

1978

Setting as an Expression of Theme in Scott's Count Robert of Paris

Judith Miller Janssen

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



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

Recommended Citation

Janssen, Judith Miller (1978) "Setting as an Expression of Theme in Scott's Count Robert of Paris," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 13: Iss. 1.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol13/iss1/14>

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 digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

Judith Miller Janssen

Setting as an
Expression of Theme
in Scott's
Count Robert of Paris



John Ruskin, writing his autobiography in 1885, recalled seeing his father some fifty years earlier throwing down Sir Walter Scott's newly published *Count Robert of Paris* with an "intense expression of sorrow mixed with scorn"--a vivid emblem of much of the subsequent evaluation of this novel.¹ Scott himself, undermined by criticism from his printer and his publisher as well as by failing health, feared that he had "wrought, . . . but not well, and what is worse, past mending" in *Count Robert*,² a judgment in which even sympathetic critics have generally concurred.³ However, an objective examination of the novel will reveal that *Count Robert* is a complex examination of the problem of perceiving and evaluating correctly two diametrically opposed cultures--the Byzantine Empire and the feudal world of the eleventh-century Crusaders. This theme is made concrete through a use of symbolic settings; Scott's protagonist, Hereward the Anglo-Saxon, traverses a moral geography in which settings embody varied cultural values and in which reactions to settings reveal much about both individuals and their societies. This use of setting as a method of revealing the character of individuals and cultures merits serious and extended examination.

That Scott thought of the theme of conflicting cultures in terms of setting is suggested by his statement in the Introduction to *The Fortunes of Nigel* that

the most romantic region of every country is that where the mountains unite themselves with the plains or lowlands. For similar reasons, it may be in like manner said, that the most picturesque period of history is that when the ancient rough and wild manners of a barbarous age are just becoming innovated upon, and contrasted, by the illumination of increased or revived learning, and the instructions of renewed or reformed religion. The strong contrast produced by the opposition of ancient manners to those which are gradually subduing them, affords the lights and shadows necessary to give effect to a fictitious narrative. (XXVI.Intro.vi-vii)⁴

As this passage indicates, visual metaphors are natural to Scott when he seeks to explain a general theme, and we will see that in *Count Robert* he repeatedly turns to descriptions of setting to convey the values of the Crusaders and of Byzantium and to make objective the emotions of individual characters. Description as a method of conveying meaning is also emphasized in the facetious discussion between Peter Pattison, Scott's persona as author, and Dick Tinto which opens *The Bride of Lammermoor*. Tinto contends that skillful descriptions of faces, gestures, and scenes can express meaning more economically than pages of dialogue, and Pattison is sufficiently impressed by his friend's advice to conclude: "I endeavored to render my narrative rather descriptive than dramatic" (XIV.i.21-22). Though these comments occur in earlier novels, the technique of conveying meaning through description of settings continues even in so late a work as *Count Robert of Paris*.

In this novel the conflict symbolized by settings and by the reactions to them is between the sophisticated but decadent Byzantine Empire and the naive yet vital Crusaders who must pass through Constantinople on their way to the Holy Land. The cleverness of Alexius Comnenus, the Byzantine Emperor, enables him to dazzle the eyes of the Crusaders through artifice and to create an illusion of power; yet even as he creates that appearance in the eyes of the Crusaders, he is also struggling to maintain control within his own court, which is honeycombed with plots to take over his throne. His power is an illusion created by artful troop deployment, adulteration of supplies so that they are not what they seem to be, and displays of wealth; appearances are manipulated to obscure reality. Similarly the plotters within his court conceal their duplicity beneath an appearance of reverence for his majesty and disdain for worldly advancement. The Crusaders are blunt, violent men, unskilled in coping with subtlety. Count Robert of Paris, who represents the extremes of

both the Crusaders' strength and their credulity, sums up the issue when he comments that "'the wonderers [sic] of sorcery, and the portents of accomplished and skilful jugglers, are so numerous in this country, that one does not clearly distinguish what is true from what is false, or what is real from what is illusory'" (XLVI.xiv.300). Significantly, this is an echo of advice given earlier to Alexius for manipulating the Crusaders; Agelastes, himself a deceiver, tells the Emperor: "'I would request your Majesty to look at the manner by which an artful juggler of your court achieves his imposition upon the eyes of spectators, yet heedfully disguises the means by which he attains his object'" (XLVI.xiii.286). Clearly, how one interprets what he sees is of great importance in *Count Robert*; Byzantium is filled with scenes which can trick the eye, and we will see that the settings left behind by the Crusaders also involve a kind of self-deception. Only Hereward consistently interprets aright what he observes.

Hereward's ability to understand what he sees is emphasized in his first appearance in the novel; Scott, having described Hereward's outward appearance as indicating that he is an Anglo-Saxon and a member of the Emperor's loyal Varangian Guard, twice emphasized his quick, intelligent glance. Hereward is said to have "a quick and startled eye, that marked an imagination awakened by sights that were new and strange" (XLVI.ii.16), yet his is not a bewildered response to these sights; he looks at his surroundings with "an air of confidence and self-possession . . . not indicating the stupid and helpless gaze of a mind equally inexperienced, and incapable of receiving instruction, but expressing the bold intellect which at once understands the greater part of the information which it receives, and commands the spirit to toil in search of the meaning of that which it has not comprehended, or may fear it has misinterpreted" (XLVI.ii.16-17). This intelligent gaze is directed at Constantinople's Golden Gate, a setting which symbolizes innate falsity of Byzantine culture. In Scott's words:

A triumphal arch, decorated with the architecture of a better, though already a degenerate age, and serving, at the same time, as an useful entrance, introduced the stranger into the city. On the top, a statue of bronze represented Victory, the goddess who had inclined the scales of battle in favour of Theodosius; and, as the artist determined to be wealthy if he could not be tasteful, the gilded ornaments with which the inscriptions were set off, readily led to the popular name of the gate. Figures carved in a distant and happier period of the art, glanced from the walls, without as-

sorting happily with the taste in which these were built.
(XLVI.ii.14-15)

Byzantium as Scott depicts it is a highly civilized culture, yet its essential characteristic is artificiality. It is, first of all, artificially created--a transplanted culture, doomed by that fact to early decay. Scott expresses this idea through an analogy from botany; a graft taken from an old tree may appear to be a youthful shoot but is in fact as old as the parent stock and will die much sooner than its appearance indicates. Similarly, efforts have been made to transplant cities and societies and to begin new ages of civilization with them:

But nature has her laws, which seem to apply to the social, as well as the vegetable system. It appears to be a general rule, that what is to last long should be slowly matured and gradually improved, while every sudden effort, however gigantic, to bring about the speedy execution of a plan calculated to endure for ages, is doomed to exhibit symptoms of premature decay from its very commencement. (XLVI.i.4)

Constantinople violates the organic law; it has been created by despoiling other cities of their treasures and art works to create a "borrowed splendour" (XLVI.i.7), and because it is artificial it lacks the creative minds which could create further beauty and greater splendor. This lack of natural growth is clearly shown on the face of the Golden Gate, where figures plundered from earlier ages ornament walls with which they have no organic relationship. This, however, is not the only sort of duplicity expressed through the description of the Golden Gate. A second factor in the setting is the duality of appearance and actual function; what was a triumphal arch has become a "useful entrance." The sort of military power memorialized by the arch has become only a memory for Constantinople: Alexius's power is nominal rather than actual, depending more on what his ancestors ruled than on what he controls. Military engines, placed on the arch and blending strangely with the already mixed ornamentation, indicate Constantinople's weakness and the danger of attack from surrounding tribes which the city once controlled. Finally, the magnificence of the gate is calculated for display, an indication of the Byzantine world's emphasis on appearance as opposed to actuality. In this society lack of substance is hidden behind a glittering facade of wealth and pageantry; thus the gate foreshadows Alexius's attempt to bewilder the Crusaders with a show of magnificence and to gain from them a

pro forma pledge of fealty.

The Golden Gate, however, is not a complete symbol of the Byzantine Empire; Scott expands his symbolism with the next setting, the Blaquernal Palace. Alexius Comnenus is threatened from within his empire as well as from without as his son-in-law, his counselor, and his generals plot to take the throne. Deceit permeates Constantinople, and that aspect of the society is expressed by the Blaquernal Palace, which is seen as a network of dark, confusing passages with secret entrances. Hereward is taken to the palace by Achilles Tatius, his military commander, who hopes to use him in the conspiracy against Alexius. However, the Emperor also needs Hereward, having summoned him for straightforward information. Achilles and Hereward enter the city through a small gate or sallyport and cross the city moat on a narrow plank called the Bridge of Peril. This bridge is the emblem of the treachery which has replaced real power in Byzantium; it has been used to dispose of men secretly through trickery. According to Achilles:

"It is said that it has been occasionally smeared with oil, or strewed with dried peas and that the bodies of men, known to have been in company with the Emperor's most sacred person, have been taken out of the Golden Horn, in which the moat empties itself." (XLVI.iii.64)

Significantly, the traitor Achilles is described as an "expert navigator of the intricacies of the imperial residence" (XLVI.iii.62); he guides Hereward "through two or three small complicated courts, forming a part of the extensive Palace of the Blaquernal, and enter[s] the building itself by a side-door" (XLVI.iii.62). The approach to the Emperor's court is devious and twisting. Furthermore, the passages and apartments seem filled with slaves, "withered and deformed beings" (XLVI.iii.64); those closest to the Emperor's chamber are mutes--deliberately mutilated men. Achilles Tatius's guiding Hereward through the maze of passages is the physical counterpart of the moral control the Greek wishes to exert over the Anglo-Saxon by involving him in the plot against Alexius. Similarly, the deformed creatures Hereward sees within the maze are the tangible embodiment of the spiritual warping and distortion which characterize Constantinople and which threaten Hereward if he should accept Achilles' leadership.

Hereward is left to wait in a chamber of black marble where the dim light makes perception difficult:

Side passages opened into it, so far as the islander could discern, descending from several portals in the wall; but as the oils and gums with which the lamps in

these passages were fed diffused a dim vapour around, it was difficult to ascertain, from the imperfect light, either the shape of the hall, or the style of the architecture. (XLVI.iii.64)

This antechamber, in which the dim, shifting light obscures clear vision, is a further objectification of the difficulty of perceiving reality in the Byzantine world. Scott repeatedly reinforces his analysis of Byzantium as a society in which appearances disguise and even displace reality by settings such as this antechamber where the lighting itself hides the actual look of the hall rather than illuminating it. A similar instance of a setting in which reality is obscured is the entrance through which the Emperor goes to confession. He will confess to the primate of the church; the heads of state and religion will meet, yet Alexius goes through a "postern, whose low arch and humble architrave seemed to exclude the possibility of its leading to any place of importance" (XLVII. v.84). In this empire men dissemble to conceal their real purposes, and the physical setting likewise hides its actual nature.

However, Hereward discerns that the gloomy stairwell off the chamber just described leads to the dungeons; his ability to perceive the nature of the scenes in which he finds himself is a measure of his worth and moral strength. This is further indicated by his reaction after leaving the palace where he has been questioned by Alexius and his daughter Anna; coming out of the "mass of turrets, battlements, and spires," he is "like a man newly restored to liberty" (XLVI.vi.143), and his words indicate that he has not been deluded by the wealth and pomp of the court:

"Methinks the air of yonder halls . . . carries with it a perfume, which, though it may be well termed sweet, is so suffocating, as to be more suitable to sepulchrous chambers, than to the dwellings of men. Happy I am that I am free, as I trust, from its influences." (XLVI.vi. 143).

Hereward's sense of the tomb-like quality of the Blaquernal Palace is a foreshadowing of later scenes in the dungeons beneath the palace--scenes which will embody the deepest evils of the civilization which created the palace.

Yet before Scott presents that element of setting and theme, he further develops the images of illusion and artifice in Alexius's court. The emperor's throne room, ornamented by mechanical lions and foliage, is the major emblem of this:

The Emperor Alexius sat upon a stately throne, rich with barbaric gems and gold, and flanked on either hand, in imitation probably of Solomon's magnificence, with the form of a couchant lion in the same precious metal. Not to dwell upon other marks of splendour, a tree, whose trunk seemed also of gold, shot up behind the throne, which it overcanopied with its branches. Amid the boughs were birds of various kinds curiously wrought and enamelled, and fruit composed of precious stones seemed to glisten among the leaves. (XLVI.vii.155)

All this is undeniably beautiful artifice, and one is reminded of Yeats's later use of Byzantium as art's triumph over time. But more pertinent here is a similar image created by Scott's contemporary, Hans Christian Anderson. The mechanical nightingale which displaced the real bird and charmed the emperor until it broke down is the appropriate analogue of this scene; artifice is displacing nature rather than immortalizing it as art does. The mechanical lions and foliage are a trick upon the senses:

It was a general custom, . . . that by means of machinery easily conceived, the lions, at the entrance of a stranger, were made, as it were, to rouse themselves and roar, after which a wind seemed to rustle the foliage of the tree, the birds hopped from branch to branch, pecked the fruit, and appeared to fill the chamber with their carolling. (XLVI.vii.154)

This display amazes and alarms foreigners, whose countries are less skilled in mechanical crafts; they are as deluded by this artifice as by Alexius's appearance of power. But, pathetically, the Emperor's own counsellors are expected to feign awe and surprise each time they see this spectacle; pretense and ritual control the actions of even those who know the mechanism by which these surprising effects are achieved.

When Alexius uses this display to impress the Crusaders, Count Robert, with his constant need to exercise his military courage, strikes the nearest lion so hard "that its head burst, and the steps and carpet of the throne were covered with wheels, springs, and other machinery, which had been the means of producing its mimic terrors" (XLVI.xiv.299). Though Count Robert appears a fool in this action, the scene symbolizes the real threat of the Crusaders to Alexius; their sheer force could break the facade of his power and expose the trumpery means by which he and his city are made to seem of great consequence in world affairs.

The mechanical lions, however, suggest only a rather triv-

ial sort of deceit; the real evil of a culture based on artifice is expressed through the dungeons and wild animal pens beneath the palace. Count Robert is drugged and placed in a pitch dark cell where he is threatened by a tiger, a live counterpart of the mechanical lion. With the capacity for instant physical action which is his single talent, Robert manages to kill the beast; he then enters the cell of another prisoner, Ursel, who has been locked in the dungeon for years because he was a political danger to Alexius. Count Robert ultimately escapes the underground prison with Hereward's aid, and this help granted by an Anglo-Saxon to a Frank symbolizes the wider reconciliation between enemies which Hereward effects in the course of the novel. Ursel, however, remains isolated and apparently blinded in his cell until Alexius himself realizes he must use his old enemy to defeat the conspiracy against him. The dungeons are fully described at this point:

At the botton of this hall, a small iron door led to a narrow and winding staircase, resembling a draw-well in shape and size, the steps of which were excessively steep, and which the Emperor, after a solemn gesture to his daughter commanding her attendance, began to descend with the imperfect light, and by the narrow and difficult steps . . . Door after door they passed in their descent, leading, it was probable, to different ranges of dungeons, from which was obscurely heard the stifled voice of groans and sighs, such as attracted Hereward's attention on a former occasion. The Emperor took no notice of these signs of human misery, and three stories, or ranges of dungeons, had already passed, ere the father and daughter arrived at the lowest story of the building, the base of which was the solid rock, roughly carved, upon which were erected the side-walls and arches of solid but unpolished marble. (XLVII.vii.105)

These dungeons are the core of the Blaquernal Palace; the center of the Byzantine Empire is literally and figuratively built on human misery. The magnitude of Byzantine duplicity is expressed in Ursel's case; the man has been tricked into believing he is blind. At Alexius's orders, Ursel had undergone a painful operation in which he believed his eyes were put out, and because no light ever reached his cell, he thought he was blind. Alexius's comment on this shows his abiding determination to manipulate every possible situation for his own advantage; he gave out the report, he explains, that the imprisoned Ursel was blind so that people would consider him incapable of governing, but he had preserved Ursel's

sight so that, if necessary, he could recall Ursel from his dungeon and use his talents.

The Blaquernal Palace with its labyrinths, mechanical displays, and dungeons is a symbolic microcosm of the Byzantine Empire; it presents in concrete fact the deceit and distortion which permeate the culture. Ironically, when normal physical perception is most confused, vision may be at its clearest. Ursel, who has believed that he is physically blind, arrives at a spirit of forgiveness and renunciation in his years of imprisonment. When he first sees objects again, his eyesight is hopelessly distorted:

His eyeballs had been long strangers to that daily exercise, which teaches us the habit of correcting the scenes as they appear to our sight, by the knowledge which we derive from the use of our other senses. His idea of distance was so confused, that it seemed as if all the spires, turrets, and minarets which he beheld, were crowded forward upon his eyeballs, and almost touching them. (XLVI.ix.144-45)

The magnificent panorama of the city is a nightmare to Ursel; it seems an abyss into which he will fall from giddiness. Although factually distorted, this nightmare vision is morally true, for the beauty of the city is a veil over corruption and deceit. Ursel is right in his fear of it just as he is justified in his ultimate withdrawal from the court of Alexius.

That a culture so false at the core cannot continue the civilized traditions of antiquity is indicated by another significant setting--the ruined garden which surrounds the dwelling of Agelastes, one of the major plotters against Alexius. This setting dates from Egyptian times, a more ancient civilization even than the Greek and Roman cultures which Constantinople regards itself as continuing:

The sight of this solitary, and apparently deserted spot, encumbered with ruins, and overgrown with cypress and other trees, situated as it was in the midst of a populous city, had something in it impressive and awful to the imagination. The ruins were of an ancient date, and in the style of a foreign people. The gigantic remains of a portico, the mutilated fragments of statues of great size, but executed in a taste so narrow and barbaric as to seem perfectly the reverse of the Grecian, and the half-defaced hieroglyphics which could be traced in some part of the decayed sculpture, corroborated the popular account of their origin. (XLVI.vii.169-70)

The theme of the ruins of empire presented visually here is a forewarning of Constantinople's fate; despite appearances of vitality, Byzantium is as much a ruin, decaying from within, as any long-dead culture.

Significantly, Agelastes summons Hereward to a meeting in this garden and tempts him with promises of wealth and power. In these surroundings Hereward affirms his ability to see and interpret accurately, a statement which is reinforced by his successful following of a "half-worn and almost imperceptible path" (XLVI.vii.174) as much as by his refusal to be tricked by Agelastes' pretense to supernatural knowledge about Hereward's past. That Hereward is unique in his clear-sightedness is established by the reaction of Count Robert and his wife, Countess Brenhilda, to the same setting and a similar situation. Leaving the other Crusaders, these two seek "a bypath which might . . . afford them . . . their principal object in the East, strange sights, or adventures of chivalry" (XLVI.x.223). They are bemused by the scene, and when they encounter Agelastes in the guise of an old man engrossed in study, they are ready to grant him full belief. Count Robert, sounding a good deal like Don Quixote after that good knight had been maddened by his books of chivalry, declares:

"Yet here, when we were even despairing to find the road to fame, we have met with one of those excellent men whom the knights of yore were wont to find sitting by springs, by crosses, and by altars, ready to direct the wandering knight where fame was to be found." (XLVI.x.227)

When Agelastes tells the two Crusaders a tale of an enchanted castle and a princess awaiting rescue, the impulsive, credulous Count Robert is eager to rush off on this new quest; only his wife's jealousy gives him pause and holds him to his oath as a Crusader not to turn aside from the conquest of the Holy Land.

The Crusaders' inability to understand and cope with the setting in which they find themselves is indicated on several occasions. As already mentioned, Count Robert's smashing the mechanical lion with a blow of his mailed fist demonstrates the violent and angry aspects of his civilization. The lion is a piece of trickery, of course; but it is also a beautifully wrought work of human skill, and wanton destruction is no better a reaction than credulous fear. The Count's earlier insolence in seating himself in Alexius's chair at the ritual of pledging fealty to the Byzantine Emperor and his backing through a lowered door in order to avoid the appearance of bowing to the Emperor are additional signs of his inability to

deal with the culture the setting symbolizes. In a society which places great emphasis on the observance of external forms, he figuratively thumbs his nose at Alexius like a little boy, thus suggesting the immaturity of the feudal, chivalric world.

Count Robert furthermore is associated with a typical medieval setting in his past--the Chapel of Our Lady of the Broken Lances. Here knights come to pray to the Virgin and to joust against the champion who holds the chapel. Robert describes the place thus:

"The image of the Holy Virgin who presides over its altar, is called by all men our Lady of the Broken Lances, and is accounted through the whole kingdom the most celebrated for military adventures. Four beaten roads, each leading from an opposite point in the compass, meet before the principal door of the chapel; and ever and anon, as a good knight arrives at this place, he passes in to the performance of his devotions in the chapel, having first sounded his horn three times, till ash and oak-tree quiver and ring. Having then kneeled down to his devotions, he seldom arises from the mass of Her of the Broken Lances, but there is attending on his leisure some adventurous knight ready to satisfy the new comer's desire of battle." (XLVI.ix.210)

With its curious blend of religious devotion and military prowess, the chapel is a microcosm of the Crusades themselves. Scott permits himself an ironic comment on the values of chivalry by having Count Robert conclude his description in these words:

"This station have I held for a month and more against all comers, and all gave me fair thanks for the knightly manner of quitting myself towards them, except one, who had the evil hap to fall from his horse, and did break his neck; and another, who was struck through the body, so that the lance came out behind his back about a cloth-yard, all dripping with blood." (XLVI.ix.210-11)

To Robert these are no more than unavoidable accidents; whatever ideas Scott's readers may have mistakenly absorbed about medieval glory (or the romance of the Highlanders, for that matter), Scott never intended to make glamorous his knights and outlaws. So deeply is Count Robert involved in the game of chivalry that he declares that even danger to his wife could not make him break the rules of a fair fight, leading to Hereward's wry comment:

"We will endeavour," said the Varangian, "to arrange matters according to thy pleasure, so that thou findest out no more fantastical difficulties; for , by my word, an affair so complicated in itself, requires not to be confused by the fine-spun whims of thy national gallantry." (XLVII.i.29)

There have been other hints that Count Robert is blinded to human needs by his single-minded drive for military glory; Godfrey of Bouillon suggests that Robert fails in his feudal responsibilities to the five hundred followers he has brought on the Crusade:

"Even in this, the very outset of the undertaking, he knows not where these five hundred men are, and how their wants are provided for." (XLVI.ix.214)

In view of this heedless blindness, it is not surprising that Count Robert is no match for Alexius and Byzantium; when his wife is held prisoner, his naive assumption that the Greeks observe the same rules of chivalry as he does virtually disarms him. In fact, he considers fighting the Emperor's son-in-law with only his sword. That Hereward can aid Count Robert is yet another sign of the Anglo-Saxon's clear-sightedness and moral worth. His response to Count Robert's foolhardy idea of fighting without horse or armor is but one indication of this:

"I shall take care, however," said Hereward, "that thou are better provided in case of need.--Thou knowest not the Greeks." (XLVII.iii.55)

Caught between the oversophisticated, decadent Byzantines and the naive, strong Crusaders, Hereward successfully interprets both worlds. He sees the flaws of both cultures and modifies the extremes of each, creating a balance in his own life. Unlike others who are deceived by the settings of this novel and by what they stand for, Hereward controls his individual world, a fact suggested by his statement that "when we walk in a labyrinth, we must assume and announce that we have a steady and forward purpose, which is one mode at least of keeping a straight path'" (XLVI.vi.150). He follows such a path, literally and figuratively, in pursuit of his "'ambition to merit the epitaph on [his] tomb, "Hereward was faithful"'" (XLVII.ii.42). His faithfulness leads ultimately to his return to Britain and to the restoration of lands that belonged to his ancestors there--a restoration symbolic of the reconciliation he has made between himself and the Frankish

Count Robert as well as between the larger conflicting parties of the novel.

Although this novel is a lesser work than Scott's most successful efforts, it is by no means the feeble failure it has often been taken to be. The theme is serious, not trivial, and the technique of expressing an inner world through external settings is skillfully used. The moral world and the physical world are inextricably linked; the elaborately described settings are never merely an inanimate backdrop for the action, but are rather as much a part of the narrative as dialogue, character conflict, and events. As this examination of the relationship between theme and settings suggests, *Count Robert of Paris* demands more of the reader than a regretful casting aside, whether literal or figurative. Whatever its weaknesses, it also has the strengths of a refusal to see a complex conflict in abstract, simplistic terms.

Louisiana Tech University

NOTES

1. *Praeterita* (1885; rpt. Boston, n.d.), pp. 34-35. An extreme example of modern critical rejection of this novel can be found in Christina Keith, *The Author of Waverley* (New York, 1964); Keith refers to *Quentin Durward*, *The Talisman*, and *The Fair Maid of Perth* as "the last three" of the Waverley Novels, thus dropping *Count Robert*, along with *Anne of Geierstein* and *Castle Dangerous* from the canon altogether (p. 52). Elsewhere Keith refers to *Anne of Geierstein*, written just before *Count Robert*, as "too late to count" (p. 133). Those books which aim at a thorough study of the Waverley Novels rather than at an examination of selected novels also give *Count Robert of Paris* scant treatment. Francis R. Hart, *Scott's Novels: The Plotting of Historic Survival* (Charlottesville, 1966), groups together all of the chivalric novels and gives them proportionately briefer treatment than the non-chivalric Waverley Novels; Alexander Welsh, *The Hero of the Waverley Novels* (New Haven, 1963), makes only two references to the characters in this novel as examples of his thesis about the nature of the typical Scott hero. Only two critics give the novel serious praise: an anonymous *TLS* reviewer who refers to it as an "absurdly neglected great book" ("Waverley Revisited," *Times Literary Supplement*, 15 Sept. 1969, p. 630), and Edgar Johnson, who discusses it as a serious study of an international conflict of cultural values (*Sir Walter Scott*:

The Great Unknown [New York, 1970], II, 1207-15). I am indebted to Johnson's analysis of the theme of the novel.

2. *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott*, Oct. (?), 1831. See Johnson, II, 1153-59, for examples of Ballantyne's and Cadell's criticism of the work in progress.

3. John Buchan, *Sir Walter Scott* (London, 1932) offers an excellent example of this when he declares that *Count Robert of Paris* and *Castle Dangerous* "must be judged not by the canons of art, but as desperate deeds, the final blows struck by a failing man in the cause of honour. Count Robert is history rather than fiction, a compilation from Gibbon and the *Alexiad*, and as prolix as Anna Comnena herself" (p. 327).

4. All references to Scott's novels are from *Waverley Novels*, 48 vols. (London, 1895), a reprint of Scott's own edition; volume, chapter, and page numbers will be given in parentheses in the text.