

Lumen

Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies
Travaux choisis de la Société canadienne d'étude du dix-huitième siècle

LUMEN

Did the Scottish Enlightenment Emerge in an English Cultural Province?

Roger Emerson

Volume 14, 1995

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1012505ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1012505ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies / Société canadienne d'étude
du dix-huitième siècle

ISSN

1209-3696 (print)

1927-8284 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Emerson, R. (1995). Did the Scottish Enlightenment Emerge in an English Cultural Province? *Lumen*, 14, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1012505ar>

1. Did the Scottish Enlightenment Emerge in an English Cultural Province?

When I sat down to write this paper I had in mind a rather straightforward piece on Robert Wodrow and Cotton Mather as *virtuosi* in distinctive but comparable towns. I thought that Wodrow and Mather, Boston and Glasgow, Massachusetts and Scotland all might be usefully compared to shed light on the origins and differences of two quite dissimilar enlightenments emerging in what John Clive and Bernard Bailyn in 1954 described as ‘England’s cultural provinces.’¹ As I worked on this essay, I realized that what I was doing was mainly setting out my reasons for believing Clive and Bailyn were wrong. In the end, it seemed better to concentrate on those reasons, to say less about Wodrow and very little about Mather and Massachusetts. This paper is, therefore, about the Clive-Bailyn thesis and only incidentally about the origins and nature of the Scottish or Massachusetts enlightenments. It tries to show that Scotland was not a cultural province of the English and that the very concept of provinciality as Clive and Bailyn used it is not helpful in dealing with Scotland and perhaps not with other regions in Europe and America.

I

Clive and Bailyn themselves wanted to understand ‘the origin of the “Scottish Renaissance” — the remarkable efflorescence of the mid-eighteenth century’ (CB, 200). They, like earlier writers, saw as factors contributing to this, increased educational opportunities and the decline of Calvinism, which allowed energies to be channelled into economic developments and cultural activities. Necessary as those conditions may have been, they were not sufficient to account for the renaissance which they perceived to be rooted in ‘the essential spirit of the time and place, as well as on the accumulation of cultural data’ (CB, 202). When they began to detail the characteristics of that spirit and to note the categories of the data they listed:

- (i) the ‘middle class’ social standing of the intellectuals.

- (ii) the enhanced status in provincial towns of those who would have been unremarkable in London, among them being many officials.
- (iii) the largely urban nature of the enlightenment and its dependence upon the leadership of professional men, particularly lawyers.
- (iv) the political and economic dependence of these towns upon London, which was also their cultural capital.
- (v) the sense of isolation, marginality and alienation of men conscious of themselves as living on the periphery of their cultural world — a consciousness manifested in concerns with fashion, styles, language, manners, imitative behaviours and in a general defensiveness about their inferiority despite their pride in being Scottish or American (CB, 205-08).²

'Provincial culture, in eighteenth-century Scotland,' they said, 'as in colonial America, was formed in the mingling of' visions of 'cosmopolitan sophistication' with 'the simplicity and purity (real or imagined) of nativism' (CB, 213). This conditioned provincial culture, sometimes driving it to creative brilliance, sometimes stultifying it. On the whole they thought the provincial milieu was stimulating and they concluded:

The complexity of the provincial's image of the world and of himself made demands upon him unlike those felt by the equivalent Englishman. It tended to shake the mind from the roots of habit and tradition. It led men to the interstices of common thought where were found new views and new approaches to the old. It cannot account for the existence of men of genius, but to take it into consideration may help us to understand the conditions which fostered in such men the originality and creative imagination that we associate with the highest achievements of the enlightenment in Scotland and America (CB, 213).

Clive and Bailyn saw their provincials as imitative, reactive, middle class men, always a bit 'out of it' and, therefore, alienated and insecure. When they were creative, there was something a bit neurotic in what they did. Their insights were fraught with the tensions which arose in men who found their values challenged, their careers blocked, their prospects limited and their beliefs and manners derided by others who were no better than they should be even though they lived elsewhere. Provincials, if not desperate to assimilate the standards, values and beliefs of the imperial metropolis, could hardly react passively to them. Imitation and angry rejection were more likely responses than were calm analyses of one's position. Reducing the dissonances in the provincials' minds and heart meant rebellion or assimilation of some sort because the imperial metropolitan capital could not allow a third choice. The *Lebenswelt* of the provincial was an anxious and usually inauthentic one

in which men and women dressed at least six months out of fashion, worried over their language, i.e. Gascon, Scotticisms or Americanisms, read books not quite current and defined themselves unsatisfactorily by reference first to Paris or London and then to Bordeaux, Edinburgh, Boston, Philadelphia or wherever. This is a persuasive, even a seductive view which still appeals to many historians.³ But, is it one which we can continue to hold? I think not.

II

Any critique of the Clive-Bailyn thesis should probably begin by noting that it contains no definition of provinces and their correlative metropolises. It simply begs the questions of how a province must be related to its metropolitan capital.⁴

Definitions and relations surely depend on contexts, times, and the subject of concern. When Charles II erected Pennsylvania into 'a Province and a Seignurie' he created a jurisdiction outside England but dependent upon the English crown or government which was sovereign with respect to it. This does not fit the Scottish case in 1700, 1750 or even now any better than it does Massachusetts under its initial charter or that given it by subsequent sovereigns.⁵ As an ancient kingdom which had often defended its liberty and which even after 1707 preserved many aspects of a sovereign state, Scotland was hardly a province of that sort. By 1750 but not in 1700 it more resembled Guienne, a once independent kingdom which by the time of Louis XIV had lost most of its pretensions to an independent existence while retaining in Bordeaux a 'sovereign court,' its own laws and a nobility, not all of whose titles derived from the French monarchs.

But these were not the only kinds of provinces which the eighteenth-century world knew. The Holy Roman Empire was a congeries of separate units of government associated loosely in a structure which lacked a true metropolitan centre. The Hapsburg court was in Vienna but the imperial treasury and courts sat elsewhere and the three hundred or so German states looked to Paris, Berlin, or even to tiny Weimar for cultural leadership. The Empire, like Switzerland, was divided along religious and linguistic lines. And the Swiss Confederation lacked a real capital. To some extent that was true of the Dutch Republic, whose political heart was in the Hague, whose economic life centered on Amsterdam, and whose cultural capitals were Amsterdam and Paris.⁶ The political reality of centre and periphery in eighteenth-century Europe is often harder for us to establish than Clive and Bailyn believed. We are used to thinking about centralized states, in terms of which

centres and peripheries make more sense than when we try to apply these concepts to what actually existed before the French Revolution, the Napoleonic period, and the formation of national states. Even in Britain political unification in the eighteenth century was limited. Parliament seldom legislated for the whole of Britain or even all of England or Scotland. Until 1747 Scotland retained peculiar and distinctive legal jurisdictions many of which survived longer in England — as we are reminded by the road signs in the Counties Palatine of Durham and Chester, the Duchy of Lancaster, the Principality of Wales, the Channel Islands, the Isle of Man or Ireland in its varied guises. Administratively, these regions were also governed by local élites whose relations to the London government were rather like those which Clive and Bailyn described and attributed to Scotland and America.

There are also problems on the political level with the Clive/Bailyn concept of provinciality. Provinces in some sense could be found everywhere in eighteenth-century Europe and in too many forms. But, the reactions of provincials do not everywhere seem to have been the same. Many Scots had long looked forward to the union of their kingdom with England. Some had seen this as requiring the convergence of laws, of religious beliefs and institutions and of the assimilating of the Scots and English nobilities in an incorporating union.⁷ Most who did so, however, had thought only in terms of economic union. Others like Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun had worked out federative schemes which would have provincialized England more thoroughly and reduced the importance of London.⁸ Still more in 1700 resisted any integration with England. Many of the themes of the political theory of the Scottish Enlightenment were defined in this period but in ways which Americans could not contemplate because of their remoteness but also because they lacked the political and religious past possessed by Scots.⁹

The defence of what Clive and Bailyn saw from their London (or Cambridge) perspective as provincial values were in Scotland seen as the values of an empire, a realm and a state wholly independent of the English until 1603 and thereafter joined legitimately only by a common sovereign whose powers in his three kingdoms were very different. The defence of this ancient constitution was the common work of Catholics such as Thomas Innes;¹⁰ Jacobites and Episcopalians grouped around Sir George Mackenzie (c.1685-88), Sir Robert Sibbald (c.1680-1712), Thomas Ruddiman (c.1715-50); and Whig Presbyterians like James Dalrymple, James Anderson W.S. and Robert Wodrow (c.1690-1730).¹¹ Although they conceived of Scotland's past in different ways they all found it good, defensible, and very different from England's. In so far as there was an American counterpart to this, it was the history of freeborn Englishmen whose historic rights had a very different pedigree from those of the

Scots. The logical outcome of the Scottish historical work was varied. With the enlightened it became 'sociological whiggism' which with Scott verged on romantic nationalism in which blood, race and place, history, and the uniqueness of a shared experience defined a sensibility to be shared by all Scots. Americans produced no histories like Robertson's and, while they admired Scott, there was no common sense of nationhood shared by slave-owning Carolinians, Philadelphia Quakers and Connecticut backwoodsmen. Indeed, while Americans sought for the United States what Scott had given his countrymen, they realized that they had few precedents and that American history would be more difficult to make national and romantic.¹² The profound divisions among American provincials would lead eventually to war as had the national divisions among the Scots and English.

The political divisions of the world of the old régimes reflected an equally regionalized economic world in which not all ties ran to political centres. In Scotland, before the union and after it, London was not always the port to which Scots looked or from which they got their news, books, cloths or even their diseases. Boston might do so but the tobacco growers of the Chesapeake by 1760 looked less to London than to Glasgow. As Richard Sher has noted, more attention ought to be paid to relations between provinces and historians' perspectives shifted from London to other British ports.¹³ Trade policy might be written in London to favor Londoners and the English but other centres did carry on virtually independent trades. Glasgow's geographical advantages made it *the* tobacco capital and this trade linked it closely to Paris. After 1776 it became one of the centres of the cotton trade. The industries associated with these trades operated within the framework of the Navigation Acts but with little relation to London. That was equally true of those manufactures revolutionized by steam, by iron machinery and by new chemical processes. Those innovations were made largely in provincial centres and were ones to which Glasgow made disproportionate contributions. Insofar as improvements of this sort and the sciences related to them had a place in the Enlightenment, the provinces, not the metropolis, set the standards.¹⁴ In the Scottish Enlightenment this was not a small issue, although in America both science and improvement tended to mean rather different things¹⁵ and industrial developments were taken up in America largely after its imperial ties had been snapped.¹⁶ One might also add that the American colonies and states were very different in their responses to these changes.

One should also notice that the Clive-Bailyn thesis harbours an anti-cosmopolitan element. Scots and Americans, they said, looked to London. London is different from Paris, and the provincial reactions to metropolitan cultures are even more different. But the provincials' world

was more cosmopolitan than it looks when one asks who read Bayle or Voltaire, Montesquieu or Rousseau, Per Kalm or Buffon, Weiland or Goethe.¹⁷ No doubt provincial cities did produce men different in outlook from those in Paris and London, but we should also notice the things which made the eighteenth century the last cosmopolitan age.

It was, first of all, a world not yet affected by nationalisms, but one which still believed in the universality and uniformity of human nature. As Lovejoy put it, it was predominantly classical in outlook and assented to the values and ideas he used to define *classicism*.¹⁸

It was still a world humanistically educated, a claim far truer of Scotland than America. Plutarch, Livy, and Cicero were as much parts of this culture as any *philosophe*. In England and Scotland, but not America, the Romans were still present — as conquerors in the south but in the north as invaders who had not subdued the Scots whom they pusillanimously had tried to wall out of their territories. Scots knew less Greek than Latin but were nonetheless captivated by the originality of the Greeks. Until the early nineteenth century, when revolution and republicanism helped to revive an interest in Greek and Greece, Scots, like most Europeans, tended to be more concerned with Romans — with imperial Rome in Edinburgh, but also with the republican Rome of the civically virtuous Francis Hutcheson and Adam Ferguson. The classics were different in different places. Although Americans, Scots, Englishmen, and Frenchmen alike read Charles Rollin's *The Ancient History* (1730) and his *The Method of Teaching and Studying the Belles-Lettres* (1726-28) (translated and published in Edinburgh)¹⁹ and very often texts by Livy, Lucian, Caesar, Cicero or Tacitus, they reacted differently to them.

The enlightened everywhere also shared a secularizing philosophical world in which reason was increasingly supplying the key to unlock Nature's secrets including those of her creator. Calvinists like Robert Wodrow or Cotton Mather knew quite a lot about Descartes, Pascal, Bayle, Locke, Samuel Clarke, and even Leibnitz to cite only six of those who had helped to define what reason meant in the early eighteenth century.²⁰ Four of these six are not English.

This was also a profoundly Christian world in which Protestant and Catholic doctrine — even in Scotland — was converging somewhat and finding more common ground with rational theologians.²¹ Among Protestants there were many international currents which had little relation to the metropolitan centres in which they tended to be scorned by sophisticates and 'minute philosophers'. Revivalism, apocalypticism, hopes for Christian unity and reform were not only open aspects of the thought of Wodrow or Cotton Mather but also the rather more secret thoughts of Newton, Boyle, Locke, possibly Pierre Bayle, and certainly

Leibnitz. These were not always remote from the minds of Gallican clerics or even St. Alphonsus Ligoria. Religion shaped the enlightenments of Protestant Europe and perhaps did so more in Scotland and America than elsewhere. Certainly it did it earlier. But what Scots and Americans here had in common was not London but Calvinism. If the study of the Scottish and American Enlightenments is to take note of these religious facts, then the lines of influence, cultural transmission and stimulus will have to run to Boston and Philadelphia from Rotterdam, Geneva, Halle, Glasgow, Edinburgh and Northampton as well as from London and Lambeth. In both Britain and America the Christian world was divided along theological fault lines which ignored political boundaries. James Wodrow, Glasgow University's professor of divinity (1692-1705), lectured on Swiss and Dutch theologians and his son Robert was far more interested in European Calvinists than in those writing in England of whom he tended to disapprove. Robert's religious awareness, however, embraced Boston divines, some in English towns, others in London, some French and Dutch thinkers, and the ungodly deists of London and Holland. In religious terms the 'metropolitan' towns for Wodrow were Geneva, Leyden, Utrecht, and London (in that order). For his friend and correspondent, Cotton Mather, the order would have been reversed and Halle would have been inserted. For a Philadelphia Lutheran, Halle would be there but would the others have been? If religion was central to the Protestant enlightenments of America and Scotland, as Henry May and others have claimed, then the Clive-Bailyn thesis contributes little to our understanding of them because Americans became less rather than more oriented toward London as the eighteenth century progressed.

Another set of problems with the Clive-Bailyn thesis arises when one asks where the most important centres of particular activities were to be found. These tended to move and were not always in the metropolises. Edinburgh medicine (but not surgery) by the 1740s was as notable as Leyden's, outranked that taught at Oxford or Upsalla, and probably that of London too. By 1800 Edinburgh and Glasgow were educating more physicians than London, Oxford, and Cambridge and were doing a better job at it. Many a Scots physician must have gone to London with the knowledge that his accent would be as much of a recommendation as a liability - just as students and visitors from the colonies, like Franklin, may have found life's '*densest Happiness*'²² in Edinburgh and not the British capital. Only in Paris by the 1780s could one have learned as much chemistry as Joseph Black and others were teaching in Edinburgh. Philadelphia by then was a second-rate centre still looking to Scotland and Europe. But medicine was not alone in exhibiting such patterns.

Dutch biblical scholarship throughout the eighteenth century seems to have been the best going. Scotland by 1775 probably had more good historians at work than London. Depending on what one includes in the enlightenment, the provincial centres will be more or less significant and independent but their prominence will probably vary far more than that of metropolitan areas.

Who leads and who follows is not a clear-cut matter in most intellectual concerns, although there was never any question of London's dominance in the arts and what we now call literature. Still, Scots often bought their pictures in Europe and their busts in Rome. Moreover that is where they, like London artists, wanted to train. Provincial markets could seldom sustain artists or the men of letters who wrote plays, novels, poetry, journalism, and did the literary odd jobs of the time.²³ This was partly a function of demand and fashion, but on the continent the concentration of publishing in capitals had much to do with licensing, censorship and the regulation of the press as it had in Britain until 1695. Later it was still a matter of economics.²⁴ Nevertheless, the republic of letters was a European place and one that the metropolises did not always completely dominate. Provincial intellectuals often looked to their counterparts elsewhere for leadership.

III

Now I should like to turn to Robert Wodrow to look at a provincial intellectual working at the beginning of the Enlightenment in a town not altogether unlike Boston. How was his world defined? Where had it come from? What would come out of it? How different was it from Boston and Scotland from Massachusetts? Let us begin by considering the extant inventory of Wodrow's natural curiosities.

Wodrow drew up in 1703 what he called a 'List of Materials for a Natural History.' These were arranged in 155 numbered boxes or drawers which he called 'shottles' and which had probably just found a place in his Eastwood study. It was an impressive agglomeration of things for a collector of twenty four who had been at it for perhaps six years. His shottles progressed more or less from the lowest element, earth, to watery things and to airy ones and then to human artifacts. The boxes held a lot of stones, some 'singular' (which I take to imply a taxonomic scheme of some sort in which they were anomalous); crystals, gemstones, stalactites, lavas; minerals or 'fossils' such as talc, bitumen, alum, asbestos, coal; ores; lodestones; flints; whins; building stones; 'Thunder bolts' such as 'a piece of stony matter that came out of a Cloud in time of Thunder and spoiled some trees and killed a horse in Kilbryde parish

about 1695.' This he noted still had 'a sulfurous smell.' All these jostled with petrifications, real fossils, bladder calculi, and other stones taken from animals. The sea had given him ivory, shells, corals, corallines, sponges, skates' egg cases, sea urchins, starfish, a 'sea serpent' and 'pearls from the water of Ayr of very odd shapes, colours and sizes.' From the air had come birds, birds' eggs, beaks, and talons. He had some roots, seeds, and leaves of exotic plants sent from abroad, along with such oddities as 'Four popish consecrate Hostie of two kinds,' 'Indian paper made of vegetables,' Chinese painted silk, 'Elf arrows of several shapes', Roman silver objects, Saxon coins, Indian pipes and wampum. Noted as 'Hanging in the Room besides the Shottles' were:

a very large *Echinus Marinus* or sea prickled Hurcheon. A Lesser one from our Western Seas. A Land Hedge hog. A large *Murex* from the East Indies. A Ramms head from the neighbouring fells with four horns one of them singular

Fuchus marinus Trifolietus singularis N.B. from Darien. A Flying Fish.

A shoe dug up from Walsly moss not far from Hamilton, all of one piece of leather. The shoe was found in a place of the moss before digged in, about two fathoms below the surface of the moss, amongst the branches of a large Oak tree that was lying there. This was attested to by two persons that were in the family where the person lived who found it, and is now dead. They tell me there was another somewhat larger found near it which is now destroyed.

A King fisher or Halicon from our West shores.

The foot of an Eagle. *Echinus marinus testaceus versicoloratus*.

A white Crow taken out of a nest beside the place of Cochran in the West, there were three other young ones black and of the ordinary kind.

A fish from Virginia called the Gare with a very singular head.

A string of Indian money from Virginia Wampam 10 of the black shells are current at our three pence, and 20 of the white ones are of the same value. A sponge from Orkney. *Piscis triangularis*.

A Whales tooth she came in to Borrowstouness about three years since and was near sixty feet in length.

A large lapis Lydens from the shore of Clyde.

A *Securis Romanus*, perhaps pictish rather of a singular stone, turned up by a plough last year in Stobcross hill.

Chrystall from the North of Scotland. Three fluors from Arran.

Several pieces of Oar from Cumberland. Lead, Silver, Copper & C.

Two pieces of a singular stone N.D. from the West Shores of England.

A Tobacco pipe in several joints from Turkey.

Another that belonged once to the Bey of Algiers his Son.

petroleum nostras Sibbaldus. Or some of the oil that swims on the top of St. Catharine's wells Libbertoun.²⁵

It must have been quite a clutter and certainly gives point to William Brodie's 1704 letter to Wodrow mocking *virtuosi* (Sharp, xxiv-xxvii). But, it is interesting in other ways.

Wodrow's collection has items purporting to be from various places in Scotland (at least ten counties), England (five counties), Ireland, Barbados, Jamaica, Virginia, Maryland, Darien, the East Indies, China, Norway, France, Italy, Algeria, Turkey, and possibly other places of perhaps dubious attribution. Scots whom he knew from the Glasgow and Edinburgh regions had ranged widely. But not all the items had come that way. Among the donors to his small museum were the Vice-President of the Royal Society of London, Dr. John Woodward; the Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Edward Lhuyd (FRS, 1708); the Bishop of Carlisle, William Nicholson (FRS, 1705); and three Edinburgh men, Sir Robert Sibbald, M.D., Dr. Alexander Stevenson, and John Adair. Indirectly, Wodrow may have come by materials collected by the London physician Martin Lister (FRS, 1671), and he probably had some shells brought back by Captain William Dampier and other objects sent by a 'Mr. Edwards'. His relations with these men put him in touch with some of the foremost British naturalists of his time and with the Royal Society of London.²⁶ From them and from their writings, he had acquired the systematically expressed curiosity which resulted in the numerous questionnaires found among his early letters. In those Wodrow sought answers to queries meant to give both light and fruit concerning the natural and moral worlds.²⁷ He was indeed a good Baconian and able to appreciate the significance given to the natural historical information which he sought both by the natural philosophers and by rational theologians. That which concerned civil and ecclesiastical history was not treated very differently, although in the end that portion which concerned Scotland and the country's most recent history would absorb his attention. What it never did was wholly to displace his early interest in natural history and natural philosophy.

Wodrow's scientific and antiquarian interests were almost certainly the product of his Glasgow University training upon which he embarked in 1691. We are used to thinking of Glasgow as a rather dull old-fashioned place in those years but it may have been more exciting and 'modern' than we think. Glasgow's Principal, William Dunlop, had functioned as a trader, as a Carolina militia officer, and as a teacher and minister before becoming Principal in 1690.²⁸ He had natural historical interests about which he had been or was in touch with Sir Robert Sibbald. In Wodrow's own words, 'he was ... one of the greatest antiquaries this nation ever produced.'²⁹ Presumably his manuscript genealogies and history of Renfrewshire³⁰ were but signs of much wider knowledge never evidenced in publications. His office of Historiogra-

pher Royal granted in 1693 may have been justified by more than his patronage connexions and political services. Wodrow's father, then the Professor of Divinity, seems not only to have taught Turretini (Geneva) and Wendelin (Heidelberg) but to have countenanced his son's study of the sermons of Archbishop Tillotson, then best-sellers both for style and content.³¹ He did not discourage the *virtuoso* interests of his son. Wodrow would have studied mathematics with George Sinclair, a competent mathematician and experimenter who was also a successful engineer. Wodrow is sometimes derided for his belief in witchcraft but Sinclair (a kind of Scottish Joseph Glanvill) had tried to give empirical proofs of the existence of spirits including witches.³² Sinclair was succeeded by his son Robert, an M.D., who like his father was something of an inventor and who taught Hebrew as well as mathematics. In William Jameson the College possessed a civil and ecclesiastical historian who was not only a polemicist but also a man eager to see the library acquire Scottish manuscripts. Next to nothing is known of Wodrow's regent, James Knibloe, who resigned in 1694. Other regents have left more of a mark. John Law knew enough natural philosophy to invent a new kind of sun dial and to publish a perpetual lunar calendar.³³ Gershom Carmichael was to be remarkable as a natural lawyer and moralist who produced textbooks in logic and ethics. By the time Wodrow had entered Glasgow, Carmichael³⁴ had probably ceased to be a Cartesian; certainly he was a more forward looking man than the fourth regent, John Tran, who did, however, notice Newton in his lectures. Finally, throughout the 1690s the curriculum was being discussed and plans to establish chairs in medicine and law were presented. This was a college in ferment whose best men had a perspective on the world which was that of the *virtuosi*.³⁵

Wodrow's later career appears in a somewhat distorted light because the editor of his three volumes of correspondence published in 1842-43, Thomas McCrie, did not say very much about many letters to Wodrow which dealt with topics other than ecclesiastical matters and historical researches.³⁶ Among Wodrow's friends and correspondents with whom he discussed scientific and philosophical matters was Robert Steuart, a rather different man from Cotton Mather. Steuart was descended from notable presbyterian sufferers and after 1703 was an Edinburgh University regent who became its first Professor of Natural Philosophy (1708-43). Steuart was educated at Edinburgh, perhaps Glasgow, Utrecht, and Leyden and possibly studied medicine. He was probably a travelling tutor between 1700 and 1703 and as such spent time in London, Holland, and Geneva.³⁷ Like Wodrow, he was a complete *virtuoso* interested not only in science and philosophy but also in history and much else. He belonged to an Edinburgh antiquarian club but is more notable for his teaching of Boyle, Newton and physico-theologians such as John Ray,

Walter Charleton, and William Derham. David Erskine, 11th Earl of Buchan, remembered him as a chemist who did parlour tricks. A frequent attender of the General Assembly, he usually put Wodrow up when the latter came to Edinburgh. Through him and others, the minister of Eastwood remained in contact with the European world of science and secular learning.

It seems clear that Wodrow, like Mather, read fairly regularly the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society of London and, when he could get them, periodicals from Holland, mostly edited by Huguenots.³⁸ At least until c.1710 he was in contact with Sibbald and other members of his circle. He received medical items such as a cure for the clap (1705) and preventatives for fever (1712) and seems to have followed the Clarke-Leibnitz controversies. In 1716 and 1718 Leibnitz's *Theodicy* and *Letters* are mentioned in the correspondence with Steuart. So too are the Boyle Lecturers, particularly Derham and Samuel Clarke. By 1715 Wodrow owned works by Robert Boyle and was reading books by John Ray and John Woodward. By 1724 he had something by Pierre Bayle and two years later he noted that Peter Shaw had translated 'Boerhaave's Chymistry.' Whether that interested him more than Mary Tofts, 'the Rabbit woman [now] found to be a great cheat,' we cannot know. In 1727 he was following the career of Colin Maclaurin, who nine years earlier he had thought a promising man. Only toward the very end of his life does his interest in science seem to have waned. That was not true of his concerns with history and with religious controversy to which we will return. Before we do so, however, we should note the importance of his scientific interests.

Wodrow as a scientist belonged to the generation which in Scotland institutionalized many new ideas which Sibbald's generation had introduced. These included both Baconianism and Newtonian physics. The universities changed and their curricula introduced the outlook and methods of the English Baconians.³⁹ Those changes had begun in the 1660s when Sibbald was young, but it was Wodrow's friends at both Edinburgh and Glasgow who taught them in the classrooms. Robert Steuart, like Wodrow, admired Boyle, Newton, and the physico-theologians and structured his natural philosophy course around their works. Regents at Glasgow and the mathematics professor, Robert Simson, were to do the same. The Scottish Enlightenment was to build on this heritage of the *virtuosi* not only in the sciences but in moral philosophy as well. As it did so, it would in a way separate science from philosophy, morals, and history as all became more specialized. The choice which Wodrow made — to be an historian and a specialist — would in the long run be amplified throughout the culture and work to break up the *virtuoso's* conception of the unity of knowledge and the range of the concerns of

the complete, well-educated gentleman. That would be aided by the growth of Scottish cities and universities and in Glasgow by the specialization of its trades.⁴⁰ What was true within the universities was also true in the Scottish clubs. Even if he did not belong to Sibbald's *virtuoso* club of 1702, Wodrow was connected with many of its members. By the time of his death in 1734, such general purpose groups were breaking up into those with scientific and those with other interests. Fifty years later that division was formally recognized in the two classes of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, founded in 1783. It is perhaps significant that the men who knew best the works of Sibbald and Wodrow, Lord Buchan and John Anderson of Glasgow, were among the last to uphold the *virtuoso* ideals which Wodrow's early career so well exemplifies.

For the first twenty-eight years of his life, Wodrow's Scotland was technically an independent kingdom united to England only contingently through their common sovereign. It was also for the first nine years of his life a country in which people who held the political and religious views of his family and their relatives and connexions were persecuted and often dreadfully harried. These two facts shaped his career as an historian and antiquary, just as they affected in similar ways the careers and historical work of his friends. Most of them were concerned to defend Scottish freedom, independence, learning and honor in every sphere and with modern methods.

Scots generally, and Wodrow and his friends in particular, saw themselves as belonging to an ancient kingdom, as old and honorable as any in Europe. Wodrow himself was still interested in and may have believed one of the various Scottish foundation myths. Was Fergus, the first Scottish king, descended from Gathelus and Scota his Egyptian wife; or, was it the case that Fergus' forbears included Albanactus the younger son of Brutus the great grandson of Trojan Aeneas? Was there another account? How would one know which was true? Each story was big with political, religious, and other implications which bore upon Scottish self-esteem.⁴¹ In pondering these, and in perhaps allowing that Thomas Innes had settled some of them in 1728, Scots were playing an old and common European game and playing finally by rules given classic expression not in London where, indeed, they were known and used, but by père Jean Mabillion and the Benedictine monks of St. Maur. As with antiquaries and historians elsewhere, in a centralizing world, there was an urgency about their historical work. It had to show that Scotland was and always had been an empire unto itself and never a dependency upon the English crown or upon the sees of Rome or York. Scots belonged to no province but to a kingdom whose subjects had been valorous, learned, pious and free. The English assimilationist pressures throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth century evoked book

after book concerned with these themes and many other manuscripts which never made it into print. History having these ends transcended political and religious divisions and allowed men like Wodrow to cooperate with Scottish Catholics like Fr. Thomas Innes; Jacobites like Henry Maule of Panmure or Thomas Ruddiman; with Episcopalian trimmers like Sir Robert Sibbald; or even with Anglican bishops like William Nicolson of Carlisle or Edmund Gibson of London. Collectively they would and did recount the history of Scots and present it as the record of an historic people who had mattered in the world and still did.⁴²

The rub came when present politics and religion were at issue. The constitutional position of the King, of the Parliament, the powers of the nobility, and much more tended to split these men into factions. After 1715 Scottish antiquaries of differing political persuasions maintained separate clubs in Edinburgh. Wodrow belonged to the Whig club as did his friend Robert Steuart.⁴³ Religion was equally divisive.⁴⁴ For Thomas Innes, Christianity properly came to Scotland under Roman and papal auspices. Englishmen tended to think the Scots belonged in the metropolitan see of York. For Sibbald and for Wodrow the Kirk traced its descent through time to the Culdees and beyond them to the apostolic age but to the eastern churches. Their Kirk was thus independent of both Rome and York. It was one which preserved and taught the original message of the gospels using legitimate liturgical forms practiced within church structures held to be those of primitive Christians or licit variations of them. Through the ages Scots had struggled to preserve the purity of their Kirk from those who had tried to corrupt it — popes and their minions, secular outsiders from France or England; kings, noblemen, heritors; fanatics and heretics both learned and vulgar. This church was no gathered community of saints but an historic established institution which from perhaps the days of St. Andrew had preached and administered the sacraments, dispensed charity, and disciplined the wayward and unruly. Its history was in part edifying and heroic but also one in which ungodly compromises had been made just as they were being made in Wodrow's own time in matters concerning appointments and the toleration of non-presbyterians.

Scots who saw their kingdom and church in these ways were hardly provincials. Hard pressed by the English they might be, but their outlook was one that was distinctively national and Scottish and certainly different from that of the American provincials whom Clive and Bailyn sought also to understand. Indeed, perhaps we should here point to some of the differences between Wodrow and his Boston correspondent, Cotton Mather, between Glasgow and Boston, between Scotland and Massachusetts.

Scotland, as Wodrow and the Scots of the early eighteenth century understood it, was first of all an historical country whose northern and Highland regions preserved vestiges of the original institutions, beliefs, and language(s) of the Scots. Highlanders might be compared to Indians, but in the end they did not live in a 'howling wilderness' but were cousins needing civility and capable of quick amendment. It was also a feudal country with a small nobility and gentry class which owned or controlled most of the land. That was a situation few questioned or took as unnatural. It still possessed most of the trappings of a seventeenth-century state including, up to 1707, an army, navy, and the usual offices of state. Even after 1707 the regalia of the monarch remained in Edinburgh symbolizing the continuance of the Kingdom of Scotland within the new United Kingdom. There was no way in which English colonists, before 1707, could see their colonies as similar to Scotland. If both were marginalized peoples, the Scots had a history which put them far more firmly in Europe and made them comparable to the Burgundians of previous centuries or to present day Bohemians. Scotland in Wodrow's time was a kingdom in disarray, but it was not one ready to concede its loss of independence. Had it been, there would have been no union debates, no uprisings in 1715, 1718 or 1745 and no spirited protests against English incursions upon the Treaty of Union signed between sovereign, if unequal, peoples. These people were not (and are not now) Englishmen.

IV

The Massachusetts of Cotton Mather was very different. Here were the descendants of refugees and other Englishmen who, under the protection of a 1629 company charter, had been given by the Crown the right:

to make, ordain, and establish all manner of wholesome and reasonable orders, laws, statutes, and ordinances, directions and instructions not contrary to the laws of this our realm of England ... for settling of the forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy in and for the directing, ruling and disposing of all other matters and things, whereby our said people, inhabitants there, may be so religiously, peaceably, and civilly governed, as their good life and orderly conversation, may win and incite the natives of [the] country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind, and the Christian faith, which in our royal intention and the adventurers' free profession, is the principal end of this plantation.⁴⁵

Whatever else it was, this was a colony of godly Englishmen whose marginality did not include the burdens of an identity at odds with that of their metropolis as it should have been. In the 'howling wilderness' of New England these men, unlike Fergus and his pagan band, had come to make a new Zion and to set upon a hill a city that would be a light unto the world. This New Jerusalem whose church was gathered until the 'half-way covenant' and Solomon Stoddard's innovations was not an historically evolved entity but, like their state, a semi-utopian endeavour. Scotland disappointed Wodrow by becoming less independent in his lifetime. Mather was disappointed by a Massachusetts becoming ever more subject to the 'laws of our realm of England.' In some sense or other most Scots would have agreed with Wodrow, but among many in Massachusetts the death of the Puritan world was welcomed and there was a more or less willing acceptance of English standards which was without a Scottish parallel except among members of the small political élite.

If Massachusetts and Scotland were different, so were Glasgow⁴⁶ and Boston. Although both were about the same size in 1700 (7,000 people), Glasgow was a more complex place.⁴⁷ It was Scotland's second city, not its capital. Nevertheless it had courts, a legal corporation, a medical guild and ten others, along with a Town Council with various privileges. These were, in effect, all late medieval or renaissance foundations as was the university. Its presbytery was important; so too was the synod which met there quarterly. But, it was hardly autonomous. The Dukes of Montrose, Argyll, and Hamilton defended the various interests they had in the burgh, including political ones which affected the Town Council, university and most other things. They were often more real presences than the King in London whom they did not always represent. Glasgow's university was, if not more independent of government, at least not always dependent upon local authorities. The burgh also had a small but cosmopolitan intelligentsia. The twenty five or so men who taught at the university between 1690 and 1731 had been in part mostly educated abroad, usually in Holland. A few had travelled to the continent as the tutors of aristocratic boys. Only one, Robert Simson, seems to have gone to an English school, but eight or nine had attended lectures at Leyden; two more had been at Utrecht and one other at an unknown French university. Many of the city's medical men in these years had also studied abroad. They included *virtuosi* like John Johnstoun (M.D., Utrecht). The doctor was a classicist, wit, antiquary, and the first holder of the university's revived medical chair. His surgeon friend who deputized for the professor of anatomy, Mr. John Paisley, was another polymath, who was the city's first important extramural teacher of medicine and anatomy. A third physician, Dr. George Thompson (M.D., Rheims)

was a *virtuoso* and friend of Wodrow. And, Robert Houston (M.D., Glasgow University's first; FRS, 1728), who left the town c.1714, was another medical man of learning. Before he left Glasgow, he had (c.1701) performed the world's first ovariectomy which in due course was reported in the *Philosophical Transactions*. Boston physicians might have been as good practitioners, but their credentials were certainly different and they were not regulated by a Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons. Glasgow's clerics show a similar educational pattern. As early as 1724 Glasgow seems to have been on the circuit for itinerant science lecturers who created a problem for the university. By 1730 this was not a dull place, even though it was Scotland's second city and not a capital like Boston.

Other differences between the worlds of Wodrow and Cotton Mather lay forty miles to the east of Glasgow and about one hundred miles to the west. Edinburgh to the east was a stimulating and exciting place the likes of which Bostonians could not find until Philadelphia began to approximate it in size in the 1760s and 1770s. In the early 1700s Edinburgh's most exciting intellectuals were probably two physicians, Sir Robert Sibbald and Archibald Pitcairne.⁴⁸ Gathered about the first were antiquaries, naturalists, botanists, and surveyors, while Pitcairne attracted Newtonian iatromechanists and raffish poets and antiquaries who frequented the taverns in which he held his consultations. Both doctors had foreign connexions and not only to men in London. Pitcairne had been for a short time a professor of medicine at Leyden; Sibbald's notions of politeness and civilized intellectual discourse were taken from Italian and French academies not from the *Spectator* papers. But they were by no means the city's only intellectuals. By 1734, when Wodrow died, Edinburgh's men of letters had produced a variety of interesting works, including Dr. Patrick Abercromby's *The Martial Achievements of the Scots Nation* (2 volumes, 1711, 1715), the works of Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, and the early poetry of Allan Ramsay. Boston could not have produced such works, just as it did not produce in the 1720s men like David Malloch or James Thomson or the many physicians and surgeons who made their way south to earn livings better than Scotia could provide.⁴⁹ For them the closest open frontier was still south of the Tweed and made accessible to them by their educations. Bostonians looked west more often than they looked to England and they went west with very different baggage and expectations.

The west for Scots was first of all Ireland, then the sugar islands, and then America — more often the southern than the northern colonies. Scots were not unmindful of Ireland from which increasing numbers of students came to Glasgow after 1688. Following the philosopher Thomas Reid, it has been customary for historians to dismiss these 'teagues' as

insignificant. Perhaps we ought not to do so, but instead, to ask, as M. A. Stewart has recently been asking, 'what effects they had upon Scottish thought?' Concentrating upon Francis Hutcheson and his friends, Stewart has concluded that out of Ireland came ideas about toleration, freedom, empire, rights, and liberty which were novel in Scotland and ultimately engendered by the treatment of Ulster presbyterians by Irish and English episcopalians.⁵⁰ If he is correct, then the Irish offer an interesting case of one lot of 'provincials' affecting another and ultimately changing the ideas of men at the centre. Scots also changed Americans who by 1790 came to look to Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Glasgow and not just to London.

In the end, Scotland and the American colonies were quite different places. Scots at the beginning of the eighteenth century were not English provincials, but subjects of a kingdom which was virtually but not entirely to disappear in 1707. When it did so, Scots then continued, as they had long done, to define themselves, their work, and their goals partly in terms of a unique national history, partly by the standards of the republic of letters in which London was but one centre and often, depending on the problem or issue, not the most important one. There is, indeed, a sense in which mid-eighteenth century Scots were more French than English — something that could not be said even of Jefferson. Those Scots were confident that they had as much truth and virtue to give the world as any Londoner. They might eschew Scotticisms as hindrances to advancement, but they were not always imitative or reactive in what or how they thought. When they were, those they imitated or to whom they reacted were sometimes in Upsalla, Leyden, Dijon, Bordeaux, Belfast or Weimar and not just in London which for them, in any case, was not a single community, style, manner or fashion. The London of the Scots was as apt to be the London of Dissenting merchants and physicians as of the Court and the Establishment. It is implausible to see Scots as always uneasy, alienated, and insecure because they were outsiders. This might be true of Boswell but such a perception ill-describes Lord Kames, David Hume, William Robertson, William Hunter, Sir John Pringle, or even Robert Wodrow.

V

What we need to do, I think, is to ask other questions about the origins of the Scottish Enlightenment than those put by Clive and Bailyn. Some of those questions revolve around the drift and currents of intellectual culture in Europe generally. Others concern the internal circumstances of historical entities such as the Kingdom of Scotland or the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. Still more concern the complex relations and influences which affected the so-called metropolitan centres and the peripheral towns and their hinterlands. The Clive-Bailyn thesis was perhaps useful in forcing historians to think about the relations which held between metropolitan centres and the towns and provinces at the peripheries of European cultural life. But provinces were not convincingly described nor were the relations between them considered. They also failed to note the impact of cities of special but not general importance. If we do that, then there is for the historian of the Scottish Enlightenment more point in spelling out the contacts between Scots and Dutch up to, say, *c.*1740 than there is in meticulously noting similarities between Scots and Americans. There may also be more point in thinking about Scottish-Irish or Scottish-French contacts than about those between Edinburgh and London. If we do think about Scotland and America, we should be more concerned with their direct and often reciprocal relations — with the migration of people, the importation of books, the common expression of religious sensibilities — and not with their differing relations to London or England.

It also seems to me that if we pay more attention to the seventeenth-century background to all enlightenments, we will find that the Scottish context was not so different from that of the rest of Europe. In France, Holland, and England, the Enlightenment clearly emerged from the world of the *virtuosi* as that was shaped by the critical and empirical methods of Baconian natural historians and humanist-trained antiquaries. Made methodologically sharper by Boyle, Bayle, Newton, and other Dutch and French philosophers and savants, European thinkers, especially scientists, brought about a restructuring of epistemology in whose wake came theories of progress or possible progress once the impediments to rational thought and reasonable actions were removed. These theories entailed a new anthropology, a new philosophy of mind and morals, and investigations of the circumstances in which men could, did and should act. These common problems everywhere exercised Europeans. How they responded to them depended more upon their past history as peoples, upon their religious views, and upon their political freedoms than upon living in a capital or at the periphery of the republic of letters. And, it mattered very much what sort of a city they lived in

and how it was situated with respect to others. Market size and the complement of institutions supporting a variety of thinkers were important. So too was political patronage and the arrangements which structured it. In Scotland it was not only enlightened middle class men who made the Enlightenment but noble patrons like Archibald Campbell, the 3rd Duke of Argyll, to whom the Scottish Enlightenment owes far more than to any of its thinkers. Such men were generally lacking in America and certainly in the Boston of Cotton Mather. Finally, we must avoid explanations like that of Clive and Bailyn which are too vague in their definitions of crucial terms and in the end turn out to be not so much empirical explanations but *a priori* insights which lead us to overlook too much.

ROGER EMERSON

University of Western Ontario

Notes

- 1 John Clive and Bernard Bailyn, 'England's Cultural Provinces: Scotland and America,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d series, 2 (1954): 200-13 (hereafter cited parenthetically as CB).
- 2 Clive and Bailyn (CB, 205) say that the Scottish aristocrats' role in the Scottish Enlightenment 'remained contributory rather than decisive.' It vastly under-estimates the power of a man like the 3d Duke of Argyll who placed or allowed the placement of about fifty university professors between c.1723 and 1761. Men like the 1st Duke of Roxburghe (d.1741) or the 3d Earl of Bute made an immense impact of their society. None of these three were 'Jacobite and Episcopalian' as Clive and Bailyn claimed was largely true of 'the Scottish nobility and gentry' after 1690. On their misperception of class and rank in the Scottish Enlightenment see also Angus Calder, 'The Enlightenment,' *The Manufacture of Scottish History*, ed. Ian Donnachie and Christopher Whateley (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1992) 32-33.
- 3 I offer as an example: 'The correspondence [between Cotton Mather and Robert Woodrow] not only demonstrates Mather's eminence abroad but also marks the beginning of a century-long and mutually fruitful communion between Scottish and American intellectuals — men drawn together by their sense of shared problems in living in cultural provinces of the British empire'; Kenneth Silverman, *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985) 223. For a variant of the Clive-Bailyn thesis see Andrew Hook, 'Philadelphia, Edinburgh and the Scottish Enlightenment,' *Scotland and America in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Richard B. Sher and Jeffrey R. Smitten (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1990) 227-41. For a select bibliography dealing with Scotland and America consult William R. Brock, *Scotus Americanus: A Survey of the Sources for Links*

between Scotland and America in the Eighteenth Century (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1982).

- 4 A point rather like this has been made by Richard Sher, 'Introduction: Scottish-American Cultural Studies, Past and Present,' *Scotland and America* (n. 3)
4. See also R. L. Emerson, 'Enlightenment & Social Structures,' *City and Society in the 18th Century*, ed. Paul Fritz and David Williams (Toronto: Hakkert, 1973) 99-124.
- 5 The founding charters for Pennsylvania and Massachusetts may be conveniently located in *English Historical Documents IX: American Colonial Documents to 1776*, ed. Merrill Jensen (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955) 72-84, 93-101.
- 6 See the essays on political unions in the eighteenth century contained in *A Union for Empire*, ed. John Robertson (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995).
- 7 This was the stand of Sir Thomas Craig *De unione regnorum Britanniae* (1603-05) and it was in part the outlook which informed Henry Home, Lord Kames' *Principles of Equity* (1767). For a brilliant discussion of these themes and others worked by Scottish writers in this period see Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) esp. 1-96.
- 8 These are discussed in detail in Robertson (n. 6) and in a companion volume dealing with the seventeenth-century schemes to unify Scotland and England to be edited by Roger A. Mason.
- 9 See William Ferguson, *Scotland's Relations with England: a survey to 1707* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1977) 97-278; *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, ed. R.A. Mason (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987) 60-265.
- 10 Father Thomas Innes, *A Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of Britain, or Scotland* (London: William Innys, 1728); *The Civil and Ecclesiastical History of Scotland* (Aberdeen: The Spalding Club, 1853).
- 11 Most of the relevant literature is mentioned in R.L. Emerson, 'Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt., The Royal Society of Scotland and the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment,' *Annals of Science* 45 (1988): 41-72; Stan A. E. Mendyk, *Speculum Britanniae: Regional Study, Antiquarianism and Science in Britain to 1700* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1989); Gordon Donaldson, 'A Lang Pedigree: An Essay to mark the Centenary of the Scottish History Society 1886-1986,' *The Scottish Historical Review* 65 (1986): 1-16; Douglas Duncan, 'Scholarship and Politeness in the Early Eighteenth Century,' *The History of Scottish Literature*, ed. Cairns Craig, 4 vol. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1987) 2:51-64.
- 12 Andrew Hook, *Scotland and America: A Study of Cultural Relations 1750-1835* (Glasgow and London: Blackie, 1975) 116-73; Hook returned to some of the themes treated there in 'Scotland and Romanticism: The International Scene,' *The History of Scottish Literature* (n. 11) 2:307-22.
- 13 Sher (n. 4) 4.
- 14 No one could read through such books as Archibald and Nan L. Clow *The Chemical Revolution* (London, 1952; Freeport: Books for Libraries, 1970); John Money, *Experience and Identity: Birmingham and the West Midlands 1760-1800* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1977); or David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven & London: Yale UP, 1990) and not believe that science was an essential part of the Enlightenment and better pursued in the provinces than in metropolitan centres like London.

- 15 James E. McClellan III, *Science Reorganized: Scientific Societies in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia UP, 1985) 140-45; Silvio A. Bedini, *Thomas Jefferson Statesman of Science* (New York and London: Macmillan, 1990) esp. 486-96.
- 16 Charts noting inventions by regions make that very clear: see the one in T.K. Derry and Trevor I. Williams, *A Short History of Technology* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1960) 734-49. A very different picture is presented by Charles C. Gillispie *Science and Polity in France at the End of the Old Regime* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980). Gillispie's world is one in which office and patronage power, not location, tend to determine what is done and where and by whom. The 3d Duke of Argyll's patronage in Scotland helped to establish the Royal Bank of Scotland, The British Linen Co. [later Bank], glasshouses and potteries, a type foundry, bleach yards, and it certainly aided the linen trade in other ways for which America can offer no parallel.
- 17 As it has been described by Robert Darnton and Daniel Roche, the reading matter of French provincials was not so different from that of Parisians. As Franco Venturi has noticed, reform demands rose everywhere after c.1760 both in capitals and in provincial centres where learned societies devoted more attention to political, social and improving topics after that date. See the essays by Darnton and Roche in *Revolution in Print: The Press in France 1775-1800*, ed. Robert Darnton and Daniel Roche (Berkeley: U of California P, 1989); see also Roche's *Le Siècle des Lumières en province: Académies et académiciens provinciaux, 1680-1789*, 2 vol. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978); Franco Venturi, *The End of the Old Regime in Europe 1768-1776*, trans. R. Burr Litchfield (Princeton, Princeton UP, 1989). For the cosmopolitan reading of Americans perhaps the best early list comes in the works of the Mathers while the best late list is that in *The Diary of Elihu Hubbard Smith*, ed. James E. Cronin, *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 95 (1973), *passim*.
- 18 A. O. Lovejoy, 'The Parallel of Deism and Classicism,' *Modern Philology* 29 (1932): 281-99.
- 19 Rollin's *Method* was recommended to Scottish university students for at least fifty years and in English saw a total of eleven editions by 1810. It was more popular in Scotland than in England; Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971) 529-35.
- 20 R. L. Emerson, 'Science and Moral Philosophy in the Scottish Enlightenment,' *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment*, ed. M. A. Stewart (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990) 11-36; ---, 'The religious, the secular and the worldly: Scotland 1680-1800,' *Religion, Secularization and Political Thought*, ed. James E. Crimmins (London: Routledge, 1990) 68-89.
- 21 Wolfgang Müller, et. al., trans. Gunther J. Holst, *The Church in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment*, vol 6 of *The History of the Church*, ed H. Jedine and J. Dolan, 10 vol. (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 329-546, *passim*. See also Mark Goldie, 'Common Sense Philosophy and Catholic Theology in the Scottish Enlightenment', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 302 (1992): 281-320. Fr. Thomas Innes was courteously treated by Scots scholars in the 1720s while in Edinburgh doing research. Fr. Alexander Geddes was honored with a Marischal College LL.D. in 1780 and was friendly with many Scottish men of letters.
- 22 Benjamin Franklin to Henry Home, Lord Kames, 3 January 1760, *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Leonard W. Labaree, 28 vol. (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1966) 9: 9-10.

- 23 In 1798 Henry Mackenzie compared London and Edinburgh as literary centres. In the latter literature was usually the avocation of professional men whose 'duties are not in general so extensive as to engross the whole man' who is consequently no specialist and can unite 'business and literary studies.' London, he noted, had men of letters who were nothing else. Henry Mackenzie, 'A short Account of the Life and Writings of William Tytler,' *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 4 (1798): 18-19.
- 24 That British and colonial papers were different and variously related to London has been shown by Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986) 132-67. Steele's papers were all London oriented and those in Edinburgh and Dublin 'were not concerned with local news or local perspectives. Prudence in these castle cities discouraged reporting on matters that irritated watchful governments' (144). *The Scots Magazine* (founded in 1739) and many later papers were, of course, rather different.
- 25 John Anderson Manuscripts, Strathclyde University Library, MS 11. I thank the University's Keeper of Manuscripts, J.M. Allan for permission to quote this passage.
- 26 For descriptions of the community he aspired to join see: Joseph Levine, *Dr. Woodward's Shield: History, Science, and Satire in Augustan England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1977); Mendyk (n. 11); Douglas Duncan, *Thomas Ruddiman: A Study in Scottish Scholarship of the Early Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965).
- 27 *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709*, ed. L. W. Sharp [hereafter Sharp] (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1937) e.g. 12-15 (Nova Caledonia), 32-33 (Western Highlands), 68-69 (Highlands); see also J. L. Campbell and Derick Thomson, *Edward Lhuys in the Scottish Highlands 1699-1700* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1963) 23-36.
- 28 Here and elsewhere in discussing the Glasgow and Edinburgh University professors I am drawing upon an unpublished paper by myself and Paul Wood.
- 29 Wodrow (n. 27) 60.
- 30 *MacFarlane's Geographical Collections*, ed. Sir Arthur Mitchell, K.C.B., 2 vol. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1904-06).
- 31 Robert Wodrow, 'Essay to recover some Accompt of ... James Wodrow ... By his Son,' Edinburgh University Library, Laing MSS, MS La II.690; Sharp (n. 27) xviii-xxiii.
- 32 George Sinclair, *Satan's Invisible World Discovered*, ed. Coleman O. Parsons (Gainesville: Scholars Facsimile and Reprints, 1969).
- 33 Sir Robert Sibbald, 'Supplement to His Prodromus 1684-', National Library of Scotland [NLS] Advocates' MS 33.5.19, pp. 110, 330, 342; Sharp (n. 27) xxvii, 27.
- 34 See the introduction to the forthcoming edition of Gershom Carmichael's Latin works translated and edited by Michael Silverthorne and James Moore.
- 35 P. B. Wood, 'Jolly Jack Phosphorus in the Venice of the North: or, Who was John Anderson?,' *Glasgow and the Enlightenment*, ed. R. Sher and A. Hook (Edinburgh: Canongate, 1995); ----, 'Science and the Aberdeen Enlightenment,' *Philosophy and Science in the Scottish Enlightenment*, ed. Peter Jones (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988) 39-66. Wood argues that the *virtuosi* made natural history and Baconianism

part of the methodological outlook of the enlightened Scots. See also Joseph Levine, 'Natural History and the History of the Scientific Revolution,' *Clio* 13 (1983): 57-73.

36 These letters are among the Wodrow MSS at the NLS, Wodrow Letters 4°.

37 Steuart's career is noticed by Michael Barfoot, 'Hume and the Culture of Science in the Early Eighteenth Century,' *Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment* (n. 20) 151-90.

38 His 'huge library' is briefly discussed by Douglas Duncan, 'Scholarship and Politeness in the Early Eighteenth Century,' *History of Scottish Literature* (n. 11) 58.

39 See note 37.

40 R. L. Emerson, 'The Scottish Enlightenment and the End of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh,' *British Journal for the History of Science* 21 (1988): 61-63.

41 These were very old concerns. See Roger A. Mason, 'Kingship, Nobility and Anglo-Scottish Union: John Mair's *History of Greater Britain* (1521),' *Innes Review* 41 (1990): 182-222; see also Kidd (n. 7), and Michael Fry, 'The Whig Interpretation of Scottish History,' *Manufacture of Scottish History* (n. 2) 72-89.

42 I. S. Ross and S. A. C. Scobie, 'Patriotic Publishing as a Response to the Union,' *The Union of 1707: Its Impact on Scotland*, ed. T.I. Rae (Glasgow: Blackie, 1974) 94-119; Duncan (n. 26) 41-71, 122-44. For fine discussions of the historians of these years see Kidd (n. 7) and David Allan, *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1993).

43 Duncan (n. 26), 67; George Chalmers, *The Life of Thomas Ruddiman, A.M.* (London: J. Stockdale and W. Laing, 1794) 74-76, 155-56.

44 One should note that Fr. Innes, Episcopalians like Sibbald, or politiquers such as William Carstares had no counterparts in New England, where church history was written almost exclusively by men like Cotton Mather.

45 *English Historical Documents* (n. 5) 82.

46 See Richard B. Sher, 'Commerce, Religion and the Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Glasgow,' *Glasgow. Volume I: Beginnings to 1830*, ed. T.M. Devine and Gordon Jackson (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995) 312-59.

47 This paragraph draws upon Emerson and Wood (n. 28).

48 See Emerson (n. 11); A. D. C. Simpson, 'Sir Robert Sibbald -The Founder of the College,' *Proceedings of the Royal College of Physicians Tercentenary Congress [6-11 September] 1981* (Edinburgh: Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh, 1982) 59-91; Anita Guerrini, 'Archibald Pitcairne and Newtonian Medicine,' *Medical History* 31 (1987): 70-83.

49 Duncan says that these Scots were 'synthesiz[ing] their intellectual heritage,' which was Scottish and Anglo-French, 'with a new notion of what it meant to think and write like gentlemen.' He sees them as shedding 'sclerotic disciplines and provincial obsessions' which 'was necessary for the nation's return to the mainstream of European thought, and in fact gave new energy to it.' That is not something that could have been written of their American counterparts who had never been in 'the mainstream of European thought'; Duncan (n. 11) 62-63.

50 M. A. Stewart, 'Abating bigotry and hot zeal,' *Fortnight* 308 (1992): 4-6.