ECSSS Bash in Bristol

Last summer ECSSS held its annual meeting for 1991 at the Eighth International Congress on the Enlightenment in Bristol, England. It was a fine conference, both for the International Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, which sponsored the Congress, and for ECSSS.


After a break for lunch and afternoon panels, ECSSS held its second event at 4 PM. Nicholas Philipson of the University of Edinburgh presented a lively keynote address on “The Scottish Enlightenment: The State of the Art,” which drew a large audience. This was followed by a reception with tea, sandwiches, and cakes.

Then came the Society’s business meeting, chaired by ECSSS president Andrew Hook. In the executive secretary’s report, Richard Sher stated that paid membership was up from 217 to 236, with the following geographical distribution: U.S. - 113; U.K. - 79; Japan - 16; Canada - 12; Other - 16 (France - 4; Spain - 3; Australia, Germany, and Italy - 2 each; Austria, New Zealand, and the Netherlands - 1 each). When broken down by discipline (where known), the Society continues to have a nearly equal representation of members in literature (68) and history (61), with strong representations also in philosophy and religion (35); social sciences and law (26); rhetoric, languages, and library studies (12); fine arts and music (10), and history of science/technology (6). Sher also reported on the society’s finances, future conferences, and publications, all of which are discussed below.

Besides the events that ECSSS sponsored, many of our members participated in other parts of the Congress. Howard Weinbrot delivered a plenary address on “Enlightenment Canon Wars.” Greg Clingham organized a seminar on “James Boswell and the Enlightenment” that included papers by Joan Pickett Wesson, Richard Sher, and Greg himself, with commentary by Irma Lustig. Other members who gave papers or chaired sessions included Stanley Twemlow, Miles Bradbury, Donald Siebert, Timothy Erwin, Bruno Morevallo, Laura Kennelly, Karen O’Brien, Horst Drescher, George McElroy, Murray Pickett, Michel Faure, Hiroshi Mizuta, Donald Nichol, Arthur Donovan, Susan Manning, Irwin Primer, Paul DeGategno, Marlies Danziger, and Malcolm Jack.

ECSSS wishes to thank the joint organizers of the Congress, Haydn and Adrienne Mason, for helping to make the Bristol conference so successful.

On to Philly!

The joint conference on “Centers and Peripheries of Enlightenment” that ECSSS is co-sponsoring with the East Central branch of ASECS is shaping up as the biggest, and perhaps most exciting, conference that each organization has ever had. Thanks to the hard work of co-program chairs Peter Briggs and Steve Smith, well over one hundred proposals have been received. As a result, the conference, to be held 28-31 October at the Holiday Inn located in Philadelphia’s historic Independence Mall area, promises to be unusually rich and diverse in its offerings, with panels in British literature, German literature, French literature, philosophy, religion, history, music, rhetoric, visual arts, science, and a variety of topics related to the Philadelphia region itself. Many of the papers and panels will have a distinctively Scottish flavor, but others will treat non-Scottish concerns.

The city of Philadelphia itself will provide a rich backdrop of eighteenth-century history and lore for this year’s conference. A partial list of historical sites within walking distance of the Holiday Inn include the Indepen-
The plenary address at the 1992 conference will be delivered by ECSSS member Thomas Crawford, who will speak on “Ideology in the Boswell-Temple Correspondence.” In addition, Irma Lustig will deliver the annual EC/AECS presidential address. Conference-goers will have the opportunity to enjoy fine food and walking tours of Philadelphia architecture.

One event with special meaning for ECSSS members will be the presentation of Burns’s “Love and Liberty” by Shoshana Shay and John Davison. The first public performance of the version of this work that Davison and John Ashmead completed just before the latter’s death (see below), it will be dedicated to John Ashmead’s memory.

Although the program had not been absolutely fixed at press time in June, here are a few approved panels that may be of particular interest to our members: Scottish Travelers in Russia and Eastern Europe; Adam Smith; Scottish Universities and the Enlightenment; The Philadelphia Connection: Center or Periphery?; Power Struggles in 18th-Century Philadelphia; Perspectives on Samuel Johnson; Truth in Narratives: Conveying Information in Genres; Real and Fictional French Letters; American Founders in Pennsylvania; The Lower Orders; Recent Critical Approaches to 18th-Century Texts; Germany and Enlightenment Letters; Women Authors; Enlightenment Rhetoric. Complete program information should soon be available, with a full schedule of sessions and other conference events.

See you in Philadelphia!

1993 in Ottawa: Call for Papers

Roger Emerson, joint program chair of the 1993 conference, reports that plans for the conference are moving ahead nicely. Co-sponsored by the Hume Society, the conference will be held at the University of Ottawa from 6 to 10 July and will have as its theme “Hume In His Scottish Setting.” As reported last year, David Raynor secured a $10,000 grant from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada that will be used to bring in some outstanding speakers, including James Moore (the first to be booked).

Papers dealing directly with the conference theme are particularly welcome, but papers are also encouraged on related eighteenth-century Scottish topics, such as common sense philosophy, the social and cultural history of Edinburgh in Hume’s day, the rhetoric of eighteenth-century philosophy, connections between philosophy and other fields such as medicine and history, and the thought or activities of Hume’s friends, enemies, and acquaintances.

Send one-page proposals to Roger Emerson, Hume Conference Program Chair, Department of History, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2.

1994 in Providence

The 1994 conference will be at the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, Rhode Island, on the theme of “Scotland and the Americas.” The conference will be coordinated with an exhibit at the library, which houses one of the best collections anywhere of early Americana. The library may have several research fellowships available for ECSSSS members who wish to be in residence in 1993-94, in part to help with planning the conference and exhibit. Those with strengths and interests in fields such as the arts, material culture, religion, bibliography, cartography, discovery and exploration, the Darien Scheme, and Scots in the West Indies are particularly invited to apply. Write to Norman Fiering, Director - John Carter Brown Library, Box 1894, Providence, RI 02912, USA.

Conferences and Gatherings

ECSSS at ASECS. At the annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, held in Seattle, Washington, in April, ECSSS was as usual well represented.

The official ECSSS panel this year was focused on the sociology of literature. Under the chairmanship of Jeffrey Smitten (Utah State U.), it was titled “Literature and Social Practice in Eighteenth-Century Scotland.” The speakers were Ian Ross (U. of British Columbia) on “Adam Smith and the Enjoyment of Intellectual Property,” Leith Ann Davis (Simon Fraser U.) on “Origins of the Specious: James Macpherson’s Ossian and the Forging of the English Nation;” and Carol McGuirk (Florida Atlantic U.) on “Polyphonic History: The Paradox of Burns’s Songs.” The panel was well attended and by all accounts a source of considerable enlightenment.

Meanwhile, other ECSSS members were delivering papers and commentaries in various ASECS panels. They include Henry Abclove, Timothy Erwin, Irma Lustig, O. M. Brack, James Basker, Leslie Ellen Brown, and John Radner.

Finally, the Society was ably represented at the Affiliate Societies Meeting by vice-president Leslie Ellen Brown.

Glasgow University Conference for Postgraduate School. The University of Glasgow has announced the establishment of an interdisciplinary postgraduate
school of Scottish history and literature. Among the areas of study in the program are “The Staggering State, 1560-1760,” “Enlightenment, Romanticism and the Vernacular, 1750-1830,” and “Romance and Realism: The Scottish Highlansds.” The school will be launched in September 1992 with a three-day colloquium on “Crossing the Atlantic: People and Ideas, 1625 to the Present,” to be held at a Highland retreat. A broader international conference on Scotland and America is planned for 1994. For more information, contact Dr. Allan I. Macinnes, Department of Scottish History, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, U.K.

William Robertson Conference at Edinburgh University. The University of Edinburgh will hold a conference in Edinburgh on 22-23 October 1993 to mark the bicentenary of the death of William Robertson (1721-1793), the distinguished Moderate literatus and ecclesiastical leader. The interdisciplinary conference is subtitled “Churchman, Historian, Principal” in honor of the three main themes of Robertson’s career: his achievements as one of the leading historians of eighteenth-century Europe; his role as leader of the Moderate party in the Church of Scotland and his personal ascendancy in the church until his retirement in 1780; and his contributions as principal of the University of Edinburgh during the noon tide of the Scottish Enlightenment.

The conference will be jointly hosted by the Faculty of Divinity and the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities. There are plans to publish the conference proceedings, if possible. Individuals wishing to present a paper at the conference are invited to contact Professor Stewart J. Brown, Department of Ecclesiastical History, New College, Mound Place, Edinburgh EH1 2LU, Scotland, U.K.

Etudes Ecossaises at Grenoble. The Scottish studies group at Stendhal University in Grenoble, under the directorship of Pierre Morère, ran a two-day conference in November 1991 on “Nature and Nurture in Eighteenth-Century Britain.” Among the participants were ECSSS members Deidre Dawson, who spoke on Adam Smith and Rousseau; Marie-Cécile Rivauger, who spoke on natural law and the rights of man; and Knud Haakonsen, who chaired a session. Deidre reports that the pleasures of the conference included some fine French cuisine.

Hume Society at Eugene and Nantes. The Hume Society held its 1991 conference at Eugene, Oregon in August, with special sessions on DH’s Political Thought, DH’s Natural History of Religion, Annette Baier’s A Progress of Sentiments, and Mark Box’s The Suasive Art of David Hume.

The Hume Society is holding its 1992 conference in Nantes, France, from 29 June through 3 July. The conference themes are Hume’s aesthetics, his relations with French philosophers, and the reception of his philosophy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For more information about the conference or the society, contact Dorothy Coleman, Secretary of the Hume Society, Department of Philosophy, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795, USA.

HUME-L. Dorothy Coleman has set up an electronic bulletin board called HUME-L, for free-ranging discussion of matters relating to Hume. To subscribe, send a Bitnet message to Listserv@wmvm1 or an Internet message to Listserv@wmvm1.cc.wm.edu; the message should read: subscribe Hume-L [your name]. Send messages to the list to Hume-L@wmvm1.

Hutcheson Conference in Glasgow. The Scots Philosophical Club and Trinity College, Dublin, will co-sponsor a conference in spring or summer 1994 to commemorate the 300th anniversary of Francis Hutcheson’s birth. The site will be the University of Glasgow. Inquiries and paper proposals should be addressed to Dr. Gordon Graham, The Scots Philosophical Club, Department of Moral Philosophy, St. Andrews University, St. Andrews KY16 9AL, UK.

Nationalism Conference at Dublin. A major conference on “Nations and Nationalisms in the Eighteenth Century” will be held at University College, Dublin, on 3-6 September 1992. The joint sponsors are the Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society and the British and French Societies for Eighteenth-Century Studies, any of which can be contacted for more information.

University of Western Ontario Seminar on the 18th Century. In March the seminar met for two days, and several papers were presented of interest to our readers: Roger Emerson, “Calvinism and Scottish Philosophers;” David Raynor, “Hume and French Philosophy in 1733;” John Wright, “Appetite, Self-Control and the Body-Machine in 18th-Century England;” Lorne Falkenstein, “Thomas Reid on the Correlative Appreciation of Colour and Space;” and Manfred Kuehn, “The Significance of ‘Moral Sense’ in Kant’s Philosophical Development.”

Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing. This organization is devoted to all aspects of book history. It will hold its inaugural conference in New York City on 9-11 June 1993, hosted jointly by the English and History departments at the City University of New York Graduate Center. Those interested in delivering papers should send a 1-2 page proposal to Dr. Simon Elhot, The Open University, 4 Portwall Lane, Bristol BS1 6ND, UK by 1 July 1992. For membership information on SHARP, contact Professor Jonathan Rose, Department of History, Drew University, Madison, NJ 07940, USA.

Robert Adam Bicentenary Planned

1992 marks the bicentenary of the death of Robert Adam, one of the greatest talents in the history of British architecture.

The National Library of Scotland will commemorate this event with a major exhibit, “Monumental Reputation: Robert Adam and the Emperor’s Palace,” which will run from 1 June through 30 September 1992 (and again from 4 November 1992 through 28 February 1993 at Kenwood, London). The exhibition will look at the European Grand Tour that shaped Adam’s development, and in particular his visit to the palace of the
Emperor Diocletian at Split and the subsequent publication of his classic book on the palace. It will display rare Clérissseau drawings from the Hermitage, St. Petersburg, and a model of Diocletian's Palace from Rome, as well as drawings, plates, and documents from major British institutions and the library's own collections.

Besides the exhibit at the National Library, other events planned include “Robert Adam and Scotland” at the Scottish Record Office: an exhibition of original manuscripts, drawings, and photographs illustrating Adam’s relationship to Scotland (6 July - 26 Sept. 1992); “A European Vision: Robert Adam’s Glasgow” at the Collins Gallery, Glasgow: Adam’s Glasgow projects and his influence on the city (22 Oct. - 23 Dec. 1992); “The Architecture of Robert Adam: Life, Death and Rebirth” at the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland, Edinburgh (10 Aug. - 17 Sept. 1992); and “Robert Adam: The Scottish Legacy” at Edinburgh University Old College: the annual conference of the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (14 Nov. 1992). For a brochure showing all events, and a listing of all of Adam’s Scottish works that are accessible to the public, contact the Scottish Tourist Board.

Successes and Snags for ECSSS Publications

The Society's publication series, “ECSSS Studies in Eighteenth-Century Scotland,” had ups and downs during the past year. On the positive side, the first volume in the series, Sher and Smitten, eds., Scotland and America in the Age of the Enlightenment, went into paperback at Edinburgh University Press and earned the Society $576 in royalties (see Statement of Finances, below). The second volume in the series, Howard Gaskill, ed., Ossian Revisited (reviewed in this issue), continued to attract attention as an indispensable work in its field.

Another bright spot was the publication in November 1991 of the third volume in the series, John Dwyer and Richard B. Sher, eds., Sociability and Society in Eighteenth-Century Scotland, as a special, double issue of Eighteenth-Century Life. ECSSS was pleased with the job that ECL and Johns Hopkins University Press Journals Division did on this volume, including the reproduction of seventeen illustrations. Unfortunately, however, Aberdeen University Press’s financial problems (discussed below) came to a head just as that publisher was about to go to press with the softcover book edition of this volume, which many of our members ordered at the very reasonable price of $15 U.S. or £8 U.K., postage paid, at the time they renewed their ECSSS membership for 1992. After waiting several months to see if the AUP crisis would be resolved, ECSSS has made a special arrangement with Johns Hopkins University Press Journals Division to have copies of the Eighteenth-Century Life double issue of Sociability and Society shipped directly to all members who have ordered a copy of this volume. Except for the covers, this volume is identical to the one that would have been sent by AUP if it had been able to fulfill its end of the contract with ECSSS. Please be patient, as the volume was shipped by surface mail in early June.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the Aberdeen University Press crisis concerns the Institute of Scottish Studies at Old Dominion University in Virginia. Since it hosted the conference from which Sociability and Society emerged, the Institute generously contributed $1000 toward publication of this volume: $500 directly to JHUP Journals Division, and $500 to AUP in the form of a book purchase agreement. The latter amount may well be lost, leaving Old Dominion with no copies of the book to show for its troubles (ECSSS had a similar book purchase arrangement with AUP, but because its money was to be paid on receipt of the published volumes, the Society did not lose any money on this transaction).

Toward the end of 1991 Edinburgh University Press published the third edition of Anthony E. Brown, Boswellian Studies: A Bibliography, which significantly upgrades the 1972 second edition of that standard reference volume. This volume was published under ECSSS auspices but is not part of the “ECSSS Studies in Eighteenth-Century Scotland” series.

The next volume planned in that series, “Glasgow and the Enlightenment,” was affected by the crises at both EUP and AUP. First, EUP withdrew from its agreement with us to publish this volume, citing financial considerations. ECSSS then turned to Southern Illinois University Press and Aberdeen University Press, which were on the verge of an agreement to co-publish this volume when financial crisis struck at AUP (see below). At present the manuscript of this volume is being readied for SIUP by the co-editors, Andrew Hook and Richard Sher, and it is hoped that another British press can be found to co-publish it (ideally a rejuvenated AUP). The projected fifth volume in our series, a collection of Boswell essays edited by Irma Lustig, is still in the initial stages of preparation.

ECSSS encourages members to submit proposals for future volumes in this series. Proposals for volumes in areas other than the history of ideas are particularly encouraged at this time.

The Crisis in Scottish Publishing

1991-92 will go down as a dismal time in the annals of Scottish scholarly publishing. All four of the major Scottish publishers of scholarly fare endured crises of one sort or another, and at press time the future of some of them was very much in doubt.

Edinburgh University Press was still recovering from the death in November 1990 of its head, Martin Spencer, when a second blow struck in the form of a major financial crisis at Edinburgh University. Out of the initial uncertainty came a reorganization, which put Vivian Bone into the top editorial position as publisher, with David Martin handling the overall responsibility of the press as executive chairman. As of 31 July 1992, EUP will become a limited company, with separate
financial status from the university. Though the press will be forced to operate under tighter constraints than formerly, ECSSS has been assured by Vivian Bone that there is still a commitment to the publication of Scottish studies, including multivolume editions of James Boswell, Thomas Reid, Sir Walter Scott, and James Hogg, and many interesting individual volumes.

The year was filled with rumors about the imminent collapse of John Donald, Ltd. and Scottish Academic Press; at press time the former was still in business and still producing Scottish books, whereas the latter had entered liquidation, though its books may still be purchased. Aberdeen University Press, meanwhile, became a casualty of the Maxwell fiasco early in 1992. At press time, the staff had been cut back to two and all publishing operations had ceased, though the press was continuing to sell books already published. Liquidation seemed likely unless a buyer could be found, and the prospects were generally grim.

During the past decade AUP became a major force in Scottish scholarly publishing, with a particularly strong eighteenth-century list, so these bankruptcy proceedings hit all of us hard. ECSSS was caught with one project under contract to AUP and another about to be so (see above), and several of our individual members are now in similar predicaments. All we can hope is that a buyer for the press is soon found, that managing director Colin Kirkwood and other staff members are rehired, and that AUP is able to reaffirm its commitment to publishing high quality works in Scottish studies.

The Crisis at Old Dominion

Following the departure of Charles Haws, the Institute of Scottish Studies at Old Dominion University has been closed down. The Institute was the site of the first ECSSS conference in 1988, and before folding it contributed a generous subsidy toward publication of the volume of essays that emerged from that conference (Sociability and Society) - including a $500 subsidy to Aberdeen University Press that now appears to be lost. Fortunately, ODU’s Scottish studies journal, Scotia, will continue to be published, under the excellent leadership of the new editor, William S. Rodner. Send your manuscripts or inquiries - or your $10 for purchase of the latest issue - to Scotia, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529.

Philly Fellowships Available

The Library Company of Philadelphia each year offers a number of fellowships for research in residence in its collections, which are capable of supporting scholarship in a variety of fields and disciplines relating to the history of North America, principally in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Founded in 1731, the Library Company was the largest public library in America until the 1850s and thus contains printed materials on every aspect of American culture and society in that period. It has since become a research library of 450,000 books, pamphlets, newspapers, and periodicals, as well as 50,000 prints, maps, and photographs.

Though American history is the primary focus of the Library Company’s collections, there are also many research opportunities in eighteenth-century Scottish studies. Until 1800 the Library Company imported most of its books from England and Scotland; even today it has one of America’s half-dozen largest collections of eighteenth-century British books. The bulk of these imports came from London, and they include many publications by Scottish authors. In addition, there are more than two thousand eighteenth-century Scottish imprints. Many of them are Scottish reprints of English books, but the collection also includes a considerable number of books first printed in Scotland. To these may be added many English and American editions of Scottish works, an exceptionally strong collection of books by and about Americans of Scottish descent, and a nearly complete file of medical dissertations of Americans who studied in Scotland.

The fellowship program supports both post-doctoral and dissertation research. The fellowships are tenable for one month at any time from June 1993 to May 1994. The stipend is $1200 per month. Overseas applications are especially encouraged, since a separately endowed fund allows an extra stipend to one fellow whose residence is outside the United States. Candidates must apply by 1 February 1993. There are no application forms; to apply, please send four copies each of a vita, a brief description of your proposed project, and a single letter of reference to: James Green, Curator, The Library Company of Philadelphia, 1314 Locust Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Telephone: 215-546-3183; fax: 215-546-5167.

The American Philosophical Society Library also boasts a fine collection of Scottish materials, and Mellon Resident Research Fellowships are available for exploring it. These fellowships are open to suitably qualified U.S. citizens and foreign nationals who wish to make use of the library’s extensive holdings. There are no restrictions as to an applicant’s discipline, but candidates must reside beyond a fifty-mile radius of Philadelphia and must be resident there during the term of the fellowship. The stipend is $1800 per month, for a term of one to three months. For more information about how to apply for these fellowships, write to: Mellon Fellowships, American Philosophical Society Library, 105 South Fifth St., Philadelphia, PA 19106-3386.

Ashmead Remembered

John Ashmead, beloved ECSSS member and Robert Burns expert, died in February at the age of seventy-four. For forty-one years a legendary English teacher at Haverford College near Philadelphia, Ashmead lived a remarkable life. He was a Japanese translator during World War II, published two novels, taught in Japan and
eight other Asian countries, and made and played
harpichords and other musical instruments.

In his last years Ashmead focused on Burns, teaming
up with his Haverford colleague John Davison to publish
*Songs of Robert Burns*, and with Davison and their
former student, Shoshana Shay, to present Burns pro-
grams that mixed original musical interpretations and
literary analysis. *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* asked
John Davison to provide us with his personal recollec-
tions of this extraordinary man.

**John Ashmead - A Memoir by John Davison**

John Ashmead, then a new young English instructor,
was one of my first teachers when I came to Haverford
College as a freshman in 1947. He liked my work in his
course and was highly encouraging. His teaching
seemed good to me, though I remember little of it.

In 1959 we became colleagues when I returned to
Haverford to join the music faculty. Since we were in
different fields, we saw little of each other until about
1980, when John proposed that we seek a grant to work
up a jointly-taught course dealing with both the verbal
and musical aspects of English-language song. I agreed
enthusiastically. We got the grant, designed the course,
and gave it several times.

As we discussed material for the course, I first
learned how many (about half!) of Robert Burns’s
poems were actually designed as songs. Burns collected
a splendid array of Scottish folk melodies and would
hum them through, putting his own new words to them.
He published many of them himself, but the Edinburgh
musician whom he got to provide keyboard accompani-
ments was unable to do justice to the quality and variety
of the tunes, and his nineteenth-century successors did
no better. All were limited by the narrow harmonic
system of their day, which did not provide for the wild
variety and, sometimes, ambiguity of scale and mode
that characterized the old Scottish tunes. I soon began
to harmonize them myself. My own harmonic language
as a composer had evolved in part from studying British-
American folk songs, and I saw what could be done with
them. I demonstrated my new settings for one of our
class notes, each of us, in working on the book, offered a few
meritations back and forth in a complex pattern of mutual criticism and en-
couragement. We came up with a substantial volume,
the second to discuss both the words *and* music of
Burns’s songs. Most publishers shied away from the
unconventional scholarly/creative mix, but Garland
Publishers accepted it. The *Songs of Robert Burns*
appeared in 1988 to almost universally favorable reviews,
including a warm one in the *London Times*. We did a
second book together on Burns’s cantata “Love and
Liberty;” it was just finished just before John’s death,
and I hope to publish it. A projected third book on
Burns will now, alas, never be written.

The publication of *The Songs of Robert Burns* led to a
whole series of further lecture-concerts at Haverford
College, the Franklin Inn Club, and the Athenaeum in
Philadelphia, and at ECSSS conferences in Virginia
Beach, Virginia, in 1988 and in Glasgow, Scotland, in
1990 (our venue on the latter occasion being the University
of Strathclyde’s eighteenth-century house, Ross
Priory, on the banks of Loch Lomond). A video produc-
tion company in Arizona became interested in expand-
ing the presentation into a video, as well as a sound-
recording in tape and compact disc. The video was
made in Tucson in 1991 (with “Scottish” scenes done on
a watered desert golf course), and it aired in early
1992 on a great many public television stations across
the United States. Happily, John Ashmead, briefly
featured in the video, was able to see it and know of its
success before his death on 7 February 1992. Shoshana
Shay and I intend to continue the Burns presentations as
opportunity offers, giving them in affectionate memory
of John.

Working with John Ashmead - and with Shoshana
Shay - on the Burns material has been one of the great
joys of the last ten years of my life. I know from various
sources that John could be cantankerous; he was never
so with me. The closest we ever came to a disagreement
was a brief period of mutual irritation when, one sum-
mer, each of us, in working on the book, offered a few
too many nit-picking criticisms of the other’s work; but
that quickly passed. We genuinely admired and sup-
ported each other. John was a very knowledgeable
musical amateur (he built and played period keyboard
instruments), and he kept playing over my Burns set-
tings, saying how much he enjoyed them. I in turn ac-
cepted his justified criticisms of my run-on sentences and
marveled at his sophisticated but totally unpedantic
way of writing - clear, readable, to the point. I’ve come
to model my own writing on it. Scholarly writing and
speaking need not be dull, and John proved it many
times over. (And scholarly he was; nobody ever took
more pains to check and recheck footnotes and bibliog-
rphies.)

Traveling with John Ashmead (twice to Scotland,
once to Virginia Beach, once to Arizona) was great fun.
His accounts of things he had done, from ranching to translating Japanese (for the Navy) to building clavichords to traveling in India, were endlessly entertaining. He was a charming, lively, considerate companion. He enjoyed a sense of the absurd, and was always cheerful, even when plagued with really alarming physical ailments and discomforts during his last few years. I learned much from him and greatly admired his sturdy courage, good nature, and delightful wit. There had grown a fine, late-blooming friendship between us, and I shall miss him very much.

Editor’s Note: Readers wishing to sample the magic of Burns as interpreted by Ashmead, Davison, and Shay may now do so. “Love Songs of Robert Burns” is a professionally produced tape available in three formats: video ($24.95), compact disc ($17.95), and audio cassette ($11.95). To order, enclose payment, plus shipping and handling ($3 for first item, $2 for each additional item) to: ELM Productions, Inc., P.O. Box 16662, Phoenix, AZ 85011-6662. Or telephone 1-800-847-9800 (in USA only).

Members on the Move

Henry Abelove spent the 1991-92 academic year at the Humanities Center, U. of Utah... AMS Press will publish Barbara Benedict’s Framing Feeling: Sentiments and Style in English Prose Fiction, 1745-1800, which will include a lengthy chapter on Henry Mackenzie... congratulations to Alexander Brodie on his election as a fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh... Pierre Carbone spoke at a conference at the Sorbonne on Kames’s view of the role of belles lettres in early education... Jennifer Carter reports the U. of Aberdeen is planning a conference for July 1993 on “Town and Gown: The University in Its Urban Environment”... Tom Crawford spent May 1992 at the Boswell Office at Yale, where he is finishing up his edition of the Boswell-Temple correspondence... David Daiches is honorary president of the Association for Scottish Literary Studies and the Saltire Society... Deidre Dawson is once again directing a summer program for college students in Tours, France from 20 June to 31 July... Gordon DesBrisay has joined the History Department at the U. of Saskatchewan... T. M. Devine’s The Great Highland Famine has won the Saltire Award for Historical Writing 1991... Maria Elosegui has moved to the Philosophy Department at the U. of Zaragoza... Jane Fagg has been named the Paul McCain Professor of History at Arkansas College, succeeding her late husband Dan in that position... Michel Faure has been elected vice-dean of the faculty of letters and sciences at U. Haute Lorraine, Mulhouse... Roger Fechner has been appointed the first official parliamentarian of ASECS... in 1991 Scottish Academic Press published a Scottish Enlightenment reader, edited by Philip Flynn, titled Enlightened Scotland: A Study and Selection of Scottish Philosophical Prose... Michael Fry’s study of Henry Dundas and his son Robert, The Dundas Despotism, will be published by Edinburgh University Press this year... Knud Haakonsen has been appointed sole editor of The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Philosophy... Lore Hisky has been invited to deliver a lecture at the Brooks Museum on Raeburn’s portrait of Alexander Home, one of five Raeburns housed in her native Memphis, Tennessee... Laura Kennelly’s article on Hume and Goldsmith’s histories (see listing below) has been nominated for the Walter D. Love Prize in History... Mike Kugler is the proud papa of a little Adam Ferguson... Deborah Leslie has taken a position as a rare book catalogue at the Library Company of Philadelphia... Jim Moore spent the fall 1991 term as a Simon Research Fellow in the Government Department at the U. of Manchester; he will spend the fall 1992 term as a visiting professor in the faculty of law at the U. of Groningen... Dean Peterson is now an instructor of economics at Seattle U. in Washington... Karen O’Brien is a research fellow in English and history at Peterhouse, Cambridge... congratulations to Carolyn Peters on her marriage in November... Clare O’Halloran has taken a position in the Modern History Department at University College, Cork, Ireland... Murray Pittock was awarded the Royal Society of Edinburgh’s BP Humanities Prize (1992) for research in language, literature, and the arts; in 1991 he became director to non-graduating students in the faculty of arts at Edinburgh U., in which capacity he welcomes applications from overseas and EC students... after ten years as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the U. of North Texas, Tom Preston returns to the faculty this summer... John Price, of 8 Cloudesley Square, London, has issued a splendid catalog of antiquarian books on David Hume and the Scottish Enlightenment... Lisa Rosner has been awarded tenure at Stockton State College in New Jersey; she is also expecting her first child in July... Ian Ross reports that after years of effort the manuscript of his biography of Adam Smith is finally off to Oxford U. Press... look for John Donald to publish P. H. Scott’s Andrew Fletcher and the Union of 1707 by early summer; also forthcoming is his collection of essays, Defoe in Edinburgh... Jeremy Shearmur has left George Mason U. in Virginia to join the Political Science Department at the Australian National U. in Canberra... Richard Sher gave up administration for the faculty at NJIT, become a member of the graduate faculty at Rutgers-Newark, and received a Warnock Fellowship for summer study at the Boswell Office at Yale U.... Hisashi Shirahara has published a number of reviews of Scottish books in Japanese publications, including a review of the Nagoya International Symposium on Adam Smith... Jeffrey Smitten has been named the new Executive Secretary of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies... David Spadafora has left the dean’s office at Yale to become dean of faculty and professor of history at Lake Forest U.... Fiona Stafford is now college lecturer at St Anne’s College, Oxford... Sandy Stewart spent much of the 1991-92 year as a visiting research fellow at the Australian National U.... Paul Wood has accepted a five-year term as secretary/treasurer of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies.
John Millar and the Enlightenment:
Toward the Construction of Diderot’s “Science de l’homme public”

Michel Faure
Université de Haute Alsace

In any study devoted to Glasgow and the Enlightenment, a prominent place must be given to John Millar (1735-1801), an alumnus of Glasgow College, to which he returned in 1761 as Regius Professor of Civil Law. For the next forty years, his fame as a law teacher was, to quote his contemporary biographer, “too well established, and too widely diffused, to admit of any competition,” and the extent of his contribution to legal studies, or jurisprudence, has been recently rediscovered and thoroughly reexamined. But, as could be expected from a man whose patrons included Lord Kames, David Hume, and Adam Smith, Millar’s interests were not restricted by his predominantly legal training. Law, as Kames wrote, “becomes then only a rational study when it is traced historically, from its first rudiments among savages, through successive changes, to its highest improvements in a civilized society.” Indeed, in Millar’s earlier writings we are struck by that peculiar association of law with civil and natural history which seems to be Montesquieu’s legacy to the latter part of the eighteenth century - combined, in Millar’s case, with the Smithian political economy heritage.

Toward the end of his life, Millar appears to have been primarily attracted by recent history and contemporary political issues. His Historical View of the English Government (1787) has been characterized as “the attempt of a radical whig and a historical jurist to rescue the whig view of English history from the ravages to which Hume had subjected it.” Similarly, his anonymous attack on the Anglo-French war, Letters of Crión (1796), bitterly criticized the British government’s foreign policy. This essay, however, will concentrate on the earlier, perhaps more universal aspect of Millar’s work, namely the study of man as a social being in his Origin of the Distinction of Ranks, first published in 1771 and much enlarged in the third edition of 1779. Much has been written on this subject since the rediscovery of Millar in the early part of this century but, in spite of William Lehmann’s meticulous research on Millar in the 1950s and 1960s, many readers of Millar’s book seem to have praised or attacked it mainly because of the convenient use that could be made of it from a twentieth-century perspective. In a recent article, John Cairns confirms Michael Ignatieff’s criticism of various “anticipatory readings” of Millar as, inter alia, the forerunner of social science, the forefather of historical materialism or, curiously, the advocate of petty bourgeois ideology. More recently, with the discovery of a new set of notes from Adam Smith’s Lectures on Jurisprudence, Millar’s book has run the risk of being seen as no more than an overblown attempt at developing the Smithian version of the “four-stages theory.” The suggestion of this essay is that the main interest of the Origin of the Distinction of Ranks lies not so much in proposing new theories, or in offering a coherent combination of existing ones, as in giving vent to what might be termed “l’esprit philosophique,” and in articulating the encyclopedic spirit of free, open, comprehensive inquiry advocated by Denis Diderot in one of his contributions to Abbé Raynal’s Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce européens dans les deux Indes.

Millar’s debt to Smith should not be minimized. He was, after all, Smith’s disciple and protégé; his emphasis on modes of subsistence as an essential factor in social development testifies to his master’s influence, and the inner structure of his chapters is generally determined by Smith’s recognition of the four successive stages of hunting, pasturage, agriculture, and commerce in the development of society. But, in the Lectures on Jurisprudence and even to some extent in the Wealth of Nations, Smith tends to be rather dogmatic, or at least seems more preoccupied with demonstration than with epistemological doubt or active experimental research. As a rule, Smith neither discusses the choice of his sources nor attempts to justify his method of inquiry. The typical opening of a chapter from the Wealth of Nations is a definition, or a postulate, and the lectures in the Lectures on Jurisprudence characteristically start with the words “I showed how...” Millar’s approach, apart from being slightly less professorial, appears to reflect the doubts and scruples of a careful observer who is sensitive to “the difficulty of obtaining proper materials for speculations of this nature.” He hopes that by the accumulation of testimonies - amounting to over a hundred and fifty different works - and above all by their comparison, his evidence will become “as complete as the nature of the thing will admit” (p. 16).

A good example of this active spirit of inquiry occurs in Millar’s inclusion of a description of polyandry, later praised by John MacLennan. This custom, alluded to by Montesquieu and Pufendorf, was sometimes criticized as entirely mythical, as in Simon-Nicolas-Henri Linguët’s sneers at the credulity of these historians. Millar, however, accepts the existence of “this unusual kind of polygamy” as soon as he finds that Strabo’s reports are corroborated by modern evidence (p. 66). Similarly, he does not hesitate to qualify the attractively simple theory according to which women gradually acquired more influence and status as societies became more “refined,” by showing that some early forms of social life are perfectly compatible with a strong element of female power (p. 68). Thus, for Millar theory is clearly not an end in itself, but rather a convenient way of grouping his “observations,” to quote the word used in the original title of his book. Consequently, one does not find in the Origin of the Distinction of Ranks the definitive statements that appear in the works of Smith, Rousseau, and Linguët. This is not to say that Millar refuses the benefit that can be derived from Smith’s theoretical efforts, both in stressing the role played by modes
of subsistence and in analyzing the connections between the principles of utility and authority. But Millar remains true above all to the spirit of Diderot and d’Alembert’s Encyclopédie, and in a sense can be said to emulate Goguet’s monumental De l’Origine des lois, des arts et des sciences (1758), in which all known societies are described, only adding to it the historical perspective and the focus that are lacking in the repetitive structure of Goguet’s systematic compilation.

The Origin of the Distinction of Ranks is thus no treatise of political or moral philosophy, nor a book of political economy but, in the author’s own words, a genuine “inquiry,” “intended to illustrate the natural history of mankind in several important articles” (p. 14). It should, therefore, be judged as such. Attention should certainly be paid, in particular, to the collection of “specimens” created by Millar in order to understand the anatomy of society. Not only does he consult the classic authors of ancient history, law, and philosophy such as Aristotle, Julius Caesar, Tacitus, and Justinian, but he also shows a keen interest in medieval history and literature, and a comprehensive knowledge of almost all treatises on natural jurisprudence. After Montesquieu, such an encyclopedic culture may be regarded as one of the prerequisites for any reflection on society, even if Rousseau, Ferguson, and Linguet seem to have been a little more sparing in the number of their quotations.

Millar is also faithful to Montesquieu’s example and, ultimately, to the true Enlightenment tradition, in his numerous references to sometimes very recent travel accounts, which testify to his constant search for new evidence of the “amazing diversity” of human behavior and institutions (p. 1). Although Adam Ferguson stressed the need “to collect facts, not to offer conjectures,” his practice sometimes contradicted his theory. While not entirely rejecting conjectures, Millar would probably agree with the natural historian’s approach as defined by Ferguson: “He admits, that his knowledge of the material system of the world consists in a collection of facts, or at most, in general tenets derived from particular observations and experiments. It is only in what relates to himself, and in matters the most important, and the most easily known, that he substitutes hypothesis instead of reality, and confounds the provinces of imagination and reason, of poetry and science.” (Essay, p. 2)

Far from limiting himself to purely factual descriptions of different peoples, however, Millar also resorts to the indirect allusions found in mythical literature, thus refusing to reject such a source in the name of Voltaire’s sometimes undiscerning rationalism. Ingenious socio-historical interpretations are then offered, not only of some passages of Homer, but also of the Amazons’ legend, or of the Athenian foundation myth (pp. 38, 63-64, 67-68). Similarly, Millar, while professing respect for the “extraordinary revelation from heaven” represented by the Lord’s “original institutions” (pp. 23-24), makes free use of the scriptures for a description of the Hebrews’ succession laws and marriage customs, their military values, and or their treatment of slaves (pp. 46-50, 182-85, 316-17). And his scope is as broad when it comes to other religions, with his observations on the Roman “coemptio” ceremony, on marriage among some North American Indian tribes, or on an initiatory ritual on Tahiti (pp. 54, 27, 37). Beliefs, traditions, social behavior are considered as emblematic of social organization patterns, and thus as part and parcel of the study of mankind.

What is known of Smith’s views on the progress of society, drawn mainly from his Lectures on Jurisprudence, tends to highlight his emphasis on the issues of economic subsistence and political power. This emphasis also appears in the best part of Millar’s works, but in the Origin of the Distinction of Ranks the psychological dimension of social changes probably appears more clearly. Indeed, perhaps because of Smith’s previous publication of The Theory of Moral Sentiments, the main passage of the Lectures on Jurisprudence in which Smith deals with the individual perception of motives for social behavior is the brilliant account of the “Natural wants and demands of mankind,” more particularly in the 1762-63 version (Lectures, pp. 334-39). Even here the question of the individual’s motives is raised and answered in relatively abstract terms, usually involving a general concept of “man,” whereas Millar constantly envisages the particular circumstances and individual responses. Even when Millar thinks he has hit on a more universal type of behavior, he will easily, by a process akin to Smithian sympathy, identify himself with his fellow human beings. For instance, in his description of the emergence of paternal, and hence political authority, he simply declares: “We naturally retain, after we are old, those habits of respect and submission, which we received in our youth; and we find it difficult to put ourselves upon a level with those persons whom we have long regarded as greatly our superiors” (p. 144).

In spite of this humble stance, or perhaps because of his frequent instinctive nearness to the objects described, Millar’s analyses are detailed enough to avoid the excessive abstraction of overschematic explanatory patterns, and they enable him to depict very slow and gradual moves involving a diversity of social, economic, and psychological factors. This careful, all-embracing approach can occasionally lead to an impression of a rather lengthy digression from, or dilution of, the point made, but on closer inspection, this method is essential to Millar’s mode of understanding society. A relatively brief example may be found in his description of the interwoven links between pasturage, acquisitiveness, and political authority: “The son, who inherits the estate of his father, is enabled to maintain an equal rank, at the same time that he preserves all the influence acquired by the former proprietor, which is daily augmented by the power of habit, and becomes more considerable as it passes from one generation to another. Hence that regard to genealogy and descent which we often meet with among those who have remained long in a pastoral state.” (p. 187) On the same subject, Adam Ferguson simply notes: “They unite in following leaders, who are distinguished by their fortunes and by the lustre of their birth” (Essay, p. 98). A
comparison between these two statements shows that what matters for Millar is the attempt to reconstruct from the available facts a plausible hypothesis concerning the mysterious dynamics of social history.

Of course, the question that should be raised now is whether this interpretation of the Origin of the Distinction of Ranks is not another anachronistic or “anticipatory” reading of Millar’s book, showing how it paves the way for the development of contemporary social sciences or how it lays the foundations for an empirical and resolutely interdisciplinary approach to man in his social and cultural context, both in “rude ages” and in more “refined” societies. As Michael Ignatieff points out, the interdisciplinary character of an eighteenth-century book is in any case a retrospective fiction, since the disciplines we know - focusing on the family, or social and economic organization and modes of government, or on the rendering of justice - had no separate existence then. But Hume’s statement, in its admirable simplicity, tends to mask some of the intricacies of the “progress” of man with its intertwining of political, economic, and moral issues. When Millar discusses the “improvement of arts and manufactures” and its ambivalent effects on individual freedom, he has to admit that, paradoxically, the government’s protection of the individual in a refined society leads, for economic and moral reasons, to the actual suppression of the rights it was supposed to guarantee (pp. 271-75). Here one might be tempted to underline the clash between civic humanism and economic liberalism, or the emphasis on unintended consequences, but these themes are only of secondary importance if we accept the argument that Millar was not primarily concerned with proposing a theoretical system, but was simply using existing explanatory schemes when he found them useful. What is perhaps more important in these pages is Millar’s obvious awareness - not demonstration - that no human factor can be considered in isolation, and that the study of social changes is based on the perception of shifting interactions rather than separate phenomena.

By a strange coincidence, in 1780 Diderot wrote in a sketchy description of his ideal “science de l’homme public” entitled “Des difficultés de l’économie politique”: “At first glance you believe that there is only one difficulty to overcome; but soon that difficulty leads to another, which in turn leads to yet another and so on ad infinitum; and you realize that you must either give up your task, or wholly comprehend the huge system of social order, lest you should come to an incomplete and faulty result. The data and the calculations vary according to the nature of the place, of its productions, its wealth, its resources, its links, its laws, its customs, its taste, its commerce and its manners. Who is the man well-educated enough to grasp all these elements? Whose mind is judicious enough to give each of these only its due appreciation? It might be daring to suggest that Millar - well-educated as he undoubtedly was - had indeed grasped all these elements or overcome all these difficulties, or again that he had even dreamt of “comprehending the huge system of social order”; but in his relentless curiosity about man in his social context, and in his obvious awareness of the complex nature of his task, he certainly came near to Diderot’s ideal. He did so by always avoiding the dangers of a superficial and simplistic theoretical answer to the questions he raised, and by never ceasing to believe what he had written in the Preface to his first edition of 1771: “thus, by real experiments, not by abstracted theories, human nature is unfolded.”

As suggested earlier, in an important sense Millar remains the intellectual heir of Montesquieu, Hume, Kames, and Smith, in the sense that for him legal and political history cannot be studied in isolation from the social, technological, economic, and psychological development of mankind. But his systematic, almost scientific eagerness for cross-examined evidence also reminds the reader of Goguet’s encyclopedic curiosity, and of the principles laid out by Buffon for his Natural History, so that Millar could even be said to announce Diderot’s great, albeit unachieved, plans for the “science of public man.”

Notes


10. See Smith, Lectures on Jurisprudence, 14, 459, and passim (on modes of subsistence), and 318, 401-2 (on utility and authority).

Editor's Note: A version of this paper was presented in July 1990 at the ECSSS conference on “Glasgow and the Enlightenment” at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.

Lord Monboddo on Rhetoric:
An Unpublished Letter

James R. Irvine
Colorado State University

James Burnett, Lord Monboddo (1714-1799) is best known to students of composition, rhetoric, and criticism for his Origin and Progress of Language (1774-92). In this treatise and other writings, Monboddo provided the late Scottish Enlightenment with a classically predisposed doctrine of subjects ranging from metaphysics to style, logic, and composition. His views stand in sharp contrast to Baconian and Lockean doctrines that influenced the “new rhetorics” of George Campbell, Hugh Blair, Adam Smith, James Beattie, Lord Kames, and others.

In an unpublished “Letter on Rhetorick” located in the National Library of Scotland (MS 24,504, fols. 77-80), Monboddo advocates Aristotelian rhetoric at a time when psychological and belletristic approaches were predominant in the theory and pedagogy of rhetoric, and when the major classical alternative to these approaches was a loosely adapted neo-Ciceronian doctrine grounded in the Latin officia. Monboddo calls teachers back to the clarity of the Aristotelian model and its attention to the three essentials of “matter,” “diction,” and “pronunciation.” Of these three, Monboddo finds matter to be of greatest importance. However, he identifies diction, consisting of grammar and composition, to be the subject treated most directly in lectures on rhetoric. Thus, he finds in Aristotle a simple and useful alternative to the more elaborate doctrines generated by the advocates of “new” approaches to discourse. Moreover, he finds a powerful argument for the union of rhetoric and composition, and he insists on their union for the teacher of rhetoric.

The “Letter on Rhetorick,” unfortunately, is unsigned and undated, though it appears in Monboddo’s handwriting, with a watermark similar to Heawood 3148, an English paper of the mid-eighteenth century. There are no marks indicating that the letter was posted. Indeed, it appears to be a draft of correspondence to an individual who had written for assistance in preparing a course of lectures on rhetoric. Monboddo corresponded widely with Scottish men of letters, and the letter may have been addressed to a colleague inclined to the “new” thinking, such as Smith, Campbell, or Blair. On the other hand, it may have been addressed to an individual whose ideas on rhetoric were directly subject to influence, specifically his friend Thomas Blacklock, the blind poet who apparently prepared lectures on rhetoric but did not deliver them. Although the actual recipient of Monboddo’s letter remains a mystery, his message to that individual is quite clear and reinforces his published views on the importance of classical study.

Because of its potential interest to students of Enlightenment rhetoric, Monboddo’s “Letter” is published here by the kind permission of the trustees of the National Library of Scotland. It appears in its original form, with brackets used to identify pagination from the original manuscript, to mark insertions that are essential for clarity, and to reference omissions resulting from fading. The fourth paragraph has been rearranged into three shorter paragraphs for purposes of structural clarity.
To show you that I did not take your letter amis I employ the first Leisure I have had since I received it to answer it; it will give me a great deal of Pleasure if I can put you into a right Method of Studying the ancient Books upon the Subject of the Art which you profess to teach; if your Application were only to the modern Books, I should not give myself the Trouble of directing you because I know you could get no good by them, and thus much hurt, that you would imagine you learned something when you learned nothing, and so the Fruits of your Studies would be vanity & conceit instead of knowledge.

In the first place it behoves you to know that what you want to learn yourself and teach others is an Art, the consequence of which is, that it is not to be learned by casual observation or [illegible] Practice but by regular Study & Progression from the first Principles or Elements, according to a certain order & Method; and after the Rules of the Art are in this manner learned, then they must be applied to Practice, both by studying the best Models and composing yourself. The this Course of Study may not be necessary for every Practitioner of the Art, yet I hold it to be of indispensable Necessity for every Teacher who must have learned himself the Rules of the Art, in the manner I have mentioned, before he can, with any Success, communicate them to others, for teaching in everything requires a more perfect knowledge than Practice.

When I say that Rhetoric is an Art I would not be understood of every part of it [2] for of the three parts of which it consists, I mean the Matter, the Diction and the Pronunciation, the last was not, in the Days of Aristotle, nor is not yet reduced to an Art, and perhaps never can, because it depends almost altogether upon natural Feelings and bodily organs and is more to be learned by the Ear than by any Art or Science, yet this is the Branch of the Art which has [to] be for the greatest Influence on the People for whom the art is designed. For it happens in this, as in many other things that the Judgment of the wise and learned is directly opposite to that of the People, for the learned rank the Parts of Rhetoric in the order in which I have mentioned them, giving the first place, without any Doubts, to the Matter, the second to the Diction and the last only to the Pronunciation or action, whereas the People reverse that order esteeming the Pronunciation most, the Diction next, but the matter considering least of all. For this Reason Aristotle observes that the Players, in his Time, were more esteemed in Athens than the Poets, and the Speaking or acting Orators more than the writing.

This part of Rhetorick I suppose you will not meddle with at all, but will refer your Scholars to Mr. Digges and Mr. Ward, in this Branch of the Art. But what you will labour chiefly is, the next Thing in popular Estimation, viz. The Diction, for as to the Matter it will be too difficult for the most of your Hearers and perhaps for yourself till you have gone through a very regular and severe Course of Study of Aristotle's Works, which will take in not only his [3] three Books of Rhetorick, but his Eight Books of Topics or Dialectic and I doubt for understanding these perfectly it will be necessary to read also his Book of Categories & Interpretation, together with a good part of his Analytikes, for to these Aristotle refers you, in his Rhetorick, as well as to the others I have mentioned. Aristotle and the Philosophers of his School differ from the modern in almost every Thing, but on nothing more than this That they studied not only what was certain and demonstrable in every Subject, but what was probable, that is what was vulgarly and popularly believed and they exercised themselves in disputing on both sides of a Question, by which means, when they had a mind to treat any Thing in a popular or esoteric way, as they called it, they have a copiousness of Argument, which is hardly to be found even among the orators by Profession. This method of Disputation Aristotle who possessed the Art of making Arts (if I may so speak) more than any man, that is, the Art of collecting scattered Rules & observations upon any art into one System, reduced to an Art called by him Dialectic, by the Means of which without being learned in any one Thing, you may dispute upon every Thing, provided only you make a sufficient collection of the opinions of others upon that subject, which are the Topicks from whence you are to draw your arguments.

This Art we [4] ignorantly despise now a days, not knowing that this Nation is now and has been for many years in a great Measure governed by it, for do you think that those orators in the House of Commons who have in former Times and do now direct our affairs are Men learned in any one Art or Science, They most certainly are not, and all that they profess is a natural Faculty of speaking improved by occasional Practice & observation, for it does not deserve the Name of Art not being acquired by teaching & regular study;

And indeed it is evident from the Nature of the thing that where the People are Judges of any Thing, they can only be persuaded by Arguments of the Rhetorical or dialectick kind because they are not capable of being taught any Thing scientifically. Before I leave this Article of the Matter I must observe a vulgar mistake among us that the art of Rhetorick is addressed to the Imagination and Passions, a mistake which has a very bad Effect on our practice of the Art, for from hence it is that our oratorical compositions are so loaded with Epithets, bold Metaphors, Similies & other poetical Figures and that our orators paint & describe when they should reason, but the Truth is that this is but a small part of the Art and which if indifferently used renders the composition guile, declamatory and even puerile. In the best orations extant, I mean those of Demonsthenes, there is but little of it and even good Poetry does not bear a great deal of it. Witness the Poetry of Milton where I maintain there is less of passions and Froth than in the Declarations of Wm. Pitt.

I will suppose therefore that the principal subject of your Lectures will be the Diction, which is subdivided into two parts, The Words and the Composition of these Words, for the Understanding of this part of Rhetorick, there is another Art absolutely necessary, I mean the Art of Grammar the Study of which you should earnestly
I must not be surprised that I have recommended to your Peruisall on this Subject only Greek Books, I really know none even in Latin, and much less in any modern Language, from which you can get any good Instruction; I cannot judge of Quinquilian because I never read him, but I am persuaded you will do as well to learn from his Masters as from himself; as for Cicero you may profit by reading him after you are taught but he will not teach you, and in generall I do not find that any of the Arts and Sciences [7] are to be learned in the Latin Language, So that a mere Latin Scholar has always appeared to me very contemptible.

You must not be surprised that I have recommended to your Scholars, and you yourself should read as much at least of some Greek Grammarians as to make you thoroughly acquainted with the Terms of Art in that Language, without which you will not be able to understand what the Greek Rhetoricians say upon the Subject of Style, for this purpose I would recommend to you Theodorus' Grammar, [10] After which I know nothing so proper for you to read as Eustathius [5] Commentary upon Homer, [11] at least the first five or six Books of the Iliad, where you will at once learn Grammar, Poetry, Rhetoric & Antiquities, and at the same time to read with Understand & Judgment the finest Poem in the World; And this, with what you may learn from Harris's Book [7] which I think I lent you, will make you sufficiently learned for the Purpose of Rhetoric in the Grammaticall Art, which you are not to despise as the Knowledge of Words and Sounds only, according to the foolish Notion of some People, but are to respect as one of the most usefull and perhaps the most ingenious Art belonging to Men and which is said to be the Art of Words with no more Propriety than Statuery or Architecture could be called the Art of Stone for as these Arts have stone for their Subject so Grammar has words.

For what is commonly called the Figures of Rhetorick whether single Words or of Composition I know nothing shorter or better than that Life of Homer, which is ascribed to the Halicarnassian, [10] This I would advise you to read even before Eustathius. As to what concerns Composition singly there is nothing extant so good as two Treatises of the Halicarnassian, [15] one inscribed of the Composition of Words, where he examines every thing relating to the sound of Language with the most minute Exactness going back to the very Letters or Elementall Sounds; The other is that [6] which he has written upon the Stile of Demonsthenes, a very long and elaborate Treatise, wherein he has very clearly shown and illustrated by Examples not from Demonsthenes only but from other great Authors that from the Composition more than from the choice of Words, arises the Difference of Style as to high[,] low or middle. These two works you should read over and over again with the utmost care and attention, And then you will be prepared to read with profit what Aristotle says of Style in his third Book of Rhetorick, with which I advise you to conclude your studys on this head, for there if I am not mistaken you will find everything that you had read before summed up and expressed in a more masterly and philosophicall a manner, and some things supplied that were wanting you will find there for Example defined that most indefinable Thing called Will which I doubt hardly any Critic or Philosopher since the days of Aristotle would have defined.

You must not be surprised that I have recommended to your Peruisall on this Subject only Greek Books, I really know none even in Latin, and much less in any modern Language, from which you can get any good Instruction; I cannot judge of Quintillian because I never read him, but I am persuaded you will do as well to learn from his Masters as from himself; as for Cicero you may profit by reading him after you are taught but he will not teach you, and in generall I do not find that any of the Arts and Sciences [7] are to be learned in the Latin Language, So that a mere Latin Scholar has always appeared to me very contemptible.

Notes

3. Aristotle identifies the "natural order" of rhetoric as "what gives things their persuasiveness" (matter), "their arrangement by style" (diction), and "delivery" (pronunciation). Rhetoric iii, 1. 2.
4. Cf. ibid., iii, 1. 5.
5. Cf. ibid., iii, 1. 4.
6. West Digges (1720-1786) was a prominent actor of the London and Edinburgh stage, noted for his "extravagant gesture and quaint elocution" (DNB). John Ward (1679-1758) was an Edinburgh University graduate who favored classical rhetoric in his lectures at Gresham College. See his Four Essays upon the English Language (London, 1758) and A System of Oratory (London, 1759).
7. Aristotle identifies rhetoric as the "counterpart of dialectic," since both are methods for disputing opinions. Rhetoric i, 1. 14; 2. 7-9.
8. Cf. ibid., i, 1. 12.
11. Cf. ibid., i, 1. 12.
12. This is a reference to the emphasis on literary style found in the period's belletristic rhetoric.
13. Theorodus Studita, works found in J. P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca.
15. James Harris, Hemès (London, 1751).
16. Herodotus, Histories, or the spurious Contest of Hesiod and Homer.

Why should intellectuals get all the credit for the Scottish Enlightenment? Surely some recognition should go to the patrons, without whose moral, political, and financial support their work would not have been possible. Roger Emerson has made this point in earlier articles; his new book provides him with ample opportunity to pursue it further. The two Aberdeen universities, King’s and Marischal Colleges, had much in common, despite the Old Town/New Town division. Certainly one would be hard-put to argue that differences in the professoriate came from obvious differences in cultural heritage, religion, or geography. Yet King’s remains an isolated backwater throughout the eighteenth century, while Marischal could boast of such Enlightenment luminaries as Thomas Reid, John Gregory, and James Beattie. The difference, Emerson’s book suggests, lies in the degree to which the professoriate was responsive to outside influences, especially Scotland’s political management. King’s could, and did, stave off outside influences in professorial appointments, but in doing so it also staved off the most exciting intellectual currents of the day. Marischal, which could not and did not, absorbed and profited from the polite and improving vision of its patrons.

To illustrate this theme, Emerson gives us a detailed description of the patronage activities at both King’s and Marischal from the 1690s through 1800. Chapter 1 establishes the rules of the game governing the interaction of professors and patrons. Chapters 2-4 explore the impact on each university of the most important political currents in Scotland through 1761: Jacobitism and its purge, the “Squadrone lords,” the first duke of Montrose and first duke of Roxburghe, and the “Argathelian interest,” led by the second and third dukes of Argyle. During this period, though parliamentary concerns were never absent from professorial appointments, the great men who controlled them “deliberately appointed men whom it is easy to call enlightened.” They did so, Emerson argues, because they “shared the tolerant, secular, pragmatic and scientistic values of the Enlightenment which they did so much to institutionalise and to perpetuate in Scotland” (p. 78).

After the death of the third duke of Argyle, however, no comparably enlightened political manager appeared. For a period of time, the Aberdeen universities went their own way, for better or worse. Control of professorships at King’s remained in the hands of the inbred and faction-ridden professoriate, with the exception of the brief and salutary period of Lord Deskford’s chancellorship. Marischal, in contrast, had the good fortune and good sense to elect as chancellor Lord Bute, who “gave the professors relative freedom from government intervention but . . . was known to expect the nominations of qualified and worthy men” (p. 89). The appointments made in this period are the subject of chapter 5, which closes with a brief account of the universities under Henry Dundas’s political management from 1785 to 1800. Emerson appears to have been much less interested in the period of the Dundas supremacy than in the preceding one hundred years, perhaps because Dundas, in contrast to previous powerful patrons, put “a commitment to Tory political principles” above Enlightenment values (p. 100).

Emerson has based this book on research into the circumstances surrounding the 450 professorial appointments made at the Scottish universities between 1690 and 1800. Some of the information he has gleaned is summarized in the many tables presented in the appendices. Though fascinating, the information is more relevant to the more comprehensive analysis of the Scottish professoriate he has in progress (p. xiii) than it is to the present book. Still, what a wealth of detail concerning the workings of patronage networks Emerson’s research reveals! And what a wealth of detail Scotland’s great power brokers had to keep in mind in order to manage effectively their local constituency! No request was too small if it led to political advantage: witness the earl of Ilay’s provision of a year’s pension for the widow of Principal Blackwell of Marischal, a librarianship for one son, and a bursary to Glasgow University for another. Kinship networks were complicated and powerful enough in shaping alliances for and against particular appointments to gratify any anthropologist. At King’s, one professor, George Gordon, was the son and son-in-law of two professors, the brother of two others, related to yet another, and the father of three more (pp. 143-44). Even at Marischal, the professoriate was well-linked by family as well as collegial ties (pp. 145-46).

Not all readers will be convinced that the patronage Emerson describes always produced the best man for the job. For example, Principal Blackwell’s son was awarded the librarianship despite Colin MacLaurin’s assessment that he was “but of mean parts” (p. 84). Nor is it clear whether it was the patrons, or the intellectuals, who set the agenda for the enlightened values both wished to promote. But this account of the Aberdeen universities will be read with interest by anyone wishing to place the Scottish universities in their political context. Such readers will look forward to Emerson’s further exploration of this topic as well.

*Lisa Rosner, Stockton State College*

Though produced for the bicentenary of the *Life of Johnson,* this collection of fourteen articles includes studies of Boswell’s journals, his letters, his legal career, and his book on Corsica, along with five articles on the *Life.* Boswell’s relationship with Johnson is frequently discussed, but so are Boswell’s significant, formative relationships with a number of other men. All the articles are interesting and many are remarkably strong; and anyone who reads more than one will find certain key topics—like Boswell’s melancholy, or his quest for a definitive “self,” or his “style” in writing and living, or the Edinburgh/London (or Auchinleck/London) polarity—examined within different contexts by writers who often disagree with each other in their assumptions or conclusions or both.

In my limited space I want to comment briefly on each of the articles rather than more extensively on those I find most intriguing. David Daiches’s “Introduction: Boswell’s Ambiguities” weaves mention of most articles in the collection into remarks on Boswell’s “interestingness” to modern readers. Thomas Crawford’s “Boswell and the Rhetoric of Friendship” usefully contrasts Boswell’s self-consciously literary letters to the Hon. Andrew Erskine (a “companion”) with his simpler, more intimate letters to John Johnston of Grange and William Temple (both “friends”). The rich quotations encourage further reading; and Crawford’s comments on Boswell’s sense of audience as he writes letters and journals can be usefully extended to his other writings, especially his essays, and perhaps qualified by focus on the *Hebrides* journal that he wrote initially for Johnson. At the start of “Scottish Divines and Legal Lairds: Boswell’s Scots Presbyterian Identity,” Richard B. Sher outlines the conflict between Moderate Presbyterians and the Popular party, then plausibly explains why Boswell in 1772-73 writes against William Robertson and the Moderates by examining the attitudes of three men closely associated with Boswell: his tutor, John Dunn (1724-92) and two lawyers who shared and nurtured Boswell’s lifestyle in Edinburgh, Andrew Crosbie (1736-85) and John MacLaurin (1734-96). Sher’s substantial essay augments the familiar drama of Boswell “struggling to satisfy or defy his (real or adopted) father” with the image of “a young professional man associating with, and learning from, his slightly older and more accomplished colleagues and friends” (p. 49). In “Boswell and the Scotticism,” Pat Rogers surveys concern among some Scots during Boswell’s lifetime about their diction and pronunciation, charts Boswell’s interest in this issue, and sensibly speculates that a tension between the “unscottified Boswell [who] lived in the prose world of London” and “the scottified Boswell [who] clung on to the poetic world of Auchinleck” (p. 66) informs numerous transactions between Johnson and Boswell. The final piece in the section on “Boswell and Eighteenth-Century Scottish Culture,” Joan H. Pittcock’s “Boswell as Critic,” discusses Boswell’s attitude toward experience and the self, his assumptions about language and audience, his sensibility. Pittcock strives to “pinpoint elements in Boswell’s critical perspective which have a decidedly modern quality” and to illustrate that Boswell’s “best work has all the appearance of openness to character and text which characterize much of our interest in fictional worlds” (p. 73).

Four articles comprise the section on “Contexts for the *Life of Johnson.*” In “Boswell’s Liberty-loving Account of Corsica and the Art of Travel Literature,” Thomas M. Curley deftly sets Boswell’s book in the context of eighteenth-century travel writing, especially Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey,* then establishes Rousseau’s influence on this early book, and persuasively argues that Boswell came to identify his own experience and hope with the Corsicans’ struggle for mature independence under Paoli’s leadership. Gordon Turnbull’s “Boswell and Sympathy: The Trial and Execution of John Reid” brilliantly links Boswell’s guilty identification with Reid and other criminals to his “emotional swerve away from . . . the ethos of an Edinburgh judicial establishment, in which language had the capacity to incarcerate and destroy, into . . . a world in which language might sustain human significance by conferring a textual immortality” (p. 104). There are some shrewd comments on Hume in Richard B. Schwartz’s “Boswell and Hume: the Deathbed Interview,” and some accurate reporting of Boswell’s activities after Hume died; but the argument seems misdirected. Because on 17 December 1775, after “really a good chat” about Hume’s early life, Boswell thought about writing Hume’s life, Schwartz labors to establish that the “deathbed interview” is deficient as part of a “Life of Hume,” and that Boswell was not qualified to write this biography. But the rest of his journal—especially the entry for 20 March 1776—indicates that Boswell only momentarily thought about writing Hume’s life; so his account of the final interview on 7 July 1776 is best read as part of Boswell’s evolving autobiography. In “Philosophical Melancholy: Style and Self in Boswell and Hume,” Susan Manning grapples with key features of Boswellian self-construction, sympathetically charting his lifelong efforts to record his whole self, including his melancholy, and in the process to move beyond melancholy. The contrast of Boswell with Hume is illuminating.

I find the section of articles on the *Life of Johnson* to be the most impressive. Responding to Donald J. Greene’s claim that Boswell’s *Life* has little value for the period before 1763, John J. Burke, Jr., surveys all the earlier accounts of Johnson’s relationship with Lord Chesterfield in “The Originality of Boswell’s Version of Johnson’s Quarrel with Lord Chesterfield,” masterfully demonstrating the superiority of Boswell’s version and our absolute need to have it to understand this significant episode in Johnson’s life. Then Burke suggestively considers why it was Boswell who first saw the importance of Johnson’s self-confident defiance of aristocratic patronage. In “Self-restraint and Self-display in the Authorial Comments in the *Life of Johnson*,” Marlies K. Danziger uses Boswell’s journal, the manuscript for the *Life,* and the changes Boswell made in the second edition to show that
Boswell was in fact remarkably restrained on some matters that troubled him as he was writing the Life, like the death of his wife and his failure at the English bar. Paul J. Korshin’s “Johnson’s Conversation in Boswell’s Life of Johnson” raises important questions about the accuracy or authenticity of the conversations recorded in the Life, and makes suggestive use of Mrs. Piozzi’s Anecdotes and Thomas Campbell’s Diary to speculate about the tone of Johnson’s actual talk. Some of the specific items cited from the Life as probably “hearsay” (p. 184) are misrepresented, however. In addition, the speculation that Boswell might have invented for his book about Corsica the Johnsonian saying about philosophers who go “to milk the bull,” since “there was absolutely no way that anyone could gainsay his accuracy” (p. 176), forgets that Boswell expected Johnson to read this book; and Korshin’s discussion of Boswell’s accuracy might be enriched by noticing how Johnson twice helped Boswell fill in blanks in his report of Johnson’s conversation (12 October 1773; 10 April 1778), and how he called the Hebrides journal “a very exact picture of his life” (3 October 1773), which “might be printed, were the subject fit for printing” (19 September). Donna Heiland’s “Remembering the Hero in Boswell’s Life of Johnson” is a richly stimulating study of authority in Boswell’s text. Focusing on the interplay between text and footnotes after Boswell formally exits from the Life (once he gets to November 1784), Heiland uses the host-parasite model to discuss the relationships between Boswell and Johnson, between Boswell and his rivals, and between Boswell and his readers. In “Truth and Artifice in Boswell’s Life of Johnson,” Greg Clingham uses Johnson’s own analysis of truth in literature to suggest a corrective to the debate about the truth or accuracy of Boswell’s Life. He illustrates the sort of “general nature” missing in Boswell’s Johnson by contrasting the famous meeting with Wilkes with key scenes involving Shakespeare’s (and Johnson’s) Falstaff; then he speculates on the psychic roots of Boswell’s achievement and limitations. He aptly concludes his article, and the collection of articles he has assembled, by wondering whether we read Boswell as his Boswell read Johnson, or as his Johnson read Boswell.


I noticed two errata: on p. 69, endnote 7 for Pat Rogers’s article is not printed; and on p. 81, line 3, “IV, 56” should read “V, 56.”

John B. Radner, George Mason University


This book, the second volume in the series “ECSSS Studies in Eighteenth Century Scotland,” is not only a much-awaited and welcome addition to Ossian studies but also a substantial contribution to many other areas. It brings together scholars with expertise in Celtic studies, English and German literature, and the history and philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment, who throw new light on many facets of both the Poems of Ossian and their creator, James Macpherson. Use of the term “creator” might well bring down on me the wrath of the editor of this collection, Howard Gaskill, who, in a seminal article in Comparative Criticism in 1986, made a powerful case for jettisoning much of the judgmental and indeed hostile approach to Macpherson as arch-forgery, which has been responsible for the neglect of these key texts of the mid-eighteenth century. Five years later, Gaskill clearly believes that the case for serious consideration of Macpherson must continue to be made. In a trenchant Introduction, he speaks of the “virtual conspiracy of silence” which still prevails, particularly in assessing the influence of Ossian on some of the greatest European poets, notably the German Romantics.

Certainly, it is curious how little impact the serious work on the poems (such as Derick Thomson’s pioneering work of 1952, The Gaelic Sources of Macpherson’s “Ossian”) has had on contemporary attitudes. Gaskill points to the neglect of Ossianic influence, but even more crucial, it seems to me, is the absence of any major literary study of the poetry itself. For example, a trowl through the M.L.A. International Bibliography for 1981-91 elicits forty-two entries under the categories of “Ossian” and “Ossianic.” Some of these deal with earlier Gaelic tradition; many focus on Macpherson, but mainly either on the forgery controversy or on the question of the influence of the poems on other writers. Only three entries are concerned with the literary analysis of the poems (one of these is in Esperanto). This imbalance is reflected in the volume under review also: roughly speaking, three contributions (and the editor’s Introduction) deal with the question of authenticity; five focus on reception and influence; and only one actually examines in any detail the structures, language, and motifs of the poems.

In this, John Dwyer explains the traditional imbalance in terms of the controversy over authenticity and the propensity of the cultural historian (predominant in the new Ossian studies) to recruit the Poems of Ossian “to support cultural explanations of the development of Scottish society.” I have to plead guilty to both crimes, having used Macpherson in a study of Irish and Scottish antiquarianism in the eighteenth century, but without due regard to the actual texts. Dwyer uses them mainly to illustrate their place in the literature of sentimentalism, but he also provides proof that the editor is correct in his conclusion that the battle to establish the untenability of the forgery charge, given today’s knowledge of Macpherson’s sources and of eighteenth-century literary practice, has not yet been won. For cropping up in Dwyer’s admirable and sophisticated analysis are throwaway references to the
Poems as “spurious documents” (itself a characteristically Macphersonian phrase) and their author/translator as a “fabricator.”

In contrast to this, Donald Meek continues the work begun by Derick Thomson in investigating the Gaelic roots of the Ossian poems, in particular the influence of the ballad tradition. Meek argues that this genre was constantly changing and re-fashioning itself, mixing poetry with prose and fusing new with older compositions - much as Macpherson did in Fingal and Temora. Meek is also concerned to assess the specifically Scottish tradition from which Macpherson drew, rather than merely pointing to the “common cultural inheritance of Ireland and Gaelic Scotland.” He then challenges the “view that [Macpherson] was utilising exclusively ‘Irish’ ballads in his writings,” which was the dominant Irish response to the Ossian poems in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. His analysis of Macpherson’s borrowings from specifically Scottish ballads is fascinating, but his rebuttal of long-abandoned Irish claims that Macpherson was a thief reinforces the impression that this volume is carrying on old controversies, as well as moving into new and more interesting areas.

Richard Sher focuses on what he calls the “noisiest and nastiest episode” of the “Ossian wars,” involving Thomas Percy, author of Reliques of English Poetry, who accused Adam Ferguson of deliberately misleading him into believing that the poems were genuine. Sher disentangles the byzantine details of the dispute as it unfolded in the press, and in trying to reconstruct what actually happened, shows that the charge against Ferguson was false. The extent to which English skepticism about the Poems was motivated by national prejudice is admirably brought out here. But once again, the need to discover the truth of the charge somewhat blurs the focus of the essay.

David Raynor’s account of David Hume’s efforts to promote the Ossian poems as genuine also deals with the theme of national prejudice. Hume urged Hugh Blair, Macpherson’s main backer, to procure testimonials from the Highlands that would support the case. He also was active in Paris in championing their cause and only much later came to reject them as false. Blair is the subject of Steven Rizza’s chapter, in essence another “rescue mission,” similar to that which Gaskill performed for Macpherson. Rizza shows how Blair’s Critical Dissertation, printed in all the collected editions of Ossian, skillfully reconciled his own primitivist view of early poetry as the product of “untutored genius” with the undoubted “refined sentiment” of Macpherson, making it a fine example of “state of the art” eighteenth-century literary criticism.

J. V. Price examines the strategies used to include the Ossian poems in the literary canon, and why they failed. He argues that Ossian had many of the attributes which are important in canon formation, including in particular the essential characteristics of stability and innovation. Price relies mainly on the traditional argument that its “dubious authenticity” caused readers to reject it, and argues that had Macpherson “owned up” to his true role in their creation, they might have been accepted.

Uwe Böker deals with the reception of the Ossian poems in Europe, focusing on the mechanics of translating and book publishing. He charts the difficulties facing European translators, first of all in getting access to the original English editions of Ossian, and then in marketing their product. These problems do much to explain the slow evolution of the response to Macpherson’s poems - first as texts of Enlightenment sentiment in countries such as America, Germany, and France, and later in Poland, Hungary, and Scandinavia as examples of full-blown Romanticism. By contrast, the American reception, in Paul deGategno’s analysis, focused on virtue. He examines Thomas Jefferson’s response to the poems, and in particular his identification with Ossian the bard, in his observance of duty, sincerity of purpose, and tenderness of affection. DeGategno provides the additional service of analyzing Jefferson’s favorite poem, “Carthon,” although not adequately.

The failure of this volume, in spite of its many strengths, to deal directly with the poems is also apparent in Fiona Stafford’s key contribution on the impact of Macpherson on the English Romantics, up until now accepted but never analyzed. She shows how Wordsworth’s curious denial of any Ossianic influence was paradoxically a symptom of its significant extent, and was due to Wordsworth’s worries about his own literary reputation in the face of the growing popularity of Sir Walter Scott’s Minstrelsy. Indeed, the insecurity of English writers from Johnson to Wordsworth and beyond, shown in their hostility to Macpherson as a representative of encroaching Scottish cultural dominance, is a theme running through many of these essays. Stafford also deals with the elements of the poems that were most attractive to the Romantics, and in particular with the figure of Ossian the bard, who could be read both as a “Romantic hero” clinging to the “values of a lost age” and as a “symbol of lonely despair” - a blind bard, whose poetry is unheard since he is “the last of his race.” The Poems of Ossian were a kind of “escapist fiction” for the Romantics, providing thrills without threat - such as, for example, the use of ghosts and spirits, which heightened the image of Ossian as a symbol of grief.

In dealing with the knotty problem of influence, Stafford has also to attempt to come to grips with the Ossian poems, in order to point out the elements which were subsequently borrowed, but has not the space here to do so adequately. Among the many lessons to be drawn from this excellent volume is the pressing need for a full literary study of the Ossian poems, which will also provide the groundwork for cultural historians and others to get the most out of these texts. Fortunately, Howard Gaskill and Fiona Stafford are at present preparing an edition of the poems. Once this appears, there will be little excuse for studies that focus on Macpherson’s Ossian as merely an “episode in literature.”

Clare O’Halloran, University College, Cork

Spencer J. Pack gives the impression of having been stung into writing this short book by having seen one Adam Smith tie too many round the necks of supporters of Ronald Reagan. Pack combines an overview of Smith's work with argument against the idea that Smith is appropriately to be understood as the patron saint of laissez faire capitalism or of "supply side" economics. He offers a summary of and a commentary upon Smith's argument in *The Wealth of Nations*, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, and the *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, together with a discussion of the bearing of his ideas on rhetoric and on explanation for the style of his writings. He pauses, in his presentation, to highlight aspects of Smith's work that would come as a surprise if one's only source on Smith had been conservative ideologues. Two chapters deal explicitly with issues of laissez faire and regressive taxation, and character formation.

This volume gives a useful overview of Smith's work. Pack discusses material outside the *Wealth of Nations* and *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. There are lots of nice quotes, and it was refreshing to have, as one's guide in such an enterprise, a writer who is not a cheerleader for economic liberalism. I enjoyed reading the book. But I'm doubtful if such a guide to Smith is really needed (especially at a cost of $50). And there is also not much here on Smith's approach to economy and society, which would come as a surprise to those who know the work of Viner, Reisman, and Heilbroner.

Pack's perspective is that of a slightly radical, late twentieth-century economist, who reads Smith with one eye upon current issues. We get rather a lot of Keynes; there are references to Sraffa and to works in Marxian political economy, and Smith is treated as a theorist of "capitalism." Pack refers to some important historically-orientated writers on Smith, including Knud Haakonssen, Istvan Honet, and Donald Winch. But his concern is not with Smith in his historical context.

In his interpretation of Smith, Pack places great emphasis upon the four-stages theory. He stresses the way in which Smith sometimes criticizes regulation as outdated. And he suggests that the *Wealth of Nations* should be understood as pertaining to the fourth stage - for Pack, "capitalism" - in a way that leaves open the possibility of a fifth stage of society, in which Pack would place us. Here, growth would be no longer our concern, and "perhaps it is . . . time to put new rules and regulations on economic self-interest and greed" (p. 174). However, Pack does not say enough about this "fifth stage" to make extended discussion possible. And he does not assess the case against seeing the four-stage theory as central to the *Wealth of Nations*.

But what of Pack's battle against the ties? As a some-time wearer of such a tie myself (albeit one who took it off when it became popular among the politicians), I am uncowed. I will conclude by explaining why.

Smith had some harsh things to say about commercial society and some of the major actors within it. He was also concerned that within such a society, moral ideals of a "civic humanist" character, which Smith appreciated as having some force, would not flourish. But (as Pack notes) Smith thought commercial society to be morally preferable to the alternatives that then seemed open. It offered the prospect of wealth - and its diffusion - and of a freedom that could extend to all citizens.

If one turns from Smith to issues of political economy today, there seems to me every reason to avoid the kind of move toward regulation that Pack seems to favor. For given the shift from the political system of Smith's day to pluralist democracy, there looks to me every reason to avoid extending the scope of government, just because of the way in which legislators and regulatory authorities are open to capture by sectional interests. Accordingly, insofar as one can talk of a "Smithian" approach to contemporary issues, there seems to me a good case for identifying it with an approach that is centered around limited government and the rule of law, and that is informed in its view of government by a moderate application of public choice theory.

To conclude, Pack himself says: "If, for Smith, the choice is between rules and regulations on the economy put forth by and for the powerful, versus no rules and regulations, then Smith is for laissez faire" (p. 63). In my view it still is, and so am I.

Jeremy Shearmur, Australian National University


In 1941, Norman Kemp Smith's *The Philosophy of David Hume* appeared. A central thesis of Kemp Smith's interpretation is that Hume came to his radically "new scene of thought" by way of reflection upon Hutcheson's moral philosophy, in particular the notion that moral judgments are not the production of analytical reason, but rather arise from our sensitive and passionate nature. But neither Kemp Smith nor his intellectual descendants seemed to be able to find a way to harmonize fully the scathing, skeptical critiques of book 1 of the *Treatise of Human Nature* with the more naturalistic, constructive, and optimistic books 2 and 3. Are Hume's skeptical
arguments convincing? If so, how can books 2 and 3 be justifiable? Should we, like Beauchamp and Rosenberg, take the skepticism seriously, even at the price of undermining much of what we thought could pass as knowledge? Or should we take the naturalistic approach, and read the skepticism of book 1 as sustained irony? Or should we, like David Fate Norton, regard Hume as bifurcated - skeptical about metaphysical knowledge, including the self and the external world, but confident about moral knowledge?

Annette Baier begins her profound study of Hume with keen reflection on the nature of the skepticism in the closing pages of book 1. Belief in external existence has been traced back to a fiction of the imagination. Furthermore, it is a belief that can only be held through carelessness and inattention. Even worse, belief in a self has been reduced to an intellectual quagmire from which traditional reason is unable to extricate itself. In despair, Hume’s narrator alternates between pathological, skeptical gloom and the thought of simply burning all his papers and abandoning reflective philosophy altogether.

Baier’s central thesis is that while book 1 is justifiably and intentionally skeptical with regard to the abilities of reason, in its traditional understanding, Hume’s thesis is not that we should (or could) become skeptics, but rather that we should reconsider and enlarge our notions of “reason” and “justifiability.” In a subtle (unintentionally subtle?) way, the despair of Hume’s narrator at the close of book 1, Baier argues, opens the door to Hume’s constructive answer: we regain our sanity, practical and theoretical, when we reexamine our presuppositions concerning the nature of reason. We need not be naive, vulgar persons, or skeptical philosophers. Instead, we may enlarge our notions of both reason and the passions so that rather than seeing them as opposites, we see them as overlapping allies.

Thus, Baier seeks to integrate fully book 1 with books 2 and 3. And in a way that eluded Kemp Smith’s articulation, Baier leads us through a Hume who leaps through the horns of the dilemma rather than choosing to be impaled. Baier then pursues her quarry, this enriched notion of reason and philosophy, from the opening pages of the book 1 through the intricacies of books 2 and 3. There are several chapters devoted to the analysis of causal relations, with other chapters on continued existence, the self, personal character, virtues, natural law, and government.

Baier’s book is not a light read. Hume suspected his own Treatise of being such a vast undertaking that it was more of a “stretch of the thought” than most readers could manage. In that regard, Baier’s book is also a challenge. But it is, again like the Treatise that inspired it, a greatly rewarding one.

A Progress of Sentiments is a remarkable work. It should change the course of Hume scholarship. I hope, though, that its readership is not so narrow, for the author’s reflections go to the core of human reason, human philosophy, and human existence.

Mark H. Waymack, Loyola University Chicago


This volume provides a convenient format for consultation of a baker’s dozen of articles on Hume’s social, political, and historical thought that have appeared over the last half century in the Journal of the History of Ideas. On the face of it, the idea of publishing a selection of essays that have in common only that they happened to be published in the same journal is not very promising, especially compared to an alternative such as printing the best articles published anywhere during that period. It is only because the JHI is such a respected journal that it could be attempted at all.

Some of the articles in this collection are very good indeed. Donald Siebert’s “Hume on Idolatry and Incarnation” (1984) documents Hume’s change of heart about the value of religious ceremony. The reader can also consult the expanded version of this article in the much richer context of Siebert’s thoughtful book, The Moral Animus of David Hume (1990). Siebert’s contribution, along with James Force’s 1982 article on the theological controversies behind Hume’s ideas on miracles, probably should have been in a separate section labelled something like “Hume on Religion.” As it is, they unaccountably appear under “Society and Political Economy” and “Hume as Historian.”

When it first appeared in 1975, S. K. Wertz’s “Hume, History, and Human Nature” was a pioneering demonstration that Hume’s historical sense was not as bad as Collingwood and other critics claimed. This is now the conventional wisdom in later work on Hume’s History by Nicholas Phillipson, Victor Wexler, Livingston, and others. To the best of this reader’s knowledge, Corey Yenning’s 1976 article on Hume’s critique of empire has not been superseded. In fact, very little attention has been paid to Hume on foreign policy, and there is probably room for a good monograph here.

Christopher Berry’s 1977 article on Hume and Hegel is much more Hegel than Hume, and it can also be consulted in revised and expanded form in Berry’s Hume, Hegel and Human Nature (1982). Charles Cottle’s 1979 article on justice has been superseded for most purposes by Jonathan Harrison’s Hume’s Theory of Justice (1981). John Werner’s 1972 survey of Hume’s influence in America is a useful supplement to the works of Douglass Adair;
an essay in J.G.A. Pocock's *Virtue, Commerce and History* (1985); and Livingston's own article on the subject in ECSSS's recent volume, *Scotland and America in the Age of the Enlightenment*.

There are sparks of debate here: whereas Robert McRae's 1951 essay asserts that Hume was no reformer (p. 31), a 1970 piece by Robert Lyons explores the sense in which he was liberal or even radical for his times (p. 39). But these are no more than intriguing suggestions in rather slight pieces.

Ernest Mossner's "Was Hume a Tory Historian?" (1941) explored some senses in which Hume was both a Whig and a Tory, a liberal and a conservative; but this is better read in the context of his well-known biography of Hume. Marjorie Greene's 1943 evaluation of Hume's Tory leanings plausibly establishes him as a Tory for seventeenth-century purposes, but it spends only one paragraph on the eighteenth-century context, with nothing, for example, about Hume's reaction to the '45. She also appears to have been taken in by the *le bon David* image, often referring to Hume's kindness (p.119) and mild disposition (p. 133) but ignoring, for example, his apparently genuine ire at the Wilkes mobs and the ferocity of some of his irony.

Even in a collection limited to the *IHH*, a number of additional articles would have been appropriate. Among them would be Mossner's "The Religion of David Hume" (1978) and his valuable edition of some of Hume's early manuscript writings in "Hume's Early Memoranda, 1729-1740: The Complete Text" (1948). The implications of the latter for Hume's political and social thought have yet to be fully explored, and reproducing it in this volume would have been a service.

Some technical points: the hardcover binding will cause some confusion in libraries, because it is stamped with the title *Hume as Philosopher of Science, Politics and History*. The articles were apparently reproduced photographically from the originals in the journal, so the type-face changes several times throughout the book, depending on the one used at the time each article was first printed. This also means that typos such as "respect" for "reflect" (in a quote from Hume at p. 49) have been reproduced. Regrettably, no index was provided. Since the publisher's production costs for this rather slim volume must have been very low, $45 seems a high price for so little effort.

The very first sentence of the Introduction claims that the first critical examinations of Hume's philosophy were by Reid (1764) and Beattie (1770) (p. ix). But Mossner and others have written about much earlier reception of Hume. See Richard H. Popkin, "Hume's Early Critics," in his *The High Road to Pyrrhonism*, ed. Watson and Force (San Diego, 1980) and Guenter Gawlick and Lothar Kreimendahl, *Hume in der deutschen Aufklärung* (Stuttgart, 1987). Also, the editors refer to Norman Kemp Smith as "Smith," but many readers of *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* will know that Kemp Smith followed the custom of his class and country in using a double surname.

The Introduction suggests that professional philosophers know very little about Hume as a "philosopher of culture," and that these readings are needed therapy. Fortunately, the 1980s and early 1990s have seen a flowering of books on Hume's social, political, and historical thought have yet to be fully explored, and reproducing it in this volume would have been a service.

The very first sentence of the Introduction claims that the first critical examinations of Hume's philosophy were by Reid (1764) and Beattie (1770) (p. ix). But Mossner and others have written about much earlier reception of Hume. See Richard H. Popkin, "Hume's Early Critics," in his *The High Road to Pyrrhonism*, ed. Watson and Force (San Diego, 1980) and Guenter Gawlick and Lothar Kreimendahl, *Hume in der deutschen Aufklärung* (Stuttgart, 1987). Also, the editors refer to Norman Kemp Smith as "Smith," but many readers of *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* will know that Kemp Smith followed the custom of his class and country in using a double surname.

The Introduction suggests that professional philosophers know very little about Hume as a "philosopher of culture," and that these readings are needed therapy. Fortunately, the 1980s and early 1990s have seen a flowering of books on Hume's social, political, and historical thought. Among other authors. Perhaps the best introductions are David Miller's *Philosophy and Ideology in Hume's Political Thought* (1981), Phillipson's *Hume* (1989), or even John B. Stewart's classic *The Moral and Political Philosophy of David Hume* (New York, 1963).


W. B. Todd's six-volume edition of Hume's *1778 History of England*, available in paperback from Liberty Classics for as little as $7.50 a volume (somewhat more in hardback), freed scholars interested in the *History* from the rare book room's rigors (notes to be taken only in pencil, and so on) and from nineteenth-century editors' notes "explaining" or, more usually, "correcting" Hume.

It has been argued by more than one scholar, Victor Wexler and Donald Siebert to cite two, that Hume's *History* incorporates his philosophy. This collection (based on papers from a 1985 symposium at the Huntington Library) focuses on how Hume's history expresses, both directly and indirectly, his ideas about liberty. History, editors Nicholas Capaldi and Donald Livingston argue, serves as *magistra vitae* for communities because within communities (themselves defined by history) the past serves as a moral foundation imparting meaning to philosophy.

These six essays illustrate the richness of Hume's *History* for students not only of Hume, but also of eighteenth-century thought. Peter Jones's "On Reading Hume's *History of Liberty*" examines Hume's political *Essays* of 1741-42 and 1752 before discussing the Stuart volumes of the *History* published in 1754-56. Jones sees the *Essays* philosophy directly reflected in the *History's* observations, e.g. that "personal inclinations, political interests, and religious zeal are constant threats to society" (p. 11). Craig Walton discusses "Hume's 'England' as a Natural History of Morals," by placing it within the Baconian model of natural history. More interesting is his brief examination of Hume's ideas about order (as seen in part by his approach to religion): "there can be too much order, such that the arts, sciences and personal liberties all decline because dull people come to be preferred, active
ones are inhibited, questioning is punished, such that submissiveness and flattery replace initiative and self-respect” (p. 49).

Although I am not comfortable with Eugene F. Miller’s seeming agreement with Hume that England came to enjoy “the most entire system of liberty that ever was known to mankind” (p. 53), his “Hume on Liberty in the English Constitution” does demonstrate that the Whig view that England’s ancient constitution antedated Norman rule cannot be supported by the facts found in Hume’s History. I find Donald W. Livingston’s “Hume’s Historical Conception of Liberty” obscured by his Miltonian rhetoric - e.g., “These prejudices constitute the moral world not because they are known to be good by some theoretical grasp of the good independent of the prejudices; rather they are known to be good because they are the deeply established prejudices that constitute the moral world” (p. 124); but it tackles an important subject: Hume’s place in critical philosophical theory.

The essay I found most valuable was John W. Danford’s well-written look at patterns of early economic development, “Hume’s History and Economic Development.” Danford discusses the validity of abstract concepts such as “luxury” as well as providing a general overview of the feudal order. The concluding essay, “The Preservation of Liberty” by Nicholas Capaldi, argues convincingly that Hume viewed his history primarily as a tool to encourage his countrymen to preserve the liberty they presently enjoyed.

This collection demonstrates what a mine of information Hume’s History provides, not only about Hume, but also about the uses history itself may serve. On the other hand, the $88 price seems too high for what is, after all, a collection of essays more useful to inspire thought about Hume’s History than to provide the last words on the subject.

Laura B. Kennelly, Denton, Texas


Thomas Reid’s Essays on the Active Powers of Man (1788) is something of a ragbag of materials derived from his lectures and from various papers delivered before the Aberdeen Philosophical Society and Glasgow Literary Society. Lacking the overall unity of his earlier volume of essays on the intellectual powers, the Active Powers nevertheless mounts a forceful attack on necessitarianism, and the complex strata of the text attest to the fact that Reid had been preoccupied with the problems addressed in the book for most of his adult life. Indeed, the first evidence we have of his fascination with the question of human free will comes in a sequence of manuscripts dating from 1736-37, related to the meetings of a philosophical club that probably met at Marischal College, Aberdeen, where Reid was librarian from 1733 until 1736. According to the minutes kept by Reid, the club discussed various moral and natural theological topics, and when Reid and his associates dealt with the issue of human liberty they surveyed the ideas of such figures as Locke, Leibniz, William King, and Samuel Clarke. For his part, Reid had more than a passing interest in the contemporary debate on free will, for he also took extensive notes from Samuel Clarke’s writings on the subject, and he tried to clarify his ideas concerning various contested points, including the differences between willing and choosing.

Arguably, the seeds of Reid’s mature views on liberty and necessity were already sown in these manuscripts from the 1730s, and it is therefore unfortunate that William Rowe makes no use of the relevant archival sources in his study of Reid’s Essays on the Active Powers of Man. For although Rowe outlines his interpretation of the Essays with admirable clarity, he does not provide a reading of Reid’s text that is grounded in the details of either Reid’s intellectual biography or his philosophical context. Though he makes some gesture toward contextualizing Reid’s defense of free will, Rowe nowhere specifies with any precision the key players and issues in what he vaguely refers to as “the [eighteenth-century] controversy over freedom and necessity” (p. 1). Consequently, it is unclear why he says little about the positions of two notable participants in that controversy, David Hume and Joseph Priestley. After all, Reid regarded the two of them as his main philosophical opponents when he came to write the Active Powers, and both left a marked imprint on its contents. Though Rowe is right to emphasize that Reid’s outlook was conditioned by the arguments of earlier figures like Locke and Collins, one simply cannot understand the thrust of the Active Powers without reference to the ideas of Hume and Priestley.

More importantly, because he makes no reference to Reid’s manuscripts, Rowe is unable to tell us how Reid himself understood the controversy and to identify the writers who shaped his perception of the debate. William King, for example, does not figure in Rowe’s story, although he is mentioned in Reid’s manuscripts, and Bishop Butler makes only a brief appearance in Rowe’s text, even though Reid’s unpublished papers attest to the fact that Butler influenced Reid deeply. Moreover, while Rowe is certainly correct in pointing to Reid’s indebtedness to Samuel Clarke, his argument would have been even more compelling if he had drawn on the notes that Reid took from Clarke’s polemics with Leibniz and Anthony Collins. For as I have suggested, these notes show that at a formative stage in his career Reid imbibed Clarke’s ideas on free will, and they indicate what Reid found of most interest in Clarke’s defense of human liberty.
In sum, for those who read the works of Thomas Reid from the vantage point of contemporary American analytic philosophy, William Rowe’s study of Reid’s *Essays on the Active Powers of Man* has something to offer. But for those who want to understand Reid’s writings in their historical context, Rowe’s analysis has less to recommend it.

P. B. Wood, University of Victoria


Gilbert Stuart has not previously been the object of any sustained scholarly attention, yet he exerted a presence (often an irritating one) among the literati in Edinburgh and London. Zachs’s study offers the reader a great deal of new information about Stuart and about his literary relationships. For instance, Zachs has unearthed Stuart’s long-lost, unpublished history of the Isle of Man; he has attributed to Stuart seven new works; he has sketched Stuart’s extensive ties with the publisher John Murray; and he has traced, insofar as possible, Stuart’s participation in such communal literary projects as the *London Magazine* and the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*. Zachs situates each of Stuart’s publications in the context of his career and in relationship to each other. In so doing, he shows - for the first time - the logic that impelled Stuart’s investigation of such varied topics as conjectural history, the Scottish Reformation, the career of Queen Mary, and the role of law in public life.

Such scholarly spadework is invaluable for our understanding of the Scottish Enlightenment because we have so little good information about the host of lesser lights that surrounded and interacted with the great luminaries. Zachs points out that “Stuart’s life is characterised more by his encounters, adventures and difficulties than by his ideas and innovations” (p. xi), and one might add that our knowledge of these “peculiarly embattled contexts” (p. 187) is essential to an understanding of the Scottish Enlightenment as a cultural phenomenon. It is not sufficient to see the Scottish Enlightenment, like Hugh Trevor-Roper, in terms of leaders and camp-followers - the leaders being the great innovators in the history of ideas owing no allegiance to a local context, the camp-followers being wholly defined by their local context, and never the twain shall meet. Rather, we must acknowledge that all these figures - major and minor - were embedded in a cultural milieu that needs to be understood in all its particularity and density, because, as J. Paul Hunter argues in *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* , “for all the would-be autonomy of texts, their originality and liberty of spirit, they exist like human beings in a world of assumption, interaction, and implication. Texts without contexts are both meaningless and impossible.” Thus, we need to take account of the social history of ideas, the way in which the culture shapes and is shaped by the discourses produced in it. “Minor” figures like Gilbert Stuart are essential to this enterprise.

What, then, are we to make of all this new factual information about Stuart’s career? Zachs is very good on showing Stuart’s paradoxes and contradictions, indicating, for example, how Stuart’s career underwent an abrupt shift from pro-Moderate to anti-Moderate as a result of his disappointment at not getting the chair of public law at Edinburgh. This sudden shift highlights what is perhaps the central interpretive question in Stuart’s career: is he simply a self-centered opportunist who will support whatever side will give him what he seeks? Or should we take him more seriously, as did William Godwin, who claimed that Stuart “from earliest life . . . breathed the soul of liberty” (quoted on p. 26)? Was Stuart a hypocrite disguising his personal ambition behind an empty rhetoric of liberty, or was he a genuine, suffering hero stripping away the mask of hypocrisy from others?

Zachs leaves the matter open. He carefully cites evidence on both sides, noting on the one hand Stuart’s personal ambition and instability (exacerbated by his alcoholism), and on the other his major achievement in historiography, the creation of a sentimental, evocative rhetoric that allowed his readers to “imagine themselves transported in time and [to] feel the spirit of historical characters within themselves” (p. 139), a rhetoric that challenged - both artistically and politically - the cooler, more detached language of William Robertson and David Hume. Zachs is probably judicious in not attempting to close this gap, yet this gap is provocative and irresistibly invites speculation. It would be satisfying to find a way to understand such an apparently incoherent and enigmatic figure as Stuart, to be able to see him as embodying something more complex than either simple self-interest or simple devotion to the cause of liberty, or even a combination of these.

Perhaps one way out of this dilemma is to consider how for Stuart the personal can also be the political. Zachs cites an interesting passage in Stuart’s *History of Mary Queen of Scots* that suggests how this principle might operate: “perhaps it would be fortunate for human affairs, if the expence, the formalities, and the abuses of religious establishments were for ever at an end . . . if every man’s heart were the only temple where he was to worship his God” (quoted on p. 76). Curiously, this passage amounts to Stuart’s appropriation of the Covenanting tradition for more secular purposes: he maintains emphasis on the strength of individual faith over against the power of institutions, but now his language is broadly moral (in the best Enlightenment fashion), not doctrinally specific. Thus, for Stuart the ground of truth appears to be intensity of personal feeling, and such manifest sincerity becomes the basis for his opposition rhetoric. It is impossible to separate the personal from the political in Stuart’s
writing, because the personal is always already political. What Stuart feels must in turn be shown, and the more intensely he feels it, the more politically true it is.

If the personal and political are indistinguishable in Stuart’s thinking, then perhaps we can understand his career less in terms of his inconsistencies of opinion and more in terms of his continuing necessity to find something to oppose. His fixation on William Robertson, for example, can be seen as his effort not so much to avenge himself on an individual as to create an antithesis to his own sincerity, something against which he can define himself. He dogs Robertson in his writing much as Robert Wringhim does George Colwan in person in Hogg’s Confessions of a Justified Sinner - to rebuke the sinful, to test his own faith, and ultimately to destroy him (though, ironically, Stuart’s and Wringhim’s obsessions are both self-destructive). Robertson, of course, could be seen as having provided the occasion for Stuart’s bitterness by being involved in the denial of the law chair, but Robertson is perhaps more important to Stuart as the means by which Stuart can manifest his own integrity and thereby lay claim to a valid political stance. It does not matter to Stuart whether his arguments support the Whigs or the Jacobites, the Protestants or the Catholics. What does matter is the resistance of the virtuous individual against the corrupt establishment, the heart’s ability to maintain its purity of feeling against the specious, hypocritical head. If we see Stuart in this way, then perhaps we can begin to understand him as a most interesting practitioner of a form of political discourse that became increasingly prevalent in the later eighteenth century - one that pits the naked truth against the deceptive dress of thought.

Jeffrey Smitten, Utah State University


What were the perceptions of medical students attending the University of Edinburgh in the eighteenth century? In the process of answering this question, Lisa Rosner casts a new light not only on university education but on the practice of medicine itself. She concentrates on the period from 1760 to 1826, when Edinburgh University was at its height. The year 1826 also marks the appearance of the Royal Commission to Investigate the Universities of Scotland, which proved to be a particularly valuable source of information for her.

The picture Rosner paints should be heartening to twentieth-century academics who worry about grade inflation, unprepared students, and college drop-outs; all were common eighteenth-century problems, too. Though regular courses were offered on a more or less standardized schedule, and a three-year course of study was required for most of the period to gain the medical degree, students attended some classes and not others, stayed for a term and left, or simply visited briefly to say they had been to Edinburgh. Comparatively few finished the complete course of study. Since professors were mainly paid directly by the students, many of them taught to their audience, although some courses such as anatomy (and toward the end, chemistry) were regarded as more important than others, and the professors of these fared better. Though professors were appointed by the town council, they were almost a closed corporation, and nearly every professor from the middle of the eighteenth century saw to it that he was succeeded by his son, who was not always up to the standards of the father. For example, Alexander Monro tertius, who succeeded to the chair held by his father and grandfather, was believed by many of the students to be offering lectures from his grandfather’s notes.

Medical study was not confined to the university itself but included the Royal College of Surgeons. In order to serve the increasing number of apprentices, the Royal College held regular lectures, which were often attended by students at the university. Conversely, many of those learning surgery also attended university lectures. Both groups of students also utilized the local hospitals to add to their knowledge, sometimes informally through apprenticeship or by accompanying a professor, other times much more informally. The traditional distinction between surgeon and physician, which held that the physician was a learned man while the surgeon was simply a craftsman, still had some meaning in Edinburgh, in part due to separate medical and surgical organizations. But students at Edinburgh had a much better grasp of both fields than those at any other English or Scottish university. Though this growing unification was progressive in a sense, it has also been argued that it tended to weaken the research skills of surgeons, who at Paris built upon their anatomical skills and post mortems to redirect the course of medicine. Neither group did many post mortems at Edinburgh due to the shortage of corpses there.

What comes out strongest in Rosner’s book is just how self-taught many of the physicians at Edinburgh were. They read standard works on their own, attending lectures for the most part as a kind of supplement. Whereas professors, conscious that the reputation of their students would reflect upon the university, tried to hold to some standards, most of their students were interested in getting through as rapidly as possible so that they could practice. In spite of various criticisms, however, Edinburgh, along with Glasgow and Trinity College, Dublin, were the only British universities offering extensive classes in medical subjects, and of the three it had the highest standards and the faculty with the best reputations. Oxford, Cambridge, St. Andrews, and Aberdeen (both King’s and Marischal colleges) offered medical degrees, but they were essentially based on the assumption that students
who gained the “moral and intellectual discipline” of a liberal arts education could learn their medicine (which was not formally taught at any of them) elsewhere and then apply for a medical degree from them. Edinburgh, then, was at the opposite end of the spectrum, since the faculty sought to make an Edinburgh University medical degree stand for proof of scientific accomplishment.

Maintaining that standard became increasingly difficult in the nineteenth century, as the number of students escalated and professors found themselves unable to give the time to examine each student as thoroughly as they had before. Inevitably, more regulation and formality came to be the norm. This trend was effectively institutionalized by the suggested reforms of the Royal Commission, which was more concerned with turning out professionals with a love of classics and the manners of gentlemen than with the advancement of science or learning.

What Rosner has given us is a bottom-up social history of the university. When one examines curriculum, faculty, and official regulations, Edinburgh appears to be a quite different place from the one usually pictured. Though the author includes one graph (student groups in five-year aggregates), this is not a quantitative study, and probably the data are not available in sufficient diversity to make it so. Rather, Rosner has done an exhaustive reading of the diaries and reminiscences of Edinburgh students, the matriculation registers (which date from 1762), handbooks, and records of the university, the physicians and surgeons guilds, and the city itself. The result is a new understanding of the eighteenth-century university and a better grasp of the underlying assumptions of eighteenth-century physicians and surgeons.

Vern L. Bullough, State University of New York at Buffalo


Reading this book, I felt akin to Huck Finn’s response to The Pilgrim’s Progress—“interesting but tough.” Part of the difficulty in this highly compressed work is inherent in any grappling with Calvinism’s tortuous, ambivalent speculations on the adequacy of the self to know God and, in consequence, the true nature of itself and others.

This initial grappling of seventeenth-century American and Scottish culture with Calvinism is believed by Susan Manning to be both archetypal and paradigmatic for the similar developments in what she defines as their “puritan provincial” tradition. There are two inherent difficulties in writing literary criticism to establish the congruity of the text with an obviously influential body of philosophical/theological ideas. First, “poetic” thought is a slippery, subtle thing, not least to the more abstract ideas that provoke it. Second, and this is the essence of the courage and difficulty of Manning’s undertaking, it can be argued that any literature can not so much evolve as metamorphose over the extended period of time here discussed, so that the initial forms may eventually contain radically different contents.

One is, therefore, ambivalent to Manning’s claims in that at times she seems, as in her chapter “The Pursuit of the Double,” to establish precisely the continuity and congruity of the fission of the self defined in Calvin’s theology, with its later literary manifestations in Hogg, Poe, and Hawthorne. At other points one feels that she is so intent on seeing the Calvinist structural skeleton under the flesh of nineteenth-century writing that she radically distorts the text by not seeing its obvious, fundamental relevance to contemporary historical concerns. The most extreme example of this sort of error is perhaps her reading of Melville’s “Benito Cereno.” Preoccupied with post-Calvinist inscrutability of interpretation, Manning seems unaware that the essence of the story deals with the horror of democratic America’s uncomprehending, “innocent” assumption of decadent Spain’s burden of imperialism and racialism. Melville does tell us that it is the Negro, not Calvin, who has cast his shadow; some meanings, despite theory, are not infinitely withheld.

The book cogently divides its six chapters into two equal parts. The first chapter deals with the basis of Calvin’s thought, the second with the radical divergence from this common source in Jonathan Edwards and David Hume. Chapter 3, “From Puritanism to Provincialism,” would, I believe, provide the perfect occasion for an interdisciplinary session at a future society conference. Though no guarantee of success, so complex are the problems, it would need such a joining of minds to discuss the veracity of Manning’s sweeping assertions about Hume, Adam Smith, Thomas Jefferson, and the Declaration of Independence as confirming her thesis of Calvinist continuity, as opposed to Enlightenment thought, as an antidote to that theology. The next three chapters are literary. The first two deal with classically inspired Calvinist problems, the divided self and the directly related problem of the certainty of evidence. These chapters interweave, mainly convincingly, readings of American and Scottish texts in order to demonstrate the shared consequences of a common theological source. The last chapter attempts to demonstrate eighteenth- and nineteenth-century secular provincialism as a manifestation of Calvinism’s archetypal journey of the soul to the spiritual center. Here, I think, the intensity of Manning’s theological awareness blinds her to more worldly, political pressures operating on American and Scottish writings.

Several major problems accrue from this thesis. First, provincialism in eighteenth-century Edinburgh and Boston was, in its usual sense, a straightforward imitation of already enervated, genteel London norms. Secondly, American literary nationalism at least as early as Melville, was intent on making America as central as England.

24
American nationalist writers felt impelled to escape Shakespeare's vast, anxiety-inducing shadow. Manning would perhaps not interpret Redburn as she does if she had paid attention to "Hawthorne and his Mosses." Further, unlike the Americans, nineteenth-century Scots were by and large happy in their provincialism, not least because some of its deviant forms were highly marketable in literary London. Or, as in the case of Thomas Carlyle, the Scottish writer could assume power at the very heart of that culture.

Nor does Manning seem aware that, just as Joyce and Beckett fled Dublin, Americans of the stature of James, Eliot, and Pound became expatriates in order to join a tradition of European literary humanism because they felt that American culture, from its theological origins, was a savage deviant. For them, a native culture of desensualized, theological prescriptiveness created an unlivable vacuum for the artist. James's Redburn defines precisely such fundamental reservations regarding "our own dear native land."

Though I am by no means convinced by all of this book, it is never less than intelligently provocative, and any subsequent account of American-Scottish relations will have to pay the closest attention to it.

Andrew Noble, University of Strathclyde


The writings of James Abercromby, Scottish-born colonial agent in the first British empire, have attracted more attention within the past decade than during his lifetime. Born in the eventful year 1707, the younger son of a Clackmannanshire family of some prominence but less imposing fortune, Abercromby joined that group of educated Scotsmen who responded to the Union by seeking their fortunes in the world of colonial administration. Arriving in America in 1751 to take up a post as attorney general and advocate general of the court of vice-admiralty for South Carolina, he filled a variety of colonial posts before returning to Britain in 1744. Although he lived most of the remainder of his life in London, eventually attaining a seat in Parliament, Abercromby long retained his involvement with America, serving regularly but intermittently as colonial agent in London for the colonies of Virginia and North and South Carolina, and of their respective Scottish governors Robert Dinwiddie, Gabriel Johnston, and James Glen.

What distinguishes Abercromby from many others in the imperial service, and what renders him of interest to historians, is his propensity to ponder and write about colonial affairs. Along with such others as Henry McCulloh, Archibald Kennedy, Cadwallader Colden, and John Mitchell, Abercromby was one of a small circle of Scots who responded in depth to the board of trade's renewed concern for colonial affairs at mid-century. In 1752 he composed a lengthy "Examination of the Acts of Parliament Relative To the Trade and the Government of our American Colonies," which circulated in manuscript in imperial circles, and in 1774 he penned "De Jure et Gubernatione Coloniarum, or an Inquiry into the Nature, and the Rights of Colonies, Ancient, and Modern." Both were recently published for the first time by the American Philosophical Society (Magna Charta for America, ed. Jack P. Greene et al., 1986). Abercromby's letter book, now published for the first time, adds considerably to our knowledge of that official.

The letter book, containing more than three hundred entries by Abercromby pertaining to the colonies he served, has been expertly edited by John C. Van Horne and George Reese. They offer a helpful and informative Introduction and clear and ample identification of the myriad figures and occurrences that float in and out of its pages.

There is much to be explained. Much of the agent's work was mundane: the presentation of colonial law to imperial officials, as well as correspondence with governors and councillors about his endeavors on behalf of provincial matters, or their own private affairs, or his own laborious efforts to obtain due compensation for his services. Two points may be of particular interest to readers of this publication. One was the informal, very personal nature of the networks involved in the conduct of both public and private business in the imperial community. Often the two are difficult to separate, as when Abercromby simultaneously promotes the North Carolina governor's positions against those of a faction represented by Henry McCulloh and Governor Johnston's personal suit against that same imperial politician. The second point is the considerable presence of Scottish officials throughout the administration of the southern colonies. Most of the correspondence was with other Scots - Dinwiddie and John Blair in Virginia; Johnston, Glen, John Rutherfurd, and James Murray in the Carolinas - along with his ubiquitous rival Henry McCulloh.

To move beyond the mass of the detail in the letter book to an understanding of how Abercromby viewed the empire they served, one must refer to his other writings. His "Examination of the Acts of Parliament" clearly shows an official with little sympathy for the turbulence and factionalism of colonial politics that had cost him so much time and effort, as the letter book reveals. This position was echoed by such other Scottish officials as Kennedy, Colden, and even McCulloh. So strongly did Abercromby defend the rights of imperial authorities to a due subordination from recalcitrant colonials, which he called a "Capital Object in Colonic Government," that Jack Greene has considered him as a representative of metropolitan perspectives upon the empire.
The presence of so many Scots among that group of officials should make us wary of easy assumptions about the metropolitan character of those positions. If Abercromby rejected what he considered the excessively narrow and particularistic claims of the colonial assemblies, he also disapproved of a metropolitan government taking arbitrary actions that unnecessarily antagonized the colonists and subverted their traditions. He insisted upon the need to adapt imperial authority to the growing "strength and wealth" of the colonies, a point he repeated several times, and one that underlay much of the argument of Kennedy and McCulloh as well. How to reconcile central control with the need to respond to the changing circumstances of a rapidly developing provincial sector was for Abercromby, and for many of his fellow provincials in imperial administration, the principal problem to be resolved within Britain's eighteenth-century empire. Abercromby's work as agent shows him presenting issues of interest to the colonies to representatives of the metropolis; his tracts represent to those same officials what he viewed as necessary reforms of the colonial administration.

Ned Landsman, State University of New York at Stony Brook


Old Aberdeen is today a refreshingly quiet, well-preserved university precinct in a busy modern city. Until the Amalgamation Act of 1891, however, it was a separate town, a burgh of barony adjacent to the much larger royal burgh of Aberdeen proper (also called New Aberdeen in the vain hope of avoiding confusion), whose equally ancient center lay just one mile to the south. As Christopher Smout points out in the Introduction to this welcome collection of essays, much of what has been most characteristic of urban life in Scotland since the late Middle Ages has its roots in dozens of small ecclesiastical and baronial burghs like Old Aberdeen. Such places have seldom attracted the individual or collective attention they deserve from Scotland's urban historians, whose gaze has tended to concentrate on the biggest royal burghs. This book begins to redress that imbalance.

The book as a whole is aimed at both a general, local audience and a more specialized academic clientele. Individual articles tend to veer one way or the other. The focus is on the medieval and early modern burgh, but much of what is said would hold equally true for the eighteenth century. Topographic, architectural, economic, and social matters predominate, to the relative exclusion of political and intellectual history (if this slim volume had an index, the word "enlightenment" might well be absent).

Grant Simpson's opening article offers a careful study of the topography of the medieval burgh, setting out the geographic features of the site and their effect on settlement patterns, and describing the way in which, by the late fifteenth century, the tiny burgh had evolved three distinct loci: the cathedral, the college, and a small but occasionally thriving market and craft center. Leslie Macfarlane follows with an essay on the turbulent life and times of St. Machar's Cathedral, offering an especially vivid account of daily life not only in and around the medieval and early modern cathedral, but in the burgh as a whole. His assertion, however, that the period from the Reformation to the nineteenth century was one of "steady and inevitable decline" (p. 29) for the town as well as its cathedral requires modification in light of Robert Tyson's fine study of the economic and social structure of seventeenth-century Aberdeen.

In recent years, Tyson's meticulous work has reshaped our understanding of the demographic and economic history of northeast Scotland. Here he shows that Old Aberdeen in fact enjoyed a generation of considerable economic expansion in the closing decades of the seventeenth century, even as New Aberdeen continued to founder in a prolonged economic slump. Tyson provides a lucid account of the complex economic ties that bound the two communities, and shows that having been spared the worst of the various devastations and disasters that befell New Aberdeen during the wars of mid-century, Old Aberdeen was well placed to cash in on a general expansion of inland trade that benefited many small towns after the Restoration.

Colin McLaren provides an equally fine account of the often stormy relations between town and gown in Old Aberdeen between 1600 and 1860. Drawing upon a wide range of manuscript sources, this is a piece worthy of close scrutiny by anyone concerned with the social history of an early modern university. The volume concludes with the editor John Smith's detailed and informed tour of the surviving buildings of the gracious old burgh.

The articles by Tyson and McLaren are alone worth the modest price (£5.95) of this handsome and well-illustrated book. Given the usefulness of the other three articles, the whole collection makes for an attractive package.

Gordon Desbrisay, University of Saskatchewan
Briefly Noted


This important book is the first to examine the development of European freemasonry as an Enlightenment phenomenon, and there is much here to interest members of this society. For example, Jacob evaluates David Stevenson's work on the Scottish origins of freemasonry, analyzes in depth the Dundee Lodge, and provides a fascinating interpretation of David Fordyce's *The Temple of Virtue* as a Freemason tract.


This edition is substantially larger and more inclusive than the second edition of 1972. ECSSS members purchasing it from Edinburgh University Press get free air mail postage.


Readers of Italian may wish to consult this work's discussion of Hume.


This pamphlet is the first issue in ESHSS's Studies in Scottish Economic & Social History series. Although only a few pages deal with the eighteenth century, they provide a good summary of the topic. (Available for £2.35 in U.K., or £2.75 overseas, including postage, from the Department of History, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow).


A digest of materials relating to America in the Court of Session and the High Court of the Admiralty, this work identifies people residing in North America who were engaged in litigation in Scotland.


This collection of articles, book reviews, bibliographies, conference reports, translations, and other materials is divided into four parts. The most important is the first part, which contains the four main articles of the book: "David Hume and the Scottish Enlightenment;" "Hume and Jacobite Ideology;" "Hume and the Court vs. Country Controversy;" and "Hume and Smith: An Unpublished Hume Letter to Adam Smith" (a brief letter dated 17 Nov. 1772).

New in Paper


Free air mail postage for ECSSS members.


Instructors wishing to assign this classic can finally relax: it is now available in the U.K. for £12.95, and the Yale edition will be available this August for $15.
**Book Deals**

Thanks to David Fate Norton, the Hume Society now has copies available of *McGill Hume Studies* (1979), a fine collection of essays by outstanding scholars, including several ECSSS members. To order, send a check for $25 U.S. (hardback) or $7 U.S. (paperback), payable to the Hume Society, to Dorothy Coleman, Department of Philosophy, College of William and Mary, P.O. Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795. Postage is included.

Laissiez Faire Books (942 Howard St., San Francisco, CA 94103) is offering the following hardback reprints from Augustus M. Kelley at these sale prices: William F. Scott, *Francis Hutcheson* (1900; $17.50); David Buchanan, *Observations on the Subjects Treated in Dr. Smith's . . . Wealth of Nations* (1817; $22.50); *A Letter from Governor Pownall to Adam Smith* ($7.50); Jacob Viner, *Guide to John Rae's Life of Adam Smith* ($6.50); and James Bonar, *A Catalog of the Library of Adam Smith* ($13.75).

The Scholar's Bookshelf (51 Everett Drive, Princeton Jct., NJ 08550) is selling Charles Camic, *Experience and Enlightenment: Socialization for Cultural Change in 18th-Century Scotland* for $4.98.

The Sales Catalog of Princeton University Press (41 William St., Princeton, NJ 08540) is offering the following hardbacks at these sale prices until 31 December 1992: David Fate Norton, *David Hume: Common-Sense Moralist, Skeptical Metaphysician* ($19.50); John Bricke, *Hume's Philosophy of Mind* ($9.50); Richard B. Sher, *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Moderate Literati of Edinburgh* ($17.50).

**ECSSS Statement of Finances, 1 Jan 1991 - 31 Dec 1991**

I. Bank of Scotland Checking Account (Chambers St, Edinburgh)
   - Balance 1 Jan 1991: £1137.68
   - Income (dues, etc.): + £442
   - Expenses (Bristol conference): - £348.20
   - Transferred to savings account: - £500.00
   - Balance 31 Dec 1991: £731.48

II. Bank of Scotland Savings Account (Chambers St, Edinburgh)
   - Balance 1 Jan 1991: £387.71
   - Interest: + £42.45
   - Transferred from checking account: + £500.00
   - Balance 31 Dec 1991: £940.16

III. Summit Bankcorporation (formerly Maplewood Bank & Trust) Checking Account (Maplewood, NJ)
   - Balance 1 Jan 1991: $1234.87
   - Income (dues, etc.): + $2035.92
   - Income (book royalties): + $576.32
   - Expenses: - $917.73*
   - Balance 31 Dec 1991: $2929.34

* Printing: $396.10; modem and answering machine: $149.75; Adam Smith postcards: $65.95; registration fee as non-profit corporation: $15.00; Holiday Inn Independence Mall - deposit for Philadelphia conference: $250.00; check returns and bank fees: $40.93. Expenses figure does not include postage, services, and supplies provided by New Jersey Institute of Technology.

IV. Summit Bankcorporation (formerly Maplewood Bank & Trust) Savings Account (Maplewood, NJ)
   - Balance 1 Jan 1991: $523.61
   - Interest: $26.68
   - Balance 31 Dec 1991: $550.29

V. Credit at Jack-B-Quick Quality Printing (Millburn, NJ)
   - Balance 1 Jan 1991: $547.55
   - Expenses: $547.55
   - Balance 31 Dec 1991: 0

VI. Total Assets as of 31 Dec 1991 [vs. 31 Dec 1990]: $3479.63 [$2306.03] + £1671.64 [£1525.39]
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Recent Articles by ECSSS Members

The items below either appear in collections received by the editor or else have been brought to the editor’s attention by individual members, many of whom submitted offprints or copies of their work. The list is limited to articles and major review articles that (1) deal with eighteenth-century Scottish topics and (2) were published in 1991, except for items published in 1989 or 1990 that were not included in last year’s list.

C. P. Courtney, “The Correspondence of Benjamin Constant: An Overview,” Annales Benjamin Constant, no. 12 (1991): 65-88 (contains some material on Constant’s years in Edinburgh and connections with Scots; see also Courtney’s edition of Constant’s autobiography, Ma Vie [Cambridge: Daemon Press, 1991]).
Peter J. Diamond, “Rhetoric and Philosophy in the Social Thought of Thomas Reid,” in SSECS, 57-80.
Howard Gaskill, “What Did James Macpherson Really Leave on Display at His Publisher’s Shop in 1762?,” Scottish Gaelic Studies 16 (1990): 67-89.


Colly H. Kullman, “Boswell’s First Meeting with the Infamous Margaret Caroline Rudd: A Study in Dramatic Technique,” University of Mississippi Studies in English 7 (1989): 76-84.


Susan Manning, “‘This Philosophical Melancholy’: Style and Self in Boswell and Hume,” in NLB, 126-40.


Key to Books Abbreviated Above


New ECSSS Members

We are happy to welcome the following new members to ECSSS. Academic disciplines, institutional affiliations, and fields of interest are noted when members have specified them.

Henry Abelove, Lit, Wesleyan U.: Ossian; Hume; history of sex; Methodism

Philip E. Baruth, U. of California, Irvine (postgrad): Boswell; autobiography

Daniel Bruehlmeier, Phil/Pol, St. Gallen, Switzerland: philosophy; law; political thought; Hume; Smith; Millar

C. P. Courtney, French, Christ's College, Cambridge: history of ideas; Scotland & France

Timothy Erwin, Lit, U. of Nevada, Las Vegas: theories of rhetoric

Athanassia Glycorrydi-Leontsini, Phil, Athens U.: aesthetics

Roy E. Goodman, Lib, American Philosophical Society: bibliography; history of science

I. Maxwell Hammett, Lit, Daito Bimka U. (Japan): Lord Monboddo

Ferenc Hoercher, Phil, Budapest U.: moral & political philosophy

Tony Inglis, Lit, U. of Sussex: literature, esp. Boswell, Burns, Scott; cultural histories

Michael L. Ireland, BBC Television, Glasgow: Boswell

Louise Marcil-Lacoste, Phil, U. of Toronto: common sense philosophy
Eighteenth-Century Scotland is published annually by the Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society (ECSSS) and is sent to all ECSSS members each spring. Submissions of articles, announcements, and news items are welcome. Address all correspondence to the editor: Richard B. Sher, Executive Secretary - ECSSS, Department of Humanities, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, NJ 07102, USA.

ECSSS officers for 1990-92: President, Andrew Hook (English, Glasgow U.); Vice-President, Leslie Ellen Brown (music, Penn State U. - Beaver Campus); Executive Secretary/Treasurer, Richard B. Sher (history, NJIT); Members-At-Large: Thomas Kennedy (philosophy, Valparaiso U.), John Robertson (history, St Hugh's College - Oxford).

ECSSS Board of Trustees: Andrew Hook, Leslie Ellen Brown, Richard Sher, Roger Emerson (history, U. of Western Ontario); Andrew Noble (English, U. of Strathclyde), Jeffrey Smitten (English, Utah State U.), M. A. Stewart (philosophy, U. of Lancaster).

Special thanks to New Jersey Institute of Technology for providing desktop publishing facilities and other assistance.

Tell a Friend - or a Library - about ECSSS

If you appreciate this newsletter, others may, too. Please tell a friend or your university library about us. Increased membership will enable us to continue to provide members with excellent services at bargain rates. Our membership fees are payable to “ECSSS” in either U.S. dollars or pounds sterling:

Individuals: $10 or £6
Institutions: $20 or £12

Copies of back issues, when available: $5 or £3 each for individuals ($10 or £6 for institutions).
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