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I argue in the first chapter that the British novel’s material textuality, that is the physical features of the texts that carry semantic weight and the multiple forms in which texts are created and distributed, often challenges and subverts present conceptions of the cultural roles of the novel in the nineteenth century. My project looks at how the multiple forms of the novel within nineteenth-century Britain both reflected and sought to change the relations between the novel and its readers. I suggest that different material instantiations of a literary work reveal historical contingencies that are unrecoverable from any one edition by itself. I consider the ways that the material characteristics of the physical document such as paper, size, and typeface, its mode of production, and other materialities, such as price and print run size constrain reading. While no reading is totally constrained by the text, every text represents possible uses of the written word in which we can recognize the constraints or discipline that these texts seek to exercise on their readers. The remaining chapters are a series of case studies that analyze how material textuality affects our understanding of Walter Scott’s Waverley, Frederick Marryat’s Peter Simple, and W. M. Thackeray’s History of Henry Esmond.
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Chapter 1

Material Textuality—What’s Past Is Prologue

Texts are inevitably affected by the physical means of their transmission; the physical features of the artifacts conveying texts therefore play an integral role in the attempt to comprehend those texts. For this reason, the concept of a textual source must involve the attention to the presentation of a text, not simply to the text as a disembodied group of words. All objects purporting to present the same text—whether finished manuscripts, first editions, later printings, or photocopies—are separate records with their own characteristics; they all carry different information, even if the words and punctuation are indeed identical, since each one reflects a different historical moment. Any such record may be a primary source, but an object which is a primary source for one purpose is not necessarily so for another.

—“Statement on the Significance of Primary Records”

Modern Language Association

The Modern Language Association (MLA), it seems safe to say, has been, is now, and will always be against the wanton destruction of books. In 1995 the “Statement on the Significance of Primary Records” cited above was drafted in response to a trend that seemed to be leading inevitably in that direction. Libraries were actively “deaccessioning” or sometimes simply throwing away whole archives of material as they microfilmed and digitized their collections. Overall, the “Statement” acknowledges the
importance and advantages of good copies over frail and deteriorating “originals.”
However, it reflects a radical concept of the material text in its justification of the
maintenance of “primary sources,” one that argues that all objects presenting a text are significant.

No one disputes the significance of records such as manuscripts and first editions, but to most of the general public and to many scholars the significance of later printings is problematic. Most reprinted texts are generally seen as disposable or, at most, worth only the paper they are printed on. Furthermore, later printings are usually seen as more prone to errors in transcription, hence often misleading. One might grant later printings significance for historical purposes—for example, within a study of the history of printing or an analysis of print culture—but one might still argue against these later printings having any literary significance; the ideas a text conveys are important, not the material means of conveyance. However, if one concedes that the physical features of a document, the textual artifact, play an integral role in the ways that a text makes meaning, then this suggests the physical features of texts do have literary significance whether a text is in its first or fiftieth printing.

The nineteenth century is the age of the steam-powered press, mechanized paper production, and an exponential increase in the demand for and supply of reading material. This makes the nineteenth century not only the age of the machine press but also the age of the reprint. Certainly texts were reprinted earlier, but this production was limited by inadequate technology, trade practices, government controls, and the lack of an audience. Texts were reformatted, reprinted, and rereleased on a scale in the nineteenth century that dwarfed all previous print production. Never before in Britain had so many people had
the access and the literacy to understand texts as in nineteenth century. In this dissertation I argue that our way of thinking about the novel changes when we consider the material texts of the novel in early- to mid-nineteenth-century Britain and the ways the texts themselves reflect on their own materiality. I consider how texts are “affected by the physical means of their transmission” and how the “physical features of the artifacts conveying texts” function in “the attempt to comprehend those texts.” Furthermore, the study and analysis of the physical artifact and the text’s relationship to it not only helps in our present-day comprehension of texts but also can reveal much about how texts were comprehended at the time of their release. Evaluating and analyzing the material conditions of the production and reception of the artifact can reveal much about the processes of reading.

My conception of material textuality, then, involves two senses of the term and is a modification of the two-part definition proposed by George Bornstein. “Material textuality,” writes Bornstein, is the notion of “both the physical features of the text that carry semantic weight and the multiple forms in which texts are created and distributed” (1). First, according to Bornstein, there are all the material aspects of the physical print and paper document itself: paper size, page quantity, paper quality, typography, design, format, binding, illustrations, diagrams, and the multiple variant combinations of these elements that appear in each material expression of the text. In short, anything and everything that might be observed in any single material instantiation of a text. However, Bornstein does not acknowledge that the semantic weight of a particular physical feature may be more in the eye of the beholder than intrinsic to text itself. For instance, is a standard font such as Times New Roman semantically weightless, or does it carry the full
burden of submission to convention? I think the answer to this question has to be decided on a case by case basis and that decision needs to take into account the second sense of the material textuality I intend.

This second sense of material textuality refers to the "multiple forms in which texts are created and distributed" for Bornstein. He is interested in how the multiple forms of a text relate to each other. I am interested in that and how each multiple form relates to the wider material context of its production and distribution. These multiple material contexts are not only embodied within the material artifact that contains the text, but additionally derived from other historical sources. Information on print runs, prices, and other material aspects of a textual creation and distribution are integral to material textuality but not really a part of any single form of a text. For instance, *Waverley* by Sir Walter Scott had a list price of eighteen shillings when it was first released. This sales price is not a part of the text. It is not printed anywhere on the first editions of the novel, and it is only to be found in the historical accounts of the novel. Furthermore, in and of itself it does have much to reveal. However, comparing this price with the prices of other novels published at the same time shows how the factor of price may have differentiated *Waverley* from other novels for its audience. We can make certain connections between the price of a text and its reception when we consider price as an indicator of relative value. How do other external material contexts relate to the different information these texts carry? How and what do they reflect about the historical moment of their creation? What were the economic motivations and constraints on textual production? Do the different physical characteristics of texts reveal different class and gender characteristics of the target audience? How did the material features of the artifacts both create and
reflect their audience? These are some of the questions implied by my second sense of material textuality as encompassing the material contexts in which a material text is created, produced, and disseminated.

The history of the novel in the nineteenth century is the history of its reprinting. Looking at the texts of nineteenth-century novels in their multiple material instantiations reveals a wider universe than any strictly textual approach. In addition, the material contexts revealed by archival sources outside the text—that is, records of print runs, prices, and marketing strategies—can tell us much about production, distribution, and consumption of different novels. We can tell a great deal about a text’s intended reception by comparing the artifact of one text against its contemporaries and by looking at the different material instantiations of the “same” text over time. Furthermore, since texts are rendered in language, we can consider the text’s own efforts to control the reception of its materiality, as when it directly addresses the reader or models scenes of reading within the text. In other words, looking at the synchronic relationships among texts, the diachronic relationships of a text to other versions of itself, and the relationships between the words and the artifact that manifests them leads to a different understanding of the novel.

Perceptions of the cultural role of the novel have been skewed because most scholars have ignored the material instantiations of nineteenth-century novels and the material conditions of production and reception these instantiations manifest. For instance, it is almost a truth universally acknowledged that the rise of the genre of the novel is linked to the rise of the middle class and capitalism and closely associated with middle-class concepts of privacy, individuality, and domesticity. This universal truth is
accompanied by a number of related assumptions. First, realism is the defining characteristic of the novel, and this realism, in its form and content, underlies the ideologies of individual consciousness and the rising middle class. Second, literary production shifts to a commodity form as patronage declines and a large anonymous reading public develops. Third, this commodity reproduces—in the sense that it both reflects and creates—the interests of the dominant class of capitalism in its construction of an individual and a social outlook. However, like Jane Austen’s “truth universally acknowledged, that a young man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife” (Pride 3), these assumptions describe the limits of a particular universe instead of being truly universal. It may seem odd to classify such a broad area as the study of the novel as only a limited universe; nevertheless, the universe of most studies of the nineteenth-century novel is limited by its focus on the text as only a “disembodied group of words.”

Taking textual materiality into account results in an understanding of the novel as something more than the monolithic and monologic ideological armature of the middle class. Rather than a defining characteristic, realism becomes merely an aspect of novelistic discourse among elements of the gothic, sensation, adventure, and romantic novel. Rather than being consumed by a large, homogenous, and anonymous public, the shift to commodity production results in a hybrid and pluralistic public that can be fluidly segmented, not only in terms of class and gender but also by age, occupation, region, and other characteristics. Rather than merely bespeaking the alienation of its producers, the commodity form, the reified novel, allows for freer (but not necessarily free) appropriations by readers for their own purposes. Rather than merely reproducing the
interests of the dominant class, commodity production also allows critiques of those interests. In other words, as Judith Butler argues, the process of ideological reproduction necessarily becomes vulnerable to critique and reimagining because it is at the moment of its reproduction that its gaps and shortcomings are revealed (Bodies 122). This is to say not that the monolithic account of the novel is wrong but only that it is not the only account. When we pay attention to the material instantiations of texts, what we find is a fragmentary and contested universe in which it is not only the words of the text that are significant but also the physical object and its material relationships that make meaning.

Of the relatively few studies of the novel that have tried to take its material expression into account, many have focused on the three-volume form of first editions. This single focus tends to support the reading of the novel as an armature of middle-class ideology. The first-edition form of most nineteenth-century novels is the well-known triple-decker: three volumes, duodecimo, that sold for 31s. 6d. from about 1823 to 1888. Triple-deckers were high-priced and printed in limited quantities. Their ownership was limited to wealthy individuals and libraries that leased these expensive books out to members. Given this mode of production and market, it comes as no surprise to find the novel the primary instrument of bourgeois ideology. The three-volume novel form, important as it was, represents only a portion of what I term “novelistic discourse.” The triple-decker is a kind of common denominator of novelistic discourse. Almost every novel was printed in this form at one time or another, and it is the form that has survived on library shelves. However, it would be a mistake to take it as a representative form merely because it sometimes has claims to priority and is still around. John Sutherland estimates that over fifty thousand novels were printed in the Victorian period and the vast
majority never received a second printing ("Victorian Novelists" 159). While these one-off novels may be important in what they can reveal about Victorian culture, their impact on culture is negligible.

If we are to consider the novel’s impact on culture and ideas, then we should consider more than just one type of material manifestation of the text. It is the novels that received many printings in different formats that not only reflected nineteenth-century British culture but also helped to create it. In addition to the triple-decker, these novels appeared as serials in parts and in magazines, as one of a publisher’s series, as special railway versions, as cheap single volumes, as collected editions of an author’s work, and as deluxe editions. Lest one think that this is merely a way of resuscitating the old canon of Victorian novels, it is not. Looking at reprinted authors, one does see, of course, Sir Walter Scott, Charles Dickens, and William Thackeray, but one also notices the likes of once popular but now nearly forgotten authors such as Harrison Ainsworth, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Captain Frederick Marryat, Charles Reade, Anne Manning, and Harriet Martineau.

In addition to the variety of the material forms of the novel, we should keep in mind the different ways in which people could come in contact with it in other than our contemporary style of silent, solitary reading. The novel was read aloud at home as a form of family entertainment. Workers in shops or factories would sometimes take turns reading aloud or hire someone to read to them if conditions and management allowed it. Authors gave public readings, and almost every popular novel was dramatized for the stage. If a novel can be compared to a pebble thrown into a pool, I am just as interested in the widening ripples as I am in the initial splash. Moreover, while some novels may have
sunk into obscurity with nary a splash, others are still skimming across the surface making new ripples with every new edition.

Today, thirteen years after the MLA issued the “Statement on the Significance of Primary Records,” its concept of the significance of the material object has had only a gradual impact on literary criticism. Some literary critics have begun to look at how “texts are inevitably affected by the physical means of their transmission,” but most still rarely pay attention to the physical artifact of the text and usually treat it exactly as a “disembodied group of words.” Even many New Historicists who seek to locate texts within their historical context often pay little attention to the “physical means of their transmission”; the text is still disembodied from the physical features of the artifact conveying it. These critics tend to leap over the physical object as they locate only a text within its broader historical context. They rarely take into account the nature of the artifact itself and its material relations; for example, Nancy Armstrong’s already convincing arguments about domestic fiction would probably be affirmed by a study of the formats, prices, and distribution of this domestic fiction (Armstrong, *Desire*). However, I am not so sure she would come to the same conclusions about *Frankenstein* and *Waverley* if she took into account the material history of these two works (Armstrong, *Novels* 58).

Other than to make sure it is an accepted scholarly edition, most scholars, with the notable exceptions of bibliographers and editors, pay no attention to the material instantiation of a text. The physical object of the book has no relevance and nothing to add to what the text of the book means. And how could it? Most of us read nineteenth-century texts in twenty-first-century books. The text may be from the past, but the object
itself is contemporary and thus can tell us little about past versions. A shelf of the Oxford World Classics or the Penguin or Norton critical editions of nineteenth-century novels presents standardized, regularized, aestheticized, reified, and materially re-contextualized texts. How different a shelf of the same set of novels looks when one has them in the volumes, serial parts, and magazines of only their first appearance in print. Go further and add the multitude of material forms in which they appeared: deluxe and cheap reprints, collected editions, illustrated and nonillustrated versions. Then, not only might whole bookcases be needed for one novel, but also we might come to a different understanding of the novel. However, only a few people collect books this way, and we simply do not think about the physical artifacts of novels like this. For most of us, why have more than one copy of a book?

One might argue that these are all the same texts and that this multitude of material forms merely demonstrates the dominance of bourgeois ideology as it variously perpetuates across and through culture. What this argument fails to account for is the autonomy of readers and the ways that the very multiplicity of forms actually reveals the gaps in and fragility of that dominance. But even if the multitude of forms was only a form of dominance, is not that all the more reason to study the effects of the physical artifact on the text within? Furthermore, I think it is important to think about how the very variety of material forms has led us so often to ignore the form of the text as a component of its meaning. But the form of the book has not been totally ignored by scholars. Traditionally, bibliography and, more recently, the history of the book have focused respectively on the physical artifact in the case of the former and the material conditions of its production, dissemination, and reception in the case of the latter.
The techniques of analytical and descriptive bibliography have been the traditional loci for the study of material texts. Both methods of bibliography provide important data and different perspectives on material texts. However, neither method is quite sufficient for my purposes. Descriptive bibliography provides the vocabulary with which to talk about the physical documents and descriptive bibliographies, such as Michael Sadleir's *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (1951), provide summary descriptions of a wide array of material texts. But the goal of most descriptive bibliographies is a comprehensive catalog of works and/or the variations of texts representing those works. They focus strictly on the physical document; for example, they may provide detailed descriptions of the variations in collation and binding in the different editions of a work, but they frequently lack the basic information of print runs and prices. To find this information one must delve into the records of publishers. Furthermore, while these bibliographies may strive for comprehensiveness, they are usually necessarily limited to a particular time period or geographic area. For example, the bibliography of Sir Walter Scott's work by William Todd and Ann Bowden runs to over a thousand pages and it is limited to works produced within Scott's life time (3). After Scott's death in 1832, no one really knows with certainty how many copies of Scott were published for the remainder of the nineteenth century. Descriptive bibliographies can be useful sources, but their limitations have to be kept in mind.

Analytical bibliography with its evaluations of the various stages of textual production or genealogy has provided me with ways to think about the relationships between literary works, texts, and their material instantiations. However, it is driven primarily by editorial theory and was initially concerned with the systematic description
and classification of writings in order "to determine a text in its most accurate form" (Gaskell 1). For much of the twentieth century, accuracy meant re-creating a literary work by coming as close as possible to an author's original intentions as an editor perceived them to be. The goal was to produce a "definitive" text that would never have to be edited again. Since literary theory has moved away from the possibility of ever determining an author's intention, even denying the importance of the concept of an author for the interpretation of a text, few present-day editors presume to offer what was once described as the definitive edition of a literary work. Analytical bibliography, which was perhaps the last stronghold of authorial intention in literary studies, has shifted toward "a socialized concept of authorship and textual authority" (McGann 8).

Contemporary critical editorial practices tend to follow one of two strategies. One strategy is focused on contextualizing the first edition of a novel as the initial moment of the social instantiation of a literary work. Jerome McGann defines the social instantiation of a text as the form in which the novel first meets the public as the product of the collaborative labor of author, publisher, printer, and bookseller (8). The other strategy strives to present a kind of hybrid text that reflects these processes of composition and revision over time. Hans Gabler's "synoptic" edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses* is an exemplar of this approach.

While I think either approach is justified for editors, I contend that for cultural and literary critics the first overlooks much of the cultural impact of a literary work and the second produces a text never existing before and overly cumbersome to use. In practice the first tends to give priority to the first edition in book form. The first book edition of a literary work is significant, but its earlier (as in the case of a serial) and later
appearances and the differences among them may be even more so. Textual critics, like certain book collectors, can fall prey to what John Carter calls “the chronological obsession” of first-edition fetishism (62). If a book is the product of a collaborative labor, then that labor does not stop with the first edition. For me, it is not only that each text is a reflection of its historical moment but that the differences between texts can reveal historical change as well. Synoptic editions might appear to answer this objection because these make it easy to trace changes in a passage or word, but it is difficult to re-create any single text from them, and they cannot represent the textual materiality of a particular edition. In my opinion, it is better to compare primary records.

If bibliography can be seen as the study of the material book itself, then the field known as the history of the book offers another approach to understanding the material text. Researchers of the “history of the book” study the effects of material forms of the book on concepts of authorship, publishing, and reading. They often focus on what the various material forms of the book and the practices of book production can tell us about the historical moment of a book’s creation and its life in time. These studies tend to work outward from publication data, changes in copyright, and shifts in technology to the wider cultural implication of changes in the book trade/industry that result in changes in distribution, readership, and culture. Many historians of the book see bibliographers as guilty of inferring too much from the artifact of the text, while the bibliographers make counteraccusations that the history of the book pays too little attention to the physical object of the book itself.

Most researchers of the history of the book have disregarded bibliographic and literary approaches in favor of the disciplines and methodologies of the social sciences
(St Clair and Finkelstein). This is partly the result of D. F. McKenzie's call for the development of a "sociology of texts" (19). Analytical bibliography, McKenzie argues, created only "printers of the mind" (9). By inferring printing practices only from the physical object of the book, analytical bibliography created an idealized construction of book production practices that was not borne out by archival evidence. McKenzie, basing his claims on the empirical evidence of the production records of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century printers, argues for the analysis of book production in terms of the wider social structures in which it occurred. He convincingly argues that the "normal" image of printers as careful and meticulous craftsmen, consistently and rationally working toward a standardized text, is the exception rather than the rule of print production. He found in his archives proof of much more complex routines of multiple production and looser, more contingent structures of job work than those that had been postulated by bibliographers before.

The history of the book has been critical not only of the approach of analytical bibliography but also of literary criticism, especially reader-response theory. In a work that has been hailed as "the most important book about early nineteenth-century print culture published in this century" (Patten, "Matters" 345), William St Clair follows McKenzie's critical strategy into the realm of the reader. He attacks the concept of the "implied reader" in much the same way McKenzie criticizes "printers of the mind":

The history of reading is at the stage of astronomy before telescopes, economics before statistics, heavily reliant on a few commonly repeated traditional narratives and favorite anecdotes, but weak on the basic
empirical research, quantification, consolidation, and scrutiny of primary
information. (9-10)

St Clair uses “empirical” information from outside the text to deduce the impact of a text
on the ideas of readers. He considers how costs, print runs, sales prices and volumes, the
internal trade customs of the book industry, its marketing policies, and the private
intellectual property regime have influenced texts, availability, prices, access, and
readership. St Clair argues that there is not much to be learned about readers from the
study of reading materials themselves. He writes that the best we can hope for from text-
based studies is a kind of implied reader who may or may not be close to actual readers;
“text based studies cannot by themselves, without circularity, reveal the meanings that
readers historically did construct” (11). St Clair’s bias toward quantifiable data causes
him to dismiss the influence of content and aesthetics on a novel’s reception. He tends to
treat novels as fungible commodities, fully substitutable one for another, subject to the
laws of supply and demand, and regulated by government in the form of copyrights. To a
degree, of course, novels are fungible. A patron of a lending library in the early
nineteenth century might have accepted a novel by Lady Morgan if nothing was available
from the author of Waverley, but often only the latest by the author of Waverley would
have done. St Clair is very astute and comprehensive on the supply side of the economics
of publishing but the demand side needs to be further developed. St Clair pays little
attention to forces that drive demand and the efforts to create and manipulate demand
from the supply side. Of course, readers and book buyers do not leave the kind of
archival evidence publishers and printers do. Once the Reading Experience Database is
completed, more reports on actual reading practices should be available. Nevertheless, we
can infer much about the demand for books from the ways that suppliers strive to meet it and from the records that do exist, such as library catalogs and loan records.

In his movement away from text-based studies, St Clair overlooks the value of the physical artifact of the book, the object readers actually read. St Clair, like many researchers in the history of the book, overlooks what seems to me to be an obvious source of primary records, not nineteenth-century texts but nineteenth-century books. Surprisingly, these books are, for the most part, readily available. First editions may be confined to the rarebook rooms and special collections, but most college libraries and large public libraries still have large collections of nineteenth-century reprinted novels readily accessible in open stacks. However, only a few libraries would or could have a "complete" collection of these material texts. Most librarians would not see the point in buying multiple versions of Waverley from the nineteenth century and allowing them valuable shelf space. These books, instead of being purchased, are usually donated by a collector. In addition, because these books are often many generations removed from the first editions, they are often the most in danger of being deaccessioned to make additional shelf space available. Even the British Library or the Library of Congress will not have every reprint because works are not generally submitted unless the publisher/printer wants copyright protection for new material. That these reprinted novels are so common as to appear nearly valueless speaks to their prior ubiquity in culture. In the past these reprints were often seen at best as good copies but more often as much worse. They were considered debased texts, bowdlerized, censored, and sometimes unauthorized pirated versions. In my argument I propose that we should be grateful for these variant texts because we can learn from them as products of their historical moment.
St Clair advocates a “systems approach” that sees each act of writing, publishing, and reading as an intervention in what “Pierre Bourdieu calls the *habitus* of literary production” (8). In this dissertation I also take a systems approach in which each material instantiation of a text is a kind of central node for the evidence of that intervention. I agree with St Clair’s criticism of any single text approach as resulting in circularity. However, this study argues that one can break the circle and gain a greater understanding of readers and the historical moments of a text by looking at these material texts as nodes within related networks. Each material instantiation of a text, then, is a node in the networks of other contemporary material texts, and it can be a node in the network of earlier and later versions of itself, of the author’s other works, of a publisher’s series, of a subgenre of the novel, and of the wider genre of the novel itself.

My methodology is that of the case study. I consider some of the most popular novels at a time when “the system” of print culture and the reading public developed at an astounding rate. As this occurred, I argue, there were changes in the mode of perception, and these changes were registered in the material textuality of these works and within the texts themselves. However, it is difficult to see this change from within the text if one is unconscious of material textuality, the physical context in which it occurs. Wherever possible I have consulted the physical texts themselves, and I have been able to physically handle nearly every material text mentioned in this dissertation. I have also supplemented these observations with information from descriptive bibliographies. Three have been indispensable: Michael Sadeir’s *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (1951), Peter Garside, James Raven, and Rainer Schöwerling’s *The English Novel 1770-1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles* (2000) and its

Additional bibliographic information that would have once required trips to individual libraries can now be found in the computerized catalogs, and a kind of virtual descriptive bibliography can be created. Although these electronic catalogs have many faults, they can still be useful. The Online Computer Library Center’s (OCLC) online union catalog, WorldCat, combines the catalogs of 57,000 libraries worldwide (OCLC). The British database, Copac, allows free access to the combined catalogs of twenty-four major university libraries in the United Kingdom and Ireland plus the British Library, the National Library of Scotland, and the National Library of Wales (“About Copac”). However, since these union catalogs on the Web are primarily finding aids rather than bibliographical records, they have to be viewed carefully and skeptically for bibliographic information. First, they are incomplete and can not be viewed as a census of publication forms. Many libraries are not members of the OCLC, and many of the libraries that are members have not yet fully cataloged their holdings. This continues to improve, but it still does nothing to correct for the second problem: the listings themselves are subject to error. For example, just because a separate record exists in WorldCat does not mean it represents a separate edition. Nor are all the books listed under one title, author, publisher, and so forth, necessarily the same. The errors in the original card catalog tend to be replicated in the online versions and new errors are often introduced. Third, libraries are usually disinclined to acquire additional reprints of a text if they already have one on the shelf, especially if it is a “cheap” edition designed to be consumed rather than collected. This means that even if every record were correct and
bibliographically accurate in all the online catalogs, they might still be only a limited reflection of a work's material textuality. Nevertheless, a virtual bibliography can give us some insight into the material dispersion of texts, especially when it is used in conjunction with contemporary catalogs, publishers' records and advertisements, and the more anecdotal information culled from authors' biographies and publishing house histories. These catalogs cannot produce a complete census, but one can find out much more than one may have thought.

The case studies that follow are meant not to be definitive but rather to indicate the capacity of a material textual approach to develop alternate constructions of the nineteenth century very different from current ones. What links the authors of my study together is not so much that they were all popular in the nineteenth century and had their works published in multiple material formats but that their literary works exemplify changes in the role of the material text and often exhibit a self-consciousness of the roles of their own textual materiality. My views emphasize historical contingency, multiple versions, and the material features of the text itself. The project thus situates itself at the intersection of literary theory and the rapidly growing area of "history of the book." From there it reaches out into areas of cultural study including material forms of cultural transmission, the hybridity of group identities, and the politics of literary gender. For me a fundamental question underlies this approach that combines bibliography, literary criticism, and cultural history; how did the novel transform forms of sociability, permit new modes of thought, and change people's relationship with power in Britain in the nineteenth century?
The rest of this first chapter gives my definition of terms and the theoretical framework of my observations. My terms and theoretical framework are drawn from a wide variety of critical areas: bibliography, narratological and Marxist theory, reader-response criticism, economics, and speech-act theory, all provide key terms and structures for dealing with the influences of material textuality.

The second chapter begins with a general overview of the cultural and material positions of the novel in the early nineteenth century before *Waverley* burst on the scene. *Waverley* is an important novel not only because it reflects a change in historical consciousness but also because it initiates the nineteenth-century mass-market novel and demonstrates its potency as a cultural force. This chapter considers the revolution in reading marked by *Waverley* and the ways that material textuality is figured within the novel’s text itself and the novel’s own later textual materiality from the first edition through the *Magnum Opus* edition in 1829.

The third chapter looks at the nautical novel, focusing on the works of Captain Frederick Marryat, and considers how a study of the material textuality of these works points to more fragmentary and contested subjectivity than is usually seen by other studies of this subgenre of the novel. I find that when we consider the material textuality of the nautical novel we can see how it contests the conventions and assumptions of the domestic novel in four ways. This contestation is hardly visible at all if we merely consider the texts. If Scott can be seen as alluding to history in the Waverley novels and constituting the individual within what Lukács characterizes as the new mass consciousness of historical forces, my second chapter claims that Marryat, by allusion to more recent history and manipulating and managing the textual materiality of his work, is
further expanding the mass consciousness into the realm of contemporary political and economic forces.

The elephant in the room that stands between my third chapter on Marryat and my fourth chapter on Thackeray—indeed, in almost any study of nineteenth-century British literature—is Charles Dickens. Dickens was able eventually to take full advantage of the material innovations of Scott and Marryat and to even go beyond them in the serial publication of original fiction in parts. As editor of *Household Words* and *All the Year Round*, he was able to masterfully control the appearance of his serials and those of others for maximum effect. And he also controlled until the time of his death much of the reprinting of his own work in other editions. Furthermore, he exercised great care in the nature of the relationships between illustrations and his text. In fact, his success in almost every material format of the novel in the nineteenth century is exactly what makes it difficult to explore the roles of the different formats. How much of his success was the result of the material form and how much was Dickens’s texts seems only speculation when he eclipses everyone else in such a manner.

While the second and third chapters are concerned with kinds of structural homologies between the texts, material texts, the individual in history and economics, and the ways that material textuality and texts work together, the fourth chapter looks at the way the material text can be in tension with or work against the textual content. Thackeray uses the material text of *The History of Henry Esmond* (1852) to create the illusion of history. *Esmond*, Thackeray’s only work to be conceived, composed, and first published in a three-volume form, was printed in an antiquated typeface and designed to look like an eighteenth-century printed text. This chapter locates *Esmond* within the
context of its production as a three-volume novel and the revival of this eighteenth-century typeface. I read *Esmond* in dialogue with these other texts and what this typeface meant to readers. In later editions, as *Esmond* was reprinted, this typeface was dropped. If Scott used material textuality to accrete history around his texts, then the later editions of *Esmond* illustrate how history is stripped from a material text.

My conclusion finds that considering the material textualities of the novel produces a more pluralistic, less ideological account for the novel: a conclusion that makes room for disciplining texts and rebelling readers. My conclusions about the material text have implications not only for further studies of past texts but also for what textual materiality can mean as we move further into a digital age, where materiality takes on a radical new form that does away with paper and ink and seems to many to do away even with materiality itself.

The foregoing discussion uses a number of terms, such as "document" and "artifact" or "work" and "text," almost synonymously. However, they need to be more carefully delineated in order to demonstrate and explain how a text's physical means of transmission may affect readers. In addition, I want to discuss how the rhetorical tropes of direct address and embedded scenes of reading work from within the text to hail or interpellate the reader and influence the reception of the text's own materiality. Many of these terms may be familiar from general usage and literary theory, but they are, of course, subject to debate. Even the seemingly simplest terms become slippery, vague, and subject to exception when we try to come up with a specific definition. For example, we might generally agree that a book is made up of print and paper bound between hard or
soft covers. But braille books, which contain no print at all, do not fit this definition.

Neither do scrolls or handwritten loose leaves in a box, both of which are not printed nor bound into a codex, and what about electronic books which are read on a computer screen? None of these fit our definition of a book, but would we say they are not books?

My goal in this section is to defamiliarize these terms and place some contingent and temporary limits on them so that I can develop my concepts and avoid spinning off into exceptions. These definitions are not meant to be definitive. They are provided for the sake of my argument, to show where my conceptions originate and how this study intervenes between the sociohistorical studies of the history of the book and the literary study of texts. My concept of the text is based on the concepts of the textual critic and Thackeray scholar, Peter Shillingsburg but it is modified by the work of Gérard Genette in the field of the paratext. From Jerome McGann comes my use of the term “bibliographic code” to describe the “meanings” the physical object may have in addition to, and perhaps complementary to, the words of a text.

First, like many scholars, so far I have used the terms “text” and “work” interchangeably. But by no means is there agreement that these two terms mean the same thing. I follow the general outlines articulated by Peter Shillingsburg.4 “By texts, for example,” he writes, “some scholars mean physical objects, some mean a series of signs and symbols (the lexical text), and some mean conceptualizations only” (Gutenberg 12). In an earlier essay Shillingsburg suggests the following interrelated terms to distinguish these different ways of looking at and thinking about texts: The physical object is the material text, “the union of the Linguistic Text and Document: A Sign Sequence held in a medium of display (paper, ink, etc.)” (“Text” 81). The linguistic text is then the sign
sequence, the words that are displayed in a document. For Shillingsburg the linguistic
text is exactly a “disembodied group of words,” but he stresses the point that we can only
know a linguistic text from its material instantiation in a document. Conceptualizations,
according to Shillingsburg, are best referred to as the “Work,” an idealized construct of
“that which is manifested in and implied by the material and linguistic forms of texts
thought to be variant forms of a single literary entity” (81). F. W. Bateson’s famous
question, “If the Mona Lisa is in the Louvre, where are *Hamlet* and *Lycidas*? (74) points
to the idealized construction of the work as a single yet intangible entity. In summary, a
single work may be represented by one or by many linguistic texts, which may or may
not be the same, but each linguistic text can only be known through its material
instantiation in a document. I stress these distinctions because, while it may seem obvious
that different linguistic texts would very likely result in different conceptions of the work,
in practice we tend not to distinguish whether different interpretations arise out of
different texts or from the same text.

While it may generally be reasonable to think of linguistic texts as identical, they
rarely are. There are elements of the linguistic text that may vary even if the words and
punctuation are the same. Line breaks, end-of-line hyphenation, ligatures, and page
breaks (which allow for certain texts to face each other) are examples of how linguistic
texts may vary and in many ways still be considered identical. Here we begin to get into
the realm of what Genette describes as the paratext. For Genette, the paratext is the
textual context that surrounds a text. More specifically the paratext can be thought of as
front matter (such as title pages, prefaces, tables of contents, and epigraphs), end matter
(endnotes, appendices, glossaries, postfaces, indices), and what we might call intramatter
(chapter titles, running heads, footnotes, subheads, illustrations). Genette writes, "More than a boundary or a sealed border, the paratext is, rather, a threshold" (2). It is "a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of transaction: a privileged place of pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that [...] is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it" (2). Then quoting Philipe Lejeune, Genette goes on to describe the paratext as "a fringe of the printed text which in reality controls one's whole reading of the text" (2). This zone of transition and transaction contains not only the textual elements of a book that are not necessarily part of the work, but it also ranges far from the text and encompasses things like reviews and the author's other works. First, I am not convinced that the paratext is always at the service of the text, as Genette writes. Second, I do not use the term to cover such a wide range of extratextual phenomena. When I use the term "paratext," I only mean to refer to the textual elements of a document that are not part of the linguistic text of the work but are nevertheless part of the material text. Thus it would be possible to have the same linguistic text surrounded by different paratexts. But if literary critics do not pay enough attention to differences between linguistic texts and different paratexts, they pay even less attention to nonlexical characteristics of the physical document, Jerome McGann's bibliographic code.

The bibliographic code of a document is made up of things like its size (length, width, and depth), the size and style of its typeface or typefaces, the use of white space (not only margins but also the spaces between lines and words), the quality of the paper and binding, and even the heft of a document. I daresay most people could correctly identify with eyes closed and from feel and smell alone which was which among a
dictionary, an atlas, a telephone directory, and a novel. They could do it from across the room with eyes open although not able to read a word of text. The bibliographic code does not merely provide a framework or set the boundaries for the linguistic code, but it is the very elements out of which the linguistic code is constructed.

The distinctions between linguistic text, paratext, and bibliographic code within a particular document are not inherent in the document but rather rest in the perceptions of the reader. To use Scott as an example, the recent Edinburgh editions of Scott’s works present his works primarily as they appeared in the first editions without the changes and additions Scott made later (Hewitt xxx). On the other hand, many of the Penguin editions currently available have been based on later editions with all the notations and paratextual apparatus that Scott added. The use of either as copy text can be reasonably justified, the former case because it is the text as it first appeared and the latter not only because in the Bowersian philosophy it represents the author’s final intention but also because it is what most people in the nineteenth century read. This may seem like a minor matter, but as Shillingsburg writes:

Regardless of how trivial or insignificant any one reader might find these elements [of the material text], two things remain true about them: that transcriptions either do or do not recognize and incorporate them and that some other reader will find them to be significant, such that a transcription that ignores them will be misleading. (Gutenberg 15)

Since each material text or, to return to the vocabulary of the “Statement” that opens this thesis, since each primary record “reflects a different historical moment,” the paratext and the bibliographic code as “zones of transition” are often where the historical moment of
production is registered. Different readers at different times require different paratexts and bibliographic codes. I choose not to see sophistications or deletions, whether textual, paratextual, or bibliographic, as necessarily "misleading" but rather to look at where they do lead and what that can tell us about the production, dissemination, and reception of the text and the contexts in which these activities took place.

The works of McGann and Genette have focused, for the most part, on how the bibliographic code and the paratext respectively function in locating the literary work within its social and historical context. However, Genette generally treats the paratext ahistorically or only in a broadly historical manner; for example, the first use of titles is a historical event, but once created the function of the title does not change over time for Genette. However, the function of the title does change, in fact, over time in multiple ways. The paratext and the bibliographic code obviously allow readers both to locate a text among other texts, as a title on the spine allows a reader to find the book on a shelf, and to locate passages within a text, say through an index or table of contents. A corollary and complementary function of these elements, perhaps even the primary function, is not just to transition readers to the text but to draw readers in, to make readers. Elements of book design and paratexts such as titles, tables of contents, epigraphs, and serial wrappers are all meant to attract readers. Changes to these elements are often meant to attract a new audience or hail new readers or, at least, new purchasers. Thus, while the paratext and bibliographic code help readers to locate and contextualize a text, they also provide the ways that the text can locate and contextualize its readers. To paraphrase N. N. Feltes, they are how readers are made by what makes the book, in short, how readers are interpellated (8).
The paratext’s and bibliographic code’s verbal and nonverbal hailing of the reader are not the only places where a reader is addressed. The linguistic text may call attention to its own materiality from within the linguistic code itself when it directly addresses the reader, as in “reader,” “Dear Reader,” or with the second person pronoun, “you.” “Dear Reader,” the direct address to the reader, is a linguistic turn that shifts the focus of the reader from the story to the discourse, from the event being narrated to the act of narration, and hence to the materiality of text itself. The direct address to the reader is explicit in its evocation of the materiality of the text. By shifting the focus of attention toward the material situation of a reader and a physical book, the direct address to the reader breaks the “fragile illusion of mimesis” (Benveniste xxx). The reader is alerted to the process of narration and the materiality of the text.

The function of the direct address to evoke the materiality of the text has the simultaneous and complementary function of the interpellation of the reader. Just as the bibliographic code, the paratext, and direct address all function in one way or another to locate and contextualize the literary work, they also locate and contextualize the reader, simultaneously situating the reader within the text as a participant in the action and as a spectator both of the events and of their narration.

Louis Althusser developed the concept of interpellation as an inescapable and irresistible function of ideology: “individuals are always-already subjects” (119). In other words, it is not the individual who precedes ideology; instead, it is the conditions of ideology that create the individual. The classic Althusserian example of interpellation is an individual hailed on the street by a police officer with a call of "Hey, you there!" For
Althusser, it is the turn to answer this hail by which the individual is recognized and recognizes him or herself as a subject.

Following Louis Althusser, I have called the locating and contextualizing functions of the paratext and the bibliographic code "interpellation," but I, along with others, differ with Althusser on a number of key points. Judith Butler has pointed out how this act of hailing or interpellation is an exercise of ideological power that simultaneously engenders its own resistance. Interpellation, for Butler, delineates a space outside the realm of law, a space of resistance simultaneously and reciprocally as it constitutes the subject within the realm of society and the law. Butler argues that Althusser “does not consider the range of disobedience” the interpellative hail can produce (Bodies 122). She points out the number of ways the interpellative hail can be resisted, ignored, and subverted, as when an individual instead of turning merely quickens his or her pace; or a whole group of persons might turn and force the hail to be repeated, thereby throwing its legitimacy into question and showing the power of the law to be initially weak and ineffectual (122). In the other chapters of this dissertation, I will explore the ways in which the paratexts and bibliographic codes of nineteenth-century British novels seek to interpellate and discipline readers and how readers resist. However, the bibliographic code and the paratext are not the only areas of a material text where interpellation takes place.

What Garrett Stewart terms “enacted reading scenes” (15), the figuration of readers reading within the text, are as equally interpellative as the readerly address, the paratextual apparatus, and the bibliographic code. Stewart—in his seminal study of the readerly apostrophe, Dear Reader: The Conscripted Audience in Nineteenth-Century
British Fiction (1996)—disputes the use of interpellation as a term to describe the explicit hailing of the reader. Stewart dislikes the term because, he argues, often in cultural studies “the notion of ‘hailing’ tends to be generalized beyond linguistic or rhetorical recognition in its usual literary applications.” In addition, he writes that interpellation is not so much a fact about narrative as it is something that narrative does: “a set of minutely calibrated verbal strategies devised by narrative rather than a blanket fact about narrative” (22). Thus, whereas Althusser sees narrative as an interpellative function of ideology, Stewart sees narrative as “doing” interpellation; narrative is capable of critiquing as well as establishing the position of the subject. Stewart might also have an additional critique of my application of “interpellation” to the bibliographic code as “beyond linguistic or rhetorical recognition,” but I would argue that the bibliographic code, while it may not be linguistic, is a system of signs and a rhetoric of persuasion, and it is worthy of analysis. Despite Stewart’s dislike of the term “interpellation” because it is overgeneralized, his use of the term “conscription” does imply an interpellative discipline in which readers are literally involuntarily drafted into the text. Nevertheless, the text is not necessarily always the armature of the state ideological apparatus. Therefore, Butler and Stewart might be said to agree with Althusser about the process of interpellation but to disagree with him on its power and priority. In other words, interpellation is not only a formative power and the reason for narrative but also simultaneously a power of conversion and the function of narrative.

While this study owes a great deal to Garrett Stewart for his analysis of the rhetorical styles and functions of direct address, my study radically departs from his perspective with its focus on material textuality. Stewart finds that the direct address to
the reader has its counterpart in the embedded image of the reader, the enacted scenes of
reading that occur within a literary work, the *mise en abyme* of readers reading. Almost
by definition, every image of a reader must contain the image of a material text; for
someone to be a reader he or she must be reading something. Therefore, while Stewart’s
focus is the reading subject, mine is the subject of the reading, the material text. Stewart
is focused on direct address as a rhetorical event and its ramifications for subject
formation. He either ignores or suppresses the corollary or complementary gesture of the
direct address toward the material text. His focus is on the reader because he finds that
cultural studies often tend to fetishize the material text; the text is displaced from
“linguistic event to social artifact, industrial object, or advertising medium” (8). In my
view, a material text is all of these and more, and, unlike most artifacts or objects,
because it is rendered in language, the material text has the capability of commenting
upon and altering its material status from within itself. Of course, my interest, too, lies
eventually in reading subjects, but I am interested in what the material text can reveal
about those subjects and how it reveals it.

Before I further discuss the interpellative functions of direct address and the
elements of material text, I feel that I should review briefly what goes on when a text is
not directly addressing the reader. In other words, what is it that the bibliographic code,
paratext, and readerly address frame, surround, or separate? George Orwell’s dictum
“Good prose is like a windowpane” sums it up succinctly. The reader is to forget about
the text and focus on the world it represents; the world the reader sees through the text
seems should seem real. I do not mean necessarily the realistic representation of the
world in which the reader actually lives but a representation as real as that world. J. R. R.
Tolkien's work, for example, is a windowpane on a world significantly different in some respects from readers' worlds. All discourse by definition posits a speaker and a listener or a writer and a reader, but a discourse may or may not acknowledge this situation. It may even act to suppress it.

Emile Benveniste, explains the way texts seek transparency, although he is concerned primarily with historical narratives or récits. He describes a "mode of statement making which excludes every 'autobiographic' linguistic form, meaning all but third-person past statements are to be banned" (xxx). The present tense, observes Benveniste, "would necessarily be the present tense of the historian; history cannot historicize itself without contradicting its project" (xxx). Similarly, first person commentaries and demonstratives—such as "here" and "now"—always shift the reader from the time and place of the event represented to the spatiotemporal frame of its narration. Benveniste is especially interested in the linguistic conditions under which a historical narrative might produce the illusion of recovering an event from the past, and in an oft-quoted passage he summarizes this operation:

It is necessary and sufficient that the author remain faithful to his role and that he banish everything foreign to the narration of events (such as allocutions, reflections, or comparisons). In truth, there is no longer even a narrator. Events are set down as if they happened at the same time that they appear on the horizon of history. No one speaks here, the events seem to tell themselves. (XXX)

Benveniste terms this mode of speech where "events seem to tell themselves" the aorist tense. "Aorist" is a term from Greek rhetoric \[aoristos = a + horistos\] where \(a =\)
"undefined" and horistos = "horizon"], and it refers to a simple occurrence of an action without reference to its completeness or incompleteness, duration, or repetition and typically without reference to its position in time beyond a general reference to the past. This third person voice, the aorist tense, masks authorship and clearly aims to suppress the narrative voice of the individual subject. By masking this authorship, the aorist tense also masks gender. It is a nongendered voice because there is no person producing the narration. The aorist tense generates a kind of immanent authenticity and appearance of truth by denying the mediation of a narrator between the event and its representation. Furthermore, as the aorist tense suppresses the mediation of the narrator, it also suppresses the role of material textuality. If events tell themselves, then the nature of the material textuality of their transmission does not matter, because the event presents itself directly, the same in all its material manifestations.

However, Benveniste admits that it is impossible for a pure aorist tense to exist (xxx). Discourse statements are hybrid and elastic linguistic constructs, usually comprising a complex mix of verb forms and personal pronouns. When the present tense of a direct address erupts amid the aorist past tense, the reader imperceptibly performs an enormous linguistic shift, slipping from the seemingly objective language of history to the explicitly subjective language of discourse. Moreover, the ever-present speaker of discourse is able to digress freely without ceasing to narrate, because an audience fully expects a narrator to comment upon his or her story as it unfolds. The very complexity of the discursive situation makes it possible for a narrator to accommodate aorist passages of historical narrative without straining the narrative thread.
In contrast, isolated discourse statements embedded within a narrative written as if “no one speaks” are not absorbed into the illusion but are always perceived as an intrusion or rupture of it. Discourse statements, writes Gérard Genette, in the context of a historical narrative “perforate and cross-cut the sequential and spatial unity of the representation.” “Discourse inserted in the récit remains discourse,” he continues, “and forms a sort of cyst which is easy to recognize and locate” (Figures 852). When direct address opens a cross-axis of attention—literally a semantic space—which is, by its very nature, social, events that “tell themselves” suddenly give way to the voice of a person—a narrator—who is not part of the principal action but is the source of its narration. This cross-axis of attention, the semantic space opened up by direct address, is a semantic space different from the space opened by the paratext and the bibliographic code of a literary work, but it performs the same function of locating and contextualizing the literary work, only from within the text of the work.

However, the gesture that the direct address of the reader makes toward the materiality of the text cannot properly be called an act of interpellation. Interpellation refers to the reading subject whereas direct address also gestures to the material text. When the narrator refers to an aspect of the principal action, he or she must generate—from within the dialogue opened with the reader—a gesture of pointing that will link the space and time of the dialogue to the space and time represented by the narrative: these gestures are necessarily deictic, like such expressions as “here,” “there,” “this,” and “now,” they depend for their full meaning on the context in which they are used.

When the narrator engages in this gesture of pointing, we recognize that the narrator offers, from some vantage point of knowledge greater than our own, information
that can only be known after the "event" has taken place. These observations are made from sometime between the time of the event and the present time of the reader/listener and from somewhere other than the space of the event or the present space of the reader. In short, the direct address to the reader takes place in a semantic space/time defined by three points: the reader/listener in the present, whose attention is drawn *either* to the sequence of events or to the interjections of a commentator who speaks from some other space and time—but not both at the same time. The reader must choose—or be compelled—to ignore one of these voices in order to hear the other. This option, constructed within the very fabric of the linguistic code, keeps open the possibility of resistance to the authority of the text. It is important to note that the authority engendered by this mastery is the result not merely of citation, of pointing, but of the process of connecting these figures in a way that makes sense. It is an authority that neither the "event" itself nor the reader can claim. These deictic gestures construct a particular kind of reader, one who shares a certain base of knowledge with the narrator but is assumed to know less than the narrator. If the reader knew as much, there would be no reason to read the narrative. The reader's act of reading constitutes acknowledgment of his or her inferiority before the narrator. In short, the narrator's mastery of the events that make up the story—a power over documents—becomes surreptitiously a power over the reader.

Michel de Certeau writes of this kind of power:

The structure inherent to the discourse produces both chicanery and a certain type of reader: that is, a receiver cited, identified, and taught by the very fact of being placed in the situation of the chronicle that stands before a knowledge. In organizing textual space, the structure establishes a
contract and also orders social space. In this respect the discourse does what it says. It is performative. (96)

When we understand that authority is socially constructed upon a demonstrable mastery of the narrative and that this mastery of the narrative translates into a surreptitious mastery of the reader, then we can understand the role of direct address and the interpellation of the reading subject. We can also see more clearly that shifts in attention—making references, gestures of pointing, deictic acts in general—are absolutely essential to the construction of authority and the reader.

In summary, it is my proposition that to read the material texts and to analyze the relationships between the linguistic text and its material textuality reveal more than the study of the linguistic text alone. The bibliographic code, paratext, and linguistic text all exercise the tactics of discipline whereby the narrative strategy of interpellation is carried out. Every material text disciplines the reader in how to read it and contains instructions on how it is to be read within the bibliographic code, paratext, and linguistic text. The reader who follows these instructions, who knows how to interpret them, is rewarded when the text makes meaning. This discipline can be subtle, indirect, and almost unconscious, what D. A. Miller refers to as a Foucauldian “regime of the norm in which normalizing perceptions, prescriptions, and sanctions are diffused in discourses and practices throughout the social fabric” (viii). The disseminating and dissembling effects of discipline, Miller and Foucault suggest, are often characteristically minor, fluid, and implicit operations that can distract our attention from the very density of their regulation (Foucault 79). Such things as the choice of a standard font, the breakdown of a novel into chapters, the style of imposition and size (for example octavo or duodecimo), and
the adherence to the other requirements of a genre are a capitulation not only to the
tactics of the discipline of the marketplace (costs) but also of readerly expectations. These
disciplinary operations are usually unnoticed or undetected because, once revealed, they
can be countered or resisted.

However, discipline can also be an explicit and direct operation, as in the case of
a direct address to the reader. The direct address “Dear Reader” is a strong form
interpellative operation, yet the use of direct address as it tries to conscript the reader also
reveals the interpellative operations and the disciplinary techniques of the text. Moments
of direct address are contingent, anxious, partial, and revelatory of their potential for
failure and the reader's capacity for resistance. Nevertheless, these disciplinary practices,
as they are iterated and reiterated, attempt to exercise some power over readers’
experience of the text. Yet, the effectiveness of this power varies among different readers
synchronically and diachronically. Indeed part of my argument is that the practice of
direct address becomes obsolete as a disciplinary and interpellative gesture in the
modernist novel of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The works of Sir Walter Scott, especially the huge popular success Waverley,
began the ascension of the novel to the dominant art form of popular culture in the
nineteenth century. However, Scott’s novels did more than just revolutionize novel
publishing; they revolutionized novel reading as well. Scott’s novels teach his audience a
new way to read. Much of the discipline that is explicit in Scott becomes implicit later in
the century. This is difficult for a reader today to distinguish, because what was once a
new way to read has been incorporated into our everyday reading. But I believe it is
recoverable by looking at the material textuality, the paratextual apparatus, the direct
addresses to readers, and the embedded scenes of reading found within the text and at the way they all work to interpellate a new reading subject. Walter Scott's mixture of history with fiction combined with new forms of the novel began the expansion of the novel bringing in new reading subjects and wrought a revolution.
Chapter 2

Walter Scott—Refracting History in *Waverley*

Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since* (1814) has often been said to mark a new era in the genre of novel.\(^1\) From the beginning of the nineteenth century until *Waverley* was published, the novel was perceived as a moribund and second- if not third- rate genre that had seen its golden age some fifty years earlier. The works of Henry Fielding, Samuel Richardson, Laurence Sterne, and some others were classics, but new novels were a product for what would be called today a niche market. They had a limited appeal to only a limited number of people. Books, in general, were expensive and beyond the reach of most people, but their cost could be justified by the sacred, practical, or philosophic knowledge they contained. However, novels in particular were seen as a light, frivolous, and costly entertainment with little or no socially redeeming value. It is estimated that there were probably less than fifty thousand novel readers out of a total population of twelve to fifteen million in all of the United Kingdom in 1814, less than one-half of one-percent of the population (Altick 19). The novel had yet to attain the cultural and material dominance it would reach by midcentury, when it would become the largest single segment of the book publishing industry and when it would achieve an even wider audience through its appearance in serial forms. The success of *Waverley* marks the beginning of the ascendency of the novel to a dominant art form of popular culture in the nineteenth century and, although much has occurred in the interim, the popularity of the novel today can still be traced back to *Waverley*.

The origins of Scott's popularity as a novelist and this new era of the novel are usually seen to lay ultimately in what Georg Lukács calls "a transformation of men's
existence and consciousness" (Historical Novel 31). This new consciousness, according to Lukács, is a new sense of history as a “mass experience” that resulted from the mass common experiences of such events as the French Revolution and the rise and fall of Napoleon (23). These events allowed people “to comprehend their own existence as something historically conditioned.” They could now see history as “something which deeply affects their daily lives and immediately concerns them” (24). Thus, for Lukács the basis of this transformation in consciousness lies outside the novel in the wider social, economic, and political changes of the era. He and others see Scott’s popularity and artistic achievement as the result of Scott’s ability to capture or reflect this new historical consciousness, as if it lay waiting to be expressed in the novel.

However, Waverley itself was also a new kind of mass experience. Tremendously popular from the moment of its first release, Waverley began the whole run of Scott’s novels. Scott published twenty-seven novels in the eighteen years between 1814 and 1832. These novels set a high-water mark in popularity that many Victorian novelists aspired to, but only one, Charles Dickens, would better. Waverley and the rest of the Waverley novels do not merely reflect this new historical consciousness, this shift in perception; the text and material textuality of Waverley perpetuate and perhaps even initiate among some readers this change in perception. If Waverley reflects this new historical consciousness, then, from its mediating position between the text and the reader, the material textuality of Waverley shows how this new historical consciousness comes into being and spreads across the culture as the material texts of the novel gradually accrete more and more history.
Walter Scott’s novels, beginning with *Waverley*, revolutionized novel reading. Scott’s novels teach his audience a new way to read. We can see this revolution in two places. It is captured in the ways that the literary work itself deals with material textuality and in the material textuality of the early texts themselves. First, the text of *Waverley* has a great deal to say about reading and the role the material form of the text plays in shaping that reading. Simultaneously, the text strives to control the reader’s perception of it through the direct address to the reader and the embedded scenes of reading found within it. Much of this readerly discipline that is explicit in Scott becomes implicit later in the century. Today this discipline is difficult for most readers to detect because it has already been incorporated into our mode of reading. In other words, well after the appearance of the *Waverley* novels, in present-day material texts this change in the mode of perception, what was once a new way to read, is less legible because it has become a part Western history and been incorporated into Victorian, modern, and postmodern consciousness. In the West we have all come to read this way or, perhaps more accurately, moved beyond this mode of reading. Second, while these attempts at readerly discipline are barely visible in modern editions, they become more visible when considered in the context of the early material texts, bibliographic codes, and paratexts. These factors all work to interpellate a new reading subject. Scott’s mixture of history with fiction combined with his methods of interpellating the reader began the expansion of the market for the novel and wrought a revolution in reading. Furthermore, using the methodologies of book history and literary analysis, we can trace in the material textuality of *Waverley* itself, especially the material instantiations of the work that appeared from 1814 to 1832, how the different editions of *Waverley* reflect not only this
new historical consciousness, but also the ways in which they are responsible for it. In other words, we can see how *Waverley*, which at first sought to redefine itself, ultimately redefined the genre of the novel.

This chapter develops as follows. First, in order to situate a material textual analysis within the critical dialogue about *Waverley* and the historical novel generally, this chapter begins with some of the ways that a material textual analysis might have affected the ideas of two seminal critics of the historical novel, Georg Lukács and Katie Trumpener. Placing the analyses of Lukács and Trumpener within two analytical models suggested by the historian of the book, William St Clair, demonstrates how a material textual analysis might make for a reevaluation of their thoughts. Second, after a brief discussion of the material context of the genre of the novel in 1814 when *Waverley* burst on the scene, I consider how elements of the bibliographic code and paratext of the early editions simultaneously identify *Waverley* as a novel and set it apart.

As I deal with *Waverley* directly, I approach the material book like a new reader, moving from the outside of the material book and its paratexts to the inside text, specifically to the first chapter. The “Introductory” chapter of *Waverley* is particularly relevant not only to my consideration of *Waverley* but also to the overall dissertation itself for two reasons. First, this “Introductory,” like much of this dissertation, is specifically concerned with paratexts and the roles of the material text. As an introduction it is unusual in that it introduces neither characters, nor settings, nor events. Instead, this chapter, almost a paratext itself by virtue of its subject matter and its position at the beginning of the text, is self-reflexively concerned with paratexts and their readings, especially the significations of titles and subtitles. Second, and perhaps more importantly,
while this introductory chapter does not introduce people, places, or actions, it does introduce the reader to a point of view. This point of view is expressed in a voice that is not merely that of a first-person or third-person omniscient narrative but a voice that expresses an extreme self-conscious of its own mediation in a printed text, in other words, a "voice" that is extremely self-conscious that it is not a voice at all but instead only mere marks on a page in a particular type of codex. It is a voice that is explicitly concerned with disciplining the reader's response to the text. Scott writes in comic overstatement, "I scorn to tyrannize longer over the impatience of my reader" (Waverley 4). But his depiction of the author as tyrant, if an overstatement, acknowledges the power that is in play between the author and the reader. I find it telling that the first chapter of Waverley is entitled with the descriptive adjectival form of the word, "introductory," rather than the usual noun, "introduction." This shift from a noun to a descriptor subtly stresses the chapter's mediating action and its function in initiating the process of reading rather than merely marks the beginning of the text. Simply put, an introduction is a thing while "introductory" stresses process, and the process of reading is my main focus.

Then, following the lead of the "Introductory" chapter on how to read a title, I return to Waverley's own title page and what its elements might have signified to readers. Later in the chapter, I discuss how changes in Waverley's title pages through the different editions delineate the text's progress from a single work to the representation of Scott's oeuvre, if not the whole subgenre of the historical novel. In addition, I look at how new title pages in different editions show the interpellation of new reading subjects. Near the end of the "Introductory," an extended metaphor for a way of reading "the great book of nature" makes use of specific elements of the bibliographic code. I then look at several
mise en abyme of reading within the text and the way the text figures and literalizes textual materiality. Finally, this chapter moves from the treatment of material texts within Waverley to the material history of Waverley's publication itself, from its first edition to the Magnum Opus edition. Through the material and paratextual changes across these editions we can see how the material textuality of the novel changes as it moves from the margins to the center.

1

What can material textual analyses show us about how Waverley came to affect the nineteenth century? Before I get to my own analysis of the novel, I would like to explore this question by comparing and contrasting Georg Lukács's theories of the historical novel with Katie Trumpener's more recent reading of Scott. Lukács's and Trumpener's critiques can fit into what William St Clair calls the "parade" and "parliamentary" models of literary progress. In the parade model, one author or genre succeeds another as they march into and out of critical perception (2). In the parliamentary model, competing groups engage in a common debate, from which one emerges victorious to dominate the field until another debate takes place and a new champion emerges (2). St Clair discusses the shortcomings of each of these models in depth, but briefly neither of these models reflects the complexity of the ways that people actually read. Reading, St Clair suggests, is less chronological and more cumulative than the parade model suggests. Older texts do not march off the field but continue to exercise influence long after the critics have stopped writing about them. The parliamentary model almost always frames the parameters of the debate so narrowly that for St Clair it is subject to oversimplification and the outcome of the debate foreordained. St Clair also
argues that the parliamentary model, because it often ignores salient material facts, tends to comparisons among texts that are incommensurate (4): for example, large sales are not necessarily an indicator of cultural influence, but it seems ill-advised for one to compare two novels without exploring the possible effects of this difference if one had sales of less than a thousand copies while the other was well into the millions.

Lukács's analysis fits generally into the parade model. He sees Scott as an innovative genius, head and shoulders above his contemporaries, whose novels teleologically arc from the eighteenth-century English novelists of the Enlightenment to the later nineteenth-century novels of social realism. Trampener, on the other hand, uses a parliamentary model. She sees Scott as a man of his time, engaged with contemporary literary, social, and political contexts, and as more of a borrower or repackager of commonplaces than an innovator. A material textual analysis of Scott’s work modifies both these viewpoints in interesting ways.

Had Lukács considered the material textuality of the Waverley novels and their narrative discourse, he might have discovered three things. First, the material textuality of the Waverley novels affirms his thinking of Scott as a central figure. Second, he might have noticed that material textuality points to the ways that the historical novel in particular and the novel as a genre not only reflect a transformation of consciousness but actively reproduce it. Third, while Lukács is very good about the effect of economics on the “artistic form” of the novel, a material textual analysis also opens the possibility for a reversed flow of influence, in other words, how new “artistic forms” transform the economics of novel production and how those changes gradually migrate into production more generally.
Georg Lukács is adamant about the primary position of *Waverley* from the very first sentence of *The Historical Novel*: "The historical novel arose at the beginning of the nineteenth century at about the time of Napoleon's collapse (Scott's *Waverley* appeared in 1814)" (*Historical Novel* 19). This first sentence shows not only that *Waverley* marks an important turning point in the genre of the novel for him but also that it is inextricably linked to history. Earlier novels had used history only as "mere costumery," according to Lukács. These previous novels had only shown the present dressed up like the past: "not only the psychology of the characters, but the manners depicted are entirely those of the writer's own day." For Lukács, Scott's innovation is historical realism, which he defines as "an artistically faithful image of a concrete historical epoch" where "the derivation of the individuality of characters [is] from the historical peculiarity of their age" (19). But every age, by definition, is defined by its "historical peculiarity." The change which makes the creation and recognition of these characters possible is the increase in the quantity and speed of historical change around the turn of the nineteenth century.

The speed and far-reaching effects of the French Revolution and Napoleon make them into events that achieve a kind of critical mass that results in the awakening of the historical consciousness for Lukács. Both quantity and velocity of social, political, and economic transformations are necessary to reveal their "historical character" and awaken a historical consciousness such that "the masses no longer have the impression of [history as] a 'natural occurrence.'" The sheer number and speed of these transformations "strengthens the feeling first that there is such a thing as history, that it is an uninterrupted process of changes, and finally that it has a direct effect upon the life or every individual" (*Historical Novel* 23).
Given that differences in quantity and velocity are important to Lukács, it is significant and somewhat surprising that he never addresses the effects of Scott’s massive and speedy popular success. Lukács might have accounted for the awakening of historical consciousness as it spread across countries and class lines as not only due to the swiftness and impact of the French Revolution and Napoleon but also due, at least partially, to Waverley’s popular success. It seems to me that a dialectic sense of history as process implies this to a degree; a change in consciousness ought to lead to a change in behavior. Nevertheless, Lukács never directly credits any of the novels he deals with in the *Historical Novel* as having any historical effects even though the first step of converting theory into praxis is historical consciousness. Of course, it would be unreasonable to ascribe the fall of Napoleon as having anything to do with Scott’s novels, but Mark Twain famously laid a great deal of the blame for the American Civil War on *Ivanhoe* (ch. 46). Waverley, like the rest of Scott’s novels for Lukács, is only a reflection of the changes in historical consciousness that arise out of the French Revolution and the rise and fall of Napoleon: “The entire development of literary forms, and here in particular the novel, is nothing more than a reflection of social development itself” (140). For Lukács, “these events, this transformation of men’s existence and consciousness throughout Europe form the economic and ideological basis for Scott’s historical novel” (31). Scott’s popular success is mentioned by Lukács as only a result of external elements; he never addresses the results of this popular success. Scott’s sales and the ubiquity of his novels in the nineteenth century offer the opportunity for Lukács to discuss how historical consciousness might be reproduced, but for him there is no reciprocity or feedback from art to its economic or even ideological basis. Lukács never
acknowledges that the novel might be an agent of, or at least a participant in, history. Thus Lukács might have found the *Waverley* novel's sales and reprinting evidence for the centrality of Scott in the development of a mass historical consciousness.

Further, while Lukács finds the ideological and economic basis of the novel in capitalism, he does not consider how the economy of novel production in the construction of literary meaning may transform ideology and the economic structure. He does not address what the economies of the novels themselves, their own means of production, distribution, and reception, may demonstrate about this transformation or the roles they may play in this transformation of consciousness. His analysis is primarily one-way, concerned on a macroeconomic level with "the interaction between economic and social development and the outlook and artistic form to which they give rise" (14). Had Lukács considered the interaction between the microeconomics of novel production/consumption and its material and artistic forms, he might have seen how changes in the "artistic form" may not only reflect this transformation of consciousness but also perpetuate, if not initiate, it throughout society.

An analysis of the economics of novel production might also have shown the struggle of the novel against its own commodification, its shift from a work of art to an article of commerce, and simultaneously how the novel often embraced, even celebrated, its status as a commodity. On one hand, commodification results in "the debasement of culture by the transformation of all things into commodities," what in *History and Class Consciousness* Lukács terms reification (26). In classical Marxism, reification usually results in a "false consciousness," as social relations seem to become objective or "natural." However, commodification does not always have to result in reification. It also
has the potential to free the text from the power of ideology because readers can do with a text as they will. They may read it, not read it, look only at the pictures, or use it as a doorstop. Thus, as the text loses its social relations, commodification challenges the omnipotence of ideological and authorial discourse. Commodification allows for the reader to act as what Claude Lévi-Strauss calls a "bricoleur" (19). Michel de Certeau, following Lévi-Strauss, defines bricolage as "the putting together in a new way of the materials at hand to say something different from what the synthesis of these unlike materials might lead us to believe—the use of power against itself" (Practice xiii). We can see acts of bricolage in the ways that Scott assembles his texts from various bits of poetry, songs, other texts, and even accounts of historical events, but perhaps more importantly acts of bricolage appear when readers use Scott's texts. The Waverley novels generate a whole industry of what might be termed derivatives. I have more in mind here than the novels that imitated the style and subjects of the Waverley novels, although those are legion. I am referring to books of engravings that are published illustrating the locations in the novels; the books of songs, ballads, and bardic poetry that add to what Scott used in his novels; and the dramatic adaptations that began to appear almost immediately after a novel's publication. These derivative or adjunct texts indicate how readers may appropriate elements of the text well beyond the reach of any authorial control or discipline.

Furthermore, if Lukács overlooks the possible role of Scott's material success in the transformation of consciousness, he also fails to register the importance of the narrative voice in the development of historical consciousness. Lukács, because of his focus on historical realism, reads through the narrative frames or voices and the material
texts without seeing them. In narratalogical terms, he is focused on the “story” rather than on the “discourse.” For him, the narrative frameworks and material texts are transparent or invisible: for example, it is impossible to tell which Scott editions Lukács is reading in The Historical Novel or even whether they are translations or abridgements. In the whole of The Historical Novel, he only quotes a Scott novel once, and while he does not misquote the passage, he does miscite the source. He cites the “Dedicatory Epistle to Ivanhoe” (62) as if in this epistle Scott was writing as the author. Lukács elides that this dedication is written in the voice of one of Scott’s authorial personas, Laurence Templeton, as a “Dedicatory Epistle to the Rev. Dr. Dryasdust, F.A.S.” Lukács’s conflation of Scott and Templeton does not affect his immediate argument, but it does demonstrate his inattention or insensitivity to complex narrative frameworks like this one (Templeton, a narrative persona that is neither Scott nor the author of Waverley, addressing an imagined audience of a stereotypical antiquarian in a personal letter/dedication). Again, the use of “dedicatory” rather than dedication, like the use of “introductory,” stresses the process of reading, what this piece of text does rather than what it is.

Even if Lukács had focused on the discourse and argued for the Waverley novels as an agent of change, he would have had to account for how this was brought about. This might have been done with a shift in focus from the characters and events of Scott’s novels to their narrative structures and material textuality. Lukács is most famous perhaps for his observations that it is Scott’s “mediocre” (Historical Novel 33) or “middle-of-the-road” (128) hero that is at the center of the historical novel. Scott’s genius, for Lukács, is in the way Scott embodies conflicting historical trends within the
middling hero and uses those heroes as a mediating force to bring these conflicts into focus for the reader. Lukács might have also noted how the narrative voices and the multiple material texts also mediate between the reader and the history depicted in the Waverley novels like the middling heroes. Scott’s novels, for Lukács, demonstrate the reflection of “an artistically faithful image of a concrete historical epoch”(19) because he is focused on the “story” rather than on the “discourse.” However, if Lukács had considered the ways that Scott filters history through multiple narrative voices and texts, he might have seen how these novels also cannot help but refract this image. And if he had considered the narrative structures and paratexts, he would have seen how Waverley is self-conscious of its own reception as it tries to discipline and control this refraction and the reader’s response to the text and to the depiction of history. Waverley, as we shall see, demonstrates that an “artistically faithful image” cannot help but be framed by these ideological and disciplinary purposes.

Katie Trumpener’s more recent analysis of the Waverley novels in Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire (1997) argues that Lukács and, indeed, most modern Scottish scholars wrongly place “the Waverley novels above and outside the fiction writing of their own time, seeing Scott as the sole inventor of the historical novel” (130). For her, Waverley does not mark any new era in the novel. As she remaps the history of the romantic novel, she argues that Scott is not the innovator Lukács and others make him out to be. “Most of the conceptual innovations attributed to Scott were in 1814 already established commonplaces of the British novel,” writes Trumpener. Other novelists contemporary to Scott offer alternative “radically different political perspectives—Enlightenment, Jacobin, feminist, and anti-imperialist—on the
same historical processes” (130). Whereas Lukács (following Scott’s own suggestion) traces Scott’s connections to the novels of the eighteenth century and sets Scott radically apart from his contemporaries, Trumpener demystifies what Lukács and others read as the isolated romantic genius of Scott’s achievement. She relocates Scott among his contemporaries by tracing his “innovations” to other sources. Her comparative analysis of the two interdependent subgenres of the novel, the national tale and the historical novel, firmly locates Scott within the sociohistoric and literary milieu of his time. Scott’s middling hero, his use of dialect, his depiction of history, for example, are all to be found elsewhere. She cites specifically three novels as examples: Charles Maturin’s *The Milesian Chief* (1812), Lady Morgan’s [Sydney Owenson’s] *O’Donnel: A National Tale* (1814), and John Galt’s *The Provost* (1822). These novels do offer alternative modes of historiography to the one proffered by *Waverley* but when we take material textuality into account these novels seem less comparable.

Trumpener’s argument stages *Waverley* and these other novels against each other on a level playing field, from which *Waverley* and its form of historiography eventually emerge victorious. This is what William St Clair calls the “parliamentary model” of literary progress (2). In reality, the field was not level. There was little or no debate among competing views; *Waverley* dominated virtually instantaneously and totally. There were simply not very many copies of these other novels in circulation. *Waverley* sold more in the first six months of its publication than these novels combined sold in the entire century. There is no record that *The Milesian Chief* was ever reprinted in Britain in the nineteenth century (369), and Galt’s novel saw one additional edition that followed very closely upon the first (534). Only *O’Donnel* had multiple reprints, in 1815, 1835,
1836, and 1848 (Garside et al. 402). It seems unlikely that the total production of these three novels was any more than five to ten thousand copies for the whole of the nineteenth century, the majority of which were O'Donnel. It is of course possible that these novels were reprinted more often but no record or copies any longer exist. But even if this lost production was double, it still pales in comparison to the literally hundreds of thousands of the Waverley novels. While sales or print runs do not necessarily measure impact or influence, as Robert Patten points out (“Review”), St Clair makes the point that it is necessary to take into account the simple availability of a text (19). Unless one can argue either for the indirect influence of a work through a small but highly influential group of readers or for the idea that a work printed in great numbers was probably only read very little, accessibility to the ideas of a text would seem to be a function of the quantity printed and sold.

Considering Trumpener’s arguments in light of the material textuality of the novels she writes about results in some interesting possibilities. If the ubiquity of the Waverley novels in the nineteenth century supports their centrality in Lukács’ argument about the transformation of historical consciousness, then it also undermines Trumpener’s assertion that any alternative historiography was readily available. Trumpener’s demystification of the “still monolithic ‘Scott legend’” by placing Scott’s works in the context of “previous and parallel fiction” is valuable (157). She proves that Waverley was in many ways similar to its contemporaries and Scott was probably not the isolated romantic genius that Lukács and others make him out to have been. However, she does little to explain the differences between Waverley and the rest and the roles
these differences may have played in its success. Instead, she predominantly pursues the nature of the alternative historiographies.

Trumpener has only a little to say about why and how Scott's became the dominant mode. According to Trumpener, the single-focus narrative voice is one of the key reasons Scott's type of historiography became the dominant mode, but an alternative perspective exists. She is more sensitive than Lukács to the functions of the narrative voice and the paratextual apparatus of Scott's fiction. She takes them into account, but she treats them as having two separate, even opposing functions. Recalling Lukács's argument that the classical historical novel provides the foundation of nineteenth-century realism, she understands the narrative voice of the Waverley novels to anticipate realism, but she sees it as paradoxically opposed to the novel's paratextual apparatus, which looks back, she writes, to the antiquarianism of the eighteenth century:

Continuously, omnisciently and for the most part unobtrusively narrated, their central narratives represent the triumph of a single-focus narrative history; they thus point forward, toward the realistic novel. At the same time, their elaborate documentary framework of footnotes and pseudoeditorial commentaries echo the footnoted debates among the late-eighteenth-century antiquarians, foregrounding the retroactive, antiquarian production of historical knowledge out of a myriad of experiences, records, and possible reconstructions. Such framing lends density to Scott's historiographical survey. Yet it also privileges the perspective of antiquarian narrators over that of historical participants, for the intellectual
I will have more to say about the documentary framework, pseudoeditors, and narrative structure later, but for now let us consider Trumpener’s statement on the narrative structure of the Waverley novels. Whereas Lukács ignores the narrative structure of Scott’s novels, Trumpener sees the “elaborate documentary framework” as something separate from, and in opposition to, a continuous, omniscient, and unobtrusive narrative voice. Yet Trumpener’s separation of the documentary framework from the central narrative seems to me a bit forced.

Her characterization of Scott’s narrative voice as continuous, omniscient, and “for the most part” unobtrusive elides how often these narrative voices are discontinuous, short-sighted, and intrusive. How does one “represent the triumph of a single-focus narrative” and at the same time privilege the plural “antiquarian narrators?” This is only possible when the narrative voice is considered separately from its “elaborate documentary framework.” Even in its early editions, when Scott is perhaps the least confident in his novel readership and at his most unobtrusive, Waverley is filled with moments of narratorial intrusion. There are at least thirty-three instances strictly within the main body of the text of Waverley where the narrative voice directly addresses the reader as “reader.” This count excludes not only the first and last chapters which bracket the novel with direct addresses to the reader but also all the editorial asides of the footnotes. In addition, there are the many moments when the narrator refers to himself in the first person or speaks of “our hero.” These addresses to the reader and other narratorial intrusions always shift the reader’s focus, if only briefly, from the events complexity of the act of historiographic assembly potentially exceeds the psychological complexity of historical experience itself. (151-52)
being narrated to the act of their narration, not merely breaking the continuity of a single focus narrative but often countering it with a different perspective.

A seemingly continuous, omniscient, unobtrusive, and single-focus narrative in Scott seems to me to be only artificially derived from the text by ignoring the narratorial asides, direct addresses to the reader, and footnotes. While it may be that when events seem to narrate themselves, as Beneveniste has written, they speak with a unified and singular focus, Scott’s novels almost always expose how and out of what this singular voice is constructed. Moments of this single focus are always surrounded, framed, and even suspended within the narratorial discourse and paratextual framework. Trampener’s opposition of the “central narratives” to the “documentary framework” flattens out the differences in voice that exist within each and polarizes a spectrum of multiple narrative voices into a binary opposition of two single-focus perspectives. It is a biased reading that privileges a “central” narrative where one can argue that none really exists, or that it only exists for a particularly willful type of reader who privileges story over discourse.

A key reason Scott’s type of historiography became dominant may be exactly the multiple refractory narratives of Scott. My paratextual analysis understands this documentary framework and the central narrative not as paradoxically opposed, as Trumpener understands them to be, but as integrally linked, even of a piece. The footnotes do not merely add density to Scott’s historiography but counter and interrogate the perspective of “single-focus” modern history. They offer different angles and perspectives, they provide other perspectives and a depth of field, and they refract other dimensions that are lacking in the flat plane of a single-focus view of history.
The paradox lies in the fact that, even for historical participants, it is the act of historiographic assembly that defines historical experience; it is only through the act of historiographic assembly that the psychological complexity of historical experience can be revealed. As this framework both resists and buttresses the central narrative's disciplinary effort toward a single-focus, it self-consciously and simultaneously reveals the weaknesses of a single-focus perspective. While Trumpener sees the density of documentation as the explicit privileging of the antiquarian narrators' viewpoint over the historical participants, I see it as implicitly privileging the reader. The antiquarian narrators' visible construction of the narrative from documentary sources is a *mise en abyme* of the reader's construction of the narrative from the text. These narrators and pseudoeditors are always readers themselves, fictively perusing and selecting documents in a mediating position between readers and the pseudodocuments from which the narrative is constructed. As the antiquarian narrators select certain documents for the readers' perusal and exclude others or speculate on what lost ones may contain, the reader becomes aware that the narrators'/pseudoeditors' power over documents translates into power over the story. This foregrounds the power of the reader as readers see how the narrator's act of reading mirrors their own. After *Waverley*, Scott's narrators are often self-serving, obviously tendentious, or just simply mistaken. Jedediah Cleishbotham of the *Tales of My Landlord* series is purposely obtuse. Laurence Templeton, who prefaces *Ivanhoe*, is nearly as dry as the Reverend Dryasdust. These pseudoeditors almost always model the ways that documents can be misread and how reading is constrained or influenced by the reader's context. They foreground how the act of separating out a single narrative of history is always a doubtful process, subject to the hidden agendas and
the other vagaries and biases of whoever is in control of the narrative. And this control is always predicated on access to the material texts, the historical documents.

One might argue that these multiple narrative voices are always somehow in essence only Scott. But that begs the question of just how unitary and monolithic any conception of personality might be. Jane Millgate has pointed out how the narrative voice of the early Waverley novels seems “unsure of its readers, defensive, tentative and secretive, while the narrative voice of the *Magnum Opus* is assured and confident, certain that its readers are interested in anything it might have to say” (119). That these two different authorial voices of the same person at different times coexist on the same page, even appearing as one voice, points to how often multiple viewpoints blur together for the reader. Of course, Scott is always Scott, but who Scott was is always an open question. We cannot ignore that through his assumed narrative personas and even his anonymity, Scott was always trying to appear as someone else. Assigning a narrative voice to one person does not necessarily unite it into a unified and monological whole; instead, it can point even to the psychological divisions within a person. The point of this is that for Scott history is always contextual; there is not one fixed history. It is always subject to revision, not only by the narrator but also by the narratee. For Scott there is no such thing as events that tell themselves—an objective history is impossible, but this does not mean one cannot make rational historical judgments and come to one’s own conclusion about events. If one, then, sees the narrative voices and documentary frameworks of Scott as not set off against each other but rather as set off against the single unitary narrative that they seem to contain, then Scott always keeps his readers conscious that history is only their own conclusions, conclusions that are contingent and
contextual. Scott’s texts keep his readers aware of the tensions between a subjective and an objective history. There is historical experience, but the nature of that experience is always another open question.

Thus, whereas Trumpener sees Scott engaged in a contestatory dialogue with his contemporaries, such as Maturin, Galt, and Owenson, a material textual analysis that takes accessibility into account sees Scott as more engaged with the past, the authors of the eighteenth century. Scott’s novels as they simultaneously strive for historical realism demonstrate how this realism is always contextual and contingent upon the differing perspectives of the reader and his or her preconceived notions of the past.
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These tensions between a subjective and objective history are visible in the material textuality of *Waverley* itself in both the ways that the first editions of *Waverley* set themselves off from their contemporaries and in the ways that the material text of *Waverley* itself shifted over time. The first edition of *Waverley* looks like a typical novel of 1814. Published in late July of that year, its paper size is duodecimo (Royal 12mo, 190 x 115mm uncut). It was bound for sale in drab, blue, or blue-grey boards with and without printed labels. The typeface is an unremarkable English pica approximately twelve points in size, and the title page carries no reference to the author or any previous works (no “By the author of” and so forth). The initial print run of 1,000 copies was about the average for a three-volume novel at the time. However, it sold phenomenally quickly, and by January of 1815 it was into its nominal fourth edition and 4,000 more had been printed. Over the next six years an additional 7,500 copies would be issued in England and Scotland in this format. Pirated editions were also printed in the United
States, France, and Germany before 1822 (Todd 309). *Waverley* was an immediate and long-term success. No other novel had sold as many so quickly nor continued to sell at such a high rate for so long.

While it looks typical, *Waverley* does materially differentiate itself from most other novels with one factor, its price. Its nominal price was twenty-one shillings or one guinea (Todd 309). Although price is not usually considered an element of the bibliographic code, the price of a novel is a key feature of material textuality. A novel’s price relative to other novels, to other genres, and within the economic structure as a whole is an integral part of a novel’s material textuality (especially in later editions). These prices may not reflect what readers actually paid for novels, but they do provide us with a benchmark scale of relative value. Many studies have noted the high price of the volume novel in the nineteenth century and have seen this as a limiting factor in the distribution of the novel to a wide audience. While this may generally be true, in the case of *Waverley*, and Scott’s novels in general, the higher price may actually have had the effect of expanding the market. The low numbers of production and high price level of novels in 1814 speak to their status as a marginal cultural commodity. The typical first edition of a novel, published in three volumes, duodecimo, was 15s or 18s (Altick 263; Garside et al.). They were seen as a luxurious indulgence for what Thomas Carlyle would later term “the reader on the sofa” (159).

Yet novels were cheap compared to poetry. Poetry tended to be published in a single volume in a larger quarto format and was much higher priced, often at £2 2s or 2 guineas (gns) per volume. Byron’s *The Corsair*, a relatively slim single volume, was priced at 4 gns when it was issued in 1814. The price in guineas is an important feature.
The guinea was, and to a degree still is, the currency of the gentleman, a signal of luxury and masculine high culture status. *Waverley* was first published in July of 1814 at a price of 21s or 1 guinea. Paradoxically, *Waverley* was able to appeal to a wider audience, not in spite of its high price but perhaps because of it. The higher price distinguished it from the run of the mill novel. *Waverley* was to other novels as single malt scotch is to a blended whiskey. Although a guinea was only three to six shillings higher than the usual cost of a novel, it represented a significant price increase of seventeen to forty percent. The price of a guinea also signals a move from the merely expensive to a gentleman's luxury good; it was a signal to readers of the shifting status of the material text. This gentlemanly price also sways the novel away from its associations with feminine domesticity, “a reader on the sofa,” and toward the perceived masculine sphere. Of course, seven years later Scott's novel *Kenilworth* (1821) would establish that "fateful" price of the three-volume novel that would stand for most of the century, 31s 6d, or a guinea and a half (Altick 269).

Looking at the other high-priced novels published in 1814 shows that women dominated the market. In 1813 not one triple-decker duodecimo sold for more than eighteen shillings, or six shillings per volume, but in 1814 five other novels sold for seven shillings a volume or more before *Waverley* was published. Frances d’Arblay (Fanny Burney), Maria Edgeworth, Elizabeth Hervey, and Jane West all published four- or five-volume novels in a larger octavo format. These books commanded a higher price because, at least in part, they were in a physically larger format and by established authors. Only Sydney Owenson (Lady Morgan), already well known for *The Wild Irish Girl* (1806) and several other novels, published a three-volume duodecimo, *O'Donnel: A National Tale*, at the price of one guinea in 1814. However, *O'Donnel* appeared in the
fall after the publication of *Waverley*. The next year, seven of fifty-five novels were priced at this level, one of which was Scott’s *Guy Mannering*.\(^8\) *Waverley’s* price was in the upper levels for a novel, and it stands out in this group as the only novel in this range that was anonymous.

Contemporary reviews make no direct mention of this high price for the novel but often offer a justification for it in their positive response. Francis Jeffrey, in a contemporary review, writes that “the mere force and truth and vivacity of *Waverley’s* colouring, [is] already casting the whole tribe of ordinary novels into the shade, and taking its place rather with the most popular of our modern poems, than with the rubbish of provincial romance” (208).\(^9\) It is no coincidence that the poetry that Jeffrey sees *Waverley* supplanting is usually much higher priced than the “ordinary novels” and masculine, while at this time women usually author “ordinary novels” that are “the rubbish of provincial romance.” The author’s gender would have been unknown to its initial audience. The only hint of the author’s gender in the first two editions is the masculine tone of the narrative voice. However, in the preface to the third edition, which is the one Jeffrey cites in his review, the author of *Waverley* does refer to himself as a “he.” In fact, about half of the preface is devoted to the public’s curiosity about the identity of the author. It offers several possibilities of who the “he” might be, but it never offers up the possibility that “he” might be a “she.”

Although *Waverley’s* bibliographic code identifies it as a novel and only signals the novel’s difference from other novels with its price, the paratext and the text itself do signal its differences from other novels. If we consider the first, “Introductory” chapter, which explicitly explores what different effects a title communicates to readers, and then
return to a close analysis of the title page as a paratextual address to readers using this
"Introductory" chapter as a key, we can see how the subtle interpellation of readers begins even before they have begun to read the text.

The first chapter of *Waverley* demonstrates Scott's consciousness of the role of the paratext in shaping readers expectations as it counters readerly expectations generated by the bibliographic code of the document. The first chapter seeks to clear a space free of associations as it interpellates readers into position to receive the text. *Waverley* does not begin as many novels do with a time and a place, what Paul Ricouer refers to as an event to be filled in (79); instead, it begins with a chapter on the meaning of the title and the meaning of titles in general:

> The title of this work has not been chosen without the grave and solid deliberation which matters of importance demand from the prudent. Even its first or general denomination, was the result of no common research or selection, although according to the example of my predecessors, I had only to seize upon the most sounding and euphonic surname that English history or topography affords and elect it at once as the title of my work, and the name of my hero. (*Waverley* 4)

The name of the hero and the title of the novel that the reader holds in hand are the blanks to be filled in by the reader at this initiating moment. The first chapter is a discussion on what the name of the container implies to readers and what the novel is even before Scott has begun to fill it, as he will in the second chapter. This process of choosing a title is described using grammatically awkward double negatives: "Not been chosen without" instead of "chosen with" and "no common research" instead of, say, uncommon or
diligent research describes the novel in terms of what it is *not*. Scott is clearing a literary space, simultaneously preparing the reader for something new and dismissing the other novels of his "predecessors." These first sentences imply that most novels have titles chosen haphazardly, based on no research at all by imprudent authors. Furthermore, the narrative voice continues:

But alas! what could my readers have expected from chivalrous epithets of Howard, Mordaunt, Mortimer, or Stanley or from the softer sentimental sounds of Belmour, Belville, Belfield and Belgrave, but pages of inanity, similar to those which have been so christened for half a century past. (4)

This is another way of disparaging the more contemporary novels associated with feminine authors and harkening back to the novels of Henry Fielding and the other masculine novelists of the eighteenth century.

The narrator's further claim that Waverley is an "uncontaminated name bearing with its sound little of good or evil" may not necessarily be as true as the narrative voice seems to desire. Claire Lamont has pointed out that "Waverley" is the name of the first Cistercian house in England, founded in 1128 and she notes that W.L. Cross has pointed out that there is a character named "Waverly" in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond* (1792) (Lamont 411). Despite the narrators claim, the name of Waverley would have had some resonance for readers. If we follow Scott's lead and look for associations based simply on alliteration, as in "Mortimer and Mordaunt" or "Belmour, Belville, Belfield and Belgrave," some interesting associations present themselves. William Wallace is the hero of Jane Porter's *Scottish Chiefs* (1810); that book and her *Thaddeus of Warsaw* (1803) are both early precursors to the historical novel. Sydney Owenson's *The Wild Irish Girl; A
National Tale (1806) is also noted as a precursor to Waverley (Trumpener 159). The narrator's failure to mention these works speaks to efforts to repress connections to any feminine precursors and achieve a masculine gendering of the historical novel by claiming a kind of romantic originality for itself. (Scott attempts some redress of this in the last chapter of the book, "A Postscript, which should have been a Preface" when he does give slight credit to Maria Edgeworth, Elizabeth Hamilton, and Anne Grant. But even that credit is overshadowed by the final dedication to Henry MacKenzie.)

However, it is not only his connections to his feminine precursors and contemporaries that Scott may be eliding by claiming purity for the name of Waverley. Horace Walpole, especially in Castle of Otranto (1765), is an important gothic influence on the historical novel traced by Avrom Fleishman. William Wordsworth's ideas about the poetic nature of common language have much in common with Scott's representation of dialects in his novels. Even Izaak Walton's The Compleat Angler (1653) seems to have an association with the apocryphal story of the misplaced early manuscript of Waverley being found in an old desk with some fishing tackle. Walton, like Scott, is also something of a folklorist, an antiquarian, and a popularizer of folk tales. Of course, Sir Walter himself has a "sounding and euphonic" connection to the word "waverley." "Waverley" is no purer and uncontaminated a name than any other, but Scott's interest in presenting it as such is related to at least one reason for maintaining his anonymity as the author. He wants Waverley to start with a clean slate, no preconceived notions as to what type of work is being presented—as might be hinted at by the intertextual references of a title and the author's name.
After this consideration of the title, the “Introductory” moves to subtitles and projects how alternatives could have shaped readers’ perceptions of the novel. The “second or supplemental title[s]” might have been “a Tale of Other Days,” “a Romance from the German” (3), a “Sentimental Tale,” or “A Tale of the Times” (4). Each of these possible subtitles would have located Waverley within the subgenres of the gothic, romance, sentimental, or fashionable novel respectively. Whereas “‘Tis Sixty Years Since” offers a round unvarnished tale according to Scott. One that throws,

the force of my narrative upon the characters and passions of the actors;—
those passions common to men in all stages of society, and which have alike agitated the human heart, whether it throbbed under the steel corslet of the fifteenth century, the brocaded coat of the eighteenth, or the blue frock and white dimity waistcoat of the present day. (5)

Therefore, Scott’s claim that he does not want his readers influenced by the title of the novel but rather by the actions that occur within the text itself reveals his sensitivity to the power and functions of the paratext and bibliographic codes. The first chapter acknowledges, even by its very position at the front of the text, that the influences of the title, while they may be unconscious or repressed, are not something that can be erased.

Waverley would then be profoundly less radical if shorn of its first introductory chapter. Nothing of the plot would have been lost if it began with the first sentence of the second chapter: “It is then sixty years since Edward Waverley, the hero of the following pages, took leave to join the regiment of dragoons in which he had lately obtained a commission” (5). This sentence begins a presentation of the past that without the previous chapter would have been rigid and two-dimensional, with the narrative voice’s and
reader's angle of vision unspecified. Specifically, this "introductory" first chapter establishes a narrative voice that comes from a reader's angle of vision, a voice self-conscious of its construction in print and the different ways that that construction can be read or misread. The narrator's consideration of multiple subtitles and anticipation of the misreading they would lead to strives to preclude the preconditioned response, teaching readers to read anew.

The concerns of the first chapter of Waverley to clear a space and establish legitimacy imply a threat to it. The work's status is dubious in someone's eyes and the fuzziness about the present and the immediate past indicates the whereabouts of the enemy, a contestatory and undisciplined reader. Waverley's genealogy creates its legitimacy and points to the lack of it in other novels. Waverley's mythic past is a defensive strategy in a real present. This genealogy of the novel stands in a dialectical relationship to the other novels that it excludes, a feminine literary or intellectual tradition that Waverley seeks to block or bypass, in spite of its associations with the physical material form of the text as a novel. The point of this first chapter is that Waverley looks like all these other novels, but it does not read like them. Though this invented genealogy insists on its own authority, it should be taken not as authoritative but as polemical with particularly strong motives for hiding the circumstances that brought it into being. The title has its resonances despite what Scott writes, and he was certainly aware of this.

These particular resonances of the title page of the first edition will be addressed further after a discussion of a metaphor at the end of the first chapter that Scott uses to figure the source of Waverley.
While Scott is interested in clearing a space for this novel that separates it from other novels, he is not interested, however, in claiming this is a novel without forebears. He does not write that it is something new, original, or created ex nihilo. Waverley, Scott writes, is a work without an "acknowledged father" (preface to the third edition, 1814) in terms of its anonymous author, but he does claim another line of descent from the "great book of Nature" (5). Others have argued for other lines of descent. Georg Lukács has traced the influence of the eighteenth-century realistic novel on Scott and Waverley, while Avrom Fleishman sees the historical novel as arising out of the different traditions of the gothic novel. But as we have seen with the treatment of potential titles and subtitles Scott is trying to disassociate Waverley from exactly these subgenres of the novel. Katie Trumpener has written about the influence of the "national tale" and the bardic tradition on concepts of nationalism as evidenced in Scott. The "national tale" and the bardic tradition, according to Trumpener, are outside what was then considered literary culture and closer to "real" life (7). Like the Romantic poets clearing a space in poetry, "to keep [the] Reader in the company of flesh and blood" (Wordsworth 323), Scott has cleared a space by defining what this tale of "sixty years since" is not. He then begins to fill that space with what the novel is: "more a description of men than manners" (4). But like the "steel corslet" and the "brocaded coat" of the earlier passage, the use of "men" continues the gendering of Waverley and the novel as a more masculine art form. Scott is taking advantage of the characterization of the real world as a masculine realm, whereas the world of manners and artifice is characterized as feminine.

"The great book of Nature" as a metaphor of genealogy aptly demonstrates what is at stake in these claims of ancestry. This complex metaphor and its extension by Scott
have implications not only to the genre of the novel but also to concepts of romantic originality, the role of the author, and the functionality of material texts. A close analysis of this metaphor shows that Scott is arguing not for a direct or transparent representation of the world but, instead, for a different way of looking at the world. The key to understanding the roles of textual materiality in a novel that was to "father" so many novels in the nineteenth century is this metaphor of the novel's own ancestry and its utilization of material aspects of texts.

In the last paragraph of the first chapter, Scott claims, “It is from the great book of Nature, the same through a thousand editions, whether of black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed, that I have venturously essayed to read a chapter to the public” (5). This figure of “the book of Nature” might at first glance seem to be offering a novel based on a slice of life from the past, the real, rather than a novel that is based on the manners and artifice of culture. On one level, the metaphor seeks to establish this novel as having a more direct relationship to the world than is possible in other genres. However, though Scott is using this metaphor to make a claim toward the real, to get outside of culture, the metaphor has a culture of its own, and it shows the difficulty of making any claim toward the real as outside of culture. Scott is not the first to make use of this metaphor. Indeed, the “book of Nature” is a figure that can be traced back to European medieval times. The idea was that one could “read” the word of God not only in the Bible but also in all aspects of the physical world. The trope of a “book of Nature” occurs often, from medieval times through recent history to Scott, but especially in the works of Henry Fielding. The idea of the book as a totality, as a complete and unified structure that organizes nature into a single meaning, was (and perhaps in a residual sense still is) the
model for understanding the world itself, for the way in which people try to make sense of the irreducible complexity of what we call nature, or reality. Scott claims not that he is presenting nature directly or transparently through a single focus but rather that he is quoting from the book of nature, not Nature itself (or herself) but the cultural artifact of nature.

Culture, then, in the form of the book is the organizing force, not nature itself. One can only read nature if it is a kind of book, yet to style nature as a book reverses the usual relation of signifier and signified. Usually nature, the world, is represented by a book, but in the "book of Nature," nature itself becomes the signifier of the word. As Michel Foucault writes in *The Order of Things*: "The great metaphor of the book that opens, that one pores over and reads in order to know nature, is merely the reverse and visible side of another transference, and a much deeper one, which forces language to reside in the world, among the plants, the herbs, the stones, and the animals" (35). This residence of language in the world would seem to offer up the possibility of direct representation, but the fact that it is "the book of nature" and not nature itself that "one pores over and reads" speaks to *a way of looking* at the world rather than any direct unmediated representation of the world. One looks at the world as one looks at a book, as a reader.

To read nature as a book brings up questions of authority and the role of the reader. The narrator is no longer the writer of the story, the authority, but a reader relating to another reader. This chain of provenance passes down an authority that does not originate with the teller of the tale but back in Nature itself. While *Waverley* does not have the multiple narrators of some of Scott's later works, the pattern of a tale derived
from other tales and texts within texts will be a pattern that Scott continues to develop throughout his novels, as he creates layers of narrative voices and source texts that frame the novels. Jedidiah Cleishbotham, Peter Pattieson, Laurence Templeton, and Captain Clutterbuck are not alternate narrative voices of the “author of Waverley” but multiple narrative voices interpreting texts within texts. Jedidiah Cleishbotham is the editorial voice of *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818), which he claims derives from a manuscript of Peter Pattieson that is “founded upon the conversation of the evening” (27) among Pattieson; two lawyers, Haklit and Hardie; and their client, Mr. Dunover. Scott would later further complicate these multiple narrative voices in the preface to the 1830 edition, after his anonymous authorship was revealed, with the claim that the character of Jeannie Deans was inspired by a letter from Mrs. Helen Goldie describing Helen Walker. In another instance, the title page of *Ivanhoe* proclaims “By the author of Waverley.” Its introduction, however, is written by the fictitious Laurence Templeton, who claims to be writing in the style of the author of *Waverley* but applying it to English rather than Scottish history. Captain Clutterbuck, the fictitious narrator of *The Monastery* (1820), meets the “author of Waverley” in the back of an Edinburgh bookstore at the beginning of that novel.

These narrators/readers are not passive receptors of the tale. They are active, biased, and judgmental. They often exhibit misinformed opinions and motivations contaminated by personal desire. An example of this is the narrator, Jedidiah Cleishbotham. In the introduction to *The Heart of Midlothian*, which was also known as the second series of *Tales of My Landlord*, Cleishbotham thanks readers for the success of the first series and the resulting “second story with atticks” that he has been able to add
to his house with the profits (7). These multiple filtering narrative voices do more than just reveal bias in the various storytellers; they also lessen the sovereign power of authority any one writer has over the text and make the writer into a reader and a kind of intermediate agency of the transmission of other texts. While *Waverley* does not have the multiple framing narrators of many of the later novels, this narrator, too, places himself as the mediating agent of a kind of found text. He becomes a reader when he writes that he has “venturously essayed to read a chapter to the public” from the “great book of Nature.” Here “essayed” is used with a meaning close to its French root verb, *essayer,* “to try,” but it also puns on the English usage as a noun, the “essay,” the personal written document. This portion of the quote might be paraphrased as venturously written, to read a chapter to the public. These alternating exchanges between readers, authors, and texts point to the way that readers write their own text each time they read a novel and at the same time gesture toward a wavering fixity of the material text itself.

This metaphor of the “book of Nature” yields interesting results when we consider how Nature’s relationship to the book of Nature is analogous to the relationship of the literary work to the material text. The book of Nature, though it occurs in “thousands of editions,” each one different, is always the same, in the same sense that every version of *Hamlet* is always the same as well, which is to say they are like other literary works paradoxically the same and different simultaneously. It is only because the book of Nature is a metaphor, an imaginary figure, that it can be “the same through a thousand editions” and efface in the same sentence its material differences, “whether black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed.”
That Scott extends this metaphor by literalizing the book of Nature in the specific material manifestations of "black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed" is important because it shows how elements of the bibliographic code can affect the production of meaning in the real literary work. It may not matter whether the imagined and idealized book of Nature is black letter or wire-wove, but it does matter in the real documents that represent a work. We can see how the bibliographic code affects meaning when we consider what “black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed” materially represent. Though the terms are probably unfamiliar to most modern-day readers, “black letter,” “wire-wove,” and “hot-pressed,” refer to the aspects of the bibliographic code of a text that are still generally recognizable to a reader today.

“Whether black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed” has generally been paraphrased as “whether in old print or new paper” (Lamont “Notes” 412). However, these elements of the bibliographic code align the text with certain cultural views of authority and gender. “Black letter” refers to a style of typeface also known as German, Old-English or Gothic. The design of a “black letter” typeface replicates the decorative handwriting of medieval scribes using broad-tipped pens. Black letter was the font for almost all of the first printed texts. The Gutenberg Bibles are printed in black letter, for example. Most modern typefaces (like the one of this dissertation, Times New Roman) are known as roman or white letter, hence black letter’s connotation of old or antiquarian texts. However, even in Scott’s era black letter did not only signify age. Many contemporary texts made use of black letter. Black letter was the preferred type for bibles in Scott’s time and often used in official proclamations and government documents. The popular press, especially the broad sheets often adopted it because of its associations with
authority. Therefore, black letter not only communicates a sense of antiquity but also carries with it echoes of the popular press and a sense of authority. It is still used in this way today [see fig. 1].

![Fig. 1—Masthead for the New York Times online in black letter and in white letter sans-serif.](image)

Not only are many newspaper mastheads still printed in black letter; birth certificates, diplomas, and professional licenses often contain several lines of black letter press, often in bold and larger than the other type faces. Thus, black letter connotes not only antiquity but also religious or governmental authority and the idea that documents in black letter are of public import; they are not only antique but long-lived and public as well. The use of black letter in the daily press and broad sheets is meant to counter the ephemeral nature of these material texts by communicating the longevity and authority of the publishers.

It is worth noting here that Waverley itself contains two brief instances of black letter type. The first is a literally a replica of the Bradwardine motto, *Beware the Bar*, inscribed beneath the stone bears that decorate the manor house, Tully-Veolan (36). The replication of the orthography and typeface seems to represent literally the actual letters themselves from within the text. The type itself becomes an illustration. The reader, through the materiality of the text, seems to gain access to the actual place and is able to see the letters as they appear underneath the windows of the fictional estate in their full lapidary glory. The other instance of black letter is the title of a poem, *St Swithin's*
Chair, transcribed by Edward Waverley into the Waverley family papers that the author of Waverley has supposedly edited into something more appropriate for those not as "attuned to antiquity" (60). Rather than access to a place, the black letter text here seems to give the reader access to the original documents, perhaps even the hand of the hero and his sense of self. In both these cases this mimetic representation of the typography as it appears in the other texts of stone or family papers is a visual citation that is meant to recall these documents physically and add to the sense of the real for themselves and ultimately for the novel. This last example of black letter is a microexample of the larger macro processes whereby the historical novel in order to provide the sense of a real past often fudges a "recourse to documents." This "recourse to documents," Ricoeur claims "signals the dividing line between fiction and history" (26).

On the other hand, "wire-wove and hot-pressed" are terms not only associated with the new industrial technology of paper manufacturing but also very often with certain belles-lettres writing and the frivolous "pages of inanity" of the last "half a century past" (Waverley 3) that in the first paragraph of the introductory chapter Scott associates with novels. Whereas black letter texts are associated with the earliest printed texts and the handwritten manuscripts of the Middle Ages, wire-wove and hot-pressed paper represent new technologies in paper manufacturing in the early nineteenth century when most paper was still "hand-laid." "Wire-wove" refers to the manner in which paper was manufactured, and hot-pressing is a finishing treatment. Early sheets of paper were formed by dipping a large wooden-frame sieve with a hand woven or "hand-laid" wire backing (the mold), into a vat of fiber slurry. Once most of the water had drained, the sheet of paper would be peeled from the mold and further dried by pressing between
sheets of felt. Hand-laid papers typically exhibit characteristic chain and wire lines, impressions left in the paper by the wire sieve, that are obvious when the paper is held up to the light. In the late eighteenth century, by making the molds with a finer machine-loomed wire screen instead of with hand-laid wire, James Whatman was able to produce a paper with an even finish that lacked the impressions of chain and wire lines. This “wire-wove” paper was slow to catch on but it was finally made in quantity during the 1790s (Gaskell 59). In the Fourdrinier process (circa 1803), the wire molds were replaced first by a belt and then by a drum of wire screen (the dandy roll) run through the vat of slurry. This allowed for the manufacture of paper in continuous rolls. Again, this technology was only slowly adopted and not widely in use until the 1820’s (“Fourdrinier”). While the difference between laid paper and wove paper is obvious to the lay person who looks for it, even scholars have difficulty determining whether wove paper was machine- or handmade in the early nineteenth century. In addition, “hot-pressed” paper was rolled or pressed between heated rollers or heavy plates to produce a smooth, almost glossy finish. In the nineteenth century, frontispieces and engravings were often printed on hot-pressed paper and inserted into a book, while the text pages might be printed on a rougher surfaced woven paper. The different finish produced by hot-pressing is easy to see and feel in nineteenth-century texts, although very often this finish was used on a heavier stock of paper that was inserted into the text when bound later. The smoother surface of hot-pressed papers also makes them better for finer intaglio or engraved printing because the smooth surface allows for finer detail in illustrations and smoother lines overall. Only expensive and fashionable books were printed on all hot-pressed paper.
"Wire-wove and hot-pressed" papers also often seem to have been associated with feminine reading. Some of these associations that "wire-wove and hot-pressed" would have communicated are evidenced in an article attributed to Alexander Chalmers in the 1805 Gentleman's Magazine. This article may have influenced the first chapter of Waverley. Scott owned a whole run of the Gentleman's Magazine (Scott Catalogue) and this essay appeared about the time Scott was composing the first chapters.¹² In this essay, Chalmers criticizes contemporary novels as "manufactured" and unrelated to real life. Chalmers ironically writes:

It is wonderful, indeed, what a difference is observable between the distresses of real life and those which are produced by the printing press; nor is the difference less striking between a disappointment, an embarrassment, a discovery, an escape, in real life, and the same event, or an event by the same name, when it is inflicted with a beautiful type, and upon paper wire-wove and hot-pressed. (912)

For Chalmers, "wire-wove and hot-pressed" represent the overemphasis of form over substance, and a novel finely printed on wire-wove and hot-pressed paper would stand in opposition to "real life" or any "book of Nature." Another example of the symbolism of the material forms of hot-pressed and wire-wove paper that speaks to its association with frivolous feminine reading is in Benjamin Disraeli's Vivian Grey (1826). One of Disraeli's characters is discussing how before a downturn in the economy everyone could afford the "luxury" of being literary:

Every body being very rich, has afforded to be very literary—books being considered a luxury almost as elegant and necessary as Ottomans,
bonbons, and pier-glasses. Consols at 100 were the origin of all book societies. The Stockbrokers' ladies took off the quarto travels and the hot-pressed poetry. They were the patronesses of your patent ink and your wire-wove paper. [...] A fall in stocks! and a halt to the spread of knowledge! (161)

Of course, 1826 is the year of Scott’s financial collapse with the failures of Constable and Ballantyne. Both these passages demonstrate how hot-pressed and wire-wove papers connote more than just the newest technology in book publishing and are associated with a particular type of literature. We may note in Scott’s defense that for Scott “real life” can be found in any book despite its form, whereas the form of contemporary novels precludes “real life” for Chalmers and the newest books can be merely bon bons for wealthy ladies in Disraeli. Scott still seems to hold out the possibility that this feminine materiality can be a medium for the “book of Nature.” However, in Scott’s, Chalmer’s, and Disraeli’s use of the terms, there is still a sense of disparagement that has perhaps a modern-day analogy in the dismissal of the glossy finely printed but unread book someone displays as a status symbol. Of course, reading the newest novel by “the author of Waverley” or owning the complete works of Scott quickly became a symbol of status and achievement during Victorian times as well.

Waverley’s material textuality blurs or straddles these oppositions of old or new, important or frivolous, authoritative or powerless, and masculine or feminine that are pointed to by “black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed.” Its own typeface is almost wholly white letter, an English roman or pica type in approximately twelve point size (Fry). But the text also utilizes different font sizes, italics, and, as we have seen, even
instances of black letter. The paper is wove but not hot-pressed, and it is more difficult to determine whether the paper is hand- or machine-made. *Waverley* was printed at a time of transition from handmade to machine-made woven paper. There may have been Fourdrinier papermaking machines in Scotland (Coleman 197), but Brian McMullin sees the quality of some deckle edges on end sheets in the first editions of *Waverley* he has examined as indicative of handmade wire-wove paper. Claire Lamont thinks that all the early editions of *Waverley* printed by Ballantyne are on machine made paper ("Waverley"), but Peter Garside and Brian McMullin think that the early editions are on hand made paper and that Ballantyne did not switch to machine made paper until the 1820's (Garside). If twenty-first-century scholars have difficulty telling the difference between machine-made wove paper and handmade wove paper, then it is likely that this difference was also difficult to discern by Scott's early readers. It is also possible that in order to meet the unprecedented demand for the novel *Waverley* was printed on both handmade and machine-made paper. Some copies of the text might be on handmade paper and others on machine made. There might even be copies that contain both. Thus *Waverley*, in terms of its own physical makeup of paper and print, blurs or straddles the differences not only between black letter or wire-wove and hot-pressed as past and present but also between the authority of the author and the power of the reader and the ideas of masculine and feminine writing and reading.

Now that I have sensitized my readers to details of the material text and the way these material details influence literary meaning, let us turn back a few pages before the "Introductory" to the paratext of the title page—like a reader, who after reading the "Introductory" chapter and considering the material conditions of *Waverley*, turns back a
few pages to look at the title page once again in a new light. The title page itself, its content and the details of its graphic design and punctuation, epitomizes the clash of modern and traditional cultures and the dual nature of a “historical novel.”
On the title page of the first edition [fig. 2], "Waverley" is printed in all capitals in large bold roman text. It dominates the title page with the extra spacing between letters, and the classical style of the typography is solid and unsentimental, perhaps even relatively
manly compared to the italicized "'Tis Sixty Years Since." This subtitle, all uppercase but not quite as large or bold as the title, is subordinate to the title by the virtues of its position under the title and the style and size of its font. The italic style of the subtitle recalls a written hand and is a kind of metonomy of the body. The contraction of "it is" to "'tis" is an explicit representation of oral speech in print. The locution "'tis sixty years since" evokes the presence of a speaker, and it creates a bond with the reader. Of course, all printed words are a sign for an oral utterance, but the elision or aphaeresis, like much of Scott's effort to represent Scot's Gaelic in dialogue, seeks to embody the voice of a speaker, to reconnect the printed word to speech. The whole phrase, like "once upon a time" in a fairy tale, is a performative. It initiates the conversation and thus the narrative contract between the narrator and the narratee (Barthes S/Z 16). It seems lifted from a conversation, designed to elicit from the reader a response of "'tis sixty years since what?" And exactly when is this "sixty years since"?

The full title, Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since, epitomizes the clash of cultures that will occupy the novel. Waverley is the title of print culture while 'Tis Sixty Years Since is a subtitle with what Walter Ong terms a high "residue of orality" (2). The eponymous novel is nothing new for Scott's time. Naming a literary work after its main protagonist is a tradition that began well before even the genre of the novel began. Robinson Crusoe (1719), Tom Jones (1749), Pamela (1740-41), Clarissa (1748-49), Evelina (1778), and Camilla (1796) are all titles that would have been familiar to most novel readers of 1814. The single title Waverley is the title of print culture. Waverley is an abstraction, closed off and decontextualized from the narrative the reader is about to engage. It has an indexical quality as the abstract label on the object of the book.
Waverley is not only the name of the eponymous character but also the name of the other members of his family, and even the family estate is known as Waverley-Honour. Furthermore, it is not only the name of the physical object of the text, the way we index it, but also the intangible literary work itself. In Scott's lifetime “Waverley” came to represent the whole of Scott's prose fiction, the Waverley novels, and even Scott himself, “the author of Waverley.”

On the other hand, if “Waverley” seems a closed term, the abstract and decontextualized product of print culture, and if “'tis sixty years since” seems open, concrete, and contextualized within an oral tradition of narrative these locutions do not demonstrate a stable relationship of orality to print culture. “Waverley” is a name, and it is a strong belief in oral cultures that a name has the power to call forth presence. In addition, the eponymous novel title is a link to the oral traditions of the epic embodied in works like the Odyssey and the Aeneid. Furthermore, while “'tis sixty years since” functions like “once upon a time,” the specificity of “sixty years” is concrete in its reference to time past. However, while it has the appearance of an index, it has a specificity that never could be quite nailed down. For it to make sense, it has to be contextualized. This phrase points simultaneously to the oral presence of a speaker and a paradoxical delay or postponement of the narrative. The time of the main event of the novel, the Jacobite rebellion, is 1745 (the action of the novel goes on significantly before and after this indexical date), and Scott began composition in 1805, but the novel was published in 1814 and the majority of its composition was delayed until just prior to that date. No reader ever read the complete novel when it was sixty years since the action. Hence, “'tis sixty years since” serves to separate and distinguish the times of the action,
the act of writing, and the act of reading. In addition, many critics have read the term “waverley” as an adjective that describes the main character and the thematic motifs of the book. Edward Waverley is a character whose loyalties waver between England and the Jacobite cause. His love interest wavers between Flora and Rose. The novel itself can be seen as wavering between a lament for the lost culture of the Scottish Highlanders and a celebration of the prosperity of a union between England and Scotland. This linear disjunction of time is more closely associated with the organized structure of history in print culture than with that of oral culture where the act of narration and listening must necessarily overlap. Thus “’tis sixty years” makes a deictic gesture to orality by invoking a voice and an oral exchange in print, and it also gestures to the literate functions of delay and postponement of the narrative. The full title, then, wavers back and forth between oral and print culture, in much the same way the novel itself wavers between history and fiction and in the way that Edward Waverley wavers in his loyalty between the Scottish and the English, the old and the new, even Flora and Rose, the romanticized ideal and the domestic reality, the past and the present.

Even the punctuation of the title can be seen as wavering. The semicolon that separates the title and the subtitle represents more than the brief pause of a comma, which would not be enough of a stop to separate the subtitle from the title, but it is not the full stop represented by a colon. Less of a stop would make the title continuous and of a piece, a single unit; Waverley, or, ‘Tis Sixty Years Since unites the two titles into one, makes the two phrases equivalent rather than subordinates one to the other. The full stop of a colon would make one clearly a title and the other the subtitle, but the use of a
semicolon combined with the use of "or," gives the whole title two brief stops and gives the enunciation of the title its own wavering quality.

The epigraph is on the title page of the first edition, but it is relegated to the half-title page in other later editions. "Under which King, Bezonian? Speak, or die!" from *Henry IV, Part 2* has an obvious resonance of the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 that is at the center of the plot of the novel. Gerard Genette writes, "The epigraph is itself a signal (intended as a sign) of culture, a password of intellectuality . . . with it [the author] chooses his peers and thus his place in the pantheon" (*Paratexts* 89). Judith Wilt writes that this line occurs in Shakespeare's play at the moment when all authority, legal, national, even personal and moral, wavers, shifts uneasily, then passes to its diffused modern form. [ . . . ] The phrase points to the drama of choices, and speeches, by which authority is composed, and recomposed, both under the king and as the king, and to the link in that composition between the world historical personage of "the king" and the professional and middle classes who increasingly exercise authority in the West. (311)

Wilt goes on to note that, in addition to this "historical" change in the composition of authority, there are personal or psychological aspects to this phrase as well. The phrase points to the struggle of the male to enter a personal history situated somewhere between slavish imitation of the legitimate father and slavish rebellion with the illegitimate one, [ . . . ] to his struggle to formulate an identity in
which the choice of independent personhood is somehow harmonized with the continued possession of the oedipal property that is his destiny. (311)

These questions of legitimacy also apply to the text itself. The epigraph foreshadows the first chapter’s concerns with who the legitimate literary precursors of Waverley are, and the text of the epigraph might be rephrased as “Under King or Queen?” The epigraph itself denies the possibility of any inheritance from any feminine ancestors, allowing the repository of power to rest only in a choice between male kings.

Wilt’s analysis is an excellent consideration of the duality and doubleness of the interrogatory portion of the phrase “Under which King,” but she does not deal with the imperative portion, “speak, or die!” Both portions of the phrase display the binary polarization that goes on in the title, and throughout this novel, between orality and literacy. The phrase is a command to the author to declare allegiance to either orality or literacy. To speak, to give voice to something, is to announce its presence and life, whereas in the Lacanian notion of writing the written word is associated with absence and with death. For Lacan, the word on the page signifies the absence of the spoken word. Rendered in print, the command of “speak, or die” can thus be read as the imperative to “speak, or write.” This epigraph, then, figures not only Edward Waverley’s own oedipal battle as Wilt would have it but also the battle of a literary work to establish an separate identity from the works that have come before it that it seems to be descended from.

Two final elements of the title page in the first edition, the printers colophon and the date, further figure the duality of this document. “Edinburgh” is given prominence in position and size of type, as is the name of the printer, James Ballantyne and Co., but the
publishers are both Constable of Edinburgh and Longman et al. of London. Thus the material text has a dual origin in both Scotland and England and projects a kind of cultural dominance, in much the same way that in the modern edition Oxford University Press has a dual transatlantic presence in Oxford and New York that dominates the West. The date of 1814 is a definitive date on its own, but wavers when it is considered in conjunction with ""Tis Sixty Years Since," because the time of the action is earlier, as mentioned before. Furthermore, it conflicts with the text, which places its own composition on "this present 1st of November, 1805" (4). Of course, later editions of the novel would bear later dates on the title page, adding additional resonance to the wavering quality of Waverley.

The title page of the first edition of Waverley, in summary, in its title, subtitle, typography, layout, punctuation, epigraph, colophon, and dates has much to tell us about the moment of its production and the readers the text was trying to capture. I do not mean to imply that there is degradation from some pristine original as the title page changes from edition to edition. Instead, each title page has something to say about the way the text was received by its readers, or about the way that authors, publishers, or printers wanted it to be received, which is perhaps even more interesting. While the physical format of the book, its three volumes and duodecimo size, identifies Waverley as a novel, the price, the title and subtitle, and the opening chapter all seek to identify this novel as something new and different. Scott could have priced Waverley for fifteens shillings and begun with the second chapter instead of the first, but then the novel would not have actively tried to differentiate itself as it sought new readers. However, this novel is not
only seeking new readers, trying to expand the novel into the masculine market, but also trying to train readers to read novels in a new way.

If the paratextual elements and bibliographic code of *Waverley*, its title, the typefaces of the title page, the punctuation, epigraph, colophon, even the price, paper, and type of the text itself all seek to clear a space for the novel by separating it from its contemporaries and establishing a longer and more prestigious genealogy for the work, the citationality of the text also points to a relationship with the past and the "real world" different from that explicitly or implicitly gestured at by the linguistic code of the work. The epigraph from Shakespeare, the allusions to Fielding and Cervantes that occur in the first chapter, the citation of "the great book of Nature," and the reference by the narrator to himself as a "maiden knight with a white shield" (4) are examples of a citationality that appears on nearly every page of *Waverley*. Scott cites from poetry, drama, ballads, folk tales, and many other textual and oral sources. Just as the structure of the narrative voices are layered or nested one within another, the linguistic code, by its citation of other words from other texts, constantly gestures to a layering of texts, a palimpsest, where there is no original or ideal text. The literary work itself exhibits an awareness of its own intermediate textual status by exhibiting a multilayered intertextuality as complex as the multilayers of narrative voices that occur in Scott's later works. As every scholar knows, whom one chooses to quote and the citations one chooses to support one's statements play key roles in establishing the credibility of a scholarly paper. Scott's novels are no different. His citation of Scottish ballads and folktales and his use of history along with the masculine canonical works of literature all aim at establishing a credible authority. But they also reveal just how authority is constructed out of the manipulation of texts.
The negative introjection of earlier works (this novel is not a romance and not a tale) frees the work cognitively from its past but also continues the consequences of repressing that past. Simultaneously, as accessibility to the "real" is claimed, accessibility recedes under layers of textuality. Nothing demonstrates this better than an analysis of the citational functions of the footnote in the Waverley novels.

Most of the work on citationality in the Waverley novels has specifically focused on the footnotes as presented in the Magnum Opus edition. However, a more rewarding account of the footnote appears if we see it in terms of the relations of materiality to the literary work. The Magnum Opus edition of the complete Waverley novels, which began appearing in 1829, was designed in the first place to take financial advantage of Scott’s wide popularity. His finances, which had been in a bad way since the failure of Ballantyne in 1826, needed the boost that the reissue of the novels could provide. The idea was to stimulate sales of the novels and reach new readers by offering relatively inexpensive, freshly annotated texts simultaneously separating it from its contemporaries and establishing a different and deeper genealogy for the work. In the Magnum Opus—a recounting of a whole oeuvre, aestheticized, monumentalized, identified with Scott, and the material instantiation of Scott as a name—the external context of the work has radically changed. Waverley has become part of its own history and the name of Sir Walter Scott is weighted with authority.

Jane Millgate was perhaps the first to recognize the difference between the footnotes of an “early” Scott and those of a “late” Scott. She has pointed out that Scott’s annotations were a way of elevating his novels to the pinnacle of literary achievement, since annotation on such a scale was usually reserved for works of poetry. Furthermore,
she sees the footnotes of the *Magnum Opus* to represent a later Scott. For her, the authorial voice of the early editions of *Waverley* is unsure of its readers, tentative in its appeal, and secretive, but the persona Scott projects in the later notes is assured and confident, even proud of its success. Nevertheless, Millgate addresses the early and late footnotes separately. As a Scott scholar, she knows which footnotes are which, and she does not speculate on the effect on readers when these two authorial voices blur together on the same page as they would for most readers. This blurring of authorial voices is like the blurring that occurs within many of the narrative voices within the novels themselves. Just as in my discussion of Trumpener’s account of Scott’s historiography, we can see how multiple authorial voices manifested in the footnote counter and interrogate the perspective of any “single focus.” Again, access to the “real” is affirmed at the same time it recedes under the layers of the fictive materiality of the narrators themselves.

Other Scott scholars see additional functions of the footnotes. Evertt Zimmerman finds the footnotes an indication of a possible desire in Scott to emulate the paratextual jokes of the eighteenth-century ironists—like Swift, whose work Scott knew intimately (67). On the other hand, Anne Rigney claims that this accretion of footnotes around the text is the logical result of Scott’s claim to be representing history. For her, the footnote strives to reconcile the pure form of narrative with the loose ends that are inherent in all historically accurate accounts (43). However, Fiona Robertson, expanding on Zimmerman’s association of Scott with the eighteenth-century ironists, links Scott’s paratextual additions to the ongoing ambiguities of Scott’s authorial stance and, thus, has gone against the received wisdom that sees footnotes as the sign that reinforces the factuality of the account. Rather than just emulating eighteenth-century authors, she sees
in the footnotes a shared concern with the nature of textual representation and materiality and many of the same techniques of dealing with those concerns (149).

The new footnotes of the *Magnum Opus* were partly the result of the commercial motives behind the reissue of the novels. They reestablished Scott’s copyrights. However, even if Scott only wrote down whatever haphazardly came into his mind as additional filler, how and why did this work for readers? Scott’s desire for prestige and a literary apotheosis does not seem to account for the convivial tone in the footnotes or their fragmented digressive nature which is often self-admitted. Robertson and Rigney are both accurate in their assessments, but their explanations fail to take into account the kinship of the later paratextual footnotes to the direct address of readers in the first edition. Footnotes, like the direct address of the reader, are a kind of *turn* from the narrative. If direct address calls attention to the act of narration and the material text, the footnote literally directs the eye to the bottom of the page and often outside the material text to extratextual evidence. From the first editions of *Waverley*, following both Robertson and Rigney, I see Scott as concerned with the interrelationship of the novel to history and the problems with representation. However, the footnotes are only one aspect of the paratext, and considerations of the footnote separate from either the full linguistic code of the work, especially moments of direct address, or the bibliographic code of the work do not fully account for the role of citation in Scott’s work. In addition, as Millgate’s work gestures to, the reception of these narrative voices changes in regard to their external context; that is, even when these voices do not change, their reception changes because of a change in the external conditions of the story that is told. Reading Scott is different in
the different material instantiations of the text. Reading Scott in 1814 is a different experience in 1820, 1832, or 2008 because the reader comes from a different context.

Scott's "citationality," his repetition and recitation of other texts within the text itself and within footnotes, is an intra- and intertextual relationship that not only adds to the authority of the work but simultaneously has a disciplinary and regulatory function that interpellates the reader into a subject position. The initially unnamed and unidentified narrator, who calls himself the unworthy editor of these papers and who cannot be directly identified as author since the author is not anywhere named, establishes authority by these intertextual connections. In the first edition or any of the later ones, the reader who is capable of recognizing these cited texts is hailed within a context of shared knowledge; the reader is capable of recognizing himself or herself as the subject addressed. The reader's subjection is established as the narrator establishes authority. One might argue that when a specific reader is addressed, as in "fair reader" or "gentle reader," a reader recognizes that it is not he or she that is being addressed but some other reader. However, this recognition of another reader is also a form of self-recognition, a delineation of the borders of shared knowledge that define who the reader is by defining who the reader is not. We can see an instance of this interpellation at the beginning of chapter 5:

From the minuteness with which I have traced Waverley's pursuits, and the bias which they unavoidably communicated to his imagination, the reader may perhaps anticipate, in the following tale, an imitation of the romance of Cervantes. But he will do my prudence injustice in the supposition. My intention is not to follow the steps of that inimitable
author, in describing such total perversion of intellect which misconstrues the objects actually presented to the senses, but that more common aberration from sound judgment, which apprehends occurrences indeed in their reality, but communicates to them a tincture of its own romantic tone and colouring. (18)

The readers who may have missed the reference to “the maiden knight with his white shield” (3) in the first chapter and who did not anticipate an imitation of “inimitable” Cervantes now have it thrust upon them. At first, this gesture toward the work of Cervantes only makes sense to a reader already familiar with it, even if only by reputation. The reader who recognizes this reference to Don Quixote (if only by reputation) and understands this connection is disciplined within this shared context of knowledge. The narrator moves the reader from the contesting position of thinking that this novel will follow an imitation of Cervantes to a subservient one; a reader must follow rather than anticipate the narrator. It might seem that this interpellative move fails with the reader who does not know Cervantes because there is no shared knowledge. But in the next sentence Scott explains Cervantes’s work. This next sentence brings readers unfamiliar with Cervantes under control and reinforces the disciplinary move on the readers already familiar with Cervantes who were disciplined in the previous sentence. By describing Don Quixote as a work that presents a “total perversion of intellect” and the work in hand as merely documenting a “more common aberration from sound judgment” (a mind that is insane versus a mind that is merely in error), Scott effectively completes the disciplinary action on all readers. Thus, this interpellation of the reader
happens whether or not the reader initially anticipated an imitation of Cervantes before being prompted by the narrator.

Significantly, the reader who wrongly anticipates an imitation of Cervantes is a "he." Admittedly, on the one hand, "he" may only be Scott’s way of referring to all readers. On the other hand, if "he" refers to all readers, it reveals the narrator’s imagination of the reader as a masculine subject. A female reader would, however, not necessarily be excluded from this imagined readership. She would be quite capable of imagining herself as a male reader if so addressed. Nevertheless, this imagination of the reader as a "he" interpellates a male-gendered reading subject.

Note the keywords “tale” and “romance” and recall their rejection as possible subtitles in the first chapter. There, Waverley is not a “tale of other days” nor is it a “romance,” but now it has become a tale, and that it does not imitate a romance seems a matter more of degree than of type. Of course these terms are generically unstable. When Constable first published Scott’s work in collected editions, he selected Waverley as the lead for Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley (1819) and selected the novels that were concerned with Scottish history from the previous two hundred years (Waverley, Guy Mannering, The Antiquary, The Black Dwarf, Old Mortality, The Heart of Midlothian, The Bride of Lammermoor, and The Legend of Montrose). However, he used the title of Historical Romances of the Author of Waverley (1822) for the novels whose subjects go back further into English history (Ivanhoe, The Monastery, The Abbot, and Kenilworth). The importance of these collected editions to the material textuality of the Waverley novels will be discussed further after I deal with the textual materiality and
readers as depicted in the “embedded scenes of reading” found within the work of Waverley.
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Edward Waverley is a model for the reader whom Waverley seeks to discipline into a new reading subject. It is his “desultory” mode of reading that Waverley seeks to correct. The following passage is an illustration of the mise en abyme that Garrett Stewart calls an “enacted scene of reading” (15). These scenes of reading embedded in the text not only gesture to the reader (images of readers reading) but also to the materiality of the very texts that are being read (texts within texts). As we have seen, like Don Quixote, Edward Waverley has read many books, but, unlike Quixote, he does not suffer a delusional “total perversion of intellect.” He has only a milder “more common aberration from sound judgment.” Edward Waverley’s fault as a reader is that he is “desultory”; he reads without any purpose, only for entertainment, and only so far as his interest drives him. His vision of the world has been tinctured by the romances he has read and the oral tales he has heard from the members of his family. Edward Waverley is “of a very bookish turn” (14) and remarkably well read:

In English he was master of Shakespeare and Milton, of our earlier dramatic authors, of many picturesque and interesting passages from our old historical chronicles, and particularly of Spenser, Drayton, and other poets who have exercised themselves on romantic fiction, of all themes the most fascinating to a youthful imagination, before the passions have roused themselves, and demand poetry of a more sentimental description. (14)
Not only is he familiar with English literature, but he is also familiar with romances in Italian, French, and Spanish. He has “read the usual authors” of classical literature. But this reading has had no positive effect because he reads “rather to awaken the imagination than to the benefit of understanding.” Edward Waverley may be extremely well read, but he is still ignorant of real experience: “Knowing much that is known but to few, Edward Waverley might be considered as ignorant, since he knew little of what adds dignity to man, and qualifies him to support and adorn an elevated situation in society” (14). What real experience he has had, he has “read” as if it were a romance, a novel. This kind of reading, “to awaken the imagination” rather than “to the benefit of understanding,” always leaves Edward in the same position he was in before; he reads to no effect.

Yet, the fault of this faulty mode of reading does not lie totally with him. It is also the fault of the texts themselves, not only their chivalrous or romantic subject matter but also their material textuality, or more accurately the way these texts efface their own physical status as documents. While this passage communicates the width and breadth of Waverley’s “desultory” reading, we do not have much of material texts in these passages. This is, in part, because it is a recounting in the past tense of what Waverley has read, but it is additionally because the mode of his reading is fostered by the documents themselves. In the library of Waverley-Honour, where the material presence of books ought to be foremost, Edward reads but he does not see the books that are literally in front of his nose. Instead, he sees only the events themselves. Enabled by “that internal sorcery by which past or imaginary events are presented in action, as it were, to the eye of the muser” (17), Edward sees only through the single focus of the “eye of the muser.” This internal sorcery is the manner in which the material presence of the books
disappears as imaginary events take priority. To read “internal sorcery” as strictly a trick of Edward’s mind is, in itself, to efface the role of the material text in facilitating or casting this spell. It only makes sense that in this key scene of the hero’s reading the material book should disappear. Edward fails to see the materiality of the texts he reads—to his own peril. If Edward Waverley had been conscious of the difference between book knowledge and real life or of the key roles that documents will play in the novel (his letters, signatures, poems, and so forth) then the plot of *Waverley* could not have taken place.

While in this “embedded scene of reading,” the description of what Waverley has read, the material text disappears; other such scenes gesture not only to the reader (images of readers reading) but also to the materiality of the very texts that are being read (texts within texts). Newspapers, poems, letters, inscriptions, and documents of all sorts are incorporated and represented in *Waverley* and provide heterogeneous “embedded scenes of reading” that model the different readings that can result from changes in the physical form and external context of the text.

The material texts in the library may have disappeared for Edward, but another material text makes its presence felt at Waverley-Honour even before we learn of Edward’s desultory reading. This material text is not a book at all but an eighteenth-century manuscript newsletter. In the second chapter of *Waverley*, Scott describes the effect of *Dyer’s Weekly Letter* on Sir Everard Waverley, Edward Waverley’s uncle and the current head of the Waverley family. Through *Dyer’s Weekly Letter*, Sir Everard (a northern English Jacobite) discovers that his younger brother has taken a series of steps
(the "events" of the following passage) to ingratiate himself with the Hanoverian government:

Although these events followed each other so closely that the sagacity of the editor of a modern newspaper would have presaged the two last even while he announced the first, yet they came upon Sir Everard gradually, and drop by drop, as it were, distilled through the cool and procrastinating alembic of Dyer's Weekly Letter. For it may be observed in passing, that instead of those mail-coaches, by means of which every mechanic at his six-penny club may nightly learn from twenty contradictory channels the yesterday's news of the capital, a weekly post brought, in those days, to Waverley-Honour, a Weekly Intelligencer, which, after it had gratified Sir Everard's curiosity, his sister's and that of his aged butler, was regularly transferred from the hall to the rectory, from the rectory to Squire Stubbs' at the Grange, from the Squire to the baronet's steward at his neat white house on the heath, from the steward to the bailiff, and from him through a huge circle of honest dames and gaffers, by whose hard and horny hands it was generally worn to pieces in about a month after its arrival. (7)

In this passage we have, on one hand, the sage urban contemporary readers, the "editor of the modern newspaper" and the mechanics, the masters of machines, who can anticipate news almost before it happens. They get their news from multiple contradictory channels, only a day old, from the modern mail coach. On the other hand, the readers at Waverley-Honour get their news from only one source, and one's social status and class determine the timeliness of their access.
Harry Shaw finds this passage a key to Scott’s method of historical representation. For Shaw, it “embodies a quality of historical representation central to Scott and his contribution to the realist novel in Europe” (104). For Shaw, “Sir Everard’s mind, the mail service, the weekly newsletter, all the people who receive it are for Scott parts of a complex and systematic whole in which personality, ideology, technology, and even geography all interact” (105; emphasis added). Shaw finds the mail service the pivotal connection of this passage—from the metropolis of London to the baronet and ultimately to the “huge circle” of commoners—and he finds it indicative of Scott’s creation of a surface network of metonymic connection that is the basis of nineteenth-century realism for him. This passage is almost a “pure construction” (and I think he means “pure construction” in the sense of an uncluttered and visible structure) of Scott’s historical method as it demonstrates the connections within/among people. I, too, find this passage a key moment, and I find Shaw’s analysis and argument compelling. However, his focus on the mail service as the “causal agent in this process” (105) seems to not be the best way to account for the “complex and systematic whole” of metonymic connection. Dyer’s Weekly Letter is an integral part of the complex system of historical process.

The mail service is a rich symbol both metaphorically and metonymically for the systems of human communications, but if instead we focus on the product rather than on the process—on what the mail system delivers instead of on the network of delivery, the material textuality of the weekly newsletter itself—we gain a new sense of the role of the material text. Certainly, the mail service, the mode of delivery, is a key element of the textual materiality, but another facet of Shaw’s system is the newsletter itself. Perhaps
Shaw does not realize or he is unconcerned that this newsletter actually existed. It is a historical citation that is a metonymymical connection itself between fiction and history. This facticity of Dyer’s newsletter and its citation within Waverley connects the reader into a complex and systematic whole that goes beyond the network of Waverley-Honour to a whole network of readers in history. Given that no one aspect of this interrelated system is any more causal than any other, I think Shaw’s focus on the steady drop-by-drop delivery of the news by the mail service overlooks the newsletter itself. Rather than look at the mode of delivery of the product, we can consider the process of this distillation through the product itself, Dyer’s Weekly Letter.

The eighteenth-century newsletter is a particularly interesting material text because of its special intermediary nature. John Dyer was an actual Jacobitical publisher in the early part of the eighteenth century. As is often the case, Scott’s history is only broadly accurate since Dyer’s newsletter had ceased publication approximately thirty years before the events of the novel take place. These newsletters were a popular mode of dissemination of the news before newspapers. They were literally letters, handwritten and delivered by post. Dyer’s, like most of them, was one sheet of bifolium, handwritten on three sides with the fourth side blank and folded in thirds to form an envelope. These newsletters were produced by copyists then sold by subscription. While we do not know whether Scott had ever seen any of Dyer’s actual letters, he was probably familiar with Dyer’s reputation as a proto-yellow journalist. This reputation was primarily established by his enemies. Daniel Defoe (Answer), Joseph Addison (Spectator 222), Richard Steele (176), and Jonathan Swift (243) all mention Dyer or his newsletter and Dyer was actually prosecuted for spreading false news (Snyder 5). In a play by Addison, a gentleman’s
valet, Honest Vellum, refuses to believe his master is dead because he has read of his
death in Dyer's Newsletter (*The Drummer* 2:1). Or conversely, in an essay by Addison,
his Tory foxhunter says, "I make it a Rule never to believe any of your printed News. We
never see, Sir, how Things go, except now and then in *Dyer's* Letter, and I read that more
for the Style than the News" ("Tory" 147). Since Dyer knew exactly who his subscribers
were and each newsletter was copied out by hand, he had a reputation for tailoring the
news as he saw it to be the most advantageous. Each individual newsletter in the archives
bears an "overly elaborate address" (Snyder 9), adding to the perception of Dyer as a
pandering news seller to the modern reader. Scott in a footnote, to the *Magnum Opus*
edition writes that when Dyer received a subscription from a coffeehouse he was reputed
to have asked what kind of people frequented there in order that he might most satisfy his
audience (*Waverley* 390). While this manipulation of the news to suit the market seems
corrupt and unethical, it is really only a difference of degree. While Dyer may cross the
line, his tailoring of the news to fit his readers is not functionally any different than the
different appeal to readers made by the *New York Times* and the *New York Post*. Now,
rather than changing the news to fit the reader, the reader has a choice in how to take the
news.

With Dyer's letter, Scott makes the feedback between readers and authors
explicit. The evidence for this feedback is the differences in the material text, and it
proves that the author is anticipating readers' reactions to the text and making changes to
it based on those anticipations. The letter also shows how this feedback is never
complete. Once the letter is written, Dyer has no control over who reads it, its circulation.
Everyone in Sir Everard's circle or in the coffee shop does not read the news the same way or for the same thing.

The circulation of Dyer's Weekly Letter points to a class hierarchy of reading and knowledge. Official news passes from the top down, and the timeliness of the news is communicated by the worn-out material condition of the paper. This class and time structure of reading in the past is juxtaposed to the modern day, when the mail coach enables every "mechanic at his six-penny club [to] nightly learn from twenty contradictory channels yesterday's news of the capital." The advent of cheap print, the penny post, and the faster mail coach collapsed this distinction of class because then everyone in the country received "yesterday's news" from the capital. Furthermore, this change in cost and delivery systems also changed the dissemination of news from a sequential to a simultaneous process, and it changed the source of news from the single unitary word of Dyer's letter to the multiple voices of "twenty contradictory channels."

These changes, from sequential to simultaneous distribution and from a single to multiple sources, have profound consequences within the story where news travels at uneven rates of time from multiple sources. In fact, they almost cost Edward Waverley his life on several occasions. Of course, the hierarchy and sequential structure of news continues in official news, both in the court (word rising up or coming down from the prince) and in the military (word of Edward's "defection" travels up and down the chain of command and out to the court and family), but gossip and oral "news" often travels from the bottom up. These changes blur the lines between what is official news and what is gossip, producing a range of news that lies between the political and the personal, and call into question how one judges whether either is valid. Scott was revolutionary, Georg Lukács
argues, because he was the first novelist to show the impact of world historical events on
the individual. Scott uses *Dyer's Weekly Letter* to demonstrate how material textuality
determines just how and in what manner world historical events can impact an
individual's modes of thought. What might be initially perceived as personal or political
documents can reverse roles or even carry on both roles simultaneously, depending on the
use to which the reader puts the documents.

In summary, while Shaw argues, "Sir Everard's mind, the mail service, the
newsletter, all the people who receive it are for Scott parts of a complex and systematic
whole in which personality, ideology, technology, and even geography all interact" (105),
the material textuality of the newsletter demonstrates that this complex and systematic
whole goes beyond the boundaries of the text of *Waverly*, the texts of the Waverley
novels, and even the works of Scott. It is a whole, a totality, much broader than Shaw
imagines for Scott. *Dyer's Weekly Letter*, its intertextual representation in Addison's and
other's work, and the letter's representation in Scott enlist and seek to interpellate the
reader into this complex and systematic whole. It is not just a system within *Waverley* in
which personality, ideology, technology, and geography interact; it is a system that seeks
to enlist every reading subject.

Scott continually explores and develops different facets of this system using a
number of different material texts within *Waverley*. Scott uses Dyer's newsletter and the
citation of other real documents within a fictional structure. If, as Ricoeur states, a
recourse to documents is what separates history and fiction (26) then Scott complicates
the position of this historical novel not only by citing real documents but also by citing
false ones, some merely personal and some openly political. The novel contains a poem
supposedly written by Waverley on the occasion of his joining the army. Scott is very particular about the fictive provenance of this fictive document. The poem was recovered by Pembroke, Waverley’s tutor, and given to Edward’s Aunt Rachel. She then transferred it to her

Common-place book, among choice receipts for cookery and medicine, favourite texts, and portions from high-church divines, and a few songs, amatory and jacobitical, which she had caroll’d in her younger days, from whence they were extracted, when the volume itself, with other authentic records of the Waverley family, were exposed to the inspection of the unworthy editor of this memorable history. If they afford the reader no higher amusement, they will serve, at least, better than narrative of any kind, to acquaint him with the wild and irregular spirit of our hero. (22)

This passage shows how the material context of the text helps determine its meaning. The poem, found among the quotidian and sentimental fragments of Miss Rachel’s commonplace book, speaks at once to its sentimental value for her, but it is its authenticity as an indicator of character that is valuable to the male reader, once the poem has been transferred from its material manifestation in the commonplace book to the novel itself. The conceit of the narrator as editor of the Waverley family papers and the fictitious provenance of what a historian would consider primary documents are motifs frequently and variously used elsewhere to add authenticity to the work. These pretenses, to both documents and to editorship, are deictic gestures to the material texts of history, even though the author knows that the reader knows that these, too, are a fiction. Both
gestures pretend to “forget” the fictional nature of the documents and sham an authentic material text.

Waverley’s tutor, Pembroke, is an author of personal texts that fail to become political or, rather, become political texts in a context other than he first imagined. He first comes face to face with the exigencies of textual production when he tries to publish his political religious manuscripts. When he presents them to a bookseller in “Little Britain,” the bookseller’s response is negative: “‘Well meant,’ he said, ‘and learned, doubtless’; but the time had gone by. Printed on small pica it would run to eight hundred pages, and could never pay” (29). Pembroke’s other work is also unpublishable, “pages so many, paper so much, letter press—Ay—I’ll tell you though, doctor, you must knock out some of the Latin and Greek; heavy, doctor, damn’d heavy” (29). The bookseller is attuned to the material risks and rewards of publishing these tomes and finds their ratio unappealing. The works are dismissed because of their cost to print and because they are hopelessly out of fashion. For Pembroke, subject matter, material form, and market perceptions all combine to make his text not only unprintable but also nearly unreadable. Pembroke goes to the trouble of copying these texts by hand for Waverley, and Waverley lugs them around with him on his travels, unread, until they resurface again in the middle of the novel, where they do finally play a political role. Although it is quite a different role than Pembroke, the author, imagined because these documents are read by different readers in a different context.

Physically at the center of the novel, halfway through volume 2, we see how the context of the reader and the materiality of the text influence the interpretation of texts within an embedded scene of reading. Waverley is forced to defend himself against
charges of treason in front of a local magistrate and clergyman, Major Melville and Mr. Morton. With this plethora of M's, the middle letter of the alphabet, at the center of the book, one wonders if Scott is just having fun with the material text. These two gentlemen, members of two different hierarchies, the religious and the state, read the documents that are relevant to Waverley's situation differently and draw opposing conclusions from the evidence before them not only because of their different backgrounds and roles in society but also because of different orientations toward print and oral testimony. Melville's arguments for treason are based on documentary evidence and Waverley's own partial admissions. The documents Waverley carries with him—Pembroke's manuscripts, and letters from Flora, Aunt Rachel, his father, and Sir Everard—can all be interpreted as treasonous when looked at in the light of Waverley's absence from his regiment and cemented with his guilt by association with the likes of Fergus Mac-Ivor and Donald Bean Lean (two acknowledged supporters of the Stuart cause).

On the other hand, Morton believes Waverley's oral representation of the events that contradicts Melville's interpretation of the printed evidence. For him, it is more reasonable to assume that Pembroke's ponderous manuscripts are not treasonous Jacobitical tracts, but merely the solitary ramblings of a beloved old tutor out of touch with political reality. Morton can believe that Flora's poem on Captain Wogan is not a justification of political overthrow, but merely a romantic tale of chivalry from a bygone past. For the major, the former interpretations make more sense, while for the clergyman it is the latter. From the reader's perspective, Waverley's oral statements more truly represent the case, but the reader can also see that Melville's interpretation of the printed evidence is not unreasonable. Major Melville is willing to believe the worst about
Waverley because of his life experience as a soldier and a magistrate, whereas Morton is willing to believe the oral statements of Waverley because he, too, has been a reader of romances. Morton’s own readings as well as his career as a clergyman dispose him toward a more generous assessment of Waverley’s actions as those of a misguided youth “misled by the wild visions of chivalry and imaginary loyalty” (163) instead of willful treason. Morton stands, then, in a parallel position to the editor/narrator who says that this is what this story is about, and also in a parallel position to the reader who is privy to all this information. Melville is the contestatory reader who has misinterpreted the texts and the events they represent.

As I have shown here, the nature of the gaze of each of these readers—the angle of vision of Morton, Melville, the bookseller in Little Britain, Pembroke, Aunt Rachel, Sir Everard Waverley, Edward Waverley—is determined by their past experiences and readings, and these readers either take the materiality of the text into account or they do not at their peril. Nevertheless, Scott shows how their readings are conditioned, or at least always subject to the possibility of being modified, by the material text. There are other readers in the text whom I could outline further to make the same point if space permitted;—perhaps just to mention them here would be sufficient. Fergus Mac-Ivor, Flora Mac-Ivor, Baron Bradwardine, Baillie Macwheebie, the covenantor—all offer different models of reading and the impact of materiality. Fergus Mac-Ivor holds a warrant from the prince that would make him a noble, should the prince regain power. In J. L. Austin’s terms, this is an infelicitous performative speech act since the conditions or context required for it to be effective are not in effect (the prince is still only the pretender). If the prince had power as king, then the document would be true, or felicitous
(14). However, the document does perform another function, which is to bind Fergus to the Bonnie Prince Charlie in his attempt to regain the throne.

These readers all offer different paradigms of reading different material texts, different *mise en abyme* of the scenes of reading, but it is the narrator/editor who stands in an intermediate position between the story of Edward Waverley and the reader of *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since*. It is from this position that the narrator/editor seeks to manipulate and control the reading of the text itself. This is especially evident at the close of the text in the final chapter and the dedication. “A Postscript, which should have been a Preface” (339) and the closing dedication are “violations of form” (341) that anticipate the contestatory reader by their very position at the end of the text. Scott writes that this postscript, by its position at the end of the novel, stands a very good chance of being read first by that class of readers who read the endings of novels before the beginnings. Further, he writes that those readers who read the end first tend to skip prefaces in any case, so that by virtue of its position at the end, it actually stands a better chance of being read than if it had come first. In addition, this material stands as a kind of paratextual commentary, part of the text, the final chapter, but labeled a paratext, a postscript. Scott has already invited those readers who wish to, to close the book at the beginning of this chapter, since the plot has now run its course (339). But how many readers would have stopped? How many readers would have begun at the end? How many readers would have skipped the preface?

It seems foolish to deny that any reader would have done so, or to assert that all readers would do so. This points to the many different manners in which a text can be read and the lengths the text can go to to anticipate these multifarious readings. This
disruption of the normal narrative progress from beginning to end thus brings the unruly readers who read the novel out of order back into the order of the novel, and in a sense their readings are adjusted and interpellated to the reading subjects that have read the novel all the way through from beginning to end. All readers are brought back to the beginning of the novel and invited to reconsider those beginnings, just as the novel invites the reconsideration of history on a wider scale.

“*A Postscript, which should have been a Preface*” returns to the themes of the introductory chapter. It echoes the first chapter’s concern with precursors and the narrative’s relationship to truth: “The most romantic parts of this narrative are precisely those which have a foundation in fact” (340). Unlike the first “Introductory” chapter, where Scott tries to separate the novel from the writings of women, this final chapter names Maria Edgeworth, Elizabeth Hamilton, and Anne Grant as inspirations for *Waverley*. However, the narrator characterizes Hamilton as too exclusively rural in her concerns and Grant as not writing a narrative. Additionally, while these authors are named within the text, their credit is overshadowed by the top priority given to a male historian. Separated from the body of the text by a full blank page is a full page dedication to “Our Scottish Addison, Henry Mackenzie” (343). Once again Scott credits a male historian as a precursor and effaces the contribution of female novelists. Visually, the full page dedication to Mackenzie overwhelms the citation of Edgeworth, Hamilton, and Grant within the text.

Thus far, I hope I have successfully demonstrated the role of material textuality in the creation of literary meaning from *within* the text of *Waverley*. In addition, what makes *Waverley* such an interesting subject for the study of material textuality is the way that
the various editions of the novel itself illustrate the mobilization of these concepts of material textuality themselves in the nineteenth century. In other words, it is not only the text and a particular material instantiation of it that is revealing but the relationships between texts and what the different material texts can tell us about the work’s relation to the world.
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As Waverley goes through different material versions we can trace the dynamic interactions of material texts that helped to define the conditions for the text’s perceptual apprehension. Waverley begins, of course, as a single anonymously authored novel. Shortly afterwards, with the publication of Guy Mannering (1815) and The Antiquary (1816), it moves from a single novel to the initial installment of a trilogy “By the Author of Waverley.” Then from there it comes to be the lead item in the first authorized collection of Waverley novels, Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley. The role of the collected editions of Scott’s novels before the appearance of the Magnum Opus edition of the Waverley novels has not been much studied. Before considering these collected editions we should put them in the context of a whole industry of print that was accreting around Waverley and the other Waverley novels. In the 1820s Scott’s novels gradually accrete various other textual appendages, additional notes, and illustrations that were not by Scott nor even directly affiliated with the novels. Waverley and the novels that followed it spawned a whole industry of derivative, if not parasitical, texts of illustrations, chapbooks, plays, music, and geographical and historical sketches. A few examples are W. H. Lizars and Alexander Nasmyth’s Sixteen Engravings from Real Scenes Supposed to Be Described in the Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley
Robert Chambers's *Illustrations of the Author of Waverley: Being Notices and Anecdotes of Real Characters, Scenes, and Incidents, Supposed to Be Described in His Works* (1822); James Skene's *A Series of Sketches of the Existing Localities Alluded to in the Waverley Novels* (1829); James Forsyth's *The Waverley Anecdotes: Illustrative of the Incidents, Characters, and Scenery Described in the Novels of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (1820); and Richard Warner's *Illustrations, Historical, Biographical and Miscellaneous of the Novels by the Author of Waverley* (1823-24). This is only a very small part of the print industry that grew around Scott's novels. In all, Todd and Bowden list more than 224 entries for derivative editions of illustrations and sketches of the people, places, and events of *Waverley* alone, and this list does not include the parodies and satires. They have also found 45 plays, and 29 different sets of sheet music based on *Waverley* and they limited their consideration to the material published in Scott’s lifetime (732). Undoubtedly this production tailed off as the century progressed, but there was an active market throughout the century. Forsyth went into at least four nominal editions between 1820 and 1887; Chambers into three between 1820 and 1884. At the beginning of the twentieth century, one still finds W. S. Crockett’s *The Scott Country* (1902) and *The Scott Originals* (1912). These derivative and parasitical texts can be seen as a kind of further filling out of the narrative, additions to the complex systemic connections of readers and texts. These numbers also suggest that at least a portion of Scott’s audience was probably more aware of his literary achievements through these altered versions rather than through the texts themselves. However, Scott and his publisher's reprinting strategies as they strove for profit in the marketplace certainly took advantage of this interest in all
things Scott. These strategies are at least partially responsible for this interest because of the ways they made Scott's texts available in multiple material formats.

*Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley* limned out a pattern for success and revealed the pitfalls to avoid, not only for the publication of the *Magnum Opus* edition, but also for the subsequent success of the publishers of other series of novels and even, in some ways, the serial novel.

Early in 1819 Archibald Constable had purchased from Scott the copyrights to the novels published thus far. Recognizing the continuing demand for this fiction, and perhaps in concert with Scott, he developed an elaborate scheme of reprinting the novels designed to appeal to a wider scope of readers [Appendix]. At first James Ballantyne printed and Constable published the collected editions of the novels in a larger octavo size (8°) on better paper, adorned with vignette titles. The plan was to follow at intervals with a less costly duodecimo (12°) edition, and then finally with the cheapest "miniature" octodecimo (18°) version. The total nominal price on the first seven novels as first issued had been £10 for all twenty-four duodecimo volumes, but by 1819 they were occasionally advertised as a set for £9.2, a ten percent discount (Todd 490). However, the first collected edition, entitled *Novels and Tales of the Author of Waverley*, offered these novels in the larger octavo in twelve volumes for only £7.4, a twenty-eight percent discount off the full price. The Scott reader could now purchase a nicer product for less money if he or she was willing to wait. Constable was actively seeking to tranch down by lowering price to expand sales to readers that would not otherwise buy Scott. The smaller sets at the nominal price of £6 for the duodecimo and £4.4 (4 gns) for the miniature version represented further discounts of forty and fifty-eight percent
respectively. However, even at this deepest discount of £4.4 the collected *Novels and Tales* were still out of reach for most readers. Constable was a man ahead of his time in the realization that cheaper books could attract a much wider audience, but he was unable, because of the costs associated with novel publication in volume form, to cut prices deep enough to obtain the wider audiences that Dickens would eventually appeal to with serial publication. It would not be until seven years after Constable’s and Ballantyne’s business failures that Dickens’s and the adaptation of eighteenth-century serial publication would achieve a price point that greatly increased the mass consumption of the novel. While the collected editions of the 1820s might not have had the revolutionary success of the *Magnum Opus* edition, they were still successful. They had a loyal audience of buyers and Cadell continued to publish them after Constable failed, even completing the final series only days after he released the final volume of the *Magnum Opus* edition.

The marketing problems with the collected editions published before the *Magnum Opus* seem obvious now and the *Magnum Opus* edition corrected them. The first problem was that each collection was published and meant to be sold complete. Consisting of anywhere from six to twelve volumes depending on the format each set cost between £3 and £7.4, an outlay that was out of the range of most buyers. The volumes of the *Magnum Opus* edition cost only 5s apiece and were released at the rate of one volume a month, typically using two volumes for a complete novel. This allowed readers to spread their costs over time and gradually accumulate the whole set. The second problem was that the sets were also published irregularly with no pattern of release dates. In contrast, the monthly release of the *Magnum Opus* allowed readers to plan for a smaller outlay. This
release schedule, in addition, built anticipation as readers got halfway through a new novel or finished an old one. This is an adaptation of the pattern of cheap part publication used advantageously by a volume publisher. However, this adaptation of part publication, while it may have built anticipation, also caused another problem of readability. Each novel tended to run a volume and a half, and so fully half of the books in a whole set would contain the final third of the preceding novel and the first third of the next. Thus, a good part of the time readers might be carrying around a volume that held only half of what they wanted to read. The *Magnum Opus* edition made it a point to keep each novel to two volumes and that combined with the steady flow of releases built up a pattern of anticipation and satisfaction that studies of serial publication have found to be a key element of material textuality.

In summary, even before the 1820s the novels of Scott were permeating the different market tranches of the reading public. He supplied the market with a steady stream of new novels available as triple-deckers. Then, as each new novel was supplanted by a successor, the older novel quickly became more available in a graduated series of less expensive formats. (It should be kept in mind, however, that the first collected series in octavo, while less expensive than the triple-decker, also presented a better quality product.) These collected editions and the *Magnum Opus* edition set the stage for the success of Frederick Marryatt’s novel serializations in magazines and Dickens’s novel serializations in individual parts. Returning to the single work of *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since*, we can see how this novel demonstrates the role material textuality plays in making meaning. From the novel’s own reflections on the material text, its embedded scenes of reading, and the direct address of readers through its multiple material
instantiations, and layers of narrative voice to the derivative forms of the work in plays, music, and satire, we can trace the text as only a palimpsest, a layering of texts in any single material document. Each reading of a material text is a performative act that recreates the work anew for a reader, and in that act recreates the whole system through which the reading subject is interpellated. We can see how Waverley has become a part of its own history, as it moves through subsequent editions that take place in different historical moments.

"A Postscript, which should have been a Preface" becomes a preface after all and the dedication at the end of Waverley becomes a dedication at the beginning of all of Scott’s novels. If one imagines a book shelf filled with the volumes of the Magnum Opus edition in order, Waverley, which comes first, with its dedication at its end, rather than at the beginning, turns this single novel into a kind of preface for the whole oeuvre of Scott’s prose fiction. Waverley moves from being a single novel to the representative of a style of narration and, ultimately, to the metonymy for the whole of Scott’s prose fiction. Waverley’s text and its material instantiations interpellate the reader into a contestatory position that constantly needs to be corrected. These interpellative strategies are spread not only by Scott’s other novels but by the multiple material instantiations of these novels. Waverley and even the whole Magnum Opus battle incessantly against its potentiality to be misread as they discipline readers textually through the paratext, direct address, enacted scenes of reading and materially through multiple material instantiations; nevertheless, this disciplinary effort reveals that the novel can be misread in multiple ways. In fact, the novel itself seems to demonstrate that we must always take into account the context of the text in its material form or the words that it contains will
end up like Edward Waverley's tutor's manuscripts, dead letters. The physical form is a constituent of the meaning of the book as much as the words, and the words of the book often seek to mediate and control the effects of the physical form.

Scott's *Magnum Opus* edition sets the pattern for maximizing market penetration of the novel within the constraints of the book form. In the next chapter we will see how the novel expands beyond the physical limitations of the material book by adding new dimensions to material textuality that make the novel available to a much wider group of readers.
Chapter 3

Captain Marryat—Nautical Fiction and a Sea Change in the Novel

There is no Frigate like a Book

—Emily Dickinson

Full thirty foot she towered from waterline to rail.

It cost a watch to steer her, and a week to shorten sail;

But, spite all modern notions, I've found her first and best—

The only certain packet for the Islands of the Blest.

—Rudyard Kipling

The 1830s are usually seen as a hiatus in development of the novel; however, some important material transformations in the production and marketing of novels occurred in this period. Two of the most salient material transformations are the practice of publishing original fiction serially in parts and magazines (Vann; Patten; Tillotson) and the development of the publisher's series, offering cheap one-volume reprints of recently published novels in a uniform size and factory binding (Sadleir; Gettman; Bray). Each of these developments increased the novel's appeal and availability to a wider audience. Despite these material innovations this period roughly between the novels of Scott and Dickens is seen as a hiatus because no major novelists stand out. I would like to suggest that we think of nothing important happening in the novel in this period because we judge the novels that were produced at this time in terms of the values of the novels that came before and after them. Further, I suggest that the nautical novels of the 1830s interrogate the values of the novel before and after this period in ways that are nearly invisible unless we consider material textuality.
The material textuality of the nautical novels of the 1830s shows us how these material innovations worked with the text to challenge and reshape the conventions of the domestic novel and modern industrialism in five ways that are instantiated within the bibliographic code of the text. These novels in serial form contest concepts of resolution, specifically the domestic novel's presentation of marriage as a resolution. Related to this critique of resolution is a critique of the concept of progress—reading this fiction in a serial that goes on for more than a year reveals questions to ideas of progress that are less visible when reading the same text in a nonserial form. Stereotypical characters defy many of the ideas associated with the commodification of the individual in the industrial age and they offer an economy of figurative construction that becomes less relevant in a nonserial. The language of the nautical novel presents a language of work. This professional language along with the settings of the sea and ships offer alternate ways of speaking and spaces that challenge the conventions of the domestic novel. All these elements can still be detected within the nonserial forms of the nautical novel. However, as the material instantiations of these nautical novels change, the challenges to or confrontations with the domestic novel and industrialism lose their purchase. They may still exist in nonserial versions of the text but they do not have the traction or relevance they had in serial versions. As these texts are reprinted in volume form they become more a part of the establishment than a challenge to it.

During the 1830s there was what has become commonplace to call a “boom” in the nautical novel. John Sutherland cites a convergence of a whole set of historical, social, and economic factors as responsible for this short-term success (Companion 456). These novels, which are most often based on the exploits of British seamen in the era of
the Napoleonic Wars, present heroic images from what seemed a simpler age in a time of political and social turmoil. The physical landscape was being crisscrossed by railroads, and the political landscape was being altered by a whole new set of voters who had been enfranchised by the First Reform Act of 1832. On the water sail was quickly giving way to steam as a means of propulsion, and this transition was often seen as symbolic of changes caused by the increasing mechanization and industrialization of society.\footnote{The nautical novel offered an escape from the increasingly complex muddle of everyday life. In addition, there were approximately 250,000 retired sailors and officers who proved both a ready audience and the source of authors for nautical fiction.}

However, the use of the word “boom” implies that there was also a bust, and by the 1840s many popular authors had switched to other genres or left novel writing completely.\footnote{The Athenaeum reported, perhaps somewhat prematurely in 1838, that the public had already grown tired of “salt-water babble” (719). Royal Gettmann sees the final death knell of the nautical novel as also its greatest artistic achievement: the one novel of the sea that “did triumphantly overcome the artistic limitations of the genre” (173). In 1851, Richard Bentley in London printed 500 copies of a three-volume novel by an American, \textit{The Whale}. He had published several of this author’s novels before to some success, but two years later, 217 copies of the novel that would later be known as \textit{Moby Dick} still languished in a warehouse. By this time, its author, Herman Melville, was working in the customs house in New York. He continued to write, but in his lifetime he never received another penny for a novel published in Britain (173).}

This characterization of a boom-to-bust cycle of the nautical novel is based on the nautical novels’ appearance as first-run fiction. It ignores the history of these works as
reprints and misleads one as to the longer-term impact of the nautical novel of the 1830s. Actually, the nautical novels of the 1830s, especially the work of Captain Frederick Marryat, who is the central focus of this chapter, never went bust. The OCLC shows many versions of these texts reprinted in every decade for the rest of the century. If the content of the nautical novel of the 1830s looked back to recent history, its material textuality looked to the future. Marryat’s texts, as we shall see, were also the novels used to lead off more than one successful publisher’s series. Jonathan Rose notes that Marryat and the other authors of nautical novels consistently appear on lists of the most popular authors in lending libraries throughout the last half of the nineteenth century (369). The nearly continual reinstatiation and reading of these novels during the rest of the nineteenth (and well into the twentieth) century calls for a deeper reconsideration of the roles these novels have played.

This perceived hiatus in the development of the novel during the 1830s has existed because many critics have treated these novels as only brief fashions or fads that were artistically substandard compared to the novels that came after. Nancy Armstrong sees these works between the novels of Jane Austen and Charlotte Brontë as primarily escapist fantasies that avoid doing the kind of cultural work that happens in the domestic novel (Desire 161). John Sutherland also finds, for example, that “nautical expertise did not extend to technical aspects of narration” (Companion 456). For him and many others, these novels lack the characteristics that might have given them staying power in the market. While they may have been popular because of a convergence of historical, economic, and social factors these nautical novels were only mere fads without aesthetic merits, popular trash (456).
On a slightly different tack, Elliot Engel and Margaret King argue for the importance of the novels of this period, not because these novels have value artistically, but because they lay the groundwork for the major novelists of the Victorian and modern period. Marryat is important, for example, because of his later influence on Joseph Conrad. Martin Green and Lawrence Kitzan, writing about the relationships between adventure novels and empire, see these novels as rough precursors to the later works of Rudyard Kipling, Robert Louis Stevenson, and Joseph Conrad. Ultimately, these novels are generally considered articles of commerce rather than works of art (Gettmann 164).

Specifically, interest in nautical novels was seen to decline so rapidly precisely because they seemed to fail at many of the usual conventions that define the novel for most of the nineteenth century. The plots, characters, settings, and language of these novels were and are dismissed by many critics as having little literary value. The plots are described as episodic, focused too much on action, and lacking any rewarding resolution. The characters are seen as flat and stereotypical rather than psychologically developed or nuanced. The settings of the sea, ships, and foreign ports are characterized as alien, exotic, and isolated, worlds apart from the everyday experience of most of the readers. The language, salted with the technical jargon of ships and seafaring, is portrayed as sometimes incomprehensible to the land-bound reader. Furthermore, the language of nautical fiction is perceived as digressive and lacking in direction, such that it has been described as often lapsing into almost "senile garrulity" (Sutherland, Companion 456).

In fact, it was its general reputation as popular trash that first attracted me to the nautical novel. I thought it would be possible to show how the material innovations of the period—serial fiction in magazines and the publisher’s series—were all interconnected
with the text. I first thought that the commercial motivations of these material innovations would be easy to discern within the texts themselves because the texts were written for money. I thought these novels would offer a kind of pure commercial materialism, unclouded by any pretensions to art or aesthetics. The nautical novel, precisely because it was not considered literary, seemed to me to offer the opportunity to study how the material instantiation of the book affects our perceptions of the text. In other words, the nautical novel seemed to me a kind of literary other. Changes in the material textuality of the nautical novel could be traced to one source: money.

The nautical novel now seems to me a different kind of literary other. What I discovered when I considered the texts of the nautical novel in their various material instantiations was that what to many critics and readers had seemed to be defects now seemed to me to be critiques of many of the conventions of the domestic novel, in particular, and in some cases the conventions of narrative, generally. Nautical fiction’s picaresque plots and its focus on action, stereotypical characters, technical language, and the spaces of the ship and sea present challenges to literary values of the domestic novel. What at first seemed the deficiencies of the nautical novel that made it an artistic failure, now seem to be challenges or alternatives to the domestic novel that defy its dominant literary values. Instead of reading the characteristics of nautical fiction as defects, the characteristics of the texts demonstrate a different set of novelistic practices. Recent critics such as John Peck, Margaret Cohen, and Cesare Caeserino have noticed these challenges but have not explored their relationships to the material forms of the text.

It is when we take material textuality into account that the challenges to the domestic novel seem challenges rather than literary ineptitude. In the nonserial versions
of these texts what appear to be the artistic defects of the nautical novel only begin to make sense when we take into consideration the interrelationships between the text and material textuality; for instance, rather than offering the artistically satisfying resolution that we often desire in a novel, nautical fiction points to the fictive nature of these resolutions through its use of the serial form and its treatment of marriage. A final marriage between the hero and his truelove may have a fuller sense of resolution for a reader of the nonserial form than it does for a reader of the serial. Only days, or perhaps a week or two, have passed from beginning of the novel to end for the nonserial reader, but the hero’s truelove may have been absent from the serial reader for more than a year. The material text of a magazine might also challenge resolution by beginning a new serial on the next page after the end of a previous one, de-emphazizing the sense of resolution one feels at the end of a novel in volume form. Nonetheless, the endings in the nonserial form of the nautical novel—which seem often cursory, tacked on, and unrewarding—can still be read as challenging the idea of resolution. These challenges are just harder to see out of their material context.

I focus on the works of Captain Frederick Marryat, generally considered the foremost practitioner of the nautical novel, not only because he was a decorated sea captain and an author, but also because he was a magazine editor and a savvy marketer of his own work. Unlike Scott, who was effectively under the control of James Cadell after 1826, Marryat was in control of how his work was published and distributed. After Scott’s death, the publishers of his work tended to follow rather than lead innovations. However, Scott and the historical novel had shown how texts, using St Clair’s term, could be tranched down to a broader audience by reprinting them in cheaper books (8). If
Scott could tranche down, then Marryat showed how to tranche up and out. Marryat’s publication history in the 1830s shows how the novel both solidified into its three-volume form for one group of readers, the traditional purchaser and library patron. Marryat brought new and timely material to these readers. In addition, his publication history also shows how the novel began to expand beyond the three-volume form for other readers, such as the serial reader and later those who wanted to own books but did not want to own or could not afford a first-edition triple-decker. The material textuality of Marryat’s work registers the transformation of the novel out of its three-volume instantiations into serial form and ultimately to multiple material instantiations. Frederick Marryat mobilizes these material textual innovations in nautical fiction to challenge the conventions of the domestic novel, interpellating a new set of readers for the novel and, perhaps, transforming existing ones.

Marryat is either responsible for, or at least associated with, three of the major material innovations in the novel that occurred in the 1830s: first, he has been credited as one of the first to publish original fiction in serial form in magazines; second, he seems to be one of the first to coordinate the publication of serials and the appearance of the work as a three volume novel to maximize sales; third, Marryat’s novels were also often the flagship of a new mode of novel publication, the publisher’s series, which began to appear in the 1830s.

In this chapter I recharacterize the artistic failures of the nautical novel within the context of several of Marryat’s novels but I focus primarily on the material textuality of one work, Marryat’s *Peter Simple* (1832-33). However, I focus less on the paratexts and embedded scenes of reading in this novel in order to explore the interrelationships
between the material instantiations of *Peter Simple* and related texts. My concern here is more the role of material textuality between texts, intertextual relationships, rather than the intratextual relationships I considered in the paratext and scenes of reading in *Waverley*. I want to be clear that I do not view the nautical novel as the only subgenre of the novel to make these material textual innovations. The historical novel; the silver-fork, or fashionable, novel; the Newgate novel, and even the travel writing of the period—all took advantage of these material practices to varying degrees during this time and helped transform the novel. But the nautical novel offers a well-defined and manageable subset of novels for tracing the development and the interconnections of these material practices, and its longevity in reprints points to the continuing yet shifting role this type of novel played in cultural formation. *Peter Simple* is one the most successful nautical novels of the period and its material history makes it an excellent subject for the study of material textuality.

If the domestic novel often moves from disorder to order based on a new social arrangement centered on marriage, nautical fiction seems just as equally to thrive on disorder and resist the centrality of the marriage plot. This can be seen even in Marryat’s first three novels, which were all first published in three volumes but only to very moderate success. Even those these are three-volume novels they demonstrate the ways in which the text challenges the conventions of the domestic novel. In Marryat’s first novel, *The Naval Officer; or, Scenes and Adventures in the Life of Frank Mildmay* (1829), Frank Mildmay has a multiple affairs, a creole mistress, and even marries a Frenchwoman and has a child. All the while he has supposedly been in love with the
same English heiress since he was fourteen. It is only when he leaves the West Indies, his
cchild accidentally drowns, and his despondent French wife kills herself that he can finally
settle down at the end of the novel with his English wife. Certainly, the final marriage
would seem to affirm the centrality of the marriage plot, but these multiple affairs, which
probably appealed to the fantasies of a masculine audience, also demonstrate how
marriage as resolution is a fictive construction. Marryat at one point in the novel almost
seems to be arguing for marriage as a means of resolution when he paraphrases Germaine
de Staël:

Madame de Staël has pronounced love to be an episode in a man’s life;
and so far it is true. There are as many episodes in life as there are in
novels and romances; but in neither case do they destroy the general plot
of the history, although they may, for the time, distract or divert our
attention. ³ (184)

All these episodic love affairs, Marryat seems to be arguing, are only diversions from the
true end of the plot, marriage. However, the qualifier of “for the time” changes the whole
tenor of the quotation. By equating time in “life” with time “novels and romances,”
Marryat elides the fact that life generally has no plot. While marriage may be the end of
the plot of a novel it is not the end of life. He leaves out the other half of de Staël’s
equation, that love is the “history” of a woman’s life. Just how long our attention is
distracted or diverted “for the time” from the different male and female characterizations
of time and the differences of time in life and novels is effaced. What nautical fiction can
show is that marriage as resolution does not always happen in life or in novels and
romances.
Indeed, an early review seems to be complaining in its final analysis that the novel is too much like life and not enough like a novel. At first, the reviewer lauds *Frank Mildmay* as representative of a “new cast” of novels. *Frank Mildmay* and this “new cast” of novels are, according to this review, “descriptive of the actual business of life,” and they offer a perspective, “which looks more to practice than to speculation—to the acquisition of realities more than the study of theories” (*Monthly Review* 214). In this same review these novels are juxtaposed to “the old cast of novels [. . .] made up of fancy scenes, and filled with characters of no recognizable prototypes in common life, added nothing to our knowledge, enlarged none of our experience, and were indeed fitted only to those who had nothing to do with life” (217). However, for this reviewer the novel is ultimately flawed:

The manner has more spirit and veracity—every thing is more direct and pointed—the style and sentiments are at once decisive and despatching; but the general tone is profligate and offensive—gasconading and *adventurous*, with frequent attempts at moralizing, which look more like mockery than piety. The hero is his own historian, and must be regarded as writing his “Confessions.” He assumes the character of the convert; but the manifest gout with which all his obliquities and enormities are detailed, only shew the taste still *fresh* [emphasis in original], and throws an air of detestable hypocrisy and disgusting cant over what is doubtless meant to be very devout and becoming language. The flippery indeed, with which serious and sacred writers are perpetually alluded to, is of the most revolting cast; and though according well with the former manners
and practices of the individual, contrast miserably with the assumed
character of sobriety and reform. The mask of the convert, in short, is so
frequently forgotten, that the assumption glances upon the reader, and
excites nothing but disgust at every recurrence. (222-23)

While praising *Frank Mildmay* for its realism in the description of life at sea, descriptions
of action, and authenticity, this reviewer simply does not believe the hero, Frank
Mildmay, makes any kind of progress. Mildmay's conversion narrative lacks any
credibility and represents the failure of the novel to offer a rewarding resolution for this
reviewer. There is no possibility in the review that *Frank Mildmay* may offer a critique of
"the character of a convert" as always a kind of mask. Mildmay's conversion seems
inauthentic to the reviewer, not because it lacks verisimilitude, but because it does not
follow the narrative conventions of the novel.

Marryat's next two novels do not offer marriage as a convincing resolution either.
A happy marriage looks probable near the end of Marryat's second novel, *The King's Own* (1831); one character even says that this particular marriage "really would be a good
subject for a novel" (342). However, *The King's Own* ends with the death of the hero just
as he seems about to realize his fortune and marriage. But in his third novel, *Newton
Forster; or, The Merchant Service* (1832) Marryat finishes with two marriages, and he
explicitly connects this novel with the previous one. He characterizes the double marriage
as making amends for *The King's Own* in a direct address to his readers: "And now, most
arbitrary public, I consider that I have made the *amende honorable*, and that we are quits;
for, if you were minus a happy marriage in the last work, you have a couple to indemnify
you in the present" (341). This quote demonstrates that Marryat, even before he
published his serial fiction, was thinking of his work's combined effect on the public. The language of contracts, exchange, and indemnification also carries connotations of the commercial nature of the relationship between the authors and readers of nautical fiction that Marryat returns to as a figure for these relations again and again. There are some other Marryat novels in addition to Frank Mildmay and Newton Forster—such as Peter Simple (1832-3), Mister Midshipman Easy (1836), and Percival Keene (1841)—that end with marriages, but the common critical complaint is that the marriages simply seem a way to end the plot rather than any climax that the narrative drives toward (Peck 182; Brantlinger 55). Snarleyyow (1836-37), like King's Own, ends with the death of its major characters, but there is a satirical marriage of two minor characters, a madam and a sergeant in the marines. None of Marryat's other nautical novels—Jacob Faithful (1833-34), Japhet in Search of a Father (1834-6), The Pirate and the Three Cutters (1836), The Phantom Ship (1839), and Poor Jack (1840)—end with a marriage. The lack of marriage in some of Marryat's novels and the cursory or formulaic nature of it in others, reflects a general dissatisfaction of the marriage plot as an authentic resolution in fiction or in life in the 1830s.

This critique marriage as resolution, at least in part, arises out of the changing structure of political economy at sea and on land. In domestic fiction marriage is not only an emotional resolution but also a material resolution; the hero's or heroine's money troubles are solved along with the emotional resolution. Before the industrial revolution, marriage and inheritance were often the basis of the successful transfer of property on land and the resolutions of domestic fiction. Nautical fiction, like the navy, is filled with officers who are second and third sons, who, under the rules of primogeniture, are
unlikely to inherit property. Crew members drawn from the working classes might become officers or share in the prize money, but officers and crew alike are men who must make their fortunes on their own. Thus, the transfer of wealth at sea is not usually from inheritance or marriage; it takes the form of prize money or piracy. This is part of the reason why, when a nautical novel does end with a marriage and inheritance of property, it often has the feeling of a deus ex machina. Good luck and mere survival are the main engines by which many of the heroes make a fortune. Thus, Marryat’s early work appeals to the novel reader with its authenticity despite the seeming liability of a poor resolution. In his later work for the serial reader, this liability becomes an asset. The serial reader’s desire for continuation is sometimes stronger than any desire for resolution. For the serial reader, the marriage of Frank Mildmay at the resolution of a serial version of the novel would perhaps be just as unrewarding as the reviewer quoted above found the actual ending of the volume novel. However, for the serial reader disappointment might result not so much from the final resolution of a novel as much as it results from the novel’s failure to continue.

As de Staël’s quote suggests, the challenge to resolution in the domestic novel is closely related to the episodic structure of nautical fiction. If domestic fiction drives toward the resolution of marriage, nautical fiction seems determined to go in circles, to repeat itself. It seems replete with stock incidents and stereotypical characters that have only a finite number of combinations. The episodic or picaresque narrative is well suited to being broken up into serial pieces, since each episode takes place in no particular sequence outside of any internal chronology, what Mikhail Bakhtin terms “adventure time” (87). In some sense, the serial is ruled more by the external chronology of the
publication schedule than by the internal chronology of the reader. A reader can pick up and put down a novel as she/he so desires, but a serial cannot be read to completion at a reader’s will. In addition, the fact that each unit of a serial is a unit unto itself, sometimes makes it less necessary for each unit be read in a specific order.

Marryat uses a moment of discontinuity to justify the serial form, what he calls “continuations,” as a positive influence on the structure of novels themselves and a tremendous pressure on authors to perform. Marryat ceased publication of *Peter Simple* in serial form in the *Metropolitan* after publishing only about two-thirds of the novel. The long note to readers at the end of this last serial installment bridges the gap between the serial version and volume version of *Peter Simple*. Marryat suggests that readers buy the novel to find out how the story ends. One would expect he might also justify why he is stopping this extremely successful serial, but Marryat does not justify why he is ending it. Instead, somewhat paradoxically, as he stops the serial novel to publish it as a three-decker, Marryat argues for the value of the serial form:

> A narrative may appear in three volumes, and if there is one good chapter out of three, the public are generous and satisfied; but when every portion is severally presented to be analyzed and criticized for thirty days, the author dare not flag. He must keep up to his mark, or he can never encounter an ordeal so severe. (Note, “Peter Simple” 70)

For an author to “flag” or fail to “keep up to his mark” reflects the pressure on the author to satisfy the public with each installment. Linda Hughes and Michael Lund suggest the serial form “can be reconceptualized in relation to feminine issues, especially the material and cultural conditions of Victorian women readers” (144) and see the cyclical pattern of
reading monthly installments and the long-term commitment required of a serial reader as appealing to women. Marryat represents the pressure on the author here in terms of male-performance anxiety. A serial author cannot risk impotency in a single installment; to do otherwise means he loses the interest of his readers.

Ceasing publication of a popular serial in progress also presented something of an ordeal for Marryat. He had broken his contract with the readers of the serial and this was not without its ramifications. Some months later in another note at the end of a serial installment of his next novel, *Jacob Faithful* he had to assure readers that “JF [sic] would be printed in the Metropolitan in its entirety” (Note, “Jacob Faithful” 57). However, the note at the end of last serial installment of *Peter Simple* demonstrates how the text of the serial is linked to its material form:

Another reason which we, as story-tellers, claim as our privilege, that of imparting a degree of prospective interest to our work, and inducing the public to look forward to the ensuing number. When the Kessehgou, or story-teller of the East, has entered upon the most effective part of his narrative, and his audience are breathless with interest and impatience, he drops his cap and his story at one and the same time, and until he perceives that his cap is replete with the small coin of the country—until, in short, Avarice has been vanquished by Curiosity, he proceeds no further. Why, then, may we not claim the same privilege, and wish to excite that interest which will occasion the purchase of the ensuing number? The praise which has been so flatteringly bestowed upon “Peter,” has invariably been mixed up with diatribes against continuations; but
these are flattering proofs of the interest which it has excited, and may be construed rather to the dislike of being obliged to leave off. But “Peter Simple” takes his leave for the present, that he may arrange the remainder of his memoirs, and lay them collectively before the public.

(Note, “Peter Simple” 70)

Marryat claims the oriental figure of the kessehgou to represent the type of storytelling going on in the *Metropolitan*, not an old tar or even a bard. James Morier had introduced the figure of the kessehgou as an itinerant storyteller of the Middle East who travels from Constantinople to Delhi telling stories on the street for money from passersby (254).

Marryat not only acknowledges the commercial motivations of fiction but characterizes the moment when curiosity vanquishes avarice as the moment when the reader is willing to pay for the continuation of the narrative. Marryat uses the text in combination with its material form to perform a somewhat unscrupulous “bait and switch.” He has lured his readers in with a serial format and now they must buy the novel in volumes, perhaps not to finish it but to have it continue.

Analyzing the relationships among time in the text of *Peter Simple* and time in the material texts of the serial and nonserial forms of the novel in terms of Frank Kermode’s two conditions of time, *kairos* and *chronos*, demonstrates how the novel challenges the construction of time in domestic fiction and narrative generally. For Kermode, *kairos* is time invested with meaning, “a point in time filled with significance, charged with a meaning derived from its relation to the end” (47) and *chronos* is just succession (45). His example is the simple sound of the tick tock of a clock (44). *Kairos* is the interval between the tick and the tock, and *chronos* is the interval between the tock and the next
tick. For Kermode, a tick presupposes a tock, and a given listener can tell from a tick how long it will be before a tock ensues but cannot necessarily tell after a tock when or even if the next tick will be. Kermode sees time in the novel as represented by *kairos*, the beginning that drives toward an end, the time between tick and tock. The seventh installment of *Peter Simple* presents just such a pattern, but within a single installment instead of across a whole novel (100-111). Marryat’s use of *kairotic* time within a single serial installment demonstrates how the relationship of text to time is different in serial and nonserial versions of the same text. The installment begins in *chronic* time, the mere succession of events recounted, and then shifts back and forth between *kairotic* and *chronic* time.

The seventh installment of *Peter Simple* contains a storm at sea, one of the mainstays of nautical fiction. After having chased several ships during a storm and forcing them to run aground within a bay, Peter’s ship itself is about to run aground unless it can be turned around and set on a new course that runs out of the bay. The ship is trapped against the lee shore of the bay by the onshore wind of the storm, and they have to execute the complex maneuver of “club-hauling” the ship to make it turn away from the rocks to safety. (They must drop the anchor as they are being driven on shore. When the anchor grabs in the shallow water close to shore, it will turn the bow of the ship around, allowing the sails to fill on the new tack, and then they can sail out of the bay. However, just as the ship begins to move on its new course they must quickly cut away the anchor line. Otherwise, the ship will founder.) The seventh installment of *Peter Simple* in the *Metropolitan* begins:
We continued our cruise along the coast, until we had run down into the Bay of Arcason, where we captured two or three vessels, and obliged many more to run on shore. And here we had an instance showing how very important it is that a captain of a man-of-war should be a good sailor, and have his ship in such discipline as to be strictly obeyed by his ship’s company. (100)

This installment then begins in *chronos* with continuation, the unspecified succession of “two or three vessels” and “many more” but shifts to *kairos* with the phrase “and here we had an instance.” This phrase locates the event within the chronic succession but points to its *kairotic* nature and the moral of the ending. Although the episode is told in a simple past tense, Marryat makes use of the second-person pronoun to draw the reader into the action as he describes the view from the deck of the heaving ship:

> It really was a very awful sight. When the ship was in the trough of the sea, you could distinguish nothing but a waste of tumultuous water; but when she was borne up on the summit of the enormous waves, you then looked down, as it were, upon a low, sandy coast, close to you, and covered with foam and breakers. (101)

The second-person pronoun establishes a “present past” tense, the “you are there” effect, and interpellates the reader into the time of the episode. The structure of the episode, though, is in two connected parts, which presents in microcosm the play of the tick-tick-tick-tick of *chronic* and *kairotic* time. Escaping the first danger, everyone relaxes and the text offers the reader an almost palpable sense of relief. However, it quickly becomes clear that the means of escape have placed the ship in another danger. Merely club-
haling the ship in the storm is not enough to get it to safety but only serves to place it into a new danger—because on the new tack the ship still may not be able to clear the point at the other side of the bay and they cannot clubhaul again because they have already cut away the anchor. The seeming resolution of escape from the rocks is no resolution at all, even of this moment of *kairotic* time. This chapter of *Peter Simple* challenges the sense of reward at the resolution of a narrative by characterizing it as always only temporary, like the resolution offered by club-hauling. The serial demonstrates the tentative and temporary idea of any final resolution other than death.

In triple-decker form this passage takes its place among a number of passages that all elucidate a number of different adventures. The passage no longer stands by itself; it becomes one of many. The changed material context deemphasizes the passage’s tensions between the senses of resolution and continuity. Instead, the text in the material form of the three-volume novel emphasizes repetition. One merely has to continue turning pages to be treated to one adventure after another and any challenge to concepts of resolution in narrative are obscured behind the three-volume form of the text.

This passage from *Peter Simple* also demonstrates what most critics have seen as the one thing that nautical fiction does well, the authentic description of life at sea in general. Especially those “realistic” moments, the depiction of naval battles, storms, shipwrecks, and mutinies, of which all of these narratives give a characteristic glimpse. We are wrong to think of authenticity only as an attempt to depict the “real.” Instead, authenticity is the attempt to make the reader understand the real, to draw the reader in.
Closely related to time, authenticity and the attempt to understand the real is nautical fiction's use of the stereotype. Robert Louis Stevenson points out how a full characterization may distance the reader from the experience of the novel and that it is action that draws the reader in: "The characters are still themselves, they are not us; the more clearly they are depicted, the more widely do they stand away from us, the more imperiously do they thrust us back into our own space as spectator. [...] It is not character but incident that woos us out of our reserve" (339). Just as the third person and the aorist tenses of the narrative voice cause the reader to focus on the event, to view events as if the events themselves tell the story, the use of stereotypical characters keeps the reader focused on the incident and not on its telling. The nautical fiction of the 1830s is more than a literature of escapism and adventure, the propaganda of empire, or a way of displacing attention from the political to some metaphysical abstraction and/or the singular experiences of an individual; it explores and critiques historical, social, and deeply political impulses not from the point of view of a spectator but as a participant.

The criticism of Marryat's characters as stereotypical is materially interconnected with the criticism of the nautical novel as a commodity. Like the apocryphal student who liked *Hamlet* but found it filled with too many clichés, it can be difficult for a modern reader to identify which characters are stereotypical and which are not. Once one has read a number of these novels the stereotypes become very familiar. The naïve midshipman, the despotic captain, the trustworthy first lieutenant, the cheating purser, the Portsmouth Poll, and the bumboat woman appear in almost all nautical fiction in one variation or another. Stereotypical characters can challenge ideas of modern identity and subjectivity. They represent the commodification of character. They can be dropped into a narrative
using only a couple of makers, a kind of shorthand, which makes them recognizable to
readers within the limited space of a serial publication. The economy of the stereotype
allows for a more intense focus on action within the limited space of the serial. The term
“stereotypical” has its origins in the printing process of stereotyping, which, although it
had been developed earlier, entered into wide commercial use in the early nineteenth
century. In printing, a stereotype is a solid plate formed by first taking an impression of
set type in papier mâché or plaster of paris and then pouring molten metal into the mold
(also known as the matrix) to form a plate that is used for printing instead of the type
itself. Stereotyping was economical because it saved wear on the original type and freed
it for other uses. More importantly, it significantly reduced the labor involved in
reprinting since type did not have to be reset each time the publisher wanted more books.
Stereotyping and the stereotypical character are thus both linked to the commodification
of texts. Labor on both the author’s and the reader’s part could be used in the production
and consumption of action rather than character. Conrad faults Marryat for using the sea
and sky as a stage to only “frame the deeds” of valor, but Conrad credits Marryat for the
“fidelity” of his descriptions and his characters:

There is an endless variety of types, all surface, with hard edges, with
memorable eccentricities of outline, with a childish and heroic effect in the
drawing. They do not belong to life. [. . .] And yet they live; there is a
truth in them, the truth of their time; a headlong, reckless audacity, an
intimacy with violence, an unthinking fearlessness, and an exuberance of
vitality which only years of war and victories can give. His adventures are
enthralling; the rapidity of his action fascinates; his method is crude, his sentimentality, obviously incidental, is often factitious. ("Tales" 48)

As stereotypes take the place of individuality and character shrinks to semaphore, a signal code of stereotypic traits and group identity, the collective, becomes paramount. In nautical fiction focused upon the navy the collective may be highly organized in a rigid authoritarian hierarchy of one’s messmates, crew members, officers, and the ship, at the pinnacle of which stands the navy, nation, God, and family. But in the novels that feature the merchant service, fishing, smuggling, or pirates, the collective may be much more loosely or differently organized. Beyond the immediate community of a ship, the collective identity may be isolated from the nation and sometimes, as in the case of pirates, even opposed to it.

Stereotypical characters not only diminish the importance of individual identity but work in concert with the episodic narration and the focus on action to demonstrate the commodification of the subject. Patrick Brantlinger often finds character and plot “oddly disconnected” (50) in nautical fiction. He writes, “Stories of heroic action in which survival is a matter of luck or providence make individual character seem beside the point. [. . .] The hero is he who swims with the tide of events which threaten every moment to overwhelm mere selfhood” (50). Life at sea is presented most often as a series of assaults upon the body. Character is often blown to bits in the service of this collective, and the body seems always to be under assault in nautical fiction. The harsh conditions of life at sea simply do not allow for any pleasant fictions. Sailors’ bodies are at risk from nature, the enemy, and occasionally even friendly fire from one’s own shipmates.
Marryat’s treatment of sailors and prostitutes reveals the low price of both men’s and women’s bodies generally in his fiction. Many critics have interpreted this as sadism. Conrad noted that Marryat has “cruelty in his fun and he can invent puns in the midst of carnage” (“Tales” 48). Brantlinger writes that Marryat’s novels are “certainly sadistic by nature. They express no regret about the tragic consequences of violence, no bitterness about the futility of war.” Brantlinger sees Marryat’s sadism and the odd disconnection of Marryat’s heroes as “prefiguring the twin goals of death and glory” (53). John Peck argues nearly the same thing but from a different point of view. For him, Marryat’s violence is a reactionary defiance of the contemporary values of domestic society: “an assertion of values of a traditional male culture that is increasingly at odds with the manners of the nineteenth century. [...] The thrust of the novels is that this is the navy as it exists and there is nothing that can or should be done about it” (56).

Marryat’s violence may be an assertion of the values of traditional male culture, but it is also an assertion of the values of the human body in an age that is seeing the advent of full-fledged commodity society and industrialism. Marryat’s violence foregrounds the fragility of the human body in the face the machines and institutions of modern society. Michael Sadleir sought to account for Marryat’s “brutality” by imagining “his arming his sensibilities against the shock of their surroundings with the weapon of unfeeling mirth” (Peter Simple xxxiii). The real horrors of naval life are rendered as comedy not out of cruelty but precisely because life was too cruel to deal with directly. Life at sea in the time that Marryat depicts was, without a doubt, often “nasty, brutish, and short” as Hobbes would have it. However, Marryat writes at a time when the era of the epic naval battle had just drawn to a close and sea travel was becoming safe and
routine. Marryat’s sadism, his “unfeeling mirth” and cruelty, are not so much a defiance
of the manners of the nineteenth century as they are an assertion of the value of the
individual in an industrializing society that increasingly treats individuals as mere cogs in
a vast machine. The images of violence against the body offer an image of the human
cost of commodification. Marryat writing about the results of a naval battle ironically
sums up the way the nation commodifies the bodies of its sailors:

The sum total of killed and wounded was excessively gratifying to the
nation, as it proved that there had been hard fighting. By-the-bye, John
Bull is rather annoying in this respect; he imagines that no action can be
well fought unless there is a considerable loss. Having no other method of
judging of the merits of an action, he appreciates it according to the list of
killed and wounded. A merchant in toto, he computes the value of an
object by what it has cost him, and imagines that what is easily and
cheaply obtained cannot be of much value. (Simple 49)

The body, always under assault in these novels, is commodified piece by piece or blown
to bits. Marryat uses stereotypical characters the way the English nation consumes its
people. Thus the readers of the nautical fiction are implicated in this treatment of people.
To the modern reader nautical fiction seems to perpetually assault the bodies that it
depicts. I am suggesting nautical fiction is often writing against these assaults, but that
the modern reader can no longer see the earlier reader’s defense. The stereotype’s status
as simultaneously authentic and fictive, representational and real is a manner of defense
against assault. Conrad’s statement about Marryat’s characters, “They do not belong to
life. [...] And yet they live,” when considered in light of the stereotype’s relation to
violence rather than to authenticity has different implications. Stereotypical characters do not die. They are almost infinitely replaceable with another version or variation of themselves. The stereotypical character is a commodity to be consumed in the production of action, and the result of action is not resolution but more action and the consumption of additional stereotypical characters. Character can be broken apart, put back together, reused, and recycled in reprinting like the stock episodes that often seem to make up the serial parts.

3

In addition to the episodic plots and stereotypical characters, the language and settings of the nautical novel also contest the conventions of domestic fiction. The language may seem incomprehensible to the landlubberly reader, but that is because it is the specialized language of a profession: a language of work. On a sailing ship there can be no questions when orders must be understood and carried out quickly. On a working ship each line, each sail, and each piece of equipment has a specific and singular name. Even if the reader did not know the difference between a sheet and a stay, the use of detail and nautical dialect added to the authenticity of the nautical novel and was a mark of the author's professional expertise. Margaret Cohen suggests this professional language is a language that stresses ontology over epistemology, "know-how" over "know-that." She defines know-how as "a particular intelligence, a kind of practical, results-oriented acumen making use of both theoretical and practical knowledge, including the most specific detail" (486). For Cohen "know-how" is at its root an ontological orientation that is opposed to "know-that," which is an epistemological questioning (487). Furthermore, she argues that know-how in nautical fiction is a new
virtue that replaces the feudal codes of personal honor and that these codes of honor are no longer vested at birth in the nobility but are now vested in a new class, the professional. The new virtue of professional competence has "democratizing political implications, for it is potentially a universal human faculty, available across rank, culture, nationality, race, class, and gender" (487). Cohen goes on to state that the nautical novels' stress on professionalism and "sea fiction's attention to the labor process places the genre at the heart of nineteenth-century modernity." She argues further that the ontological orientation of nautical fiction makes it "explicitly opposed to two key aspects of modern labor [. . .] the division of labor in the factory and the commodity system where labor is objectified, split off from the worker, bought and sold" (491). For Cohen, since a sailor must be able to do many jobs and since all these jobs produce no product (other than to make the ship move) then in the nautical novels of this period the worker cannot become alienated from the product of his/her labor.

While I agree with her that the nautical novel is explicitly opposed to the modern division of labor and the commodity system, I take issue with her in the nature of this opposition. I agree, at sea labor cannot be split off from the body. However, in the nautical fiction of the 1830s, it is not labor that is objectified and split off; rather, the very bodies of workers themselves are commodified. In the factory it is the worker's labor that is split off from the worker and commodified, but at sea it is the sailor's body itself that is commodified. Unlike earlier economies, where the acquisition of a set of skills made an artisan or a craftsman an individual, the professional seaman became himself a commodity, an able-bodied seaman, a hand. The language of the nautical novel, then, not only reflects authenticity but also shifts to an ontological orientation that reflects on the
nature of individuality in an industrializing society. While this is true in both serial and nonserial forms, the difference is, like the difference between stereotypical characters in serial and volume instantiations of the text, that nautical language’s challenge to commodification is less visible as the texts themselves become commodified unless we read them with their material textuality in mind.

4

An analogous problem presents the same structure when we consider the spaces of the sea and ships. As the technology of ocean transportation converted from sail to steam, the space of the sea was changing in the cultural consciousness. The space of the sea and ships has almost always offered an alternative space from which to challenge and counter the space of land. A tendency of much of the criticism of nautical fiction is to view the sea as ahistorical, a constant, but my argument is that as the land changes, the nature of the sea as a counterspace to it changes also. In the 1830s the sea was being transformed from what was a dangerous wilderness for the Romantics into a mere highway for the Victorians. The wild sea that men had plied subject to the unpredictable natural forces of the winds and tides became just a routine link to the far reaches of empire. Anyone might travel by sea according to a schedule based on the industrial power of steam. In the nautical fiction of the 1830s, between the Romantics and the Victorians, the sea is no longer a wilderness and not yet a highway. It moves from the background to the foreground of social consciousness in this period as it becomes a space of transition—a space of work. During this time, the sea is a space of conversion and transformation, a liminal space, a frontier on the edge of society that is being transformed
from a wilderness to one incorporated within the bounds of society. The sea becomes a place of business and of labor.

The space of the ship itself was also a counterspace of transformation. The sailing ship, constructed of oak and cloth, powered by the wind and human labor was quickly becoming obsolete. However, the organization of labor on a sailing ship—specialized, authoritarian, hierarchical, unified—provided a model for the organization of the modern factory. Cesare Casarino, who also sees the space of the ship as a counterspace, characterizes this social space of the ship as a Foucaultian “heterotopia.” It is both a real space and one that “simultaneously represents, inverts, and contests, all other spaces in culture” (10). To say that a ship can “simultaneously represent [...] all spaces” seems hyperbolic to me, but the concept that it can be a different counterspace to different readers and at different times seems more reasonable. Casarino is concerned with the space of the ship as a metaphor for isolation and alienation in the later fiction of Melville and Conrad. However, in Marryat’s and other nautical novels of 1830s, the close community of a ship is not as isolated as it would become in Melville’s and Conrad’s later fiction. The work of a sailing ship is a collective endeavor. The task-oriented division of labor assigns specific responsibilities and is the basis of working relations among the crew. It ranks the different duties and sets a corresponding wage scale. The captain, mates, carpenter, gunner, surgeon, boatswain, sail hands, deckhands, cooks, and others all have their specific duties, and they must perform them in a well-coordinated manner. In the nautical fiction of the 1830s the social structure of the ship’s company and their strengths and weaknesses in seamanship are factors of life at sea, but the purpose of a voyage, the seaworthiness of a vessel, and responsibilities to families, to
owners, or to nations begin and end on land in a more complicated society. Additionally, in the nautical novel of the 1830s the episodic structure, stereotypical characters, nautical language, and space of ships and the sea are factors that exist in each material instantiation, but the interrelationships of these factors to readers, authors, and publishers with the serial and nonserial forms are not always the same and become more visible in the material textuality of the nautical novel. Thus far I have shown in this chapter how certain features of the work may perform differently when we take their material textuality into account. In addition, the material textuality of Peter Simple also demonstrates how Marryat and his publishers were able to manipulate the material text to their benefit but also how the material text could get beyond their control.

The material texts and publishing history of Peter Simple demonstrate the interrelationships between the serial, the stereotypical characters, the language, and the settings of the nautical novel and the commodification of literature and its consumption as a consumable good. Peter Simple is an interesting case because, as I have already mentioned, not only was it published as a serial and as a three-volume novel but Marryat suspended publication two-thirds of the way through its run as a serial and only published the last third of the story in a three-volume novel. Its success also initiated a whole industry of Marryat reprints and thus shows the material intertextual relations between serials, first editions, and reprints and how the material instantiations of a text, and thus the text itself, are not all necessarily within the control of the author.

Marryat did not come to his editorship of the Metropolitan with just three novels to his credit. He had some success in publishing in areas other than fiction even before he
left his career in the navy. He had written a signal code for merchant vessels in 1817 which was still being reprinted in the 1880s (Code), and a pamphlet against impressment in 1822 (Suggestions) that caused a stir in the admiralty and that Marryat quickly withdrew from publication (Florence Marryat 22). He had also had some success publishing in an area that until recently received little critical attention from literary historians, nineteenth-century prints. While stationed on St. Helena, he had sketched Napoleon on his deathbed and had carried the dispatches reporting Napoleon’s death back to England. He was a workmanlike sketch artist and had had a number of his drawings engraved and published (Pocock 65). Perhaps his most successful work of illustration was in collaboration with George Cruikshank on a series of prints that dealt with the theme he would later cover again in his novels, *The Progress of a Midshipman* (1820).⁵ He wrote and published his first two novels, *The Naval Officer; or Scenes and Adventures in the Life of Frank Mildmay* (1829) and *The King’s Own* (1830), while he was still on active duty.

After resigning from the navy, Marryat became at first a contributor to and an investor and later the owner and editor of a new magazine the *Metropolitan: The Monthly Journal of Literature, Science, and Art*. The *Metropolitan* was first published in 1831 by James Cochrane, and its editor was the poet Thomas Campbell, author of “Ye Mariners of England” (1801). The idea of this magazine, which sold for a half crown (2s 6d), was to replace the *Naval Chronicle* that had folded in 1819 and compete with the more general-interest magazines like *Fraser’s*. In addition to the serialized nautical fiction of Marryat, William Glascock, Frederick Chamier and others, the *Metropolitan* printed poetry; articles on politics, science, history, and travel; literary and dramatic reviews; a
meteorological record; and lists of bankrupts, patents, recently published books, prints, and music. The list of publishers and booksellers on its title page not only describes where the magazine might have been acquired but also communicates the national scope of the magazine: James Cochrane and Co., 11 Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; J. Andrews, 167 Bond St.; Ball and Bradfute, Edinburgh; Smith and Son, Glasgow; W. F. Wakeman, Dublin. It does not appear to be illustrated in the 1830s—at least none of the bound copies or microfilms examined contain illustrations or indications of illustrations—but none of the copies I have seen preserved the wrappers. The first issue of the magazine in May 1831 contained the first installment of Chamier’s Life of a Sailor and began a serialization of a varied group of tales by Marryat, embedded in a continuous narrative structure like The Arabian Nights, entitled The Pacha of Many Tales. The Pacha ran intermittently in the magazine until 1835, but in June of 1832 it appeared alongside the first installment of Peter Simple which appeared continuously from June 1832 to September 1833.

The publication history of Peter Simple demonstrates both Marryat’s ability to cross-market his fiction within the British market and to enter simultaneously foreign outlets even with the lack of control any author or publisher had in this period in the growing international market. By the September 1833 issue, Marryat had only published sixteen parts in the Metropolitan, about two-thirds or forty-two chapters of the completed novel (Vann 103). At this point he abruptly ceased Peter Simple and proceeded with the first installment of a new novel, Jacob Faithful. About this time Marryat, who had become the editor of the magazine in 1832, was purchasing it and making arrangements for a new publisher, Saunders and Otley (Warner 90). Perhaps the reason for ceasing the
serial was to provide a "hot" novel for Saunders and Otley to publish immediately as part of the incentive to take on the publication of the magazine. In any case, *Peter Simple* was published in volumes in Britain in December of 1833 and by the end of 1834 was in its third edition. During 1834, *Jacob Faithful* ran in the *Metropolitan*, and Marryat's earlier publishers, Colburn and Bentley, who owned the copyrights on *The Naval Officer*, reprinted it as *Frank Mildmay* to capitalize on the success of *Peter Simple*.

In America the success and suspension of *Peter Simple* had interesting bibliographical results that demonstrate how the text began to escape Marryat's control. Michael Sadleir reports *Peter Simple* as an early instance of a practice that would be repeated often during the Victorian period, where the American edition of a novel appears in volume form before an English edition (*Nineteenth* 1: 238). There was a lively transatlantic trade in printers' proofs and other early versions of novels on both sides of the Atlantic. It is not possible to say whether or not Marryat ceased publication of the serial in order to deprive the American publishers of the final volume, but this is in fact what happened. The first two volumes of *Peter Simple* published by the American firm of Carey and Hart of Philadelphia and Baltimore are based on the serial. These volumes mirror the breaks in the serial issue as chapter breaks, and the chapters lack the epigraphs Marryat added to the volume edition. The third volume, printed early in 1834, now reproduces the chapter breaks and epigraphs of the British edition, but it begins where the serial left off. This indicates that the serial was used as a copy-text for the first two volumes but that the British third volume was used as the copy-text for the final volume of the American edition. Carey and Hart printed a complete second edition in 1834, and
throughout this edition the chapter breaks and epigraphs at least resemble, if they are not exact copies of, the British first-edition in volumes.

Carey and Hart were the first to capitalize on the market potential for Marryat, even before his British publishers. In conjunction with Ticknor and Allen of Boston, they reprinted two earlier Marryat novels, *Frank Mildmay* and *Newton Forster*, in 1833 in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston and began a lively business in Marryat reprints. None of Marryat’s novels had been reprinted in America or Britain prior to 1833, but the success of *Peter Simple* marked the beginning of an international popularity. In fact, I have identified no less than eleven American publishers that reprinted twelve of Marryat’s novels in what appear to be more than eighty different versions by 1841. The American versions of Marryat’s novels were reprints in a variety of formats—from cheap pocket editions to deluxe illustrated editions. Furthermore, editions in English were printed not only in America and Britain but also in France, Germany, and India. In addition, nearly all of Marryat’s novels had been translated into Dutch, Spanish, French, Danish, Swedish, and German versions by 1841. Marryat had no influence over these publications and never received a penny of the proceeds.

In 1837 Saunders and Otley began what promised to be a whole new illustrated edition of Marryat’s works. In late 1836 they advertised seven of Marryat’s novels as forthcoming in illustrated form, with the first to be *Peter Simple* in January of 1837 illustrated by R. W. Buss (Sadleir, *Nineteenth* 1: 238). Only this edition and *Jacob Faithful* were ever published. Marryat left Saunders and Otley at this time and moved to Longmans for his first-run fiction. But he was leaving for an extended stay in America and Canada and he sold the copyright on seven of his novels to Richard Bentley in 1837
for £1,500-1,600 (Pocock 219). These novels were published in Bentley’s Standard Novels. This series was modeled after the Cadell edition of Scott but it contained the work of many different authors. Bentley’s Standard Novels offered a standard size and binding with steel engravings. Standard Novels supplied a complete novel in one volume for 6s whereas Scott’s novels in Cadell were usually two volumes and a complete novel therefore cost 10s. Thus Bentley gave his readers a complete recent work in one volume for about one-fifth the cost of a first-run triple-decker. This series of collected authors and subjects became “the most famous series of cheap novels ever published” (Sadleir, Nineteenth 2: 92). As an additional attraction to readers many of the novels in Bentley’s series carried new remarks by their authors and varying degrees of authorial revision. Marryat did not write an introduction, add any new material, or make significant revisions, perhaps because Marryat did not have the time before his trip or perhaps neither Bentley nor Marryat wished to make changes since Marryat’s novels were still relatively new. Mr. Midshipman Easy and Japhet in Search of a Father were only two years old. In the 1840s Bentley continued to reprint and sell Marryat’s works steadily and the German publisher Baron Tauchnitz reprinted Marryat often in his long-running series Collected British Authors (1842-1914) which was published on the continent in Leipzig (Todd, Tauchnitz). In 1850 after Marryat’s death, Bentley sold the copyrights, plates, and probably some actual sheets to Routledge for £3,350 (Pocock 219; Sadleir, Nineteenth 2: 169). Bentley was a shrewd business person and Routledge was no spendthrift. Routledge reprinted these novels in the early 1850s as part of Routledge’s Standard Novels series and later in the decade reprinted them again as railway novels.
which were known as Yellowbacks (Sadleir Nineteenth, 2: 54, 169-70). While just
printing a book is no guarantee that it is, in fact, sold, that a book was subsequently and
often reprinted at least implies that these texts were certainly being bought and that there
is a likelihood that they were being read as well. It seems probable that both Bentley and
Routledge made a good deal of money from the Marryat’s works.

The popularity of Marryat’s fiction in other forms in addition to the triple-decker
points to an appeal to a rising mass audience, both working- and middle-class, that was
reacting against, or perhaps simply had no use for, what it perceived as the conventional
novel. Marryat was able to produce texts that, for a time at least, in the format of the
serial and the reprint challenged the structure of culture, ideas of work and class, and
their relations to individuality. He was able to work his copyrights and platoon his texts
to develop a new audience to an extent that had not been done before, even if he was not
fully in control of the material instantiations of these texts and the results of his efforts
probably not as he always intended. Peter Simple and many of Marryat’s other works
demonstrate how the text and material textuality challenge and reshape the conventions
of the novel. Eventually, as these texts became available only in the familiar format of
the modern novel, they became mere cultural background and seem only poor reflections
of the domestic novel they challenged when they were first written. It is only when we
consider these texts in their material textuality that we can appreciate the ways that they
were dealing with the problems of their time. In the next chapter we shall see how
William Makepeace Thackeray, reacting against the commodification of literature, tried
to resurrect the material instantiation of an eighteenth-century memoir but this material
instantiation was nevertheless subsumed in the very system of commodification he was reacting against.
The actors in the old tragedies, as we read, piped their iambics to a tune, speaking from under a mask, and wearing stilts and a great head-dress. 'Twas thought the dignity of the Tragick Muse required these appurtenances, and that she was not to move except to a measure and cadence. So Queen Medea flew her children to a slow musick: and King Agamemnon perished in a dying fall (to use Mr. Dryden’s words): the Chorus standing by in a set attitude, and rhythmically and decorously bewailing the fates of those great crowned persons. The Muse of

There are a number of features of the bibliographic code that a modern reader notices looking at a first edition of William Makepeace Thackeray’s The History of Henry Esmond (1852). On the first page of text [Fig. 3] the first thing one notices is likely to be the typeface because it uses the dated convention of the long s. If this long s makes the typeface, known as Caslon Old-face, look odd to nearly all modern readers.
now, it also made it look almost as odd to most Victorian readers when the novel was first published. The long s had gone out of use in the latter half of the eighteenth century, but its use is so frequent throughout *Esmond*, nineteen times in twelve lines on the first page alone for example, that initially the text is nearly indecipherable to readers unfamiliar with the convention. In addition, the ligatures, the small connecting lines between pairs of letters, such as the c and t in “actors” and the long s and l in “decorously,” are also characteristics of eighteenth-century typefaces that are out of date by the Victorian era. Other features of the style and layout of *Esmond* that are characteristic of the eighteenth century do not stand out like the long s, but an observant reader might notice them nonetheless. The antique spellings of some words, such as “music” and “tragic” with ck, the use of uppercase letters for emphasis, the classical references to Agamemnon and Medea, and the reference to John Dryden—all seem designed to recall the impression of an eighteenth-century text for the reader from the very first page. Even the generous use of white space—not only in the margins but also in the spaces between lines and letters—sets *Esmond* apart from most other nineteenth-century novels. This generous use of white space was associated with expensive books and was to a degree an indicator of the artistic importance and cultural cachet of a work.

Furthermore, a modern or Victorian reader who was conversant with the work of Thackeray might also notice that this work in three volumes is a departure from the serial format in which Thackeray usually first published. In fact, a Victorian reader familiar with Thackeray’s work coming upon *Esmond* in its first edition would have good reasons to view this novel’s three-volume form as not merely a sign of cultural cachet but also as a specific indication that the novel should stand out from the Thackeray’s serial texts in
terms of consistency, coherence, and the level of artistry. Of course, there are many, many more things an observant reader could notice about *Esmond*, but let us linger for a moment on the long s. I suggest that the way we process this feature of the typeface is representative of how readers may process material textuality in general.

When most readers begin the first edition of *Esmond* the long s briefly poses an enigma. The long s puts a glitch in one’s reading. The reader, momentarily stymied, must stop at the word that contains it, linger on the long s for a moment, and mentally translate it in order to make the word make sense before moving on. Eventually, almost any reader can learn to make this adjustment and not even notice the long s while reading, much less have it inhibit the text’s ability to make sense. The process is the same for most of the material features of a text. There is a momentary glitch in reading when something new appears, it is processed, and eventually the process becomes unconscious and we forget about it. Of course, the material text may have features that might permanently inhibit one’s reading process: for example, the typeface may just be too small for some readers. While it is certainly true that some readers would probably never make such an adjustment, I would argue that most of the time our reading automatically and unconsciously adjusts for changes in the material text—if it can—and we forget about it. However, just because we forget about the material text does not mean it disappears or that it does not do anything.

Except for the first two editions, the publishers of every edition of *Esmond* have stripped most of these physical features from each subsequent material instantiation of the novel as if they did not matter. It is my contention, of course, that they do matter for a number of reasons. They matter because how these different material features came to be
there in the first place demonstrates how *Esmond* was conceived and produced in collaboration. They matter because they are as integral to the work of *Esmond* as Juliet McMaster suggests illustrations are integral to the work of *Vanity Fair* (16). Furthermore, the material features of the first editions also locate the novel within a context that might otherwise not be noticed. They matter because, stripped away from the text, they demonstrate how different material instantiations of the same text can effect interpretation. However, they may matter less in their presence or absence from any single material instantiation. The changing itself is a stronger indication of meaning than any one material instantiation alone.

Just as the reader of the first edition of *Esmond* becomes accustomed to the long s, I hope my readers are accustomed to material textuality, the paratext, the direct address to readers, and embedded scenes of reading. This chapter makes use of all those concepts but in a more intergrated style than the previous chapters. This integration is possible not only because my readers are familiar with my terms but also because, of all the novels I consider, *Esmond* has had the most critical notice of its material textuality. Gérard Genette, Georg Lukács, Avrom Fleishman, John Sutherland, Elaine Scarry, J. Hillis Miller, N. N. Feltes, Peter Shillingsburg, and Daniel Hack all offer insightful and relevant analysis of *The History of Henry Esmond*. This chapter traces the relationships between history, materiality, and intention through the work on *Esmond* by these critics next. Then it considers how an embedded scene of reading figures these problems within the text of the novel. Last in this chapter I consider how Caslon Old-face type locates *Esmond* within another context that would be difficult to discern without a knowledge of the typeface. *Esmond* and its changing material textuality demonstrate not only how the
material text can reveal more about its historical moment than mere words alone but also how those revelations are always contingent upon both the context of the past and the context of their perception in the present.

The History of Henry Esmond is a historical novel, like Waverley, but its relationship to history is very different. Waverley is a novel that has accreted history as it has gone through various material instantiations. It began as an anonymous novel and it became the leading text of Scott’s whole body of work in the novel. Indeed, it became the representative of the whole subgenre of the historical novel. It gained footnotes, prefaces, songs, poems, afterwords, illustrations, addendums, in an expansive editorial apparatus of documentation and supplementation. Waverley brings a mediated history to the reader through layer upon layer of voices and documents with its paratexts, its multiple levels of editing and editorial voices, and, perhaps most importantly, its recourse to real and imagined documents.

Esmond inverts this historicist project. Instead of bringing history to the reader through the interpretations and interpreters of documents, it seems to bring the reader to history, to offer a historical document directly to the reader. The eighteenth-century typeface, the antique orthography, the first-person narrative voice, the form of the memoir, the tone, and the syntax all seem to present a historical document itself. Even the title page of The History of Henry Esmond proclaims “Written by Himself” and Thackeray never breaks this illusion by speaking in propia persona as he so often does in his other novels. “Written by Himself” initiates the illusion of a first-person narrative of the eighteenth century. This is more than just the simple claim of authorship. “Written by
Himself’ often appeared in the narratives of persons, real and fictional, who were outside the usual pale of the literary production. “Written by Himself” was often used in broadsheet publications purporting to be the last words of convicts at the gallows. Captivity narratives, narratives of exploration and survival, and slave narratives also make use of the claim. A well known author would have no need to make this claim; readers would assume it was the case. Thus, not only does this claim identify a narrative in the first-person voice, but it also identifies the marginality of the author to literary production. This claim was also almost always subject to some degree of skepticism. Many of the narratives that made this claim were often about people that were illiterate so that readers were skeptical of taking this claim at face value. Nevertheless this claim attempts to convey some degree of authenticity. If not always literally true, it was always the sign of an individual subject's point of view. However, “Written by Himself” does not necessarily mean a first-person narration, as we shall see in *Esmond* where the narrator, Henry Esmond, relays the majority of the events in his life in a third-person voice.

Gérard Genette cites the first edition of *Esmond* as an exemplary case in which “the graphic realization is inseparable from the literary intention” (*Paratexts* 34). While I generally agree with Genette’s statement, I read “literary intention” in *Esmond* as a much slipperier and more complex term than Genette seems to imagine at this point in *Paratexts*. I suggest that we think of “literary intention” in *Esmond* as more than authorial intention; that we think of it as also encompassing the publisher’s intention and the intentions of others involved in its production, such as editors, compositors, and even printers. I am well aware of the longstanding and continuing problems of reading any type of intention in a text, material or otherwise. However, these problems are the
problems that *Esmond* both deals with textually and embodies in its own material textuality. *Esmond*'s material textuality is not so much inseparable from the literary intention as it is the demonstrable historicizing of concepts of the relationships of literary intention to authorship and textuality.

One manner in which the material text of the first edition embodies the problems of literary intention is the duality of its construction. While the first edition appears to look like an eighteenth-century text, it also makes clear that this appearance is only the performance of one. As some of the material features and the linguistic code of the text establish the eighteenth-century look and feel, other features simultaneously contradict any reading of text as of eighteenth-century text. The three-volume form is more closely associated with the nineteenth century than it is with the eighteenth. While there are three-volume novels in the eighteenth century, there are also one-, two-, four-, five-, and even six-volume novels. The three-volume novel does not become a standard and gain its monumentalized form and its cultural cachet until Scott’s novels in the 1820s, as I have discussed in chapter two of this dissertation. Reading the three-decker as an eighteenth-century form would be an anachronism. In addition, the paratextual dedication and half-title pages proclaim Thackeray as the author of the novel simultaneously with the claim of the title page that the text is the autobiography of Henry Esmond. Furthermore, the novel was advertised and promoted as Thackeray’s and, unlike some other novels printed in Caslon Old-face around the same time as *Esmond*, no one ever seems to have mistaken the author of the novel for anyone other than Thackeray. Much as a reader can look at the long s and simultaneously see a word with a modern s, the readers of the first edition of *Esmond* could read the work as simultaneously Esmond’s
memoir and Thackeray’s novel. There is nothing particularly special about this duality. There are many novels that belong both to the author and its protagonist. My argument is, however, that *Esmond* is a novel whose material textuality historicizes this relationship rather than allowing it to remain unconscious. The material indeterminacy of the text—eighteenth-century memoir or nineteenth-century novel—is of a piece with the antiheroic rhetoric of the novel and the indeterminacy of history that are Thackeray’s larger projects.

Georg Lukács most likely never read a first edition of *Esmond* or saw it in Caslon Old-face but his analysis of the novel forms a starting point from which the role of material textuality in the novel can be explored. The antiheroic rhetoric of *Esmond* appeals to Georg Lukács but he finds that the novel ultimately fails compared the “classical” historical novels of Scott. He agrees with Henry Esmond’s expressed desire to expose the false heroism promoted by historical legend (*Historical* 202). He shares the antiheroic sentiments expressed by Esmond in the first chapter:

What spectacle is more august than that of a great king in exile? Who is more worthy of respect than a brave man in misfortune? Mr. Addison has painted such a figure in his noble piece of *Cato*. But suppose the fugitive fuddling himself at a tavern with a wench on each knee, a dozen faithful and tipsy companions of defeat, and a landlord calling out for his bill; and the dignity of Misfortune is straightaway lost. (4)
Lukács notes that the private “subjective” viewpoint expressed in the passage is exactly the appropriate form with which to expose the “pseudo-greatness” of English and French history that only takes place at the courts of Windsor and Versailles. This familiar view of history offers a proximity that allows the human flaws of historical figures to be revealed. However, Lukács also faults *Esmond* exactly for its subjective history.

Thackeray has chosen a member of the upper class as his focal point and this “reduces his story to the intrigues of the upper classes.” Therefore, Thackeray “does not see people” (203). This subjective approach to history, for Lukács, can never yield the kind of understanding offered by Scott and his “objective” history because the individual characters are alienated members of the bourgeois. These characters “have come adrift from the main currents of popular life and hence from the really important problems and forces of the age” (205). Lukács almost immediately acknowledges that he is conflating Esmond’s view of history with Thackeray’s and he excuses it by arguing that “the relationship between private manners and historical events is very similar, say, to that in *Vanity Fair,*” and “with a writer as important and conscious as Thackeray the composition of *Henry Esmond* cannot be accidental” (202). By conflating Thackeray with Esmond, Lukács misses the possibility that Thackeray might be demonstrating exactly the shortcomings of a subjective history. Thackeray already distrusted what Lukács calls the “objective” history of Scott exactly because it often fails to offer history with psychological realism. However, Thackeray also seems to be aware that part of this psychological realism is the human capacity for self-delusion which almost always tempers the individual recall of historical events.
While Lukács argues that the failures of *Esmond* are due to the upper-class origins of its protagonist and author and their socially determined historical viewpoint, N. N. Feltes contends that the novel’s failure is due to the socially determined material form of the three-volume novel itself. Whereas Thackeray’s serial fiction had a working class appeal suggests Feltes, the three-volume form of *Esmond* is an “overdetermined” form of “bourgeois moralism” (35). *Esmond*, argues Feltes, was specifically designed to “interpellate the middle- and upper-middle-class subscriber to Mudie’s [Circulating Library]” (27). Three points about the *Esmond*’s material textuality militate against Feltes’s reading. First, while he may be right about the bourgeois moralism of the Mudie’s subscriber, the production numbers of the novel point to a much larger and wider audience for the novel. Second, Feltes seems to argue that all three-volume novels are the same, or at least that they are all overdetermined by the cultural context of their production in the same way. He does not account for the material differences that make *Esmond* stand out among typical three-volume novels. Third, he fails to account for the ways the linguistic code of the text acts in concert with the material text to subvert what may be the overt establishment ideology represented by the three-volume form.

The first point against Feltes’s reading of *The History of Henry Esmond* is that the novel was not produced for Mudie’s subscribers. Mudie’s initially bought four hundred copies of *Esmond*, and a short time later purchased another hundred (Shillingsburg, *Pegasus* 195).² As John Sutherland has shown Mudie’s provided a sure market which guaranteed a small and unspectacular profit for book sellers (*Victorian Novelists* 30). George Smith, Thackeray’s publisher, contracted with Thackeray to print between 2,500 and 2,750 copies of the book in the first impression (Shillingsburg,
This amount was well above what he and Thackeray both would have known would be purchased by Mudie’s. While Smith took a risk printing this many novels in the first impression, this risk paid off when novel sold out of its first printing quickly. *Esmond* did so well in fact, that Smith printed another 1,000 in early in 1853 and sold more than half of those before sales began to tail off at the end of that year (*Pegasus* 194). Therefore, Mudie’s only represented twenty percent at most of the market for the novel, a significant number but not a controlling one. Furthermore, Mudie’s buying power allowed it to negotiate deep discounts thus while it was a significant source of sales it was a much less significant part of the overall profits. In addition, after Thackeray’s success with *Vanity Fair*, a purchase from Mudie’s was probably viewed by Smith and Thackeray as virtually assured. How could a circulating library not have the most recent novel “by the author of *Vanity Fair*” on its shelves? Thus, Smith may have had Mudie’s in mind when he proposed the contract to Thackeray and Thackeray might have had Mudie’s patrons in mind as he wrote the novel, but Mudie’s is hardly as constraining or encompassing force as Feltes suggests. Smith and Thackeray had higher goals for the novel and correctly anticipated, as the novel’s sales indicate, a much wider audience for the novel well beyond the relatively narrow audience Feltes projects.

The second point against Feltes’s analysis is his narrow focus on the socially determining factors of production. His focus does not allow for any differentiation among three-volume novels. He does not account for how the typeface and other aspects of the material construction of the first editions of *Esmond* are not designed to make the novel conform but designed to make this novel stand out from what were the hundreds of novels produced each year during this period. The mere fact that *Esmond* first appears in
three volumes situates the novel for Feltes with every other three-volume novel. This means that the novel inevitably bears the stamp of the establishment in both form and content. Furthermore, as I argued in the chapter on nautical fiction, while the three-volume form may repress and even negate the subversive tendencies of the serial in some ways, traces of that subversion still exist in nonserial versions. The form of the three-volume novel is simply not as homogenous and controlling as Feltes would have it.

The third point is one that Shillingsburg points out: “It is a significant shortcoming of Feltes’s work that he did not apply his critical apparatus to a reading of the text” (208). Feltes makes no note of the antiheroic rhetoric of the novel that is a key to the novel for Lukács. *Esmond’s* antiheroic rhetoric, which begins in the first chapter is part of a steady drumbeat against the bourgeois mythologizing of history throughout the novel:

> The old French King Lewis the Fourteenth—the type and model of kinghood [. . .] was but a little wrinkled old man, pock-marked and with a great periwig and red heels to make him look tall, —a hero for a book if you like or for a brass statue [. . .] but what more than a man for Madame Maintenon, or the barber who shaved him. (3)

*Esmond’s* depictions of other historical figures, Joseph Addison, Richard Steele, the Duke of Marlborough and the Pretender are psychologically realistic rather than mythologizing and are a reason to reject Feltes reading of the novel as perpetuating a bourgeois ideology. Feltes’s overdetermined text blinds him to the potential for the linguistic code to subvert the ideology nominally associated with the material form of the three-volume novel. Furthermore, a careful reading, contends Shillingsburg, suggests “a
conclusion opposite to the one Feltes reached.” Had Feltes noticed the text or even tried to account for many of the critical readings of the novel he would have noticed what has made this a profoundly disturbing work to many readers (Pegasus 208).

From its first appearance many readers of Esmond have been deeply disturbed by the ending of the novel in which Henry Esmond marries the woman who has acted as his mother for most of the novel, Rachel Esmond. However, while many readers have complained about this ending, it seems clear that it was part of the plan of the novel from the beginning though Rachel often takes a backseat because of Esmond’s infatuation with her daughter, Beatrix. Rachel knows she is in love with Henry well before her husband dies and before the naïve Henry even guesses it. Her love shows in her almost explicitly jealous reaction to the news that Henry has been visiting Nancy Sievewright, the blacksmith’s daughter (Esmond 65). It shows when she spends too much time fussing about Esmond’s room before his third visit home from college, placing fresh cut flowers in his window and making a new counterpane for his bed (91). It shows in her hysterical reaction when she screams and passes out when told the news that “Henry” was killed in a carriage accident, though the Henry involved turns out to be Mohun, not Esmond (117). It also shows in the guilt she experiences in reaction to her husband’s death and in her grief-stricken rejection of Henry at the same time (136). Only upon rereading the “Preface” signed by Esmond’s daughter, Rachel Esmond Warrington, can one see hints that Rachel Esmond was to become Henry’s wife (xxv-xxix). Although this preface was composed after Thackeray had finished the novel, it may motivate the reader to pay attention to Rachel Esmond in the text.
The apparent though not real incest was only partially what readers found disturbing in *Esmond*. According to Shillingsburg what readers found most disturbing was this love of a woman for a man other than her husband. Shillingsburg states the subversive nature of this love succinctly:

Rachel’s secret love was even more disturbing to the Victorian consciousness [...] for it portrays a good woman—the heroine angel in the house—in the grip of a powerful and lifelong illicit passion she must and does suppress with visible effort. Morally the book’s psychological realism [...] is profoundly subversive to the establishment. (*Pegasus* 209)

Thackeray’s portrayal of a troubled angel in the house goes against the grain of Victorian bourgeois ideology. However, it does coincide with the other novels printed around the time as *Esmond* in Caslon Old-face. This will be further developed in part 4 of this chapter.

Should the reader really consider the characterization of the relationship between Rachel and Henry as only Thackeray’s depiction of a troubled love? Many critics have been quick to trace *Esmond* as Thackeray working out his heart break at the end of his relationship with Jane Brookfield. However, I would like to suggest that the elderly Esmond may be misrepresenting the past in order to make his present relationship with Rachel seem inevitable to his children and grandchildren. Conversely, many readers seem to have found Henry Esmond’s narrative withholding of his relationship as purposely misleading and an artistic mistake. This indeterminacy of who and where exactly to lay the blame or the praise reflects a wider indeterminacy that lies at the center of *Esmond*. 
Like Rachel’s secret love, which is an undercurrent of the novel made visible upon a rereading, the nature of Thackeray’s control of the text rather than Esmond’s may be what underlies the visible errors. The text reveals an indeterminacy that echoes the structure of the material indeterminacy. As the novel is materially both an eighteenth-century memoir and a nineteenth-century novel, the text also belongs to both Esmond and Thackeray, but which one is responsible for the errors?

_Esmond_ is a text famous for its errors. Characters are called by different names. One servant is known variously in the novel as Jack, John, and Job. Events are recalled differently at different times. Characters are sometimes in one place, suddenly in another, and then back again with no explanation. John Sutherland has argued that these errors are the result of Thackeray’s the improvisational composition practices that were habitual to Thackeray’s pressured production of serial texts (Thackeray 74: “Thackeray” 16-27). Elaine Scarry argues that these errors are not Thackeray’s at all, but Esmond’s. These errors are put there on purpose by Thackeray to undermine his protagonist’s narrative. Scarry has identified a large number of errors that undermine the rhetorical force of Esmond’s protestations for truth—at one point, for example, after declaring himself against the divine right of kings, he praises Beatrix in a language that recalls submission to the throne (199). Scarry argues that Esmond “who has taken truth for his motto,” is undermined by Thackeray, “who has taken the absence of truth for his theme” (7). Sutherland has countered Scarry’s argument by acknowledging that while there are some errors clearly contrived by Thackeray, there is no way that “that all the irregularities and contradictions in Harry’s account are the product of Thackeray’s artfulness”
Elaine Scarry and Peter Shillingsburg see these errors as indicative of Thackeray's desires to puncture the illusion of narrative coherence that is commonly mistaken for truth in history. Which errors are Esmond's, which Thackeray's, and which errors have their origins in the publication process itself, has been predominantly thought of as a problem for editors. But the nature of this problem of who is responsible for the text is one of indeterminacy that is not decided by the text or the editor or by the reader. Thackeray leaves the question of responsibility open. It is resolvable only on a contingent basis, always subject to revision, the open question of language. If *Esmond* were a text without errors, or even a text that might be made error free, would that not point to the possibility of a narrative coherence that is not an illusion?

Daniel Hack also finds that the indeterminacy of the material text mirrors the indeterminacy of the work once it moves beyond the authors control and ultimately that it mirrors a fundamental indeterminacy of language. Hack, citing Genette, argues that *Esmond* "both puts into play and reflects on the relationship between graphic realization and literary intention, the physical materiality of texts and authorship" (14). *Esmond*’s changing bibliographic code is seen by Hack as an allegory for the management of the threats against authorial control of the text: "Thackeray seems to control, or at least control for, his own text’s uncontrollability by representing this lack of control" (20). Gaining control of something by representing one’s lack of control is a slight recompense. It is a valid strategy of control although it is a weak one, but perhaps it is of more value as an indication one should look elsewhere. If control does not lie with the author perhaps it lies with the reader, but how does a reader exercise control over a text?
Hack argues that the contingent nature of authority is demonstrated in the text’s reflection of the author’s intention. He finds that the material instantiation of a text is just as likely to act as a barrier to understanding as it is to enable it. Ultimately, he finds that the materiality of *Esmond*’s early editions really have no effect on meaning (23).

However, Hack looks at the functions of the typeface in terms of Thackeray’s narrative practice in text of *Henry Esmond* itself and the texts of Thackeray’s other novels; in other words, Thackeray’s practice as an author. However, a very different picture emerges if instead of viewing the role of the typeface through the eyes of the author we view this issue as readers. Hack is, in a sense, working upstream from the material text back to the author and I suggest we look downstream. But this is not a river that just flows one way. It is more of a field in which the worlds of author, text, reader are all interconnected (Shillingsburg, “Text” 45). Engaging with the materiality of the text through a systems approach that focuses on readers yields a more rewarding conception of textual control and the values of material textuality than a focus on authority can.

I suggest that Hack’s statement on control can be rephrased to reflect this shift in perspective: The material textuality of *Henry Esmond* manifests the tensions between author and reader engaged with a text to create meaning. What *Esmond* points out is that this is not always a mutual project, authors and readers are more often than not at cross purposes and the text can be both a bridge and a barrier to understanding.

Hack claims, “The very material form of the first edition thus promotes an understanding of the novel as free from the deforming (let alone determining) influence of material contingencies” (16). In this statement he fails to acknowledge that while the material form of the first edition may be free from the influence of the material
contingencies of the serial, it is not wholly free; instead, it is subject to the different set of material contingencies that accompany the three-volume novel.

In an embedded scene of reading Thackeray demonstrates how the materiality of the text controls the reader's reaction in ways that no author can fully control. Hack cites this scene from *Esmond* in order to buttress his argument. However, he fundamentally misreads this scene from a number of angles and the scene itself is worth recounting here in some detail because of the ways it echoes the sham of *Esmond* as a memoir with its “sham” newspaper. “A Paper out of the *Spectator*,” recounts “a little joke” Esmond plays on his cousin, Beatrix Esmond. Beatrix has persistently rejected Esmond as a suitor and openly shops on the marriage market for a wealthy husband. “Smarting under the faithlessness of women,” Esmond comes up with a plan. With the aid of “his friend Dick Steele,” the publisher of the *Spectator*, he has printed for April fool’s day a paper that is “printed exactly like Steele’s paper, and by his printer, and laid on his mistress’s breakfast table” with the revealing epigraph: “*Mutato nomine de te Fabula narratur.*—Horace / Thyself the moral of the Fable see—Creech (288).” This epigraph within the confines of the plot is directed at teaching Beatrix a lesson. But it also resonates with Esmond as author and asks readers to think about themselves in what they read.

Esmond’s imitation *Spectator* consists of two letters. The first is signed “Oedipus,” who is a servant to the lady “Jocasta,” and the second is signed “Cymon Wyldoats” (288-92). The first letter seeks Mr. Spectator’s aid in identifying an admirer of Jocasta, “a woman of learning and fashion.” Jocasta has such numerous acquaintance that “tis one smart writer’s work to keep her visiting-book—a strong footman is engaged to carry it.” Jocasta has met a gentleman in the country who “made a considerable impression upon her and
touched her heart for at least three and twenty minutes,” but upon seeing him again she realizes “she has forgotten his name” and that no one else knows it either (289). Coquettishly trying to get the gentleman to tell her his name without her having to ask, Jocasta claims she has been discussing the differences between pronunciation and spelling and asks him how he spells his name. To which he replies, “O Madam, [...] I spell my name with the y” (290). Oedipus, explaining that his lady “if balked in anything, she is sure to lose her health and temper: and we servants suffer, as usual, during the angry fits of our Queen” (290), begs for Mr. Spectator’s help in solving this riddle. This letter is followed in the paper by one to Mr. Spectator from the gentleman himself, who recounts the same sequence of events from his perspective. Having been “greatly fascinated by a young lady in London,” he writes, he becomes “entirely her slave.” However, the gentleman quickly realizes “that this fair creature was but a heartless worldly jilt, playing with affections that she never meant to return, and, indeed, incapable of returning them” (291). Recounting her failed transparent attempt to discover his name, he signs his letter “Cymon Wyldoats.” Esmond then goes on to immediately explain that “the above is a parable, whereof the writer will now expound the meaning.” Esmond’s desire is to teach Beatrix a lesson by showing her that she was “a flirt” and that “her artifice and precaution” would profit her little. He writes that he is Cymon and Beatrix is Jocasta, and that Beatrix had told him this very story (292).

Hack argues in this passage that “the material manifestation of the text thus appears here as an element over which the author exercises absolute control, and indeed an essential part of the work as conceived by its author” (21). Furthermore, he continues,
“Esmond’s absolute control over the physicality of the sham Spectator and the material conditions of its production does not translate into control over the text’s reception” (22). His argument here rests solely on the scope of control exercised by the author and he seems to fundamentally mistake it as the only control over the text when Thackeray seems more concerned with the controlling features of the material context. While I agree that “the material manifestation of the text” is “an essential part of the work as conceived by the author,” I disagree that the control is by any means figured by Thackeray or Esmond as absolute.

How does Esmond exercise “absolute control” over the text when, for his joke to work, the paper must look, feel, and read like the Spectator? Esmond could have chosen not to make the sham Spectator, but once he chooses this context a number of material features immediately constrain him. The specific material requirements of this very individual material form must be strictly conformed to if the joke is to work. He uses the press and the very paper upon which the real Spectator is printed, which points also to the necessity of collaboration with Steele. It is Esmond’s joke, but he could not have done it without Steele’s help. Furthermore, the specific form of a letter to “Mr. Spectator,” the tone and style of writing, and even the vocabulary are textual constraints closely associated with the material text within which Esmond must operate. These constraints are no more within his control than Dick Steele and the printer. In addition, the content of this story is a retelling of an incident that Beatrix has told him about before. It is not original composition of Esmond’s. Nevertheless, Esmond is able to operate with a high degree of freedom given this network of constraints, but Hack’s argument about Esmond’s absolute control of the material manifestation of the text can be rejected.
In regard to the reader, on the other hand, the conditions of production while they may fail to control the reception of the text in the ways that the author designed this does not mean they exercise no control at all. What Thackeray demonstrates in this passage is not only how the text can never be fully determined but also how readers are controlled in ways that an author cannot foresee. Beatrix does not react the way that Esmond wants because she is not one to believe everything she reads. She is an experienced reader and she recognizes undercurrents to the text that even Esmond cannot forecast. As she begins to read the article she cries out, “Epsom and Tunbridge! Will he [Steele] never have done with Epsom and Tunbridge, and with beaux at church, and Jocastas and Lindamiras? Why does he not call women Nelly and Betty, as their godfathers and godmothers did for them at baptism?” (295). At this point her mother mildly chastises her for speaking flippantly of a sacrament, and she replies, “Mamma thinks the Church Catechism came from Heaven, […] and was brought down by a Bishop from a mountain” (296). She continues to read and at the punch line of “Spell my name with a y,” turns and immediately accuses Esmond of having written the paper. She goes on reading and then recants her belief that Esmond wrote it:

No, I think you couldn’t have written it. I think it must have been Mr. Steele when he was drunk—and afraid of his horrid vulgar wife.

Whenever I see an enormous compliment to a woman and some outrageous panegyric about female virtue, I always feel for sure that the Captain and his better half have fallen out over-night, and that he has been brought home tipsy, or has been found in——. (296)
We can see here how Thackeray characterizes Beatrix’s seemingly uncontrolled reception as not actually controlled by the author or the material instantiation of the text but controlled by the way this text elicits her psychological response and how it fits into her contextual experience of previous texts.

Thackeray presents a realistic chain of psychological association in his depiction of Beatrix’s reaction to the text. The name of Jocasta, instead of having the classical or tragic allusions for Beatrix that Esmond desires, reminds her of the affected style of the paper. She desires her scandal unadorned by classical allusions. The concern with names combined with “beaux at church” recalls to Beatrix the rite of baptism, whereupon she is chastised by her mother, whom she associates with the Church Catechism. Beatrix characterizes Rachel as a reader who thinks the authority of the Catechism is unquestionable. Rachel then is a reader who would have fallen for Esmond’s sham newspaper completely. As Beatrix continues to read, she sees Esmond’s possible association with the text but reads right through his actual authorship, finally attributing the paper to Steele and a scandalous reading of the “enormous compliment.” It is not that Beatrix’s reception of the text is uncontrolled by the material instantiation of the text, it is that Esmond, as author, cannot foresee how the elements of the text will control Beatrix’s reaction. This is not the same as having no control over the reception of a text.

One final element of this *mise en abyme* of reading in the novel is the letter y. The letter y is a cipher in the *Spectator* like the long s is a cipher in the novel. Both disguise authorship: Esmond is behind Wyldoats in this sham *Specator*, just as Thackeray is behind Esmond in this sham eighteenth-century memoir. In neither case is the text fully determined.
For Hack *Esmond* is the sign of Thackeray’s “loyalty to a premodern model of authorship” (36). However, while *Esmond* may offer a “premodern” model of print culture, it is also looks ahead to a post-modern model of the performative nature of speech or more accurately, print. *Esmond* anticipates moments in print culture when the material text can only be separated from the linguistic code with an obvious loss. In this way *The History of Henry Esmond* is a predecessor to the such works as William Morris’s *Kelmscott Chaucer* and even the poetry of E. E. Cummings.

Like those artists, Thackeray was reacting to the pressures of modern life by stretching the conventions of print and the material constraints of the medium in which he worked. Opposed to the factory aspect of churning out serial fiction, month after month, the three-volume novel seemed to offer a return to the artistic craftsmanship of an earlier time. The three-volume form offered Thackeray the advantages and constraints of a sustained effort and a complete work that was not affected by the contingencies of serial production. However, Thackeray discovered that, while it may have been free from the pressures of serial production, it had a different set of pressures all its own.

While the material textuality of *Esmond* recalls the past and anticipates the future it also makes contemporary connections to another group of works that might not be noticed unless the material text is considered. *Esmond* was not the only novel to be printed in Caslon Old-face during this time. It was a part of a small group of novels that were printed in this typeface to give them the appearance of texts from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is not known whose idea it was to print *Esmond* in Caslon Old-face or even when it was chosen before the first proofs were printed in it. Thackeray
as a parodist was a master manipulator of the conventions of genre and print culture generally, and he was often openly self-conscious about his use of these conventions. *Vanity Fair: A Novel without a Hero* (1847-8) is filled with moments of self-conscious disruption that change the valence of many novelistic conventions. 

7 *Punch's Prize Novelists* (1847), “Rebecca and Rowena” (1849), “Major Gaagahan” (1838), “A Legend of the Rhine” (1845) and “The Diary of C. Jeames de la Pluche, Esq.” (1845) offer up parodies of the styles of such popular authors as Walter Scott, G.P.R James, Bulwer-Lytton, and Benjamin Disraeli, not to mention other send ups of Jane Austen and James Fenimore Cooper. These parodies show how Thackeray honed his own practice of undermining his narrative by first undermining the narrative practice of others. *Esmond* is not a parody but it certainly has parodic elements. Perhaps, Smith and Thackeray were aware of the successes of these other works and thought that they could do better.

These works were not only printed in the same typeface and but also engaged in a similar historical project. The publisher Charles Whittingham and the printer William Pickering had used Caslon Old-face on the title pages of editions of certain seventeenth-century authors beginning around 1840. In 1844, they published an edition of George Herbert's *The Temple* (1633) completely set in Caslon Old-face (Harden, Textual 407). That same year, Hannah Mary Rathbone's historical novel of the seventeenth century, *So Much the Diary of Lady Willoughby as Relates to Her Domestic History & to the Eventful Period of the Reign of Charles the First*, was published by Thomas Longman. Longman “had a new fount specially cast at the Chiswick press” by Whittingham (“Rathbone” *DNB*). 9 This novel was so convincing as a diary that the second edition carried a disclaimer stating it was only a novel. Edgar Harden notes that by 1852,
Rathbone had published a sequel to the earlier novel and that Anne Manning had published several fictional works, all set in Caslon Old-face. Out of the plethora of novels published in the Victorian age there would be hardly any reason to relate these to *Esmond* were it not for the typeface. However, reading these novels one recognizes certain shared thematic concerns with *Esmond*.

Hannah Mary Rathbone and Anne Manning were the two most popular users of this typeface around the time *Esmond* was produced. In addition to Caslon Old-face these novels shared the appearance of a memoir with *Esmond*. These novels were presented as faux diaries and they used a number of other material features to appear as if they were from an earlier time. The pages were generous with white space, decoratively ruled, and printed with rubrics or red letters. However, unlike *Esmond*, these novels are barely in the form of a novel at all. All these novels initially issued in small duodecimo single volumes much smaller than the larger three-volume Post octavo form of *Esmond*. They were manufactured in fancy bindings that actually looked like diaries or journals. The first edition of *Mary Powell* has thick boards with beveled edges that are covered with delicately embossed red leather. *Lady Willoughby's Diary* is even more ornate in black leather half-binding with a multi-colored harlequin pattern on the cover. These documents seem designed to give the reader unmediated access to a personal and private history. These novels, however, tend to offer history from a woman's point of view, unlike the male viewpoint of *Esmond*. These fictional diaries are accounts of the domestic life of women marginally associated with canonical historical figures. Manning's most famous novel, *The Married and Maiden Life of Mary Powell, afterwards Mistress Milton*, is styled as the diary of Milton's sixteen-year-old wife from before she married him,
through their courtship, marriage, separation, to their reunification. Another Manning novel in Caslon Old is Deborah’s Diary which returns to Milton as a subject in a much later time period of his life and from the point of view of Milton’s youngest daughter. Manning wrote several other novels all set in domestic scenes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Hannah Rathbone’s Diary of Lady Willoughby documents the life and trials of a military wife during the time of the English civil war.

These novels for the most part offer hagiographic accounts of the domestic life of historical figures, and they seem primarily to promote the Victorian ideal of the pious angel in the house as a constant of English history. Like Esmond they try to offer up a “familiar” history, but it is a history that is familiar with the heroic rather than a history which decmystifies heroism. Nevertheless, these novels in Caslon show how the typeface could be a code with which to press the limits of middle-class respectability. As Rachel Esmond’s repressed love for Henry was subversive to the Victorian conception of the angel in the house, these novels also make veiled gestures from behind the material text towards the taboo subjects of incest, divorce, and abuse. Mary Powell famously left Milton and he wrote his treatise on divorce before they reunited. Mary Powell is in its way an answer to that treatise. Deborah’s Diary outlines the tremendous sacrifices that Milton’s daughters made in service to his genius. Though on the surface, Deborah never begrudges these sacrifices to her father and treats them as her duty. Lady Willoughby is concerned with the problems of keeping domestic order when the family is besieged by powerful political forces. However, the settings in the past, ornate covers, genteel heroines, flowery prose, and antiquated typeface were at least ways of ameliorating Mrs. Grundy as these seemingly innocuous texts dealt with more contemporary problems.
Henry Esmond wonders, at the opening of *Esmond*, if the Muse of History will ever “pull off her periwig and cease to be court-ridden” as he argues for a familiar history instead of a heroic one (3). After the first two editions the text of *The History of Henry Esmond* did have its figurative periwig of Caslon Old-face pulled off and in these later forms the reader does have a history rendered in a text that is a familiar one. However, this does not translate into a less historical text. Paradoxically, the text in these later material instantiations accretes history not by what is added to it but by what is taken away. The cheap edition of 1858 even though it looks like an inexpensive nineteenth-century reprint and thus seems to have achieved the familiar, it still maintains traces of its original materiality in the use of capitals for emphasis and in the ways that the three-volume form originally influenced the linguistic code. It is not that the later versions of *Esmond* lack history but, like the nautical novel, the history of these later versions is more difficult to perceive unless we consider the novel’s full material textuality.
Coda

In its “Statement on the Significance of Primary Records” the Modern Language Association took a stand against the prevailing notion of the text as a “disembodied group of words” free floating from any one material instantiation and separated not only from their material instantiations but also history itself. However, as I have shown using the works of Scott, Marryat, and Thackeray, the British novel’s linguistic code can never be fully separated from its material instantiations even though it may appear to be so. Every text, even electronic ones, is a product of its historical moment. The role the material instantiation of a text plays in the creation of meaning may be either be suppressed or acknowledged by both authors and readers. However, by acknowledging material textuality rather than ignoring or suppressing it we may gain a deeper understanding of how texts and language work. The tensions that exist among a text’s material instantiations and its abstract conception as literary work challenges our conceptions of the nature of texts in the modern period as we approach the seemingly disembodied texts of the electronic age. Walter Scott’s *Waverley* is a text that has accreted history as it has gone through its multiple material instantiations. *Waverley* carries its own history with it in its multiple texts, paratexts, and material instantiations. *Waverley* with its recourse to documents, its third-person narration, and its mediating editorial voices strives to make visible the processes through which texts bring history to readers. Frederick Marryat’s *Peter Simple* is a text that reveals how the changing material instantiations of texts can register the changing relevance of texts to readers, and that the bibliographic code may change but traces of a text’s earlier material instantiations remain within its linguistic
code. While Scott's *Waverley* was concerned with the process of how history was brought to readers through a recourse to documents, William Makepeace Thackeray's *Esmond* inverts the historicist process by bringing history to readers by giving the reader direct recourse to a historical document itself. Thus *Esmond* is less concerned with the process by which history is transmitted and more concerned with how history is created in the first place. These aspects of the novel are lost to readers of modern editions, and could be destroyed as we move to digitized versions if readers fail to consider the material textuality of a text and treat a text as if it were the same in all its material instantiations.
Notes

Chapter 1


1 See also Butler, Psychic 95-96, 106-131.

2 William Todd’s personal collection of Scott in nineteenth-century prizebooks at the Harry Ransom Center of the University of Texas, a valuable archive of nineteenth-century book production, is not yet cataloged as of August 2008. Prizebooks are books that were especially produced as prizes for school contests.

3 Tauchnitz’s Collection of British Authors, for example, always lists the date of first publication in the series on the title page. Only a skilled specialist familiar with the various bindings used by the firm can date a material text with any accuracy. In the case of a rebound text, even an expert can often make no more than an educated guess.

4 Shillingsburg has addressed these issues extensively, but he is perhaps most succinct in the essay “Text as Matter, Concept, and Action.” See also From Gutenberg to Google for his most recent revisions of his thought.

5 Shillingsburg, in a footnote, provides another example of just how slippery these terms can be. He notes that in Roland Barthes’s essay “From Work to Text,” Barthes uses “work” to refer to the material text and “text” to refer to the conceptualization; “The work is held in the hand, the text is held in language” (57), writes Barthes. Shillingsburg further notes that while he is in general agreement with what Barthes has to say in this essay, he “prefer[s] to use several different terms for the various things he [Barthes] denotes by the term Text” (“Text” 38n 8).
See for example: Hook, Inglis, and Wilson. In addition, Tony Inglis’s edition of *The Heart of Midlothian* represents a kind of hybrid edition that seeks to incorporate the elements of both the first edition and later editions. However, although these editions are still in print, Penguin has begun to shift its copytext to the Edinburgh editions as they become available; see for example Hewitt, “The Waverley Novels in Penguin.” For a detailed outline and explanation of the editorial practices recommended by the General Editors for the Edinburgh editions, see Hewitt et al., *The Edinburgh Edition*.

See also *The Psychic Life of Power* 106-31 for Butler’s additional critique of Althusserian interpellation. She notes particularly that the concept of guilt in the interpellative turn of the addressee seems to presuppose an existence of a subject before the hail occurs.

Chapter 2

David Daiches writes that *Waverley* “marked the emergence of the modern novel in the western world” (v). See also Carter, *Printing and the Mind of Man*, entry 273.

The *Magnum Opus* edition is the last form of the novel I consider for the purposes of this study. However, the Waverley novels continued to evolve in numerous reprints throughout the century with the *Magnum Opus* as the primary copy text for all the reprints throughout the Victorian age and until recently. This changed with the advent of the Edinburgh editions of the Waverley novels, which strive to reprint the texts of the first editions as they would have appeared had Scott had time to correct them.

See also Derrida, “Structure, Sign and Play.”
4 See Ford, Mitchell, and Todd for some of the plays, operas, music, chapbooks that were all derived from *Waverley*.

5 *O'Donnel* was one of Bentley’s Standard Novels. This important series is addressed further in the next chapter.

6 This is perhaps not as unlikely as it may sound. There may be no additional British printings, but American or continental reprinting or serial issues would not have been sent to the British Library for copyright protection nor would other pirated copies. Additionally, if the publishing firm’s records no longer exist and the reprint was not advertised, then the only way we can know about a reprinting is through isolated individual copies still in existence. But, likewise, the same would hold true for unknown reprints of *Waverley*, which would actually seem more likely given that it was such a proven property.

7 Trumpener consistently refers to *Waverley* as a novel of 1814, but in her list of works cited, she lists only an edition derived from the 1829 Cadell edition of the novel.

8 1815 seems to have been a bad year for the novel. Fifty-five is the least number of new titles published in the thirty years encompassed by Garside’s study, 1800-1829.

9 Although anonymous, W. A. Copinger identifies the author of this article as Jeffrey (25), as does Edgar Johnson (455).

10 Claire Lamont has pointed out that Henry Fielding uses the same "book of nature" figure in *Tom Jones* Book 7, Chapter 12; Book 11, Chapter 1.

11 Carlyle makes use of a similar conceit in *Sartor Resartus*, as the fictional editor of Herr Teufelsdreck’s papers.
12 A full run of the *Gentleman’s Magazine* from 1763 to 1819 is listed in Scott’s *Catalogue* and he also owned several other works authored or edited by Chalmers.

13 My source is Coleman, table 15 (197). His information is based on the 1837 “Fourdrinier Committee Report,” but Spicer shows none in Scotland until 1820 (appendix 7).

Chapter 3

Emily Dickinson. “There is no Frigate like a Book.”


1 See Thackeray “Second Lecture,” and Ruskin on W. M. Turner’s *The Fighting Temeraire towed to her last berth, to be broken up* (1838).

2 Captain Marryat published his last nautical novel in 1842 and switched to works for children. Edward Howard, author of *Rattlin the Reefer* (1836), became an attorney. The prolific James Fenimore Cooper, who was very popular in Britain with nautical novels such as *The Pilot* (1824), *The Red Rover* (1828), *The Water-Witch* (1830), and *Homeward Bound* (1838), switched to tales of the American frontier and other subjects.

3 Mme. Germaine de Staël. “L’amour est l’histoire de la vie des femmes, c’est un episode dans celle des homes.” [Love is the history of a woman’s life, it is but an episode in a man’s.]

4 Parenthetical citations are from the 1998 edition of *Peter Simple* unless otherwise noted.

5 See Rediker, *Between* 83-95 for a detailed description of duties of each position and the hierarchy of a ship’s crew.
See Patten, Cruikshank 194-205 for an insightful analysis of both Marryat’s and Cruikshank’s contributions to this collaboration.

I am sure some of these are probably not different impressions but only reissues with new dates on the title pages. Nevertheless, it is an impressive number.

Chapter 4

1 Thackeray, The History of Henry Esmond, ed. Harden. Except where noted, all further references to Esmond will be from this edition, and noted parenthetically in the text. This edition is based on the manuscript as copytext and the first 1852 edition. For a fuller description of the editorial practices used to prepare this edition see Harden, “Textual.”

2 In Pegasus Shillingsburg offers a detailed and complete accounting of the production history of Esmond based on the surviving records (193-99).

3 See also John Sutherland, Victorian Novelists 106.

Her love for Henry shows more in this passage in other editions, Book 1: Chapter 11. Edgar Harden discovered that the printers of the 1852 edition had made a mistake interpreting the manuscript and printed “They all conducted Harry Esmond to his chamber, the children running before, Harry walking by his mistress, hand in hand.” However, the manuscript reads “hat in hand.” Harden prefers the authority of the manuscript over the first edition in this case, but there is the possibility that Thackeray saw the error and let it stand without comment. See for examples: Esmond: Sutherland 151; Harper 1950, 128; and Scribner 145. The Scribner edition also has an illustration by
George Du Maurier of Esmond walking with Rachel with his hat in one hand while her hand is in the other.

5 If this is meant to be William Creech the Scots publisher then it is another anachronism. Creech was born in 1745, thirty-three years after the date of the spectator.

6 Book 3, chapter 3 in other editions.

7 The subtitle, *A Novel without a Hero*, is one such disturbance, but see also Chapter VI in the first edition with the projection of the narrative into the different genres of the "Newgate" and "Silver fork" novel.

8 Also known as *Novels by Eminent Hands*.

9 See also Harden 408.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Series Title</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Price £.s.d.</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Novels in the Series</th>
<th>Original Dates of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td><em>Novels and Tales</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.4.0</td>
<td>9 Dec 1819</td>
<td>Waverley-Montrose</td>
<td>1814-1819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12°</td>
<td><em>Novels and Tales</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0.0</td>
<td>31 Mar 1821</td>
<td>Waverley-Montrose</td>
<td>1814-1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td><em>Historical Romances</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.12.0</td>
<td>5 Jun 1822</td>
<td>Ivanhoe-Kenilworth</td>
<td>1819-1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12°</td>
<td><em>Historical Romances</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
<td>12 Oct 1822</td>
<td>Ivanhoe-Kenilworth</td>
<td>1819-1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td><em>Novels and Tales</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4.0</td>
<td>20 Sep 1823</td>
<td>Waverley-Montrose</td>
<td>1821-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td><em>Novels and Romances</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4.0</td>
<td>10 Dec 1823</td>
<td>The Pirate-Quentin Durward</td>
<td>1821-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12°</td>
<td><em>Novels and Romances</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7.6</td>
<td>3 Jan 1824</td>
<td>The Pirate-Quentin Durward</td>
<td>1821-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td><em>Historical Romances</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2.0</td>
<td>Feb 1824</td>
<td>Ivanhoe-Kenilworth</td>
<td>1821-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td><em>Novels and Romances</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9.0</td>
<td>8 Jan 1825</td>
<td>The Pirate-Quentin Durward</td>
<td>1821-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td><em>Tales and Romances 1</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4.0</td>
<td>17 May 1827</td>
<td>St Ronan’s Well-Woodstock</td>
<td>1823-1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12°</td>
<td><em>Tales and Romances 1</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7.6</td>
<td>28 Jul 1827</td>
<td>St Ronan’s Well-Woodstock</td>
<td>1823-1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td><em>Tales and Romances 1</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9.0</td>
<td>27 Oct 1827</td>
<td>St Ronan’s Well-Woodstock</td>
<td>1823-1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td><em>Tales and Romances 2</em></td>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>5.8.0</td>
<td>4 May 1833</td>
<td>Canongate-Castle Dangerous</td>
<td>1827-1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16°</td>
<td><em>Tales and Romances 2</em></td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>4.2.6</td>
<td>4 May 1833</td>
<td>Canongate-Castle Dangerous</td>
<td>1827-1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td><em>Tales and Romances 2</em></td>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>3.3.0</td>
<td>4 May 1833</td>
<td>Canongate-Castle Dangerous</td>
<td>1827-1831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix —Publication and Pricing Schedule for Series of the Collected Novels of Sir Walter Scott. (Todd Scott)