Ripping the Bodice Off of Sir Walter Scott: Investigating the Evolution of Historical Fiction Through Representations of the Jacobite Rebellions

Morgan Mosby

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Graduation with Honors in History

Southwestern University
2020

Approved

Dr. Jessica Hower
Honors Advisor
Department of History

Dr. Jethro Hernandez Berrones
Committee Member
Department of History

Dr. Eileen Cleere
Committee Member
Department of English

Ripping the Bodice off of Sir Walter Scott: Investigating the Evolution of the Historical Novel Through Representations of the Jacobite Rebellions

> History, real solemn history, I cannot be interested in. [...] I read it a little as a duty, but it tells me nothing that does not either vex or weary me. The quarrels of popes and kings, with wars or pestilences, in every page; the men all so good for nothing, and hardly any women at all. It is very tiresome: and yet I often think it odd that it should be so dull, for a great deal of it must be invention. The speeches that are put into the heroes' mouths, their thoughts and designs the chief of all this must be invention, and invention is what delights me in other books.
>
> - Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey* ([1818] 1985, 123)

Leading up to the series premiere on Starz in 2014, Vanity Fair published an article with the accompanying title: "Does the New *Outlander* Series Have What It Takes to be More Than Just a Bodice-Ripper?"[1] The resounding answer was "No." The author, cultural critic Joanna Robinson, asserted that the show was clearly marketed towards women, which she believed to be "a huge mistake." She continued on to argue that catering this specific show to a female audience was flawed, as it had already garnered a huge female following as a result of the immense popularity of the novels among women. The question Robinson asks to anticipate the series premier is whether or not men will show up for the series, a demographic apparently crucial to a show's success. A mostly female audience, in other words, is a niche too specific to create and sustain success. Further, the title's central term, "bodice-ripper," coined by the New York Times in the 1980s, is a fundamentally gendered one, with mostly negative connotations, meant to conjure up images of excess, female lasciviousness, and perhaps most importantly, escape. By calling ex-

---

[1] Joanna Robinson, "Does the New *Outlander* Series Have What it Takes to be More than a Bodice-Ripper?" *Vanity Fair*, July 28, 2014.

plicitly on the bodice-ripper and associating *Outlander's* female audience with market failure, *Vanity Fair's* article inadvertently reveals the ways in which historical fiction has been conflated with the feminine in popular discourse and the anxiety this association produces when considering public appeal and success and evaluating merit.

This underlying assumption has plagued the genre since its inception.[2] As a result, scholars of historical fiction must grapple with it: a proper understanding of the historical novel must necessarily include gendered analysis to fully understand the work the historical novel is doing.[3] After all, like all pieces of fiction, the historical novel *is* doing work and it does so in at least two ways. It serves as an intervention into understandings of a particular moment in the past, inherently questioning more official, scholarly histories. Equally, it serves as a means by which to present a particular historical present, commenting on the soon-to-be historical moment in which the novel was produced. Strikingly, even Jane Austen, one of the most prolific fiction writers of the nineteenth century and arguably the most significant, pondered the factuality of "real solemn history" in her 1818 novel, *Northanger Abbey*. In the epigraph that opens this introduction, Austen foregrounded several major challenges to the practice of history in ways that are incredibly germane to this paper. In these few, short sentences, Austen captures the ways in which academic histories have failed women in neglecting to include them in any significant way. She also alludes to the inherent constructedness of histories and questions why, if history is always already invented narrative, are women not included in them more? Moreover, she posed her cri-

---

[2] Jerome de Groot, *The Historical Novel: The New Critical Idiom* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010),19.

[3] The idea that literature *does* work in the world derives from Marxism ideology. Though Georg Lukacs, for example, never explicitly stated the tangible effects of a work of literature, he nevertheless believed that the novel could reveal something critical about the past in a way that profoundly influences the present.

tique more than a hundred years before scholars began to address the same issues—issues that have come to define History as a discipline.

Austen makes several significant moves here. First and foremost, she equates "real" history with "the stuff of popes and kings, wars and pestilence" in Catherine, the protagonist's, mind. In this passage, the author succinctly and accurately articulates early nineteenth-century conceptions of History and their preference for a high politics, high church narrative. This understanding, as expressed by Austen, is historiographically sound as well. In the following lines, Austen observes the absence of women from historical narratives, something that scholars did not expressly or extensively address until the 1970s. The excerpt concludes with Catherine's declaration that it is the "invention of other books" that excites her most. If history is an invention, as Catherine claims it must be, then it follows that it can be played with and utilized in a form that is more exciting, like the novel. Further, she implies that by using the form of the novel, "real" history can be expanded to include women and events below the workings of kings, popes, and wars. Thus, Austen lucidly defines the limits of history in ways that anticipate the feminist and postmodern critique of history in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In this way, she reveals at least two fronts on which the historical novel can be used to challenge "real solemn history."

It makes sense, then, that the ways in which a historical novel intervenes in the past have changed over time and are often also in line with contemporary historiographical trends. The purpose of this thesis is to trace these changes and intersections, intertwining history, historiography, and novelization, and thereby understanding the mechanisms by which authors fictional-

ize their chosen historical moment as well as how those mechanisms evolve and what they reveal about the past and present. I argue that a more complete understanding of the historical novel must necessarily include discussions about gender, national identity and colonialism, for these themes are the foundation on which the genre rests. I find that the historical novel is both historical narrative and historical artifact, revealing that the genre operates on a number of levels, revising the past in a way that reflects the anxieties of the author's contemporary moment.

What is the Historical Novel?

Most discussions of the historical novel begin with Sir Walter Scott and his 1814 novel *Waverley; Or 'Tis Sixty Years Since.*[4] This critical phenomenon is due in large part to Georg Lukács' monumental work *The Historical Novel* (1965), which offers a Marxist discussion of the sociopolitical changes of the late eighteenth century that allowed a new form, the historical novel, to emerge. Lukács explains this process in the first section of his monograph, citing the French Revolution as the impetus of a new historical consciousness: the French Revolution, he argues, made history a "mass experience" for the first time.[5] In its wake, people began to conceive of themselves as not separate from the processes of history, but rather as active agents in history with the ability to influence and shape it. Moreover, the shared experience of the Napoleonic Wars fostered a national sensibility that became "the property of the broadest masses."[6] According to Lukács, this shared experience of history coupled with a new national consciousness highlighted the "historical character of development," which had necessarily been

---

[4] Georg Lukács, T*he Historical Novel* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983).

[5] Lukács, *The Historical Novel*, 23.

[6] Lukács, *The Historical Novel*, 25.

influenced by class struggle—the impetus for human progress. In other words, change was no longer understood as an ahistorical process, independent of human activity. Rather, human social conflict becomes, for Lukacs, the sole driver of progress and therefore history. This is the new historical consciousness that emerged after 1789 and out of which *Waverley* was born.[7]

Lukács points to *Waverley* as the first truly historical novel, arguing that Scott was the first author to capture and articulate a new understanding of history as a human-driven process in narrative form. More specifically, Scott captured the gradual disappearance of traditional Scottish Highland culture at the hands of the bourgeois modernity ushered in by the English after the Jacobite rebellions.[8] *Waverley* is also special, according to Lukács, because it captures "the specifically historical… derivation of the individuality of characters from the historical peculiarities of their age."[9] In other words, Scott reveals the essence of the age rather than just cloaking the present in the trappings of the past. And while I agree with Lukács' assessment that *Waverley* is an important text when discussing the historical novel and its history, I am inclined to dispute his claim that Scott was the originator of the form. Scott himself wrote of being influenced by the Irish author, Maria Edgeworth, a fact that is severely overlooked by critics. He writes that the "manner" of *Waverley* is "palpably imitated while the pictures are original."[10] Scott appropriated the form and populated it with his own images. This is the nature of literary inheritance, but it

---

[7] Lukács, *The Historical Novel*, 19-30.

[8] Mariadele Boccardi, *The Contemporary British Historical Novel: Representation, Nation, Empire* (Basingstoke England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009),11.

[9] Lukács, *The Historical Novel*, 19.

[10] Sir Herbert Grierson, *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott* (London: Constable, 1932-1937). This letter was published online, at the following web address: http://www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk/etexts/etexts/letters3.PDF

nevertheless seems significant that Scott is largely credited with "creating" and "new" genre when he himself admits it to be project a synthesis. Lukács himself dismisses Anne Radcliffe's influence on Scott, arguing that tracking down Scott's "second and third-rate" forerunners "brings us not a jot nearer to understanding" Scott's work.[11] While I am not suggesting that Lukács was being overtly misogynistic, it is telling that Lukács' successors have colluded to successfully omit Radcliffe and Edgeworth when discussion Scott's version of the historical novel.

Nevertheless, It is difficult to overstate how influential Lukács' work on the historical novel, and *Waverley* in particular, has been; nearly all scholarly discussions of the historical novel are in dialogue with or offer revisions of Lukács' work and thus call on Scott. Avrom Fleischman, for example, builds upon Lukács in his own meditation of the genre, *The English Historical Novel*. He begins with the assertion that "Everybody knows what a historical novel is; perhaps this is why few have volunteered to define it in print."[12] Yet this scholar goes on the venture one; similar to Lukács, Fleishman defines the genre based on the relationship between the novel and its concept of history "as a shaping force."[13] Similarly, Fleishman also locates the origins of the historical novel with Scott at the beginning of the nineteenth century. However, where Lukács is focused on the historical socio-political changes that precipitated the historical novel, Fleischman turns his attention towards the historical novel's aesthetic value. A good historical novel, for Fleishman, is an artistically rendered vision that results in a "contemplation" of the timelessness of the human condition and influences of historical change. In this respect, both

---

[11] Lukács, *Historical Novel,* 30.

[12] Avrom Fleishman, *The English Historical Novel: Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf* (Baltimore and London, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971), 3.

[13] Fleishman, *English Historical Novel,* 15.

Fleishman and Lukács charge the historical novel with the ability to capture totality in a way that transcends temporality and is therefore familiar to people in every age. Both scholars in turn identify Scott as the genesis of imbuing the historical novel with these kinds of capabilities.

The assumptions underlying the historical novel as understood by Fleishman and Lukács are succinctly explained by Amy Elias, who posits that the traditional historical novel

> assumes the ontology of history; that history, as the shaping force of culture, can be identified and assessed by unmotivated, neutral human observer who can inductively extrapolate a development pattern in history itself; it upholds notions of cultural and personal value driven largely from western bourgeois economies; the shape of history to be linear and the motivation of history is Progress.[14]

Elias, who, with the benefit of hindsight, nicely summarizes the fronts on which Fleishman and Lukács were challenged and revised—namely that their interpretations follow the Whig model of history, whereby history is understood as process that inevitably leads straight the present moment. The problem with this theoretical approach is that it is often in collusion with larger institutional powers to suppress dissenting voices in order advance the dominate narrative. Recognizing the potential danger in this model, scholars began revising the theory of the historical novel. These changes in critical discourse are pivotal for this project as they acknowledge the wide-ranging potential influence that the form has. These developments are therefore worth treating chronologically in order to demonstrate how the field has evolved over time and where this project fits into this trajectory.

The postmodernists offer the first substantial revision of the governing theories proposed by Lukács and furthered by Fleishman. Both theorists were interested in capturing totality, yet

---

[14] Amy J. Elias, *Sublime Desire: History and Post-1960s Fiction; Parallax: Re-Visions of Culture and Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 12.

the postmodernists inherently question the notion of totality and its existence, let alone the ability to articulate it. In his introduction to a special issue of the journal *Rethinking History*, White admittedly states that one can *work towards* a kind of totality through the marriage of prose and history.[15] However, it is clear that White's notion of "totality" is significantly different than that posed by Lukács and Fleishman, for while the latter were concerned with an objective totality of history, White conceives of totality as existing only in the intentional fictionalization of history. In regards to the historical novel, then, White maintains that the value of the form lies in its capacity to accommodate both the "truth," or that which is contained in documentary records, and the "real," which belongs to the domain of fiction. Moreover, White defines the "real" as containing everything that can be said truthfully about "actuality, plus everything that can be truthfully said about what it could *possibly* be."[16] Put it simply, the difference between these theories lay in their conception of history and how it is produced; the two ultimately prove to be unavoidably and fundamentally at odds. Whereas Lukács and Fleishman believe in the existence of an objective totality, White argues that totality can only be achieved when room is made also for subjective actualities as well.

A pillar of postmodernism lies in its insistence that there is no such thing as an objective history. History is, rather, a consciously constructed narrative. In *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe*, White boldly asserts that all historical work is "a verbal structure in the form of a narrative prose discourse" meant to explain past structures and

---

[15] Hayden White, "Introduction: Historical Fiction, Fictional History, and Historical Reality," in *Rethinking History* 9, no. 2 (2005): 147.

[16] Hayden White, "Introduction",147.

processes by representing them in text.[17] Here, as well as in *Tropics of Discourse*, the scholar analyzes major historiographical texts in literary terms to draw readers' attention to the form of these texts, rather than their content. In doing so, he foregrounds the impossibility of these texts bearing objective, or even neutral, narratives with external meanings, as they too rely on emplotment to convey meaning, just as fiction does. White argues that the events of history,

> are made into a story by the suppression or subordination of certain [elements] and the highlighting of others, by characterization, motif repetition, variation of tone or point of view, alternative description strategies, and the like—in short, all of the techniques we would normally expect to find in the emplotment of a novel.[18]

If history is governed by the same literary rules as other forms of prose writing, then the critical distance between historical representation and fictional representation shrinks considerably, and we are left without a clear understanding of the fundamental differences between fiction and history.[19] Mariadele Boccardi poses a solution. She summarizes their difference as "the difference between events and their representation in narrative, between knowledge acquired through scholarly research and the presentation of that knowledge in persuasive, authoritative and seemingly objective form."[20] Postmodernism, in other words, questions historical truth in such a way that renders the type of historical totality promoted by Lukács and Fleishman an impossibility. Postmodernism, when applied to the historical novel, essentially sanctions the questioning of traditional historical narratives, a process that allows for the introduction of other, marginalized voices into critical discourses.

---

[17] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 2.

[18] Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 83.

[19] Boccardi, *Contemporary British Historical Novel*, 7.

[20]Boccardi, *Contemporary British Historical Novel*, 7.

Linda Hutcheon is equally as interested in the confrontation between fictional and historical representations in her 1988 book *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. Hutcheon asserts that to "re-write or to re-present the past in fiction and in history is… to open [history] up to the present, to prevent it from being conclusive and teleological." In other words, history as presented in fiction is neither closed nor is it final. Rather, it is eligible for re-working in the present, due in large part to its fictional representation. Furthermore, Hutcheon coins the term "historiographic metafiction" to describe works that are "intensely self-reflexive" and locates the advent of these novels around the 1960s. These texts confront and often disrupt the assumptions of the traditional historical novel. They are postmodern in an epistemological sense, as they "criticize, undermine, complicate, or try to position themselves" against Enlightenment modernity.[21]

Herein lies the difference between a historical novel and a postmodernist historical novel: the traditional historical novel as extolled by Luckás and Fleishman and found in Scott is an exercise in Enlightenment practices and values, namely objective empiricism and faith in progress. The postmodern historical novel, on the other hand, questions the existence of true objectivity and challenges the notion of linear progress. Moreover, the advent of the postmodern historical novel suggests that an objective historical fiction text is a delusion based in Enlightenment understandings of what representations of the past can achieve.

It might seem counter-intuitive, then, that White was such an ardent defender of both traditional historical novels (as defined by Elias) and postmodernist historical novels. But maybe it is less so when one considers White's task in *Rethinking History*—to reclaim the historical novel as a legitimate tool for understanding History. Skepticism abounds when contemplating fiction's

---

[21] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* 12.

ability to faithfully re-present the past. In order to address these concerns, White argues that the historical novel makes room for the possibilities of history in a way that scholarly histories cannot (or will not); the reader will recall his distinction between the "truth" and the "real" and what the marriage of the two can produce. With this definition of the capabilities of the genre as a whole, including both traditional or postmodernist texts, White exposes an opportunity for people who are usually excluded from the historical narrative to gain entry via fiction: women, people of color, queer communities, and other marginalized groups.

This is where Diana Wallace steps in. Recognizing that historical fiction has been one of the most widely read genres by women over the course of the twentieth century, she provides a comprehensive historiography of historical novels written by women in every decade of the twentieth century. Despite the genre receiving more scholarly attention (due in large part to the aforementioned theorists), Wallace asserts that there was still a large gap in critical work pertaining to the historical novel: gendered analysis. For Wallace, the historical novel is an inherently gendered genre and cannot be understood apart from these discussions.[22] Recognizing that historical fiction has a mostly female readership, especially in the twentieth century, Wallace first challenges the common excuse used by critics to dismiss the merits of the genre, questioning why literature written for women is dismissed as escapism, then challenges the notion that escapism is necessarily a bad thing. This argument is made to show that because the form is read so widely by women, it is of critical importance that the genre be understood in those terms. This is markedly different from Lukács and Fleishman, who both posit models of the historical novel as fundamentally male. Lukács, for one, never mentions female authors and his historically con-

---

[22] Diana Wallace, *The Woman's Historical Novel: British Women Writers, 1900-2000* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 1.

scious subject is at all times a male. One can only assume that he conceives of his audience to be comprised of males as well. Moreover, Fleishman states three determining criteria for the historical novel:

> that the novel is set in the past by 40-60 years; includes a number of "historical" events, particularly those in the public sphere (war, politics, economic change, etc.), mingled with and affecting the personal fortunes of the characters; and that it includes at least one '"real" personage.[23]

Fleishman's understanding of what constitutes historical fiction "worth writing about" is gendered and bars women, as authors, subjects, and readers, from identifying with the text. As Wallace is apt to point out, all three criteria serve to exclude novels written by women. On the first point, a requisite of 40-60 years between the novel and the history it describes excludes family dramas, a form that has been an important historical form for female writers. This definition precludes the family saga on the grounds that most are not set in such a distant past.[24] The second point is even more overtly gendered when one acknowledges the traditional marginality of women in "historic" events in the public sphere, in such arenas as war, politics, and economics. This point reinforces the situation described by Austen in the epigraph with respect to the exclusion of women from these histories. The third point is similarly problematic, as the historical record includes far fewer "real" female personages than male.[25] This further limits what women could write about: considering that the majority of "real" personages who populate the historical record are men, female authors had neither the language nor the historical figures to look to in order to write histories about women's issues.

---

[23] Fleishman, *English Historical Novel,* 3.

[24] Wallace, *Woman's Historical Novel,* 13.

[25] Wallace, *Woman's Historical Novel,* 13.

Paradoxically, however, this is precisely why Wallace argues that historical fiction is critical for the recuperation of women's histories: historical fiction allows women to reimagine and repopulate histories that are closed off to them by traditional scholarly narratives. Wallace's argument is so successful because she demonstrates how female authors used the historical novel for exactly this purpose in every decade between 1900-2000. Wallace provides an incredibly logical model for discussing works of historical fiction that is equal parts historical context and textual analysis, aimed solely at exposing the changing relationship between gender and the historical novel. This thesis largely follows the framework as modeled by Wallace, but with several important revisions. I expand her theoretical parameters to include discussions on narratives of national identity and colonialism.This allows for the introduction of more marginalized voices, and perhaps begin to parse the influence that gender has on conceptions of national identity and colonial narratives.

One of Wallace's biggest tasks in her monograph is to show that escapism is not necessarily a bad thing. This is central for her overarching argument, as she fights to demonstrate the value of the woman's historical novel, which is often lambasted as escapist trash. Where Elias sees no value in "bodice-rippers"[26], Wallace convincingly finds sites of feminist resistance against hegemonic, patriarchal power. Just because something is escapist and/or popular, Wallace contends, does not mean that it lacks substance, or does not do work. The result is a smart reading of critically neglected texts that highlights the work they do, for and by women.

Aside from offering a feminist analysis of the genre, Wallace also differs from her peers in her approach. Lukács and Fleishman, for example, evaluate the historical novel in terms of its

---

[26] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* 16.

ability to comprehensively capture, a particular historical epoch. Hutcheon and Elias, on the other hand, focus their energies on explaining the ways in which post-1960s historical novels challenge historical truths, whether or not such a thing even exists, and the fundamental role that fiction plays in these texts. Wallace, however, explicitly understands her chosen novels as primary texts. In other words, her purpose is to foreground how historical novels often reveal more about the time in which they were written rather the time they seek to represent. It is Wallace's contention that representations of the past tell us much about the "powerful ideologies" of the present.[27] What links all of these theorists together, however, is the fact that they all descend from and situate their works in relation to Lukács.

Yet while each scholar offers their own revision of Lukács, none question his assertion that Scott was the first historical novelist. Jerome de Groot offers a much-needed shift in the perspective of the origins of the genre. When discussing the origins of the historical novel, de Groot asserts that Scott was merely "developing the novel's [already existing] fascination with history."[28] He lucidly highlights other works of historical fiction that predate *Waverley,* in some cases by four centuries. De Groot points to Homer, Virgil and Wu Cheng'en as examples of classical authors who used creative forms to conceptualize history, then to Chaucer, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Milton as poets who similarly made fictional fodder from history.[29] As for true historical *novels,* he identifies Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (1605)*,* Luo Guanzhong's *Three Kingdoms*

---

[27] Wallace, *Woman's Historical Novel*, xi.

[28] de Groot, *Historical Novel,* 11.

[29] de Groot, *Historical Novel, 12.*

*(*1522), and Lafayette's *Princess of Cleves* (1678) as works in the genre well predating *Waverley*.[30]

De Groot highlights the fact that Scott's almost universal acceptance as the creator of the genre, despite the many other works that predate *Waverley*, is incredibly Eurocentric. His simple questioning of origins reveals that the historical novel, at least from its critical inception, is closely bound to national as well as imperial narratives. In their unwillingness to consider works outside of post-industrial Europe (both chronologically and geographically), then, critics implicitly solidify a Eurocentric critical methodology, establishing a tradition of selecting novels "worth writing about"[31] that are influenced by *and* participate in imperial ambitions. Thus, the historical novel is deeply shaped by national and colonial narratives. However, de Groot, like Hutcheon, sees this as an opportunity for critical revision in important ways. He asserts that the historical novel "provides space for political intervention and reclamation […] destabilization" (139). De Groot thus argues that the historical novel challenges particular versions of events. He thus affirms the power of historical fiction to promote ideological positions, lament a lost history, or challenge the mainstream version of events "for polemic and political purposes."[32] In other words, historical fiction uses the conventions of a novel to challenge the historical writing. For de Groot, the historical novel is overtly political and thus implicated in colonial, postcolonial, and national discourses.

---

[30] de Groot, *Historical Novel,*

[31] Fleishman, *English Historical Novel,* 3.

[32] Wallace, *Woman's Historical Novel*, 139.

The impetus for this project stems from my shared interest in literature and history and what happens at the intersection between the two. The stark differences in the powerful, positive reception of *Waverley* in the centuries since its publication and the reception of more recent historical fiction provides an entry into this intersection, as an understanding of this phenomenon requires both historicization and textual analysis. This thesis asks how the historical novel has been transformed, in scholarly as well as popular understandings, from a critical darling penned by a man for a presumably male audience in *Waverley,* to being labelled mere escapist wish-fulfillment trash written by a woman for denigrated female audiences by the middle of the twentieth century. This question is intimately and inextricably linked to issues of gender, whether of author, subject, or reader. As it turns out, it is all of the above. Moreover, these issues have plagued the genre since at least the publication of *Waverley* in 1814. As such, my work foregrounds gender as it operates at all levels, both within and outside of the text, in historical novels. Further, I find not only that these texts are inherently gendered, but they also participate in narratives about colonialism and national identity, whether implicitly or explicitly.

This, then, is the gap I wish to fill in the scholarly literature—the historical novel's complex and evolving relationship to narratives of gender, national identity, and colonialism. In order to achieve this task, I offer a new approach to the study of the historical novel, comparing works of historical fiction—and more specifically, works chosen because they represent the same event—across time and space. Analyzing novels about the same historical moment allows me to better identify the critical interaction between the text and narratives of gender, national identity and colonialism, and begin to answer how and why these interactions have changed over time. Because the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 is the historical backdrop for Scott and he remains the

chief influence on the genre, I compare works written across the span of two centuries that are set during, in the run-up to, or in the aftermath of the conflict.

Waverley is my first case study. Whether it deserves the place it has been given as the first work of historical fiction is highly debatable, yet nevertheless, it is too crucial in the field to ignore and positing it at the fore of a lengthier examination serves to help complicate its lofty place. The last case study chronologically is Diana Gabaldon's *Outlander,* which represents the opposite end of the spectrum when it comes to gendered readership, authorship, and critical reception. Despite covering the same subject, the two texts could not be more different, and herein lies the inspiration for my method. The novels that I have selected for analysis all represent the same historical moment, the '45, yet span the late-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century, thereby revealing the changes in Jacobite historical fiction over time. They also attend to matters of gender, especially in authorship and readership, as well as crises in national identity and the prevalence of colonialism, to capture the number of ways in which historical fiction is deployed. Robert Louis Stevenson's *Kidnapped*, and Naomi Mitchell's *The Bull Calves* each represent the same events as Scott and Gabaldon, but do so from different points in history, which in turn influences the means and ends of each text.

By putting these four texts in dialogue with one another in such a way, we gain fruitful insights into the theory and practice of historical fiction, thereby better understanding its two component parts, history and fiction, on a number of fronts. At the broadest level we understand the work the historical novel has done across time. More locally, however, we gain a better understanding of Jacobite history and historiography through a fictional lens. Since these works

represent the same event, it becomes obvious that historical novels can be interpreted as both primary and secondary texts, which makes their purpose inherently twofold, making the form itself incredibly complex. But perhaps most importantly, it becomes increasingly clear that the historical novel is fundamentally gendered at its core and shaped by colonial and national narratives.

I

> "Whereas the English drank for Jacobitism and the Irish dreamt of Jacobitism, the Scots died for Jacobitism.
>
> - Allan I. MacInnes

While it is difficult to pinpoint the exact moment that the Jacobite "problem" was born in the British Isles, the Exclusion Crisis of 1679-1681 works exceptionally well for this study. By 1679 Charles II had been ruling as King of England, Scotland, and Ireland for nineteen years, after being restored to the throne in 1660 following the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. Charles' reign marked a much-needed period of relative political and social stability after the tumultuous 1640s and 1650s.[33] However, by the end of the 1670s, it became clear that King Charles and wife, Catherine of Braganza, would have no children, making his brother, James Duke of York, a known Catholic, heir presumptive.[34] In the summer of 1679, parliament seized on the entirely fabricated Popish Plot—an alleged scheme by a group of Jesuits to assassinate Charles and bring the Catholic York to the throne—to introduce legislation officially prohibiting James from as-

---

[33] Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 91-92.

[34] Carolyn Andervont Edie, "Succession and Monarchy: The Controversy of 1679-1681," *The American Historical Review* 70, no. 2 (1965): 351.

cending.[35] Charles, however, was adamant that the proper line of succession be upheld, not because of any loyalty to James but rather because he believed that parliament had no right to alter the line of succession of kingship.[36] No less than three versions of the exclusion bill were introduced over three years, but each failed.[37]

Though it failed to exclude James, the crisis nevertheless had several important implications for the future of the realm. As the first concerted attempts at excluding Catholics from the throne, it was a moment that rallied support to the Catholic Stuart line. Second, it precipitated the formation of two political parties, the Whigs and the Tories, which replaced their Civil War counter parts, the Roundheads and Cavaliers.[38] The Roundheads, who had supported parliament and believed in constitutional monarchy, thus supported Parliament's right to intervene in the natural line of succession and exclude James, for the betterment of the kingdom. The Whigs were largely protestant and appealed to Scottish Presbyterianism. The royalist Cavaliers, who had supported Charles I and then his son Charles II through the Interregnum and Restoration, believed in absolute monarchy and the divine right of kings; by late-century, they, in turn, supported Stuart right at all costs. The Tories were more associated with High Church Anglicanism and Catholicism.

---

[35] W.A. Speck, "William Augustus, Prince, duke of Cumberland (1721–1765), army officer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

[36] Pincus, "English Politics at the Accession of James II" and Edie, "Succession and Monarchy."

[37] Edie, "Succession and Monarchy."

[38] Robert Willman, "The Origins of 'Whig' and 'Tory' in English Political Language," *The Historical Journal* 17, no. 2 (1974): 247–64.

When King Charles II died in 1685, his brother succeeded to the throne and by most accounts, was met with general support.[39] However, James quickly began a process of Catholicizing his largely Protestant nation while simultaneously emasculating Parliament.[40] Influenced by the brand of Catholicism as well as the modern absolutist political model of his cousin, King Louis XIV of France, James embarked upon erecting a modern absolutist state across the British Isles.[41] He professionalized the army and navy, commissioned Roman Catholics, packed the courts with his supporters, opened Catholic schools, universities, and churches, and propagated Catholic apologist literature.[42] On June 10, 1688, James and his Catholic Queen, Mary of Modena, welcomed a son.[43] Until this moment, James's daughters, Mary and Anne, borne by his first and, significantly, protestant wife Anne Hyde, were his sole heirs. However, James's infant son now superseded his half-sisters' claims. Many in the realm were appalled by the thought of the Catholic Stuart line continuing their potentially absolutist rule.[44] These events spurred the so-called Immortal Seven to write to William of Orange, the Dutch stadtholder and husband to James' daughter Mary, in 1688 inviting him to take the English throne.[45] William accepted the

---

[39] Edie and Pincus both argue that the coronation of King James II was met with widespread support because it upheld English tradition which was seen as crucial in maintaining political and social stability. In affect, the English people conducted a cost-benefit analysis, deciding that the benefits of upholding English tradition would do more good than a Catholic monarch would do bad. Moreover, as Pincus points out in his fourth chapter, King James initially promised to protect the religious rights and general liberties of his subjects.

[40] Steve Pincus, *1688*, 6.

[41] Pincus, *1688, 6.*

[42] Pincus, *1688,* 6

[43] Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester University Press, 2019), 61.

[44] Szechi, *The Jacobites,* 62.

[45] "Invitation of the Seven to the Prince of Orange," 30 June 1688 Bill of Rights (1689)

invitation and his army successfully landed at Torbay on November 5, marking the beginning of the Glorious Revolution. James' army quickly deserted him and his daughter, the future Queen Anne I, defected to the invaders. James fled to France, where his wife and infant son, James Francis Edward, Prince of Wales and the future "Old Pretender," were already in exile. There, they rallied supporters: the Jacobites,[46] named from the Latin form of the king's name, *Jacobus*.[47]

There were three major Jacobite revolutions: 1689-91, 1715, and 1745-1745. Between 1689-1691, Jacobites in Ireland and Scotland waged bloody wars against the British army, contesting the validity of William's reign.[48] While the Jacobites were ultimately defeated, the wars fundamentally changed the British Isles, sowing deep resentment among Jacobite stalwarts towards William II and his successors. His positions secure, William obtained the Act of Settlement of 1701, ensuring the exclusion of Catholics from inheriting the throne in England, Ireland, and Scotland.[49] The Act of Settlement also mandated that, upon the death of the childless Queen Anne, the crown would pass to the next Protestant line, the lineage of Electress Sophia of Hanover.The most junior line of the Stuart dynasty, the Hanovers were the next protestant line eligible to inherit the throne. William II died in 1702 and the crown passed to his sister-in-law Anne I. Queen Anne secured the Act of Union, joining the parliaments of Scotland and England,

---

[46] Speck, "William Augustus, Prince, Duke of Cumberland"

[47] Daniel Szechi. *1751: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006) 1.

[48] Szechi, *1751,* 2.

[49] Act of Settlement (1701)

thus formally creating the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. When Anne died in 1714, the crown passed to Sophia's son, George I—the first Hanoverian British king.

By 1715, it was clear to the Scots that they would never be treated as equals under the Act of Union.[50] The suggestion of separating the parliaments once more was floated and garnered cross-party support, but was effectively quashed by George. To many Scots, this move represented their last means of constitutional redress.[51] James Francis thus organized an uprising while in exile in France meant to overthrow the Hanoverian regime, which ultimately led to Jacobite attacks on Perth and Preston in 1715.[52] These uprisings were ultimately unsuccessful due to the arrest of two Tory Jacobite leaders in England, which effectively dismantled the Jacobite troops in England, as well as the surrender of the Jacobite leader at Preston, who insisted on surrender after witnessing the slaughter and destruction of the battle.[53]

Despite this botched attempt at restoration, the Jacobites imbued the next generation with their same hatred of the Hanoverian regime. These are the Jacobites who would once again take up the cause, this time in 1745, supporting Charles Edward Stuart or "Bonnie Prince Charlie," grandson of Charles II and son of the Old Pretender. In 1742, frustrated by repeated military failures in the war with Spain, several Tory members of parliament began thinking about "the King across the water."[54] Subsequently, these MPs, through Jacobite proxies, invited French King

---

[50] Szechi, *The Jacobites,* 135.

[51] Szechi, *The Jacobites* 153.

[52] Szechi, *Jacobites, 133-142*

[53] Szechi, *Jacobites,* 139.

[54] Szechi, *Jacobites,* 194.

Louis XV, to invade England in another attempt to restore the Stuarts.[55] After agents of the French court toured London and spoke with the MPs, Louis grew convinced that the Tories were genuine and agreed to assist with the invasion.[56] After the initial invasion, set for 1744, was abandoned due to bad weather, Bonnie Prince Charlie was rebuffed by both the French as well as Highland Chieftains, who refused further support. However, he set out on "a lightning campaign of charismatic personal diplomacy," convincing these same Chieftains to rise in support of Charles Edward.[57] Their forces were able to defeat English troops at several battles, including at Prestonpans in September 1745. Charlie assured his men that both the English Jacobites and French troops would rise and support their campaign once they entered England but these claims were exposed as either "deliberately mendacious or naively self-deceiving," for Charles Edward had received no communication from either faction.[58] As a result, the war committee voted to retreat at Derby in December, much to Charlie's chagrin. Though they had retreated from England, the Jacobites still held Scotland and were subsequently chased into the Highlands by English forces. Against the wishes of his war council, Charles Edward insisted on fighting an "unorthodox defensive action" at Culloden in 1746.[59] The Jacobites were summarily defeated by British troops, led by Prince William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, youngest son of King George II, who was nicknamed "Butcher Billy" for ordering the brutal executions of Jacobites

---

[55] Szechi, *Jacobites,* 194.

[56] Szechi, *Jacobites,* 194.

[57] Szechi, *Jacobites,* 196.

[58] Szechi, *The Jacobites,* 200.

[59] Szechi, *The Jacobites,* 202.

and suspected rebels in the wake of the battle. While "Butcher Billy" slaughtered Jacobite forces, the Bonnie Prince Charlie fled to the Continent.

After the conflict, memorialized as the '45, the Jacobite movement began to fall apart, especially as the financial benefits of the Union were beginning to be felt. The British enacted a series of programs meant to push Scotland toward English industrial pursuits. Later dubbed the Highland Clearances, these programs were intended to erase the distinctiveness of Highland culture, economics, and politics.[60] For instance, the wearing of traditional clan tartans was banned. Episcopalian clergy had to swear public oaths to pray for and support the Hanoverian regime.[61] Moreover, the Highland Clearances created severe poverty in the Highlands, resulting in forced emigration to other parts of the Empire. Historian Amy Clarke suggests that the Battle of Culloden and the destruction of the traditional Highland clan system marks the crucial moment of transition in Scottish historiography between memory/tradition and history/modernity.[62] Before the '45 and the Clearances, memory and tradition were critical in preserving Highland culture and society. Afterwards, however, the history of the Highlands was subsumed by a larger British narrative, one that purports that the history of the Highlands is a history of defeat. Only after the "catastrophic" separation from the memory/tradition era could its landscape, people, and tradi-

---

[60] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992) 120.

[61] Colley, *Britons,* 120.

[62] Amy Clarke, "The 'Outlander' Experience: Time-Travel, Literary Tourism and North American Perceptions of the Scottish Highlands," *Trans-Atlantic Dialogues on Cultural Heritage: Heritage, Tourism and Traditions International Conference* (Liverpool: 13-16 July 2015), 6-7.

tions be romanticized, as that rift ensured that that way of life would never and could never return.[63] *Waverley* was born out of this moment of critical distance.

II

> Seriously I am very glad I did not live in 1745 for though as a lawyer I could not have pleaded Charles's right and as a clergyman I could not have prayed for him yet as a soldier I would I am sure against the convictions of my better reason have fought for him even to the bottom of the gallows. But I am not the least afraid nowadays of making my feelings walk hand in hand with my judgement though the former are Jacobitical the latter inclined for public weal to the present succession.
>
> - Sir Walter Scott in a letter to Miss Clephane, 1813

Waverley; or 'Tis Sixty Years Since was published anonymously in 1814. Despite being Scott's first major foray into prose writing, it was met with much critical and popular success. It was not until 1827, compelled by financial motivations, that Scott decided to publish new editions under his initials, S.W.S. Though already a success, *Waverley* received renewed attention under the name of the acclaimed poet. Despite ostensibly appearing to be an adventure novel about the last and perhaps most successful major Jacobite uprising, the main conflict of the novel lies in the protagonist's struggle to reconcile his conflicting loyalties to both the Hanovers and the Stuarts and parse the morality of each position. Edward Waverley, our titular hero, is a dreamer inspired by his romantic books to seek adventure only to be dismayed when confronted with the harsh realities of navigating a political climate as precarious as the Highlands in 1745. I argue that by rehashing the rebellion, *Waverley* provides a gendered exploration of the relationship between England in Scotland, both in 1745 and 1814. This relationship is couched in a dichotomy between passion and rationality at play throughout the novel, as the author conflates

---

[63] Clarke, "The 'Outlander' Experience," 7.

Highland culture with the former and English sensibilities with the latter. In so doing, the novel is both deeply implicated in national identities and responsible for the creation of Scottish national narrative.

Waverley follows Edward as he becomes acquainted with both sides of the ‘45. The character split his childhood between his uncle, a Jacobite sympathizer, and his father, an employee of the Hanoverian government. After receiving a commission in a Hanoverian regiment stationed near the Lowland-Highland border, Edward takes leave to visit a friend of his uncle, the Baron Bradwardine. There, he finds himself in the midst of staunch Jacobite loyalists and is quickly caught up in their fervor, ultimately defecting to join their cause. Edward becomes a witness to some of the most critical battles and deliberations of the ‘45. He is saved by an English colonel after being brought before the court for treason. This act of kindness ultimately serves to show Edward the errors of his ways and he switches his allegiance once more, back to the Hanoverians. The novel ends with Edward, owner of his own Lowland estate, settled comfortably in domestic bliss.

Before further analyzing the work *Waverley* does, it is critical to place it historiographically. *Waverley,* often identified as the first historical novel, can be more accurately labelled as one of the first Romantic novels. “Romance” is a loaded term with an almost endless number connotations. In this case it references the Romantic turn in history which prevailed during the first half of the nineteenth century, replacing Enlightenment thought as the dominant perspective informing the process of history writing. Like Enlightenment ideologies, Romanticism is complex and multifaceted. However, it can best be described as a movement that valorizes the past

while simultaneously positing a variety of ideas for the political transformation of modern society.[64] *Waverley* fully satisfies both these aims: Scott glorifies the Highland past through his elegant prose and picturesque descriptions of the place and its people, vesting them both with a kind of majestic grandeur. He also suggests that this same culture is potentially a mere relic of a bygone era, ushered out of existence by the advent of English modernity. Just as the Romantics cast their gaze backwards in order to move forward, so too does *Waverley*, exposing the human loss and cultural erasure that occurs as a result of this process.

Moreover, Romantic historians understood their task to be an informative one, though it was realized in a radically different manner than their predecessors. Their goal was to educate their readers of their own national histories by appealing to their imagination.[65] Thomas Babington Macaulay, perhaps the most eminent English historian of the nineteenth century, suggested that the "perfect historian" is one who captures the spirit and character of a particular age in miniature, revealing the nation to his readers by process of narratization.[66] He also made the radical claim that the "noiseless revolutions," the ones seldom or unable to be recorded in the archives, are the ones of greatest importance to national history.[67] In other words, it is not wars and treaties that constitute the stuff of history, rather it is often undetectable changes over time

---

[64] Georg Iggers, Q. Edward Wang, and Supriya Mukherjee, *A Global History of Modern Historiography* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), 54.

[65] Adam Budd, *The Modern Historiography Reader: Western Sources* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 123.

[66] Thomas Babington Macaulay, "History," in *The Modern Historiography Reader: Western Sources,* ed. Adam Budd (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 134.

[67] Macaulay, "History," 133. The noiseless revolutions that Macaulay names are "the circumstances which have most influence on the happiness of mankind, the changes of manners and morals, the transitions of communities from poverty to wealth, from knowledge to ignorance, from ferocity to humanity."

which affect the common man that is the proper stuff of history and Macaulay asserts that these are best explained in narrative form. Scott, though not interested in a noiseless revolution, is nevertheless interested in how the ’45 affected those who exist below the levels of King and parliament. It is not surprising then, to learn that Macaulay was an admirer of Scott’s work. An 1834 edition of *Fraser* magazine paraphrases Macaulay who welcomed the contrast between the scarcity of the chronicles with the “vivacious energy after Scott has breathed into dead bones the breath of life.”[68] Scott embodies Macaulay’s perfect historian; not only does Scott embody Macaulay’s theory of history writing, but his goals are also in line with Macaulay’s prescription. Despite his apprehensions about the historical novel, Scott ultimately demonstrates that the narrative form lauded by Macaulay is the most effective means to explore these questions. Narrative conventions allow Scott to accommodate two competing points of view without compromising either. This has the effect of legitimating both narratives, mapping onto the Romantic’s desire to turn to a nostalgic, glorified past in order to progress politically, often along national lines. Waverley valorizes the Jacobite past, simultaneously casting his gaze to the present and future relationship with the English.

The critics of the Romantic turn, however, were equally influential on Scott and the text of *Waverley*. Macaulay admits some historians harbor an “aristocratical contempt” for those who choose to write histories in forms other than chronicles. Before the Romantic turn, proper history was understood to encompass objective facts exclusively; anything less was considered ahistorical. Macaulay suggests that there were some hold-outs who still put their faith in this kind of

---

[68] Unknown author, “Has History Gained from the writing of Sir Walter Scott?” *Frasers Magazine,* v. 36, 1847, 346.

historical practice. This points to one of the reasons Scott may have chosen to publish anonymously. He seems to have been aware that a more obviously narrated history was perceived, by some at least, to be the antithesis of histories grounded in "objective" "facts." He writes to B.S. Morritt: "I am not sure it would be considered quite decorous for me as a Clerk of Session to write novels. Judges being monks, clerks are a sort of lay-brethren from whom some solemnity of walk & conduct may be expected."[69] Scott reveals that he thinks his position as government official demands a certain code of conduct, and the characteristics associated with novel writing are at odds with that conduct. Scott's apprehension about publicly authorizing his novel stems in part from these debates about what constitutes history and how the conception of "proper" history was gendered. Scott's novel, though undoubtedly a history, is predicated on Romantic elements of history writing. Not only would the reliance the romantic serve to delegitimize Scott's historical authority, it would also mark his work as feminine. Romance was closely associated with a female readership and was subsequently denigrated as an inferior form, something Scott would have been painfully aware of.[70] In short, Scott had to, anonymously, defend his work on two fronts, both in its generic form as well as the gendered expectations that result from writing in this genre.

In order to guard *Waverley* from accusations that it was frivolous or feminine, Scott is at pains to show that his is an academic endeavor, grounded in facts and empirical evidence. In his author's note, for example, Scott writes:

---

[69] Sir Herbert Grierson, *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott* (London: Constable, 1932-1937). This letter was published online, at the following web address: http://www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk/etexts/etexts/letters3.PDF

[70] Jerome deGroot, *The Historical Novel: The New Critical Idiom* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010) 20.

> I had been a good deal in the Highlands at a time when they were much less accessible and much less visited then they have been of late years, and was acquainted with many of the old warriors of 1745, who were, like most veterans, easily induced to fight their battles over again for the benefit of a willing listener like myself.[71]

More than just a boast, Scott mentions his associations with battle-hardened veterans of the uprising to lend authenticity and legitimacy to his narrative. And to a certain extent, it worked. Scott's ultimate success was making the denigrated, feminized romance genre more respectable by infusing it with elements of proper, empirical history. In a preface to the novel, Scott expresses his wish that *Waverley* will help to place the Scots in a "more favorable light than they had been placed hitherto" in English history and "procure sympathy for [Scotland's] virtues and indulgences for [its] foibles." Further, Scott estimates *Waverley* to be a "tolerably faithful portrait of Scottish manners."[72] *Waverley,* thus, is Scott's attempt to elucidate Scotland's national character in a sympathetic manner while nevertheless situating Scotland's history comfortably and satisfactorily in English historiography. The function of *Waverley* is thus two-fold: intervention and reconciliation. Scott's fictionalized intervention into the '45 rebellion was intended to reconcile the two nation's histories in hopes of promoting a more harmonious present historical moment. The conciliatory aspect of the novel is realized near the end, as Edward finally chooses to align himself once and for all with the English royal government.

Analyzing the differing, competing masculinities of two main characters reveals how gender performance is a facet, and perhaps even a product, of national identity. On the one hand,

---

[71] Sir Walter Scott, "General Preface to the Waverley Novels," *Waverley; or 'Tis Sixty years Since* (New York and Boston: The C.T. Brainard Publishing Co., 1814).

[72] Scott, *Waverley*, xiv.

there is Fergus MacIvor, the hypermasculine Highland chieftain, loyal to the Jacobite cause and on the other, there is Colonel Talbot, the rational and domestic English gentleman and officer, arm of the Hanoverian government. Upon Edward and Fergus' first encounter, Edward is struck by "the peculiar grace and dignity of the Chieftains figure."[73] He continues, "the martial air of the bonnet… added much to the *manly* appearance of [Fergus'] head… and, upon any check or accidental excitation, a sudden, though transient lour of the eye showed a *hasty, haughty, and vindictive temper.*"[74] These passages reveal the respect that Fergus inspires while also indicating the passionate and volatile temperament that lay at his core. Scott associates this volatility and violence with all Highlanders, though in the character of Fergus these qualities merge to create the epitome of a noble Highland warrior, thereby transforming a once denigrated quality into a desired trait.

The performance of Scottish Highland masculinity, at once romantic and rugged, is best seen in the narrative surrounding Fergus' execution. After being captured by the English, Fergus is tried and sentenced to hang for crimes against the English crown. As the sentence is handed down, the judge declares that Fergus cannot hope for mercy. Fergus, "in the same manly and firm tone," replies that he desires nothing more than death if he must be punished for remaining loyal to the Bonnie Prince Charlie.[75] Fergus begins their final encounter by asking Edward about his upcoming marriage, to which Edward responds by asking how he could think of such things at a

---

[73] Sir Walter Scott, *Waverley* (Penguin Books, 2011) 115. This is the version of the novel I cite for the remainder of the paper. The earlier citations were included because this publication is missing several author's notes that were included in the aforementioned publication.

[74] Scott, *Waverley,* 116, emphasis mine.

[75] Scott, *Waverley,* 422.

time like this. Fergus replies, “I am no boy, to sit down and weep because the luck has gone against me. I knew the stake of which I risked; we played the game boldly and the forfeit shall be paid *manfully*.”[76] His final words exemplify his devotion: the executioner says, “God save King George” to which Fergus replies, “God Save King *James*.”[77] In the narrative of the Highlanders, loyalty and bravery become synonymous with manliness. Despite facing certain death, Fergus remains steadfast in his loyalty to the Jacobite cause, which allows him to embody a spirit of romantic masculinity that is grounded in honor and chivalry.

While Fergus’ narrative of nobility undoubtedly contributes to the nostalgic image of the lost Highlands, Scott nevertheless consciously offsets, and implicitly critiques, this mode of being through the character of Colonel Talbot, an officer in the Hanoverian army. He too embodies a particular kind of masculinity, though it is drastically different than Fergus’. Talbot devotes himself to his national cause in much the same way that Fergus does, though Talbot’s character is rooted in Enlightenment thought and perceptions of modernity as defined by the English. Where the Highlanders are fierce and passionate men, the English—embodied by Talbot—are more rational and domestic in nature, which the book implicitly codes as effeminate. Flora MacIvor, Fergus’ sister, highlights the difference between these two kinds of masculinities when describing the life she envisions for Edward, saying:

> high and perilous enterprise is not Waverley's forte … I will tell you where he will be at home, my dear, and in his place—in the quiet circle of domestic happiness, lettered indolence, and elegant enjoyments of Waverley-Honour. And he will refit the old library in the most exquisite Gothic taste, and garnish its shelves with the

---

[76] Scott, *Waverley,* 428.

[77] Scott, *Waverley,* 350.

> rarest and most valuable volumes; and he will draw plans and landscapes, and write verses, and rear temples, and dig grottoes; and he will stand in a clear summer night in the colonnade before the hall, and gaze on the deer as they stray in the moonlight, or lie shadowed by the boughs of the huge old fantastic oaks; and he will repeat verses to his beautiful wife, who will hang upon his arm;—and he will be a happy man.[78]

English masculinity is thus defined by its academic and domestic pursuits as opposed to the "high and perilous enterprises" of Highlanders. Thus the Scottish and the English are depicted as diametrically opposed but in constant competition.

Consequently, *Waverley* readers are given full portraits of both sides of the conflict, heretofore couched in a discussion of masculinity, because of the passive function Edward assumes in the novel. He is free from narrative constraints and can contemplate political ideologies seriously without much fear of lasting consequences. Unlike Fergus or Talbot, he has no real ideological stake in the conflict, despite being a member of a Hanoverian regiment. Edward therefore vacillates between opposing sides of the conflict, both physically and ideologically. Edward, by virtue of his narrative function, successfully exposes readers to both sides of the conflict. Where he finally lands, then, perhaps indicates where the book, and the author, land as well. After declaring his loyalties to the Jacobites, Edward is saved from being convicted of treason when Talbot steps up to defend him in court. Edward, moved by Talbot's lobbying for his life, pledges his allegiance to Hanoverian government once and for all.

Edwards decision to once and for all ally himself with the British government indicates the reconciliatory ambitions of the novel. JCD Clark argues that Scottish histories of the rebel-

---

[78] Scott, *Waverley,* 323.

lion up until Scott "failed to establish a working relationship" with an English audience which would have launched a proper, more nuanced study of the Jacobites. Instead, that relationship was "left to the realm of literature."[79] In this literary enterprise, Highland culture is marked as a relic of of the past. Edward and his transition from Jacobite loyalist to Hanoverian sympathizer is represents his maturation from a romantic and naive boy to a rational, modern, imperial citizen of the English crown. Moreover, the fate that Flora described for Edward is what ultimately befalls him. In this ending, it is clear that Highland culture, though admired, is marked for the past while the English program of modernity is posited as the only true way forward. As Elias aptly points out, Scott was greatly influenced by the Scottish philosophy, which promotes stadial theories of history, in which society progresses from societies based on hunting to pastoral, agricultural, and finally commercial.[80] Indeed, between 1760 and 1850, Scotland underwent a period of unprecedented economic growth and had the fastest rates of urbanization in Western Europe.[81] The vast improvements of the material realities of Scots—at least in the Lowlands—could not have been lost on Scott. Being a member of the core of the Empire has its benefits, and these benefits were being felt by the beginning of the nineteenth century. *Waverley* reflects the moment that allowed this process to began in earnest. The representation of the relationship between Fergus and Talbot is therefore the relationship between England and Scotland, one imposing its will

---

[79] JCD Clark, "The Many Restorations of King James: A Short History of Scholarship on Jacobitism" in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, (Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 17.

[80] Amy Elias, *Sublime Desire: History and Post-1960s Fiction*. Parallax : Re-Visions of Culture and Society, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001) 11. Elias makes it clear that the Scottish theories of human progress were critiqued because they legitimized western colonial narratives in much the same way the Whig interpretation of history did.

[81] T.M. Devine, "In Bed with an Elephant: Almost Three Hundred Years of the Anglo-Scottish Union," *Scottish Affairs*, no. 57 (Autumn 2006), 8-9.

on the other.

This representation of a subordinated Scotland would have rendered this history a palatable one, therefore potentially appealing to a larger English audience. Moreover, Scott-the-government-official understood that rationality and moderation were the qualities expected to govern his conduct, making a full-throated support of Jacobitism unwise. Consequently, *Waverley* is a novel that goes just far enough in its portrayal of the Jacobites: Scott romanticizes their cause, a cause that he ostensibly marks as a relic of a bygone era through the death of Fergus MacIvor. Fergus dies, Edward becomes the Lowland gentleman that Flora anticipates, metaphorically closing the book on the Jacobites and ushering in the dominance of English culture in Scotland. *Waverley* safely indulges in historical romanticism because it seems to indicate that it is a history and a culture that has been effectively dismantled and eliminated. In other words, this history can be painted in a better light because it is no longer a threat to the dominant order.

Waverley is finally a novel riddled with contradictions. This perhaps, is no surprise, considering Scott's own political inclinations. In a letter to a friend, Scott says that his personal feelings walk hand in hand with the Jacobites, though his professional judgement lies with the Hanoverians. Indeed, for all that the novel seems to suggest the final, overwhelming suppression of Highland culture, the last ten pages of this novel subtly questions how effective this campaign of obilteration actually was. After Edward comes into his own estate, he hangs a painting on the wall at the newly constructed Tully-Valeon. This painting was

> large and animated… representing Fergus MacIvor and Waverley in their Highland dress, the scene wild, rocky, and mountainous pass, down which the clan were descending into the background… [The painter] could not have done more

> justice to the subject, the ardent, fiery, and impetuous character of the unfortunate Chief of Glennaquioch was finely contrasted with the contemplative, fanciful, and enthusiastic expression of his happier friend.[82]

Once more, this passage captures the ultimately gendered differences between the English and the Scottish Highlanders. More importantly, however, is the fact that the image serves as a kind of window to the world outside of Tully-Valeon; it directs the viewer's gaze to the past and as a symbolic object, suggests the persistence of Highland culture despite the program of erasure the English carried out in the wake of the rebellions.[83] The "origin myth" *Waverley* forges is established by the picturesque beauty of the landscape and cemented through the representation of the brave, resiliency of the people who inhabit it. The romanticization of the Jacobites that this novel carries out roused *national* sympathies at moment when some parts of Scotland were reconciling the benefits of empire with the need to preserve a distinctive character while the other were experiencing the pain of clearance and dispossession.

The material realities of Scotland at the time Scott wrote were vastly different; some parts of Scotland were experiencing unprecedented economic growth while other parts, especially the population in the Highlands, were still subjected to the brutality of the clearances. Consequently, Scott sought to create a narrative that would bind all of Scotland together, preserving a distinct national character. Because the Clearances ensured that the Highland clan system would never rise again, Scott looked to that moment, more recent in memory but still culturally harmless, to construct his unifying mythology of the spirit of the Scottish people. His work was instrumental

---

[82] Sir Walter Scott, *Waverley,* 361.

[83] Saree Makdisi, "Colonial Space and the Colonization of Time in Scott's 'Waverley,'" *Studies in Romanticism* 34, no. 2 (1995): 173-175.

in historicizing the Scottish past for a broader audience. Because of the way Edward is used in the novel, Scott effectively exposed both sides of the ‘45, giving particular credence to the Jacobites and their cause. The goal of this choice was two-fold: to render a bloody past not only palatable, but respectable and to create an “origin” myth that extolls the distinctive virtues of the Scottish people and connects them to a shared experience of disaster and oppression.

As I have demonstrated, the cultural tensions between the English and the Scottish throughout the novel can be illuminated by taking a gendered approach, further revealing the way in which notions of masculinity contributes to distinct national identities and influences the performance of that national identity. Gender is crucial to this reading, for it is the primary way in which Scott establishes and maintains the image of the noble Highland Chieftain, represents the dignified character of the entity of the Scottish population.The hypermasculine Highland warrior is ultimately physically defeated by the more “rational” English gentleman, paralleling Scottish defeat by British forces. However, the spirit of the Highland warrior triumphs, refusing to become a mere relic. A romanticized martyr narrative was useful in 1814 as many Scots still dealt with the immediate fallout of the ’45.

III

> Don’t put ’N.B.’ in your paper: put SCOTLAND and be done with it. Alas, that I should be thus stabbed in the home of my friends! The name of my native land is not NORTH BRITAIN, whatever may be the name of yours.
> - Robert Louis Stevenson in a letter to S.R. Crockett, April 1888

In many ways, Robert Louis Stevenson continues the tradition forged by Sir Walter Scott earlier in the nineteenth century; Stevenson adopted the romantic adventure novel as means to

preserve Scottish culture and confront the binaries imposed on Scotland— namely the widespread acceptance of the stark cultural divisions between the Highland Celts and Lowland Saxons as well as the belief that Scotland represents the antithesis of English modernity—by external forces. Where Scott indulges these binaries, albeit critically as demonstrated in the previous chapter, Stevenson directly challenges the commonplace nineteenth century assumptions about eighteenth century Scotland. He took great pains to reclaim and reinterpret a national history that had been largely lambasted in English historical narratives.[84]

Born in Edinburgh in 1850 to a middle class family, Stevenson was deeply invested in Scottish history and committed to preserving the distinctiveness of Scottish culture. In reply to a letter Stevenson received from fellow Scottish writer S. R. Crockett, who referred to Scotland as "N.B" (North Britain), Stevenson vehemently rebuked Crocketts use of the styling N.B.[85] Stevenson's passionate reply, quoted in the epigraph above, reveals his dismissal of any notion of a unified or even assimilated British identity. Instead, he resolutely asserts Scotland's distinct and separate character.

The *fin-de-siècle* Scottish cultural revivalists, of whom Stevenson was considered a part of, were keen to promote the uniqueness of Scotland and Scottish identity. Working against centuries of English incursions, their goals were multifaceted; to resist, viś-a-viś their art, the act of lumping Scotland and England together as a single, homogenous cultural entity while also pro-

---

[84] T.M.Devine, "In Bed with an Elephant: Almost Three Hundred Years of the Anglo-Scottish Union," *Scottish Affairs*, no. 57 (Autumn 2006), 1-18.

[85] Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Letters*, VI, p. 156 (c.10 April 1888).

moting a more cohesive, nationally unified Scotland.[86] Their task was a great one considering the prevalent discourse surrounding the perceived cultural disparities that differentiated between the Highlands and Lowlands. While these differences were commonplace assumptions amongst the English, they were also prevalent within Scotland itself.

Michael Shaw argues that divisions between the two regions were erected and discussed along ethnic lines. From 1688 onward, the embrace of white Anglo-Saxon Protestant identities in England in response to the country's new Protestant monarchs, William of Orange and his wife, Mary (daughter of King James II) presented an opportunity for Scotland to assert its equality with England. Protestant, Anglo-Saxon identity was considered superior to the Catholicism of the Celts, a moniker which still referred to the entirety of Scotland at this point, according to Shaw. Because of the Act of Union and the Jacobite Rebellions as well as a concern for Scotland's reputation abroad, Scottish Enlightenment thinkers like David Hume and William Robertson began claiming and asserting a kind of Germanic (Saxon) ethnicity for the Scottish Lowlands in the hopes of integrating Scotland into the English imperial and economic center and distancing themselves from the "Highland" Jacobites.[87] The result was that the Lowlands were coded as Germanic and therefore progressive, commercial and British, while the Highlands were marked as Celtic and therefore violent, rebellious, Jacobites, and "backwards."

This division along ethnic lines persisted well into the nineteenth century as Shaw demonstrates. He cites Matthew Arnold's 1867 *On the Study of Celtic Literature* and claims that he "styles the Celt as sensual, feminine, spiritual, and ineffectual and politics—traits juxtaposed

---

[86] Michael Shaw, "The Scottish Romance Revival," in *The Fin-de-Siécle Scottish Revival,* (Edinburgh University Press, 2020).

[87] Shaw, "The Scottish Romance Revival," 39.

against the factual, masculine, and rational Saxon."[88] Shaw also points to Lowland print media as an avenue by which the Highlands were further marginalized. Scots blamed the famine and Highland Clearances on "the racial indolence of the Celtic Highland inhabitant, who were incapable of adapting to the industrious 'Anglo-Saxon culture.'"[89] In a very nineteenth century move, geography appeared to justify imperial incursion, conflating the character of the Celt with their home in Highlands—both are unruly and counter to the rationality of Anglo-Saxon culture.

It is in this climate that the Scottish revivalists begin writing and was the environment that Stevenson's 1884 novel *Kidnapped* was born. Their goal was to interrogate the assumed divide between the two regions and stimulate a kind of national cohesion, if not unity. This was critical if they were to maintain the assertion of a distinct Scottish national character and culture. Moreover, these authors also questioned notions of progress and civilization as set forth by the English. It is easy to see, then, that the writings of the romantic revivalists were in the tradition of Walter Scott. Indeed, another proponent of the Scottish cultural revival, Andrew Lang described *Kidnapped* as "a volume containing more of the spirit of Scott than any other fiction in English."[90] A contemporary of Stevenson, Lang's sentiment is revealing for two reasons. First, he places Stevenson squarely in an established *Scottish* literary lineage; second, this association is understood as a good thing. The Scottish literary tradition as epitomized by Scott was critical in

---

[88] Shaw, "The Scottish Romance Revival," 38: While I am inclined to disagree with Shaw's assumption that prior to the Glorious Revolution, the "ethnicity of England was broadly conceived as 'Celtic', he nevertheless makes a useful point.

[89] Shaw, "The Scottish Romance Revival," 42.

[90] J.R. Hammond, *A Robert Louis Stevenson Companion* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Press, 1984), 134.

the creation of sympathetic Scottish national narratives. To this end then, Lang's valuation of *Kidnapped* is an overwhelmingly positive endorsement.

The similarities between the two authors have been noted outside of the nineteenth-century literary realm as well; British historian J.C.D Clark credits both Scott and Stevenson for the revival of Jacobite studies as a legitimate avenue of historical inquiry. Clark goes a step further, however, asserting that Scottish histories of the rebellion up until Scott "failed to establish a working relationship" with an English audience which would have launched a proper study of the Jacobites. Instead, "that relationship was left to the realm of literature."[91] This implies that Scottish narratives of the rebellion more than likely cast the English in an unfavorable light, as something other than gentlemanly, benevolent victors, an image of themselves they quite enjoyed and were able to promote as the victorious party in the conflict. In comparison, the explicitly fictionalized version of events in both *Waverley* and *Kidnapped* offer a satisfactory version of events that is more "true" to the Scottish experience yet one that does not impinge on a well-established sense of English national identity. According to Clark then, Scottish authors fictionalizing this history are in a precarious position; they must maintain the appearance of deference to English sensibilities, which acts as a cover that disguises their oblique criticisms. In this sense, it is appropriate to view Stevenson as a natural extension of Scott. However, the two authors handle their criticisms in very different manners. What happens to the history of '45 in the hands of Stevenson is of chief importance in this section, for it reveals the ways in which understandings

---

[91] Clark, J.C.D. "The Many Restorations of King James: A Short History of Scholarship on Jacobitism." in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, 9-57, (Palgrave MacMillan, 2010) 17

of the Jacobites had changed over the sixty-nine years separating the two publications, but also, crucially, the ways in which the historical novel had evolved over that period as well.

Kidnapped takes place six years after the rebellion. As a result, it is a novel that inherently and primarily deals with memory and the ramifications of such a monumental event years later. If Scott explored the rebellion itself through his novel as it unfolded, Stevenson picks up where Scott left off, offering his audience a portrait of Scotland and its people after the struggle was quashed. Placing the setting in 1751 is a strategic move on several fronts. Perhaps most obviously, the distance makes each characters convictions all the more powerful; to feel so strongly after so much time reveals the strength of the ideological commitments of the conflict. The distance also provides the opportunity to obliquely discuss the psychological and economic ramifications of the ’45 in Scotland wrought through English imperial policy.

Kidnapped is the story of David Balfour, a teen who sets out from Edinburgh to claim his inheritance. He is thwarted by his miserly uncle Ebenezer, who connives to have David kidnapped aboard a ship bound for the Carolinas. The bulk of the tale chronicles David’s adventures after he boards the ship, tracing his escape from his captors, his journey across the Highlands, his suspected involvement in the Appin Murder and the manhunt that follows, and his final confrontation with his uncle to claim his rightful inheritance. In other words, *Kidnapped* is the story of an engineered kidnapping to the British colonies gone wrong superimposed on a larger tale about a political manhunt through the wilds of Scotland in which the rivalry between Whigs and Jacobites is deftly interwoven. If Scott is interested in juxtaposing Scottish and English identities, Stevenson concerns himself with the aforementioned binary between the Highlands and Lowlands. Following in the tradition of Scott, however, this binary can be interpreted and ex-

plored through a gendered reading of the two main characters; Whiggish Lowlander David Balfour and Jacobite Highlander Alan Breck. What Stevenson produces, then, is an ostensible reading of Scotland as a hopelessly divided nation. A different reading, however, reveals the prospect of reconciliation between the two regions, creating a *Scottish* foundation for a critique of English colonial aggression and Scotland's imposed place within the English economy in the wake of the '45. When taken together, these two disparate readings reveal the peculiar fitness of the genre to explore complex histories such as this.

After being tricked on board by his uncle, David is assigned to assist the crew with daily tasks. Because of this new position, he is in the room when Captain Hoseason interrogates a man that he has pulled from the sea near the Scottish coast. This man, unbeknownst to David, is Alan Breck,who immediately outs himself as a Jacobite rebel who essentially runs errands between clan leaders forced into hiding in Highlands and the Stuart court in exile. The ensuing encounter between Alan and the captain reveals two things: the commitment to opposing political ideologies as well as hinting at the economic activity of the Highlands in reaction to English imperial exploits. I will address each in this order, for the economic component makes itself fully known only at the end of the novel.

The confrontation between Hoseason and Alan succinctly establishes the political, social and cultural convictions each sides claim for their respective parties while simultaneously hinting at David's disinterest in the matter; Alan asks the captain, "'So… are ye of the honest party?'(meaning, Was he a Jacobite? for each side, in these sort of civil broils, takes the name of

honesty for its own)."[92] From this brief interaction, Stevenson establishes that both Jacobite and Whig lay claim to a certain kind of virtuosity, here expressed through their political identity. Stevenson loads political affiliation with moral social and cultural connotations. "Honest" occupies a double meaning in this instance; the "honest" party as in the rightful Kings of England who the Jacobites believed to be the Stuarts, as well as in the moral sense, being truthful and free from deceit. Alan's multivalent use of the word honest conflates these two definitions, linguistically demonstrating how political parties become metonyms for entire ideological systems. The captains responds that he is "a true-blue Protestant and [he] thank[s] God for it."[93] In short, both sides lay claim to a kind of higher morality couched in terms of political (or religious) identities.

Later that evening, after the confrontation between Alan and Hoseason, Alan asks David if he is a Whig. David gives a dubious response, claiming to be "betwixt and between," or otherwise disinterested, so as not to "annoy" Alan. Because this is a first person narrative, the audience learns that David, in all actuality, claims to be "as a good a Whig as Mr. Campbell could make [him]."[94] David's evasive answer can be read as an attempt at self-preservation, keeping himself from the potential wrath of a rebel Jacobite. More likely though, his answer indicates the disparity between the ways the Whigs and Jacobites experienced the rebellion and its aftermath. For teenaged David, the legacy of the conflict does not bear as much weight on the trajectory of his life as it does for others, like Alan who was well into manhood by the time fighting broke out in 1745 and directly impacted by subsequent English policies. Not only do David and Alan cast

---

[92] Robert Louis Stevenson, *Kidnapped* (Bantam Publishers, 1982), 64

[93] Stevenson, *Kidnapped, 64.*

[94] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, pg 64.

their support behind opposing sides, but do so for different reasons and with differing levels of conviction. David quickly evaluates Alan as a man "whose life was forfeit… for he was not only a rebel and a smuggler of rents, but had taken service with the King of France,"[95] the greatest crime any English subject could commit. David's understanding of Alan's "traitorous" nature offends the loyalist, and more than likely unionist, sympathies he was inculcated with as a child. David's allegiance to King George seems to be a product of his upbringing rather than a result of any personal convictions, and therefore understands Alan's actions only in monarchical terms. On the other hand, Alan's rebellion against the crown is a direct result of the '45 and what followed.[96] Alan believes his actions to be not only a display of loyalty to the rightful Kings of England (the Stuarts) but also as a kind of moral righting, carried out in the real of economics. These are the terms on which David and Alan enter into a kind camaraderie, if not full-fledged friendship. *Kidnapped* and *Waverley* are often interpreted in the same fashion. David and Alan are coded as the embodiment of their geographical locales, but instead of the Scotland/England divide that is present in *Waverley*, they represent the irreconcilable tensions between Highlands and Lowlands. While this novel can most certainly be interpreted as vision of irreconcilable Scotland, it is also a novel that investigates and complicates the Highland/Lowland binary, promoting a more cohesive Scotland united in criticism against English colonial incursions in Scotland. As such, Stevenson uses the relationship between Alan and David to reveal both the differences that continued to divide Scotland well after the '45 and the terms on which Scotland could be united against a common enemy.

---

[95] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 67.

[96] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 65-66.

The main thrust of David and Alan's relationship is Alan's attempt to remedy David's performed political apathy. I use the term "performed" because in David's own mind, he is not apathetic—he supports the king. But his allegiance has no practical foundation or ideological basis, and Alan endeavors to, at the very least, shake David from his complacency and recognize the tangible consequences of supporting King George II. Historians Martin Shichtman and Laurie Finke assert that "the historians knowledge of the past is always inextricably bound up with his or her investments in and anxieties about the present."[97] Alan essentially plays the role of the historian in his relationship with David, trying to impress upon him the significance of the '45 from the perspective of someone who not only lived through it but whose narrative has since been marginalized. As a result, Alan's knowledge of the past is deeply informed by his anxieties about the present, namely the fact that he is still considered a rebel with a price on his head for "rent stealing" and collusion with the French king. Because he lived through the rebellion and is now suffering the consequences of defeat, Alan's history has a moral imperative that spurs on his resistance. As a loyalist for whom the events of the '45 had little or no impact, David is incapable of validating, or even seeing, the sense of morality and justice that motivates Alan to commit high crimes. Thus a divide that seems to be purely political for one character reveals itself to be deeply personal for another. Alan, who lived through the '45, relies on memory—history from within—to impress upon David the significance of Jacobite history in and for the Highlands, where it was bloody and violent.

Throughout the novel, Alan's hints at moments from his personal history to reinforce the notion that personal political affiliations have real life consequences. For example, David men-

---

[97] Laurie Finke and Martin B Shichtman. "Profiting from the Past: History as Symbolic Capital in the Historia Regum Britanniae," *Arthurian Literature* Vol. 12 (1993), 11.

tions his good friend Mr. Campbell to Alan, which produces a visceral reaction from Alan who exclaims "I know nothing I would help a Campbell to… unless it was a leaden bullet. I would hunt all of that name like blackcocks."[98] David is struck by this violent sentiment and insists that the Campbells are a people one would be "proud to give their hand to."[99] His companion's naivety prompts Alan to recount the treacherous history of the Campbells. One of the most prominent of the Highland, the clan threw their lot in with the crown during the '45 and afterwards acted as agents of King George II, collecting rents and seizing property to give to the crown.

In the exchange that follows, Stevenson clearly elucidates the ways in which memory, affiliation, and expectations of manhood all influence a sense of justice and the ways in which this bisects the history of the '45. When speaking of the Campbells, Alan remarks,

> 'It's little ken of Campbells… Him beaten? No: nor will be, till his blood's on the hill-side… there grows not enough heather in all Scotland to hide him from my vengeance.'
> 'Man, Alan,' said [David], 'ye are neither very wise nor very Christian to blow off so many words of anger… it's a kent thing that Christianity forbids revenge.'
> 'Ay,' said [Alan], 'it's well seen it was a Campbell taught ye! It would be convenient world for them and their sort if there was no such thing as a lad and a gun behind a heather bush…'
> 'Let me have a word,' said [David]. 'Be sure, if they take less rents, be sure Government has a finger in the pie. It's not this Campbell's fault, man—it's his orders. And if ye killed this man to-morrow, what better would ye be… ?'
> 'Ye're a good lad in a fight,' said Alan; 'but, man! ye have Whig blood in ye!'[100]

This passage reveals David and Alan's two very different notions of justice. Alan clearly sees violent retribution against the Campbells as not only warranted, but necessary. David, on the oth-

---

[98] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 89

[99] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 89

[100] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 95-96.

er hand, is horrified by such a response, invoking Christian sensibilities as a deterrent to this course of thinking. Alan's response equates David's religious defense with a passivity that he sees as characteristic of "Whig blood," perhaps implying a closer kinship with the English than his fellow Scots. In one fell swoop, Alan attaches several meanings to a single ideology: to be a Whig is to be non-combative as well as a royal apologist which, at least in Alan's eyes, alienates David from his fellow countrymen. This is what experiencing the '45 first-hand has done to Alan's perception of history. What for David is a mere matter of politics, is for Alan deeply personal, national, and a still-fresh wound.

Moreover, Alan implies that David's non-combative Whiggishness is a reflection on his manhood. Alan is often defined by the first person narrator in terms of his specific performance of masculinity. David describes Alan as passionate and angry with "a propensity to take offence and to pick quarrels."[101] These attributes are not only foreign to but condemned by David. From David's consternation at Alan's behavior, readers gather that he perceives himself to be the opposite: mild-mannered, even-tempered, and rational. As such, much like *Waverley*'s central male characters, Alan and David represent two different modalities of masculinity, each associated with a particular ideology. Accordingly, while in *Waverley* manhood became a means to express national identity, in *Kidnapped* it functions as a way to explore the Highland/Lowland binary.

The way in which masculinity functions in the text can be read as a way in which Stevenson seeks to investigate and challenge the Highland/Lowland divide. The beginning of the novel establishes these gendered stereotypes in order to refute them in the second half. We have already seen that Alan thinks that David is meek. This assumptions seems to be confirmed about forty

---

[101] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 98.

pages later when, after their ship wrecks just off the coast, Alan and David are separated and each must fend for themselves. Readers follow along with David as he struggles to survive in the unfamiliar territory he now finds himself in. He remarks that he only had money and a silver button in his pockets, and that "being inland bred, [he] was as much short of knowledge as of means." David suggests that being born and raised in the "inland" of the Lowlands has left him ill-equipped to deal with a survival situation such as this. The economic and social implications of this statement are telling. The Lowlands have been left in relative peace, not being subject to the same violent skirmishes and forceful English incursion in the Highlands. As a result, the Lowlands have been able to prosper economically, rendering survival knowledge and skills less necessary than they are in the North. As a result, David is unable to provide for or protect himself in this situation. He is coded as weak, helpless, and defenseless, keeping in line with Alan's prior assessment. Unable to protect himself, he is the opposite of a Highland man, who would have prided himself first and foremost on his ability to survive and defend himself. While readers never learn how exactly Alan survives this period, the next time we see him, David comments that he had a fishing-rod with him, suggesting that Alan utilized his skill and knowledge to fashion tools for survival. Later, when David and Alan are fleeing through the Heather trying to escape English forces—they are suspected of having killed Campbell of Glenure—it is Alan who directs their next steps and movements. He is the one with tracking skills as well as knowledge about the area. At every point in the novel, Alan is marked as the survivalist and David as the one dependent on Alans wherewithal. Alan and David are thus set as opposites in terms of their ability to provide, a commonly understood attribute of manhood.

It is worth noting that these scenes of survival and manly swashbuckling adventure constitute roughly one half of the entire novel. Indeed, *Kidnapped* is considered to be an adventure romance. This is largely due to the venue in which it was published. Stevenson only publishes three of his works in the traditional book form—the rest were published serially in various magazines. *Kidnapped* is one of three stories published in popular *Young Folks* penny weekly.[102] Jason Pierce argues that the surge in publications of juvenile periodicals from 1865-1875 was largely due to improvements in education. As a result, these kinds of publications became profitable and were widely disseminated in the market. Pierce points out that the majority of these penny weeklies were inclined to market themselves separately towards boys and girls. He argues that *Young Folks* resisted this model, a choice reflected in the very name itself. Pierce refutes one scholars claim that *Young Folks* was read mostly by "middle-class boy who thirsted mightily for daredeviltry and heroics" by quoting one contemporary reader who said that the weekly always contained "at least one serial, intended for girl readers, of domestic joys and sorrows,"[103] It is telling that Pierce thinks a token story about "domestic joys and sorrows" is enough to indicate that the publication was equally for both boys and girls.

Kidnapped was published in this venue because this was the audience Stevenson was appealing to; the novel clearly was written with a young/teenage boy in mind. As stated above, over half of the narrative is dedicated to a daring escape through the Highlands, full of close calls and duplicitous characters. Moreover, only three women are mentioned in the entirety of the novel

---

[102] Ian Duncan, "Stevenson and Fiction," in *The Edinburgh Companion to Robert Louis Stevenson*, ed. Penny Fielding (Edinburgh University Press, 2010) 14; the other two novels published in *Young Folks* were *Treasure Island* (1881-82) and *The Black Arrow* (1883).

[103] Jason Pierce, "The Belle Lettrist and the People's Publisher: or, the Context of 'Treasure Island's' First-Form Publication," *Victorian Periodicals Review* 31, no, 4 (Winter 1998), 360.

and none of them have names. The first "lassie" appears on page 155. As David and Alan are fleeing from English troops, the come upon a house with tinted windows, something Alan reveals to be a symbol for Jacobite sympathizers. They beg entry and explain their situation. The couple immediately work to provide the pair with food, shelter, and provisions for their journey. This includes burning their clothes (Alan has been wearing remnants of French military uniform). The "lassie" comes out of the house carrying a bundle of clothes and David reveals that it has often made him smile "to think of how Alan's instinct awoke at the mere sight of it."[104] A clear double entendre, Alan's "instinct" can be interpreted as either his concern for what they are doing with his close, or his penis "awakening" at the sight of a young girl. Only a few paragraphs later we are introduced to the girl's mother, who "sat by the fire and wept, with her face in her hands." She is rendered useless by her overly emotional state. The last "lassie" is a young maid David and Alan trick into ferrying them across a river into safety in David's hometown. They pretend that David is a gravely ill Jacobite rebel whose only hope fir survival lay on the other side of the river and assert that she is the only one who can get them there. They rest their hope in her feminine maternal and nurturing instincts, reinscribing the ideological gender roles that dominated the Victorian era. So as it stands, according to *Kidnapped*, women are either objects of men's desire, rendered useless by their feminine nature, or early manipulated by imposing male figures. Just as the women are coded as being helpless on the whole, so too is David by Alan as well as the text earlier in the novel. Perhaps Alan's earlier assessment of David, then, also carried gendered connotations potentially coding David as effeminate. However, by the time the women appear to provide examples of "true" femininity, David has already proved himself to be adept at

---

[104] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 155

survival, even if only at Alan's direction, and brave in the face of grave danger. *Kidnapped* is ultimately a novel that promotes homosocial masculinity to its largely young, male audience.

Stevenson was most certainly aware of his audience and as a result, he is at pains to educate them as well. Only when David begins to act daring does he earn Alan's respect, thereby indicating the "proper" kind of manhood deserving of respect. When debating the best course of action to escape the red-coats, David declares that either option (to press on or retreat) means almost certain death, so they should persevere. This delights Alan who exclaims "ye are altogether too canny and Whiggish to be company for a gentleman like me; but there come other whiles when ye show yoursel' a mettle spark; and it's then, David, that I love ye like a brother."[105] "Mettle" is synonymous with tenacity, fortitude, and resilience, meaning that Alan interprets David's boldness as a character development that is antithetical to his meek Whiggish identity. This is the first instance in the novel that explicitly reveals the growing kinship between the two and it is couched in terms of a mutual attitude supportive of combative masculinity. This is a moment of identification for Alan in which he realizes that there may be something more that connects the two men together, despite their differences. It is David's cooptation of Highland masculinity that leads Alan to this conclusion.

One of the ways in which Stevenson advocates for a more cohesive Scotland is through this exact plot device. At all points throughout the novel, he inverts the assumptions about stereotypical characteristics of Lowlanders and Highlanders. This is perhaps most obviously demonstrated by the stories' main villain, David's miserly uncle Ebenezer. He is a Lowlander imbued with characteristics usually attributed to Highlanders. Ebenezer disregards customs surrounding

---

[105] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 82.

hospitality when David first arrives at his house. He then connives to steal his nephews rightful inheritance by plotting to have David kidnapped into slavery and potentially murdered. Prevailing stereotypes would have it that these are the characteristics of a "savage," amoral, socially inept Highlander. Inverted and used to describe a Lowlander, Stevenson persuasively challenges the assumption that the Lowlands are somehow culturally and morally superior to the Highlands. This point is further challenged upon David's first encounters with Highlanders after being saved from dying while stranded after the shipwreck. He is treated kindly and thinks to himself "If these are the wild Highlanders, I could wish my own folk wilder."[106] This challenges the common stereotype that Highlanders are "barbarous" and violent, once more disrupting the assumed dichotomy between the Highlands and Lowlands. This lays the groundwork for promoting a more unified version of Scotland to his young audience. Indeed, responding to Alan who claims that the Highlands are not David's country, David exclaims, "It's all Scotland," implying the absurdity of the notion that the Highlands and Lowlands essentially constitute separate countries, asserting instead that they are a part of the same whole.

A greater identification between Highlanders and Lowlanders is also facilitated by the construction of an external enemy in the text: the English. Stevenson places Scotland squarely within the British imperial economy and positions it as a victim of English colonial aggression. This is realized mostly through Alan's subplot about his clans relationship to the Campbells. The Appin murder is the immediate historical event drives the middle section of the novel. Colin Campbell of Glenure was a Highlander as well as a British-allied rent collector who "[ensured]

---

[106] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 119.

the flow of surplus value from the Highlands to the Lowlands and England."[107] David explains that the "tenants of Appin have to pay rent to King George" and Campbell is the much-hated man who collects it.[108] Alan's anger towards Campbell reveals the extent to which English policies were financially predatory in the Highlands. This is further reinforced when, after the shipwreck, David comes across a merchant ship, "quite black with people," that he quickly realizes is an emigrant ship bound for America.[109] Janet Sorensen argues that this is a moment in which Stevenson makes visible the "larger processes of a world market," a world which was largely unknown to his readership.[110] Stevenson personifies the impact of English colonial aggression by representing a scene of forced emigration from the Highlands to the colonies. This is why Alan loathes Campbell.

In order to enact some kind of retribution against the Campbells as well as the Crown, Alan confides that although the tenants of Appin are forced to pay rent directly to the Crown, "their hearts are staunch, they are true to their chief… the poor folk scrape up a second rent for Ardshiel" and that he is "the hand that carries it."[111] That was the errand that Alan was returning from when he was pulled from the sea by Hoseason. And though David's anger towards the English never quite reaches the same fever-pitch, his identification with the Highlands, viś-a-viś growing uncertainty of the English, is nevertheless strengthened by Alan's tales of his experience

---

[107] Janet Sorensen, "'Belts of Gold' and 'Twenty-Pounders: Robert Louis Stevenson's Textualized Economies," Criticism 42, no. 3 (Summer 2000) 290-291.

[108] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 92.

[109] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 128.

[110] Sorensen, "'Belts of Gold' and 'Twenty-Pounders," 282.

[111] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 92.

during the rebellion at the hands of the English. David's commentary on the emigrant ship marks the moment when his perceptions of the English truly begin to change; after hearing of English-induced economic ruin, being confronted with the human costs precipitates a change in David. This change, however, is most clearly articulated when he notices the overwhelming presence of redcoats in the Highlands during the period he was separated from Alan. He says that "[he] had seen King George's troops" and "had no goodwill to them."[112] This demonstrates that shift, no matter how slight, that has taken place within David. From a royal apologist and supporter to a critic of their occupation of the Highlands, David's changed attitude towards royal forces represents a moment in which Highland and Lowland are united against a common enemy. This is not to say that this is a full-scale conversion to Jacobitism. David remains a Whig by the end of the novel, but one who now understands first hand the tangible affects of adhering to a dissenting ideology and is subsequently rather more skeptical of his government. While the characters may insist on their cultural differences, Stevenson nevertheless asks his audience to recognize the potential affinity between the two, especially when viewed in opposition to a much larger, external threat.

I would like to briefly suggest an alternative and indeed entirely contradictory reading of the novel than the one offered in the previous pages. I think it is a useful exercise whose benefits will be made known monetarily. I propose an interpretation *Kidnapped* that positions the Scottish Lowlands as participants in English colonial aggression in Scotland. In this interpretation, Scotland occupies a dubious role as integral part of the British colonial machine but also subject to British, more specifically English, colonial aggression itself. This divide falls along the Lowland/

---

[112] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 137.

Highland divide. That David's uncle has the opportunity to sell his nephew into slavery reveals in and of itself the extent to which English market and commercial exploits have penetrated Scotland. The Act of Union has made participation in colonial slave trade accessible to Scotland. For colonialism to operate, there has to a perceived lack that the colonizer sees himself as being able to provide. Often, colonizers saw a "lack" of "civilization" in these places and understood their mission as one of salvation, bringing order, law, and morality to places its did not exist before. This theme is present in *Kidnapped*. During a period when he is separated from Alan, David meets a catechist from the "Edinburgh Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge," sent to "evangelise the more savage places of the Highlands."[113] This demonstrates Lowland cultural imperialism in the Highlands. Stevenson tellingly shows how Lowlanders internalized and appropriated English justifications for colonialism, engaging in their own "civilizing mission" against the "savages" of the Highlands by way of Christianity.

A final point on the suggested kinship between the Lowlands and England and the shared spoils of empire: the novel's ending see's David come into his full inheritance, upholding primogeniture and patriarchal mandates. The novel ends with David claiming that "the hand of Providence brought me in my drifting to the very doors of the British Linen Company's bank."[114] The British Linen Company has its roots in the Scottish linen industry—the nation's single largest export in the eighteenth century due in large part to colonial markets. By 1750, nine-tenths of Scottish linen was exported from Scotland to North America and the West Indies.[115] David,

---

[113] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 130.

[114] Stevenson, *Kidnapped*, 263.

[115] Devine, "In Bed with an Elephant," 98.

therefore, finally chooses enterprise that is reliant on markets established and dominated by the British Empire.

This alternative reading is not meant to negate the previous one. Instead, when taken in tandem, it becomes clear the Stevenson creates a version of Scotland that is both engaged in colonial activities, internally and externally, and subject to colonial aggression themselves. Literary theorist Anne Colley suggests that this was a position Stevenson himself was aware of and occupied during his time in the South Seas.[116] She argues that Stevenson was joining a host of other Scots who had cast their lot with the empire and emigrated to its holdings. She also notes, however, that Stevenson would have recognized the parallels between Scotland and the South Seas, from the clan system and the imposition of foreign rule to the fact that both Highlanders and natives of the South Seas were labelled as "savage" and "barbaric" by those who colonized them. Thus, Stevenson functioned as both "a victim and as an intrusive colonial."[117] In other words, Stevenson is an "intrusive colonial," as both a Lowlander in the Highlands and a Scotsman in the South Seas; however, as a Scot, he is a victim of "English cultural imperialism."[118] *Kidnapped* realizes that, like its author, Scotland occupies a dual, contradictory role as colonizer and colonized. More than anything, *Kidnapped* demonstrates how the structures of colonialism inform and shape the genre of historical fiction. A dual reading of this historical novel functions as a performance of the unclear, even contradictory nature of historical interpretation. *Kidnapped*

---

[116] Stevenson was plagued by poor health for most of his life. As a result, he travelled constantly to different climates in the hopes it would suit his constitution better. This is how he came to live in the South Seas.

[117] Anne Colley, *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Colonial Imagination* (Ashgate Publishing Company: 2004), 5.

[118] Colley, *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Colonial Imagination,* 5.

advanced the genre of historical novel in that it significantly broadened the parameters of what an historical novel can be about. Stevenson highlights the fitness of the genre as an avenue to explore larger, more universal, debates about essentially contested concepts like empire and national identity.

I have argued that *Kidnapped* continues the tradition of the historical novel as defined by Scott. By adopting this form, Stevenson also exploits tensions between two reasons in the service of a greater meaning. As with Scott, these tensions are manifested through contradicting performances of masculinity. Because of the cultural moment Stevenson found himself in, he chose to reconcile the Highlander and the Lowlander and shift their mutual consternation outward, focusing instead on an external enemy, the British. This was meant to promote a unified Scotland, an image necessary if the Scots were going to preserve their cultural and national identity—apparently Scott's fears about cultural assimilation plagued authors seventy years later. However, as the novel suggests, the final us-versus-them dichotomy is not so simple or straightforward as it is in *Waverley*. *Kidnapped* usefully demonstrates the predicament Scotland once found itself in—grievously subject to British imperialism but also willing participants in that same regime.

IV

> In a book which has the social and political implications that this book obviously has, one's motives are not purely artistic—if such a thing is ever possible.
>
> - Naomi Mitchison, Notes on Part One

This first work written by a female author in this thesis is Naomi Mitchison's *The Bull Calves*. An expansive book published in 1947 that is part war-novel, romance, coming-of-age story, and mystery, *The Bull Calves* offers shrewd insight into a particularly interesting moment

in the development of the genre of historical fiction as well as Jacobite historiography. During and after World War II the book market was inundated with so-called "escapist" novels, often written by women, due in large part to the sheer number of women who turned to reading in order to distract themselves from the vulgarity of war as well as the boredom they incurred because of it.[119] As Diana Wallace convincingly argues, the novels written by women during this time that were maligned as "escapist" were often about a great deal more than initially given credit for. Since society deemed war to be the prerogative of men, women increasingly turned to historical fiction as a means to express their own anxieties and concerns about war.[120] It is out of this historical moment that *The Bull Calves* was published; it is a novel that has described as a "reinscription of the feminine in a world consumed by cataclysmic masculinity."[121] However, in Mitchison's pages, the world consumed by destructive masculinity is of course not one but two, separated by time: Scotland post [17]45 and Europe post [19]45.

Mitchison's biography provides some clues as to why feminism was so central to her writing. Born Naomi Mary Margaret Haldane in Edinburgh in 1897, Mitchison was the daughter John Scott Haldane, who was Scottish, and his wife Kathleen, who was part Scottish, part Jewish. From an early age, Mitchison's parents encouraged her to play and learn with her brother. She attended Oxford Preparatory School for Boys until 1911 when, because she had reached puberty, her mother demanded that she be taught by governess. This is one example of the contradictory nature that defined Mitchison's mother, a person who biographers claim had much influ-

---

[119] Diana Wallace, *Woman's Historical Novel,* 78.

[120] Wallace, *Woman's Historical Novel,* 79.

[121] Gill Plain, "Naomi Mitchison," *Women's Fiction of the Second World War: Gender, Power, and Resistance* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), pg 142.

ence of Mitchison's beliefs. Her mother was both an active suffragist as well as a conservative Tory and passionate supporter of the empire. Mitchison's parents held radically different political views, and while Mitchison and her brother aligned themselves with their mother's ideology in their youth, they later rebelled in support of more liberal thought. Though one cannot point to a single factor to explain Mitchison's staunch feminism, the blend of "upper-class adherence to Edwardian notions of girlhood and exploration of scientific ideas with her brother" contributed to her keen awareness of the social-sexual differences that structured the lives of men and women.[122] This inequality would come to dominate her writings.

Though Mitchison attended college, she never finished her degree, choosing instead to work as a nurse during the First World War. During this time, she married her husband and future Labour MP, Gilbert Mitchison. She established her writing career in 1923 and maintained her prolific output over the next five decades.[123] The Mitchison family moved to Carradale in Kintyre in 1939 and it is here that Mitchison lived through the second World War. Inspired by Scotland, the people of Carradale and her connection to the city, and the war raging around her, Mitchison began the meticulous research that would ultimately culminate in the *Bull Calves*.

The Bull Calves is remarkable in many ways, but especially for the way in which centers femininity and the experience of women during catastrophic war. Mitchison's narrative suggests that a proper understanding of the female wartime experience hinges largely on considerations of the family unit, both immediate and extended, as well as familial relations. As a result, she defines the female experience in terms of the domestic sphere, placing much of her narrative there.

---

[122] Elizabeth Maslen, "Mitchison [née Haldane], Naomi Mary Margaret, Lady Mitchison (1897–1999), writer and social activist," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

[123] Maslen, "Mitchison."

Yet at the same time, Mitchison effectively challenges what constitutes that sphere and usefully blurs the boundary between the public and the private, the domestic and the social or political. This creates room in the novel to legitimize female anxieties about war, promote the alternative ways women use their political voices, and identify sites of resistance to the patriarchal order which leads to war.

The novel is set over the course of two days in the summer of 1747 at the Haldane estate in the Lowlands of Scotland. Most of the Haldane clan, an ostensibly Whig family, has gathered at their ancestral home in order to reconnect in the aftermath of the '45. Mitchison's biography is crucial to understanding these choices to make this novel a family affair set in the immediate shadow of the conflict. The epigraph of the novel coupled with an extensive family tree placed at the beginning critically reveals that the characters are Mitchison's ancestors. It reads,

Dedicated to the other Bull Calves, living and dead, and
to the Highlanders they may have loved. But
most of all to those who are only
names in a family tree,
and, of those,
mine.

This epigraph, an example of concrete poetry, creates an inverted triangle on the page, with the last line and smallest line consisting of a single word: "mine." This is a powerful move, both visually and rhetorically, as it not only underscores Mitchison's narrative creation, but emphasizes the story which bears the burden of a lived history as well. That Mitchison's narrative revolves around the domestic sphere marks an important moment in the evolution of the genre for it reveals the spectacular ways in which a woman co-opted the genre and integrated it to tell oft-excluded histories: in this case, the history of one particular family.

At the novel's opening, readers are immediately introduced to a myriad of characters in rapid succession. However, it becomes clear relatively quickly, that, rather than an endless stream of characters, each is a single individual referred to by at least three names: Christian, family, and estate.[124] Not only does this move reduce the number of characters the reader feels she must keep up with, it also critically de-emphasizes the importance of the paternal familial name (by way of using other forms of signification, i.e., Christian and/or estate names). In so doing, Mitchison immediately challenges the significance of patrilineal inheritance. This is a theme that governs the entirety of the novel. Inheritance as envisioned by Mitchison, moreover, entails more than land and patrilineal surnames. As the story progresses, it becomes clear that the "inheritances" that Mitchison investigates are of the intangible variety; they include patriarchal modes of knowledge and power structures that seem to govern reality, or, the symbolic, both in the context of the novel as well as its time of publication.

Mitchison's decision to set the novel two years after the event seems to be a further revision of Scott and Stevenson in terms of chronology. Where Scott is concerned with capturing the moment of a nation in crisis and Stevenson about exploring the lasting social and political changes wrought by the conflict, Mitchison is interested in conveying the more immediate consequences of differing ideas held by familial intimates. In locating the events of the novel merely two years after the conflict in question, Mitchison captures the divisions and rifts that ideological-induced passions can sow, even after the event is over. Moreover, the publication of the novel coincides with the timeframe of the events of the narrative: in much the same way the narrative is set two years after the events of the '45, the novel was published two years after the conclu-

---

[124] Plain, "Naomi Mitchison", 144.

sion of World War II. Whether or not this was done purposefully, Mitchison's novel is clearly meant to act as a metaphor for 1947 and serve as a guide to navigating a post-war world.

The first two sections of the novel revolve around central character Kirstie Haldane narrating her life to her young niece, Catherine. In these sections Mitchison, through Kirstie, most thoroughly questions the patriarchal symbolic, the extent to which it is indeed the "rational" order of things that it purports to be, and explores the almost magnetic temptation towards different ways of being that exist outside of these austere confines. The symbolic, as it is employed in the novel, is the implicitly agreed upon structures that govern language and therefore condition human behavior. The symbolic is therefore patriarchal, seeing as it operates both under and in conjunction with the rules of the patriarchy. Kirstie's narrative arc is predicated on testing the validity and strength of the very boundaries that govern society.

In same two opening sections, Mitchison imbues Kirstie with a deep knowledge of high politics, the machinations of war, and theological debates. Moreover, she contextualizes these "masculine" issues in order to discuss their effect on women's lives. That Kirstie is so well-versed in these masculine matters is further evidence of Mitchison's smart use of the historical novel to turn both history and historiography on their heads. That a woman is, first, present in the narrative, and, second, so deeply knowledgeable about that which is deemed to exist exclusively in the masculine realm subverts the expectations of both history and historiography. As it stands currently, Jacobite historiography is dominated by men.[125] These histories are mostly political in

---

[125] The foremost scholars of the study are Allan MacInnes, Daniel Szechi, Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Frank McLynn. The study of the Jacobites as a legitimate topic is itself still a relatively new field, but nevertheless gained traction in 90s, well after several feminist movements fundamentally altered how history is practiced.

nature; they deal with war, high politics, and issues of national identity. Even at the present moment, academic treatment of the Jacobites is typically carried out by men, discussing that which traditionally constitute "masculine" realms. Mitchison's novel, therefore, stands out as a major intervention into the historical record. By opening the '45 so that it speaks to women's wartime exeriences, the novel rewrites Jacobite history and its historiography in a feminist vein. This feminist articulation includes meditations of course on gender differences, but also on ideology, national identity, colonialism, theological debates, politics, and sexuality. For the purposes of this thesis, I will focus on these elements as they manifest themselves in Kirstie's narrative. I will conclude by further considering the ways in which this novel was a product of its time and a reflection Mitchison's deep desire to achieve sustaining peace after the horrors of the Second World War.

The historical novel, as a form, is particularly well-suited for Mitchison's goal of revising history in ways that are in dialogue with her contemporary moment. In fact, literary critic Gill Plain posits that the historical novel is the "ideal form" for the feminist writer. She suggests that the genre "owes only the scantest amount of allegiance to the 'facts'" and that "it has the potential to resist or question the symbolic order, its only technical duty being the attempted re-creation of the characteristics of a particular age."[126] Plain articulates the value of the historical novel à la Lukács while simultaneously highlighting the radically subversive potential the form has in the hand of a feminist woman. Lukács emphasized the importance of situating the "great events" of history within the context of everyday reality. Mitchison fulfills this requirement by setting the plot of the novel in the domestic realm of the aftermath of the '45. However, she

---

[126] Plain, "Naomi Mitchison,"154.

quickly and importantly moves beyond the limits imposed by Lukács' argument. The novel interrogates the "great events" of history and questions what these events have to do with women. This goal is realized by shifting the focus of the narrative from the *event itself* (as it pertains to the experience of men) to the subsequent consequences of the conflict as understood and experienced by women.

It is important to note, however, that at the time in which Mitchison was writing, Jacobite Studies was at an all-time low and for reasons which are uncannily germane to the issues of this thesis. Historian J.C.D. Clarke suggests that the relative non-existence of academic studies of the Jacobites in the decades between 1920-1970 was due in large part to their commodification in popular culture[127]—in other words, scholarly work waned because of novel's like Mitchison's. Professional academic historians chose to stay away from the topic lest their work be devalued by association. But as has already been discussed, works of historical fiction were categorically dismissed by critics anyway. Despite being overlooked by academics, Mitchison's work nevertheless stands a crucial intervention into Jacobite historiography at a moment when anxiety about perception rendered professional historians silent.

Mitchison's important historiographical intervention in Jacobite studies has been neglected despite the huge surge in popularity of the field since the 1970s. Prominent Jacobite historian Daniel Szechi divides the field into three distinct categories: the "optimists," the "pessimists," and the "rejectionists." The "optimists" are those historians who believe the Jacobites had a legitimate chance at overturning the Hanoverian regime; the "pessimists" are those who recognizes the cultural significance of the Jacobites but nevertheless doubt their ability to bring about sus-

---

[127] Clarke, "The Many Restorations of King James," 9-57.

tained successful political change; and the "rejectionists" are those who believe that the Jacobites never posed a serious threat at any time.[128] The common, defining characteristic of these approaches is that they are all mostly concerned with High Politics. The result is that most studies of Jacobitism are either political, geopolitical, and/or military histories in approach.

Mitchison productively refocuses the historical gaze, revising the questions asked of Jacobite history and problematizing its familiar narratives. This allows her to unflinchingly explore an alternative to the patriarchal symbolic order, suggesting feminine semiotic modes of being can not only be a legitimate, but an ideal way of healing society. These alternative modes of existence engendered by the novel are those elements that exist outside of the patriarchal symbolic, pre-linguistic concepts like forgiveness, love, and compassion. Though not inherently feminine attributes, these are traits are associated with femininity and as a result, are some of the tenants that guide and shape Mitchison's feminism.[129]

In her biography of Naomi Mitchison, Jill Benton explores Mitchison's feminism, including a lengthy passage from Mitchison's uncompleted[130] book on the topic:

> If one is in this curious position of being a woman, one cannot unquestioningly accept the ordinary historical point of view about the values of civilization. Why not? Because up to the last few years all historians have been men. In some branches of knowledge it does not appear to make any difference whether men or women practise the search for truth… but the nearer we get to the human side of truth and especially art… the more we find that the sex of the seeker or researcher or writer makes a great difference to the result.[131]

---

[128] Szechi, *Jacobites*, 2-7.

[129] Plain, "Naomi Mitchison," 139-165.

[130] Benton offers a reason as to why the work remained unfinished. She posits that the task of analyzing women's culture was overwhelming and that some implications of the work were frightening, Moreover, the political climate of the 1930's were quite stifling to a feminist agenda. (1990, 74).

[131] Jill Benton, *Naomi Mitchison: A Biography* (Pandora, 1990), 74.

Here Mitchison displays an acute understanding of the limitations of a strictly masculine history. She seems to suggest that truth depends on the one telling the story, not merely what the history entails. History, she argues, is especially vulnerable to one-sided representation. *The Bull Calves*, therefore, can be understood in part as a project not only to recuperate a particular family's history but to (re)create women's history in the wake of the '45 Jacobite rebellion. Mitchison realizes this dual goal through the representation of the bodily experience of women, particularly wives and mothers during the war, and positions these experiences in oppositions to women with "deviant sexualities." Both modes of embodying womanhood allow Mitchison to explore the emotional toll of war on women and the manners in which this specific experience of trauma visibly and tangibly manifests itself.

As Kirstie relates her life story to Catherine, she often offers shrewd gender analysis of events that are usually studied and discussed in the context of men. Her discussions of war and politics, in particular, always hinge on how these things affected women. For example, Kirstie recalls the encounter she had as a young adult with her cousin, Isobel of Ardsheal, the young woman married to a Jacobite rebel captured after a minor battle with the English.[132] She explains that the English burned the Ardsheal estate to the ground, forcing a pregnant Isobel to flee. Kirstie powerfully states that the English were not only cruel, but infinitely more so towards a pregnant woman, lest "her big belly might offer too pretty a chance to a dragoon's bayonet."[133] Kirstie offers Isobel shelter and protection for some weeks. By privileging Isobel's pregnant

---

[132] The familial connection between the Haldane's and the Lanrick's is never explained fully. Kirstie characterizes their relationship to be that of cousins, although it is not clear how one family branch became Lowland Whigs while the other became Highland Jacobites.

[133] Naomi Mitchison, *The Bull Calves* (Kennedy and Boyd, 2013), 57.

body and the dangers the war poses to it, and in such graphic terms, Mitchison offers an alternative way to interpret to a history that is traditionally offered by its relation to men.

Importantly, Kirstie self-identifies as a Whig during her youth, in line with the rest of the Haldane family. Earlier in her conversation with Catherine, Kirstie provides an explanation for this by revealing that her father was first a member of the Scots Parliament, then finally the English Parliament after the Act of Union—a position the entire family treated with great seriousness. Kirstie forcefully contends that, "We Haldanes had aye stood for liberty of conscience and against the Bishops and the great nobles and any kind of divine or unreasonable rights, either of kings or others."[134] This quotation is striking because it illuminates the fact that Haldane's opposition to the Jacobites is grounded in "reasonable" ideology, a tenet that becomes central to understanding this novel. Catherine, aware of her aunt's early political convictions, is thus astounded to learn that her aunt once harbored a Jacobite rebel—her cousin Isobel—during active conflict. Kirstie replies that Isobel "was [her] own cousin, gif [sic] her man was twenty times a Jacobite."[135] This exchange acknowledges that familial ties were of greater importance, at least to Kirstie, than any political allegiance. For all intents and purposes, the conflict of the public has been, however locally, resolved in the feminine domestic space through love and familial loyalty.

In this same section, Kirstie offers a scathing critique of the ways in which warfare fundamentally disrupts one key process of life: childbearing. Kirstie laments, "Wars will take no accounts of the reasonable things of life, such as the getting and bearing of bairns."[136] Here, the

---

[134] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 39.

[135] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 57.

[136] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 57.

biological process of reproduction is marked as "reasonable," implicitly marking war and thus masculinity as not only "unreasonable" but as the antithesis of reproduction—destruction. Not only is Isobel's house destroyed as a result of war, but so is her family; though her son lives, her husband does not.

What constitutes "reasonable" is exactly what Mitchison tries to work out and critique in *The Bull Calves*. This is perhaps most evident when analyzing Kirstie's first marriage to Andrew Shaw, an Episcopalian preacher. Their marriage is a mostly unhappy one; Kirstie admits that she felt as though he never really courted her, implying that romantic connection was never a factor in their relationship. Alluding to Andrew's coldness, Kirstie suggests that religious zeal was present where intimacy should have been. She poignantly states that Andrew was courting "his own idea of salvation, and it must have seemed to him that I was part of it…"[137] This statement serves as an important shift in the narrative Kirstie relates to Catherine. Here, she recalls the abuse she suffered at Andrew's hands; while it was never physical, it was nevertheless mentally and emotionally destructive. His religion was predicated on a warped and corrupt interpretation of holiness and piety, indeed one that verges on cruelty. Importantly, the novel positions Andrew's violent and tyrannical religious philosophies as the antithesis to true Christianity.[138] His conception of Christianity, that it should be a war on sin, leads Mitchison to mark his version of Christianity as unreasonable because its foundation lay in a violent and destructive force.

The Bull Calves thus frames Christianity as a whole as a violent patriarchal tool used to oppress and destroy women. Kirstie reveals the anguish she felt as her father and brothers casual-

---

[137] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 84.

[138] Plain, "Naomi Mitchison", 150.

ly debated the intricacies of religious doctrine with her husband, never once recognizing what he was doing "with their own flesh and blood."[139] The men's concern for the minutiae of Christianity comes at the expense of their recognition of the harsh reality that structures their daughter's lived experience. This move implicitly marks patriarchal Christianity not only as dismissive to the plight of women, but implicated in their oppression. The fact that both of Kirstie's sons fathered by Andrew die in infancy is yet another way Mitchison highlights how the power structures employed by the patriarchy can be read on and through the female body. Just as war disrupts women's reproductivity, so too vicious patriarchy, represented here by Christianity, literally and metaphorically hinders successful female reproduction.

Throughout the novel, war is also upheld as a beacon of "unreasonableness." Very early on, Kirstie proclaims that

> If 'a the governing of the world were left to the women of it, they would never do the daft-like things men do, throwing away their own lives, aye and others. The world could surely be managed the way a house-hold is, cannily. Aye, a good household under a good and careful woman. And the men and the bairns would be free to dream and to have their adventures.[140]

As interpreted by Kirstie, war is "daft" and a literal waste. This quotation provides an alternative to the current symbolic order, albeit one that is informed by traditional, patriarchal gender roles. Kirstie suggests that, if allowed, women could govern the public sphere in much the same way the private sphere is maintained. While the definition of a "good household" is never explicitly defined, I nevertheless interpret it to mean one that is morally, religiously, and fiscally responsible. Moreover, the simplicity with which Kirstie envisions this change suggests a fluidity between the public and private spheres that is not fully recognized. It implies that the duties re-

---

[139] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves, 87.*

[140] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 38.

quired to maintain a well-run household are the same needed by governments to sustain themselves. In this passage, Kirstie provides an alternative to the status quo, conferring the potential for political power on those agents who maintain the domestic realm, arguing that they are also the most qualified to maintain the public one.

The Bull Calves is full of instances in which women display power in the face of the overwhelming patriarchal hegemony. Most consistent throughout the book is Kirstie's intimate knowledge of proceedings of the male sphere. For example, when discussing how much she missed being in close proximity to her family during her marriage to Andrew, she offers the following remark to demonstrate that she still kept up with her family:

> For there was Mungo in his great wig and talk of Parliament and the Whig policies and some new lawsuit he was contemplating over his shares in the South Sea Company… For indeed the Union was turning out a poor bargain for ourselves. Our old trade has been ruined during the times of the religious troubles […] Our fisheries had to face the competition of the bigger and better equipped Dutch boats […]Our coal trade with Ireland suffered from a duty that was not placed on English coal. Our linen trade was attacked, for all it was our staple, just as much as wool was the English one.[141]

In demonstrating her deep desire to remain in contact with her natal kin, Kirstie reveals her deep knowledge of geopolitics and transnational trade economies; she uses this information to justify her assertion that the Act of Union was disadvantageous to the Scottish people, making it an issue largely defined by competing national identities even though the act was meant, to a certain degree, to reconcile the two and nations and bring them together. This moment is a striking one because it demonstrates the way in which Kirstie was not only able to gain intimate knowledge about issues usually deemed to be the prerogative of men (and only certain men at that), but further provides a shrewd analysis of the ways in which different political, economic, and social

---

[141] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 102-103.

factors coalesce to render the relationship between England and Scotland precarious. Mitchison was deeply committed to portraying that Scottish women were political women.

To display her breadth of knowledge, Kirstie also offers an astute critique of class distinctions based in religious ideologies. During their marriage, Andrew was called to a bigger parish in Ayr, a location heavily populated by colliers. Kirstie explains that, after being beckoned by a collier woman to follow her, Kirstie's curiosity got the better of her. She says:

> I had a curiosity to see these colliers that were serfs and savages and for whom John Knox had ordained no good Scots schooling, for what use would reading or writing be to a collier? They could sum the corves of coal tallies, and the bairns went to the pit when they were old enough to know why they were whipped. They were worth something to their fathers and to their fathers owners, for they could scratch together the loose coals…[142]

The first sentence is rife with sarcasm. Kirstie challenges Knox's social policies while simultaneously identifying Christianity with cruelty and unreason once again. However, this critique is even more-multifaceted than the first, as she condemns mercantilist greed for unilaterally dehumanizing an entire group of people. Though she would have never dared speak her disdain to Andrew, it is nevertheless significant that she is passing down the moral consternation of women to the next generation, her niece. This is an example of the matrilineal inheritance that is advocated throughout the novel as an alternative to combative masculine patriarchy. Thus historical fiction provides a space to privilege female relationships and conversations in a way that traditional history and historiography does not. The content of these conversations further reveals the breadth of female knowledge and proposes alternate modes of being to the ones currently in place, which serve to relegate women to the domestic and devalue their knowledge.

---

[142] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 98.

Kirstie, however, is not the only woman to demonstrate alternative forms of power in the novel. Her mother, Helen Erskine has perhaps the most poignant moment in the story. During her marriage to Andrew, Helen falls seriously ill and Kirstie comes back home to care for her. While home, she meets Black William, a Jacobite rebel, for the first time and their connection can only be described as love at first sight. William is on the run and in desperate need of money and other supplies. After their encounter, she returns home and tells Helen of the Jacobite in need. Helen then commands Kirstie to help him. She says in part,

> Take four gold pieces. They will not be Scots money, nor yet English, but sequins from Rome and Venice and Milan. And you will give them to this man of yours from Helen Erskine that has lived her life in a Whig house of Haldanes and loved them everyone, yet never saw just the same way they did, and never quite had her will… But they never knew it, none of them![143]

Helen has remained loyal in her heart to the Jacobite cause despite living amongst the Whigs and concealing her true sympathies for decades. In one of her last acts, she chooses to support the cause she never could. Helen explains that the Haldanes trusted her and that she never once betrayed their trust. Nevertheless, in her act of financial support, Helen seems to imply that she has always been sympathetic to the Jacobite cause even though she would not dare voice her contrary opinion. Her support of the cause can only happen after her husband is dead (which he is by this point in the novel), foregrounding the fact that as a young woman, Helen was expected to conform to whatever belief system her husband's family held, further communicating the implicit power of the patriarchy. Moreover, Mitchison implies that the relationship between gender and cultural sympathies has been overlooked by imbuing her female characters with their own independent political and cultural opinions.

---

[143] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 113.

Mitchison's text once more sheds light on undeveloped facets of Jacobite, and Scottish, history: women's understanding of and relationship to politics and other cultural issues. Helen's final rebellious act—for indeed it is rebellious—serves as a self-authored revision of her own history, providing correction about her presumed beliefs and identity. She seizes on the power available to her and declares her contrary sympathies, changing everything Kirstie thought she knew about her mother. Though it is not a full-throated support of Jacobitism, it is nevertheless an instance in which Helen Haldane reclaims power, altering her own narrative and identity, creating a flexible version of Britishness that allows her to hold her true beliefs while maintaining the appearance of those she is expected to have. Helen's narrative suggests that Scottish identity is ultimately one about survival, for Helen adheres to her expected role in order to maintain the peace in her new marriage. But Helen's story is also deeply about unbridled resilience in the face of oppression. While Helen's marriage to her husband was by all accounts a happy one, the fact that she nevertheless "conformed" to his beliefs indicates that patriarchal power structures, in this case marriage, was meant to control women's relationship to the state. Helen, however, reveals that she has maintained her own, interior relationship to the state, outside of her husband's influence. Mitchison points to the fact that, for a large and forgotten population, national identity is hampered by invisible constraints. Nevertheless, it is distinct and resilient. Considering that Mitchison wrote at the beginning of the process of decolonization, when many parts of the empire were invested in distinguishing themselves from the British core, she reveals through Helen and Kirstie's narratives that this has always been a project of Scottish national identity.

Mitchison wrote *The Bull Calves* with the recent events of World War II firmly in her mind. Gill Plain suggests that the potential for the spread of fascism was one of the reasons Mitchison desperately clung to rationality and reason throughout her text.[144] The machinations of the patriarchal order, an order that considered itself to be the hallmark of rationality, led the world to this unprecedented moment of brokenness. This, for Mitchison, was the very definition of irrationality.[145] Mitchison deeply believed that rationalism could defeat fascism. However, as the text makes clear, the kind of rationalism that will defeat fascism is not the rationality of the symbolic (read: patriarchy), but the kind of rationality predicated on love, forgiveness, and matrilineal inheritance.

Consequently, forgiveness is a major component of Kirstie's narrative arc. After Andrew's death and before her marriage to William, a period of roughly a year, Kirstie joined a coven of witches. Interestingly, Kirstie discusses this moment in her life only briefly with Catherine. Instead, she divulges more about her time in the coven later that night, as she lays in bed with William. She explains that Andrew's oppressive version of patriarchal religion literally drove her away from the Church and into a group of women who offered solidarity, if not support. Kirstie describes the make-up of the coven, saying that "Most of us were widows or other women well on in life, and with our experiences, but there was one young lassie."[146] These demographics describes are well in line with the history of witchcraft in Scotland. As Julian Goodare has shown, the typical Scottish witch was usually an older, poor woman, though one that was settled in the

---

[144] Plain, "Naomi Mitchison."

[145]Plain, "Naomi Mitchison."

[146] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 166.

community as opposed to vagrant or a beggar. However, Goodare usefully notes that most people in early modern Scotland were poor, like those in Ayr, which suggests that it was likely that most of the population could be accused of witchcraft based on their economic status. He also notes that it is likely that the marital status of witches in Scotland were the same elsewhere: half of the witches were married and most of the others were widows.[147] The make-up of the coven as described by Kirstie matches Goodare's findings.

When confessing of this period in her life to William, Kristie remarks that "I had a feeling that we were near to understanding the heart of things that could have been turned to good, yet not the kind of good that would be recognized by… the members of the congregation. Least of all maybe, the men."[148] This is a statement reveals that different, feminine modes of knowledge and ways of being will always be rejected by the "respectable," Church, and especially its men. Kirstie continues on to explain that the members of the coven convinced her it was time for her to meet the devil himself and that, while she dreaded the thought, she felt she had nothing to lose. She made all the preparations and waited for him to appear on one particular night, dressed only in her nightgown. This suggests that Kirstie was intending to make her pact with the devil, a critical act to understanding witches and witchcraft in early modern Europe. Goodare mentions that accusations of witchcraft almost always included a moral offence: that the witch had sex with the devil.[149] Kirstie, though never outright admitting to it, implies that she was willing to make that pact.

---

[147] Julian Goodare, "Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland," Social History 23, no. 3 (October 1998): 290.

[148] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 166.

[149] Goodare, "Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland," 294.

However, after the devil knocks on her door and enters her home, William of Borlum, otherwise known as Black William, enters instead. He has just returned from a decade in North America to ask Kirstie to marry him. She agrees and vows to forget her time in the coven. This is not the first time William has heard her describe her time in the coven, yet it is the reader's first exposure to the encounter in such detail. Kirstie's foray coven seems to reveal anxieties about women's dangerous potential outside of marriage. Read in a different light, however, it is indicative of *Kirstie's* apprehension of marriage and domestic life. As Wallace demonstrates, figures like the witch in post-war fiction often represent the anxieties women suppressed about marriage and family.[150] Kirstie joins a coven after the death of her abusive husband and traumatic death of her two sons. Her decision to cast her lot here perhaps indicates her dissatisfaction with the options given to her as a woman in early modern Scotland. It is interesting then that Kirstie renounces the coven because of another marriage proposal. In this way, Mitchison can be read as a product of her time; the love of a good man and promise of a happy home is enough to save a good woman. Whatever reservations we may have, today, about this choice, William's ultimate forgiveness nevertheless represents the ability for love to overcome the evil in the world. This is once more an alternative to the symbolic order.

Feminism was crucial to Naomi Mitchison's self-identification. She wrote in her diary that "[her] feminism is deeper… than, say nationalism or socialism: it is more irrational, harder to argue about, nearer to the hurting core"[151] The idea of the "hurting core" suggests a vulnerabil-

---

[150] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 81.

[151] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 140.

ity as well as a kind of tenacity, something that is vital to the experience of womanhood but also dismissed or suppressed by a patriarchal society. It is the goal of *The Bull Calves* to recognize this hurting core, legitimize it, and suggest different ways of moving forward. This goal is projected onto the past in the hopes of providing a framework for her post-war present. In Mitchison's hands, Jacobite history becomes much more nuanced than the three schools proposed by Daniel Szechi. The Bull Calves closes with over 150 pages of extensive notes, which are part essay, part citations. It is not only a meticulously researched novel, providing pages upon pages of notes about Scottish agriculture and economy, explaining her rationale for using Scots language in some places but dialect in others, and the vices and virtues of socialism, but a labor of love and education. She writes that her book is mainly for those who happen to be interested in the kind of problems that Scotland faced, problems "of thought and conduct which still appear to interest most Scots… who… have been ground into a featureless, history-less, culture-less, pulp by the international mill of capitalism."[152] This book, in other words, is meant to shed light on issues in Jacobite history that have been obscured by larger forces. Her job is truly one of recuperation; it is deeply concerned with Scottish issues and what it means to be Scottish. Rather than politics, wars, and religion, the history of Scotland is the history of its people, which necessarily includes women. Mitchison states she hopes to capture the spirit of eighteenth-century Scotland through this book.[153] The Bull Calves demonstrates that the spirit of eighteenth century Scotland lives in its women, those who preserved different, semiotic kinds of wisdom but also held their own opinions about the political and social milieu. While there is no evidence to sug-

---

[152] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 457-458.

[153] Mitchison, *The Bull Calves,* 452.

gest that Mitchison had read Lukács' theory of the historical novel before writing he own, she nevertheless created a work that was in line with his definition and also unknowingly revised his thesis on the same grounds feminist critics of the late twentieth century would. From her position in 1947, Mitchison was able to refocus the historical gaze and reorient the questions asked of "great historical events" and how they affect women. *The Bull Calves* poignantly demonstrates the ways in which war and its aftermath are cataclysmic to the female experience. Importantly, however, it also offered a philosophy for moving past the patriarchal symbolic order.

I have argued that *The Bull Calves* is an important novel for the way in which it foregrounds female experience, especially during wartime. The novel is a rebuke of the "unreasonable" functions of patriarchy, like war and tyrannical Christianity, that lead to violence and death. Mitchison discusses the effect of these functions in regard to women's lives. Moreover, she imbues her female characters with a deep knowledge of those topics which are considered to be masculine pursuits, like religion, politics, and other social issues. In so doing, Mitchison imagines an alternative, feminine semiotic way of being and governing. This longing for a kinder, more empathetic world stems directly from living through the Second World War and its aftermath. By setting the plot of the novel two hundred years in the past, Mitchison is able to discuss her fears anxieties about war and the patriarchy without fear of censure or condemnation from her contemporaries. In this way, *The Bull Calves* confronts and criticizes its present moment by couching the narrative in the past. The historical setting also allows Mitchison to explore her own families history as well as the history of women, illuminating just how much women have (or have not) been granted access to the public sphere.

V

> People often say to me, 'You write such strong female characters,' and I say, 'Well, I don't like stupid women.'
>
> - Diana Gabaldon in an interview with *Goodreads*, June 2014

The final novel under investigation in this thesis is Diana Gabaldon's 1992 *Outlander*. The first of eight completed (and ten planned) books, *Outlander* has sold over twenty-five million copies worldwide and has been adapted into a hugely popular television series on Starz.[154] In many ways, the novel is an amalgamation of the three other works discussed in this study: Outlander is a romantic adventure novel that interrogates the relationship between identity and formal structures of power. This includes the individuals relationship to history itself. Gabaldon is the only non-Brit in this study, which reflects in the questions she asks of her text. While she is most certainly interested in identity, it is not a Scottish identity *per se*. Instead, Gabaldon uses the history of the Jacobites in order to interrogate the relationship between the oppressed and their oppressors. This investigation takes shape in the novel *through* the relationship between the Jacobites and the British, as well as the relationship between men and women. In an oblique way, it also plays itself out in the tension that riddles the text between past and present, pre- and post-modern. *Outlander* explores the connections between different identity markers and how they can be subverted or manipulated in the face of hegemonic cultural power.

Outlander also presents an interesting moments of comparison in regards to historical fiction written by women. Where *The Bull Calves* is a poignantly meditative reflection on female experience during war as well as a surrogate by which Mitchison could offer critiques of World War II and provide insights about healing and reconciliation in its aftermath, *Outlander* appears

---

[154] Valerie Estelle Frankel, Adoring Outlander: Essays on Fandom, Genre, and the Female Audience (Jefferson, North Caroline, McFarland & Company Publishers: 2016), 1.

to be more in line with the daring adventure of Stevenson's *Kidnapped*. This kinship only goes so far, however, considering that *Outlander's* hero is a woman. Moreover, Stevenson and Gabaldon are writing at two very different moments in the life of the British Empire, circumstances that absolutely come to bear on each text. Stevenson was writing during a period in which the British Empire was practicing both informal empire as well as New Imperialism. Although *Kidnapped* makes it obvious that Stevenson is critical of this imperialism (by way of discussion of the '45), Stevenson is nevertheless concerned with might of the British Empire in 1886. Gabaldon, on the other hand, is writing in the shadows of the moment that many consider to be the final end of the Empire: the Sino-British Joint Declaration on the future Hong Kong's governance was signed in September of 1984 and was fully realized with the Chinese assumption of sovereignty of the former Crown Colony on July 1, 1997 after the ninety-nine year lease of the New Territories was up.[155] While the official hand-over was completed in 1997, one year after the publication of *Outlander*, Gabaldon was nevertheless cognizant of the looming expiration date on the empire. As a result, she questions not the British Empire, but the rather the validity of the ideologies that propelled it forward.

At their cores, however, *Outlander* and *The Bull Calves* are very similar. Both feature numerous female characters who get the opportunity to speak for themselves. Both imbue their women with intimate understandings of politics. Both center female experiences during times of crisis, privileging feminine modes of knowledge in the process. Perhaps this is the constant that bridges the temporal gap separating these two novels, the reliance on the historical novel as the most efficient narrative form to bring historically marginalized voices to the fore. On each side

---

[155] Jürgen Osterhammel, "China," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century,* ed.Judith M. Brown and WM. Roger Louis (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 664.

of this gap there are social and material differences that influence the shape of each novel, but the center remains the same. Where Mitchison's writing is shaped by World War II, Gabaldon's is influenced by the intellectual milieu of the 1980s and 1990s.

Outlander is perhaps the most well-known novel under investigation herein, but it is also the one that has received the least amount of scholarly attention. Diana Wallace's study of the woman's historical novel explains how and why female authors have written historical novels as a response to their particular moment in each decade from 1900-2000.[156] While historical fiction had been negatively associated with female writers before, the 1970s was the decade in which these associations were solidified. Beginning in this decade, a division in the works of fiction written by women became ever more prominent, distinguishing between the "serious" novel and the "popular" novel. The "serious" women's novel was born directly out of the feminist movement of the 1970s. They were generally realist texts and served as a medium through which women's experiences were centered in order to foreground the oppression they suffered under the patriarchal order; these novels were meant to foster and solidify a female-consciousness.[157] This kind of feminist thinking rejected the romantic ideology present in most "popular" novels. Popular became synonymous with "romance," which as a subgenre, is defined as one where sexual or romantic desire figure prominently into the story. As a result, popular novels were deemed conservative by feminists insofar as they reinforced the dominant model of social ordering.[158] Feminists interpreted these popular romance novels as upholding the unequal social and

---

[156] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel.*

[157] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 150-175.

[158] de Groot, *Historical Novel*, 51.

economic realities between men and women in institutions like marriage and sexual relationships more broadly. This is one of the main reasons the genre of romance was rejected by the second-wave feminists.

By the middle of the 1970s, however, publishers realized that three-quarters of all fiction was either bought or borrowed by women, and women were reading "popular" novels. Recognizing their opportunity, presses began producing and marketing novels that appealed to directly to women.[159] What is more, most of these novels have historical settings, as it provides the distance between audience and subject matter required to fulfill the desire of the reader.[160] Because of the success of Mills and Boons Masquerade series—forty-six novels produced between 1977-1979—the historical romance proved to be a lucrative subgenre.[161] For better or worse, the historical novel became associated with the historical romance, which was itself associated with female authors and audiences.

Beginning in the 1980s, however, feminist scholars began lending more credence to the popular historical romance by way of increasingly sophisticated interpretations of these works. A major development to come out of this critical discourse was the recognition of the "realistic" element contained in popular historical romances novels, the description of a "real" historical period, negating the division drawn in the 1970s. [162] At the same time however, the historical setting is also an alien one, allowing for the enactment of the fantasy of romance while maintaining

---

[159] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 151.

[160] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 153.

[161] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 151-152.

[162] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 152-153.

a safe distance from the audience.[163] In other words, the historical setting serves two, seemingly contradictory functions—it both legitimizes the romance as "real" and simultaneously exposes it as an illusion by locating it in the unknowable and irretrievable past. Moreover, these scholars also identified ways in which female characters were able to seize power in the very same terms the feminist movement used to dismiss these novels—sexual relationships.[164]

Described by literary critic Patricia Waugh as a decade of a "generalised 'post'-condition"—referencing the widespread theoretical debates about postmodernism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, post-feminism, and the like—the historical novel of the 1990s explored the ways in which historical representations change over time and what these changes communicate about the relationship between representation and structures of power, including gender.[165] Influenced by all of the post-isms, but postmodernism and poststructuralism especially, authors of historical novels in the 1990s recognized that history was knowable only through textual representation. As a result, the woman's historical novel of this decade does not try to faithfully reproduce history but rather complicate history by emphasizing the "subjective, fragmentary nature of historical knowledge."[166] Instead, it explores the unknowability of the past.

Outlander was born out of the cultural climate in which it was produced and as a result, it is a text preoccupied with postmodernism, a theoretical turn that questions whether or not we can actually know the past. Literary critic Amy Elias suggests that there are three types of postmod-

---

[163] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 153.

[164] Interestingly enough, Wallace points out that many feminists later identified themselves as closet romance readers, suggesting that romance novels fulfilled certain needs that were not satisfied by "serious" female texts.

[165] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 204.

[166] Wallace, *Women's Historical Novel*, 204.

ernism: epistemological, sociocultural, and aesthetic. Epistemological postmodernism is concerned with the history of modernity, "a historical phenomenon birthed for Western Europe and the Americas in the Age of Reason."[167] It rejects rationality and positivism and operates on an antihumanist bias, rejecting the notion that mankind should be understood as historically relative.[168] Sociocultural postmodernism is the "aestheticization of everyday life," characterized by the fact that reality becomes increasingly indistinguishable from the version of reality projected by media, advertising, and other "escapist entertainment" technologies.[169] Finally, aesthetic postmodernism looks different in different mediums, but in literature, it is a reaction to the realism of the High Modernists (think Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, and Virginia Woolf). Aesthetic postmodernism is understood to have two distinct phases of development: the metafictional phase that dominated the 1960s-1970s and the "anti-modernist" phase of 1980s and 1990s.[170] The anti-modernist cultural critique of the 1980s and 1990s centered on the politics of gender, race, and class, and was realized in several ways: "a propensity toward theoretical self-reflexivity… a distrust of history or a felt need to revise it…. A blurring of traditionally separate literary genres; a reversal or destruction of traditional high art/low art hierarchies; experimentation with popular or "low" art genres, such as science fiction, romance."[171] Elias contends that though these are three distinct versions of postmodernism, they are nevertheless interlocked, as aspects of one version speak to and influence another.

---

[167] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* xxi.

[168] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* xxii.

[169] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* xxiii.

[170] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* xxvi.

[171] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* Xxvi, xxvii.

Written during the late 1980s and published in the early 1990s, *Outlander* is a novel that ideologically straddles both decades. The influences of both the 1980s and 1990s are apparent in the plot and structure, respectively. A major thrust of the novel is the romance and intense sexual relationship that blossoms between Claire and Jamie. Power is often negotiated and communicated through that relationship. The structure of the novel, however, reflects elements of both epistemological and aesthetic postmodernism as described by Elias. The text complicates and positions itself against the precepts of enlightenment modernity as seen in its generic hybrid status as both romance and science fiction.

Enlightenment thought demands positivistic notions of progress and linear time. In a post-Einsteinian world, these mandates are shattered as time and space are become interchangeable and interrelated.[172] If time and space are relative, then history can be understood neither as a linear progression nor a stable narrative. Rather, it depends entirely on the observer. In the case of Outlander, Claire is the first-person observer. The introduction of a science fictional time travel element to Claire's narrative overtly challenges the existence of linear time and stable narrative. Moreover, *Outlander* concerns itself with the politics of the body, a hallmark of aesthetic postmodernism. Claire is only considered to be a Scot after she sleeps with Jamie—the marriage ceremony is not enough. Though this act was intended to keep Claire out of the hands of Captain Randall, it also had the effect of bringing her more fully under the control and jurisdiction of the MacKenzie clan. Later in the novel, Jamie's body becomes a site where tensions between two nations and national identities are exploited and played out.

---

[172] Elias, *Sublime Desire,* 8.

Outlander is thus a product of its time, imposing conventions of the historical romance as established in the 1970s and 1980s onto a 1990s postmodern framework, in order to question the existence of objective, linear, knowable history. Importantly, it is also the first novel in this study to extensively consider and explore issues of sexuality and sexual orientation. I therefore propose to analyze *Outlander*-as-text in terms of epistemological and aesthetic postmodernism and Outlander-as-cultural-phenomenon in terms of sociocultural postmodernism, befitting a novel that operates on multiple levels, both textually and culturally. Through postmodernism, the meta-commentary that the time-travel element of the novel provides can be more fully articulated. It allows for the exploration of the power dynamics between oppressed and oppressing identities, often providing powerful moments of resistance to the hegemonic power.

Outlander follows the story of Claire Randall, the first-person narrator and protagonist. At the story's beginning, Claire is on a delayed honeymoon with her husband, Frank, in the Scottish Highlands. The year is 1947 and they are reconnecting after their respective careers separated them during World War II—Claire a combat nurse and Frank a British intelligence officer. While exploring alone one day, Claire falls through a set of ancient stones and is transported back to 1745 Inverness. Discovered first by British troops, she is immediately taken to see Captain Jack (Black Jack) Randall, who happens to be Frank's sixth-great grandfather. He attempts to rape her, but she is saved by members of clan MacKenzie, who happen to be lifting cattle nearby. Claire remains under their protection and moves to their clan seat at Castle Leoch. Claire is forced to marry Jamie Fraser, the nephew of the clan leaders, Cloum and Dougal MacKenzie, an act which makes her Scot. As a Scot, she cannot be detained or interviewed by Randall, per an

unwritten understanding between English forces and Highland chieftains. Narrated from Claire's perspective, *Outlander* re-imagines a woman's experience during a historical moment of crisis privileging narratives that are altogether absent from academic scholarship. Sex is portrayed as means by which women could seize power, often over her male counterparts, as well as function of both personal and imperial control. The novel is thus an exploration of Claire and Jamie's relationship, the machinations of Highland clan society, as well as a portrait of the Jacobites in the months leading up to the '45. Claire's marriage to Jamie introduces her to the full spectrum of Highland society, which at each level is characterized by an intense distrust, if not hatred, of the English.

Claire and Jamie's marriage is the axis on which the entire narrative orients itself. It is crucial to the rest of the plot. Readers must be invested in the relationship between Claire and Jamie in order to be invested in pro-Jacobite narrative of the novel. As will be discussed at greater length below, Jamie's character serves as *the* representative of Highland culture. Claire's intense attraction to him has the intended effect of aligning the readers sympathies with Jamie, and by extension, the Highlands more generally. The novel hinges on Claire's desire to return to her own time. The first four-hundred or so pages are filled with Claire scheming of ways to return to the stones and 1947. Even after she marries Jamie, Claire attempts an escape only to be captured by the Redcoats, forcing Jamie to rescue her.[173] Only after Claire is put on trial for witchcraft, a subplot which will be discussed at length shortly, does she admit to Jamie that she is from the future.[174] Jamie takes Claire to the stones that could return her to her own time in order

---

[173] Gabaldon, *Outlander,* 354-388.

[174] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 550-551.*

to let her decide which moment she wants to be in. An agonizing choice, Claire makes this decision by first analyzing her feelings for Frank, her 1947 husband, and Jamie, her 1744 husband. When that proves to be a hopeless endeavor, she places herself half way in between the stone that could return her to her own time, and the cottage where Jamie is staying. She begins walking and remarks that "before I even knew that I had decided, I was halfway down the hill" toward's the cottage.[175] She ultimately chooses to stay in 1744, saying only that she "had to."[176] This is the moment represents Claire's decision to fully align herself with Jamie's life and the causes he, now they, are committed to. Presented with the opportunity to return home to Frank, she chooses instead to stay with Jamie, signaling to the readers that this is the historical moment we too should be invested in.

However, for the majority of the novel, Claire describes her connection with Jamie as one of sexual desire rather than romantic love. Claire often explicitly associates love with Frank for the first three-quarters of the book.[177] When speaking of her relationship with Jamie during this time, however, she describes it as an"infatuation," "an intense affair," and a "startling deep bodily passion" at various points.[178] Therefore, sexuality is crucially important to the plot. Rather than being mere wish-fulfilment though, each sexual encounter is crucial to the advancement of the plot. For example, the first time Claire and Jamie have sex, on their wedding night, Claire asks Jamie if it is a problem that she is not a virgin and he responds by saying only if she doesn't

---

[175] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 561.*

[176] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 562.*

[177] The argument can be made that she loves Jamie long before she says as much, but nevertheless, we will let her speak to her own feelings.

[178] Gabaldon, *Outlander,* 306, 306, and 410, respectively.

mind that he is, establishing that Claire in the dominant partner in this respect. This is an immediate reversal of the traditional romance plot, which usually involves a virginal, pure young woman and a roguish, experienced man. Here the roles are reversed, and Claire is the partner with the experience. Each ensuing encounter serves to solidify the bond between Claire and Jamie. Most scenes of physical intimacy follow a moment of vulnerability between the two, moments when either Claire or Jamie have revealed something from their past or discussed their feelings candidly. Instances of mental connections are almost always followed by scenes of physical ones. Over time, this pattern demonstrates how Claire and Jamie become one, in both spirit and body. The process of increasing identification between the two reinforces the correctness of Claire's choice to stay with Jamie in 1744.

In making Claire the dominant partner in this relationship, Gabaldon runs the risk of contradicting her own feminist ambitions. After their marriage, Claire wonders how many young girls resent her for removing "an eligible bachelor from circulation… noting the number of cold glances and behind-the-hand remarks."[179] Claire is a woman from the future and she is the one who lands the handsome Jamie. The novel suggests that Jamie is so taken by Claire because of her modern sensibilities. Although he does not know them as such, readers, with benefit of hindsight, recognize Claire as 1940s modern woman. She is whip-smart, opinionated and outspoken, "foul-tongued,"[180] and sexually experienced. Except for the last one, these are the traits that those in the MacKenzie clan associate with Claire. Before they are married, Jamie takes the punishment for a local village girl who is set to be whipped in public. After this incident, Claire asks

---

[179] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 456.*

[180] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 386.*

Alec, the horse master and the man Jamie works for, if Jamie took her punishment because he wanted her for a wife. Alec's response is an articulation of the implicit hierarchy Gabaldon subtly creates between women: he says, “That’s not the wife he should have[…] Nay he needs a woman and not a girl. Laoghaire will be a girl when she is fifty[…] I ken the difference [between girl and woman] verra weel […] so do you lass.”[181] While Claire is left to contemplate Alec’s remark, it is abundantly clear to the reader that Alec perceives Claire to be a woman, where Loaghaire is a girl. The difference between those two identities is what makes Claire, rather than Loaghaire, a suitable match for Jamie. Whether intentionally or not, Gabaldon suggests that eighteenth century women would not have been able to secure Jamie’s affection because they lack the very characteristics that lead Alec to imply that Claire is a woman, as opposed to a girl. In a way, Gabaldon infantilizes eighteenth century women, suggesting that her twentieth century counterpart is superior. This is emblematic of the struggle many feminist female artists faced, especially in the 1990s: the creation of a feminist text whose feminism does not rely in some way on “othering” a different group of people. Here, Gabaldon falls right into that trap, marking Claire as exceptional, or at least superior, to her "othered" peers.

Despite undermining her own goal, however, Gabaldon insists on negotiating power and control through sexual relationships and encounters. These moments often function as a framework through which larger discussions about politics and national identity can be explored and expressed. The two most compelling instances of this in the novel happen during Claire and Geillis Duncan’s witchcraft trial and the chapters that take place in Wentworth Prison where Captain Randall rapes Jamie. The first provides a model for ways in which women could acquire po-

---

[181] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 158.*

litical agency through conscious exploitation of prescribed gender roles and the second demonstrates how tensions between national identities are marked and played out on the body. Both moments nevertheless serve as a meta-commentary on the fact that issues of sex and sexuality are indistinguishable from issues of politics, specifically the politics and power structures of imperialism.

The witch narrative is persistent throughout the novel, but reaches its climax during Geillis and Claire's trial. To better understand how we get to this moment and begin to parse its implications for gender and national identity in the novel, a brief summary of their relationship and the witchcraft narrative is necessary.

Geillis and Claire bond over their shared interests in herbs and their medicinal uses. Though Geillis is rumored to be a witch, Claire befriends her anyway. Jamie warns Claire to steer clear of her, for associating with a suspected witch opens Claire up for accusations as well. Jamies sense of foreboding is comes to fruition one afternoon while he, and the leaders of the Clan MacKenzie, Dougal, and Colum, take the visiting Duke of Sandringham on a hunting expedition. Claire receives summons to Geillis' house and promptly goes to her. It quickly becomes obvious, however, that they have been set up, for Geillis maintains that she did not send for Claire. As they try to sort out the confusion, prison guards rush into her home and arrest both Geillis and Claire for witchcraft. They are thrown into a cell together to await trial, During this time Geillis admits to Claire that she is a Jacobite. The two women are then tried and sentenced to death, but Jamie returns at the last possible moment to save Claire. As he threatens the minis-

ters of the kirk with bodily harm, Geillis admits to being a witch and proclaims Claire's innocence. This creates enough of a distraction allowing Claire and Jamie to escape.

There are several important elements at play here, the first being Geillis' professed Jacobitism, and the second being Gabaldon's general yet anachronistic invocation of witchcraft. The witchcraft narrative, however historically misplaced, is representative of the ways in which women could co-opt sexually-charged pejoratives to establish dominance over male counterparts. The subject of Geillis' Jacobitism and strong sense of Scottish national identity is broached and articulated through her sexual relationship with Dougal, deftly showcasing the relationship between sexuality and established power structures.

Arguably one of the most powerful moments in the witch narrative, indeed in the entire novel, comes when Claire calls upon the mere idea witchcraft in an attempt to save Jamie by deeply unsettling Captain Jack Randall. Jamie is a known rebel with a price on his head and is captured at his estate, Lallybroch, and taken to Wentworth, an English prison known for its brutality. He is sentenced to hang and Claire and several MacKenzie clansmen set out to free him. After tricking her way into the jail, Claire finds the dungeon where Jamie is being kept, and discovers him gravely injured. Randall returns and threatens to kill Claire, but makes a deal with Jamie to secure her freedom.[182] As Randall escorts Claire from the prison, she turns to him and says, "You asked me, Captain, if I were a witch… I'll answer you now. Witch I am. Witch, and I curse you. You will marry, Captain, and your wife will bear a child, but you shall not live to see your firstborn. I curse you with knowledge, Jack Randall—I give you the hour of your death."[183]

---

[182] See discussion below.

[183] Gabaldon, *Outlander,* 723.

Claire exploits Randall's superstitious belief that she is a witch to give him the prophetic knowledge that he dreads most—the day he will die. In this way, Claire assumes power over Randall, exposing him as a weak and superstitious man rather than the tough and valiant soldier he represents himself to be and the way history remembers him. Claire has claimed the pejorative title of witch for herself to demonstrate the power she has in her relationship with Randall.

Geillis, on the other hand, discusses the political agency she has within the Jacobite movement through her sexual manipulation of Dougal MacKenzie. Geillis first admits to killing her husband with arsenic some weeks prior after he walked in on her changing and discovered her pregnant belly. Geillis' husband was impotent meaning that her pregnancy was an immediate sign of infidelity. Geillis then reveals, much to Claire's shock, that the father of her unborn child is Dougal MacKenzie. Claire asks Geillis if she was with Dougal for power or money, to which Geillis replies that she has plenty of money—she had diverted nearly ten thousand pounds from Arthur over the last two years. When Claire asks why she would do this, Geillis simply says, "for Scotland," for is "a patriot."[184]

Patriotism was a fundamental component of Scottish Jacobitism and a major rallying cry to the cause. In a 1743 speech decrying the "pretend Union," James, Prince of Wales—or, "the Old Pretender" as he is often referred to in English historiography—maintained that Scotland was "a nation always famous for valour, and highly esteemed… reduced to the Condition of Province, under the specious Pretence of an Union with a more powerful Neighbour."[185] James relies upon a Scottish patriot tradition which directly links the survival of the nation with the

---

[184] Gabaldon, *Outlander*, 523.

[185] Murray Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans: The Jacobite Army in 1745* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009) 151.

"valour" of its people. Historian Murray Pittock asserts that this was a standard Jacobite rhetorical move: an invocation of a "connection to patriot 'Republican' values which resisted empire, wealth and corruption."[186] Geillis displays patriotic valor and resists empire through her feminine sexuality. She exploits the patriarchal order in a way that allows her to meaningfully support a political cause seeking to overthrow the Hanoverian regime. Expected to marry, Geillis chooses a man with an important position and deep pockets.[187] She uses that connection to monetarily support the campaigns trying to restore the Bonnie Prince Charlie to the throne. Moreover, her affair with Dougal provides her with a close connection to another man of influence, one who can sway public opinion, both as a gifted orator and as brother to a prominent chieftain. For Geillis, the affair with Dougal was only a means to an end.[188] She tells Claire that,

> Colum would have been better [to have an affair with] … A pity. His misfortune is my own, as well. It's him would have been the one I should have had; the only man I've seen could be my proper match. Together we could … well, no help for it. The one man I'd want, and the one man in the world I couldn't touch with the weapon I had.[189]

The "misfortune" Geillis alludes to is Colum's warped legs, which often leave him immobile and in great pain. Claire internally diagnoses his condition as Toulouse-Lautrec Syndrome upon their first meeting. She also notes that disease renders those who suffer from it impotent. Therefore, when Geillis refers to him as the one man she "couldn't touch with the weapon [she had]," the weapon in question is sex. Had she been able to consciously manipulate Colum with sex and thereby gain his confidence and exert influence over his decision-making process in the same

---

[186] Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans,* 151

[187] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 163.*

[188] Dougal, on the other hand, was invested in the romantic elements of the relationship.

[189] Gabaldon, *Outlander,* 524.

way she did with Dougal, Geillis implies they could have exerted real, authoritative power. In other words, Geillis views sex as a political tool of sorts, one that allows her to gain entry into the upper echelon of Jacobite society. She uses sex to consciously manipulate the patriarchal mandates operating against her, allowing her to tangibly support the political cause she believes in.

Gabaldon's insistence on the witch narrative as one that confers power is striking, however, considering the fact that it is inherently anachronistic. Witchcraft historian Julian Goodare points out that the witch-hunt in Scotland lasted from about 1550-1700.[190] *Outlander*'s use of is therefore out of place by a near half-century. Moreover, the Highlands were relatively free of witch-hunts when compared with their Lowland counterparts, due in large to their dramatically different political structure; here, authority resides with the clans rather than the formal institutions of church and state.[191] So why is witchcraft so crucial to Gabaldon's narrative? I suggest that it is so because witchcraft is both accessible to audiences as well as a gendered and sexed crime.

The witch hunts of the seventeenth century are fairly familiar in popular cultural memory. It is often regarded as a mystical relic of a "premodern" society. Its presence in Outlander therefore does not *seem* out of place. However, by relying on the association between witchcraft and, per Claire's words, more "primitive" societies like the Highlands, Gabaldon once more risks slipping into problematic territory by uncritically reinforcing colonial narratives.[192] That other

---

[190] Goodare, "Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland," 289.

[191] Goodare, "Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland," 293.

[192] Claire describes the Highlands and Highland society as "primitive" no less than six times. See pages 65, 83, 90, 268, 353, 578.

cultures were deemed to be more “primitive” often served as the impetus *and* justification for colonization. In fact, this kind of rhetoric was deployed by the English to rationalize and condone colonial aggression in Scotland since the thirteenth century.[193] In the context of the trial, Claire describes how spectators “[chanted] in a rough rhythm to the tuck of the drum" as she is led to her execution.[194] This has the effect of conveying the spectators full-throated support of the justice about to be carried out, potentially reinforcing colonial narratives about the superstitious and “backward” nature of the Highlanders.

However potentially problematic, the witch narrative can also be used to a more empowering end, the interpretation I imagine Gabaldon was aiming for. As Goodare points out, the accusation of witchcraft usually implied that a woman had had a sexual relationship with the Devil, a coded way to express concern about female sexuality.[195] When Claire tells Randall that she is a witch, he most likely assumes that she acquired that piece of prophetic knowledge during such an illicit diabolical encounter. Claire exploits the gendered assumptions surrounding witchcraft to her benefit. In a somewhat similar vein, Geillis utilizes the gendered connotations of witchcraft to hide her real crime—treason. By leaning on this historical convention, Gabaldon is able to explore the complex interactions between gender, sexuality, and national identity and their relationship with formal structures of power like colonialism. In this regard, she advances the Jacobite historical novel by using including sexuality as a mode of historical critique.

---

[193] The Declaration of Arbroath (1302).

[194] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 537.*

[195] Goodare, “Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland,” 294.

The convergence of gender, sexuality, and national identity as it comes to bear on interactions with colonial powers is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in the sexual encounter between Captain Randall and Jamie inside of Wentworth Prison. If Jamie serves as the embodiment of the Scottish Jacobites, then Jack Randall serves as the embodiment of the British army. He is described as a sadist, deriving pleasure from the pain he inflicts on his victims. The first encounter between Claire and Randall, after she falls through the stones at Craigh na Dun, sees him attempt to rape her. Claire, and the reader, immediately loathe Randall who functions as a kind of metonym for the evils of British army at large. In this respect, Outlander follows in the tradition established by Scott and Stevenson, whereby two male characters embody their respective national or regional identities, allowing the relationship between them to symbolize the relationship between the nations. Gabaldon expands upon this scheme, symbolizing the relationship between England and Scotland through the sexual interaction between Jamie and Randall.

Jamie is captured by English soldiers at his estate, Lallybroch, because of an outstanding warrant for his arrest. He is transported to Wentworth prison and once there, Captain Randall takes Jamie to his private cell. The two strike a deal: Randall can "have" Jamie if he lets Claire go. Over the next two chapters, Jamie reveals bit by bit in excruciating detail what Randall did to him. It becomes clear that when Randall raped Jamie, he not only challenged, but destroyed Jamie's identity as well. Jamie says,

> It's like… I think it's as though everyone has a small place inside themselves… It's like a little fortress, where the most private part of you lives… Now its like my own fortress has been blown up with gunpowder—there's nothing left of it but ashes and a smoking rooftree, and the little nakes thing that lived there once is out, squeaking and whimpering in fear, trying to hide itself.[196]

---

[196] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 760.*

For Randall, the encounter was equally about the pleasure derived from intercourse with Jamie as much as it was about establishing power over him. Earlier in the novel, Jamie's sister reveal that though Randall attepmted to rape her, he was unable to "perform."[197] This, coupled with Randall's self-proclaimed "unnatural tastes" alludes to the fact that he is, at the very least, somewhat sexually attracted to men.[198] Sexual pleasure, however, is only the half of it. The sense of power Randall gets from exerting this kind of control over Jamie is just as gratifying. Jamie's fortress was his faith in his own identity, an identity predicated on a kind of Scottish-Highland clan hypermasculinity as well as his undying loyalty to Claire. Randall completely eroded both through this heinous act. Jamie later tells Claire, "And all the time, we would talk of you, and keep you before my eyes… it's all linked for me now. I canna think of [Claire], even of kissing you or touching your hand, without feeling the fear and the pain and the sickness come back."[199] Randall has conditioned Jamie to think of him whenever he thinks of Claire thus destroying any possibility of any intimacy between the two. Jamie's masculinity, which has so often been expressed in the novel through his passionate physical devotion to Claire, is now rendered lifeless. Put in an incredibly vulnerable position, Randall's attack on Jamie's masculinity effectively destroyed a fundamental part of his identity, an outcome Randall was undoubtedly hoping for. This encounter between Randall and Jamie can be read as a kind of foreshadowing to what is to happen to the Highlands and clan systems at the hands of the British in the wake of the '45. They too will be destroyed.

---

[197] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 587.*

[198] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 715.*

[199] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 794.*

As I have tried to show, the witchcraft narrative as well as the scene in Wentworth prison demonstrate the ways that Gabaldon relies on sexuality to frame larger discussions about gender and national identity and their relationships to power. Gabaldon is not always unproblematic in the quest, but *Outlander* nevertheless marks an important moment in the development of genre. It is an example of an historical romance novel, in the vein of its 1970s and 1980s predecessors, that provides a schematic for postmodern musings, as evidenced by the reliance on the politics of the body discussed above as well as the insistence on unknowability of the past. Elias points out that many postmodern historical novels written after the 1960s are set in the eighteenth century, so as to directly confront the legacy of Enlightenment thought. She suggests that these kinds of historical novels "all rewrite the history of the eighteenth century in a way that asks whether the Enlightenment was a good thing."[200] In *Outlander*, this questioning happens both implicitly and explicitly. The time-travel element directly challenges the notion of linear time and therefore the stability and validity of historical narratives that rely on linear time structures. At one point in the novel, as Claire travels on horseback, she bemoans the inconvenience of such travel. However, she quickly amends this, thinking "If travel was inconvenient, there were no enormous stretches of concrete blanketing the countryside, nor any noisy, stinking autos—contrivances with their own dangers… life was much simpler and so were the people."[201] Though not directly questioning tenants of Enlightenment ideology, Claire nevertheless questions whether or not the "progress" resulting from the Enlightenment was actually positive. Claire uses cars as an exam-

---

[200] Elias, *Sublime Desire, 153.*

[201] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 562.*

ple: though convenient, they are loud and dangerous. Likewise, increased urbanization destroys the picturesque beauty of the countryside. Claire asks if these things, if this progress, is worth it.

By making Claire a modern woman and setting her against this image of the preindustrial Highlands, Gabaldon marks Highland society as one that exists outside of the Enlightenment. Claire values the simplicity that this brings to her new life in the Highlands. While she extolls the virtues of a "premodern" past, Claire self-reflexively reminds the reader of the fantasy of it all throughout the novel. after witnessing a battle between British troops and members of the Mac-Kenzie Clan, Claire remarks that "This time in many ways was still unreal to me; something from a play or a fancy-dress pageant."[202] A play is not a reality but rather the constructed performance of one. Claire romanticizes the past even as she exists in it. She continues on to compare the scenes of mechanized warfare of the twentieth century to the "small, pitched battle" of the eighteenth century she just witnessed. She says that "men armed with swords and muskets—seemed picturesque rather than threatening."[203] This is a powerful line that articulates the process whereby even the most violent histories become sanitized by time and distance. The overall effect then, of modern-woman-Claire in 1743 Highlands, is to provide the reader with a modern frame of reference in order to reconstruct an image of Highland society that is both romanticized and aestheticized.

In this way then, Gabaldon carries on the tradition established by Sir Walter Scott. Both rely on romantic perceptions of the premodern Highlands, in terms of both its landscape as well as its population. What has changed, however, are the conversations need to be had and just how

---

[202] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 395.*

[203] Gabaldon, *Outlander, 395.*

much each author is able to respond to through their rendering of the Jacobites. Scott was able to have a larger conversation about Scottish national heritage and what that looked like as the devastating consequences of the Highland Clearances were being felt there. Gabaldon facilitates larger conversations about the relationship between power structures and notions of gender, sexuality, and national identity. While not writing under the pressures of empire like Scott and Stevenson, the late 80s and early 90s were moments of profound cultural reckoning with the consequences of British colonialism. By romanticizing premodern Highland society in a Scott-esque way and through Claire's decision to remain in that moment of un-Enlightenment, Gabaldon seems to offer her take on the value of modernity as defined and created by the British Empire. Premodern Scottish Highland society is clearly coded as the "good" set opposite of the Modern English "bad," marking this moment as a kind of romantic, Scottish "golden age," a problematic proposition to make, and even more so considering that Gabaldon is American with zero connection to a Scottish, or even British, identity.

The similarities between Scott and Gabaldon do not stop there, however. Scott's works instigated the first wave of "Highlands tartan-tourism,"[204] or those who visit the Highlands because they were so taken by Scott's imagery and rendering of the region. In fact, Queen Victoria can be counted as one amongst those numbers. In a similar fashion, the popularity of the *Outlander* novels, and especially the popularity of the television adaptation, has led to an increase in tourism in the Scottish Highlands.[205] There are a number of independent tour companies dedicat-

---

[204] Amy Clarke, "The 'Outlander' Experience: Time-Travel, Literary Tourism and North American Perceptions of the Scottish Highlands," *Trans-Atlantic Dialogues on Cultural Heritage: Heritage, Tourism and Traditions International Conference* (Liverpool: 13-16 July 2015), 11.

[205] Amy Clarke, "The 'Outlander' Experience."

ed to taking visitors to historical sites that are central to *Outlander's* narrative, including the Culloden Battlefield near Inverness.[206] After the process of Scottish devolution returned tourism records to the Scots, Scottish authorities noted just how big of an impact that novels and series had on tourism. As a result, the Scottish government and VisitScotland introduced several campaigns marketed towards fans of the series in the hopes of enticing them to visit Scotland and see the history referenced in the series.[207] Mike Cantlay, the VisitScotland Chairperson, told the press that he expected the television series to be a "fantastic advert for Scotland" because of its focus on "stunning scenery, romance, adventure, and ancestry."[208] This appeared to be the case, for Cantlay later reported that they were "seeing more and more tourism business" in the wake of series premier and were "looking at ways in which [they] can capitalise on the show."[209] Frederic Jameson argues that the postmodern historical novel "can no longer set out to represent the historical past; it can only 'represent' our ideas and stereotypes about the past (which then becomes 'pop' history)."[210] While I would not call *Outlander* a postmodern historical novel, it certainly engages with the same questions as postmodernism, it nevertheless fits with this description. *Outlander* is a romanticized, nostalgic rendering of premodern Highland culture that relies on established historical stereotypes, indeed some of those established by Scott himself, to make it R/romantic, thus rendering it "pop" history. Perhaps more interesting, though, is to consider the

---

[206] Clarke, "The 'Outlander' Experience," 9.

[207] Clarke, "The 'Outlander' Experience," 10.

[208] Brian Ferguson, "London Gets a Scots Makeover for Outlander Premier," *The Scotsman*, March 10, 2015.

[209] Ferguson, "Scots Makeover."

[210] Frederic Jameson, Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (London and New York: Versco, 1991), 18.

Scottish government in this scenario. By providing curated tours of the Scottish Highlands and its history that reflect the images and history set forth in the novels and series, the Scottish government engages in a kind of sociocultural postmodernism, where reality, or in this case history, have become indistinguishable from, and indeed catered to, the version projected by media. This speaks the power of the historical novel in world operating under late stage capitalism, for good or ill.

Outlander, then, presents an interesting moment both in the evolution of the historical novel and in this thesis. It is perhaps the most problematic novel included here, both for the hierarchy Gabaldon establishes between "modern" and "pre-modern" and for the seeming preoccupation with rape throughout the novel. Jamie's rape is brutal and traumatic, Claire is nearly raped at least three times, and many minor characters often make jokes about rape. I have chosen to interpret the first two invocations of rape through a discussion of power dynamics at play between different genders and different national identities. While Gabaldon's insistent use of rape as a plot device should not go uncriticized, I argue that it marks an important moment in the evolution of the historical novel, for it shows that historical novels can represent and then explore complex *structures* of power; how they are created, preserved, enforced, and perpetuated. *Outlander* is a novel obsessed with these power systems and wants to demonstrate just how integral sexuality, national identity, and gender are to their formation and upkeep. Jaime's rape, his relationship with Claire, and the witchcraft narrative are all elements of the novel that illuminate this goal.

This thesis has attempted to trace the trajectory of the historical novel from the moment widely regarded to be its inception to a more current iteration. Though this study is not a comprehensive one—nor was it meant to be—by carefully selecting four historical novels about the same history and treating each one in-depth, I nevertheless hope to have provided interesting commentary on the evolution of the genre. These two centuries have seen the genre shift from being predominantly written by men, about men, and for male audiences to the almost exact opposite. Consequently, twenty-first-century historical fiction is often dismissed as nothing more than escapist fantasy for women, no matter the gender of the author. This study has shown, however, that each of the four novels in question have been maligned, one way or another, in gendered terms. Rather than a sudden embrace of gender as a mode of critique, I have argued that the gendered criticism of the historical novel has always been present, but merely shifts where it places its critical emphases.

In the early nineteenth century, the *genre itself* was associated with the feminine and female audiences, an understanding that Scott was aware of and worked hard to subvert, as evidenced by his "objective" and historically accurate rendering of the '45. Moreover, the history that Waverley tells is a masculine one; it is a young man's coming of age novel that depends on the visibility and parsing of competing notions of manhood, each subsumed by larger national narratives, as a means to demonstrate that Edward Waverley has come of age. As a result, it is a novel deeply committed to representing historically masculine interests in a moment of international crisis. Scott's treatment of Jacobite history is therefore shaped by his need to respond to cultural anxieties surrounding the form of the novel and the newly created historical novel. By the end of the nineteenth century, however the genre's audience was gendered in new ways as the

project of empire shifted. *Kidnapped* was published in a boy's magazine, making clear in no uncertain terms the novel's intended audience. Consequently, the plot of the novel implicitly infantilizes, and thus feminizes, its audience, by instructing its readers on the process of acquiring a distinctly Scottish version of masculinity that can also fully participate in the British Empire. The version of masculinity extolled by the novel relies on daring adventure and masculine bravado, rendering its depiction of manhood a rather youthful one. By the time Stevenson wrote his novel, the rhetorical justifications for British imperialism had shifted from progress and civilization to that of expansion and permanent domination. Imperial manhood defined by a permanent, resilient boyhood fit the needs and aims of New Imperialism, which held a "non-developmental understanding of global politics," making masculine identities resistant to development—perpetual boyhood—ideal.[211] However, *Kidnapped* does not map neatly onto this framework nicely; it condemns the imperial project on the grounds of moral opposition while simultaneously embracing the financial benefits of empire. Stevenson's history of the Jacobites thus sheds light on Scotland's precarious place in the empire and discusses what it means to be a Scot in the age of New Imperialism. Over the next five decades, the British Empire expanded and shrank. By the 1940s, disenchanted by the Great Depression and World War II, women began to co-opt the historical novel to not only act as an historical cover for contemporary dissent, but to also write themselves into a history that had largely excluded them. Post-war Western historiography increasingly tried to turn history into a social science, relying heavily on empirical evidence and analytical research, with similar approaches to history as the Rankean model of the previous century, which

---

[211] Bradley Deane, "Imperial Boyhood: Piracy and the Play Ethic," *Victorian Studies* 53, no. 4 (Summer, 2011): 690.

helped professionalize the discipline.[212] These historians were confident in the existence of a real, objective history.[213] This kind of history, however, often only accommodates for one point of view—the dominant one. *The Bull Calves* resists this insistence on male-populated histories, providing instead a domestic narrative, told mostly from a female perspective and concerned largely with "feminine" issues like marriage, childbirth, domesticity, and fully situates these issues within larger political discussions about national identity and cultural sympathies. Women, Mitchison included, turned to historical fiction to speak their truths and were categorically ignored by critics. Although not a direct critique, the critical and cultural silence surrounding these texts nevertheless acts as an inherent condemnation of works written by women about the "domains of men." By the time we get to Gabaldon in the late 1990s, the historical novel had undergone several changes, due in large part to several different feminist waves and larger cultural shifts. Critics denigrated the historical novel because of its authorial voices, subject matter, and audience, which appeared to many to uphold and endorse conservative elements of the patriarchy.[214] While *Outlander's* narrative centers around a heterosexual relationship, it is a novel that interrogates the complex interactions between identity and structures of power. Moreover, influenced by the cultural preoccupation with postmodernism, *Outlander* questions modernity and the knowability of history, though we may be uncomfortable with some of the implications of the answer the text provides, which stem from Gabaldon's methodology.

---

[212] Iggers, Wang, and Mukherjee, *A Global History of Modern Historiography,* 205.

[213] Iggers, Wang, and Mukherjee, *A Global History of Modern Historiography,* 205.

[214] Jessica Luther, "Beyond Bodice-Rippers: How Romance Novels Came to Embrace Feminism," *The Atlantic*, March 18, 2013.

Despite being published decades and centuries apart and receiving different kinds of criticism, certain elements are constant across each novel. Both *Outlander* and *Waverley* are deeply invested in romance and the grand mythology of the Scottish Highlands. Each codes specific characters as the literary embodiment of their respective national identities. While Scott explores the relationship between these national identities in terms of gender performance, rendering the Highlands as ruggedly masculine and the English as decidedly feminine, Gabaldon does similar work, but couches the debate in terms of sexuality, sexual orientation, and sexual proclivities, portraying the Scots as romantic, hypermasculine beacons of chivalry and the English as sadistic, unappealing brutes, specifically through the heinous encounter between Jamie and Randall. However, each authors engagement with the romantic, defeated Jacobite narrative serves different purposes, reflective of their respective contemporary moments. The Highland Clearances effectively ensured that traditional Highland society could never return, making it a safe history to romanticize by the early nineteenth century. Scott took up the mantle in order to construct a narrative of victimization that serves as kind of origin myth, binding Scottish people together through a shared sense of ongoing injustice.[215] His novel seeks to reclaim Scottish history from ill-treatment in English historiography. Gabaldon, on the other hand, is not so invested in preserving Scottishness in the same way Scott is. She is more interested in broadly exploring individuals relationship to systematic power, how that might play out on the body, and individuals capacity to resist or subvert this kind of overwhelming power. Scott was motivated by issues

---

[215] Allan I.MacInnes, "The Scottish Gaeldom: the first phase of clearance," in *People and Society of Scotland, vol. I,* ed. T.M. Devine and R. Mitchison (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988) 70-89. MacInnes divides the Highland Clearances into the three distinct phases, the first lasting from 1760-1820, meaning that Scott wrote in a moment in which Scottish identity was being actively oppressed.

germane to his immediate identity and existence while Gabaldon asks new questions of the same history in a way that was responsive to the culture of the 1990s.

Mitchison and Stevenson, on the other hand, were both British subjects wrestling with the British Empire at very different stages in its development. Stevenson writes while the empire is gearing up for another phase of expansion, Mitchison at a time of global decolonization. Both had ambivalent feelings about the empire. Stevenson held contradicting visions of Scotland and its place in the empire; he wanted a cohesive Scottish identity and to preserve that distinctiveness, while still enjoying the spoils that came with a being a part of the core of the British empire. *Kidnapped* tries to reconcile this through its historical representation: a main character who comes to feel a real camaraderie with a Jacobite rebel, bonding over a shared distrust of English forces, and who ultimately gets his inheritance in the end, investing his money in a company that profits from British imperialism. Mitchison wrote all through the second World War, ultimately presenting a critique of the cataclysmic masculinity that leads to violent conflict every ten years or so. But like Stevenson, and even Scott before him, Mitchison explores what it means to be Scottish. Where Stevenson and Scott conceive of Scottish identity in exclusively male terms, Mitchison provides a poignant example of Scottish womanhood, predicated on a strength that combines both masculine and feminine attributes. Gender was not an explicit issue for Scott or Stevenson in the same way it was for Mitchison. Scott and Stevenson are most focused on national identity, but the contemporaneous cultural perceptions about gender and gender relations nevertheless shape the narrative of their texts. For Mitchison, bringing gender fully into question with national identity was paramount, for women had been, and still are, largely absent from Jacobite studies.

For all that I have tried to show about the ways in which these texts speak to one another and comment on larger trends within the genre, this project—like any of this length—contains limits. By endeavoring to show how the historical novel has gone from Scott's critical darling to Gabaldon's derided bodice-ripper, I arranged my case studies in chronological order, indulging in an inherently teleological methodology. While I think this approach was critical for the sake of this study—indeed, my research question made it so there were really no other options—it is nevertheless important to acknowledge the potential pitfalls of a teleological argument. Teleological arguments often omit those narratives that either contradict or do not fully support their own. This can lead to the assumption that the proposed narrative is both uncontested and inevitable. Teleological arguments, void of any productive or critical nuance, often collude with larger institutional powers to suppress dissenting voices. Though I could not avoid teleology in this project, I hope to have rather demonstrated that these changes did occur, are important to understanding the evolution of historical novel, and are reflective of the current moment, but in no way imply that the evolution of the genre that I have outlined here was in any way inevitable. Moreover, this project is a local one, not meant to be an exhaustive study of the genre as a whole. That said, I do think there is extensive academic work to be done on the historical novel. Most treatments of the historical novel are by literary critics, but an understanding of the full potential of the genre would be greatly expanded if historians were to participate in the conversation, for, as I hope this thesis has shown, historical novels are both about history and historical artifacts themselves. The study of the historical novel would especially benefit from treatments by historians of gender and sexuality, nationalism and its many manifestations, and colonial and post colonial studies. Historians and literary critics would thus have an arena to debate and where one disci-

pline ends and the other begins. While I think this line has already been usefully blurred by postmodernism and its champions, there is still room to more firmly make the case that literature is the prerogative of historical inquiry and has a place in traditional historical studies. Historical fiction is the perfect vehicle to carry out these much-needed cross-disciplinary conversations.

This thesis has tried to demonstrate the usefulness of putting four texts about the same event in dialogue with one another. The utility of this project reveals itself on several levels. On the most basic level, it allows us to see how perceptions of the ’45 have changed over time, focusing specifically on representations of gender, national identity, and colonial narratives. Identifying *how* these novels reflect shifting understandings led to larger questions about the cultural moment in which the text was produced. Historical fiction is thus both historical narrative and historical artifact, attesting to the fact that, as a genre, it operates on multiple levels, much like traditional academic histories do. The difference between these two forms then—the historical novel and the academic history—lies in how much faith each one puts in objective history. Despite the popularity of the postmodern turn, there is still an expectation that academic histories contain “objective” “facts” or inherent “truths.” Historical fictions reminds us that these things do not exist, as much as people want them too. It draws attention to the constructedness of all historical writing. That is not to say that we should throw the baby out with the bathwater, however. Traditional histories still have a place but reading historical novels alongside them can only be to the benefit of both works; if we are to understand history as a dialectical process in the way Lukács wants us to—for I agree with him on this part at least—then the historical novel importantly functions as one half of the conversation, replying to academic histories/historians to ask:

have you considered this, or, what about me? The historical novel is the democratic counterpart that challenges the fixity of “true" historical narratives.

Primary Sources:

Act of Settlement (1701).

Gabaldon, Diana. *Outlander*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1991.

"Invitation of the Seven to the Prince of Orange," 30 June 1688 Bill of Rights (1689).

Mitchison, Naomi. *The Bull Calves*. Kennedy and Boyd, 2013.

Robinson, Joanna. "Does the New *Outlander* Series Have What it Takes to be More than a Bodice-Ripper?" *Vanity Fair*, July 28, 2014.

Scott, Sir Walter. "General Preface to the Waverley Novels." *Waverley; or 'Tis Sixty years Since.* New York and Boston: The C.T. Brainard Publishing Co., 1814.

Scott, Sir Walter. *Waverley; or 'Tis Sixty years Since.* Penguin Books, 2011.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Kidnapped*. Bantam Publishers, 1982.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Letters*, VI. (c.10 April 1888).

The Declaration of Arbroath (1302).

Unknown author, "Has History Gained from the writing of Sir Walter Scott?" *Frasers Magazine,* v. 36, 1847.

Secondary Sources:

Andervont Edie, Carolyn. "Succession and Monarchy: The Controversy of 1679-1681." *The American Historical Review* 70, no. 2 (1965): 350-370.

Benton, Jill. *Naomi Mitchison: A Biography*. Pandora, 1990.

Boccardi, Mariadele. *The Contemporary British Historical Novel: Representation, Nation, Empire.* Basingstoke England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Budd, Adam. *The Modern Historiography Reader: Western Sources*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Clark, JCD. "The Many Restorations of King James: A Short History of Scholarship on Jacobitism." In *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi. Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

Clarke, Amy. "The 'Outlander' Experience: Time-Travel, Literary Tourism and North American Perceptions of the Scottish Highlands." *Trans-Atlantic Dialogues on Cultural Heritage: Heritage, Tourism and Traditions International Conference* (Liverpool: 13-16 July 2015), 1-14.

Colley, Anne. *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Colonial Imagination*. Ashgate Publishing Company: 2004.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

Deane, Bradley. "Imperial Boyhood: Piracy and the Play Ethic." *Victorian Studies* 53, no. 4 (Summer, 2011): 680-714.

de Groot, Jerome. *The Historical Novel: The New Critical Idiom*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Devine, T.M. “In Bed with an Elephant: Almost Three Hundred Years of the Anglo-Scottish Union.” *Scottish Affairs*, no. 57 (Autumn 2006), 1-18.

Duncan, Ian. “Stevenson and Fiction.” *The Edinburgh Companion to Robert Louis Stevenson*, edited by Penny Fielding. Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

Elias, Amy J. *Sublime Desire: History and Post-1960s Fiction; Parallax: Re-Visions of Culture and Society.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Finke, Laurie and Shichtman, Martin B. "Profiting from the Past: History as Symbolic Capital in the Historia Regum Britanniae.” *Arthurian Literature* Vol. 12 (1993).

Fleishman, Avrom. *The English Historical Novel: Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.

Frankel, Valerie Estelle. *Adoring Outlander: Essays on Fandom, Genre, and the Female Audience*. Jefferson, North Carolina, McFarland & Company Publishers: 2016.

Goodare, Julian. “Women and the witch-hunt in Scotland.” *Social History* 23, no. 3 (October 1998): 288-308.

Grierson, Sir herbert. *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott.* London: Constable, 1932-1937.

Hammond, J.R. *A Robert Louis Stevenson Companion*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Press, 1984.

Iggers, Georg, Wang, Q Edward, and Mukherjee, Supriya. *A Global History of Modern Historiography.* London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Lukács, Georg. T*he Historical Novel*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. “History.” In *The Modern Historiography Reader: Western Sources,* edited by Adam Budd. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

MacInnes, Allan I. “The Scottish Gaeldom: the first phase of clearance.” *People and Society of Scotland, vol. I.* Edited by. T.M. Devine and R. Mitchison. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988.

Makdisi, Saree. “Colonial Space and the Colonization of Time in Scott's ‘Waverley.’” *Studies in Romanticism* 34, no. 2 (1995): 155-184.

Maslen, Elizabeth. "Mitchison [née Haldane], Naomi Mary Margaret, Lady Mitchison (1897–1999), writer and social activist,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004.

Osterhammel, Jürgen. “China,” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century.* Edited by Judith M. Brown and WM. Roger Louis. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Pierce, Jason. “The Belle Lettrist and the People’s Publisher: or, the Context of ‘Treasure Island’s’ First-Form Publication,” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 31, no, 4 (Winter 1998), 356-368.

Pincus, Steve. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Pittock, Murray. *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans: The Jacobite Army in 1745.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Plain, Gill. "Naomi Mitchison." *Women's Fiction of the Second World War: Gender, Power, and Resistance.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.

Shaw, Michael. "The Scottish Romance Revival." *The Fin-de-Siécle Scottish Revival.* Edinburgh University Press, 2020.

Sorensen, Janet. "'Belts of Gold' and 'Twenty-Pounders: Robert Louis Stevenson's Textualized Economies." *Criticism* 42, no. 3 (Summer 2000), 279-297.

Speck, W.A. "William Augustus, Prince, duke of Cumberland (1721–1765), army officer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

Szechi, Daniel. *1751: The Great Jacobite Rebellion.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006.

Szechi, Daniel. *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788.* Manchester University Press, 2019.

Wallace, Dianna. *The Woman's Historical Novel: British Women Writers, 1900-2000.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

White, Hayden. "Introduction: Historical Fiction, Fictional History, and Historical Reality." *Rethinking History* 9, no. 2 (2005): 147-157.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse.* Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Willman, Robert. "The Origins of 'Whig' and 'Tory' in English Political Language." *The Historical Journal* 17, no. 2 (1974): 247–64.