THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

A Thread of Scottishness:

Mapping the Allegorical Tapestry of Scottish Literature

Helena F. G. Liddle

PhD, Faculty of Arts

The University of Edinburgh

2006

Declaration

I, Helena F. G. Liddle, candidate for the degree of PhD, have composed this dissertation. The work submitted here is my own and has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Signed,

Helena F. G. Liddle

A Thread of Scottishness:

Mapping the Allegorical Tapestry of Scottish Literature

"I believe that fiction with a thread of Scottishness in its truth has helped me to

know how to be myself as a Scot." – A. L. Kennedy

Table of Contents

Abstract

Scottish authors throughout the ages have linked their art to their nationality. When the contemporary writer A. L. Kennedy observes, "I believe that fiction with a thread of Scottishness in its truth has helped me to know how to be myself as a Scot," she pinpoints the value of literature for both her predecessors and peers. However, the idea of Scottish literature as an autonomous and coherent national literature is controversial. Questions concerning self-sufficiency, unity, and value continue to haunt the idea of a Scottish literary tradition. Many studies have attempted to address the stereotype of Scottish literature's fragmentation and its place as a sub-category within English literature; however, few critical works have considered specific literary forms as constituting a basis for the Scottish literary consciousness. "A Thread of Scottishness" argues that Scottish literature uniquely sustains an allegorical framework traceable from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance to the present. Chapter one discusses allegory's history, definition and relationship with the reader. Chapters two, three, and four focus upon the specific theoretical strands of the Scottish allegorical form: nature, nationalism, and morality, respectively. Each of these three chapters begins with a discussion of works from the medieval period and follows the progression of the Scots' use of allegory through time. More modern works, including S. Ferrier's *Marriage*, R. L. Stevenson's *The Master of Ballantrae*, N. Shepherd's *The Weatherhouse*, are shown to reflect the narrative traditions of medieval and Renaissance texts, such as R. Henryson's *Morall Fabillis* and *The Testament of Cresseid*, King James I's *The Kingis Quair*, and Sir D. Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. Thus, through a consideration of the use of allegory within specific Scottish texts, I posit continuity for Scottish literature as a whole. 94,849 words.

Acknowledgements

Introduction
Redding the Skein: Untangling the Dilemma of Criticism

Situating oneself within existent critical discourse is a difficult task that all who wish to identify themselves as literary critics must face. All of us must incorporate a welter of source material and previous thought. It is understood that literary critics must not only absorb the primary text and all the cultural and historical details that surround it, but also take in everything important that has been written about that text. Secondary and even tertiary reading is essential to full fledged scholarship. And yet, such expectations bring with them certain difficulties. Surely, as Stanley Stewart has pointed out, no one critic can be expected to have read and assimilated everything that has ever been written which pertains to his or her subject, nor is one's decision to enter into a particular critical dialogue devoid of bias (27-31). Placing oneself, and one's work, within a certain critical conversation creates a kind of self manipulation. By choosing one genre, period, or theory over another we direct ourselves down particular (and often well trod) paths. We enter a maze with more than one possible route, following the thread of our particular thesis. But we do not mind either the blind corners or the possibility of lurking minotaurs. The "problem" of situating the critic is not, Stewart proposes, a problem at all (32). Rather, the process is often more relevant than the product. Learning what we know is crucial if we are "to say no more than we know."[1] Similarly, Gordon Teskey describes Spenserian allegory as "more [. . .] a heuristic instrument for exciting the mind to activity, than it is an end in itself" (99). For allegory, as with the production of criticism, the journey is as crucial as the destination.

In general, allegory is written with the purpose of manipulating readers in a specific manner. Allegory demands action in its readers; it causes a dynamic relationship between readers and text. Authors who create allegory craft their texts to engender (and then reveal) complicity within their readers. Allegory removes the division between the world of the text and the readers' reality. It is generally accepted that all authors intend to show their readers certain perspectives. Readers necessarily must take note of the ideas and subjects placed before them on the page. Allegory, however, transforms the act of reading from a passive "taking note" to an activity that

---

[1] Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Preliminary Studies for the* "Philosophical Investigations": *Generally known as The Blue and Brown Books*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958, 45.

involves readers in the meaning of the text. While discussing the *Divine Comedy* in his "Epistle to Can Grande" Dante Alighieri states, "The profitableness of what he [the hearer of the *Divine Comedy*] is about to be told begets a favourable disposition in the hearer; its being out of the common engages his attention; and its being within the range of possibility renders him willing to learn" (Minnis 463). Dante's end in writing the *Divine Comedy*, a work that encompasses all of allegory's subtlety, is to effectively move the audience. Dante writes for "a practical purpose" within the philosophical branch of ethics; he writes to precipitate action within his readers (Minnis 462). Through the use of multiple meaning, and the assumption of readers who are capable of divining hidden truths, allegorical authors compel their readers to actively participate in the implications of the text.

Although such an understanding of the relationship between readers, text, and author clarifies allegory's unique position as a form of literature, it by no means simplifies the diversity of its use. Allegory has been used as a form and a practice for several thousand years. It has undergone many transformations, and allegorical theorists and critics often have the tendency to overlap its several uses, forms, and meanings. On the one hand, for example, we can observe the practice of *allegoresis* or allegorical interpretation. In his *Allegory and Violence*, Teskey defines this type of allegory as "allegorical theory" (161). On the other hand, we might consider the actual creation of allegorical texts, texts that are written to contain multiple and simultaneous meaning. Teskey dubs this form of authorship "allegorical practice" (161). Allegorical theory and allegorical practice are often confused because they arose from similar interpretive desires. The use of classical pagan visions of allegory for theological interpretive purposes led to the yoking of Christian allegorical practices for the creation of secular texts. In *allegoresis*, allegorical theory initiates searches for a greater understanding of God's Word. Such a reading can also be applied to humankind and the world. Thus, when applied to non-biblical texts, such as classical myths, allegorical theory formed the basis for allegorical practice. Authors began to actively create texts that were meant to be understood on many levels but finally led to the revelation of truth.

However, a key distinction within both forms of allegory is not temporal in nature (e. g., classical versus medieval); rather, it is defined by those perspectives that, to use Hugh of St. Victor's metaphor of construction, distinguish the foundation (literal level) of the verbal edifice from its entire upper structure (figurative level) and

those that define the different kinds of meaning implied at each of the literary structure's levels (the literal, tropological, allegorical, and anagogic levels.) Much of the difficulty of clarifying allegory's use, place, and meaning over the years has stemmed from the inability to properly grasp the above differentiation. For medieval theorists, the fourfold system of allegorical theory was accepted "without much critical examination because it had attained the status of a quasi doctrine, and because to question it raised the specter of heresy" (Bezanker 62). But the fourfold system is also a useful way to consider the purpose of allegorical practice. Allegory is written with the intention of encompassing multiple meaning as the means to create ultimate understanding.

Over time, both the dualistic and the fourfold perspectives' dependency upon the reader has also become less distinct. What more simplistic definitions of allegory do not fully take into account is the essential relationship between writers and readers of allegory. For Hugh of St. Victor, for example, allegory is created to move a particular audience towards a better life in this world. In his *Didascalicon*, Hugh describes the study of allegory as the study of symbolic architecture that is designed to appeal to literate, truth-seeking Christians.

> Take a look at what the mason does [. . . Allegorical structure] is that spiritual structure which is raised on high, built, as it were, with many courses of stones as it contains mysteries [. . .] you have come to your study, you are about to construct the spiritual structure [. . .] The very bases of your spiritual structure are certain principles of the faith – principles which form your starting point. (140-142)

The multiple levels of allegory are created to guide specifically attuned readers to ultimate truth. As Teskey writes, "In a manner of ritual initiation the work of art that leads to this goal [inexpressible absolute truth] functions as a sort of labyrinth, though in the end the work is reduced to that status of a *text*, a thing that has been woven, a veil" (3). Allegory both conceals and provides access to the truth. It creates a pattern that is not easily discovered but which, when traced, reveals the reader's own convoluted path. In allegory the reader is led past a series of barriers to meaning and understanding that must necessarily be surmounted in order to reach revelation.

Medieval and early modern Scottish authors' use of allegory was by no means out of the ordinary within their period. Their works *do* display a certain proclivity towards the symbolic and narrative methods of allegory. And I will discuss these methods in some detail. However, the use of allegory was clearly widespread across

medieval and early modern Europe. In focusing primarily on the Scottish use of allegory, my intention is not to imply that Scottish medieval authors were utilizing an un-common form, but to specify that these authors set a precedent that their literary descendants followed and continue to follow to the present day. It is in the *continuation* of actively allegorical authorship that Scotland is unique among the British nations. Teskey locates Renaissance and pre-Renaissance allegory as a literary representation of ideological order. Through allegory, authors created metaphorical indications of idealism which in turn became a cultural force for maintaining stability in knowledge, politics and sexual relations (16-17). Scottish literature has continued this use of allegory. Within the Scottish medieval tradition, for example, authors such as Robert Henryson grappled with the tension between lay practices and Christian intentions, but were confident in the ability of their texts to transcend through spiritual merit. Through the passing era, this confidence in Christian visions as an appropriate sett for the tapestry of Scottish literature has never faded.[2] The allegorical tendencies which link Scottish literature as a whole descend from the original process of assimilating classical visions of allegory for Christian purposes, and the continued use of these types of allegorical practice maintains Scottish identity.

The use of allegory to define the warp of a national literature naturally evokes certain critical concerns. Attempts either to apply current critical standards to ancient works or to utilize older literary modes to define more recent texts must be undertaken carefully. Stewart's discussion of modern readings of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* highlights the inherent difficulty of divining meanings within older texts. He describes literary criticism's tendency towards "a traditional distinction between truth and falsity, which [. . .] implies that there are appropriate and inappropriate accounts of historical texts" (73). For Stewart, there is a danger within criticism both of importing concerns contemporary to the critic and of elevating the supposed culture surrounding the text to the highest interpretive importance. Moreover, Stewart describes many critics as seizing upon the idea that texts such as *The Faerie Queene* should be read in one particular way and have a singular "real" – read hidden – motive (73-82). For Stewart, the critic's search for a singular and usually culturally driven truth such as "Post-colonial culture-shock" or "the

---

[2] Sett: "A pattern, esp. that of a tartan." In *Webster's New International Unabridged Dictionary* (Second Edition). Cambridge, Mass: The Riverside Press, (c 1954).

pornographic gaze" is ultimately invalid because it fails to create any specific sense of particular texts. "Does 'culture' as agency never sit one out? If not, it is not clear what sense the notion that 'culture determines what counts as [. . .] criticism' makes" (89). Such critical ideas concerning culture are similarly inappropriate for reading allegorical texts due to the motive behind allegorical practice. Allegorical texts do not depend upon a single "hidden" truth; rather, as Stewart writes concerning Spenser's use of sexuality in *The Faerie Queene*, the truth is available to all readers (64-65). It is the path that one must take to discover that truth which purposefully is made difficult. Likewise, the question of how much culture "counts" concerning the use of allegory within Scottish literature may seem to be inapplicable. However, my project here is not to propose that culture affects allegory, a proposal that Stewart would describe as painfully obvious. Rather, I intend to consider how Scottish authors' use of allegory affected their readers and thus contributed to the understanding of national identity.

Medieval and early modern Scottish allegorists saw themselves as Makars, word builders, who were mimicking the Divine's structure (the ordered creation of God) in order to guide their readers down the proper path. Allegory contains a meaning for people at every level of intelligence and education. However, Scottish literature's specific purpose also activated the more secretive side of allegory's nature. Allegory's ability to hide its truth, to reserve the most profound understanding for those who are able to comprehend it, is necessary for its connection to national designs. All meanings within allegory are available to all readers, but readers must also have or gain the tools to fully access that truth. Medieval and early modern Scottish authors chose to include specifically Scottish references within their allegories for topical or political ends. Sir David Lindsay, for example, focused on allegory's ability to make political truth more palatable for everyone involved, but also used allegory's initiation of complicity to highlight the discomfort of reality's disjunction from that truth. As Teskey writes, "That *allegory* refers to political discourse is suggested to the ancients by its rootedness in the verbs *agoreuo* ('to speak publically, to harangue') and *ageiro* ('to gather'). Allegory speaks in the agora, the gathering place, but in an 'other' way, mysteriously, disclosing a secret to the initiated while keeping away the profane" (123). More modern Scottish authors continued to utilize allegory for such purposes but, after the Union of the Crowns,

specifically Scottish allusions were a necessity for the maintenance of the Scottish identity itself.

Because of the movement of the Scottish court from Scotland to England during the reign of James VI, Scottish literature – then very much a part of court culture – underwent an uprooting and transportation to foreign soil. Over the centuries, this produced a certain difficulty for the nomenclature of Scottish literature. Much of what has more recently been re-claimed as falling under that category was originally subsumed under the label of English literature. Moreover, those of the literary elite who chose to remain in Scotland after the Union of the Crowns were forced to endure the stigma of parochialism. Certainly on an international scale, Scottish literature written after the Union of the Crowns has been either relegated to an obscure ethnological corner or overlooked entirely. In combination, the dilution and exclusion of Scottish literature after the Union also encouraged the creation of the vision of a pristine, wholly Scottish medieval past. The works of Scottish authors prior to the Union became idealized examples of unadulterated Scottish creation.[3] From this perspective, the only "truly" Scottish literature was forever linked to concepts of the past.[4]

In his depiction of Scottish writers in London after the Union of Parliaments, Robert Crawford describes a process which internalized and concealed "any Scottish component so that it remained present only as a secret trace, identifiable [only] to those in the know" (54). It is just such subterranean and ancient traces that I locate throughout Scottish literature as the threads that support its pattern as a whole. Scottish allegory is meant to particularly appeal to the people of Scotland. Although Scottish literature written in English is accessible to a wide reading public, many of the details included within Scottish works, and essential for a full understanding of their themes and purposes, would only be recognized by someone immersed in Scottish culture.[5] The need to perpetuate a belief in the Scottish national character

---

[3] This vision of purity does not, clearly, take into account the influence of European thought upon the visions of Scottish medievalists.

[4] Such a nostalgic vision of Scottish literature has been ultimately damaging. Many of the weaknesses critics stereotypically attribute to Scottish literature have been associated with Scotland's vision of an ancient literary utopia. See, for example, Nairn 122.

[5] Many works of Scottish literature, particularly those written during the Romantic and Victorian eras (the novels of Sir Walter Scott and Susan Ferrier, for example)

allowed for (and continues to support) allegorical authorship beyond the medieval/early modern period. Moreover, that character in and of itself is particularly suited to allegory's active purpose. Thus, Scottish authors across the ages sought to include a "thread of Scottishness" within their works that would encourage a revelation and investigation of self.

Scottish texts from diverse periods contain a tendency towards allegorical signification: a purposeful and active inclusion of the reader in what it means to *be* Scottish. An understanding of allegorical philosophy and morality is essential to revealing Scottish literature as the continuous product of a people, the result of a specific literary outlook. By analyzing its use of allegory, I hope to detail for Scottish literature what Michael Cherniss terms a "structural core"(5), a center of difference that distinguishes Scottish literature from other British literatures. Stewart similarly describes the ability to reveal a "family resemblance" within certain literatures when he discusses Wittgenstein's philosophical use of Sir Francis Galton's photographic technique. "To 'investigate' philosophical problems in a way that did not distort the effort, he [Wittgenstein] needed to escape from the formal design of the argumentative essay. Rather than a single 'finished' picture, he offered an expanded 'album' of impressions of the 'same' landscape" (129-130). Just as Wittgenstein took up Galton's idea of creating photographs of "family resemblance" for philosophical enlightenment, it is possible to discuss the shape of a national literature.

At the core of problems concerning Scottish literature's identity we find its hypothetical "gap," an extended period of Scottish history purportedly empty of culture and closely associated with the supposed "disjunction" within the character of the Scottish people. The critical supposition of a division within Scottish identity first appeared after the publication of G. Gregory Smith's *Scottish Literature: Character and Influence*. In this work, Smith posits the Scottish character, and by association its literature and history, as innately divided between the "heart" (the past, romance, and "civil society") and the "head" (the present and the future, reason, and, by association, the British state.) He dubs this division in Scottish identity the "'Caledonian antisyzygy' a reflection of the contrasts which the Scot shows at every turn, in his political and ecclesiastical history, in his polemical restlessness, in his adaptability [and . . .] in his practical judgment, which is the admission that two sides of the matter

---

were written for a British audience. Even these, however, contained language and references that necessitated a Scottish perspective for complete understanding.

have been considered" (4). Although Smith could not have guessed the far-reaching consequences of his assertions, his arguments formed the foundation for a singularly pervasive perspective on Scottish identity. Since the publication of Smith's book, other critics have taken up the implications inherent within his thesis and applied them to diverse periods of Scottish literary history. Thus, critics have argued that, after the Union of the Crowns and specifically during the seventeenth-century, Scottish literature of any worth ceased to exist and was resurrected only by the appearance of modern nationalism.[6] It has similarly been posited that after the Union of the Parliaments, approximately one hundred years after the first Union, a phalanx of cultural and national "neuroses" rose up within the Scottish literary intelligentsia, and all cultural output after such time was twisted and deformed by association (Nairn 129). Even those critics who make it their purpose to vociferously put down Smith's arguments must first incorporate Smith's "antisyzygy." Like feminists, supporters of Scottish connectedness must define their argument by what it is not.

Critics of Scottish literature suffer in many ways from the problems that Stewart locates as central to the task of criticism itself. "Perhaps the greatest inconvenience of 'inescapability' pronouncements in practice is that they rely on reference, not to the evidence of [. . .] texts, but to secondary sources" (89). Critics of Scottish literature seem to have become enamored of the structures forming their critical maze rather than returning to the texts that created their journey in the first place and are ultimately the only way to negotiate any coherent path. I propose that critics consider Scottish literature as linked by allegory and that they return to Scottish literature itself to reconsider what many have described as broken. For example, it is possible, as stated earlier, to view the Union of the Crowns as having significant influence upon Scottish literary production without viewing division as a stigma. In fact, both Unions strengthened the need for a form of allegorical writing particular to Scottish needs. According to Teskey, allegory in general utilizes the tension between division and union. "The very word *allegory* evokes a schism in consciousness –

---

[6] In *Scottish Literature and the Scottish People, 1680-1830*, David Craig tells us that he chooses the 18th century because, "This period [. . .] stretches from the point at which literary activities began to pick up after the disorder, bloodshed, and tyranny of the religious wars to the point at which Scotland was all but emptied of native talents during the early Industrial Revolution and the increase of emigration" (12). Further, he writes that "from 1825 to 1880 there is next to nothing worth attention" in Scottish literature (273). In *The Break Up of Britain*, Tom Nairn makes us of Craig's dates but extends the end date to 1920 (113).

between a life and a mystery, between the real and the ideal, between a literal tale and its moral – which is repaired, or at least concealed, by imagining a hierarchy on which we ascent toward truth" (2). For Scottish authors, allegory was the perfect form for the expression of their struggle with the balance of unity and separation inherent in Scottish identity and culture.

As Hugh MacDiarmid's poem, "The Seamless Garment" (1931), testifies, Scotland's literary past and present maintain the continuity of a bolt of allegorical cloth. Through the metaphor of weaving, MacDiarmid seeks to alert his audience to the importance of continued literary practices for the Scottish consciousness. He speaks directly to the common Scotsman, a worker in a cloth mill, about the intersections of political and literary understanding. Describing the mill MacDiarmid writes:

> The haill shop's dumfoonderin'
>   To a stranger like me.
> Second nature to you; you're perfectly able
>   To think, speak and see
> Apairt frae the looms, tho' to some
> That doesnae sae easily come. (19-24)

The implication is one of divided understanding: as MacDiarmid is unable to easily decipher the workings of the looms, his listener is unable to immediately assimilate the politics and poetry that intermingle within the poem. MacDiarmid's treatment of his fellow Scot as an equal, however, presupposes the ability of author and reader to gain an understanding of the other's craft. If the common person can grasp the workings of the great looms, then surely he or she can come to understand the motion and purpose of literature. This connection between socio-economics and culture reappears continuously throughout the poem:

> Lenin was like that wi' workin' class life,
>   At hame wi't a'.
> His fause movements couldna been fewer,
>   The best weaver Earth ever saw.
> A' *he'd* to dae wi' moved intact
>   Clean clear and exact
>
> A poet like Rilke did the same
>   In a different sphere,
> Made a single reality – a' a'e 'oo' –
>   O' his love and pity and fear;
> A seamless garment o' music and thought. (25-35)

MacDiarmid's interest is in fostering a vision that considers the world as if it were a seamless garment. He longs for a people who are able to surpass the machinery that dominates their lives and to understand the depth and multiplicity of existence.

> Lenin and Rilke baith gied still mair skill,
>   Coopers o' Stobo, to a greater concern
> Than you devote to claith in the mill.
>   Wad it be ill to learn
> To keep a bit eye on *their* looms as weel
> And no' be hailly ta'en up wi' your 'tweel'? (55-60)

MacDiarmid's poem teaches and encourages his audience to read their lives allegorically: to see through the simple specifics of everyday life and grasp the strands that connect them to their nation, to the past, and to the future. He asks his audience to "ken" the past as women folk do, through tradition and a natural understanding of the movement of life, but he also incites them to avoid backsliding into a worship of obsolete contrivances: the "handloom [. . .] Or paintin' oor hides" (69, 71). Despite his references to an ancient form, and his encouragements to make good use of the past, MacDiarmid is aware of the dangers of destructive nostalgia.

Through the symbol of the mill, MacDiarmid draws his audience to understand themselves multilaterally:

> Hundreds to the inch the threids lie in,
>   Like the men in a communist cell.
> There's a play o' licht frae the factory windas.
>   Could you no' mak' mair yoursel'?
> Mony a loom mair alive than the weaver seems
> For the sun's still nearer than Rilke's dreams. (83-88)

With the association of men and threads, MacDiarmid asks his audience to see themselves collectively as a strong and useful material with which the fabric of a nation might be made. All that stands in his readers' way is their inability to recognize allegorical possibility, their inability to recognize complicity. First MacDiarmid incites his audience to consider themselves in a different light, and then he turns the image against itself in a warning against blindness and lethargy. Like the garment MacDiarmid proposes, his poem makes continuous figural use of the milling of cloth to link past and present, culture and industry, politics and poetry. If the allegorical figure of cloth is read correctly, he implies, it has the power to structure a nation.

In choosing to write his poem in Scots, MacDiarmid formally asserted the national thrust of his poem. Any reader, Scottish or otherwise, is forced to connect MacDiarmid's work with his country of origin. However, the subtlety of the poem's position within Scottish literature can only be fully appreciated through an understanding of its reiteration of the Scottish allegorical tradition. "The Seamless Garment" begins and ends with direct references to allegory's form and abilities. MacDiarmid's opening quotation of Coleridge immediately places his poem within a wider symbolic tradition.[7] *"Whene'er the mist which stands 'twixt God and thee/ Defecates to a pure transparency"* (.5). The quotation is, in itself, a poetic description of the aim of Christian allegorical perception: to remove the veil between God and humanity, to clarify humanity's God given gift of reason and reveal the infinite.[8] MacDiarmid's specific interest is in the veil that separates the common man from a pure understanding of political necessities.   However, the quotation also directly includes allegory in his poetic equation. The final lines of MacDiarmid's poem complete his reader's understanding of the connection between allegory and Scottish literature. The piece moves from Coleridge's English romantic vision of allegory's veil to a full statement of Scottish literature as both allegorical and of a piece:

> And as for me in my fricative work
>> I ken fu' weel
> Sic an integrity's what I maun ha'e,
>> Indivisible, real,
> Woven owre close for the point o' a pin
>> Onywhere to win in. (84-89)

With his final stanza, MacDiarmid emphasizes the necessarily interwoven nature of Scottish literature and harkens to its allegorical basis. Like his medieval predecessors, MacDiarmid ends his poem with a discussion of the value of "fricative work" and the possibility of integrity within that fiction. With his weaving imagery, as with the depictions of the nut and shell which are so much a part of the Scottish medieval vision of literature's allegorical purpose, MacDiarmid calls attention to the

---

[7]The quotation is found in "What is Reason" (in *The Complete Poems*. William Keach, ed. 1829, 375), a poem which concludes with a passage in Italian from Dante's *Paradiso*, Canto I. Interestingly, Coleridge and the other Romantics were not particularly supportive of allegory as a form. They found it static and preferred their definitions of symbolism instead. See Gay Clifford's *The Transformations of Allegory*, 3-4 and 122.

[8] I will more fully discuss the connections between Christianity and allegory in later chapters.

all important intermeshing of the invisible and real in his work. Within his poem, as within Scottish literature in general, a multitude of understandings are woven so tightly that not even a pin may find purchase. Likewise, for Scottish literature, allegory is that which binds Scottish readers through its revelation of identity.

As discussed above, the medieval and early modern perspective of both allegorical theory and practice included the use of a system of meanings that separated the reader from the truth. Only by properly negotiating this polysemous sign system could readers fully grasp the meaning of an allegorical text. Although medieval and early modern Scottish allegorists generally utilized the fourfold system of literal, tropological, allegorical, and anagogic meaning, other levels of comprehension were also included within their specific use of the form. In particular, Scottish allegorical authors were concerned with including an understanding of their physical surroundings (a Scottish nature), a specific perspective on the negotiation between nation and individual (a "bottom up" perspective), and a particular ethical purpose (a proper path for life.) Like the fourfold system of interpretation, these additions aid in recognizing Scottish allegory *as* allegory. Moreover, they allow initiated readers to lift the final veil separating them from the final Scottish truth and finally to comprehend their identity.

For medieval authors, Nature and humanity's physical surroundings formed an intimate connection between humanity and the divine. Through Nature, God exhibited His divine order. However, due to the fallen nature of the sublunary world, and humanity's fallen state within that world, our physical environment was viewed as locked within a cycle of decay. Nature's duality perfectly symbolized the division between our fallible, corporeal self and our divine and unimpeachable soul. Similarly, the process of allegorical reading echoes nature's polysemous effects. Both Nature and allegory enact themselves upon humanity in multiple and simultaneous ways; both surround humanity with necessary action. However, after such general connections between the medieval view of Nature and its propensity for allegorical expression are made, it is useful to break the medieval perception of Nature into three uses: Nature personified, Nature the sphere, and Nature as quality or "kind." I will address each of these three concepts individually and then utilize them to analyze both medieval and more recent Scottish works. Questions of morality, free will, and human potential combine within these three concepts to link the processes of allegory

to humanity's place within God's natural plan. Within each specific work I consider, Nature is used to empower the reader to confront all aspects of life allegorically.

Allegory plays a similar role in the construction of Scotland's literature as nationally centered. Like Scottish literature, the Scottish national identity (both political and cultural) has been plagued by stereotypes of opposition, polarity, and disfigurement. Generally accepted visions of what constitutes "nationalism," or even a "nation," often cause difficulties for the clarification of Scottish national sentiment. Because its history is checkered with division (Highland versus Lowland, Gaelic speaking versus English speaking, Catholic versus Protestant, etc.) and striped with excessive unification (the urge to become part of a British nation, the out-flux of Scotsmen into England and elsewhere, etc.), Scotland proves difficult to define. Only an understanding of allegorical literature's role in the shaping of the Scottish identity can negotiate the tangle that traditional views of nationalism make. Utilizing Benedict Anderson's theory of the "imagined community" as the basis for my discussion, I will argue that Scottish literature inspires a different sort of national identity from other British literatures. Scottish literature's national imagination does not follow the norm. Scottish authors posit their "imagined communities" from within rather than from without, through a technique that I have dubbed "bottom-up" identification. In Scottish literature, the individual defines the community. Moreover, Scottish authors exhibit this "bottom-up" identification through the use of allegorical technique. Allegory is generally well suited to national purposes, but within Scottish literature it is even more so. Because of its polysemous nature, its ability to connect the universal to the specific, its layered and contingent significances, its traditional uses, and its origins, allegory serves to combine two of Scottish nationalism's most powerful identifiers, history and religion, for literary purposes. Literature is not simply the medium through which Scottish authors can voice and deconstruct national concerns. Literature also has the ability, as a viable canon, to support arguments for a Scottish nation in general. As Hugh Stetson-Watson argues in his *Nations and States*, "Scottish literature is an institution that would recognize Scotland's status as a nation" (472). For Scotland, literature is not simply a mechanism for the perpetuation of national culture. It also foregrounds questions of national autonomy and proves that autonomy's existence. A discussion of a nation as defined by literature, however, also foregrounds considerations of that literature's ultimate goal.

As the embodiment of humanity's rational nature, morality is inherently connected with the Christian vision of mind. As the practical application of morality to life, ethical actions flow directly from the proper orientation of human nature. Ethical choices are the product of the moral interplay between the one and the many, the individual and his or her social context. With its use of complicity, allegory is ideally suited to call its readers' attention to their own place within society and their role in creating their own world. For allegorical practice, an initiation of a realization of morality within the reader becomes the purpose of writing itself. Scottish allegorical authors in particular create texts which guide their readers to choose and follow proper ethical paths. Scottish allegorical literature, more so than other British literatures, focuses upon how best life is to be lived.

As with the fourfold system of allegorical interpretation, none of the particulars of Scottish literature is meant to function on its own. No one allegorical perspective enables a vision of the tapestry of Scottish literature as a whole. Rather, all must be viewed as woven together to form a beautifully patterned whole. Thus, mimetic, political, and ethical allegorical visions all depend upon the readers' comprehension of them.

Although it would be impossible (and ludicrous) to argue that all of the texts I discuss are directly influenced by earlier or contemporaneous writings, any argument that posits a national literature must also suggest interplay between the works defined by nation. In general, the works I consider fall into the temporal categories of medieval/early modern and Romantic/post-Romantic. However, I have tried to punctuate my arguments with a broad range of texts from within the Scottish canon. The attempt to place specific texts within theoretical frameworks often necessitates a temporal flexibility. At times, the shape of my argument requires a discussion of texts that defies chronological order. All temporal inversions have been made for structural reasons and will be noted as such. Finally, although I have selected texts from widely differing periods, forms, and authorial perspectives (from Medieval poetry and plays written by men to post-World War I novels written by women), most of the works I include follow a narrative structure. Thus, I argue that through the telling of a story, Scottish authors from diverse periods attempt to create national literary representations. I am aware that not all texts falling within the Scottish canon are applicable to my thesis. However, I hope to offer an allegorical vision of Scottish

literature not as a template carved in stone, but as the "family resemblance" that links particular texts.

I am also keenly aware of the possibility of over-reaching one's own comparative argument. Is it possible that the allegorical strands I follow might be my own contrived creation? Actively involving readers through polysemous meaning cannot, after all, be the strict purpose of every author I discuss. Fortunately, allegory itself will save me from my own possibility for error. As Rosemond Tuve writes, "we must realize that some of the greatest allegories in the world's literature were not the consciously intended meanings of the original writers" (219). Generally, I believe that the works I discuss *were* intended, at least in part, to be read allegorically; however, the strength and direction of that reading must naturally be driven by the expectations of reader and society. Once we become conscious of firm allegorical connections, the question of authorial intention becomes more a sense of literary purpose combined with wider social understanding. As Cherniss writes of his vision of Boethian apocalypse, "Once one finds the 'common denominator,' once he understands how the 'literary devices' should serve the 'literary purpose', how, in short, the literary mode at its best works to convey meaning, then he can move from description to interpretation and evaluation" (8). As a literary device allegory serves Scottish literature's purpose well, and as a critical focus it helps us "go on together" (Stewart 5) through the process of literary analysis.

Chapter One

Strands of Allegory: Tracing the Warp of Scottish Literature

An Introduction to Allegory, Scottish and Otherwise

Within the classical tradition, the basic definition of allegory is a simplistic concept. In his *De Oratore*, Cicero refers to a kind of speaking which joins a succession of metaphors "so that one thing is said, but something else has to be understood" (*ut aliud dicatur, aliud intellegendum sit*) (III. xli. 166). Saying one thing, but meaning another has remained basic to allegory throughout the ages. Simplicity within allegory, however, ends with Cicero's definition. As a term, "allegory" is used in many and often conflicting ways. After the expression began its first circulation, allegory was repeatedly embroidered for individual purposes. Within the classical realm, allegory has been found to contain at least eleven interrelated and, at times, subordinated elements. These include:

> (1) other-speaking (by similarity or contrast); (2) a succession of metaphors; (3) seven species – irony, antiphrasis, riddle, charientismos, astismos, sarcasm, and proverb or proverb and application; (4) visualizing and concretizing the invisible and abstract; (5) symbolic gods and events (6) personification; (7) allusion; (8) literal, external concealment of a hidden, inner meaning; (9) fable as impossible story; (10) concealed biographical reference; and (11) analogy as in comparison, parable, example and fable. (Rollinson 18)

Medieval, scholastic criticism refines this model hermeneutically and categorically. As stated in the introduction, the medieval critic on the one hand distinguishes between theological *allegoresis* (allegorical theory) that concerns absolute truths but lies within the realm of the commentators, and poetic allegory (allegorical practice) that exists within the context of contingent and practical ethics but is practiced by creative writers. On the other hand, allegory becomes divided, as described in Dante Alighieri's *Il Convivio*, into literal, tropological, allegorical and anagogical significance.

After considering the diversity of classical and medieval visions of allegory, it is easy to understand the modern critic's difficulty with pinpointing the term. Current criticism's dilemma stems from its inheritance of all of allegory's meanings but its lack of awareness of those meanings' differences. Over time, writers attached differing meanings and extensions of meaning to allegory. Moreover, the concept and processes of allegory were identified, in diverse times and places, with other terms.

In some ways, the difficulty of mapping allegory, as both a term and a form, across the ages stems from problems that Stewart locates as central to Renaissance criticism. The issue for Stewart is one of belief in shared meaning (24). Thus, he uses Wittgensteinian ideas such as "going on together" and "justified assurance" to clarify that reading and criticism depend upon communication based on shared/cultural understanding (21-23). For Stewart, and Wittgenstein, communication within criticism and philosophy is key. "Wittgenstein modestly suggests that it doesn't much matter what we say or how we say it. The point is to make sense, so as to clear away misunderstanding" (19).[9] The problem with the criticism of allegorical texts, then, stems in part from a lack of "justified assurance" concerning both specific texts and the form as a whole, and therefore an inability to communicate, to "go on together." Thus, oversimplification seems almost a necessity for more contemporary critics and authors alike. In his *Glossary of Literary Terms*, M. H. Abrams writes:

> An allegory is a narrative fiction in which the agents and actions, and sometimes the settings as well, are contrived to make coherent sense on the 'literal', or primary, level of signification, and at the same time to signify a second, correlated order of agents, concepts, and events. (4)

However, despite its generalization (based upon Cicero) and lack of detail, Abrams's definition of allegory provides an excellent outline for an understanding that synthesizes both ancient and more modern visions of the term. If allegory is the use of language calculated to imply more than what its words directly mean, then allegory necessitates a certain depth. In order to sustain allegory, a text must continually maintain two levels of meaning at the very least. Allegory's medieval fourfold structure can be simplified into a binary: "even as a reflection of a kind or method of expression they [the four levels] do not refer to four kinds of expression but only two, literal and figurative, with four possible categories of meaning" (Rollinson xii). The division of allegory's structure of persuasive perspectives, however, is never simple. In his *Sum of Theology*, for example, Alexander is particularly interested in the specific number of divisions within allegorical theory:

> The multiplicity of understanding of Holy Scripture lies in the existence of four [senses . . .] But objections are made against this. Hugh of Saint-Victor supposes that there are only three [. . .] Moreover, Augustine in his book *On the Usefulness of Belief* says: 'All that part of Scripture which is called the Old Testament is set forth in four ways.' (Minnis 220)

---

[9] See for example, *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958, 90.

Although Alexander focuses specifically upon the theological aspects of allegory, his catalogue of the difficulty in numbering allegory's "senses" or levels displays the complexity of its total nature. No matter their number, however, allegory's perspectives do not stand alone in their own significance. To constitute allegory a specific form of perspectival correspondence is necessary. The literal and figurative (or literal, tropological, allegorical, and anagogic) levels of allegory must form an interwoven structure.

To maintain allegorical connection a text must create the perfect balance between clarification and opacity. If the text's comparison is too direct, then the attempted allegory becomes a simple statement of fact; if the comparison is too vague, then the connection is lost. In this way, allegory necessitates a specifically calculated position between surface and structure in order to function properly. As the medieval division of allegorical significance indicates, however, allegory's balance does not operate like the scales of justice, through precise duality. The balance necessary for allegory is more akin to the subtle delicacies of shading in an ornate tapestry. The relationship between tone and color, background and foreground, detail and subject matter, all play a role in allegory's power over its reader. There is an implicit dialectic at work in allegory. As Teskey puts it, "A polysemous sign can mean different things in different contexts because all such signs are supposed to belong to one truth toward which they collectively tend. Nothing in an allegory is absolutely opposed to anything else" (57). Thus, the literal level holds significance on a personal and historical level; the tropological contains both practical, political significance and theoretical morality; the allegorical encompasses spiritual understanding; and the anagogic hints at the mysterious ways of the divine.[10] It is this delicate balance among many levels of meaning that allows allegory to actively engage its readers.

The maintenance of allegory's intricacy enables readers to both initiate and complete their own ideological searches. Allegory asks its readers to actively

---

[10] Although each of these levels depends upon its relationship with the others, medieval understanding did rank them according to their connection with the divine. In this manner, despite the importance of allegory's literal level, the anagogical was frequently considered the "highest" aim of allegory and was treated as such within allegorical practice. Also see my discussion of James I's *Kings Quair* and the purpose of dream vision in chapter two.

participate in the discovery of deeper significances. Allegory is "a figure of speech incomplete in itself, which, for this very reason, makes certain demands on an audience" (Murrin 58), but it also provides for its own completion. To fully grasp an allegory, the reader must recognize both the truth as missing and the truth that exists in the text only to be discovered. Thus, allegory's status depends not only upon the maintenance of levels, the separation between the text's "fictions," what it says, and "truths," what it means, but also upon the assumed psychological activity of the reader in acknowledging the correspondence between fiction and truth.

Dramatic allegory, in which the "sentence" is presented physically and visually to an assembled audience, offers the clearest illustration of the psychological requirements of allegory. Medieval dramatists' inclusion of morality within their work necessitated the careful negotiation of a persuasive dilemma. At one and the same time, they were writing morality dramas and needed to make clear the serious allegorical "sentence" that justifies performance, but they also promised entertainment appropriate for a holiday. The necessary interplay between morality and entertainment informed the audience's connection with the play's serious meaning. Works such as Sir David Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of The Thrie Estaitis* (1540-1555) utilize their audience's moral complicity *as* an audience. Within the play, allegory operates at several levels. Physically, the audience is participating in an entertaining spectacle that juxtaposes excess with proper living. Literally, the audience is presented with the struggle between the king and his baser nature, while the fate of the nation hangs in the balance. Figuratively, the audience is led to understand that the action of the play inscribes not only humanity's struggle in life, but also the specific national situation of the audience themselves. Together, these levels create an eventual psychological acknowledgement of humankind's precarious position on the slippery slope of human life in general, and the effect of morally incorrect life choices on Scotland in particular. Anne Brannen's words as applied to "Mankind," "The play works by causing the audience to become implicated in sin, and then causing it to notice this," are therefore relevant to Lindsay's persuasive art as well (16). This being so, a full analysis of David Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis* will aid in the clarification of allegory's effects.

The 1552 Cupar production of the *Thrie Estaitis* was preceded by a "Proclamatioun" that performed the task of advertising the play itself. Such a mini-performance was common for medieval drama. Performers would spread the word of

their play by advertising time and place and offering a taste of the type of entertainment yet to come. The "Proclamatioun" certainly includes detailed information about the where and when of the *Thrie Estaitis*. Nuntius, the first character introduced to the audience, proclaims,

> Fail nocht to be upon the Castell Hill
> Besyde the place quhair we purpoiss to play: [. . .]
> We sall begin at sevin houris of the day, [. . .]
> On Witsonetysday cum see our play, I prey yow.
> That samyne day is the sevint day of June. (17-18, 23, 271-272)

He also describes the basic intention of the play,

> Richt famous pepill, ye sall understand
> How that ane prince richt wyiss and vigilent
> Is schortly for to cum in to this land,
> And purpossis to hald ane parliament. (1-4)

However, the "Proclamatioun" as a whole does not focus on the coming of a parliament or even the reform of the king that allows a parliament to take place. Rather, the "Proclamatioun" focuses on the entertainment of its audience with the interaction of a succession of comical stock characters.

Immediately after Nuntius finishes his primary proclamation of the time and place of the play, a Cotter and his wife appear, declare that they will go to the play and then argue about who should stay home to do the chores. They engage in a husband and wife exchange of insults common in medieval comedy and sure to elicit laughter from the audience: "I haif ane quick divill to my wyfe, / That haldis me evir in sturt and stryfe, / That warlo!" (31-32). They are soon joined by Fynlaw of the Fute Band (infantry company), a soldier who purports to love war and bloodshed but is quickly exposed as a coward with hilarious results, as well as a Fule, an Auld Man and his young wife, Bessy, and her suitors, the Courteour, Marchand, and Clerk. What ensues is a bawdy and often scatological free-for-all guaranteed to entertain. None of these characters, however, will reappear in the *Thrie Estaitis* and seemingly none has anything directly to do with the action or lesson of that play. It would be tempting, then, to see the "Proclamatioun" simply as the comic "hook" to get people to attend a much more serious play. What must be taken into account, however, is that the "Proclamatioun" plants the seeds of allegorical complicity that the first part of the *Thrie Estaitis* will reap.

During his introduction, Nuntius speaks directly to the audience and asks them
specifically to bring alcoholic drink to the performance of the *Thrie Estaitis*,

> Of thriftiness that day I pray yow ceiss,
> Bot ordane us gude drink aganis allevin. [. . .]
> With gude stark wyne your flacconis see ye fill,
> And hald your self the myrieast that ye may. [. . .] (15-16, 19-20)

Make sure you bring plenty to pass around and we will have a wonderful time, he tells
his listeners, and immediately afterwards the Cotter appears. The Cotter has just
come out of the pub and the kind of entertainment that Nuntius proposes sounds just
the sort for him:

> I salbe thair, with Goddis grace,
> Thocht thair war nevir so grit ane prese,
>   And formest in the fair,
> And drink ane quart in Cowpar toun
> With my gossep Johnne Williamsoun,
>   Thocht all the nolt sould rair. (25-30)

The Cotter would like nothing better than to escape his duties at the farm and stand
around drinking with his friend. The Cotter's appearance and sentiments begin the
audience's complicity. Although the "Proclamatioun" is an early modern work, it
displays some of the conventions of medieval drama, primarily the absence of a
fourth wall. Within medieval (and some early modern) drama actors were free to
interact with and move among the audience at will. Thus, although the text of the
"Proclamatioun" does not contain many stage directions, it would have been likely
that the Cotter was physically associated with or standing near the crowd of Nuntius's
listeners. Indeed, the Cotter casts himself as part of Nuntius's audience, "I micht not
thrist owtthrow the thrang, / Till that yone man the play proclamit" (64-65).
Moreover, he expresses the mood of the audience, a play was a chance to catch up
with friends and enjoy drink and entertainment.

The "Proclamatioun" locates drinking and bawdy humor as central to
entertainment. Moreover, audience participation, as well as "good-humored"
complicity, is maintained throughout. For instance, when the Auld Man awakens
from his nap to find that Bessy is gone (she is fornicating with the Fule in a nearby
bush), he asks the audience, "Is thair na man that saw my Bess?" (212). The answer
to this question is categorically that every man there knows where Bessy is, but no
man is willing to share that knowledge with the Auld Man both because it would spoil
the fun of the dramatic action and because the stock character of an old man with a
young wife does not engender sympathy. The audience, then, becomes complicit in

Bessy and the Fule's actions, but little fault can be found in them doing so. Similarly, the immediate appeal that the "Proclamatioun" makes to relax, enjoy and drink is fair within itself, and will be briefly repeated within the *Thrie Estaitis*. However, such actions are also the usual start of sinful decline in the very morality tradition which is being "proclaimed." The sins of the flesh (sloth, gluttony and lechery) lead to those of the world and ultimately to the devil, and Lindsay will utilize his audience's complicity to highlight the dangers of physical pleasures.

After viewing the "Proclamatioun" and the antics that its characters perform, the audience of the *Thrie Estaitis* would be forgiven for expecting more of the same. Assuredly, they have brought their drink, as Nuntius requested, and are ready to mingle with their neighbors and be entertained. Diligence's words at the opening of "Part One" alert the reader to the tone and boisterous nature of his audience. His speech begins with a not unusual prayer for the audience that God,

> [Save] yow all that I sie seasist in this place,
>   And scheild yow from sinne,
> And with His spreit yow inspyre
> Till I haue shawin my desyre. (8-11)

However, with the knowledge that it is not God's "spreit" that saturates the audience, Diligence's words take on a different meaning, a meaning further tempered with his need to shout for silence. "Silence, [soveranis], I requyre, / For now I begin! / *Pausa* / Tak tent to me, my freinds, and hald yow coy!" (12-14). Although it was by no means unusual that a medieval performance begin with a general call for quiet, Diligence's speech speaks to both the inebriated and noisy nature of the crowd.

From Diligence's first speech to the end of "Part One" drunkenness and moderation become a central theme not only for the action of the play, but also for its engagement of the audience. The *Thrie Estaitis* combines the dual purposes of drama (imparting a moral lesson and entertainment) to initiate a connection with its audience. Rex Humanitas, the figure of both the king and humanity, is introduced when he is uncorrupted by vice and feels that righteousness is the proper path, "O Lord, I hairtlie The exhort / To gif me grace to use my diadeame / To Thy pleasure and to my great comfort" (99-101). Rex recognizes that he needs God's guidance to be a proper king, and that his role as king is not to seek out worldly pleasure and comfort, but to strive to bring pleasure to the Lord through right acts, and thus gain spiritual comfort. Such sentiments are divine, but they are not entertaining, a "fault"

that Diligence noted in his opening speech. After summarizing the action of the entire play, Diligence asks for the audience's patience:

> Als I beseik yow famous auditouris,
> Conveinit in this congregatioun,
> To be patient the space of certaine houris
> Till ye have hard our short narratioun. (54-58)

Although the audience recognizes the truth and goodness behind Rex's opinions as a "newly born" king, they are unlikely to be particularly interested in them, especially after their preparation by the "Proclamatioun." They are primed for entertainment, and what they will receive is an artful counterpointing of serious and comic arguments.

Without the interplay of literal and moral, temporal and divine, the audience could not fully undergo Rex's salvation with him. Like the audience, Rex is only human and he is led to follow vice through human weakness. Immediately after Rex's humble prayer, three courtiers, Wantonnes, Placebo, and Solace, wait on him. They, his physical and emotional needs and his tendency to accept earthly substitutes for divine comfort, get the better of Rex, encouraging him to allow Sensualitie a royal presentation. Sensualitie's appearance in turn leads to the ascendancy of vice in Rex's court. All of the links in this chain of sin are joined by one predilection: drunkenness (or gluttony). When we are first introduced to Wantonnes and Placebo they are discussing their companion Solace and his connection to Sensualitie.

> I left Solace, that same greit loun,
> Drinkand into the burrows-toun:
> It will cost him halfe of ane croun,
>   Althoucht [he] had na mair!
> And als, he said hee wald gang see
> Fair Ladie Sensualitie. (126-131)

Of the three courtiers, two are directly connected with excessive drinking. When Solace appears, he is obviously drunk but also quite happy with himself, and extremely entertaining. His inebriated speech about his mother, for example, contains the same kind of bawdy humor found in the "Proclamatioun." Here, then, is the kind of entertainment that the audience was expecting. This festivity continues as the courtiers indulge themselves and use drunken logic to convince the king to allow Sensualitie accesses to his person. As is to be expected, one sin leads to another. Gluttony will bring about lechery, lechery will encourage sloth, and this downward spiral will drag the king and his nation inexorably into the depths. The connection

between excessive drinking and falling to vice continues through each successive introduction of evil into the court. At first, however, the audience is prevented by their own role of "being entertained" to notice gluttony's place in vice's access to the nation.

After Rex has taken to his bed with Sensualitie, the play switches tone again. The audience is presented with the serious words of Gude Counsall, words that will at first fall on deaf ears both inside and outside the play's action. Neither the characters nor the congregated patrons are yet able to heed Gude Counsall. It is also in this speech that the state of Scotland as a nation fallen to vice is addressed: "Bot out of Scotland, wa alace! / I haif bene flemit lang tyme space" (578-579). Scotland has not allowed Gude Counsall within its borders for quite some time, as both Rex's actions and the actions within the "Proclamatioun" show. Scotland has fallen under misrule from the highest ruling position to the lowest Cotter. And before Gude Counsall can truly make his point to the audience, the primary vices arrive, again shifting the play's focus from morality to entertainment. Flatterie, Falset, and Dissait bring with them their particular brand of bawdy and slapstick humor, and remove all possibility for direct reformation of either monarch or audience, until a future moment. No one can listen to Gude Counsall when they are being so well entertained.

The vices' manner of entrance, however, does allow for the subtle shift in the audience's awareness of complicity. Flatterie makes himself known by shoving his way through the crowd, "Mak roume, sirs, hoaw! that I may rin! / Lo, se quhair I am new cum [in]" (602-603). Dissait arrives similarly, "Stand by the gait, that I may steir! / I say Koks bons, how cam I heir? / I can not mis to tak sum feir / Into so greit ane thrang" (658-661). By entering through and making such direct comments on the audience, the vices show themselves to be a part of (or to have sprung from) the crowd itself. They, of all the characters involved in "Part One," interact the most directly and easily with the audience. They represent the possibility of what the audience may become if the balance between entertainment and morality is not appropriately negotiated. From this point on, the play's humor begins to take on an edge of discomfort.

Throughout the remaining action of "Part One" each of the vices' true nature is exposed to the audience. Dame Sensualitie, for example, does not appear so lovely after her godly counterparts Dame Veritie and Dame Chastitie appear. Like Gude Counsall, these virtuous ladies attempt to counteract the effects of weakness and sin.

Unlike him, their words will not fall on deaf ears because their elevated speech and comportment form a counterpoint to the base actions of all those around them. Moreover, unlike the comical violence of the clashes between the vices, these Ladies' harsh treatment cannot be easily born. By the end of "Part One," drunkenness, sin, and vice have been clearly linked. The encounter between Chastitie and the Taylour and Sowtar, for example, reveals excessive drinking as the common man's downfall. Thus, the *Thrie Estaitis* uses the audience's own physical state, both their consumption of alcohol and their actual relationship to the action of the play, to underline the possibility of their complicity in sin. Worldy enjoyment has its place, but excess ultimately leads to corruption.

Although the physical presence of an audience enables the *Thrie Estaitis* to perform much of its allegorical power, all creative allegory operates within similar parameters. Anne Brannen's description of medieval dramatic technique also describes the mental work that is required of readers of allegory. She writes, "the technique of including the audience in the drama, not just to entertain it, but to cause it to remember what it already knows about the nature of sin and the possibility of redemption [is] one of the most intelligent of the medieval dramatic techniques" (17). Like medieval drama, non-dramatic allegory presupposes the lack of a literary "fourth wall." Authors of allegory purposefully remove the division between reader and text that more modern readers have come to expect. Allegory "contains instructions for its own interpretation" (Teskey 3). Readers of allegory have a task: to recognize and interact with the meshing of multiple meaning. Readers become an active part of allegory. Meaning is not simply provided; readers must use what they know to strive for it. In Sayre Greenfield's words, "Allegory is extraordinary mental work" (13). Allegory includes its readers in its messages; it forces them to hold a mirror up to their psyche. By reading polysemously, readers become part of the text themselves. Their multiple and simultaneous understanding *is* allegory, and allegory utilizes that understanding to direct psychological action. It empowers readers to delve into the depths of meaning and grasp hidden truth. As with the audience's relationship with the *Thrie Estaitis*, by experiencing creative, non-dramatic allegory, readers learn how to (re-)interpret their own life choices.

Because allegory depends upon the assumption of truth as supporting fiction, authors of allegorical texts frequently write with an ethical purpose. Allegorical fiction is put to the task of molding readers' minds to the right way of thinking. As

Hugh of St. Victor describes in his *Didascalicon*, humanity has forgotten its previous unification with truth; thus we must engage in study to recognize our proper nature (46). Within the Christian tradition, allegory has long been used to exemplify ethical decision-making. For medieval and early modern authors, ethical purpose validated poetic creation. Allegory's ability to educate enabled medieval and early modern literary theorists to place poetry within the realm of necessary philosophy. Many of the debates surrounding poetry's validation, and comparing the purpose of poetry with that of the Bible, center on both allegorical visions and ethical validation. Saint Bonaventure's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, for example, includes the question, "Whether this book or theology has contemplation as its aim, or that we should become good; in other words, is it speculative or practical science?"[11] Poetry is relegated to the category of base and lying fiction, but may be redeemed through its connections to moral philosophy and its use of allegory to initiate ethical action.

Some more recent critics, such as John Gardiner, feel that allegory is too static a form to allow for the flexibility necessary to enact valid change within its readers. In his *On Moral Fiction*, Gardiner equates allegory with propaganda as "knowing what it thinks from the start," and therefore unable to enact anything but dogma (411). From this perspective, allegory is seen exclusively as something both bound and binding, but boundaries are essential if ethical choices are to be made. Moreover, it is not its parameters that allegory focuses upon. Rather, allegory's goal is the mediation of choice within a specified situational structure. Allegory functions within what Wittgenstein refers to as a "form of life,"[12] "the human matrix in which the individual expression [. . .] made perfect sense" (Stewart 12). Allegory causes its readers to recognize that the text is working at more than one level, and to psychologically enact that interplay between meanings. As J. Hillis Miller succinctly puts it: "The act of reading would lead the reader voluntarily to impose the necessary ethical law embodied in that text on himself" (19). Allegorical works draw the reader into an active initiation of the ethical interplay embodied by their text.

A majority of my arguments necessarily focus upon allegorical practice. However, it is also important to be aware of allegorical theory's place within the conception of allegory as a whole. The theologians' process of allegorical

---

[11] *S. Bonaventurae opera omnia* (Quaracchi, 1882 - 1902), i. 9-15. Minnis, trans.
[12] See *Preliminary Studies for the* "Philosophical Investigations": *Generally known as the Blue and Brown Books*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958, 93.

interpretation, typological allegory, is rather different from poetic allegorical composition. Instead of imbuing a text with crucial ethical visions, it divines God's meaning from His Word. The typology of theologians was seen as reading along mimetic lines as implied by the biblical text, while composed allegorical texts were viewed as necessitating authorial intention, working perspectivally, and contingent in their usefulness.[13] Initially, the understanding of allegory as divided by four-fold meaning was primarily applied to biblical interpretation. The allegorical patterns that emerged out of classical thought were typologically applied to the Bible. Medieval theorists implicitly accepted the fact that the Bible was written with allegorical analysis as one of its fundamental purposes. Saint Paul himself initiated this vision of the Bible. In his letter to the Galatians, Paul reads the Old Testament allegorically:

> For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave woman and the other by a free woman. One, the child of the slave, was born according to the flesh; the other, the child of the free woman, was born through the promise. Now this is an *allegory*: these women are two covenants. (Galatians 4:21-24, my emphasis)

The verb *aligoreo*, "to speak allegorically," is the only form of this word for "other speaking" found in the Bible, and Paul's use of it sets the formative example for future Christian exegesis (Rollinson 30). Neither Paul's reading, however, nor subsequent Christian readings of the Bible denied the historical truth of the text they interpreted. Instead, typological readings unearthed the spiritual reasons for biblical events to have been written down. In this manner, God himself becomes the ultimate allegorical author, and history the shining example of creative allegory recorded for the edification of Christianity. To the Christian typologist, the Old Testament was made up of details which pointed to the New Testament and thus directly to God's plan: "Scripture begins to turn into a series of splendidly written articles on the world, a book of God about that other book of God" (Whitman 80). Through such allegorical interpretation, biblical history was not a sequence, but a process that operated within the providential purpose of God. Justifiably, it is difficult to import the theoretical concerns of medieval typologists, such as Augustine, for a discussion of allegory in general. However, the ideas of such medieval biblical theorists developed in part from the classical/pagan. Thus there is a significant relationship between biblical typological allegory and allegorical secular texts. Typology

---

[13] See Rollinson 81, for a discussion of this.

(allegorical theory) makes the world into a book, while allegorical practice makes books into the world.

Allegorical theory and allegorical practice each forms a part of the greater question of fiction's integrity. While the former defines the importance of allegorical visions themselves, the latter serves as a justification of the supposed frivolities of imagination. Yet identical problems of allegorical interpretation plague both the Bible and its mundane kin. How can allegorical interpretation be held to a logical and consistent standard? How do readers come to know that they are meant to initiate allegorical practices and how do they know if they are making the proper interpretations? Hints of the presence of allegorical significance within any work could be wholly a question of interpretive expectation. Classical theorists were certainly aware of such difficulties. In Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, Cotta criticizes Balbus for using allegorical methods to explain mythology.

> Again, why are you [Balbus] so fond of those allegorizing [. . .] methods of explaining mythology? The mutilation of Caelus by his son, and likewise the imprisonment of Saturn by his, these and similar fragments you rationalize so effectively as to make out their authors to have been not only not idiots, but actually philosophers. [. . .] One can only pity your misplaced ingenuity! (III.62.1-15)

Allegorical interpretation is often arbitrary and does not display authorial intention, but rather reflects the interpreter's ingenuity in inventing semi-appropriate significances for the text at hand. And what about those critics who argue for allegorical meanings that the author of a text might be unaware of? As Stewart asks, "Is it possible to focus so completely on 'unconscious thought' that one's awareness of conscious expression is impaired?" (59). Unsurprisingly, Stewart uses Wittgenstein's "form of life" to answer such questions. When our readings clearly derive from a different "form of life" than do the texts that they purport to describe we must begin to investigate our critical motives (Stewart 244). We must remember that all texts seek to communicate meaning and stem from a particular "form of life," and that a text written to be read allegorically does not free it from its status *as* a text. The solution to problems concerning allegorical meaning and intention is difficult to pinpoint, and this difficulty has also been used to widen the divide between allegorical theory and allegorical practice.

In his objections to allegorizing pagan myth, St. Augustine follows Cotta's rationale. Augustine's view of allegorical interpretation of the Bible, however,

delineates certain reading practices that enable proper allegorical understanding. In order to prevent perverse and heretical readings, Augustine mandates that all meanings interpreted from the Bible must conform to known Christian truth (*Christian Doctrine* II. vii. 10). Moreover, the obscure point must always coordinate with the obvious one; the interpreter must learn the unknown by its appropriate relationship with the known (*City of God* xvii. xvi). Because scripture itself uses the same image in a multitude of senses, allegorical interpreters must apply their minds to the immediate context of the passage (*Christian Doctrine* II. xxv. 35-37). Finally, Augustine asserts that allegorical interpretation may never deny or question the historical accuracy of the biblical facts literally indicated by the passage. Although Augustine himself scrupulously separates his vision of proper biblical allegorical reading from secular works, his critical inheritors often apply many of his rules for interpretation outside the Bible. The difficulty for secular literature, however, is that no one overarching truth unifies its purpose; instead, the diversity of critical perspectives creates an endless array of possible truths. Still, it is necessary to follow Augustine's arguments for linking the known with the unknown, finding the obscure significance that knits the particular truth of the text.

There is no simple answer to the question of how one is to know when to read allegorically. Yet, readers can usually recognize allegory by combining two observations. Firstly, they can notice the polysemous nature of the text they are engaged with, the interplay between fiction and underlying truth (or entertainment and morality). When considering the status of literary work "within the frame of tradition," Teskey views the work as a treasure, a monument, and a mirror (159). For him, works themselves have a threefold system of understanding. It is his concept of text as monument, however, that is most useful here. "The monument is perceived in itself as a thing, but in that act of perception something other is called" (Teskey 160). Although Teskey goes on to argue that for the Middle Ages that other is truth itself, while for the modern world it is value, in both cases, "one keeps returning to the monument to be reminded of something for which it stands" (160). The movement between literal and "other" must be maintained for the "monument" to function. Secondly, as exemplified by my previous discussion of the *Thrie Estaitis*, readers can notice their level of engagement; they can intuit how the text enacts its lessons on their psyches. In this manner, an activity akin to the view of reading as internalized or private that underpins reader response theory (Stewart 92) combines with the

polysemous nature of the text to cause readers to recognize their own complicity. "For successful communication to take place, the allegorical expression *must* be assisted by some means other than, and beyond, its own verbal expression" (Rollinson 21). Allegory's flaw is that if readers cannot recognize either part of the dual combination described above, then allegory ceases to exist. As Rollinson asserts, the key to allegorical interpretation lies in the combination of expression and intention: the reader must take into account both the text and the author's context (21). If one is to make the connection between a literary discipline and its allegorical tendencies, then the signaling of allegory through context, through "a form of life," is a crucial assertion. Readers must be prepared for, or expect, deeper significances to be discovered within the text. Scotland's long tradition of biblical study, for example, aids in the creation of readers with allegorical expectations, readers who are able to "go on together."

Hugh of St. Victor's metaphor of a well-built house similarly precludes the vision of allegory as relative. For Hugh, problems of reading do not stem from the mode itself, but from a lack in the reader's education. If readers have not built their understanding upon a foundation of holistic study, if they have not studied all of the history of the matter, then their readings will collapse (*Didascalicon* 139-144). Although the product of allegorical practice may be based upon any number of truths, it can only be properly read if readers have been initiated into the work's position within literature and into their own position as readers of allegory. Scottish readers have been made aware of allegory through the continuity of literary tradition; Scottish authors across time have utilized their craft to maintain the thread of allegorical understanding.

Much of Scottish allegorical practice stems from a link between the present and the past. Teskey argues that allegory "teaches us to reflect on the past as real" (167). Such a lesson allows allegorical authors to free the past from the calcified status of a "golden age." Within a given culture, allegory performs the ritualized transaction of interpretation (Teskey xi). Allegory utilizes what has gone before to flesh out the concerns of the present. "It is of the very essence of allegorical practice to capture and reorganize the material remains of the past in an ideological frame that belongs to the present" (Teskey 187). Allegorical practice, for example, was structured upon allegorical theory. Moreover, an understanding of the past as unified is necessary for allegorical understanding. In this manner the "loss of temporal

relatedness among allegories, and more generally, of relatedness to previously made works, was accompanied by a loss of vitality" (Teskey 163). More modern Scottish author's continued allegorical practice is in part a response to the lack of unity and vitality of the western literary-historical tradition that Teskey attributes to the Enlightenment:

> Because the narrative sequence of [historical] causes was not, like the allegorical structure of signs, secured by the power of transcendental reference, the literary-historical narrative required a basis for permanence amid change that would be latent in the tradition itself. Such a foundation was supplied by the concept of culture, of a collective subjectivity that can contemplate itself in the things it has made. (150)

In Teskey's view the Enlightenment caused allegory (and history) to become confined to the self rather than extended through a coherent narrative. He also attributes the Romantic period's elevation of the symbol (to the realm of singularity once held by allegory) to the breakdown of allegory as a historically articulated form. Still, his vision of culture as "collective subjectivity" allows for allegory to maintain its integrity on a more local basis (98, 149-150). Thus, Scottish literature is able to maintain its allegorical continuity through the "collective subjectivity" of Scottish culture.

Despite allegory's status as necessarily founded in cultural unity, it is able to operate within a spectrum of intention. Sometimes authors choose to write allegorically in order to communicate truth exclusively to those who can understand it, keeping the masses from destroying and distorting truth with their ignorance. In other instances the allegorist only thinly obscures the truth, and it can generally be discovered after concentrated examination, as when a tapestry is specifically woven to reveal the warp threads beneath the weft. Generally, however, allegory accomplishes something in-between. As Giovanni Boccaccio points out in his "Short Treatise in Praise of Dante,"

> Gregory says of Holy Scripture that which may also be said of poetry, namely, that in a single discourse (*sermone*), by narrating (*narrando*), it discloses both the text and the mystery which underlies it. And thus at a single moment it tests out the wise at one level and reassures the ingenious at the other; it makes public that by which little children may be nourished, and conserves in private that by which it may keep the minds of the loftiest of thinkers rapt in admiration. (495)

Although anyone might discover the morality that underpins an allegory, only those who are knowledgeable may discover its fullest significances. In a similar manner,

allegory's polysemous nature allows, at one extreme, an infinite range of readings, and at the other, tightly enclosed and specific meaning. Where a particular allegorical work falls within the scope of these opposing poles is entirely up to the author, and depends upon his or her allegorical purpose. Some medieval authors, such as Geoffrey Chaucer, chose allegory as a tool for revealing questions that encouraged their readers to expansively consider the difficulties of sublunar existence, that human love is fleeting, for example. Others, such as Robert Henryson, James I, William Dunbar, William Drummond and Sir David Lindsay, resist such an open-ended, question inducing approach, preferring to utilize allegory's ability for audience control. Much of Scottish medieval and early modern literature does not raise problems of interpretation due to such a preference. Similarly, across the ages Scottish allegorical authors favor allegorical methods that provide readers with a clearly defined, if difficult, path. Scottish allegorists tend to create allegory that is symbolic and exhibits a meaningful narrative.

Recently, critics like Ellen Leyburn have begun to lament the fact that personification allegory has come to stand for allegory proper: "The usurpation of the word allegory by personification [. . . has] been more responsible than any other development for the disrepute into which the term [allegory] began to fall in the late eighteenth century and from which it is only beginning to emerge" (4). Unfortunately, this usurpation has also obfuscated the utility and importance of personification allegory's more demanding foil, symbol allegory.[14]

The difference between these allegorical methods concerns levels of interpretation. Personification allegory endows abstractions with an animation and will of their own. Thus, "Mercy," "Lust" and "Nature" may be separated from their places within the human world and shown to act directly. What must be understood about such concepts is that in and of themselves they do not contain the multiple meaning to support allegorical reading. A character named Lust who is lustful *is* what his name says he is. "Lust" *is* lust. As R. W. Frank describes it, "Personification-allegory is clearly allegoric [only] when abstractions engage in action" (Frank 242). Only a personified character's actions or situation can be interpreted allegorically. When reading personification allegory, it is crucial to remember that the names of personifications express a single meaning. For personification allegory, the reader's

---

[14] R. W. Frank clarified this terminology in his "Art of Reading Medieval Personification-allegory" (238).

duty is to find the second meaning in the "pattern of relationship and activity" of the personification's actions and environment (Frank 245). In this sense, we might read "Part One" of Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis* as a personification allegory. Rex Humanitas's courtiers, Wantonness, Placebo and Solace, are the kind of human errors that would plague a ruler. Their actions, leading the king to gluttony and encouraging him to indulge in Sensualitie and sloth, demand allegorical interpretation: falling prey to human weakness leads to greater vice. However, Lindsay's addition of a national aspect to his play adds a further layer of allegorical reading. Thus, the *Thrie Estaitis* can also be read as a symbol allegory.

In symbol allegory, characters and situations exist in a more concrete form. They function fully at the literal level and also symbolize another discrete meaning. The task for readers in this case becomes doubly difficult. First, readers must recognize a symbol's other meanings. Second, readers must understand the other meanings of that symbol's actions and its relationships to other symbols. In the *Thrie Estaitis*, Rex is not simply a man plagued by human weaknesses, he is the king and his weaknesses are particular to kingship. Similarly, if a man falls to Sensualitie, he only endangers his own soul; if a king does so his nation is also in peril. In the case of Rex, it is difficult to tell which is the primary meaning of the symbol and which the secondary, man or king. However, when readers have recognized that there *are* multiple layers of meaning, the connection between man and weakness and king and nation has been made, so that it is possible to read many passages of the *Thrie Estaitis* as a symbolic allegory.

"Part Two" of the play can most easily be read as a personification allegory. Each of the Estaitis, for example, acts according to its kind, and only through an interaction between the Estaitis, their vices and the characters associated with them, can the reader gain allegorical knowledge of the need for justice through the king's parliament. However, the fact that these Estaitis are *not* simply representations of abstractions, but are actually parts of the Scottish nation, again also allows for a symbolic allegorical reading. Rex is not just any king, he is the Scottish king; and Spiritualitie, Temporalitie and the Merchands are not just any representation of the spiritual, temporal and merchant classes, they are specifically Scottish. The *Thrie Estaitis* is not simply a commentary on how a king lured into sensual living affects his nation; it is a consideration of the state of the Scottish nation and the specific corrections that need to take place within its borders.

As allegorical methods, personification and symbol allegory need not be used exclusively. Frank describes medieval authors as often complicating matters by employing both forms in the same piece of writing (238), something that is certainly true for Lindsay. But what is also true for the *Thrie Estaitis* is that personification and symbol allegory are expressed simultaneously. The play would operate quite well for a general audience in getting across its messages about humanity and even kingship in general. For a Scottish audience at the time, however, such generalities became symbols for the specific needs of the Scottish nation. In this manner, Lindsay reserved the most difficult allegorical significances for his Scottish audience, a trend that would continue throughout Scottish literary history.

Another division of allegorical method coalesces around the distinction between allegories that utilize objects or people which in and of themselves represent physical and intellectual qualities of existence and allegories with plots that operate at more than one level. John MacQueen terms the former "figural allegory" and the latter "narrative allegory" (*Allegory* 18). As with personification and symbol allegory, Scottish medieval allegorists utilize both methods but favor narrative allegory, the more complex of the two. Narrative allegory can be clearly observed at work within one of the most traditional carriers of ancient sentiment: fables. Through fables, medieval authors were able to create or build upon a narrative with allegorical significances and then guide readers to specific interpretations of that narrative. Fable logic most clearly played upon the movement between layers of meaning. With the inclusion of particular *moralitates*, fables display the link between the foundational (narrative/historical) meaning of the text and successive structural layers of meaning. *Moralitates* show the allegorical author's craftsmanship and expose the architectural design that Hugh of St. Victor locates as the core of allegorical understanding: "As you are about to build, therefore, lay first the foundation of history; next, by pursuing the 'typical' meaning, build up a structure in your mind to be a fortress of faith. Last of all, however, through the loveliness of morality, paint the structure over as with the most beautiful of colors" (138). *Moralitates* explain why and how allegory works and encourages the reader to re-think, correct, and re-read along similar lines. Thus, the fable exhibits both a difficult process of understanding and a particular circumscribed lesson.

In the Middle Ages fables were used for both scholastic and moral teaching. They "appear to have been used as the basis for rhetorical exercises, for training in

reading, ethics, and argumentation" (Gray 45). Fables were (and are) also often included in Christian sermons. Like allegory proper, fables offer something to people from the general folk; they act as "literary pictures." Fables with their short length and easily remembered narratives/morals are meant to both please and instruct. Animal fables, for example, bring readers closer to an understanding of their position within the world. In his *Morall Fabillis* (1477-1571), Henryson describes humanity as having become like beasts through sin. Thus, the sinful mistakes that animals make in fables more exactly duplicate human error than explicit description would. Such an argument is strongly supported by the medieval world vision.[15] Animal fables are beneficial because by studying animals, which are part of God's creation, humanity may be brought to ponder its Maker. Moreover, humanity's position at the apex of the natural creation and our status as a "little world," "a composite being, partly akin to the angels who are rational but [. . .] not animal, and partly akin to the beasts which are animal but not rational," give animal fables particular human relevance (Lewis, *Image* 152-53). Because of their analogical relationship with humanity, animals are the perfect vehicles for moral implication.

Animals are not necessary either to the fable form or to narrative allegory. However, traditional types, such as the "other world journey" at the center of Henryson's *Orpheus and Eurydice*, do often structure narrative allegory. At the core of Henryson's *Orpheus* is the classical tale of Orpheus's descent into Hades in search of his wife Eurydice. Along the way, he encounters many strange and wonderful worlds and beings, all of which Henryson elaborates both within the text proper and within the attached *moralitas*. Although the myth of Orpheus was not generally used as a fable, Henryson's addition of a specific and separate moral links it to that form. Moreover, it is in the *moralitas* that Henryson reveals the meanings underlying the narrative of his poem. Hidden under "the cloik of poetré" is "gud moralitie, / Rycht full of fructe and seriositie" (420, 423-424). Thus, Henryson clarifies for his readers his use of symbol allegory. Orpheus is "the pairte intellectyfe" of the human soul, just as Eurydice is "our effectioun, / Be fantesy oft movit up and doun" (428, 431-432). Her death and Orpheus's subsequent mythical voyage represent the struggle between human intelligence and our baser desires. Although Henryson's text does display several instances of figural allegory (for example, Orpheus's harp is

---

[15]The sinful man turned beast is a conventional medieval idea based ultimately on the Aristotelian concept of reason. See Powell 73.

representative of intellect's eloquence) his use of allegory as a whole depends upon narrative. Without Orpheus's journey, no particular figure would amount to much. Henryson even imports several other classical myths into Orpheus's experience in Hades as mini-examples of narrative allegory. Henryson includes Tantalus's tale, for example, to illustrate the evils of greed as well as intelligence's (Orpheus's) ability to show us the dangers of placing too much confidence in the useless objects of the human world. Unlike Orpheus's journey, however, these mini-narratives are included in the *moralitas* alone. Orpheus himself only sees the consequences of evil actions and gives aid; he finds Tantalus in the classical position of perpetual thirst, hunger, and tantalizing relief and uses the power of music to assuage Tantalus's cravings. It is in the *moralitas* that Tantalus's full story of sin (his sacrifice of his son in exchange for worldly riches) is brought to the reader's attention and allegorically converted into ethical meaning. Thus, within the *moralitas*, figures are given their own narrative allegory, and serve as a means of emphasizing the full impact of narrative action and consequence. As with much of Henryson's work, the action and outcome of stories carry the greatest allegorical and ethical power.

Scottish allegorical authors tend to favor symbolic and narrative allegory because, as Jack and Rozendaal write in describing the "makar's" predilections, "the best art is also the most demanding" (xvii). Reading allegory is in and of itself a demanding task, but the symbolic and narrative methods of allegory require the highest standards of analytical interpretation. Moreover, they allow for a more refined control of the reader's experience of the text. Symbol allegory necessitates the ability to grasp a particular symbolic meaning, while narrative allegory compels the reader to associate certain plot lines with polysemous reading.

In the hands of Christian authors, Scottish and otherwise, allegory becomes a tool for achieving humanity's salvation. With it, a reader can be given the key to his or her own redemption and encouraged to use it. As mentioned previously, in his "Epistle to Can Grande," Dante Alighieri describes his purpose in writing the *Divine Comedy* as the teaching of humanity (463). Dante, then, assumes that humanity has the capacity for salvation. As Tuve writes, "the concept of man, as that creature [. . .] who belongs to the kind that may be delivered from the ravishment of death and united to the heavenly original whence it sprang, is a conception of man which is of central importance to the question of allegorical reading" (17). The basic assumption that redemption is a possibility underlies allegory as a whole. Why write about the

evils of society, the corruption of the court, or the improper life of an individual soul unless changes for the better can be made? The end of allegory is to move its readers to a better life. Teskey's description of allegory as the union of the self with the other also supports allegory's redemptive function. "At the root of the motives for allegorical expression is [. . .] instrumental meaning, meaning not as a representation of what already is but as the creative exertion of force" (5). Allegory asserts the proper path; it forces its readers to recognize and choose what is right. In this manner, when combined with Christian beliefs, the Scots' tendency to favor more difficult methods of allegory requires readers to engage in the analytical contemplation of ethical arguments. Such contemplation also requires the recognition of personal complicity and thus the psychological enactment of epiphany.

In the Middle Ages, allegory was a widely used and understood literary technique. As I stated in the introduction, medieval and early modern Scottish authors who chose to write allegorically were not unique in their general practices. However, as described above, they did favor allegorical methods that were particularly demanding of their readers' understanding, methods that their literary inheritors also prefer. Similarly, it is possible to discern certain allegorical tropes as common within the Scottish canon. Mimetic, political and ethical allegorical visions are those that most concern Scottish authors. Although each trope displays a distinct perspective on the world, within Scottish literature none works alone. Each practice is contingent upon the other and all are unified through allegory's polysemous nature.

Mimetic Naturalism

Mimesis for an Aristotelian exists causally as a means (*causa materialis* and *causa formalis*) and not as an end (*causa finalis*).   In book two, chapter three of his *Physics*, Aristotle discusses the connection between Nature and Art as one that concerns the means and the end of a thing. In Aristotle's view, material causes, what the thing is made of or can be cut up into, and formal causes, that which the matter of a thing proximately constitutes, are joined with the final cause, what the other two causes are *for* in the best sense (II.3.194.b16-195.b30). Material and formal causes are the means to the final cause. Aristotle also sees the act of creating art in this way, "the art of statue-making and the bronze are both causes of a statue [. . .] they are not, however, causes in the same way, but the latter is a cause as matter, and the former as that from which the *change* proceeds" (II.3.195.a5-10, my emphasis). Mimesis, in

that it is an artistic representation, a recreation, of Nature, can be equated with "the art of statue-making" while Nature itself can represent "the bronze," the *causa materialis*. Using Aristotle's definitions, evoking a *change*, a proper moral reaction among the chosen audience, can be seen as the final cause of artistic creation. Hugh of St. Victor, for example, utilizes the Aristotelian point of view when he discusses Nature and Art from both a moral and Christian perspective. In book one, chapter ten ("What Nature Is") of his *Didascalicon* he outlines Aristotle's distinctions with three quotations, 1) "Nature is that which gives to each thing its being," 2) "The peculiar difference given to each thing is its nature" and, 3) "Nature is an artificer fire coming forth from a certain power to beget sensible objects" (57). Hugh then goes on in book two, chapter one ("Concerning the Distinguishing of the Arts") to define the arts, humanity's attempt at "an artificer fire" as, "concerned with [. . . restoring] within us the divine likeness, a likeness which to us is a form but to God is his nature" (61). In this way, that which is a *causa materialis* or a *causa formalis* to us, is God's *causa finalis*. From a Aristotelian Christian perspective, Nature is that which may be used for the betterment of humanity. Further, allegory is an excellent tool for the artisan to use in crafting his work.

The mirror is a recurring image used in descriptions of allegory's function. However, as Northrop Frye points out, allegory is not itself the mirror, but that which holds the mirror up so that readers can scrutinize their experience (71-92). In his critical text, *The Veil of Allegory*, Michael Murrin describes the theological vision that makes allegory an excellent medium for the expression of reality:

> The poet's fictions reflected a true situation. The soul recalled through vision its actual paradisic state. It perceived the ideas in the Divine Mind and wove this revelation into a figured discourse which would re-create the same vision in other people. The vision could be transferred because all men had once experienced it and needed only a powerful stimulus to draw it out of their deeper memories. (62)

The truth, though remembered by all, cannot be directly communicated to humankind in its blinded post-lapsarian state. A human author channeling the divine is unable to express him or herself directly because no human understanding may fully encapsulate divinity. Instead, allegorical texts create an accessible reflection of reality. "What the mirror reveals is, to be sure, just a reflection of reality; but it is only by means of the reflection that reality is to be perceived" (Leyburn 8-9). Likewise, a complete understanding of reality is far beyond any human grasp; only

through observing the least of the cosmos's physicality can humanity hope to comprehend what may exist in totality. In the natural world, the smallest interactions are symbolic of the divine plan. Their obscurity exists for our edification. In this manner, "The split reference of allegorical language uniquely suited the needs of a God who had somehow to be distanced from what was his own" (Whitman 195). Like Nature, in showing us what is not (through its failure to achieve divine perfection) allegory obliquely signs what is. Similarly, Teskey argues that allegory yokes "together heterogeneous things by force of meaning" (2). The allegorical relationship that links humanity, Nature, and God can be viewed as a "force of meaning" that unites what would otherwise be divided. "Instrumental [allegorical] meaning creates consciousness by concealing the presence of [. . . the] rift between the self and the world, transforming the otherness of nature into a hierarchy of anagogic (upward-moving) meanings" (Teskey 7). From these perspectives, the natural world is ideally suited to be the focus of allegorical works. However, some allegorical theorists, such as Angus Fletcher, complicate this view of allegory by asserting that the persuasive purpose of creative allegory is antithetical to mimesis:

> The mimetic poet using metaphor is only trying to understand nature; his art attempts to bring about catharsis of spent emotion. By means of his 'message,' on the other hand, the allegorical poet is furthermore trying to control his audience. He seeks to sway them by magic devices to accept intellectual or moral or spiritual attitudes. (Fletcher 192)

Thus the constrictions which allegory places upon its subjects render it inimical to representation. Allegory becomes the mirror of ideology, not the mirror of reality. Nature, in the sense of the total corporeal world that surrounds (and makes up) humanity, in allegory only exists as an idealized creation. The allegorical *kosmos* can never mimic Nature; instead it creates its own, false logical necessity. In rejecting the supernatural, mimesis rejects what Fletcher posits as a fundamental device of allegory (150). Such arguments, however, contain the seeds of paradox.

The constraints of purpose that circumscribe the allegorical author also impinge upon the "mimetic" author: "The mimetic poet must impose limits, derived from nature, on his choice of mimetic object" (Fletcher 148). Both mimesis and allegory necessitate a regularized view of reality. Maureen Quilligan sums up the connection between allegorical and natural order with three points:

1. Words are signs of natural facts.
2. Particular natural facts are symbols of particular spiritual facts.

3. Nature is the symbol of spirit. (194)

Nature, then, is an excellent tool with which to obliquely sign questions of the spirit. Like all mimetic literature, mimetic allegory must follow the strictest rules of Nature. Fantastical structures do accompany many allegories, but "magic devices" are not necessary, nor does allegory's penchant for the fantastical preclude allegory that utilizes natural structures. What separates allegorists from other authors is not the reproduction of Nature, but the impact of that reproduction upon readers. Simplistic mimesis shows readers the world. Allegorical mimesis places readers in the world and manipulates their understanding of how they are able to fill that place with greater (or lesser) success. Allegorical mimesis enacts Nature upon its readers. It uses the realities of existence to position readers appropriately, and to allow them to feel the appropriateness of their role in the natural order of existence.

Again, the medieval Christian worldview provides the key to understanding allegory's dependency upon Nature. Jon Whitman links allegory's often-paradoxical Nature with an understanding of the paradox of a creative and yet all encompassing God:

> To retain both his creativity and his integrity, God needed to make a world while remaining unworldly, to extend his power while reserving it wholly to himself. The problem with earlier views of the creation was their directness [. . .] What was needed, that is, was an oblique account of his action, an allegory of the creation. (195)

The existence of evil and sin, as incorporated within the divine, has led to many theological debates, likewise the question of free will within the divine plan. If God is the one being in which all else comes together, then how can humanity exist in a post-lapsarian state, in a post-lapsarian world? Our being must always be considered in relation to the God of whose essence we are a part. To rationalize such a paradox, Nature must itself be described as allegorical. God separates Himself from Creation as allegorists separate truth from their readers. Nature is that with which God signs Himself obliquely.

In essence, allegories that consider Nature reflect on the human condition, our relationship with the divine. Moreover, through the allegorical consideration of humanity's place within Creation, a system of natural signs becomes apparent. The sublunary world garners particular spiritual meanings. Specific abstract ideas become associated with specific mimetic figures: the analogy between the disturbance of a

monotonous landscape by a prominent feature and the disturbance of human consciousness by a significant idea, for example, or the garden as a space which contains the basic polarity between wilderness and civilization. In utilizing an understanding of Nature based in theological conception, many allegorists reveal their texts' deeper meaning, and work on their readers, through a natural setting. In Henryson's *Orpheus*, for instance, Eurydice meets the lecherous shepherd and her fatal asp in a flower filled meadow. Readers learn through the *moralitas* the import of shepherd "gud vertew," and asp "deadly syn" (436, 441). They also find that the meadow is the world, thus "vane plesans" and the breeding ground of human error (439). The natural setting in this case clues readers in to Eurydice's, and their own, exposure to the temptations of the physical world.

Although the medieval Christian understanding has no difficulty in aligning mimesis with allegory, the more recent division between naturalism and symbolic purpose creates difficulties for more modern allegorists. Secularization and industrialization have, in many cases, removed the allegorical impulse to see the story of man as written on the face of Nature. Within the tradition of Scottish literature, however, the use of Nature to structure allegorical purpose is essential. It is possible to cite many historical or economic reasons for Scotland's unique retention of Nature's significance within its literature: Scotland's unique position as both rural outpost and urban metropolis, its continuation of traditional agricultural practices into the modern age, its emphasis on certain political structures (or their lack), its difficult and invasive weather, all contributed in part to the continual inclusion of significant Nature within Scottish literature. Moreover, Scotland's unique relationship with Christianity, its firm alignment of belief with national character, predisposes an allegorical vision of the natural world. Yet without its unique connection to its literary medieval past, Scottish literature might have lost its relationship to Nature despite these historical realities.

Political Vision

As established previously, the products of medieval allegorical practice were viewed as both practical and contingent. This separation between theological absolute and poetic practicality echoes Aristotle's views about philosophic and practical wisdom in the *Nicomachean Ethics*:

> Philosophic wisdom is scientific knowledge, combined with intuitive reason, of the things that are the highest by nature [. . .] Practical wisdom on the other hand is concerned with things human and things about which it is possible to deliberate. (1141b.3-10)

Philosophical wisdom, like theological allegory, cannot concern itself with practical ethics. Practical wisdom, however, like poetic allegory, must be concerned with deliberation: "For we say that this is above all the work of the man of practical wisdom, to deliberate well, but no one deliberates about things invariable, nor about things which have not an end, and that a good that can be brought about by action" (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1141b.10-13). Moreover, the purity necessary for philosophic wisdom or theological allegory precludes either one from involvement with the political: "It is evident also that philosophic wisdom and the art of politics cannot be the same; for if the state of mind concerned with a man's own interests is to be called philosophic wisdom, there will be many philosophic wisdoms" (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1141a.28-32). Thus, Aristotle makes a distinction between philosophic wisdom and the art of politics because politics is, like practical wisdom, contingent upon the actions and individuality of humanity. The connection between practical wisdom and politics, then, is not explicitly made in the *Nicomachean Ethics* but it is implied through association. If philosophic wisdom is unsuited for the art of politics because politics is contingent and philosophy is absolute, then the subjective form of wisdom, practical wisdom, is logically suited to political purposes. Similarly, allegorical theory can never be linked to politics, but allegorical practice is essentially political in intent.

Teskey contends that allegory necessarily takes a position that is concerned with human rights. His discussion of allegory as linked to the verb *ageiro* ("to gather") includes a consideration of "the commitment of allegory to transforming the agora into a *chora*, a scene of imprinting" (134). In this manner, allegory depends upon the making of bodies into the basis of signs. As, for example, happens to Rex Humanitas in Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis*. Teskey further proposes that the allegorical figures of "Risk" and "Care" describe political activity itself (146). On the one hand "Care urges the body to seek comfort in itself," and on the other hand, "Risk urges the body to dominate all other bodies" (146). Moreover, it is the struggle between these two figures that defines "the individual who advances along the road of political concern" (146). Thus, for Teskey, there can *be* no political voice and no political

action without allegorical understanding. Through the use of themes tailored to suit various conditions of people, allegorical practice attempts to change the human condition. Texts created through allegorical practice are linked to the particular; they are based upon specific cultures and human relationships. In addition, as Hugh of St. Victor argues in his *Didascalicon*, the knowledge of history, culture and politics must serve as the basis for full allegorical understanding (135-139). Although allegory treats of topics outside the political, one must grasp politics in order to truly comprehend allegory's message. Without the common understanding initiated by culture, many of the ideological connections which allegories make would remain un-discovered.

Without knowledge of culturally based and publicly recognized sign systems, readers would be unable to comprehend allegory's deeper meanings, to "go on together": "In all allegorical fictions [. . .] we must look for conventions, or public meanings, which point [. . .] to the reasons why events of details take a certain form" (Tuve 397). If a society had no concept of chivalry or the questing knight, then what understanding could readers gain of the truth underlying an allegorical work like *The Fairie Queene*? Allegories depend upon a deeper recognition; they call for a symbolic meaning that readers can understand. Like the concept of language as contingent upon symbols supported by society, allegory must posit a system which is comprehensible. It is essential to grasp the "form of life" central to an allegorical work in order to fully comprehend its total depth of feeling. Likewise, the importance of system to the construction of a culture or "form of life" particularly suits allegory's structure. Allegory as a "mode is hierarchical in essence owing not only to the use of traditional imageries which are arranged in systems of 'correspondences' but furthermore because all hierarchies imply a chain of command, of order" (Fletcher 23). Like western society, allegory necessitates an ordered system, an array of values, which are generally recognized. Authors of allegory base their work upon a presupposition that the symbolic systems in their work are broadly accepted. Not just the symbols of truth, the characters and significant details imbued with multiple meaning, but also that truth itself must be generally recognized. God's tripartite being cannot be signed through a triptych unless society recognizes His being as such. A venomous and fetid she-dragon cannot symbolize the dangers of lustfulness unless Lust is known to be a sin and the dragon's qualities connected with sinfulness.

Allegory maintains the political necessity of both creating and maintaining social structures.[16] Allegory's practical and hierarchical nature tells humankind how to live within society. Although Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* (524) may not have been directly written as allegory,[17] it is an excellent example of the use of contingent politics within a societal structure. The *Consolation*'s purpose is essentially practical. Through the course of the narrative, Boethius, the protagonist, learns how best to live. Although there is no change in his external circumstances (he remains a political prisoner), through Philosophy's intervention Boethius comes to understand God's purpose for the human being. First, he is able to accept his position in God's hierarchy, and then it becomes possible for him to re-align himself within society. Fletcher writes:

> The temporal chain of being opens up a whole new world in which the old allegorical 'progress' will take on an even grander scope than it had when individual perfection was its goal. Now whole societies, whole technologies, whole cultural ideas are seen developing in a progressivist vision. We can look ahead to the novel of social reform and political struggle. (240)

He refers to the ascension of modern thought within allegorical structures. However, as we have seen, medieval Christian allegorical understanding had already posited the assimilation of man into a hierarchical and infinite structure, and secular allegory quickly utilized that structure for its own socio-political needs.

Historically, Scotland has been seen and lamented as a nation lacking in socio-political direction.[18] This is not to say that Scotland lacked a national identity. Much of Scottish literature concerns itself with what it means, precisely, to be a Scot. Certainly, the Scottish Literary Renaissance of the 1920s was deeply involved in solidifying the Scottish identity as both unique and political. Authors such as Hugh MacDairmid and Edwin Muir were overtly concerned with creating literature based in nationalism. These authors were writing in response to what they viewed as the shameful lack of a Scottish political literary conversation. However, despite the efforts of the 1920s Renaissance, the national content of Scottish literature cannot

---

[16] The power, and perhaps danger, of allegory as a social tool become apparent in the use of political allegory by the fascist and Bolshevik regimes. "By a process of identification the audience, like the allegorical agents, would itself tend to become fixed into stereotypes. This, of course, is precisely the aim of political propaganda art" (Fletcher 68).

[17] See Cherniss's *Boethian Apocalypse*, 42.

[18] See Web 74-75 and Harvie 7, 11-35 and 162-188.

generally be viewed as political. As Stewart asserts, "It is 'natural' and even 'admirable' that critics wish for a serendipitous wedding between literary and political understanding, but when the conjunction is too vigorously forced, inconveniences inevitably mar the outcome" (84). Unlike its Celtic cousin, Ireland, Scotland's literature has not been overtly concerned with the politics of nationalism, with the specifics of government and the rights of the people. Rather Scottish literature concerns itself with questions of nationhood more relevant to the Scottish people at an individual level. Instead of propaganda or (for the most part) political satire, Scottish literature exhibits an interest in tracing the links between nation and psyche. What does it mean to be Scottish? How are Scots meant to represent themselves and their nation? How is Scotland, past, present, and future, to be envisaged? As an active mode, one that requires participation and internal analysis from its readers, allegory was, and is, well suited to the needs of Scotland. Through allegory, Scottish authors are able to place their readers within a specifically Scottish realm of choice and manipulate them into making the right psychological decisions. Similarly, Scottish authors are able to create allegory which only those readers familiar with Scottish circumstances may fully comprehend. By exploiting the cultural mythology that defines Scotland as a nation, Scottish literature posits Scotland *as* a nation.

Ethical Purpose

The forms and nature of allegory are specifically suited to the enactment of moral concerns. One of allegory's most significant purposes, influencing its readers to action through belief, is directly related to its connection with ethics. If ethics is defined as the enactment of moral vision, then allegory as a literary mode concerned with psychological action is ideally suited both as a carrier of morality and as a genus which encourages ethical movement. The polysemous nature of allegory itself encourages the transmission of moral vision. Allegory's scheme of truth veiled by fiction, for example, allows authors to justify their creative choices. On the one hand, fiction renders specifically moral purposes generally palatable and allows authors to target a certain type of reader for the understanding of that purpose. As Aristotle argues, understanding which is hard to come by is much more valued and pleasurable

than that which is easily gained.[19] On the other hand, the creation of fiction is an onus that must be endured in order to reveal certain truths. In the Prologue to his *Morall Fabillis* Henryson states:

> The nuttis schell, thocht it be hard and teuch,
> Haldis the kirnell, sueit and delectabill;
> Sa lyis thair ane doctrine wyse aneuch
> And full of frute, under ane fenyeit fabill.
> And clerkis sayis, it is richt profitabill
> Amangis ernist to ming ane merie sport,
> To light the spreit and gar the tyme be schort. (15-21)

Within Henryson's explanation, the need to tell (or read) an entertaining story is morally "hard and teuch" while the complex truth hidden within the entertainment is "sueit and delectabill." Still, the idea that ease and difficulty must be mingled in order to accomplish an ethical understanding through literature is the crux of his meaning.

The practical nature of creative allegory, its requirement of a belief in the improvement of humanity, makes it particularly suitable for the inculcation of moral ideals. As works such as the *Morall Fabillis* show, the need to encourage ethical practice and the drive to evaluate the intricacies of human life are well suited to an allegorical structure. The growth of creative allegory alongside of, and in part out of, the Christian tradition only further encourages its use for ethical concerns. Allegorical exegesis of the Bible exists to allow humanity true insight into God's plan for the rightness of action; in mimicking this plan creative allegory imbues itself with an ideal vision of human purpose.

For Scottish authors, the value of allegory's ethical concerns is distinctly linked to their placement *as* Scottish authors. As mentioned previously, socio-political nationalism proper has long been noted as conspicuously absent from Scottish culture. The active politics that in other nations were the driving force of national identity is strangely absent from the Scottish consciousness as a whole. Many factors have been blamed for this lack (the existence of a strongly political Scottish ecclesiastical system for one.) The politics of Scottish identity, however, is readily found within Scottish literature and is inextricably bound up with Christian

---

[19] In *Metaphysics*, Book I, Chapters I and II, for example, Aristotle discusses various kinds of knowledge and wisdom. He argues that true wisdom stems from knowledge of the first causes, the "why" of things, an understanding that he differentiates from the simple, direct knowledge gained through the senses.

ethical concerns. In Stewart's words, "It seems clear that questions of canon formation involve ethical judgment" (84). But judgment is not only passed *on* texts but *by* authors through their choice of form. Through allegory, Scottish authors enable their readers to make the ethical choices that are nationally definitive. A true Scot, Scottish authors imply, should and would act in this or that way. Thus, not only do Scottish authors utilize allegory to posit Scotland as a nation, they apply rules of membership to that nation. Scottish allegorical fiction describes the ways in which Scotland and its people are different from others, and it utilizes allegory to insure the transmission of specifically Scottish values. If allegory is ethically active, then it is ideally suited to a nation whose authors wish to create a national creed. In using allegory, Scottish authors show their readers how to understand themselves within a national context.

Purposefully Polysemous

Although mimesis, politics, and ethics each informs a subdivision of the allegorical technique, and each is particularly suited for Scottish allegorical visions, none is adequately able to map Scottish literature's allegorical trends alone. Neither allegory proper, nor its use within Scottish literature can be viewed from a single angle. It is in the necessary relationship between reader and text, universal and particular, absolute and contingent, macrocosm and microcosm that allegory's powers lie. Allegory is able to sign deeper significances to its readers only through its polysemous nature. Allegory is indeed representational, but moving beyond its surface to consider texture and discover what lies beneath the weave is essential. Allegory works both horizontally and vertically; it interconnects and crisscrosses. Its representational ability depends on the purpose of the author, the needs and understanding of its readers, and the shape of those readers' society.

When discussing allegory one cannot stress enough the importance of the author's relationship to the text. All allegories are specifically written with the purpose of changing or influencing the reader. Like rhetoric, allegory may, in Aristotle's words, "be defined as the faculty of observing in any case the available means of persuasion" (*Rhetoric* II.1355b.25-26). The rhetorical (and equally pedagogical) purpose of Scottish allegorists, however, should be viewed with more specificity. Scottish authors of all periods have utilized allegory to influence their readers to choose a particularly "Scottish" path. By choosing allegorical writing to

envisage their land, their national identity, and their moral ideals, Scottish authors unite themselves and their readers with a common bond.

The comprehensiveness of the allegorical mode across Scottish literary history replaces traditional views of opposition with harmony, duality with multiplicity and separation with interrelationships. Scottish allegorists of every period both stimulate and control their readers. Authors of allegory fill an educational role; "they civilized [the] audience" (Murrin 81). Scottish allegorical authors propose to disseminate a cultural ideal, a conceptualization of Scottish civilization. Through recognition of the need for a greater understanding of national consciousness, Scottish authors make it their mission to spread a vision of what "Scottish" represents.

Allegory as Historically Problematic

Scottish authors of diverse periods utilize allegory as an intermediary for the myriad of notions of what it means to be "Scottish." The critical view of allegory, however, has suffered from the modernization of thought. Both Romanticism and New Criticism, for example, have endeavored to graft allegory into their literary practices, but neither has fully taken into account allegory's multifaceted nature (Clifford 117). Allegory has also been seen as problematic outside of the medieval sphere. Can, for example, early Christian thought anticipate the questions raised by any other age? Can the product of fideistic certainty address, for instance, the problems inherent in our own relativist age of materialism and doubt? More global questions concern the integrity of the criticism of allegorical texts (both medieval/early modern and otherwise). In Stewart's opinion, one of the difficulties of criticism is that it introduces "those differences which, arising as they do from a myriad of personalities quite unlike [the author's . . .], allow for the confusing sense that something in [the text . . .] evades 'the discipline' of literary criticism" (205). Such difficulties partially stem from reader response theory. If every reader necessarily has a different experience when exposed to a particular work of allegory, then how can we argue that that allegory was written to be read in a certain way?

> Some critics encounter [a difficulty] in disentangling the past [. . .] from what we say about it, for in order to do so they must make an unmakable distinction between signifier and signified, exterior and interior, past and present – that is, between [the author's . . .] 'self' and that of the reader. (Stewart 228)

However, like readers of allegory, critics must learn to yoke the divide between "exterior" and "interior" to further the understanding of their purpose *as* critics. In

this way, critics must use what Stewart describes as "the cauldron of critical exchange," that productive blend of literary history, critical history, critical theory and philosophy (25), in order to reconcile their position as both removed from and imbedded in a text. Such concerns and recommendations are certainly relevant to the criticism of Scottish allegorical practice; however, by mapping the movement of allegory from its classical inception through its Christian metamorphosis and by discussing the methods and tropes most common to Scottish allegory, I have attempted to speak to the difficulty of situating the critic that is particular to this study. What follows will continue that process.

Chapter Two

Nature as Weft: Weaving a Scottish Moral Landscape

An Introduction to Nature, Physical and Otherwise

One of the most recognizable allegorical forms that the Scots practice is the use of Nature to signify deeper truths. As with the correspondence between "truth" and "fiction," Scottish allegorists work with the correspondence between the physical world and the psychological or divine world. By utilizing aspects of the corporeal to represent that which cannot be directly observed or touched, Scottish allegorists may more easily breach the literary "fourth wall" and call their reader's attention to the mystery inherent in the minutiae of every day existence. Through allegory, readers are given the key to interpreting what they find in the physical world around them, and thus the ability to make the proper choices concerning both the physical and the mysterious. Take, for example, the previously mentioned fable form. In his *Morall Fabillis*, Henryson uses the actions and aspects of beasts to describe the flaws of humankind. Moreover, when reading the *Morall Fabillis*, Henryson's audience is meant to make connections between beast like comportment and their own behavior and to act accordingly. Such a direct comparison, however, is only one of the many ways in which allegorists make use of Nature. In medieval Scottish literature, readers were often asked to situate themselves within God's macrocosmic creation. Humanity was placed at the highest point in the sublunary world, and we were also considered to embody the entirety of that world within ourselves.

In this manner, Nature is an excellent tool for the use of allegory as a guide to salvation. Humanity's place within the fallen world combined with our position at that world's apex, manifests our special ability to deny or achieve salvation. If allegory's purpose is to inspire epiphany, then Nature, both human nature and the natural world, seems a most suitable tool to elicit inspiration. Further, the medieval view of "truth" as inherently impossible to encounter directly allows the allegorical use of Nature to maintain cogency across the ages. Within the medieval worldview humanity is naturally blind to truth because of its post-lapsarian state. During life, an understanding of the divine must be gained indirectly. Thus, allegorical texts become an accessible reflection of truth. Such texts mimic Nature because all must be understood through a connection between microcosm and macrocosm. In order to grasp the infinite, one must contemplate the miniscule. The smallest natural

interactions reflect the grand divine plan. In both allegory and Nature, by observing and coming to understand one thing, we are able to grasp some part of the significance of another. Nature, in the medieval view, signified both humanity's separation from the Godhead and our connection to it.

More modern perspectives on humanity's relationship with Nature exemplify this divide, but focus more on the idea of what Nature *is* in respect to reality. As stated earlier, Quilligan connects allegory and natural order by making the cognitive leap between words as "signs of natural facts," natural facts as "symbolic of particular spiritual facts," and Nature as "the symbol of the spirit" (194). In his book, *Language in Thought and Action*, S. I. Hayakawa discusses the connection between Nature and human understanding in a much more secular but equally constructive way. In a chapter entitled "How We Know What We Know," Hayakawa discusses the relationship between humanity and Nature by describing and illustrating our use of a "process of abstracting" (154). Using the example of Bessie, a particular cow, he describes the process by which we abstract the reality of Bessie into the category of "cow." "When we say, then, that 'Bessie is a cow,' we are only noting [. . .] Bessie's resemblances to other 'cows' and *ignoring the differences*" (154, author's emphasis). Hayakawa then goes on to use the example of Bessie to exemplify the abstraction ladder, by which all human thought moves from the object of experience (an interaction with a particular animal or thing) through successively higher levels of abstraction which move further and further away from the physicality of the "cow" standing before us. Although Hayakawa is clearly *not* utilizing the abstraction ladder to make a point about the use of allegory or humanity's connection to the divine, his description of the process that is *necessary* for advanced human thought and expression clearly manifests both the process of allegorical understanding and the medieval/early modern view of humanity's place within God's mystery. Although we can only *know* what we experience, we can (and in many ways must) intuit much higher levels of understanding from that experience. Moreover, Hayakawa points out that even that which we experience of Nature is in fact only a portion of existence. Below "the object of experience, that which our nervous system abstracts from the totality that constitutes the process-cow" is "the cow known to science" (155). On the abstraction ladder, below the object which we perceive is the object that "ultimately consists of atoms, electrons, etc., according to present-day scientific inferences. Characteristics are infinite at this level and ever-changing. This is the *process level*"

(155, author's emphasis). Thus, Nature itself is unknowable because our human senses could never possibly comprehend either *all* that represents Bessie or all that represents her *at all times*. In the Christian (and medieval/early modern) worldview only God would have the power to know Bessie in her entirety. Thus, the only way that humanity may know Bessie is by abstracting her, by allegorizing her, and thus vaguely gaining an understanding of that which is not seen.

The difficulty in connecting allegory to Nature in such a way is, of course, the question of distinction. If Hayakawa and critics who agree with him consider *all* human experience to be based on abstraction, what makes allegory any different from other forms of communication (literary or otherwise)? What must be remembered is that what distinguishes allegories from other types of communication is not the reproduction of Nature, but the purpose and impact of that reproduction. Basic communication shows us a perspective on the world. Allegorical communication contextualizes readers within the world and manipulates their understanding of how they are able to fill that place with greater (or lesser) success. Allegorical representations of Nature enact the natural world upon their readers, using the realities of existence to allow readers to comprehend their role in the orderliness of existence. Likewise, the medieval/early modern Christian worldview provides the key to understanding allegory's dependency upon Nature.

Nature is an excellent resource for the initiation of the search for divine meaning. Through Nature, humanity can begin its search for God and begin to understand its own unique position within God's divine plan. Thus, humanity's fall is closely linked to allegory's many representations of Nature. On the one hand, humanity's post-lapsarian state may cause us to externalize our own Nature and thus mistakenly perceive all Nature as fallen; on the other hand, Nature itself may *be* a fallen realm and thus a fitting receptacle for humanity. In the former case, our own inability for clear perception clouds our understanding of Nature and Nature itself becomes an allegorical text. Nature is that which contains truth but which we must constantly strive to interpret correctly. Nature becomes both the book upon which humanity may read God's concrete Word and the mirror that reflects His will. Through our contact with the natural world, and our place within that world's temporality, humanity may come to understand our particular God given gifts and our greater position in the cosmos. Nature's narrative is indicative of the human narrative. Nature is a representation of the order that God intended, and humanity's

place within that plan allows for a clarification of His purpose. Moreover, the workings of Nature both exhibit the distance between God and humanity, and symbolize our connections. The unbridgeable gap between the perfection of the divine and human fallibility necessitated Nature's signing system. The turning of the seasons and the cycles of life prove that everything had its rightful purpose. The beauty of Nature proves that God is the Creator of wonders; its wholesomeness shows that God is merciful and will provide. Even Nature's cruelty gives clarity and direction to life's struggles. Thus, it is unsurprising that, when personified, Nature was often described as the vicar of God. It is she who passes down God's greater vision to humankind. She becomes the intermediary between our plane and that of the Divine. Thus, God *can* be found in Nature, but we must strive to overcome our fallen inclinations in order to find Him. Nature gives us the hope of regaining what we have lost.

In the case of Nature as itself fallen, Nature is like us and we are like it. From this perspective, humankind lost the ability to truly merge with God and His divine purpose when Adam and Eve chose to eat the apple and fell. Because of our progenitors' choice, both Nature and humanity are eternally doomed to chase, but never attain, perfection. Nature can be no more than a vague reflection of God's will because it is the creative principle of a fallen world. From this perspective, Nature encapsulates all the pain and loss that humanity has endured. This view of Nature posits its cycles as inevitably leading to, and dependent upon, decay.[20] Humanity, by failing to properly obey God, had violated the symmetry of God's original pattern. The natural world was condemned with the moral; humanity's sin took root in Nature, and the part corrupted the whole. "The geocosm had been persistently affected by the microcosm. With each of man's major sins, the earth had grown increasingly ugly" (Nicolson 144). Distinct from the eternal purity and rightness of paradise and the heavens, earthly Nature is defiled and so, like humankind, must fall. Yet corruption may also become a tool for redemption. By disclosing the world's frailty and turning humankind to the contemplation of God, decay operates to enhance God's glory. Harris lists the purpose of decay thus: "The world's corruption is related definitely to man's sin, or it is a sign of the approaching day of judgment, or it is used to persuade sinners to seek salvation" (89). Within the medieval and early modern Christian

---

[20] Victor Harris's study of the concept of decay in early modern thought, *All Coherence Gone,* describes decay as a distinctive aspect of understanding the Christian Medieval and Renaissance universe (3).

tradition, Nature is not only related to humanity's failures, it is ideally suited to allegorically persuade humanity to follow a redemptive course. From this perspective, Nature remains an allegorical text, but what it signifies changes. Here, Nature clarifies our separation from God. God is not like us and Nature testifies to that fact. When we fell from grace, Nature fell with us and serves as a constant reminder of our sins and as a constant temptation to repeat those sins.

In both cases described above, God uses Nature to separate Himself from humanity as allegorists separate truth from their readers. Nature must be that with which God signs Himself obliquely. In this manner, allegories that consider Nature reflect on the human condition, our relationship with the divine. Moreover, the two perspectives of Nature, should not be viewed as incompatible. What Nature *is* is closely linked to how we portray it. In this manner, by creating art, allegorists seek to mimic God's grand design. Nature's function within allegory is to help readers to consider their place within the world. What does it mean to be human? What is humanity's role; what is our purpose? In Genesis 1:26 we are told that "God said, 'Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth'." Shortly after this pronouncement, God is shown as describing Nature to the humans he has just created, and describing to them the needs and purpose of each living thing in relation to humanity (Genesis 1:27-31). As stated above, the fall was viewed as obscuring the clarity of God's first instructions and complicating humanity's relationship with both human nature and Nature itself. However, the very fact that the sublunary world does exhibit beauty and wholeness, that (barring revelation) Nature is still the only link that humanity has with the celestial, gives hope and creates purpose. Through humanity's struggle with Nature, we find the ability to better ourselves, the choice to lift ourselves above imperfection.

Allegorical medieval and early modern authors such as Sir David Lindsay chose to yoke humanity's relationship to Nature in order to offer their readers a greater understanding of life's purpose and guide them along the proper path. In the "Prolog" to Sir David Lindsay's *The Dreme* (1526), for example, the poet describes himself as unable to sleep one January night. He rises and, dressing warmly, goes out for a walk. His destination is the sea but on the way Lindsay meets Dame Flora, Nature's springtime incarnation. As Lindsay watches, many small birds fly to Dame

Flora and make their complaints; they ask her why spring has forsaken them and
make a kind of funeral lament for summer.

> 'Quhar art thou May, with June, thy syster schene,
> Weill bordourit with dasyis of delyte?
> And gentyll Julet, with thy mantyll grene,
> Enamilit with rosis, reid and quhyte?
> Now auld and cauld Janeuar, in dispyte,
> Reiffis frome us all pastyme and plesoure.
> Allace! Quhat gentyll hart may this indure?
>
> Oversylit ar, with cloudis odious,
> The goldin skyis of the Orient,
> Cheangeyng in sorrow our sang melodious,
> Quhilk we had wount to sing with gude intent,
> Resoundand to the hevinnis firmament.
> Bot now our daye is changit in to nycht.' (99-111)

The bird's lament reflects Lindsay's inability to sleep due to winter's chill and his
"Remembryng of divers thyngis gone" (67). Like him, they can only recapture the
springtime of their existence through memory, and like him, their sadness renders
them unable to create. Once he reaches the beach, Lindsay settles himself into a
sheltered spot and attempts to write a poem: "And purposit, for passing of the tyme, /
Me to defende frome ociositie, / With pen and paper to regester in ryme / Sum mery
mater of antiquitie" (120-123). His attempt only results in writer's block. Like Flora
in her widow's garb and the heart-sore birds, winter's idleness has dulled his spirits,
and he cannot decide how to begin writing. Staring at the winter roughened sea,
Lindsay contemplates the world's instability and the possibility of redemption. Soon,
however, his lack of sleep and the lulling sounds of wind and water take their toll on
his mind; Lindsay succumbs to his dreams and the "Prologue" comes to an end.

Within *The Dreme*'s "Prologue," Lindsay utilizes natural figures to reiterate
and strengthen the issues that underpin his poem as a whole. Memory, taking good
counsel, creativity, and the onset of age are all encapsulated within his wintertime
nocturnal stroll. Flora's somber dress mourns not only her own exile, but also the
passing away of human creativity and the inconstancy of the sublunary world.
Moreover, it is her allegorical presence that leads to the redemptive dream that makes
up the greater part of Lindsay's poem. Through his contemplation of long-gone
springtime and the cruelty of youth's passing, Lindsay gains Dame Remembrance, his
guide through the infinite spheres of God's righteous plan. Through his reflection on
the natural cycles of life, Lindsay gains purpose that he, in turn, attempts to activate

within his king, the addressee of the poem. Thus, even meditation on winter and decay enables an enactment of our place within the divine scheme.

Allegorically, Nature serves to initiate a process that properly places humanity within the cosmos. However, it is humankind's relationship to the divine, our possession of a soul, that makes us directly susceptible to natural guidance. Like Nature, humanity's intrinsically divided existence (winter and summer, body and soul) implies both the fallen and the divine. Our physicality places us under natural law, while our God-given free will elevates us beyond Nature's control. Our natural position, suspended between animal and spiritual, manifests Nature's own position within the cosmos and supplies an excellent source from which artists might gather inspiration for managing their readers' moral state. As Pearsall describes:

> A world so Janus-faced could be turned into a moral allegory. The earth's potential for good or ill could be 'interpreted' as man's inner struggle to direct his activities towards the fruitful life of the spirit, not towards the barren life of the material universe. (127)

Literature that utilizes Nature and her animal denizens becomes an ideal venue for the discussion of humanity's strengths and frailties. By appropriating Nature, humankind may learn more about itself and find the right way to its divine destiny.

Within the medieval and early modern worldview, Nature was an extremely complex and varied concept. It is possible, however, to somewhat simplify these understandings of Nature by loosely grouping them into three categories. First, there is the idea of Nature as the traits and qualities that define a certain kind of natural object. This vision of Nature as "kind" includes human nature, as well as the natural inclinations of animals. Second, Nature can be seen as a realm or physical sphere. In this manner, Nature is the place where God's divine plan is enacted. Nature is specifically and necessarily ordered. Such an understanding of Nature includes political order, which is also modeled on the divine. Third, Nature may be personified. Nature becomes the Goddess Natura and the vicar of God. It is she who dispenses justice to those who uphold or disdain divine natural order. It is important to remember, however, that humanity is the key to understanding each of these three conceptions of Nature.

Nature as "kind" implies the inherent qualities of God's creations. Every object and creature in the sublunary sphere follows its own Nature. It is the Nature of beasts, for example, to devour one another. More specifically, each object and

creature has a Nature distinct from any other: it is the Nature of the fox to be sly. Such individual Natures allow for a classification and hierarchy of the world that follows the divine plan. Human Nature, however, gives humanity the ability to simultaneously transcend the confines that bind other creatures and follow the will of God. Humanity's Nature is tempered by reason. We alone may move beyond the motives that move all beasts. Our Nature allows us the choice to interpret our post-lapsarian state, to strive toward divine perfection. Henryson's *Orpheus and Eurydice*, for example, utilizes this vision of humanity's proper Nature through a contemplation of our ability to follow our reason. Orpheus is introduced to the text through a lengthy genealogical description. Within the *moralitas* of the fable, however, the reader discovers the necessity of such detail when the symbolic allegorical meaning of Orpheus's family members, and thus his own significance, is revealed:

> Faire Phebus is the god of sapience;
> Caliopee, his wyf, is eloquence.
> Thir twa, maryit, gat Orpheus belyve,
> Quhilk callit is the part intellectiue
> Of mannis saule and vnder-standing, free
> And separate fra sensualitee. (425-430)

Begotten from the best of human characteristics, Orpheus represents that which separates humanity from its sensual/animal Nature, our powers of intellect. Orpheus' proper choices and mistakes show us the way that our own minds can guide us and our own bodies might deceive us. As we follow him, we become aware of our own fallibility. Thus, in further deviation from the original fable, the shepherd who threatens Eurydice, by association with his flock, becomes "gud vertew," and the meadow where she meets her fatal asp becomes the plane upon which all humanity must guard against possible misstep. As "effectioun" Eurydice has the power to misdirect the intellect; her flight from virtue leads Orpheus on a journey that ends in a warning to properly blend desire with reason or suffer the consequences.

> Quhen our desyre with ressoun makis pess,
> And seikis up to contemplatioun,
> Of syn detestand the abutioun.
> Bot ilk man suld be wyse and warly se
> That he bakwart cast nocht his myndis e,
> Gifand consent and delectatioun
> Of fleschly lust and for the affectioun;
> For thane gois bakwart to the syn agane
> Our appetyte, as it befoir was slane
> In warldly lust and vane prosperité,

And makis ressoun wedow for to be. (617-628)

Thus, despite intellect's ability to properly direct humanity, we must remain ever vigilant; otherwise our physical nature may pull us down. Through his allegorical fable and *moralitas* Henryson shows his reader the importance of balance within human existence.

Within the medieval and early modern Christian tradition humankind is constantly depicted as being in conflict. In our original, pre-lapsarian state we were entirely reasonable; human Nature was directly linked with God. After the fall, however, human Nature became split between this world and the divine. "However sincere his aspirations to attain the original dignity and virtue for which he was intended, man, since his Fall, must constantly struggle to control that which in his original nature was unequivocally ruled by his rational faculty" (Economou 89). In this way, our Nature is both redemptive and degenerative. Because of our internal division humanity becomes both cursed and exonerated, inextricably linked with the sublunary world and able to transcend it. Thus, humans are those beings which best echo the vacillations of the sublunary world and the only beings that can benefit from their own fallen state.

Nature as a physical sphere encompasses all that touches humanity in the physical and structural sense. It inscribes the plane upon which the human experience is played out, as well as our place within divine law and political order. The sphere of Nature places humanity within our rightful place in the cosmos. It describes the sublunary world within a greater cosmic construction. In medieval conception the cosmos was made up of concentric spheres, each in harmony with the next. Thus, the natural sphere had an important role to play in balancing the spheres that surrounded it. Nature was the realm through which humanity could view the instrumentalism of God and consider our own place within God's plan and the human structures that echo that plan. As discussed above, allegorical works like Dante's *Divine Comedy* (1306-1321) and Lindsay's *The Dreme* often utilize natural imagery to initiate a spiritual journey of revelation. By moving their narrators through the natural world, authors used the narrative of journey to represent the relationship between man and God. After moving through the celestial spheres, for example, *The Dreme* addresses the "quantite" and "devision" of the earth. Subsequent to his encounter with the vastness of the heavens, Lindsay wishes to understand the makeup and importance of

humanity's realm. Dame Remembrance indulges him with a scientific account of the earth's size and then a lesson in geography that proclaims the perfection of the divine through numeric splendor. It is this discussion of the righteous division of earth which eventually leads to Lindsay's perusal of Paradise: "Than I inquirit of eirthly Paradyce, / Of the quhilk Adam tynt possessioun" (*Dreme* 752). Thus, Lindsay's journey through the divine realms leads to the contemplation of earth's divine organization and then to a discussion of Adam's crime. Through a greater understanding of the spheres, Lindsay is led to questions of humanity's place within creation and ultimately to a consideration of his homeland. All of the knowledge that Lindsay gains from Dame Remembrance leads him to question the inequities found in Scotland:

> Quhen that I had oversene this regioun,
> The quhilk of nature is boith gude and fair,
> I did propone ane lytall questioun,
> Beseikand hir the sam for to declare,
> 'Quhat is the cause our boundis bene so bair?'
> Quod I, 'Or quhate dois mufe our misere?
> Or quhareof dois proceid our povertie? (806-812)

How is it, Lindsay asks, if all the spheres are in harmony, that Scotland can suffer so?[21] Echoing Boethius, Lindsay asks of his female mentor: "What power dooms us to unfair misery?" Examinations of the natural sphere, then, also contain the all-important consideration of fate and free will. If all of Nature is God's implement, then humanity must be a tool in the hand of God. If humanity is a tool, then how can we be in control of our own destiny? Ordered conceptions of the world ultimately bring about questions concerning the obvious chaos of reality.

The third vision of Nature, the Goddess Natura, is the specific personification of Nature's power. She works directly within the human sphere and often serves as a moral guide. In Chaucer's *Parliament of Foules* (1380-1382), for example, she is the figure leading both reader and narrator to the moral implications of the natural occurrences before them. She is placed at the center of a moral discussion concerning the implications of love and human sexuality. As a goddess, she becomes the arbitrator of the moral concerns that permeate her sphere. Chaucer's description of both the lifestyle of birds and Natura's reaction to them not only stresses humanity's

---

[21] I will consider the implications of Lindsay's discussion of Scotland with more detail in a later chapter.

glorious diversity, but also points to the wide spectrum of human behavior over which Nature presides. Moreover, humanity needs to be kept in check by Nature lest we turn divine direction to chaos. Personified, Nature is given the power to be as directly moralizing as possible. She becomes the reader's instructor and aggressively exacts her lessons accordingly. However, Nature's command does not extend directly to divine concerns. Her inability to comprehend spiritual matters clearly displays her inferiority to God. Although Nature may punish humankind for breaking her laws, ultimately she is inadequate as an authority figure. Her power is only natural and secular; Nature "cannot understand matters appropriate to the realms of faith and grace" (Cherniss 58). She cannot control humanity's free will, which is essential to moral choice. Allegory may compel reform, but it is still possible, through willful distancing or lack of effective complicity, to avoid change. Due to her inability to transcend the sublunary realm, the personification of Nature also becomes an ideal warp for the more complex patterns of symbolic allegorical visions. In many cases, Natura acts under multiple and simultaneous guises. In James I's *Kingis Quair* (1423), for example, Natura is shown to us through the actions of other goddesses and personifications.[22] Similarly, because of her connection to humanity, she can easily merge with human characters to exhibit both her own characteristics and humanity's inherent flaws.

Although most of the examples of medieval uses of Nature used above are Scottish examples, I have said little that directly touches upon Scottish literature's particular use of Nature. As stated previously, I am not arguing that medieval or early modern Scottish authors used allegory or its forms more frequently than their Southern or Western neighbors. However, the Scottish allegorists' use Nature did (and does continue to) exhibit some idiosyncrasies. Generally, when more modern readers consider visions of Nature, they are inclined to recall idyllic settings. Medieval Scottish literature's vision of Nature, however, often focuses upon the harsher sides of the natural world. Although the paradisal vision of Nature is most commonly understood, and Scottish authors do make use of the connection between humanity's original surroundings and the fallen realm, Scottish authors rarely simply idealize the natural world; there is always a darker side to their vision. Medieval and early modern Scottish authors such as Robert Henryson and Sir David Lindsay readily

---

[22] I will be discussing the *Quair* in greater detail later in this chapter.

utilize the harsher side of Nature to further their allegorical visions, and the glorification of Scotland's difficult Nature does not end with medieval authorship. More modern Scottish works continue to emphasize bleaker visions of Nature. An astute commentator once described the connection between the Scottish people and their natural surroundings as the ability to "stand upon a bare mountainside, lashed with cold wind and rain, and like it just fine, thank you." Like their medieval progenitors, more modern Scottish authors utilize Nature's characteristics allegorically. Cold, windy, and wet mountainsides, the beauty of sere views and the darkness of unknowable woodlands echo meaningfully throughout Scottish literature. Humanity's plight of living in a difficult world, Scotland's historical, political, and economic struggles, and the harshness of Scotland's climate and geography all resonate within the Scottish literary consciousness.

Although it would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to prove that Scotland is more closely linked to its physical aspects than other nations, Scottish literature's continual reliance upon mimesis (both physical and social) is directly related to its preoccupation with allegory. Nature in Scottish literature does not simply show a place and its relationship to people; it is specifically utilized to initiate the kind of polysemous meaning that forces readers to work out the essential configurations of existence and actively play their role within those structures. As with allegory proper, the use of natural structures to symbolize humanity's place in the world and to serve as a guide along the path of life is not exclusive to Scottish literature during the Medieval period. However, Scottish authors' continued use of Nature to encourage psychological complicity sets them apart from their counterparts across Britain. Scottish literature's continuing allegorical perspective on the corporeal world is one of its defining characteristics.

The Use of Nature in Specific Medieval and Early Modern Scottish Texts

Nature's placement within medieval works is as variously organized as the menagerie that inhabits its sphere. Thus, a discussion of specific texts is necessary to exemplify Nature's medieval and/or early modern use. As with the more modern authors I introduce in this chapter, their predecessors share the common goal of the active redemption of readers and all facilitate such redemption by necessitating complicity through multiple meaning. The work of Robert Henryson focuses closely on the reform of the individual. Henryson's "Preiching of the Swallow" (included

within the *Morall Fabillis*) and *Testament of Cresseid* (1532), each presents Nature as that which may transform his readers if we are able to recognize the moral mind that makes us human. It is in the individual that Henryson places the power of God-given choice. James I's *Kingis Quair* utilizes personification, symbol and dream allegory to show us both the making of a Scottish king and the formation of a Scottish nation based in Christian morals and understanding. Approaching Scottish monarchy and symbol allegory from a different angle, Sir David Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis* presents the Scottish court as a map of the natural and political sphere, and then places the king upon that map, asking for a restructuring of the hierarchy that follows the Christian vision of Nature.[23] Steeped in political as well as moral concerns, both the *Quair* and the *Thrie Estaitis* consider the wider social implications of their allegory as well as their impact on specific souls. Finally, each of these authors builds upon greater medieval constructions of Nature and conceptions of allegory while simultaneously writing for specifically Scottish readers.

All of Henryson's *Fabillis* follow the basic dualistic blueprint of allegorical animal story combined with directional moral. However, despite Henryson's choice to endow each of his tales with a specific meaning, his readers are also expected to bring their own knowledge to the text. Henryson knows that his readers are cognizant of Nature's many levels and he uses their knowledge to manipulate them. Henryson also employs specific references to Scotland's natural aspects to structure the lessons his readers participate in.

The "Preiching of the Swallow" exemplifies Henryson's use of Scottish natural phenomena through both its descriptive passages and its general tone. Its narrative describes the fate of a group of wild birds that the narrator first encounters during a springtime walk in the countryside. Inadvertently he overhears a Swallow warn the other birds of the dangers inherent in a farmer's decision to plant hemp and flax:

> 'O ye birdis on bewis heir me by,
> Ye sall weill knaw and wyislie understand:
> Quhair danger is, or perrell appeirand,
> It is grit wisedome to provyde befoir
> It to devoyd, for dreid it hurt yow moir.' (121-125)

---

[23] See chapter one for a discussion of R. W. Frank's term "symbol allegory," an allegory in which characters are both themselves and symbolize something else.

Her fellows scorn the Swallow's counsel and go about their business, but in the course of the seasons, the rash and foolish birds get their comeuppance. Despite the Swallow's repeated warnings, they continue upon their doomed path and are indeed eventually caught by the farmer's plan. This narrative, however, only provides the core of the fable's true moral.

Both the usual *moralitas* and a philosophical discussion of Nature bracket the tale of the Swallow's intelligent warnings and the downfall of her foolish peers. The fable opens not with a direct reference to its protagonist but with a consideration of humanity's place within the divine scheme:

> Thairfoir our saull with sensualitie
> So fetterit is in presoun corporall,
> We may not cleirlie understand nor se
> God as He is, nor thingis celestiall;
> Our mirk and deidlie corps materiale
> Blindis the spirituall operatioun,
> Lyke as ane man wer bundin in presoun. (8-14)

Henryson chooses to begin his tale of unresponsive humanity with a description of both the profound wisdom of God and the baser portion of Nature with which humankind must continually do battle. Moreover, according to Henryson, even humanity's powers of reason should not attempt to question the motives of the Trinity: "And mannis saull is febill and over small, / Off understanding waik and unperfite / To comprehend Him that contenis all" (23-25). Thus, Henryson qualifies the traditional understanding of human Nature. No matter that humanity's soul brings us closest to God. No matter that, in the fallen world, humankind occupies the highest point of God's divine order. Humankind must retain its humility and never forget that God alone comprehends the infinite. We must remember that only through God's works is it possible to even glimpse the eternal.

It may be within human Nature to aspire to join with the divine, but it is not our place to question the path that life in the sublunary world takes. Only the sphere of Nature, in all its fullness, offers a vision of God's ultimate goodness and signals a divine plan that man may safely follow:

> Yit nevertheles we may haif knawleging
> Off God almychtie, be his creatouris,
> That He is gude, fair, wyis and bening.
> Exempill tak be thir jolie flouris,
> Rycht sweit off smell and plesant off colouris,
> Sum grene, sum blew, sum purpour, quhyte, and reid,

Thus distribute be gift off His Godheid. (35-41)

As George Economou writes, "All things obey a certain course and rejoice in their return to their proper place; nor is there any order unless each thing join its beginning to its end and make itself the firm, immutable circle that characterizes the world" (39). Humanity has its own rightful position within God's order as well as a duty to aid in the maintenance of that order. Henryson, then, reminds his readers both of their natural place and the responsibilities that accompany their exalted position. Henryson's readers must situate themselves within the moral framework of the fable, and become complicit in the conclusions he draws from it.

Through his specific use of natural phenomena within his work, Henryson merges these wider visions of the relationship between God, Nature, and humanity with Scottish concerns. Henryson displays the properly cyclical nature of God's plan with a description of the seasonal cycle. Summer, autumn, and spring are dealt with along traditional lines. Each is extolled for the length of one stanza and accompanied with classical representations. Winter, however, merits two stanzas and is given a more realistic and detailed scope of description:

> Syne wynter wan, quhen austerne Eolus,
> God off the wynd, with blastis boreall
> The grene garment off somer glorious
> Hes all to-rent and revin in pecis small.
> Than flouris fair faidit with froist man fall,
> And birdis blyith changit thair noitis sweit
> In styll murning, neir slane with snaw and sleit.
>
> Thir dalis deip with dubbis drounit is,
> Baith hill and holt heillit with frostis hair,
> And bewis bene ar bethit bair of blis
> Be wickit windis off the winter wair.
> All wyld beistis than from the bentis bair
> Drawis for dreid unto thair dennis deip,
> Coucheand for cauld in coifis thame to keip. (77-90)

The second winter stanza is significant in its minutiae. The description of frost and frozen branches underlines the season's bareness. Moreover, Henryson's choice to include a consideration of the effects of the cold upon beasts resonates along human lines due to his selection of fable as a vehicle for his message. If "all wyld beistis" are driven into their caves by the harshness of winter, then how well do humans fare within its grasp? In his fable, winter becomes allegorically significant as the harshness of life, and the definite progression towards death, which all God's

creatures must endure. As the one creature in winter's grasp to comprehend the need to separate oneself from base, animal needs and prepare for the spiritual life, the Swallow (a symbol of Christ) provides an exemplar for both beasts and humanity. Henryson's nationality, however, adds greater significance to his focus on winter, a season with which all Scots are familiar. His audience would have been more than aware of the difficulties of the cold months, and thus more able to identify with the moral inherent in his work. "Of the seasons [. . .] it is winter, characteristically for a Scots poet, that is most powerfully described, though still in fairly conventional terms" (Pearsall 197). The harsher aspects of Nature's cycle are endowed with the most detail because they are the most prevalent in Henryson's own experience with his land and a thus more powerful tool for the inclusion of his readers in the allegory of his text.

Nature's more foreboding face is also displayed in Henryson's other modifications of the "Preiching of the Swallow" from its traditional form. The fate that awaits the heedless birds is given far more attention and detail than in previous versions:

> Thir small birdis, for hunger famischit neir,
> Full besie scraipand for to seik thair fude,
> The counsall off the swallow wald not heir, [. . .]
> With that this churll over thame his nettis drew.
>
> Allace, it wes grit hart sair for to se
> That bludie bowcheour beit thay birdis doun,
> And for till heir, quhen thay wist weill to de,
> Thair cairfull sang and lamentatioun.
> Sum with ane staf he straik to eirth on swoun,
> Off sum the heid, off sum he brak the crag,
> Sum half on lyfe he stoppit in his bag. (252-254, 258-264)

Henryson lingers over the cruel fate of the birds as if relishing the agonies that they have earned with their stubborn blindness. When considered in the context of his earlier description of winter's wrath, however, it becomes clear that Henryson simply has no illusions concerning the fate of those who are unable to accept God's beneficence. Like the beasts blasted by winter's harsh winds because they are unable, by natural decree, to find more than a cave for protection, the rejection of the Swallow's advice (Christ's words) leads to dire corporal (spiritual) hardship. Within the "Preiching of the Swallow," only the swallow is guided by her God-given wisdom and intelligence; all the other birds listen only to their animal instincts and thus are led

to their destruction. In this manner, Henryson emphasizes Nature's harsher lessons because they are most readily available and most suited to connect his audience to his work.

In the *Testament of Cresseid* Henryson portrays both natural symbolism and moral implications in a more subtle manner, but he works with specific concerns similar to those utilized in his *Morall Fabillis*. Both the narrator of the *Testament* and its protagonist are allegorically symbolic of types who may or may not learn to uphold their proper Nature. The narrative begins with a description of the narrator's own situation. He is old, but still worships the goddess of love and, one cold day in early spring, re-reads Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and is led to think on Cresseid's cruel fate:

> [. . .] how was thow fortunait
> To change in filth all thy feminitie
> And be with fleschelie lust sa masculait
> And go amang the Greikis air and lait,
> Sa giglotlike takand thy foull plesance! (*Testament* 79-83)

From the beginning of the poem, the link between Nature and mental state is clearly made. The wintry scene, the poet's age and his proper fealty to Venus are contrasted with Cresseid's springtime youth and her failure to remain pure, a cycle of naturally based comparison that will continue throughout the poem. The narrator's age and physical state make him particularly susceptible to pity for a woman who is about to lose her own youthful power. His wish to tell her tale properly will result in her redemption, but also reflects his own inability to accept physical decline.

Whereas Cresseid will lose her physical beauty to leprosy, and thus learn to cherish the divine portion of her Nature, the narrator will only continue to lament Cresseid's loss and her inability to appreciate the physical gifts she had while they still remained. In Michael Cherniss's words, the narrator "ignores the inevitability and appropriateness of Cresseid's fate [. . .] because he has reached the Saturnine stage in his own life and does not want to face its inevitable physical consequences" (220). Unlike enlightened narrators such as Boethius , and Cresseid herself, the *Testament*'s narrator is unable to accept his place on fortune's wheel and thus to take advantage of his spiritual gifts. Cresseid's punishment is righteous when considered in terms of Nature (rather than justice); the gods control generation and decay in the world and their natural function is to give and remove their gifts. As aspects of Nature, the gods are unable to control human conduct; moral choice belongs to the

individual. The gods are only able to guide through gift and punishment. However, once Cresseid's punishment is enacted, she is indeed able to utilize her celestial gifts and purify her soul. The movement from her inability to recognize Troilus, the final aspect of her spiritual blindness, to her confession of guilt epitomizes her spiritual growth and acceptance of her higher Nature:

> 'Becaus I knaw the greit unstabilnes,
> (Brukkil as glas, into my self, I say)
> Traisting in uther als greit unfaithfulnes,
> Als unconstant and als untrew of fay –
> Thocht sum be trew – I wait richt few ar thay.
> Quha findis treuth, lat him his lady ruse;
> Nane but my self, as now, I will accuse.' (568-574)

Cresseid's description of herself and the world epitomizes the inconstant nature of fortune. Like many others before her, Cresseid makes the mistake of allowing the rise and fall of life to rule her in all matters. She allows the baser, animal manifestations of life to affect her choices. However, once she is given to understand the true implications of life's fickleness, that gifts may be taken away as well as given, Cresseid understands that her present lot in life is not only just but also natural. Freed from the shackles of physical concerns, her divine Nature is finally able to assert itself.

The narrator, however, fails to learn from Cresseid's mistakes in a similar manner. He ends the tale with a moral plea that focuses wholly on Cresseid's deception of Troilus and makes no mention of her spiritual redemption:

> Now, worthie wemen, in this ballet schort,
> Maid for your worschip and instrutioun,
> Of cheritie, I monische and exhort;
> Ming not your lufe with fals deceptioun.
> Beir in your mynd this sore conclusioun
> Of fair Cresseid, as I have said befoir:
> Sen scho is deid, I speik of hir no moir. (610-616)

In other words, be true or you might also receive punishment. The narrator makes no concession to the fact that punishment is inherent in the nature of life and the true gift is the human soul, through which we may ascend to a higher plane. As a pagan who is unaware of God's grace, Cresseid's spiritual growth is a miraculous one; as a Christian, the narrator's misreading is a great pity. Henryson's goal is that his readers identify with both. Age and loss of beauty come to us all; it is how we choose to interpret that loss, and how our interpretation guides us, that really matters. The

Testament asks its readers to perform a choice; will they understand their higher Nature and utilize it to overcome the difficulties and vicissitudes of the sublunary world, or will they fail to read their lives allegorically and focus only on the cruelty of loss?

Both the "Preiching of the Swallow" and the *Testament of Cresseid* focus on the individual spirit. They are concerned with humanity's proper Nature; they place their readers within God's plan and challenge them to fulfill their celestial potential. Moreover, Henryson's work utilizes the interwoven quality of allegorical figurations of Nature to underline his purpose, a tradition which his predecessors will follow.

Simply the idea that *The Kingis Quair* was written by King James I of Scotland makes it an excellent candidate for a discussion of the connections between physical, political and national Nature. As king, James traditionally symbolized all that was his nation. In *City, Marriage, Tournament* Louise Fradenburg discusses the position of the Scottish king as highly emblematic. He was the physical link between God and the people of Scotland, a living representation of both divine law and political order. Such structures, however, were not "natural" in that they needed to be exemplified and reiterated. The king must take part in what Fradenburg describes (echoing Rousseau) as "the arts of rule," a creation of himself and his power for his subjects (xi). The king's power is, in part, enacted by "works of imagination, without which the bonds on which sovereignty depends could not be affected" (Fradenburg xi). Thus, James's choice to create a literary retelling of both his own life and the physical settings that surrounded him becomes doubly telling. Moreover, his decision to model the structure of his *Quair* upon a previously existing moralized work links generally accepted medieval visions of the world with specifically Scottish circumstances.

In the third stanza of his *Quair* James refers directly to Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*:

> Of quhich the name is clepit properly
> Boece (eftere him that was the compiloure),
> Schewing the counsele of philosophye,
> Compilit by that noble senatoure
> Off Rome, quhilom that was the warldis floure,
> And from estate, by Fortune for a quhile
> Forjugit was to povert in exile. (15-21)

Further, the structure of the *Quair* is modeled after the *Consolation*. The authors of both works suffer imprisonment. Boethius, in his cell, calls upon Philosophia to give him a reason for his fate. He knows he has been a good man; thus he cannot comprehend how he should be made to suffer while those that he knows to be evil prevail. Philosophy appears to him and leads him through a succession of arguments culminating in an understanding of man's relationship with God. James, in a similar situation, also calls for a divine answer and receives a reply. His pleas, however, are both made to and answered by aspects of Nature. Unlike Boethius's arguments, the persuasive focus of which is death, James is concerned with Nature's providences, love and marriage. Similarly, whereas Boethius's difficulty is philosophic, and thus best answered by its allegorical personification, James's struggle is located within the framework of poetry. In deviating from Boethius with both his persuasive focus and the root of his inner turmoil, James chooses Nature as the guiding concept of his work.

Like Boethius, James's primary complaint centers upon the question of freedom. Unlike his predecessor, however, James considers the question of free will through a contemplation of Nature. The birds outside his prison window cause him to question God's divine plan. If the beasts of the field are given their freedom, if they are by Nature free, then why is he doomed to imprisonment? The bird's presence initiates a contemplation of the nature of fate and freedom. However, his first sight of Joan, his future queen, interrupts James's comparison of the freedom of beasts and men:

> And therewith kest I doune myn eye ageyne,
> Quhare as I sawe walking under the tour,
> Full secretly new cummyn hir to pleyne,
> The fairest or the freschest yong floure
> That ever I sawe, me thoght, before that houre;
> For quhich sodayn abate, anone astert
> The blude of all my body to my herte. (280-286)

Suddenly, James's discussion of freedom becomes one of love. Considering the connections between Nature and freedom and Nature and love, however, the change in theme is not particularly unwarranted. If James feels himself imprisoned and separated from divine radiance, a contemplation of marriage might indeed comfort him, and such comfort would put him in excellent literary company. Within medieval thought marriage and the proper enactment of human Nature were often linked. Alain

de Lille's depictions of Natura, for example, reveal marriage as that which "repairs the fallen will and restores the couple to paradise, to likeness and intimacy not only with each other but also with the divine" and "marriage becomes a way of recovering – at a distance – the immediacy, the nearness, the embodiment of divinity" (Fradenburg 88). If James wishes to please Natura in her role as the vicar of God, marriage is an excellent way of doing so. James's contemplation of Joan resonates with both natural and moral themes. He describes the way Joan makes him feel as, "sudaynly, my hert became hir thrall / For ever, of free wyll" (291-292). James gives himself freely to Joan, but his description of her as the "freschest yong floure" places her fully in the natural sphere. When his heart becomes "hir thrall," then, James also gives himself fully to Nature's power. His imprisonment by love opens the doors to a greater union with Nature's plan.[24] Through Joan, James finds a greater focus for his consideration of humanity's place within the divine scheme.

James exploits the comparison between Joan and Nature throughout his description of her, even going as far as to refer to the goddess Natura directly: "Or ar ye varray Nature the goddesse / That have depaynted with your hevinly hand / This gardyn full of flouris, as they stand?" (303-305). As Natura, Joan symbolizes the end to which James must strive. Thus, her departure does not alter the theme of his oratory. His resumed lamentations are ruled by the natural laws around him:

> The long day, thus gan I prye and poure,
> Till Phebus endit had his bemes bryght,
> And bad go farewele every lef and floure;
> (This is to say, approchen gan the nyght)
> And Esperus his lampis gan to lyght,
> Quhen in the wyndow, still as any stone,
> I bade at length and, kneling, maid my mone. (504-511)

James's prayers are directed to God's natural trappings. Through Joan, James has more firmly placed himself within Nature's power. Fittingly, the elements of the Natural sphere, "aire and watere and hote fyre," bring him to his first divine instructor.

James's attendance at the court of Venus echoes the humanity displayed by the birds in Chaucer's *Parliament of Foules* in scope and variety. Upon his arrival, James views all manner of men who have given themselves over to the rule of Venus,

---

[24] History tells us that James's engagement to Joan Beaufort did indeed improve his situation and hasten the willingness of the English to arrange his release.

> Sum for dispaire without recoverance,
> Sum for desyre, surmounting thaire degree,
> Sum for dispite and other inmytee [. . .] (611-613)

And all share the need for complaint against Venus and her sister, Fate. However, few of Venus's supplicants actually have a right to the boons they ask. Men who have gone against their reason and followed their baser Nature fill her hall. Despite his poor company, James has the temerity to speak. He begs the goddess to assuage the recent wounds that Joan has inflicted upon his heart. He asks for his heart the freedom to roam that his body is denied:

> [. . .] with the stremes of your percyng lyght,
> Convoy my hert that is so wo-begone
> Ageyne unto that swete, hevinly sight
> That I, within the wallis cald as stone,
> So swetly saw on morow walk and gone. (721-725)

He calls upon Venus's ability to guide the human heart saying, "Ye may convoye and, as yow list, convert / The hardest hert that formyt hath Nature" (709-710). Fortunately for James the Venus whom he stands before differs greatly from her counterpart who holds court over Cresseid in Henryson's work. The *Quair*'s Venus is "truly a legalized passion [. . .] part of the orderly workings of God's providence, intermediary for – rather than rival of – Minerva" (Fradenburg 132). Venus's reply directs him to his earlier questions concerning free will. She advises James to follow his divine Nature. Venus tells him to choose the morally right path and thus become worthy of his love, but she also recognizes that he might not yet possess the strength and knowledge needed to gain the moral high road. "Venus's special province is the 'cure' of his 'sekness,' unrequited love, but he needs Minerva to provide the 'lore,' 'hestis,' 'counsele,' in short, the moral instruction which is beyond Venus's ability to supply" (Cherniss 203). Venus directs James to Minerva, but gives him Hope as his guide.

> Like Venus, Minerva recognizes James's difficulty immediately:

> "Gif thy lufe be sett alluterly
> On nyce lust, thy travail is in veyne.
> And so the end sall turne of thy folye
> To payne and repentance." Lo, wate thou quhy?
> Gif the ne list thy lufe on vertew set,
>   Vertu sal be the cause of thy forfet. (904-909)

As Jack and Rozendaal point out, "the secondary sense of 'vertu' as 'vigour' would indicate that lust without love would be the reason for his loss ('forfet') of lady and soul" (43, footnote 62). She also directs James to the will of God, the right way of living through reason and not lust. James defends himself by avowing that his love is the proper kind. They then discuss the tension inherent within human Nature, and Minerva cites Fortune as that which controls humanity's happiness:

> "For suth it is that all ye creaturis
> Quhich, under us, beneth have your dwellyng,
> Ressaven diversely your aventuris;
> Off quhich the cure and principall melling
> Apperit is, withoutin repellyng,
> Onely to hir that has the cuttis two
> In hand, bothe of your wele and of your wo." (1015-1021)

Like Nature, fortune consists of a balance between zenith and nadir. Fortune's very dividedness allows for the motion of human life. Fortune, however, has long been viewed as not only divided but fickle. In the *Consolation* one of Boethius's primary complaints is that he is a puppet of fate, that he had gained a height by fair means and then, seemingly without purpose, his status was taken from him. James makes similar complaints throughout the *Quair*, first concerning his physical imprisonment and then directed towards his love for Joan. It is telling, then, that James's next divine encounter should be with Fortune herself. As George Economou writes, "the function of nature, as the ruling principle of an aggregate of mutable bodies, is part of god's mode of operating the world which is called fate" (29). Thus, James is finally sent to the fount of God's divine plan.

On his way to meet Fortune, however, James encounters an idealized version of the natural sphere, an idyllic setting filled with diverse and wondrous beasts:

> Quhare in a lusty plane tuke I my way,
> Endlang a ryver plesant to behold,
> Enbroudin all with fresche flouris gay,
> Quhare – throu the gravel bryght as ony gold –
> The cristall water ran so clere and cold,
> That in myn ere maid contynualy
> A maner soune, mellit with armony. (1064-1070)

Whereas, during his imprisonment, James is only able to view Nature from afar, he is now submerged in its glory. The land through which he travels rivals any previous description of Nature in the poem. Creatures of every form and stature loll beside the crystal stream; fish of enormous diversity swim within it, and luscious fruit trees lend

it shade. In contrast to the contained garden in which James first spies Joan, Nature here is wild and plentiful. Yet James's bestiary should not be viewed as simply florid or excessive. Rather, its situation between his meetings with the goddesses Venus and Minerva and his final encounter with Fortune imbue the animals he lists with a varied but definite import.

Psychologically, James's bestiary signs his understanding of the divine pattern underlying worldly mutability. Each of the creatures he describes is also given a specific Nature:

> The wyly fox, the wedowis inemye;
> The clymbare gayte, the elk for alblastrye,
> The herknere bore, the holsum grey for hortis,
>   The haire also that oft gooth to the wortis. (1095-1098)

Each displays the characteristics that most clearly define it. As with all medieval bestiaries, however, this list also encompasses *all* the significances possible for each beast. Medieval readers would be able to understand and interpret the variety of beasts in a number of combinations, each with a different symbolic content. Moreover, they would discern the pattern inherent within such polysemous and interwoven allegory. For medieval readers, the listing of beasts allegorizes the order of Nature and thus the orderliness of divine law.[25] The beasts allow both free and varied interpretation and encapsulate the concept of celestial order. By positioning his bestiary at this juncture in the text, James shows the reader his internal progression. Whereas at the beginning of the text, Nature was only a source of confusion and a reminder of what James was himself unable to attain, now the natural world displays the allegorical quality of life and asserts Nature's inherent order.

When James finally encounters Fortune and her wheel, he is ready to gain from the experience. He is properly daunted by the sight of men spinning above a chasm, rising and falling at the will of Fate, yet he is still able to ask for her succor. The answer she gives him differs little from the advice he had received from the other two Goddesses. James must accept the life Fortune allots to him and gain his freedom by exercising natural reason. Fortune then offers him a place upon her wheel and,

---

[25] The *Quair*'s scenery could easily be described in the terms Cherniss uses to describe the "golden landscape" of Chaucer's *Parliament*: "An earthly paradise, analogous to the spiritual Heaven. This landscape represents an unattainable ideal for the living and so appears without human inhabitants, but it offers a spatial correlative for the highest human aspirations in love" (134).

with few words of advice, sends him into the waking world. James's final knowledge condenses into the unavoidable fact that it is the nature of life to be unpredictable. Understandably, when he awakens he feels that his journey had been purposeless, "Quhat lyf is this? Quhare hath my spirit be? / A, merci Lord, quhat will ye do with me?" (1228-1229). Uncertain as to the value of his dream, James cries out for a truly divine sign and is rewarded by a visit from Nature's physical manifestation. One of the birds that had so tormented him with its freedom flies into James's prison bearing a message written upon a tree branch:

> "AWAK! AWAKE! I BRING, LUFAR, I BRING
> THE NEWIS GLAD THAT BLISFULL BENE AND SURE
> OF THY CONFORT. NOW, LAUCH AND PLAY AND SYNG,
> THAT ART BESID SO GLAD ANE AVENTUR –
> FOR IN THE HEVYN DECRETIT IS THE CURE." (1253-1257)

The appearance of the bird, a dove that traditionally symbolizes divine grace, fidelity, and love, reveals the order and roundness of God's plan. Moreover, the bird's placement outside of James's dream vision further layers the message it carries with meaning. The popularity of poetic dream visions within medieval literature is in part dependent upon the ability of dreams to allow direct metaphysical revelation. James, however, chooses to locate the anagogical meaning of his poem within the waking realm. In the *Quair*, God chooses to reveal his meaning through direct natural invention. Thus, James locates the "highest" meaning of his poem, the anagogical meaning, firmly within the natural sphere. Similarly, the bird's message, which James pins to his bedstead, affirms the providential nature of his "journey" and the importance of Nature for revelation. All natural creatures, including James himself, must follow the oscillations of the sublunary world, but humanity alone is given the strength to understand and interpret its place within God's plan.

Through a merging of free will and divine intervention, James is able to embrace love in all its variety. His love of Joan, his love of life, and his passion for the spiritual all merge in his final understanding. He thanks each goddess in turn, lingering on Fortune to whom he attributes both his freedom and the imprisonment that led to his epiphany. He hopes that his work may lead others to a similar greater understanding and he thanks God for overseeing the entire drama:

> And thus endith the fatall influence
> Causit from heyvn quhare powar is commytt
> Of govirnance, by the magnificence
> Of Him that hiest in the hevin sitt.

> To Quhame we thank that all oure lyf hath writt,
> Quho couth it red agone syne mony a yere,
> "Hich in the hevynnis figure circulere." (1372-1378)

Thus, James, like Boethius, reaches an understanding that allows for both free will and divine providence. Through imprisonment, dream, and revelation, James discovers the balancing principles of Nature in all senses of the word. As both author and narrator, James exhibits the way in which allegorical understanding made an impact upon his life. Like all readers of allegory, James is compelled to act and complicit in his own conversion; he learns to read his own life and experiences as they should be read. Similarly, as an allegory, James's text pulls his readers along the path that the king takes.

It is crucial to remember that James's preoccupation with his own moral path is essential not only to his own life, but to the well-being of a nation. As ruler of Scotland, James had a duty not only to himself but also to his land and his people. Thus, the implications of his imprisonment reach further than general questions of Nature and free will. On the one hand, if the king himself lacks freedom, then how can common people be expected to control their own destiny? On the other hand, the king's freedom of choice is naturally limited by his duty to the subjects that depend upon him. These questions, specific to rightful political order, draw James's readers into an active consideration of their own role in Nature's structures.

During Medieval times it was commonly believed that the body of the king was innately tied up with the natural order of things. Thus, James's readers would have implicitly understood the tensions with which he begins his work. The questions of fate that permeate the *Quair* begin with a metaphoric tripling that links the process of James's writing with his misfortunes at sea and thus his eventual imprisonment:

> For sothe it is, that on hir tolter quhele,
> Every wight cleverith in his stage,
> And failyng foting oft, quhen hir lest rele,
> Sum up, sum doune; [. . .]
>
> Among thir thoughtis rolling to and fro,
>   Fell me to mynd of my fortune and ure. (63-66, 70-72)

This portrayal of life on Fortune's wheel echoes the description of James's literary voyage:

> Ryght as the schip that sailith stereles
> Upon the rokkis most to harmes hye,

> For lak of it that suld bene hir supplye;
> So standis thou here in this warldis rage,
> And wantis that suld gyde all thy viage. (107-111)

Like a sailor standing on the deck during a storm, James describes himself as being tossed about at the whim of Nature. Like that same ship wrecked on a rocky spur, James finds himself entrenched in writer's block. That James goes on to describe his own sea capture, "Upon the wavis weltering to and fro, / So infortunate was us that fremyt day" (168-169), only increases the connections between divine/political order and the king's person. If the king is the direct link between God and country, and that king endures imprisonment and gains an epiphany, then his land undergoes similar trials and rewards. James learns to rule himself and thus his nation. Fradenburg describes the process as, "inner governance and fidelity" displacing "English control of the young King's will" (131). Moreover, James's narrative virtually spans his entire life, revealing its centrality to that life.

The *Quair* includes not only James's initial state of confused youth, but also the life that he leads as a response to divine revelation, and the actual poetic recreation of the events that shaped James's life into a comprehensible whole. The *Quair* encapsulates the life of a king; it focuses upon James's heaven-sanctioned love as that which released him from prison and empowered him to embrace the wheel of change. James emerges from the narrative an altered man. No longer a youth tossed on the sea of fortune, James truly becomes a divine monarch. As his readers follow James's narrative, not only must they chart his metamorphosis, but also its relevance to their own role as subjects. James's redemption would certainly affect their lives. The conversion of a king, for good or evil, has direct bearing on the fate of his people. Thus, readers of this particular allegory would have more invested in the text than the effort needed to grasp polysemous meaning; they would also understand that the meaning held within the text would shape their nation. James's movement towards spiritual and moral revelation is Scotland's. Through his surrender to Nature, and thus God's will, James gains freedom and autonomy not only for himself but also for his readers and his land.

What, then, can be made of James's natural descriptions? Neither the view which he offers his readers of the garden that surrounds his prison tower nor the idealized landscape in which he discovers Fortune and her wheel can be directly cited as descriptions of Scotland itself. The garden is, in fact, English, and the ideal

wilderness hearkens more to paradise itself than to any actual woodland. We must remember, however, that the focus of James's work is not the actual land of Scotland, but his own responsibility to it.[26] James's concerns are implicitly larger than his own welfare and happiness, and his audience would have recognized this. James acknowledges his own position as a symbol allegory; he is both himself and the King. Thus, through a contemplation of his place within God's plan, James comes to understand his role as both king and man in ensuring his own freedom, and that of his nation, from the chains of corporeal life. James's position as spiritual guide for his people, however, is implied by his role in the divine order rather than directly stated. Later Scottish authors, such as Sir David Lindsay, would choose to consider the connections between king, Nature, and nation more directly. If the king is representative of his land, then he becomes the ideal *mappa mundi* for discussing spiritual implications. The king may be viewed as a natural sphere within himself, and his struggles against the base side of human nature as the struggles of a nation.

In his introduction to the *Thrie Estaitis*, Roderick Lyall argues for a firm dating of the first production of the play. Despite critical arguments to the contrary, made by John MacQueen for example,[27] Lyall asserts that the play was first performed at the Castle Hill, Cupar on 7 June 1552. He also describes the audience that attended the performance as "citizens of a deeply troubled nation" (vii). Government at the time was in the hands of a faction led by James Hamilton, earl of Arran and duke of Chatelherault, but Hamilton's rule was short lived. "By the time the play was performed again at Edinburgh, probably on 12 August 1554, he had been replaced by Mary of Guise, mother of the Queen who was then only twelve years old, and who had been absent in France, the bride of the Dauphin, since 1548" (Lyall vii). Scotland at this time was fraught with political upheaval. Moreover, lack of clear rulership and positive reform spilled over into that other bastion of Scottish culture, the church, and the Scottish people suffered from that quarter as well. "Much [. . .] oppression was suffered at the hands of churchmen" (Lyall vii). Thus, it is

---

[26] At its basest level that which occupies much of James moral considerations, the eventual wooing of Joan, is what will complete one of his primary duties as king, the securing of an heir.

[27] See MacQueen, '*Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*', SSL 3 (1965-66), 129-43.

unsurprising that injustice in the church and in politics forms the core of Lindsay's play.

As an author, Lindsay was particularly enabled to create texts that focused on the intersections among personal, political and universal spheres due to his close relationship to the Scottish monarchy. Carol Edington asserts that Lindsay's political roles affected all aspects of his writing. His positions as court poet and herald gave him the ability to describe and affect the political situation of the time. As Edington describes, Lindsay's "principal concerns would be for the maintenance of order, the welfare of the commonweal, and the reinforcement of the type of strong monarchical authority able to achieve these goals" (21). Lindsay was deeply involved in the political welfare of the Scottish people. However, as an allegory, the *Thrie Estaitis* is not simply concerned with the need for specific political reform, but also the universal need for humanity's reform. Due to this multiple focus, and despite the lack of a true king in 1552, the play's audience would have recognized Lindsay's Rex Humanitas as both a political figure (the representation of a void that desperately needed to be filled) and an everyman type (who symbolized the struggle that all humanity must endure).

As discussed in chapter one, not only the content of the *Thrie Estaitis* but also its physical setting were utilized to alert the audience to their own complicity in the action of the play. In a similar manner, Greg Walker, who locates the first performance of the *Thrie Estaitis* earlier than 1552, places the audience within both divine and political systems through a discussion of the structure of the court. Walker argues that the *Thrie Estaitis* was first performed as an indoor interlude before James V at the royal palace of Linlithgow in 1540. He maintains that Lindsay's play was written not only with the politics of a court in mind, but specifically utilized the court's physical limitations and characteristics to enhance its moral motives. In Walker's words, "the 'place' for acting was also the domestic space of its audience" (Walker 2). Lyall argues that despite conclusive evidence that a dramatic performance occurred in 1540, and the striking similarities between it and the *Thrie Estaitis*, the earlier performance cannot be viewed as issuing from the same text as the later. Yet he does locate Lindsay as the author of this earlier "interlude" and places the Scottish king within the audience (x-xii). Thus, even if the *Thrie Estaitis* itself was not performed at court, it is clear that Lindsay would have recognized the use of the court as a politicized and active space. Performances before a monarch and within

his or her hall held many possible implications for spatial content. For example, the assemblage at court had the specific role of *mappa mundi*. Among its denizens could be found people from all social levels and walks of life. Thus a mixed audience, with its Lords and servitors, poets and fools, provided both a microcosm of society and a rich possibility for the moralization of the world's human hierarchy. As Walker argues,

> It is crucial to recognize just how completely household drama [. . .] was a product of the households which produced it, both of the physical space in which it was performed and of what we might term the moral economy of household life (52).

The monarch in particular played an important moral role in this physical and social hierarchy. On the one hand, from his height on the daïs, the sovereign directly symbolized a vision of the divine. Just as God stands above creation, so too the king presided over both his subjects and the entertainment. On the other hand, the king was the physical embodiment of his nation's body politic. His choices and actions were not simply his own but symbolized the political whole. "The king is important [. . .] as a political leader whose moral condition determines the state of the nation" (Kantrowitz 96). As such, a king is bound by the strictures of his kingship. Moreover, given his duty to provide a moral exemplar for his subjects to imitate, there is a sense in which the king is perhaps more restricted than others by the primary rules of conduct. "The stage on which the king played his part was set with structures which he had not designed and which he could rarely alter in any radical way" (Burns 2). Just as the order of Nature is the order of God's creation, political order – the election of a king – flows from moral law, which in turn is the will of God. The king is the divine ruler but he is also a servant of the divine. Thus he is able to control the Nature of his nation, the bounty of his land and the unions of his people, while simultaneously being controlled by natural law himself.

Although the play at Cupar in 1552 was not performed in front of the king, its audience would have been aware of a monarch's place within the political and physical hierarchy. Moreover, the significance of the absence of a Scottish king at the time of the *Thrie Estaitis* performance would have been brought home by the weaknesses exhibited by the monarchical figure in Lindsay's play. The *Thrie Estaitis* enacts the consequences of the lack of proper monarchical power upon its audience. It makes them complicit in what is wrong with Scottish politics, and the Scottish

nation itself, and shows them how these wrongs might be combated. The root of the play, the misguidance of Rex Humanitas, his eventual return to the right moral path, and his decision to purge the corruption that plagues the major human arenas – the church, business, and the commoners – leads the audience to place great importance upon the role of the king both politically and personally. As with Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, when the monarch strays from the straight and narrow, all of Nature (for both individuals and the nation) becomes blighted.

Within the play, Rex Humanitas's acceptance of Dame Sensualitie and his refusal to allow Chastitie admittance emphasize his inability to choose the rational side of his own Nature, and thus his betrayal of the natural order. When Sensualitie makes her first appearance before Rex she gives a speech that immediately alerts a classically educated audience to the danger, and crimes against Nature, that she represents:

> O Queene Venus, unto thy celsitude
> I gif gloir, honour, laud and reverence,
> Quha grantit me sic perfite pulchritude
> That princes of my persone have pleasance.
> I mak ane vow, with humbill observance,
> Richt reverentlie thy tempill to visie,
> With sacrifice unto thy [deitie].
>
> Till everie stait I am so greabill
> That few or nane refuses me at all:
> Paipis, patriarks or prelats venerabill,
> Common pepill and princes temporall
> Ar subject all to me, Dame Sensuall. (I.499-510)

Unlike James I's chaste and divine vision of a Venus who closely intertwines with Nature, Dame Sensualitie calls upon the baser conception of the goddess of love. Medieval authors and audiences generally understood that Venus exhibited a Janus face. On the one hand she was the purveyor of right and pure love, while on the other, she embodied lust and animal passion. Sensualitie's prayer has nothing to do with love. Instead she asks for power, the ability to control those that should by rights be incorruptible. She also links her strength to the confusion of the divine hierarchy, "common pepill and princes," but is careful to specifically exclude the divine from it: "princes temporall."

In this manner, Lindsay's audience is immediately clued in to Sensualitie's division from the natural order of things, an understanding that is only deepened by the appearance of her alter ego, Chastitie.

> How lang sall this inconstant warld indure,
> That I sould baneist be sa lang, alace?
> Few creatures or nane takis on me cure,
> Quhilk gars me monie nicht ly harbrieles.
> Thoucht I have past all yeir fra place to place,
> Amang the Temporal and Spirituall staits
> Nor amang princes I can get na grace,
> Bot boustuouslie am halden at the yetis. (I.1200-1207)

Chastitie's list of those who choose to turn her away alludes to Sensualitie's call to power. Moreover, Chastitie's lament is linked with considerations of the perversion of Nature, "this inconstant warld." Like Sensualitie, Chastitie separates human princes from the divine; however, Chastitie's words also allow for a connection between earthy princes and divinity.

Chastitie's appearance brings proper natural order to the forefront of the audience's minds. Her criticisms of the corruption of the estates focus upon their movement away from God's eternal plan. Of the Priores, for example, she declares, "Sho maid that vow for ane abesie, / Bot nocht for Christ Jesus, our Lord." Moreover, Chastitie's encounter with the Sowtar and Taylour only serves to deepen the sense of inversion initiated by her previous treatment:

>   TAYLOUR
> Is this fair Ladie Chastitie?
> Now welcum, be the trinitie:
> I think it war ane great pitie
>   That thou sould ly thairout.
> Your great displeasour I forthink:
> Sit doun, Madame, and tak ane drink,
> And let na sorrow in yow sink,
>   Bot let us play cap out!
>   SOWTAR
> Fill in and [drink about],
>   For I am wonder dry:
> The Devill snyp aff theair snout
>   That haits this company!
>
> [*Heir sall thay gar Chestety sit down and drink.*]
>
>   JENNIE
> Hoaw, Mynnie! Mynnie, Mynnie!
>   TAYLOUR'S WYFE

> Quhat wald thow, my deir dochter Jennie?
> Jennie, my joy quhair is thy dadie?
>   JENNIE
> Mary, drinkand with ane lustie ladie,
> Ane fair young mayden, cled in quhyte,
> Of quhom my dadie takes delyte.
> Scho hes the fairest forme of face,
> Furnischit with all kynd of grace:
> I traist gif I can can reckon richt,
> Sho schaips to ludge with him all nicht. (I.1296-11317)

Although the Sowtar and Taylour recognize Chastitie, the Taylour's daughter identifies her in terms of a prostitute.[28] Ironically, the Sowtar and Taylour's wives seem more upset when they discover her true guise:

>   TAYLOUR'S WIFE
> I am content, be God[i]s mother!
> I think for me, thay huirsone smaiks
> Thay serve richt weill to get their paiks.
> Quhat maister feind neids all this haist,
> For it is half ane yeir almaist
> Sen ever that loun laborde my ledder. (I.1327-1332)

The acceptance of Chastitie by these common men, combined with the vitriolic response that she evokes in their wives, provides not only bawdy humor but also a direct reference to the injustices that plague Nature:

> Reason, Natura's greatest gift to man, which enables him to understand the purpose of her laws, should dictate to him the proper way in which to express the passionate side of his nature. The inversion of this moral pattern, the enslavement of reason to lust and unbridled passion, will become the explicit cause of the goddess' complaint. (Economou 80)

Together with the inactivity that Sensualitie engenders in the king, the persecution and eventual imprisonment of Chastitie signal to the audience the divine importance of abiding by natural law. The king's position as fully representative of his land only reinforces the overreaching consequences of Sensualitie's rule. As Joanne Kantrowitz writes, "Simply stated, the *Thrie Estaitis* is built [. . .] on the basic antagonism between reason and sensuality, as that antagonism affects society" (61). By succumbing to Sensualitie and eschewing Chastitie, the king removes his nation entire from natural order.

---

[28] Perhaps part of her mistake has to do with the fact that Chastitie has in fact sat down to play drinking games with the men. Thus this moment in the play also works within the peramiters of complicity that I linked with drinking in Chapter One.

In making use of the audience's understanding of proper natural order Lindsay fully employs symbol allegory; Lindsay creates an allegory in which his characters are both themselves and symbolize a different meaning. The *Thrie Estaitis* masterfully reaches its audience by placing politics on a moral level and vice versa. The audience viewing Lindsay's production would have recognized the political and ethical, social and individual, implications of the contradictions in natural order that occur throughout the play and would have considered the implications of such anarchy in respect to the connection between the Scottish monarchy and its people. At the political level, the audience would have recognized their nation's lack. The disruption and corruption within the play would have highlighted the absence of a stable Scottish monarchical power. At the individual level, they would have realized their own complicity in the moral decline of their society. The lure of Sensualitie and of other physical sins is one of the world's greatest traps. The need to struggle against such temptations is humanity's greatest burden; the ability to transcend them is humanity's gift from God.

Early modern Scots believed, on the Bible's evidence, that God was "directly and personally involved" in their national history and that "the scourge of his correction" was seen on the land (Kantrowitz 31). The failure of a king to follow the proper moral path would ultimately lead to the decline and necessary punishment of his nation unless proper balance was quickly restored. Within the *Thrie Estaitis*, once Rex is released from Sensualitie's corrupting control, he is able to employ his God given power, the single quality that marks the king as king, his ability to dispense justice. Because Scotland lacked a strong or stable ruler at the time of the performance, the audience would understand the nature of the injustices that ruled their land. Likewise, the undeniable pull of Sensualitie on their individual lives would lead to the recognition of their complicity in the problems that plagued Scotland itself. In this manner, the banishment of Sensualitie shifts the focus of the play from the symbolic portrayal of the king's relationship to society to an examination of Scotland's political problems and the Scottish clergy. Thus, in Lindsay's hands, an understanding of Nature molds the Scottish people as individuals and as a nation.

Each of the three early Scottish authors discussed above is deeply concerned with the reiteration of a certain kind of reading. Using the interconnected significances inherent in Nature, they instruct their readers in the art of allegorical

analysis, not only of text, but also of human life. Their readers become an active part of textual meaning. Without readers' active identification with and understanding of allegorical interconnection, their texts would cease to function within a moral paradigm. In this manner, their works utilize Nature to allegorically symbolize the importance of complicity, awareness, and action.

Scottish Literature's Continued Use of Nature

During the medieval and early modern periods the use of Nature to create allegorical works was by no means isolated to Scottish literature. However, Scottish literature's continued allegorical structure, including the use of Nature as a spur to recognizing complicity, is that which marks it as unique among the literatures of the British Isles. In describing more modern authors as utilizing a suggestive medieval technique, I do not necessarily seek to posit a specific link between authors. Particular medieval authors or texts did not necessarily affect Scottish literature's allegorical tone directly.   Rather, the general use of allegory to create an active readership became a focus for the purpose of Scottish authorship. Likewise, due to their variety and temporal scope, the nineteenth- and twentieth-century works I have chosen are certainly influenced by many factors and stand alone in their own right. Susan Ferrier's *Marriage* (1818), R. L. Stevenson's "The Merry Men" (1882), and Nan Shepherd's *The Quarry Wood* (1928) all inhabit their own realms of reality. It would be foolish to attempt to draw exclusively direct parallels between either these works or the medieval Scottish texts with which I introduced my argument. But, each of these nineteenth- and twentieth-century works can be seen to exploit Nature's medieval aspects.

Susan Ferrier's novel, *Marriage*, focuses upon its characters' romantic life. *Marriage* charts the fate of Mary, the novel's protagonist, and her twin sister, Adelaide, as they progress towards the usual destiny for women in romantic novels, a wedding. Unsurprisingly, the novel's tone is unswervingly feminine and, like Jane Austen's work, dwells upon different types of femininity. However, as Kathryn Kirkpatrick writes in her introduction to the novel, although the voice of *Marriage* is female, "The accent is Scottish" (xi). Through Mary, Ferrier creates a romantic novel different from its contemporaries in that it addresses the issues a British nation presented at the time. She is interested in the individual impact of national identity upon her female characters. Writing during a time that Benedict Anderson has

described as marking the rise of "popular national movements" (68), a definition for which print capitalism was essential, Ferrier's choice to weave considerations of land and nation into her novel seems unsurprising. The way in which she alerts her readers to national concerns, however, becomes complicated when one considers that Ferrier "had no interest in finding an essential Scottishness in ballads and relics from the past" (Kirkpatrick xiii). Despite a lack of *direct* interest in the past, however, Ferrier molds her protagonist into a form that typifies medieval allegorical visions of Nature. Mary overcomes the difficulties and confusions inherent in being a woman of dual nationality by becoming symbolic of Nature; she is both herself and representative of the goddess Natura. Moreover, she gains her allegorical power through connections with both the Scottish landscape and divine law.

Mary is separated from Adelaide early in their infancy. Through a twist of fate, Mary's English mother chooses to abandon her and, as a result, the sisters are raised in widely differing environments. Mary becomes the adopted daughter of a wise and kindly Scottish Lady and is brought up in both a Christian and rural manner, while Adelaide is taken to live in England. Ferrier's early descriptions of Mary's adoptive and birth mothers, Mrs. Douglas and Lady Juliana, respectively, serve to initiate the theme of national comparison that underpins the novel as a whole. Lady Juliana's reaction to Scotland's scenery immediately marks her as a silly and intemperate woman. When she first arrives in Scotland its natural wonders hold no attraction for her: "In vain were creation's charms spread before Lady Juliana's eyes. Woods, and mountains, and lakes, and rivers, were odious things; and her heart panted for dusty squares, and suffocating drawing-rooms" (Ferrier 115). Thus, Lady Juliana's Englishness is both highlighted and painted in dreary opposition to her breathtaking Scottish surroundings. Mrs. Douglas, on the other hand, is described as both spiritually and physically connected to her land:

> Mrs. Douglas, though not a woman of either words or systems, possessed a reflecting mind, and a heart warm with benevolence towards every thing that had a being; all the best feelings of her nature were excited by the little outcast. (158)

Mrs. Douglas represents a balance between earthy mother figure and spiritual exemplar that will influence Mary to follow her better Nature. Under Mrs. Douglas's tutelage, Mary grows to be a proper Scottish lass; she gains a well-guided physical

and spiritual freedom, characteristics she will come to depend on during the trials of her life.

Mary's idyllic freedom is threatened and her temperance tested when she moves to England and is reunited with her birth mother and twin. Lady Juliana has not lost her contempt for all things Scottish and, even before she sees her now-grown daughter, Mary's connection with Scotland serves to drive a wedge between them:

> 'Then, what can I do with a girl who has been educated in Scotland? She must be vulgar – all Scotchwomen are so. They have red hands and rough voices; they yawn and blow their noses, and talk, and laugh loud, and do a thousand shocking things.' (189)

Tellingly, Lady Juliana's criticisms focus upon an association with the outdoors and the freedom of expression that Ferrier earlier praised. This essential connection between Mary and Scotland's physical aspects is only reinforced by her removal from the land of her birth. The chapter that details her separation from Scotland begins with Robert Burns's *My Heart's in the Highlands*:

> Farewell to the mountains, high covered with snow;
> Farewell to the straths, and green vallies below;
> Farewell to the forests, and wild hanging woods,
> Farewell to the torrents, and loud roaring floods! (195)

Moreover, her journey south highlights Mary's connection with divine order, and humanity's rightful path. Speaking to her uncle as they sit upon Calton Hill in Edinburgh she waxes lyrical over the view:

> 'And you are in the right, my dear uncle. The ideas which are inspired by the contemplation of such a spectacle as this are far – oh how far! – superior to those excited by the mere works of art. There, I can, at best, think but of the inferior agents of Providence: Here the soul rises from nature up to nature's God. (209)

Her speech is nearly a direct quotation of medieval perspectives on similar subjects. With these words, Mary recognizes the separation between human and divine creation and situates herself within God's natural laws. In combination with her connection to Scotland's natural diversity, her comprehension of human nature and God's natural design completes the idea of her as a symbolic Scottish version of the goddess Natura.[29]

---

[29] Applying the popularity of the picturesque during the period of Ferrier's writing career, Moler argues that, "Flowery addresses to beloved spots were part of the stock in trade of the heroine of sensibility" (59); however, considering the self-proclaimed

Mary's arrival in England and the difficulties and adventures she meets with will only serve to enhance her position as a figure of symbol allegory; not only is Mary a woman in her own right, but she is also an incarnation of Natura, as well as a symbol of the plight of Scotland's position within the United Kingdom. Her forbearance, despite the corrupting influence of her English mother and English raised sister, highlights her role as a Scottish moral guide. Set against the fickle and godless Nature of her female relations Mary embodies the virtues that accompany medieval visions of Natura: reason, piety and chastity. Mary's virtuous connection to God is suitably offset by reason and a levelheaded disposition. Mary's one and only act of defiance against the petty despotism exerted by Lady Juliana, for example, is an insistence upon attending church, a propensity that shocks her English family as a whole: "'Pon my honour, a young lady that can fly in her mother's face about such a trifle as going to church, is not very safe company.' And Adelaide shunned her more than ever" (255). Mary's attendance to life's spiritual side also serves to set her up as an ethical indicator. Mary provides an example as to the right way of conducting oneself, and the rest of the characters are judged accordingly. Certainly Lady Juliana and Adelaide cannot be seen as anything but lacking when compared to Mary.

The true significance of Mary's religiousness, however, can be discovered only through a contemplation of the poem that she reads to the one woman that shares her piety, Mrs. Lennox:

> [. . .] Forever gone! What words of grief –
> Replete with wild mysterious woe!
> The Christian kneels to seek relief –
> A Saviour died – It is not so [. . .]
>
> Forever gone! oh, dreadful fate!
> Go visit nature – gather thence
> The symbols of man's happier state
> Which speak to every mortal sense [. . .] (291)

Although Mary questions the literary value of such sentimental pieces, she cannot help but be moved by the words. Her exile has divided her both from her homeland and the spiritual and natural support she found there. In England there are no striking views to remind her of her relationship with God's law. As with her comments on Calton Hill, her moral consideration of the process of artistic creation completes the

---

political aspects of Ferrier's work, "flowery addresses" expressed by Mary take on a more critically specific tone.

reader's understanding: "She loved amusement as the *amusement* of an imperfect existence, though her good sense, and still better principles, taught her to reject it as the *business* of an immortal being" (292). Mary understands the separation between this intemperate life and its pleasures and the divine will of God. Amusement and creation are under the providence of God, and only he may wield them properly. Thus, in Mary reason and virtue combine to create a woman ideally suited to properly play the hand life deals her.

Describing Mary's trials within the novel, Kirkpatrick writes, "[Mary] must learn to rely on [her] own reasoned judgment if [she is] to constitute [her] own happiness" (x). In this way, despite the negative influence of English society, Mary is able to negotiate the obstacles that lie between her and the proper marriage she achieves. Early in the novel, the possibility that Mary might find a suitable partner for marriage while in England comes under consideration. Her reply to the worries that her aunt voices is telling:

> 'Don't be afraid, my dear aunt,' said Mary, with a kind caress, 'I shall come back to you your own "Highland Mary." No Englishman, with his round face and trim meadows, shall ever captivate me. Heath-covered hills, and high cheek bones, are the charms that must win my heart'. (192)

This statement proves to be doubly ironic. Mary does lose her heart to an Englishman, but one with enough Scottish blood to provide both heath-covered hills and high cheekbones. Combined with Mary's good sense and piety, her opinion that marriage should only accompany the most elevated esteem reinforces her underlying role as Natura.

Medieval constructions of the Goddess Natura show her with both the ability to control and to be balked by human sexuality. Natura's greatest complaint is that humanity has fallen prey to its baser instincts and thus forsaken all possibility of redemption.[30] Humanity should avoid "intemperate, adulterous and unnatural love" at all costs and instead seek the godly union of marriage (Economou 73). Proper adherence to divine law requires the control of our baser Nature, and the body's many sensual traps are seen as our greatest weaknesses. Moreover, as in James's *Kingis Quair*, the physical motives of marriage must be linked to proper political motives. Proper marriage creates a union which is true to all aspects of God's plan. This

---

[30] As stated earlier, Chaucer's *Parliament of the Foules* is an excellent example of the Goddess Natura in this guise.

concept of restraint and appropriate love also lies at the heart of Ferrier's novel. *Marriage*'s very title displays the importance of cultural and moral forbearance over sexuality.

When viewed together, Mary's relationship with Colonel Lennox, and her arguments against her sister's intemperate marriage, form a clear picture of Ferrier's conception of the ideal marriage. Moreover, the motives and choices of both women would have resonated with Ferrier's predominantly female audience. Within Ferrier's society, appropriate marriage was *the* concern for most eligible women. The question of whether to marry for money or for love, and the possibility of achieving both would have been foremost in her reader's minds. The ties that bind Mary to Colonel Lennox are rooted in her own connection with morality, order and the land. Her feelings for him first blossom after she watches him read a passage describing landscape to his mother: "'What would a blind man give to see the pleasant rivers, and meadows, and flowers, and fountains, that we have met with!' [. . .]" (334). Mary's reaction to his words stems not only from the tender moment between mother and son that follows the reading but also from her own devotion to Nature and her current exile from it. Moreover, Colonel Lennox's words echo the courtship that will follow. Both Mary and he will, at first, be blind to the connection between them and act accordingly, but when they gain sight a brilliant love will be revealed.

Mary's initial blindness also resonates with her complaints against Adelaide's own choice of husband. At first, both seem to go against proper human Nature. Adelaide's decision to abase herself for physical concerns embodies the improper sexual choices that Natura warns against. Because she covets financial security and an excessively comfortable lifestyle, Adelaide is prepared to falsely profess vows ordained before God. Unlike James's proper choice of Joan as his future queen and his avowal to Venus that his love is founded in proper natural and political reasons, Adelaide's reasons for marriage are purely physical. The match benefits neither the moral nor social order. Mary sees her sister's choice as ultimately unnatural, yet "[Adelaide] would not acknowledge, even to herself, that she had done wrong in marrying a man whose person was disagreeable to her, and whose understanding she despised, while her preference was decidedly in favour of another" (427). By placing Adelaide in such a position, Ferrier calls her reader's attention to the pitfalls of making a choice based purely on concern for physical comfort and heightens their

complicity by highlighting the faults of a society that in many ways guides young women towards such a choice.

Unfortunately, Mary's opinions concerning Colonel Lennox's first professions of love are equally as wayward as her sister's choice of a husband, if better founded morally. Because of a conversation overheard between the Colonel and his mother, during which Mrs. Lennox recommends that he love Mary, Mary herself is unable to believe that the Colonel could love her out of anything but duty for a dying parent. Moreover, although she realizes her own regard and love for him, her conclusions concerning his feelings combined with her moral respect for God's natural plan keep her from accepting his proposal:

> 'He *has* tried to love me! thought she; but it is in obedience to his mother's wish, and he thinks he has succeeded. No, no; I cannot be the dupe of his delusion – I will not give myself to one who has been solicited to love me!' (387)

Her use of commercial words such as "solicitation" to describe the Colonel's feelings only serves to bring home what she considers to be the improper nature of his love. Only after Mary realizes that the love he feels for her stems not from duty or solicitation, but from respect and understanding, does she feel free to marry him. Thus, Ferrier illustrates to her readers the possibility of (and need for) a true union while remaining within the prescribed boundaries of society.

Despite the achievement of what many readers might consider to be the novel's obvious conclusion, Mary's acceptance of her proper suitor, *Marriage* does not end until Mary has been reunited with her proper Natural and socio-political sphere. Not until Colonel Lennox's connection to Scotland is discovered can Ferrier fully close her narrative. *Marriage* ends exactly as a Scottish goddess Natura would have it. Mary and Colonel Lennox are bound by the state of properly moral marriage, their passion for each other "serving a useful end in God's plan for the world" and also "controlled and checked by moderation" (Economou 87). Moreover, they have returned to the nation that allowed Mary to properly choose her fate:

> Colonel and Mrs. Lennox agreed in making choice of Lochmarlie for their future residence; and, in a virtuous attachment, they found as much happiness as earth's pilgrims ever possess, whose greatest felicity must spring from a higher source. [. . .] All shared in their benevolence whom that benevolence could benefit. And the poor, the sick, and the desolate, united in blessing what heaven had already blessed – this happy Marriage. (468)

Ferrier's final reference to the diversity of human life and its possibility for redemption again echoes the *Kingis Quair*. Like James, once Mary has been joined in marriage she is able to return from exile and assume her rightful place as moral and political shepherdess. As Mrs. Lennox, Mary fully attains her potential as a natural and national figure, allowing her to ascend to her proper place within God's divine plan.

Although Ferrier's work might lack direct influence by medieval sources, the connection between medieval and early modern visions of the goddess Natura, a vicar of God whose duty is to serve as guide over sexual, moral, and social matters, and Mary's character and choices is undeniable. Moreover, Mary's difficulties, and those of her sister, manifest the plight of many of her readers. Within a society that requires so many choices in order to evade poverty and gain stability, how is it possible to also achieve happiness? Mary's connection to her land and her God shows Ferrier's readers the right path. In this manner, Ferrier's novel is a symbol allegory that utilizes the literary style of its time to create not only a character who is both herself and a personification but also a world that simultaneously represents the human path and proper Scottish choice. Mary's position as a woman pulled between Scotland and England, both physically and ideologically, creates in her a particularly Scottish vision of Nature and humanity's place within it. Without her Scottish blood, the story seems to argue, Mary would be unable to make the rational choices that her status as Natura would demand.

As with Ferrier's *Marriage*, Robert Louis Stevenson's work is deeply concerned with the effects of Scottish blood (and its divisions) upon his characters. Stevenson's famous novella, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, describes the difficulties of a Scottish doctor in regard to the separations of good and evil inherent in human nature. But Stevenson was also deeply concerned with the effect of humanity's natural surroundings upon their actions. Within *Jekyll and Hyde*, for example, it is the story of a door and the descriptions of a city, supposedly London but more like Edinburgh, which rule the psychological action of the text. For Stevenson, the landscape of Scotland exhibits as much character as those who walk upon it, and he uses this landscape to highlight transgressions against natural and divine law. In his short story "The Merry Men" the protagonist's nationality and the national texture of the landscape provide the perfect backdrop for the moral (and mortal) tale that Stevenson unfolds. Stevenson uses a combination of Scottish

landscape and medieval allegorical and spiritual understanding to underline his readers' complicity in the action of the text.

The narrative of "The Merry Men" focuses upon one family that inhabits a lonely Scottish island. Over the course of the tale, the reader is repeatedly made aware of a connection between the events related by the narrator, a break in the natural order of things, and the landscape upon which the action plays out. By centering his story upon a Scottish island, Stevenson creates a microcosm of the sublunary world. Separating his characters from the rest of humanity, Stevenson underscores the importance of their decisions with the Nature of the island. Like Henryson, Stevenson utilizes the harsh and unyielding Nature of his land to act as a stringent; the harshness of reality is used to alert readers to their own possible moral downfall. Like Lindsay, he identified improper rulership of self and others as the downfall of his characters and their land. The Scottish landscape exposes the Scots to a specific and difficult reality, a natural sphere that is particularly suited to punishment and redemption, but which is also prone to temptation. Existence itself becomes a trial which the Scots must undergo and still prove themselves spiritually worthy to claim the kingdom of God.

Early in the tale, Stevenson sets up a parallel between fate and Nature. "The Merry Men" opens with a description of weather directly linked to Stevenson's narrator's mood: "It was a beautiful morning in the late July when I set forth on foot for the last time for Aros [. . .] leaving all my baggage till I had an occasion to come round for it by sea, [I] struck right across the promontory with a cheerful heart" (363). This happy description, however, is the last cheerful moment the protagonist will narrate as tension builds both within the tale and Nature itself. Indeed, the narrator's description of his uncle as "a man whom ill-fortune had pursued" could easily refer to the tale as a whole (363). Before the narrator even sets foot upon Aros, an unnatural and Godless act takes place that will distort both the island's Nature and the possibility of freedom of choice, an act that the narrator eventually discovers and censures:

> I knew as well as if I had been there that the man who now lay buried at Sandag had worn a hairy cap, and that he had come ashore alive. For the first and only time I lost toleration for the man who was my benefactor and the father of the woman I hoped to call my wife. (394)

Moved by the violence of his island, by the murderous shape of the waves that crush ships against its rocks, the narrator's uncle commits the most diabolical of crimes. As the patriarch of the island, the narrator's uncle holds a position not unlike that of a monarch. It is his role to serve as moral guide and indicator for those who look to him for support. However, like Rex Humanitas in the first act of the *Thrie Estaitis* the uncle ignores the pull of his soul, and falls prey to the basest forms of Nature. In this case, however, it is greed, not lust and sloth that are his undoing. Like Shakespeare's Macbeth the narrator's uncle murderously disrupts the natural order of things and Nature shifts to show its roughest face, rushing to compensate for the discord. Moreover, like Lindsay's Rex Humanitas, the uncle's actions require a reaction in his subjects if the divine political order of the island is to be maintained. Stevenson's readers, however, are at first unaware of the uncle's barbarous act and can only feel its effects through the tone and quality of the tale. Stevenson saturates the story with suspense and dread, emotions that many of his readers would have relished.[31] However, in this case, such emotions are eventually revealed in a less than positive light. Thus, Stevenson's text utilizes the conventions and propensities of its readers to implicate them in wrongful thought and then confront them with their complicity.

Stevenson's short story is appealing to its audience in part *because* of its masterful weaving of horrific events. Stevenson understood the entertaining nature of a terrible tale and he utilized his audience's fascination with fear and dread for their moral instruction. Within the first chapter of the story, the narrator describes events that are both natural and frightening, a part of God's plan that is both beautiful and terrible:

> I have often been out there in a dead calm at the slack of the tide; and a strange place it is, with the sea swirling and combing up and boiling like the caldrons of a linn, and now and again a little dancing mutter of sound as though the *Roost* were talking to itself. But when the tide begins to run again, and above all in heavy weather, there is no man could take a boat within half a mile of it, nor a ship afloat that could either steer or live in such a place [. . .] it's here that these big breakers dance together – the dance of death, it may be called – that have got the name, in these parts, of the Merry Men. (367)

Stevenson's words elicit the delicious fear that accompanies his description of the Merry Men, and (for now) such a reaction is appropriate when contemplating the

---

[31] Victorian readers were connoisseurs of suspense and drama, as the popularity of so called "Penney Dreadfuls" and serial novels replete with cliffhangers during the period attests.

awesome works of God. However, Stevenson soon turns his readers' wish for titillation against them by utilizing that same Nature to point out the impropriety of such fear and sensationalism when partnered with human acts.

The narrator's uncle falls prey first to greed and then to a lust for power and excitement. In line with the medieval understanding, succumbing to one sin quickly leads to the enactment of others; such is the nature of sin. In Stevenson's narrative, the violent side of the natural world symbolizes humanity's tendency to fall prey to sinful deeds. The Merry Men enact their terrible power on ships that carry rich cargo, surely an allusion to the pirate ships that populate much of Stevenson's fiction, and thus are symbolic of God's punishment for transgressions against proper human nature. However, the narrator's uncle makes the mistake of associating God's will and plan with his own sinful desires. His proximity to the Merry Men elicits an improper connection with them that breaks his alignment with divine order and initiates a punishment by way of that very order. Throughout "The Merry Men" Stevenson highlights a connection between Nature and the wrathful hand of God. As with Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*, Stevenson's narrator portrays natural phenomena as the instrument of fate. Like Cresseid, the uncle's inability to properly utilize his intellect will lead to punishment. The island's very name conjures connections between Nature and divine judgment: "Aros Jay, I have heard the natives call it, and they say it means *the House of God*" (365). Moreover, the island exhibits the duality of Nature that medieval moralists found so compelling. It is harsh and beautiful, barren and lush. The island is able to sustain life: "There was some very good pasture, where my uncle fed the sheep he lived on; perhaps the feed was better because the ground rose higher on the islet" (366). Yet it is equally quick to take life away. Thus, the island represents God's will, the struggle that is inherent in all life and the choices that are made available by human nature.

It is humanity's duty to accept fortune's wheel and Nature's harsh visage yet still retain the soul's purity, a duty that the narrator's uncle fails to uphold. Instead he begins to see *himself* as the wielder of Nature's power, and he implicates the text's readers with his own morbid lust for wealth, excitement and power. When discussing a recent ship wreck caused by the Merry Men the Uncle decrees:

> 'But, man, they were sair wonders that God showed to the *Christ-Anna* – wonders, do I ca' them? Judgements, rather: judgements in the mirk nicht among the draygons o' the deep. And their souls – to think o' that – their souls, man, maybe no prepared! The sea – a muckle yett to hell!'

I observed as my uncle spoke, that his voice was unnaturally moved and his manner unwontedly demonstrative. (375)

As the narrator observes, his uncle is "unnaturally moved" by his own story, a description that both serves to alert readers to the uncle's evil deed and to suggest to them their own complicity. The uncle is invested in his narrative because he "helped" send one of the crew of the *Christ-Anna* to find God's judgment. He took his role as steward of the island and his connection to divine order one step too far and tipped the natural balance to benefit himself. Stevenson's readers are invested in the narrative because of the appeal of terror. They, in part, condone and applaud the uncle's actions because his choices are excitingly frightening to contemplate. Murder is even more compelling than natural disaster and who has not dreamt of an "easy" discovery of unclaimed wealth.

As his uncle's sanity comes into question, and the narrative moves toward its doom-filled conclusion, the narrator himself heightens the connection between fate (both within the text and without) and Nature. A frightening conversation about shipwreck clarifies the narrator's fears that his uncle murdered a sailor for the spoils of his wrecked ship:

"If it were not too late," I cried with indignation, "I would take the coble and go out to warn them."
"Na, na," he protested, "Ye maunna interfere; ye maunna meddle wi' the like o' that. It's His' " – doffing his bonnet – "His wull. And, eh, man! But its a braw nicht for 't!" (396)

The uncle's intimation that it is God's will that men be shipwrecked further underlines his twisting of the natural order. If horrors such as shipwreck are part of the natural plan then surely murder is also. The uncle's ability to excuse his own actions is reiterated through the possible options open to the text's readers. Will they simply revel in the sensation of the narrative, or will they recognize their own complicity in enjoyment. Finding murder and death to be entertaining both removes and underscores the true horror of such occurrences. As with the *Thrie Estaitis*, entertainment masks and highlights a multitude of sins.

It is not until the novel's conclusion that Stevenson makes the final break between the actions of the uncle and the reactions of his readers. Following the dreadful conversation with his uncle, the narrator returns to his beloved cousin and

makes a speech that sums up the tension among humanity and Nature, text and readers:

> 'Mary,' I said solemnly, 'You must not laugh at me just now. God knows I am in no heart for laughing. If we could get your father with us, it would be best; but with him or without him, I want you far away from here, my girl; for your own sake and for mine, ay, and for your father's too, I want you far-far away from here. I came with other thoughts; I came here as a man comes home; now it is all changed and I have no desire nor hope but to flee – for that's the word – flee, like a bird out of a fowler's snare, from this accursed island'. (397)

The morally and spiritually metaphoric undertone of his speech, "getting away" from moral corruption and escaping damnation, is sharply underscored by its resonance with Henryson's "Preiching of the Swallow." By using avian imagery, Stevenson situates his narrator within a prophetic position much like Henryson's Swallow, and – like the Swallow – for the remainder of the tale the narrator will sense impending doom and warn of it, but be unable to fend it off. Like Henryson's greedy, heedless birds, the narrator's uncle is too far-gone for redemption. Moreover, the narrator's request that his intended not laugh at him highlights the inappropriateness of levity in such a situation. Mary, like Stevenson's readers, must choose the proper reaction for the tale. She must choose between Godly awe and corrupting entertainment.

As Stevenson pulls his reader towards the tale's fateful end, he emphasizes the improper Nature both within and without his text. Unable to follow his better Nature, the narrator's uncle falls to mimicry of the harsh Nature he witnesses around him; natural descriptions begin to resonate with human characteristics and vice versa. The natural phenomena observed by the narrator, for example, echo his beloved's description of her father. The narrator first depicts the sky as changed, scowling, and marked: "the change upon the sky was even more remarkable. There had begun to arise out of the southwest a huge and solid continent of scowling cloud [. . .] The menace was express and imminent" (391). Later he utilizes similar words to describe the negative changes in his uncle: "he's not long for here. The mark is on his brow; and better so – maybe better so" (398). Both the sky and the narrator's uncle bear a mark of the grave, a mark of Cain. Stevenson's readers, however, have been given the tools to escape the uncle's fate. If the uncle cannot heed his nephew's warnings it is because he, unlike the readers, could not benefit from the intercession of the text. By utilizing Nature to make his readers uncomfortable with their traditional experience of reading sensational literature, Stevenson allows them to benefit from

the final natural punishment of the narrator's uncle. The uncle reads the black man who spells his doom incorrectly, as the devil. The readers know that the "man out of the sea" represents the uncle's natural end. He cannot escape the murder he has committed: "Turn where he would, he was still forestalled, still driven toward the scene of his crime [. . .] the thing was now beyond the hands of men, and these were the decrees of God that came to pass before our eyes" (418). The physical body that had led the uncle to temptation becomes a part of the natural round, and his soul is sent to its eternal judgment. Unlike the earlier chapters of the story, however, these words do not simply elicit horror, but also righteousness. Whereas, the readers had been able to shudder at the *thought* of death, they are now presented with it in its most Natural form. The uncle's madness leads him to death at sea: "at the far end of Aros Roost, where the sea-birds hover fishing" (418). Through his tale, Stevenson directs his readers' attention to their own complicity in evil through the cult of sensation and allows them to recognize humanity's place within God's natural scheme.

Attention to the position of Nature within Stevenson's "The Merry Men" allows readers to fully interpret the moral narrative underlying the tale's action. When the narrator speaks to his uncle for the last time his words mold the tale's moral in an almost fabular manner:

> 'We are both sinful men walking before the Lord among the sins and dangers of this life. It is by our evil that God leads us into good; we sin, I dare not say by His temptation, but I must say with His consent; and to any but the brutish man his sins are the beginning of wisdom. God has warned you by this crime; He warns you still by the bloody grave between our feet; and if there shall follow no repentance, no improvement, no return to Him, what can we look for but the following of some memorable judgment?' (408-9)

The doom that the narrator foretells for his uncle, however, has already been set into motion and, almost before he finishes speaking these final words of caution, the shipwrecked, black crewman appears and drives the tale to its fateful conclusion. With the death of the uncle, and the implied marriage of the narrator to his cousin, Natural order is restored at both a political and individual level. Because of his prophetic role in the narrative, we can only assume that the narrator will more properly manage his position and power than his intemperate uncle was able to do. Within the narrative, however, only Stevenson's readers directly benefit from the narrator's words. "It is by our evil that God leads us into good" is the rallying call of the text; Stevenson speaks directly to his readers. By presenting them with their own

support and enjoyment of evil, the entertainment they found in reading an account of horrific events, Stevenson allows them to choose the good. They may save themselves from the uncle's fate. Stevenson's readers are given the option to avoid the enslaving thrill of terror and violence. Thus, by allegorically yoking the natural sphere to moral purposes, Stevenson continues the tradition that his medieval forefathers initiated.

Nan Shepherd's novel, *The Quarry Wood*, also considers the link among humanity, choice, Nature and nation. However, *The Quarry Wood* more directly allows for final redemption than Stevenson's tale. The novel's narrative, much like Ferrier's *Marriage*, follows a young girl's struggle towards adulthood. Unlike Ferrier's Mary, though, Shepherd's Martha lacks a naturally strengthened purity of focus. Instead, she finds herself divided by ties to the land. Pulled between her rural upbringing and her university education, Martha finds it difficult to divine the separation of her base Nature from her higher reason. Moreover, the novel encourages confusion between the two. In *The Quarry Wood* an uneducated rural lifestyle does not necessarily engage the more animalistic side of humanity, nor does it essentially uphold reason. A university career may hone the skills needed for reasoning. However, it is unable to teach the morality needed to properly utilize such powers. Thus, Martha's true passage to adulthood is the trial of balancing both sides of her Nature.

With its first words *The Quarry Wood* enters into the discussion of divided Nature by describing Martha's attachment to another Scottish woman who had run the gauntlet of prevaricating humanity, Aunt Josephine:

> Martha Ironside was nine years old when she kicked her grand-aunt Josephine. At nineteen she loved the old lady, idly perhaps, in her natural humour, as she loved the sky and space. At twenty-four, when Miss Josephine Leggatt died, aged seventy-nine and reluctant, Martha knew that it was she who had taught her wisdom; thereby proving – she reflected – that man does not learn from books alone; because Martha had kicked Aunt Josephine (at the age of nine) for taking her books (1).

Throughout the narrative, Aunt Josephine's example provides Martha with the guidance that she so desperately needs. Although Martha's choices are necessarily her own, by the novel's conclusion she reaches a level of autonomy and calm that, of all the novel's characters, only Aunt Josephine shares. With these opening sentences, Shepherd initiates her readers into both the stages of life yet to come and the problems

with any attempt to keep Nature and reason in discrete groupings. However, before such unification can occur, each side of human Nature must be individually explored.

Martha's home and her family are described early in the novel with rustic and colloquial detail. The unity of farm life and Nature is emphasized, as are the difficulties, poverty and squalor, for example, that accompany it. Such an introduction to Martha's life reminds Shepherd's readers of both the pre-lapsarian and fallen status of human life. As with medieval authors, "the philosophical tradition of seasonal description [. . .] with its emphasis on the ordered cycle of germination, growth and decay, [and] the measured procession of the seasons [becomes] an aspect of universal order and as such an image of human life" (Pearsall 197). Through her connection with the Scottish farming community Martha is intimately linked with God's divine plan and His laws. Martha is not, however, a typical country girl. Unlike her family, she is not simply content to bide her time as one of God's creatures. Martha craves a higher knowledge, and, at first, her potential for reason clashes sharply with her familial situation:

> Martha gulped. She suddenly wanted to scream, to cry out at the pitch of her voice, 'I haven't time, I haven't time, I haven't time! What's a kitchen table in comparison with my Latin, with knowing things, with catching up on the interminable past! There isn't *time*!' (27)

Martha's preoccupation with learning and time sets her apart from her seasonally based family; it drives a wedge between Martha and her rural roots and, eventually, sends her away to university in search of higher knowledge. Martha's difficulties also call into question social and class based prejudices that resonate within her readers. At a time when Scotland was growing culturally and economically while struggling to maintain ties to its particular past and heritage, Scottish readers would have recognized the difficulty of reconciling modern knowledge with rural tradition. What Shepherd wishes to highlight is the inconsistency in the need to choose between the two. Her readers' own prejudice towards choice in general, either old *or* new, never old *and* new, implicates them in Martha's mistakes. Their ability to recognize the problematic nature of a dependency on choice in Martha's case allows them psychological escape from their own prejudices.

It is not Shepherd's intention in setting Martha's upbringing against her university career to morally elevate one realm over the other. Rather, her novel seeks to tease out an understanding of the particular balance needed between the two for the

right way of living. Touching scenes between Martha and her oak-like father come into direct opposition with her intense love of schoolwork. However, like her Aunt Josephine, Martha must learn to be both "sky and space" and a fount of wisdom. Therefore, Shepherd seeks to induct her readers into the need for balance through the separation of intelligence and reason. Certainly, Martha is intelligent. However, the manner in which she conducts her studies and her life is not always guided by reason. Instead of building upon the even progression of life that her background encourages, Martha's first year at university promotes the base and intemperate portions of her Nature:

> Martha snatched. There was no time to build a cosmos. Her world was in confusion, a sublime disordered plenty. Some other day, far off, she would order it, give it structure and coherence [. . .] Meanwhile there was the snatching.
>   She snatched because she lived in fever. Greedy, convulsive, in a jealous agony, she raced for knowledge, panting. (50)

In severing herself from her rural roots, Martha succumbs to the lure of chasing an impossible and static eternal summer. Instead of gaining an even understanding of her own fallen Nature from the natural surroundings of her birth, instead of recognizing that "the passage of the year through the landscapes and activities of the months was a trenchant commentary upon man's loss of that original garden of everlasting life and spring" (Pearsall 122), Martha hubristically ignores the order of things and seeks the divine capacity of all-encompassing knowledge.

Martha's love for Luke, and his opinion of her, further highlights her need for balance. The biblical symbolism of their names activates deeper layers of meaning in their relationship. The biblical Luke was a Gentile convert and composed his book of the Bible for a Gentile, rather than a Jewish, reading public. Moreover, Luke's writing exhibits a high quality of literary style. "Of all four Evangelists, he is preeminently a person of broad culture, capable of adapting his Greek diction to different occasions [. . .] As a gifted literary artist he produced what has justly been described as 'the most beautiful book in the world'" (*Oxford Bible* footnote 76). Like Shepherd's Luke, the Evangelist is a symbol of intellectual creation and also of poetic beauty. Also like Shepherd's narrative, the biblical Martha's story is told through Luke's perspective. Although Luke is not an eyewitness to the life of Jesus, he tells us that he used great care in collecting information for his book; his stories are both

direct and convincing. Like Shepherd's Luke, the biblical Luke describes Martha's actions through his own interpretation.

The story of Martha's encounter with Jesus, however, in itself adds to a consideration of Shepherd's protagonist:

> Now as they went on their way, he [Jesus] entered a certain village, where a woman named Martha welcomed him into her home. She had a sister named Mary, who sat at the Lord's feet and listened to what he was saying. But Martha was distracted by her many tasks; so she came to him and asked, 'Lord, do you not care that my sister has left me to do all the work by myself? Tell her then to help me.' But the Lord answered her, 'Martha, Martha, you are worried and distracted by many things; there is need of only one thing. Mary has chosen the better part, which will not be taken away from her.' (Luke 10:38-42)

In the biblical text, Martha represents the active (and traditional) female role, while her sister Mary embodies the contemplative (and spiritual) path of life. Yet when applied to Shepherd's protagonist, the lines between the two figures blur. Is Martha's connection to the earth and natural landscape a symbol of the traditional female role, or is it the path to an enlightened vision of the world? Will her education prepare her for practical life, or does it embody the knowledge she will require to connect with the spiritual? Shepherd's Martha finds herself divided into both a Martha and a Mary. Her relationship to Luke only emphasizes this difficulty.

Martha's feelings for Luke waver between an emotional attachment; she looks up to him for his education, and a physical need: "The Ironside in her blood was up. Like her father who had swept the proud Leggatt beauty on to marriage, masterful until he had his will [. . .] Martha was ready to spurn the whole world and herself as well, in the savage imperious urge of her desire" (115). Because of his position at the university, Luke inspires her intelligence; because of his married state he encourages her base Nature. Despite all his influence, however, Luke never activates her reason. Unlike the biblical Luke, Shepherd's Luke never inspires allegorical reading. When they fatefully meet within the Quarry Wood, Martha is aflame with passion for Luke, but he reacts only to his own vision of her: "She touched him with a kind of awe. Impossible ideas she had, of course; not of this world: but her speech was like a lit and potent draught. What fools men were, to think the spirit could not be manifest in human flesh!" (100). Thus, both Martha and Luke are trapped by polarity. Because of her love for him, Martha is "rapidly becoming what Luke loved her for not being – a woman" (111). Because of his vision of her as more spirit than mortal, Luke is

unable to see Martha as she truly is. Martha, however, eventually gains the insight needed to free herself from Luke's calcifying expectations. Through her full range of experience, Martha begins to understand the multiple facets of life.

Martha's relationship with Luke leads her to an understanding of the necessity for a balance between both sides of her Nature. Her choice of reason, of a connection to Nature tempered with wisdom, is directly linked with an understanding of Luke's true feelings toward her:

> He had willed her on, taking all she could give [. . .] raped her of what he wanted in her and flung the rest aside; deflowered her, using colour and contour and perfume for his delight, and refusing to see that he had plucked the blossom whole to have them. Was it any mitigation for him to say, *I did not want the flower*, since the flower was taken? He had no right to her essence if he did not want herself. Fiercely she resented his claim in her; fiercely she repudiated her own proud passion of giving. (179-60)

In recognizing that Luke does not love all of her – that he wishes to separate out her soul and make it his, but does not cherish the body that goes with it – Martha reiterates the Goddess Natura's complaint: "Natura has been the victim of a metaphorical assault by the viciousness of man [. . .] his general propensity to seek satisfaction for the lusts of his eyes" (Economou 77). Luke's vision of Martha removes her power to read herself, to understand the complexity of her Nature. For him, she is a text to be read. Luke allegorizes her but does not allow her the ability to understand her own identity; he chooses one of her aspects to represent her as a whole and refuses to acknowledge any of her other aspects. Moreover, Luke is unable to see Martha as more than a personification allegory. Luke is only able to think of Martha as a static personification whose individuality has no meaning without interaction with him.[32] For Luke, Martha is pure, and his vision of her fails to take into account any of her other emotions or roles. In understanding Luke's reading of her as an imposition, Martha finally begins to see herself as a polysemous entity. Martha's realization that Luke separates her Nature finally allows her to come to terms with her own Janus face. As in medieval understanding, Martha realizes that "a vision of [Nature] which was both harmonious and comprehensive had to be achieved in the restless context of seasonal growth, not in the happy finality of an eternal spring, whatever the moral implications" (Pearsall 67). She accepts the role that Aunt

---

[32] Again, for a discussion of the difference between personification and symbol allegory see chapter one.

Josephine once commanded. She gives herself wholly to the balance of Nature. She becomes earthly mother and reasoning mentor.

Throughout the novel Martha is more closely linked to Nature than even she is able to comprehend. By paralleling Martha's trials and dawning comprehension to seasonal change and thus to the labors of Scottish rural life, Shepherd endows her readers with an understanding of the importance that Nature plays within a wider Scottish context. Even during her blind and intemperate university years, Nature and the seasons marked the passage of time and the changes in Martha's life:

> Luke came in upon a day in August [. . .] January changed the wind [. . .] On a day in early June she sat and read upon the cairn [. . .] May was a frail blue radiance [. . .] June was a hot and heavy month [. . .] That January Martha loved the earth as she had never loved it before. (42, 60, 80, 113, 133, 204)

Nothing in *The Quarry Wood* takes place without natural order as an accompaniment. Thus, the reader understands throughout that Martha will eventually gain the proper balance between intellect and physicality, educational and natural life.

From the first paragraph of *The Quarry Wood* Shepherd utilizes Nature and its connections to humanity as a guide for her reader's understanding. She structures the conflict within the narrative to echo the social and political conflicts affecting her nation. Scotland of the 1920s was a nation deeply divided between the urge to increase technological progress and the need to retain an identity that was deeply rooted in rural practices. Martha's conflict *is* Scotland's conflict. How does a nation balance the need for knowledge of a changing world with the need to maintain continuity with its past? Should learning and technology take precedence over culture and heritage? In truth, is it possible to so sharply separate the past from the present? Or will the attempt result in an inability to recognize or define Scottish identity itself? With her narrative, Ferrier proposes a Scotland that is able to reconcile its past with its present in order to create a stable and unified future.

Like Ferrier and Stevenson, Shepherd chooses to reveal the truth of human Nature through a consideration of the impact of her land upon the roles and understanding of her characters. All three authors ask their readers to recognize both their own complicity with text and the allegorical layers that accompany that recognition. Likewise, all three authors choose a specifically Scottish vision of humanity's role in Nature to cause their readers to make the proper choices for maintaining a coherent identity.

Conclusions Concerning Nature's Place Within Scottish Literature

Questions concerning humanity's place within the sublunary world, our connection with the divine, and the possibility of free will can be found in all three of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century texts discussed above. All share an affirmation of the order of the natural world and all rework that structure to affect their readers. These authors take account of their reader's place in the world and manipulate an understanding of humanity's ability to negotiate existence. Their texts turn human Nature itself upon their readers and allow them to feel the appropriateness of their role in the natural order. Moreover, despite – and perhaps because of – their use of medieval conceptions of Nature these texts situate themselves within their own periods. Ferrier, Stevenson, and Shepherd each describe the Nature inherent to their own time and according to their own comprehension of that Nature.

Although all of the more recently written texts discussed above deal both directly and indirectly with divine law, the needful order of things, they seemingly lack the emphasis on political order I discussed within the context of Nature and medieval/early modern Scottish texts. Both James's and Lindsay's allegorical use of Nature was firmly based in political structures and concerns, whereas Ferrier, Stevenson and Shepherd's inclusion of political order seems more a side-effect of their position *as* Scottish authors grappling with their own literary identity. The lack of overtly political motivation in the more modern works contemplated above, however, does not exemplify a lack of political concerns in the transformations of allegory for Scottish literature over time. Rather, texts that most specifically identify themselves with Nature after the Unions are not necessarily as logically or directly linked with their earlier, more political, counterparts.[33] "Allegorical writing, like other kinds, changes because the material it seeks to analyse is changed – the world and society, or more precisely, people's knowledge and perception of them" (Clifford 44). Political concerns, and allegories that consider such concerns (or their lack), do continue to exist within Scottish literature. However, the complications of absence that have been located at the heart of Scottish socio-political nationalism necessarily

---

[33] As stated earlier, authors who wrote during the "Scottish Renaissance" of the 1920s frequently *did* compose texts that were highly political in nature. However, political change and commentary were the specific and direct *aims* of such authorship. Hugh MacDairmid and his cohorts wrote specifically politicized texts in order to fill a vacuum that they recognized within Scottish literature.

alter the path that political uses of allegory must take, as the following discussion of allegory when connected to Scottish national identity will attest.

Chapter Three
National Concerns: Defining a Scottish Literary Pattern

An Introduction to the Questions that Surround the Scottish National Identity

As described in chapter one, the literary use of allegory is difficult to map coherently across the ages. Teskey, for example, views the Enlightenment as causing allegory to become confined to the self rather than extended through a coherent narrative, and he attributes the Romantic period's elevation of the symbol (to the realm of singularity once held by allegory) to the breakdown of allegory as a historically articulated form (98). However, cultural integrity can be seen as a solution to the problem of allegory's supposed lack of integrity. Tesky's vision of culture as "collective subjectivity" allows for allegory to maintain its integrity on a more local basis (149-150). Thus, Scottish literature is able to maintain its allegorical continuity through the "collective subjectivity" of Scottish culture. Moreover, the tradition of allegory in Scottish literature is itself a significant thread in the tapestry of the Scottish national identity.

The Scottish people have traditionally been seen, and viewed themselves, as invested in maintaining an autonomous national identity at an early date. The *Declaration of Arbroath* (1320) adds weight to such opinions as a document with an unarguable "place [. . .] in the development in European history of the concept of nationalism" (Fergusson, *Arbroath* 1). As a document, the *Declaration* is not well known, either within its own context or more generally; however, it serves to exemplify Scotland's early vision of itself as a nation. The *Declaration* is actually a letter written by the Barons of Scotland and addressed to Pope John XXII, dated at Arbroath on the sixth of April 1320. The core themes of the document include the basic concepts of the divine right of kings, free will, and the divine plan. The *Declaration* at once provides a support for royal and religious political power and the conviction of a particular people to engender their own rule:

> To him [the king], as to the man by whom salvation has been wrought unto our people [Christ], we are bound both by law and by his merits that our freedom may be still maintained, and by him, come what may, we mean to stand. Yet if he should give up what he has begun, and agree to make us or our kingdom subject to the king of England or the English, we should exert ourselves at once to drive him out as our enemy [. . .] and make some other man who was well able to defend us our king. (*Declaration*)

The *Declaration* encapsulates many of the themes that have come to represent the Scottish national identity. Within it, concepts that are allegorically reiterated within Scottish literature were used for a directly political purpose. However, politics and the Scottish national identity are not necessarily contingent upon each other. In his introduction to *The Cry of Home: Cultural Nationalism and the Modern Writer* Ernest Lewald argues, "The political trajectory from clan to nation to state represents the history of a struggle to make political boundaries coincide with cultural ones" (4). Scotland has seen a continual separation between its cultural and political visions of self. During political nationalism's heyday in Europe such nationalism simply did not exist within a Scottish context. The people of Scotland were unified by their cultural vision, not by a drive for political direction or autonomy. Even in more modern considerations of Scotland, however, "there was no simple correspondence between cultural and political nationalism" (McCrone 173). Scottish culture and politics, then, had not simply grown apart. They were never truly connected.

Historically, Scottish political (separatist) nationalism has lacked strong endorsement. The Treaty of Union itself can be seen as an expression of political nationalism. "To the Scots a full union seemed the only way by which national progress could be achieved. An increase in wealth, commerce and trade were seen as a necessary condition for future Scottish development" (Webb 24). Moreover, when political nationalism did begin to call for devolution it did so in a particularly moderate fashion and failed to garner widespread support. Political nationalism between 1850 and 1914, for example, at no time had separation or independence as its major aim. "The number of people involved in any home rule activity was very small at any one time, although steadily increasing as the First World War approached" (Webb 41). Nairn attributes this lack in support of political nationalism to the lack of a concrete need for nationalism in its political form. "Scottish non-nationalist development worked. It was because it worked [. . .] that a consequent form of politico-cultural nationalism did not arrive until so recently" (165). Unlike other, "underdeveloped" nations, Scotland was able to succeed economically and advance technologically without the impetus of politicized nationalism. Yet despite politics' lack of importance for the Scottish national identity, ancestry and a united past were crucial to its formation and maintenance. It is not the politics of the past that support the Scottish national identity, but the symbols associated with that past. As Keith Webb argues in *The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland*, the conceptualization of a

nation "usually incorporates a view of history which is more or less mythical and idealized" (4). The Scottish people created a historical narrative, an allegorized history, to structure their identity.

In this manner, the historical narratives that support the Scottish identity are not necessarily based upon political "fact." However, the strength of the symbolism of mythic history renders questions of fact moot. What does truth matter when an entire nation has come to identify itself with a particular conception of the past? The collection of essays under the title *The Manufacture of Scottish History*, share a general identification with the concept of a mythologized history. In his preface to the text, Cairns Craig argues: "In Scotland, a particular way of seeing our culture, of representing ourselves, has come to dominate our perceptions" (Donnachie viii). All of the essays within the collection share the understanding that Scottish history has been manufactured and perpetuated for cultural, moral, and (even) political ends. All agree that the past, which so much of Scottish identity rests upon, was itself engendered with a particular purpose in mind. Within Scottish history, for example, both the elevation of Highland culture to represent *all* of Scots culture and the creation of the Kailyard School of literature represent a cultivation of particular historical myths. That both stemmed from cultural and literary historical interpretations is unsurprising. "Elite and learned culture [. . .] has been a critical ingredient in the process of manufacturing Scotland's history. Literature, especially the novel, has done much to shape and reinforce popular notions about Scotland's past" (Donnachie 7). Representations of history, then, have created some of the most powerful connections between the Scottish people and their nation.

Throughout the discussion above, the word "nation" is bandied about quite naturally. However, "nation" needs some clarification if it is to be truly useful as a term. Hugh Stetson-Watson acknowledges the difficulties of "nation" when he writes, "I am driven to the conclusion that no 'scientific definition' of a nation can be devised; yet the phenomenon has existed and exists" (5). If national identity exists then it is necessary that nations exist to support it. For Benedict Anderson the characteristics that define "nation" depend upon imagination, limitation and sovereignty. The nation is an image of communion, it maintains elastic boundaries, and it allows its members the right to determine their future (6, 145-150, 159). And as can be seen with the creation of nationally supported Scottish historical myths, imagination is essential in the creation of a national continuity. Thus, a nation is

dependent on the images created by its people and these images must be communally based. As Stetson-Watson writes, "A nation is a community of people whose members are bound together by a sense of solidarity, a common culture, a national consciousness" (1). There can be no nation without a sense of shared community. The defining characteristics of such a community, however, need not be any more specific in order to create a national identity because "it implies nothing specific about the internal organization of the state or nation" (Webb 5). Although a nation requires criteria for membership and a vision of its status as unique, it is not necessary that these requirements be specific or political in any way. Nations require solidarity, but not necessarily specifics.

The specifics of a national community do, however, determine the way in which national identity is particularly expressed. National cohesion is undeniably aided by the manipulation of myths, symbols and rituals, the building blocks of culture. The culture of a nation is, in many ways, the propagator of that nation's sense of self. Without cultural specifics, nations would be unable to spice up the banal particulars of politics and form an excitement for national concerns. Moreover, because of its malleability, the nation is well suited as the topic of artistic expression. The Irish poet William Butler Yeats, a strong proponent of the connection between literature and national identity, once remarked, "There is no fine nationality without literature, and [. . .] no fine literature without nationality" (Newey ix). Literature and the nation, then, are intimately linked. Each serves as support for the other. Nations cannot exist without a specific underlying cultural reality. Such assertions are particularly relevant for the nation of Scotland. As a national institution, Scottish literature is a large part of the culture that initiates its people into an understanding of their roles as Scots.

Opinions on the temporal and ideological origins of the Scottish national identity are divided. Some critics, such as William Fergusson, and Keith Webb, argue such an identity has always existed (or at least has existed since the concept of Scotland was formed in the dark ages).[34] Other theorists, Stetson-Watson and David McCrone for example, place the date for the inception of a Scottish national identity much later: sometime between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.[35] Most discussions of Scotland's particular case, however, whether positing a pre-history or Enlightenment theory, date the emergence of a Scottish national identity as rather earlier than more

---

[34] See, for example, Fergusson 5-7, and Webb 9.
[35] See, for example, Stetson-Watson 33-34 and McCrone 161-174.

general discussions of "nationalism as modern product." It seems accepted that, because of its historical circumstances, Scotland was one of the first nations to exhibit national tendencies. This concept of difference is also deeply imbedded in discussions of Scotland's identity. In his introduction to Webb's *The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland* Nigel Tranter writes:

> There is something strong in the Scots national character which insists always on surviving and the means of survival. I do not suggest for a moment that as a people we are better or more worthy than our neighbors – only that we are *different*, and have down the ages always sought to ensure that the difference continued. (vi)

It has been argued that this difference is one of comparison, that Scotland feels as it does about itself through English influence. "An insight into Scottish nationalism can only be gained by understanding both the relationship that has existed through time between England and Scotland, and the different influences that have operated on the two countries to reinforce the feeling of a separate Scottish identity" (Webb 9). In order to resist sublimation to its Southern neighbor, Scotland became *more* Scottish. Historically, it is assumed that Scotland's national identity was affected first by its need to defend against English invasion and then by the monarchical and economic Unions. In other words, the Scots felt the need to defend their separateness against (and then within a state ruled by) foreign concerns.

The idea that the nation is largely upheld by an "us vs. them" sentiment is nothing new; however, the interconnections between Scotland and England particularly exacerbate such divisions. Questions of separation, however, also bring considerations of similarity. A comparison of Scottish and English concerns permeates many of the fields that focus upon Scotland. "By the 1980s much of the debate about the sociology of Scotland focused upon the extent of its similarities and differences with the rest of the UK" (McCrone 8). Tom Nairn's *The Break Up of Britain*, for example, posits modern Scottish political nationalism (and the historical lack of the same) as a reaction to the rise and fall of British imperialism (92-195). Whereas, at first, Scotland had no need for political (or, according to Nairn, even cultural) nationalism because of the comfortable position of its bourgeoisie and its lucrative participation in the British Empire, when that empire began to falter, Scotland (as well as the other smaller nationalities subsumed under the British name) began to abandon the old and sinking ship for better economic and political prospects (Nairn 190-195). In this scenario both Scotland's separation from England and the

Scottish participation in the British Empire become essential to an understanding of the Scottish national identity.

Historically, the parliamentary Act of Union in 1707 allowed for Scotland to maintain its separateness and linked it inextricably to the rest of Britain. Many critics agree that without the leeway associated with the 1707 Union, Scotland could not have maintained its separateness as a nation.[36] Three branches of the Scottish social system in particular were preserved and would be identified with the core of Scottish identity. The Union of Parliaments allowed for the retention of the Scottish mint, legal system, and Church. Thus, a key aspect of the important fields of economics, governance and culture was allowed to continue in its "original" Scottish form. "The bargain struck in 1707 allowed Scotland to survive as a sufficiently different civil society within the confines of the unitary British State" (McCrone 22). Scotland's union with England, then, was never fully realized. The connection between the two countries allowed for a rather malleable interpretation, "less of a once-and-for all bargain, and more of a continuously tested negotiation" (McCrone 123). However, despite civic leeway, the removal of the Scottish Parliament did affect a relegation of Scottish concerns to the edges of British society. Without true political and cultural centralization Scottish affairs became secondary to British (and often English) concerns. Nor has Scotland been able to dissipate the stigma associated with inhabiting the "fringe."

After the Act of Union much of Scotland's attention shifted southward. Many Scots chose emigration to the "center" as remedy to their new situation, a "remedy" that led to much of the climate of prejudice and dislike between the two nations.[37] Scotland's position at the "edge" of Britain led to the modern understanding of Scotland as colony. It has been argued that Scotland *is* an English colony, a casualty of English imperialism; thus discussions of Scottish nationalism (cultural and political) should be treated in a specifically post-colonial manner (Webb 89-95). Moreover, as mentioned above, the decline of the British Empire and Scotland's stake in it have been cited as the impetus for Scotland's more recent objections to its union with England. Such theories have, however, been vociferously put down. When considering internal colonialism, Webb describes his position as not arguing that colonial relationships never existed within Britain, but simply that "Scottish-English

---

[36] See, for example Webb 25 and Harvie 6 and 39.
[37] The emigration South began with the Union of the Crowns.

relations do not fit this framework" (90). Yet he goes on to insist that colonialism has formed the basis for a way of imagining the Scottish condition. In this manner, despite the questionable nature of visions of Scotland as "periphery" or "colony," such imagery has made a lasting effect on the expression of the Scottish national identity.

Although Scottish identity and culture was (and continues to be) affected by the Scottish nation's place in the margin, such a perspective is primarily gained from the outside looking in. One is marginalized by the "center", and there must be a "center" in order for one to marginalize oneself. It is not surprising, then, that after the Unions the Scottish identity primarily rejected politics for its inspiration. Historically, the Scots have placed their energy and emphasis on defining themselves through ideological visions, spiritual forces "composed of the ethos, language, and socio-political interests [. . .] that find genuine expression on an artistic [. . .] level" (Lewald viii), instead of rooting their consciousness in purely political concerns. The Scots expressed their national identity in religion, literature and art. Even the modern political Scottish nationalist movement was initially spurred on by cultural concerns: "Many of the early nationalists [. . .] were in the main motivated by a fear for Scottish culture which they saw as being increasingly anglicized" (Webb 53).[38] General concepts of nationalism are, as Nairn points out, unsuitable for a discussion of Scotland's socio-political status. Scotland simply did not, and continues not to follow the norm where nationalism is concerned. Nairn situates Scotland's difficulty in the complexity of the word "nationalism" itself. He is adamant as to the existence of a "cultural sub-nationalism" or a "repressed complex of Scottishness" that remains strong to the modern day (173). Despite the negativity discernable in Nairn's choice of wording, his argument is sound. The Scottish vision of self is indeed underpinned with complexity (to slightly skew Nairn's meaning.) Scottish literature, and its use of

---

[38] Such fears also served to twist modern concepts of Scottish culture. As discussed previously, the language of absence and irregularity quickly came to haunt the Scottish national identity. What has come to stand for Scottish culture, that which makes it distinct from the rest of the UK, has taken on negative connotations: "The dominant analysis remains a pessimistic and negative one, based on the thesis that Scotland's culture is 'deformed' and debased by sub-cultural formations such as tartanry and kailyardism" (McCrone 12-13). It is crucial, however, to resist such negative blanket assessments. Not simply for the obvious reason that Scottish culture is more diverse than descriptions of deformity and exclusion allow, but also because no matter the current opinion on the value of certain cultural forms, all help to construct and shape Scotland's national identity.

allegorical forms, provides a strong warp upon which national identity may be traced, woven, and embroidered.

As discussed briefly above, in his landmark text, *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson argues, "All communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined" (6). Anderson contends that the relationship between the general and the particular is both essential to ideas of national identity and realized through literature. When individuals envisage an "imagined community," a fellowship extending beyond their own physical realm yet sharing temporal links, the nation is born. The "imagined community" comes to define the individual in a "top-down" understanding; "I" becomes "we." As with nationalism proper, Scotland does not fit within Anderson's neat paradigm. Scotland's literary conceptions of itself no more reflect the norm than Scottish nationalism, and many of the "dualisms" and "psychoses" that supposedly plague Scottish literature in part stem from this difference. In Scottish literature, the individual defines the "imagined community"; the one defines the many. Scottish literature identifies with community in a manner different from Anderson's thesis, but this difference does not weaken the bonds between literature and nation. Rather, the combination of imaginative difference and Scotland's lack of a directly political nationalism places a greater (and more emotional) emphasis upon the "imagined community" that Scottish literature creates. Moreover, Scottish literature's particular national conceptions are inherited from and reinforced by its allegorical tendencies.

Allegory is essential to a full understanding of Scottish literature's "bottom-up," particular to general, technique. Through the actions of one, Scottish literature allegorically posits the situations of many, creating a structure of hierarchical power. Individuals recognize themselves and their place in society through the symbolic comprehension of other individuals. The Scottish literary consciousness performs a continual balancing act in which the shape of the nation is upheld from one position; it empowers by inverting Anderson's system. In Angus Fletcher's words:

> Hierarchy is never simply a system giving people their 'proper place'; it goes further and tells them what their legitimate *powers* are. Any hierarchy is bound to elicit sharp emotive responses toward these powers [. . .] Allegories are far less often the dull systems that they are reputed to be than they are symbolic power struggles. (23)

The national identity that Scottish literature fosters, then, is itself allegorically structured. Its function, to show Scots who they are and what is most important

within their world, echoes the allegorical struggle for "proper place." Literary works that utilize political concerns, such as the *Thrie Estaitis*, allegorize the human condition. As a literary form, allegory serves to connect a plethora of meanings and to reach, and thus influence, a broad spectrum of readers. If the creation of a national identity depends upon the linking of diverse peoples through layers of common cultural bonds, then allegory becomes the obvious instrument for signifying such links in a literary manner. Through allegory, the individual character, situation or community, can be understood as symbolic for the whole.

Allegory allows for the multiple strands of Scottish culture and politics to be interwoven within the actions of a single protagonist, community or scenario. Most conceptualizations of national identity incorporate, to some degree, a discussion of history and religion. Traditionally, history has been equated with fact; it constitutes the exact nature of the past. As discussed earlier in this chapter, Scottish history (if not all history) is a narrative affected by the imagination. Like literature, the creation of history has purposes extending beyond the simple notation of fact and into the realm of manipulation. For Scotland, history has always been part of any conception of self. The use of allegory allows Scottish authors to exemplify the power struggles and diversity of understanding that accompanies their nation's history. Many historians and theorists also consider Christian belief systems and customs to be a guiding principle in the formation of the Scottish national identity.[39] The Reformation, Calvinism, and the retention of the Scottish Kirk after the 1701 Union, all guaranteed a strongly Christian mindset for the Scottish people. Thus, the Scottish imagination can be described as a Christian (and thus allegorically suited) imagination.

Religion and history are inseparable within the formation of the Scottish national identity. Characteristically, the idea of religion as influencing Scottishness is attributed to the Reformation and the period after the Union of the Crowns: "For a people whose sense of nationhood was removed early in the eighteenth century, religion remained one of the few facets of Scottish civil life in which a collective identity could survive" (Brown 6). But, as with most European societies, religion greatly affected the Scottish people long before the advent of Protestantism. Religion was one of the mainstays of Scottish medieval and early modern culture.

---

[39] See, for example, Webb 34-35 and Harvie 16-18.

Despite the Catholic separation of laypeople from the Bible and the general trend of illiteracy, the majority of medieval Scots would have been familiar with the biblical text through indirect sources. Through the intermediaries of fable and drama, the imagination of medieval and early modern Scotland was saturated with religious significance. As Sarah Carpenter describes in her essay "The Bible in Medieval Verse and Drama":

> Ordinary people [during the Middle Ages and Renaissance] were likely to be familiar, more so than today, with a variety of stories, ideas and texts from the Bible [. . .] filtered through layers of interpretation provided by Christian tradition and Church fathers [. . .] the most significant of these [. . .] a pattern which saw the events of the Old Testament as all foreshadowing and reflecting the events of the New Testament. (66)

Thus, religious trends enabled an allegorical vision of history that, in turn, provided for a biblical allegorization of specifically Scottish history. As noted in chapter one, typology fostered a "sense of identification with the biblical story" (Wright 5). As a discrete group of God's children, the Scots came to see themselves as part of God's historical plan and read their own trials and tribulations through the medium of their Old Testament precursors. The medieval worldview fostered a weakening of the division between sacred and secular, biblical and non-biblical, which would become part of the core of the Scots national vision.

The Scottish Reformation only cemented such ties by rediscovering the Bible "not for liturgical recitation, but for common apprehension of its mind and message" (Wright 173). The Scottish Reformation sought to make the Word of God accessible to all people and to promote the understanding that the Bible had significance for everyone, not just the learned. As with the understanding of allegory during the Middle Ages and Renaissance, this vision of the Bible allowed for the dissemination of biblical meaning through non-biblical texts. Scottish authors writing after the Reformation, such as Hogg, Scott, Burns and Galt, found the common use of the Bible quite natural and its place in their writing equally instinctive. Moreover, due to the combination of Christian allegorical understanding and common access to the Bible, the reading public of such authors would have easily discerned and been affected by the biblical allusions within their literary works.

The effects of particular religious movements within Scotland are often linked with essentials of the Scottish character. The divisions between Catholic, Episcopalian and Calvinist beliefs, for example, reiterate more general divisions

within the Scottish cultural geography. However, unlike the trend of utilizing characteristics usually associated with the Highlands to represent the whole of Scotland, it is the Lowland Calvinist vision of the world that has come to stand for the Scottish religious character. In the words of Callum Brown, "The Calvinist emphasis on the doctrine of predestination [. . .] has been used to explain features of the Scots as diverse as their glumness, their aggression to succeed in worldly affairs, and their Rabelaisian qualities" (9). Questioning this narrow vision of both Scottish systems of religious belief in general and Calvinism in particular leads to a greater understanding of the underlying continuities within the Scottish psyche. Calvinism's view of humanity as able to interpret the Bible properly closely coincides with visions of allegorical cohesion. "Calvin did not hesitate to put the Bible in the hands of the humblest Christian," trusting that the power of the Word will speak to even the simplest and most ignorant (Ramsay 20). Calvin assigns a very high value to the imagination amongst all man's intellectual powers; moreover, he utilizes the allegorical strength of literature to empower that imagination.[40]

Whereas the Catholic approach to polysemous understanding is resolved in terms of God's vision, and the necessity for mediation between the sublunary and the divine, Calvinism posits the layered meanings inherent in life in human terms. Frequently, the emphasis placed upon the doctrine of predestination has confused the issue of multi-leveled understanding and provided a more narrow vision of Calvinism than Calvin himself intended. If we consider the body of Calvin's writings, however, we are more able to understand the polysemous views underscoring his teachings:

> Predestination we call the eternal decree of God by which He has determined with Himself what He would have to become for every man. For [. . .] eternal life is foreordained for some and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being formed for one or the other of these ends, we say that he is predestined to life or death. (*Institutes* III, xxi, 5)

Although the above quotation seems unreasonably harsh, coupling it with the details of Calvin's doctrine enables us to fully comprehend the placement of predestination within the divine plan. Interpreting the scripture, Calvin argues that the words "Catholic Church" and "communion of saints" refer to the whole body of the redeemed peoples of all times and places. This true Church is invisible; God alone knows its members. There can be no certainty of the elect, the membership of the one

---

[40] For similar arguments, see R. D. S. Jack's "The Prose of John Knox." *Prose Studies*. Vol. 4, no. 3, 1981. 293-51.

Church, but "by a judgment of charity" those who by confession, example, and participation in the sacraments humble themselves to God can be regarded as members. Encapsulated within Calvin's vision of predestination we find the difficulties of free will and the necessity for polysemous understanding that underpin both allegory and the Catholic vision of humanity's place within the divine plan.

Calvin's vision of predestination is to be mentioned only in the context of redemption in Christ. As John McNeill writes in *The History and Character of Calvinism*, "The essential meaning of election is discovered and verified in our progressive comprehension of Christ's sacrifice, which overcomes the malignity of sin" (211). Without an allegorical understanding of Christ's sacrifice, there can be no election. God's justice could not have been extended towards man without the intercession of Christ through the scripture. "That any should be saved is due to His wholly undeserved mercy. This mercy is extended to those whom, in His inscrutable will, He has eternally chosen to receive it. Others are excluded from the operation of His gratuitous saving grace, to suffer the consequences of their sin" (McNeill 210). Calvin's doctrine of predestination, then, is founded on a conjunction of opposites.[41] The essentially sinful nature of man is countermanded by God's mercy. Moreover, its basic premise is only part of the general assertion of God's plan in all its hidden unity and complex variety.

As with the Catholic understanding of God as a Being who perceives time simultaneously rather than consecutively, Calvin's vision of predestination locates humanity within the divine plan while still allowing for freedom of choice.[42] Calvinism's suitability to allegorical significances places it within Scottish literature's dialectic; it is both utile for allegorical visions and encourages those very visions within the Scottish literary consciousness. Moreover, as a Christian doctrine, the Calvinist perspective is one that assigns purpose and meaning to the human story and is confident that grace patterns the most baffling strands of individual and social life. As Christ taught by his presence on Earth, it is humanity's duty to suffer trials by following our destiny, which is to submit to the sufferings inherent in life and the divine justice awaiting us in death. Christ Himself initiated the "bottom-up" pattern

---

[41] St. Thomas Aquinas's vision of predestination is founded upon similar perceptions.
[42] From a Catholic perspective we are predetermined in God's eyes but not in our own freedom. Hence, in his *Inferno*, Dante can describe individual freedom as humanity's greatest gift and yet exclude all pre-Christians from heaven.

of understanding; the story of His life within the New Testament is the ultimate symbol of the one who represents the many.

The continuity that allegorical reading allows for the Scottish national character fully supports Alec Cheyne's assertion that "it would not be a very great exaggeration to say that Scotland [. . .] was indeed the country of a Book" (193). Within Scottish literature, conceptions of history and religion intersect to become part of a definition of the Scottish character, the precedence of which is traceable to medieval allegorical literary conceptions. Such trends run throughout the Scottish literary tradition and are found both in more modern Calvinist visions and medieval conceptions based in scholasticism. In Barbour's *The Bruce*, for example, history and religion are spun together to create strands of Scottish national character. Written in the 1370s *The Bruce* is the earliest surviving Scots poem of any length. It traces the Scottish Wars of Independence in the early fourteenth century from their origins through to the deaths of its protagonist Robert I and his ally James Douglas. Despite, and partly because of, its historical basis, *The Bruce* is strongly centered on both literary and theological questions. The interplay between the historical and metaphysical focuses of *The Bruce* both subjugates political concerns to the spiritual and strengthens the link between the two. Much of *The Bruce* is not written allegorically but as a direct knightly code. However, Barbour begins his text with a complex allegorical discussion before moving on to detail his more simplistic narrative.

Book One of the text places questions of freedom within a tale of the Scottish monarchy. Moreover, it considers the question of freedom both contingently and mysteriously. Freedom is placed within a specifically national framework. Barbour laments the life of injustice that English rule forces upon the Scots, but also considers it in context with the divine. The possibility of *any* freedom is discussed. Barbour crafts a symbol allegory that utilizes the actual plight of the Scottish people to represent humanity's place within the divine plan. Thus, the Scottish nobles' poor judgment in trusting the English king is bracketed by a description of God as the only all-knowing Being:

> For in this warld that is sa wyde
> Is nane determynat, that sall
> Knaw thingis that ar to fall;
> Bot God, that is off maist poweste,
> Reservyt till His majeste,

> For to knaw in His prescience
> Of alkyn tyme the movence. (Barbour I.128-134)

Despite humanity's inherent blindness, our divine nature gives hope. *The Bruce* shares the vision of human nature espoused by its literary inheritors: the more man uses his knowledge to anticipate events, the less he will be bound by fate. Feudal law is similarly used to form a symbol allegory concerning free will:

> Than mays clerkis questioun
> (Quhen thai fall in disputacioun)
> That, gyff man bad his thryll owcht do
> And in the samyn tym come him to
> His wyff and askyt him hyr det,
> Quhetheir he his lordis neid suld let
> And pay fryst that he aucht, and syne
> Do furth his lordis commandyne;
> Or leve onpayit his wyff and do
> Thai thingis that commandyt is him to. (I.249-258)

The "wyff" and the "lordis" allegorically represent the many duties and ties that humankind must struggle to manage and maintain. Duties to the body and duties to the soul, for example, are often in direct opposition. How, then, can humanity make clear or right choices when so many demands are made on us and we are bound by so many contradictory oaths? Barbour leaves answering such riddles to those of greater mental prowess, but his questions reveal the difficulties inherent in certain divinely authorized bonds. This perspective also encourages his audience to consider life as governed by God upon a multitude of overlapping levels. Barbour considers questions of free will through allegory's infinite range and its place within the four-fold system of historical (personal), tropological (practical and theoretical), allegorical (spiritual) and anagogical (mysterious) significance. At the historical level, he leads his reader to view the Scottish plight. At the tropological level Barbour discusses politics (e.g. freedom following upon thralldom and praised in relation to it) and ethics. At the allegorical level he creates figures that relate to Christ. Finally, at the anagogical level he reminds his readers of their place within the divine and unknowable plan. By utilizing allegory's infinite range, Barbour creates a text that is deeply personal to the Scottish nation but also one that addresses the spiritual concerns crucial to human existence.

    The Bruce's opening stanzas encapsulate the didactic methods of a fourteenth century bard:

> Storys to rede ar delitabill
> Suppos that thai be nocht bot fabill;
> Than suld storys that suthfast wer
> – And thai war said on gud maner –
> Have doubill plesance in heryng.
> The first plesance is the carpyng,
> And the tothir the suthfastnes
> That schawys the thing rycht as it wes;
> And suth thyngsis that ar likand
> Tyll mannys heryng ar plesand. (I.1-10)

A story based in truth is doubly pleasant: the first pleasure is in hearing the tale and the second is in knowing that the narrative is steeped in truth.[43] Taken as a whole, however, Barbour's narrative partially inverts the relationship between truth and fiction that he initiates. The first book of *The Bruce* depends upon allegorical understanding, while the rest of the work continues in a simpler story/moral vein. Thus, Barbour chooses to initiate the metaphysical and allegorical significations of his tale immediately, and then to elaborate a pleasing story. The more refined pleasure of finding imbedded allegorical truths opens the narrative and then the tale's perspective changes. By choosing a historically relevant tale as the meat of his narrative, by casting himself in a position of prescience, Barbour authorially imitates divine

---

[43] Much of the strength of Barbour's text rests upon the notion of truthful or "suthfast" narration. The retrospective nature of *The Bruce* both conceptualizes Robert I's task within the struggle for the Scottish crown and encourages the reader's partiality to the metaphysical meanings that support the text. The concept of "suthfast" telling, however, is rather removed from modern visions of "truth." Throughout his narrative, Barbour twists historical accuracy to support the underlying themes of his text. The actions of Robert I during his youth, for example, are repeatedly conflated with those of his grandfather, thus a "family hero" who fully displays the national character strengthens the story. Similarly, Robert the Bruce's story is repeatedly compared with tales of the nine worthies, figures who straddle myth and history. Barbour is himself aware, however, of the nature of his text. Despite his several protestations as to the "suthfast" nature of the tale he tells, Barbour also interrupts his text to address his audience and place his narrative within a context more forgiving of fiction:

> Lordlings, quha likis for till her,
> The Romanys now begynnys her,
> Of men that war in gret distres
> And assayit full gret hardynes
> Or thai mycht cum till thar entent. (I.445-449)

By choosing to describe his mode as "Romance" rather than "Chronicle," Barbour justifies his tendency to blend actual events with events that should have happened.

foresight. However the relevance of Barbour's choice is only intended for those who are able to recognize the metaphysical importance of his first book. He invites those in his audience who can recognize allegory to read their own history and lives allegorically. Thus, he empowers them to consider Scottish politics as a representation of greater concerns and to alter their own actions accordingly. In this manner, Barbour's decision to base his narrative upon the history of the Scottish nation yokes age old allegorical techniques to a national purpose.

Through the fictional works of its people, a nation may expand and explore the dimensions of its identity. The conceptions and ideals that are passed down through the generations of a people are often encased within their literature. Many of the authors who form the traditional core of the Scottish literary canon (such as Robert Burns, Sir Walter Scott, and Hugh MacDiarmid) openly exhibited their socio-political ideals through their work.[44] Such authors believed that literature should lead the Scottish people through their national struggles. Most Scottish authors, however, wove the strands of national identity into other than directly political patterns. They chose to express Scottishness in a less overt manner. Through allegory, Scottish authors posit a "bottom-up" system of value judgments that pits the universal against the particular and then reconciles the two. In this way, through their visions of the world and their expression of these visions, Scottish authors provide the key to conceptions of Scotland from within and without.

Locale, Sovereignty, and Egalitarianism in Scottish Literature

The revelation of national concerns within specific Scottish texts exhibits many textures. If Scottish identity reveals itself through a consideration of the microcosm, then its experience must be varied. Through the links between history, religion, and allegory, the Scottish literary concept of self can be traced along (at least) three distinct strands. Thus, Scottish literature's particular national bent follows certain patterns. An emphasis on specific socio-geographical locale, the importance of a linear sovereignty, and a tendency to favor the myth of Scottish egalitarianism all accompany national concerns within Scottish literature. Each of these loci of Scottish

---

[44] "Burns and Scott were fierce patriots, although Unionists," and their political opinions frequently shone through in their literary offerings (Webb 31). Hugh MacDiarmid spent much of his literary career campaigning for Scottish national concerns and was arguably more politically involved than any other Scottish author.

identity also touches upon questions of history, religion, and individuality in a unique but unifying way. Scottish literature's emphasis on locale, on the microcosm, echoes the medieval and early modern Christian visualizations of humanity's place within nature. The focus upon an unbroken line of kingship draws upon visions of the king as being divinely empowered, linked to the land, and the living carrier of history. The Scottish "trait" of egalitarianism reverberates with the Catholic theme of humanity's fallen nature and also recalls similar tenets within Scottish Protestantism. Through the dissemination of Scottish literature, these three characteristics have come to symbolize what it is to be Scottish both to the Scots and to the world at large. In discussing each, and considering their older and more modern literary sites, we come to better understand both the Scottish "bottom-up" vision of national representation and its importance for the Scots literary concept of self.

The Importance of Locale

For the Scottish national identity, the concept of place is not dependent upon geography in the strictest sense of the term. In her introduction to *Kidnapped* Emma Letley writes, "The novel's setting is 'in a manner' geographical [. . .] one of the book's greatest strengths is the immediacy of its physical descriptions [. . .] that said, however, Scotland is as much a psychological as a geographical place" (xiii). In much of Scottish literature, geography is more a projection of the psyche than a concrete reality. Instead of geography, the term "locale" better describes the landscapes within Scottish literature, a collection of images and references that is tied to the physical world but does not make the physical its most important referent. Windswept hillsides, villages, and cityscapes that are particularly Scottish, but not found upon any geographical map of Scotland, make up Scottish literature's physical representation.

Through a "bottom-up" understanding, locale is used to describe the Scottish nation allegorically. The nation is realized through an understanding of its smaller parts. Utilizing specific "landscapes of the mind" to describe a nation, however, ultimately creates many difficulties. The way in which Scottish authors treat Scotland as a place aids in pinpointing schisms (and their bridges) within Scottish national identity as a whole. Many of the "divided" and "crippled" aspects of Scottish culture have been linked to divisions within the Scottish landscape of the mind. Both the

supremacy of the tartan and the popular appeal of the Kailyard School, for example, have been described as built upon a misled emphasis of inappropriate locale.[45]

As previously mentioned, one cultural vision in which conceptions of Scottish geography and cultural vision are closely linked is the division between the Highlands and Lowlands. This geographical separation, like that between Scotland and England, has never been a physical given. Nor can the Highland/Lowland split be attributed to ancient beliefs.[46] Still, the division between the two cultures has become deeply imbedded in Scotland's literary vision of self. The argument that took place over the supposed "Ballads of Ossian," for example, rested firmly upon the Highland/Lowland separation. "In the Ossianic controversy the real argument was about Scottish national identity" (Fergusson 311-12). Anti-Ossianists wished to prove that the Scottish nation was of Germanic/Lowland origin, while Ossianists sought to link Scotland as a whole to a Celtic stock. The odd history of the cultural influence of the Highlands further illustrates such conceptual difficulties. After the Union of the Crowns, specific Highland cultural expressions, such as the wearing of the plaid, became highly debated. For almost a century many outward symbols of a Highland nature were legally banned. Yet from 1745, the tartan and other Highland accoutrements were appropriated by Lowland Scotland and eventually came to symbolize the nation as a whole.[47] Tellingly, authors such as Sir Walter Scott greatly aided this "gentrification" and assimilation of Highland culture and the tartan. In this way the symbols that have come to stand for Scotland globally essentially stem from Highland culture. As a mythic structure, Tartanry has been labeled as simply a negative reflection of the detriments of the Union with England. Highland mythology, much of which has been propagated for agendas south of the Highland line, is commonly viewed by the cultural elite as an inappropriate representation of Scotland as a whole. Yet, from a perspective that considers national identity from an

---

[45] See Alan Bold's *Modern Scottish Literature* (105-108) for more details on the Kailyard School. See also David McCrone's *Scotland - the Brand* (14) for a brief consideration of the Kailyard School and a general discussion of Tartanry's place within Scottish culture.

[46] The schism between Highlands and Lowlands did not take place until well after the Middle Ages: "in the early Middle Ages there was little separation between 'Highland' and 'Lowland,' even the terms did not exist. There was, in fact strong cultural contact and interaction throughout much of Scotland's story" (Fergusson 310).

[47] See McCrone 180-181.

allegorical "bottom-up" perspective, the use of a specific form of Scottish culture and its narratives to symbolize a more universal whole becomes valid.

If Tartanry is seen as unacceptable as a base for Scottish high culture, then the Kailyard School has been viewed as a blight upon the Scottish literary canon. Derided as a popular and overly emotive literary form, the Kailyard novel brings the physical divisions within conceptions of Scotland as a nation to the foreground. For Scotland, a nation that "between 1750 and 1850 [. . .] became not simply an industrial society, but one of the world's foremost examples [of industrialization]" (McCrone 62), the division between the urban and rural became eminently relevant. As cities grew and the divide between urban and rural life deepened, the ideal of a pre-industrial society, a golden age, grew more prominent. The Kailyard novel is one expression of that ideal. Kailyard fiction usually focuses upon the trials and tribulations of small community life. Visions of rural paradise were used to combat urban isolation. Within the Kailyard, concepts of "Scottishness" and the "Scottish nation" were intimately linked with the value of individual communal life. The microcosm came to symbolize the ideology of the macrocosm. Small communities and the type of life they represented were viewed in a redemptive light. "The essence of 'Scotland' was located in this image of small, intimate communities" (McCrone 118). The Kailyard School was well suited to its age; however, the stereotypical vision of Scotland as regressively parochial that accompanies it must be addressed. Although the Kailyard School has frequently been seen as reductive, supposedly keeping Scottish literature from confronting more important issues, its focus upon the microcosm closely echoes Scottish national ideologies. As Webb asserts, the Scottish national identity,

> displays the influence of the 'small is beautiful' philosophy [. . .] the emphasis on de-alienation of the individual [. . .] the emphasis on the community, the idea of personal responsibility, and the protection of the environment are all consistent with this philosophy. (111)

Thus, the Kailyard School is in part a reflection of the Scottish "bottom-up" allegorical vision of self. Moreover, it stems from those aspects of the Scottish character that have been highly praised.

The importance of "locale" within Scottish culture in general and Scottish literature in particular, then, underlines the societal, political, moral and psychological landscape Scotland has created for itself. Yes, national conceptions of Scotland are

based partly on geographical realities, but it is the creation of image and metaphor from such physicality that makes the physical realm relevant to considerations of national identity. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scottish authors utilize national spatial relations in much the same way that their medieval and early modern predecessors did, as symbolic of a metaphorical "lay of the land." By detailing a specific locale, both early and more recent Scottish authors initiate their readers into a deeper understanding of the complex national undertones in their work.

As discussed in chapter two, the first part of Sir David Lindsay's *Ane Satire of the Thrie Estaitis* utilized the medieval and Renaissance vision of nature as a sphere to locate the Scottish king and court, and thus the Scottish nation, within the divine plan. It is a vision of national locale and political order, however, that becomes the focus of the play's second part. When the estates are brought together for trial all aspects of the courtroom and legal actions essentially embody Scotland, and Lindsay utilizes that locale to put Godly national reform into action. The appearance of the estates, however, is not the audience's first vision of Lindsay's "bottom-up" political stance. Through the play's Interlude, the audience is acquainted more thoroughly with the ills that the king's thrall under Sensualitie has wrought.

In the Interlude, we are introduced to both the Pauper and the Pardoner, characters of mirth who, nonetheless, are the grass roots representation of the greater evil that affects Scotland. The Pauper appears at the beginning of the Interlude as a foolish character. Running about the stage, he acts as an "interruption" in the play and is treated as such by Diligence: "Quhat now? Me thinks the carle begins to crack! / Swyith, carle, away, or be this day, Ise break thy back!" (Interlude.1949-1930). The Pauper's response to this rebuke, however, is to place himself, and his complaints, upon a higher level. *"Heir sall the Carle clim up and sit in the Kings tchyre"* (Interlude. Stage Direction). By putting his Pauper on the king's throne, Lindsay signals the significance of the Interlude for the play. Here is a scene in which the common folk who have been affected by the king's poor governance are represented, those affected by kingship upon high are finally able to express themselves from a height. Moreover, the Pauper's choice of seating further emphasizes the inverted state of Scottish affairs. The king's poor rulership has both allowed his position to be questioned and placed his people in the position of valid complaint. As with the nobles who drafted the *Declaration of Arbroath*, the Scottish people under Rex Humanitas are in part empowered by their king's incorrect actions.

The Pauper's complaint, however, is not directly against the monarchy. Rather, he has come to the gathering of the three estates in search of a fair hearing. Once Diligence convinces the Pauper to come down from his position on high, we are regaled by the poor man's tale. Due to a combination of deaths in the family and the tax which the clergy levies after death, the Pauper has been stripped of all his worldly possessions. Moreover, in response to his complaints, the Church has excommunicated him, removing all of his spiritual rights. Thus, the Pauper represents the inequities of the Scottish clergy that have flourished during the king's negligence. The Pauper represents the effect of the web of social and political imbalances spun within the first part of Lindsay's play. Moreover, despite his admission that he "dwell into Lawthiane, ane myle fra Tranent" (Interlude.1969), the Pauper's descriptions of his trials places him in the much more general locale of "poor farming community." He is a symbol of the plight of Scottish commoners, and his travels across Scotland searching for justice display the ills of the land as widespread. Rex's laxity has removed the king's one defining feature, the dispensing of divine justice, and the Pauper represents one facet of the effects of that loss.

Once the Pauper says his piece, and promises to confront the corrupt clergy with their injustices, he lies down for a nap and the Pardoner takes up the part of the Interlude's fool. As a fraudulent religious figure, the Pardoner makes an appropriate foil to the Pauper. With the first words of his speech, the Pardoner places himself within the camp of corruption:

> I give to the Devill with gude intent
> This unsell wickeit New Testament,
> > With them that it translaitit:
> Sen layik men knew the veritie
> Pardoners gets no charitie. (Interlude.2057-2061)

As an enemy of Veritie and her book, the Pardoner aligns himself with Sensualitie and her ilk. His actions within the Interlude only serve to strengthen this association. The reappearance of the Sowtar and his wife and their wish for a divorce makes a mockery out of all that Veritie and her sister Chastitie represent. The Sowtar complains that his wife is "ane storme of stryfe" and his wife carps that the Sowtar is "baith cauld and dry," neither follow the true nature of husband or wife (Interlude.2142, 2170). The Sowtar is neither master of his house nor lusty, and his wife is neither submissive nor chaste. As displayed by the actions of these characters in the first half of the play, the nature of Scotland has been corrupted. Together the

Pardoner (and his apprentice), the Sowtar and his wife, and the Pauper create a vision of the Scottish community that is full of corruption and woe. The actions of the king in the first half of the play have poisoned his land and its people. Each of the characters within the Interlude portray a part of society and their association makes a commentary upon the state of the Scottish nation as a whole. At the end of the Interlude both Pauper and Pardoner are thrown into prison to await the arrival of Divine Correction and the reformed Rex (Interlude.2397-2300). Just as Scotland must await political reform in order to regain its sense of godly community, so must they.

If the Interlude enacted the commoner's locale, Act Two of the *Thrie Estaitis* is an allegorical representation of those realms of society that politically structure the Scottish nation. The second part of the play begins with a proclamation by Diligence that lets the audience understand the gravity of what is about to take place. "The Thrie Estat[i]s of this natioun," says he, "Cum to the Court with ane strange gravitie" (II.2302-2303). Diligence then launches into a speech about truthfulness that echoes that in *The Bruce*. The play will report the truth, but it is the audience's job to make the most out of that truth. Finally, Diligence invokes Jesus and Saint Paul in a benediction that focuses upon proper judgment and then the three estates enter "*gangand backwart, led be thair vyces*" (II.Stage Direction). Prefigured both by the Interlude and Diligence's call for truth and clear judgment, the appearance of the estates as backward and in the company of vice gives the audience a clear vision of what is wrong with Scottish society. As in the Interlude, the locale of the court allows for pointed political commentary. The king's reaction to the report of the estates' entrance finally shows the audience the depth of change within him and gives hope for reform within the nation. When Wantonnes tells him:

> Sir, wee have seen ane marvelous thing,
> Be our judgement:
> The Thrie Estaits of this regioun
> Ar cummand backwart throw this toun,
> To the Parlament! (II.2336-2340)

The king replies:

> Backwart? Backwart? How may that be?
> Gar speid them haistelie to me,
> In dreid that they ga wrang. (II.2341-2343)

Wantonnes seems most impressed by the king's ability to command the three estates to attend parliament, but Rex has been made aware, through his conversion in the first part of the play, that going backwards will only lead one down the wrong path. Finally, the estates arrive and present themselves to their monarch. When Divyne Correctioun, the symbol of God's justice and divine political order, asks them about their choice to walk backwards "the veritie thairof faine wald I heir" (II.2390), the answer is given by Spiritualitie:

> Soveraine, we have gaine sa this mony a yeir.
> Howbeit ye think we go undecently,
> We think wee gang richt wonder pleasantly. (II.2391-2393)

The court then settles into place, all the members of the estates take their seats and the matter is dropped, but the theme of improper and dangerous action as particularly endorsed by the clergy remains prominent throughout the play.

A more resonant supplicant soon takes up the complaint against the spiritual estate first advocated in miniature by the Pauper. Once Diligence states:

> All maneir of men I wairne that be opprest,
> Cum and complaine, and thay salbe redrest;
> For quhy, it is the nobill Princes will
> That ilk compleiner sall gif in his bill. (II.2420-2423)

Johne the Common-weill stands to make his complaint. As an allegorical figure, Johne is more representative than any Pauper. Throughout Medieval and Early Modern literature he is recognized as an image of general society. Like Ireland's Kathleen ni' Houlihan, Johne is a physical embodiment of the national character. He is the ultimate symbol of "bottom-up" representation, and throughout the remainder of Lindsay's play he is the instrument of complaint. The suffering and woe of the nation is aired through Johne's supplication:

> REX
> Shaw me thy name, gude man, I the command.
> JOHN[48]
> Marie, Johne the Common-weil of fair Scotland.
> REX
> The Common-weil hes bene amang his fais!
> JOHN
> Ye, Sir, that gars the Common-weil want clais.
> REX
> Quhat is the caus the Common-weil is crukit?

---

[48] The spelling of Johne's name is variable throughout the play; it is spelled here as it appears in the text.

JOHN
Becaus the Common-weil hes bene overlukit.
    REX
Quhat gars the luke sa with ane dreirie hart?
    JOHN
Becaus the Thrie Estaits gangs all backwart. (II.2442-2449)

The rhyming play with Johne's name and his complaint leads to a direct accusation of ill deeds leveled at each of the estates in turn. All of the nation's woes, from unsafe passage on roadways to church levies, are addressed; even the Pauper is given leave to speak his mind. Thus, through the locale of the royal parliament, an individual who represents the Scottish people initiates reform. The individual character "Johne the Common-weill" represents an idealized understanding of the Scottish nation "as it should be," and his truthful accusations encompass the core of the play.

Throughout his works, Lindsay utilized Johne the Common-Weill to physically represent the force that linked the Scots and their rulers to the Scottish nation. Lindsay's placement of Johne the Common-Weill within the *Thrie Estaitis* echoes his use of Johne in *The Dreme*. In that poem, after Dame Remembrance takes Lindsay on a tour of the earth and Paradise itself, Lindsay asks to see his own nation. When confronted with the disparity between Scotland's vibrant landscape and excellent people and its poverty stricken state, Lindsay becomes confused: "For I marvell gretlie, I yow assure, / Considderand the peple and the ground, / That ryches suld nocht in this realme rebound" (*Dreme* 838-840). To which Dame Remembrance replies:

> The falt is nocht, I dar weill tak on hand,
> Nother in to the peple nor the land [. . .]
> Wantyng of justice, polycie, and peace,
>   Ar cause of thir unhappynes, allace! (844-845, 860-861)

Their conversation is interrupted by the appearance of Johne the Common-Weill, who is dressed in rags and looks terribly worn. When Lindsay asks him what has happened, Johne tells a story similar to that of Chastitie's in the *Thrie Estaitis*, neither he nor his companions (Policy, Justice, and Reason) have found any rest in Scotland. All were treated badly and forced to decamp. When Lindsay asks Johne, "Quhen that ye purpose for to cum agane?" Johne responds:

> Thare sall na Scot have confortyng
> Of me tyll that I see the countre gydit
> Be wysedome of ane gude auld prudent kyng,
> Quhilk sall delyte hym maist, abone all thyng,

> To put justice tyll exicutioun,
> And on strang tratouris mak puneisioun. (1001, 1003-1008)

Within *The Dreme*, as within the *Thrie Estaitis*, Johne the Common-Weill symbolizes the political relationship between the Scottish people and their nation. He is the link between serving people and serving monarch. Geographically, Johne is the site of Scottish justice. He is an embodiment of the geography of political balance necessary to maintain the nation.

Early modern Scottish authors such as Lindsay may have pioneered the use of the microcosm of Scottish community to symbolize wider political and moral concerns; however, such allegorization can be traced throughout the Scottish literary consciousness. As discussed previously, Scottish literature formed entire genres (i.e. the Highland Romance and the Kailyard School) that utilized geographical concerns as the basis for their consideration of Scotland as a nation. Thus, the use of psychological geography to portray the Scots nation can itself be considered a tradition. However, unlike Lindsay's position as court poet, and thus his place in the public eye and as counselor to the king, later Scottish authors who chose to contemplate the political importance of locale have suffered from the stigma of parochialism that generally affects more recent Scottish works. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century authors who focus upon Scottish locale have been criticized for the lack of "reality" and "urban truth" within their work. Although the work of such authors follows the national trends of both their medieval and their more immediate predecessors, few critics have made the connections between literary locale and national identity. An upsurgance of interest in Scotland's literary culture has begun to encourage a reconsideration of literary styles that had previously been relegated to the darkened corners of "parochialism." Nonetheless, authors such as Nan Shepherd have remained in the periphery. Indeed, despite its cultural relevance, her work has not even gained the acclaim that some of her predecessors (J. M. Barrie, R. L. Stevenson, and Sir Walter Scott, for example) and inheritors (Lewis Grassic-Gibbon, for example) have garnered.

As literature at the fringe of the fringe, Shepherd's work easily lends itself to considerations of Scotland's physical and psychological position. Theorists, like Aileen Christianson, who do analyze Shepherd's fiction often focus upon her particular use of the imagery of boundary and perimeter (or lack thereof). Christianson's work concerning Scottish women's fiction locates Shepherd's national

focus as existing between the poles of community and infinity.[49] It is, in fact, impossible to consider Shepherd's work without considering boundaries and community. Similarly, to do so without analyzing the delicate interplay between macrocosm and microcosm that Shepherd's work utilizes would be to ignore her place within the conceptual framework of the Scottish national identity.

Shepherd's *The Weatherhouse* utilizes a small town both to describe Scotland more generally and to place that nation into a global context. Her novel creates a small community, linked to a particular space and mindset, that comes to represent the whole of the nation. Instead of imagining the faceless masses, Shepherd offers the contiguous known. Shepherd's communities are Scotland's "every-community." The interplay between modern and traditional, past and present that spurs the action of *The Weatherhouse* serves to lead the characters, and the reader, to a greater understanding of what it is to be Scottish. Moreover, as with Lindsay's use of Johne the Common-weill, Shepherd's characters are not simply figures situated in a specific moment; they are the "every-man/woman" so frequently used in traditional allegory. While addressing the particular interplay between individuals, Shepherd's novel signals the difficulties that face the Scottish nation. Shepherd offers her characters up as an allegorical enactment of the "Caledonian antisyzygy" and uses their actions and choices to provide a solution to that cultural gap. Within *The Weatherhouse*, she uses both narrative allegory (a quest for truth and unity) and symbol allegory (by creating characters that represent their land as a whole as well as themselves.) Thus, her use of allegory follows traditional Scottish paths and simultaneously combats a more modern socio-political problem.

The Weatherhouse narrates the fables of one small Scottish community, Fetter-Rothnie, and it is in the connections between locale and community that Shepherd's allegory becomes most apparent. Shepherd's description of an imaginary rustic Scottish community echoes many of the traditions of the Kailyard School. In his introduction to the text Roderick Wilson says of the Shepherd's narrative that, as "an account of Scottish rural life and character in the first decades of this century, it is a humourous delight" (V). Fetter-Rothnie's inhabitants are simple, in the old-fashioned sense, and exhibit a strong sense of character; the landscape they populate is beautiful, a symphony to the Scottish countryside. Together, people and place

---

[49]See "Imagined Corners to Debatable Land: Passable Boundaries," *Scottish Affairs*. No. 17, Autumn 1996. 120-134.

project an image of pre-industrial harmony.[50] Thus, *The Weatherhouse* is in part a delicate portrayal of a traditional Scottish farming community, though it is also a literary commentary on the place of such communities within the Scottish national psyche. Fetter-Rothnie is the type of community that, according to critics of the Kailyard, ultimately clashes with modern visions of Scotland as a nation.[51] Shepherd, however, utilizes this supposed conceptual difficulty to make Fetter-Rothnie the site of a negotiation between past and present. She locates her village on the edge of the sweeping changes brought by war and industrialization, and its story is one of negotiation.

In an echo of the struggles undergone by Scotland's national imagination, each of the novel's primary characters is forced to negotiate past and present; each is allocated their own growing pains. The novel's youngest protagonist, Lindsay Lorimer, must place her future as Garry Forbes's wife within the connections to the past her marriage will bring. In the aftermath of an introduction to Barbara Patterson, Garry's aunt, Lindsay escapes to the outdoors to contemplate her future, but the Scottish landscape has other plans:

> The night astonished her, so huge it was. She had the sense of escaping from the lit room into light itself [. . .] The matted snow and grass were solid enough beneath her feet, but when she looked beyond she felt that she must topple over into that reverberation of light. Her identity vanished. (29)

Transfixed by the night sky, Lindsay loses all sense of herself, and becomes absorbed into the Scottish landscape, until the very woman who precipitated her nocturnal walk appears. Released by the night from earlier reservations, Lindsay asks, "Will you show me Knapperly?" hoping for a glimpse of Garry Forbes's home and her own future. But the vision Lindsay receives is not one of comfort, but of growth:

> 'There's Knapperly for you,' its owner said.
> > Lindsay stared. From every window of the tall narrow house there
> > blazed a lamp. They blazed into the splendour of the night like a spurt
> of defiance.
> 'But the Zepps,' she gasped.
> 'They don't come this length.'
> 'But they do. One did. And anyway, the law.'

---

[50] Although the town is occasionally overrun by gossip and its people are connected through layers of history, Fetter-Rothnie is far from the neighborhood of George Douglas Brown's green shuttered house.

[51] See, for example, Cairns Craig's *Out of History*, for a discussion of "Scottish writing's retreat from reality" (45).

'That's to learn them to leave honest folks alone.'
   A spasm of terror contracted Lindsay's heart. Miss Barbara had
clambered on to the next dyke [. . .]
         'Will she kidnap me and make me her servant girl? But I couldn't
         live in a house with lights like that. There would be policemen if there
weren't Zepps.' (30)

Confronted with Barbara Patterson's staunch belief in the old ways, and flagrant lack

of respect for modern war or modern authority, Lindsay is unable to easily assimilate

herself into Knapperly's community. Her youth most readily connects her to

"modern" concerns, the prospect of the Zepps' existence does not frighten her, but her

inability to identify with the past marks her with terror. Lindsay is unable to link the

brightness of the moonlit night, that which brought her closest to the land, with the

light that pours from Knapperly's windows. Stricken with an inability to come to

terms with the past, Lindsay flees. Ironically, she seeks comfort at the Weatherhouse,

symbol of Scottish community and idiosyncrasy, home of four aged custodians of the

past. Lindsay does not realize that the past is all around her and affects the future

through a multitude of relationships. But her stay at the Weatherhouse, her exposure

to Fetter-Rothnie and its denizens, will force Lindsay to incorporate the past into her

life. Shepherd's narrative, then, enacts the necessity for compromise; her novel's

locale (its negotiation of people and place) symbolizes both a vanishing past and the

necessity of that past for envisaging a future.

     Within *The Weatherhouse* the geography of Shepherd's Scottish village is as

much built upon the relationships between its characters as the spatial reality that they

inhabit. Before she even begins her narrative, Shepherd places her cast of characters

into seemingly discrete groups: "the young protagonists," "The Ladies at the

Weatherhouse," and "From the Neighbourhood," forming a specific, socio-political,

hierarchical map within her text. Each of the novel's primary characters is placed in a

sub-group and identified by age, through association with other characters, and by

primary physical characteristics or noteworthy deeds. Thus, Garry Forbes's entry

reads: "*Capitan Garry Forbes* (30), ('the Gargoyle'), son of the timid Benjamin

Forbes who was half-brother to Barbara Patterson. Wounded in the trenches of the

First World War" (xi). Once we have made our way through Shepherd's list of main

characters we gain a greater understanding of where each character fits not only

within their own sub-grouping, but also within the community as a whole, or at least it

would appear that we do. Instead, what Shepherd gives is a collection of bare

minimum facts that do not necessarily make an impact upon the main action of the narrative. It is interesting that Garry's father is timid, and the father's temperament may influence his son's war experiences or the town's opinion of Garry, but the information does not directly affect the action of the text. By placing her characters within a "cast list" Shepherd immediately calls attention to the link between imagination and demarcation. She echoes Benedict Anderson's "imagined community," the tendency of small communities to imagine themselves through relationships and groupings that may or may not have an effect on the actions of its members, and then utilizes those groupings to undermine the utility of Anderson's hypothesis.

Shepherd's list of "main characters" is an allegory for the psychological and political organization of a small town. Consider her first group of characters, "The Young Protagonists." Anderson notes that many modern national movements utilized the idea of youth and even the word "young" for political purposes.[52] This use of youth does not necessarily demand actual youth; however, it is necessary for the understanding of the growth of a new national sentiment from the ashes of old nations. As is immediately clear from the descriptions that accompany each character, only Lindsay Lorimer physically fits the nomenclature of "young." Instead her fellow "Protagonists," Garry Forbes and Louie Morgan, join Lindsay to become symbols of the struggle to envisage a "new" Scotland, a "new" national self.

As a soldier in the Great War and an idealistic Marxist, of the three, Garry Forbes is most directly linked to the greater world. His experiences on the war front and his problems upon returning home also expose the necessity of unifying the general with the particular. Garry contributes to the novel in a similar manner to Johne the Common-weill's position in Lindsay's work. Garry offers an ideal as well as a catalyzing force. He generalizes the war against evil with his own need for truth. While fighting in the trenches, Garry becomes shell-shocked and encounters his doppelganger. In an act of heroic compassion, Garry recognizes his own mortality:

> Up to the thighs in filthy water, he had tried to suck the poison from another man's festering arm. The other fellow died where he stood, slithered through his fingers and doubled over into the filth, and Garry was violently sick. (53)

---

[52]See Anderson 119.

In the same instant, he is confronted with the horror, filth, and lack of control inherent in life: "He [Garry] stared at the horror beside him, and now he saw that the blood had coagulated in the pit between the man's knees and his abdomen. 'Poor beggar, he must have had another wound [. . .] A wound I didn't know of,' he thought. 'A wound you couldn't see'" (53). Garry becomes obsessed with the dead man because he represents both the terrors of modern warfare and the imminence of death in everyday life: "Perhaps his own abdomen was like that – black with blood. Squandered blood. Perhaps he too was wounded and did not know it" (53). For Garry, the future becomes marked by the evil of modern warfare. After encountering death in the trenches and identifying it with his own existence, Garry forms an attachment to purity and life that, ironically, in wartime led him to drag a corpse to safety. War forces Garry to identify himself with an all-pervasive concept and his mind is never the same after the strain. The war deadens him, it empties the content of his body and soul, and thus he must be "wounded – here, in the abdomen. Here" (54). In a perversion of "bottom-up" signification Garry imagines himself as one of the dead and much of the action in Shepherd's novel stems from this perversion.

It is only when Garry returns home, though, to an idyllic Scottish country town that seems virtually untouched by the war raging outside its borders that war's Cain mark is revealed upon him. Although Fetter-Rothnie might seem to be the ideal place in which to recover from the strains of war, a place of purity, it is there that Garry indulges his need to struggle for the truth. When Garry inadvertently stumbles upon Louisa's lie about her engagement he becomes incensed:

> 'David was the cleanest thing on God's earth. And not killed, you know. Not a clean, sharp death. Rotted off. Diseased. To die like that! Its an insult. A stupid, senseless, dirty joke. I wish that hadn't added this to it. These scandalmongers. They must always be at something. This tale about an engagement. Another dirty joke. Senseless and dirty. Accusing him of moral disease, as though the physical were not enough.' (63)

Unwittingly, the words he uses to describe Louie's deception, "[she] clawed him up from the dead and devoured him. I wish her joy of the meal" (63), echo his own wartime actions. Moreover, Garry defines David's death as "diseased" and "dirty" as opposed to a clean quick man-made death, seemingly forgetting his experience with disease and filth in the trenches. As in the trenches, Garry has difficulty differentiating life from death and truth from fiction. He does not see that his own

narrative is as much imagined as Louisa's. As with Shepherd's list of main characters, Garry's "truth" is all a question of perspective.

Shepherd presents thirty-five-year-old Louisa's engagement as questionable from the first, "Louie claims to be engaged to David Grey, Garry Forbes' engineer friend, who died of T.B." (xi), and so we are prejudiced against her before the narrative even begins. Like Garry, we make the mistake of not understanding Louisa's way of seeing the world as representational of all imagined communities. Like Garry we are led to see in black and white: "The claim was a lie, and must be exposed as such. Here was a small but definite engagement in the war against evil, and Garry's heart, on the first evening of the engagement, rose pleasurably to the fray. It was not often one could deliver so clear a blow against falsehood" (66). However, Shepherd's treatment of Louisa's descent into madness, clearly marks this last of the three "Young Protagonists" as suffering from the same difficulties as her comrades. Like Lindsay, Louisa has a difficulty in reconciling the past with the present. Louisa's problem, however, is a reverse of the younger woman's. By using the inconsistencies of the present, Louisa seeks to bind the past to her will. Through an interpretation of the myth of a lover lost in wartime, Louisa creates a false relationship with a dead man. She attempts to place herself within a communal role by fabricating a coherent past. Like Garry, Louisa's self-definition relies on both death and truth, but once again, her enactment of that reliance works in an inverted manner. To find herself Louisa relies on a blurring of truth and fiction and a willing association with death. In aligning herself with David, she may have attempted a resurrection similar to Garry's wartime experience, but her brush with death encourages a masking of truth not its revelation.

Like Lindsay and Garry, Louisa is confronted with the problem of simultaneity, a difficulty that plagues Shepherd's characters throughout *The Weatherhouse*. All within the Scottish community must discover a viable method of linking universal and specific, past and present, life and death, truth and fiction, and each character exhibits the strain of such necessary interweaving in his or her own way. Like the "Young Protagonists," Mrs. Ellen Falconer (Nell) is symptomatic of the improper negotiation of self definition. She is described as particularly adept at living in a fantasy world, and it is that world that leads to despair:

> And a bird had gone up out of Ellen's heart, pursuing its unaccountable way into the distance. A flake from her earth had risen. Life had a second spring,

> and it was opening for this woman of sixty who had lived so long among her
> dreams [. . .] And her fancy was off. She saw that it was she who was to help
> the young man (she called him mentally her son-in-law) to establish the truth,
> to rout Louie. (78)

Nell is an example of mismanaged imagination and improper temporal negotiation at their most grave. Her actions lead Garry to understand his own failings of vision and force Louisa into a confrontation with "truth" that ultimately drives her mad. A representation of the ills associated with the schizophrenic Scottish self, *The Weatherhouse* envisages all that has been cited as "wrong" with Scottish culture and identity. As a depiction of the flaws inherent in a vision based upon parochial life, Shepherd's novel can be read as part of the anti-Kailyard School tradition. Yet, once the reader considers the redemption that the novel offers, such parallels become moot.

Unlike Benedict Anderson's contention that simultaneous time initiates national identities, Shepherd's novel underlines the painful nature of such visions and offers a different sort of bridging. The power of *The Weatherhouse* lies in its individual locale. Although Shepherd may preface her narrative with town gossip and misinformation, the text as a whole utilizes such communication to formulate its message. Without community and the support it gives, all of Shepherd's characters would be doomed to live out life like Louisa and Nell; none would gain Garry Forbes's redemption. Without his attachment to Fetter-Rothnie, Garry Forbes would be unable to negotiate the balance between general and particular that is necessary for modern survival. His place as a landmark in the community, even as a figure of hilarity ("the Gargoyle") anchors him and allows for identity. In *The Weatherhouse*'s prologue, Shepherd offers a description of Garry Forbes that sums up both his negotiation of general and particular and his finally balanced place within a "bottom-up" Scottish national vision of self. She describes the many, and often conflicting, ways that people see Garry: as a "keen long-headed manager," a "rampageous Socialist," or a "confounded Scotch engineer" (1). Yet only in the small Scottish community of Fetter-Rothnie is Garry a legend. Garry is a symbol, an allegorical representation of the negotiation of truth and fiction, past and present. Garry represents the path to self-definition.

Garry Forbes's inability to properly balance his vision of self after the war seems to have led to his position as a byword, but it also propels the making of him as a man. Through his confrontation of Louisa and its repercussions, Garry Forbes

comes to understand the nature and structure of the world, a comprehension that his experience outside of Scotland could not bring him. Shepherd's vision of Scottish identity depends upon a balance not unlike the medieval conception of the celestial spheres. Her characters fill many roles, but each revolves around and necessitates the other. By considering the psychological and political tension between microcosm and macrocosm, self and community, Shepherd signifies Scotland's own difficulty with equilibrium. Her use of classical yet specific considerations of morality and truth within the landscape of a small Scottish community inscribes Scotland as a nation. Shepherd's novel creates a small community linked to a particular space that comes to represent the whole of a nation.

Both Lindsay and Shepherd call upon a community and the particular individuals within that community to allegorically define the needs of their nation. Through their relationship to particular Scottish locale, Rex Humanitas, the Pauper, Johne the Common-Weill, Lindsay Lorimer, Garry Forbes, and Louisa Morgan all serve as national representations. Each has a role to play within the community of Scotland, and each symbolizes the needs of the nation. As the works of both Lindsay and Shepherd attest, Scotland is a community realized through the individual. Conceptually the individual as representative of the nation unifies many strands within Scottish literature.

The Problematic Concept of Sovereignty

The power of the conceptions of monarchy for the Scottish national imagination also utilizes the concept of the one as representative of the many. In chapter two, I discussed the crucial links between nature and nation initiated by James I's narrative of kingship. The importance of the monarchy to the Scottish national identity, however, requires more direct explication. The vision of an unbroken line of Scottish monarchy has been an underlying pattern within visions of Scotland as a nation since the *Declaration of Arbroath*, but through the intervention of history the concept of kingship has suffered many transformations. Monarchy can both stabilize and threaten national imagination.

Historically, much of Scotland's national identity and cohesion has been based upon the Scottish monarchy and succession. The king, what he stood for, and how he related to the nation were all bound to the concept of what it was to be Scottish. Implied in the relationship between king and nation were two important monarchical

concepts. The first was the idea of the one who represented the many. The Scottish king not only represented his nation, he *was* his nation: "The sovereignty of the state had found its visible embodiment in the prince whose will was the state. *Regis voluntas suprema lex*" (Kohn, *Meaning and History* 21). The king was the physical embodiment of his combined people and as such he had a particular responsibility both to himself and to his nation. The second concept focuses upon the king as a representative of God. Certainly in Medieval times the king occupied the top tier of the hierarchy between God and nature. He was divinely chosen by God to be the ruler of his people. The sovereign was at the pinnacle of a natural and political hierarchy that organized the nation as a whole. Thus, the monarch represented both avatar and shepherd. This vision of the relationship between the king and his people was not isolated to the Scottish case; however, such a balance "between the one, the few, and the many form[ed] the basis of Scottish politics" (Williamson 116). For these reasons the Scottish king was a powerful figure for his nation's imagination. Not only did he embody civic power, but he also incorporated religious hierarchy and national identity.

The role of the Scottish monarchy throughout history, and before the Union of the Crowns, was one of both consolidation and demarcation. The idea of a continual Scottish monarchical line stretching from prehistory remained one of the main motifs in Scottish historical, and thus national, perceptions. Despite the historically polysemous nature of Scotland as a nation it has been argued that a Scottish nation whose most important single agency was the monarchy and the institutions that accompanied it arose by the time of the Bruce.[53] The importance placed upon kinship, the folk tradition of small community life, the system of law that often opposed both of the former, and the historical struggle with England all centered upon the monarchical line of Scotland.

That this line of kings might not be completely based in fact was not relevant. As Fergusson states, "The extraordinary strength of Scottish kingship [. . .] undoubtedly was one of the great creative forces that made Scotland" (13). The possibility of tracing their monarchy back for generations gave the Scots a sense of continuity and age:

---

[53] See Stetson-Watson 26.

> The powerful cement that bonded it all together was the genealogy of the
> kings of Scots [. . .] Many generations of Scots were conditioned to believe
> that this was the true and authentic history of their nation [. . .] As late as
> 1838, for example, people in the highlands could seize on this lengthy
> genealogy to welcome the latest scion of that ancient and illustrious royal line,
> the young Queen Victoria. (Fergusson 307)

The histories of Scotland themselves were originally little more than king lists. It is unsurprising, then, that the concrete factuality of that history was less than important. What mattered was the concept of lineage itself. The monarchy emphasized continuity where often there was no other source upon which to found the concept of a Scottish nation. In the sixteenth century the historian Boece filled out much of Scotland's history:

> In doing so he triumphed over what many Scots had regarded as Edward I's
> great act of cultural genocide: his seizure of Scottish public records and his
> effort to destroy all monuments, history, and memory of Scotland's ancient
> past. (Williamson 120)

By embroidering Scotland's king lists, Boece gave Scotland a narrative past based upon monarchical succession. Williamson's comment, however, adds greater power to Boece's addition to Scottish culture. Boece not only rescued Scottish history, he saved it from English attack. Such assertions concerning Scotland's struggle for historical cohesion combine the monarchy's moral engendering role with its power to maintain national boundaries.

The Union of the Crowns naturally proves difficult to fit into such equations. If, suddenly, a debatable crown (consider the opposition to Mary) became a non-existent or divided crown, then how could a monarchically supported Scottish national identity survive? It cannot, as such. After the Union of the Crowns it was necessary to bring a new mode of questioning into what was traditionally an absolute realm. Moreover, we must not forget that historically the role of the monarchy was beginning to change. Politics were soon to subvert religious empowerment. Thus, the position of Scottish kings within the moral network of divine right both aided and caused difficulties for Scotland's national consciousness before the Union. On the one hand, a traditional monarch provided the sort of stability which later a more

democratic government was unable to sustain. As Kohn aptly writes: "How could the new sovereign, the people, express a unified will? How could the people become one as the prince was one?" (*Nation Myth and History* 21). On the other hand, how could a single monarch possibly provide for the people's needs? To err is human. As with the contradictions of truth and fiction, past and present, the paradoxes of kingship greatly affected the Scottish national identity and were conceptualized and managed through Scottish literature.

To embellish upon previous example, it is impossible to read Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis* as anything other than critical of both the government and the Church of the time. This is not to say, however, that Lindsay's poems and performances were categorically shocking or new to their audience. Rather, Lindsay chose to utilize his specific connection with the crown to push the boundaries of his artistic form and manipulate the expectations of his audience. As my earlier discussions of the text have suggested, the *Thrie Estaitis* directly exhibits the complex nature of Scottish sovereignty during the Scottish Renaissance. The play's subtle manipulations bear out in the interconnections between microcosm and macrocosm. Lindsay is not making or following general allusions to monarchical duty; instead, he maintains specificity throughout the play. Rex Humanitas is not simply an everyman figure; he is both the Scottish monarch and every Scotsman. Lindsay's participation in allegorizing court life, his own relationship with the king, and the complex moral and hierarchical nature of Renaissance politics all combine to form a work supremely national in its importance. Direct literary influence upon the Scottish crown, however, was to be irrevocably disrupted by the Union of the Crowns.

Not long after Lindsay's lifetime, the monarch of Scotland was to decamp southwards. Suddenly, the monarchy was not only divided from its people through traditional feudal and moral hierarchy, it was altogether absent. Although the Union of the Crowns, and the Union of Parliaments which followed it by approximately one hundred years, had generally been cited as a spur for national identification within Scotland, it is difficult to follow the connection between an absent king and a monarchical vision of national self through anything but a sense of absence. This sensation of loss in itself forms a compelling argument for the importance of royal lineage for Scottish nationalism. If the Unions took away the most obvious focus for authors who wished to consider themselves in the light of sovereignty, then a shift in emphasis to absence and contested monarchical right would be expected.

Although the poetry of William Drummond of Hawthornden focuses upon a number of subjects appropriate to an early modern author (religion, death, authorship, etc.) two of his poems in particular address the difficulty of an absent Scottish monarch. Although differing greatly in style and content both *Forth Feasting: A panegyricke to the Kings most excellent Majesty* (1616) and *For the Kinge* (1711)[54] focus upon the direct effects of the removal of the royal presence from Scotland. Although labeled as a panegyric *Forth Feasting* is actually more of an elegy or a lament. It focuses upon the plight of a kingless nation and the revelry and prosperity that would accompany the re-possession of the Scottish throne. It does not directly criticize the king for his absence, but instead implores him to return home and assume his rightful position. *For the Kinge* is a more lighthearted work but no less serious in its accusations. Its message is satirical in nature but it too criticizes the king, in this case less for his absence than for his (in)actions. *For the Kinge* is much less forgiving than *Forth Feasting*; it catalogues the sins that may overtake a ruler and, by association, attributes them to the king of Britain. When taken together, these works symbolize the changes inherent in the Scottish vision of monarchy after the Union.

Addressed to James the VI, *Forth Feasting* was written to honor a royal visit to Edinburgh. Drummond begins his praise of the king by describing his own "rude" awakening by the revelry that attended the king's homecoming: "What blustring Noise now interrupts my Sleepe?"(1). However, it soon becomes apparent that not only the city of Edinburgh is celebrating, but all of Scotland:

> What Melodie, what Sounds of Ioy and Sport,
> Bee these heere hurl'd from eu'rie neighbour Spring?
> With what lowd Rumours doe the Mountaines ring?
> Which in vnusuall Pompe on tip-toes stand,
> And (full of Wonder) ouer-looke the Land? (4-8)

Once the extent of the revelry is described, the poet finally attributes it to the return of the king: "Then is it true what long I wish'd in vaine? / That my much-louing PRINCE is come againe?" (19-20). He compares the effects of James's decampment and return to the cycle of hardship and prosperity that Persephone's loss brought to the land, "When sixe blacke Months are past the Sunne doeth rolle" (22). This vision of James as strongly affecting the physical state of Scotland echoes throughout the

---

[54] This poem was first attributed to Drummond after his death.

poem. The poet repeatedly invokes nature to come and celebrate with the Scots, utilizing both traditional classical imagery and descriptions of Scotland itself:

> And you my Nymphes, rise from your moyst Repaire,
> Strow all your Springs and Grotts with Lillies faire:
> Some swiftest-footted get her hence and pray
> Our Floods and Lakes, come keepe this Holie-day;
> What e're beneath *Albanias* Hills doe runne,
> Which see the rising or the setting Sunne,
> Which drinke sterne *Grampius* Mysts, or *Ochells* Snows:
> Stone-rowling *Taye, Tine* Tortoyse-like that flows. (25-52)

Drummond lists each of Scotland's tributaries and streams in turn, calling all to proclaim the joy of the Scottish people at the sight of their king. He compares the royal return to the necessary loves of humanity and land. The joy which youth finds in flowers, seamen in an even wind, pilgrims in the blessed shade, and parched earth in the rain, none of these compare to the gladness of the Scottish people for their monarch. Still, as with Persephone's perpetual return to Hadies, James's presence calls to mind his absence: "That Day (deare Prince) which reft vs of thy Sight" (75). Moreover, Drummond's allusion to the myth underlines the king's complicity in Scotland's decline.

Drummond describes the period of James's decampment as removing all poetry and life. When the king leaves Scotland he takes the muses themselves with him and dooms all of nature to mourn: "Yee know it Meads, yee murmuring Woods it know, / Hilles, Dales, and Caues, Copartners of their Woe" (85-86). Not only does James's absence remove all Scotland's beauty, it threatens the nation itself. James takes away that which marks Scotland as different from other lands: "Gone are those maiden Glories, gone that State, / Which made all Eyes admire our Hap of late" (91-92). With the inclusion of the word "state" within his description of woe, Drummond not only describes the details of Scotland's distress, but also alludes to the removal of that which defines Scotland as nation. Without the king, there is no Scottish "state." Once the poet has portrayed the decay of the kingless nation, however, he moves to a description of Scotland under a just and righteous king.

Drummond depicts the period of James's life in Scotland as one of great prosperity and good fortune. The flourishing of the natural world symbolizes political strength and growth. While James lives in Scotland the nation does not even envy those mythological lands that are known for their bountiful nature. No paradise could compare to the land over which James rules. Moreover, the poet directly attributes

Scotland's physical prosperity to James's rule: "No Place there is so desart, so alone, / Euen from the frozen to the torrid Zone, / From flaming *Hecla* to great *Qunicys* Lake, / Which Thine abode could not most happie make" (109-112). Thus, any natural region would benefit from the presence of the Scottish king. Drummond describes James as receiving all the gifts of heaven so that Scottish king and Scottish nation become an example to all others. James's effect is so great that it alters the state of the nation itself. His birth initiated a time of peace between Scotland and its southern enemy: "Scarce wast Thou borne, when joyn'd in friendly Bands / Two mortall Foes with other clasped Hands" (127-128). James did so much good for Scotland, that England coveted him for herself. In this way, by linking the bounty of Scotland to the monarch, the poet underlines both the goodness of his own land and that land's need for the rule of its own king. Nature must be husbanded by the proper hand in order for it to prosper.

Once the more general connections between king, people, and land are established, Drummond moves on to a more spiritual consideration of James's importance to his people. He describes the monarch as the ultimate example: "How by Example more than anie Law, / This People fierce Thou didst to Goodnesse draw" (181-182). As the one who represents the many and leads them down the proper path, James becomes associated with the ultimate Christian figure, Christ himself: "Though crown'd thou wert not, nor a King by Birth, / Thy Worth deserues the richest Crowne on Earth" (191-192). As a Christ figure, James takes on the attributes most valued by Christianity. He scorns wealth and exhibits meekness; he seeks peace above all things. With this comparison, Drummond draws upon James's own vision of Christian power. He makes reference to James's belief in divine right and his hand in the unification of Britain. Thus, Drummond shows James to be both the physical inheritor of a rightful line of kingship, "By just Discent Thou from moe Kings dost shine, / Then manie can name Men in all their Line," and the nation's spiritual guide, "the onlie Monarch of all Hearts" (205-206, 242). Drummond uses Nature to create an allegory of sovereign duty.

Both the royal line and James's effect upon his people are interrupted by his choice to move the court to England. Although Drummond does not directly bring James's southward move into the poem until its end, the implication of loss reverberates throughout. The poet's comparison of James with Christ, "a true Victor [. . .] sent from aboue," is followed by a list of wished for virtues and the denunciation

of their opposing sins. The act of wishing, of hoping for the future, inserts a level of uncertainty.

> That Murder, Rapine, Lust are fled to Hell,
> And in their Roomes with vs the *Graces* dwell,
> That *Honour* more than *Riches* Men respect,
> That *Worthinesse* than *Gold* doth more effect,
> That *Pietie* vnmasked showes her Face,
> That *Innocencie* keepes with *Power* her Place [. . .]
> Are wish'd Effects of Thy most happie Raigne. (255-260, 264)

 Drummond repeatedly wishes for the goodness and prosperity he knows are associated with James's rule, but he cannot guarantee them for his land. He can only exhort the king to remember his homeland and keep that land close to his heart. Drummond can only ask the king to live up to his position and keep in mind all the kingdoms under his rule: "Through this Thy Empire range, like Worlds bright Eye, / That once each Yeare suruayes all Earth and Skie" (343-344). He can only remind James of the rights of Scotland to its own king: "Hills, Bullwarks of our Freedome, giant Walls, / Which neuer Fremdlings Slight nor Sword made Thralls" (355-356).[55] Echoing *The Declaration of Arbroath* and *The Bruce* Drummond reminds his king that Scotland was never (willingly) ruled by outside forces.

Drummond ends his poem by evoking images of himself as a natural avatar of Scotland. He claims that Scotland holds a greater need for her king and that she loves him more:

> Ah why should *Isis* only see Thee shine?
> Is not thy FORTH, as well as *Isis* Thine?
> Though *Isis* vaunt shee hath more Wealth in store,
> Let it suffice Thy FORTH doth loue Thee more. (383-386)

With this proclamation, Drummond utilizes all of his previous praise to show James his proper place despite the king's imminent return to England:

> Now when (by *Honour* drawne) thou shalt away
> To Her alreadie jelous of thy Stay,
> When in Her amourous Armes Shee doth Thee fold,
> And dries thy Dewie Haires with Hers of Gold [. . .]
> And chides (perhaps) Thy Comming to the North,
> Loathe not to thinke on Thy much-louing FORTH. (391-398)

---

[55] *Fremdling*: "foreigner," derived from the adjective *fremd*, "foreign," which is now obsolete, except in Scots and certain Northern dialects (Kastner, notes 248).

Despite the wealth England holds, Drummond reminds his monarch, it is the royal blood of Scotland that runs in his veins, "whereof Thy royall Stemme / More than an hundreth wore a Diademe" (399-400). More than one hundred Scottish kings ruled before James so that he could wear gold upon his brow and wield power. Thus, the poem ends upon a note that is both defiant and mournful. James's blood and his ties to the land make him the greatest of kings, but these gifts also take him from his rightful people. Only through his royal Scottish blood will James's name be "charactered" in flowers and his "high Exployts at last make euen, / With Earth thy Empyre, Glorie with the Heauen" (407-408), but that glory will not be enacted in the land of his birth. In this way, Drummond's poem is both a panegyric to his king and a eulogy to the sovereignty of his own land. By removing himself from Scotland, James is shown to have lost much of what made him a true sovereign and Scotland is doomed to be a nation that has lost its sovereign identity.

Drummond's *For the Kinge* also deals with the attributes of the British king; however, it does so more from a perspective of ridicule rather than of loss. The poem's tone may be linked to a change in subject. L. E. Kastner locates *For the Kinge* as having been written about James's son rather than James himself, saying, "the cap, it seems to us, fits Charles I equally well if not better" (415). *Forth Feasting* retains some semblance of hope for the return of the Scottish monarchy, but the tone of *For the Kinge* clearly exhibits a loss of all optimism. Instead of reminding the king of his responsibilities through a catalogue of his gifts, *For the Kinge* satirizes the king's failings and then asks for liberation from them. The poem itself is broken into six stanzas, the first five dedicated to one of the king's senses with the final stanza considering his sensations in abstract. The first stanza focuses upon sight, asking that the king be kept from falling prey to the machinations of a pretty face that hides evil intent: "From such a face quhois excellence / May captiuate my souerainges sense, / And make him, Phoebus lyk, his throne, / Reseinge to some young Phaeton" (1-4). The stanza closes with a blessing that will set the pattern for the following stanzas: "Quhersoeuer he has his being, / Blis my soueraing & his seing" (13-14). One implication of these final lines is that the poet does not know where the king lodges, certainly not in Scotland; another plays upon the king's possibly perverted sexuality (wherever he puts himself) and will be reiterated throughout the rest of the poem.

The second stanza of *For the Kinge* deals with hearing. With it, Drummond injects political as well as moral considerations into the poem. He asks that the king be protected "From Spanisch treitties that may wound / Our countries peace" (19-20). The blessing asks that the king remember that his power comes from a higher maker, to hear the voice of God. The third stanza continues the religious theme but specifies its nature by asking that the king remove himself from Catholic influences, "From the canditis poysoned baittes / Of Jesuitts and the desaittes, / Italian sallets, & Romisse d[r]ogis, / The milk of Babells proud houris duggis" (31-34). Drummond prays that his king be kept from feasting, like the Pope and his ilk, upon the blood of innocents, but his blessing implies that his prayer may be too late: "At all banquetts & al feasting, / Bliss my soueraing and his taisting" (39-40). The fourth and fifth stanzas meld all previous criticisms under the senses of smell and touch, respectively. Drummond asks that his king be kept from the idolatrous smell of Catholic incense and the influential breath of a "Ganemed / Quhosse hoourische breath hath pouer to lead / His Maiestie such way he list" (49-50). He prays that his king be kept from kissing the lips of foul-smelling men. The fifth stanza hints at the vile deeds that the king has already committed, "From prick of Conscience, such a stinge / As kills the soule, Heauens blisse my king" (55-56), and requests,

> From such a smouth and bardles chine
> As may prouocke or tempt to sin;
> From such a hand quhosse palme may
> My soueraing leid our from the way;
> From things pollutit and wncleine,
> From all thats beastly and obschene;
> From quhat may set his soule one reilling,
> Bliss my soueraing & his feillinge. (59-66)

Clearly Charles's way of life is both questionable and un-kinglike. Thus the satirical prayers that Drummond offers up only serve to call greater attention to Charles's lack. The poem's final stanza locks Charles into the mistakes that he made but offers some redemption, through God. If Charles can only be made to use his senses properly, as for example Lindsay's Rex Humanitas was, then the perpetrators of his sins might be punished. Drummond prays to God as the dispenser of divine justice to rid his distant king and court of their sinful maladies.

For the Kinge is an allegory of the senses; it utilizes both figural and symbolic allegory to describe the king's failings. In and of itself, each of the five senses represent a vice. They become figures, like Orpheus's harp: seeing represents lust,

hearing represents greed, smell represents gluttony, and touch represents sloth. Drummond uses the senses as figures that each represent one of the facets of the king's greater failings, his weakness and his ability to be lead. Like the situation surrounding the fall of Rex Humanitas, the particular failings of the king's senses bleed into each other and create a general climate of dissolute action and moral laxity. Because Drummond is describing an actual king, with actual failings, his allegorical figures also form a symbol allegory. These corrupted senses are not simply equated with vices, they are the personal failings and corruptions of court which beset a particular king and thus threaten a nation.

When comparing Drummond's two poems on kingship, it becomes obvious that his beliefs in the power and position of the king changed greatly with both the movement of the monarchy to the south and the ascension of Charles I to the throne. James VI was the last of the British kings to rule Scotland through the routines of a Scottish monarchy. He was the last king of Scotland to rule Scotland as itself. After James, the line of Scottish kings is truly broken. This disruption is made clear through the metamorphosis of Drummond's themes between *Forth Feasting* and *For the Kinge*. Whereas James's style of rule is made much of and his power over his people is emphasized, Charles is mocked as a weak ruler, governed first by his earthly senses and then by the lackeys surrounding him at court. James is depicted as a much-loved king whose connection to his homeland affects every aspect of life. Charles, however, is so removed from his proper nature that he can only be addressed through the basest aspects of his physical form. The high style and many classical references made throughout *Forth Feasting* show it to be a serious piece concerned with defining the land through its sovereign. *For the Kinge* touches upon the monarch's position of ruler over many lands only in its criticism of him for falling under bad influence, for example, the references to Charles's religious policy, seen by many as attempting to bring the Anglican Church closer to Roman Catholicism. Although Charles was born in Scotland, Drummond makes no specific reference to that land. Charles is still the king, and as such he has responsibilities to himself, his people, and God, but Charles is not the king his father was. Charles is no longer the king of Scotland.

If the removal of the Scottish king to the south eventually removes the possibility of that kingship entirely, then how, if at all, could the literary concept of nation as defined by sovereignty continue to exist? More modern Scottish authors

who wished to write their nation into their texts would have to consider the question of divided national power and yoke the deficiency to a new form of definition. Robert Louis Stevenson's work, for example, explores absences and division. Stevenson's novel *The Master of Ballantrae* (1889) allegorizes sovereignty and considers the implications of conflict and absence within that context. *The Master* traces the lives of two brothers, James and Henry Durie, as they struggle for control over the livelihood of their family. The Duries are the last in the line of an old Scottish family that had ruled over Durrisdeer and Ballantrae since antiquity. As the oldest son, James is known as "the Master of Ballantrae" and is set to inherit from his father and marry his wealthy cousin, Miss Alison Graeme. The Master is well liked by all but a bit of a rogue with several possible sins attributed to his name. Henry, on the other hand, is a mediocre sort of man "neither very bad nor yet very able," but he is honest and hard working (11). Henry lacks his brother's charisma, and he is not much spoken of in the neighborhood. The brothers, then, are different, but no less than one would expect within the traditional roles of heir and second son.

Their division is emphasized, however, when Bonnie Prince Charlie lands in Scotland. The family decides to "send one son forth to strike a blow for King James, my lord [the elder] and the other staying home to keep in favour with king George" (11). But the question quickly becomes: Which brother will go and which will stay? Logically, or so Henry and Allison think, as heir, the Master should remain home for king and country while Henry, as expendable second son, should be sent away. The Master, however, has different ideas about the matter:

> 'It is the direct Heir of Durrisdeer that should ride by his King's bridle,' says the Master.
> 'If we are playing the manly part,' says Mr Henry, 'there might be sense in such talk. But what are we doing? Cheating at cards!'
> 'We are saving the house of Durrisdeer, Henry,' his father said. (13)

The gaming metaphor suits both the projected adventure and the Master well. He feels his temperament is more suited to travel and adventure and he means to be the one to go. But as Henry argues, the Master's argument is flawed both politically and in terms of the rules of linage:

> "And see, James," said Mr Henry, "if I go, and the Prince has the upper hand, it will be easy to make your peace with King James. But if you go, and the expedition fails, we divide the right and the title. And what shall I be then?"
> "You will be Lord Durrisdeer," said the Master. "I put all I have

upon the table.”

      “I play at no such game,” cries Mr Henry. “I shall be left in such a situation as no man of sense and honour could endure. I shall be neither fish nor flesh!” he cried. And a little after he had another expression, plainer perhaps than he intended. “It is your duty to be here with my father,” said he. “You know well enough you are the favorite.”

      “Ay?” Said the Master. “And there spoke Envy! Would you trip my heels – Jacob?” Said he, and dwelled upon the name maliciously. (13)

Through this filial argument, Stevenson not only divides the brothers along lines of temperament and politics, he initiates the theme of biblical envy that will thread his text as a whole. Moreover, due to the relationship between his Scottish readers and the Bible, Stevenson's direct reference to a well known biblical story allows his readers to consider the relationship between the Durie brothers as a narrative allegory. When James calls Henry "Jacob," he is referring to the story told in Genesis 25-28 (*Oxford Bible*). According to the biblical text, Rebekah bears Isaac's twin sons, Esau and Jacob. Esau is the first-born while Jacob follows his brother, gripping Esau's heel. As men, Esau is described as a hunter, a man of the field, while Jacob is a quiet man, content to stay at home. One day Esau comes in from the field stricken by hunger and finds his brother cooking stew. Esau asks his brother for some stew but Jacob replies, "First sell me your birthright" (Genesis 25:31). Esau agrees and, in exchange for food, sells his position as first-born to his twin. Later, when Isacc is an old man and blind, this exchange of birthright becomes a legitimization for Rebekah's plan to steal Esau's paternal blessing and bestow it upon Jacob. After discovering what Jacob has done, Esau cries out in anger "Bless me, me also, father," but Isacc replies, "Your brother came deceitfully and he has taken away your blessing" (Genesis 27:34). Through the exchange of birthright and the stolen blessing, Jacob becomes Esau's master. Finally, however, Esau's hatred for his brother drives both of them from the home of their parents and leads Jacob to his biblical destiny (Genesis 28:6-9).

      As discussed in chapter one, typology is the study of the Old Testament as an allegory for the New Testament, or as an allegorical allusion to future history. In this manner, the struggle between Jacob and Esau, and their eventual founding of separate tribes of Israel, can be seen as prefiguring any number of political divisions within the body of the New Testament or in the Christian religion itself. Stevenson's readers would have known to read the biblical narrative of sibling rivalry allegorically. Thus

his choice to link Jacob and Esau to the Duries asks his readers to view James and Henry's struggle in a similar light.

When he takes up the fateful gold coin, James builds upon his metaphors of wager and barter and, filled with anger and driven by jealousy, Henry agrees to abide by its fall.

> 'I will stand and fall by it,' said Mr Henry. 'Heads, I go; shield, I stay.'
> The coin was spun, and it fell shield. 'So there is a lesson for Jacob,' says the Master.
> 'We shall live to repent of this,' says Mr Henry, and flung out of the hall. (13)

Thus, James and Henry may solve their argument with a fateful coin toss, but in the process they also set the pattern of their struggle. Like the pane of stained glass Allison shatters with the same coin, the Durie line is irreparably broken by the brothers' temperaments. Henry is doomed to be a prophet and neither "fish nor flesh," while James will become the thorn in Henry's side. James's actions strip the title of Master from him, but his personality sets the brothers into a perpetual struggle for mastery over their destinies. Moreover, the story of James and Henry Durie does indeed mimic that of Esau and Jacob. Through news of James's supposed death at Culloden, Henry becomes the head of his family; he usurps the position of the first-born. Moreover, he receives the wife and privileges that the Master would have enjoyed if James had remained at home to claim his birthright. With a toss of a coin, James does indeed sell his proper place to his brother. Further, when James returns, his hatred eventually drives Henry to attempt an escape to America. Like Jacob, Henry finds a new land and starts fresh. Unlike Jacob's journey, however, God does not bless Henry's trip. The selling of birthright does not lead to the glory of the Durie family; it leads to its destruction. James and Henry's protracted struggle for sovereignty devastates their family's linage. James dies without legitimate offspring and Henry's children return home to a barren estate, living together as brother and sister into old age. Thus, through the simple act of tossing a coin Henry and James become symbol allegories who represent the political fate of their nation. Just as Jacob and Esau become the forefathers of separate, but equally important, biblical tribes and thus represent certain divisions within the Jewish and, eventually, Christian peoples, Henry and James represent the divided fate of the Scottish monarchy. On the one hand, after the Union of the Crowns, the Scottish monarchy retains the throne. On the other hand, in retaining his position the Scottish king also loses his direct link

to his people, as does Henry when he becomes the head of the family. On the one hand, the movement of the monarch gains him and his heirs power and wealth. On the other hand, his separation forces him to favor peoples other than his own and skews the divinely ordained political order. Both Henry and James become twisted by their positions *between* normal roles of power; they are both themselves and symbolic of the fate of the Scottish monarchy.

James's and Henry's desires, actions and fate are inextricably intertwined, a narrative choice that is particularly highlighted by Stevenson's choice of narrator. The narration of the struggle between these two brothers falls to one whose motives are also strangely questionable. Henry Durie's steward, Ephraim Mackellar, places himself in the role of narrator so that the truth of the matter will finally out. Like the narrator of *The Bruce*, Mackellar is particularly bent upon claiming historical veracity for his tale. Unlike Barbour, however, Mackellar does not cushion his protestations with literary assumptions. *The Master* may be a romance, but Mackellar is adamant about his own role in the story as well as the truth of what he relays. If "the full truth of this odd matter is what the world has long been looking for" (9), then Mackellar positions himself as the one person with the knowledge to satisfy public curiosity. Mackellar links himself closely to both brothers:

> I knew the Master [James]; on many secret steps of his career I have an authentic memoir in my hand; I sailed with him on his last voyage almost alone; I made one upon that winter's journey of which so many tales have gone abroad; and I was there at the man's death. As for my late Lord Durrisdeer [Henry], I served him and loved him near twenty years; and thought more of him the more I knew of him. (9)

But both Mackellar's protestations of truth and his descriptions of the Master and Henry, hint at the deceptions inherent in such absolutes. Not only must Mackellar contend with the inherently fickle nature of "truth," he is also personally involved in the narrative and thus the possibility of his impartiality is removed. Mackellar's narrative is neither truthful nor impartial. As many feminist critics have pointed out concerning narratives written by men that include women, narrative voice connotes appropriated power and possible manipulation. Neither the Master, nor Henry for that matter, is ever able to speak for himself. All of their words and deeds are filtered through Mackellar and, as such, all are presented to the reader as a narrative that depends upon division. Even those descriptions of the Master to which Mackellar himself is not privy suffer from the removal of several levels of narration. Chevalier

de Burke tells tales of the Master's wanderings and Mackellar selects those portions of Burke's memoirs that will be included in the text's narration. The lines between the Master and his brother are drawn early in the book, but both official history and the tale's narrators conspire to maintain the sibling's division.

By placing the narration of *The Master* in the hands of an unreliable witness, Stevenson seeks to highlight the questions of sovereignty and subjection that permeate his text. Mackellar is both the sovereign of the narrative and an example of the true Scottish subject, pulled between the whims of two battling monarchs. Despite Mackellar's narrative power, his physical life is strongly affected by the Duries' struggle. Mackellar's abilities are caught within the web of the Caledonian antisyzygy. He is forced to narrate the division between "head" and "heart" that the Durie brothers embody. Moreover, Stevenson's choice of an apparently powerless servant to narrate a novel that focuses upon the struggle for Scottish sovereignty allegorizes the problematic nature of negotiating a "bottom-up" national understanding. If Scottish sovereignty is irreparably fractured, then the basis of the monarchical one who represents the many itself becomes problematic. Neither the Master nor Henry could be identified as an "Everyman." Only Mackellar, like the Pauper in Lindsay's *Thrie Estaitis*, offers a unified solution. Yet Mackellar and the Pauper are pawns of the existing political pattern, and as such are doomed to act as fool and foil to their more powerful counterparts. For Lindsay's Pauper, such a role is ultimately rewarding, all's well that ends well. But for Stevenson's Mackellar (like Drummond's poetic narrators) division fills the foreseeable future. Mackellar cannot narrate from any position of stability, monarchy (even the difficult British monarchy) will translate into democracy, and Scotland will lose even its full parliamentary control.

Similarly, Stevenson's apparent association of James with Scotland's "heart," its romantic inclinations, and Henry with the nation's "head," its rationality, unravels as the tale moves to its conclusion. The Master is, indeed, a figure of romance; he is the "Beloved Scoundrel" whom Leslie Fiedler cites as Stevenson's most compelling literary creation (81-83). However, the Master is also most certainly demonic. He receives little redemption within the narrative and, in the end, can only incite his brother's death. Yet Henry also comprises a poor locus for the concept of rationality. James's actions drive Henry farther and farther from his position of "head." Mackellar describes Henry's relationship with his son, for example, as echoing the

treatment of the Master by the old Lord. When Mackellar takes Henry to task over the matter, Henry falls down in a fit:

> When I lifted my head my lord had risen to his feet, and the next moment he fell heavily on the floor. The fit or seizure endured not very long; he came to himself vacantly, put his hand to his head, which I was then supporting, and says he, in a broken voice: 'I have been ill, Mackellar,' he said again. 'Something broke Mackellar.' (127)

Shocked by the comparison of his beloved son, whom he had taken as an echo of himself, with his hated brother, Henry "loses his head." Moreover, after his injury Henry slowly descends into insanity. In an inversion of the biblical story, here it is "Jacob" who becomes obsessed with his brother:

> Every morning fair or foul, he [Henry] took his gold-headed cane, set his hat on the back of his head – a recent habitude, which I thought to indicate a burning brow – and betook himself to make a certain circuit [. . .] It was the hour when the Master sate within upon his board and plied his needle. So these two brothers would gaze upon each other with hard faces; and then my lord move on again, smiling to himself [. . .] Here was his mistress: it was hatred and not love that gave him healthful colours. (175-176)

Despite Mackellar's interventions within the narrative on Henry's behalf, and against the Master, the brothers' actions blur. Whereas James dogs Henry's footsteps at the Durrisdeer estate, Henry haunts James in America. Moreover, despite Mackellar's repeated assertion that James's one purpose is to cause his brother pain, many of the Master's actions have a motive divorced from malicious intent. It is the need for money, and Henry's refusal to provide it, that brings James back to Ballantrae. Moreover, James does not want his title returned to him, and he seems to harass his brother more out of boredom than anything else. What James wants is the freedom that the money of the estate can bring. Nor does the Master follow his brother to America to enforce guilt or cause more anguish. Rather, James is interested in reclaiming the buried treasure that will allow him again to live the life to which he has grown accustomed. It would have been possible, then, for Henry to avoid all the pain which James's presence causes him, first by continuing to pay him off, if not with the exorbitant amount requested then some more manageable tithe, and second, by ignoring the Master's expedition into the wilderness.

The exchange of birthright with which Stevenson begins his narrative initiates a cycle that ultimately leads to the corruption of both brothers. Henry attempts to become the Master's opposite, but in filling his role, Henry becomes more of a

doppelganger. On the night of February 27, 1757, a night to which Stevenson devotes an entire chapter, Henry and James engage in a duel that both echoes the original coin toss and irrevocably confuses their psyche. In his attempts to convince his brother to pay him for his absence, James pushes Henry too far. "Dear God, will this never be done?" James asks, meaning his extended (and to him dull) stay at the familial estate. Henry's reply, however, surprises him:

> Mr Henry laid down his cards. He rose to his feet very softly, and seemed all the while like a person deep in thought. 'You coward!' he said gently, as if to himself. And then, with neither hurry nor any particular violence, he struck the Master in the mouth.
> The Master sprang to his feet like one transfigured; I had never seen the man so beautiful. 'A blow!' he cried. 'I would not take a blow from God Almighty!' (94)

Between them the brothers make the first concurrent decision that they have ever made in their lives. The Master asks for blood and Henry is ready to give some of his own if he may shed his brother's. Together, the brothers make for the long shrubbery to fight a candlelit duel, but before they begin, the Master makes a particularly apt summary of Henry's situation, and his own:

> But see how strong is my situation! If you fall, I shift out of this country to where my money is before me. If I fall, where are you? My father, your wife – who is in love with me, as you very well know – your child even, who prefers me to yourself: - how will these avenge me! (96)

James thinks only of money, but he plays upon Henry's need for familial approbation. Still Henry is not to be swayed from his path. They fight, Henry gains the advantage; then James attempts foul play and falls on his brother's sword. Immediately Henry is repentant, but the duel has made him a murderer, much worse than the coward that he called his brother. He has brought the very shame down upon his family from which he sought to save them. In an act of physical power, Henry both loses and gains psychological strength. He had been the bastion of right-action, but what is he now? Although Henry and his family eventually learn that the Master did not lose his life on that night – that Henry is not a murderer – Henry's actions have brought him down to his brother's level. Like the coin toss before it, the duel puts Henry in a place of sundered power.

From its inception, *The Master*'s narrative is tainted by the absence of legitimate monarchical power. In terms of the Scottish psyche, the concept of sovereignty has become representative of absence and distortion, thus any assumption

of royal power becomes in itself corrupting. A close analysis of the relationship between the Durie brothers serves to drive home the difficulty of the relationship between Scottish monarchy and Scottish national identity. Neither James nor Henry is ever truly the master of his fate; both are locked into the politics of their time and the desires of the other. Mackellar's conscious attempt to separate the Duries and his final failure to do so (they are even buried in the same tomb and share a head stone) emphasizes the difficulty of divided power with which Stevenson grapples in much of his Scottish fiction. In his introduction to *Kidnapped*, Donald McFarlan writes: "Perhaps the main point to remember is that Stevenson is not in the end writing about two conflicting cultures within Scottish history, but about two deeply battling sets of sympathies within himself – and perhaps making an attempt to explain Scottishness to himself" (xvi). Although here McFarlan describes the division between Highlander and Lowlander within *Kidnapped*, his words easily apply to the plurality within *The Master*. The struggle for mastery that permeates every level of the text, from narration to descriptions of personal insanity, gives *The Master* its vitality. As Fiedler writes, Stevenson "begins with the outward Romance of incident [. . .] and moves through allegory, often elusive, to the naïve or unconscious evocation of myth" (78). Within *The Master* two lairds struggle for control over a narrative history that, ultimately, neither is able to master. Like Scotland itself, they are deeply concerned with sovereignty and yet no longer able to affect any change within their political structure. Through his obsession with division, Stevenson allegorizes the very nature of Scottish politics. Division, however, does not affect Scottish literary nationalism in the negative manner by which it impacts political concerns. The search for sovereign unity, and the confrontation with fragmentation to which such a quest ultimately leads, allows Scottish authors to explore their national vision of self.

Egalitarianism as a Unification of Identities

If locale and sovereignty are important to the literary realization of the Scottish national identity, then they are so because of their potency as images. I have argued repeatedly that, for the Scots, national identity is more of a "bottom-up" proposition than Anderson's "imagined communities," that Scotland envisages itself by focusing on the microcosm of community, be they rural or courtly, and the actions of individuals within such communities. Due to their particular perspectives and political difficulties, Scottish authors have sought to create an allegory to describe

their land and their people. Further, the combination of "bottom-up" locale and an absent or divided sovereignty has created the ideal climate for fostering a national image of egalitarianism. If, for example, the microcosm is more representative of Scottish identity, then the idea that every person is a microcosm in themselves and thus equally representative or important can be fostered. Moreover, if there can be no monarchical everyman, no sovereign who stands for his land and people, then that land and those people must stand for themselves; all become "everyman," and all represent the whole. Egalitarianism, then, becomes the manner by which Scottish authors may weave their land and people into a symbol and/or narrative allegory. Each Scottish character stands for him or herself and also for his or her nation. Each story told echoes with stories of the past and of the future. And as in the polysemous nature of allegory, none can exist with out the others and none are more valued than the rest.

In his discussion of the Scottish myth of egalitarianism McCrone bases its existence and persistence in three defining categories: firstly, egalitarianism receives institutional expression in the structure of Scottish civil society; secondly, it is sustained by the romantic retrospective visions of Scottish immigrants; finally, egalitarianism is embedded in the Scottish literary identity (115). Naturally, it is this last assertion that holds the most relevance for the current study. Egalitarianism is essential to the Scottish literary identity because it is the ultimate basis for any "bottom-up" understanding. As a structure for an enduring vision of the Scottish nation, the myth of egalitarianism does present temporal difficulties. The literary modes that McCrone links to the Scottish egalitarian myth are relatively modern, mainly appropriate to the Kailyard and Highland Romance. However, the myth of egalitarianism's basic pattern can be traced to earlier literary moments.

Although it would be ridiculous to cite the belief in Scottish egalitarianism as existing in Medieval or Renaissance Scotland, the inception of such a belief can be detected in the wider understandings of both periods. Medieval and early modern conceptions of allegory incorporate an egalitarian understanding of the world. Although allegory often depends upon structured pattern, to view these patterns as two-dimensional would be a gross oversimplification. In chapter one, I compared allegorical reading strategies to tracing the interwoven threads of a complex tapestry. Such a comparison is equally valuable to understanding allegory's egalitarian nature. Within allegory's four-fold structure of literal, tropological, allegorical, and

anagogical, no one level is emphasized above the other. One might suppose that, due to the nature of Christian thought, the anagogical would be deemed the most serious and important, and such supposition carries weight. In *Il Convivio* Dante Alighieri describes the anagogical as "above the senses." However, he also describes the four fold structure as ultimately inter-dependent: "The literal should always come first as being the sense in whose meaning the others are enclosed, and without which it would be impossible and illogical to attend to the other senses" (*Convivio* 41: Book II, Chapter 1). Thus, allegory's layers are mutually supporting. The anagogical level may have pride of place within the senses, and the literal may be the essential building block for all other understanding, but the anagogical cannot be interpreted without the literal, and the literal has no value without its hidden significances. Each level of allegorical understanding has its importance within the structure. Moreover, it is allegory's ability to signify all four levels of meaning within one literary work that gives it utility and value. A work that specifically includes all four of allegory's levels, such as Dante's *Divine Comedy*, would be highly valued by a medieval or early modern theorist. Even authors that choose to highlight particular meanings within their work, such as Henryson with his *Morall Fabillis*, make their readers aware of other, equally relevant, possible interpretations. In this manner, allegory is egalitarian in both its form and function.

Within a more modern context it is similarly important to keep in view the specifics of what we mean by egalitarian. Gellner's description of the nature of modern society aids a great deal in the definition of the term "egalitarian":

> Modern society is not, of course, egalitarian in the sense that it is free of tremendous differences in wealth and power. It is egalitarian in the sense that the differences are arranged along a kind of continuum, so there is not, at any one point, a major break, ratified by law, ritual or deep custom. (27)

In other words, egalitarianism depends upon the maintenance of balance. Egalitarianism, like allegory, bridges distances and, like national identity, unifies peoples. McCrone's choice to describe egalitarianism as, "not dependent on 'facts', because it represents a set of social, self evident values, a social ethos, a celebration of sacred beliefs about what it is to be Scottish" (120), and also as fundamentally dependent on visions of otherness (Scottish *not* English), only serves to bring home the difficulties of maintaining egalitarianism's balance. As I have previously discussed, the problem with defining Scotland as other than English is one of

negation. In defining Scotland through a "not" we may fail to describe what Scotland is. Through a consideration of Scottish literary national identity, however, it is possible to trace the myth of egalitarianism along purely Scottish paths.

If one applies the Scottish myth of egalitarianism to the "bottom-up" visions of nation found within Scottish literature, it is possible to trace many threads of connectedness. The pilgrim or traveler, perhaps the original depiction of the one who represents the many, is the traditional focus of Scottish Medieval and Renaissance allegories like James's *Quair*.[56] In the light of "bottom-up" signification, later visions of the pilgrim within Scottish literature gain additional significance. One aspect of the Kailyard novel that has been frequently mocked is the usual inclusion of a "lad o' pairts." A stock character within the Kailyard School, the "lad" is usually a bright young man from a small town who leaves to find his fortune and returns home to meet his fate. That such stock characters exist in Kailyard fiction is undeniable; consider the ironic representation of such in George Douglas Brown's *The House With the Green Shutters*, for example. Yet, the "lad" surely traces a much longer ancestry. His position as stock character does not condemn him to isolation. Rather, the "lad" is a continuation of the allegorical "bottom-up" vision of the world. Moreover, the "lad" is a specifically Scottish representation of that allegorical understanding. The "lad" is the pilgrim who searches for his better nature, God, and an understanding of his place in the world. The "lad" is a sovereign who has been separated from his land and his people through an appeal to his baser nature. The "lad" is a woman divided between education and life's lessons. The "lad" is the one who represents the many. He is the one who goes out to experience life, but who discovers that all change originates at home, within the self. Further, the "lad's" journey is itself a narrative allegory. The "lad" leaves his home to seek "better things," to search for his own strength and power in the world, and to cut himself off from what is familiar. However, because the "lad" is Scottish, he or she ultimately learns that the search for power (or truth) is more complex than following a single road and, after all, it is a grounding in the Scottish past and in Scottish customs and

---

[56] Although many medieval visions of pilgrimage included an establishment of purpose and character along hierarchical lines, leaders to lead and followers to follow, the concept of an everyman, the pilgrim of life, places both leaders and followers in the journey through life. Christ himself had to suffer and learn the consequences of humanity. Thus, as the individual who comes to represent humanity's struggle, the pilgrim lacks any class definition.

people that allows for growth and strength. As the characters of many Scottish authors discover, the journey is in part a struggle for power that, in the end, becomes a realization and celebration of the power of democracy, of the power of individual choice.

As a representation of parochial Scotland who comes to represent the nation as a whole, the "lad" represents the totality of a nation that itself has been associated with egalitarianism. The "lad" is a small town boy (or girl) who leaves the village and comes to represent something greater than the sum of his "pairts." Thus, Lindsay's Johne the Common-weill (and his Pauper), Shepherd's Garry Forbes (and her Martha), and Stevenson's Mackellar (and the narrator of his "The Merry Men"), are all pilgrims of one sort or another; each of them is a Scottish "lad 'o pairts."[57] Whether they undertake moral and psychological journeys or physical explorations of their world, all are part of the literary pilgrimage to discover the nature of their national myth. Johne *is* egalitarianism. Garry's staunch socialism and visions of universal truth in a war-scarred Scotland mark him as a more modern representation of the myth of Scottish egalitarianism. Finally, Mackellar's strenuous attempts to organize the Durie family within concepts of rightful sovereignty display an empowerment usually unheard of in the serving class. Thus, all of the works discussed above place their narrators and/or protagonists within a continuum of equality. Medieval and early modern Scottish court poets and playwrights were somewhat empowered to confront their betters with political and moral criticism. Their characters moved through a world that encompassed all the spheres of humanity and nature. Likewise more recent authors place their characters within a sphere that enables them to become representative of the Scottish nation as a whole.

When Stevenson became himself a "lad o' pairts" and undertook a voyage to California, he chose to represent that voyage through a negotiation of the egalitarian myth and the allegorical union of general and particular. The resulting work, *The Amateur Emigrant*, perhaps exhibits better than any other the delicate balance necessary to envisage Scotland as a whole. Stevenson's text focuses not upon sweepingly general considerations of morality and existence but the small, everyday occurrences and individual people that best exemplify wider processes. Traveling with "a shipful of failures, the broken men of England," Stevenson loses all that

---

[57] Certainly King James I and Ferrier's Mary, and even Henryson's Cresseid and his Sparrow, can be seen in this light.

specifically marks him as Scottish, including his ability to differentiate nationalities (*Amateur* 15). Describing a shipmate, Stevenson writes: "I thought him a Scotsman who had been long to sea; and yet he was from Wales" (11). But Stevenson's distancing from the physical attributes of his nation brings him closer to its mythical inheritance.

Stevenson's voyage places him in the true position of everyman and in total appreciation of egalitarianism. When considering the class-divisions greatly emphasized by the geography of the ship's quarters, Stevenson states, "I have little of the radical in social questions, and have always nourished an idea that one person was as good as another" (29). As one among many, Stevenson finally grasps his relationship to home and realizes the egalitarian myth and its correlates. In his words: "Emigration has to be done before we climb the vessel; an aim in life is the only fortune worth finding; and it is not to be found in foreign lands, but in the heart itself" (*Amateur* 34). By choosing to be an immigrant, Stevenson learns the true importance of being representative of the Scottish nation, that all are representative. Through the physical journey to America and the psychological journey towards an "aim" Stevenson becomes the ultimate "lad 'o pairts." That Stevenson's realization is made through a national and geographical affiliation only serves to underline the fullness of the cycle he has completed:

> I am usually very calm over the displays of nature; but you will scarce believe how my heart leapt at this [. . .] I had come home again – home from unsightly deserts to the green and habitable corners of the earth. Every spire of pine along the hill-top, every trouty pool along that mountain river, was more dear to me than a blood relation. (*Amateur* 137)

It does not matter if these pines and pools physically belong to California, psychologically they represent Stevenson's home, the "lad" finally returns from exile.[58]

As displayed by *The Amateur Emigrant*, it is not any static definition of the nation, but the attempt to bridge gaps and symbolize the importance of union between microcosm and macrocosm that drives the Scottish literary identity. Scottish literary identity may follow larger historical and political trends, and it is more than relevant to consider them for a full understanding of the placement of texts within the Scottish

---

[58] Many of Stevenson's biographers have noted his tendency to link every place he visits to Scotland both geographically and psychologically. See, for example, Bell's *Robert Louis Stevenson: Dreams of Exile, a biography* (117).

canon; however, any attempt to bind the Scottish literary consciousness to a static national vision is impossible. Instead, the Scottish literary identity centers on the ability to negotiate the nation from a "bottom-up" perspective. Over time, an elevation of locale combined with the physical loss of sovereignty has created and reinforced a sense of egalitarianism that is indeed particular to the Scottish nation. Moreover, the already existent tradition of allegory within Scottish literature was a form that suited the dissemination of such a myth very well indeed.

Conclusions Concerning the Intersection of the Scottish National Identity and Literature

Allegory, then, is that which binds together Scottish literature and yokes it to the trends of the Scottish national identity. As argued above, the national identity of the Scottish people quickly became divorced from political concerns. However, it never lacked a coherent form of expression. The Scottish "bottom-up" perspective, Scottish identity's focus on religion and history, and the consideration of locale, sovereignty, egalitarianism in Scotland's literary explorations of the self all combine with an allegorical understanding of the world and form a unique perspective on identity. Moreover, the choice of allegory as the unifying form for literary expression allows Scottish authors the ability to interact fully with their readers. Scottish allegorists wrote with a view to causing a transformation within their readers. They utilize and transmit the motifs and ideals of the Scottish nation in order to cause a recognition of self within their readers that will ultimately lead to a pursuit of the right way of living.

Chapter Four
A Scottish Literary Ethic: Mixing a Moral Mordant

An Introduction to the Issue of Ethics in Scottish Literature

Much of the previous chapter depends upon the idea of Scottish literature as envisaging the general through the particular. I have said very little, however, about the aim of such cognitive negotiations. What is the ultimate purpose behind the creation of a literature that defines the self? How do such authors attempt to affect their readers? Surely, in one sense, the expected audience is already aware of their position within a nation. Scottish literature may give the Scots a way of seeing themselves, but what else does it do? Once readers understand their role, where does the literature lead them? The answer to such questions lies in a consideration of the inherent morality of allegorical literature and the way in which Scottish authors utilize their works to encourage their readers to make specifically ethical choices. As has been argued throughout this study, allegory depends in part upon its ability to elicit complicity within its reader. It requires active participation and the reader's recognition of his or her own place within the allegorical action. Allegory's ability to remind the reader of the proper ways of living and its goal of influencing readers to strive to accomplish those ideals underlines its utility within the Scottish context.

Although allegory is often associated with morality, it is necessary to focus on the particulars of text when considering connections between the Scottish use of allegory and the Scots' predilection for literature that offers ethical guidance. In *The Ethics of Reading*, J. Hillis Miller describes particularity as essential for any study of the ethical nature of literary texts: "Ethics and reading *must* be discussed in terms of specific cases, although the choice of any one literary case itself causes problems" (2). For Miller, a discussion of generalities can never speak to the issue of literary ethics. Yet he cautions would-be critics to consider their exemplum carefully and allow for the lack of innocence inherent in their literary choices. The same must be said for the concepts of morality and ethics themselves. They are inherently both general and specific, and a clear understanding of their meaning must be achieved before such concepts can become critically useful.

When discussing morality and ethics from a western and/or Christian point of view, it is often difficult to separate moral philosophy/philosophical ethics from moral theology/Christian ethics. Philosophy as a whole is the contemplation and study of

existence in general. "Philosophy is a study which supplies the answers to the last *Why's* [. . .] to all being and becoming" ("Philosophy" 2). Such an overreaching definition, however, necessitates further division for clarification. Thus, *The Catholic Encyclopedia* separates philosophy into practical philosophy, which encompasses ethics, economics and politics, and speculative philosophy, which is divided into metaphysics, mathematics, and physics ("Philosophy" 4, "Ethics" 1). The former leads to an acquaintance with morality; the later leads to an understanding of logic. If philosophy is the study of the universal order, then,

> Man is one part of it: hence the relations of man with the world of sense and with its Author belong to the domain of philosophy. Now man, on the one hand, is the responsible author of these relations because he is free, but he is obliged by nature itself to reach an aim, which is his moral end. On the other hand, he has the power of reflecting upon the knowledge which he acquires of all things, and this leads him to study the logical structure of science. Thus, philosophical knowledge leads to philosophical acquaintance with morality and logic. ("Philosophy" 2)

Theology, on the other hand, and Christianity in particular, deals with "the science of God and Divine things" ("Moral Theology" 1). Theology can also be defined through more specific categorization into moral and dogmatic theology. Moral theology is concerned with "those doctrines which discuss the relations of man and his free actions to God and his supernatural end, and propose the means instituted by God for the attainment of that end" ("Moral Theology" 1). Dogmatic theology, in contrast, has as its subject matter, "those doctrines which serve to enrich the knowledge necessary or convenient for man, whose destination is supernatural" ("Moral Theology" 1). In other words, dogmatic theology "has as its end the scientific discussion and establishment of the doctrines of faith" ("Moral Theology" 1). Thus, philosophy and theology are both separated into a consideration of human actions and their proper end on the one hand, and a scientific study of reality on the other.

Such an overlap in categorization in part explains the difficulty of separating Christianity from discussions of moral actions. For example, "like ethics, moral theology also deals with the moral actions of man, but unlike ethics it has its origin in supernaturally revealed truth. It presupposes man's elevation to the supernatural

order, and, though it avails itself of the scientific conclusions of ethics, it draws its knowledge for the most part from Christian Revelation" ("Ethics" 1). In most of the Scottish texts I will discuss in this chapter, the issue of morality and theology will be similarly linked and thus a separation between philosophical and theological ethics becomes moot. For many Scottish authors the separation of morality and Christianity would be inconceivable. As is written in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, "to distinguish between moral theology and ethics [moral philosophy] is sooner or later to admit a science of ethics without God and religion [. . .] This contains an essential contradiction [. . .] without God, an absolute duty is inconceivable, because there is nobody to impose obligation" ("Moral Theology" 6). Even those Scottish authors who are struggling with their faith, or are using their texts to discuss such struggles, link their moral standards to Christian Revelation. Thus, when discussing specific Scottish texts within this chapter, Christian morality and ethics will be my focus, yet these considerations will be tempered with the constant reminder that, as quoted above, moral philosophy and moral theology *both* consider the actions of humanity.

As with the distinctions between moral philosophy and moral theology, a differentiation between morality and ethics is necessary for clarification in any discussion of the two. Everyone has a general understanding of what "morality" and "ethics" mean. They have something to do with the internal drive to choose between different courses of action, and the need to label such actions as "right" or "wrong," but confusion often lies beyond the general. Morality and ethics are frequently viewed as interchangeable. Their division, however, shares similarities with the separations inherent in the fourfold definition of allegory. As with the dual functions of the tropological aspect of allegory, morality and ethics are separated by application. In both philosophy and theology, morality is concerned with the theoretical aspect of choice making, while ethics deals with the practical and contingent. Moreover as discussed briefly above, within the Western culture, morality and ethics are deeply concerned with the questions of divine nature and choice that accompany Christian assumptions. In *The Theory of Morality*, Allan Donagan considers the possible link between morality and rational thought:

> The Stoics, rather than Aristotle or Plato, are to be credited with forming the first reasonably clear conception of morality: not because they had a theory of divine law, but because they conceived the divine law as valid for all men in virtue of their common rationality. (4)

Thus, we are led to understand not only that the concept of morality is ancient, but also that it is applicable to human nature; it is connected to what we *are*. Morality is generally thought to be based upon the human drive to "do what is right" and avoid what is "wrong," as Donagan suggests when he writes: "The fundamental principle of morality is a proposition to the effect that reason, if it functioned without error, would prescribe that actions of a certain kind [. . .] are unconditionally not to be done" (210). Morality follows a particular kind of instinct, a rational instinct. Morality, then, is humanity's ability to differentiate within theoretical situations, to intuitively "know" the difference between right and wrong. For Christian authors, this aspect of human nature, the rational and moral aspect of human nature, is that which takes us closest to God and His plan for our actions.

Ethics is the specific beliefs that underpin morality; it is morality's practical application. In the *Epistle to Can Grande*, Dante Alighieri defines the branch of philosophy that shapes his *Divine Comedy* as:

> That of morals or ethics; inasmuch as the whole as well as the part was conceived, not for speculation, but with a practical object. For if in certain parts or passages the treatment is after the manner of speculative philosophy, that is not for the sake of speculation, but for a practical purpose; since as the Philosopher says in the second book of the *Metaphysics*: 'practical men occasionally speculate on things in their particular and temporal relations.' (462)

For Dante, as for most medieval literary theorists, ethics is essential to the proper channeling of moral philosophy/theology. Poetry's highest purpose, then, was to directly affect its readers through a contemplation of moral choice. Medieval grammarians, for example, often discussed the field of philosophical science that their commentaries (or *accessus*) pertained to: "The statement that 'almost all' the grammatical authors 'directed themselves towards ethics' is found in many *accessus* [. . .] text after text is declared to 'pertain to ethics'" (Minnis 13). Ethics was considered to be the field of moral science. For the grammarians, ethics was the science of appropriate logic and style, a model for readers as to the correct manner of writing. Boethius's description of Philosophy's appearance situates ethics within a structured context that would dictate the medieval understanding of the purpose of literature:

> Her clothes were made of imperishable material, of the finest thread woven with the most delicate skill. (Later she told me that she had made them with her own hands). Their splendour, however, was obscured by a kind of

film as of long neglect, like statues covered in dust. On the bottom hem could be read the embroidered Greek letter Pi, and on the top hem the Greek letter Theta. Between the two a ladder of steps rose from the lower to the higher. (*Consolation* I.i)

The Greek letters Pi and Theta represent practical and speculative (or contemplative) philosophy, respectively. The former includes moral philosophy and ethics, the latter theology, metaphysics, and natural science or physics. Thus, Philosophy's garb displays her two-fold character. Yet "the speculative and practical intellects cannot be rigidly separated" (Minnis 310, Footnote 86(4)). Just as they are joined in Philosophy's cloak by an ascending ladder, they are linked in literature by understanding and effect. As Giles of Rome points out in his *On the Instruction of Princes*, "We undertake moral study not for the sake of abstract contemplation, nor to gain knowledge, but in order that we may become good" (249). Thus, Philosophy's concern in *The Consolation* is Boethius's understanding and application of the good, and Boethius's purpose in writing down his revelation is to share that knowledge and encourage similar action in his readers.

Another question inherent in the consideration of ethics is its place in the relationship between individual and society. Giles of Rome views the connection between moral study and society through a consideration of his audience,

Although the title of the book is [dedicated to princes], all the populace is to be instructed by it. For although not everyone can be a king or prince, everyone ought to do his best to see that he becomes the sort of person who would be worth to be a prince or king. This cannot be achieved unless the tenets which are to be related in this work are known and observed [. . .] But only a few are endowed with acute understanding; hence the remark in the third book of the *Rhetoric* that the larger the population the farther they are from understanding. So the audience for these moral matters is simple and unsophisticated [thus . . .] one must proceed in the sphere of morals in a figurative and broad way. (249-250)

For Giles, the educated reader is rare, thus moral fiction must consider its terms broadly in order to reach the greatest amount of people. His argument also hints at the utility of allegorical writing in reaching a variety of readers and its ability to negotiate the general and the specific. Gardiner argues more directly for the need to balance society's needs with the individual's role: "There can be no truly moral art that isn't social, at least by implication [. . .] and on the other hand, there can be no moral social art [. . .] without honesty in the individual – the artist – as a premise for just and reasonable discussion" (82). Morality is enacted by ethics through the

connection between the individual and his or her society. Moral fiction is innately social; it concerns itself with affecting the ethical enactments of society. However, social morality (in literature or otherwise) cannot exist without the moral vision of the individual, without individual rationality. Like the concept of "bottom-up" national understanding, the many envisaged through the individual, morality is enacted through ethics. The broader theoretical understanding that humanity must have of the world is filtered and enacted through individual ethical decisions.

As it concerns allegory, then, the inclusion of the reader in certain literary processes, the intent of allegorical authors to reveal their readers' complicity in (improper) decision-making, focuses on the movement between morals and ethics. Allegorical authors intend their readers to confront the particulars of their own actions within their general knowledge of what is "right." Such authors, in fact, are taking moral duty upon themselves. They choose to hold up their work as a reflection of life, as a way in which – and through which – readers might enact the moral process of humanity's rational and social interaction. In more recent literary criticism, the act of considering texts through their effects upon the reader has been referred to as "reader-response criticism." Such criticism places the relationship between author and reader at the forefront. Thus, in reader-response criticism, the text as an object is less relevant than what the text *does* to its readers, or what it makes them do. Reading is an event that happens to readers through their own participation in the act of reading itself. Stanley Fish has written extensively about the aims and effects of seventeenth century literature from such a perspective. For him, certain texts from that period were written to illicit particular responses from their readers. That some of the texts that he chooses as examples for his study are allegories, such as *The Pilgrim's Progress*, is unsurprising. Moreover, several of Fish's main arguments present a vision of literature that involves complicity. The abstract for *Self Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth Century Literature*, for example, describes Fish's argument as: "It is characteristic of these works [. . .] first to involve the reader in discursive activities – in evaluating, deducing, interpreting – and then to declare invalid or premature the conclusions these activities yield" (vii). Further, Fish describes the author of such texts as "the good-physician" (*Self* 2-4). In this manner

the relationship between reader and author is likened to that of the physician and patient.[59]

However, Fish also chooses to separate the effects of literature into two categories "self-satisfying" (or rhetorical) and "self-consuming" (or dialectical). He describes a work as "self-satisfying"/rhetorical if it:

> satisfies the needs of its readers. The word 'satisfies' is meant literally here; for it is characteristic of a rhetorical form to mirror and present for approval opinions its readers already hold. It follows then that the experience of such a form will be flattering, for it tells the reader what he has always thought about the world and that the *ways* of his thinking are sufficient. (*Self* 1)

On the other hand, a "self-consuming"/dialectical work is

> disturbing, for it requires of its readers a searching and rigorous scrutiny of everything they believe in and live by. It is didactic in a special sense; it does not preach the truth but asks that its readers discover the truth for themselves, and this discovery is often made at the expense not only of a reader's opinion and values, but of his self-esteem. (*Self* 2)

The end of a rhetorical work, then, is affirmation while the end of a dialectical work is conversion. But the difficulty of such a division for the purposes of this study is that, as I have argued previously, allegories, and specifically Scottish allegories, seem to work as *both* "self-satisfying" *and* "self-consuming" in that they reveal truths that all humankind, or all Scots, *should* know; it is simply that these truths have been forgotten and that human nature inexorably leads to such forgetfulness. Scottish allegories do not use the revelation of complicity to *convert* their readers, but rather to lead those readers back to a thread of understanding that they may have lost sight of. Thus, such works create a literary space in which readers can actively re-evaluate and re-affirm their identity and be led to further conform to the ideals of goodness and Scottishness.

Although Fish's definitions of "self-satisfying" and "self-consuming" works seems divisive, in a later work he proposes a critical reading that yolks the two. In *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in* Paradise Lost, Fish locates the text as one that confronts readers with their own inabilities but that uses the well known Christian concept of the fall to do so. Milton's readers would have had the knowledge that their

---

[59] Fish also describes the metaphor of the good-physician as "one of the most powerful in western literature and philosophy. In the Christian tradition it belongs preeminently to God. Thus, the relationship between God, Nature, the artist and the common man is upheld within the metaphor as well" (*Self* 2).

understanding was flawed and why it was so, but they may not have truly understood the full effect of such a truth. Due to humanity's fallen status we are forced to search for truth if we wish to find it, and to use flawed tools in that search. Although humankind is endowed with reason, truth is by nature difficult to discern: "If recognizing the truth meant simply attending to evidence that was self-declaring, the choosing intellect would have nothing to do except assent to the undeniable" (Fish *Sin* xxvii). Humankind must struggle to discover truth because of our inadequate and fallen nature, and Fish locates this difficulty as the central focus of *Paradise Lost*.

By reading the poem, Fish argues, Milton's audience was lead through a process of correction that could ultimately lead to a revelation of truth. As in my analysis in chapter one of complicity within allegory in general, Fish focuses his discussion on internal revelations created by confrontations with the text. However, Fish's analysis is more finely tuned to the intrinsic questions of morality and ethics that permeate a Christian consciousness of the fall. Specifically, the reader "(1) is confronted with evidence of his corruption and becomes aware of his inability to respond adequately to spiritual conceptions, and (2) is asked to refine his perceptions so that his understanding will be once more proportionable to truth and the object of it" (*Sin* lxxi). In other words, *Paradise Lost* exposes both readers' misconceptions *and* their inability to properly understand truth and then allows readers to choose to learn how to think as they should. In this manner the poem's subject *is* the reader and Milton's purpose is "to educate the reader to an awareness of his position and responsibilities as a fallen man" (*Sin* 1). Fish also argues that Milton works to accomplish his task by re-creating the drama of the fall in the mind of the reader. Further, as we progress more deeply into the poem our thoughts gradually become more and more refined until, at last, we are able to see the clarity of God's divine order. Thus, "we are led to consider our own experience as a part of the poem's subject" (*Sin* 3). Unfortunately, due to our unavoidable fallen Nature, such a process has two flaws. First, we may choose *not* to work towards our own regeneration and revelation, and second, even if we do achieve clarity we are unable to maintain it and will therefore either make the same mistakes in a different context or quickly forget what we have learned altogether (*Sin* 344-355). It is necessary, then, to maintain constant vigilance; and the process of gaining divine clarity through reading must be a continuous one. Humanity must continuously make the effort to refine our perception in order to choose the proper course of action, and texts such as *Paradise Lost* or

those that utilize allegory offer us a space in which to enact the drama of complicity and revelation.

Like *Paradise Lost*, Scottish literature often helps its readers to make the right choices by creating an intellectual locale that enables revelation. William Dunbar's satirical poem, *The Treitis of the Twa Mariit Wemen and the Wedo* (1503-1508), for example, considers the possibility for ethical action within a flawed temporal realm. Dunbar's narrative encapsulates a serious debate about the nature of marriage and sovereignty. Unlike *The Bruce*'s framing of such questions within wider concepts of Christian thought, however, Dunbar encourages his readers to consider the possibility of free and ethical action through humor.

Like many more serious Scottish medieval texts, Dunbar gives *The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo* a narrator who is connected to a natural setting but separated from the action of the poem:

> The dew donkit the daill, and dynnit the feulis.
> I hard, under ane holyn hevinlie grein hewit,
> Ane hie speiche at my hand with hautand wourdis.
> With that, in haist, to the hege so hard I inthrang
> That I was heildit with hawthorne and with heynd leveis. (10-14)

This poem's narrator, however, is not a sleeper who receives divine knowledge through the mediation of dreams and nature. Instead, he hunkers down in the hedges and eavesdrops on three women as they discuss marriage in general and their husbands in specific. Despite the women's courtly appearance and seemingly philosophical topics, their language and descriptions of marriage are the lowest sort: "I have ane wallidrag, ane worme, ane auld wobat carle, / A waistit wolroun na worth bot wourdis to clatter, / [. . .] Quhen kissis me that carybald, than kyndillis all my sorow" (89-94). Through the women's crude speaking style, and the mediation of a peeping tom, Dunbar initiates his readers into the complexity of medieval sovereignty.

Led by the venerable, and liberated, Wedo, the three women debate the possibility of manipulating the medieval rules of marriage to strategically wrest power from their husbands. Throughout the narrative, the women draw upon traditional medieval allegorical themes: the possibility of free will within a predestined reality, the conflation of man and beast, the discrepancy between seeming and being. However, their words trap them even more firmly within layers of stereotype. As in Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale* and *Miller's Tale*, Dunbar's women are themselves

representations of a particular type of womanhood. They are the sexually predatory and self-serving creatures that such tales serve to warn men about. Thus, as Jack and Rozendaal argue, "the poem satirizes husbands through statement and wives through enactment" (136). Within the poem, readers have no concrete moral ground to base their opinion upon. The marriage system as a whole is revealed as corrupt.

When considered in conjunction with those philosophical dilemmas that complicate human existence, Dunbar's work forces his audience to grapple with flawed existence. Dunbar ends his poem with a sinister query:

> Ye auditoris most honorable, that eris has gevin
> Onto this uncouth aventur, quhilk airly me happinnit –
> Of thir thre wanton wiffis, that I haif writtin heir,
> Quhilk wald ye waill to your wif, gif ye suld wed one? (527-530)

Through this question, Dunbar alters his readers' position. So long as we are eavesdropping on the debate between the Mariit Wemen and the Wedo, we do not need to apply the questions they raise to our own lives. Now, however, we are drawn into the discussion; Dunbar reveals our own complicity.

If readers attempt to understand Dunbar's women as personified characters, then the "Wedo" must be read as acting as all widows do, likewise the Mariit Wemen. The Wedo and her circle show us the reality of women who, like Lust, are what they are. As personifications, only their actions, their movements within the garden in relationship to each other and in relationship to their husbands, are allegorical. The women and their husbands show us the reality of sexual relationships. However, Dunbar's inclusion of the reader within his text precludes such a basic reading. Instead, by asking his readers to place themselves within his poem's boundaries Dunbar creates a symbol allegory. These women are both themselves *and* the idea of infidelity and avarice. They, like the readers, have the ability to act as themselves and to enact specific human failings. The women have made incorrect choices, but by directly addressing his audience Dunbar causes us to consider the possibility of making the right ones.

The poem asks its readers to place themselves within its boundaries and then attempt an ethical choice; it enforces recognition of complicity. In Fish's words, it insists that we "become our own critics" (*Sin* 9). If we were women with such husbands, what would we do? Are we such women? If we were men with such wives, how would we react? Are we such men? The satirical nature of both male and

female stereotypes within the poem only complicates the issue. Are any of the observations or opinions within the poem reliable, or are all simply a recitation of oversimplified visions of humanity? How can we break free of such oversimplifications and reach our potential as divine beings? How can anyone in the sublunar realm make the proper decision? By contextualizing one of humanity's more difficult dilemmas within a humorous narrative, Dunbar asks his readers to consider the way that they view human relationships within the real world. Where do the flaws lie, in the system or in the innately corrupt nature of humanity? Dunbar's narrative asks us to position ourselves outside of literary stereotype. It calls attention to the inadequacy of such visions for the consideration of divine themes, and then asks us to measure ourselves against similar criteria. In the end, Dunbar's poem may not specifically dictate action, but it asks us to act. It asks us to scrutinize our own lives and relationships and modify them accordingly.

In the preface to *Surprised by Sin*, Fish describes *Paradise Lost* as, "a poem about how its readers came to be the way they are; its method [. . .] is to provoke in its readers wayward, fallen responses which are then corrected [. . .] In this way [. . .] the reader is brought to a better understanding of his sinful nature and is encouraged to participate in his own reformation" (x). Such a description also applies to both allegory in general and the use of allegory within Scottish texts. Due to its active relationship with the reader, allegory is ultimately suitable for enacting ethical goals. Moreover, it is this connection between literature and action that I posit as that which tonally affects the Scottish literary psyche. The goal of ethical action affects the threads of Scottish literature as a mordent. Through their use of allegory Scottish authors are able to tailor shades of meaning to their audience's tastes and needs. Scottish literature is deeply concerned with questions of literary cause and effect. Fish writes of *Paradise Lost*, "the personal drama of Adam's regeneration, the national drama of God's chosen people, and the final drama of the unfolding gospel, merge for the reader in a poetic institution of oneness which is beyond poetry and outside time" (*Sin* 287). Such a sentiment also applies to Scottish allegorical texts in that they illustrate themes that are particularly relevant to the Scottish people but which also encompass universal applications. To borrow Fish's phrase, the demands that Scottish authors make on their readers flow from a sense of responsibility to them (*Sin* 50). Scottish authors feel a responsibility to their readers as ethical guides, and ethical questions tailored to Scottish concerns are central to their work.

The remainder of this chapter falls into three sections, each of which considers the links and disparities between two authors, one Scottish and one otherwise (although still bounded by the Western tradition), both broadly from the same historical period. Although I have rejected the method of literary comparison outside Scottish literature throughout most of my arguments, when considering Scottish literature to be more concerned with moral and ethical issues it is essential that some comparison be made. By basing my argument on comparisons I hope to show that Scottish authors are more concerned with ethics as a purpose for their writing than their non-Scottish contemporaries. For example, in the following comparison of Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* and Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, both Henryson and Chaucer are described as emphasizing a particular inconsistency within human life. Only Henryson, however, asks his reader to act in a particular manner in order to counteract the difficulties of life in the sublunary realm. Moreover, I wish to show *how* each Scottish work performs a moral function upon its readers and consider the degree to which each work accomplishes its purpose.

Robert Henryson and Geoffrey Chaucer: Makar versus Maker

Within his "Prologue" to the *Morall Fabillis* Robert Henryson discusses not only the importance of allegory for understanding humanity's place in the world, he also signals the necessity of moral education and announces his intention to utilize fables for ethical instruction:

> Thocht feinyeit fabils of ald poetré
> Be not al grunded upon truth, yit than,
> Thair polite termes of sweit rhetoré
> Richt plesand ar unto the eir of man;
> And als the caus quhy that thay first began
> Wes to repreif the of thi misleving
> O man, be figure of ane uther thing. (1-7)

By telling imaginative tales (in this case tales about beasts) Henryson will lead his reader to understand the dangers of "misleving" and sway his or her life choices. Like Lindsay's use of complicity in the *Thrie Estaitis*, Henryson will seek to remind his readers that poor choices are often and easily made. The mental work needed to realign oneself with the truth only emphasizes the utility of the message hidden within his narrative. Having to strive for learning makes comprehension that much sweeter when one reaches it. "The nuttis schell, thocht it be hard and teuch, / Haldis the

kirnell, sueit and delectabill" (15-16). Further, the enjoyment and pleasure that fictitious tales bring aids in the learning process, all allowing for a brief respite from study: "For as we se, ane bow that is ay bent / Worthis unsmart and dullis on the string" (22-23). Like a bow kept always too taut, the mind may grow slack from over use. Mingling the pleasant with the difficult, then, allows one to profit from both conditions. As Aesop himself said, "*Dulcius arrident seria picta iocis*" (*Fabillis* 38). Serious issues please us more when they are adorned with pleasant things. Balance is the key to right living.

Henryson's "Prologue" also prepares his reader for the type of material his *Morall Fabillis* will address. It describes in detail, and through the use of allegorical metaphor, the importance of fables (and allegorical beast fables in particular) for moral education:

> My author in his fabillis tellis how
> That brutal beistis spak and understude,
> And to gude purpois dispute and argow,
> Ane sillogisme propone, and eik conclude;
> Put in exempill and similitude
> How mony men in operatioun
> Ar like to beistis in conditioun. (43-49)

Beasts are the perfect tools for allegorizing human actions because humans who stray from the proper ethical path often act like beasts. When humanity is easily led, we become as sheep; when we are greedy, we are like pigs. By utilizing fables in which animals speak as if they are human, Henryson makes a direct comparison between animals that act like people and people who act like animals.

Henryson's choice to allegorize Aesopic and Reynardian fables allows him the freedom to utilize eclectic methods for the moral advancement of his audience.[60] In shaping his moral lessons as fables, Henryson can make use of a variety of styles and structures. Even the order that his fables follow serves as example. In his introduction to the *Morall Fabillis*, George Gopen observes several structures that serve as a guide for Henryson's audience. The pattern of fables that Gopen labels "Climactic Symmetry" hinges upon the central positioning of "The Lion and the Mouse." This fable is the poem's numerical midpoint, both as seven of thirteen and

---

[60]See also MacQueen's arguments on the moral advancement of the audience.

because it is preceded and followed by exactly 200 stanzas. [61] Thus, Gopen sees "The
Lion and the Mouse" as a turning point for the fables as a whole. He identifies it as
the fable in which ethical existence could not possibly get any better and after which
follows "a progression of increasing frustration that finally reposes in despair" (23).
As Gopen describes, only this fable has its own separate prologue, is presented as a
dream vision, and contains characters that gain ultimate triumph by listening to and
following wholesome advice. It stands as a shining example which, followed by the
harsh reality of the "Preiching of the Swallow," is never realized in waking life.
Thus, in writing his fables, Henryson used their very order to alert his readers to their
task *as* readers and also their position as humans. Moreover, as is unsurprising within
a medieval literary context, Henryson's work follows more than one symbolic
numerical pattern.

The most complex structure that Gopen identifies he labels "Concentric
Symmetry" because of its similarity to ripples receding from the center point of a
stone dropped in water. This structure primarily deals with the symbolic significances
of the fables:

> 1) The Cock and the Jasp: Introduction – misuse of choice, no
>   consequences
> 2) The Two Mice and 3) The Cock and the Fox: Non predators escape
>   harm – divine justice/intervention
> 4) The confession of the Fox and 5) The Trial of the Fox: The Fox is killed
>   – divine justice/intervention
> 6) The Sheep and the Dog: God forsakes man – misuse of reason
> 7) The Lion and the Mouse: Vision of Utopia – proper use of reason
> 8) The Preaching of the Swallow: Man forsakes God – misuse of reason
> 9) The Fox, the Wolf, and the Cadger and 10) The Fox, the Wolf, and the
> Husbandman: Fox succeeds – human tyranny/ lack of divine intervention
> 11) The Wolf and the Wether and 12) The Wolf and the Lamb: Non
>   predators suffer harm – human tyranny/ lack of divine intervention
> 13) The Paddock and the Mouse: Conclusion – misuse of choice, fatal
>   consequences

"Concentric Symmetry" fully supports "Climactic Symmetry" by mapping the flow of
moral consequences from the utopian center point of "The Lion and the Mouse"
outwards. In employing structures that resonate with humanity's (often incorrect)
choices, Henryson imitates the divine plan and reinforces his status as a Makar. He
writes, as Henry of Ghent recommends, so that "the situation of [. . .] knowledge

---

[61] The order differs radically only in the Bannatyne Manuscript which John MacQueen
uses as the basis of his arguments concerning Henryson.

corresponds to the various positions which men occupy – as far as concerns their intellect and affections" (253). The hidden structures in the *Morall Fabillis* are linked to their theological unity and ethical purpose and readers who read carefully enough are able to compare the progression of Henryson's fables to their own actions. The fables ask readers to place themselves upon a sliding scale of success and failure and then act accordingly.

Henryson's choice to encapsulate his ethical messages within a structured system of fables and *moralitates* also highlights his position as educator. Although little is known about Henryson's life it is widely held that he was, at some time, a teacher.[62] Many theorists have been lead to this conclusion simply by Henryson's choice to work with the fable form. Henryson's use of rhetorical methods throughout his work was also a common practice within the medieval educational system. As is evidenced by Hugh's *Didascalicon*, the classical study of rhetoric was meant to lead young minds to a deeper understanding of the importance of study, and to enable them to properly argue important (and often ethical) assumptions. Through the use of eclectic styles, rhetorical modes, and allegorically activated complicity, Henryson crafted his *Fabillis* as ethical exempla to aid those living in the difficult sublunary world.

Although several of Henryson's works utilize *moralitates* to remind his readers of their own precarious position in life, Henryson does not always rely upon *moralitates* in order to define the ethical purpose behind his works. *The Testament of Cresseid* focuses upon ethical concerns, but it does not have a lengthy or interpretive *moralitas*. Instead, as the imaginative ending for a pre-existing text *The Testament* can be read as itself forming a sort of *moralitas*. As the conclusion to Criseyde's story as related by Chaucer, *The Testament* makes a powerful statement about how life is best lived.

Despite Henryson and Chaucer's temporal and physical separations, a comparison of their works is valuable due to the premise of continuation that Henryson's *Testament* depends upon. That Henryson was generally influenced by the

---

[62] The lack of concrete data concerning Henryson's life has led several critics to speculate about his literary intentions. In *Robert Henryson*, Douglas Gray employs the social background of Henryson's era to explore the use of natural, economic, and political imagery throughout the *Fables* (6, 7, 27). Robert Kindrick and John MacQueen also consider Henryson's life and works in such a manner (Kindrick 26, MacQueen 170).

work of his predecessor has been argued repeatedly. Henryson is often labeled a "Scots Chaucerian."[63] However, due to the differences between Henryson's and Chaucer's interpretations of the classical love story, a comparison of both specific works and general tendencies is essential. Moreover, as a medieval author, it is unsurprising that Henryson chose to embellish a preexisting narrative. Yet, Henryson's choice to create a text that supremely alters its predecessor in order to morally elucidate its readers and provide them with a concrete conclusion is fundamental to the nature of Scottish authorship. Neither Henryson nor Chaucer was a stranger to questions of authorial duty, moral contemplation, and practical ethics. Moreover, the particular story that they chose to tell, in *The Testament of Cresseid* and *Troilus and Criseyde*, was a common one. Both the events of the Trojan War and Troilus and Cresseid's tragic love story were familiar tropes within the medieval consciousness.[64] Henryson's presentation of the story, however, could not be more disparate from Chaucer's version. In writing *The Testament*, Henryson wishes to actively influence his reader's ethical decisions and utilizes allegory to do so. Chaucer's *Troilus* is more generally concerned with morality, with the contemplative and theoretical questions concerning authorship and love, and it is not specifically allegorical.

Both Henryson and Chaucer begin their narratives with a brief introduction in which the narrator of the tale outlines his purpose. As with "The Preiching of the Swallow," *The Testament* begins with a description of a wintry landscape:

> Richt sa it wes quhen I began to wryte
> This tragedie; the weddre richt fervent,
> Quhen Aries, in middis of the Lent,
> Schouris of haill gart fra the north discend,
> That scantlie fra the cauld I micht defend. (4-8)

Although the season is spring, winter weather is far from loosing its hold upon the Scottish countryside. As I observed in a previous chapter, Henryson's opening introduces themes of heat and cold, springtime and winter, youth and old age that will

---

[63] When Chaucer and Henryson are the topic of one discussion there is often a tone of hierarchy included in the argument. Henryson's work, particularly the *Testament of Cresseid*, is seen as heavily influenced by Chaucer's own corpus. Undeniably, Henryson was very much inspired by Chaucer's work; however, it is as unfair to place him wholly within the category of "Chaucerian poet" as such labeling would downplay the influence of Boccaccio, Dante, or Boethius on Henryson's work.

[64] Troilus and Criseyde are, in fact, a creation of the medieval mind stemming from much older descriptions of the Trojan War (Benson 1).

echo throughout the narrative and directly affect the manner in which he influences his readers. Henryson builds upon these themes when his narrator refers to himself as both cold and aged, and describes the desire to write about love as an attempt to regain youthful heat:

> Thocht lufe be hait, yit in ane man of age
> It kendillis nocht sa sone as in youtheid,
> Of quhome the blude is flowing in ane rage;
> And in the auld the curage doif and deid
> Of quhilk the fyre outward is best remeid:
> To help be phisike quhair that nature faillit
> I am expert, for baith I have assaillit. (29-35)

Unable to himself partake in passion, Henryson's narrator takes up a tale that focuses on love. His identification with the text, however, centers not upon Troilus, the romantic hero, but Cresseid:

> O fair Creisseid, the flour and *A per se*
> Of Troy and Grece, how was thow fortunait [. . .]
> I have pietie thow suld fall sic mischance! (78-79, 84)

In this manner, an old man, wishing to regain the spring of his youth, aligns himself with a woman who once embodied the spring but now feels the bitter cold of an exile from beauty and corporeal love. For the narrator, Cresseid represents the possibility of redemption in life:

> I sall excuse als far furth as I may,
> Thy womanheid, thy wisdome and fairness,
> The quhilk fortoun hes put to sic distres
> As hir pleisit, and nathing throw the gilt
> Of the – throw wickit langage to be spilt! (87-91)

Her sad tale echoes his own, fortune takes youth and vigor from all who live in the sublunary world. Through Cresseid's tale, the narrator wishes to find release from his own fate. On the physical level, however, this is wholly impossible, a fact that the narrator never fully grasps. Henryson's *Testament*, is a symbol allegory in which one of the layers of meaning is the act of reading allegory itself. Henryson's narrator symbolizes the literal meaning of the text. He represents humanity's inability to interpret the world properly without aid. The narrator cannot acknowledge his own complicity; he does not see what Cresseid's story could reveal to him. His inability to grasp more complex meaning, as with Cresseid's, is meant to guide the reader to a deeper understanding. When Fish writes, "a Christian failure need not be dramatic; if the reader loses himself in the workings of the speech even for a moment, he places

himself in a compromising position [. . .] the failure (if we can call it that) involves the momentary relaxation of a vigilance that must be eternal" (*Sin* 12), he is describing the reader's possible reaction to the devil's rhetoric in *Paradise Lost*. However, such a description would suit equally well for Henryson's Christian narrator. As a Christian, the narrator should be able to discern the truth behind Cressid's tale. However, he instead chooses to focus upon Cresseid's speech and beliefs *before* her redemption. Thus revealing his own reading as a failed action. Again, as noted previously, Cresseid suffers not because of her sin, but because she fails to understand humanity's place in the sublunary world. Her redemption, similarly, is enacted through an acceptance of the nature of humanity to come to grief in life. Henryson's narrator is unable to grasp these meanings and learn as Cresseid does, but his incomprehension is itself meant to benefit the reader. We are meant to see ourselves in him and thus understand our own failings.

The narrator of Chaucer's *Troilus* shares many characteristics with his successor in *The Testament*. He describes himself as too old to be directly involved with love and passion; instead he will counsel those that may still serve Cupid:

> For I, that God of Loves servantz serve,
> Ne dar to Love, for myn unliklyness,
> Preyen for speed, al sholde I therfore sterve,
> So fer am I from his help in derknesse. (*Troilus* I.15-18)

Also like Henryson's narrator, he is concerned with his position as author and focuses upon the concept of fortune as linked to love:

> [. . .] and thus Fortune on lofte
> And under eft gan hem to whielen bothe
> After hir course. (*Troilus* I.138-140)

Moreover, like Henryson's text, *Troilus* endorses an understanding of divine love as perfect and freeing; it highlights the inability to understand that earthly love is only a facet of its celestial counterpart, and thus an imperfect substitute. Chaucer's narrator, however, does not guide his readers to a practical understanding of love. Whereas *The Testament* can be used to concretely define and thus aid in accepting the pain of life, *Troilus* focuses more on the fact of painful imperfection.

The division of ethical intention and contemplative morality within Henryson's *Testament* and Chaucer's *Troilus* may be exemplified through the consideration of two critical themes. Firstly, Henryson's text lacks the driving and limiting structure that Chaucer's must follow. In moving beyond the original plot

structure, Henryson is able to bend the tale to advocate his ethical vision. By choosing to reconsider a story with a pre-set plot line, Chaucer's work has a more limited ethical effect. Secondly, Henryson's work contains an element of earthly purpose while Chaucer's text focuses upon redemption after death. Henryson's *Testament* advocates a specific ethical conclusion, even if that conclusion is seemingly difficult or masked. Conversely, Chaucer's *Troilus* is much more focused on the division between humanity and the divine, and thus the inability to reach true conclusions in life.

The distinction between the source structure of Henryson's work and Chaucer's is one of direction and creative independence. The *Testament* follows from the *Troilus* and builds critically upon many of Chaucer's themes. Questions of free will, earthy love, and the responsibility of the author are present within Henryson's text; however, the *Testament* is able to answer such questions in its own manner. Henryson's choice to create a narrative that extends, but does not wholly depend upon, previous works gives him the autonomy to create his own ethical interpretation of the original tale. Henryson's Cresseid must maintain some of the characteristics of her predecessors, but she is free to live out her days in her own way. The core of Henryson's narrative concerns the consequences of Cresseid's infidelity and allegorizes her punishment for the benefit of his reader. The *Testament* follows Cresseid from her accusation of the gods and trial before them through divine punishment, redemption and death. In this way, Henryson's Cresseid undergoes visible ethical growth. She is initially revealed as Chaucer left her, opaque and distant, but through Henryson's narrative she is led to a deeper understanding of the human condition.

When we first see Henryson's Cresseid in her father's house she retains her beauty but lacks the wisdom to see her own faults. She views her fate as due to the actions of others, the gods and the men who used and discarded her. When her father questions her about her sudden appearance she replies with a sigh: "'Fra Diomeid had gottin his desire / He wox werie and wald of me no moir'" (101-102). The blame for Cresseid's return to her father's house is placed on Diomeid. He did not want her anymore, so she had no other place to go. The irony of such a statement would not have been lost on Henryson's audience. Familiar with Chaucer's text they would recognize that Cresseid certainly once had a place for herself; before she gave herself

to Diomeid she was independent, secure, and loved. Cresseid's accusation of the gods rests on similar hubristic self-deception:

> "Ye gave me anis ane devine responsaill
> That I suld be the flour of luif in Troy;
> Now am I maid ane unworthie outwaill,
> And all in cair translatit is my joy.
> Quha sall me gyde? Quha sall me now convoy,
> Sen I fra Diomeid and nobill Troylus
> Am clene excludit, as abject odious?
>
> O fals Cupide, is nane to wyte bot thow
> And thy mother, of lufe the blind goddes!" (127-135)

Like Troy, Cresseid has fallen because of her inability to admit weakness or the possibility of her own poor decisions. What Henryson unveils to us at the start of his *Testament* is not only that Cresseid has much farther to plummet before she reaches the end of her descent but also that this second fall is, in fact, a fortunate one.

Angered by her misguided allegations, the gods reply to Cresseid by scrutinizing her actions. Her past is judged by the eternal cosmos; the seven planets and their inherent natures form a backdrop for her human fallibility. Each planet is described in detail as to its appearance and demeanor, symbolizing as a whole the non-human factors that influence every human life. Before the celestial host, Cresseid is herself accused of blasphemy by the very god who she blames for her own misfortune:

> "Lo," quod Cupide, "qua will blaspheme the name
> Of his awin god, outher in word or deid,
> To all goddis he dois baith lak and shame,
> And suld have bitter panis to his meid.
> I say this by yone wretchit Cresseid,
> The quhilk, throw me, was sum tyme flour of lufe,
> Me and my mother starklie can reprufe." (274-280)

Although Cupid is willing to be associated with Cresseid's happiness, he will not take the blame for all that has happened after the flowering of love. Instead he calls Cresseid to account for her own actions, including her choice to turn against the gods:

> "Saying of hir greit infelicitie
> I was the caus, and my mother Venus,
> Ane blind goddes hir cald that micht not se,
> With sclander and defame injurious.
> Thus hir leving unclene and lecherous
> Sho wald returne in me and my mother." (281-287)

Cresseid's punishment of leprosy, then, removes her squandered god-given gifts and emphasizes the effects of her own choices; Cresseid's poor judgment in love becomes manifest in her person. Her beauty is taken from her. That which Cresseid depended on and which, if one considers Chaucer's scenes involving Troilus and Diomede's first sight of her, brought her the possibility of choice in love crumbles before Cresseid's eyes:

> "Thy greit fairnes and all thy bewtie gay,
> Thy wantoun blude, and eik thy goldin hair,
> Heir I exclude fra the for evermair.
>
> "I change thy mirth into melancholy,
> Quhilk is the mother of all pensivenes;
> Thy moisture and thy heit in cald and dry;
> Thyne insolence, thy play and wantones,
> To greit diseis; thy pomp and thy riches
> In mortall neid; and greit penuritie
> Thou suffer sall, and as ane beggar die." (313-322)

By removing all that Cresseid has taken for granted and placing her in the position of an ugly beggar, the gods' curse allows her the opportunity to understand what she had truly lost in choosing to abandon both Troilus and the gods themselves. No longer a beautiful and rich woman, Cresseid is stripped of her pride. Utilizing the gods and their punishment allegorically, Henryson signals the proper path to his reader. Misguided readers, such as his narrator, are unable to benefit from Henryson's wisdom but those who come to understand the text allegorically, as Cresseid is eventually able, will gain ethical direction.

Cresseid's internal transformation and acceptance of humility is not immediate. Her initial reaction to the gods' judgment differs little from her primary accusations of them. She roots their decision in fickle nature:

> "Lo, quhat it is," quod sche,
> "with fraward langage for to mufe and steir
> Our craibit goddis; and sa is sene on me!
> My blaspheming now have I bocht full deir." (351-354)

Moreover, Cresseid's actions are no different from those that led her to her father's house; only their location has been altered. Instead of hiding in a temple, she will hide in a hospital. It is only in her "Complaint" that a change emerges. All of the losses she lists are material and vain: her bedroom, her garden, her voice, etc. Yet when Cresseid begins to consider her life as a warning to other women, her emphasis

alters. She asks women to view her as an example, not of blasphemy but of the
squandering of youth and the dangers of bad decisions:

> "Nocht is your fairnes bot ane faiding flour,
> Nocht is your famous laud and hie honour
> Bot wind inflat in uther mennis eiris,
> Your roising reid to rotting sall retour;
> Exempill mak of me in your memour,
> Quhilk of sic thingis wofull witnes beiris.
> All welth in eird, away as wind it weiris;
> Be war thairfoir, approchis neir your hour;
> Fortoun is fikkill quhen scho beginnis and steiris." (461-469)

Cresseid's mistake is not falling in love, but putting stock in worldly love and
possessions. By showing his readers Cresseid's mistakes, and echoing them with the
narrator's, Henryson reveals our own human failings to us. After all, it is in the
nature of youth to take its gifts for granted, and it is in the nature of humanity's
animal side to put stock in the occurrence of this life instead of trusting in the
promises of the next.

After her "Complaint" Cresseid is able to accept the influence of a leper lady
who teaches Cresseid to make the best of the life that remains:

> "Quhy spurnis thow aganis the wall
> To sla thyself and mend nathing at all?
>
> "Sen thy weiping dowbills bot thy wo,
> I counsall the mak vertew of ane neid." (475-478)

Taking the lady's advice, Cresseid becomes a useful part of her new community, the
first step of the last stage of her journey towards redemption. Only when Cresseid
finally accepts that she is human and resigns herself to the will of fate is she given the
opportunity to fully redeem herself. Her final meeting with Troilus shows her both
what might have been and allows her to fully accept what she has become. Despite
her fallen state, Troilus recognizes in the leprous beggar woman something of
Cresseid's former self:

> Na wonder was, suppois in mynd that he
> Tuik hir figure sa sone, and lo, now quhy:
> The idole of ane thing in cace may be
> Sa deip imprentit in the fantasy
> That it deludis the wittis outwardly,
> And sa appeiris in forme and lyke estait
> Within the mynd as it was figurait. (505-511)

Cresseid may have been stripped of her worldly beauty, but her inner soul, the possibility for redemption within her has not faded. If anything Cresseid's inner beauty has grown stronger if it overcomes her ugliness for even a moment.

Cresseid's final meeting with Troilus removes the last vestiges of her pride and reveals the truth of her life: "Nane but my self, as now, I will accuse" (575), which Henryson's narrator echoes in the poem's last stanza: "Ming not your lufe with fals deceptioun" (613). In this way, Henryson's Cresseid moves from a position of self-delusion to one of spiritual clarity. In the end, she understands her own role in the fate that has consumed her beauty. When considered with the difficulties Henryson's narrator raises, his inability to understand Cresseid's punishment allegorically or to fully grasp the ethical import of her conversion and redemption, Cresseid's tale reveals the readers' own frail humanity. Understand human limitations, Henryson urges, and adjust your actions accordingly if you wish to be content in life. Humanity may not escape from its earthly chains except through an understanding of the transitory nature of existence and faith in celestial judgment.

Picking up the thread of narrative where Chaucer left it, Henryson's text is able to weave its own pattern. Henryson is able to allegorically envisage his Cresseid as an ethical example. He is free to unpick her life in ways that reveal the wisdom of divine purpose. Chaucer's *Troilus* considers similar moral questions; however, he chooses the speculative over the practical. Chaucer's work is well known for inventiveness, consisting in his ability to create a structure that allows for interaction between the diverse materials he brings together. However, his *Troilus* follows many of the conventions inherent in the traditional story of the two lovers.

Based most directly on Boccaccio's *Il Filostrato*, Chaucer's *Troilus* maintains a fine balance between repetition and ingenuity. Certainly there are many important differences between Chaucer's work and his primary source. For example, *Il Filostrato* focuses upon the beauty of earthly and sensual love while Chaucer's text emphasizes such love's inconsistency.[65] However, Chaucer's primary concerns are deeply linked to Boccaccio's main themes. Both authors consider the value and dangers of physical love. Moreover, Chaucer's presentation of the theme of historical destiny and of the meeting between the two lovers, their subsequent separation, and

---

[65] For a detailed description of the differences between Boccaccio's and Chaucer's texts, as well as a discussion of the major theoretical arguments surrounding those differences, see apRoberts and Seldis's introduction to *Il Filostrato*.

the subsequent fall of Troy is founded in Boccaccio's work. As apRoberts and Seldis write, Chaucer "makes Criseyde's departure a fated event, a necessary part of the destiny of Troy, for the exchange of Antenor, whose later treachery leads to the downfall of the city" (li). Although Boccaccio's work did not present the relationship between the two lovers as so directly linked with the fate of their city, the historical context is there and it must necessarily be included if the action of either Boccaccio's or Chaucer's text is to progress. The story of Troilus and Criseyde cannot function without the basic plot structure that both Boccaccio and Chaucer follow. Troilus must fall in love with Criseyde after viewing her from afar, Pandarus must act as go between, the lovers must consummate their love, they must be separated by the war, and, finally, Criseyde must betray Troilus. That Chaucer's presentation and interpretation of these necessary events differs from Boccaccio's is certain. In closely following a pre-set story line, however, Chaucer sacrifices much of his authorial freedom.

Chaucer's choice to follow a historically structured narrative provides a plot structure familiar to his readers and thus easily accessible to them; it also serves to remove them from the center of *Troilus*'s action. Bloomfield describes *Troilus*'s historical framework as, "a frame that distances us from and authenticates the inner story by history and the historical consciousness" (184). Narrative distance and authenticity have positive effects. Chaucer's readers may, for example, consider his text as relaying truth more than they would when confronted with an "invented" narrative such as Henryson's. However, historical distancing also works in opposition to purposeful ethical effect. If the reader is not involved with the narrative then it has no power to evoke complicity and its ethical implications become moot. Instead, by presenting itself as the mirror of a world full of choices, Chaucer's *Troilus* shows us the difficulties of deciding on a path. Chaucer points out the problems of sublunar existence, but he chooses not to attempt to extend a concrete solution to such problems. As Mark Lambert argues, *Troilus* prizes fidelity over flexibility:

> Love and art require fidelity; but also room to grow and change. As a love story, *Troilus and Criseyde* overtly celebrates and exemplifies – fidelity; covertly it makes us feel something of the claustrophobia which comes with fidelity rigidified, gone wrong. (72)

Thus, Chaucer shows his readers the complications of trying to maintain a divine characteristic in the fallen world. His characters and their actions show his readers

that making a choice is always difficult and that real world actions have little correlation to the ideals of morality. However, Chaucer offers no solution to this dilemma. Instead, Chaucer's readers become as trapped by destiny as the characters within his narrative. Chaucer reveals truth, but he offers no course of action.

Henryson allows his Cresseid much more textual freedom than Chaucer can offer his Criseyde. Cresseid is able to be both herself and the allegorical symbol of proper ethical choice. Her concerns, words, and soliloquies are strikingly realistic and often build upon those of Chaucer's heroine, but with a more simplifying and direct intent. Cresseid's continued anxiety about what people, particularly Trojans, think of her, for example, stems directly from Criseyde's worry about propriety. Henryson chooses to use Cresseid's human flaws and nuances to lead her towards a specific ethical understanding. Her hubris and vanity cause her blasphemy, which leads to her curse, which allows for her final comprehension. On the other hand, Chaucer's personae contain a subtlety of characterization that might at first fool a reader into envisaging a possibility of their escape from doom, but neither they nor the readers may find comfort in this life; they must wait until the veil has been lifted.

Henryson's and Chaucer's purposes and styles are most clearly opposed in the endings of their narratives. From the start, Henryson posits his work as clarifying Chaucer's text by providing a concrete ending for it:

> Of his [Troilus] distres me neidis nocht reheirs,
> For worthie Chauceir in the samin buik,
> In gudelie termis and in joly veirs,
> Compylit hes cairis, quha will luik.
> To brek my sleip ane uther quair I tuik,
> In quhilk I fand the fatall destenie
> Of fair Cresseid, that endit wretchitlie. (58-64)

Here, Henryson places his own work in direct opposition to Chaucer's. By referring to his own text as already completed, he imbues his task as author with a sense of finality. Chaucer's text followed Troilus's story to its final tragic ending, its counterpart will do the same for Cresseid. Yet Henryson's description of Chaucer's *Troilus* calls the sense of an ending for that text into question. Henryson tells his readers that Troilus's story does not need in depth discussion because Chaucer has told that tale already, but by including "quha will luik" at the end of a description of Chaucer's text, Henryson calls the wholeness of Chaucer's text into question. *Troilus*

is unable to lull Henryson's narrator to sleep because it is open ended. Narrator and readers alike need Henryson's *Testament* to fulfill their expectations of closure.

The difficulty of the *Troilus*'s ending is a well-known point for discussion among Chaucerian critics. "The poem is notorious for the trouble it finally has in coming to a stop" (Lambert 63). Chaucer's final stanzas draw upon a great number of premises. *Troilus*'s ending includes: a warning to women about the inconstancy of men, a description of Troilus's ascension into the heavenly spheres after death, an exhortation to young people to remember the inconsistency of life and turn their thoughts to the eternal love of God, and an invocation of both an earthy author and the divine Author of all. Considering the ending respectively with the rest of the narrative, critics like Ida Gordon view *Troilus* as an exhortation concerning the transitory nature of the sublunary world and human love.[66] In combination with the whole of Chaucer's text, argues Gordon, Chaucer's ending presents a love story gone wrong that encourages its reader to choose more proper love. According to medieval doctrine, sexual love should only be seen as a distant representation of divine love. Thus, Gordon considers *Troilus* to be a masterwork of irony that utilizes allegory to provide its reader "with a kind of living experience at all levels" (139). If one chooses the inconsistencies of love as guiding Chaucer's ultimate design, then one could read Chaucer's moral as follows: Humanity should be careful of its sexuality and only consider human love in the context of divine love. Unlike Henryson's textual insistence that his readers consider life itself as inconstant and turn themselves over to the power of God, Chaucer's ending simply calls his readers' attention to the inconsistencies of love and life. Chaucer's text does not recommend direct action that can realistically be taken in life. Troilus only understands his mistakes after death:

> And down from thennes faste he [Troilus] gan avyse
> This litel spot of erthe that with the se
> Embraced is, and fully gan despise
> This wrecched world, and held al vanite
> To respect of the pleyn felicite
> That is in hevene above. [. . .] (*Troilus* V.1814-1819)

In death Troilus learns the transitory nature of the sublunary world, but unlike Henryson's Cresseid he does not do so before the divine is revealed to him. Instead of earthly possibilities, Chaucer chooses to focus on humanity's ultimate goal, "And syn he [Christ] best to love is, and most meke, / What nedeth feynede loves for to

---

[66] ApRoberts and Seldis also support this view.

seke?" (*Troilus* V.1847-1848). While Henryson chooses to highlight the journey and use complicity to influence his audience to make the best of what they have, Chaucer reminds us that only in merging with the ultimate can we come to full understanding. For Chaucer, there can be no change until after death.

By elucidating an ending for Chaucer's *Troilus*, Henryson has the freedom to create a conclusion that is spiritual, philosophical, *and* physical. His vision for Cresseid, although dark and occasionally cited as the root of many future anti-feminist understandings of the story, [67] allows for an earthly morality that Chaucer's work distains. Henryson's only limitations are the continued separation of Cresseid from Troilus and the eventual death of both characters, and even these he manages to partially overcome. When Troilus and Cresseid are momentarily united, Troilus is allowed a glimpse of the woman he once loved, just as Cresseid is finally brought to an understanding of precisely what she chose to give up in him:

> "Thy lufe, thy lawtie and thy gentilnes
> I countit small in my prosperitie, [. . .]
>
> "For luf of me thow keipt continence,
> Honest and chaist in conversatioun;
> Of all wemen protectour and defence
> Thou was, and helpit thair opinioun." (547-548, 554-557)

Moreover, Cresseid's will in life binds her more closely to Troilus in death and affects his own end:

> Quhen he had hard hir greit infirmitie,
> Hir legacie and lamentatioun,
> And how scho endit in sic povertie,
> He swelt for wo and fell doun in ane swoun;
> For greit sorrow his hart to brist was boun;
> Siching full sadlie, said, "I can no moir;
> Scho was untrew and wo is me thairfoir." (596-602)

Cresseid passes on not only his ring, but also her own understanding of the role which humanity must play. We can do no more than accept our place within the cosmos and act accordingly. The inclusion of Cresseid's two lives in the inscription on her tomb only serves to underline the lesson learned: "'Lo, fair ladyis, Cresseid of Troy the toun, / Sumtyme contit the flour of womanheid, / Under this stane, lait lipper, lyis

---

[67] Benson argues that Henryson's choice to depict Cresseid's fate as a camp prostitute who contracts leprosy as punishment for her mistakes "quickly became absorbed into the received story and gave later, less subtle English poets even more ammunition for facile moralizing and anti-feminist attacks" (4).

deid'" (599-601). The beautiful but proud and misdirected Cresseid who was, becomes united with Cresseid the leper who experienced revelation. In discovering her humanity, Cresseid finally gains peace.

Due to Henryson's *Testament*, the medieval reader saw Chaucer's work as having a direct ethical purpose. In 1532 Thynne's standard edition of *Troilus* supplied the *Testament*, which was generally accepted as Chaucer's own, as the ending of the original text. Combined with the mistaken attribution of his work to Chaucer, Henryson's initial urge to use complicity to show his readers their role in life, as well as in death, creates a narrative with concrete ethical use. The *Troilus* asks us: What is the greatest good? How should we interpret human feeling? And it offers the revelations of the afterlife in answer to such questions. The *Testament* argues that earthly growth and learning, stretching towards God during life, is the good that we seek. For Henryson, humanity's best path is the acceptance of our fallen state on Earth and the choice to move toward God through an understanding of our faults before we join him in the afterlife.

For classical and medieval visions of allegory, contemplative and spiritual understanding was perhaps the most difficult and highly sought after of all allegorical comprehension. Still, as discussed previously, an understanding of the contingent and practical levels of allegory is essential if one is to gain higher understanding. Thus, without practical ethics, and the functionally persuasive levels of allegory, it is impossible to glimpse the absolute. Both Henryson and Chaucer grappled with the difficulties inherent in signaling the connection between the contingent and the absolute within their work, but Henryson chose to posit a structure whereby concrete ethical choices would lead to a connection with the divine. For Chaucer, literature is the platform from which to consider the problematic nature of morality; for Henryson literature is itself ethically influential.

As role models for their literary inheritors, the choices Henryson and Chaucer made initiated specific national trends. Questions of literary morality are infrequently located within a national context. Occasionally, as in the case of American authors, national trends are described as a splitting off or a mutation of British ethical concerns. Farrell's discussion of American "bottom dog" literature, for example, is a variation on the theme of "proletarian" literature (21-24). In Scottish literature,

though, national identity necessarily permeates ethical concerns and vice versa.[68]
Much of Scottish literature follows Henryson's pattern of a delineation of specific
ethical paths, and perpetuates the vision of morality as necessitating concrete answers.
Through allegorical understanding Scottish authors throughout the ages attempt to
expose their reader's own life choices and ask them to self evaluate, a process that in
turn is meant to encourage proper action. Certainly, this national trend is frequently
tinged by historical concerns. Every era has its own ethical locus, its own way of
envisaging "the good of man." It is in the replication of form and purpose that
Scottish literature displays its taste for ethical processes.

Susan Ferrier and Jane Austen: Morality and Mores

When considered next to Jane Austen, Susan Ferrier is a little-known novelist.
Ferrier has not spawned a cult of Ferrierites, nor has she suffered the stringent
criticism to which Austen has been subjected. However, like Henryson and Chaucer,
the link between Ferrier's and Austen's works has been made repeatedly. An
unsigned review of Ferrier's *The Inheritance* in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*
dated June 1824 describes her thus:

> It is impossible for us to deny her a place considerably above any other female
> who has come before the British public in these days, as a writer of works of
> imagination. She has *all* that Miss Austen had – but she is not merely a
> Scotch Miss Austen. Her mind is naturally one of a more firm, vigorous, and
> so to speak, masculine tone. (Southam, *Jane Austen* 112)

Although this reviewer favors Ferrier over Austen others simply make a connection
between the two women. Masculine tones aside, closeness in style and subject matter
makes comparisons of these two authors unsurprising. Like Chaucer, Austen has long
been viewed as an innovator of her time and is firmly entrenched in the English
literary canon. Like Henryson and Chaucer, Ferrier was often linked to her English
counterpart through a sort of post hoc logic. And like the differences in ethical
concerns between Henryson's and Chaucer's writing, Ferrier and Austen are divided
by the question of intent. Ferrier's works deal with the more visceral effects of
morality, with tangible ethical action. As *Blackwood's* anonymous reviewer
describes, Ferrier's ethical intent is both "firm" and "vigorous".   In comparison,

---

[68] The teachings of Aristotle, for example, remained the major educational source in
Scotland longer than in England, and Aristotle argued that morality was the proper
end of all imaginative persuasion.

Austen's vivid portrayals of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century gentrified life provide endless moral dilemmas, but do not relate concrete guidance.

Ferrier is interested in showing her reader a particular, proper path to follow while Austen illustrates the inescapable pitfalls of human existence. Like Henryson's and Chaucer's texts, Ferrier's and Austen's novels are separated by allegorical design. Similarly, the parallels in Ferrier's and Austen's texts may be used to highlight variance. By comparing Ferrier's *Marriage* with Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* (1813) I will consider the question of intentional ethics for each. As argued in chapter two, Ferrier places her heroine in the position of a Scottish goddess Natura. Mary is a symbol of proper choice and her journey through life toward the ultimate goal of happy marriage utilizes both narrative and symbolic allegory. Despite the seemingly allegorical nature of Austen's title, however, her heroines do not symbolically represent either "sense" or "sensibility," nor does her narrative show her readers a comprehensive path to happiness. Both *Marriage* and *Sense and Sensibility* focus upon the lives and different perspectives of two sisters as each attempts to navigate the social patterns around them. Both end in the expected and necessary state of matrimony.[69] However, Ferrier and Austen each choose very different paths for their heroines to follow and while it could be argued that Ferrier's sisters undergo less hardship than Austen's, it would be difficult to conclude that Austen's ending is the happier of the two.

Both narratives hinge upon the necessity of marriage within polite, elevated society and the best way of attaining such a union. Ferrier's *Marriage* utilizes the route to marriage as an ethically exemplary journey. Her work moves beyond simple social considerations by including both an explicit national tone and a specifically Christian theme within her text. *Because* she is a good Scot and a good Christian, Mary is able to join with a man who complements her perfectly. Likewise, her sister's Anglicization and secularization compel her choice of a husband based upon money. Adelaide chooses for the incorrect reasons and thus is saddled with a husband for whom she has no regard. Life for Mary and Adelaide is not simply a question of following society's maze in the least damaging manner, while avoiding the Minotaur of poverty. Instead, each woman symbolizes national and spiritual representations of the correct path to take and of that which should be avoided, respectively. Ferrier's

---

[69] For a plot summary of Ferrier's text, see chapter two.

concluding description of Mary's marital bliss exhibits the balance and propriety of Mary's choice:[70]

> Colonel and Mrs. Lennox agreed in making choice of Lochmarlie for their future residence; and, in a virtuous attachment, they found as much happiness as earth's pilgrims ever possess, whose greatest felicity must spring from a higher source. The extensive influence which generally attends upon virtue joined to prosperity, was used by them for its best purposes. It was not confined either to rich or poor, to cast or sect; but shared in their benevolence whom that benevolence could benefit. And the poor, the sick, and the desolate, united in blessing what heaven had already blessed – this happy Marriage. (468)

Ferrier's "happy ending" can be read almost as a *moralitates*. Thus, *Marriage* reaches a concrete and ethical ending.

Unlike Ferrier's novel, Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* does not detail a righteous and blissful wedded life. As with the feminist complaint about fairy tales, Marianne and Elinor's "happily ever after" is never directly expressed. The final unions Austen's characters make are not as firmly articulated as Mary's wedded bliss, nor do they contain direct ethical import. The description of Marianne's marriage, for example, is decidedly open ended:

> They each felt his [Colonel Brandon's] sorrow and their own obligations, and Marianne, by general consent, was to be the reward of all. With such a confederacy against her, with a knowledge so intimate of his goodness, with a conviction of his fond attachment to herself [. . .] what could she do? [. . .] She found herself at nineteen submitting to new attachments, entering on new duties, placed in a new home, a wife, the mistress of a family, and the patroness of a village [. . .] Marianne found her own happiness in forming his was equally the persuasion and delight of each observing friend. (314)

Marianne may have finally chosen marriage with the "better" man, but where is direct evidence of the happiness such a union is meant to bestow? She "submits" herself to forming *his* happiness, hardly the future that Prince Charming normally offers. Nor is Elinor's marriage to her first choice of suitor without a hint of questionability. Elinor is able, through the opportune wiles of her rival, to marry Edward, but how is her own "sensibility" helpful in gaining this end? One could almost attribute the positive conclusion of Elinor's narrative to her rival:

> The whole of Lucy's behaviour in the affair, and the prosperity which crowned it, therefore, may be held forth as a most encouraging instance of what an earnest, an unceasing attention to self-interest, however its progress

---

[70] Although I have already utilized this quotation in chapter two it is worth viewing it again in full.

may be apparently obstructed, will do in securing every advantage of fortune, with no other sacrifice than that of time and conscience. (312)

Lucy's earnestness and unceasing attention, not Elinor's, make possible the necessary matrimonial union. Thus, Elinor and Marianne marry well, but what do they learn via their journey to that end? That one must play by society's rules while at the same time struggling to retain individuality? And without the winds of fate, even this course of action does not assure happiness. Ferrier's novel portrays a concrete division between proper choice and corrupt decision-making; Austen's portrayal of marriage offers a comment on the proper way to play the social game. *Marriage* does represent society as problematic. However, the combination of the novel's social scope and ethical vision gives Ferrier's readers the possibility of choice and offers them a guide toward the correct path.

Marriage considers social questions from a much wider, more British, perspective than *Sense and Sensibility*. In choosing a heroine who shares both English and Scottish blood, and is, in essence, asked to make ethical decisions based upon the split in her heritage, Ferrier encourages her reader to link Mary's decisions with national concerns. The link between nation and morality, however, is made long before Mary confronts her English family. As discussed previously, the actions of Mary's mother while in Scotland provide the initial national division. Moreover, it is Lady Juliana's choice to give Mary over to the care of her sister-in-law, a worthy Scottish woman, which truly leads to Mary's ability to make the proper decisions in life. Mary's adopted mother, Mrs. Alicia Douglas, is an excellent candidate for fostering both a strong ethical and national sentiment.

In introducing Mrs. Douglas, Ferrier chooses to give her reader a rather long prefatory tale of love lost and peace regained. Interestingly, Alicia Douglas's story of youthful sorrow incorporates many of the aspects of Austen's narrative in *Sense and Sensibility*. Alicia falls in love with her cousin, and he with her, against the wishes of her aunt and society at large. Due to a promise made out of familial duty to her Aunt, she feels herself unable to marry the man she loves and instead settles for another. Her married life is described thus: "In the calm seclusion of domestic life, Mrs. Douglas found that peace which might have been denied her amid gayer scenes" (92). Similar to Austen's Elinor, Alicia is kept from marriage by the contempt of her suitor's mother. Alicia's choice to marry another due to circumstance echoes Willoughby's decision to abandon Marianne (albeit Alicia's reasons are better

founded). Her final acceptance of her fate mirrors Austen's description of Marianne's married life. The crucial factor altering all comparisons, however, is that of nationality. Alicia's aunt finds Alicia unsuitable because of her northern heritage: "She accused her niece of the vilest ingratitude, in having seduced her son from the obedience owed his mother; of having plotted to ally her base Scotch blood to the noble blood of the Audleys" (78). Thus, Alicia's decision to avoid Sir Edmund Audley stems not only from familial duty but also national pride; she flees to her Scottish grandfather and Edinburgh. Ferrier's description of Alicia's reception at Edinburgh and her growing love of the city underlines both Alicia's choice to marry Mr. Douglas and Mary's later association with the city. Once in Edinburgh, Alicia's Scottish nature takes over and mingles with her Christian duty to "honor thy father and mother." The result is peace. In Edinburgh as well, Mary finds a sort of peace in understanding where she comes from, in strengthening her national attachment before she must journey south. Thus, Mary's adoption by Mrs. Douglas predisposes her to make proper choices in life, to learn from the difficulties her foster mother had encountered. Like Mrs. Douglas, Mary must face the English side of her heritage and come to accept her true nationality. The English may see their blood as tainted by Scottish ancestry, but the Scottish view themselves as Scots *in spite* of any mingling of heritage.

Despite the connections that might be made between Mary and Austen's heroines, the existence of national concerns provides a wholly different ethical concept. The difficulty Ferrier poses is not one of conforming to society or becoming an outcast, it is of the outcast coming to terms with the society in which she finds herself. Mary's British adventures create a perspective that Austen's English setting does not. This is not to say that Ferrier does not place her own country under scrutiny. There are pitfalls to be found within any society.[71] It is, however, Scottish upbringing and education that allows Mary, and Alicia Douglas, to choose the correct ethical path.

Unlike Ferrier's novel, Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* is concerned with a narrower social sphere. Anyone familiar with Austen's work knows the "drawing

---

[71] The grotesque antics of Mary's Scottish aunts paint a caricature of the "backward" nature of Scottish Highland country life. Like the witches in *Macbeth*, Miss Grizzy and her ilk symbolize a darker, almost pagan, side to Mary's homeland, even if that darkness is lined with a satirical humor.

room" quality with which it is ultimately invested. Her characters and plots are undeniably English and have loosely (through a wide reading public) come to represent the global vision of eighteenth-century England. Thus several critics have viewed Austen's work as the perfect medium for her ethical vision of that society; as Kenneth Moler writes in *Jane Austen's Art of Allusion*, "Jane Austen's intellectual preoccupations involve the concept of opposition [. . .] that underlies much of the aesthetic, ethical and political controversy of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries" (10). It is often assumed that because Austen chooses society, and the difficulties of living within it, as a main motif for her work she is by association an ethical author. But instead of encouraging ethical choice, Austen's work often creates a reassertion of the very societal confines that she was seeking to problematize. In his introduction to *Jane Austen the Critical Heritage* Southam describes "her elevation as a kind of cultural shibboleth" as an unwelcome feature of the later nineteenth-century (*Jane Austen* 30). Her Victorian readers utilized her almost exclusive English point of view as an assertion of English society's enlightenment and as a reassurance of England's progress as a nation, despite the fact that many of her novels actively criticize English society.

Austen's work often focuses upon the problematic nature of the roles set out by society. Two opposing schools of criticism in particular focus on Austen's struggle with set roles and calcified choices. On the one hand, the school of "self knowledge" argues:

> Self knowledge, for the Austen protagonist, is nearly always the realization that he has allowed his heart to run away with his head, or an awareness that his value for decorum or convention or the prudential virtues has led him to underestimate the importance of his heart. (Moler 12)

Thus, the internal question of a text such as *Sense and Sensibility* becomes just that: Which should be followed, the head or the heart? Austen's characters must choose properly according to the mores of society. Considering the novel in this way allows Moler to argue for a sort of moral blindness as the focus of Austen's work. Because Elinor and Marianne fail to see the truth in both their suitors and each other, their moral lesson is one of internal realization. The difficulty with this view is Austen's focus on the *lack* of any possibility for correct choice; neither sister is able to "see." Despite their differences, both fall into the same trap and, due to their place within society, neither is able to truly learn from their mistakes. They must regard their

world through the lens of their limited environment and the limitations placed upon women at the time. Austen's works certainly struggle with moral questions, but they rarely reach ethical answers. Duckworth's argument for socio-moral separation through a misuse of internal morality also encounters textual opposition:

> In Marianne's subjective attitudes Jane Austen has revealed how the self, unaided by the forms of culture and the administration of self-discipline, finds herself alienated from society and friends. By considering her internal inclinations sufficient arbiters of moral action, Marianne has denied external sources of obligation in family, society, and religion. (109)

If Marianne could have avoided pain through "self-discipline" and social concern, then how is it that Elinor, the sensible sister, comes to similar grief? Elinor may avoid general *public* humiliation, but she is still subjected to the private degradations of Lucy Steele as well as to her own internal turmoil. Both Elinor and Marianne's choices are bound by the particulars of English society. There are only so many choices one can make within such a context, and it seems that none of these can lead to control over one's happiness.

Such questions of the possibility of happiness or redemption within Austen's society have prompted some critics to invert the social question. Thus, the "subversive" school of Austen criticism contends: "Jane Austen undermines the social values she seems to affirm [. . .] She can discover personal equilibrium in a society she detests only through the secret ironies of her art" (Duckworth 7). In other words, Austen is a socio-moral critic in that she criticizes the very social structure upon which her works depend. As Richard Simpson writes:

> That predestination of love, that pre-ordained fitness, which decreed that one and only one should be the complement and fulfillment of another's being – that except in union with each other must live miserably, and that no other solace could be found for either than the other's society – she treated as mere moonshine, while she at the same time founded her novels on the assumption of it as a hypothesis. (31)

If one considers Austen's text in this light it is necessary to believe that she predicates her narratives on structures that she herself found abhorrent. I, however, find the "subversive" viewpoint problematically paradoxical. Too much of Austen's work depends upon both the form of romance and the structure of society. Although

moments within her work and some of her texts are surely meant ironically, the thesis that *all* of her writing must be read entirely as satire seems excessive.[72]

Neither the school of "self knowledge" nor the "subversive" view, however, moves beyond a vision of Austen's work as limited to particular social concerns. The question of whether Austen's work supports or undermines the social perspectives of her time does not pre-dispose it to an ethical position. Arguing that it is moral to fall in line with society or immoral to fail to question it does not lead to an ethical conclusion *per se*. What are Austen's readers to do with her view of society? How can it affect them? If neither Austen nor her characters can break free from the power of "polite society," then how can her readers?

Ferrier's *Marriage* allows a modification of social confines by considering the rightness of her character's actions as related to a higher power. Ferrier's Mary is openly Christian, and even those moments when she chooses to go against the grain of Christian teaching have their pious reasons. Ferrier's detailing of a discussion between Mary and her cousin Lady Emily regarding the decision to ignore her mother's wishes as to attending church but acquiesce to them over a ball reveals the depth of Mary's Christianity:

> 'Without my mother's permission,' said she, 'I shall certainly not think of, or even wish,' with a sigh, 'to go to the ball; and if she has already refused it, that is enough.'
> Lady Emily regarded her with astonishment. 'Pray, is it only on Sundays you make a point of disobeying your mother?' [. . .]
> 'My obedience and disobedience both proceed from the same source,' answered Mary. 'My first duty I have been taught is to worship my Maker – my next to obey my mother. My own gratification never can come in competition with either. (257)

In disobeying and obeying her mother, Mary walks the very fine line upon which a truly Christian ethical understanding depends. Mary knows that "without Divine grace [. . .] a morally good life for any length of time is impossible" ("Ethics" 11), and that everything in life owes duty to Divinity. As she says of her actions: "it is not because of the reasonableness of our parents' commands that we are required to obey them, but because it is the will of God" (257). With thought and understanding, Mary allows Christianity to rule her life and patiently endures any negative result. Unlike her cousin and sister, who obviously were not raised to value biblical teaching,

---

[72] For a delicate, yet still implausible, example of the "subversive" school of Austen criticism see Booth's final chapter.

Mary's early life in a pious Scottish family has made a dramatic impact on her reactions to the world.

Mary's piety however, does not save her from the pain of choice required by the sublunary world. Human existence, as Henryson showed us, is not meant to be easy. Rather, we must utilize our understanding of God and existence to help us make the best decisions. All of Ferrier's characters in some part must recognize this truth or suffer the consequences. As the passage from *Marriage* quoted above shows, Mary is not the only character within the novel to struggle with morality and ethics. Lady Emily is not only Mary's advocate, and thus closer to the path of the righteous, but also still a part of English upper-class society, unhappily divided from God. Like Mary, Emily is faced with the human dilemma: the division between the spirit and the flesh. The same may be said for any number of Ferrier's characters including Mrs. Douglas, during her youth in England, and Colonel Lennox's mother, who causes no end of problems in terms of Mary's vision of the Colonel's love for her. Even Mary herself makes some mistakes of kind when confronted by the ethical dilemma of marrying a man whom she loves but who (she thinks) feels only pity and a sense of duty for her. As Fish writes when discussing *Paradise Lost*, "freedom in a monistic universe is both a gift because not all creatures have it and a burden because not all creatures are subject to its risks" (*Sin* xxii). Through Mary and her English relations, Ferrier chooses to highlight Christian choice and the difficulties of human existence.

For Fish, choice within *Paradise Lost* is located as both necessarily difficult and affective. "Even though the operation of the will is independent of the world [. . .] the world is not independent of it and will change – at least for the willing agent – depending on the direction freely, but momentously, taken" (*Sin* xxxii). Human choice is powerful in that it can alter reality, as Adam and Eve's choice irrevocably did. However, the choice of the reader is equally as important: "the reader [. . .] moves, or advances, until his cleansed eye can see what has already been there. At least the reader is given the *opportunity* to advance. He may not take it, and so remain a captive of his clouded vision" (*Sin* 345). Like Milton, Scottish authors in general and Ferrier in this case, both initiate the activity of choice and (perhaps unlike Milton) propose or highlight a proper path. By experiencing choice and its effects within Scottish literature, readers may come to understand their own choices and may begin making them in the proper divinely inspired manner. This is not to say that characters within Scottish literature make the *right* choices. As with Milton's Adam

and Eve, sometimes readers learn the most by experiencing the wrong choices. Thus, in Mary, Ferrier forms a character that is both realistic and the vessel of a specific allegorical and ethical vision. Mary makes her mistakes and she (as well as the reader) is given the chance to learn from them.

Ferrier's Mary accepts and cites God as guiding her decisions. Austen's heroines, however, have no such over-reaching guiding principle. While Elinor may make excellent decisions within society because manners dictate that she do so and Marianne may shirk the group-will because her sentiment tells her of higher things, neither roots her choices in the firmness of faith. Neither understands her duty as a human being, a duty that, for Mary, supersedes societal concerns. If Elinor and Marianne make moral decisions, they do so based upon social, not spiritual, obligation.

Some of the choices that Ferrier and Austen make are dictated by their individual perspectives on the genre of literature that they chose to work with. Ferrier and Austen both work within the genre of "romance novel," a form Duckworth describes as "inherited – almost hackneyed" (104).[73] Their narratives focus upon the trials and tribulations of female characters in love, and their plots conform to the clichéd pattern of the intricacies of finding a marriageable partner. Both Ferrier and Austen are aware of the literary atmosphere defining their genre, but each deals with the confines of genre in her own manner. Ferrier combines the form of the romance with external (national and spiritual) concerns, bridging the gap between her reader's questions and her ethical answers, while Austen utilizes the possibility of paradox within assumption. Ferrier's *Marriage* allows the escape from society that Austen's novel cannot provide. Mary is given the possibility of right ethical choice and her narrative encompasses conclusion. Unlike Elinor and Marianne, Mary's end is not a recreation of a polite society of sociable neighbors. Mary does not retire to her country estate to socialize with family and friends, protected from the negative influences of the world. Instead, Mary's *finis* is given a distinctly redemptive tone. She and her husband become exemplary to society as a whole, rich and poor, healthy and sick. Thus, Ferrier is finally able to overcome the confines of her genre. Yes,

---

[73] Because of their choice of the novel (and, some would argue, because of their sex) neither author has been firmly included within the Romantic period that labels the poetry of their male contemporaries. Both however, were firmly rooted within a particular form of romantic novel writing.

Mary finds her one true love and is blissfully wedded; however, in becoming Mrs. Lennox, she is allowed a kind of freedom that Austen's heroines never achieve. Both novels ask: What is the moral of this narrative? Ferrier's *Marriage* provides a concrete answer. For Austen, the question itself serves as the distinction of her work. What, indeed, she asks philosophically, can be the moral one is to take away from such a society? Where Ferrier offers her reader a path out of the stagnation of English society into a proper way of life, Austen points out the pitfalls that may be avoided within all pervasive social confines.

Both Ferrier and Austen were aware of the problematic nature of the neatness of their chosen genre. Romantic fiction creates both expectation and laxness on the part of the reader. A person picking up a novel with the label "romance" feels he or she already knows what to expect in the plot, and expects the ending to fall along certain clean, preordained lines. Each author, however, deals with the difficulty of literary predetermination in her own manner. Ferrier's adaptation of the romance genre to national and Christian ethical concerns imbues *Marriage* with the ability to both question and answer her reader's assumptions. By taking Mary outside of her natal society and placing her on a voyage of rebirth and redemption, Ferrier gives her heroine a greater possibility of choice within the confines of her chosen genre. Unlike Austen's heroines, Mary chooses, at least to a point, to leave her home willingly. Although her illness encourages the trip south, Mary's is ultimately a journey to know herself better through an exploration of a hitherto unknown half: "to behold her mother – she to whom she owed her existence – to embrace her sister too – and one for whom she felt all those mysterious yearnings which twins are said to entertain towards each other" (182). As a proper Scottish girl, Mary certainly has pangs of homesickness for the only land she has ever known, but she accepts her journey as one that will ultimately end. Mary does not fall from Eden, but instead chooses a path that leads to experience and the possibility of return once the right choices have been made. Mary's journey through Scotland, moreover, underlines Ferrier's commitment to her heroine's place as the moral, and national, center of the novel. Mary's journey leads her through her homeland and further underlines the division between Scottish society and the English life she is about to encounter. England for Mary will, in part, signify the crumbling of her ideals. The reader may know what is in store for the Scottish daughter of Lady Juliana, but Mary must go through the trials to return as reborn. If her mother asks: "Then, what can I do with a girl who has been educated in

Scotland?" Mary herself will be given the power to "do." Her strong religiosity and ethical understanding will guide her through any difficulty which society might place in her path. Ferrier's text exhibits the necessity of piety in the world of romance and social pressures. How else may a woman overcome the powerful edicts of society but through the guidance of God? Mary's ability to overcome the problems of sentimentality with the aid of both her spirituality and her nationality similarly shows Ferrier's reader the correct path.

Despite the lack of piety directly exhibited by Austen's work critics like Doody have argued for biblical themes as counter structures within the wider context of romance: "The two big public texts that would have affected Jane Austen almost from birth are the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer" (347). Thus, her questioning of the reader has sometimes been seen as following religious lines, even if her texts lack any obvious spirituality.[74] In *The Improvement of the Estate*, Duckworth sees the structure of Austen's work as a whole as based upon a belief in a prior order and her narratives as the working out of humanity's freedom to create within that order. Her "morality," he maintains, stems from religion and tradition and is manifested in the edenic structure of the estate. For Duckworth, Austen is interested in a structure of painful, if fortunate, expulsion. *Sense and Sensibility* offers an excellent example of such a theory. The novel opens with the expulsion of Austen's heroines and their mother from the safety of their home. Moreover, one can see the novel's movement towards (solvent) marriage as an attempt to regain the paradise lost. It is here, however, that the possibility of Christian structure and ethical intent are at odds. As opposed to Mary's journey, which serves to achieve a closer link to the infinite, Austen maps out an almost satanic attempt to scale the walls of paradise. Those who have been flung out strive to be let back in, with no repercussion. Instead of rebirth, Austen's novel describes an attempt to recreate the idyllic estate. And, at the novel's conclusion, the sisters find themselves well homed and united with their families, "living almost within sight of each other" (315). The paradise, however, is tainted, both by the trials Elinor and her sister have undergone and by the influences of society. Elinor and Marianne are, in the end, compared to those whom Austen has led us to scorn. Like Edward's deplorable family, Elinor and Marianne are able to "live without disagreement between themselves, or producing

---

[74] Garis sees *Sense and Sensibility* as an argument against the story of Mary and Martha, which in some ways fails to "see the point about Mary" (67).

coolness between their husbands" (315). Nothing other than good manners separates them from the novel's "evil doers." Fanny and Lucy, for example, both make excellent matches and gain property through marriage. In the end, *everyone* gets her man and settles into an estate, and we can gain no insight to an overreaching ethical vision. Unlike Ferrier's Mary, Austen's characters have no form of national or spiritual guidance to support them through their trials and they suffer for it.

The question of Ferrier's versus Austen's ethical intent finally rests upon what each wishes her reader to take away from her work. What, if anything, can one learn from reading *Marriage* or *Sense and Sensibility*? Ferrier's *Marriage* understands the difficulties of society and presents its reader with a figure who may overcome them by making the right choices. Mary's upright nature and her unfailing support of the Christian ethical comprehension informed by her Scottish upbringing makes her the type of woman who would appeal to Colonel Lennox and who would complement and enrich his life. By accepting instead of struggling against the form of her genre, by focusing not upon its confines but upon her purpose, Ferrier enacts her ethical design. In comparison, *Sense and Sensibility* centers upon the impossibility of ethical choice within a realistic and specific setting. Austen's characters are a part of one type of English society and, as such, must play by that society's rules no matter what morality might dictate. Neither Elinor's sense nor Marianne's sensibility can act as a true guide to happiness. Not even a balance of the two will lead to the right path. Both sisters suffer and both come to their "happy" ending almost without the aid of their supposed characteristics. If Elinor had been more openly sensitive she would not have more speedily gained matrimony with Edward. If Marianne had been more reserved she could still have fallen for Willoughby's manipulation and found herself in the same situation. Both women's true dilemma is their dependency upon society to create a sustainable life for themselves.

Ferrier's choice of title for her *Marriage* immediately circumscribes the problem that Austen concentrates upon. Ferrier's focus in the question of matrimony is not that of love and money, but that of love and morality. Ferrier's Mary does not worry about the economic suitability of her future husband because she does not have to. The very fact that Adelaide does worry about it, and unnecessarily so because none of the men who court her are poor in the least, exhibits the ridiculousness of such concerns within the romance genre. Her dalliance with Lord Lindore only emphasizes the depth to which she has fallen:

> Lady Juliana seemed now touching the pinnacle of earthly joy; for, next to being greatly married herself, her happiness centred in seeing her daughter at the head of a splendid establishment [. . .] Adelaide was aware she had a part to act, and she went through it with an ease and self-possession that seemed to defy all scrutiny. Once or twice, indeed, her deepening colour and darkened brow, betrayed the feelings of her heart, as the Duke of Altamont and Lord Lindore were brought into comparison; and Mary shuddered to think that her sister was even now ashamed of the man whom she was so soon to vow to love, honour, and obey. (362-63)

Not only does Adelaide marry for money, she then throws away the sacraments of marriage for supposed love. No traditional romance concerns itself with money in questions of love; there is simply no need to do so because everyone is comfortably well off. Lady Emily's bantering answer to Mary's questions about marriage and love defines Ferrier's understanding through a mild tone of irony:

> 'In short, you are to marry for love – that's the old story, which, with all your wisdom, you wise, well educated girls always end in. Where shall I find a hero upon five hundred a year for you? Of course he must be virtuous, noble, dignified, handsome, brave, witty. What would you think of Charles Lennox?' (383)

The only term lacking from Emily's list is "Scottish." Mary's concerns in marriage are indeed love, sincerity, honor, faith, and nationality.

Unlike Austen's Marianne, who does not question Willoughby's actions and seeming protestations of favor, Ferrier's Mary considers Colonel Lennox as a husband only after she is sure he has no motivation for her courtship other than integrity and love. When compared, Willoughby's description of his feelings of love for Marianne and Colonel Lennox's declarations exhibit the vastly different level of morality with which each author is concerned. Colonel Lennox displays a form of love that Willoughby's pitiful protestations to Elinor (not Marianne) cannot hope to match: "to have resisted such attractions, to have withstood such tenderness! Is there a man on earth who could have done it! Yes, I found myself, by insensible degrees, sincerely fond of her" (Austen 268). While Mary and the Colonel simultaneously discover their love, as fitting for a romantic hero and heroine, Willoughby's description of falling in love sounds almost like a hostile takeover. Similarly, the reasons behind Willoughby's decision to give up Marianne underline the impossibility of linking morality and practicality within Austen's framework: "My affection for Marianne, my thorough conviction of her attachment to me – it was all insufficient to outweigh that dread of poverty, or get the better of those false ideas of

the necessity of riches, which I was naturally inclined to feel and expensive society had increased" (270). While Marianne is trapped by an economy that cannot be controlled, Mary is given the ability to choose her own alliances with open eyes.

Due to her subject matter, audience, and personal life experiences, Austen was very much preoccupied with economic questions. *Sense and Sensibility* in particular has been cited as a novel primarily concerned with monetary matters. At the very start of the novel we are presented with the problems that many women face where money is concerned. Elinor and Marianne's father survives his rich and mildly misogynistic relative no longer than a twelvemonth:

> Ten thousand pounds, including the late legacies, was all that remained for his widow and daughters. His son was sent for, as soon as his danger was known, and to him Mr. Dashwood recommended, with all the strength and urgency which illness could command, the interest of his mother-in-law and sisters. (23)

But Mr. John Dashwood is not only "cold-hearted and rather selfish" he is also married to a woman who is "a strong caricature of himself: more narrow-minded and selfish" (23). Together they contrive to leave their dependent stepfamily almost penniless. Considered in such a context, the allocation of funds might be almost viewed as a moral concern in itself. Certainly Duckworth views Austen's literary obsession with money as signifying moral concerns:

> It is a consistent mark of moral integrity in her novels that solely financial considerations be excluded from personal decisions [. . .] Frequently, 'economic' words are employed intentionally to assert that possession of money entails a commensurate moral responsibility. (30)

Yet even he temporizes the absolute possibility of such a "moral" separation within Austen's novels, saying, "though there are also occasions on which it would be unwise, if not immoral, not to take them into account" (Duckworth 30). When practical concerns enter into the equation, monetary ethics must be questioned. A similar difficulty haunts the separation between money and love:

> If love for Jane Austen is a sine qua non in marriage, so is money [. . .] However, although she shows that a due attention to income is necessary in a couple considering matrimony, Jane Austen disapproves of those who marry for money alone [. . .] Those who marry, or try to marry, for money alone come to grief in the same way as those who marry for looks alone. (McMaster 291)

Yet couples such as the John Dashwoods do just fine despite money's importance to them. They may not be very nice people, but they are never fully described as

unhappy. Ethically, then, it is difficult to pin down Austen to one view of the effects of money, partly because she understands the impossibility of reconciling coin with contentment. Thus, Austen chooses money as the focal point for her questioning process. How can anyone escape the physical reality of monetary needs while maintaining a moral stance regarding the choices in life? As Copeland argues:

> The economic world of *Sense and Sensibility* reflects a far more sober, even frightened response to the predicament of women in a remorselessly money-oriented society [. . .] in *Sense and Sensibility* the wicked, the stupid, the selfish are rewarded financially, exercise power without control, and are by their own lights successful without check. (83)

Austen's genre and setting creates a catch twenty-two for any ethical statement she might wish to make. On the one hand, it is impossible for her heroines to ignore the necessity of money; on the other hand, they are romantic heroines and so necessarily end their narrative in lucrative marriages. A love match to a wealthy man is the natural conclusion of most romantic novels; the reader expects such an ending and no amount of consideration over the evils of money can change that fact. Even Marianne's supposedly sensible and loving matrimony to the suitable Colonel Brandon falls prey to economic language: "They each felt his sorrow and their own obligations, and Marianne, by general consent, was to be the reward of all" (314). If Austen's novels argue against a standard of morality founded on money, they also fail to provide any possible place where ethics can reside. The issue at stake is one of dependence. By emphasizing economic necessity as a motive for marriage, Austen illustrates the limited options for women at the time. This is the message of most of her novels. It may be that no concrete concerns can alter the goodness within her heroines' hearts nor change the happy fate which awaits them, but ironically no influence from them can truly affect that fate or that of those who misuse their powers.

The distinction between Ferrier's and Austen's visions of the world is that of ethical possibility versus social mores. Ferrier's *Marriage* encompasses a wider scope both ethically and socially. *Marriage* signals the ways in which one may be happy through the choice of a proper path. Ferrier focuses upon the answers that *can* be gained through her genre, instead of pointing out those that are paradoxical or impenetrable. By following Mary through the trials of travel, family, and finally love, we are able to better understand the ways in which ethical choice may positively affect each phase of life. Moreover, those around Mary, including her future lover,

benefit and are uplifted by her strong Christian, moral center. In making Mary his bride, Colonel Lennox finds "as much happiness as earth's pilgrims ever possess" (468). Like Ferrier's reader, Mary is given the capacity to understand the ways in which she may affect her own happiness. Conversely, Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* focuses upon the problems and expectations inherent in a specific society at a specific time. Austen's form is a comedy of manners. Her heroines may gain a greater self-knowledge, "but she doesn't always succeed in making this learning process dramatic, or convincing, or significant" (Garis 61). Elinor and Marianne learn how to act within the confines of their world, and in doing so they are granted a socially acceptable, if inert, vision of happiness. The means by which the sisters reach their end, Austen's concepts of "sense," "seeing well," and "behaving well," all are linked to appropriate behavior within society or the gaining of an understanding of that behavior. As Garis points out both Elinor and Marianne:

> After all, have been deceived by their lovers, both have *seen* badly, and if Marianne's suffering- the break-down and accompanying éclat – seems quantitatively greater than Elinor's drab depressions, this isn't a moral criterion which we can use with any dignity [. . .] Both the practical and the moral issues are confused. (65)

Thus, Austen's conception of "how to live" is not specifically ethical, nor can it be applied to any circumstance other than that within her novels as any but the widest understanding of "be nice to your acquaintances." If Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* teaches the best ways to survive the game of life and win, Ferrier's *Marriage* first shows how to make ethical decisions and then, through those decisions, how to gain happiness.[75]

Like Henryson, Ferrier chooses an approach that would support ethical answers to the questions that the process of reading and writing naturally provokes. Unlike him, however, Ferrier chooses a national context as the warp for her grand design. It would be impossible to argue that Ferrier was in any way directly influenced by Henryson; however, the concept of Christian, moral authorship to which he aspired was clearly that which she chooses as the center of her work. As with Robert Louis Stevenson, the final Scottish author I will discuss within the frame

---

[75] It is important to note that, although most of Austen's titles can be described in this manner, *Persuasion* seems to provide an exception to the rule. It alone among Austen's works posits a specific course of action as the right way to happiness. This study, however, must content itself with a simple note in description of *Persuasion* due to considerations of space and scope.

of intended morality, Ferrier's insistence on a moral literature is intimately linked with her position as a Scottish author.

R. L. Stevenson and Henry James: A Modern Game of Questions and Answers

As authors occupying the overlap between the Victorian and Modern periods, Robert Louis Stevenson and Henry James inhabited an historical moment full of literary questions and answers. Theirs was an era of changing attitudes of what literature's primary concern should be: practical and ethical or theoretical and aesthetic? Both authors were "of a generation stirred by the new intellectual mood that was abroad. Darwin, socialism, atheism: there was a logic to it all, a refreshing honesty, truths that the old shibboleths had obscured" (Bell 87). They were also of a generation plagued by the nightmares that such modernization of thought might bring. This was a period affected by Romance, realism, extravagance, experience, fantasy, and observation, everything that "went into the Christmas pudding of the mid-Victorian novel" (Cooper 2), but both Stevenson and James pulled away from Victorian literary traditions with their art. Stevenson was brought up within the confines of the rising Edinburgh upper-middle class and, due to an acute sensitivity to hypocrisy, chose to live outside the borders of Victorian British society. His life was a series of travels away from the "proper" world of the Victorian urban middle-class.[76] James, on the other hand, experienced a far from average American upbringing that placed him "thoroughly outside of the dominant cultural institution of his own moment in all of its attitudinal, moral, and social dimensions" (Freedman 4). As an adult, his emigration from the United States and his adoption of British social ideals reflected a need for social stability. Both men have been hailed as "the first of the great moderns." However, with the introduction of nationality, temporally based comparisons must end. Despite Stevenson's and James's shared profession, despite their mutual rejection of traditional literary mores and their dedication to a creation of new literary art-forms, and despite their close relationship as both artists and friends,[77] Stevenson's and James's urges to create were driven by widely different purposes.

Stevenson's work is riddled with ethical concerns and his awareness of them: "We are never far away from the Scottish Catechism in Stevenson, with its awe-inspiring first question: 'What is the whole duty of man?'" (Robson 97). Accounts of

[76] See Bell and Cooper for details about Stevenson's life outside of Scotland.
[77] See Bell 183, as well as other biographies of both authors.

Stevenson's childhood and youth vary. Some biographers, such as Lettice Cooper, argue that as a child Stevenson was relatively unhappy, that his youth was marred by sickness and childhood fears; others, like Moray McLaren, describe Stevenson's youngest years as full of imagination and love. All, however, agree that many of the themes inherent in Stevenson's work stem from his upper-middle class Edinburgh upbringing: "Stevenson's style cannot be separated from his life or his background just as his choice of subject must be seen also in this context" (Calder 9). Stevenson's relationship with his Scottish nanny Alison Cunningham, affectionately known as Cummy, is often cited as the basis of his concerns with morality and ethics. Cummy was a staunch Calvinist with a romantic devotion to the Covenanting past; she was also deeply superstitious and the carrier of many Scottish folk tales (McLaren 35; Bell 48). Years later, Stevenson's wife Fanny would attribute the idea behind one of Stevenson's best known works to Cummy's influence: "Cummy, 'with her vivid Scotch imagination,' had, Fanny said, told 'her nursling' many romances about [William Brodie]" (Bell 188). Cummy's tales of Deacon Brodie, well-known citizen of Edinburgh by day and notorious thief by night, would in part spawn Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886). Moreover, Cummy exposed the young Stevenson to the cadences of rural Scottish speech that had all but died out from the vicinity of polite Edinburgh society (Bell 47). It was in childhood, then, that the groundwork for Stevenson's creative imagination was laid.

Much of Stevenson's fiction is preoccupied by the motives of his time and a relationship with Scotland. The attachment to, but removal from, traditionally Calvinist views, the Evangelical veneration of the Covenanters, and a romantic regard for the Scottish countryside combined to form a backdrop for Stevenson's upbringing. It was Stevenson's relationship to Edinburgh, however, that most deeply affected his ethical focus. Although Stevenson was deeply attached to his city, nineteenth-century Edinburgh society was severely divided along class lines, a separation that Stevenson regarded with deep distrust and scorn. "Edinburgh [. . .] was a city of high living, high thinking and high stinking" (McLaren 20). In his days as a student at the University of Edinburgh, Stevenson took to studying (and in part aping) the "lower" elements of Edinburgh society. Taking up the Bohemian credo, Stevenson rejected the hypocrisy of Victorian gentility and respectability. "He defended beggars and prostitutes, was ineptly kind to servants, took umbrage with the iron rule of class, and acquired a degree of contempt for New Town society" (Bell 78). Stevenson's revolt

against his upper-middle class upbringing was principled, but it was not without repercussions. Although eccentrics were acceptable within Edinburgh society, they were meant to be aged and were not acknowledged if they were otherwise: "All Edinburgh, both the conventional and the permittedly unconventional, were naturally opposed to him. It was only in the true underworld, amongst the unselfconsciously unconventional, that R. L. S. of the velvet coat was accepted without question" (McLaren 79).[78] In his youth, then, Stevenson first became aware of that brand of social and political hypocrisy that would form the core of his understanding of evil. His own unconventionality would enable him to view the society, if not the city, to which he was born from without and find it severely lacking.

Despite Stevenson's innate abhorrence of the social system upon which the city of his birth was founded, he remained strongly tied to both Edinburgh and Scotland. His non-fictional work, *Edinburgh*, clearly illustrates his love for the city and many of his fictional works reveal an admiration for Scotland as a whole, but it was not the physical locale of his birth that he found offensive. Instead it was the corruption of Victorian society that repelled him (Bell 109). Many of his works reject Scottish Victorian high society, and the standards of the British Victorian upper-middle class in general, while making much of those natural virtues, such as chivalry, kindness, and honesty, which to Stevenson embody Scotland's best qualities. Moreover, much of his work dwells upon the possibility of overcoming duality within a unified whole. With *Kidnapped*, for example, Stevenson represents the traditional divisions between Highland and Lowland, wilderness and civilization, but he does so with the purpose of national unification:

> Stevenson does not seem to be primarily concerned with [the Lowland/Highland divide] in either historical or picturesque terms. It is as if for him 'Lowland' and 'Highland' stand for two possibilities of man, possibilities that might ideally be realized in the same individual. And what David [the Lowland protagonist] unwittingly seems to register is that the individual who does not realize them both is lacking in something. (Robson 105)

Stevenson was concerned with divisions in society and self. The core of *Kidnapped*'s narrative encapsulates a topographical movement across the Scottish countryside that correlates the moods of the two protagonists. "It was a symbolic

---

[78] When he visited the underworld Stevenson wore a velvet coat and he soon became known under that pseudonym.

combination: Bohemianism and Calvinism [. . .] the City and the Country [. . . that was] included in Scotland as Stevenson saw her" (Daiches 31). Stevenson loved his nation, but he was troubled by the divisions that were attributed to it, and that Victorian society perpetuated. Thus, his fictions often considered division along both moral and national lines.

Many of Stevenson's works, including *Kidnapped*, also deal with the intersections between nationality and human nature. In his travel writing, for example, he tends to compare everything with the topography and people of Scotland (*Travels With a Donkey* 18, 42, 45, 69, 102, 112, 125-126). No matter where Stevenson resided, Scotland's past gave him a sense of himself and a focus for his literary creations: "As he looked back on his work, he saw himself as mainly a Scottish writer [. . .] He picked out his most Scottish work as that most likely to endure" (J. Smith 137). In many ways, Scotland's influence was *the* defining characteristic of his work. Thus, although Stevenson was never overt or heavy handed in his national preferences, pride in the Scottish nation played a large part in his life.[79] In a letter to Sidney Colvin dated August 1893, Stevenson writes: "Singular that I should fulfill the Scots destiny throughout, and live a voluntary exile and have my head filled with the blessed, beastly place all the time!" (Bell 11). For Stevenson, Scotland, like Edinburgh, was both blessed and beastly, and much of his fiction is involved with reconciling the two.

Stevenson's dedication to ethics and the Scottish national character, however, did not lessen his interest in the technical aspects of literary production: "He was an artist, who cared passionately for the quality of what he wrote and spent his whole life trying to write better" (Cooper 28). As an author on the brink of the Modernist age, Stevenson was involved in the explorations of literature as art. Most prominent in his concerns was the concept of "realism." In Stevenson's opinion, literary ideals were often sacrificed by the authors of his day in the pursuit of a "realism" that was itself unrealistic. As he describes in "A Humble Remonstrance," reality itself is simply an

---

[79] In the *Handy Cyclopaedia* Stevenson includes an entry defining English culture and history as an off-shoot of Scottish culture and history:

> '*English, The*: - a dull people, incapable of comprehending the Scottish tongue. Their history is so intimately connected with that of Scotland that we must refer our readers to that heading. Their literature is principally the work of venal Scots.' (Daiches 11).

abstraction that the author creates as a conduit for his or her theme. In "A Note on Realism" he makes similar, if more pointed, arguments on the subject:

> A man of the unquestionable force of M. Zola spends himself on technical success. To afford a popular flavour and attract the mob, he adds a steady current of what I may be allowed to call the rancid. That is exciting to the moralist; but what more particularly interests the artist is this tendency of the extremity of detail, when followed as a principle, to degenerate into mere *feux-de-joie* or literary tricking [. . .] This odd suicide of one branch of realists may serve to remind us of the fact which underlies a very dusty conflict of the critics. All representative art, which can be said to live, is both realistic and ideal. (*On Fiction* 66)

For Stevenson, works that consider the "rancid" aspects of life are not necessarily artistic, nor does their excitement of traditional "moral" sensibilities make them so. A pursuit of realism that sacrifices a true exploration of the representative nature of literature must necessarily fall short; it is merely a sleight of hand. Instead, it is literature that recognizes its position as linking the real with the ideal that most clearly represents life. As Calder writes, Stevenson "was a man of fluid mind and temperament, with a heart and an intellect of sparkling attentiveness. This combined with his concern to get things right, a deeply moral honesty, is a radical aspect of his writing character" (2). Stevenson's choice to base much of his fiction upon the romance, then, is in part a rejection of the cult of realism that he thought beneath his profession, but also a function of his wish to honestly capture the heights of human passion: "In the highest achievements of the art of words, the dramatic and the pictorial, the moral and romantic interest, rise and fall together by a common and organic law. Situation is animated with passion, passion clothed upon with situation" ("Humble" 55). The problem with much of Victorian fiction, Stevenson argues, is its tendency to admire the drawing room while rejecting dramatic incident, to choose the accents of the curate over humanity's passions. Instead, Stevenson contends, literature should attempt a balance between passion and description, idealism and realism, ethics and art. Authors should make both sides of literature's nature an integral part of their purpose.

As Stevenson's contemporary, colleague and friend, Henry James shared many of Stevenson's artistic concerns. However, Stevenson and James differed on many points. If Stevenson's upbringing instilled in him a hatred of hypocrisy and a rejection of the ideals of realism and high society, James's position as an American expatriate in England deeply affected his understanding of the evils of civilization.

As both an artist and a popular author, James chose three spheres of human interest for his writing: the issue of "evil," the encounter between American and British ideals, and the etiquette of Society. Within his work none of these three spheres are considered in isolation. Instead, each combines with the others. For James, the issue of evil concerns a corruption of innocence often accompanied by a dislocation of place and an entrance into foreign society. James's "good" similarly involves a generosity, kindness and self-sacrifice associated with innocence tempered by knowledge and the crossing of cultural and social borders. In *The Portrait of a Lady*, for example, the reader is presented with an innocent American girl who is taken advantage of by corrupt and jaded Europeans. She survives the attack and chooses to take her proper place in society in order to protect another, less able, innocent. As Weisbuch argues, the Jamesian "good" is "a complete recognition of self and other, which is Jamesian salvation, [. . . combined with] acts of generous and intensely subtle thinking, thinking that is beautiful and self-expelling" (118). Moreover, James's "observation post as a cultivated expatriate supplied him with a rich array of subjects" (Tompkins 3). James's fiction, then, is concerned with both realism and the drawing room. Unlike Stevenson, James shuns direct confrontations with incident or passion within his work: "James's world is one of people deformed by the fear of violating etiquette [. . .] the moral protest in James is relatively pale. He was rather a reflector of the moral tone of sections of the upper classes in his own time than a moralist in any serious sense of the word" (Farrell 7). Whereas Stevenson is concerned with an honest representation of the passionate nature of life and the direct confrontation of hypocrisy, James's interests lie in the depiction of "drawing room" psychology and the acceptance of social roles.

Moreover, as literary theorists, both Stevenson and James contributed to the lively debate concerning the so-called "art of fiction." In the autumn of 1884 Henry James contributed a "manifesto" on fiction to *Longman's Magazine* entitled "The Art of Fiction." James's essay praises *Treasure Island*, but its more general premises roused Stevenson's critical faculties. He replied with "A Humble Remonstrance," which appeared in *Longman's* shortly after James's piece.[80] Although many of the topics that Stevenson and James touch upon in their respective essays are similar, the difference between the two pieces lies in each author's perspective. Through an

---

[80] December 1884.

analysis of Stevenson's "A Humble Remonstrance" and James's "The Art of Fiction" it is possible to situate each author within a particular conception of literature's form and purpose. For Stevenson, the danger in writing is "lest, in seeking to draw the normal, a man should draw the null, and write the novel of society instead of the romance of men" ("Humble" 91). Stevenson's purpose in writing is not to form a complete picture of common life but to encapsulate the greater drama of humanity, the struggle for the good of humankind; such purpose necessitates intention, structure, and conclusion. In contrast, James insists, "If you must indulge in conclusions, let them have the taste of a wide knowledge. Remember that your first duty is to be as complete as possible – to make as perfect a work" ("The Art" 869). To James, conclusion and structure are stumbling blocks on the road to artistic expression. Literature must strive for perfect replication and no other purpose is worthy. Stevenson and James, then, are divided by intent. Whereas Stevenson wishes to engage his readers' complicity by confronting them with their humanity, James is more interested in showing his readers the perfection (or lack there of) of a moment.

Much of the division between Stevenson's and James's views about literature hinges upon a fine point of dissension. As Stevenson writes in criticism of James's piece:

> Mr James utters his mind with a becoming fervour on the sanctity of truth to the novelist; on a more careful examination truth will seem a word of very debatable propriety [. . .] No art – to use the daring phrase of Mr James – can successfully 'compete with life'; and the art that seeks to do so is condemned to perish *montibus aviis.* ("Humble" 84)

For Stevenson, no art form can possibly hope to capture the totality of life; reality is too complex to be copied exactly. Instead, literature and its brethren must be content to signal the diversity of human existence symbolically, through structure, form and language. The art of narrative cannot possibly be free; it is limited by its position as a mere reflection of the cosmos: "Man's one method, whether he reasons or creates, is to half-shut his eyes against the dazzle and confusion of reality [. . .] and regard instead a certain figmentary abstraction" ("Humble" 84). As with the Christian understanding of allegory, the truth can only be shown to us by what it is not. In Stevenson's opinion, literature cannot hope to imitate reality, nor should it try. Instead, literature provides a safe testing ground for considering the human condition ("Humble" 84). In contrast, James's focus upon reality and freedom within the literary art discredits the concept of the veil between humanity and reality, and

discounts the protection that such a separation might provide.   He considers the "power to guess the unseen from the seen, to trace the implication of things [. . .] the condition of feeling life in general so completely that you are well on your way to knowing any particular corner of it" to be the characteristics of the great author ("The Art" 859).   James's vision of authorship endows the author with the power to directly reveal the truth to his or her readers.   For Stevenson the purpose of the literary artist is to convey the vastness of existence through a specific and artificial structure (from a "bottom-up" perspective.)   James, however, envisages the art of fiction as the ability to know all and symbolize all through a replication of the cosmos on a smaller scale.

The question of perspective is reiterated throughout both "A Humble Remonstrance" and "The Art of Fiction."   In Stevenson's view, all narratives should be purposefully guided by one thought or theme; all literary texts should be inherently structured.   Stevenson, then, offers both his reader and the imaginary "young artist" a particular perspective on art's "lowest terms": "Let him choose a motive, whether of character or passion; carefully construct his plot so that every incident is an illustration of the motive, and every property employed shall bear to it a near relation of congruity or contrast" ("Humble" 90).   In contrast James, as Stevenson himself points out, is more concerned with "genial pictures of what an art may aspire to at its highest" ("Humble" 90).   James's thesis rests upon the idea of literature as art, not as a skill or craft.[81]   He is most concerned with the general vision of art and the way in which fiction fits itself to that understanding:

> 'Art,' in our Protestant communities, where so many things have got so strangely twisted about, is supposed in certain circles to have some vaguely injurious effect upon those who make it an important consideration, who let it weigh in the balance. It is assumed to be opposed in some mysterious manner to morality, to amusement, to instruction. ("The Art" 857)

All of James's arguments concerning literature follow a similar general theme.   When he describes art's ability to instruct, morally or otherwise, he does so within the widest possible context.   Thus, for James, the ability of a novel to affect its reader comes down to the matter of taste: "Nothing, of course will ever take the place of the good old fashion of 'liking,' a work of art or not liking it" ("The Art" 864).   Neither can any specific ethical position be applied to taste: "I am quite at a loss to imagine anything (at any rate in this matter of fiction) that people *ought* to like or dislike"

---

[81] James is not concerned with "making" in the Scottish medieval sense.

("The Art" 864). For James, then, the value of literature lies in its position as art, as the endless possibility of representation and the freedom to avoid expectations. The novel's position as art enables it to escape from traditional beliefs:

> One [critic] would say that being good means representing virtuous and aspiring characters, placed in prominent positions; another would say that it depends upon a 'happy ending' [. . .] Another still would say that it means being full of incident and movement, so that we shall wish to jump ahead, to see who was the mysterious stranger [. . .] But they would all agree that the 'artistic' idea would spoil some of their fun. ("The Art" 858)

Art is the high purpose to which James holds the novel, and none other. For him, there is no better function for literature than the aspiration towards artistic expression. The novel must be free to represent what it will and should not answer to any specific purpose, and the way in which any one literary work might affect its reader is simply dependent upon taste. Art imitates life, but art's impact upon the reader should not be dictated.

Stevenson's conception of literature as purposeful in its theme and effect is also at odds with James's repudiation of classification within the greater narrative tradition. Whereas Stevenson argues that each novel, and each class of novel "exists by and for itself," and then goes on to list three main classes of novel: the novel of adventure, the novel of character, and the dramatic novel, James's vision of literature differs in Stevenson's own words "by the whole width of heaven" ("Humble" 86). James finds divisions between classes of novels to be synthetic and awkward:

> The critic who over the close texture of a finished work shall pretend to trace a geography of items will mark some frontiers as artificial, I fear, as any that have been known to history. There is an old fashioned distinction between the novel of character and the novel of incident which must have cost many a smile to the intending fabulist who was keen about his work. It appears to me as little to point as the celebrated distinction between the novel and the romance. ("The Art" 862)

For James, the classification of novels impinges too much upon the freedom of the author. As James sees it, the literary artist may (in fact *must*) strive to make any part of existence his subject and the classification of narrative threatens that artistic freedom. Stevenson, however, defends literary classification as necessary for clarification of theme and thus transmission of meaning: "That which was in one case an excellence, will become a defect in another; what was the making of one book, will in the next be impertinent or dull" ("Humble" 86). He also classifies James's work within the novel of character, as treating the statistics of character, "studying it at rest

or only gently moved" ("Humble" 88). Even those works that James dedicates to passion lack the expression of extreme emotion: "strong passion is indeed employed; but observe that it is not displayed" ("Humble" 88). Within James's narratives passion is suppressed; it "passes unseen behind the panels of a locked door" (*On Fiction* 88). In this way, Stevenson argues that even James's novels may be classified and not suffer for it. Thus, while discussing James's *Author of Beltraffio* Stevenson writes:

> I trust that no reader will suppose me guilty of undervaluing this little masterpiece. I mean merely that it belongs to one marked class of novel [the novel of character], and that it would have been very differently treated had it belonged to that other marked class [the dramatic novel], of which I now proceed to speak. ("Humble" 88)

For Stevenson, classification and structure free the author to enact his or her motive as clearly as possible and it is only through such forms that a narrative may make a direct impact upon its reader.

As with the earlier authors discussed in this chapter, Stevenson and James are divided by practical and theoretical understandings of the purpose of literature. Similarly, many of Stevenson's contentions (and certainly those which oppose James's views) follow medieval allegorical perspectives. In disagreeing with James's exclusion of poetry from "the art of fiction" Stevenson writes: "Chaucer's tales and prologues [. . .] contain more of the matter and art of the modern English novel than the whole treasury of Mr Mudie"[82] ("Humble" 82). Stevenson's depiction of the shape and importance of narrative also echoes many medieval attitudes concerning fiction. His assertion that no narrative may do more than weakly mimic the total of existence, for example, almost exactly replicates the medieval view of literature as a copy of nature, and nature, in its turn, as a reflection of the divine. Similarly, Stevenson's insistence upon the importance of structure and focus, upon all points leading to one clear understanding, reiterates the medieval use of allegory. Dante's "motive" in writing *The Divine Comedy*, for example, was to fully depict divine Justice, and all the allegorical significances and levels within his text work towards that purpose. For Stevenson, the multiplicity of life can be depicted only through

---

[82] "Mudie's Lending Library was one of the great circulating libraries of the second half of the nineteenth-century. It played an important role, through its influence on publication and distribution, in determining the range and nature of fiction in popular circulation" (*On Fiction* 82, end note 5).

coherent and intended structure. In his final advice to the "young writer" Stevenson again makes direct reference to the medieval: "In this age of the particular, let him remember the ages of the abstract, the great books of the past, the brave men that lived before Shakespeare and before Balzac" ("Humble" 90). Interestingly, though, what Stevenson describes as the abstract is the particular structuring pattern found in allegory: "For although, in great men, working upon great motives, what we observe and admire is often their complexity, yet underneath appearances the truth remains unchanged: their simplification was their method, and that simplicity is their excellence" ("Humble" 90). Stevenson's "art of narrative" has allegorical intent as its warp.

James's assertion that "the only reason for the existence of a novel is that it does attempt to represent life" ("The Art" 856), is not only in direct opposition to many of Stevenson's arguments, it is also inimical to the medieval (and Scottish) allegorical understanding of literature. James's criticism of the idea of literature as "make believe" and the author's acceptance and clarification of his or her work as such, for example, fails to acknowledge the medieval precedence of similar literary views: "It is still expected, though perhaps people are ashamed to say it, that a production which is after all only a 'make believe' (for what else is a 'story') shall be in some degree apologetic – shall renounce the pretension of attempting to represent life" ("The Art" 856). From the medieval perspective, however, it is just this renouncing of pretension that allows allegory its freedom and its ability to engender complicity. Literature, as Stevenson points out, is *not* reality, it is something other and its purpose is not to exactly replicate but to affect the reader through stylized representation. It is unsurprising, then, that James held allegory in particularly low esteem (Edel 9). His emphasis on "freedom," dislike of prefabricated structure or category, and lack of a Scottish literary identity would lead him to reject allegory as a form. Moreover, much of his understanding of allegory was undoubtedly marred, like many English modernist authors and critics, by the Romantic vision of it. Stevenson's "A Humble Remonstrance" clearly grasps the medieval conception of allegory, while James's opinion of allegory echoes the English Romantic bias.[83]

---

[83] See, for example, Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "The Statesman's Manual" (30). Coleridge's definition of "symbol" incorporates many of the attributes that medieval theorists assigned to "allegory." However, he separates that which was unified in the medieval consciousness.

Further, James's focus is on the individual in society, his contemplation is of the part conforming or not conforming to the whole. His characters are not representative of anything else in and of themselves, rather they show his readers what James considers to be the realities of life. Stevenson's characters, in comparison, are the part that represents the whole, the individual who is everyone. Stevenson writes from a "bottom-up" perspective, reminiscent of the medieval everyman and rooted in the Scottish myth of egalitarianism.[84]

If a comparison of Stevenson's and James's essays concerning fiction combined with a similar analysis of their biographically based value systems contextualizes the difference between each author's purpose and intention, then a closer consideration of their fictional works would provide textual evidence for such differences. Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and James's *The Turn of the Screw* (1898) can both be placed within a certain literary framework. Both novels are short and episodic, share an eerie tone, and are infused with the supernatural; both utilize literary form to pose questions with the aid of actions that, and characters who, exist outside normal human realms of existence. Only Stevenson's text, however, asks these questions with a view to answering them. If *Jekyll and Hyde* and *Turn* are both driven by their genre, mystery and ghost story respectively, only Stevenson's text utilizes his genre to implicate his reader in certain ethical conclusions. Similarly, Stevenson's choice of the scientific instead of the supernatural combined with his focus on the ethical choices inherent in all life, as opposed to an emphasis on the mores of society, allows his reader to orient him or herself within Stevenson's text. Although *Turn* invites the reader in, James provides no obvious path or conclusive exit. With *Jekyll and Hyde* and *Turn*, Stevenson and James contemplate the difficulties of living in a classed society whose structure of authority is inherently flawed, but the conclusions (or lack thereof) reached in each text clarify the divide between practical and aesthetic evidenced by their author's critical debate.

Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* follows the basic pattern of a mystery story. The full title of the text evokes images of police work and resonates within the confines of its genre.[85] Moreover, the narrative itself is expressed through short, episodic pieces that

---

[84] For a complete discussion of this see chapter three.

[85] Another famous mystery writer of Scottish origin, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, utilized similar language.

serve as mediator between reader and text. The tale opens with "The Story of a Door" and unfolds through successive chapters entitled: "Search for Mr. Hyde," "Dr. Jekyll was Quite at Ease," "The Carew Murder Case," "Incident of the Letter," "Remarkable Incident of Dr. Lanyon," "Incident at the Window," "The Last Night," "Dr. Lanyon's Narrative," and, finally, "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case." Each of these sub-headings reiterates the tone set by the text's title, and the reader is given the impression of a reported criminal investigation. Due to its very nature as a mystery *Jekyll and Hyde* implies a solution, a coherent ending, to the problems it sets before the reader. It is in the interplay between problem and resolution that the text's ethical purpose plays out. What is the mystery the text encapsulates for its reader? Any reader in the twenty-first century would readily answer such a question with, "The mystery involves Mr. Hyde's identity, and the solution is the discovery that he and Dr. Jekyll are one man."[86] However, the text itself unfolds its mysteries through a series of questions and answers more subtle than the story's place within contemporary consciousness would suggest.

Like the text as a whole, the tale's mysteries are approached episodically. In the "Story of the Door" Stevenson presents his reader with a mini-mystery. Early in the chapter, the narrator, Mr. Utterson, and his friend, Mr. Enfield, encounter the titular door and their contemplation of it initiates a series of events. Stevenson pays particular attention to describing the door with detail:

> The door, which was equipped with neither bell nor knocker, was blistered and distained. Tramps slouched into the recesses and struck matches on the panels; children kept shop upon the steps; the schoolboy had tried his knife on the mouldings; and for close on a generation, no one had appeared to drive away these random visitors or to repair their ravages. ("Jekyll and Hyde" 465)

---

[86] Since the publication of *Jekyll and Hyde* the story has continued to capture public imagination even to present day. Stevenson's work introduced a type character who would quickly become a part of popular mentality. In the Victorian era, *Jekyll and Hyde* became the subject of many sermons and moral pamphlets. More recently, it has been the subject of plays, the basis of films, and even the inspiration for Bugs Bunny cartoons. Each successive interpretation, from the psychoanalytical (consider the comic book hero "Hulk") to the Marxist (as seen in the film *Fight Club*), adds its own layers of meaning, but all are based upon the conception of split personality, a more dangerous self housed in the body of a seemingly upstanding and innocuous personality.

This apparent emphasis on realism, however, is quickly justified by the door's significance. Indeed Mr. Enfield's remarks upon the door focus the reader's interest in it as more than a piece of scenery:

> Mr. Enfield and the lawyer [Mr. Utterson] were on the other side of the by-street; but when they came abreast of the entry, the former lifted up his cane and pointed.
>
> "Did you ever remark that door?" he asked; and when his companion had replied in the affirmative; "It is connected in my mind," added he, "with a very odd story."
>
> "Indeed!" said Mr. Utterson, with a slight change of voice, "and what was that?" (465)

Enfield proceeds to tell the chilling tale of a man who, like a "damned Juggernaut," nonchalantly tramples a child under his boots (466). When demands are made that the man pay reparations for the damage he has done, he opens the mysterious door with a key. Thus, through the mystery of the door, and the building into which it opens, the reader is introduced to both Mr. Hyde and his connections with a momentarily unnamed upstanding citizen of the city. "The Story of the Door" is an episode formed entirely of questions: Where does the door lead? What manner of man can be described with, "I never saw a man I so disliked, and yet I scarce know why. He must be deformed somewhere; he gives a strong feeling of deformity, although I couldn't specify the point" (469)? Who is the well-known man who wrote the check clearing Mr. Hyde's name? Both Utterson and the reader are caught by such questions and guided by the narrative to search for answers.

Through the chapters following "Story of a Door" many answers unfold for the reader. Like any good lawyer, Utterson provides as full an account as possible, with as much concrete evidence as he can supply, of the mystery's movement towards solution. Included within his own narration are letters written both by Jekyll's closest friend, Dr. Lanyon, and in Jekyll's own hand. The former reveals many solutions to the text's mysteries; the latter provides both solution and ethical purpose. When, in Lanyon's presence, Jekyll drinks his potion, he transforms into Hyde and reveals his dark secret. Yet the conclusion to Stevenson's mystery does not rest simply upon the revelation that Jekyll shares his body with Hyde. Jekyll's epistle goes on to expose the flawed ethical decisions that lie behind the distillation of his transformative potion.

During his studies, and with a guilty conscience about his own actions, Jekyll comes to understand the nature of man as divided into good and evil:

> It was on the moral side, and in my own person, that I learned to recognize the thorough and primitive duality of man; I saw that, of the two natures that contended in the field of my consciousness, even if I could rightly be said to be either, it was only because I was radically both; and from an early date, even before the course of my scientific discoveries had begun to suggest the most naked possibility of such a miracle, I had learned to dwell with pleasure, as a beloved daydream, on the thought of the separation of these elements. ("Jekyll and Hyde" 520)

Jekyll seeks to separate his good nature from his evil, and he distills a potion he supposes will have the desired effect. His plans, however, backfire in more ways than one. Yes, primarily, Jekyll's difficulties lie in his inability to control the deformed creature of complete evil that his potion spawns. Jekyll's awareness that Hyde grows stronger and threatens to become the dominant personality is also troubling, but Jekyll's true downfall is one only the reader can discern. If Jekyll's potion was meant to separate out pure evil from pure goodness, then why has Jekyll himself not changed? Why has he not become a being of angelic quality to match Hyde's hellish nature? The answer lies in an understanding of Jekyll's words:

> I was driven to reflect deeply and inveterately on that hard law of life, which lies at the root of religion, and is one of the most plentiful springs of distress [the sinful nature of humanity]. Though so profound a double-dealer, I was in no sense a hypocrite; both sides of me were in dead earnest; I was no more myself when I laid aside restraint and plunged in shame, than when I laboured, in the eye of day, at the furtherance of knowledge or the relief of sorrow and suffering. ("Jekyll and Hyde" 520)

Although Jekyll denies it, he is a full representation of the Victorian upper-middle class, urban society Stevenson saw as the basis of hypocrisy and evil. In attempting to separate out the "pure" side of his nature and reject all else, Jekyll only reinstates those values of decent society that first evoke his shame. Polite society expects people of good character to act a certain way in public; those who fail to act as society dictates are scorned. Of course, what a person of "high character" does behind closed doors is left to his or her choosing, as long as everything is done with subtlety. Thus, in unleashing Hyde, Jekyll only underlines the hypocrisy of urban, upper-middle class Victorian life. Hyde continues to lurk in the lowest corners of society, and he continues to use Jekyll's good name as the coin to buy him out of embarrassing situations.

Stevenson's conception of *Jekyll and Hyde* in a dream is common knowledge to many of his admirers. However, Stevenson's wife, Fanny, also influenced the tale.

After reading his first draft, Fanny told Louis (as Stevenson preferred to be called) that he had "missed the allegory" (Bell 189). In a rage, Louis threw the draft in the fire but, after calming down, he realized that his wife was correct in her criticism. Stevenson's second draft became the text as it is recognized today. In *Jekyll and Hyde*, Stevenson allegorizes both the form of his chosen genre and the evils of society. Through his exploration of the mystery story, Stevenson's text builds upon existing narrative structures but leads its reader to unexpected conclusions. *Jekyll and Hyde* encompasses mysteries built upon mysteries, challenging the reader to make his or her own conclusion while simultaneously providing guidance. But the ethical center of *Jekyll and Hyde* is more complex than the surface layers of mystery imply. Although simplistic readings might lead to useful *moralitas*,[87] Stevenson structures his text to inspire a complex understanding of the true nature of evil. Even though Hyde's actions are reprehensible, he does not represent Stevensonian evil. Instead, it is Jekyll's beliefs and deeds, allegorically representative of a particular brand of Victorian hypocrisy, that Stevenson reveals to his reader as truly horrifying. Jekyll's character and actions are part of a symbol allegory that reveals Victorian, upper-class society for what it really is.

Moreover, Stevenson wishes his reader to understand that the human soul is not simple, nor is life a mystery to be easily and completely solved. As with Henryson's Cresseid, Jekyll must learn to understand humanity's place within God's overall scheme. The mortal world is innately flawed and acceptance of this fact is the only path to divinity. Over-simplified assumptions and perspectives on life lead to the ultimate evil of hypocrisy. Through the contemplation of a man who moved in Edinburgh's upper-middle class circles and took the views of that society to their utmost extreme, Stevenson seeks to warn his reader of the dangers of placing social expectations over all others.[88] Like Ferrier's Mary, Dr. Jekyll is presented with the difficulty of living in a society that encourages a divided nature and places importance on the temporal. Unlike Mary, Dr. Jekyll makes the wrong choice; he creates a life

---

[87] One could read Stevenson's message as, "Humanity is in part inherently evil," "Goodness cannot exist without its opposite," or "Be careful what you wish for or you might get it," or even, "There can be no separation of the human soul without the loss of humanity."

[88] Although *Jekyll and Hyde* is often described as taking place in London, some theorists have placed its location in Edinburgh. Among these, G. K. Chesterton was the first, and perhaps most notable, "The dark contrast between the dark evil and the almost equally ill-lit virtue is pure Edinburgh" (McLaren 157).

for himself that focuses on earthly concerns alone. Out of guilt about his humanity, he seeks to separate what underpins human existence: a union of eternal, intelligent soul with fallible body. Moreover, Dr. Jekyll makes the mistake of over-valuing his own "scientific" reason. As Fish describes in *Surprised by Sin*, the over-valuing of "the faculty one has recourse to when an obvious temptation presents itself" is perhaps even more dangerous than the temptation itself (241). In fact, what Stevenson, wishes to show his reader is "that the analytical intellect, is itself an instrument of perversion and the child of corruption because it divides and contrasts and evaluates where there is in reality a single harmonious thing" (Fish *Sin* 143). What Mary succeeds in uniting through her proper choices, Dr. Jekyll willfully, if inadvertently tears asunder. Thus, through the creation of both a symbolic and narrative allegory, *Jekyll and Hyde* engenders an understanding of evil and the necessity of avoiding the traps of social ideals.

Like Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*, James's *The Turn of the Screw* utilizes a traditional story form to structure its narrative and mediate between the reader and the tale. Unlike Stevenson's novella, however, James's text does not lead the reader to ethical revelation. James's tale begins with a group of gathered friends listening to ghost tales on Christmas Eve:

> The story had held us, round the fire, sufficiently breathless, but except the obvious remark that it was strangely gruesome, as on Christmas Eve in an old house a strange tale should essentially be, I remember no comment uttered till somebody happened to note it was the only case he had met in which such a visitation had fallen on a child. (*Turn* 115)

These words do not refer directly to the tale that occupies most of James's *Turn*, but they encourage one of the fireside companions to narrate the full matter of the text: "If the child gives the effect another turn of the screw, what do you say to *two* children–?" (115). James's opening situation, however, only serves to set the tone, and apparently the title, of his narrative. Once the ghost story proper begins the reader is taken far from the Christmas Eve fireside and allowed no return. Instead, the text follows the strange existence of a governess and her charges in a landscape rife with terrifying and psychologically threatening specters. Told as a simple ghost story, the governess's tale clearly follows the precedents of the genre. She takes residence in an old and isolated manner house. Shortly after beginning the task of caring for her charges, Miles and Flora, the governess learns of the mysterious deaths of two previous household servants, Peter Quint and Miss Jessel. Once Miles returns from

school, the servants' ghosts make themselves known, if only to the governess. She strives to protect her charges, but the ghosts' influence is too strong. Flora is driven mad and Miles is killed even as he finally escapes from daemonic possession. James's tale, though, cannot be read quite so simply, as critical readings of it attest. The question that James's narrative most directly asks is revealed to be: "Do the ghosts exist or are they simply part of the governess's imagination?" The answer to that question has divided James's critics across the board.[89] The text itself offers no concrete answers to such critical conjectures. Truly, one could read *Turn* with either view in mind. Even the novella's ending gives no coherent basis for the choice of a supernatural reading over a psychological one. The final confrontation between the governess, Miles, and the ghost of Peter Quint is disconcertingly vague:

> For there again, against the glass, as if to blight his confession and stay his answer, was the hideous author of our woe–the white face of damnation [. . .]
> 'Is she *here*?' Miles panted as he caught with his sealed eyes the direction of my words. Then as his strange 'she' staggered me and, with a gasp, I echoed it, 'Miss Jessel, Miss Jessel!' he with sudden fury gave me back.
> I seized, stupefied, his supposition–some sequel to what we had done to Flora, but this made me only want to show him that it was better still than that. 'It is not Miss Jessel! But it's at the window–straight before us. It's *there*–the coward horror, there for the last time! [. . .]
> 'It's *he*?'
> I was so determined to have all my proof that I flashed into ice to challenge him. 'Whom do you mean by "he"?
> 'Peter Quint–you devil!' His face gave again, round the room, its convulsed supplication. '*Where*?' (236)

Miles never does admit to seeing Quint (the governess supposes the ghost to have disappeared forever at its naming), but the governess claims the act of naming Quint as a sign of her charge's redemption. She can only understand the circumstances as supernatural or spiritual, and from her perspective they appear to be simply that. Outside of her understanding, however, the reader may interpret the governess's final interrogation of Miles as a study in psychological leading. Miles's confession can be likened to that of the prisoner who is innocent, but under duress tells his captors what they wish to hear. Thus, James's text does not provide us with any guidance as to interpretation; instead we are presented with questions concerning the possibility of evil. Unlike Stevenson's direct representation of the greatest evil among many vices, James provides his reader with divided perspective.

---

[89] See the Kimbrough edition of *The Turn of the Screw.*

Within *Turn*, evil resides in the problems of class and the breaking of social codes, in the governess's egotism, and in the possible corruption of the children themselves. When they were living, it is hinted, the ghostly servants overstepped the proper bounds of society: "'Oh it wasn't *him* [Miles]!' Mrs Grose with emphasis declared. 'It was Quint's own fancy. To play with him, I mean – to spoil him.' She paused for a moment; then she added: 'Quint was much too free'" (150). Moreover, the governess herself mistakenly overreaches her social position. Her regard for both her employer and her young charges crosses the boundaries of what is appropriate within the class based servant/master relationship. *Turn* also posits egotism as evil:

> What raises itself to the level of Evil is not merely egotism but egotism's disregard of the Otherness of other people, even and especially helpless children. Authentic hauntings or no, the evil is the forcing of children to confront what their psyches, tender or corrupted or tainted, cannot bear; whether or not Quint or Jessel began the ruin of their childhood, the Governess ends it, and ends it for reasons all her own. (Weisbuch 108)

The vision of the governess as the only *true* evil within the text is rooted in her inability to see her situation from any but her own perspective. Similarly, children who harbor corruption, and thus are innately self-serving, could be viewed as the source of evil within *Turn*:

> 'Two hours ago, in the garden' – I could scarce articulate – 'Flora *saw* [the ghost of Miss Jessel]!'
> Mrs Grose took it as she might have taken a blow in the stomach. 'She told you?' she panted.
> 'Not a word – that's the horror. She kept it to herself! The child of eight, *that* child!' Unutterable still for me was the stupefaction of it. (*Turn* 156)

As another form of inversion, children who are wise and cunning beyond their years are doubly sinister. The evil works from both sides of the equation, it occurs in the dynamic between dark knowledge and children. The effect of evil in such a dynamic, however, is equally as calcifying as adult egotism. Thus, James's choice to leave his text open to so many interpretations, and wholly lacking in closure, might be considered as a resistance of evil. As Weisbuch argues:

> Evil is borne of a self-denying libido that somehow encourages a refusal to entertain possibility without irritably and simply demanding an answer [. . .] in each case as well, this need to know in absolutes and allegories is linked to a stunning self-ignorance in regard to desires and resentments both social and psychological. (106)

From this perspective, any form of answer or guiding structure would be seen as detrimental. Where, though, does such a vision of evil situate the reader? James's *Turn* displays the fear of an individuality that seeks to overturn the defined social structure, but he does not provide any guidelines for his reader. Once his reader has considered each of the evils that James presents, what is he or she to do? In refusing to exemplify any concrete ethical solution *Turn* allows its reader little forward motion. Instead, James's readers are presented with the difficulty of living in society. Like Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*, James's *Turn* picks out the difficulty of living but, due to the great importance placed upon social mores, cannot offer comfort in life.

As displayed in their respective critical essays, Stevenson and James maintain disparate literary purposes. The choices they make within their fictional works only serve to underline these differences. Stevenson's choice of the scientific over the supernatural as the basis of his *Jekyll and Hyde*, for example, echoes his dedication to literature as a "craft," a skill, a science to be perfected. As Bell describes: "He chose to begin – and it is not a bad tactic – as a craftsman before he contemplated becoming an artist" (80). For Stevenson, as for his medieval and early modern predecessors, structure and purpose were more important than the creation of an aesthetically pleasing object. Stevenson's account of the creative act stresses composition, selection, and a controlling sense of the main design, rather than detailed observation or technical virtuosity. Stevenson goes to nature for material and creates by changing reality in the pursuit of an ideal (J Smith 73). Similarly, in Stevenson's fiction, human nature is both black-and-white and strangely mixed. The Master and his brother in *The Master of Ballantrae* exhibit this type of melded morality, as do the characters in many of Stevenson's other novels. His Hyde is the epitome of evil, but Hyde exists without a perfect foil. Likewise, Jekyll mistakes humanity's place in the world. Human nature mingles the animal and the divine. The removal of one or the other removes humanity itself. Instead it is the lot of humankind to seek a balance between the two, to understand animal drives as echoing or controlled by divine wisdom.

Stevenson's ethical system is structured upon such an understanding and it rejects the impact of society's supposedly moral codes: "He was acutely aware of what could happen when moral structures collapsed, he wrote about this often, but he made it quite clear that the individual had to work out his own morality" (Calder 5).

Jekyll's transformation into Hyde is in keeping with the strictures of Victorian society; evil was accepted if it was kept out of sight and any damage was paid for. Thus, in attempting to separate his nature, Jekyll only emphasizes the defects of his society. Instead of accepting his place within humanity as a whole, Jekyll is driven to act by the dictates of his social circle. In Bell's words: "If psychological health is threatened by a denial of the 'animal,' the beast inevitably breaks loose" (193). Dominated by the rules of a hypocritical society, Jekyll is forced to become Hyde.

Throughout *Jekyll and Hyde* Stevenson utilizes the door as an allegorical figure for his ethical purpose. As discussed earlier, a door initiates Stevenson's reader into the mysteries that his story presents. That door, however, also symbolizes the barrier that urban, upper-middle class Victorian society erects between the "acceptable" and the "unacceptable." When the door is first described it is connected with tramps and children, people who occupy the fringes of society. Stevenson firmly places Utterson and Enfield within polite society even before they encounter the door, thus their inability to guess at its purpose and their lack of access to its secrets is sealed. Only Hyde, a creature wholly divorced from humanity and thus free of the dictates of society, can utilize the portal freely. Yet without the door, and the laboratory behind it, Hyde could not exist. He is a creature of social hypocrisy, a creation of Victorian polite society's inappropriate barriers. The importance of this door, however, changes with the addition of another entrance into Jekyll's inner sanctum and Hyde's abode. Once Utterson discovers that the anonymous door opens upon Jekyll's property, the lawyer seeks another entryway:

> 'Jekyll,' cried Utterson, with a loud voice, 'I demand to see you.' He paused a moment, but there came no reply. 'I give you fair warning, our suspicions are aroused, and I must and shall see you,' he resumed; 'if not by fair means, then by foul-if not by your consent, then by brute force!' ("Jekyll and Hyde" 506)

Certain that Hyde is a murderer, and that he is closeted with Jekyll, Utterson and Jekyll's servants force the second, interior door with dramatic consequences:

> Poole swung the axe over his shoulder; the blow shook the building and the red baize door leaped against the lock and hinges. A dismal screech, as of mere animal terror, rang from the cabinet. Up went the axe again, and again the panels crashed and the frame bounded; four times the blow fell; but the wood was tough and the fittings were of excellent workmanship; and it was not until the fifth, that the lock burst in sunder, and the wreck of the door fell inwards on the carpet. ("Jekyll and Hyde" 506)

Stevenson's description of the assault on this door operates on several levels. By breaking down the door, Utterson brings both Lanyon's and Jekyll's epistles to light. Moreover, the door allegorizes the artificial and detrimental boundaries erected by society and therefore must be destroyed in order for Stevenson's reader to understand the role it played in Hyde's creation. Similarly, Stevenson's text allies the destruction of the door leaping "against the lock and hinges" with Jekyll and Hyde's death cries: "a dismal screech, as of mere animal terror." Both the door and the divided creature it spawned resist destruction and revelation, but neither is able to prevent them. Neither Jekyll/Hyde nor the barriers that urban, upper-middle class Victorian society erects offer enough stability to resist the onslaught of truth.[90] For Stevenson, life and passion should not be locked away behind closed doors, and it is hypocritical to do so. Stevenson provides his reader with a vision of evil that is both Victorian and Modern in nature, but the wish to expose that evil and the drive to enable his readers to recognize and combat it stem from his connections to the Scottish literary psyche. Through his fiction, Stevenson gives his readers a way of reconciling the changes inherent in his era with traditional Scottish literary forms.

Unlike Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*, James's *Turn* courts the propriety of social division. Many of the dilemmas within *Turn* are supported by the necessity of proper association. The governess does not go to her employer with her fears because she has been given express orders not to contact him. Nor can she confront the children directly because it is not her place to do so. As in Jane Austen's society novels, confidences are never forced; the governess must wait for the children to unfold themselves to her. Moreover, as discussed above, those moments where such social boundaries are crossed become the sites of either evil or violent emotion, or a combination of the two. The supernatural level of the story seems to exist only to underline the dangers of social corruption, to elevate the tale's shock value. Just as in life Quint and Jessel crossed the boundaries of propriety, so in the afterlife they cross the boundaries of death. Similarly, the children are portrayed as both angelic and overly knowledgeable. Certainly the governess sees them as knowing more about

---

[90] Ironically, it is Utterson, the epitome of proper Victorian society who orders the destruction of the door. Yet Utterson is less hypocritical than Jekyll, he accepts and denies his more animal nature, even if he is not open about that denial: "He was austere with himself; drank gin when he was alone, to mortify a taste for vintages; and though he enjoyed the theatre, had not crossed the doors of one for twenty years" ("Jekyll and Hyde" 463).

corruption and evil than herself. Edel describes James's tales as generally inhabiting a world that is plastic and analytical, leisurely and peopled with the civilized and the self-aware (Edel 174). Within James's *Turn* this world becomes inverted. The governess's leisure, civilization, and self-awareness are brought into question. Within *Turn* James "renews the consequences of Evil by problematizing its reality" (Weisbuch 103). Thus, no matter the reality or psychological nature of the ghosts, James confronts his reader with a social sphere gone terribly wrong, with a world of manners that has been improperly invaded by misplaced passions. As Tompkins writes:

> Even if one does not agree that the governess is responsible for the catastrophy, and blames the ghost, as she does, the cause of Miles's death remains the same: both Peter Quint and the governess direct at the defenseless child the perverted love of a frustrated adulthood. (8)

To build upon Tompkin's argument, not only love is perverted in *Turn* but all of society. Both the ghosts and the governess's love threaten the structure of society and ultimately lead to corruption and destruction. Moreover, like Austen's portrayal of society as inescapable, James's choice to exclude a definitive ending imprisons the reader within the details of his tale. Most of the governess's actions, excluding the final two confrontations of the children, are unavoidable considering her social position, but these actions are those which lead inexorably to the children's doom.

The ghosts, governess, and children in *Turn* fail to be true to their positions in life, thus their tale ends in disaster. Unlike Stevenson's exposure of society's hypocrisy in *Jekyll and Hyde*, with *Turn* James wishes to keep society's evils behind closed doors. Within *Turn* evil is represented by those alterations in society that most directly threaten the traditions upon which "high culture" rests. James "was invested in a vision of traditional high culture as providing the necessary social guide in a world where ethnic minorities and women were entering the body politic in increasing numbers" (Freedman 11). Thus, Quint is a redheaded Irishman and the governess an educated woman. James's *Turn* shows his reader what evil is, but because his "good" and "evil" are derived from social concerns and not Christian truth, his ending provides paradox not ethical direction. Evil in *Turn* is the slow movement towards inevitable disaster created by a social structure that must be upheld to protect against creeping corruption; it is the vicious cycle that society often creates. The governess has no recourse but to cross society's boundaries, but in doing so she unleashes the

evil against which she has been struggling. For James, evil is inevitable and in many ways inescapable. In contrast, Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* depicts evil as something that must be combated. His readers are shown what *not* to do instead of being given a world in which freedom and choice cannot be negotiated. Stevenson's Jekyll dies because he rejects his God-given nature; James's governess ruins the lives of two children because she inhabits a powerless social position. Although the ethical specificity of both authors has been questioned, [91] Stevenson's text allows his readers a definite conclusion, an ethical position that might be utilized as a guide in everyday life. If Stevenson can be described as "ready for chaos; he sought it out, lived within in" (Bell 21), then James might equally be portrayed as looking for the aesthetic cure for life's chaotic nature. If Stevenson's early life in Scotland conferred upon him the abhorrence of hypocrisy, yet a devotion to his nation, James's position as an American ex-patriot taught him to both revile and depend upon English society's corrupting influence.

Conclusion: Shades of Ethical Purpose

Throughout this chapter, I have attempted to explore Scottish authors' particular uses of allegory for divinely based ethical purposes. Scottish literature encourages a process of active reading that Fish describes as "a direct relationship between the (potential) effect the poem has on the reader and his ability to read it; a curiously circular relationship" (*Sin* 161). By engaging with Scottish allegorical texts, both readers' literary comprehension and their understanding of humanity's place are affected. Scottish authors seek to reveal the proper way of negotiating life by causing the reader to negotiate both the text itself and his or her own reaction to the text. "The concept is simply the rigorous and disinterested asking of the question, what does this word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, chapter, novel, play poem, *do*?" (Fish *Self* 387). Scottish authors focus on what their texts *do* to their readers and how such effects can be used to help readers negotiate the difficulties of sublunary existence. They utilize and reveal the cause and effect relationship between reader and text. Such authors, then, place themselves in a position that mediates between the mortal and the divine, and they recognize that "language is inadequate to the reality of [their] received intuition and to the task of persuasion [they] would bend it to" (Fish *Sin* 202).

---

[91] For a discussion of Stevenson's moral ambivalence see Calder and Gifford.

Therefore, language must be structured and controlled in such a way as to reveal what *is* through a representation of what is not.

Likewise, Scottish authors create allegorical structures that enforce choice on those who read them. As Fish writes of *Paradise Lost*, "choice then is what is required [. . .] and the requirement is not to be avoided either by gracefully throwing up one's hand in the face of multiplicity, or by complaining that choice is exclusionary (of course it is; that is its job)" (*Sin* xliii). Most of the non-Scottish authors that I chose to consider above create texts that *do* "throw up their hands" or "complain that choice is exclusionary," just as their Scottish compatriots fully embrace the empowerment of choice itself. Scottish authors cause their readers to recognize their own complicity by involving them in narrative choice; they write narratives with which their readers cannot help but identify and thus such narratives illicit self-criticism. They allegorize the act of reading itself. What Scottish allegorical texts *do* is cause their readers to consider their own choices in the light of choice as portrayed in the text while simultaneously causing choice through the cumulative act of reading itself. Readers may choose to willfully misunderstand or ignore the lessons that are set before them. Readers may choose not to use their divine abilities, but they must make a choice.

By exposing humankind's use of fallible reasoning through an enactment of proper or improper choice, Scottish allegorical texts teach us of the existence of *recta ratio* or right reasoning. The division between rhetoric, or beautiful words that hide falsehood, and logic, or the proper use of words to illustrate truth, must be made due to the very nature of the relationship between reader and text, text and narrative, narrative and character. "Rhetoric is the verbal equivalent of the fleshy lures that seek to enthrall us and divert our thoughts from Heaven, the reflection of our own cupidinous desires, while logic comes from God and speaks to that part of us which retains his image" (Fish *Sin* 61). Again, humanity's divided nature is essential for our salvation. Yet readers must also be wary of putting too much trust in logic, lest, like Dr. Jekyll, they make assumptions about the world that are as far removed from truth as rhetoric can be. Balance, an understanding of careful reading, and a vision of all as part of the structured path to salvation are essential. In this manner, a fall may also be fortunate: "Rhetoric is thus simultaneously the sign of the reader's infirmity and the means by which he is brought first to self-knowledge, and then to contrition, and

finally, perhaps, to grace and everlasting bliss" (Fish *Sin* 38). Similarly, the logical path is not always the right one.

Choice is essential for salvation and, as discussed in the introduction to this chapter, ethical choice is necessarily practical and specific. Through the comparison of each pair of authors in this chapter I have attempted to exemplify the wide spectrum of the use of symbolic and narrative allegory for ethical purposes throughout Scottish literature. Scottish authors focus upon the practical aspects of morality and literature to compose their work with an ethical purpose in mind. In utilizing ethical themes identified by their medieval predecessors, Scottish authors across the ages have considered broader, theoretical moral questions by reproducing the process of specific ethical decision-making. Henryson's creation of a practical *moralitas* for Chaucer's more theoretical text allows the *Testament* to guide readers to proper earthly decision and to highlight the possibility of choice as affecting *this* life. Ferrier's allegorical vision of a female character who embodies both Scotland and proper Christian decision allows her *Marriage* to break free of the confines presented by polite society and genre. As a result of her journey, Mary is able to make proper use of her national and religious heritage, and vice versa. Finally, Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* employs both symbol and narrative allegory to expose the hypocrisy of urban, upper-middle class Victorian society. Stevenson chooses "the romance of men" over "the novel of society." He uses the technique of the "good temptation" (Fish *Sin* 216) upon his reader through rhetoric that at first seems appropriate but actually conceals society's evil. We are tempted to see Mr. Hyde's nature as the true evil and true solution of the tale, when in reality it is neither. Each of these Scottish authors worked within the confines of their genre and time, but through a use of polysemous meaning they were able to engender in their readers an understanding of both the nature of literature and the goals of life. If allegory is Scottish literature's warp, and nature and nationalism make up its pattern, then ethical questions provide its distinctive depths and shadings.

Postscript

Where Do We Go from Here?

Throughout this study, I have argued that Scottish authors across the ages have used allegory as a way to consider themselves and their nation. I have also proposed that causing readers to explore their own images of self and national identity is a large part of Scottish authors' choice to use allegory. If my arguments are valid, then such literary trends should perforce continue into present day Scottish literature. The bulk of my study has not focused on any authors writing after the Second World War. However, the Scottish practice of using multiple meaning to communicate with readers who are capable of comprehending hidden truth, and thus actively participating in the implications of the text, did not cease to exist during the post-industrial age. Once again, that which differentiates Scottish literature from other British literatures is the *continued* use of allegory from the Middle Ages to modern day.

Moreover, an emphasis on mimesis, national identity and ethics continues to be used by Scottish authors. Modern, post-modern and contemporary Scottish authors such as Willa Muir, John Buchan, Lewis Grassic Gibbon, Neil Gunn, George Douglas Brown, Naomi Mitchison, Muriel Spark and Alasdair Gray, to name a few, use allegory to write about their environment, the formation of identity (both of individuals and of the Scottish nation) and the right way to live. Like the authors I have closely considered, each is influenced by the concerns and trends of his or her own era and by his or her role as a practitioner of allegorical writing. Unfortunately, due to the nature of this study, it is not possible for me to consider the works of these more modern authors in depth or detail. Simply stating their status as Scottish allegorical authors must suffice.

Allegory is a tool that has been useful for Scottish authors across the ages and it is still used by them today. They continue to draw upon complicity to affect their readers and continue to focus on mimesis, national identity and ethical concerns as catalysts for the initiation of that complicity. Describing Alasdair Gray's fiction, Marshall Walker writes, "The hand that holds the pen may more easily be imagined at the end of the reader's arm than at the end of Gray's, although, of course, it is there too" (42). Walker's words describe a process that Scottish literature perpetuates

throughout the ages. For Scottish authors across time, the act of reading (or being part of an audience) has always been a process that may be harnessed to allow people to make the right choices about their identities and their lives. Thus, uniquely within British literature, Scottish allegorical writing has been and continues to be the enactment of responsibility to self, others, community, the nation, and the world.

Works Consulted

Primary Texts:

Brown, George Douglas. <u>The House With the Green Shutters</u>. Ed. Dorothy Porter.
London: Penguin, 1985.

Buchan, John. <u>Witch Wood</u>. Edinburgh: Canongate Classics, 1927.

Drummond, William of Hawthornden. <u>The Poetical Works of William Drummond
of Hawthornden: with 'A Cypresse Grove'</u>. Ed. L. E. Kastner. New York:
Haskell House Publishers Ltd., 1968.

Dunbar, William. <u>The Tretis of the Twa Mariitt Wemen and the Wedo</u>. Jack and
Rozendaal 136-151.

Fergusson, Sir James, ed. and trans. <u>The Declaration of Arbroath</u>. Edinburgh:
Edinburgh UP, 1970.

Ferrier, Susan. <u>Marriage</u>. Ed. Herbert Foltinek. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

Gibbon, Lewis Grassic. <u>A Scots Quair</u>. London: Penguin, 1986.

Gray, Alasdair. <u>Lanark: A Life in 4 Books</u>. London: Picador, 1994 (Edinburgh:
Canongate, 1981).

---. <u>Poor Things: Episodes from the Early Life of Archibal McCandless M. D.
Scottish Public Health Officer</u>. Chicago: Dalkey Archive P, 2001 (c1992).

Gunn, Neil M. <u>Highland River</u>. Edinburgh: Canongate Classics, 1938.

Henryson, Robert. <u>Robert Henryson: The Poems</u>. Ed. Denton Fox. Oxford: Clarendon
P, 1987.

---. <u>The Poems of Robert Henryson</u>. Ed. Robert L. Kindrick. Kalamazoo, MI:
Medieval Institute Publications, 1990.

Hogg, James. <u>Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner</u>. Ed. John Carey.
Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.

Jack, R. D. S., and P. A. T. Rozendaal, eds. <u>The Mercat Anthology of Early
Scottish Literature 1375-1707</u>. Edinburgh: Mercat P, 1997.

Lindsay, David. <u>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis</u>. Ed. Roderick Lyall. Edinburgh:
Canongate Classics, 1989.

---. <u>Sir David Lyndsay: Selected Poems</u>. Ed. Janet Hadley Williams. Glasgow:
The Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 2000.

MacDiarmid, Hugh. "The Seamless Garment." <u>Collected Poems of Hugh
MacDiarmid</u>. New York: MacMillan, 1967. 290-292.

"Mankind." Bevington 903-938.

Mitchison, Naomi. Beyond this Limit: selected shorter fiction of Naomi Mitchison. Ed. Isobel Murray. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1986.

---. Five Men and a Swan. London: Allen & Unvin, 1957.

Montgomerie, Alexander. "The Cherrie and the Slae." Jack and Rozendaal 289-329.

Muir, Willa. Imagined Selves. Ed. Kirsty Allen. Edinburgh: Canongate Classics, 1996.

Shepherd, Nan. The Grampian Quartet. Ed. Roderick Watson. Edinburgh: Canongate Classics, 1970.

Spark, Muriel. The Girls of Slender Means. London: Penguin, 1966.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. The Amateur Emigrant. London: Hogarth P, 1895.

---. "A Humble Remonstrance." Norquay 80-91.

---. Kidnapped and Catriona. Ed. Emma Letley. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

---. The Master of Ballantrae. Edinburgh: Canongate Classics, 1946.

---. "The Merry Men." Neider 363-419.

---. "The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde." Neider 463-538.

---. Travels with a Donkey in the Cevennes and An Inland Voyage. New York: Current Literature Publishing Co. 1913.

Secondary Texts:

Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms: sixth edition. Fort Worth, TX: Hardcourt Brace College P, 1993.

Alighieri, Dante. Dante's *Il Convivio*. Trans. Richard H Lansing. New York: Garland, 1990.

---. *The Divine Comedy* of Dante Alighieri. New York: Vintage, 1950.

---. "Epistle to Can Grande della Scala." Minnis and Scott 458-469.

Alter, Robert. "Playing host to the *Doppelganger*." Times Literary Supplement. (October 24): 1986.

Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities. Verso: London, 1991.

Anderson, Carol, and Aileen Christianson, eds. Scottish Women's Fiction 1920s to 1960s: Journeys into being. East Lothian: Tuckwell P, 2000.

Anderson, Eric. "The Kailyard Revisited." Campbell 130-147.

apRoberts, Robert P., and Anna Bruni Seldis. "Introduction." Il Filostrato. New York: Garland, 1986. xii-lviii.

Aristotle. <u>The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation</u>. Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.

---. "Nicomachean Ethics." Barnes. Vol. 1, 1729-1867.

---. "Rhetoric." Barnes. Vol. 1, 2152-2269.

Auerbach, Erich. "The Idea of Man in Literature." Gunn 105-119.

---. <u>Mimesis</u>. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953.

Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo. <u>The City of God</u>. Trans. Marcus Dods. New York: Modern Library, 1993.

---. <u>On Christian Doctrine</u>. Trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. New York: Liberal Arts P, 1958.

Austen, Jane. <u>Sense and Sensibility</u>. New York: Signet Classics, c1811.

Barnes, Jonathan, ed. <u>The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Baudrillard, Jean. "Toward a Principle of Evil." <u>Postmodernism: a reader</u>. Ed. Thomas Docherty. New York: Columbia UP, 1993, 344-361.

Beatty, Bernard. "Byron and the Paradoxes of Nationalism." Newey and Thompson 152-162.

Beichner, Paul E. "The Allegorical Interpretation of Medieval Literature." <u>PMLA</u>. Vol. 82 (1967): 33-38.

Bell, Ian. <u>Robert Louis Stevenson: Dreams of Exile, a biography</u>. Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1992.

Bell, Ian A. "Introduction: The Politics and Place of Writing." Ian A. Bell 1-5.

---. ed. <u>Peripheral Visions: Images of Nationhood in Contemporary British Fiction</u>. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 1995.

---. "To See Ourselves: Travel Narratives and National Identity in Contemporary Britain." Ian A. Bell 6-26.

Bell, Millicent. "The Unmentionable Subject in 'The Pupil'." Freedman 139-150.

Benson, C. David. <u>Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde</u>. London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Bernstein, Stephen. <u>Alasdair Gray</u>. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1999.

---. "Doing as Things Do With You: Alasdair Gray's Minor Novels." Moores 147-164.

Berthoff, Warner. <u>Literature and the Continuances of Virtue</u>. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.

Bevington, David. <u>Medieval Drama</u>. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Bezanker, Abraham. <u>An Introduction to the Problem of Allegory in Literary Criticism</u>. Doctoral Dissertation Series Publication No.: 11, 244, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1955.

Bloch, R. Howard, and Stephen G. Nicholas, eds. <u>Medievalism and the Modernist Temper</u>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.

Bloom, Harold, ed. <u>Henry James: Modern Critical Views</u>. New York: Chelsea House, 1987.

Bloomfiend, Morton W. "Chaucerian realism." Boitani and Mann 179-193.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. <u>Il Filostrato</u>. Trans. Robert P. apRoberts and Anna Bruni Seldis. New York: Garland, 1986.

---. <u>The Life of Dante (Tratello in Laude di Dante)</u>. Trans. J. G. Nichols. London: Hesperus P, 2002.

---. "Short Treatise in Praise of Dante." Minnis 492-503.

Boethius. <u>The Consolation of Philosophy</u>. Trans. Victor Watts. London: Penguin, 1999.

Böhnke, Dietmar. "Shades of Gray: The Peculiar Postmodernism of Alasdair Gray." Stierstorfer 255-276.

Boitani, Piero, and Jill Mann, eds. <u>The Cambridge Chaucer Companion</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Bold, Alan. <u>Modern Scottish Literature</u>. London: Longman, 1983.

Booth, Wayne C. <u>The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction</u>. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.

Bowden, Edwin T. <u>The Themes of Henry James</u>. New Haven: Yale UP, 1956.

Bradbury, Malcolm, and John Fletcher. "The Introverted Novel." Bradbury and McFarlane. 394-415.

Bradbury, Malcolm, and James McFarlane, eds. <u>Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890 – 1930</u>. London: Penguin, 1991.

Bradbury, Malcolm. "London 1890-1920." Bradbury and McFarlane 172-190.

Brannen, Anne. "A Century of *Mankind*: How a Very Bad Play became Good." <u>SEMA: At the Turn of the Millennium Methodological approaches to Medieval Scholarship in the Twentieth Century</u>. Guest Ed. Cynthia Ho. Richmond, Kentucky: Eastern Kentucky UP. Vol. 15, No. 2 (Fall 2000).

Brockliss, Laurence, and David Eastwood, eds. <u>A Union of Multiple Identities: the British Isles</u>. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997.

Broun, Dauvit, R. J. Finlay and Michael Lynch, eds. <u>Image and identity: the making and re-making of Scotland through the ages</u>. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1998.

Brown, Callum G. <u>The Social History of Religion in Scotland Since 1730</u>. London: Methuen, 1987.

Brown, Dennis. <u>The Modernist Self in Twentieth Century English Literature</u>. New York: St. Martin's P, 1989.

Burns, J. H. <u>The True Law of Kingship: Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland</u>. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.

Calder, Angus. "Politics, Scotland and Prefaces: Alasdair Gray's Non-Fiction." Moores 123-146.

Calder, Jenni, ed. <u>Stevenson and Victorian Scotland</u>. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1981.

---. "Introduction: Stevenson in Perspective." Calder 1-10.

Calvino, Italo. <u>The Uses of Literature</u>. Trans. Patrick Creagh. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.

Campbell, Ian. "The Bible, the Kirk and Scottish Literature." Wright 110-127.

---. "Introduction." Campbell 3-5.

---, ed. <u>Nineteenth Century Scottish Fiction</u>. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1979.

---. "James Hogg and the Bible." Wright 94-109.

Carpenter, Sarah. "The Bible in Medieval Verse and Drama." Wright 65-78.

Carter, Gillian. "'Domestic Geography' and the politics of Scottish landscape in Nan Shepherd's <u>The Living Mountain</u>." <u>Gender, Place and Culture</u>. Vol. 8, No. 1 (2001): 25-36.

<u>The Catholic Encyclopedia</u>. Vol. 12. Online Version. New York: K. Knigt, 2003. <www.newadvent.org>

Charlton, Bruce. "The Story So Far." Crawford and Nairn 10-21.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. <u>The Riverside Chaucer</u>. Ed. Larry D. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.

---. "The Parliament of Fowls." L. D. Benson 383-394.

---. "Troilus and Criseyde." L. D. Benson 471-587.

Cherniss, Michael D. <u>Boethian Apocalypse: Studies in Middle English Vision Poetry</u>. Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books, 1987.

Cheyne, Alec. "The Bible and Change in the Nineteenth Century." Wright 192-207.

Christianson, Aileen. "Imagined Corners to Debatable Land: Passable Boundaries." <u>Scottish Affairs</u>, No. 17 (1996): 120-134.

---. "Muriel Spark and Candia McWilliam: Continuities." <u>Contemporary Scottish Women Writers</u>. Eds. Aileen Christianson and Alison Lumsden. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. <u>Cicero on the Idea of Orator (De Oratore)</u>. Trans. James M. May and Jakob Wisse. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.

---. <u>De Natura Deorum</u> and <u>Academica</u>. Trans. H. Rackham. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1961. 2-286.

Clifford, Gay. <u>The Transformations of Allegory</u>. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "The Statesman's Manual." <u>The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge</u>. Ed. Kathleen Coburn. Vol. 6, "Lay Sermons." New York: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1972. 3-52.

Collingwood, R. G. <u>The Idea of Nature</u>. London: Oxford UP, 1945.

Conrad of Hirsau. "Dialogue on the Authors." Minnis and Scott 39-64.

Cooper, John M. "Hypothetical Necessity." <u>Aristotle on Nature and Living Things</u>. Ed. Allan Gotthelf. Bristol: Bristol Classical P, 1985. 151-67.

Cooper, Lettice. <u>Robert Louis Stevenson</u>. London: Arthur Barker Limited, 1947.

Copeland, Edward. "Jane Austen and the Consumer Revolution." Grey 77-92.

Coupland, Reginald. <u>Welsh and Scottish Nationalism: a study</u>. London: Collins, 1954.

Craig, Cairns. "Going Down to Hell is Easy: <u>Lanark</u>, Realism and The Limits of the Imagination." Crawford and Nairn 90-107.

---. <u>The Modern Scottish Novel: narrative and National Imagination</u>. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.

---. <u>Out of History: Narrative Paradigms in Scottish and British Culture</u>. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1996.

---. "Scotland and the Regional Novel." <u>Regional Novel in Britain and Ireland, 1800-1990</u>. Ed. K. D. M. Snell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998, 221-256.

---. "Scott's Staging of the Nation." <u>Studies in Romanticism</u>. Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring 2001):13-27.

Craig, David. <u>Scottish Literature and the Scottish People, 1680-1830</u>. London: Chatto and Windus, 1961.

Crawford, Robert. <u>Devolving English Literature</u>. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1992.

---. "Introduction." Crawford and Nairn 1-9.

Crawford, Robert and Thom Nairn. <u>The Arts of Alasdair Gray</u>. Edinburgh: Edinburgh

UP, 1991.

Criscuola, Movshin Margaret. "Originality, Realism and Morality: Three Issues in Sir Walter Scott's Criticism of Fiction." <u>Studies in Scottish Literature</u>. Vol. 16 (1981): 29-49.

Daiches, David. <u>Robert Louis Stevenson and His World</u>. London: Thames and Hudson, 1973.

---. "Stevenson and Scotland." Calder 11-32.

David, Alfred. <u>The Strumpet Muse: Art and Morals in Chaucer's Poetry</u>. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1976.

Dillard, Annie. <u>Living by Fiction</u>. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Donagan, Allan. <u>The Theory of Morality</u>. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1977.

Donnan, Hastings, and Thomas M. Wilson. <u>Borders: frontiers of identity, nation and state</u>. Oxford: Berg, 1999.

Donnachie, Ian, and Christopher Whatley, eds. <u>The Manufacture of Scottish History</u>. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1992.

Doody, Margaret Anne. "Jane Austen's Reading." Grey 347-364.

Duckworth, Alistair M. <u>The Improvement of the Estate: A Study of Jane Austen's Novels</u>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1971.

---. "Nature." Grey 317-319.

Ebin, Louis A. <u>Illuminator, Makar, Vates: Visions of Poetry in the Fifteenth Century</u>. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.

Eco, Umberto. <u>The Name of the Rose</u>. Trans. William Weaver. Berkshire: Minerva, 1980.

Economou, George. <u>The Goddess Natura in Medieval Literature</u>. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1972.

Edel, Leon, ed. <u>Henry James: a collection of critical essays</u>. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

---. "Introduction." Edel 1-10.

---. "The Tales." Edel 172-179.

Edington, Carol. <u>Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir. David Lindsay of the Mount</u>. East Linton: Tuckwell P, 1995.

Ellmann, Richard, and Charles Feidelston Jr., eds. <u>The Modern Tradition</u>. New York: Oxford UP, 1965.

Empson, William. <u>Structure of Complex Words</u>. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1967.

"Ethics". <u>The Catholic Encyclopedia</u> 1-21.

Farell, James T. <u>Literature and Morality</u>. New York: The Vanguard, 1947.

Fergusson, William. <u>The Identity of the Scottish Nation: an Historic Quest</u>. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1998.

Fiedler, Leslie. <u>No! In Thunder</u>. Boston: Beacon Press, 1960.

Fish, Stanley E. <u>Self Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth Century Literature.</u> Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1994.

---. <u>Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost</u>. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1971.

Fletcher, Angus. <u>Allegory: the theory of a symbolic mode</u>. Ithica: Cornell UP, 1964.

Fox, Denton. "Henryson's <u>Fables</u>." <u>ELH</u>, Vol. 29, No. 4 (December 1962): 337-356.

---. Introduction. <u>The Poems of Robert Henryson</u>. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983. P. xiii-cxxiii.

Fradenburg, Louise Olga. <u>City, Marriage, Tournament</u>. Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.

Frank, Robert Worth, Jr. "The Art of Reading Medieval Personification-Allegory." <u>ELH</u> Vol. 20, No. 4 (December 1953): 237-250.

Fraser, G. S. "Cultural Nationalism in the Recent English Novel." Lewald 22-38.

Freedman, Jonathan. "Introduction: The moment of Henry James." Freedman 1-20.

---, ed. <u>The Cambridge Companion to Henry James</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Frye, Northrop. <u>Anatomy of Fiction</u>. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Gardiner, John. <u>On Moral Fiction</u>. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978.

Gardner, John. "Signs, Symbols, and Cancellations." Hermann and Burke 195-207.

Garis, Robert. "Learning Experience and Change." Southam, <u>Critical Essays</u> 60-82.

Garrett, Peter K. "Cries and Voices: Reading <u>Jekyll and Hyde</u>." Veeder and Hirsch 59-72.

Gellner, Ernest. <u>Nationalism</u>. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1997.

Gibson, John. "The Bible in Scotland Today: Retrospect and Prospect." Wright 208-220.

Gifford, Douglas. "Stevenson and Scottish Fiction: The Importance of <u>The Master of Ballantrae</u>." Calder 62-87.

Giles of Rome. "On the Instruction of Princes: Book I, Chapter i." Minnis and Scott 248-250.

Gilson, Etienne. The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy. Trans. A. H. C. Downes. Notre Dame, Indiana: U of Notre Dame P, 1936.

Goldstein, R. James. "Blind Hary's Myth of Blood: The Ideological Closure of The Wallace." Studies in Scottish Literature. Vol. 25 (1990): 70-82.

Gopen, George D., trans. and ed. The Moral Fables of Aesop. Notre Dame, Indiana: U of Notre Dame P, 1987.

Gordon, Ida L. The Double Sorrow of Troilus: A Study of Ambiguities in Troilus and Criseyde. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1970.

Gordon, R. K., ed. The Story of Troilus. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co, 1964.

Gray, Douglas. Robert Henryson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

Greenfield, Sayre N. The Ends of Allegory. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998.

Gregor, Ian and Brian Nicholas. The Moral and the Story. London: Faber and Faber, 1962.

Gray, Alasdair. Why Scots Should Rule Scotland. Edinburgh: Canongate, 1992.

Grey, David J., ed. The Jane Austen Companion. New York: Macmillan, 1986.

---. "Topography." Grey 380-387.

Gunn, Giles, ed. Literature and Religion. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Habermas, Jurgen. "Modernity – An Incomplete Project." Postmodernism: a reader. Ed. Thomas Docherty. New York: Columbia UP 1993. 98-109.

Hale, Dorothy J. "Henry James and The Invention of Novel Theory." Freedman 79-101.

Harris, Victor. All Coherence Gone. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1949.

Harvie, Christopher. "Alasdair Gray and the Condition of Scotland Question." Crawford and Nairn 76-89.

---. "The Politics of Stevenson." Calder 107-125.

---. Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics 1701 to the Present. (Fourth Edition). London: Routledge, 2004.

Hassan, Ihab. "Beyond Postmodernism: Toward an Aesthetic of Trust." Stierstorfer 199-212.

Hayakawa, S. I. Language in Thought and Action. (Fourth Edition) San Diego: Hardcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978.

Hendershot, Cindy. "Overdetermined Allegory in Jekyll and Hyde." Victorian News Letter. Vol. 84 (Fall 1993): 35-38.

Henderson, Arnold Clayton. "Medieval Beasts and Modern Cages: The Making of

Meaning in Fables and Bestiaries." PMLA, Vol. 97 (1982): 40-49.

Hermann, John P., and John J. Burke, Jr., eds. Signs and Symbols in Chaucer's
Poetry. Alabama: U of Alabama P, 1981.

Hill, David. "Of Mice and Sparrows." Forum for Modern Language Studies. Vol. 38,
No. 1 (Jan. 2002): 1-13.

Hobsbaum, Philip. "Arcadia and Apocalypse: the Garden of Eden and the Triumph of
Death." Moores 5-30.

Hopper, Stanley Romaine. "The Poetry of Meaning." Gunn 221-236.

Hugh of Saint Victor [1096?-1141]. Didascalicon: a medieval guide to the arts. Trans.
Jerome Taylor. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.

Hult, David F. "The Allegoresis of Everyday Life." Yale French Studies. Vol. 95
(1999): 212-233.

Hunt, Dixon. "The Picturesque." Grey 326-330.

Huppé, Bernard F. "The Unlikely Narrator: The Narrative Strategy of the Troilus."
Hermann and Burke 179-194.

Jack, R. D. S. "Discoursing at Cross Purposes: Braveheart and The Wallace."
Renaissance Humanism - Modern Humanisim(s). Eds. Walter Göbel and
Bianca Ross. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. (Winter 2001).

---. "Of Lion and of Unicorn: Literary Traditions at War." Of Lion and Unicorn. Eds.
R. D. S. Jack and Kevin McGinley. Edinburgh: Quadriga Publishing, 1993.
67-99.

James, Henry. "The Art of Fiction." The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism.
Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York: W. W. Norton, 2001. 855-869.

---. The Aspern Papers and the Turn of the Screw. Ed. Anthony Curtis. London:
Penguin, 1984.

---. The Turn of the Screw. Ed. Robert Kimbrough. New York: W. W. Norton & Co,
1966.

Jamieson, Ian W. A. "Henryson's 'Taill of the Wolf and the Wedder.'" Studies in
Scottish Literature. Vol. 6, No. 4 (April 1969): 248-57.

Jenkins, Anthony W. "Henryson's The Fox, the Wolf, and the Cadger again."
Studies in Scottish Literature. Vol. 4, No. 2 (October 1966): 107-112.

Jones, Richard Foster. Ancients and Moderns: A Study of the Rise of Scientific
Movement in Sixteenth-Century England. St. Louis: Washington UP, 1961.

Kaczvinsky. Donal P. "Making up for Lost Time." Contemporary Literature. Vol. 42,

No. 4 (Winter 2001): 775-799.

Kantrowitz, Joanne Spencer. <u>Dramatic Allegory: Lindsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*</u>. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1975.

Kennedy, A. L. "Not changing the world." Bell, <u>Peripheral Visions</u> 100-102.

Kidd, Colin. "Sentiment, race and revival: Scottish identities in the aftermath of Enlightenment." Brockliss and Eastwood 110-126.

Kindrick, Robert L. <u>Robert Henryson</u>. Boston: Twayne, 1979.

Klähn, Bernd. "The Threefold Way: About the Heuristics and Paradigmatics of (Post)Modernist Culture and Literature." Stierstorfer 77-89.

Knight, Stephen. "Regional crime squads: location and dislocation in the British Mystery." Bell, <u>Peripheral Visions</u> 27-43.

Kohn, Hans. <u>The Age of Nationalism: The First Era of Global History</u>. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood P, 1962.

---. <u>The Idea of Nationalism: a study of its origins and background</u>. New York: Macmillan, 1945.

Kuna, Franz. "The Janus-faced Novel: Conrad, Musil, Kafka, Mann." Bradbury and McFarlane. 443-452.

Lambert, Mark. "Telling the Story in <u>Troilus and Criseyde</u>." Boitani and Mann 59-73.

Lewald, H. Ernst, ed. <u>The Cry of Home: Cultural Nationalism and the Modern Writer</u>. Tennessee: U of Tennessee P, 1972.

Lewis, C. S. <u>The Allegory of Love: a study in medieval tradition</u>. London: Oxford UP, 1936.

---. <u>The Discarded Image: an introduction to medieval and renaissance literature</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge P, 1976.

---. <u>Mere Christianity</u>. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co, 1943.

Leyburn, Ellen Douglass. <u>Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man</u>. New Haven: Yale UP, 1956.

Litz, Walton. "Criticism, 1939-1983." Grey 110-117.

Lodge, David. <u>The Modes of Modern Writing</u>. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.

---. "Jane Austen's Novels: Form and Structure" Grey 165-178.

Lukács, Georg. <u>The Historical Novel</u>. Trans. Hannah Mitchell and Stanley Mitchell. London: Merlin Press, 1962.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois "Answering the Question: What is postmodernism?"

Postmodernism: a reader. Ed. Thomas Docherty. New York: Columbia UP, 1993, 35-46.

MacDonald, Donald. "Narrative Art in Henryson's Fables." Studies in Scottish Literature. Vol. 3, No. 2 (October 1965): 101-13.

Mack, Douglas S. "'The rage of fanaticism in former days': James Hogg's Confessions of a Justified Sinner and the Controversy Over Old Morality." Campbell 37-50.

MacQueen, John. Robert Henryson: a study of narrative poems. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1967.

---. Allegory. London: Methuen and Co, 1970.

Malinowiski, Bronislaw. "The Social Psychology of Myth." Ellmann and Feidelston 630-634.

Mann, Jill. "Chance and destiny in Troilus and Criseyde and the Knight's Tale." Boitani and Mann 75-91.

Manning, Susan. "Belonging with Edwin: Writing the history of Scottish women writers." Scottish Literary Journal. Eds. Penny Fielding and Alison Lumsden. No. 48 (Spring 1998): 1-9.

Maritain, Jacques. The Responsibility of the Artist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960.

Masson, David. Drummond of Hawthornden: The Story of his Life and Writings. London: Macmillan, 1873.

Maixner, Paul, ed. Robert Louis Stevenson: the critical heritage. London: Routledge, 1981.

McCrone, David, Stephen Kendrick and Pat Straw, Eds. The Making of Scotland: Nature, Culture and Social Change. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1989.

---. "Represneting Scotland: Culture and Nationalsm." McCrone, Kendric and Straw 161-174.

McCrone, David, Angela Morris and Richard Kiely, Eds. Scotland – the Brand: the making of Scottish heritage. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1995.

McDiarmid, Matthew P. Robert Henryson. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1981.

---. "Robert Henryson in His Poems." Bards and Makars: Scottish Language and

Literature: Medieval and Renaissance. Eds. Adam J. Aitken, Matthew P. McDairmid, and Derick S. Thompson. Glasgow: U of Glasgow P, 1977. 24-40.

McKean, Keith F. The Moral Measure of Literature. Denver, CO: Alan Swallow, 1961.

McKenna, Steven R. Robert Henryson's Tragic Vision. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

McLaren, Moray. Stevenson and Edinburgh. London: Chapman & Hall, 1950.

McMaster, Juliet. "Love and Marriage." Grey 286-296.

McMillan, Dorothy. "Constructed out of bewilderment: stories of Scotland." Bell, Peripheral Visions 80-99.

McNeill, John T. The History and Character of Calvinism. New York: Oxford UP, 1954.

Meek, Donald. "The Bible and Social Change in the Nineteenth-Century Highlands." Wright 179-191.

Mehl, Dieter. "Chaucer's narrator: Troilus and Criseyde and the Canterbury Tales." Boitani and Mann 213-226.

Miller, J. Hillis. The Ethics of Reading. New York: Columbia UP, 1987.

---. "The Poetry of Reality." Gunn 177-190.

Mims, Edwin. Great Writers As Interpreters of Religion. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury P, 1945.

Minnis, A. J. and A. B. Scott, eds. Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism: c1100 – c.1375. Oxford Clarendon P, 1988.

Moler, Kenneth L. Jane Austen's Art of Allusion. Lincoln, Nebraska: U of Nebraska P, 1968.

Moore, Edward. Studies in Dante. Third Series. Miscellaneous Essays. New York: Haskell House, 1968.

Moores, Phil, ed. Alasdair Gray: Critical Appreciations and a Bibliography. Boston Spa & London: The British Library, 2002.

---. "Editor's preface." Moores ix-xii.

"Moral Theology". The Catholic Encyclopedia 1-23.

Morgan, Edwin. "Gray and Glasgow." Crawford and Nairn 64-75.

Morgan, Susan. "Jane Austen and Romanticism." Grey 364-368.

Morris, David. Robert Louis Stevenson and the Scottish Highlanders. Stirling: Eneas Mackay, 1929.

Muir, Edwin. Essays on Literature and Society. London: Cassell and Co, 1949.

Murison, William. Sir David Lyndsay: Poet and Satirist of the Old Church in
     Scotland. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1938.

Murrin, Michael. The Veil of Allegory. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1969.

Nairn, Tom. The Break-up of Britain. Second edition. London: Verso, 1977.

Neider, Charles, ed. The Complete Short Stories of Robert Louis Stevenson. New
     York: Da Capo P, 1998.

The New Oxford Annotated Bible. Eds. Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy.
     New York: Oxford U P, 1973.

Newey, Vincent, and Ann Thompson, eds. Literature and Nationalism. Liverpool:
     Liverpool UP, 1991.

Newlyn, Evelyn S. "Affective Style in Middle Scots: The Education of the Reader
     in Three Fables by Robert Henryson." Nottingham Mediaeval Studies. Ed.
     Antonia Gransden. Vol. 26 (1982): 47-56.

Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. The Breaking of the Circle: studies in the effect of the
     "new science" on seventeenth-century poetry. New York: Columbia UP, 1960.

Norquay, Glenda, ed. R. L. Stevenson On Fiction: An Anthology of Literary and
     Critical Essays. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.

Nussbaum, Martha C. Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature. New
     York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Ong, Walter J. "Voice as Summons for Belief: Literature, Faith, and the Divided
     Self." Gunn 68-87.

Page, Norman. "Influence on Later Writers." Grey 228-236.

Pearsall, Derek and Elizabeth Salter. Landscapes and Seasons of the Medieval World.
     London: Elek, 1973.

Petrovic, Lena. "Hear the Voice of the Artist: Postmodernism as Faustian Bargain."
     Stierstorfer 51-75.

"Philosophy". The Catholic Encyclopedia 1-34.

Piehler, Paul. The Visionary Landscape: a study in medieval allegory. London:
     Edward Arnold, 1971.

Pillsbury, Walter Bowers. The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism. New
     York: D. Appleton and Co., 1919.

Powell, Marianne. Fabula Docet: studies in the background and interpretation of
     Henryson's Moral Fabillis. Odense U P, 1983.

Prillinger, Horst. "Family and the Scottish Working-Class Novel 1984-1994: A study of novels by Janice Galloway, Alasdair Gray, Robin Jenkings, James Kelman, A. L. Kennedy, William McIlvanney, Agnes Owens, Alan Spence and George Friel." <u>Scottish Studies International</u>. Ed. Horst W. Drescher (Vol. 29) New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Quilligan, Maureen. <u>The Language of Allegory</u>. Ithica: Cornell UP, 1979.

Ramsay, M. P. <u>Calvin and Art: Considered in relation to Scotland</u>. Edinburgh: The Moray P, 1938.

Reiss, Edmund. "Chaucer's Thematic Particulars." Hermann and Burke 27-42.

Rennison, Nick. <u>Contemporary British Novelists</u>. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Ricoeur, Paul. "The Symbol Gives Rise to Thought." Gunn 211-221.

Robertson, D. W., Jr. "Simple Signs from Everyday Life in Chaucer." Hermann and Burke 12-26.

Robson, W. W. "On <u>Kidnapped</u>." Calder 88-106.

Rollinson, Philip. <u>Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture</u>. Appendix by Patricia Matsen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1981.

Rose, H. J. <u>A Handbook of Latin Literature</u>. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1996.

Roy, Ross. "The Bible in Burns and Scott." Wright 79-93.

Ryle, Gilbert. "Jane Austen and The Moralists." Southam, <u>Critical Essays</u> 106-122.

Samuels, Charles Thomas. <u>The Ambiguity of Henry James</u>. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1971.

Sandison, Alan. <u>Robert Louis Stevenson and the appearance of modernism: a future feeling</u>. Basingstoke: Macmillian, 1996.

---. "Robert Louis Stevenson: A Modernist in the South Seas." <u>Durham University Journal</u>, Vol. 52 (January 1991): 45-51.

Santayana, George. "An Allegory of Human Life." Ellmann and Feidelston 914-918.

Scheps, Walter, and Anna J. Looney. <u>Middle Scots Poets a reference guide to James I of Scotland, Robert Henryson, William Dunbar, and Gavin Douglas</u>. Boston, Mass: Hall, 1986.

Schlegel, Friedrich. "The Ironic Consciousness." Ellmann and Feidelston 438-457.

Self, Will. "Introduction." Moores 1-4.

Singleton, Charles S. <u>Journey to Beatrice</u>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977.

Smith, G. Gregory. <u>Scottish Literature: Character and Influence</u>. London: Macmillan,

1919.

Smith, Janet Adam. <u>R. L. Stevenson</u>. Folcroft, PA: Folcroft P, 1969.

Simpson, Lewis P. "Southern Spiritual Nationalism: Notes on the Background of
     Modern Southern Fiction." Lewald 189-210.

Southam, Brian. C., ed. <u>Critical Essays on Jane Austen</u>. London: Routledge & Kegan
     Paul, 1968.

---. "Criticism, 1870-1940." Grey 102-109.

---, ed. <u>Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage</u>. New York: Barnes & Noble,1968.

Speirs, John. <u>Chaucer the Maker</u>. London: Faber and Faber, 1951.

---. <u>The Scots Literary Tradition: an Essay in Criticism</u>. London: Chatto and Windus,
     1940.

Stetson-Watson, Hugh. <u>Nations and States: an Enquiry into the Origins of Nations
     and the Politics of Nationalism</u>. Boulder, Colorado: Westview P, 1977.

Stevenson, Randal. "Alasdair Gray and the Postmodern." Crawford and Nairn 48-63.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. <u>Edinburgh: with 12 illustrations in colour by James Heron</u>.
     London: Steeley Service & Co. Ltd.

Stewart, Stanley. <u>"Renaissance" Talk: Ordinary Language and the Mystique of
     Critical Problems</u>. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1997.

Stierstorfer, Klaus, ed. <u>Beyond Postmodernism: Reassessments in Literature, Theory,
     and Culture</u>. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

---. "Introduction." Stierstorfer 1-10.

Strohm, Paul. "The social and literary scene in England." Boitani and Mann 1-18.

Swinnerton, Frank. <u>R. L. Stevenson: A Critical Study</u>. London: Martin Seker, 1924.

Taylor, John A. <u>Popular Literature and Construction of British National Identity
     1707-1850</u>. San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1997.

Teskey, Gordon. <u>Allegory and Violence</u>. Ithica: Cornell UP, 1996.

Thompson, Ian. "Absolutely Fabulist." <u>Independent</u>. (December 24) 1993.

Toliver, Harold E. "Robert Henryson: From *Moralitas* to Irony." <u>English Studies</u>.
     Vol. 46 (1965): 300-309.

Tompkins, Jane P., ed. <u>Twentieth Century Interpretations of *The Turn of the Screw*
     and Other Tales</u>. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Tracy, Robert "Ireland: the Patriot Game." Lewald 39-57.

Trickett, Rachel. "Manners and Society." Grey 279-303.

Trigg, Stephanie, ed. <u>Medieval English Poetry</u>. London: Longman, 1993.

Tuve, Rosemond. Allegorical Imagery: some medieval books and their posterity.
    Princeton: Princeton UP, 1966.

Veeder, William, and Gordon Hirsch, eds. Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde after One
    Hundred Years. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

---. "Introduction." Veeder and Hirsch ix-xviii.

Walker, Greg. The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama. Cambridge:
    Cambridge UP, 1998.

Walker, Marshall. "The Process of Jock McLeish and the Fiction of Alasdair Gray."
    Crawford and Nairn 37-47.

Wallace, David. "Chaucer's Continental inheritance: the early poems and Troilus
    and Criseyde." Boitani and Mann 19-38.

Watson, Roderick. "…To Get Leave to Live: Patterns of identity, freedom and
    defeat in the fiction of Nan Shepherd." Scottish Studies: Publications of the
    Scottish Studies Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg Universitat Mainz in
    Germersheim. Eds. Joachim Schwend and Horst W. Drescher. Frankfurt:
    Peter Lang, Vol. 10 (1990).

Watt, Diane. "Nationalism in Barbour's Bruce." Parergon. Vol. 21, No. 1 (July 1994)
    89-107.

Webb, Keith. The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland. Glasgow: Molendinar P, 1977.

Webster, Bruce. Medieval Scotland: the making of an identity. Basingstoke:
    Macmillan, 1997.

Weisbuch, Robert. "Henry James and the Idea of Evil." Freedman 102-119.

Whitehead, A. N. "Nature as Organism." Ellmann and Feidelston 398-407.

Whitman, Jon. Allegory: the dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval technique.
    Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Wilder, Amos N. "The Uses of a Theological Criticism." Gunn 37-52.

William of Conches. Dialogue on natural philosophy (Dragmaticon philosophiae).
    Trans. Italio Ronca and Matthew Curr. Notre Dame, Indiana: U of Notre
    Dame P, 1997.

Williamson, Arthur H. Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI.
    Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979.

Williamson, Kevin. "Under the Influence." Moores 165-189.

Windeatt, Barry. Oxford Guides to Chaucer: Troilus and Criseyde. Oxford: Clarendon
    P, 1992.

---. "Literary Structures in Chaucer." Boitani and Mann 195-212.

Witschi, Beat. "Glasgow Urban Writing: A Study of Alasdair Gray's Fiction."
    Scottish Studies International. Horst W. Drescher, ed. (Vol. 12) New York:
    Peter Lang, 1989.

Woolf, Virginia. "The Ghost Stories." Edel 47-54.

Wotton, George. "Writing from the margins." Bell, Peripheral Visions 194-215.

Wright, David F., ed. The Bible in Scottish Life and Literature. Edinburgh: St.
    Andrew's P, 1988.

---. "'The Commoun Buke of the Kirke': The Bible in the Scottish Reformation."
    Wright 155-178.

Zima, Peter V. "Why the Postmodern Age Will Last." Stierstorfer 13-27.