

**INDECORUM, COMPROMISED AUTHORITY AND THE SOVEREIGN
BODY POLITIC IN *THE FORTUNES OF NIGEL* AND
*THE HEART OF MID-LOTHIAN***

A.D. COUSINS

Macquarie University

tony.cousins@mq.edu.au

DANI NAPTON

Macquarie University

dani.napton@mq.edu.au

ABSTRACT. *In The Fortunes of Nigel (1822) and The Heart of Mid-Lothian (1818), Walter Scott's respective characterizations of both James I and Caroline, George II's regent, enable him to create the duality of a historically recognizable and deeply qualified representation of the sovereign as natural body and as body politic. He considers how each monarch sought to establish, consolidate and legitimate their respective authorities in the dynamic politico-religious environments they presided over. To do so, Scott positions James' and Caroline's monarchical authority as inherently compromised and achieves this using three stratagems. First, he positions them both as either personally or politically indecorous, displaying actions unbecoming sovereignty. Second, he demonstrates how each monarch's perceived or actual lack of masculinity reduces the authority each wields. Finally, he shows that the justice and social harmony sought by the protagonists of each novel is effected, yet emphasizes that this is not due solely to the monarch's involvement, but to others better positioned to assist the respective hero and heroine at an individual level (and thus the sovereign at a macrocosmic level) to achieve that lasting form of justice and societal harmony. As such, Scott is able simultaneously to affirm the positive nature of both Stuart and Hanoverian monarchical rule yet maintain a qualified, wary and less than wholehearted appreciation of these two specific monarchs.*

Keywords: Walter Scott, Two bodies theory, Sovereignty, Stuart monarchy, Hanoverian monarchy, Indecorum.

FALTA DE DECORO, AUTORIDAD COMPROMETIDA Y EL CUERPO POLÍTICO SOBERANO EN *LAS AVENTURAS DE NIGEL Y EL CORAZÓN DE MID-LOTHIAN*

RESUMEN. *Las respectivas caracterizaciones que Walter Scott realiza de Jaime I y Carolina, esposa de Jorge II, en Las aventuras de Nigel (1822) y El corazón de Mid-Lothian (1818) permiten que el autor cree una dualidad de la representación del soberano como cuerpo físico y cuerpo político que se puede identificar históricamente. Scott muestra cómo cada monarca pretendía establecer, consolidar y legitimar su respectiva autoridad en el dinámico entorno religioso y político que regentaba. Para ello, Scott señala la autoridad monárquica de Jaime y de Carolina como intrínsecamente comprometida a través de tres estratagemas. En primer lugar, los coloca a ambos como faltos de decoro personal o político, mostrando acciones que no se corresponden con la soberanía. En segundo lugar, demuestra la manera en la que falta de masculinidad de cada monarca, sea ésta real o percibida, reduce la autoridad que ejerce. Por último, muestra que se alcanza la armonía y la justicia que persiguen los protagonistas de cada novela, aunque subraya que esto no se consigue únicamente gracias a la intervención del monarca, sino gracias a otros mejor posicionados para ayudar al héroe y a la heroína a nivel individual (y por tanto a la soberanía a nivel macrocósmico) para que alcancen un estadio duradero de justicia y armonía social. De esta manera, Scott es capaz de afirmar la naturaleza positiva tanto de la monarquía Estuardo como de la Hanover y, simultáneamente, de mantener una apreciación precavida, cualificada y poco menos que incondicional de estos dos monarcas.*

Palabras clave: Walter Scott, Teoría de los dos cuerpos, soberanía, monarquía Estuardo, monarquía Hanover, falta de decoro.

Received 8 May 2017

Revised version accepted 7 June 2018

The Fortunes of Nigel (1822) and *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* (1818) are two of several Waverley novels where Scott focuses on the role of the monarch in effecting both individual instances of justice and a wider social cohesion between or among violently dissenting factions, premised on (frequently intertwined) national, theological or political divides. As we know, other of his novels focused on the Stuart and Hanoverian monarchies after the Union of the Crowns include *Woodstock*, *Pevelev of the Peak*, *Waverley* and *Redgauntlet*.¹ In *The Fortunes of*

¹ Stuart monarchs or regents ruling prior to that union are, of course, foregrounded in *The Abbot* and *The Monastery*, both set in sixteenth-century Scotland and considering notions of rightful sovereignty and justice within that kingdom. In those novels Scott's qualified, careful support of the Stuart monarchy does battle with his awareness of the inherent flaws of that dynasty that led to its political demise.

Nigel and *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, however, Scott's characterizations of the foregrounded monarchs—James VI and I (with his son, Babie Charles, in a fledgling role as future monarch) and Caroline, George II's regent (in the actual and metaphoric absence of her husband)—create both historically recognizable and strongly qualified representations of the sovereigns in terms of traditional 'two bodies' theory, that is to say, as personally individuated figures and, in microcosm, as incarnations of the body politic. One of the earliest definitions of this theory, premised on a distinction between the physical body of the monarch and the office of sovereignty, exists in Plowden's *Commentaries* first published in 1562:

The King has two Bodies, viz., a Body natural, and a Body Politic. His Body natural ... is a Body mortal, subject to all infirmities that come by Nature or Accident... But his Body politic is a Body that cannot be seen or handled, consisting of Policy and Government, and constituted for the Direction of the People... and this Body is utterly void of... natural Defects and Imbecilities, which the Body natural is subject to." (Plowden 1792: 212a).²

It is in the broad context of the 'two bodies' theory that we argue that Scott presents the respective monarchical authorities of James in *The Fortunes of Nigel* and of Caroline in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* as inherently compromised. This is not to suggest that representation of the body politic and natural body of the sovereign does not occur in other Scott novels focused on notions of monarchy, or that Scott only constructed those two monarchs in this framework of reference. For example, *Woodstock* is also concerned with such issues, as Judith Wilt and Gary Kelly both note. Wilt (1985: 153-84) considers the public and private significance of (the unrecognized) Charles II renouncing his amorous pursuit of Alice, given his 'refusal to disencumber himself from 'womankind'... would be fatal to his public authority, not dishonourable to his private affection or dignity; yet again as with Everard himself the avoidance of this public pitfall is camouflaged as an act of private generosity." (Wilt 1985: 175). Kelly sees the duel between Markham Everard and Charles as "yet a further example of Charles' failure to govern his private character according to the requirements of his public position and responsibilities" (Kelly 1989: 167-8). Moreover, in various Waverley novels, Scott represents a number of sovereigns in the duality of the body politic and the natural body, including, for example, but not confined to, Stuart and Hanoverian monarchs in *Waverley* and *Redgauntlet* (Napton 2015: 250-65).

² The landmark discussion of the 'two bodies' theory and the monarch as natural body and incarnation of the body politic is Kantorowicz (1957). Fradenburg (1991) is useful in its consideration of the monarch's two bodies in the context of Scottish sovereignty. Olwig (2002) examines notions of the body politic and the natural body of the monarch represented by surrounding physical spaces from Jacobean times to the present.

Scott uses three tactics to effect his representations of the Stuart monarch, James VI and I, in *The Fortunes of Nigel* and of the (notional) Hanoverian sovereign, Queen Caroline, in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* as intrinsically compromised within the framework of the ‘two bodies’ theory. First, he portrays them both as personally or politically indecorous, performing actions unbefitting a sovereign. Second, just as he implies James’ deficient masculinity (in terms of then-heteronormative expectation), while still seeking to evade identification of the monarch’s overt homosexuality, so he seeks to attribute Caroline’s reduced authority to her femaleness *per se* and to her husband’s taking a mistress whom she admits to her retinue. Finally, Scott shows that while the justice sought by the protagonists of each novel—Nigel Oliphant for the legal restoration of the Glenvarloch estate to himself as the rightful hereditary owner in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, and Jeanie Deans for her sister’s pardon for ‘unproven’ infanticide in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*—occurs primarily as a result of the monarch’s involvement. Yet Scott also demonstrates that the creation of social harmony—signified by each protagonist’s marriage and their respective inhabiting of the financially restored environs of Glenvarloch or the newly created domestic environment at Knocktarlittie—is beyond both James and Caroline’s capabilities as monarchs. The social harmony effected is by others better positioned to assist the respective hero and heroine at an individual level, and who assist the respective sovereign at a macrocosmic level.

1. “As a man, king, legitimate heir, and successor, husband and father, James from the moment of his proclamation represented a nation’s hope of stable, good government.” (Sharpe 2010: 16). One could fairly summarize this as the national desire for both a decorous king and a government of administrative as well as financial decorum. Kevin Sharpe was referring, of course, to England’s hopes regarding its new monarch; yet it is through the mechanism of the personal union of James’ sovereignty over England and Scotland that Scott exposes the inherent challenge for James in *The Fortunes of Nigel*. As James VI, he had been reigning over Scotland for several decades. However, as Scott makes clear, it is not only England adjusting to a new monarch: the king is reshaping his model of sovereignty, as he adapts to reigning over the two nations as both James VI and I. Similarly, Scotland, emblemized through the many Scotsmen of various classes who have made their way in the train of James’ court to London, is also grappling with the changed nature of monarchical rule effected by the Union of the Crowns. Hence, while Nigel is notionally appealing to the longstanding King of Scotland, Scott makes it apparent that Nigel’s supplication for justice is made

to a sovereign deeply conflicted by his dual monarchical responsibilities. Scott's assessment of James' success as a king therefore includes analysis of his rulership over both nations.³

It cannot be argued that Scott portrays the 'hope of stable, good government' of which Sharpe wrote as being realized in *The Fortunes of Nigel*. In his portrait of James VI and I in that novel, Scott considers a number of questions about decorum and sovereignty, representing James as unroyally indecorous in various ways and matters. For all that, Scott draws on an extensive array of historical representations of James in order to rehabilitate both the king and his reign. Yet he does so warily and with heavy qualification, examining the monarch's physicality, scrutinizing various roles James plays, and deploying redirection along with interpretation as he constructs his characterization of the king.⁴

Scott had no shortage of sources, historical and historiographical, on which to base the characterization of James VI and I in *The Fortunes of Nigel*. In his own day and long afterwards, James provoked extensive if diverse historical appraisal. It is not surprising that most of the assessments of James written in the century after his death were to be found in the Library at Abbotsford.⁵ That library of course housed

³ Tara Ghoshal Wallace makes a similar point: "the union of two kingdoms in one king's body has not effected a cohesive body politic" (Wallace 2012: 110).

⁴ Scott's portrait of James, and its purpose, have been the subject of varied critical interpretation. Robert C. Gordon, while agreeing with James Gibson Lockhart that James and his court were "natural" subjects for Scott, considers the character of James itself an irresistible opportunity, in fact, an essential part of the inevitability of Scott's writing *The Fortunes of Nigel*—for Scott, as a "man who enjoyed mad pedants, ineffectual antiquaries and superstitious dominies, could hardly have been expected to resist James I, who embodied so many of the same qualities in his royal person." (Gordon 1969: 129). See also, however: Hart 1966: 198; Burke 2000: 295-323, at 300; Holman 1972: 73; Shaw 1983: 174; and Robertson 1994: 66-7.

⁵ The following histories specifically referring to James VI and I are included in the *Catalogue of the Library at Abbotsford* (1838) and are referenced verbatim from this source:

Howes's (Edmund) History of England from the invasion of the Romans to King James I., 1614. With an Appendix, &c., relating to the three Universities of England, &c., 1615. B. L. Wants title page. fol.

Williams's (John, Bishop of Lincoln) Great Britain's Salomon. Funeral Sermon on King James I. &c. sm. 4to. Lond. 1625.

Sanderson's (William) Life and Raigne of King Charles, from his cradle to his grave. fol. ib. 1658.

Robertson's (Rev. Principal William) History of Scotland during the reigns of Mary and James VI. 3d edit. 2 vols. 4to. ib. 1760.

Spotswood's (Abp.) History of the Church of Scotland, from A.D. 203 to the death of James VI. 4th edit, with Appendix, fol. Lond. 1677.

Calderwood's (Rev. Dav.) History of the Church of Scotland, from the Reformation to the end of James VI. fol. 1704.

Scott's own *Secret History of the Court of James I* (1811).⁶ This volume comprised various critical representations of James—Osborne's *Traditional Memoirs*, Weldon's *Court and Character of King James* and Peyton's *Divine Catastrophe of the House of Stuarts*—and one rather more approving one, *Aulicus Coquinariae*. In addition to his use of other contemporary histories, Scott appears to have drawn more heavily on aspects of Weldon and Osborne's representations of that monarch than upon the more favourably inclined *Aulicus Coquinariae* in the construction of his 'character' of James in *The Fortunes of Nigel*. Just so, Scott's own assessment of the decorum of James' person and his sovereignty is frequently scathing. It is never wholeheartedly positive; and, indeed, Scott's most detailed descriptions of James can hardly be interpreted as glowing. Nevertheless, Scott's preoccupation in *The*

Coke's (R.) *Detection of the Court and State of England during the reigns of James I. Charles I. and II. And James II.; as also the Interregnum, &c.* 4th edit. 3 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1718-1719.

Clarendon's (Edward, Earl of) *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, begun in 1641, &c.; with copies of Dean Swift's MS. notes.* 3 vols. fol. Oxford, 1702-1704. Complete History of England; with the Lives of all the Kings and Queens thereof, from the earliest Account of Time to the Death of King William III. &c. (Edited by Bishop Kennett.) 3 vols. fol. Lond. 1707.

Scott's (David) *History of Scotland, &c. from the year of the world 3619 to the year of Christ 1726.* fol. Westminster, 1727.

Rapin de Thoyras's. *History of England (translated into English, with additional notes, by Nicholas Tindale.* 2 vols Lond, 1732-1733—Tindale's (Nicholas) *Continuation of Rapin from the Revolution to the Assession of George II. &c.* 3 vols. ib. 1744-1775.

Lodge's (Edmund) *Illustrations of British History, Biography, and Manners, in the reigns of Henry VIII. Edward VI. Mary, Elizabeth, and James I. &c.* 3 vols. 4to. ib. 1791.

Hume's (David) *History of England, to the Revolution in 1688.* 8 vols.—Smollett's (Dr. Tobias) *Continua, of Hist. of Eng. to death of Geo. II.* 5 vols.—13 vols. 8vo. ib. 1796-1800.

Historic and Life of King James the Sext, from a MS. of the 16th Century. Edited by Malcolm Laing. royal 8vo. ib. 1804.

Hutchinson's (Mrs.) *Memoirs of the Life of Col. Hutchinson, Governor of Nottingham Castle, &c. With her own Life prefixed.* Published from the Original MSS. by the Rev. Julius Hutchinson. 4to. ib. 1806.

Secret History of the Court of James I. (Weldon, Osborne, Heylin, and Peyton, &c.) Edited by Sir W. Scott 2 vols. royal 8vo. ib. 1811.

D'Israeli, J. *Literary and Political Character of James I.* 8vo. London, 1816.

Aikin's (Lucy) *Memoirs of the Court of King James I.* 2 vols. 8vo. ib. 1822.

⁶ It is interesting to note that Arthur Wilson's *The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of King James I* (London, 1653), another well known, highly influential and negative portrait of James I, is not included in the *Catalogue of the Library at Abbotsford* (1838).

Fortunes of Nigel with recreating James as an historically recognizable ‘character’ enabled him to juxtapose an essentially accurate representation of the King with a careful, and heavily qualified, support of his sovereignty. As John J. Burke astutely notes, [w]hat better way to defend James than to create a portrait that would acknowledge all his weaknesses yet show that on balance he still deserved a place in the nation’s affection?” (Burke 2000: 314). How compromised Scott’s characterization of James is can be seen when we examine his descriptions of the King’s physique, physical presence, and physical surrounds. It is through these that his various indecorums are predominantly portrayed. Deliberately deflating James’ textual attempts at self-representation, Scott reduces both *Basilikon Doron* and *Trew Law*—“more than a claim of divine right; it was a restatement of imperial kingship” (Cramsie 2006: 48)—to “notes of unmercifully long orations, and essays on kingcraft” (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 66).

Scott’s careful foregrounding of James’ peculiarities and his construction of the ‘character’ of this monarch through his personal attire and physical environs commences early in the novel:

The king’s dress was of green velvet, quilted so full as to be dagger-proof—which gave him the appearance of clumsy and ungainly protuberance; while its being buttoned awry, communicated to his figure an air of distortion. Over his green doublet he wore a sad-coloured nightgown, out of the pocket of which peeped his hunting-horn. His high-crowned grey hat lay on the floor, covered with dust, but encircled by a carcanet of large balas rubies; and he wore a blue velvet nightcap, in the front of which was placed the plume of a heron, which had been struck down by a favourite hawk in some critical moment of the flight, in remembrance of which the king wore this highly honoured feather. (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 66-7).

Scott minimizes the cruel exaggeration and suggestion of deformity to be seen, for example, in Weldon’s physical description of James, focusing rather on his “inconsistencies in dress and appointments,” the appearance of clumsy and ungainly protuberance” and the mistaken buttoning that “communicated to his figure an air of distortion.” Although seeming to portray James’ physical characteristics accurately, Scott transfers to his dress and appearance those oddities of deportment for which James was famed, and by doing so distances them from James’ own body. At the same time, however, Scott makes no attempt to disassociate James’ peculiarities of appearance from his psychological indecorum. In fact, he links them overtly: “[S]uch inconsistencies in dress and appointments were mere outward types of those which existed in the royal character, rendering it a subject of doubt amongst his contemporaries, and bequeathing it as a problem to future historians (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 66-7).

Scott then extends this representation of James' character to a broader physical canvas. James' inner sanctum also acts as a facsimile of his psyche:

The scene of confusion amid which he found the king seated, was no bad picture of the state and quality of James's own mind. There was much that was rich and costly in cabinet pictures and valuable ornaments; but they were slovenly arranged, covered with dust, and lost half their value, or at least their effect, from the manner in which they were presented to the eye. (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 66)

Again Scott shows James' genuine merits being obscured and diminished by his indecorous, even uncouth, self-presentation. Scott uses the material, personal environment with which he surrounds himself to suggest the discernment, yet also careless luxuriance and waywardness incongruously informing James' consciousness.

Scott illustrates the asymmetry between James' character and his sovereignty by setting the monarch's physical presence and behaviour against the requirements of decorum and responsibility. For example, when Nigel seeks to speak with the King at Greenwich, in order to assure James of his innocence, Scott depicts James on horseback, engaged in that most manly of pursuits, hunting. The King succeeds in killing the stag, having been first on the scene, as royal protocol dictated. Yet Scott undermines this royal display of physical, manly endeavour when he shows James' trepidation upon Nigel's approaching him. Again, Scott emphasizes contrariety within his characterization, revealing and denying monarchic decorum in the King's corporeality. James' presence in the "lugg" in the Tower—that hidden cavity built for the King to eavesdrop on private conversations—forms another instance. This indecorous place, expressive of illicitly exercised and compromised authority—and encouraging as well as facilitating such behaviour in the King—is ironically presented as nonetheless enabling James to perform his monarchical responsibilities.⁷ Using this dishonourable mechanism, James effects the justice Nigel merits and also commences the restoration, such as he is able, of the House of Glenvarloch by smoothing the way for the marriage of Margaret and Nigel. Bizarrely, unexpectedly, the indecorous behaviour of the king's corporeal body facilitates, albeit only in part, the role expected of the sovereign as at once head and microcosm of the body politic. That having been acknowledged, the reader knows that James was never, of course, going to be capable of restoring the financial fortunes of the House of Glenvarloch. That task falls to Richie Moniplies

⁷ The Bachelardian concept of 'topoanalysis'—the concept of memories of a place and its various parts being not something merely remembered but rather entwined with the ongoing experience of that place—is useful when considering James' recalling his experience as both man and monarch in that locale, which is a geographical metaphor for James' simultaneous and enmeshed indecorum and noble intent. (Bachelard 1994)

and Martha Trapbois. Thus, by alluding to that decorum expected of the sovereign in embodying the body politic, Scott is mindful of historical accuracy while subtly diverting attention from what was traditionally seen to be the full extent of James' individual corporeality. He thereby indicates a contrast between James' appearance and the presence of some positive, truly royal attributes. Ironically, it is the Scottish George Heriot and the Earl of Huntinglen who, by recalling their experiences of James in his role of King of Scotland in Holyrood, draw attention to those qualities of kindness, righteousness and good intent, as they entreat James to display that same kingliness of spirit with regard to Nigel's plight.⁸ Scott demonstrates that different qualities co-exist disconcertingly in James, and that monarch's inappropriate behaviour seems paradoxically to be the means by which justice is, after a fashion at least, realized.

The Fortunes of Nigel and *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* have at their centres a very similar plot. In each novel, the protagonist and his or her immediate family face situations that require monarchic intervention if natural justice is to be done. Once justice has been achieved, the hero or heroine thereafter marries, that marriage signalling in microcosm the creation of a harmonious social order based on the affirmation of traditional values. However, despite the similarities of plot in each novel—not least, as regards the monarch's role—there exist significant differences between the two fictions. These can be usefully demonstrated by exploring Scott's treatment of Caroline in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* and contrasting that with his characterization of James in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, for Scott depicts Caroline and her sovereignty very differently from the way in which he presents James and his rule over England and Scotland.

James's presence suffuses *The Fortunes of Nigel*, however indecorously it may do so; Caroline, while mentioned at various points in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, is absent for much of the novel, only appearing in one (albeit climatic) chapter that depicts her interview with Jeanie Deans. She is notably absent from depictions of social unrest and rioting. Indeed, her absence betokens a compromised authority—one that fails to assume its rightful role in effecting true justice and, thence, social harmony. Moreover, Scott emphasizes, in conjunction with keeping Caroline absent throughout the novel, that she rules not in her own right but only as George II's regent (and George II is himself another absent monarch of Scotland, as well as of England). Her authority, although legitimate, is therefore further compromised by her being a substitution for kingly authority. Intrinsic to many of the Waverley novels in which Scott foregrounds a Stuart or Hanoverian monarchy is the notion of that monarch's supreme authority. Although

⁸ This arguable disparity between James' appearance and his character can also be seen in 'Tales of a Grandfather' (Scott 1836: 159, 342-3).

Scott may question the monarch's ability to wield royal authority appropriately—as he does in *The Fortunes of Nigel*—that monarch's rightful position as sovereign is maintained and, furthermore, asserted throughout those novels. Early in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, however, Scott introduces Caroline and immediately points out that her sovereignty is not of the same order. She is “Queen Caroline, (regent of the kingdom during the absence of George II on the continent)” (Scott 2004 *Mid-Lothian*: 35). Thus she is merely a surrogate for, as it were, the monarch's body politic in the absence of his natural body. She can assume the responsibilities and authority of the monarch, but necessarily remains less than he. Ian Duncan points out that in this novel female sovereignty does not exist in its own right: “[F]emale power is produced by an absence of patriarchy... Queen Caroline wields power in the absence of her husband” (Duncan 1992: 161). This is not to suggest that Caroline is unaware of her surrogacy, indeed Scott has her deliberately define her rule as such, deprecating the nature and extent of her own compromised and qualified authority. As Caroline herself tells Jeanie: “I cannot grant a pardon to your sister”: while she can instigate the pardon, she cannot grant it for her authority is (ostensibly) confined to “warm intercession with his Majesty” (Scott 2004 *Mid-Lothian*: 341). Thus, Scott, while lauding Caroline's political prowess, yet undermines it by indicating that her abilities are only required because of George II's own lack of monarchical capabilities and lack of interest in ruling England. Caroline's power exists only in the absence of the rightful monarch's exertion of power—whether that results from the lack of his physical presence or of his sovereign qualities and capabilities. Scott seems to be at pains to differentiate her from those kingly counterparts preceding her (and George II's) rule in a number of ways.⁹ He pervasively implies that absence, of one kind or another, in fact typifies her and her husband's rule.

In this context of qualified regency, Scott then explores the nature of the justice that Caroline effects in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* and represents it as being, for the most part, significantly compromised. Within *The Fortunes of Nigel*, *Woodstock*, *Peveril of the Peak* and *Waverley*, the monarch is induced to pursue justice, which necessitates his transcending the abuse or limitations of the current legal authority being exercised, and subsequently effects an instance of natural justice. The monarch's decision whether to involve himself in the pursuit of justice is made according to the strengths and weaknesses of that monarch's personality. James in *The Fortunes of Nigel* is shown to be lazy in his performance of his sovereign

⁹ James P. Carson's chapter on *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, while not touching on the subject of Caroline herself, explores other notions of legitimate authority and demonstrates a number of instances in that novel where Scott's discomfort with feminine power is evident (Carson 2010: 45-75). Susan Broomhall and David G. Barrie also provide useful consideration of Scott's thoughts in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* on the relationship between governance and masculinity. (Broomhall and Barrie 2011: 65-90).

duties, rejecting myriad minor petitions from his Scottish subjects and ignoring other, more significant claims. The combined efforts of George Heriot and the Earl of Huntinglen are required to engage the King in making restitution to Nigel Olifaunt and giving him the sign-manual essential to his continued ownership of Glenvarloch. Even then, James' initial response is to encourage Nigel to relinquish his ancestral inheritance and to "let the land gang, man, let the land gang" (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 114); and it is James' failure to address Nigel's legal issues in a timely manner that results in the loss of his precious sign-manual. Yet although James' tardiness in addressing Nigel's situation is the catalyst for Nigel's adventures, Scott shows that James himself does not instigate unjust legal activities.

Scott shows Caroline's initial engagement in the processes of justice to be very different. For a start, he depicts her as actively involved with the legal processes affecting Scotland. In the wake of Wilson's hanging, her decision to grant Captain Porteous a reprieve of some six weeks, thus overriding the Edinburgh court's decision to sentence him to death, leads to the Porteous Riots: they are a direct and vehement reaction to that perceived injustice. Caroline is thus at least partly responsible for inflicting injustice upon many of her subjects—and inciting the resistance to her sovereignty explicit in the Porteous Riots—rather than being responsible solely for the achievement of an instance of actual justice. Scott depicts Caroline's involvement in the public performance of justice as a comprehensive failure, for her involvement brings about injustice. Further, her inflaming discord between elements of her sovereignty, namely England and Scotland, is at once politically indecorous and politically dangerous.¹⁰ So too is the reprieve she grants Captain Porteous which the Scots perceive as a blatant disregard of and contempt for the authority of the law in general and Scottish law in particular. Thus she exacerbates existing resentment at the English dominance over Scottish law and society consequent upon the Union. Caroline is the only monarch in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, *Woodstock*, *Peveil of the Peak*, *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, *Waverley* and *Redgauntlet* to engage in determining a judicial outcome both unjust and resulting in social disruption.

2. Indecorum, whether personal or political, is in its various guises a significant aspect of both James' and Caroline's sovereignties as depicted by Scott. Although Scott was supportive of both the Stuart and Hanoverian monarchies, he remained acutely aware of the limitations of those two monarchs' personal authorities (by contrast to the authorities of the states over which they presided). Yet he indicates

¹⁰ This is not to say, of course, that Caroline is the only monarch in the Waverley novels to effect an unjust judicial result and subsequent social discord. Several novels, for example *Quentin Durward* and *Ivanhoe*, also focus on this phenomenon.

that their lessened sovereignties were not, nonetheless, the results only of personal indecorum. Scott also considers, for example, lack of masculinity to result in a sovereign's authority being diminished and, as far as James is concerned, to be linked specifically to indecorous, if unspecified, modes of conduct.

One important aspect of James' inappropriate behaviour as king that Scott does not include when portraying James' body, physical surrounds or physical presence is the king's homoeroticism. Seeking neither to deny nor to stress James' sexual preference Scott attempts sleight-of-hand by obliquely acknowledging it. Chief among his techniques is the deployment of allusion. His wary acknowledgement of the king's homoeroticism is quite literally the identification of a love which Scott will not conceal but which he will not name. It is not insignificant that Scott refrains from using Osborne's graphic descriptions of James' demonstrations of affections for his favourites, such as James "kissing them after so lascivious a mode in publick" (Osborne in Young 2000: 125). Instead, through his use of allusion he remains as reticent as Weldon, or as Wilson—neither of whom overtly refers to James' known sexual proclivities. Scott addresses the intimacy between James and the Duke of Buckingham (it was well known in Jacobean times, and Scott's own, that they were lovers) by using the trope that the lovers themselves used throughout their mutual letters, that of father and son. Scott has Buckingham frequently refer to James as his "dear dad and gossip," a phrase James used of himself in his letters to Buckingham.¹¹ This tactic allows Scott clearly but discreetly to acknowledge James' homosexuality and to associate it covertly with the notion of compromised personal authority.¹²

¹¹ The actual nature of this homoeroticism has been the subject of considerable debate, with a specific focus on whether James and Buckingham's relationship extended beyond desire into behaviour. Maurice Lee argues that, as James was "simply not much interested in physical sex," the consummation of this mutual desire did not occur (Lee 1990: 249). However, both Roger Lockyer and David M. Bergeron make a point of the likelihood of James and Buckingham's relationship extending into physical expression. "Buckingham himself provides the evidence that at Farnham he at last gave in to the King's importunity," argues Lockyer, citing a letter (undated) from Buckingham in which he recalls "that time which I shall never forget at Farnham where the bed's head could not be found between the master and his dog" (Lockyer 1981: 22). Bergeron directs the reader to "Steenie's" contribution to a letter from Prince Charles from Madrid (dated 20 August 1623), which refers to Buckingham's desire that once he "gets hold of [James'] bedpost, never to quit it" (Bergeron 1999: 97). Michael B. Young, in his chapter "Sodomy", considers the seventeenth-century definitions and perceptions of sodomy and how James' homoeroticism could, as a result, be both realized and reconciled in that historical context (Young 2000: 36-50).

¹² Young, in his discussion of Weldon and Wilson's respective descriptions of James VI and I, makes the point that "[m]any of his English subjects found him doubly puzzling because he was both a Scot and a man who loved other males. They viewed him through the distorting lenses of xenophobia *and* homophobia" (Young 2000: 122).

In Chapter 9, he uses another form of allusion. Two English courtiers' quiet asides in response to James' discourse on his ancestors run as follows:

"Ay, ay—*Beati pacifi*. My English lieges here may weel make much of me, for I would have them to know, they have gotten the only peaceable man that ever came of my family. If James with the Fiery Face had come amongst you," [James VI and I] said, looking round him, "or my great grandsire, of Flodden memory!"

"We should have sent him back to the north again," whispered one English nobleman.

"At least," said another, in the same inaudible tone, "we should have had a *man* to our sovereign, though he were but a Scotchman." (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 110)

Scott has James make a doubly unfortunate allusion to his ancestry. Even though the king explicitly disassociates himself from his "great grandsire, of Flodden memory," unavoidably he associates himself with that ancestor by the very act of naming him. The 1513 Battle of Flodden was a disastrous defeat for the Scots following on their invasion of England; in evoking his "great grandsire," James draws attention not only to his own, foreign presence in England but also to his being rather less than a personal success as king. More important, his allusion invites the second courtier to remark that James is a failure as a man. The remark implies, that although James' ancestor was merely "a Scotsman," he was at least heterosexual. Scott has the king's naïve reference at once mark him as diversely flawed in the eyes of those around him and further diminish his personal authority).

Another allusion is no less noteworthy. In Chapter 33 Scott pointedly stresses that the king's interest in Margaret Ramsey occurs as a direct result of his finding her disguised "as a pretty page" (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 369). Scott's narrator makes the point "that [the] learned and good-humoured monarch... had been much struck (that is, for him, *who was not very accessible to such emotions*) with the beauty and embarrassment of the pretty Peg-a-Ramsay, as he called her, when he first saw her" (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 397, our emphasis). Moreover, James' calling Margaret "his pretty Peg-a-Ramsay" is no accident. Careful readers of the novel will be aware that Margaret Ramsey is not the only character to whom the epithet of Peg-A-Ramsay is applied. Lord Huntinglen's contemptuous dismissal of the Duke of Buckingham ("Mind not Buckingham, he is a Peg-a-Ramsey"—Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 119) mirrors the comment by Shakespeare's Sir Toby in 'Twelfth Night' that "Malvolio's a Peg-o'-Ramsey" (Shakespeare 2008: II. 3. 68-9). In both instances, reference is ironically to a sexually experienced and wanton female. Bonny Peggy Ramsay's trade was lauded in the eponymous ballad (D'Urfey 1719-20: 139).

James' calling Margaret Ramsay "Peg-a-Ramsay" is not meant to convey his perception of her as a wanton, but it does enable Scott, having first covertly acknowledged the source of James' interest, to signal James' ongoing sexual arousal at Margaret's dressing as "a pretty page." Perhaps this could be argued to demonstrate James' heterosexual interest in Margaret as a female, but it is at least equally possible—and rather more credible—that it was her masculine disguise that aroused his desire.

Scott carefully crafts his depiction of the King, then, by employing an apparently candid but in fact carefully selective historical verisimilitude, in which he subtly nuances our perceptions of James' clothing, surroundings, and presence. Ina Ferris suggests that "the awkward figure of the Stuart king continues to block the recuperative efforts of history, constantly under rehabilitation but somehow never quite rehabilitated" (Ferris 2006: 75). Assimilating James' indecorum—the King's metaphorical and actual "fiddling about his cod-piece" (Weldon 1811: 2)—within an attempt at sustained rehabilitation of this representative of the Stuart monarchy, Scott's 'character' of the King as both corporeal body and corporate entity enables a recognizable re-imaging of this "wisest fool in Christendom" (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 67).

It is not only James whom Scott positions as having compromised authority because lacking masculinity. In *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, despite emphasizing that Caroline "possessed the masculine soul of the other sex" (Scott 2004 *Mid-Lothian*: 331), Scott underscores the contingent nature of Caroline's power and standing when he draws attention to her enduring, with supposed equanimity, her husband's mistress as a lady-in-waiting. Nor is Scott's focus on Caroline's consequently diminished stature as a monarch the sole instance of his discomfort with the notion of female political authority. Michael Cohen suggests that "the first novel to recognize the heroic possibilities of sisterhood, Sir Walter Scott's *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* ... fights the idea of female empowerment every step of the way" (Cohen 1993: 59). And he sees this antagonistic response to "female empowerment" as extending to Scott's representation of the Queen. Cohen argues that Scott adapts a salacious episode in Georgian history when he brings the king's mistress, Henrietta Howard, Lady Suffolk, into his account of Jeanie Dean's appeal for a royal pardon. He suggests that Scott's "Queen Caroline is at one moment an empowered woman dispensing power to women in despite of men's lust (*sic*), and at another moment she is only a bawd whose power is in imitation of male power and who, to get it, services male lusts at the expense of another woman" (Cohen 1993: 67).

This interesting assertion misrepresents Scott's subtle use of Lady Suffolk; nonetheless, it is true that Scott does consciously demean the Queen's private and

public personae. Lady Suffolk's presence at the interview between Caroline and Jeanie Deans reminds us that the Queen, if the predominant influence over the king, is not his sole advisor. Lady Suffolk also enjoys intimacy with, and influence over, the sovereign. Although apparently applauding Caroline's adroit risk management, Scott makes her rivalry with Lady Suffolk and her inherently humiliating circumstances overt: he diminishes Caroline's stature again, as a monarchical figure and as an individual woman. Despite her magnificent decorum in responding to an unpleasant situation, she is helpless against encroachments on her public status and the nature of her authority by the sexual preferences of George II.

3. Common to *The Fortunes of Nigel*, *Woodstock*, *Pevekil of the Peak*, and *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* is Scott's use of his protagonists' marriages to signify the creation of new, idealized social orders. For example, Charles II, in *Pevekil of the Peak*, effects the marriage of Julian Pevekil with Alice Bridgenorth and by doing so creates Martindale-Moultrassie: he creates an emblematic locale symbolizing social reconciliation. Neither James nor Caroline, however, has the personal authority or public standing (and, in James' case, the financial strength) to effect the creation of those signifiers of social order in microcosm, either Glenvarloch by sole agency or, indeed, Knocktarlitie at all.

In *The Fortunes of Nigel*, James takes great pleasure in bringing about the marriage of Nigel Olifaunt and Margaret Ramsay. Nevertheless, while he has some part in the subsequent orchestration of Nigel's regaining his ancestral lands, that is due primarily to substantial financial assistance from Richie Moniplies and Martha Trapbois. Scott intimates the limitations of this flawed monarch, this notionally least masculine of the Stuart kings, but demonstrates James' agency in both an instance of effecting justice and a representative regeneration of Scottish social order. Glenvarloch not only signals the melding of Scottish aristocracy and bourgeoisie to achieve social and economic stability in that nation. It simultaneously demonstrates James' recalling his kingly responsibilities as both James VI and I, while showing that James is able only to achieve harmony between fellow Scots and within Scotland. At no point does Scott demonstrate James' ability to overcome the animosity between the countrymen of the lands over which he rules. Scotland and England remain as disunited at the close of the novel as they were in the beginning, still grappling with the ramifications of the Union of the Crowns.¹³

¹³ It could be argued that the marriage between the Scottish Richie Moniplies and the English Martha Trapbois signals the creation of a fledging relationship between the two lands. However, this is not James' doing and nor does Scott demonstrate any wider form of reconciliation occurring between the myriad other Scots and English feuding throughout the novel.

Thus the marginalized state of social melding in *The Fortunes of Nigel* (and the need for others to provide the financial support required) demonstrates the limited capacity of James to effect significant social harmony. In *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, however, the Queen does not seek to or achieve any form of societal reconciliation. Caroline's pardoning of Effie Deans mirrors the reprieve (and implied expectation of a subsequent pardon) granted previously to John Porteous, yet it does not signal that Caroline acknowledges her earlier injustice. Nor does it undo the social damage caused by the Porteous Riots. Scott limits Caroline's success as a monarch and as an instrument of justice to the essentially domestic issue of Effie Deans' child-murder charge. Against the public, the political and the masculine, Scott sets the private, the domestic and the feminine.¹⁴ Caroline's role in effecting justice is confined to her dealing with a private request for mercy in a conversation that takes place within a secluded garden at Richmond, far removed from the court. It is only in the domestic realm that Caroline brings forth justice. However, it is important to recognize that, despite Scott emphasizing the Queen's lesser stature as regent rather than as ruler in her own right and his earlier assessment of Caroline choosing to minimise her own power and insisting rather that George II be accorded the achievement of her efforts on his behalf—it is Caroline who effects that justice.

Yet she remains a constrained figure of monarchical power: just as Caroline's physical presence in the novel is confined to a single chapter, so her engagement as monarch in the creation of justice is confined to the instance of securing Effie's reprieve. She is never allowed to be the creator of a new, notionally ideal social order, as is, for example, Charles II in both *Woodstock* and *Peveril of the Peak*. A symbolic locale of a new social order may be created in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, but it is not brought about by the English Queen as the penultimate figure of justice in Britain. The Duke of Argyle, that idealized, patriarchal figure of "traditional loyalties, and the landlord of active humane concern" creates it (Hart 1966: 145). Scott implicitly and explicitly qualifies the nature of Caroline's authority and the justice that she—as Queen and as regent, as public and private personage—can effect, which he does not do in the cases of James I and Charles II or, indeed, with respect to the Duke of Argyle.

It is the Duke of Argyle, whom the Queen cannot afford to disdain since his power in Scotland exceeds her own, who effects that symbol of lasting societal reconciliation. Indeed, Scott depicts him as having a *de facto* monarchical role in his own, Scottish environment and as achieving a form of social order and

¹⁴ Scott is of course intrigued in this novel especially with the concept of masculinity, exploring it via the characters of Caroline, Staunton and Madge Wildfire, and through the concepts of cross-dressing and gender role reversal.

cohesion that Caroline cannot. Thus Jeanie Deans' interview merely effects a "momentary success with Queen Caroline," and it is the Duke of Argyle, that "benevolent enchanter" (Scott 2004 *Mid-Lothian*: 380), who brings about the familial reconciliation necessary for Jeanie Deans and Reuben Butler's marriage to take place. It is he who constructs Jeanie and Reuben's new life with his creation of an idealized domestic environment at Knocktarlitie, as Hannaford notes (1998: 11). The commencement of their life together emblemizes the creation of social order within Scotland. Whether or not the Duke of Argyle functions as *deus ex machina*, his role in creating an emblem of enduring, conservative social and judicial harmony is undeniable. It is important to note, however, that just as the creation of an emblem of social order—Glenvarloch—signalled only that occurring within Scotland itself, so too is the Duke of Argyle's own instance of social and judicial cohesion.¹⁵ No symbol of improved relations between England and Scotland exists. Thus, Caroline is further marginalized as a monarch of both countries. Scottish masculine figures of sovereignty, whether James or the Duke of Argyle, have the desire and the power to effect a microcosm of social harmony founded on concepts of natural justice in Scotland itself through the emblems of Glenvarloch and Knocktarlitie. Caroline can neither effect an example of English-Scottish accord, nor create an entity located in Scotland premised on coherence between law and justice.

4. Scott portrays both James and Caroline as indecorous monarchs. He depicts both, whether personally or politically, as demonstrating behaviours unbefitting sovereignty. In addition, their respective lack of masculinity result in a further compromising of their authorities. Finally, Scott shows that neither solely brings about the justice and social harmony established in each novel, although James—that "least talented of the Stuarts"—is demonstrably more involved in the creation of a lasting form of justice and social harmony than is Caroline, she being overshadowed by the Duke of Argyle's larger-than-life localized sovereignty (Scott 2004 *Nigel*: 67). Scott certainly indicates that monarchy functions as an appropriate form of government for Scotland and England. Nonetheless, his assessment of James I and Caroline is inherently qualified and guarded. Scott's astute representations of these two monarchs, that is to say, of their 'two bodies' as evidently flawed allows him to emphasize the positive nature of both Stuart and Hanoverian monarchical rule as a whole while still maintaining a wary and less than wholehearted appreciation of James I and Caroline themselves.

¹⁵ Indeed, Knocktarlitie is as much a refuge from Scottish law as it is from English law; signifying the complexities inherent in the novel of Jeanie walking to England to gain a pardon from Scottish law while her compatriots revolt over English law presiding over Scottish legal rulings.

REFERENCES

- Bachelard, Gaston. 1994. *Poetics of Space: The Classic Look at How We Experience Intimate Places*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bergeron, David M. 1999. *King James and Royal Letters of Homoerotic Desire*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Burke, John J., Jr. 2000. "The Homoerotic Subtext in Scott's *The Fortunes of Nigel*: The Question of Evidence". *CLIO* 29, 295-323.
- Carson, James P. 2010. *Populism, Gender, and Sympathy in the Romantic Novel*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Broomhall, Susan and Barrie, David G. 2011. "Changing of the Guard: Governance, Policing, Masculinity, and Class in the Porteous Affair and Walter Scott's *Heart of Mid-Lothian*". *Parergon* 28, 65-90.
- Cohen, Michael. 1993. "Empowering the Sister: Female Rescue and Authorial Resistance in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*". *College Literature* 20, 58-69.
- Cramsie, John. 2006. "The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I". *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*. Ed. Ralph Anthony Houlbrooke. Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate.
- Duncan, Ian. 1992. *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel: The Gothic, Scott, Dickens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- D'Urfey, Thomas. 1719-1720. *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills to Purge Melancholy*, Volume 5. London: J. Tonson. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/26679/26679-h/26679-h.htm#Page_139>.
- Ferris, Ina. 2006. "The 'Character' of James the First and Antiquarian Secret History". *Wordsworth Circle* 37, 73-76.
- Gordon, Robert C. 1969. *Under Which King?* Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd.
- Hannaford, Richard. 1998. "Dumbiedikes, Ratcliffe, and a Surprising Jeanie Deans: Comic Alternatives in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*". *Studies in the Novel* 30, 1-19.
- Hart, Francis R. 1966. *Scott's Novels: The Plotting of Historic Survival*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Holman, C. Hugh. 1972. 'Nigel and the Historical Imagination.' *The Classic British Novel*. Athens: University of Georgia Press. 65-84.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. 1957. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kelly, Gary. 1989. *English Fiction of the Romantic Period 1789-1830*. Harlow: Longman.

- Lee, Maurice. 1990. *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in his Three Kingdom*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lockyer, Roger. 1981. *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628*. London: Longman.
- Napton, Dani. 2015. "Sir Walter Scott: Home, Nation and the Denial of Revolution". *Home and Nation in British Literature from the English to the French Revolution*. Eds. A. D. Cousins and G. Payne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 250-65.
- Olwig, Kenneth R. 2002. *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Plowden, Edmund. 1792. *Commentaries or Reports*. Dublin: H. Watts.
- Robertson, Fiona. 1994. *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Scott, Sir Walter. 2004. *The Fortunes of Nigel*. Ed. Frank Jordan. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scott, Sir Walter. 2004. *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*. Ed. Alison Lumsden and David Hewitt. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scott, Sir Walter. 1838. "Tales of a Grandfather". *Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott*. Edinburgh: Robert Caddell. <<http://www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk/etexts/etexts/grandfather.html>>.
- Scott, Sir Walter. 1838. *Catalogue of the Library at Abbotsford*. Compiled by John George Cochrane. Edinburgh: T. Constable.
- Scott, Sir Walter. 1811. *Secret History of the Court of King James I*. Edinburgh: James Ballantyne & Co.
- Shakespeare, William. 2008. *Twelfth Night*, in *The Norton Shakespeare, Volume 1: Early Plays and Poems*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Hans E. Howard and Katharine Eisaman Maus. New York: Norton.
- Sharpe, Kevin. 2010. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Shaw, Harry E. 1983. *The Forms of Historical Fiction: Sir Walter Scott and His Successors*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wallace, Tara Ghoshal. 2012. "Monarchy and the Middle-Period Novels". *The Edinburgh Companion to Sir Walter Scott*. Ed. Fiona Robertson. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 106-117.
- Weldon, Sir Anthony. 1811. *The Character of King James*, reprinted in vol. II. *Secret History of the Court of King James I*. Ed. Sir Walter Scott. Edinburgh: James Ballantyne & Co.

- Wilt, Judith. 1985. *Secret Leaves: The Novels of Walter Scott*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wormald, Jenny. 1991. "James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: the Scottish context and the English translation". *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Ed. Linda Levy Peck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, Michael B. 2000. *King James and the History of Homosexuality*. New York: New York University Press.