SIR WALTER SCOTT'S IVANHOE: NATIONS IN CONFLICT

Szerző: Zubor Attila
anglisztika (BA), végzett (jelenleg MA-s) hallgató
Konzulens: Dr. Reichmann Angelika főiskolai docens

III. helyezés

Introduction

"Why, how call you those grunting brutes running about on their four legs?" demanded Wamba.

"Swine, fool, swine," said the herd, "every fool knows that."

"And swine is good Saxon," said the Jester; "but how call you the sow when she is flayed, and drawn, and quartered, and hung up by the heels, like a traitor?"

"Pork," answered the swineherd.

"I am very glad every fool knows that too," said Wamba, "and pork, I think, is good Norman-French; and so when the brute lives, and is in the charge of a Saxon slave, she goes by her Saxon name; but it becomes a Norman, and is called pork, when she is carried to the Castle-hall to feast among the nobles; what dost thou think of this, friend Gurth, ha?"

(Scott[1] 32)

Ivanhoe is still the favourite among Sir Walter Scott's novels (Wilson, *Introduction* xix) as it was in the time of its publication (Duncan viii), selling "10,000 copies in a fortnight" (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* xiv). The conversation above, quoted from the first chapter of the novel, has an important role as the idea that originally attracted Scott's attention to the Middle Ages – particularly to the time of the Norman conquest – through a discussion with one of his friends (*Ivanhoe; A Romance*).

Scott has been, and continues to be the subject of much criticism on the basis of his historical inaccuracies in *Ivanhoe*. One of his most zealous critics was the Victorian historian Edward Augustus Freeman (Wilson, *Introduction* viii-ix), who argued against the separation of Normans and Saxons still existing at the end of the twelfth century (qtd. in Williams 1). It is important to note another critic, Alessandro Manzoni, who criticises the whole genre of the historical novel. His critique is twofold: first he argues that "fact is not clearly distinguished from invention" and second that when it is, then "the author plainly distinguish[es] factual truth from invention" thus "destroying the unity" (qtd. in Groot 30). This critique is too ambiguous to stand its ground. We will have to take a look at how factual a historical novel should be. Scott is also often suggested to lack the sufficient knowledge to write about the Middle Ages (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 153). I seek to provide my opinion on this criticism from several viewpoints.

[1] Throughout this essay I will use the 2008 Oxford edition of *Ivanhoe* for referencing the actual tex t of the novel.

First, I would like to focus on the critique regarding Scott's historical knowledge. The Oxford version of *Ivanhoe* lists in the notes section quite a few historical sources which were used in writing the novel (Duncan 529), and by taking a look at them one can clearly see that Scott – after consulting a series of history books – must have had some knowledge about the times that he wrote about. Even more so, as Wilson puts it "Scott knew far more about the Middle Ages than most people of his generation" (*A Life of Walter Scott* 154). As he continues to argue, with the development of modern scientific methods and information technology, one can acquire the same knowledge in a matter of hours that for a person of Scott's time would have taken years to collect (154). One should also consider that research since the publication of the novel brought together the reconsideration of many opinions about the times concerned (Chibnall 1). Therefore, one can easily admit that criticising the novel's historical mistakes retrospectively is an unintelligible effort. In contrast to these facts, however, I must add that Scott himself admitted that his "antiquarian researches" were "unsatisfactory" (*Introduction* 13). How can we reconcile this image with the fact that Scott is best known as the first historical novelist?

First we need to examine what genre Ivanhoe belongs to. The subtitle of the novel is "A Romance". Indeed, in his book entitled *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel* Ian Duncan tries to explore Scott's novels – listing the *Waverley* novels and *Ivanhoe* as well – belonging to the form called "historical romance". Yet he fails to give a clear-cut definition for the genre, and what he means by *historical romance* is blurry to say the least (1-20). The other way of categorising Scott's novels is by calling them *historical novels.* Jerome de Groot in his book titled *The Historical Novel* refers to Nield, who holds the expression *historical romance* to be problematic, because it is too broadly interpretable, moreover he speaks of the "complexity and manipulability of the genre" (Groot 6). On one instance – in agreement with the prevailing view – Groot mentions Scott introducing the form *historical novel* (17), on other instances he states that Scott being considered the first historical novelist is a misconception (11-13). What he probably means by that is that Scott developed the preceding "mere costumery" (24) – as he quotes György Lukács – into a "rational realist form" (16). He lists two definitions for the *historical novel*:

Set before the middle of the last century [...] in which the author is writing from research rather than personal experience (Johnson qtd. in Groot 50)

Fiction is historical if it includes reference to customs, conditions, identifiable persons, or events in the past [. . .] among factors considered are literary excellence, readability, and historical value (McGarry and White qtd. in Groot 50)

He mentions however the opinion of Manzoni about the genre tending "towards obfuscation and falsehood" (32) and quotes Johnson again who states that "it's too broad" and "overlaps with other genres" (50), just about the same things mentioned about the *historical romance* earlier. The question remains nevertheless: Does *Ivanhoe* fit the category of *historical novel*? "Modern criticism" takes *Ivanhoe* as the decline of a "once influential historical realist" (Duncan viii). According to Scott himself the root for the critiques can be found in the fact that *Ivanhoe* is in reality not a historical novel, but an antique romance, and therefore – as he argues – it is not bound to present only historical facts (*Scott's Notes* 505). He continues to reason with a particular example, about the black slaves of the templar, a custom which has no historical proof, neither has

it however any against it (*Scott's Notes* 505). As he argues similarly on another instance, a painter is not restricted to copy the exact characteristics of the terrain nor should he introduce any incongruences (*Introduction* 20). Notice that this is exactly what he said about the case of the black slaves. Scott also "refrains from an exact date" because "this is the chronology of romance rather than of history" (Duncan 532). As we see, the picture is a bit hazy. Even though Scott calls *Ivanhoe* a romance, the above two definitions for the *historical novel* perfectly apply to *Ivanhoe*: it is set before the middle of the last century – as it was already by the time of its publishing – and includes references to older times to a great extent. One more criterion which is mentioned several times and ways in the book is that it should have some connection with the present: make the past understandable, create a connection, help to establish "national character and self-definition" (Groot 3; 16; 22; 27-9; 33-4; 93-4). An important part of this essay is to explore how *Ivanhoe* fulfils these expectations. In my opinion we can declare though, that there is no trace of the historical novels' need for perfect historical accuracy.

Let us take a look at the nature of *Ivanhoe*'s real sources, and how they were put to use. As Duncan states, Scott was well read "in English literature, from the Middle-English romances and old ballads to Shakespeare and the King James Bible" (525). These readings contribute most to the making of the novel, because as Wilson explains, Scott composed *Ivanhoe* continuously, without checking the details (*Introduction* xvii) and as he aptly puts it: "It grows out of the very depths of Scott's favourite reading" (Wilson, *Introduction* xvi). The reason for not stopping to look up historical data is that *Ivanhoe* – alongside with *The Bride of Lammermoor* – was created during a long illness (Duncan xxvii, xxxi; Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 150), and there was a "rush to publication" (Duncan xxx). Also, Scott's writing style was quick, and he demanded his associates to correct his mistakes (Duncan xxix). In addition, more than once instead of taking the time to look up materials, he simply made up quotes fitting to the atmosphere (Duncan 562). So, as one can see, Scott's writing style did not depend on research, the soil from which *Ivanhoe* grew out was the fact that he was enormously well-read, especially in contrast to his contemporaries.

I will now present some of Scott's vices and virtues regarding accuracy. One only needs to take a look at the notes section in a better edition of *Ivanhoe* to see Scott's many historical mistakes, introducing most of the time clothing, proverbs and quotes from literature (Duncan xxviii) belonging to later centuries. Let me give some examples for these: when describing the dresses of Gurth and Wamba (Scott 28), he describes pre-conquest garments already outdated by the time (Duncan 532). An example for the proverbs can be found when the Prior is discussing his ransom with Locksley: "At a word – since I must needs, for once, hold a candle to the devil – what ransom am I to pay for walking on Watling-street, without having fifty men at my back?" (Scott 359). To hold a candle to the devil is a proverb from the mid-fifteenth century, "meaning to assist in wrongdoing" (Duncan 565-6). Some of the mistakes are minor: as Wamba disguises himself to enter Front-de-Boeuf's castle, he gives himself off as a priest, stating "I am a poor brother of the Order of St Francis" (Scott 268), which he could not have done, as the order was only founded in 1209 (Duncan 557). Scott must have been unaware of the exact date of foundation. Other mistakes are much bigger, like describing the tournament after the fashions of a period two hundred years later (Duncan 542). Scott himself

admitted these errors (Scott 13) and although we cannot know for sure, but he may have been well aware of them. Other times he displays a surprising precision: for example he uses the rule of the Knights Order as a source, quoting directly from it and making only tiny alterations to fit the story (Duncan 569). He is also aware of the fact that the people of the time were really offered the choice of choosing a champion (Chibnall 168), as we see in the novel Rebecca using this opportunity as her last chance: "I challenge the privilege of trial by combat, and will appear by my champion" (Scott 414). The existence of serfs in the service of Saxon lords of the time was an existing practice (Chibnall 210), identically to Gurth's and Wamba's situation. One can also find a similar story about King Richard in the romance "of his adventures in the Holy Land" to the exchange of buffets with Friar Tuck (Duncan 517). Finally, the fact that he actually helped in a siege in disguise, something only discovered in 1882 (Wilson, *Introduction* xvii), is also a great affirmation of Scott's sometimes brilliant historical intuition.

The greatest misdeed of Scott according to the critics is presenting twelfth-century England as a place where "colonial antagonism between Normans and Saxons" still takes place (Duncan xiv). Indeed, plenty of historical evidence proves that not long after the conquest the Norman conquerors started to identify themselves with the native traditions and history, thinking of themselves as English (Chibnall 39, 208-10; Williams 5). There is proof that by 1130 Normans and Saxons were so mixed with each other that one could not differentiate them (Williams 5, 187; Chibnall 5, 208). In this regard critics would be right. However, the biggest so-called fault of *Ivanhoe* is in my opinion the most crucial part of the novel, and in the next chapter I will shed light on what I think to be the cause for these historical inaccuracies of Scott, how I think they were conscious and totally indispensable for conveying the message of *Ivanhoe*.

According to Marjorie Chibnall the motif of the Norman Conquest has been more than once translated to represent the events of various times (1). The aim of my thesis is to present my reading of *Ivanhoe* as the representation of the Anglo-Scottish relations as well as Scottish history of Scott's own time. I already reacted to some of the criticism which I think to be misinterpretations regarding the novel, which stem from the lack of clear-cut definition regarding its genre and also from its metaphorical nature. After this I plan to present the similarities between the contents of the novel and Scottish events around the time of Sir Walter Scott. Lastly, I will take a look at the representation of Jews in the novel taking into consideration the actual history of English Jewry and its relation to the metaphor of the situation of Scotland.

1. *Ivanhoe* and the Events in the Time of Sir Walter Scott

Throughout this chapter I will compare the events from the novel with the Anglo-Scottish relations and events of around the time of Sir Walter Scott, and show how they are consciously built up to represent them.

Let me make an attempt to present how ambiguities in Scott's works are natural consequences of the mood of Scott's time and of his own personality. Wilson notes that Scott had the biggest influence as a medievalist (*A Life of Walter Scott* 153), and indeed Scott himself admitted that by writing only about Scottish matters he would have been likely to lose the appreciation of his readers (*Introduction* 4). As follows, he wrote *Ivanhoe*, which was a success throughout Britain. That he was not writing about

"Scottish matters" is not even halfway true, however. There is always much correspondence between different ages in Scott's novels (Cottom 144), because he has a very good intuition to present how "quite different aeons momentarily touch one another" (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 43). As Daniel Cottom points out, all the motifs in his novels can be grouped on two sides:

On the side of the past [. . .] are such elements as violence, superstition, disorder, pagans, Saxons, Catholics, Scotland, the Highlands, and the Stuarts, and on the side of the present are law, reason, peace, Christians, Normans, Protestants, England, the Lowlands, and the Hanoverians. (128)

As he notes, Scott's novels mostly deal with chaotic times, "before the emergence of a new order", with a feeling of loss for the old era and forecasting the times to come (128). This translates in Scott's time to the "aristocratic world of the recent past" and the "emerging middle-class world of Victorian England" (144). This "duplicity" results in the works of Radcliffe, Austen and Scott – writers of the end of eighteenth and beginning of nineteenth century – in great "uncertainty" (Cottom 29-31), because in that "time of indecision [...] we cannot expect unambiguous results" (Kuehn).

Let us now analyse how these ambiguities can be understood in Scott's writing. As Wilson remarks, Scott discovers that "if we respect the past, it is impossible to take sides" (*A Life of Walter Scott* 45), and indeed fewer and fewer historians do, concerning the Norman-Saxon relations (Chibnall 2). As Wilson points out, even when he took sides, Scott could still be able to observe objectively (*Introduction* xxiii-xxiv), and as follows he tried to show both the negative and positive aspects of his characters (Kuehn). Consequently, his characters do not exist in a black and white, but in a "blurred", uncertain world, where characteristics which should belong to one side can be identified on the other side, and there is more tension than relief (Cottom 28,129,133). Scott is often described as someone whose personality was two-sided: "the lawyer and the laird" (Cottom 188), "Tory rationalist [...] and timeless lover of romance" (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 20), "sentimental feudalist and a 'rational son' of 'the Enlightenment'" (Kuehn). Not only in the person of Scott, but in eighteenth-century Scotland in general there was a confrontation of old traditions and the development of new structures, realised in the Jacobite movement and the Hanoverian regime (Kuehn). He himself became a supporter of the movement for a short period of time, but realised the despondency of its goals and changed his opinion about the matter. It is easy to admit, how Norman-Saxon antagonism is a perfect substrate for the metaphor of Anglo-Scottish relations.

In Scott's works, and especially in *Ivanhoe*, this longing for the past on the one hand, but realistic view of the need of progression on the other hand appears to be the underlying notion. "The contradictions [are] not just faults of writing or logic, for they point to that great tension in Scott's work between his commitment to the present and his yearning for the past" (Cottom 138). The mourning for the past in his novels is so intense indeed that it overwhelms the acceptance for the changes of the present (Cottom 136-142). Scott was obsessed with the past and not too enthusiastic about living in the present (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 9, 56). He knew nevertheless that in the end only progress can come out as the winner, so in this regard he was "writing against himself" (Cottom 127,169). This opinion is expressed for example in Rowena's scepticism about Cedric's plans (Scott 202). Scott knows that history moves forward by the "means of

violence, disruption, and irreparable loss" (Cottom 143), even so he thinks that "the Norman Conquest was a Good Thing, as from this time onwards England stopped being conquered and thus was able to become top nation" (Duncan xix). As we see in the opening the Druidical ruins, we are reminded that the Saxons were conquerors as well (Duncan xiii). We can see that ambiguities stem from the events of Scott's own time. Let me explore in detail how this time is represented in *Ivanhoe*.

1.1 General Similarities

In this chapter I concentrate on the abundant list of similarities between *Ivanhoe* and Scottish history after the Act of Union. First I examine the Anglo-Scottish relations of the time in a broader sense represented in the novel, then I deal with the similarities of certain aspects, like dresses and habits, language, and even kings and witchcraft.

As Wilson notes, Scott was obsessed with the events of his time (*Introduction* xxiii-xxiv), and *Ivanhoe* is a book which utterly reflects the atmosphere of the era (*A Life of Walter Scott* 147). Scott himself states that he did not strive to make an acute historical representation of the 12th century, but wanted to interpret it in a way that his contemporaries could appreciate it (*Introduction* 17-18). As Northrop Frye remarks: the "written word is far more powerful than simply a reminder: it re-creates the past in the present, and gives us, not a familiar remembered thing, but the glittering intensity of the summoned-up hallucination" (227). For Scotsmen of the era the events of the past immediately before the Union of the Crowns and since then were still reality (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 26), and this reality was a history of war (Brown 40) and considering the English as the enemy (Langford 153). Many of them still "continued to glorify the martial deeds of their ancestors" (Brown 40). Likewise does Cedric glorify his own and the Saxons' martial deeds when the Norman guests dine in his castle:

Ay, that was a day of cleaving of shields, when a hundred banners were bent forward over the heads of the valiant, and blood flowed round like water, and death was held better than fight. A Saxon bard had called it a feast of the swords – a gathering of the eagles to the prey – the clashing of bills upon shield and helmet, the shouting of battle more joyful than the clamour of a bridal. (Scott 66)

Neither the Union of the Crowns in 1603 (Wormald 22), nor the Parliamentary Union in 1707 did much to lessen the hostility (Smout 4): "At every level [...] the English and the Scots simply quarrelled with one another, verbally and physically, when they met" (Wormald 24). Scots of the time were also the target of much ridicule (Langford 153). Immediately, for someone familiar with the novel, the picture of the Normans and Saxons comes to the mind, fighting and provoking the other continuously whenever they come across each other, one of the many instances being when Malvoisin states mockingly about the Saxons: "They go before us indeed in the field – as deer before dogs" (Scott 167).

There are many similarities with the conquest in the reception of the union and its effects. At the time the union was thought of as a disaster for Scotland (Kidd 182; Smout 5; Morril 60), very much like the conquest for the Saxons (Williams 1). Scotland is described as a province (Langford 168) "overwhelmed by the fashions and standards of England" (Kuehn), in the same manner as England was overwhelmed by Norman culture (Kuehn). Scotland is thought to be oppressed (Kidd 173), to have lost its national sovereignty (Kidd 181), some sources even speak about an "English conquest" (Morril

64). By the beginning of the 1800s Scots were thinking about ending the union (Wormald 33), similarly to Cedric and Athelstane conversing and plotting about gaining national independence:

Meanwhile Cedric and Athelstane, the leaders of the troop, conversed together [. . .] on the chance which there was that the oppressed Saxons might be able to free themselves from the yoke of the Normans, or at least to elevate themselves into national consequence and independence, during the civil convulsions which were likely to ensue. (Scott 200-1)

From this perspective, the similarities between the provincial Scots and the conquered Saxons are striking. In the English parliament "7 per cent represented Scotland, many of those Englishmen" (Morril 65); similarly, after the Norman conquest "pre-conquest tenants-in-chief had a mere 5.5 per cent" of the land (Chibnall 38). As the Norman taxes (Chibnall 14) and, as Scott remarks, the forest laws were "a most sensible grievance" to the Saxons (*Scott's Notes* 504), so was the exclusion of the Scots from sea trade by the Navigation Acts (Whatley 124). Scots, as a result, did not strive for distinctiveness, but for the same rights as the English (Kidd 186). Scots also felt neglected by the English (Hutchison 256), they felt their country to be "like a farm managed by servants" (Smout 4) because the English parliament and public opinion was generally uninterested in Scottish matters (Hutchison 251-2). In consequence many of them feared to be "reduced to the provincial status of Ireland" (Wormald 25). This resembles the Normans as the ruling class and the Saxons cultivating the land: "affording a striking contrast betwixt the Saxons, by whom the soil was cultivated, and the Normans, who still reigned as conquerors, reluctant to mix with the vanquished, or acknowledge themselves of the same stock" (Scott 5). In both cases the oppressed had a severe influence on the oppressor (Williams 209). But the English had the more influence on the Scotsmen, they were facing a large-scale "Anglicization" (Kuehn), and those who failed to assimilate had a much harder time (Langford 162). Scott himself reacted as follows: "If you *unscotch* us, you will find us damned mischievous Englishmen" (Smout 8). The problems arose from their different habits and language, and I attempt to outline how these conflicts of culture are represented in *Ivanhoe* in the following chapter.

1.2 Habits and Language

Let me examine now how the Saxon and Norman dresses and habits correspond to the ones of the eighteenth century, then analyse the role of language in the novel and in the reality of the time. As Kuehn explains, in the eighteenth century Scottish national symbols were banned, this included clothing as kilts and tartan, the bagpipe, and even the Gaelic language. The reason for this is that they were associated with Highland culture, and Highlanders, whose traditions were too different and barbaric in the eyes of the English (Kuehn). This attitude towards the natives' habits is also reflected in *Ivanhoe*.

First I will focus on the dresses and habits as represented in the novel. Scots of the turn of 17th and 18th century were the victims of a great amount of ridicule and "venomous satires", they were perceived as barbarian (Langford 145-8), poor and backward (Brown 50): Langford speaks about "the mockery of unmodish Scottish customs and manners, the barbarity of the Scots dialect" (147). I already mentioned the

constant quarrelling and derision between Saxons and Normans in the novel, but let me mention some specific cases similar to how the English treated the Scotsmen. In the chapter where Cedric and Athelstane are dining with the Norman lords they are nearly laughed at because of their Saxon garbs, unfashionable in the eyes of the conquerors:

Cedric and Athelstane were both dressed in the ancient Saxon garb, which, although not unhandsome in itself, and in the present instance composed of costly materials, was so remote in shape and appearance from that of the other guests, that Prince John took great credit to himself with Waldemar Fitzurse for refraining from laughter at a sight which the fashion of the day rendered ridiculous. (Scott 163)

This is interesting because the Saxon clothing in another instance in the novel is also compared to that of a Scottish Highlander: "Sandals, bound with thongs made of boars' hide, protected the feet, and a roll of thin leather was twined artificially round the legs, and, ascending above the calf, left the knees bare, like those of a Scottish Highlander" (Scott 29). According to historical sources the opposite was the case: when the Normans saw the dress of the Saxon nobles they were looking in admiration (Williams 189).

The Saxons' behaviour at the banquet as well as their dwelling place are described as simplistic, rude and barbaric, similarly to the perception of Scots in the 17th and 18th centuries :

The other appointments of the mansion partook of the rude simplicity of the Saxon period, which Cedric piqued himself upon maintaining. (Scott 47)

Magnificence there was, with some rude attempt at taste; but of comfort there was little, and, being unknown, it was unmissed. (Scott 73)

But, though luxurious, the Norman nobles were not, generally speaking, an intemperate race. While indulging themselves in the pleasures of the table, they aimed at delicacy, but avoided excess, and were apt to attribute gluttony and drunkenness to the vanquished Saxons, as vices peculiar to their inferior station [. . .] the Norman knights and nobles beheld the ruder demeanour of Athelstane and Cedric at a banquet, to the form and fashion of which they were unaccustomed. (Scott 164-5)

The Scots of the time made their living by agriculture (Whatley 109) similarly to the Saxons living by swine-heraldry, which was considered menial by the Normans, as seen in de Bracy's conversation with Lady Rowena: "How else wouldst thou escape from the mean precincts of a country grange, where Saxons herd with the swine which form their wealth" (Scott 241-2).

Second, I would like to examine the role of language in *Ivanhoe* in comparison with Scott's time, and what the historical sources say about the period of the conquest. The union "gave the Scots language another push in the direction of spoken English" (Brown 51) as it became "the prime criterion of full acceptability" (Langford 162). Higher-rank Scotsmen of the time spoke the English dialect to express their superiority (Kuehn), which is similar to the Norman characters' – as the Prior or Prince John – insistence on conversing in French, although they understand English:

"I speak ever French, the language of King Richard and his nobles; but I understand English sufficiently to communicate with the natives of the country." (Scott 57)

"What says he?" said Prince John, affecting not to understand the Saxon language, in which however, he was well skilled. (Scott 118)

As we see in *Ivanhoe*, Anglo-Saxon English is spoken by the lower class: "The dialogue which they maintained between them was carried on in Anglo-Saxon, which, as

we said before, was universally spoken by the inferior classes" (Scott 30-31). Norman-French is the language of the upper class: "who maintained the following conversation in the Norman-French language, usually employed by the superior classes" (Scott 42). Between these two classes a new mixed language is forming: "[...] said the Prior, raising his voice, and using the lingua Franca, or mixed language, in which the Norman and Saxon races conversed with each other" (Scott 39). Duncan considers this to be a "crucial analogy", because something similar was happening in eighteenth-century Scotland, where "English was a foreign dialect" (*Introduction* xviii). Also there was a resentment of the Scottish dialect from the side of the English (Langford 154). Let us take a look at what historical sources say about the linguistic relations after the conquest. According to Williams "the changes which produced Middle English" were far earlier than the conquest and have been the results of the Scandinavian settlements. After the conquest the lower classes remained to be English-speaking (Chibnall 212; Williams 219), while in the upper classes, especially in the government, Latin continued to be the ruling language, as it had been before (Chibnall 211-214;Williams 215), while French was – as all over northern Europe – the language mainly used by the clergy (Chibnall 213). This picture is clearly different from the one painted by Scott, so one can easily see that he used languages in *Ivanhoe* as an analogy of the situation of the Scottish dialect.

1.3 Kings and Witches

Many connections can be found between the portrayal of Richard Plantagenet and the kings after the Union of the Crowns, especially James VI. The same is true for the witch trial and its counterparts in the Scotland of the time.

As Cottom explains, Scott longs for a strong and ideal monarch, but he nevertheless pictures irresponsible rulers constantly (Cottom 184-6). When he pictures a strong king – Richard the Lion-Hearted – the king "acts too personally" (Cottom 186), and even though he has a good character, he is not suitable to be a good king: "popular as he was by his personal good qualities and military fame, although his administration was wilfully careless, now too indulgent, and now allied to despotism" (Scott 496). He is very similar the Scottish rulers following the Union of the Crowns. James VI turned out to be an "absent monarch" for Scotland (Brown 38), as well as George I more than a hundred years later (Kuehn). This absence let the Scottish nobility to become "overmighty and oppressive" (Smout 5), and the only person who was not "timorous, resentful, distrustful about the union" was James himself (Wormald 13). Still he did not turn out to be a good monarch, even though he was described as "affable, cheerful, witty, relaxed", because "he never really coped with being the King of England" (Wormald 27). This case is all too similar to the happenings of *Ivanhoe*. Richard the Lion-Hearted looks to be the perfect king at first glance, and when Cedric must "name a Norman deserving to be remembered", he names Richard (Scott 169), showing that even the most Saxon of the Saxons has some trust in him, but, as Cottom notes, no king can reach the standard set up by Scott (Cottom 190). A ruler has to "convince his [...] subjects of his right to rule" (Chibnall 54), and Richard promises Cedric that he will prove his right to the throne (Scott 470), he even learns their language and ballads (Duncan xviii), but nonetheless his feats turn out to be useless and unnecessary in the scene of government:

In the lion-hearted King, the brilliant, but useless character, of a knight of romance, was in a great measure realized and revived; and the personal glory which he acquired

by his own deeds of arms, was far more dear to his excited imagination, than that which a course of policy and wisdom would have spread around his government. Accordingly, his reign was like the course of a brilliant and rapid meteor, which shoots along the face of Heaven, shedding around an unnecessary and portentous light, which is instantly swallowed up by universal darkness (Scott 458-459).

He indulges himself in fights of knight-errants' "while the weighty affairs of his kingdom slumber" (Scott 374), he is too careless (Scott 496), and in the end he turns out to be an absentee monarch alike. So much that he is "best known as 'the absent king'", spending no more than six months in total during his reign in England (*King Richard I*). It is interesting to add that Scott mentions James V, who was thought to be travelling similarly in disguise as Richard (Scott 7). One more exciting fact is that Richard did not speak English, or very little (Snell, "Richard the Lionheart"), this is just another literary tool in the hands of Scott.

The witch trial can be understood as a critique in close connection with James VI. From the seventeenth century there is an increase in the number of witches accused, and it is mostly in Scotland where these accusations happened (Whatley 108). In the novel, similarly to the Scots who still believed in witches, the Saxons are described as superstitious people: "As the cavalcade left the court of the monastery, an incident happened somewhat alarming to the Saxons, who, of all people of Europe, were most addicted to a superstitious observance of omens" (Scott 198). The reason for this is that James thought of himself as an expert on witchcraft, and under his reign witchcraft became a criminal offense. Moreover, he thought that if there was one witch, there should be more who helped her, so they always executed more than one subject. He also believed that there is no difference between black and white witches. As a result someone who provided healing was as guilty as any other witch ("James I and Witchcraft"). Immediately the trial of Rebecca comes to one's mind. As she provided healing to a peasant through a balsam, she can be accused of being a white witch:

Two mediciners, as they called themselves, the one a monk, the other a barber, appeared, and avouched they knew nothing of the materials, excepting that they savoured of myrrh and camphire, which they took to be Oriental herbs. But with the true professional hatred to a successful practicioner of their art, they insinuated that, since the medicine was beyond their own knowledge, it must necessarily have been compounded from an unlawful and magical pharmacopeia, since they themselves, though no conjurors, fully understood every branch of their art, so far as it might be exercised with the good faith of a Christian. (Scott 409)

The chapter presents us with the ridiculousness of a witch trial, and through Bois-Guilbert maybe the author's opinion is expressed: "Will future ages believe that such stupid bigotry ever existed!" (Duncan xi).

1.4 A New Type of English

While Scott may have admired many of the Highland traditions, he felt that the defeat of their feudal system is a progress for Scotland (Kuehn). By the integration of Scotland Britain became the largest free-trade area in Europe, of which Scotland also profited greatly, although at the prize of oppression (Kuehn). Similarly did the Norman Conquest bring along much development which was, as Chibnall notes, "neither Anglo-Saxon nor Norman, but truly Anglo-Norman" (218), and we will see the importance of

this. There were improvements in the laws, literacy, trade, productivity, population growth and architecture (Chibnall 101, 216). As Williams puts it, the conquest made the reception of French culture – by which England would have been influenced anyway – much easier. Ivanhoe and King Richard are the materialisations of this new Anglo-Norman type of English, because of their "culture-crossing skills" (Duncan xix). By this, they set themselves apart from Cedric and Prince John, who are entirely devoted to the one or the other side (Duncan xviii). Cedric more than once expresses his unfamiliarity with Norman chivalry, which can be seen as a symbol of Norman culture:

[Discussing the tournament:] "Our going thither", said Cedric, "is uncertain. I love not these vanities, which were unknown to my fathers when England was free." (Scott 61)

"Not a jot I", returned Cedric; "I have never been wont to study either how to take or how to hold out those abodes of tyrannical power, which the Normans have erected in this groaning land. I will fight among the foremost; but my honest neighbours well know I am not a trained soldier in the discipline of wars, or the attack of strongholds." (Scott 328-9)

At the assembly of Saxon families all the representatives are elderly men, in contrast with Ivanhoe and his generation, who are already crossing the barriers of the two cultures:

There were assembled in this apartment, around a large oaken table, about a dozen of the most distinguished representatives of the Saxon families in the adjacent counties. These were all old, or at least, elderly men; for the younger race, to the great displeasure of the seniors, had, like Ivanhoe, broken down many of the barriers which separated for half a century the Norman victors from the vanquished Saxons. (Scott 465)

Scott himself created a new type of Brit in Waverley (Kuehn), and Ivanhoe is the same character. Both of which can be a representation of Scott's faith in "the ethnically and culturally heterogeneous formation of Britain (Duncan xii) and a new type of Scottishness, which was the union of old and new (Kuehn).

Scott believed in the union, but only by keeping the respect for cultural identity. The marriage of Ivanhoe and Rowena is attended by both Saxons and Normans, signifying the alliance of the two into one nation, but take notice that it is a marriage within the same race, so it "is an inter-cultural but not an inter-ethnic union" (Duncan xxv). Scott was the originator of many newly invented old Scottish traditions (Smout 8). He believed that the two countries should "develop their distinctive national traditions", in opposition to the picture in *Ivanhoe*, in which "Anglo-Saxon manners, laws, and languages [are] being swept aside in the Normanization of England" (Wilson, *Introduction* xxvii). The picture above can be entirely translated as the Anglicisation of Scotland. The message is that every nation must have its own traditions, but they must recognize their "interdependence and [...] common good" (Wilson, *Introduction* xxviii-xxix). As Duncan puts it, "*Ivanhoe* represents a politically divided (rather than organically harmonious) medieval England in order to draw the dynamics of compromise" (xv).

1.5 Colonisation as rape

One of the aims of Scott can be to present – beside the situation of Scotland – something universal about colonisation, something timelessly true for all ages. As he quotes from *The Merchant of Venice* in the introductory text to the novel:

Our ancestors were not more distinct from us, surely, than Jews are from Christians; they had „eyes, hands, organs, dimension, senses, affections, passions"; were „fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer," as ourselves. (Scott 19-20)

In *Waverley*'s first chapter he writes about the passions being the same for men of all ranks and all times (Duncan 530). As Cottom notes, in all of Scott's works the distinction between the old and new times is represented by a contrast between violence and law (170). But the seemingly peaceful world of law is the place of "greater insecurity and a worse violence than ever" (Cottom 170-1). One of the clashing "forces is usually described as finally dominating the other", bringing together an "enchanted imprisonment, infantilization, and feminization of men" (Cottom 158). Cottom calls this the "perversely fascinating state of submissiveness" (154). According to Duncan the two most important historical sources for *Ivanhoe* are Hume and Henry. The former presents the conquest of the Saxons "as a genocide", the latter the conquest of the Normans "as a rape" (xx-xxi). As he argues, Scott takes the latter approach (xx-xxi). If we remember the case of Rowena, as well as Rebecca, we can see how women are the embodiment of this notion. As De Bracy says to Fitzurse "the work of the Conquest should be completed" (Scott 175) – as Prince John suggested to him – by wedding Rowena and so taking her wealth as well:

"We shall cheer her sorrows," said Prince John, "and amend her blood, by wedding her to a Norman. She seems a minor, and must therefore be at our royal disposal in marriage. – How sayst thou, de Bracy? What thinkst thou of gaining fair lands and livings, by wedding a Saxon, after the fashion of the followers of the Conqueror?" (Scott 154)

These forced weddings stand really close to the historical truth. Although "Frenchmen were forbidden to engage in illicit relationships with English women" (Williams 12), they nevertheless tried to find English wives, as an opportunity to acquire wealth (Williams 200). This is also proven by the fact that many English women are known to have taken shelter as nuns, not because of religiousness but to escape French men (Williams 12; Scott, 246). Similarities can be found in Anglo-Scottish intermarriages, when we observe them as "diluting Scottish identity" or "as border raiding" (Langford 161). The submission of men was a reality as well, Scots being "oppressed by their own domestic superiors" (Kidd 172), with Scotland's kings and nobles being described as "despotic" and "tyrants" (Kidd 182). To conclude – similarly to post-colonial writings – the masculine order of the conquerors causes a feminine submissive state on the part of the conquered. We already saw how Saxon women have an important place in this representation of rape, of total submission. Jews and women share this unique place (Duncan xx), and Rebecca embodies both, the explanation of which deserves its own chapter.

2 Jews in *Ivanhoe*

In my opinion Jews in *Ivanhoe* are another metaphor for Anglo-Scottish relations, and colonialism in general. Scott's representation of Jews is something unconventional for his age, something improved, more than the stereotypes before. Jews were absent from England between 1290 when Edward expelled them from the country (Holmes) until the second half of eighteenth century (Roth), excepting maybe some individuals or really small communities. Nevertheless, as I will explore later, they were present in English consciousness through religious literary texts as early as the Anglo-Saxon times. Scott relies much on two famous plays, Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (Duncan 540-1, 560), which use stock characters as Jews, the usurer father, and his daughter who wants "nothing more than to be rescued from her cultural fate by a handsome Christian" (Misiura). These works can be seen as anti-Semitic, which was common for both Shakespeare's age, and for Scott's as well (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 156-7), but Scott transcends these stereotypes, by refraining from the "conventional outcome" in which the Jewess converts to Christianity for the love of the hero (Duncan 560).

Scott is not the only one using the Jews in the role of the conquered as a metaphor for colonialism. Jews were not present in Anglo-Saxon England physically, but they were the more present in Christian texts (Scheil 3, 7). Anti-Judaism was an inseparable part of Christianity for a very long time – and probably still continues to be one (Ludovici; Scheil 240), presenting the Jews as "antagonists"; "archetypes of error"; examples of "how not to behave" (Scheil 35, 44, 205). "Jewish stereotypes" had been so much encoded in English minds that they were still present in Elizabethan England, with actual Jews being absent for more than 400 years. The first influential Christian texts establishing these images stem from the 6th and 7th century, from the cleric Gildas and the monk Bede. Bede's work, the *Historia Ecclesiastica* was composed to "promote a sense of English identity" (Scheil 107), and indeed these texts interpret the "populus Israhel" mythos – that is the tale of the people of the Old Testament – as the ascension of one ethnical group above the other (Scheil 159). The native Britons are compared to the "blind, stubborn, sinning Israel" (Scheil 147), and what happened to them is compared to the events of the Old Testament (Scheil 143-4). The Anglo-Saxons as "younger, mightier people" took their place and became the new chosen people of God, similarly to Christians (Scheil 175):

In his blessedness God saw to it that the accursed race should lose the lands of their ancestors by their own sins; and that a more fortunate people should enter their cities, a people that would fast the commands of the Lord. (Scheil 148)

The Anglo-Saxons are, however, destined to the same cycle of events (Scheil 147), that is through the Norman conquest, as we see in *Ivanhoe* as well. As Rebecca voices in the novel – probably in her most important monologue – how ancient her people are, still overtaken by the younger Christianity:

"Thou hast spoken the Jew,' said Rebecca, "as the persecution of such as thou art has made him. Heaven in ire has driven him from his country, but industry has opened to him the only road to power and to influence, which oppression has left unbarred. Read the ancient history of the people of God, and tell me if those, by whom Jehovah wrought such marvels among the nation, were then a people of usurers! – And know, proud

knight, we number names amongst us to which your boasted nobility is as the gourd compared with the cedar – names that ascend as far back to those high times when the Divine Presence shook the mercy-seat between the cherubim, and which derive their splendour from no earthly prince, but from the awful Voice, which bade their fathers be nearest of the congregation to the Vision – Such were the princes of the House of Jacob." (Scott 433)

The Jews are here represented as the most ancient of people, the people of God, but they are oppressed by the younger, and – compared to them – newcomer Christians, who misread the Bible to justify themselves, which is a common practice of Scott's characters (Cottom 172):

"If thou readest the Scripture," said the Jewess, "and the lives of the saints, only to justify thine own licence and profligacy, thy crime is like that of him who extracts poison from the most healthful and necessary herbs." (Scott 253)

2.1 Exploitation of the English Jewry

Let me present how the evil practices against Jews were justified and what were their true motivations. We can clearly find them pictured in the novel similarly to reality.

Jews in the middle ages were held to be carnal beings, often accused to have some relationship with the devil – as sorcerers who commit evil blood rituals – and therefore even the murder of a Jew was not a sin but a deed appealing to god. They were held to be spiritually blind – because they were unable to recognise Jesus as the Messiah – and therefore they are too carnal, too much of the body, which connects them to "sickness and disease, consumption, gluttony, and excretion" (Scheil 267-8). Their sickness is a common image (Scheil 28) and it presents itself in *Ivanhoe* as well, for example as the Grand Master refuses to touch Isaac:

"Back, dog!" said the Grand Master; "I touch not misbelievers, save with the sword. – Conrade, take thou the letter from the Jew, and give it to me." (Scott 389).

They are also said to be possessed by the devil (Scheil 218), as it appears in the novel as well: "The devil, that possessed her race with obstinacy, has concentrated its full force in her single person!" (Scott 396). This belief manifests itself in 12th century English reality in accusations of evil deeds, such as "poisoning wells, [...] desecrating hosts, bearing demonic body parts (e.g., tails, cloven hooves)" (Scheil 9), "blood sacrifice" such as kidnapping and killing a Christian child in a similar way to Jesus' passion (Holmes), and other "machinations" against the Christian community (Scheil 206). And – similarly to Rebecca's trial – Jewish healers of the 16th century were held to be sorcerers, one of them even accused of trying to poison Queen Elizabeth I. It can be observed in *Ivanhoe* that Isaac and Ben Samuel fear the accusation of blood guilt and necromancy, because they are "often used for cloaking evil practices on our people" (Scott 421). The revenge on Jews is justified in Christian texts as a godly deed (Scheil 141), so powerful as capable of healing the sick (Scheil 265, 267). Even the "good marks of Christianity" in *Ivanhoe* are slaying Saracens and keeping a Jew captive:

"Safe thou art," replied De Bracy, "and for Christianity, here is the stout Baron Reginald Front-de-Boeuf, whose utter abomination is a Jew; and the good Knight Templar, Brian de Bois-Guilbert, whose trade is to slay Saracens – If these are not good marks of Christianity, I know no other which they bear about them." (Scott 289)

Religious reasons were most often used as a disguise to exploit the wealth of the Jewish population. Usury was something forbidden for the Christian community, therefore only practiced by the Jews of the time – that is, before the 12th century – and they were therefore a force to be reckoned with through the money they acquired. The Jews' position was in many aspects enviable (Ludovici), since they controlled the loans (Roth) and were, "by law, permitted to charge a very high rate of interest" (Ludovici). They had moreover an exceptional place, because of the "charter of protection to the Jews" issued by King Henry I, which made them "answerable to him alone". This preferential treatment led to many riots, seemingly connected with the crusade, and sorcery accusations of the Jews, but they were in reality caused by barons indebted to them (Palomino; Schoenberg). Their "enviable" position in the eyes of many was not so bright in reality, because their exceptional situation was only a tool to squeeze out more money from them by kings as Henry I and Richard I – for financing the crusades (Duncan 539-40; Schoenberg*)* and Richard's ransom (Palomino) – and John (Schoenberg*;* Palomino). Even their banishment from England by Edward I was a means to acquire their possessions (Holmes). This practice appears in the novel as King John also held a wealthy Jew captive, similar to Front-de-Boeuf, tearing his teeth out one by one, until he agreed to pay a large ransom:

It is a well-known story of King John, that he confined a wealthy Jew in one of the royal castles, and daily caused one of his teeth to be torn out, until, when the jaw of the unhappy Israelite was half disfurnished, he consented to pay a large sum, which it was the tyrant's object to extort from him. (Scott 81).

Less than 20 years before Scott's birth, in 1753 the Jewish Naturalization Bill – which would have given foreign Jews the same rights to those born in England – caused such agitation, that it was withdrawn (Palomino). Anti-semitism was a widely spread reality in England, maintaining itself throughout the centuries. We cannot be surprised that Isaac pauses at the gate of the preceptory, fearing to be hurt either because of his religion or because of his wealth (Scott 383).

2.2 Jews and colonialism

In the following I will present how submission and pursuits of acculturation manifest themselves in the novel. Scott chooses to present "a generalized account of persecution" of the Jews, ignoring the atrocities against them a few years before the action of the novel (Duncan 540). While until the beginning of the 18th century Jews were very much outcasts of the society, by the end of Scott's life people started to approach them with respect and tolerance (Roth). While Scott shared many of the old prejudices, nevertheless he managed – similarly to Shakespeare – to create a new picture of the Jew, who is oppressed by the Christian community (Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott* 157; Rogers). His portrayal of the Israelite shows an acceptance and solidarity. So does Ivanhoe himself, as at the entrance of Isaac in the hall of Cedric he offers his seat while all the others ignore him:

While Isaac thus stood an outcast in the present society, like his people among the nations, looking in vain for welcome or resting place, the pilgrim who sat by the chimney took compassion upon him, and resigned his seat, saying briefly, "Old man, my garments are dried, my hunger appeased, thou art both wet and fasting." (Scott 65)

But aside from this resemblance Jews get an even greater role in Ivanhoe than the eponymous hero: as Duncan aptly puts it "Rebecca and Bois-Guilbert are the true antagonists of *Ivanhoe*". Bois-Guilbert's utopistic imperialist dreams confront Rebecca's vision of universality, through which she is made Scott's "prophet of modernity" (Duncan xxiv-xxv). The Jews are often perceived in the Christian context as a "distinct 'race' with customs, rites, and a history of their own" (Scheil 68), and they are represented by Rebecca's speech superior in their culture (Scott 433; Duncan xxii). Yet their Christian hosts want the differences to be extinguished, by forcing baptism as Friar Tuck does when locked up together with Isaac:

"How's this, Jew?" said the Friar, with a menacing aspect; "dost thou recant, Jew? – Bethink thee, if thou dost relapse into thine infidelity, though thou art not so tender as a suckling pig – I would I had one to break my fast upon – thou art not too though to be roasted! Be comfortable, Isaac, and repeat the words after me. Ave Maria!" (Scott 352-3)

The Grandmaster "offers" it in exchange of Rebecca's life as well:

Repent, my daughter – confess thy witchcrafts – turn thee from thine evil faith – embrace this holy emblem, and all shall yet be well with thee here and hereafter. In some sisterhood of the strictest order, shalt thou have time for prayer and fitting penance, and that repentance not to be repented of. This do and live – what has the law of Moses done for thee that thou shouldest die for it? (Scott 416)

This baptism can be read as an acculturation, which the Scottish of the time were also facing. An example of this is that in Scottish schools in the 19th century education was carried out according to "English values and methods" (Hutchison 253).

This offer is, however, refused: Rebecca preserves her culture at any cost imaginable (Duncan xxii):

"Forgive the interruption," said Rebecca, meekly; "I am a maiden, unskilled to dispute my religion, but I can die for it, if it be God's will." (Scott 417)

This makes her the ideal of the modern Scotsman, who does not try to become British by melting in English culture, but by staying faithful to his own traditions. Scots were often seen as "mercenary calculator[s]"; "parasites" of England seeking for "personal enrichment", which is very similar to the image of Jews in the Middle Ages. Women and Jews have a similar perception in Christianity: they are associated with weakness, vulnerability, sickness, being too much of the body (Scheil 268-270; Duncan xxii). Moreover, they are hindered from speaking for themselves, something characteristic for Jews and especially Jewish women in Christian culture (Scheil 265; Said 23). As Edward Said observes commenting on Flaubert's affair with an Egyptian courtesan: "He [Flaubert] spoke for and represented her. He was *foreign, comparatively wealthy* [and] male" (Said 23). This is very similar to the situation of the Scottish, ignored by the English influenced government as I discussed before. As Duncan argues:

The Gothic plot of the female body as object of totalitarian power expels any notion of reciprocity of consent, and with that the potent ideological category of feminine subjectivity, from the imperial allegory of the heroine as vessel of a union of races. The birth of the nation is founded on rape. (xxi)

According to Cottom a love relationship is similar to the submission of men to each other, and law brings along this submission, which makes violence "nostalgically appear as a surer justice" (158-180). This nostalgic feeling for violence can be observed as I have pointed out earlier both by after-Union Scotsmen and by Saxons in the novel.

Rebecca appears to be the most important representative of this forced submission, both by law – as in the trial scene – and by love – Bois-Guilbert's "love" towards her: it appears both on the level of her person and of her whole race:

"Lamented be the hour," said Rebecca, "that has taught such art to the House of Israel! But adversity bends the heart as fire bends the stubborn steel, and those who are no longer their own governors, and the denizens of their own free independent state, must crouch before strangers. (Scott 428)

As we can see, Jews' representation in *Ivanhoe* – although somewhat faithful to their real historical situation – can be understood as one of the strongest pillars of Scott's metaphor of colonisation, acculturation, colonisation as a rape and the birth of an intercultural new generation.

Conclusion

As we have seen, the critical response to Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* is hard to support, since criticising the novel on a historical basis ignores its metaphorical nature, furthermore even if we could decide the genre of the novel for certain, there seem to be no clear-cut definitions on which everyone agrees. Scott's historical realism is not something based on research, but the living reality of his time, nor is *Ivanhoe* something created by checking every bit of data, rather something what represents how well-read and educated a man Scott was. Moreover, I think his critics failed to recognize the underlying metaphor of the whole novel, which is a big flaw, considering many of them were historians.

In my opinion, Scott continues to write about after Union Scottish matters, he just does this in a more subtle way, in order not to bore his readers, to create something new. Altering history by presenting a Norman-Saxon antagonism creates the metaphor for the Scottish situation after the Union of the Crowns and the Act of Union, using such tools as the situation of language, dresses, manners, and the general attitude of Normans towards the Saxons, to represent the situation of the Scottish dialect and the Gaelic language, the prohibition of Scottish national symbols, and the mockery of Scots in English journalism.

He also recreates many of the problems of government and rights, as he paints the picture of a bid fair monarch, who turns out to be incapable of his task, the oppressive and neglectful English government and its unjust laws, or the barbaric practice of witch accusations. He lays down the path for a new type of "Briton", as a symbol of modernity and progress, who respects and retains his cultural rights, but who is not over-idealistic about them. Meanwhile he – as a warning – draws attention to what will be, or can be lost during the process, by showing how violent and oppressive change can be.

He uses not only one, but two cultural metaphors for colonisation. The first is the Norman Conquest itself, the second is the portrayal of Jews. The latter is a more universal metaphor, used throughout the centuries by English language Christian texts as a metaphor of one people becoming the nation of God over the other. With this metaphor he paints an even bigger picture of the cyclic nature of history. He portrays the oppressed nature of woman, and Jews, and especially Jewish women to represent the threatened rape by a foreign force, the most prominent image of it being Bois-Guilbert, with his

imperialistic dreams about the future. He implies that one must preserve his cultural roots even at the cost of his own life.

In the end, however, people must learn to live together, and appreciate each others' traditions, to create something new, something stronger, bearing the benefits of both sides and lacking the weaknesses of them. In my opinion Scott strove to achieve this ideal for himself and Scotland, and it is represented in the person of Ivanhoe.

Works Cited

Apple, Rabbi Dr. Raymond. "Beginnings of Anglo-Jewry." oztorah.com, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Brown, Keith. "A Blessed Union? Anglo-Scottish Relations before the Covenant." *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 37-56. Print.

Chibnall, Marjorie. *Anglo-Normal England 1066-1166.* Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell Inc., 1986. Print.

Cottom, Daniel. *The Civilized Imagination.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985. Print.

Duncan, Ian. "Introduction." Sir Walter Scott. *Ivanhoe*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2008. Print.

Duncan, Ian. "Editor's Notes." Sir Walter Scott. *Ivanhoe*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2008. Print.

Frye, Northrop. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature.* Toronto: Academic Press Canada, 1981. Print.

Hickman, Kennedy. "Crusades: King Richard I the Lionheart of England." militaryhistory.about.com, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Holmes, Tara. "Readmission of Jews to Britain in 1656." www.bbc.co.uk, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Hutchison, I. G. C. "Anglo-Scottish Political Relations in the Nineteenth Century, c. 1815-1914." *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 247-66. Print.

"Ivanhoe; A Romance." www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk, Edinburgh University Library, 2007. Web. 03. Dec. 2011.

"James I of England, James VI of Scotland (b.1566 r.1603-1625)." Armchair Travel Co. Ltd., 2007. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

"James I and Witchcraft." *www*.historylearningsite.co.uk, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Kidd, Colin. "Eighteenth-Century Scotland and the Three Unions." *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 171-88. Print.

"King Richard I – The Lionheart." militaryhistory.about.com, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Kuehn, Ingo. "Robert Burns and Sir Walter Scott – Two Versions of Scottish National Identity." www.worldburnsclub.com, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Langford, Paul. "South Britons' Reception of North Britons, 1707-1820." *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 143-70. Print.

Ludovici, Anthony. "The Jews, and the Jews in England." Boswell Publishing Company, 1938. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.

Misiura, Linda. “The Portrayal of Jews in Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice and Marlowe’s The Jew of Malta.” www2.cedarcrest.edu, 2007. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.
Morril, John. “The English, the Scots, and the Dilemmas of Union, 1638-1654.” *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. New York:Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 57-74. Print.
Palonimo, Michael. “Jews in England.” www.geschichteinchronologie.ch, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.
Rogers, Jami. “Shylock and History.” www.pbs.org, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.
Roth, Cecil. “A History of the Jews in England.” www.iamthewitness.com, 1941. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.
Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* London: Penguin, 1977. Print.
Scheil, Andrew P. *The Footsteps of Israel.* The United States of America: The University of Michigan Press, 2004. Print.
Schoenberg, Shira. “The Virtual Jewish Tour – England.” www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.
Scott, Sir Walter. “Introduction.” *Ivanhoe*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2008. Print.
---. *Ivanhoe.* New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2008. Print.
---. *Ivanhoe.* London/Harmondsworth???: Penguin Books, 1986. Print.
---. “Scott’s Notes.” *Ivanhoe*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2008. 503-524. Print.
Smout, Thomas Christopher. “Introduction.*” Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas ChristopherSmout. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 1-12. Print.
Snell, Melissa. “Richard the Lionheart.” historymedren.about.com, n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2011.
Whatley, Christopher Allan. “Taking Stock: Scotland at the End of the Seventeenth Century.” *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 103-26. Print.
Williams, Ann. *The English and the Norman Conquest.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995. Print.
Wilson, Andrew Norman. *A Life of Walter Scott.* Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1980. Pimlico Ed. , 2002. Print.
---. “Introduction.” *Ivanhoe*. London/Harmondsworth???: Penguin Books, 1986. Print.
Wormald, Jenny. “O Brave New World? The Union of England and Scotland in 1603.” *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900.* Ed. Thomas Christopher Smout. NewYork: Oxford University Press Inc., 2005: 13-36. Print.