Literature Compass 9/2 (2012): 140–150, 10.1111/j.1741-4113.2011.00865.x

Situating Scotland in Eighteenth-Century Studies

Juliet Shields*
University of Washington

Abstract

This essay surveys general trends in book-length studies of 18th-century Scottish literature and culture to examine how moving Scotland from the peripheries to the centre of 18th-century studies has transformed our understandings of the field. It describes three categories or phases of scholarship – canon formation, contextualization and comparison, and methodological reflection – and suggests what kind of work remains to be done in each category. It also discusses how new approaches to reading minor literatures, including those informed by postcolonial theory, Atlantic studies, and devolutionary criticism, have shaped and been shaped by scholarship on 18th-century Scottish literature and culture over the past two decades.

That Scotland should occupy a central place in 18th-century studies seems to some extent self-evident. The 18th century saw the creation of the British nation-state with the 1707 Anglo-Scottish Union of Parliaments; and many of the era's major works in economics, history, philosophy and medicine, among other fields, were written by Scots. Yet only during the past two decades have scholars begun to move Scottish literature and culture from the peripheries to the centre of 18th-century studies. The recent and marked increase in book-length studies focusing on 18th-century Scottish literature and culture might be explained by recent political events: the long-predicted ''break-up of Britain'' with the devolution of Scotland's Parliament in 1997, and the possibility of a referendum on Scottish independence within the next 5 years.[1] However, it also reflects the development of new approaches to reading Scottish literature including those informed by colonial and postcolonial studies, Atlantic studies, and what has variously been called ''devolutionary,'' ''archipelagic'' or ''four nations'' criticism.[2]

To illustrate how these approaches have reconfigured Scotland's place in 18th-century studies, this essay will survey three categories of scholarship on 18th-century Scottish literature and culture. In what are perhaps rather reductive terms, they might be characterized as canon formation, contextualization and comparison, and methodological reflection. The first of these asks ''what is Scottish about Scottish literature and culture?''; the second, ''what did Scottish literature and culture contribute to the eighteenth-century world ?''; and the third, ''how might Scottish literature and culture transform our understanding of the eighteenth-century world and the categories through which we study it?'' While these categories of scholarship have developed dialogically, with each responding to earlier work in the field, they are not chronologically exclusive, but overlapping and mutually informing.

Critical interest in 18th-century Scottish literature, as in many minor literatures, began with the recovery of literary traditions and the construction of a canon. Deleuze and Guattari explain that a minor literature is ''not the literature of a minor language but the literature a minority makes in a major language'' (16), and in establishing a recognized canon, critics have helped transform Scottish literature from a minor into a major or

national literature.[3] Particularly in its initial stages, this transformation raised the question of what is distinctively Scottish about Scottish writing. The answer for mid-20th-century critics often was that 18th-century Scottish writing manifests some version of what Gregory Smith termed "Caledonian Antisyzygy" (4), a sense of cultural division supposedly aggravated, although not initiated, by the 1707 Union.[4] Post-Union Scottish writers had to negotiate between fidelity to native literary traditions and appeal to a newly British, but heavily English, readership.[5] Following Smith, critics including David Daiches and Kenneth Simpson suggested that this post-Union "crisis of cultural identity" (Simpson 15) resulted in the dissociation of Scottish sentiment from English rationality, or in aesthetic terms, of romance from realism. This dissociation was manifest linguistically (in Robert Burns's use of Scots and English diction), formally or aesthetically (in the fragmented narrative of Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling*), and thematically (in the observations of the travelers in Tobias Smollett's *Humphry Clinker*). Somewhat surprisingly, critics continue to posit an originary, authentic Scottish culture that was deformed through Anglicization after the Union, even though recent efforts to further expand the Scottish literary canon call into question the existence of such an originary identity.[6] Instead, the Gaelic poetry and Scots songs that are only beginning to be integrated into this canon point to a multiplicity of cultures in pre- and post-Union Scotland.[7]

The relatively recent establishment of a canon of Scottish writing was an important first step in claiming Scottish literature and culture as a valid field of study. Yet while canon-building has rescued 18th-century Scottish writing from critical neglect it also risks perpetuating its perceived status as distinct from, and perhaps implicitly inferior to, English writing. To identify certain conventions or traits as peculiar to Scottish writing is not only potentially misleading; it also hazards marking this writing as parochial in its deviation from the supposedly universal aesthetic standards embodied in what we might call the Anglo-English canon.[8] Attentive to this possibility, scholars in the past two decades have situated Scottish writing in a broader literary and cultural context – most often British, but occasionally transatlantic or imperial. Identity politics thus remains central to their studies: while earlier scholarship explored the Scottishness of Scottish writing, recent scholarship has examined Scotland's contributions to the creation of British national and imperial identities.[9]

Scholars have defined British identity variously, from Linda Colley's claim that it lay in Protestantism to Juliet Shields's that it resided in a properly regulated sensibility. Whereas a few of these scholars, including Colley and Weinbrot, have argued for the increasing cultural uniformity of a united Britain, most agree that post-Union Britain was far from "a homogeneous stable unit," but instead was a work-in-progress composed of "heterogeneous elements" (Davis 1). While recognizing nation-formation as a dynamic process, scholars have debated how this process worked. On the one hand, Howard Weinbrot accords agency primarily to the English, arguing that English writers' willingness to "assess, adapt, variously enjoy and incorporate" non-English literary cultures (3), including those of Wales and Scotland, enabled the creation of a British literary canon. On the other hand, Shields claims that the task of constructing a British identity fell primarily to those who had been most disempowered by the Union, and for whom there was arguably most at stake politically and culturally in the formation of Great Britain – Scots. Falling between these extremes, Leith Davis and Evan Gottlieb represent the process of British nation formation as dialogic, with Scottish and English writers responding to each other and contributing more or less equally to the formation of a British identity. Alternatively, Katie Trumpener construes what Weinbrot describes as English writers' willingness to incorporate other cultures as a form of imperialism. She argues that Scots

were less concerned with participating in the creation of a British identity than in preserving a distinctive Scottish identity in the face of post-Union Anglicization.

As this spectrum of positions indicates, scholars disagree over the answers to what are seemingly the most basic questions to the study of 18th-century Scottish literature and culture: what *was* post-Union Scotland? How should we describe its position in relation to England? In relation to Great Britain? Michael Hechter's *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536-1966* (1975) perhaps poses the most enduring answers to these questions. Hechter describes post-Union Scotland as an internal colony, governed and indeed exploited, by southern England's metropolitan, relatively industrialized core (7–39). Yet as Mark Netzloff rightly emphasizes in his study of 16th-century England's colonization of its Celtic peripheries, Hechter's model of internal colonialism is economic rather than cultural; and economic exploitation does not necessarily entail cultural colonialism, or the ''spread of core culture and values to the periphery'' (Netzloff 7). If, as Davis, Gottlieb and Shields have suggested, pro-Union Scots played active parts in imagining a British identity and in creating a British nation-state, the extent to which post-Union Scotland can be characterized as colonized – or even Anglicized as opposed to ''Britishized'' – is questionable.

Increased scholarly attention to the literature and culture of the Scottish Highlands has revealed that 18th-century Scotland replicated within itself the division between core and periphery that Hechter ascribed to Britain. Colonialism thus was ''internal'' in a way that Hechter did not recognize, as the relatively urban, prosperous and cosmopolitan Lowlands joined with metropolitan England in ''improving'' an undeveloped, rural Highland periphery. In the wake of the 1715 and 1745 Jacobite Rebellions, both of which originated in the Highlands, Parliamentary legislation divested Highlanders of their identity by outlawing traditional dress, music and weaponry. These measures encouraged the erosion of the feudal agrarian structure of Highland life and contributed, albeit indirectly, to the clearance of Highland crofters from their land during the late 18th and 19th centuries. Janet Sorensen, Kenneth McNeil and Matthew Wickman have shown that the Scottish Highlands functioned as a training ground for various colonial practices – linguistic, military, economic and cultural – that were subsequently implemented elsewhere in Britain's imperial outskirts. Yet at the same time, Lowland *and* Highland Scotland were situated at the centre of Britain's growing empire. Scots played a disproportionately large role in defending and settling Britain's colonies in the East and West Indies, Africa, and North America. By the end of the 18th century, ''Scots had conquered their sense of provincial inferiority'' through their ''muscular seizure of opportunities'' in Britain's colonies (Richards 87); and even Highlanders, long considered the victims of forced emigration, turned the militarization of the Highlands to their advantage by using the army as a stepping stone to a more prosperous life in North America (Mackillop 198–221).

Eighteenth-century Scotland thus occupied a vexed and perhaps unique position in a British empire comprised of multiple, overlapping, unstable centres and peripheries. It was at once a disempowered and internally divided periphery and part of the vital imperial centre. Postcolonial theory has provided 18th-century studies with an initial vocabulary for exploring post-Union Scotland's position in Great Britain and its empire, but the unsuitability of some its terms suggests that post-Union Scottish writing might help us to rethink some of the assumptions of postcolonial and globalization studies.[10] Eighteenth-century Scotland provides a historical precedent for the ''complex, overlapping, disjunctive'' system of centres and peripheries that often is represented as a recent phenomenon, the product of a ''new global cultural economy'' in which the nation-state no longer has a place (Appadurai 296). Post-Union Scots, writing just prior to the emergence of the

modern nation-state, explored various forms of intra-, extra- and inter-national community. The study of 18th-century Anglo-Scottish relations helps to contextualize accounts of the demise of the modern nation-state by reminding us how historically and geographically limited was the dominance of this political formation.[11]

While scholarship that situates Scottish literature and culture in the context of British nation formation and empire building has benefited from and contributed to postcolonial theory and criticism it remains Anglo-centric in that it privileges the examination of Scotland's relationship to England over its relationships to England's other Celtic peripheries – Wales and Ireland. Cairns Craig makes a compelling case for tracing the connections among Scottish, Welsh and Irish literature when he explains that because the peripheries ''feel themselves threatened and repressed by the core culture, their true relationships are not centripetal but centrifugal, not towards the core but towards the other marginal cultures who share a similar relation to the core'' (28). Murray Pittock's *Scottish and Irish Romanticism* (2008) provides evidence for Craig's claims by demonstrating that late 18th- and early 19th-century Scottish and Irish writers constituted a literary community that distinguished itself from an English republic of letters through its use of genre and language to perform national identity (7–21). Pittock's exploration of formal, thematic and linguistic similarities between Scots and Irish writing allows him to overlook religious and political tensions between the two countries that had been exacerbated by Scotland's 17th-century colonization of parts of Ireland. This colonial history informed the touchy debates surrounding James Macpherson's *Ossian* (1760–3), in which the Scots and the Irish each claimed ownership of the Gaelic sources of the poems and of the heroes that the poems described. Pittock similarly downplays the Celtic peripheries' participation in British imperialism through the term ''fratriotism,'' which he uses to describe Scots and Irish identification with the peoples they helped to colonize (29). Trumpener's *Bardic Nationalism* (1997), perhaps the only critical study to bring together the literatures of Scotland, Ireland *and* Wales, does so by similarly homogenizing the Celtic peripheries. Trumpener's analysis of an Irish, Scottish and Welsh ''bardic'' nationalism that recovers – or invents – indigenous Celtic traditions in the face of Anglicization is predicated on the assumption that the conquests of Ireland and Wales are easily comparable to the ''occupation and pacification of the Highlands,'' with each leading to the ''lasting psychic and intellectual dislocation of the colonized'' (Pittock 29). While *Bardic Nationalism* valuably reveals similarities in the strategies that Scottish, Irish and Welsh writers used to assert distinctive cultural identities, it also effaces important differences among the Celtic peripheries' cultural and political relationships to metropolitan England and to each other.

Whereas the vocabularies of postcolonial theory and criticism sometimes have failed to satisfactorily describe these relationships, devolutionary criticism, a method of reading perhaps most thoroughly exemplified by John Kerrigan's magisterial *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics 1603-1707* (2008), offers a nuanced framework for exploring them. Devolutionary criticism analyses the interactions between shifting centres and peripheries within the British Isles. It aims to shift attention from ''a culture that has been disproportionately endowed with influence and documentation,'' like that of metropolitan England to those that, like Scottish, Irish and Welsh cultures, ''are dispersed and more skeletally understood'' (Kerrigan 80). Devolutionary criticism is informed by J. G. A. Pocock's commentary on the Anglo-centrism of so-called British history. Over three decades ago, Pocock called for a ''New British History'' that would be more than simply ''the history of England with excrescences'' but that would instead examine the interactions among ''the various peoples and nations, ethnic cultures, social structures, and locally defined communities, which have from time to time existed in the area known as

'Great Britain and Ireland.' '' Doing so, Pocock hoped, would reveal ''new ways of understanding the causes and effects of momentous historical events'' (317).

As its name suggests, the discipline that we still generally call English literature is arguably even guiltier of Anglo-centrism than is History, as our purportedly ''British'' literature courses focus on what Kerrigan in pointed jest calls Anglo-Eng. Lit. – a canon of works written by English authors for English readers in England (12). Devolutionary criticism brings Pocock's insights to the discipline of English not only by recovering the multiplicity of literatures and cultures in the early modern British Isles, as Dafydd Moore has done in his examination of late 18th-century Cornish literary culture, but also by subjecting Anglo-Eng. Lit. to decentering re-readings, as Alok Yadav has done in his analysis of 18th-century English writers' sense of ''provincial secondariness in the world of European culture'' (2). Rather than taking England as the stable centre against which to read the literature and culture of the peripheries, devolutionary criticism reveals that ''Englishness was a contested resource … open to reconceptualization, defined against and meshed with its neighbours'' (Kerrigan 12). Devolutionary criticism thus far has been more popular in early-modern studies than in 18th-century studies, but it suggests that a more thorough examination of the Englishness of English literature and culture might be as important to our understanding of 18th-century Anglo-Scottish relations as is the study of Scottish literature and culture.[12] The danger of devolutionary criticism, however, is that it might inadvertently re-install Anglo-Eng. Lit. as our central object of study as we examine English authors' representations of the peripheries, from Samuel Johnson's journey to the Hebrides to Victor's Frankenstein's retreat to the same islands in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. Yet Johnson also offers an illuminating example of how we might read Anglo-Eng. Lit against the grain, as recent attention to Johnson's vexed relationship with Scots and Scotland has expanded the parameters of ''the Age of Johnson.''[13]

Devolutionary criticism offers a potentially illuminating framework for exploring the British peripheries' relationships to each other and to metropolitan England. Yet this approach, with its exclusive focus on the four nations comprising the British Isles, overlooks the equally significant relationships among these four nations and Britain's American colonies. Recent studies of the cultural and literary exchanges between Scotland and the American colonies suggest that Atlantic Studies might complement devolutionary criticism.[14] Scots sought in the American colonies the political and professional opportunities from which anti-Scottish prejudice barred them in England; and the many Americans who completed their education at Scottish universities also participated in the exchange of ideas. Richard B. Sher's *The Enlightenment and the Book* (2006) suggests the immense influence that the Scottish Enlightenment had on early American culture by documenting the American re-publication of works by David Hume, Adam Smith, Thomas Reid and other writers in fields including moral philosophy, rhetoric, aesthetics, history and medicine.[15]

If we keep in mind Craig's recommendation that we study peripheral cultures in relation to each other, as well as to the core, then it is perhaps as important to read Scottish writers in conjunction with their American contemporaries as with their English, Welsh and Irish ones. Although the American colonies broke away from Britain to become the United States, they arguably continued to share the Celtic peripheries' sense of cultural secondariness to metropolitan England well into the 19th century. Andrew Hook has shown that late 18th- and early 19th-century Americans turned to Scotland as an example of a thriving provincial culture that they might emulate, and Susan Manning similarly suggests that American writers drew on the ideas of their Scottish predecessors when the colonies' continued unity with Britain came into question. Manning's *Fragments of Union*

(2002) builds on Hook's account of cultural and literary ties between post-Union Scotland and the early American republic by comparing Scottish and American writers' explorations of the relationship between part and whole – whether in political, psychological or grammatical terms. Spanning the years between the 1707 Anglo-Scottish Union of Parliaments and the American Civil War – two moments when the political relationships between part and whole came into question – *Fragments of Union* posits that historical circumstances nurtured in Scottish and American writers a particular interest in the tension between unity and fragmentation. Manning avoids tracing the ''direct pressure of one writer or piece of work on another'' (5), instead using ''associative and analogical models of comparison'' developed by David Hume to trace connections between Scottish and American writing. In seeking to free the study of Scottish literature from the constraints of ''traditionally influence-led methodologies of comparative literary studies'' (4), Manning's book marks the beginnings of a third, methodologically self-reflexive, phase of scholarship.

While the first phase of scholarship focused on constructing a Scottish literary canon, the second phase situated Scottish literature and culture in a broader context by exploring its connections with the literatures and cultures of England, Ireland and North America. This phase, influenced by work in colonial, postcolonial, Archipelagic and Atlantic studies has remained concerned primarily with questions of nation formation and national identity. Scholars have answered the question implied by the title of Carla Sassi's *Why Scottish Literature Matters* (2005) by suggesting that Scottish literature is important because of what it might reveal about processes of nation formation more generally. While scholarship focused on issues of national identity remains valuable, it runs the risk of suggesting that Scottish literature – like other minor literatures – is important primarily as a case-study rather than a valid field of study in itself.

However, recent scholarship on 18th-century Scotland suggests that the imperative to self-justification is diminishing. Even while this scholarship tacitly assumes that Scottish literature and culture does not require comparison to other literatures and cultures in order to validate its analysis, it situates 18th-century Scotland in a range of literary and theoretical contexts. By bringing various methods of reading to the study of 18th-century Scottish literature and culture, recent scholarship contributes to current concerns in 18th-century studies beyond questions of nationhood and empire – important as those questions undoubtedly remain. In many cases, this scholarship derives its methods of analysis from 18th-century Scottish texts, self-reflexively suggesting the centrality of these texts to literary study more generally. For instance, Matthew Wickman's *The Ruins of Experience* (2007) locates the culturally and politically marginal Scottish Highlands at the centre of a major late 18th-century epistemological shift that resulted in the devaluation of direct experience in comparison to juridical probability. Penny Fielding's *Scotland and the Fictions of Geography* (2008) demonstrates 18th-century Scotland's contributions to another mode of thinking that we might regard as constitutive of modernity by examining Scottish writers' historicization of space. Gottlieb's *Feeling British* (2007) and Shields's *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Identity* (2010) draw respectively on Hume's and Smith's theories of sympathy to examine how the 18th century's culture of sensibility participated in the formation of British identity. Fielding's *Writing and Orality* (1996) and Sorensen's *The Grammar of Empire* (2000) employ 18th-century Scottish rhetorical and linguistic theory to examine how Scotland's multiple dialects and languages informed the standardization of spoken and written English. These studies share in common the assumption that 18th-century Scottish literature and culture has played a vital role in the world beyond Scotland and beyond the 18th century. They also demonstrate how the

analysis of Scottish literature and culture might revise the questions we ask about the 18th century and the categories through which we study it.

Recent studies of 18th-century Scottish literature and culture urge us to rethink the meanings not only of ''British'' and ''American,'' but also, perhaps more fundamentally, of ''the eighteenth century.'' By inviting us to see Enlightenment and Romantic ideologies as coexisting rather than consecutive, this writing broadens our sense of what the 18th century comprises. While Scotland's contributions to literature of the Enlightenment long have been recognized, assessments of its participation in Romanticism were until recently confined to studies of Robert Burns and Walter Scott, suggesting that Scotland's impressive mid-century efflorescence had waned by the beginning of the 19th century. However, re-examinations of old standbys like Burns and Scott, in addition to discussions of now less well-known writers like James Hogg, James Macpherson, Elizabeth Hamilton and Susan Ferrier, have suggested that the origins of Romanticism might be located in the mid-18th century and that the concerns of the Enlightenment extend well into the 19th century.[16] The editors of *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism* (2004) contend that in Scottish writing, the genres and discourses characterizing Enlightenment and Romantic ideologies occupied ''the same historical moment and institutional base, rather than defining successive stages or periods'' (Davis et al. 3). Scottish writing, in other words, disrupts periodization that is derived from Anglo-centric literary histories, calling into question the discreteness of Enlightenment and Romantic as literary-historical categories that resonate similarly across the literatures of the British archipelago.

We might question whether the study of 18th-century Scottish literature and culture has reached a terminus of sorts now that scholars have moved beyond the questions of identity that dominated the first and second phases of criticism. On the one hand, scholars can take for granted the Scottishness of Scottish literature and approach it from as many different angles as we might English literature. On the other hand, we cannot overlook its Scottishness without negating some of what makes it interesting and important to study. Rather than reaching a terminus, I would suggest that our acknowledgment of this paradox is merely a starting point. Accordingly, work remains to be done in all three categories of scholarship that this essay has discussed.

The diversification of a Scottish literary canon and the comparative study of Scottish literature must continue to go hand-in-hand. Despite the studies of Gaelic poetry and Scots song mentioned above, the canon of 18th-century Scottish literature remains dominated by writers who chose to write in English rather than Scots or Gaelic.[17] Expanding our field of study to include Scots and Gaelic writers will necessarily diversify the canon in terms of gender, class, genre and region, bringing to critical attention poets like Janet Little, ''the Scotch milkmaid'' and contemporary of Burns, or the Highland seer, Donnchadh Bàn Mac-an-t-Saoir (Duncan Bàn Macintyre). Broadening the canon of Scottish texts in turn helps to facilitate the comparative study of Scottish literature. While postcolonial theory, Atlantic studies, and devolutionary criticism have helped to situate 18th-century Scotland within Britain and its growing empire, Scotland's relationships to Ireland and Wales remain largely unexamined. If the complicated histories and multiple languages of the peripheries pose challenges to this kind of comparative work, two recent essay collections, *English Romanticism and the Celtic World* (Rawes and Carruthers, 2006) and *Scotland, Ireland, and the Romantic Aesthetic* (Duff and Jones, 2007) provide examples of the collaboration that might enable it. Exploring Scotland's, Wales's and Ireland's relationships to each other promises to also enrich our understanding of their relationships to England, and of the nuanced distinctions between colony, periphery and nation. It is perhaps salutary to remember that devolutionary criticism and postcolonial studies, while

expanding the context in which we examine Scottish literature and culture, entail their own form of parochialism. Neither has contributed to our understanding of Scotland's complex relationships to continental Europe. Yet post-devolutionary Scotland's desire to participate in the European Union on its own terms, rather than on England's, should remind us that Scotland has a long history of political, religious and cultural interaction with continental Europe, particularly France and the Netherlands.[18] While Murray Pittock's *Poetry and Jacobite Politics* (1994) acknowledges the ties that Jacobitism fostered between Scotland and France, Deidre Dawson and Pierre Morère's interdisciplinary collection of essays, *Scotland and France in the Enlightenment* (2004), opens up new lines of inquiry by tracing the transformation of Scotland and France's political ''Auld Alliance'' into the cultural connections that flourished during the Enlightenment. *The Reception of Ossian in Europe* (2004) exemplifies how the literary connections between Scotland and Europe might be explored by focusing on the reception history of a single work.

The third category of scholarship described in this essay, which asks how Scottish literature and culture might transform our understanding of the 18th-century world and the categories through which we study it, offers perhaps as many possibilities for further scholarship as there are critical and methodological approaches in 18th-century studies. For instance, Thomas Reid, David Hume and other writers on what we now call psychology might help to historicize cognitive approaches to literary study while Scotland's long tradition of pastoral poetry, some of which reflects the dramatic effects of land enclosure in the Highlands, might lend itself to eco-critical readings. While Scots may not quite have achieved the heights that the title of Arthur Herman's *How the Scots Invented the Modern World* (2001) claims they did, 18th-century Scottish literature and culture did contribute significantly to the emergence of modernity both ''as an empirical category of historical sociology *and* as a structure of historical consciousness'' (Duncan, 'Pathos' 40). Recent scholarship has demonstrated that the legacies of 18th-century Scottish literature and culture continue to inform the disciplinary categories and methodological approaches we use to study the 18th century. As future scholarship further reveals the Scottish underpinnings of literary criticism, we will surely begin to recognize the ways in which Scotland has long been central to 18th-century studies.

Short Biography

Juliet Shields is Associate Professor of English at the University of Washington. She is the author of *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Identity, 1745–1820* (Cambridge 2010) and several essays on the intersections between gender, race and nationality in 18th- and 19th-century British and American literature. She is currently working on a book examining 18th-century writing by and about British emigrants to North America.

Notes

* Correspondence: University of Washington, Box 354330, Seattle, WA 98195-4330, USA. Email: js37@u.washington.edu

[1] On ''the break-up of Britain'' see Nairn. In May 2011, the Scottish National Party won its first majority in the Scottish Parliament, leading Scotland's First Minister, Alex Salmond, to propose a referendum on independence within the next 5 years.

[2] This essay follows Dafydd Moore in using the term ''devolutionary criticism'' to describe the practice of reading the literatures of England's colonies and peripheries against that of the metropolitan centre to ''replace a monolithic, metropolitan notion of English [literature] with a more carefully nuanced set of cultural contexts'' ('Devolving

Romanticism' 2). The terms ''Four nations'' and ''Archipelagic'' seem to me to limit this type of criticism to a specific political and territorial context rather than describing a method of reading. For further discussion of these terms, see Crawford 1–15 and Kerrigan 10–2, 79–90.

[3] David Lloyd's *Nationalism and Minor Literature*, which takes Anglo-Irish literature as its exemplary minor literature, also defines the concept in ways that are particularly relevant to Scottish literature.

[4] In addition to Smith, see Muir, Daiches and Simpson.

[5] Two recent studies suggest that Scottish writing in fact had a substantial readership beyond metropolitan England. Sher examines the circulation of Scottish writing in a transatlantic literary marketplace, while Towsey discusses its readership in provincial Scotland.

[6] For instance, Katie Trumpener describes the Enlightenment as a covert form of Anglicization or ''of political and cultural imperialism'' that suppressed an authentic Scottish folk culture (x).

[7] *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature: Enlightenment, Britain, and Empire* (Brown et al., 2006) includes several informative essays on Gaelic poetry and Scots song.

[8] I derive this term from John Kerrigan, who uses it to differentiate works written by English writers from Anglophone literature, or works written in English.

[9] See, for instance, Colley, Weinbrot, Trumpener, Davis, Sorensen, Gottlieb and Shields.

[10] Studies informed by postcolonial theory include Sorensen, McCracken-Flescher, Gottlieb and Shields.

[11] On the decline of the nation-state, see Brennan and Nairn.

[12] Examples of devolutionary criticism in early modern studies include Baker and Maley, Bradshaw and Roberts, and Schwyzer. On 18th-century English identity, see Newman, Langford, Kumar and Yadav.

[13] See, for instance, Curley, and Duncan, 'The Pathos of Abstraction'.

[14] These studies include Sher and Smitten, Court, Manning and Hook.

[15] See also Court 1–34.

[16] On Burns see Leask; on Scott see McCracken-Flescher and Duncan, *Scott's Shadow* 96–115; on Macpherson see Moore, *Enlightenment and Romance*; on Hogg see Alker and Nelson, and Duncan, *Scott's Shadow* 147–214; on Hamilton see Perkins and on Ferrier see Shields 129–38.

[17] The three volume *Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature* has inspired a series of Edinburgh Companions to Scottish Literature that includes a volume on Gaelic literature in addition to those on canonical figures including James Hogg, Walter Scott and Robert Burns.

[18] On post-devolutionary Scotland's participation in the European Union, see Lazarowicz.

Works Cited

Alker, Sharon and Holly Faith Nelson, eds. *James Hogg and the Literary Marketplace*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.

Appadurai, Arjun. 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy.' *Theory, Culture & Society* 7 (1990): 295–310.

Baker, David J. and Willy Maley, eds. *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Bradshaw, Brendan and Peter Roberts, eds. *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533–1707*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Brennan, Timothy. 'The National Longing for Form.' *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 44–70.

Brown, Ian, et al., eds. *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature: Enlightenment, Britain, and Empire (1707-1918)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Carruthers, Gerard and Alan Rawes, eds. *English Romanticism and the Celtic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging a Nation, 1707–1832*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Court, Franklin E. *The Scottish Connection: The Rise of English Literary Study in Early America*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001.

Craig, Cairns. *Out of History: Narrative Paradigms in Scottish and English Culture*. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1996.

Crawford, Robert. *Devolving English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Curley, Thomas. *Samuel Johnson, the Ossian Fraud, and the Celtic Revival in Great Britain AndIreland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Daiches, David. *The Paradox of Scottish Culture*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Davis, Leith. *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation, 1707–1830*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Davis, Leith, Ian Duncan, and Janet Sorensen, eds. *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Dawson, Deidre and Pierre Morère, eds. *Scotland and France in the Enlightenment*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2004.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 'What Is a Minor Literature?' *Mississippi Review* 11 (1983): 13–33.

Duff, David and Catherine Jones, eds. *Scotland, Ireland, and the Romantic Aesthetic*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007.
Duncan, Ian. 'The Pathos of Abstraction: Adam Smith, Ossian, and Samuel Johnson.' *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism*. Eds. Leith Davis, Ian Duncan and Janet Sorensen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 38–56.
——. *Scott's Shadow: The Novel in Romantic Edinburgh*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
Fielding, Penny. *Scotland and the Fictions of Geography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
——. *Writing and Orality: Nationality, Culture, and Nineteenth-Century Scottish Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
Gaskill, Howard, ed. *The Reception of Ossian in Europe*. London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004.
Gottlieb, Evan. *Feeling British: Sympathy and National Identity in Scottish and English Writing, 1707–1832*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007.
Hechter, Michael. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536–1966*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
Herman, Arthur. *How the Scots Invented the Modern World: The True Story of How Western Europe's Poorest Nation Created our World and Everything in it*. New York: Crown, 2001.
Hook, Andrew. *From Goosecreek to Gandercleugh: Studies in Scottish-American Literary and Cultural History*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 1999.
Kerrigan, John. *Achipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics 1603–1707*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
Langford, Paul. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650–1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Lazarowicz, Mark, ed. *New Scotland, New Europe: Scotland and the Expanding European Union*. Edinburgh: Centre for Scottish Public Policy, 1999.
Leask, Nigel. *Robert Burns and Pastoral: Poetry and Improvement in Late Eighteenth-Century Scotland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Lloyd, David. *Nationalism and Minor Literature: James Clarence Mangan and the Emergence of Irish Cultural Nationalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
MacKillop, Andrew. *'More Fruitful Than the Soil': Army, Empire, and the Scottish Highland, 1715–1815*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
Manning, Susan. *Fragments of Union: Making Connections in Scottish and American Writing*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
McCracken-Flesher, Caroline. *Possible Scotlands: Walter Scott and the Story of Tomorrow*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
McNeil, Kenneth. *Scotland Britain, Empire: Writing the Highlands, 1760–1860*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2007.
Moore, Dafydd. 'Devolving Romanticism: Nation, Region and the Case of Devon and Cornwall.' *Literature Compass* 5 (2008): 949–63.
——. *Enlightenment and Romance in James Macpherson's The Poems of Ossian: Myth, Genre and Cultural Change*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
Muir, Edwin. *Scott and Scotland: The Predicament of the Scottish Writer*. London: Routledge, 1936.
Nairn, Tom. *The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis of Neo-Nationalism*. 2nd ed. London: Verson, 1981.
Netzloff, Mark. *England's Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
Newman, Gerald. *The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740–1830*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1987.
Perkins, Pamela, ed. and intro. *The Cottagers of Glenburnie and Other Writings*. By Elizabeth Hamilton. Glasgow: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 2008.
Pittock, Murray. *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
——. *Scottish and Irish Romanticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Pocock, J. G. A. 'The Limits and Divisions of British History: In Search of the Unknown Subject.' *The American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 311–36.
Richards, Eric. 'Scotland and the Uses of the Atlantic Empire.' *Strangers Within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*. Eds. Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991. 67–114.
Sassi, Carla. *Why Scottish Literature Matters*. Edinburgh: The Saltire Society, 2005.
Schwyzer, Philip. *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Sher, Richard B. *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland, and America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
Sher, Richard B. and Jeffrey R. Smitten, eds. *Scotland and America in the Age of the Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990.

Shields, Juliet. *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1745–1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
Simpson, Kenneth. *The Protean Scot: The Crisis of Identity in Eighteenth Century Scottish Literature*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988.
Smith, G. Gregory. *Scottish Literature: Character and Influence*. London: Macmillan, 1919.
Sorensen, Janet. *The Grammar of Empire in Eighteenth-Century British Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Towsey, Mark R. M. *Reading the Scottish Enlightenment: Books and Their Readers in Provincial Scotland, 1750–1820*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
Weinbrot, Howard D. *Britannia's Issue: The Rise of British Literature From Dryden to Ossian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
Wickman, Matthew. *The Ruins of Experience: Scotland's "Romantick" Highlands and the Birth of the Modern Witness*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
Yadav, Alok. *Before the Empire of English: Literature, Provinciality, and Nationalism in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.