INTRODUCTION

The politics and sentiments of union

On January 16, 1707, Scotland's Parliament ratified the Treaty of Union that would incorporate the Scottish into the English Parliament to form a new British state. On this momentous occasion, the Duke of Queensberry, one of the prime players in negotiating the Union, urged his fellow Scots "to become one in Hearts and Affections, as we are inseparably joyn'd in Interest with our Neighbour Nation."[1] Queensberry would be one of sixty-one Scots in the newly created 764-person British Parliament. He also stood to gain a large portion of the money that the English treasury had promised to pay Scottish peers in return for their acceptance of the terms of union outlined by England's Parliament. Despite his personal investments in the formation of a British state, Queensberry counseled Scots to understand the Union not merely as an economic and political partnership, but also as a sentimental or affective alliance. He implied that Scotland's and England's shared political and economic interests should foster a mutual, even familial, fondness among the inhabitants of the newly established Great Britain.

This book argues that Scottish writers from Tobias Smollett, Adam Smith, James Macpherson, Henry Mackenzie, and James Boswell in the middle of the eighteenth century to Christian Isobel Johnstone, Susan Ferrier, Walter Scott, James Hogg, and John Galt in the early nineteenth century responded to Scotland's loss of independent sovereignty by seeking in sentiment, or virtuous feeling, a compensation for political dispossession. These writers explored the potential advantages and limitations of defining the nation as a community united by sympathy rather than by shared blood or common political and economic interests. In doing so, they did not envision an apolitical alternative to the state; rather, they explored the political implications and uses of feeling. Most of the writers I discuss in this book were from Lowland Scotland and were part of an educated, professional class that generally, although not uniformly, hoped to make the Union work because it provided the mercantile Lowlands

with access to England's already sizeable commercial empire. However, even the Union's strongest supporters could not ignore Scotland's gratingly subordinate role in what was glossed as an egalitarian partnership. To varying degrees, these writers sought to create a distinctive Scottish identity while also participating in the formation of an inclusive British identity.

Recent studies of the emergence of British identity after the 1707 Union between Scotland and England have been dominated, anachronistically, by the nineteenth- and twentieth-century paradigm of the nation-state, an entity in which political, territorial, and cultural boundaries are aligned. For instance, Linda Colley's *Britons*, Leith Davis's *Acts of Union*, and Katie Trumpener's *Bardic Nationalism* assume the nation-state as the inevitable telos of a newly formed Great Britain comprising multiple ethnic and regional communities that were governed by shared political institutions but that lacked the shared traditions, behaviors, and feelings that might create a sense of shared British identity.[2] By exploring the importance of sentiment in British nation formation, I seek to recover understandings of nationhood preceding the model of nation-state-based nationalism that has dominated literary studies of nation formation in recent years.[3] I take as my lens of analysis two closely related concepts through which the writers I discuss themselves understood nation formation – sensibility and sympathy. I will explore the meanings of each of these notoriously slippery terms in greater depth below. They can be distinguished at the most basic level through a preposition: sensibility connotes feeling *for* someone or something, and sympathy implies feeling *with* someone. While Scottish writers did not create single-handedly the culture of feeling that, according to Adela Pinch, defined the long eighteenth century, they certainly played a disproportionately prominent role in exploring the moral workings of sensibility and sympathy.[4] They did so, I will argue, to empower a politically and economically disadvantaged Scotland. By envisioning a Great Britain divided by political, economic, and ethnic conflicts as a nation united by shared feeling, Scottish writers not only explored possible means of negotiating these conflicts, but also imagined a British identity to which Scotland could contribute.

During the early decades of the eighteenth century, pro-Union propagandists such as Daniel Defoe confidently predicted that, as Queensberry had hoped, shared political and economic interests soon would foster a more heartfelt attachment between the Scots and the English. However, the 1715 and 1745–6 Jacobite rebellions dramatically challenged the Treaty of Union's efficacy in integrating these two peoples. In 1745 Charles Edward

Stuart rallied Scots to support his efforts to recover the British throne from the Hanoverian monarchy by questioning whether Scotland and England did in fact share economic and political interests, let alone mutual affections. Declaring that Scotland had been "reduced to the condition of a Province, under the specious Pretence of an Union, with a more powerful Neighbour," Charles Edward promised to restore "Honour, Liberty, and Independency" to Scots.[5] However, the Jacobite troops' defeat at Culloden in 1746 only further "reduced" Scots' liberties. Parliament enacted measures intended to bring the Highlands, where the rebellion had originated, under the control of centralized British authority: heritable jurisdictions were abolished; landowners who had participated in the uprising forfeited their estates; and weapons were prohibited along with the traditional forms of dress and music thought to inspire Highlanders' martial spirit. While Lowlanders suffered less dramatic consequences than Highlanders, the uprising increased English prejudices against Scots and led to various forms of discrimination, from the flurry of anti-Scottish propaganda published in the wake of the '45, to Parliament's refusal to include Scotland in the 1757 Militia Act for fear of another uprising.

Mid-century anti-Scottish propaganda, which I will discuss in further detail in Chapter 2, demonstrates that the '45 had the unfortunate effect of coupling the terms "Scot" and "Jacobite" in English popular culture. England had sought union with Scotland at the end of the seventeenth century largely to ensure that the two countries would continue to share the Protestant monarchy that had been established with the exile of James II and the importation of William and Mary in 1688. The Jacobites' efforts to restore the Catholic and Scottish Stuart monarchy thus signaled Scotland's treasonous breach of contract. The acrimony and anxieties dredged up by the '45 inspired the predominantly pro-Union Scottish writers I discuss in this book to reconsider the importance of "Hearts and Affections" in Anglo-Scottish relations. While these writers realized that they would need to undertake damage control if any semblance of Anglo-Scottish harmony was to be salvaged, they also resented Scotland's denigration and disempowerment and sought to protect it from English calumny. Accordingly, they claimed sentiment as a peculiarly Scottish trait that differentiated a hospitable, even familial, "North Britain" from the unfriendly, economically driven, English metropolises to suggest that Scots could and, given the chance, would, heal the breach they had supposedly created. Ironically, however, the sentimental rhetoric that these predominantly pro-Union Scottish writers employed to imagine

an amicable and even affectionate Anglo-Scottish Union was derived largely from Jacobite literature and culture.

The Scottish Enlightenment's philosophical contributions to eighteenth-century discourses of feeling have been well documented by Pinch, John Dwyer, John Mullan, and others.[6] Francis Hutcheson, David Hume, Adam Smith, and others minutely dissected sympathy in their attempts to discover not simply how it works, but also whether it is innate or acquired, laudable or potentially pernicious. Their philosophical inquiries are not antithetical to, but rather, as the following chapters will demonstrate, an outgrowth of a less openly acknowledged Jacobite culture of sentiment. The devastation of Highland and Jacobite cultures in the wake of the '45 ironically became a source of literary and national regeneration for Scottish writers in the eighteenth century and beyond. Murray Pittock, one of the foremost scholars of Jacobite literature and culture, has pinpointed the suppression of the '45 as the moment when Jacobitism became more feeling than action, more sentimental nostalgia than political threat. With a certain justice, Pittock has accused early nineteenth-century writers of further sentimentalizing Jacobitism, that is, with *misrepresenting* it as an ideology grounded in emotion rather than in carefully calculated political principles and reasoned arguments.[7] Thus, for instance, in Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1814), the eponymous hero is seduced into joining the Jacobite army in part by the seeming glory of its cause and by the charming valor of its representatives, Flora, Fergus, and Charles Edward. With the benefit of historical hindsight, Scott can represent Jacobitism as inevitably doomed by its "absurd political prejudice" while also valorizing Jacobites' "singular and disinterested attachment to the principles of loyalty which they received from their fathers, and of old Scottish faith, hospitality, worth, and honour."[8] Pittock dismisses this sentimentalization as a Romantic revision of a supposedly authentic political Jacobitism; yet William Donaldson has shown that, on the contrary, seventeenth-century Jacobite literature evoked "golden ages of political independence, social autonomy, and pure uncomplicated heroism tragically compromised and lost."[9] In other words, seventeenth-century Jacobite literature was already sentimental. By exploiting virtuous feeling for political ends, Jacobite writing shows the distinction between the political and the sentimental to be untenable.

The dangers of supporting the Stuart monarchy openly in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries forced Jacobite culture underground. Poems, songs, and proclamations transmitted orally or in manuscript attempted to sustain a sense of purpose in their audiences by

appealing to their feelings of loyalty, courage, generosity, and heroic self-sacrifice. Frequently, Jacobite writing makes these sentimental appeals through gendered images of familial and romantic affection. For instance, in his royal proclamations, Charles Edward repeatedly represents himself as a benevolent father, undoubtedly in an effort to undercut the Stuarts' reputation for arbitrary tyranny. Similarly, an anonymous poem compares Charles Edward's generous forgiveness of his ungrateful subjects to the Biblical story of the prodigal son: "Such Love a Parent's Heart, for Sons ingrate, / Keeps dormant till Repentance, even tho' late; / Restores the unduteous Offspring to his Arms, / And all his Race with filial Tears disarms."[10] Such virtuous tears punctuated Jacobite writing. Another poem urges Scots to join the Jacobite cause by reminding them of Britain's repeated ill-treatment of the valiant Stuart monarchs during the preceding century: "Weep Brittons, Weep, the Royal Martyr's Blood / For Vengeance or Repentance calls aloud."[11] The Jacobites' decisive defeat at Culloden elicited grateful sorrow from Charles Edward, as he proclaimed, "with tears we remember our warm and sincere Love for [our subjects], and the just sense which we have of their Fidelity, Zeal, and Courage will never be effaced from Our Hearts."[12] While the would-be monarch most often casts himself as the paternal guardian of his people, some Jacobite writing casts Charles Edward as the chivalrous suitor of a feminized Scotland. Thus a poem celebrating the Jacobites' victory at the Battle of Gladsmuir depicts Scotia, the spirit of Scotland, gratefully praising "the gallant youth," Charles Edward.[13] Whether Charles Edward figures as a father or a lover, Jacobite writing emphasizes the bonds of loyalty and affection uniting the Scottish people and their king.

Jacobites' copious literary tears certainly did not win them much pity in the decades after the '45. On the contrary, Whig satirists seized on Jacobite displays of feeling to ridicule and feminize their opponents. The Stuarts' detractors depicted women, with their supposed emotional susceptibility, as Charles Edward's strongest supporters, and they implied that his escape from Scotland disguised in women's clothing accurately reflected his lack of manly courage. Although the Jacobites' defeat at Culloden contributed to Scotland's disempowerment, and to the feminization through which that disempowerment was symbolized, pro-Union Scottish writers such as James Boswell, Tobias Smollett, and Walter Scott began to incorporate Jacobitism's positive associations with martial qualities – heroic courage, noble self-sacrifice, loyal devotion, and generous compassion, into a sentimental but re-masculinized Scottish identity. While historians and literary critics understandably have equated

Jacobitism with Scottish resistance to the Union, I will suggest to the contrary that Jacobitism was compatible with support for the Union.[14] Just as anti-Unionists were not by default Jacobites, pro-Unionists were not necessarily anti-Jacobites. Many of the writers that I discuss in this book reconcile Jacobitism and Unionism by dislocating sentiment from its Jacobite origins and transforming it at once into a marker of Scottish national character and Scots' particular contribution to a united Britain.

By 1823, the year that concludes my study of British nation formation, this displaced Jacobite sentiment had been reinvested to some extent in Anglo-Scottish unity under the Hanoverian monarchy. George IV's 1822 visit to Edinburgh did not so much symbolize Scots' belated acceptance of Hanoverian rule as confer legitimate authority on the king by associating him through a tartan-infused spectacle with the Stuart monarchy.[15] The strongly pro-Union *Blackwood's Magazine*, which seized the occasion to examine in detail the transformation of Anglo-Scottish relations since 1707, emphasized Highlanders' prominence both in the pageantry surrounding the visit and in the legitimation that it symbolically performed. *Blackwood's* recalled that in 1745 the Highlanders following Charles Edward "had pierced with their claymores into the very heart of England." Yet less than a hundred years later, their descendants recognized George IV "as the heir and descendant of 'Scotland's royal race'," and welcomed him to Edinburgh with pride "as a kinsman."[16] *Blackwood's* rhetorical conflation of sentimental ties and blood bonds was repeated incessantly throughout the king's visit. Edward Said describes affiliation, or the volitional formation of community founded in shared feelings, beliefs, and values, as a compensation for the failure of filiation, or the breakdown of community founded in the "natural" bonds of "genealogical descent."[17] Yet, as I shall demonstrate in Chapters 3 and 4 in particular, sentimental and racial nationhood were in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century writing often two sides of one coin, with sympathetic yearnings signaling hitherto undiscovered blood ties, and with consanguineous bonds in turn cultivating shared sympathies. Eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Scottish writers employ this coincidence of sentimental and blood ties, or "metaphysics of blood," to define the nation as an affective community.[18] Thus *Blackwood's* explains the formerly treacherous Highlanders' attachment to the British monarch by comparing it to the familial affections structuring the clan system: "Scottish loyalty partakes of the nature of the domestic ties; in its higher sentiments, it is something akin to filial reverence, and in its familiar, to fraternal affection."[19] Although George IV's visit to Edinburgh seemed

to celebrate the transformation of Scottishness into Britishness, giving performative closure to the process of union, my final chapter's examination of two novels published in 1823, John Galt's *The Entail* and James Hogg's *Three Perils of Women*, will suggest that the sentimental legacies of Jacobitism continued to trouble Anglo-Scottish relations.[20]

SENTIMENT, SENSIBILITY, AND SYMPATHY

Since the publication of Jane Tompkins' *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction 1790–1860* in 1985, sentiment's importance to nation formation has been generally acknowledged in American studies, a field that is virtually defined by the concept of nationhood. Julia A. Stern's *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel* and Elizabeth Barnes' *States of Sympathy*, among other recent studies, have examined how late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century American writers employed discourses of feeling to represent the transformation of Britain's former colonies into an independent and internally united nation as a movement from disorderly fragmentation to organic harmony.[21] *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Identity* examines the British precedents for American writers' negotiation through sympathy of political conflicts. The relatively recent interest in nationhood in British, as compared to American, studies perhaps attests to the success of eighteenth-century writers in naturalizing Britishness, or alternatively to our tendency to conflate English and British, to assume that we are discussing Britain when in fact we are only discussing England. Literary critics and historians have traced the theories of sympathy circulating in post-Revolutionary American literature and culture to David Hume and Adam Smith, citing the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment on early America's university curriculums as one of the sources of transmission.[22] Yet studies of British nation formation thus far have neglected to examine why eighteenth-century *Scottish* writers might have been so interested in sympathy. Evan Gottlieb's *Feeling British: Sympathy in Scottish and English Writing 1707–1832* argues that Scottish *and* English novelists and poets drew on eighteenth-century theories of sympathy to envision a united Great Britain, a project in which both were mutually invested.[23] While Gottlieb follows Davis's *Acts of Union* in representing literary nation formation as a dialogic, give-and-take process between English and Scottish writers, I contend that Scottish writers played a much larger part than English writers in the literary imagining of British identity. It is perhaps because Scots' opportunities to contribute to the

political aspects of nation formation were so limited that they explored in such depth the sentimental dimensions of nationhood. Moreover, participating in the construction of Britishness enabled Scots to distinguish themselves from Britain's colonized populations abroad, groups that had neither stake nor voice in British nation formation. Yet Scottish writers did not only draw on discourses of feeling to imagine a *British* identity, as Gottlieb suggests. They also constructed a sentimental Scottish identity distinct from, and sometimes incompatible with, a unified Britishness. In attending primarily to Scottish writers, this book emphasizes that British nation formation was not in fact dialogic. Instead, it explores Scotland's position as at once an integral part of the British imperial center and a disempowered and internally divided periphery, as a stateless nation and a part of a nationless state.

Eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Scottish writers defined discrete Scottish and British identities in large part by exploring the gendered connotations of sentiment, demonstrating that, as Ania Loomba reminds us, "If the nation is an imagined community, that imagining is profoundly gendered."[24] Although Scotland produced very few women writers compared to the proliferation of authoresses in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century England, male writers sought to define national identities by fixing gender identities. Loomba explains that "during the early modern period, gender and sexuality provided a language for expressing and developing ideas about religious, geographic, and ultimately *racial* difference."[25] Scottish writers used gender not only to examine the forms of difference that Loomba describes but also to explore possible configurations of Anglo-Scottish relations and to contest discrepancies in Scotland's and England's respective access to political and economic power. Gender functions in their writing symbolically, by signifying relationships of power, and literally, by negotiating between an older but still current understanding of the nation as race or consanguineous community and a newer concept of the nation as sentimental community. Literary critics and cultural historians working in British studies have tended to relegate discourses of feeling to the realm of the domestic and familial much as Scotland has been relegated to the margins of British studies.[26] In moving Scotland to the center of British studies, I explore how discourses of feeling in fact shaped and were shaped by eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century nation formation.

While Gottlieb's otherwise persuasively argued book follows our contemporary practice in using the term "sympathy" to refer to various modalities of fellow-feeling, I have tried to attend to the subtle but crucial

eighteenth-century distinctions between sentiment, sensibility, and sympathy in order to explore the gendered implications of these forms of feeling. In its broadest sense, the term "sentiment" referred simply to virtuous feeling; but by the 1770s, the decade in which sentimental novels reached the height of their popularity, it often referred to one mode of feeling in particular – sensibility.[27] Sensibility connoted "extremely refined emotion," and was sometimes used synonymously with compassion or pity.[28] Women were widely believed to be more sensible or compassionate than men because, according to eighteenth-century medical theory, their bodies contained more nerves than men's.[29] On one hand, sensibility was venerated as a distinctively feminine virtue, one of the qualities that suited women to be wives and mothers. Yet, on the other hand, sensibility seemed to indicate weakness, justifying women's confinement to the safety of the domestic sphere. A man who was too compassionate and too easily moved to tears was considered effeminate both because he exhibited moral or behavioral traits that did not align properly with the physiological sex of his body and because he lacked the supposedly masculine qualities of judgment and self-control necessary to regulate his feelings. For instance, after a period of melancholy in which he "even in public could not refrain from groaning and weeping bitterly," James Boswell compared himself to a "hysteric lady" and reminded himself of the importance of "preserving a manly fortitude of mind."[30] By the beginning of the nineteenth century, middle- and upper-class men had incorporated sensibility – although not the serious depression that Boswell experienced – into an ideal of benevolent patriarchy. At the same time that this "'masculinization' of formerly feminine gender traits" situated sensibility as foundational to patriarchal authority and social order, women, supposedly lacking self-control, were accorded the aberrant and rebellious passions associated with Jacobinism.[31]

In contrast to sensibility, or the ability to feel compassion *for* someone, sympathy designates the ability to feel *with* someone, or to share in another's feelings. While sensibility is a uni-directional feeling, sympathy is a morally neutral mechanism that enables the transmission of any sentiment, from outrage to joy, among two or more people. The writers I examine in this book understand sympathy as a complex social behavior that is learned rather than innate, and that requires the complementary exercise of sensibility and self-control. I am going to explain the workings of sympathy here using Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* simply because, as a philosophical treatise, it explains most explicitly and abstractly a process that other works explore in socially embedded

instances, and sometimes also through their narrative forms. However, I do not mean to imply that the novelists, poets, and essayists I discuss in the succeeding chapters simply borrowed from or responded to Smith's philosophy. Nor do I mean to privilege philosophy above what we now describe as literature – a term that for eighteenth-century readers would have included philosophical works like *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. On the contrary, Chapter 1 returns more fully to *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* as one of many mid-eighteenth-century explorations of Great Britain's historical and racial origins, and Chapter 2 shows that Tobias Smollett's *Roderick Random*, published ten years before *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, constructs a British masculinity that foreshadows Smith's emphasis on the importance of balancing sensibility with self-control. As the ensuing chapters will illustrate, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* is only one of many texts by Scottish writers that emphasizes self-control as a necessary compliment to sensibility and as an essential element of sympathy. These writers' common understanding of sensibility and self-control as acquired skills rather than natural responses suggests that for many Britons, cross-cultural sympathy did not come easily.

The Theory of Moral Sentiments is in part a response to David Hume's *Treatise on Human Nature* (1739), which argues that the communication of feelings among individuals is facilitated by relations of contiguity and resemblance. Hume posits that we most readily share in the feelings of those who are near us and who are most like us. Consequently, our natural propensity for sympathy explains "the great uniformity we may observe in the humours and turn of thinking of those of the same nation." Hume's representation of sympathy as a natural, almost contagious, "communication" of "inclinations and sentiments" among already like-minded individuals raises the question of whether sympathy that transcends cultural, political, or national boundaries is possible.[32] It also leaves unanswered the question of how feelings run amok might be controlled. Smith, writing after the '45 had demonstrated just how dangerous such contagious feelings might be to Britain's security and stability, proposes some answers to these questions in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*.

Smith defines sympathy as a correspondence or concurrence of sentiments between two people: a spectator and an actor. To achieve this concord, the spectator must "change places in fancy" with the actor and try to "bring home to himself every little circumstance of distress which can possibly occur" in order to imagine how he would feel in the actor's situation.[33] However, Smith acknowledges that the limitations of imagination prevent us from ever fully appreciating the intensity of emotions