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struggle to accommodate events to a long-cherished narrative’ (140). None of this sounds very promising for the reader whose principal interest is in the philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment.

In recent years, a distorted picture in which Hume figured as Scotland’s only major philosopher has been corrected by renewed philosophical interest first in Reid, and then in Smith, both of whom are increasingly reckoned to be philosophers with a status comparable to Locke, Berkeley, or Mill. The judgments I have quoted from the contributors to this collection do not suggest that we can expect their celebrated contemporary, Adam Ferguson, to attract a similar re-assessment. At the same time, the essays in this collection cannot be said to show this to be the case. What they do show, perhaps, is that there is scope, and even need, for a further, different sort of volume, one devoted to seeing whether moral philosophy and social theory can still profitably engage with Ferguson.
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In recent decades in the United Kingdom, the Scottish Enlightenment has been recruited to nationalist, anti-nationalist, leftwing and rightwing political standpoints, and has been utilised to define Scottish history. The Scottish Enlightenment is therefore a significant contributing factor in the continuing process of redefining Scotland’s current cultural and political identity. Coteminoous with the changeful present, the extent and uses of the concept of Enlightenment morphs: ideas once held to be purely metaphysical or epistemological spike outward to become notions that inform other spheres of post-Enlightenment discourse. And now, anxieties concerning modernity and the attendant need for humanity to become beneficently re-accommodated to more sustainable communities and to the natural world, alert us to the importance of working to recover continuities between past and present Scottish thought to enrich understanding of the Enlightenment’s extensive legacy. Since, within the future of Scottish thought, there is potentially a great deal at stake – culturally, ethically, politically, and economically – it is a discourse that ought to be well tended by the major academic initiative of uncovering and progressively developing ideas that connect the Scottish Enlightenment with philosophical discourse throughout the past two centuries.

Cairns Craig’s Intending Scotland is the culmination of his long-standing engagements with the intellectual, philosophical, and literary history and culture
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of Scotland. Part of what Craig sets out to initiate is nothing less than a substantial recovery of post-Enlightenment Scottish thought. He is therefore attempting to produce a work that is genuinely ground breaking through exploring certain aspects of 19th and 20th-century post-Enlightenment Scottish intellectual culture as an important continuation of and response to philosophical traditions inherited from philosophers such as David Hume, Thomas Reid, Adam Ferguson, and Adam Smith. While most of these thinkers have in recent decades become comparatively famous, virtually all of their 19th and 20th-century successors remain unknown and continue to be marginalised as irrelevant.

Though many scholars today would readily concur that Scotland’s intellectual prominence declined during the 19th century, Craig questions this opinion as intimated by, for example, George Davie (Democratic Intellect and Scotch Metaphysics), T.C. Smout (Century of the Scottish People 1830–1950), and Arthur Herman (Scottish Enlightenment: The Scots’ Invention of the Modern World). But, given the scale of the task of countering what seems to be the prevailing view concerning the intellectual history of Scotland after the Enlightenment, Craig claims, modestly but intriguingly, that Intending Scotland provides ‘not a history but rather a prolegomena to a history, a series of excavations’ and thus, what he offers the reader is intentionally ‘provisional: part of a narrative whose implications we are only just beginning to discern’ (12).

But, if Craig’s modesty is fitting, it is also misleading since his later excavations do dig deeply, suggesting lines of thought that could initiate a host of masters and doctoral theses, let alone a series of global conferences of contemporary relevance that might interrelate characteristically Scottish philosophical notions with Continental and American attempts to address (to allude to Jürgen Habermas), the ‘unfinished project’ of the Enlightenment. Craig is opening the ground for nothing short of a major re-discovery of the principal characteristics of Scottish thought during the 19th and 20th centuries as a continuation of certain principal elements of Scottish Enlightenment discourse.

I would state the leading question as follows: if it is tenable to discuss a specifically Scottish Enlightenment, what happens during the 19th and 20th centuries to Scottish philosophy and more generally to Scotland’s intellectual history as embodied in its close relatives in the histories of science, religion, literature, and culture considered as responses to that Enlightenment? Attempting to answer this ambitiously broad question cannot be the work of one individual. It requires a collaborative effort of many scholars over coming decades. One need only consider how little has been published on the work of a mere cluster of once eminent 19th-century professional Scottish philosophers—think of Sir William Hamilton, James Frederick Ferrier, Edward Caird, Alexander Bain,
and the markedly philosophical nature of certain Scottish theologians such as Robert Flint. In volume terms alone, recovery of such figures is a daunting task, particularly given the currently indeterminate status of their philosophical or cultural relevance.

The scale of such an undertaking has perhaps prompted Craig to conceive of his task in a distinctively imaginative way, inviting his reader into this conversation suggestively, as he indicates his title’s variable meanings concerning intentionality, a topic that recurs at various stages throughout the book. One of the notions informing Craig’s whole approach is his use of a gardening metaphor that he pointedly situates in relation to the Classical garden of the Scottish poet Ian Hamilton Finlay, Little Sparta. Eloquently discussed by Craig as an enactment of environmental transformation thought impossible in the cultural and material wasteland that Scotland had become, Little Sparta symbolises the cultural revival that transformed Scotland during the latter three decades of the 20th century ‘from provincial decline and decay into a place of internationally recognised creative fertility’ (22). The gardening metaphor informs Craig’s handling of cultural and political transformations as he draws attention to the need for ‘active intention’, and a ‘constant tending’ of garden, culture, and the nation as permanently intended, forever becoming but never finalised. Craig also stresses the role in tending and intending the future garden, of hybridisation, borrowing from abroad, and tracing what is cultivated to more exotic climes. The gardening metaphor thus suggests permeability, of culture, and of the nation as no longer a bounded unity but rather as the site of cultural exchange. This is a condition of perpetual growth, decay, and renewal crucially interwoven with human activity and most importantly with intention.

Through his critical discussion of gardening Craig is developing an ecologically-based critique of Scottish culture with considerable potential to be expanded into a critical perspective of wide-reaching significance. However, Craig’s gardening metaphor, and the critical theory that emerges from it, might have been advocated more strongly had he attempted to incorporate discussion of a very different Scottish garden to that of Ian Hamilton Finlay, namely, Charles Jencks’s amazing enactment of postmodernity through his Garden of Cosmic Speculation, situated at Portrack, close to Dumfries and only a few miles from where, significantly, Thomas Carlyle first coined the term ‘environment’. Taken together these extraordinary gardens by Hamilton Finlay and Jencks constitute something of the greater critical friction that might help to develop Craig’s theoretical perspective, as one that could accommodate Jencks’s notion of critical modernism, drawing in turn on the playful ironies, staggering inventiveness with natural form, and the powerful intellectualism of Jencks’s work.

However, Craig’s critical perspective, though integral to how he approaches much of his subject matter, only constitutes part of this compelling book.
A much larger dimension has to do with Craig’s attempt to recover certain Scottish thinkers from oblivion. We still know too little about once prominent figures such as, for example, Hamilton, Edward Caird, A. S. Pringle-Pattison, Norman Kemp Smith, and John Macmurray. As Craig claims:

The fact that a scientist such as James Clerk Maxwell, whose work constitutes the very foundations for everything that we, now, experience as modernity, barely merits mention in many of the major histories of Scotland of the last twenty years is symptomatic of how little of Scotland’s real contribution to the modern world has actually become part of our contemporary conception of the Scottish past; the complete absence of its modern philosophers and social thinkers an indication of how etiolated is the conception of cultural significance in the perspectives of contemporary historiography. (Intending Scotland, 12)

The fact that Clerk Maxwell has been so overlooked by historians does indeed suggest something of how poorly Scotland has tended its past. As Craig asserts, ‘The importance of Maxwell’s work can hardly be overstated’ (104), and:

If there was a period in which Scotland did in truth ‘invent the modern world’, our modern world, it was the period […] when Thomson [Lord Kelvin] made long-distance telegraphy possible, when Maxwell produced (in 1861) the first colour photograph, when Bell invented the telephone, and when Maxwell laid the groundwork for Einstein’s physics of relativity. (Intending Scotland, 105)

In other words, the period of the 1850s through the 70s was materially more important in relation to our times than the Scottish Enlightenment, which has become so revered by philosophers, historians, and politicians. Numerous other examples might be cited as similarly symptomatic of a collective amnesia concerning Scotland’s intellectual and cultural history.

Clerk Maxwell provides a striking example of a Scot whose scientific theories’ importance to present-day experiences of modernity has recently brought him into the limelight through, for example, Basil Mahon’s The Man Who Changed Everything (2003), and, more symbolically, a commemorative statue in Edinburgh in 2008. But, if Maxwell is presently becoming popular, one might justifiably worry that he will merely be known as yet another individual to add to an old, flaccid inductive argument that lazily concludes with some uninformative statement about Scotland being a nation of great innovators. Ignorance of the richness of Scotland’s intellectual and cultural past is the condition in which the false worshipping of heroes best thrives. What is needed is a rediscovery of Maxwell’s achievements within his scientific and more general cultural contexts – which, thankfully, Craig does discuss to some extent by, for example, relating Maxwell to Lord Kelvin. To go further still, we need to ask searching
questions concerning why so many Scots may well have invented things but then failed to develop them, or had to move elsewhere to do so.

If we are to trace continuities in Scottish thought, then we do need a study of Maxwell’s intellectual roots or the preconditions that helped to foster his innovations. However, Maxwell’s Scottish intellectual roots at present remain almost entirely hidden, in part because so little is known about the philosophical discourse of his most formative educational period and of several of his associates and friends during the 1840s at Edinburgh. Craig does highlight the importance of, for example, Sir William Hamilton as one of Maxwell’s most admired professors at Edinburgh University. But Hamilton’s influence on the young scientist—the roles that logic and metaphysics may have played in stimulating Maxwell’s ground-shifting theories—is not, nor has it ever been, examined in any detail. And yet, there are distinct echoes of Hamilton in some of Clerk Maxwell’s work, particularly with regard to Hamilton’s introduction of certain notions of relativity. Craig does not trace this potent cord of continuity. But such omissions are entirely forgivable. Even Clerk Maxwell’s biographers, quite understandably, have nothing to say about the Scottish Enlightenment dimension as mediated by Hamilton, and the simplest reason for this is that so little has been written about Hamilton for well over a hundred years. Nevertheless, the question of Hamilton’s influence on Maxwell is just one of several ways in which 19th-century evolutions of Scottish thought from the Enlightenment, thread their way into ideas of more well-established magnitude (such as Einstein’s special theory of relativity), and may thereby merit the further exploration of Scottish thought that Craig initiates.

The Scottish Enlightenment involved an intellectual crisis as potentially catastrophic with regard to human conduct as occurred in 18th-century France. That the Scottish response to Hume, initiated by Reid, was effectually a re-grounding of philosophy within the practical domain of principles (as given assumptions underpinning social well-functioning), must have done much to contain Hume’s more abstract, novel, and seductively brilliant reasoning. But Hume’s scepticism did not go away. It haunted Scottish and European thought. As James Hutchison Stirling claimed in 1884, ‘Kant has not answered Hume’ (quoted by Craig, 92). Though positive evidence for Humean scepticism’s spectral presence within the intellectual history of Scotland and Europe seems (fittingly for a spectre), exceedingly thin, Craig is, I believe, rightly aware that Hume’s scepticism is a critical continuity in Scottish thought throughout the 19th century.

But, I would disagree with some of Craig’s interpretation of Hume. For example, Craig argues that Hume sees ‘the self as fundamentally social’ (175). However, it is instead Reid who emphasises the social foundation of the self as part of his attempt to counter Hume’s atomism and scepticism, a scepticism one might add, that is relentlessly in disingenuously resorting to the social or natural self and the curative powers of society and a game of backgammon. However, partly
through Craig’s discussion of Macmurray and R.D Laing, but also in response to Robert Crawford’s more recent anti-essentialist vaunting of linguistic hybridity. Craig is surely on the right lines in arguing that ‘a “dialogic” conception of the self has been a fundamental aspect of Scottish thought at least since the Enlightenment’ (227). This dialogism is evident in Reid but it is probably fair to say that it becomes much more prominent in Hamilton’s description of Reid’s direct theory of perception as a system of natural dualism or natural realism in which self and other, the knower and known, are realised in each act of perception. And herein another crucial strand from the Scottish Enlightenment traced by Craig in his discussion of Macmurray: action.

Somewhat surprisingly, given the most welcome attention Craig gives to Thomas Carlyle and Hamilton, he seems to miss opportunities to link back to both Carlyle’s doctrine of work (which is fundamentally a doctrine of action), and to Hamilton, who describes perception and memory as forms of action and the knower and known as co-relatives. In a number of the quotations provided by Craig, not only does Clerk Maxwell seem to echo Hamilton, but some others reverberate with Carlylean and Hamiltonian notions, suggesting the need for some more thoroughgoing study of the extent to which these once so famous Scots helped shape or condition later 19th-century Scottish intellectual discourse. However, drawing attention to the role of action in Macmurray, Craig is inviting his readers to explore and elaborate upon the greater significance to Western thought of the non-Cartesian dualism inherent within the Scottish philosophical tradition’s potent dialogic conception of the self-other relationship. Eloquently but forcefully, Craig is reasserting the status of this major strand in Scottish thought as of profound international significance over and against, or certainly in much closer relation to the Continental tradition running from Descartes to the phenomenalism of Husserl’s Cartesian Meditations and Heidegger’s Being and Time. Craig’s discussion is perhaps at times too broad-ranging and some philosophers may find this unsatisfactory. But to read the text as Craig himself advises as ‘a series of excavations’, and to grasp the important invitation to become a critical participant and thus agent within this discourse, will be the best tribute that his readers can pay to this marvellously stimulating work.

The scope of Craig’s Intending Scotland is impressively extensive as he moves between literary and cultural critique, history of science, political theory concerning nation and community, and philosophy as a central preoccupation of Scottish thought. Craig is suggesting a significant step forward for the study of Scottish literature, culture, politics, and philosophy that crucially reinstates the importance of a cluster of 19th and 20th-century thinkers of greater or lesser philosophical orientation, including Carlyle, Hamilton, James Frederick Ferrier, James Hutchison Stirling, A.S. Pringle-Pattison, Edward Caird, Clerk Maxwell, William Thomson (Lord Kelvin), J. G. Frazer, Ian D. Suttie, John Macmurray.
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There are of course omissions and certain elisions—for example, the early post-Enlightenment period arguably deserves much more attention. However, it is to Cairns Craig’s enormous credit that he has so thoroughly, engagingly, and convincingly produced a work that deserves to play a seminal role in the development of post-Enlightenment Scottish thought.
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