

1980

The Making and Un-Making of Sir Walter Scott's Count Robert of Paris

Kurt Gamerschlag

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gamerschlag, Kurt (1980) "The Making and Un-Making of Sir Walter Scott's Count Robert of Paris," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 15: Iss. 1.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol15/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Studies in Scottish Literature by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

Kurt Gamerschlag

The Making and Un-Making of
Sir Walter Scott's
Count Robert of Paris



The beginning of December 1831 saw the publication of the last two novels of the famous "Author of Waverley." *Count Robert of Paris* and *Castle Dangerous* were brought out in four volumes as the *Tales of My Landlord, Fourth and Last Series*, supposedly collected and arranged by Jedediah Cleishbotham, schoolmaster and parish-clerk of Gandercleugh.

Exactly 15 years before this date, the first series of these *Tales* comprising the novels *The Black Dwarf* and *Old Mortality* had come out and had set the reading world wildly guessing as to who their anonymous author could be--a man who had, it seemed, at least in the latter novel, produced a masterpiece. Enthusiastic reviews had been written in the most influential periodicals; severe attacks against the historicity of the novels had been launched and answered; and the publishers, Blackwood and Murray, had deemed themselves fortunate to have captured such a big prize from their ever-expanding rival, Constable of Edinburgh.

Now, fifteen years later, the scene was largely changed. Hardly any of the big "Reviews" did more than mention or print extracts from the avowed last product of the respected and pitied author. An author who, as all the world knew, was labouring hard to make good his huge losses from the bankruptcy of Constable's firm in 1826 and who had just two months before

started on a voyage to the Mediterranean on account of his failing health. If there were people who found it necessary to criticize these last novels, they did it gently and with reverence for a willpower so great as to enable the author, despite everything, to produce works of a quality still well above average. Scott's son-in-law, John Gibson Lockhart, certainly uttered no great falsehood when he tried to cheer him up with the good news: "Your tales have been out for some days & all the literary gazettes [in] London & Edinburgh treat them with courteous words. What is better, they are selling capitally I am told."¹ Underneath all this understanding and gentleness, however, lurked a severe and final judgement which came into the open seven years later in Lockhart's *Memoirs* in a bland statement concerning the publication of the last series of the *Tales*: "...Count Robert, and Castle Dangerous...--(for I need not return to the subject) came out at the close of November [1831] in four volumes, as the Fourth Series of Tales of My Landlord."² Lockhart's great respect for Scott and his own gentlemanliness prevented him from saying more, but his condemnation of the novels is, nevertheless, clear. Howbeit, when, 140 years later, the same reluctance to probe into the merits of *Count Robert* and *Castle Dangerous* apparently continues to get the better of Scott critics, and when one finds scholars still, more or less unquestioningly, relying on what Lockhart thought advisable to say about the genesis of the novels, it is high time to remind oneself of the recent criticisms of Lockhart's Scott biography and to go back to the original sources.

The task set for the present essay is, on a much smaller scale, that which H. J. C. Grierson set out to do in 1938: i.e., to supplement and correct Lockhart's account. Although most of the data were competently and finally handled in Edgar Johnson's biography *The Great Unknown* of 1971, his section on *Count Robert* leaves much to be desired. This is presumably due, on the one hand, to the more limited number of MSS to which he had access and, on the other, to his failure to inspect the surviving pre-stages of the text of this novel. Had Johnson given closer attention to the several sets of proof-sheets of the novel in the National Library of Scotland, he could not have written so laconically:

Lockhart did the last revisions, making substantial cuts and corrections. Their usefulness is incontestable but is still merely editorial; all the essential achievement is Scott's own.³

In fact, nearly one-third of the novel *Count Robert of Paris* was rewritten by Lockhart against the express wishes of its

original author who, in the end, almost certainly never realized what had become of his novel.⁴ It has always been openly or silently assumed that Lockhart's revision of *Count Robert* was an amelioration of a text hardly worth printing. The first such statement can be seen in James Ballantyne's letter to Scott's publisher, Cadell, who had also taken a considerable part in the proceedings--James Ballantyne being the printer:

Dear Sir,

I will speak very honestly on this occasion. I think very much of the judgement and attention displayed by Mr. L[ockhart] in his alterations, and quite as much of your own. Without both, the thing would have been imprudicable.⁵

Whether or not this really is the case can only be revealed by printing the *original* text in full--a text which was definitely not used as the basis for the few critical statements published on *Count Robert*.⁶

However, to start at the beginning: the first reference to a further novel after *Anne of Geierstein* which came out on 20 May 1829, is to be found in Cadell's business "Memoranda" of 24 February 1830, in which he calculates £2,625 as being the author's share of sales from a "New Novel by Sir Walter Scott" to be published in 5000 copies.⁷ There were, at this time, probably no more grounds for the calculation than a mere hint from Scott that he would like to start another work, and that he was looking for a suitable subject. Roughly six months later Scott had decided on the time-setting for the novel. Cadell's "Notebook" of conversations with the famous author records on 5 September 1830: "...he put into my hand the title of the Book which is fixed to be *Robert of Paris* a Romance of the Lower Empire."⁸ One month later, however, Scott decided to change the title of the book to *Count Robert of Paris* in order to avoid the rather farfetched, but possible, association with the mediaeval scholar John of Paris. Cadell readily complied.⁹

During most of October and November, Scott was occupied with reading up on Byzantine history. Towards the end of November he put pen to paper and wrote three chapters of the new novel. These chapters were sent immediately to the printer and returned in proof to Scott after Ballantyne had corrected the sheets. Ballantyne's reading of Scott's proof-sheets had never been restricted to mechanical correction--indeed, he had always been encouraged by the author to read the sheets with a view to their literary merit and, if necessary, to propose changes in this area. Scott, for his part, had in most cases readily agreed, if not always without grumbling, and had tried to cor-

rect and change accordingly. Scott's rejoinders to Ballantyne's proposals were however, of late, becoming more impatient and querulous in direct proportion to the growing number of criticisms on the one hand, and Scott's increasing realization of his failing powers on the other. This had made Ballantyne's task far from easy, and he had decided that he would no longer express his opinions without the backing of at least one other authority, be it the publisher, Cadell, or J. G. Lockhart--preferably of both.

Ballantyne saw the first proof-sheet of the new novel at the end of November.¹⁰ The next two sheets, comprising chapters II and III, followed in the first days of December 1830. Though the speed with which the author supplied new copy seemed to reflect new vigour and determination, Ballantyne was not at all happy with these chapters. He thought them, on the whole, rather dull; particularly the nearly 24-page stretch of inflated dialogue at the end of the third chapter. Having now become too cautious to tell Scott this on the strength of his own opinion, the printer went to Cadell on Saturday, 4 December, and gave him the finished pages to read, not hesitating to mention his own criticisms.¹¹ The publisher, however, did not think the beginning of the novel too bad but agreed with Ballantyne that the odd-sounding Greek and Latin names of the characters should be changed.¹² After much thought on how to approach Sir Walter with Ballantyne's and his own objections, Cadell wrote a long letter to Scott on the following Monday, 6 December. The letter, a nice piece of diplomacy, presented James's argument (considerably toned down) that a vivid beginning such as that of *The Talisman* was a certain sign of a good novel, whereas a dull beginning such as that of *The Betrothed* was an omen of a bad one--as indeed he feared this new one tended to be--setting his own, more favourable, opinion against Ballantyne's. Cadell even went so far as to single out Scott's use of the decaying plant as "simile" for the state of the Byzantine Empire of the eleventh century for special praise. In the minor matter of the names, he cited Ballantyne's example of J. G. Lockhart's novel *Valerius* as an instance where a good novel had been damaged by Latin names associated with learnedness but not with "light amusing or pleasing reading."¹³ Despite his cautious phrasing and cheering assertions, Cadell found that his tactics had, this time, been detected and fully comprehended.

Scott's replies to Cadell and Ballantyne arrived two days later and were couched in such terms as made it quite clear that he had understood the degree of their fears, despite Cadell's euphemistic phrasing, and moreover, that he shared them:

My Dear Sir,--

Although we are come near to a point to which every man knows he must come yet I acknowledge [*sic*] I though[t] I might have put it off for two or three years for it is hard to lose ones power of working when you have perfect leisure for it. I do not view James Ballantynes objection...so much as an objection to the particular objects of his criticism which is merely fastidious as to my having failed to please him an anxious and favourable judge & certainly a very good one...

As to Cadell's particular argument of Latin and Greek names, these only proved the point. Had he not made low-sounding and despised names such as those of MacGregor and MacGruther more than acceptable? But his imitators had learned the knack of it now, while he, Scott, had lost the "power of interesting the country by surprizes and ought in justice to all parties to retire" while he had some credit left.¹⁴ Scott did not want to give up *Count Robert* altogether, but, as he mentioned in his letter to James of the same date, he wished to lay it aside and go abroad for a few months' diversion.¹⁵

Cadell, thinking he fully understood Scott's "excellent" answer, immediately sent it on to Ballantyne and plunged into the reading of the next set of proof-sheets of *Count Robert*.¹⁶ The printer's main task now was to persuade Scott that nothing was as yet lost, and that any thoughts as to whether Scott's powers were failing were out of the question. Ballantyne assured Scott that his criticisms were not in the least meant to point to flagging imagination, but rather to warn the author that the subject matter might prove unrewarding and the period too devoid of interest. Indeed, he stated that he was more than willing to bow to Scott's superior knowledge and that since he, Ballantyne, did not even know what the subject was, it was surely much too early to make any far-reaching decisions such as stopping the experiment.¹⁷

Next day, 10 December, Ballantyne called on Cadell. They "had a long crack" about these matters, the result of which was two letters from Cadell to Scott; the first being written the same day. Cadell urged strongly for the continuation of the work on the novel and against a longer journey to the Continent; he also suggested a personal talk between Scott, Ballantyne, and himself for the following weekend. The second letter followed three days later; the need to continue the novel in hand being once again brought forward. Cadell pointed out that, after all, the sheets Ballantyne had criticized formed "but a dawning of the work;" that Ballantyne might be

wrong in his criticisms, especially since Scott was the only person who knew how the further story was to unfold; and that it would be best, for the present, to plan on writing at least half a volume, have Ballantyne set it in type, and only then have Ballantyne pronounce his opinion.¹⁸

Whatever the critics had hoped to effect with their letters, Scott this time proved more difficult than expected. Ballantyne's letter of the 9th had not had the desired soothing effect, but had rather affirmed Sir Walter's doubts about himself. In his answer to James of the 11th, the tone of resignation had grown even stronger than in his former letter. Scott had always regarded Ballantyne as "a fair & favourable specimen of the capricious public" and "a very good omen of their opinion." Now this opinion was, far more fundamentally than Ballantyne cared to admit, in opposition to Scott's latest efforts. Scott realized full well that to put the blame for the dull beginning of the novel on the subject was to put the saddle on the wrong horse. As for the consequences of his better judgement:

The only question seems to be whether to leave the plough in the furrow or finish the job and I incline for the first. It will be better than to convince all the world of our own truth which it is as wise to keep to ourselves.¹⁹

Cadell received his answer two days later in the evening just after he had written his aforementioned second letter to Scott. The tone was that of Scott's letter to James, who again was brought forward as a competent and sincere judge against whose opinion Scott would not strive. There were strong hints at Sir Walter's awareness that his illness would not allow him to write as well as he used to. Above all, Scott makes mention of his imitators who, in his opinion, even if inferior had shown the public the true value of compositions such as the projected *Count Robert* "by showing at what a cheap rate an imitation...can be constructed." In short, Scott's self-confidence was so severely shattered that he wanted to give up *Count Robert*, and even went so far as to suggest it might be better to start on another novel with an altogether different subject. Nevertheless, Sir Walter agreed to see Cadell and Ballantyne at Abbotsford the following Saturday, 18 December, in the hope that a personal talk about these matters could help to clear up misunderstandings.²⁰ Cadell's reaction to this letter was one of shock and grief. He started on his reply the same night, repeating at length his views on the matter, now suggesting that the whole manuscript should be completed before any of

Ballantyne's criticisms be taken into consideration. To give up now, he warns Scott, would certainly damage the sales of the *Magnum Opus*. It needed a "noble finish":

I do most pointedly say that if Count Robert is not popular--if it is not received with more applause than any of its precursors up to the Tales of the Crusaders--it will injure the Magnum, and this injury will be done to 45 preceding volumes---...²¹

The tone of this letter was that of business dealings, little suited to the ill author's mind. The writer sensed this and hesitated to post it. The following day, however, he met Ballantyne who had just received a very cheering note from Scott in which Sir Walter stated that he had overcome the fright into which he had been thrown by the adverse criticisms; that he would continue writing; and, in the event of Ballantyne being better pleased with the sheets to follow, that one could always "cut down the first proofs of County Paris [*sic*] or cancel them entirely & try a new departure." There were, furthermore, hints of other works to be taken up and quite a number of things to be discussed. All this, Scott maintained, could most conveniently be settled in the meeting at Abbotsford the coming Saturday.²² Cadell was delighted. Nevertheless, he thought that his anxious "lucubrations" of the previous night should not be lost, and he sent them off with a postscript manifesting his relief and hope that his considerations would be taken for what they were meant to be: expressions of his "confidential candour" in dealing with Scott. The publisher certainly was not going to miss this chance of putting himself in a good light and, at the same time, of reminding the author of the "dire" financial risks at stake should Scott flinch again from his proposals.²³

Cadell's "Notebook" serves as the source for information about the events of the first meeting since Scott's "fright."²⁴ As the publisher sat down on Saturday night to record the sayings and doings of the day, his first recollection was of the feeling of anxiety with which he and Ballantyne had come to Abbotsford in the early afternoon; a feeling caused by the correspondence on *Count Robert* and "the general gloom apparent in Sir Walters letters about himself." During a walk through the shrubbery Scott had broached the subject and had startled his visitors with yet another change of mind. He had decided to lay aside *Count Robert* after all and had been wondering how the money advanced for the new work could be disposed of. Ballantyne had argued strongly against this new

decision but Scott had countered with the various difficulties of the subject matter of the novel, not the least of them being that there was absolutely nothing new in it; nothing that had not already been taken up by others and that "in fact there was no place to put his foot upon." Cadell had himself then brought up various business reasons for the continuation of the work. Scott's response had been to plead his inability to read his own handwriting, but the proposal of an amanuensis promised to provide a solution to this problem. The outcome of the day's discussion had, in the end, been that Scott was willing to go on, with one of the main reasons for his doing so being Cadell's weighty argument that to close the series of the *Magnum Opus* edition of the Waverley Novels with Volume 47 (a leave-taking volume after *Anne of Geierstein*) "would sound ill," and that "the object would be to close with 48 or 50 volumes." Scott had liked the plan for 50 volumes and had proposed to write *Count Robert* in three volumes "and the fourth a dialogue or leave taking." As for the story of the novel, Scott had given his guests a rough outline of it after dinner. This day, then, had closed on a much happier note than could have been, or indeed had been, expected by any of the three men. Scott had been put in good spirits and his mind had been eased considerably.

Sunday saw Scott still more self-confident and cheerful. He boastfully stated "that he was not afraid of the public on any subject." However, when the cautious publisher asked him whether he had the story of the novel already blocked out in writing, which would have helped them get a better view of what Scott proposed, he was disappointed and had to be satisfied with the verbal outline of the previous evening. Scott maintained that he had it "all in memory" and that he, anyway, "always found a character to come out much more at length than he had originally sketched him in his mind."

The "Notebook" makes it clear that neither Cadell nor Ballantyne had any confidence in this boastful attitude of the author. The printer even went so far as to state openly that he did not think Scott would ever finish *Count Robert*. Scott's frequent allusions to his attacks of paralysis, his stammering, and his inability to write legibly seemed to point all too clearly to the probability of Ballantyne's assertion. Despite Sir Walter's contention that he would continue the novel the visitors left Abbotsford on Monday morning even less cheerful than on their arrival; the optimism of Saturday evening totally withered: "...we were both gloomy, gloomy, gloomy, & I fear the Great man is going to droop I trust [?] we may be both wrong."

Having at last come to a decision, though, Scott was not the man to hesitate putting it into practice. In his *Journal* entry

of 21 December he reminded himself of his new resolution and set to work.²⁵ Only three days later the first letter of praise arrived from Ballantyne.²⁶ Another three days and Cadell followed suit with the reassuring news that Ballantyne was confident and "Count Robert was looking as gay as possible."²⁷ Scott, however, was not that easily hoodwinked, despite Ballantyne's protestations of sincerity, and noted: "J. B. send[s] me praises of the work I am busy with. But I suspect a little supercherie though he protests not."²⁸

Nevertheless, Scott had started working on the novel again, if not without interruptions by other undertakings such as the notes to the *Magnum* edition. Cadell, for his part, had picked up the first proof-sheets of *Count Robert* again, revised sheet A for the third time and sheet B for the first on 28 December. Moreover, he did not forget that Scott needed further encouragement to be persuaded that his illness had done and was doing no damage to the work. In a long letter to Scott he proposed a second series of the *Tales of a Grandfather* which could be published for Christmas 1831.²⁹ Sir Walter, never averse to new undertakings, readily consented. He would plan to start on the second series at the end of the holidays but would first see how well *Count Robert* went after 6 January.³⁰

On 11 January, we find Scott writing in his *Journal* that he had completed three pages of manuscript in the morning and found it difficult to proceed in the evening because of "drowsiness and pain in [his] ha[n]ds." His old friend and amanuensis, Laidlaw, had after dinner offered to take his dictation and they had made three or four pages progress, "worth perhaps double the number of print."³¹ (Laidlaw had first come to Sir Walter's aid when Scott had been unable to write during the composition of the *Bride of Lammermoor* in 1819.) Having his help eased Scott's mind considerably, the more so as he could dictate to him while sitting for the sculptor Macdonald. Working in this way for about five hours a day, things went "bob-bishly enough."³² On the 20th the first volume was nearly finished; Ballantyne is reported to be in "extacies" about the resulting clear copy, and Scott began to pick up hope again that the "stammer" he had noticed in his own writing had not been due to his brain having been impaired by his last stroke in November, but more probably by his fantasy producing ideas faster than his hand could put them to paper.³³ Dictation to Laidlaw went on until 29 January but by this time the previous burst of energy had dwindled to a crawl:

It does not work clear, I do [not] know why.
The plot is nevertheless a good plot and full
of expectation. But there is a cloud over me
I think and interruptions are frequent.³⁴

In spite of the snowy weather, Scott went to Edinburgh on 31 January to consult his doctors and to settle his will. Snowstorms kept him in town for ten days and he sorely felt the need of Laidlaw's assistance as, once again, his pen stammered egregiously and he wrote "horridly incorrcoect."³⁵

Nevertheless, much work was done while Scott was held captive by the weather in Cadell's home in Atholl Crescent. Cadell invited the painter Will Allan who had recently been to Constantinople, to talk to Scott about his impressions of the town, the people, and their manners, and to show him the sketches he had done there. Although Cadell meant well and only wanted to help Scott with accurate descriptions, he found that he had overtaxed Sir Walter's patience: "...notwithstanding the subject Sir Walter gave many hearty yawns and Allan said to me next day that he was afraid he had bored him."³⁶ Two days later Ballantyne sent for a motto to the fifth chapter of *Count Robert* which was instantly composed, put in proof, corrected, and supplied with its fictive source "Deluge a Poem."³⁷

Even though everything seemed to proceed well enough from Cadell's viewpoint, with Scott being obviously in much better health than in December when the publisher had last visited him, the author must often, behind the scenes, have despaired over the way his hand had no control over his words. Scott was glad enough to be back in Abbotsford on the 9th and to start working with Laidlaw again the following morning.³⁸

In little more than a week the novel moved on into a quarter of the second volume, and the last proof-pages of the first volume were corrected and sent back to Ballantyne. Scott seems now quite his usual self when we find him writing:

Is it good or not? I cannot say. I think it
betterns as it goes on and so far so good.
I am certain I have written worse abomination,...³⁹

Even his nonchalant attitude towards his way of composition has assumed some of the old tone:

The work is half done. If any asks what time I
take to think on the composition I might say in
one point of view it was seldom five minutes out
of my head the whole day. In another light it
was never the serious subject of consideration
at all for it never occupied my thoughts entirely
for five minutes together except when I was dic-
tating to Mr. Laidlaw.⁴⁰

Not even from his two critics was adverse opinion to be heard. On the contrary, Scott received praising letters from

Cadell complimenting him:

Count Robert seems to get on most gallantly it is full of the most gorgeous description and is most interesting--I am in great hopes from the present appearance of the story and the personages.⁴¹

Scott kept up a steady pace of five to six hours' work daily with Laidlaw (except on weekends). By the middle of March the second volume was finished; about 20 pages of the third were written; and Sir Walter hoped to have done with the Count by the beginning of April.⁴² This, though, proved to be too optimistic. By 6 April little more than half of the last volume of *Count Robert* had been dictated to Laidlaw and, what was more, Scott felt that the story was flagging, and that it wanted more action. However, he feared that he should "want the stuff to fill it," and although there was always the possibility of eking it out with some ingenious padding, he would "not willingly bombast it with things inappropriate." Maybe a little rest was advisable.⁴³ William Laidlaw had for some time felt this was necessary; noticing to his deep concern and pity as he took dictation hour for hour, how Scott's mind was daily losing more of its energy, how often he fell into a kind of semi-consciousness, how he sat bewildered and then only by tremendous willpower roused himself again.⁴⁴

New trouble, however, was afoot. For a fortnight Ballantyne and Cadell had been reading the proof-sheets with increasing anxiety. The story had by then advanced to the complicated intrigues through which the Caesar, Emperor Alexius' son-in-law, hopes with the aid of a traitorous section of the bodyguard to overthrow his father-in-law's followers. The Emperor has by this time revenged himself for the insults offered him by Count Robert and his wife Brenhilda by holding both separately captive. The Caesar has determined to make a public gathering in the arena the occasion for his attempt to seize power, and he has challenged Count Robert, who he knows cannot meet him, to fight with him in single combat. Brenhilda, to whom the Caesar has been making advances, has, for her part, challenged him in order to achieve liberty for herself and her husband. Count Robert, however, has in the meantime been freed by the Varangian Hereward in whose rooms he is hidden. In chapter XII of the second volume [proof-pages 283 ff.] the old dame Vexhalia appears in Hereward's rooms to inform the Count that his wife is apparently pregnant and consequently will not be able to fight. The Caesar has already, on learning this, had the Countess transferred to the palace and has ordered Vexhalia, a skilled midwife, to attend her.⁴⁵ The following

plots and counterplots, in which this "condition" of the Countess is made one of the turning points of the action, bring Vexhalia and her husband, an old Anglo-Saxon officer, very much into the story.

Both Cadell¹ and Ballantyne had, for some time already, considered this strand in the narrative to be highly offensive and against the usual delicacy and decorum of Scott's novels, and had decided to urge Sir Walter to a change. Neither of them had, however, had the courage to approach the author on this subject, especially since Scott's reaction to their criticisms of the previous December was still fresh in their memories. But time was working against them even though the fresh pages daily coming under their scrutiny till then had shown only few direct signs of the Countess's pregnancy, and all related matters had as yet been relegated to a less prominent position in the narrative. Eventually though, the discussion could no longer be postponed. Cadell and Ballantyne, on being invited to Abbotsford for the weekend of 9-10 April to talk over business matters, decided to take this opportunity to voice their opinions. Cadell reports the events of the Saturday afternoon:

About this time James Ballantyne asked if I had spoken about Count Robert and Brenhilda, Ballantyne looked surprised when I said No--and entered upon the point, adverting to Brenhilda being enceinte, and that he and I were afraid of the effect of the incident. Sir Walter did not appear to like this very well, and said he had thought well of it, and he did not see how it could be changed this threw Ballantyne and I somewhat aback I said little, having the wish now as heretofore to let Ballantyne bear the brunt of these critical discussions, the issue was that the conversation was postponed till the evening.⁴⁶

The evening's discussion did not prove successful for the two sensitive critics, although Ballantyne had, for reference purposes, brought a particularly offending sheet with him in order to show the indecencies.⁴⁷ Scott was adamant that he was not going to take out "the incident" and only repeated his purpose to put more action into the rest of the last volume which "he thought he would conclude with a battle where the celebrated Greek fire might be brought into play."⁴⁸

Sir Walter obviously did not waste much thought on these new criticisms. Indeed, there is not mention at all of them in his *Journal* which only reports his concern that what he is writing may be too dull. Even Laidlaw seemed to think so, but there

was "too much space to fill and a want of the usual inspiration."⁴⁹

Only a few days before Scott had toyed with the idea of re-writing about a third of the last volume to make it more exciting, but after the weekend he could only see one way out: "...if it prove dull why dull it must be."⁵⁰ So on he plodded, and he had only another 100 pages to write when, the following weekend, he had another stroke which nearly killed him.⁵¹ Nevertheless, he recovered surprisingly quickly. Within a few days he had taken up dictating again and a week later reported in his diary that *Count Robert* was progressing at the rate of half a dozen leaves per day.⁵² Cadell, however, was far from happy about Scott paying so little attention to his precarious state of health, and wrote solicitously: "Above all things, do not overdo, do not strain or exhaust yourself--take recreation--have amusement--but do not work hard." The narrative had by that time been brought up to the last few chapters and Scott was certain it would soon be completed if he again started to "pull the oars in earnest," but they agreed that there was no need to push on so hard since, with a general election coming on, the season for publishing the new novel was rather unfavourable.⁵³ Thus Sir Walter worked on steadily but, "as the transatlantic say, at a very slow pace indeed."⁵⁴

New trouble, pertinent to their old criticisms of Countess Brenhilda's pregnancy, was brewing for the printer and publisher: Scott had mentioned in previous discussions that he would like to finish the novel with a stirring combat scene and no doubt his critics had agreed heartily to this, but little had they dreamed what was in store for them. Scott had resolved on a complex picture of contrast between the degenerate Byzantine society of the East and the ascending, rather barbarian, but robust society of the Franks of Western Europe. This contrast was to be worked out not only in terms of opposing the male but also the female characters since the latter were figures in which the peculiarities of the different systems of values and manners could be most strikingly shown:

One remarkable characteristic of the fair sex was equally contrasted with the manners of the Greek females, and those accounted decorous among the people of the East. The western ladies, in contradiction to the doctrines of Christianity, and of Nature herself, were remarkable for the slight occasion on which, transgressing the dictates of Homer, they proudly refused to leave the business of war to men, or, in other words, they mingled, without either fear or scruple in

combats, which were the chief and constant employment of their husbands and lovers; while in other countries the female sex was contented with awarding the prize of valour, if in any respect they mixed in the field.⁵⁵

The climax in this thematic contrast was to be a contest between Anna Comnena, the Greek Emperor's daughter, and Countess Brenhilda, followed by a combat between Count Robert and Hereward. Scott had given much attention to working up the narrative strand of the contrasted women, stressing the valour of the one and the conceited refinement of the other as well as hinting at the peculiar but "natural" condition of the former and the indomitable pride of the latter which would enable her, in lieu of her cowardly husband the Caesar, to meet the warlike Countess in combat.

Scott began chapter IX on page 166 of the third volume and opened the female contest with a battle of wits in which Princess Comnena easily outdistances the Countess. In the second stage of the contest, the battle takes on a physical form--single combat with swords. The scene closes with the Princess, though hard pressed and virtually overcome, once again appearing as victrix--but this time due only to Brenhilda's sudden collapse. Only after this, and Vexhalia's explanation of the cause of this unexpected defeat, does Count Robert step forward and demand the Caesar to appear in the lists against him. Then, as the Caesar does not come forward, Hereward takes up the challenge on his behalf and battles with the Count. This combat, however, is between two Westerners and thus devoid of the basic contrastive symbolism of the whole.⁵⁶

On Friday, 6 May, the proof-sheets of volume III, chapter IX, came off the press. Ballantyne took them to Cadell immediately. Both agreed that Brenhilda's part would have to be deleted and they resolved, after a long conference, to write Sir Walter separately.⁵⁷ Only Cadell's letter seems to have survived. Its sentiments are clear enough:

Dear Sir,--

Mr Ballantyne has made an appeal to me to-day as to the incident near to the conclusion of *Count Robert* and I cannot but say that I agree with him in every particular. I beg and entreat of you to reconsider what Mr Ballantyne points at; when he and I were at Abbotsford last you did not yield to the views we then and now entertain as to Brenhilda when she first appears likely to become a mother.

But I confess the combat and what follows have cast a gloom over me which I cannot get rid of... The composition appears to my poor wits to be excellent, better you never wrote but it is the incident that is damning. I would be the last person living to put you to any unnecessary trouble, but trouble...is nothing compared to the pain of having committed a great fault, or I might call it a great blot, and not be told of it. But the book is so near a close that the trouble would be but slight, very slight. All, nearly, up to the Combat might do, but I look to certain shipwreck if *it* remains as it is now.

This was strong stuff; the more so as Cadell did not fail to bring his heaviest cannon to bear against the author who was working to clear himself from debts:

I do most earnestly place before you the consequences of a break down with *Count Robert*--that it will injure all your work to the extent of many thousand pounds cannot be for a moment doubted...⁵⁸

Scott's *Journal* shows how hard this hit him; especially as he could see that the changes called for were not just a matter of some slight amendment, but involved rewriting at least the whole of the last volume. He feared, however, that the opinion of these two "critical persons" might "coincide with that of the public; at least it [was] not very different from [his] own." The only way he could see, at that moment, of following their advice was: "I will right and left on those unlucky proof sheets and alter at least what I cannot mend."⁵⁹ But this was easier said than done. Scott, sick of heart, rallied himself and tried to think of possible solutions but none occurred to him: "Did I know how to begin I would begin this very day although I knew I should sink at the end."⁶⁰ His answer to Cadell's letter reflects this despairing mood and shows the great author reduced to meek compliance with the publisher's wishes:

Dear Sir,--

I have thought very much on the conclusion of Robert of Paris and no mode of altering it has occurred yet. It is no doubt very possible to make different which I will see about doing but I have little hope of making it better.⁶¹

Scott, however, gave vent to his far from meek indignation in a letter to Ballantyne; he being, as Cadell had not forgotten to point out, the originator of this latest trouble. The letter begins with a cold "Dear Sir" instead of the usual "Dear James." Sir Walter immediately states that he entirely disagrees with Ballantyne's criticism and considers it mere mawkishness since "our old friend Addison one of the most scrupulous of writers you would find" had settled "the debate between the sexes upon the same principle" as he had adopted. Scott also states, though, that since Cadell agrees with Ballantyne's opinion he cannot but try to rewrite the third volume.⁶²

Three days later Scott gave up trying, resolving to "lay by Robert of Paris" and to take it up when he felt he could work again. The permanent worrying about it was making his head swim.⁶³ The publisher readily agreed to his proposal to go on in the meantime with the French *Tales of a Grandfather*, especially since *Count Robert* would do better in October or November than during the summer, and light work would ease Scott's mind.⁶⁴

Scott, however, sensed that he was fighting against time and admitted to Lockhart and Laidlaw in private that he did not rate his chances of recovery as being very high. Nevertheless, he still wanted to finish *Count Robert*; write another "little story about the Castle Dangerous" which had long been in his head; and, of course, bring to a close the notes for the *Magnum Opus*.⁶⁵ Cadell was also of Scott's opinion, not even expecting him to be able to finish the novel on hand, and he agreed with Lockhart that Sir Walter should be persuaded not to take on any more work; that "it would be better if he were to write no more Novels."⁶⁶

Four weeks later, though, the "little story" alluded to had already grown, according to Scott's calculations, into a full volume with another planned for this "tale of arms love antiquities battle & so forth called Castle Dangerous."⁶⁷ When Cadell came to Abbotsford on 6 July, he found that the author could show him 113 pages of manuscript. Scott's estimation, however, proved to have been overoptimistic. On seeing Laidlaw's rather large handwriting Cadell judged that the sheets would just make up to about 120 pages in print. Despite this seeming drawback the publisher immediately started his business calculations and agreed that the new tale should be brought out before *Count Robert*.⁶⁸ Scott worked on the new book at full pressure and on 13 July was able to show Lockhart the first proof-sheets. Seven weeks later everything but the work on the final proofs was completed.⁶⁹

Although *Count Robert* had made no progress at all during these weeks, Scott had begun to hope that he could tackle it

shortly and was confident that the changes could be quickly effected and the novel ready for publication within a month of the completion of *Castle Dangerous*. Sir Walter had reassured Cadell that he had understood what the publisher wanted done in the way of alterations, even if he had no confidence that they would improve the book. Indeed, he suspected rather the opposite: "I fear," he said, "it will always be like mended china."⁷⁰ The publisher, in the meantime, had sought and found another ally in his criticism, one able to exert a stronger influence on Scott than Ballantyne and he. Cadell's choice had fallen on John Gibson Lockhart with whom he had "had a long confab about Sir Walters Count Robert" in early June and who, he found, agreed with him "on every point."⁷¹

With *Castle Dangerous* as good as finished by the end of August, Scott plucked up courage and went over the proof-sheets of *Count Robert* again in an attempt to comply with Cadell's wishes. On Friday, 2 September, the publisher received a packet of proofs accompanied by the author's note saying that he had altered the novel as best he could.⁷² As far as can be judged from the extant proof-sheets these alterations had, in fact, only consisted of the cancellation of a few allusions to Brenhilda's pregnancy and to Vexhalia's profession in volume II and the first chapters of volume III. The crucial chapter IX, however, had remained virtually unchanged with the only substantial correction (in Laidlaw's handwriting) being an account of Countess Brenhilda's speedy recovery from her swoon and the assurance that nothing serious had happened to her.⁷³ How Scott could have thought these alterations would satisfy Cadell's wishes is far from clear and must, probably, be attributed to his recurring moments of mental confusion. Laidlaw had already one month previously warned the publisher of these attacks.⁷⁴ Indeed, Cadell was to be witness to one of them on a visit to Abbotsford on 5 September: on being told by Cadell that there were still a few pages to write in order to complete *Count Robert*, Scott was quite willing to discuss the matter with him. Unfortunately, as soon became clear, Sir Walter was talking about *Castle Dangerous* and not *Count Robert*. Later that day he showed Cadell a manuscript entitled "Continuation of Count Robert of Paris" which, however, proved to be not the completion or continuation of this novel but of *Castle Dangerous*. Thus it became all too obvious to the publisher that Scott's "ideas were confused and that he was not sensible of what he said..." and he left Abbotsford with little hope.⁷⁵

What hope Cadell had was certainly further diminished when, on Wednesday, 7 September, he sat down to read what Scott had in fact done to better the novel. On seeing the disappointing results, the only remedy which occurred to him was to mark the

proof-pages of *Count Robert* at the places where he wanted allusions to Brenhilda's pregnancy and Vexhalia's profession removed. In addition, he drew up a list of the offending passages in the hope that this would make it easier for the author to find them.⁷⁶ Cadell furthermore made the suggestion that if Sir Walter was not willing to cancel the fight between Brenhilda and Anna Commena altogether, and remained insistant that Anna win, he might still be willing to consider the possible solution of "some other reason...for Brenhilda not being able to fight."⁷⁷

Once again, Scott meekly attempted to comply with this critic's wishes. He began working on the corrections and the writing of the last few pages necessary to bring *Count Robert* to the required length.⁷⁸ He had deleted nearly all the passages listed by Cadell when, on reaching the ninth chapter of the last volume, he must have been struck by the fact that the only way out of his difficulties there would be to cancel the combat between Brenhilda and the Princess altogether. This in turn, however, also brought difficulties with it, as it would necessitate a recasting of the earlier volumes in order to bring back even a semblence of the symbolic balance of the book as a whole. As Sir Walter was no longer able or willing to do this, he decided to let it stand as it was and disregard his pusillanimous critics. Consequently, he set about invalidating his former cancellations by the note "stet." Having done this Scott wrote two short concluding chapters, X and XI. The main feature of these chapters is the attempt to vindicate his narrative from charges of critics such as Ballantyne and Cadell by calling the facts of history to his aid. In a postscript following these chapters the author takes his farewell from his readers--*Castle Dangerous* had already been completed--excusing his production with his illness; his extravagance of going back to the Byzantine Empire, with his search for novelty; and his contrasting figures Brenhilda and Commena, with the interests of historical accuracy and the need for strong symbolic contrast, referring those critics in doubt as to the morality or decency of the incidents to Addison as a precedent.⁷⁹ Sir Walter sent all this to Edinburgh on 13 September, enclosing three notes to Cadell stating that he would not make cuts or corrections with which he was not in agreement and that the novel, such as it was, would have to take its chances.⁸⁰

Cadell promptly acknowledged receipt of the papers but refrained from any open comment apart from the practical piece of advice not to add another sheet of 24 pages to the preceding volume at the cost of volume III, as Scott had proposed in his third note, but rather to lengthen the final volume with these pages. In his diary, however, he remarked drily that he

had received the packet "with changes on Count Robert not at all to [his] mind."⁸¹ This seemingly ready compliance with his decision made Scott somewhat suspicious and, on 14 September, he sent Cadell a further note repeating his intention not to make any further changes; even though he did not think the story had "so good a chance as its neighbours," he found it impossible to make it any better.⁸² Sir Walter hoped by this note to forestall Cadell's calling new allies to his aid to further worry him. The additional material was put into proof without further comment on the part of Scott's critics and was, at least partly, proofread by Ballantyne.⁸³

On 16 September Cadell had to go to Abbotsford to settle some financial matters before the author's departure for the Mediterranean. He decided to stop off on the way at Chiefswood to see his old ally Lockhart and to talk over the latest developments with him. No decision was reached as to their future tactics. Lockhart did, however, make the suggestion that if Sir Walter would write one of his Jedediah Cleishbotham introductions they could, since *Castle Dangerous* was rather short, put the two books together and publish them under the title of *Tales of My Landlord*. When Cadell mentioned this, Scott had no objections but did not, just then, feel "in the vein for such an Introduction."⁸⁴ A week later Cadell was again at Abbotsford, this time to make final arrangements before Scott's departure for London on Friday, 23 September. Cadell once more brought up the suggestion of a Jedediah introduction as a means of bringing the joint publication of *Count Robert* and *Castle Dangerous* to the usual number of pages required for four volumes. On Cadell's insistence that this introduction could not successfully be replaced by anything else such as, for instance, the fictive *Letters of the 17th Century*, Sir Walter eventually gave in and promised to write the introduction while in London and before leaving for the Mediterranean.

Of much more moment to the future of the book than this agreement between author and publisher was "a short confab" between the publisher and Lockhart which took place the same morning. It was decided that once the author was safely out of the way they would go over his last two novels again and correct them according to their own lights. Lockhart was to start the rewriting as soon as Scott, to be his guest in London, had left for Portsmouth.⁸⁵

Scott, awaiting word to board the *Barham* for his long journey to the Mediterranean, wrote and revised the "Jedediah Introduction" as promised.⁸⁶ In the meantime, Cadell kept up contact with Lockhart and, as previously arranged, prepared to have a parcel made up of *Count Robert* and *Castle Dangerous* to send to Lockhart the moment he had notice that Scott had left

London. The very day that Scott heard his ship would sail on 24 October, Lockhart sent a note with the news to the publisher. He received the parcel from Edinburgh a few days later.⁸⁷

The *Barham* was held up in Portsmouth for a while by adverse winds but when she finally left on 29 October, Lockhart had already done the major part of his "revisions," and on Friday, 4 November, Cadell received the proof-sheets of *Count Robert* "with...emendations."⁸⁸ The publisher's diary for the following two weeks reveals the feverish activities necessary to have the novel ready for publication on 1 December. As Lockhart's copy was to be given to the printer as soon as possible, Cadell started revising the reworked proof-sheets the following evening.⁸⁹ Two days later Lockhart's version of *Castle Dangerous* arrived. By 10 November Cadell had read it but professed to be "sorely troubled with the conclusion of it."⁹⁰ Another two days passed and Cadell had "Lockharts Introduction to Count Robert & C. Dangerous," i.e., the re-written Jedediah introduction.⁹¹ Finally, on Saturday the 19th, the last proofs of the *Tales of My Landlord, Fourth Series*, consisting of *Count Robert of Paris* in 2 1/2 volumes and *Castle Dangerous* in 1 1/2 volumes, were "dispatched."⁹² On 1 December, exactly one year after Cadell had sent the first proof-sheets of the new novel *Count Robert* to Sir Walter for revisions, the last *Tales* came out as planned by his "critics."

The author had confessed in his *Journal* that he had written "two Waverly things but not well and what is worse past mending."⁹³ The mending now had been done thoroughly; first by Lockhart and then by Cadell. The proof-sheets, when compared with the first edition, show three stages of revision of *Count Robert of Paris*. The supplementary texts, as well as the text of the novel itself, were eventually cut by nearly half a volume and substantially re-written in about another half volume. More than five pages are missing from Scott's "Jedediah Introduction," and the remaining text was so thoroughly revised that it cannot any more be called Scott's. Sir Walter's "Postscript of the Author of Waverley" was deleted in its entirety, as were two chapters in the third volume presenting Emperor Alexius's attempts to secure the support of the persecuted Manicheans without losing that of the Orthodox. Further substantial cuts were made in the last three chapters of volume II and the notorious chapter IX of volume III. Extensive revisions are moreover to be found in the first two chapters of the novel, chapters IX and X of volume II, and the concluding chapter of the novel.⁹⁴ Thus, only fractions of the original text were suffered to survive into the first edition.

The author of the original version of the book, however much he may have suspected Cadell's plans to interfere while

he was away, was kept totally in ignorance of these doings. Cadell and Lockhart certainly sent him the anxiously awaited accounts of the novel's favourable reception, but there is no hint in their letters to Sir Walter of their "improvements" to *Count Robert*. Several weeks after the publication of the book Scott saw a copy of the pirated edition by the Paris publisher Calignani and he sent Lockhart a list of errata.⁹⁵ It is, however, greatly to be doubted that this list was the product of rereading the complete novel; had Scott done so he could not have avoided, even in his cloudy state of mind, finding the considerable changes from his original in the second half of the novel. Neither his *Journal* (its last entry is for 15 April, 1832), nor his letters, nor the reports of his conversations make the slightest mention of it. It was, in any case, too late for him to do anything even if he had wanted to; his time was running out fast. In the middle of May, Scott decided it was high time for the trip home--"after all the best place to live in and certainly the best to die in."⁹⁶ When he reached Abbotsford some two months later, it was indeed only to die there.

University of Bonn

NOTES

¹ John Gibson Lockhart to Sir Walter Scott, 5 December 1831; National Library of Scotland [NLS] MS 5317, fol. 90. Lockhart is, of course, touching up the picture. Only nine "gazettes" printed more than mere announcements of the *Tales*. Lockhart could, at this time, have known only five of these, which were indeed favourable to the new novels. Cf. J. C. Corson, *A Bibliography of Sir Walter Scott* (London, 1943), p. 275.

² *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (Edinburgh, 1837-8), VII, 310. Lockhart softened the expression in parentheses in later editions to: "(for I may not return...)," which indeed he never did. The day of publication of the *Tales of My Landlord, Fourth Series*, as far as can be ascertained from the Edinburgh newspaper *The Scotsman*, was 1 December 1831.

³ *Sir Walter Scott: The Great Unknown* (London, 1971), p. 1207. Cf. likewise Prof. Sultana's dismissal of the case: "Lockhart remained in London to look over *The Quarterly Review* and to see the proofs of *Count Robert of Paris* and *Castle Dangerous*, to which he had made substantial cuts and corrections

on receiving them from Cadell." *The Siege of Malta Rediscovered* (Edinburgh, 1977), p. 25.

⁴ Scott saw the pirated edition by the Paris publisher, Calignani, in Italy (*cf.* Sultana, p. 81) but it is highly unlikely that he ever reread the novel *in toto*.

⁵ NLS MS 3777, fol. 1; [19 November 1831].

⁶ A critical edition of the novel is being prepared by D. Pohl and the author of this essay.

⁷ NLS MS Acc 6080.

⁸ NLS MS Acc 5188, fol. 73^r. In a letter of 31 August Cadell had pressed Scott "to fix on the title of the New Novel" so that he might insert it in his prospectus of forthcoming books (NLS MS 3919, fol. 316^v).

⁹ NLS MS 1752, fol. 130; Scott to Cadell, 7 October 1830.

¹⁰ NLS MS 5188, Cadell's "Diary," 1 December 1830; "First Sheet of Count Robert of Paris gone to Sir Walter in proof to day."

¹¹ Cadell records this in his "Diary," 4 December 1830.

¹² *Ibid.*, "I do not think it bad but the names are oddish & should be changed..."

¹³ For the full letter (NLS MS 3915, fol. 142) refer to W. Partington, *Private Letter-Books of Sir Walter Scott* (London, 1930), pp. 365-6. See also H. J. C. Grierson *et al.* (ed.), *Letters of Sir Walter Scott* (London, 1932-37), xi, 431-2, fn.1.

¹⁴ *Letters* XI, 432, [8 December 1830]: Scott to Cadell. Cadell was at least insofar successful as the name Pleuxippus was changed.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 431-2, [8 December 1830]: Scott to Ballantyne.

¹⁶ Cadell's "Diary," 9 December 1830.

¹⁷ *Letters* XI, 435-6. Ballantyne here mentions his objections to 24 pages as "an enormous length for a single conversation, of no great interest perhaps, betwixt [NLS MS 869,

fol. 133 as against *Letters* "between"] Achilles and Hereward in the third Chapter."

¹⁸ Cadell's "Diary," 10 December 1830; NLS MS 3915, fols. 158-9, 10 December 1830: Cadell to Scott; *Ibid.*, fol. 168, 13 December 1830: Cadell to Scott.

¹⁹ *Letters* XI, 435, [11 December 1830]: Scott to Ballantyne.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 436-8, 12 December 1830: Scott to Cadell.

²¹ Cadell's "Diary," 13 and 14 December 1830; NLS MS 3915, fols. 168-174, 13 December 1830: Cadell to Scott.

²² *Letters* XI, 439-40, 14 December 1830: Scott to Ballantyne. The other works hinted at turned out to be an article on property tax. Publisher and printer devoted much time during this weekend to dissuade Scott from writing on this subject. They eventually succeeded.

²³ Cadell's "Diary," 15 December 1830; "Postscript" on NLS MS 3915, fols. 174-5; 15 December 1830: Cadell to Scott. Scott endorsed this letter: "Mr. Cadell 13 December The Bishops fist is in it vide Gil Blas."

²⁴ NLS MS Acc 5188, fols. 76^r-81^r, 18-20 December 1830; Cadell's "Diary," 18 December 1830.

²⁵ W. E. K. Anderson (ed.), *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott* (Oxford, 1972), p. 616: "It was agreed after long pros and con; it was settled to trie the tale once more and only bring it forward or not as it would be found to succeed." For the weeks preceding this weekend there are no entries in the *Journal*.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 618.

²⁷ *Letters* XI, 448 fn., 27 December 1830: Cadell to Scott.

²⁸ *Journal*, p. 618. Scott was quite right in his suspicion. Lockhart later records Cadell as commenting on Ballantyne's and his own positive attitude regarding the novel at this time: "'If we did wrong...we did it for the best: we felt that to have spoken out as fairly on this as we had done on the other subject [Scott's projected pamphlet on property tax], would have been to make ourselves the bearers of a death-warrant.'" (*Memoirs* VII, pp. 249-50).

²⁹ Cadell's "Diary," 27 and 28 December 1830; *Letters* XI, 448 fn., 27 December 1830: Cadell to Scott.

³⁰ *Letters* XI, 452, 30 December 1830: Scott to Cadell; *Journal*, p. 619, 29 December 1830.

³¹ *Journal*, 11 January 1831, p. 624.

³² *Ibid.*, 19 January 1831, p. 627.

³³ *Ibid.*, 20 January 1831, p. 628. On Saturday, 22 January, Scott had proceeded to 46 pages in manuscript. *Ibid.*, 22 January 1831.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 28 January 1831, p. 630. Next day Scott reports: "Much in the same way as yesterday rather feeling than making way." *Ibid.*, 29 January 1831.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 631, [8 February 1831]. The entry is dated 31 January 1831 but the contents make it clear that Scott wrote this the day before he returned to Abbotsford.

³⁶ Cadell's "Notebook," 5 February 1831, NLS MS Acc 5188, fol. 88^F.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, fols. 88^V-89^F; Cadell attached Scott's MS and the corrected proof-sheets to the pages of the "Notebook" (fols. 88b/c).

³⁸ *Journal*, p. 631, 10 February 1831.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 633-4, 19 February 1831. To Cadell he optimistically writes that he is working "like a tiger," and the publisher even thought it advisable to rein this zest for work: "...there is no call for your over-doing. Count Robert will do right well in April--then there is an occasional hour now and then to the Notes for the Magnum--or the next French Tales--but all with slaving in no way. We cannot have you long if you load yourself with work." *Letters* XI, 467 and fn.: Scott to Cadell, 12 February 1831; Cadell to Scott, 13 February 1831.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 635, 23-25 February 1831.

⁴¹ NLS MS 3916, fol. 214, 28 February 1831: Cadell to Scott.

⁴² *Journal*, p. 640, 16 and 17 March 1831. Scott found, however, that he had miscalculated the number of pages for the

second volume. Ballantyne drew his attention to this on 18 March 1831 stating that Scott's copy would only amount to 265 pages in print, the usual number being about 330 per volume. Scott remarked in his *Journal*: "...so 45 more pages must be furnished to run it out to pages 329. This is an awful cast back. So the gap is to be made up." *Journal*, p. 640, 18 March 1831. In fact, the first two chapters of volume III were contracted into one chapter and this was put at the end of volume II (as Chapter XIII); cf. NLS MS 3777.

43 *Journal*, p. 645, 5 and 6 April 1831.

44 *Memoirs* VII, pp. 234-5.

45 Cf. NLS MS 3777, fols. 182 ff.

46 Cadell's "Notebook," NLS MS Acc 5188, fol. 93^v, 9 April 1831.

47 *Ibid.*, fol. 94^r. This was probably the proof-sheet containing vol. II, pp. 283-7 with Vexhalia's explanations to the Count.

48 *Ibid.*, fol. 95^{r-v}, 10 April 1831.

49 *Journal*, pp. 647-8, 12 and 13 April 1831.

50 NLS MS 1752, fol. 261, 8 April 1831: Scott to Cadell; *Journal*, p. 648, 13 April 1831.

51 *Journal*, p. 649, 16-24 April 1831.

52 NLS MS 1752, fol. 272, 23 April 1831: Scott to Cadell; *Journal*, p. 650, 30 April 1831.

53 NLS MS 3917, fol. 272, 25 April 1831: Cadell to Scott; NLS MS 1752, fol. 277, 26 April 1831: Scott to Cadell. Ballantyne, of course, readily chimed in with the congratulations about Scott's recovery but angered Scott with an ill-timed joke about joining a Temperance Society. Cf. Johnson, *Great Unknown*, p. 1174.

54 *Journal*, p. 650, 2 May 1831. At this date Scott seems to have nearly finished *Count Robert* as he writes to Cadell: "Two or three days will finish Count Robert though not so well as I would wish." NLS MS 1752, fol. 283.

⁵⁵ Unpublished "Postscript" to *Count Robert of Paris*, NLS MS 3780, fol. 14^r. The MS, in Laidlaw's handwriting, is in NLS MS 876, fols. 44-54.

⁵⁶ Cf. NLS MS 3777, fols. 309 ff.

⁵⁷ Cadell's "Diary," 6 May 1831.

⁵⁸ Quoted from W. Partington, *The Private Letter-Books of Sir Walter Scott* (London, 1930), pp. 371 ff. Partington's version differs, as usual, from the MS, NLS MS 3918, fols. 25-26 in some accidentals. Cadell to Scott, 6 May 1831.

⁵⁹ *Journal*, pp. 652 ff., 6 and 7 May 1831.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 653, 8 May 1831.

⁶¹ NLS MS 1752, fol. 284, 8 May 1831: Scott to Cadell.

⁶² NLS MS 1752, fol. 286, 9 May 1831: Scott to Ballantyne. The letter was dictated, Scott only signed it. In the postscript to *Count Robert*, Scott justifies himself again with the same authority plus other precedents: "The author had not forgotten what the reader will probably remember, the ingenious allegory, namely, of the sexes, which exists in the Spectator [in fact the *Guardian* of September 4, 1713] and where the several nations, as they are pretended to be, of men and women, are finally reconciled, after several ingenious events, by the force of those passions to which both man and woman are naturally subject, and the contradiction of which must be, in a great measure, considered as a contradiction of the proper ends of their nature. This allegory itself, well known in its prose shape, exists also in poetry, and is, we believe, found in the earlier numbers of the Scottish Magazine. The version is extremely poetical, and must be familiar to many of my readers." NLS MS 3780, fol. 17^r.

⁶³ *Journal*, p. 654, 12 May 1831. Lockhart too, who came to Abbotsford on the 10th, advised Scott strongly to lay aside the novel and give himself a rest. Cf. *Memoirs* VII, 284.

⁶⁴ NLS MS 1752, fol. 288, 14 May 1831: Scott to Cadell; MS 3918, fol. 45, 16 May 1831: Cadell to Scott.

⁶⁵ *Memoirs* VII, 283. The subject of *Castle Dangerous* had first been mentioned in Scott's letter to Cadell of 12 December 1830, *Letters* XI, 438.

⁶⁶ Cadell's "Diary," 16 May 1831; "Notebook," fol. 98^v, 2 June 1831.

⁶⁷ NLS MS 1752, fol. 322, 3 July 1831: Scott to Cadell.

⁶⁸ Cadell's "Notebook," fol. 99^{r-v}, 6 July 1831. Scott at first wanted the book to be printed by Shortreed, not by Ballantyne with whom he had quarrelled again on political questions; but Cadell was anxious to keep Ballantyne as the sole printer for the novels and dissuaded Scott from this. Cf. Cadell's "Notebook," fol. 99^r, 6 July 1831. Johnson, *Great Unknown*, pp. 1184 and 1186, still reproduced the old "legend" as he did not have access to the "Notebook."

⁶⁹ NLS MS 1752, fol. 370, 7 September 1831: Scott to Cadell.

⁷⁰ NLS MS 1752, fol. 301, 26 May 1831: Scott to Cadell; *Ibid.*, fol. 322, 3 July 1831: Scott to Cadell; *Ibid.*, fol. 328, 15 July 1831: Scott to Cadell.

⁷¹ Cadell's "Notebook," fol. 98^v, 2 June 1831.

⁷² NLS MS 1752, fol. 364, 2 September 1831: Scott to Cadell; Cadell's "Diary," 2 September 1831.

⁷³ Cf. NLS MS 3777, fols. 182 ff., 225 ff., 310 ff., 326. There are quite a number of Scott's corrections on fols. 37-42 but these do not affect the Brenhilda-story but the combat between the Count and Hereward. None of these corrections were incorporated in the final text. The changes mentioned in the Brenhilda-story may perhaps be of a later date, i.e., after Cadell on his list of offending passages (NLS MS 900, fols. 42-3) had drawn Scott's attention to the fact that "so far as regards the *enceinte* state of *Brenhilda*, if this is changed she need not be left behind Count Robert [when he leaves for Palestine]."

⁷⁴ Cadell's "Notebook," fol. 110^r, 9 August 1831: "I had another short talk with Laidlaw, who told me that the morning after I came Sir Walter could not get on with Castle Dangerous his ideas get confused, & he has since then laid it aside..."

⁷⁵ Cadell's "Notebook," fols. 112^r-113^r, 5 September 1831.

⁷⁶ Cadell's "Diary," 7 and 9 September 1831; NLS MS 900, fols. 42-43. Cadell points especially to the proof-sheets of

volume III, pp. 217-22 which "contain the fight, and the exposé which it would be most important to have the story denuded of as well as the prior allusions to it, as far as regards the *enceinte* state of *Brenhilda*..."

⁷⁷ NLS MS 399, fol. 125, 9 September 1831: Cadell to Scott. Cadell moreover mentions another weak point in the conclusion of the novel: "It is a pity that Hereward & Count Robert fight at all. Hereward is almost lost in Vol III--I mention these points in consequence of their occurring on going over the book just now."

⁷⁸ NLS MS 1752, fol. 376, 11 September 1831: Scott to Cadell.

⁷⁹ Cf. NLS MS 3777, especially fols. 350 ff. and MS 3780, fols. 13-18; 19-24.

⁸⁰ NLS MS 1752, fol. 377, 12 September 1831 and 13 September 1831: Scott to Cadell. The third note seems to be lost.

⁸¹ NLS MS 3919, fol. 137, 13 September 1831: Cadell to Scott: "I have received all your notes, as well as Count Robert with additions..."; Cadell's "Diary," 13 September 1831.

⁸² NLS MS 1752, fol. 378, 14 September 1831: Scott to Cadell.

⁸³ The "Postscript," NLS MS 3780, fols. 13-18, shows Balantyne's marks.

⁸⁴ Cadell's "Notebook," fols. 116^r and 117^r, 16 September 1831.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, fols. 122^v-123^r.

⁸⁶ NLS MS 1752, fol. 399, 3 October 1831: Scott to Cadell; *Journal*, p. 665, 14 October 1831.

⁸⁷ Cadell's "Diary," 17, 18, and 24 October 1831.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 4 November 1831.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 5 November 1831.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 7 November 1831, 10 November 1831.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 12 November 1831.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 19 November 1831.

⁹³ *Journal*, p. 659 "Interval."

⁹⁴ Cf. K. Gamerschlag, *Die Korrektur der Waverley Novels: Textkritische Untersuchungen zu einer Autor-Korrektor-Beziehung* (Bonn, 1979), pp. 267-73.

⁹⁵ Cf. Sultana, p. 70. The list referred to does not seem to be extant any more.

⁹⁶ W. M. Parker, "Scott in Florence and Venice," *The Scotsman*, 10 March (1962), p. 7.