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Abstract and Keywords

Scott’s work was not only immensely popular but also extremely procreative: that is, it generated many new versions of itself in both print and other media. Using the concept of remediation, Chapter 2 focuses on Scott’s procreativity in other media, especially the theatre, in order to explain the apparent paradox that novelistic adaptation was linked both to the desire for new forms of immediacy and to the pleasure of reiteration. After a brief survey of the adaptations of his work to the visual arts and material culture, the chapter turns to dramatizations of the Waverley novels, focusing in particular on the repeated productions of Rob Roy (1817) whose popularity on stage is explained as a way of performing Scottishness ‘live’. The later adaptations of the novel to the screen show how Scott’s novel helped relay popular culture into the twentieth century.
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As with genes, immortality is more a matter of replication than of the longevity of individual vehicles.


In April 1819, the Covent Garden theatre advertised a play called *Heart of Midlothian: Musical Drama* that would meet with enough public enthusiasm to run for sixteen nights. The daily playbills did not mention the name of the playwright, but they did identify the person responsible for the musical arrangements—‘The Overture and Musick, which are selections from the most approved Scotch Airs, arranged by Mr Bishop’. They also identified the artist responsible for painting the scenery: ‘from Sketches made by Alex. Nasmith, Esq of Edinburgh’. Apparently the scenery was one of the distinctive selling points of this particular production, since the bills also listed the many locations that would be on display: ‘Salisbury Craigs and Arthur’s Seat, with Deans’s cottage in the distance; Deans’s cottage on St. Leonard’s Craigs...Hall of Tolbooth; Muschat’s Cairn; and Holyrood House...The High Street, with the Tolbooth, St Giles’s Church’, and so on.¹

This was one of the many theatrical productions of *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* mentioned earlier and as such just one of the many hundreds of productions of Scott’s work that filled the British stage from the mid-1810s onwards. The Covent Garden production in April 1819 was an ephemeral affair lasting just a couple of weeks. But it was part of a larger series of Scott productions that continued for almost a century in which the novels were recursively transposed to the stage. Just as the books had provided a public forum for reworking other stories, the theatre in turn provided a platform for recycling the novels and giving them new life. In this case, Scott’s story, traditional music, and landscape painting combined to generate an atmosphere of pure Scottishness for a London audience. Indeed, the importance of the Scottish scenery to this particular production suggests that the theatrical spectacle was a variation on yet another cultural practice: tourism (which was itself in part inspired by Scott’s work, as I shall show in Chapter 5). Whether tourism was shaped by theatre or the other way around, it is clear that this theatrical production was caught up in an intermedial dynamic in which Scott’s stories were both objects of appropriation and cultural agents: reproduced and transformed on many platforms with the encouragement of Scott himself, they were also helping to shape other cultural practices and inspire new work.

The combination of painting, music, scriptwriting, and acting offered by the theatre serves as a reminder that multimediality (the simultaneous use of different media) and intermediality (the cross-fertilization between media) are not recent phenomena. Nor did the convergence of media on a common platform have to wait for the arrival of the Internet: the popular theatre brought together and recycled elements from other platforms, as did indeed Scott’s novels themselves.² These were both autonomous works of art and cultural cogwheels, caught up in the ongoing transfer of stories across different media and different platforms, in which both repetition and transformation were at play, and many agents involved, including Scott himself and his publishers. This bears emphasizing in view of the tenacious assumption among literary critics, not only that the proper unit of cultural analysis is a discrete text, but also that adaptations, imitations, and
tie-ins are merely derivative forms of culture. My concern with the social life of texts entails breaking with this tradition by following the morphings of individual works as they travel to other media and by considering these derivative forms of production as interesting in their own right. In order to grasp the combination of innovation and repetition at work in such derivative forms, I will refer to productive remembrance (acts of recall that also involve producing a new image or story) and link it with what I have been calling Scott’s procreativity: the ability of his works to generate new versions of itself in other people’s acts of productive remembrance. Procreativity, as we shall see, produces unexpected continuities within a culture of rapid turnovers and ephemeral sensations. Linked to this, I shall argue, it also plays a distinct role in shaping collective identities by appealing to the familiar and the traditional, but in a modern guise and in an immediate way. These identities are based on the common appreciation of earlier stories and on maximizing the pleasurable interaction with them, rather than on the solemn recollection of political and military events.

(p.51) Remediating and Remembrance

The usual way of judging the cultural impact of writers is by counting the number of new editions and sales figures. An alternative is to examine the intensity with which their work was replicated in other cultural expressions. In this regard, the Waverley novels had an astoundingly fertile second-life. The intensity and range of their productive reception by other people is testimony to their mnemonic power: they invited recall and set creative energies in motion to produce new paintings and plays, and indeed versions in almost every conceivable medium. One of the paradoxes of the popularity of the Waverley novels, as already indicated in the case of Jeanie Deans, is that they became common property and left the authorial control of their maker (although Scott, as we shall see in Chapter 6, was also feted as a cultural icon in his own right). The value of his fiction was not linked to aural scarcity, but rather to communality. It enjoyed ‘social canonicity’, the term David Brewer uses with reference to popular fiction at this period, in which value was expressed by collective appropriation and proliferation in a maximum number of media.3

The challenge is to analyse this particular interplay between remembrance and creativity, between repetition and novelty. A starting point is offered by John Ellis, who once wrote in a very brief but illuminating essay that adaptations ‘trade on the memory of the original’ and represent ‘a massive investment (financial and psychic) in the desire to repeat particular acts of consumption within a form of representation that discourages such a repetition’.4 In many ways, Scott himself had set the ball rolling by becoming his own replicator and creating a new pleasure in repetition within the framework of constantly renewed novelty. He did so by presenting the Waverley novels as part of a series (itself revolutionary and a foretaste of much culture to come), and by producing novels that, while projecting highly distinctive narrative worlds, also resonated with each other and, as we have seen, with other stories already in circulation in oral history as well as in print. For all that each novel brought into life a new range of remarkable characters and situations held together by a unique storyline, they also represented variations on the same Waverley model—to the delight of many of his readers, to the dismay of some
critics. What is more, Scott’s writings also gave rise to new versions in the form of images, dramatizations, costumes, tourist itineraries, architecture, interior decorating, as well as the names of places, ships, and railways mentioned earlier. This everyday remembrance reflected the penetration (p.52) of the Waverley model into both private and public spheres, and the ubiquitous presence of the past that Scott himself had helped to cultivate.

Because of the traditional predilection of twentieth-century criticism for innovation and defamiliarization, and for those exceptional individuals who staked out the future rather than recycled the past, this enormous body of diverse material has not been studied in any integrated and extensive way (though happily there are some specialist studies of Scott’s impact on painting and drama upon which I can draw). This neglect can be linked to the derivative and sometimes trivial character of many of these spin-offs and tie-ins, whose aesthetic merit and historic interest is moot. But it has certainly also to do with a general lack of conceptual tools within traditional literary criticism to talk about reiterations, repetitions, and gradual transformations in culture. Given the all-out prioritizing of ‘the first’ above ‘the repeated’ in twentieth-century aesthetics, it is only recently that repetition and repetition-with-a-difference has emerged as an active ingredient in the making of culture and hence as an issue in cultural analysis. Things changed with the emergence since the 1960s of an academic critique of originality and continue to change with the growing salience of intertextuality, ‘sampling’, and ‘covering’ as dominant modes of cultural production in the digital age. As our appreciation of these derivative forms increases, so too does the retrospective perception that reworking, recycling, and tie-ins were also an important feature of nineteenth-century culture, sometimes driven by a commercial desire to maximize the number of products from any given original, but sometimes also by a desire to prolong and intensify the memory of stories that had already given pleasure, while yet offering something new. The importance of sampling is brought out in the following title published by Thomas Hailes Lacy in the 1860s with its extraordinary sedimentation of versions and agents, of replication and novelty: *The Heart of Mid-Lothian; or, the Sisters of St. Leonard’s: A Drama, (with unregistered effects) in Three Acts. Adapted from Sir Walter Scott’s admired novel, with introductions from T. Dibdin’s play, W. Murray’s alteration of the same, Eugène Scribe’s opera, and Dion Boucicault’s amalgamation of the above; Colin Hazlewood’s adjustment and re-adjustment, J.B. Johnstone’s appropriation, and other equally original versions, together with a very small amount of new matter* (London, c.1863).

As Linda Hutcheon’s *Theory of Adaptation* (2006) clearly shows, recent attempts to analyse derivative (palimpsestic, second-hand) forms of cultural production have yielded a variety of concepts (intertextuality, appropriation, transcoding…) and a range of insights into what is at stake intellectually, aesthetically, and even legally, when a new work reworks an old one. By and large, however, studies of adaptation (to stick with this (p.53) umbrella term for the moment) have taken what I call a bilateral approach: that is to say, they focus on the relations between two versions of a story and, taking the later version as the *terminus ad quem* of the exchange, they examine the difference between
the earlier and the later versions, often to the advantage of the latter, which, following a modernist narrative of progress, is often construed as a critical subversion of the original. While I draw in what follows on some recent studies of adaptation, my approach will nevertheless be significantly different. Since the concern of this study is not so much with the aesthetic effects of particular versions, but with how reworking Scott was an agent of cultural memory, its focus inevitably extends beyond the bilateral relations between discrete texts to the broader cultural landscape and to the long-term framework in which particular adaptations had both a prehistory and an afterlife. The point is not just to reiterate the over-familiar argument that there are no absolute origins in culture and no places of absolute stability since culture is always on the move. Instead, it is to take this fact as a starting point for locating different sorts of repetitions within the dynamics of change or, more specifically, for locating remembrance in a mode of production that was based on novelty. How to conceptualize adaptations in such a way that they are neither reduced to mere repetitions nor automatically assumed to be critical subversions of the original?

There is certainly evidence that Scott’s works were picked up and reworked in a whole range of cultural practices, from the evening dresses in ‘La mode écossaise’ that were popular fashion statements in 1820s Paris, to the Waverley textiles that were designed to fill the interiors of neo-gothic houses inspired by Abbotsford, to the tableaux vivants of Waverley characters performed in private homes, to the hundreds of paintings, the many films, and the thousands of theatrical productions inspired by his work. Although architecture, fashion, and place-names do not traditionally fall within the purview of literary criticism, they are impossible to ignore in the case of Scott. One of the claims of this study is that an important part of Scott’s legacy lies in his having extended the life of the historical imagination to the material world (especially the urban and domestic worlds of middle-class readers) and to his having integrated memory into everyday, embodied life—down to the clothes people wore, the upholstery they sat on, and the games they played. What began as poetry and narrative thus ended up in the way in which people named their streets, decorated their houses, and, later in the century with the production by the Wedgwood Company of an Ivanhoe dinner service, ate their meals. In this way, his work helped to re-introduce signs of collective memory into the everyday environment, creating the banal canonicity referred to earlier. In contrast to traditional milieux de mémoire.
in Pierre Nora’s sense, however, this everyday memory was a highly mediated one in which the imagination played a key role, thus exemplifying Appadurai’s contention that one of the key features of modernity is the fact that imagination is no longer confined to the arts and ritual, but informs everyday life.

It would be going too far to claim that Scott consciously envisaged how his stories would be translated into other media and practices. But he certainly colluded with it. Although he worked within the confines of the printed book, his use of language and narrative design seem to be already on the verge of turning into a piece of theatre, a painting, or even tourist excursion (to which I will return in more detail in Chapter 5). Because his depictions of the past were highly visual, he can be said to have helped imagine the paintings and spectacles, including the cinematic ones, to which his own work later gave rise. Indeed, the term cinematographic can be legitimately applied *avant la lettre* to his depiction of the Porteous riots in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* or the siege of Torquilstone castle in *Ivanhoe*. One reviewer of *The Lady of the Lake* (1810) exclaimed that Scott ‘sees everything with a painter’s eye’, a point echoed in 1834 with reference to the novels by a French critic who praised Scott for having ‘drawn’ all his scenes: ‘Every one of [his] pages is a painting which one only has to reproduce.’ Certainly a scene such as

*Figure 2.1: The Lady of the Lake, printed cotton (c.1830).*
that in *Waverley* where the romantic hero has a vision of Flora McIvor within a natural amphitheatre lent itself easily to the word *tableau*; and indeed Scott invited this comparison by comparing his character to one ‘of those lovely forms which decorate the landscapes of Poussin’.16

The invitation to visualize the novels was eagerly taken up. To begin with, Scott and his publishers included engravings, specially commissioned from a team of artists, in the magnum opus edition of the Waverley novels (1829–33) so that later editions were usually accompanied by actual and not just virtual images. As Richard Hill has shown, Scott valued antiquarian and topographical accuracy as a visual auxiliary to his own narrative rather than illustrations of high drama that would have been a distraction from it, and tried to control the selection of images with this in mind.17 The symbiosis between the novels and illustrations was facilitated by the introduction of cheap steel-plate engraving and it culminated in the lavishly illustrated Abbotsford Edition of 1842–7 that set a new trend in Victorian publishing.18 This tendency to translate the stories into pictures also led to the publication of stand-alone collections of engravings supplementing the texts in the form of virtual art galleries. These offered portraits of the main characters, as in *The Waverley Gallery of the Principal Female Characters in Sir Walter Scott’s Romances; From Original Paintings by Eminent Artists* (1841), but more often, they consisted of depictions of (p.56) the locations associated with particular scenes in the novels and seen through the lens of the story; these included *Landscape-Historical Illustrations of Scotland and the Waverley Novels; from Drawings by J. M. W. Turner, Professor R.A.* (1836–8) and *Landscape-Historical Illustrations of the Waverley Novels* (1840).19

Outside the field of book publications, Scott’s writings also gave rise to countless stand-alone drawings, engravings, and paintings both in Great Britain and elsewhere, especially France.20 His work, according to Richard Altick, almost singlehandedly touched off a century-long tradition of ‘literary landscapes’ inspired by poetry and novels.21 Painters continued to produce Scott paintings until the 1880s, while shifting in the process along with the fashions of the time from the aesthetics of sublime landscapes to historical drama, to genre painting. Thus Turner’s drawings for the magnum opus edition of the novels gave way to Daniel Maclise’s enormous historical tableaux of the 1840s and to the intimate scenes of John Everett Millais’s *The Bride of Lammermoor* (1878) and James McNeill Whistler’s *Arrangement in Yellow and Grey: Effie Deans* (1876–8). Although it lasted into the final decades of the century, as these last examples show, Scott’s power to generate images reached its highpoint in the period 1830 to 1850 when more than four hundred paintings illustrating his works were exhibited. In 1843, for example, no fewer than thirty of such paintings appeared at the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy, the Scottish Academy, and the British Institution. At the Paris salon of 1831, thirty items were inspired by Scott, which was more than the number inspired by biblical or mythological themes.22 Where the earlier visualizations of his work had concentrated on locations, took the form of engravings, and were largely inspired by his poems, the many paintings produced from the 1830s onwards followed the model of historical genre paintings, concentrating in full colour on characters at a dramatic moment in the action.23
In all this painterly activity recalling Scott’s novels, selective mechanisms were nevertheless at work and these take some unravelling. Given Waverley’s prominence as a flagship of the series, for example, it is surprising to note that it inspired virtually no painting at all (nor did it inspire much dramatization, as we will see below). In contrast, scenes from The Bride of Lammermoor and The Heart of Mid-Lothian gave rise to no fewer than eighty paintings each. Their popularity was only surpassed by that of Ivanhoe, which was painted more than one hundred times. Moreover, within that Ivanhoe corpus pride of place was given to the figure of Rebecca, to whom a third of these paintings was devoted.\(^{24}\) As we shall see, the preference of painters for certain works coincided to a large extent, but not entirely, with the preferences of dramatists. Ivanhoe was notably prominent in both spheres, a point I will come back to in Chapter 3. Even within the treatment of particular stories, moreover, there was selection going on: The Heart of Mid-Lothian has already shown how some scenes, such as the meeting of the two sisters in prison, were depicted over and over again, becoming iconic for the story as a whole. In some cases, popular images fed into theatrical productions in the form of costumes, decors, and tableaux vivants, while theatrical productions in turn inspired some of the popular images in circulation.\(^{25}\)

While the paintings and drawings often circulated independently of the novels, they nevertheless ‘traded upon the memory’ of the original, to recall John Ellis’s phrase. James McNeill Whistler was asked by the buyer of his Effie Deans painting to add Scott’s words to the canvas: ‘she sunk her head upon her hand and remained seemingly unconscious as a statue.’\(^{26}\) The painting (now with words added) was a trigger to recall Scott’s work at the same time as it also offered the visual delights of a painting in the here and now. The addition of the words in the case of Whistler’s painting made explicit a mechanism that was surely behind all of the other Scott paintings: these were both autonomous visual artefacts, interesting in their own right, and cues recalling a story that was told elsewhere and whose broad outlines were presumed familiar to the viewer even if they did not necessarily have direct knowledge of the text. As the painterly shift of focus to Effie indicates, ‘trading on the memory’ of the novel also involved modifying it to fit latter-day preoccupations: in remediating and recalling the story, people were also adapting it to current notions of what was memorable.

When Scott’s contemporaries highlighted the visual qualities of his writings and claimed excitedly that they were suitable for reproduction as paintings, they were intuitively operating from an understanding of the relations between the different arts that resonates with more recent theories, which see media as interrelated rather than as discrete systems, and as continuously emergent rather than stable. The most thorough-going elaboration of this emergence view of mediation is offered in Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin’s seminal Remediation: Understanding New Media (2000), which argues that every act of mediation (that is, every attempt to describe the world) is always already an act of remediation (that is, a re-working of an earlier attempt, not necessarily using the same technologies). Cultural dynamics are thus driven by the constantly renewed effort to create a greater sense of immediacy with the help of new techniques and representational technologies. In the process, media are continuously ‘commenting on,
reproducing, and replacing each other’ since they ‘need each other in order to function as media at all’.  

(p.58) Up to a point the theory of remediation provides a model for the analysis of the productive remembrance of Scott’s work and the complex interplay between word, image, material culture, and performative practices that it entailed. The history of his afterlife in other media runs parallel to the history of modern media technologies: steel engravings, dioramas, photography, magic lanterns, and, from the twentieth century on, film, radio, television, computer games. The emergence of new technologies over the decades seems indeed to have continuously stimulated fresh adaptations by providing new possibilities for revivifying the story. Bolter and Grusin link remediation exclusively, however, to the desire to produce new sensations and they view cultural history as an asymptotic, ever-renewed gravitation towards the production of immediacy with the help of technology. The evidence collected here shows, however, that remediations of Scott were caught up in complex ways with remembering rather than overwriting earlier stories; while they fed into a desire for the sensation of immediacy (and this makes them highly modern), they did so while evoking the memory of a story told in another medium. Immediacy and recollection worked together or, to put this in media-theoretical terms, remediation worked together with premediation: the shaping force of an earlier narrative on new productions. Productive remembrance needs to be seen as caught up between the old and the new, and bound up with the desire to appropriate the old in such a way as to make it fit into contemporary interests. 

In what follows, I describe some of this complexity by examining adaptations of Scott’s work in one particular medium: the theatre, where ‘liveness’ was bound up with the recycling of stories, paintings, and other expressions. It was also the most popular, if most ephemeral platform when it came to remediations of Scott’s works in the nineteenth century. How did performance (the unique immediacy of things happening in the here and now) connect to the remembrance of things read or heard elsewhere? I argue that the liveness of theatre provided a platform for performing identity and memory in a non-historicizing mode.

Staging Scott

As part of a general performative turn in the humanities, theatricality and the popular theatre have recently come into critical focus as key elements of nineteenth-century cultural life in Great Britain. Within this framework, the afterlife of Scott’s work must be sought not only in reading, but also on the stage where it had a salient role in the ninety-odd years between the publication of Waverley and the first feature films of the 1910s. The theatre played an important role in disseminating novelistic works among urban groups who, because of limitations in education or income, would otherwise have had little access to them. In some cases the theatrical scripts were themselves the basis for new chapbook editions of the Waverley novels, which further extended their social reach. The dramatizations also generated the publication of ‘Musical illustrations’ to the novels on a par with the compilations of landscape drawings. For those theatre audiences who had not actually read the novels in question, but knew them by reputation
as part of what Ellis calls ‘general cultural memory’, watching the plays was a substitute for reading and, as the playbills often suggested, a way of putting a story in dramatic form to the name of a famous book. For those groups who had access both to the novels and to the theatre, the latter could serve to recall the original through the lenses of the drama, with all the sensual immediacy of a live performance, something that during the best part of the century was likely to be a fairly noisy and crowded affair.

In view of the important role attributed to newspapers and novels in generating imagined communities in the nineteenth century, the fact that the theatre provided a continuing forum for face-to-face contacts within an urban setting is sometimes overlooked. David Worrall has shown with respect to the Georgian era that the theatres provided an important platform for sociability, giving rise to subcultural networks within the larger cities that, in some cases, worked as an alternative public sphere. In an age when television had not yet been imagined and panoramas or dioramas were the best alternative, theatres also offered a platform for re-enacting events from recent history in the mode of grand spectacle: thus the coronation ceremony of George IV in Westminster Abbey in 1820 was re-enacted in tableau form every night on a weekly basis just as some of the sea battles against Napoleon’s forces were replayed on stage ‘with real Men of War and Floating Batteries’. Scott’s own funeral would be transposed to the stage in the form of a funerary masque in 1832. The step from the theatrical stage to the staging of public life was a small one.

That being said, the value of theatrical versions of contemporary events seems to have lain not in their news value as such, but in their character as a spectacle to be enjoyed collectively as a sensual experience and, as one advertisement put it, to produce ‘an unprecedented climax of astonishment and applause’. In advance of the great spectacles of the Victorian Age (exemplified by the Great Exhibition of 1851 and the Crystal Palace), the theatre was the venue for collectively shared displays, with live performance in an impressive setting as important as the story being related. So strong was the visual component in one Scott production that a critic complained in 1826 that in time, ‘Old Drury will be called the Dramorama.’

Scott was a very active supporter of the Theatre Royal in Edinburgh, even reputed to have aroused Scottish theatre ‘from lethargy and stagnation’. He also attended productions of the Waverley plays in various locations, and wrote about the theatre. It is all the more surprising, then, given his immense success in so many other fields from poetry to antiquarianism, and the presence of so many theatrical elements in his fiction, that he had little talent or inclination for play-writing. His imagination was apparently more suited to the looser form of the romance than to the rigours imposed by a brief performance, and to writing rather than performance as such. The closest he came to theatrical success was his orchestration of George IV’s spectacular visit to Edinburgh in 1822, which has been described as an adaptation to the theatre of public life of the story of Waverley. With lavish displays of tartan that extended even to the person of the king, the distinctiveness of Scottish culture was celebrated hyperbolically even as the political union with England was being acted out again. As the Royal Visit illustrates, and as I
shall show in more detail in Chapters 4 and 6, the theatre and public life were closely interlinked in a century when public processions and mass meetings were more regular occurrences than has been traditionally recognized.

If Scott himself was no playwright, his oeuvre triggered a staggering amount of theatrical productions, including the many versions of *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* mentioned earlier. From 1816 on, when Daniel Terry staged a version of *Guy Mannering*, almost all the Waverley novels were put on stage within months of being published. Whenever a new novel seemed imminent, dramatists jostled to get hold of the manuscript or advance copies of the book so as to score a première (indeed, Scott is known to have helped his friend Terry in this way). While it became quite common to dramatize fiction in the nineteenth century (novels by Dickens and the Brontës, for example, also made it very quickly to the stage), the sheer number of theatrical productions inspired by Scott has been surpassed only by productions of Shakespeare. In *Scott Dramatized* (1992), H. Philip Bolton provides evidence for more than four thousand theatrical productions derived from Scott’s works in the course of the nineteenth century in Great Britain and North America, some of which have been mentioned in Chapter 1; Barbara Bell has analyzed more than five thousand Scott playbills relating to productions in Scotland alone. The crest of that theatrical tsunami followed on the initial publication of the novels and lasted throughout the 1820s and 1830s. But even with the ebbing of this tide, Scott plays continued to be performed for the best part of a hundred years, albeit more selectively: there were several new scripts (p.61) and libretti produced up to the 1890s and a smaller peak in productions in the 1870s, presumably as part of the renewed attention to Scott as a cultural monument on the occasion of his centenary. In the twentieth century, cinema and television (and to a lesser extent, radio) took over as a forum, though they did so, as we shall see later, with reference to an ever more reduced repertoire. This vast body of theatrical activity has been charted, but with a couple of exceptions, not yet studied in much depth.

The multimedial character of the stage performances is indicated by the ubiquitous use of ‘melodrama’, ‘musical drama’, ‘musical play’, ‘romantic opera’, and ‘operatic romance’ in the subtitles of the Scott adaptations. The proliferation of terms is also symptomatic of the diversity, both social and artistic, of the theatrical productions of the Waverley novels. When Scott’s fiction first appeared in print, the only theatres licensed by law to put on serious drama, i.e. based on the spoken word, were the so-called legitimate or ‘patent’ theatres (including the Theatre Royals at Drury Lane and Covent Garden). This left the many other theatres emerging throughout Great Britain to specialize in performances where the spoken word was subordinated to other forms of theatricality. In practice the divisions between the serious and the popular theatres were less strict than the law envisaged and than some more high-minded critics, regretting the absence of a thriving literary theatre, would have liked. The corpus of Scott productions indicates that varying combinations of script, music, and spectacle occurred across the board, both in the popular and in the legitimate theatres (a legal distinction that was dropped in 1843). The Scott dramatizations were so influential in the long term, according to Barbara Bell, because they helped give the non-patented theatres a ‘respectable, semi-legitimate’
reertoire that was based in literature. As we have already seen in the case of *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* the theatrical productions were often the occasion for tie-ins in the form of chapbook versions of the stories. Here too we see how the Waverley phenomenon operated in a translation zone at the interface between ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture.

With varying degrees of emphasis, music was a key component of theatrical productions in the 1820s as were the spectacular settings, the latter morphing into the sensationalist aesthetics of high Victorian melodrama as well as into grand opera. In his classic study *The Melodramatic Imagination* (1985), Peter Brooks argued that a ‘mode of excess’, arising from the non-verbal aesthetics of the illegitimate theatres, penetrated all walks of theatrical and literary life throughout the nineteenth century, and cut across distinctions between the serious and the popular. While the aesthetics described by Brooks defined the basic theatrical language of the Scott dramatizations, one should be wary of lumping all productions together since they served different groups of theatre-goers. There was also considerable generic range: ‘international’ opera in the Italian style, spectacular melodrama with huge production values, sensationalist melodrama in Victorian style, and circus-like acts with live animals (as in Astley’s Amphitheatre, which was in operation from the late eighteenth century up to 1895). Symptomatic of their position between a literary culture increasingly protected by copyright and a popular culture serving a growing urban population was the fact that these various dramatic versions were regularly (re)composed on a cut-and-paste method from earlier plays, stories, and musical events, forming compositional medleys whose authorship was multiple and often anonymous. There are some two hundred and fifty published Scott scripts extant, along with many songbooks derived from the theatrical productions. There were probably other unpublished versions but these can no longer be traced since the records of performance do not always indicate the name of the playwright.

In tracking Scott’s immense and long-lasting ripples into the world of theatre, I have been fortunate, as mentioned earlier, in being able to draw on the treasure-trove of information offered in Bolton’s *Scott Dramatized*. I have also benefited from Jerome Mitchell’s *Walter Scott Operas* (1977) and *More Walter Scott Operas* (1996), whose accumulative titles already speak volumes about the proliferation involved (arguably because of their association with classical music and high culture, the Scott operas have been studied in more detail than the plays). Mitchell has identified no fewer than ninety operas inspired by Scott, some of which were key in circulating Scott’s stories across Europe: *The Lady of the Lake* is by now best known internationally through the mediation of Rossini’s *Donna del Lago* (1819), while *The Bride of Lammermoor* is remembered through Donizetti’s *Lucia* (1835), a staple of the modern international operatic repertoire. Versions in which classical music was not the dominant mode (i.e. the vast majority of the Scott plays that are my focus here) would seem to have been largely confined to the English-speaking world. Conversely, the operatic versions by Rossini, Donizetti, and other Europeans were less widespread in England than the other dramatic forms and, as Christina Fuhrman has shown in a recent article called ‘Scott Repatriated’, were greeted with some reticence in London as European appropriations of what had
come to be seen as distinctly British heritage.  

Particularly in the 1820s and 1830s it was not uncommon for various Waverley plays to be offered in British theatres side by side as part of an evening programme; for example, patrons of the Theatre Royal in Glasgow were treated to both *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* and *Rob Roy* on 30 December 1826 while patrons of the Theatre Royal in Edinburgh were offered a double bill of *Waverley* and *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* on (p.63) 23 February 1830. Nor was it uncommon for two versions of the same play to run concurrently at different theatres—in March 1825 citizens in Edinburgh could choose between two versions of *Rob Roy*, one at the Theatre Royal, the other at the Caledonian; as late as February 1863, patrons in London could choose between two *Hearts of Mid-Lothian*: Dion Boucicault’s *The Trial of Effie Deans*; or, *The Heart of Midlothian* at Astley’s Theatre Royal and, across the river at the Surrey Theatre, an anonymous *Effie Deans: or, The Lily of St. Leonard’s*. Given all these different versions multiplied by the number of productions and performances at multiple locations, it is difficult to assess the scale of these activities and their social penetration. But even the most conservative estimates point to a major cultural phenomenon that, with only a couple of notable exceptions, has been allowed to pass under the radar screen of literary critics and even of theatre historians, its existence noted, if at all, as a curious form of cultural pathology.

For some theatregoers the plays may have been the first or only encounter with the Waverley novels, though there is incidental evidence showing that some people attended more than one stage version of the same play or went back to see the same production twice. William Hazlitt, for example, attended the two versions of *Ivanhoe* running concurrently at Drury Lane and Covent Garden in 1820 and wrote up a comparative analysis for the *London Magazine* in which he intimated his desire to go back and see the Drury Lane production. One enthusiast complained of a Glasgow production of *Rob Roy* in 1840 that ‘although we have seen it [Rob Roy] played above two hundred times, including in its casts all sorts of persons, from Macready to Mumford, an [sic] in all sorts of places—theatre, barn, and booth, we never saw it more wretchedly performed.’ The wording suggests that this patron’s disgruntlement was with the quality of the performance rather than with the fact it was the umpteenth production of *Rob Roy* that he had attended. After all, new productions and live performances meant that the play was continuously being renewed in contrast to the more fixed form of books and films.

The playbills advertising such productions regularly invoked Scott’s reputation, with references to the ‘celebrated’ author or the ‘celebrated’ novel. It was quite common, however, for the performance to be presented without any explicit reference to Scott while assuming that the public knew they were dealing with a new version of an old story. Very quickly Scott’s stories seem to have acquired the status of collective texts and treated as common property, although in this case they also retained their association with the pseudo-anonymous ‘author of Waverley’. As Isaac Pocock wrote in 1820 in the preface to the printed edition of his version of *Rob Roy*, his contemporaries expected fidelity to the novel and to the (p.64) ‘name of Walter Scott’—a direct, but not unique reference to Scott himself that is all the more striking in view of the fact that he had not
officially declared his authorship:

the whole of the novel-reading world, in which is included nine tenths of the audience, come with the romance at their fingers’ ends, and expect to find a literal transcript of it on the stage; the whole three volumes, the usual quantum in which these popular works are doled out, must be spoken and acted in three brief hours, or at least without any material deviations. Any aberration from the direct broad road of romance, is considered a high crime and misdemeanour against the name of Walter Scott.\(^\text{52}\)

Playbills from the late 1810s on seemed also to suppose a rough knowledge of the main outlines of the story since they unhesitatingly revealed the outcome of the drama and regularly enumerated the various scenes that the public could look forward to enjoying along with the musical interludes. The pleasure on offer apparently lay, then, in the fresh re-enactment of something that was already known rather than in the unfolding of something unpredictable. This is borne out by the fact that critics—and judging by the passage just quoted above, the audiences—usually evaluated the success of the production in terms of its fidelity or lack of it with respect to the original novel and, as time passed, also with respect to earlier productions. Only on rare occasions did Waverley playwrights break so free from the memory of the original as to be evaluated on their own merits as autonomous dramas. This did happen a generation after the first adaptations in the case of Boucicault’s *The Trial of Effie Deans* (1863), which reduced the whole of Scott’s rambling novel to a courtroom drama.\(^\text{63}\) The *London Times* praised the playwright for having ‘endeavoured to construct a drama that will create an interest independent of its connexion with the novel’ in contrast to the other version at the Surrey Theatre, running at the same time, which was both more faithful to the original and more spectacular in its appeal.\(^\text{64}\) While the reviewer from the *Times*, perhaps suffering from a spot of Waverley fatigue, implicitly preferred Boucicault’s innovations to his rival’s fidelity to the memory of Scott, the crowd at the Surrey seems to have had no such desire to change a winning horse. Having been treated to a scaffold on stage along with ‘a huge cataract of real water, which falls from nearly the top of the stage and really breaks against the craggy rocks at the bottom’, the ‘mass of humanity that crowded every part of the theatre burst out into an uproarious demonstration of satisfaction at the termination of the drama.’\(^\text{65}\)

So far I’ve been referring to the Waverley novels as if they were uniformly procreative in the theatre. But there were important differences between them and these are worth considering as indications of the way in (p.65) which the theatrical medium filtered, channelled, and promoted memories. Bolton shows that five novels in particular—*Rob Roy, Guy Mannering, The Bride of Lammermoor, The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and *Ivanhoe*—inspired almost two-thirds of the Waverley productions, with more than half accounted for by *Rob Roy* and *Guy Mannering* alone. The popularity presumably also worked accumulatively, with success breeding success and later productions mixing and matching the successful features of earlier ones. For reasons that have yet to become clear some works fell out of the picture while others, like *Guy Mannering*, enjoyed an
intense afterlife on the stage but not elsewhere. I shall come back to some possible explanations later. Suffice it here to recall that the first novel to fall by the theatrical wayside was *Waverley* itself. Despite the symbolic importance of the name, *Waverley* (1814) generated few paintings, as has been noted already, and it only gave rise to three dozen or so theatrical productions, beginning in 1822 (that is, after the other novels had been dramatized) and ending in the 1870s. It generated just one operatic version, Holstein’s *Hochländer* (1876), which led a tenuous life until its last revival in 1900. Unlike other works, moreover, *Waverley* did not even enjoy the honour of being parodied. Most surprising of all, there has never been a production of *Waverley* in film or television (nor, as far as I have been able to establish, on radio). Despite the fact that it gave its name to streets across the globe, as mentioned earlier, and became the icon of Walter Scott and all his works, the story of *Waverley* never crossed over into drama. This may have been because the novel was the first one and difficult to adapt to the stage; but since the latter didn’t stop playwrights in other cases, it seems more plausible to look to the fact that it arrived too soon to ride the dramatizing wave and was so quickly overtaken by *Guy Mannering* (1815) and *Rob Roy* (1817) that it was less subject to remembrance in its own right. The afterlife of each work followed its own trajectory.

An analysis of all this material would take a lifetime. I have opted to concentrate instead in what follows on the dramatizations of the most popular of all the plays, *Rob Roy*. The intensity with which it was produced over and over again up to World War I, especially in the Scottish theatres, offers a unique perspective on the cultural resonance of Walter Scott and a key to ‘live’ theatre as a medium of cultural remembrance.

**Rob Roy**

On the last evening of his visit to Edinburgh, King George IV attended a performance at the Theatre Royal of *Rob Roy; or, Auld Lang syne; National (p.66) Opera*. A wet night it was and a very crowded theatre, as James Dibdin recalled the occasion in his *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage*:

> Inside the house the crush was intense, while matters were made infinitely worse by the cloud of steam that ascended from the saturated garments of those present. Good humour, however, prevailed, and Scotch songs were sung in chorus to pass the time away until the arrival, about 7.30 of the box occupants.

When the king arrived and the curtain rose, the chorus of Scottish songs turned into an enthusiastic singing (*con amore*, as Dibdin put it) of ‘God Save the King’. That it should have been *Rob Roy* above all that was used on such a politically sensitive occasion is indicative both of its popularity and of the status it had acquired as a specifically ‘national’ opera. This status would be maintained for a long time: a century later in 1962, when the King of Norway came on a state visit to Edinburgh in the company of the British Royal Family, it was again *Rob Roy* that was put on for their majestic benefit. Although by that time neither the play nor the theatre enjoyed the same popularity as in 1822, it was apparently felt appropriate to perform *Rob Roy* once again, not as a matter of current fashion or taste, but rather as part of a self-reflexive tradition of performing Scottishness and ‘conveying’ it at home and to the outside world.
Although there are relatively few visualizations of the novel Rob Roy extant, there is no doubt but that it dominated the stage, especially in Scotland. Between its first stage appearance in early 1818 and the most recent one in 1990, the story of the eighteenth-century Scottish outlaw, whose career was embroiled in both modern economic life and Jacobite rebellion, has been produced almost one thousand times. The hundreds of programme bills extant, advertising both new productions and revivals of old ones, often invoked the ‘popular novel’, the ‘very popular novel’, or the ‘highly-admired novel’ on which the play was based (‘founded on the popular novel of Rob Roy’; ‘founded on the highly esteemed work of the late Sir Walter Scott’). While the memory of the novel and its author was regularly invoked with various degrees of solemnity, the name of the dramatist was only seldom mentioned. But it seems probable that the vast majority of these anonymous versions were based on a single version: Isaac Pocock's Rob Roy MacGregor; or, Auld Lang Syne! A musical drama, in three acts, founded on the popular novel of Rob Roy, first performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden, Thursday, March 12, 1818 (London: John Miller, 1818).

In a rare appearance, Pocock turned up in an 1879 advertisement for a Rob Roy ‘dramatized by Isaac Pocock with the consent and approval of SIR WALTER SCOTT’. There is no evidence that this version had been officially endorsed by Scott, as the playbill claimed, but the invoca (p.67)
tion of the Great Man's authority implies that Pocock's version was seen as somehow the 'official' or canonical one. The fact that Pocock's script was often republished (there were eight editions up to 1864) is also indicative of its popularity as the basis for new productions.\textsuperscript{77} There was no other obvious rival, the only other published versions being George Soane’s \textit{Rob (p.68) Roy: A Drama in Three Acts} (1818) and the burlesque \textit{Robbing Roy; or, Scotched and Kilt} (1879), neither of which was produced very often. But the most important indication of Pocock's influence is in the titles given to the many productions which, by and large, carry a variation on his subtitle with the tale-tale inclusion of \textit{Auld Lang Syne}.

What made Pocock's play stick in the public's mind? Scott had provided a portrait of commercial life in Glasgow that was recognizable to a middle-class public, while at the same time he tapped into a vibrant interest in Rob Roy among the public at large; his publishers had also whetted the appetites of the public by re-circulating some of the familiar legends in advance of the novel's appearance.\textsuperscript{78} Rob Roy, before ever he became the figurehead of Scott's novel, was something of a celebrity and had, among other things, given his name to a play staged in Durham as recently as 1810.\textsuperscript{79} This interest in Rob Roy was itself also part of a certain vogue for outlaw figures in the popular culture of the time; witness the renewed interest in the figure of Robin Hood, whose ubiquity in this period has been well mapped (indeed Stephen Knight has suggested that the appearance of Scott's \textit{Rob Roy may in turn have inspired another novel called Robin Hood}, which appeared in 1819).\textsuperscript{80} That the two outlaws were linked in the popular imagination—one working as an avatar for the other around a basic narrative of resistance—is borne out by William Wordsworth's poem 'Rob Roy's Grave' (1803), which predates Scott's novel by a decade and begins with a comparison between the two men: 'A famous man is Robin Hood | the English ballad-singer’s joy! | And Scotland has a thief as good | An outlaw of as daring mood; | She has her brave ROB ROY!' Scott's novel had resonated with these deep-seated stories of banditry—what might be called the popular memory of bandits—while giving them a renewed and culturally legitimate impulse.

Reflecting this interplay between literary culture and popular memory, the novel and its theatrical versions together generated new spin-offs in the form of chapbooks and ballads.\textsuperscript{81}

Since Pocock stuck quite close to the novel (and relative to other Waverley dramatizations, he used extensive dialogue) his play drew its imaginative appeal from Scott's original exploration of the interface between the worlds of Glasgow, London, and the Highlands. Up to a point, then, his success was merely a matter of his riding on the crest of the novel's success, inheriting the imaginative power of the novel along with its deeper roots in popular memory. In adapting the novel, Pocock also demonstrated considerable skill as a playwright. He succeeded in transposing Scott's lengthy and unwieldy romance into the confines of a three-act drama without deviating on any major points from the original (this again in \textsuperscript{(p.69) contrast to George Soane's version, which had appeared almost simultaneously in 1818 but was deemed to have so far deviated from the 'popular novel' as to have made the latter unrecognizable).\textsuperscript{82} Pocock reduced the number of characters while giving a prominent place to the comic ones alongside Rob
Roy; he condensed certain incidents in the plot, channelled the actors towards the same locations, and began *in medias res* when Rashleigh Osbaldistone had already engineered the downfall of the family firm. The broad lines of the plot are nevertheless maintained and indeed some of its inconsistencies are ironed out with only a few of Scott’s many threads left dangling. Given the limitations of the dramatic medium this was itself something of an achievement, as was the colourful dialogue, which allowed room for some great character-acting, particularly in the role of the Bailie Nicol Jarvie. This was to become something of a famous set-piece for actor Charles Mackay (the origin of the ‘Real McKay’, according to Bolton) of whose performances it was said: ‘it is not acting, it is reality.’

Beyond its qualities as a play and the effective acting, what seems to have clinched the success of Pocock’s version was its music. The history of the many stage productions of *Rob Roy* is above all a history of the songs that accompanied it. It was, as the subtitle put it, a ‘musical drama’—literally, a melodrama. The melodramatic in this case, however, was less a matter of Brooks’ ‘aesthetics of excess’ and the abundant use of pathetic tableaux, than it was a matter of embedding musical interludes in the narrative. In some later productions indeed the generic label shifted to ‘operatic drama’, ‘musical play’, and even ‘opera’.

From the word go, songs were inserted into the script, many of which had been composed from well-known poems and set to traditional Scottish airs by John Davy and Henry Bishop. The lyrics were only tangentially connected to the narrative, but this was not a compositional problem within a theatrical framework that accommodated medleys and ‘variety’ more easily than a long and continuous script. The *Auld Lang Syne* that was such a fixed feature in the plays’ titles referred of course to Burns’ song, which already thematized the injunction to remember (and specifically to collectively remember this moment): ‘Should auld acquaintance be forgot, and never brought to mind?’

Repeated from one production to the next Burns’ *Auld Lang Syne* became a signature song for the play itself—indeed, Bolton argues that the cultural longevity of the song that has since become a fixed feature of New Year’s celebrations in the English-speaking world was generated by the success of the Rob Roy play.

The various productions were built up around a fixed repertoire of songs that included, along with *Auld Lang Syne*, *My Love is like a Red, Red Rose* (also from Burns), and *A Famous Man was Robin Hood* (based on the *p.70* poem by Wordsworth). These, together with the opening song *Soon the Sun will Gae to Rest* and the closing song *Pardon Now the Bold Outlaw* were regular features in productions—a degree of ‘stickiness’ that is surprising in view of the cut-and-paste aesthetics evidenced in many of the other Waverley plays where scripts tended to be continuously modified from one production to the next. In the case of *Rob Roy*, the fixed items on the musical menu were regularly supplemented by other songs, usually selected from a repertoire of traditional Scots airs or from other Waverley plays (though it is interesting to note the addition of a popular Irish air—Thomas Moore’s *Minstrel Boy*—at a performance in Dublin in 1851).

As the programme bills indicate, each production sold itself in effect on the songs it had on offer: whereas in other plays, the tableaux were advertised, in the case of *Rob Roy* it was above all the musical interludes and, to a lesser extent, the dances and actors that were important. The public was promised both a play and a medley of familiar songs...
that were almost invariably coded as Scottish. By all accounts, the performances had something of the character of a concert. The dramatization of the novel provided not just an occasion for revisiting a popular story, but also an occasion for activating other forms of cultural heritage in other media, though ‘evergreens’ or ‘favourites’ may be a more appropriate word here than heritage. Bolton has suggested, moreover, that the inclusion of traditional ballads and airs offered in particular a way for displaced Highlanders now working in the industrialized cities to enjoy familiar melodies, copies of which were sometimes sold in the lobbies. 

Surprisingly, relatively little attention has been paid in cultural memory studies to the mnemonic function of music and to aurality as a connector between past and present. But the term ‘evergreen’ itself indicates that singing is an important medium of collective memory, one that provides a living and, indeed, embodied connection between the past and the present through the voices of the participants. The memorability of songs, like that of the poetry on which they are often based, is less based on narrative and the recollection of past events, than it is on the self-reflexive reiteration of sound and word patterns. Remarkably, many of the songs that figured at the Rob Roy performances were based on poems by Burns, Moore, Wordsworth, and Scott himself. As if to doubly ensure their stickiness they were now combined with traditional melodies whose music resonated in the here and now with the deep aural memory of the listeners. (I have found no direct evidence of sing-alongs during the plays themselves, though enthusiastic fans are known to have left the theatre in Perth in 1818 roaring ‘Rob Roy for ever’ and the audience waiting for the royal performance in 1822, as we have seen, passed the time in collective singing.)

The case of Rob Roy suggests indeed that music in the nineteenth-century theatre provided what Pierre Nora has called a milieu de mémoire (memory environment): a relationship to the past based on the continuity of repetition rather than on the rupture implied in historicizing modes of remembrance that look back to the past from a distance. Repetition and re-citation would certainly seem to be key to the revivals of Rob Roy throughout the nineteenth century, where the charm of the songs lay in their familiarity rather than in their novelty, and in the (nostalgic) presence of the past in the musical performance.

In the case of Rob Roy, more so than in the case of Guy Mannering, which it resembles in many other respects, this pleasure of reiteration took on a distinctly national character. As such, it bears out the general point made by Michael Ragussis in his recent Theatrical Nation (2010), namely, that the theatre provided ‘unusually vivid (visual and aural) representations of ethnic and national identities’ and thereby constituted a live communal environment ‘in which the community publicly inspected and responded to these representations and to one another’. Ragussis does not explicitly refer to adaptations of Rob Roy, but his formulation is particularly apt to describe their character. The repeated invocation of the concept of the national (which we have already encountered in the case of The Heart of Mid-Lothian) indicates that performances of the play were also performances of what it meant to be Scottish. Indicative in this regard is the fact that
Scott and Burns—the Siamese twins of Scottish literature—were sometimes mentioned side by side on the same programme, in a potent combination which we will be encountering again in Chapter 6.93 While the title of the first known performance on 17 January 1818 simply referred to Rob Roy, the influence of Pocock’s version ensured that it became more and more frequently subtitled _Or, Auld Lang Syne_. This memory cue for Scottishness later became written into the title of the play, to which was then added a further subtitle designating its national character. From August 1819, then, when _Rob Roy MacGregor; or, Auld Lang Syne_ at the Theatre Royal in Edinburgh was announced as a ‘national opera’, it became common for the attribute ‘national’ to be applied in various combinations to subsequent productions, including the one attended by George IV. ‘National drama’, ‘national play’, ‘national melodrama’, ‘national opera’: these all featured at various points.94 The term ‘national’ was also extended to particular features of the production: in 1849, for example, a programme bill referred to the ‘national air’ of Auld Lang Syne while another referred to the ‘admired national pas seul of Miss Eyre’, and yet another advertised a dance to the ‘national air’ of the ‘The Blue Bells of Scotland’.95 All this talk of ‘national’ suggests that productions of _Rob Roy_ were both a way of reiterating narrative and songs (p.72) and a way of performing a collective identity in a pleasurable and convivial form. As Barbara Bell has argued, they were also part of a new awareness of the distinctiveness of Scottish theatre, with its own key actors, decors, stories, that the Scott repertoire had helped generate as an object of pride and cultivation.96

All of these ingredients are present in the account given by the _Scotsman_ on 20 February 1819 of the opening night of Pocock’s play in Edinburgh (attended incidentally by Scott himself, again recognized as its progenitor):

> He who is without affections does not deserve the name of man. But he who is at once a man and a Scotsman, must be delighted with ‘Rob Roy MacGregor, of [sic] Auld Lang Syne.’...Why should not we be proud of our national genius, humour, music, kindness and fidelity? Why not be national? We found ourselves pre-eminently so on Monday evening. Our recollection of the novel of Rob Roy, and the almost universal genius of its author, with the perfect conviction that he is a Scotsman, and was then present in the theatre, gave sufficient interest to this musical drama at the commencement; and the manner in which the different parts were cast and supported, not only preserved it to the last, but made it grow upon us, so as to become absolutely intoxicating. So perfect was the illusion, from the admirable combination of scenery, costume, character, expression and acting, that, in a word, we were ‘hurried off our feet.’ [emphasis AR]97

As this rave review suggests, ‘being national’ was not just a feature of the production as such. It was rather the capacity of all those present to be moved at the same time, indeed ‘intoxicated’ by the multimedial combination of spectacle, music, acting, the memory of the book, and in this case, the physical presence of the writer. ‘National’ was something one could ‘pre-eminently’ be of a Monday evening—in a theatre. In 1784, Friedrich Schiller had proposed the theatre was a platform for creating national solidarity through shared experience.98 The case of Rob Roy suggests that the popular theatre did fulfill such a
function in the case of Scotland in the nineteenth century, albeit in a more demotic and less moralizing form than that envisaged by the German theorist of the public sphere. The theatre was a place where readers and non-readers alike came together as a public and ‘conveyed’ their self-image in the presence of each other.

It is no coincidence that the celebration of nationality quoted above should have appeared in the Scotsman since it would appear from the hundreds of productions listed by Bolton that the epithet ‘national’ was used almost exclusively with reference to productions in Scotland (and these account for a large proportion of the total number of Rob Roys) while it was absent at other venues, where the term ‘Scotch’ was often used (p.73) instead to designate the distinctiveness of the heritage on display in a foreign setting. This difference in designating what was essentially the same play is striking especially since Scott’s works and their dramatizations were in circulation throughout the British Isles. But it is indicative of the relationality of national identities and of the play’s capacity to articulate different positions on the two islands both from within a ‘national’ Scottish perspective and from an outsider one. A certain self-conscious memorialization of the play itself developed in the course of all these repetitions, with frequent reference made in the playbills to the ‘original music’ and to its status as part of the national canon. This status was clinched by its production for the benefit of the visiting monarch in 1822 (after which the subtitle ‘national’ became standard) and further reinforced by its revival on the occasion of the lavish commemorations of Scott’s centenary in 1871, which I will be discussing at greater length in Chapter 6. On these later occasions, the play itself was not just performed in all its immediacy, but a piece of theatrico-national history was also literally re-enacted.

Reflecting the performative turn in the humanities referred to earlier, increasing attention has been paid in recent years to performative practices, alongside narratives, in the production of cultural memory. Reflecting this shift in perspective, commemorative ceremonies have come to be seen as performative in the sense that they involve music, spectacle, and so on, but also performative in the linguistic sense that they make things happen: in this case, they create communality through an embodied and self-reflexive act of remembrance that is shared at a particular time and place. This change of perspective has highlighted the importance of commemorations in creating communities in the nineteenth century that were embodied (they involved people being together in the same place and time) rather than just ‘imagined’ in Benedict Anderson’s sense (that is, connected through media). In Chapter 6 I will discuss the commemorations of Scott himself in greater detail. Here my concern is rather with extending the idea of performative remembrance to the theatre and to the pleasures of reiterating Rob Roy as part of a self-reflexive cultivation of a collective text. Barbara Bell has described the impact in Scotland of the ‘national dramas’ based on Scott’s work in terms of their offering a ‘public arena’ in which people could ‘assert their shared cultural identity’ by witnessing over and again their national heroes and heroines in national costume and with Scottish accents. Whether or not the audience actually shared a common past, they did share the common experience of ‘being national’ thanks to the theatre, at least for the duration of the performance.
It would be pushing the argument too far to suggest that the theatrical versions of Rob Roy constituted some sort of commemorative ritual in any strict sense—though Royal presences on different occasions did give the performance of Rob Roy in Edinburgh official weight as a formal recognition of Scottish cultural identity within the political union. Even on less august occasions, however, performances of Rob Roy in Scotland appear to have had both a commemorative character (recalling the memory of Scott, Rob Roy, popular songs, Highlands) and a ritualistic one (based on reciting and repeating). The complaint voiced in The Edinburgh Dramatic Review in March 1825 about ‘national dramas’ to the effect that they were loose compilations dependent on the memory of the public unwittingly articulated the underlying principle at work:

These national dramas, however, are not to be judged by strict rules; the connection between the different scenes is extremely loose; and the memory of the audience is required as an adhesive plaister to bind them together.103

Within the pleasurable framework of an evening’s theatre, the memory of outlaws and depopulated Highlands were invoked for the benefit of urban audiences, many of them recent emigrants to the burgeoning Scottish cities. The public’s pleasure and, on occasion, their possibly nostalgic ‘intoxication’ with Scottishness, to recall the review in the Scotsman, was linked to their being able to participate in an event that was absolutely familiar and cherished (the play, the songs) and yet absolutely unique (the immediacy of the particular performance). Ernest Renan famously wrote that the memory of suffering can connect people more than the memory of joy, and a similar perspective has informed much recent reflection on collective memory and identity, with trauma and suffering being seen as the basis of solidarity.104 Written and performed in a different age, the case of Rob Roy serves as a reminder that pleasure too can be binding and that repetition in the singular mode of a live performance can itself be a source of pleasure, albeit one that may be structurally tinged with nostalgia against the background of change.

Rob Roy, Forever?
Recent theories of remediation emphasize the drive towards new experiences and new sensations, John Ellis suggesting that adaptations aim to ‘efface the memory’ of the original text on which they are based. The theatrical productions of Rob Roy that I have been discussing here emerged against the background of an incipient consumerist culture, but nevertheless worked not by effacing the memory of the original, but by reiterating within the immediacy of a singular performance. As such, the theatre supplemented other ‘long-distance’ forms of culture, by providing a forum alongside novels and newspapers in which experience was shared in an embodied way more characteristic of oral societies than of the media-saturated world of Scott.

Before rounding up this discussion of Scott in the theatre, it should be pointed out that theatrical productions of Rob Roy dried up abruptly in the first decades of the twentieth century, having gradually declined in the preceding decades. With the exception of incidental theatrical productions in Edinburgh in 1922, 1931, and 1962, the cultural afterlife of Rob Roy in the twentieth century has been on the screen rather than on the
stage. Like many of Scott’s other works, the novel was adapted at a very early stage to the movies with the appearance of films called Rob Roy in 1911 (dir. Arthur Vivian), 1913 (dir. Henry J. Vernot), 1922 (dir. W. P. Kellino), 1953 (dir. Michael French), and 1995 (dir. Michael Caton Jones), along with two BBC series for television in 1961 and 1971. This development answers to the classic model of remediation whereby each new technology leads to a transformation of old stories into new interfaces. The (diminished) afterlife of Rob Roy in the twentieth century, like that of other Scott stories, was as much bound up with the screen as with print.

Apart from revivals of some of the Scott-based operas, the theatre did not figure much in this more recent afterlife. Certainly the song-filled and the live character of the evenings in the theatres of the 1800s was not carried over, could not be carried over, into the silent cinema. The cinema was international in its reach, rather than embodied locally, and this meant that the shift to film was not merely a change of medium, but also of social function. It is telling in this regard that none of the twentieth-century screen versions of Rob Roy have either Auld Lang Syne or ‘national’ in their subtitles. The new screen technologies offered new possibilities for bringing the eighteenth century to life, but they also diminished the ability to mobilize audiences around a live performance. Canonicity in this case had a shelf-life: dramatizations of Rob Roy (with the symbolic weight of Scott behind them) had a symbolic, social, and aesthetic value in the nineteenth century that they largely ceased to have in the twentieth.

There is another twist: while the shift to a new medium could have been taken as an opportunity to go back to Scott’s original as a model, it is striking that the movies made in the twentieth century seem to have turned instead to the folk traditions concerning the historical Rob Roy. Although the 1911 and 1913 films are unfortunately no longer available for viewing, the list of dramatis personae indicates a fidelity to the Scott/Pocock script at least as far as the basic narrative is concerned. W. P. Kellino’s 1922 version is quite different: no Baillie, no Osbaldestone, no Diana Vernon, but instead the story of Rob Roy’s fight at the head of his clan against injustice and the tyranny of the Marquis of Montrose. In a convoluted way, the first intertitle of the film, which has happily been preserved in the British Film Institute, both acknowledges and dismisses Scott’s legacy: ‘To Scotland, not to Scott, did we go for the facts on which our story of “Rob Roy” is built. There, amid the mountain lochs and glens, nature made peace and man made war.’ Even as it piggy-backed on Scott’s reputation, the intertitle indicates a return to the folkloric representations of Rob Roy circulating prior to Scott’s novel, and on which Scott himself had drawn.

Scott’s novel together with its dramatizations and various other spin-offs helped ensure that the memory of Rob Roy remained alive throughout the nineteenth century. Even when it was no longer associated with the novel, this figure of memory circulated as part of a collective text that belonged to everyone who wanted to appropriate it rather than to a single author. Thus the blockbuster Hollywood version of Rob Roy (1995), starring Liam Neeson, was based more on the 1922 film version than on Scott’s original, and hence indirectly reconnected with the folkloric tradition that Scott had helped revivify.
The 1995 film was a travesty of the memory of Scott’s work, but also its legitimate offspring. On the one hand, Scott’s novel was a unique work of literature that offered an imaginative and complex reconstruction of Scottish life in the eighteenth century, more complex than any dramatic or filmic version could ever be. On the other hand, it drew on folkloric traditions which it reworked and, in this light, the later popular versions of Rob Roy represent a fitting outcome of a translatio that began with the novelist’s own sampling of folklore. Scott had chosen the name Waverley, it will be recalled, because it was ‘uncontaminated’ by any associations. For the same reason, he had hesitated in 1817 before conceding to his publisher’s proposal that he use ‘Rob Roy’ for his latest novel because it was the name of a ‘real hero’: ‘Nay’, answered Scott, ‘never let me have to write up to a name. You well know that I have generally adopted a title that told nothing.’

Scott’s strategic instincts proved correct as far as the branding of this work was concerned: in the case of popular remembrance of Rob Roy, his own novel resonated so well with other versions that it was ultimately overwritten by them.

A parallel story could be told about the persistence of Rob Roy as a text and about the painstaking reconstruction of the ‘original’ edition in the Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels (2008). But by looking only at the text at its moment of genesis, one misses out on its rich afterlife as an object of transformation in other media and its appropriation by various groups. It has by now become something of a commonplace that all traditions are constructed; that they are based on the representation of imagined genealogies. This case suggests the contrary: that the remediations of Scott’s work over the course of what is now almost two centuries constitute a continuous tradition, one that is real and not just imagined although it is made up of new starts and new departures alongside reiterations. It represents a tradition of inventions rather than an invention of tradition. From the perspective of our understanding of cultural remembrance in the age of new media and fast turnovers, this tradition of inventions suggests an underlying connectedness between generations that needs to be seriously considered as part of the fabric of modern culture, despite our habitual reliance on a discourse of imminent obsolescence.

Cultural memory, to recall Jan Assmann’s words, amounts to a collection of ‘reusable texts, images, and rituals specific...whose “cultivation” serves to stabilize and convey that society’s self-image.’ In the case of Rob Roy collective identities were ‘cultivated’ through the reiteration of the same script in new performances. The next chapters will address the case of Ivanhoe, which followed a different trajectory: the script itself was continuously rewritten in an attempt to stabilize a society’s inherently contested self-image.
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