own making. Scott describes him as a child who “culled and arranged, from the splendid yet useless imagery and emblems with which his imagination was stored, visions as brilliant and as fading as those of an evening sky” (Scott 55). This penchant for dreaming will make him the ideal receptacle for the romantic perspectives of the Jacobites, Flora and her brother Fergus. Edward lives up to his surname, wavering between his Jacobite and Hanoverian influences, between support of the English and Scottish causes, until, with the defeat of the Jacobites, he settles in the present but nurses a nostalgia for the past. Unlike in the later *Chronicles of the Cannongate* (1827), where Scott will set up a narrator who will judge both the past and the present and eventually side with the present, in *Waverley* the narrator remains as impartial as the hero of his novel.

Accordingly, the narrator complicates his readers’ views of the characters, proving that even the natural conflict that occurs between people of opposing viewpoints is not as clear-cut as it seems from the outset. Richard and Sir Everard Waverley, who begin the novel alienated from each other, are later brought together by an insult to Richard’s person. Richard, a rising statesman, is dismissed by the king—a dismissal that was “accompanied by something like personal contempt and contumely. . . [Richard] retired to the country under the comfortable reflection that he had lost, at the same time, character, credit, . . . and emolument” (Scott 198). Sir Everard is moved by his brother’s plight: “his brother’s disgrace seemed to have removed

from his well-natured bosom all recollection of their differences” (Scott 198). Both brothers insist that Edward resign from the English army, a resignation that will motivate Edward’s alignment with the Jacobite cause. Sir Everard and Richard’s relationship, first on opposing sides and then brought together by insult, is not the only instance of Scott’s multifaceted doubling. In a less obvious instance, the Baron of Bradwardine, a man whose political and economic situation aligns itself with Sir Everard, is placed in parallel with Fergus Mac-Ivor. Both are Scotsmen of the Jacobite persuasion and leaders—the Baron, of his estate, and Fergus, of his clan. The Baron exercises his authority over a select few. Scott writes that on the Baron’s lands “the prejudices of ancient birth and Jacobite politics, greatly strengthened by habits of solitary and secluded authority, which, though exercised only within the bounds of his half-cultivated estate, was there indisputable and undisputed” (Scott 87). Fergus, a Scottish chieftain, meanwhile, leads a large and complex Scottish clan. Rose Bradwardine describes him as “a gentleman of great honor and consequence; the chieftain of an independent branch of a powerful highland clan” (Scott 127).

The Baron adheres to a traditional patriarchal and feudal economic order of inheritance despite the fact that the pre-capitalist traditional order does not make economic sense: he loves his daughter but will not leave his estate to her. Instead, the Barony will be left to a distant relation. The Baron “used to have a perverse pleasure in boasting that the barony of Bradwardine was a male fief, the first charter having been given at the early period when women were not deemed capable to hold a feudal grant” (Scott 119). Fergus exemplifies a debased version of the Baron’s feudal economics. He charges fees for his protection and allows his people to steal from those who have failed to pay the protection. Readers meet Fergus after the Baron, having failed to pay blackmail to Fergus to ensure protection, has a herd of his cattle stolen. One of Fergus’ followers, Evan Dhu, explains the logic of the system: “he that steals a cow from a poor widow

or a stirk from a cotter is a thief; he that lifts a drove from a Sassenach laird is a gentleman-drover. And, besides, to take a tree from the forest, a salmon from the river, a deer from the hill, or a cow from a Lowland strath, is what no Highlander need ever think shame upon” (Scott 148). In the end, both the Baron and Fergus will both lose their economic power, traditional or otherwise. The Baron will forfeit his right to the House of Bradwardine, and Fergus will be executed for his part in the Jacobite Rebellion.

In *Waverley*, unlike in Scott’s later novels, the gothic is almost absent; in its stead romance plays a role in the novel’s pictured historical progress and economic development. Edward’s youth was primarily spent in the library, where he became “particularly well acquainted with Spenser, Drayton, and other poets who have exercised themselves on romantic fiction” (Scott 48). In *Flora*, Edward encounters living romance: Flora is defined by her passion, by a “zeal of loyalty burnt pure and unmixed with any selfish feeling; she would have as soon made religion the mask of ambitious and interested views, as have shrouded them under the opinions which she had been taught to think patriotism,” and this zeal instills in her an ethereal quality that people are drawn to (Scott 169). Edward falls almost immediately under her spell. When Flora guides him into a romantic glen to sing him a Gaelic song, he is filled “with a sense of dizziness” and regards her as a “fair apparition” (Scott 175). In *Flora* Scott nudges the gothic elements in the *White Lady* and *Balfour of Burley* towards romance.

Flora’s passion often takes over all of her senses, and she is regarded as prophetic by the narrator. She prophesies Edward’s quiet future to Rose, but she also prophesies the future of her country.

“The ruthless proscription of party seems to degrade the victims whom it brands, however unjustly. But let us hope that a brighter day is approaching, when a Scottish country-gentleman may be a scholar without the pedantry of our friend the Baron; a

sportsman without the low habits of Mr. Falconer; and a judicious improver of his property, without becoming a boorish two-legged steer like Killancuret.”

Thus did Flora prophesy a revolution. . . (Scott 183)

Though this could be read as Flora simply possessing an astute ability to analyze the current future and political climate, the zeal that gives her an ability to make such predictions tends towards the gothic. Indeed, Flora’s passionate drive has dark, gothic consequences. Readers’ final glimpse of her, on the eve of her brother’s execution, finds her seated “in a large and gloomy tapestried apartment” (Scott 468). Flora, whose passion is a factor in driving her brother to fight in the losing Jacobite Rebellion, is undone by the thought that her passion has led to his traitor’s death. She admits to Edward that she believes that there is a devil inside her, one who implicates her in her brother’s death. Wildly, she tells him, “there is a busy devil at my heart that whispers—but it were madness to listen to it—that the strength of mind on which Flora prides herself has murdered her brother” (Scott 468). She believes herself haunted by her own political ends, admitting that the devil “haunts me like a phantom: I know it is unsubstantial; but it will be present—will intrude its horrors on my mind” (Scott 468).

If Flora is a romantic, sometimes gothic, drug who overpowers Edward’s senses, Rose is presented as the antidote. She is well-educated—in part by Flora—and is under the Jacobite influence of her father; however, her more moderate nature has enabled her to resist the zeal that leads to Flora’s undoing. Flora sees the difference between herself and Rose. Flora is caught up in political intrigues, but she sees a different future for Rose. She prophesies that Rose’s “husband will be to her what her father now is—the object of all her care, solicitude, and affection. She will see nothing, and connect herself with nothing, but by him and through him” (Scott 183). Rose will *see* nothing where Flora can *see*, or prophesy, everything. When Edward’s fighting on the side of Fergus is over, Edward’s mind

turned to the supposed death of Fergus, to the desolate situation of Flora, and with yet more tender recollection, to that of Rose Bradwardine, who was destitute of the devoted enthusiasm of loyalty, which to her friend, hallowed and exalted misfortune . . . [Edward] felt himself entitled to say firmly, though perhaps with a sigh, that the romance of his life was ended, and that its real history had now commenced (Scott 415).

After his final meetings with Flora and Fergus, Edward will be relieved from Flora's gothic spell. Scott narrates that "the next morning, ere day-light, he took leave of the town of Carlisle. . . He hardly dared look back towards the Gothic battlements of the fortified gate under which he passed" (Scott 477). He rides home to his life with Rose, a future which heals him of the horrifying experience he has just been through. The gothic horror of his visit with Flora and of her brother's execution is "softened by degrees into melancholy—a gradation which was accelerated by the painful, yet soothing task of writing to Rose" (Scott 478). Flora's gothic, romantic nature and Rose's counter to it becomes one of the most important dynamics in *Waverley*. In these two characters, Scott's first novel utilizes the gothic in his portrait of Scotland's economic revolution and economic historical progress.

Conclusion

Edward Waverley is memorable because of his constant changing of sides, and this changing becomes a movement typical of Scott's later novels. It occurs in *Old Mortality* (1816), in Morton's choice to fight with the Covenanters, in *The Monastery* (1820), in Halbert's conversion to Protestantism, in *Chronicles of the Cannongate* (1827)—in both Chrystal's ever-changing character and in *The Story of the Highland Widow*—and in *Kenilworth* (1821), in Queen Elizabeth I's changing mind regarding the Earl of Leicester's circumstances. What is notable about this side-changing is not that it occurs, but why it occurs. In general, a sense of duty leads to transgression of a character's original side-taking. Edward leaves the English army

because of a slight that has happened to his father, and that he feels it is his duty to avenge; Morton is moved to support the Covenanter cause because of a fundamental injustice he sees occurring in his society. The narrator says Morton's "mind was . . . revolted by the tyrannical and oppressive conduct of the Government" (Scott 209). Queen Elizabeth I's love and devotion to her favorite Earl is overcome by the wrong he has committed against both herself and Amy Robsart. It is not solely duty that moves the characters to change sides, however—another motive is chance. Often by accident Scott's characters switch sides, not knowing how their current actions will affect them later. It is by chance that Edward moves into the sphere of the Jacobites, and it is also by chance that he is later pardoned and returns to his original side. Edward chooses to save a life of a soldier during the heat of battle, and it is this action that will later give him grounds on which to be pardoned for participating in the Jacobite Rebellion. It is by chance that Morton meets Balfour and is introduced into the Covenanter cause.

The elements of chance and duty involved in the side-changing of Scott's novels are indicative of the fact that the sides Scott is portraying are not as clear-cut as they originally seem. Edward's pardoning by the English, hence by representatives of a more modern, capitalistic society is an example. The bureaucracy of the Hanoverian English should not permit the arbitrary grace of pardons; pardons are a vestige of the Jacobite world of Fergus and Flora. When Edward is pardoned this traditional act of feudal-era grace by a modern society points to the fact that politically, the two sides—pre-capitalist and capitalist, feudal and post-feudal— are not as far apart as they may seem. This political blurring will occur again and again in Scott's novels—from the character of Sir Percie Shafton in *The Monastery*, a man of humble roots whose upward mobility, a signal of the capitalist future, does not have capitalist ends, as he wishes to be considered nobility and represent the feudal order, to Anthony Foster of *Kenilworth*, a man who

has benefited by the dissolution of the Catholic Church—who lives, in fact, on lands that once belonged to it—and yet believes that the Earl of Leicester should be served by “decent, God-fearing men,” Catholic or Protestant (Scott 47). Through the actions, behaviors, and beliefs of his characters, Scott depicts his country’s path to capitalism and modernity as a far from straightforward one. It is through accident, by chance, and by a belief that what they are doing is the right thing, that the characters move forward in the narratives. But if the characters move blindly, the give and take that occurs between the opposing sides Scott displays in his novels allows for progress to occur.

There is a third factor, a gothic and romantic factor, involved in the side-taking. The *Waverley* model establishes a unique relationship among the gothic genre, economics, and patriarchy: Edward’s father is barely present, but haunts Edward’s actions in the novel. His youth is shadowed by two father figures, his father and uncle, of the two, his uncle is a more significant presence; but, Edward’s actions are influenced by his father in spite of his absence. Edward’s actions become motivated by his father’s feeling of being slighted by the English king. This is similar to a phenomenon Derrida finds in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*,

Hamlet is “out of joint” because he curses his own mission, the punishment that consists in having to punish, avenge, exercise justice and right in the form of reprisals; and what he curses in his mission is the expiation of expiation itself; it is first of all that it is inborn in him, given by his birth as much as at his birth. Thus, it is assigned by who (what) came before him. Like Job (3,1), he curses the day that saw him born: ‘The time is out of joint. O cursèd spite,/ That I ever I was born to set it right!’ . . . The fatal blow, the *tragic* wrong that would have been done at his very birth, the hypothesis of an intolerable perversion in the very order of his destination, is to have made him, Hamlet, *to be* and *to be born*, for the right, *in view of the right*, calling him thus to put time on the right path, to do right, to render justice, and to redress history, the *wrong* [tort] of history. (Derrida 21)

In *Waverley*, Scott is working with the same connection between the gothic and patriarchy that for Derrida occurs in *Hamlet*. Like Hamlet, Edward is on a mission that has been assigned to him

because of the family that he has been born into: he has no economic class because he is between classes; he is not his uncle's son, but he has been raised in the privileged world of his uncle, he is his father's son and yet he is not raised by him. In spite of this, Edward's actions will be motivated by his father: "to do right," by him by leaving the English army.

This model of patriarchy without living patriarch can be found in Scott's following novels. In *The Monastery* both Halbert and Edward have been raised without their father, who has been killed defending the Scottish Catholic church. In the two boys' first appearance in the novel, Halbert deeply feels his father's loss. When Halbert is a small child he confronts an English soldier who is visiting the family's home, saying "I will not go with you. . . for you are a false-hearted Southron; and the Southron killed my father; and I will war on you to the death, when I can draw my father's sword" (Scott 41). Edward, more mildly, has kept his father's religion in spite of his father's death; he tells the soldier he will not go with him "because [he] is a heretic" (Scott 41). In *Kenilworth*, more literally, Queen Elizabeth I must bear the burden her father has left her: she must reign over his kingdom, her inheritance. Her actions are influenced by the fact that, in the absence of a living male heir, she must take on a traditionally male role. She strives to deny her feelings for the Earl of Leicester, telling herself that if she were "as others, free to seek [her] own happiness, then, indeed [she could have the Earl]—but it cannot—cannot be." (Scott 362). She takes on her father's traits even if it means going against her heart. "Her hair was loosened by her haste of motion, and her eyes sparkled as they were wont when the spirit of Henry VIII mounted highest in his daughter" (Scott 366). In *Old Mortality* Morton's father has died when Morton was young; however, Balfour of Burley calls upon Morton to repay a debt: Balfour saved Morton's father's life. Now he expects Morton to repay the favor. Morton remembers that "His father, whose memory he idolized, had often enlarged upon his obligations

to this man, and regretted that, after having been long comrades, they had parted in some unkindness at the time when the kingdom of Scotland was divided into Resolutions and Protesters; the former of whom adhered to Charles II” (Scott 86). Morton’s decision to repay his father’s debt sets him off on an adventure of wavering side-taking and of gothic dimensions that will last the duration of the novel. In *Chronicles of the Canongate*, Chrystal includes “The Tale of the Highland Widow” in which Hamish MacTavish is expected to take on his late-father’s role as a highland chief. His mother “doubts not that she should rise to her former state of importance, when [her son] should be able to wield the arms of his father” (Scott 78). It is her expectation that Hamish should follow in his late father’s footsteps that dooms Hamish to a traitor’s death. When Hamish decides to interpret his destiny in a different fashion, joining the English army in order to “emulate his father’s prowess . . . in some other line of warfare, more consonant to the opinions of the present day,” she does her best to sabotage his plans, tricking him into awaking the “unnamed and angry passions which he inherited from his father” (Scott 90).

The prevailing argument of the preceding thesis was that the economic changes of Scotland are the driving force of each of Scott’s novels, deciding the fates of the characters and shaping how Scott judges the country’s present. This phenomenon is present in Scott’s novels, as the plots are driven by the characters’ struggles to come to terms with how capitalism is changing their respective realities; however, the characters without living (or with absent) fathers are also working to come to terms with the fact that they must move forward in the present at the same time as they are haunted by the actions their fathers have taken in the past. Like Hamlet, their fates are partially decided by the roles they have been assigned by those who came before them. And so Scott has depicted the emergence of a modern economy haunted by the specters of

the past: the gothic, and romance, will remain a constant in the characters' changing economic realities, a reminder of those who have come before them.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources:

Hogg, James. *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*. London: Cresset, 1947. Print.

Lewis, Mathew G. *The Monk*. Stillwell, KS.: DigiReads, 2008. Print.

Scott, Walter. *Chronicles of the Canongate*. London: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.

Scott, Walter. *Kenilworth*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1903. Print.

Scott, Walter. *Old Mortality*. Boston: Fields, Osgood, and Company, 1863. Print.

Scott, Walter. *The Monastery*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. Print.

Scott, Walter. *Waverley*. London: Penguin, 1985. Print.

Secondary Sources:

Anderson, James. *Sir Walter Scott and History*. Edinburgh: Edina, 1981. Print.

Carswell, Donald. *Sir Walter Scott: A Four-Part Study in Biography*. London: John Murray, 1930. Print.

Duncan, Ian. *Scott's Shadow: the Novel in Romantic Edinburgh*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007. Print.

Hart, Francis. *Scott's Novels: The Plotting of Historic Survival*. Charlottesville: The UP of Virginia, 1966. Print.

Jacques, Derrida. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Lukács, György. *The Historical Novel*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1983. Print.

Marx, Karl, and Fredrick Engels. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." *Marx/ Engels Selected Works*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Progress, 1969. 98-137. Print.

Robertson, Fiona. *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon, Oxford UP, 1994. Print.

Sutherland, John. *The Life of Walter Scott: A Critical Biography*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995. Print.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958. Print.

Wilt, Judith. *Secret Leaves: The Novels of Walter Scott*. Chicago: Univ of Chicago Pr (Tx), 1986. Print.

Works Consulted

Beiderwell, Bruce John. *Power and Punishment in Scott's Novels*. Athens: University of Georgia, 1992. Print.

Brown, David D. *Walter Scott and the Historical Imagination*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979. Print.

Cockshut, A. *The Achievement of Walter Scott*. New York: New York UP, 1969. Print.

Ferris, Ina. *The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History, and the Waverley Novels*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1991. Print.

Hayden, John. *Scott: The Critical Heritage*. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc, 1970. Print.

Kerr, James. *Fiction Against History: Scott as Storyteller*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge UP, 1989. Print.

Maxwell, Richard, and Katie Trumpener. *The Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

Scott, Walter. *The Lady of the Lake*. New York: Dodo, 2007. Print.

Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: the Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1997. Print.

ACADEMIC VITA of Claire O. Slagis

Claire O. Slagis
319 Vassar Ave
Swarthmore, PA 19081
cos5035@psu.edu

Education: Bachelor of Arts Degree in English, Penn State University, Spring 2010
Minor in Communication Arts and Sciences
Minor in International Studies
Honors in English
Thesis Title: Capitalism Versus the Clan: An Examination of Sir Walter Scott's
Use of the Gothic to Define the Economics of the Scottish Reformation
Thesis Supervisor: Robert L. Caserio

Related Experience:

Editing Internship with The Pennsylvania State University's English Department
Supervisor: Robert L. Caserio
Summer 2003 and 2004
Internship with The Tonight Show With Conan O'Brien
Summer 2009
Supervisor: Erin Martin

Awards:

ACHA Academic All-American
Pennsylvania State University Student Activities Leadership Award
Schreyer Honors College Internship Grant
Department of English Enrichment Scholarship
Pennsylvania State University Liberal Arts Scholarship
Dean's List
Phi Beta Kappa
Published in "Kalliope," 2006, 2007
National Honors Society

Presentations/Activities:

Co-Captain and President of The Pennsylvania State University Women's Ice
Hockey Team.
Nominated by peers to compete in the New York Times' Collegiate Public
Speaking Contest, 2007