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Chapter 4

From Flirtations with Romantic Otherness to a More Integrated National Synthesis

“Gentleman Savages” in Walter Scott’s Novel *Waverley*

Begun in 1805 and first published in 1814, *Waverley* is a historical novel set around the time of the 1745 Jacobite rebellion.¹ Several aspects of Walter Scott’s work which concern us here—that is, the presentation of traditional Highland culture as noble but savage and ultimately doomed to oblivion, and the absorption of selected “Highland” features into the anglophone mainstream of a unified, pacified nation—have already been addressed by previous studies. Some of those even make explicit recourse to postcolonial theory and terminology.² Nonetheless, it seems expedient to readdress *Waverley* here, not only because well-known canonical texts furnish accessible entrance points for readers of introductory surveys like this one, but also because extant postcolonial analyses of *Waverley* are not necessarily very detailed and often do not take account of all its intricacies. Conversely, more detailed studies which are not explicitly postcolonial although they address postcolonially relevant themes do not always bring out the full theoretical implications or overseas colonial parallels in a form which is sufficiently accessible to readers from the international postcolonial mainstream. Thus, it seems desirable to bring both strands together in detail, elucidating the (post)colonial aspects of *Waverley* in a more stringent form, at the same time introducing enough specific textual analysis as well as highlighting overseas parallels more clearly.

The story of *Waverley*’s fictional protagonists is interwoven with historical information about the rising, as well as about Scottish manners, customs, and culture of that time.³ This information appears partly in the main text and partly in footnotes, introductions, and postscripts. The book aimed not only at Scottish audiences, but also at a wider British and international readership. One reason might have been the relative smallness of the Scottish market, so that an ambitious author would naturally look to a wider public.⁴ There may also be patriotic reasons: Scott apparently wanted to increase mutual understanding between the various parts of British society, for instance between English and Scottish people. His footnotes and ethnographic explanations
not only recover aspects of national history for a home audience, but also undertake intercultural mediation and translation. All this links Scott’s work to various novels produced in former overseas colonies which likewise aim to recover aspects of a national past in order to assist nation-building and come to grips with harsh experiences of externally induced “modernization” and rapid historical and cultural change. There as well, such inward-looking interests and the aim to reach an audience in the author’s own country are complemented—or, as some have argued, compromised—by a need or wish to address overseas audiences from very different cultural backgrounds and render one’s own culture intelligible to them. Both in Scott and in those overseas authors, this dual orientation toward inside and outside audiences can render literary production a precarious balancing act. It can incur violent criticism from nationalists who are anxious about a potential sellout and commodification of national culture for the needs of outsiders, about a related danger of distorting national reality, about sacrificing cultural autonomy or distinctness, and about over-adaptation to foreigners’ literary forms, tastes, and expectations. In a Scottish context, similar concerns have been raised about James Macpherson’s Ossianic prose poems.

In the case of Waverley, such problems of cultural translation are not only evident in its mixed target audience or in passages concerned with ethnographic background information, but they are also built into the novel’s plot and the characters of its protagonists. Its deep concern with intra-British cross-cultural communication is one of the reasons why this novel is so pertinent to this study, especially as it does not restrict its treatment to a simple Scottish/English or Gaelic/Saxon dichotomy, but instead has a tripartite structure that reflects the separate identities of the Highlands, Lowland Scotland, and England, further complicated by mutual intermingling as well as foreign, especially French, influences. Another factor which makes Waverley an interesting subject for postcolonial analysis is that it discusses cultural differences not—or at least not always—in order to vindicate cultural heterogeneity, but also in order to contribute to pan-British national integration. In some respects, Waverley voices postcolonial concerns about prejudice and cross-cultural communication problems. But in other respects, for instance concerning its justification of the Union and assimilation, it can be regarded as a master text of British internal colonialism.

The plot revolves around the adventures of Edward Waverley, the young scion of a wealthy English family of mixed political loyalties: his uncle and aunt are Jacobites, while his father is a Whig. Edward himself starts out as a Whig, but his literary tastes (e.g., for tales of chivalry) and general disposition make him susceptible to backward-looking romanticism. Edward takes up a commission in the government army in Scotland in 1744, and after a while takes temporary leave from his regiment to visit his uncle’s friend, the Jacobite Baron of Bradwardine, and his daughter Rose. Their Perthshire home belongs to the Lowlands but is close to the Highland line. During this
visit, Edward makes the acquaintance of a neighboring Gael and is invited to spend some time with his clan to experience the Highlands and their way of life. He befriends the Jacobite chieftain Fergus Mac-Ivor and unrequitedly falls in love with Fergus’s fervently Jacobite sister Flora. When Fergus tries to convince the well-connected English visitor to join the insurgents, Edward is tempted, hoping that this might help him gain Flora’s affection, but he is still reluctant to break his soldier’s loyalty to the Hanoverian government. However, due to a chain of unfortunate events, misunderstandings, and the intrigues of one of the clansmen, Edward is dismissed from the army, and the authorities’ misplaced suspicions of his loyalties hurt his pride. This, together with personal enthusiasm for Flora and the charismatic Stuart prince, sways Edward to join the rebels. Gradually, as the misunderstandings underlying his dismissal come to light, showing that his former superiors in the government army were free from blame, and as Edward perceives the foolhardiness of the Jacobite endeavor, he regrets his enrollment in the rebel forces. Moved by such feelings, he saves the life of an English soldier, Colonel Talbot, and their growing friendship further contributes to Waverley’s change of loyalty toward the Whigs, as well as his disenchantment with the Gaels. Accidentally separated from the troops, Waverley misses the Jacobites’ final defeat. Nonetheless, he is outlawed along with the Baron and Fergus, who have forfeited their estates. Talbot gains Edward a pardon and helps him to purchase the Bradwardine estate, which is afterwards restored to its former owner. Fergus is captured and executed, and Flora prepares to join a convent in France. Edward has meanwhile fallen in love with Rose, marries her, and comes into his English inheritance.

Waverley’s spatial and intellectual journeys offer Scott ample scope for exploring differences within the nation and its population. (Anglocentric) Britain, (Lowland-dominated) Scotland, and Highland Scotland form “Russian dolls” of otherness: the larger units encapsulate the smaller ones, but each is a separate entity; and as Waverley gets further and further “inside,” the spatial units become smaller while otherness becomes greater. Otherness in this novel provokes a variety of reactions. Partly, it is represented in a relatively neutral fashion, for instance where factual information about local customs is recorded without obvious attempts at evaluation. This accords with James Chandler’s argument that writers of the romantic age—despite indebtedness to Enlightened theories about universal historical stages—not only spoke in abstractions supposedly valid for all humanity, but also acknowledged the need to understand historically or spatially different cultures on their own terms, as well as acknowledging intra-cultural contradictions. There was a sense of balance, or dialectic, between particularity and generalization. Chandler also stresses romantic thinkers’ skepticism concerning the objective knowability or judgeability of the past, and their awareness that their own subject position might influence their perceptions. In Waverley, frequent reluctance to set up absolute hierarchies is combined with an emphasis
on multivocality. There is a marked interest in exploring and combating prejudice between Britain’s various subjects, both on the plot level and, presumably, among the novel’s readership. Partly, this happens on the emotional level: Edward’s friendship with Fergus and his romantic affections for Flora and Rose create English-Scottish sympathy which is not merely personal, but also affords a metonymy and blueprint for increasing mutual understanding between Britain’s different ethnic and national groups. Prejudice is also countered on the cognitive level, through increased knowledge. Englishmen are shown to be especially prone to prejudice and to be gravely ignorant of Scottish matters. This is even true of Waverley himself, at least at the beginning, but in the course of the story he gradually gains a deeper understanding of the country. Readers share this learning process.

Elsewhere, reactions to otherness in Waverley are less “neutral” and more reminiscent of colonial discourse. This also takes different forms: partly, there is primitivist romanticism and an idealization of the Other, and partly there is a more critical attitude based on Enlightened progressivism. This underlines that romanticism and Enlightenment—perhaps especially in frameworks of internal and external colonialism—need not be diametrically opposed to each other, but were essentially two sides of the same coin. In Waverley, all the usual tropes of romantic Highlandism are skilfully played on and exploited, but at the same time they are often ironized. However, such irony does not necessarily aim to deconstruct all discursive colonizations of the Scottish or Gaelic Other: often, deconstruction is only aimed at romantic primitivism, while equally colonizing discourse of “improvement” receives less censorship.

Another connection between Waverley and colonial discourse is its concern with mapping. The protagonist’s journeys and the ethnographic paratext chart different geographical and cultural segments of Britain’s more or less “barbarian” north. The English and, with regard to the Highlands, also the Lowland Scottish colonizing eye gains knowledge about the Other, complementing material conquest by intellectual conquest. For David Richards, mapping is an issue where Waverley does not conform to colonial patterns. He argues that spaces which are mapped must always be previously unknown, whereas the Highlands had already been mapped since at least the sixteenth century and thus did not constitute a previously unknown space when Scott wrote his novel in the early nineteenth century. However, it seems legitimate to ask whether the longer history of mapping automatically disqualifies readings which identify colonial mapping in Waverley: Although maps of the Highlands had indeed existed for a long time, many Lowland and English readers in the early nineteenth century still envisaged the terra of the Highlands as sufficiently incognita and “other” to them, so that mappings of an “exotic” Highland space—in Scott’s novels, but also in travel writing—were consumed with eager interest. Waverley’s maps were indeed useless to practical “colonial” projects of the government or of economic investors, who had
long reconnoitered and conquered that space through earlier mapping and infrastructure projects. But the imaginary colonization of the Highlands in the minds of the wider British reading public—whose role as patriotic citizens gave them an ideological stake in the colonization of internal others—was still a very contemporary project in Scott’s time, so that it still seems possible to speak of *Waverley* as a piece of colonial discourse. Moreover, even where people feel that a territory is already somewhat familiar to them, for instance through previous reading or map use, this does not necessarily cancel out the need for further reading and mapping. Richards overlooks that narration and maps can also have a performative function: national identities and colonial discourse both rely on frequent reiteration, for instance to combat anxieties. Hence, even the rereading of familiar maps, or the production of new maps for well-known lands, can contribute to a colonizing discourse.

The treatment of cultural difference in *Waverley* is also noteworthy because most of the boundaries are portrayed as permeable. David Richards seems to assume that both colonial discourse and postcolonial scholarship are necessarily premised on the assumption of very clear boundaries and binarisms between colonizer and colonized, and of internal homogeneity within these groups. The lack of clear binarisms, as well as the existence of strong internal heterogeneity in the Scottish case in general, and in Scott’s novel in particular—for instance concerning the ambivalent role of the Lowlands—is thus, for Richards, a main reason why postcolonial readings are questionable. In reality, however, even overseas colonial discourse, even where it indeed aims for such binarisms, struggles with the messily complex realities of cross-cultural encounters and social hierarchies which do not fit into neat binary frameworks. Hence, the importance of ambivalence and hybridity in *Waverley* (and Scottish culture in general) speaks for, rather than against, its pertinence to postcolonial studies. Partly, this novel actively constructs cultural boundaries, and partly such boundaries are systematically undercut. Ambivalence can also have a specific function in internal colonialism, since the deconstruction of internal boundaries can be motivated by a wish for the ideological unification of Britain’s national community. Boundary-crossing can show the feasibility of amalgamation; and the preservation of selected differences goes hand in hand with their neutralization as a politically disruptive force.

**Mapping Difference: The Lowlands**

Even the Scottish Lowlands often appear “other” enough to be classified as primitive and to be described through colonial discourse tropes. Sometimes, such tropes are only used by certain characters, while the narrator seems to distance himself from them. In other cases, the narrator himself partakes of the
colonizing impetus. Where possible, the following analysis will take account of this distinction. But even where a character’s colonial viewpoint is relativized by narratorial comment, the use of a colonial trope reflects divisions within British society and aspects of popular opinion, as well as contributing to the general ideological matrix which often positioned Scotland among the international ranks of the colonized in the colonial imagination.

When Waverley first arrives at Tully-Veolan, the Bradwardine estate, his initial reaction resembles denigratory kinds of colonial discourse. He focuses on the squalor and primitiveness of lower-class life in the village and voices his critique in the language of Enlightened progressivism:

\[\text{The houses seemed miserable in the extreme, especially to an eye accustomed to the smiling neatness of English cottages. They stood, without any respect for regularity, on each side of a straggling . . . unpaved street, where children, almost in a primitive state of nakedness, lay sprawling. (Waverley 74)}\]

The houses are “miserable cells,” the locals are “sunburnt loiterers” (74), communal agriculture is “unprofitable” (76), the income of landlords is based on “scanty rents” (78), and the estate is only “half-cultivated” (87). Waverley perceives the squalor but almost instantly attempts to romanticize it as picturesque, while the narrator remains more critical of the lack of “improvement” in mid-eighteenth-century rural Lowland life. But even Waverley cannot banish progressivist thoughts, even at the height of picturesque:

\[\text{Village girls . . . formed more pleasing objects; and, with their thin, short gowns and single petticoats, bare arms, legs and feet, uncovered heads, and braided hair, somewhat resembled Italian forms of landscape. Nor could a lover of the picturesque have challenged either the elegance of their costume, or the symmetry of their shape; although, to say the truth, a mere Englishman, in search of the comfortable, . . . might have wished the clothes less scanty, the feet and legs somewhat protected from the weather, the head and complexion shrouded from the sun, or perhaps might even have thought the whole person . . . considerably improved, by a plentiful application of . . . soap. The whole scene was depressing; for it argued, at the first glance, . . . a stagnation of industry, and perhaps of intellect. . . . Yet the physiognomy of the people, when more closely examined, was far from exhibiting . . . stupidity: their features were rough, but remarkably intelligent. It seemed . . . as if poverty, and indolence, its too frequent companion, were combining to depress the natural genius . . . of a hardy, intelligent . . . peasantry.}
\]

Some such thought crossed Waverley’s mind. (75–76, Scott’s italics)
This description of the Lowlands uses a trope which Martin Martin had previously applied to the Gaels of the Western Isles: the concept of a noble savage whose good qualities are perceptible even in a primitive state, but would shine more brightly if the rough diamond were polished by a civilizing mission. Another motif in this passage which is comparable to Orientalist and overseas colonial discourse is the eroticization of exoticized indigenous women. Their mode of dress is unusual to English eyes and reveals more of their bodies than English fashions would, which connotes sexual promise. Later examples of the eroticization of Highland women and their exposed legs can be found on late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century postcards, which often showed Highland women doing the laundry, treading the washing with their skirts hitched up—a sight considered extremely daring by the strict standards of Victorian and Edwardian morality.¹⁸

The otherness of this Lowland Scottish scene to Waverley’s eyes is highlighted when he compares the locals to foreigners: in the passage just cited he feels reminded of Italy, while in another passage he thinks of Greeks (75). The foreigners to whom Lowland Scots are compared are “other” and perhaps also somewhat more “primitive,” but they are still fellow Europeans. The Gaels, by contrast, are usually compared to non-European foreigners, especially Orientals or the indigenous populations of overseas colonies.¹⁹ This distinction is related to the fact that the Lowlanders in Waverley are constructed not as an essentially Celtic, or at least ex-Celtic, population sharing the same descent as the Highlanders, as James Macpherson or James Hogg claimed, but as people of Saxon stock. For instance, the surname of the Bradwardine family, and the first name of its founding father Godmund, sound un-Celtic and even un-Scottish.²⁰

Although the Lowlanders share a common ancestry with the English, they are shown to be less “advanced” than their southern neighbors. The Lowland Scots of the mid-eighteenth century are placed in an intermediate stage of development between old feudal traditions which are more completely preserved in the Highlands, and the modern society already found in England. This intermediary position becomes clear when Highlanders commit a cattle raid upon Tully-Veolan. The Baron’s first impulse is to retaliate in a feudal manner by following the raiders and recover the booty by force of arms, but Rose thinks this inadvisable in a modern polity: “we cannot defend ourselves as in old times, for the government have taken all our arms” (124, also see 125–27, 129). This refers to the post-1715 Disarming Acts which had succeeded in disarming the Lowlands and perhaps some Hanoverian Highland clans, but had not been thoroughly implemented in large parts of the Highlands (125). Waverley shows a Lowland region halfway on the peace-path toward a modern civil society where the use of violence is only permitted to state authorities. Temporarily, the Lowlanders are the worse for it, since they observe rules which their unruly Highland neighbors do not respect: they can no longer defend themselves, and the state cannot protect them either, as its
power or interest does not sufficiently reach the Gaidhealtachd as yet. From a Lowland perspective, it would thus be desirable to either return the whole country to the feudal system of petty armies and constant private warfare, or propel the Highlands forward into disarmed modernity as well. It later becomes clear that the novel advocates the latter path.

The idea of linear development is expressed in metaphors which liken social evolution and history to the course of a human life. The first metaphor is that of old age: several Jacobite characters are advanced in years, such as Waverley’s aunt and uncle, their chaplain Mr. Pembroke, or the Baron of Bradwardine. This suggests that Jacobitism is an outdated political stance, whereas the future lies elsewhere. Apart from physical old age, the Jacobites seem intellectually old-fashioned, for instance because they are preoccupied with dry antiquarian matters and styles, reflected in the excessively bulky and boring theological manuscript which Mr. Pembroke bestows on Waverley for spiritual edification on his journey (which he never reads due to said boredomness), and the Baron’s profusion of Latinate quotations.

The other metaphor relating Jacobitism to a human life span is, at first sight paradoxically, youth. But this is not the youth of newly adult people who take over society from retiring elders and proceed to develop it further according to the needs of the times. Instead, it is the earlier youth of childhood and adolescence—the stage of development before youngsters take on major responsibilities, and before their actions have serious consequences. At this age, people are free to play, and feed on tales and dreams of romance and adventure, without having to be overly concerned with potentially harsh social realities. It is exactly this kind of reading and adolescent romanticism which makes Waverley susceptible to Jacobitism; and it might also play a part in shaping the attitudes and actions of another young Jacobite in the book: Prince Charles Edward Stuart.

Jacobitism is not the only aspect of Waverley’s Scottish experience which is associated with youth. Metaphors of youth are also used to comment on Scottish society in general, as a colonial discourse trope symbolizing the immaturity of indigenous society at an earlier stage of development. In Waverley, Scotland with its residues of feudalism is socially less “mature” than England. The association between feudalism and childlikeness is discernible, for instance, when Waverley finds that the Baron—both a Jacobite and a Scottish feudal landlord—as an elderly man still looks very much like the portrait of his ten-year-old self.

The portrayal of Scotland as a less advanced country which, despite its primitive virtues, needs improvement can even be discerned in the description of Rose:

She . . . showed a natural taste, which required only cultivation. . . . [In] music . . . she had made no proficiency further than to . . . accompany her voice with the harpsichord, but even this was not very
common in Scotland at that period. To make amends, she sung with
great taste and feeling, and with a respect to the sense of what she
uttered that might be proposed an example to ladies of much super-
ior musical talent. Her natural good sense taught her. . . . Her singing
gave more pleasure to all the unlearned in music, and even to many
of the learned, than could have been communicated by a much finer
voice and more brilliant execution, unguided by the same delicacy of
feeling. (111)

Waverley colonizes Rose’s mind by lending her books, interesting her in Eng-
lish poetry, endeavoring to “explain difficult passages” (120), and helping her
to study Italian (378). However, this does not go uncriticized—the narrator
observes: “the wild romance of his spirit delighted a character too young and
inexperienced to observe its deficiencies” (120). Another complication is that
Rose’s intellectual improvement is not entirely owed to Edward, but also to
Flora (367)—the French-educated Highland woman appears more cultivated
than the Lowland girl, and plays a part in the civilizing mission aimed at
Rose’s mind.

Waverley does not always deconstruct colonial tropes and intereth-
nic prejudices—some of them remain unquestioned throughout the book.
Nonetheless, it is instructive to look into further instances where this
novel emphasizes deconstruction, multivocality, and the contextuality of
perceptions. English prejudices about Scotland are frequently exposed as
contrafactual or exaggerated. On the eve of Edward’s departure, his aunt
warns him “against the fascination of Scottish beauty” (71):

She allowed that the northern part of the island contained ancient
families, but they were all Whigs and Presbyterians except the High-
landers; and respecting them . . . there could be no great delicacy
among the ladies, where the gentlemen’s usual attire was, as she had
been assured, . . . very singular, and not at all decorous. (71)

The phrase “as she had been assured” highlights that her opinions are
entirely based on hearsay. That rumour can distort reality is shown when
Edward (and with him the reader) arrives in Scotland: the Baron is a Jacobite
although he is a Lowlander; and Flora is an elegant, sophisticated woman
although she is a Highlander.

Waverley himself also has prejudices, but it becomes increasingly clear
that his English ways of looking at the world do not necessarily apply in
Scotland, whose society follows a different logic. After hearing about the
cattle raid and Fergus’s involvement in the “blackmail” or raid-and-ransom
system, Edward asks “whether this Fergus, with the unpronounceable name,
was the chief thief-taker of the district. ‘Thief-taker!’ answered Rose, laugh-
ing; ‘he is a gentleman of great honour and consequence; the chieftain of an
independent branch of a powerful . . . clan, and is much respected” (127). She further explains that “he is a very polite . . . man, . . . and his sister . . . is one of the most . . . accomplished young ladies in this country” (128). This is one of many passages which emphasize a plurality of perceptions and systems, as well as the contextuality of social values. Other examples can be found in the novel’s concern with names as signals of value judgments and metonymies of entire sociocultural systems, and with the clashes and shifts of cultural values implicit in the plurality of names. For instance, Charles Edward Stuart has multiple designations: Jacobites call him “the Prince,” Whigs call him “the Pretender,” and where both search for neutral ground they call him “the Chevalier” (e.g., 386). Another person with multiple names is Fergus: Edward initially labels him “Mr Mac-Ivor,” only to be corrected by Rose about the niceties (and plurality) of local usage:

That is not his name; and he would consider master as a sort of affront, only that you are an Englishman, and know no better. But the Lowlanders call him . . . by the name of his estate, Glennaquoich; and the Highlanders call him Vich Ian Vohr, that is, the son of John the Great; and we upon the braes here call him by both names indifferently. (128, Scott’s italics)

Referring to a gentleman by the name of his estate is apparently related to feudalism; hence, representatives of Lowland feudalism likewise partake of this custom: “The Baron of Bradwardine . . . was generally so called in Scotland (although his intimates, from his place of residence, used to denominate him Tully-Veolan . . .)” (66).

Multivocality is also reflected in the emphasis on multilingualism. The Baron frequently intersperses his utterances with French words (e.g., 116), which hints at his Jacobite sympathies since France was the asylum of many exiled Jacobites. Although his way of expressing himself is sometimes an object of ridicule, it draws attention to multivocality in a way which ultimately questions the notion that objective standards of cultural evaluation exist. Further multilingualism can be found in the occasional use of Scots, not only in dialogue (e.g., 119) but even by the narrator himself: besides using certain Scottish words, he expressly draws attention to linguistic differences and gives explanations, so that Waverley and the readers increase their linguistic competence together. Chapter 9 ends with the words: “Waverley learned . . . that in Scotland a single house was called a town and a natural fool an innocent” (85, Scott’s italics). Subsequent occurrences of the word innocent are still italicized but no longer explained (105): the reader is now expected to know the term. Further examples of linguistic mediation between Scots and English appear on p. 99 (“the hallan, or earthen partition of the cottage”), or in the Baron’s use of the word sorners (bullying beggars) which is explained in a footnote (125). English people’s occasional reluctance to be
drawn into non-English linguistic universes is taken up in Waverley’s own initial reluctance and bafflement, but his subsequent development shows that such difficulties can be overcome. At first, Scotland appears to Waverley as an Other which is hard—and sometimes even impossible—to understand, let alone imitate, as when he asserts that he will never learn to pronounce *Glen-naquoich* or *Vich Ian Vohr* (128), but eventually his linguistic and cultural competence grows as both he and the reader learn some Scots and Gaelic words.\(^{25}\)

Although Waverley’s knowledge of and sympathy for Scotland increase, he does not lose his English prejudices completely: temporarily imprisoned, he fears trial in a Scottish court because he is ignorant of and prejudiced against Scottish law, while the narrator implicitly questions this attitude (256). The two countries’ traditions are shown to be different, but equally meritorious.

Concern with prejudice is not confined to antipathies between Scottish and English people, but also takes in intra-Scottish ones. Gael and *Gall* pursue their mutual rivalry even when campaigning on the same (Jacobite) side: Lowlanders look “with a jealous eye on the Highlanders’ avowed pretensions to superior valor, and utility in the Prince’s service” (394). This can also be read as an allusion to a later period, between the 1760s and Scott’s own time, when Lowland opinion developed anxieties that the new prestige of Gaeldom—in literature, the British Army, and the symbolization of Scottishness—might eclipse Lowland achievements. Scott is less simplistically pro-Lowland, as he is concerned to show the strengths and weaknesses of both sides. He counterbalances mid-eighteenth-century Lowland prejudices about the Highlanders’ alleged tendency toward fanaticism and violence by showing that some Lowlanders could be just as fanatic and dangerous as the Gaels (304)—although other parts of this novel seem to corroborate the notion that Highlanders are particularly prone to these failures. It is in the description of Highlanders that *Waverley’s* preoccupation with prejudice, and the use of colonial discourse tropes, is most intense.

### Mapping Difference: The Highlands

Again, a geographical divide also represents a historical divide—Waverley travels in both space and time. While England represents the state of the art in modern social organization and truly belongs to the eighteenth-century present, the Lowlands are partly stuck in fourteenth-century feudalism, and the Highlands appear even more medieval, or even pre-medieval.\(^{26}\) The Highlanders’ status as contemporary ancestors becomes explicit in Scott’s “General Preface” to the 1829 edition of the Waverley novels, where he talks of “the ancient traditions . . . of a people who, living in a civilised age and country, retained so strong a tincture of manners belonging to an early period of society.”\(^{27}\) Before Edward leaves home to join the government army, his
Chapter 4

Jacobite uncle regrets that the feudal system of military recruitment is no longer customary in England (65). However, Edward soon finds out that feudal military structures persist in the Scottish Highlands. This helps to make Jacobitism and Highland ways attractive to the young Englishman who has been nurtured on chivalric tales from or about the Middle Ages, and whose education was partly colored by the (in England anachronistic) notions of his uncle. In Scotland, he can live out his chivalric and historical fantasies where they are still part of everyday reality. In Tully-Veolan, he finds it interesting that the region preserves such ancient practices as cattle raids, and “might have said . . . , ‘I am actually in the land of military and romantic adventures, and it only remains to be seen what will be my own share in them’” (129). Waverley again romanticizes Gaels as contemporary ancestors when he encounters an old Highlander who represents a precapitalist, tradeless subsistence economy: “In this person . . . Edward admired a relic of primitive simplicity. He wore no dress but what his estate afforded . . . , nor did his table . . . offer an article but what was of native produce” (193).

At first he is astonished that primitive customs can still be found so close to his civilized home: “It seemed like a dream to Waverley that these deeds of violence should be . . . happening daily in the immediate vicinity, without his having crossed the seas, and while he was yet in the otherwise well-ordered island of Great Britain” (130). It is implied that such barbarism can usually only be expected in remote history or contemporary foreign lands, for instance among Orientals or indigenous populations of overseas colonies. Associations with remote history occur when the abode of the cattle raider Donald Bean Lean reminds Waverley of a “Scythian camp” (146), which alludes to ancient Greek discourse on barbarism. Another link to ancient history appears in a scene at Glennaquoich when Edward is “offered the patriarchal refreshment of a bath for the feet” (162). As the epithet “patriarchal” suggests, such refreshments are also mentioned in the Bible. This echoes James Macpherson’s attempts to conceptualize Highland culture as developmentally coeval with the world of the Old Testament. However, Scott’s description juxtaposes romance and reality in a way which immediately punctures Waverley’s inflated literary dreams of entering ancient worlds: “he was not . . . so luxuriously attended . . . as the . . . travellers in the Odyssey . . . , not by a beautiful damsel . . . but by a . . . skinny old Highland woman, who did not seem to think herself much honoured by the duty imposed upon her” (162). Her lack of enthusiasm also deconstructs romantic ideas about the supposed “natural” and voluntary devotion of “primitive” peoples to their social superiors. But most things can be bought for a certain price—a degree of commercial spirit has even penetrated this remote and otherwise precapitalist region: “A small donation . . . amply reconciled this . . . handmaiden to the supposed degradation; and . . . she gave him her blessing, in . . . Gaelic” (162). The illusion of a devout native/lower class can be restored with the help of money.
“Gentleman Savages” in Walter Scott’s Novel Waverley

In addition to associations with antiquity, Gaels are also likened to more contemporary “barbarian Others.” Waverley exoticizes the Highlands when a scene at Donald’s camp reminds him of “an Oriental tale” (139). Highlandwoman Flora is complicit in the exoticization of her own culture when she calls herself (as translator of Gaelic poetry) a “dragoman” (174), which originally denotes a translator of Oriental languages. Another connection between Gaelic and Muslim Others appears in the title of chapter 58: “The Confusion of King Agramant’s Camp” (395), which here refers to the Jacobite army. Agramant was the king of the Moors in Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso. Comparisons move even further afield when Waverley accompanies the clan on a hunting trip and sustains an accidental injury. A shelter which the Gaels erect for him is called a “wigwam” (189), which likens Highlanders to indigenous North Americans. The clan physician is described in terms which evoke white people’s descriptions of Native American or African “medicine men”: “The surgeon . . . appeared to unite the characters of a leech and a conjuror” (189). His work is accompanied by ceremonies which, to the “modern” outside observer, appear impractical and superstitious:

He observed great ceremony in approaching . . . ; and though our hero was writhing with pain, would not proceed to any operation which might assuage it until he had perambulated his couch three times . . . according to the course of the sun. . . . Edward was given to understand that . . . the ingredients [of the medicine] had been gathered . . . during the full moon, and that the herbalist had . . . recited a charm. (190)

When he finally attends to the injuries, he is “never failing to murmur prayers or spells” (190). When the cure takes “speedy effect,” Edward ascribes this “to the virtue of the herbs,” while the Gaels ascribe it to the spells and rituals (190). Another connection between Highlanders and overseas colonial subjects is established when Gaelic soldiers are described as moving “in single or Indian file” (280).

Othering goes even further: Gaels are not only compared to “exotic,” “primitive” humans, but also to animals. In colonial discourse, the same strategy of dehumanization has been applied to non-European indigenous peoples. In Waverley, a Highlander steals a dead English soldier’s cloak and hides it with “the caution of a spaniel hiding a bone” (329). Another Highlander, who is involved in a clandestine military mission, merges not only into the animal world but even into the inanimate nature of the very soil as he “snuffed the wind like a . . . spaniel, . . . stooped down upon all-fours, wrapped up in his plaid, so as to be scarce distinguishable from the heathy ground on which he moved, and advanced in this posture to reconnoitre” (280). Waverley’s nose is worse than the Highlander’s (280), suggesting that the civilized Englishman is more remote from the animal world than the
uncivilized Gael is. Later, this Highlander moves out of the animal world to reenter the realm of overseas colonized humans: “crawling on all fours with the dexterity of an Indian” (281).

Primitiveness is also suggested by other passages. The attendants of Evan Dhu, a member of the clan gentry, are labeled as “wild Highlanders” (134), the dinner at Glennaquoich “was simple, even to rudeness” (i.e., primitiveness, 162), and clan commoners on the Jacobite campaign are described as follows:

The grim, uncombed, and wild appearance of these men, most of whom gazed with all the admiration of ignorance upon the most ordinary production of domestic art, created surprise in the Lowlands, but it also created terror. So little was the condition of the Highlands known . . . , that the character and appearance of their population, while thus sallying forth as military adventurers, conveyed to the south-country Lowlanders as much surprise as if an invasion of African Negroes or Indians had issued forth from the northern mountains of their own native country. (324)

Here, however, the narrator reports other people’s views rather than his own, for his own feelings are dominated by pity rather than condescension or terror (324–25). A similar report of other people’s prejudices, while the narrator seems more distanced, occurs when the Jacobite army comes into contact with English people: “the ignorant gazed with astonishment, mixed with horror and aversion, at the wild appearance, unknown language, and singular garb of the Scottish Highlanders” (390).

Variations occur in the way Gaelic otherness and “primitiveness” are evaluated. Sometimes the Highlanders appear as noble, sometimes as ignoble savages. The latter is exemplified by Callum Beag, who displays the negative side of clanship and its fierce loyalties: an equally fierce aggression toward people from outside the clan. At times, negative associations are also evoked by the otherness of the Gaelic language, which can form an insurmountable barrier for communication between Highlanders and people from other parts of the country. This in turn can create anxieties and feelings of helplessness in the uninitiated stranger. On first coming into the Highlands, Waverley is left with a guide who hardly speaks any English, whereupon he feels vulnerable and becomes suspicious of the Gaels’ intentions (137). Although in this particular case his fears turn out to be ungrounded, the use of Gaelic, and the gaps of communication and comprehension it occasions, are stressed so frequently throughout the novel (e.g., 143, 190, 195, 273) that it is difficult to avoid the impression that linguistic heterogeneity within a country can pose a serious problem. For instance, when Waverley participates in a Highland hunt, he is almost overrun by a herd of deer because he cannot understand a Gaelic warning (189).
One of the most completely and unsettlingly “Other” scenes he encounters takes place at the camp of Donald Bean Lean, who is othered in a way which not only illustrates Waverley’s perspective, but also plays on the likely expectations of contemporaneous readers. The sensationalist title of chapter 17—“The Hold of a Highland Robber” (139)—might be intended to tickle the reader’s fancy and give a pleasant thrill. Donald is another ignoble specimen of savagery, not only because he is a cattle raider, but also, as readers learn later, because of his intrigues which aim to alienate Waverley from his Hanoverian regiment. Donald himself, however, does not wish to be seen as a savage and tries to wear a civilized mask to impress his guest from the English center. This act of mimicry does not have the intended effect, as in Waverley’s eyes this is worse than honest plaid-wearing barbarity:

He had served . . . in the French army, and in order to receive his English visitor in great form, . . . he had laid aside the Highland dress . . . to put on an old . . . uniform, and a feathered hat, in which he was far from showing to advantage, and indeed looked so incongruous, compared with all around him, that Waverley would have been tempted to laugh, had laughter been either civil or safe. (141)

The description and the “civilized” outsider’s reaction are reminiscent of Marlow’s reaction to the African wearing European dress in Joseph Conrad’s Heart of Darkness more than eighty years later: Marlow feels reminded of “a dog in . . . breeches and a feather hat, walking on his hind legs.”

At Glennaquoich, Waverley also encounters primitiveness to boot, but of a less sinister kind. Moreover, Flora and Fergus are French-educated and multilingual—unexpected elements of “real” civilization in the midst of a primitive culture, as opposed to the sham and incongruous civilization of Donald Bean Lean. Despite his “civilized” traits, Fergus sometimes appears as a picturesque specimen of Highland noble savagery, with the usual aesthetic trappings of colorful garments and weapons which underline his military role and competence:

Peculiar grace and dignity . . . , above the middle size, and finely proportioned, the Highland dress . . . set off his person to great advantage. He wore the trews, or close trowsers, made of tartan, . . . a dirk, very richly mounted with silver. . . . His countenance was decidedly Scottish, with the . . . northern physiognomy, but . . . had so little of its harshness and exaggeration, that it would have been pronounced in any country extremely handsome. The martial air of the bonnet . . . added much to the manly appearance of his head, which was besides ornamented with a far more natural and graceful cluster of close black curls than ever were exposed to sale in Bond Street. (153–54)
As in Martin Martin’s comparison between urban and island women, the natural beauty of the noble savage surpasses the artificial beauty of fashionable metropolitans. The same applies to Fergus’s sister Flora, whose “hair was not disfigured by the art of the friseur, but fell in jetty ringlets round her neck” (167). Thus, Waverley at least sometimes exploits the stock conventions of romantic Highlandism, either because characters, narrator, or author partly subscribe to these notions as well, or in order to play along with the expectations and tastes of contemporaneous readers. The iconography of Gaelic noble savagery also informs the description of Evan Dhu (131): again, it emphasizes not only picturesqueness, but also the physical fitness which seemed to make the Gaels ideal raw material for Britain’s imperial army, once their pacification had progressed far enough to make them trustworthy. Plaid, tartans, armor, and physical fitness are stressed throughout the novel.33 Other aspects of Highland life which appealed strongly to anglophone audiences of Scott’s time and appear frequently in Waverley are Gaelic music, especially pipes (e.g., 192, 219, 321), as well as the beauty of the landscape and its ruins (e.g., 135, 139, 283).

While Waverley uses various tropes of primitivism and noble savagery, it also frequently ironizes them. For instance, it reveals the simplistic and sometimes even entirely fictional nature of such constructs, and points out the negative sides of “primitive” life or of the Jacobite past which serve as a warning against over-romanticization. While Evan represents mainly the good qualities of “barbarism,” being “unpolished” but good-natured and unselfishly loyal, his moral integrity is by no means shared by all his fellow Gaels. Donald does not even display the loyalty to his chief which romantic Highlandism regarded as so typical (363). Fergus’s morals are not entirely noble, either: despite good qualities like “openness and affability,” he also shows self-importance, rashness, authoritarianism, and vindictiveness. While the omniscient narrator hints at these flaws almost from the outset, he notes that Waverley himself as a more romantically minded onlooker would not recognize those faults until later (154). As Fiona Stafford observes, “despite the romantic atmosphere, . . . Fergus and Flora . . . are flawed by pride, intolerance, and political obsession while there is a clear suggestion that their tragedy has as much to do with the character of the race as with external forces.”34

Apart from “racial character” and post-1745 missions of externally induced assimilation, internal social factors also play a part. The narrator qualifies romantic clichés of Gaels as valiant and picturesque ideal soldiers by pointing out that, while the clan elites were indeed of formidable valor and appearance, their commoners seemed a pitiable, poor, half-naked, and insufficiently armed rabble (323–24). This poverty is linked to the unimproved state of the feudal Highland economy: “he crowded his estate with a tenantry, hardy indeed, . . . but greatly outnumbering what the soil was calculated to maintain” (157). Fergus’s Highland home is similarly unimproved as the Lowland estate of Tully-Veolan:
Gentleman Savages” in Walter Scott’s Novel Waverley

There appeared none of that attention to convenience, far less to ornament, which usually surrounds a gentleman’s habitation. An inclosure or two... were the only part of the domain which was fenced; ... scanty crop of barley, liable to constant depredations from the herds. (160)

Romantic idealizations of barren Highland landscapes are criticized: “the hills were high and heathy, but without any variety of surface; so that the whole view was wild and desolate rather than grand and solitary” (160). Such passages still display an undertone of colonial discourse, but now of the Enlightened progressivist rather than romantically primitivist kind.

Enlightenment perspectives on the primitive are also echoed in the representation of Fergus’s attitudes to women. He thinks it completely legitimate to use women and marriage as pawns in political and dynastic schemes, without paying much attention to love or the will and needs of the lady. His own heart is not suited to domestic comforts, as his main pursuit is politics, and he wants a wife mainly as a bearer of children to continue his line, rather than as a beloved companion. In his opinion, matches should be made between the prospective husband and the male guardian of the bride-to-be, such as a father or brother. This does not conform to the modern bourgeois sentimental ideal of love marriages, here represented by the attitude of Englishman Waverley (184, 206, 209, 301–2, 368–69, 373–74, 377, 391). In practice, this ideal has been frequently disregarded even in bourgeois spheres, where women have likewise been married off for material reasons without consideration for their feelings. But in bourgeois ideology, the love marriage served as a marker to distinguish the older “feudal” order, supposedly more coercive and unemotional, from the allegedly more humane morality of the bourgeois age.

Fergus’s attitude to women appears as a morally brutalizing, old-fashioned stance springing from the primitive Gaelic feudal order, or from his education in France (205, 302, 368). France, though some kind of “civilized” center, is marred by its absolutist and essentially pre-bourgeois political system which in English eyes appeared feudal enough to seem dated as well. Certain Scottish Enlightenment thinkers, such as John Millar, considered the treatment of women as an important indicator of social development: the more respect a culture paid to females, the higher it stood on the civilizational ladder. In a debate with Fergus, Waverley says: “I am ignorant of the customs of the Highlands in that particular. But... I would not take the hand of an angel, with an empire for her dowry, if her consent were extorted by the importunity of... guardians, and did not flow from her own free inclination” (391). This can be read as a comment on the barbarity of Highland culture.

A further aspect of Waverley’s portrayal of Highlanders which is reminiscent of colonial discourse is, again, the eroticization of exoticized local women. The short-skirted Lowland girls noted earlier find their Highland counterpart in Donald’s flirty (and rather lengthily described) daughter Alice:
She had secured time . . . to arrange her person in her best trim . . ., a petticoat, of scanty longitude . . .; but . . . clean, and neatly arranged . . .

Her form, though rather large for her years, was very well proportioned, and her demeanour had a natural and rustic grace . . . The smiles, displaying . . . teeth of exquisite whiteness, and the laughing eyes, with which . . . she gave Waverley . . . greeting . . ., might have been interpreted . . . as meant to convey more than the courtesy of an hostess. (146)

Flinging her plaid around her, she advanced up to Edward, and, with the utmost simplicity, taking hold of his hand, offered her cheek to his salute. (147)

However, the novel’s stance toward the primitive is not entirely a colonizing one. There are also passages on Highland culture which display considerable respect for difference. The discrepancy between native and (unreliable) outside perceptions is highlighted when Waverley encounters a Gael for the first time: as the latter enters Tully-Veolan in full Highland costume, to which weaponry is integral, Edward is inclined to be alarmed, whereas the locals are used to the sight and treat it as a harmless matter of fact (131). Another attempt to evaluate different cultures on their own terms is made in the description of the encounter between Highland Jacobite rebels and government troops: “the two armies, so different . . ., yet each admirably trained in its own peculiar mode of war” (332).

Although this novel was written by a Lowland author describing Highland society from the outside, it repeatedly takes care to reproduce the insiders’ perspective as well, for instance displaying awareness of the indigenous logic of cattle raiding. Knowledge of Gaelic norms also extends to poetry: one passage reports that a panegyric by the clan bard ended with a complimentary reference to Flora (170), which reflects the genuine Gaelic convention of ending panegyric poems with a short praise of the lady of the house.

Multivocality is also reflected in an emphasis on linguistic pluralism. In Scott’s novel, even Highlanders who are rather fluent in English use a peculiar kind of English which is neither the Lowland Scots nor the Standard variant. Partly, this Highland English seems an artificial invention for literary characterization, but other elements appear relatively genuine, for example when characters use a considerable amount of Gaelic proverbial wisdom in their English utterances. The text also includes utterances by characters who know very little English, and whose use of this language is so “broken” or pidginized that it seems hardly intelligible to anglophone characters or readers. A local guide once says to Waverley: “Ta cove was tree, four mile; but as Duinhé-wassel was a wee taiglit, Donald could, tat is, might—would—should send ta curragh” (137). Many readers might share Waverley’s puzzlement as
attention is drawn to problems in cross-cultural understanding as well as gradual learning processes: “This conveyed no information. The curragh . . . might be a man, a horse, a cart, or chaise. . . . But . . . Edward began to conceive his meaning when . . . he found himself on the banks of a . . . river or lake” (138)—the curragh is a boat, which soon arrives.

Further Gaelic expressions are introduced throughout the book. Sometimes snippets of Gaelic are given in a linguistically “authentic,” “correct” manner, as in deoch an doruis (drink of the door, 94). At other times, such snippets are at least recognizable, though they appear in rather adventurous spelling, as in Duinhé-wassel for duine-vasal, “gentleman.” Despite such limitations, the use of Gaelic in this novel draws attention to linguistic and cultural gaps. It also displays basic respect for an indigenous language which might not be perfectly understood by author or readers, but which is nonetheless deemed worthy of representation, as a metonymy for a more extended indigenous discourse in the background which forms a discursive universe of its own that can only be partially known and represented by an outsider. This becomes particularly clear in the postscript, where the narrator shows awareness of his linguistic shortcomings, stressing that he was “not born a Highlander (which may be an apology for much bad Gaelic)” (492).

Although Scott’s Gaels are merely fictional characters in an English-language novel by a Lowland author, his emphasis on multivocality allows the “natives,” at least to a certain extent, a voice of their own. Constructed or not, Scott’s fictional native voices highlight the existence and validity of such voices outside this text. However, such tolerance might only have become possible because by Scott’s time the Other was no longer menacing.

Another aspect of Waverley’s quest for tolerance toward Highland otherness is, again, the deconstruction of prejudice. One strategy is to show that prejudice and ignorance are mutual: Gaels and English speakers are equally biased toward each other. The romantic cliché that Highland noble savages are physically fitter than their anglophone southern compatriots is not only believed by outsiders like Waverley, but even by insiders like Evan Dhu: Edward “was anxious . . . to remove the opinion which Evan seemed to entertain of the effeminacy of the Lowlanders, and particularly that of the English” (136). Initially, Evan’s condescension towards Waverley’s hardihood seems justified as the young Englishman is unaccustomed to so much exercise and rough terrain (136), but later Edward shows himself adaptable through training. Another Gael who is ignorant and prejudiced about southerners is Flora: one reason why she is so little impressed by Edward is his shyness, “which, as she had been educated in the first foreign circles, and was little acquainted with the shyness of English manners, was, in her opinion, too nearly related to timidity and imbecility” (317). Further evidence that Highlanders can be as biased and self-righteous as their southern neighbors is afforded by Fergus’s conduct while the Jacobite army occupies Edinburgh:
his attempt to convert his Presbyterian Lowland landlady to Catholicism or at least Episcopalianism (311) could be interpreted as a colonizing mission in reverse.

Not only is othering portrayed as mutual, but boundaries are also shown to be permeable. This novel constantly emphasizes border crossing and cultural mediation. At times, boundaries not only seem permeable, but threaten to dissolve altogether: various instances of hybridity illustrate the artificiality of cultural categories, which are thus exposed as highly unstable constructs.

Deconstructing Difference? Border Crossers and Mediators

While the purest instances of Highland primitiveness are encountered among the lower ranks of Gaelic society, the principal representatives of its elite, Fergus and Flora, are cultural hybrids, partly still anchored (or re-anchored) in traditional Gaelic society, and partly shaped by the “high civilizations” of Europe’s metropolitan cultures through education at the French court. This French connection makes even their metropolitan features alien to the British mainstream, but they are undeniably “cultured.” They are also relatively familiar with British metropolitan culture: both speak flawless English, and Flora is well versed in English literature, such as the works of Shakespeare. Fergus’s hybridity, which sets him apart from most of his “primitive” clansmen, is reflected in the fact that he, like his fellow Jacobite the Baron of Bradwardine, often intersperses his English utterances with French words (e.g., 353, 376). Where Fergus uses Gaelic traditions, he does so selectively, and only when it suits his purposes. When Waverley arrives, Fergus’s monocultural clansmen want their chief to present himself according to Gaelic custom with a large feudal retinue. Judging from their own experience, which is limited to the Highlands, they think that such a retinue would impress not only local chiefs, but also an English outsider. By contrast, Fergus is a man of the world who estimates an outsider’s reaction more realistically and refrains from using Gaelic tradition in an inappropriate context:

He was well aware that such an unnecessary attendance would seem to Edward rather ludicrous . . . ; and while few men were more attached to ideas of chieftainship and feudal power, he was . . . cautious of exhibiting external marks of dignity, unless . . . when they were most likely to produce an imposing effect. Therefore, although, had he been to receive a brother chieftain, he would probably have been attended by all that retinue . . . , he judged it more respectable to . . . meet Waverley with a single attendant. (153)

Fergus, similar to the Lowland Baron, is midway between two civilizational stages:
Had Fergus MacIvor lived Sixty Years sooner . . . , he would . . . have wanted the polished manner and knowledge of the world which he now possessed; and had he lived Sixty Years later, his ambition and love of rule would have lacked the fuel which his situation now afforded. (157)

He is already half-civilized, but his authority (and some of his character) is still that of a feudal chieftain. Traditional, and perhaps cliché, Gaelic features include his belief in supernatural apparitions. Fergus’s ambivalence is evident in his dismissive remarks to Waverley about the Highland traditions of which he partakes: Fergus speaks of “my rude mansion” (161), calls the clan feast “the barbarous ritual of our forefathers” (171), and “apologised for the confusion” created by the great number of clansmen at the festivity. He seems to regret that his position binds him to respect rude and unprofitable traditions: “I must find them beef and ale, while the rogues will do nothing . . . but practice the broadsword, or wander about the hills, shooting, fishing, hunting, drinking, and making love” (164). It is not entirely clear how much of this critique is sincere and how much is tactical mimicry to establish common ground with his English guest by affecting to share an outsider’s perspective. Elsewhere in the novel, Fergus is evidently fond of certain feudal traditions, such as his unquestioned authority as a chieftain. Perhaps he wants the best of both worlds: loyal feudal followers, grand titles, independence, and a sense of his own greatness, plus a modern landlord’s freedom from obligations to his tenants, and a capitalistically maximized income. Fergus’s attitude toward Gaelic poetry likewise appears ambivalent: he asserts that he has no interest in it (169, 171–72, 181), while Flora claims that he does (172).

Fergus’s ambivalent position as a perpetual border crasser also becomes clear from the fact that he and his foster brother Evan, now Jacobites, have only recently served in the Black Watch of the government army (150, 157). Fergus does not correspond to conventional romantic images which portrayed Highlanders as figures who fought for the Stuarts out of pure unselfish loyalty and moral righteousness. The chief of the Mac- Ivors is a calculating opportunist who changes his allegiance as its suits his own interests. The narrator highlights this deviation from the cliché, stating that Fergus “was too thorough a politician . . . that we should term him the model of a Highland Chieftain” (170). The rest of his clan does seem to fight for loyalty alone—but a loyalty which looks to the chief, not to kings or the nation at large. Concerning their change of allegiance from King George to the Stuarts, Evan says: “you must ask Vich Ian Vohr about that; for we are for his king, and care not much which of them it is” (150). This suggests that the Gaelic commoners are not really to blame for the Jacobite uprising, as the guilt lies with the chiefs who abused the clansmen’s loyalty for rebellious purposes. It also implies that, once Jacobitism is defeated, the clan commoners have just as much potential to be loyal servants of the Hanoverian regime. This had
become the dominant interpretation of Jacobite guilt and Highland loyalties by Scott’s time.

Flora, too, is a hybrid figure between tradition and modernity:

The dress of the lady . . . partook partly of the Parisian fashion, and partly of the more simple dress of the Highlands, blended together with great taste. (167)

She was highly accomplished, and had acquired those elegant manners to be expected from one who, in early youth, had been the companion of a princess; yet she had not learned to substitute the gloss of politeness for the reality of feeling. (169)

Flora partly appears as a noble savage highly suitable for romantic idealization. But such associations are also deconstructed—while the enraptured Waverley often romanticizes Flora and “primitive” Gaeldom, the narrator is more distanced. When Flora sings to Edward by a waterfall, this appears to him as a real-life, unpremeditated materialization of the kind of scene one would otherwise only encounter in stories. The narrator, by contrast, tells us that the scene has been carefully landscaped and prepared by Flora, so that it is not the result of a “natural,” unaffected Highland environment and culture, but the manufactured product of artful stage management (174–77, 502). This contrast between apparent naturalness and actual artificiality is underlined by the labeling of the glen in which this performance takes place as a “sylvan amphitheatre” (175)—“sylvan” connotes forests, unsettled country, wildness, and an absence of civilization, whereas “amphitheatre” evokes the “high” civilizations of ancient Greece and Rome. The illusory nature of romanticized images is also exposed when the narrator points out that Waverley’s idealization of Miss Mac-Ivor results from the absence of the object of desire—only distance allows us to distort reality and forget its faults:

Distance . . . produces in idea the same effect as in real perspective. Objects are softened . . . and rendered doubly graceful; the harsher and more ordinary points of character are mellowed down. . . . There are mists too in the mental as well as the natural horizon, to conceal what is less pleasing in distant objects, and there are happy lights . . . upon those points which can profit by brilliant illumination. (225–26)40

This applies not just to Edward’s idealization of Flora, but also to early nineteenth-century readers’ romanticization of the Jacobite era, which by then had become distant in time.41 Scott’s language in this passage also suggests applicability to romanticizations of anything Highland, as mists and
striking light effects are both an actual part of the Highland landscape and a conventional element of its representation in romantic discourse.

Another instance where Flora appears as an intermediary between barbarism and civilization, and where it is possible to identify another jibe at romanticism, occurs when she is presented as a translator of Gaelic poetry into English. The terms in which this role is described humorously allude to Macpherson’s Ossian—Fergus tells Waverley that his sister dabbles in poetic translation, and asks her to provide a sample for their guest, to which she replies: “You know how little these verses can possibly interest an English stranger, even if I could translate them as you pretend” (172). The same scruples were initially felt by Macpherson. Another parallel is Fergus’s supposition that Flora had a hand in the original Gaelic text of the poem the clan bard presented on that night. To counter suspicions of forgery, Macpherson had prepared Gaelic versions of his Ossianic works, but instead of being his original sources (as claimed), these were largely retranslations of his English texts. Skeptics soon suspected this, too, though conclusive proof was only published later. Waverley also alludes to Macpherson when Flora claims that Fergus considers his bard a greater poet than Homer (172), and that, if these poems “are ever translated into any of the languages of civilized Europe, cannot fail to produce a deep and general sensation” (173). Later, the narrator refers to feasting as “the joys of the shell, as Ossian has it,” and says that the Gaels were “probably as deeply engaged in the discussion of politics and news, as Milton’s spirits in metaphysical disquisition” (188)—Paradise Lost had been a reference point for Macpherson when he positioned his “translations” in an epic framework. Although Waverley is set long before Macpherson published his Ossianic texts, these passages ironically foreshadow the translations and debates of the 1760s.

Another, though more implicit, jibe at romantic Ossianism can be discerned in the reference to a Highland girl at Glennaquoich who sings a “burlesque elegy of a countryman on the loss of his cow” in “comic tones” (182)—which undermines post-Macphersonian mainstream clichés which pictured all Gaelic poetry as melancholic and sublime. One of the most explicit deconstructions of romanticism comes from Flora herself, although she is the very character who at first glance seems most suited to be a romantic figure. Talking to Rose, she perceptively and ironically says:

High and perilous enterprise is not Waverley’s forte. He would never have been his celebrated ancestor Sir Nigel, only Sir Nigel’s eulogist and poet. I will tell you where he will be . . . in his place—in the quiet . . . domestic happiness, lettered indolence, and elegant enjoyments of Waverley-Honour. And he will refit the old library in . . . Gothic taste, . . . and gaze on the deer . . . in the moonlight—and he will repeat verses to his . . . wife . . . —and he will be a happy man. (370–71)
“‘And she will be a happy woman,’ thought poor Rose” (371)—on whom the irony is entirely lost.

Occasionally, Evan likewise features as a border crosser: sufficient competence in Lowland culture enables him to speak “in good English,” though this English is unidiomatic, being heavily interspersed with translated Gaelic metaphors which to an outsider would sometimes render his speech unintelligible (132). Callum Beag is also capable of cultural border crossing: when he accompanies Waverley to the Lowlands, he quite successfully mimics Lowland speech in order to conceal his Highland background which, if discovered, could result in capture by radical Whigs (229). Further border crossing occurs in the following passage:

Our hero . . . endeavoured to address them, but was only answered with “Cha n’eil Beurl’ agam,” i.e., “I have no English,” being as Waverley well knew, the constant reply of a Highlander, when he either does not understand, or does not choose to reply to, an Englishman or Lowlander. (273)

The first border crossing is accomplished by Waverley himself, who has now picked up enough Gaelic to understand simple sentences like this one, though not enough to gather the information he desires without recourse to English. The second border crossing is the narrator’s provision of a translation for the reader—who thus learns some Gaelic, just like Waverley has before. Third, many Gaels are here said to know some English. A fourth border crossing occurs in the mimicry performed when they tactically cross back from their actual bilingual and hybridized state into the fake purity of an entirely “uneducated,” monoglot Gaelic Other when it suits their purposes.

While these passages highlight the existence of border-crossing Gaels, there are also characters that cross the Gael-Gall boundary from the other side, that is, Lowlanders who have a limited competence in Gaelic culture. The Lowlanders of Perthshire, as inhabitants of a border zone, are multilingual or at least use Gaelic loanwords in their English, for example in “what they technically called deoch an doruis, a stirrup-cup” (94, Scott’s italics). Again, the reader is invited to participate in the border crossing by learning about the Other’s language and culture, helped by a footnote which explains the deoch an doruis custom in more detail (497–98). Here, a further Gaelic loanword is used and explained: “the clachan or village” (497). Neighboring Lowlanders’ partial competence in Highland culture is also evident in the dealings between the Baron and Evan when the latter comes as a post-cattle-raid ambassador to negotiate terms: “the Baron . . . well knew their customs, and the proper mode of addressing them” (132).

One of the most important border crossers is Waverley himself: an Englishman who goes native and becomes highlandized. Even his surname marks him as an in-between figure: with his “wavering and unsettled habit of mind”
(73), he is torn between cultures, women, and political opinions. His indecision makes Edward an ideal site for the projection and exploration of different cultures and attitudes, where their conflicts can be negotiated and finally resolved. Waverley’s shifting cultural identities are often externalized through dress. Symbolically reclothed in tartan, he temporarily becomes a Highlander. This first happens at the start of a hunting trip shortly before the Jacobite rising: “Waverley complied so far with the custom of the country as to adopt the trews (he could not be reconciled to the kilt), brogues and bonnet, as the fittest dress for the exercise . . . , and which least exposed him to be stared at as a stranger” (187). Later, when the Highlanders rescue him from captivity among the Whigs, they again clothe him in Highland dress, this time in a plaid (273–74). The Stuart Prince ritualistically affirms Waverley’s admission into his service by arming him “after the Highland fashion” with a broadsword which is an heirloom of the Stuart family (298). Soon afterwards, Fergus has Edward clothed in trews and a plaid of Mac-Ivor tartan, one of Fergus’s own cloaks, and “a blue bonnet of the Prince’s pattern” (300). This reclothing is a symbolic act of political and cultural appropriation which makes Edward a Jacobite and an honorary Gael—in Fergus’s words: “you will be a complete son of Ivor” (300). This point is repeated when the chief calls Edward “an adopted son of Ivor” (313). Waverley himself still has practical difficulties with his new identity, for instance needing assistance in handling his new garments (320). Nonetheless, he has sufficiently gone native as a barbarian—“our hero having now fairly assumed the ‘garb of old Gaul’” (305) alludes to the primitivist song quoted in chapter 3 of this study.

When the Baron learns of Edward’s gaelification, he takes umbrage, as he would gladly have offered Waverley a different kind of scottification as a Lowlander through a position among the Bradwardine contingent of Jacobites (303)—as in Edward’s wavering romantic inclinations, Lowland and Highland Scotland vie for his sympathy. Initially, the Highlands have the upper hand in his heart and imagination, as they give him the opportunity to live out his romantic fantasies. To his enjoyment, being part of his friend’s Highland regiment gives him firsthand experience of the loyalty normally only shown to a chief (326). Nonetheless, Edward never goes completely native: at least inwardly, he always remains skeptical about certain Highland attitudes, such as the belief in second sight. Despite his romantic inclinations, he is never totally “irrational.”

Waverley’s hybridity enables him to mediate between Britain’s ethnic and political factions. How far he has moved away from the anti-Scottish stance of many of his English compatriots becomes clear when he meets Colonel Talbot, who is a much more uncompromising specimen of the “prejudices which are peculiarly English” (366). Talbot calls the Gaels “a gang of . . . cut-throats” (366) and staunchly refuses to be impressed by the beautiful and accomplished Flora. He puts his dislike down to her allegedly affected airs, but the narrator gives a different reason, namely that to the biased Colonel
“the white cockade on the breast, . . . and the Mac at the beginning of a
name, would have made the devil out of an angel” (366). Talbot is also preju-
diced about the Gaelic language: “your Highland friend, Glen—what do you
call his barbarous name?” (386). He exclaims:

Let them stay in their own barren mountains . . . : but what business
have they to come where people wear breeches, and speak an intelli-
gible language? I mean intelligible in comparison with their gibberish,
for even the Lowlanders talk a kind of English little better than the
negroes in Jamaica. (387)

This is juxtaposed to the opinions of the now much less biased Waverley, who
tries to temper his fellow Englishman’s xenophobia: “For shame, . . . you
swell at sight of tartan, as the bull . . . at scarlet. You and Mac-Ivor have
some points not much unlike, so far as national prejudice is concerned. . . .
You judge too harshly of the Highlanders” (387).

Despite the novel’s emphasis on tolerance and mediation, it becomes clear
that Waverley’s infatuation with Highland culture is related to his personal
immaturity, and must be overcome in a process of growing up. As in the
presentation of the Lowlands, personal immaturity and social primitiveness
go hand in hand and are frequently expressed through images of childhood
or adolescence, which must inevitably be transcended by personal and social
maturation. Waverley’s repeatedly emphasized youth and his romantically
immature, unrealistic, and irresponsible reading play an important role in
making him susceptible to Jacobite, primitivist, and gaelicizing influences—he
attempts to reenact fantasies based on literature. Though intelligent, Edward
is inexperienced, does not yet trust his own judgment, and defers to the
advice of others, such as Fergus (201–2). When Waverley loses his commis-
sion in the Hanoverian army, his hurt pride makes him cry like a child and
seek consolation: “he . . . threw himself into Mac-Ivor’s arms, and gave vent
to tears of shame and indignation” (202). Childlikeness makes him open to
manipulation, for instance when Fergus, after comforting him, tries to use his
hurt pride to steer him into the Jacobite camp (203).

Sometimes Fergus himself also displays attributes of immaturity, childli-
arness, or adolescence, as he is proud, stubborn, and easily offended.47 His
willfulness may also be encouraged by his absolute power as a feudal chief.
Thus, his personal flaws and immaturity also stand for the immaturity of the
“primitive” society he lives in. The connection between the Gaelic “primitive”
Other and immaturity is also reflected in Scott’s own reaction to Macphers-
son: first, he was enthusiastic, but later came to think that “Ossian . . . has
more charms for youth than for a more advanced stage.”48

In Waverley, the protagonist’s individual growing up—becoming a little
older, but also, as is repeatedly stressed, physically stronger—is linked to
social and political maturation.49 During this process, the Hanoverian order
and its representative Talbot become ever more likeable.\textsuperscript{50} Waverley’s maturation culminates in his becoming a de-highlandized pro-Hanoverian subject, getting married, and coming into his inheritance, accepting adult responsibility as the head of a family and as a landlord. His particular choice of wife underlines the superseding of individual, political, and civilization “immaturity.” His first love, Flora, stands for social immaturity, representing “primitive” Highland culture and an equally dated and fated Jacobitism. She also highlights Waverley’s personal immaturity by being slightly older than himself, and intellectually at least his equal, if not even superior. Rose comes from a less “backward” society, and makes Waverley feel and appear more mature than he would have seemed next to Flora: Rose is slightly younger and much more dependent on his intellectual influence. The marriage between Rose and Edward reenacts the Union of England and Scotland on a personal level, unionism being an important part of “mature” progressivist Whig attitudes. Significantly, this marriage is a union between England and Lowland Scotland, while the Highlands ultimately play no great part: they must be neutralized, marginalized, or even killed off before the union can take effect—Jacobitism is vanquished, Fergus is executed, and Flora is neutralized by ceasing to be an object of desire for Waverley, and later retreating into the loveless, childless celibacy of a nunnery.\textsuperscript{51} In view of the parallels between Edward’s individual maturation and national maturation, Murray Pittock appositely calls \textit{Waverley} a “\textit{bildungsroman} of nations.”\textsuperscript{52} 

Read in this way, \textit{Waverley} appears essentially as a narrative of progress. A different reading is proposed by Cairns Craig, who argues that the linearity of progress is destabilized by underlying skepticism. For him, Waverley as an Englishman initially represents a more “advanced” stage, while his highlandization exposes the civilization process as reversible. Although the end of the novel shows that this reversibility is only temporary and is again superseded by a forward-looking narrative of progress, Craig argues that \textit{Waverley’s} beginning poses unsettling questions, for instance whether progress really is inevitable, whether it can last, or whether it can be reversed, both personally and socially.\textsuperscript{53} While plausibly pointing out potential anxieties of progressivists, such a reading might overemphasize the reversability of progress in this novel because Edward’s highlandization might not really be a civilization regression: although Waverley the Englishman comes from a \textit{society} which on the whole seems more advanced than the Scottish/Gaelic one, his \textit{personal} stage of development is that of an adolescent and, moreover, an unrealistic romance reader. As such, he is from the outset, even when still in England, linked to a “backward” mindset. An adolescent will inevitably grow up, and once this has happened, the childhood metaphor of progress usually does \textit{not} allow a lapse back. In this light, progress seems less insecure and reversible than Craig assumes.

The inferiority of Jacobite and Gaelic otherness is expressed not only through the childhood metaphor, but also through the metaphor of femininity:
like children, women have often been assumed to be intellectually inferior, or at least more prone to emotionalism, dreaming, romanticism, and fantasy. This was linked to the notion that women and children could afford to dream more than adults and men could, because it was with the latter that social power and responsibility lay, so that their tasks forced them to be more rational and pragmatic. For women and children it was supposedly quite safe to dream, as less depended on their actions and choices. Hence, it seemed safe to commend or tolerate attitudes in women and children which would be less acceptable in an adult male. In practice, male adult authority was supposed to overrule social inferiors like women and children. Such familial images furnished basic metaphors of power which were also highly popular in colonial discourse, where subject populations were both infantilized and feminized.

In Waverley, admirers of Gaelic poetry are either unsophisticated clan commoners (guests at the feast), women (Flora, 169–72, 181), or outsiders who do not understand the language and are childishly romantic (Edward). Gaelic literature is designated as a pursuit for the powerless or the intellectually inferior. Fergus, by contrast, does not seem to share this admiration—unless he is merely unwilling to admit it, as Flora suggests. Waverley’s association of Gaelic culture with dependence and femininity anticipates the progressive feminization of the Celtic image in the further course of the nineteenth century.

Feminization can also be observed in relation to Jacobitism: Fergus’s Jacobitism is shown to be opportunistic and morally flawed, while Flora’s Jacobitism is a fitter subject for unqualified romanticization, as hers is really idealistic and unselfish (168–70, 184–85, 206–7, 216). She shares her first name with a devoted female Jacobite from real history who after Culloden played a crucial role in helping the Stuart prince escape from his pursuers, and who has featured prominently in romantic images of Jacobitism ever since: Flora MacDonald. It was safer to romanticize Jacobitism in a woman than in a man because women had less social power, whereas male Jacobitism posed political and military danger.

As the “immaturity” and flaws of his Jacobite and Highland involvements become more obvious, the newly hybridized but gradually maturing Waverley embarks on a reverse course of de-gaelicization. Even before he meets Colonel Talbot, Edward starts to see his hybridized position as unnatural and hears the calling of his own “race”—when he perceives the approaching English government soldiers at Prestonpans, his cultural allegiances waver yet again:

Waverley could plainly recognise the standard of the troop he had formerly commanded, . . . the English dialect, . . . the commanding officer, for whom he had once felt so much respect. . . . Looking around him, he saw the wild dress and appearance of his Highland
associates, heard their whispers in an uncouth and unknown language, looked upon his own dress, so unlike that which he had worn from his infancy, and wished to awake from what seemed . . . a dream, strange and terrible, and unnatural. (333)

For a while, Waverley has represented the intersection of two cultures and historical stages within himself, but now this ambivalence unsettles him—his lately acquired Highland features seem increasingly alien to him, and the lost unity of his identity has to be restored. Increasingly disenchanted with, and suspicious of, his Gaelic comrades, he eventually dismisses his Highland attendant and hires a servant from Edinburgh (365), apparently because a Lowlander seems less alien to him than a Gael, and thus more trustworthy. Edward’s appreciation of English virtues also increases, for instance when he endorses Talbot’s approach to military activity, which is “in every point” that of “the English soldier,” as opposed to the apparently inferior approaches of Fergus and the Baron (365). When Talbot advises Edward to leave the Jacobite army as soon as possible, he again clothes this matter in the symbolic language of dress: “Unplaid yourself on the first opportunity” (388). Lacking such an opportunity, Edward perforce remains highlandized for a while, so that eventually he “equalled any Highlander in the endurance of fatigue, and was become somewhat acquainted with their language” (389). After a quarrel with Fergus, however, Edward takes the first step to complement his inward de-gaelicization by an outward one. When the Jacobites left Edinburgh, he initially intended to follow the custom of English military elites and ride on horseback, but was immediately persuaded to follow Fergus’s example and march on foot at the head of his clan (320). Now, however, Edward mounts a horse and decides to ask the Baron for a place in his regiment (393), that is, he leaves the innermost of the Russian dolls of otherness, de-highlandizes himself, and joins a Lowland troop, which is culturally closer to his English roots. As Buzard puts it: “Waverley undertakes the ethnographer’s double journey: he undergoes immersion in the alien culture in order to achieve a greater . . . withdrawal from it, to that final distance from which one can assert authoritative apprehension of the whole.”

After the reconciliation with Fergus, Edward joins the Gaelic infantry once more, but now this apparently stems more from personal affection for Fergus than from a primitivist romanticization of Gaelic culture (408)—essentially, Waverley has become an outsider again. This process is completed after his separation from the Jacobite army and his ultimate reintegration into the English establishment. Nonetheless, even after the final pacification of the country, he retains at least some Highland habits, which can now be relished in a peaceful, harmless context. He clings to the Highland custom of traveling on foot when he journeys through Scotland, and the narrator reemphasizes that “his campaign had considerably strengthened his constitution, and improved his habits of enduring fatigue” (432). Residues of Waverley’s
hybridity and partial Gaelicness are reinvoked shortly before Fergus’s execu-
tion, when the chief implores Edward: “You are rich, . . . and . . . generous. 
When you hear of these poor Mac-Ivors being distressed . . . by some harsh 
overseer or agent of government, remember you have worn their tartan, and 
are an adopted son of their race” (472). Fergus asks Waverley to alleviate 
Gaelic suffering by the only method which remains possible: through alms 
given by a man who had once been one of them, but now acts from the posi-
tion of a paternalistically benevolent, wealthy English outsider who is not 
persecuted by the government, unlike many Scottish leaders. Edward honors 
Fergus’s plea.

Through these developments, cultural hybridity loses much of its subver-
sive potential and survives only in a politically neutralized form, as part of an 
essentially unionist, assimilative, and thus arguably “internally colonialist” 
vision.

The End of Otherness? Unionist and Hanoverian Conclusions

Waverley cements this ultimately pro-establishment message by emphatically 
suggesting that the victory of unionism, Hanoverianism, assimilation, and 
progress was inevitable. This is already evident in the childhood metaphor 
which implies an inescapable growing-up. The inevitability of “progress” is 
also expressed in the suggestion that the flaws of Gaelic traditions and Jaco-
bitism made them self-destructive, or so destructive for the rest of society that 
their disappearance was necessary.

Clanship must disappear because it is destructive to the national com-

munity: it makes people unreliable patriots, as their loyalties to the crown 
are always indirect and mediated through the chief. Clansmen are loyal 
to a king as long as the chief commands them to be, but can turn swiftly 
into insurgents if the chief changes his mind. This is also noted by Waver-
ley’s Lowland servant Alick: “there’s mony o’ them wadna mind a bawbee 
the weising a ball through the Prince himself, an the Chief gae them the 
wink” (395). The disruptive force of clanship also creates rivalries within the 
Jacobite camp, whose smallness in the face of a far more numerous enemy 
means that any additional problems arising from internal fragmentation are 
disastrous (e.g., 399). The heterogeneity of this army is underlined through 
language, in a Babelian confusion of Scots, Gaelic, French, and English: “The 
Baron lectured, the Chieftain stormed, the Highlanders screamed in Gaelic, 
the horsemen cursed and swore in Lowland Scotch” (398). The confusion 
becomes even more hilarious when the Prince commands a French officer to 
call the Scottish troops to order—the Frenchman speaks none of the local 
languages sufficiently well, so that the soldiers can barely understand his com-
mands (399–400): “‘Messieurs les sauvages Ecossois—dat is—gentilmans 
savages, have the goodness d’arranger vous.’ The Gaels, comprehending the
order more from the gesture than from the words . . . hastened to dress their ranks” (400). Notably, when the Frenchman addresses the Lowlanders, he varies his address from “gentilmans savages” to “Gentilmans cavalry” (400), reflecting the widespread perception that Lowlanders were less barbaric than Gaels. Presumably it is just as well for the Jacobite army’s discipline that the Gaels have not understood the Frenchman’s words: had they realized that he called them “savages,” they might have created further uproar in indignation, instead of obeying the order. The linguistic cacophony is metonymic of the general heterogeneity of pre-Union Scotland or pre-Culloden Britain. Destroying clanship and at least partly assimilating Scotland is inevitable if British nation-building is ever to be completed.

The fated and partly self-destructive nature of the Gaels is also reflected in a lack of successful love stories, of marriages, and of children. In Macpherson’s Ossian, one reason why the “Dark Age” Gaelic heroes die out is the fact that their “mating patterns were too destructive.” In Waverley there is no successful Gaelic mating either: Evan loves Alice, but is executed before serious wooing can take place. Fergus is denied even the (by bourgeois romantic standards unsatisfactory) feudal dynastic marriage he desires; death without heirs awaits him instead. His sister highlights the exchange of the one for the other while she works on his shroud: “I am sewing his bridal-garment” (469). Flora herself asserts from the beginning that her heart is not bent on marriage at all, as she lives only for the Stuart cause (214). After Jacobitism’s final defeat she seals her—and her whole lineage’s—fate of infertility and heirlessness by retiring to a convent.

The extinction of the Mac-Ivor chieftainly line is also linked to the devastations which its clan (and by implicit extension, Gaeldom in general) has wrought upon its non-Gaelic compatriots: for centuries, Mac-Ivor chiefs when close to death have been visited by the ghost of a Lowlander killed by one of their ancestors. Fergus is no exception and sees the ghost before his capture by government forces and his resulting execution. That this ghost is a Lowlander might be significant. It appears as if the sins which generations of Highlanders have committed against their Lowland neighbors and against the peace of the realm are being revenged upon them. This national dimension is emphasized in connection with Fergus’s own death as the last of his line and one of the last traditional Highland chieftains. This element of revenge, now completed with the death of the “last of the race,” is hinted at when Fergus asks the ghost: “art thou come to . . . enjoy thy triumph in the fall of the last descendant of thine enemy!” (473).

While earlier sections of this novel give much space to plurality, and even show it respect, in the end none of this plurality escapes the now ubiquitously valid and enforced law of the British state. This is made clear by the proclamation of the verdict over Fergus and Evan, which carefully takes in every single one of their multiple names: “Fergus Mac-Ivor of Glennaquoich, otherwise called Vich Ian Vohr, and Evan Mac-Ivor, in the Dhu of
Tarrascleugh, otherwise called Evan Dhu, otherwise called Evan Maccom-bich, or Evan Dhu Maccombich—you, and each of you, stand attainted of high treason” (464–65). Although the narrator condemns the mercilessness of the law against Fergus, this condemnation is uttered not in the name of Highland difference, but in the name of British national unity: “Such was the reasoning of those times, held even by . . . humane men towards a vanquished enemy. Let us . . . hope that, in this respect . . . , we shall never see the scenes, or hold the sentiments, that were general in Britain Sixty Years Since” (464).

One negative aspect of the Union was the extension of the harsh English law on high treason to Scotland, whose own legislation on the subject had been less cruel (474)—in this respect, Scotland seems to have been more civilized than England and was forced to regress into more primitive practices by its southern neighbor. However, unified Britain can again ascend on the scale of civilization and mercy after the country has been sufficiently pacified: Fergus prophesies that the harsh treason law will be abolished “when there are no longer any wild Highlanders to benefit by its tender mercies—they will blot it from their records, as levelling them with a nation of cannibals” (474).

The “vanishing race” is not the only motif Waverley has in common with Macpherson’s Ossian. A related trope, likewise used by both, is the imagery of ruins: when Waverley contemplates Fergus’s and the Baron’s loss of position—and potentially also of life—he worries about “those who clung for support to these fallen columns, Rose and Flora” (429). Another metaphor shared by the two authors, and by various later nineteenth-century writers on Celticity, is twilight: “the success at Falkirk had thrown a faint and setting gleam over the arms of the Chevalier” (429). The gleam implies a certain amount of moral luster which indicates that historical change, though unavoidable and ultimately beneficial, also entails regrettable losses. Stafford suggests that this very “ability to accept the inevitability of change, while retaining a deep affection for the superseded, . . . made Scott’s work so influential in the nineteenth century.”

Apart from Fergus, his clan has another “last of the race” figure in Edward Waverley, since he, though not a native Gael, was temporarily an “adopted” one. Like Macpherson’s Ossian, Waverley stands at the interface between clashing historical periods and cultures, and survives the death of his companions. Edward’s perspective, however, is less bleak, as he is not a full member of the vanished Gaelic world and can thus reemerge from his Highland phase into his modern English self, surviving as part of the new order with a happy future and offspring.

Besides clanship, another Other which must disappear is Jacobitism, whose mid-eighteenth century manifestations are referred to as “that unhappy period” (159) by the narrator. Jacobitism is likewise presented as self-destructive, for instance when, elated by their victories, Jacobite soldiers fire their guns at random in celebration and one bullet grazes Flora’s temple. Though she, in equal high spirits, dismisses the injury as unimportant
(358–59) and thus comes off as laudably high-minded, the incident also highlights a negative trait of Jacobitism, presenting its followers as so imprudent that they disregard the safety of people from their own party, and even their own lives. Further critique is expressed through ironic treatment of the Stuarts’ claim to royal authority, and of the Jacobites’ hopes that they would fare better under the old dynasty than under the new. The Stuarts’ support for Britain’s Jacobites is exposed as a sham, consisting of little more than grand empty gestures (159). After the Prince’s arrival, there is an overinflation of high-sounding titles without substance, and of high-ranking military commanders without enough troops to direct (e.g., 286–87, 297–98, 322, 356). Waverley also deconstructs the Jacobite notion that the contemporary Stuarts were more native to Britain than the originally German House of Hanover, and had more affection for their Scottish subjects than the Hanoverians had. The deconstruction of these ideas is most obvious when the Stuart Prince as a skilled diplomat tries to pacify internal quarrels in his army:

Charles Edward . . . rode to the head of the Mac-Ivors, threw himself from his horse, . . . marched about half-mile along with them, inquiring into the history and connections of Sliochd nan Ivor, adroitly using the few words of Gaelic he possessed and affecting a great desire to learn it more thoroughly. He then mounted his horse once more, and galloped to the Baron’s cavalry, . . . examined their state of discipline; . . . enquired after their ladies . . . ; rode about an hour with the Baron . . . , and endured three long stories . . . . “Ah, Beaujeu, mon cher ami,” said he as he returned to his usual place . . ., “que mon métier de prince errant est ennuyant, par fois . . ..”60 (402–3, italics mine)

This is tactical transculturalism: the Prince pretends interest in the cultures and concerns of all his subjects because he presently needs their support to establish his power. He talks to all of them about what interests them most: genealogy for the Gaels, discipline and ladies for the Lowlanders—a difference which again shows the latter’s higher civilization.61 But in truth he remains a foreigner. His usual place is with the French friend he has brought from exile. French is the language in which he feels most comfortable and reveals his true feelings. This debunks the myth of Stuart nativeness, showing the Prince as just another power-mongering hypocritical foreign politician. In fact, he is portrayed as being more foreign than King George, who in Talbot’s description is not a German outsider, but a scion of a dynasty gone native: “my prince can be as generous as yours. I do not pretend . . . that he confers favour with all the foreign graces . . . of your Chevalier errant; but he has the plain English manner” (456, italics Scott’s).

When Flora laments the debased state of the disaffected Scottish elites, she hopes for “a brighter day . . . when a Scottish country-gentleman may be a
scholar without . . . pedantry . . . ; a sportsman without . . . low habits . . . ; and a judicious improver of his property without becoming a boorish two-legged steer” (183). For her, this future is linked to the restoration of the Stuarts. The narrator, by contrast, implies that even the hopes of the Jacobites are ultimately fulfilled by the Hanoverian triumph, so that there can be no just qualms left to smolder among the populace: “Thus did Flora prophesy a revolution, which time indeed has produced, but in a manner very different from what she had in mind” (183).

After the Jacobite peril is neutralized, as many (ex-)Jacobites as possible are reintegrated into the victorious body politic. Their political motivations are downplayed and substituted with more excusable ones. The Whig Major Melville makes a statement which proves prophetic for the respective fates of Fergus and Waverley, and for the future rehabilitation of other (ex-)Jacobites who had merely been misguided: “He whom . . . hope of personal advantage, has led to disturb the peace . . . , let him fall a victim to the laws; but . . . youth, misled by the wild visions of chivalry and imaginary loyalty, may plead for pardon” (252). In Edward’s case, the excuse for rehabilitation is his youth and romantic reading. Most clan commoners are—as often in romantic Highlandism—exculpated as victims of misplaced loyalty for their blameworthy chiefs, by whose “arbitrary authority” they had been “forced into the field” (323). Numerous characters became Jacobites for all sorts of reasons except for political ones. Many are desperadoes who feel that they have no other choice: Waverley himself is barred from a lawful career in the right army due to ungrounded government suspicion (e.g., 350). Another Jacobite soldier hopes to pay off his debts with the money his laird pays him for military service (288). A farmer follows his laird to war in order to ensure the renewal of his land lease (289); and a jealous lover joined the Jacobites because his sweetheart danced with a Hanoverian soldier (365). The Jacobite side also includes Englishmen with “broken” fortunes and nothing to lose (390), and an Edinburgh woman who sympathizes with the Stuart cause because she is so taken with the dashing, gentlemanly Highland soldiers (307, 430–31). Later, readers are told that her case was symptomatic: “The ladies . . . of Scotland very generally espoused the cause of the gallant and handsome young Prince, who threw himself upon the mercy of his countrymen, rather like a hero of romance than a calculating politician” (312). Waverley exculpates most Jacobite characters from political guilt, emphasizing that they could just as easily become good Hanoverian subjects—and soon did so, as history had shown in the intervening “Sixty Years.” Talbot observes:

So many unfortunate gentlemen . . . [were] lately in arms against the Government. . . . Their treason . . . is . . . arising from mistaken virtue, and therefore cannot be classed as a disgrace, though . . . highly criminal. Where the guilty are so numerous, clemency must be extended to far the greater number. (424)
The majority of Highlanders are vindicated because it is assumed that they were primitive and unenlightened, and thus not fully responsible for having chosen the wrong course of action—unlike the more civilized chief Fergus: “that he was enlightened and accomplished made his crime the less excusable. . . . He had been the means of bringing many hundreds of men into the field who, without him, would never have broken the peace” (463). Scott’s “General Preface” to the 1829 edition of the Waverley novels again reflects on the exculpation and recent rehabilitation of Highlanders:

The sufferers of that melancholy period have, during the last and present reign, been honoured both with the sympathy and protection of the reigning family, whose magnanimity can well pardon a sigh from others, and bestow one themselves to the memory of brave opponents, who did nothing in hate, but all in honour. (530)

After the most dangerous elements of mid-eighteenth-century British society are eliminated (Highland clanship, the vestiges of Lowland Scottish feudalism, and the principal Jacobite leaders), the United Kingdom can finally complete the process of national integration and build a better future characterized by progress, law and order, and an internally peaceful civil society. Of course, progress also entails certain losses: the Jacobite party “has now almost entirely vanished . . . , and with it . . . , much absurd political prejudice—but also many . . . examples of loyalty which they received from their fathers, and of old Scottish faith, hospitality, worth, and honour” (492). Several colorful and picturesque Scottish customs have also been lost. But when gains and losses are weighed against each other, the end of romance ultimately appears as a good thing. This, at least, is the opinion of the protagonist, and perhaps also of the narrator, when Waverley “felt, in . . . confidence and mental dignity, a compensation for the gay dreams which . . . experience had . . . dissolved” (432–33). The end of the clan system also inspires relief, as the modern forms of social organization which supplant it appear—at least on the whole—less cruel, less arbitrary, and more humane.

The humaneness of the new order is highlighted by Rose’s position. Her critique of the rising is not based on political motivations, but on personal ones—she is only interested in the safety of those she loves (219–20), which is endangered by any kind of civil war. This is why she, already at the start of the rebellion, writes a letter to Waverley which expresses her longing for a settled civil society after the English model: “I hope . . . you will get safe home to England, where you used to tell me there was no military violence nor fighting among clans permitted, but everything was done according to an equal law that protected all who were harmless and innocent” (220, also see 221). The Baron represents the old Scotland, with its feudal spirit, militancy, and Jacobitism, whereas Rose represents the new Scotland, eager for modern law and order. Significantly, her enthusiasm for civil society has been aroused
by the Englishman Waverley, who can be said to have colonized her mind and later marries her in a symbolic reiteration of the Treaty of Union.

The unionist national allegory can also be discerned in Waverley’s worry that, after the Jacobites’ defeat, Fergus and the Baron can no longer protect and support their female dependents Flora and Rose. Thus, Edward thinks about his own role: “It might be still his fate to supply the want of those guardians they had lost” (429). Scotland has lost its own native sovereigns and feudal elites, but is adopted by the paternally benevolent superior power of England which becomes Scotland’s guardian. Any kindness now bestowed on the Scots is bestowed on English terms; at the discretion of the hegemonic south: the Hanoverian dynasty grants pardons to some ex-rebels like the Baron; Waverley and Talbot buy the forfeited Bradwardine estate and later restore it to its previous owner; Waverley marries and supports Rose as well as giving substantial alms to the survivors of Clan Mac-Ivor. English superiority and seniority are also reflected in the fact that Rose and Edward’s first son will inherit the English estates, while their second son will inherit the Scottish possessions—this reiterates a metaphor of regional hierarchy which is at least as old as Geoffrey of Monmouth, who had depicted Britain’s eponymous founding father Brutus as dividing the island among his sons, giving England to the oldest and Scotland to the youngest one.66

In Waverley, both Highland and Lowland Scotland come under English guardianship, but the Lowlands are accepted on more lenient and more equal terms, though not entirely equal ones. Fergus, representative of Highland feudalism and Jacobitism, must be executed; but the Baron, representative of Lowland feudalism, is soon reintegrated into society and regains his estate. The shared Saxonness of the Lowland Scots and the English is conducive to British integration.67 The different degrees to which Gael and Gall are amenable to cultivation are also reflected in the names of the female protagonists. Flora’s name evokes not only the Jacobite heroine Flora MacDonald, but also the entirety of plant life, the flora. This might be taken to signify nature: full of splendor and grandeur, but untameable. The rose, by contrast, is only one particular kind of plant, and mainly associated with domesticated garden flowers rather than wild varieties. Moreover, it is the heraldic flower of England. All this underlines Rose Bradwardine’s receptiveness to English standards of cultivation. The colonizing impetus in this marriage is captured in Talbot’s comment on Waverley’s change of affection from Flora to Rose: “simplicity may be improved, but pride and conceit never” (426). Again, this can be interpreted as a national allegory on the relative virtues and “civilizability” of Highlands and Lowlands.

Although the wedding between Rose and Edward casts feminized Scotland as the officially subordinate and weaker partner, at second glance she is revealed to be quite resourceful and in control, sometimes even more so than Edward, for instance when it comes to light that she was secretly responsible for his rescue from captivity among outlaws and for the healing of his injuries. She has saved his life and for a while clandestinely steered it (446–50).68
This role of being officially the subordinate, female, weaker partner, but unofficially in charge, parallels the way in which Scotland’s role in the Union has often been evaluated: supposedly the weaker partner, but actually playing important roles, for instance in Britain’s government and administration under the Earl of Bute and his proteges, and in overseas imperialism.

The Union envisaged by Scott need not entail complete assimilation: instead of a total leveling of differences, he wants (and thinks it possible) to balance the preservation of selected differences against peaceful amalgamation and progress. But this willingness to respect selected differences is inextricably related to the fact that difference no longer poses a danger. When the Baron regains his estate, it is no longer a feudal barony but an untitled property bought with money. He “has been ‘restored’ as an antique among antiquities, . . . a ‘figurehead.’ . . . Bradwardine becomes at the new Tully-Veolan the prisoner of a feudal ‘Scotland’ he is made to embody.” The neutralization of the Baron’s eccentricities can also be read as a national allegory: “His absurdities, which had appeared grotesquely ludicrous during his prosperity, seemed, in the sunset of his fortune, to be harmonised and assimilated with the noble features of his character, so as to add peculiarity without exciting ridicule” (450). Again, the sunset imagery also seems to symbolize the decline of an entire sociocultural system. But Edward’s example suggests that some of the laudable old values which are endangered by progress can be detached from their original cultural and historical matrix, to be grafted onto representatives of the new order—perhaps especially onto young people who are more open-minded, impressionable, and flexible than their older, more irreconcilable compatriots. The youth of such hybridized mediator figures also symbolizes hope for the future.

Eventually, even extreme instances of otherness like Jacobitism and Gaeldom, previously so harmful that they had to be uprooted, can be partially integrated into the new nation—but only in a form which neutralizes both the threatening aspects of otherness and the gruesomeness of the conquest. One strategy for neutralizing the Jacobite and Gaelic peril lies in the multiple time frames of Waverley: the past in which the action is set is not just once, but twice removed from the time when the novel reached its first audiences. This temporal distance strengthens the sense of containment. The novel was published in 1814, while the date of the narration is 1805, and the main action is set in 1745. “From the beginning, then, the reader is conscious that a lost world is being . . . reconstructed and that the gulf dividing him from the period under discussion is bridgeable only in imagination.” The intervening years seemed to have shown that history was on the side of the Lowlanders and Hanoverians. The implications of the subtitle “’Tis Sixty Years Since” are ambiguous. On the one hand, it gives immediacy, suggesting that it is only sixty years since parts of Scotland were so unsettled and barbarous. On the other hand, the dangerous aspects of this otherness have now disappeared, and only the temporal distance makes it safe to relish them.
Further containment takes place on the level of plot. The circular structure of this novel means that gaelicization and political dissent are only a passing episode in Waverley’s life which is overcome before the story ends. Protagonist and readers are only temporarily swept away into Highland romance and a “backward” stage of social development, until both return to a dynamic, modernizing world in which they can function as loyal pro-Hanoverian British subjects. Even the Gaelic characters seem already once removed from their traditions: Flora can be seen as a revivalist of a waning cultural heritage.

The effect of celebrating and commemorating vanishing traditions while firmly containing them in the past is reinforced in the postscript. The postscript also makes clear that remembering the past can contribute to the ideological affirmation of the present. Helping readers of Scott’s own time to recall how different and “primitive” their country had recently been underlines the huge development which happened in the meantime, thus nourishing pride in the progress made:

The effects of the insurrection of 1745—the destruction of the patriarchal power of the Highland chiefs—the abolition of the heritable jurisdictions of the Lowland nobility—the total eradication of the Jacobite party, which, averse to intermingle with the English, or adopt their customs, long continued to pride themselves upon maintaining ancient Scottish manners and customs—commenced this innovation. The influx of wealth, and extension of commerce, have since united to render the present people of Scotland different from their grandfathers. . . . We are not aware of the progress we have made, until we fix our eye on the now distant point from which we have been drifted. (492)

Highlanders are appropriated by the mainstream “as museum pieces for the appreciation and self-comprehension of those who are supposed to have left them behind.”

The unionist “museumization” of history also requires that the atrocities committed by the Hanoverian regime to suppress Jacobitism and clanship must be silenced or at least softened. There is no direct description of the Battle of Culloden and the harsh penalty measures inflicted on the Gaidhealtachd during its aftermath. The only glimpse of the effects of penalty measures in rural Scotland is restricted to the Lowlands, which were less seriously affected. We see the Baron expropriated, outlawed, and in hiding, but he does not suffer too badly and is eventually reintegrated into society without serious losses—while in reality such lenience was apparently never shown to people who had participated in both the 1715 and the 1745 rebellion. Scott also softens or rewrites history in the court scene when Evan is offered a pardon in exchange for pleading that he only rebelled on his chief’s orders, not of his own accord—an offer he refuses (466). In reality, there were
indeed clansmen who tried to achieve a pardon by pleading that they had been coerced into rebellion, but the courts did not accept such pleas. Scott’s fictionalization of history presents the clansmen as more loyal to their chiefs, and the laws as more lenient, than they really were. Another silencing occurs when Fergus forbids Waverley to attend his execution—as a result, the reader does not get a direct, detailed impression of the scene either. If such a description had been included, the extremely cruel methods used in the execution of Jacobite leaders—hanging, drawing, and quartering—might have created so much empathy in readers that it might have damaged the novel’s project of affirming the Hanoverian order. Historical horrors are largely neutralized and softened into historical or personal romance. One such neutralization occurs after Fergus’s execution:

The impression of horror with which Waverley left Carlisle, softened . . . into melancholy, . . . accelerated by the painful, yet soothing, task of writing to Rose; and, while he could not suppress his own feelings of the calamity, by endeavouring to place it in a light which might grieve her, without shocking her imagination. The picture which he drew for her benefit he gradually familiarized to his own mind, and his next letters were more cheerful, and referred to the . . . peace and happiness which lay before them. (478)

History and tradition can also be neutralized by transforming them into safely contained, decontextualized museum pieces. This happens not only through the time structure and the conception of Waverley as a historical novel, but also on the level of plot. Edward museumizes Gaelic culture when he, after leaving the Jacobite army, decides to preserve the Highland dress and arms he wore on campaign. This is partly because he regards them as objects of curiosity (428). During his time as an adopted Gael, he used them as objects of daily wear, but now these things are re-othered by a newly de-gaelicized Waverley who regards them as exotic objects of wonder. His second reason for preserving them lies in their being a souvenir of his friend Fergus (428). Soon after, the re-englishized Waverley is asked by a fellow Englishman who has no firsthand knowledge of Gaelic culture to give some specimen, and manages to “satisfy his curiosity by whistling a pibroch, dancing a strathspey, and singing a Highland song” (428–29). Later, it is reported that the young English onlooker has been “seized with a tartan fit ever since” (490). Now that the Highland army is no longer a danger to England, this Englishman can develop romantic curiosity and enthusiasm for the Highlanders’ culture. Elements of that culture are conveyed to him not by full immersion (e.g., by a Highland journey of his own), or even by a real expatriate Highlander, but by Waverley, a non-dangerous Englishman who is no Other himself, but has sufficient knowledge of the Other to act as a cultural mediator by giving harmless snippets of Gaelic culture in a perfectly safe anglophone environment.
Further museumization occurs when the characters celebrate the restoration of Tully-Veolan manor to Rose’s father. A shadow of the feudal customs witnessed at previous Glennaquoich scenes is preserved—but no more than a shadow: the fountain is filled with brandy instead of water to give the “lower orders” a share in the festivities. However, this is emphatically “for that night only” (490), in implicit contrast to the more imprudent, because more frequent, entertainment of the lower orders which Highland tradition had demanded of feudal elites and about which Fergus had complained. Post-Culloden Scotland preserves a hint of its feudal traditions, but only to a limited extent which does not impede capitalist economizing and modern estate management.

Museumization can also be seen in the decorations which, at the end of the novel, grace the refurbished house at Tully-Veolan. The arms which Edward wore as a soldier are now just a wall ornament. A portrait of Waverley and Fergus in Highland dress, with clansmen and mountain scenery in the background, has been painted by a London artist after a sketch that was made of the two friends while on campaign in Edinburgh (489). Thus, the picture gives some representation of Gaelic tradition and Jacobite history, but it is several times removed from reality: even when the sketch was taken, the wild mountains cannot have been there, as the drawing was made in the Lowland capital. The final painting was executed even further from the Highlands, in London. Moreover, the depicted past has in the meantime been contained by the realities of the Hanoverian victory: Fergus and traditional chieftainship are dead, and the clansmen shown in the background will march to rebellion no more. The painting eclipses the unpleasant aspects of both the recent past and the present of Highland experience, such as Fergus’s execution and life under the penalty measures. Only by eclipsing these nasty details, and focusing on the picturesque and noble (pretty plaids, handsome young friends), can the portrait be aesthetically enjoyable: though beholders may shed a few tears for the late Fergus, the aesthetics are not marred by overly upsetting details about his execution.  

While the novel presents a partisan rewriting of history which silences many problematic aspects, it could also be argued that the way in which such rewritings (e.g., the portrait) are described, and the narratorial ironies which deconstruct romanticizations, at least show a metatextual awareness which draws attention to the fact that such images of the past are not necessarily realistic but may show a significant degree of partiality, artificiality, conjecture, and remoteness from the reality they purportedly represent.  

Nonetheless, it seems to have been the containing, unionist, and colonizing aspects of Waverley which played an important part in ensuring this novel a favorable reception at the time, and a lasting influence on the depiction of colonized peoples in Britain and overseas. Many readers praised Waverley as a remarkably accurate description of culture and history. Several early reviews drew on Enlightenment theories of history and on the “contemporary
ancestor” theme, praising Scott’s novel for illustrating earlier stages of society which in the Highlands, and partly even the Lowlands, seemed just a few decades away, whereas in the rest of Europe they might have been gone for centuries. The *Edinburgh Review* commented:

[The 1745 rebellion] brought . . . to light . . . for the last time, the fading image of feudal chivalry in the mountains, and vulgar fanaticism in the plains; and startled the more polished parts of the land with the wild but brilliant picture of the devoted valour, incorruptible fidelity, patriarchal brotherhood, and savage habits, of the Celtic Clans on the one hand,—and the dark, untractable . . . bigotry of the Covenanters on the other. Both forms of society had indeed been prevalent in the other parts of the country,—but had there been so long superseded by more peaceable habits, and milder manners, that their vestiges were almost effaced, and their very memory nearly forgotten. . . . When the . . . central Highlands . . . were opened up to the gaze of the English, it seemed as if they were carried back to the days of the Heptarchy;—when they saw the . . . West-country Whigs, they might imagine themselves transported to the age of Cromwell. The effect, indeed, is almost as startling at the present moment; and one great source of the interest which the [novel] . . . possess[es], is . . . the surprise . . . that in our own country, and almost in our own age, manners and characters existed . . . which we had been accustomed to consider as belonging to remote antiquity, or extravagant romance.83

*Waverley* was praised as an authentic ethnographic document, not only on customs and mentalities of the past, but also—at least to some extent—on those of the present:

The object of the work . . . was evidently to present a faithful . . . picture of the manners and state of society that prevailed in this northern part of the island, in the earlier part of the last century; . . . and . . . the basis of almost all that was peculiar in the national character. . . . The . . . delineation has been made from actual experience and observation; . . . [though] perhaps only . . . [of] a few surviving relics and specimens of what was familiar a little earlier—but generalized from instances sufficiently numerous and complete, to warrant all that may have been added to the portrait. . . . The great traits of Clannish dependence, pride, and fidelity, may still be detected in many districts of the Highlands, though they do not now adhere to the chieftains when they mingle in general society; and the existing contentions of Burghers and Antiburghers, and Camerons, though shrunk into comparative insignificance . . . may still be referred to, as complete verifications of all that is here stated. . . . The traits of the Scottish
national character [as depicted in the novel] can still less be regarded as antiquated.84

Concerning the faithfulness of the novel’s ethnographic account of Highlanders, the reviewer further singles out the “gradations of the Celtic character, from . . . savage imperturbability of . . . [one] who stalks about with a battle-ax on his shoulder, to . . . lively unprincipled activity . . . coarse unreflecting hardihood and heroism . . . and . . . pride, gallantry, elegance and ambition.”85 Another contemporary reviewer called Waverley “a vehicle of curious accurate information upon a subject which must . . . command our attention—the history and manners of a . . . large and renowned portion of the inhabitants of these islands; of a race who, within these few years, have vanished from the face of their native land.”86 Since the Gaels are here claimed as part of the national community, possessing some knowledge about them is considered a duty of every British subject. This might be interpreted as an act of discursive conquest. Like Waverley and the narrator, many readers expressed relief that the upheavals of national hyper-heterogeneity and civil war had been left behind.87 Katie Trumpener lucidly observes the links between the discursive internal colonization of Scotland and the colonization of other peoples overseas:

Scott’s historical novel, with its stress on historical progress, . . . won out as the paradigmatic novel of empire, appealing to nationalist, imperialist, and colonial readers alike. For Scott insists simultaneously on the self-enclosed character of indigenous societies (living idyllically, if anachronistically, outside of historical time), on the inevitability with which such societies are forcibly brought into history, and on the survival of cultural distinctiveness even after a loss of political autonomy. As he enacts and explains the composition of Britain as an internal empire, Scott underlines the ideological capaciousness of empire . . . and argues for the continued centrality of national identity as a component of imperial identity.

Throughout the nineteenth century, . . . in the . . . British overseas colonies, the Anglo–Celtic model of literary nationalism that arose in response to British internal colonialism . . . helps ensure that cultural nationalism (as long as it separates cultural expression from political sovereignty) can be contained within an imperial framework.88

This helps to explain why Scott’s Waverley novels were among the most widely circulated books throughout the nineteenth-century British Empire.89 Macpherson’s and Scott’s descriptions of Gaels had a strong influence on “dying race” literature in more obviously colonial contexts overseas, for instance on James Fenimore Cooper’sLast of the Mohicans(1826), one of the first treatments of the “last of the race” motif that used “race” in the
modern sense of cultural and physical differences between sections of the human species.\textsuperscript{90} Cooper’s America and romantic-era Scotland both saw the increasingly successful establishment of a (white or Lowland/anglicized) mainstream, so that it became possible to look on the marginalization of indigenous (Native American or Gaelic) culture with mixed feelings which also included guilt and romanticism. In both cases, the disappearance of native culture was claimed to be inevitable, though somewhat tragic. The mainstreams had no local ancestry to root them in the newly conquered soil, placate occasional pangs of conqueror’s guilt, and legitimate their rule. In both countries, selected elements of marginalized indigenous cultures were appropriated and romanticized to partially “nativize” the colonizers and validate their supremacy on those territories.\textsuperscript{91} Another white North American author whose portrayal of Native Americans is comparable to Scott’s portrait of Gaels is the Canadian Thomas H. Raddall.\textsuperscript{92}

However, there are also differences between Scott’s portrayal of Gaels and North American authors’ portrayals of Native Americans. For Scott, the difference between Gaels and anglophone Britons is linguistic and cultural, but not racial in the modern sense. Moreover, while all these authors show regret and relief about the decline of indigenous cultures, the proportions of these feelings seem different: in white American literature, relief seems stronger and regret somewhat weaker than in Scott.\textsuperscript{93}

Such differences innuancing notwithstanding, \textit{Waverley} is another anglophone Scottish text about Highlanders which, despite its relatively positive portrayal of the Other, can be read as part of a colonial discourse tradition which stretches (in time) all the way back to classical antiquity and (in space) all the way to America and other parts of the modern British Empire. However, not all romanticizations of Highlanders through colonial discourse tropes have been constructed by colonizing outsiders: the same tropes have been used by Gaelic-speaking or Highland authors themselves, in ways which could either be regarded as submission and self-colonization or as subtle tactics of adaptation, self-advancement, and subversion.\textsuperscript{94}

In romantic thought, “Celts were no longer unwanted aliens . . . to British civic society,” but “the picturesque representations of both the heroic bedrock and finer feelings of that society.”\textsuperscript{95} The very success of the “civilizing” missions had made this possible. However, this was not the last word: in the further course of the nineteenth century, social developments created anxieties about whether the civilizing project had miscarried. These setbacks were not blamed on the new social order, but on the Gaels themselves. Voices which insisted on the lingering otherness and inferiority of the Celt again became louder, and were now often linked to a new branch of social and anthropological science: race theory. These developments are explored in the next chapter.