

healthy prospect for this indigenous critical effort. Although few authors in the book write with the sharpness of Paranjape, or make evident any keen interest in developing clear theoretical models, there is enough material here that can give us fresh insights and starting points.

SHYAMAL BAGCHEE

Robert Crawford, ed. *The Scottish Invention of English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Pp. xii, 259. \$59.95.

The central argument of this provocative but uneven collection of essays on the Scottish origins of the discipline of English, edited by Robert Crawford, is embedded in its chronological structure. The collection begins with the French antecedents of eighteenth-century Scottish Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, moves on to offer reassessments of some of the major as well as lesser-known figures of this movement, and then traces the spread of the Scottish model of rhetoric to other parts of the British Empire. It is only in the penultimate chapter (just before a discussion of Australia and New Zealand) that we reach England, and that, in a sense, is Crawford's point. The study of the English language and literature, which is "invented" in Scotland during the eighteenth century, does not in fact arrive in England until the nineteenth century, when it is introduced, largely by Scottish professors, into the curriculum of the newly formed University College, London. The explanation for the Scottish genesis of the discipline is that post-Union, English Studies offered Scots a means of assimilating to English culture and thereby of obtaining a more cosmopolitan and economically viable identity.

The proposition of the collection (as well as of Crawford's earlier book *Devolving English Literature*) is thus that English Studies is a Scottish invention which is subsequently exported to other parts of the Empire. One difficulty with this thesis is that it requires Crawford to exclude from his collection the teaching of English that went on in the Dissenting Academies in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Crawford rationalizes this omission by confining his study to developments within mainstream universities. But this exclusive focus on mainstream institutions proves difficult to sustain, and some of the most interesting moments in the collection are those in which the authors move outside of university settings. In a chapter on Adam Smith, Ian Duncan relates the growth of English Studies to the rise of print, and juxtaposes Smith with Samuel Johnson, a figure of the new, more commercialized literary culture. Duncan sees Smith's *Lectures on Rhetoric* as attuned to modern structures of literary production and as "insist[ing] on the social, historical and functional dynamism of literary discourse" (42). For Duncan, Smith's contribu-

tion is to conceive of literacy as a means of obtaining individual and national identities. In her chapter on the formation of English Studies in England, Linda Ferreira-Buckley also relates disciplinary developments to the rise of print culture, and discusses the popularity of Scottish rhetoric texts such as Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* in English Mechanics' Institutes. In "The Entrance of the Novel into the Scottish Universities," Paul Bator offers the example of the Edinburgh Belles Lettres Society to show how the novel begins to penetrate university curricula in part through the activities of student societies. The novel genre, banned from Oxbridge classrooms, becomes invaluable to Scottish universities as another means of self-improvement, a "vehicle by which . . . students could observe and learn vicariously the manners of their English brethren without having to make the journey to London" (90).

Crawford notes in his introduction "how crucial to the origins of the university discipline were perceived marginalizations in space, gender and genre" (2). Thus in addition to Bator's chapter on the novel, Martin Moonie and Neil Rhodes raise questions of gender. Moonie uncovers a connection between William Greenfield's dismissal from his post at Edinburgh and his homosexuality, but does not convincingly establish that Greenfield's sexual orientation is related to his promotion of Scottish literature. In his piece on the influence of French belletrists on Scottish rhetoricians and particularly on the transition from Rhetoric to Criticism, Rhodes proposes that "the gradual transformation of Rhetoric can be construed in gendered terms" (3) but again does not adequately develop this interesting idea.

Although gender and genre do receive some attention, spatial or geographical marginalizations are clearly what interests Crawford most, while religious and class marginalizations, which played important roles in the history of the discipline, are given less emphasis. Geography has to dominate because Crawford's scheme is a nationalistic one, as his conclusion to the volume, which links the devolution of English Studies to the devolution of Britain, confirms. Crawford's approach stands in contrast to that of Thomas Miller's *The Formation of College English*, in which Scottish and Irish developments are looked at alongside the growth of English Studies in the Dissenting Academies. As a result, Miller is able to identify important differences between the motivations that fuelled the development of the discipline in the Scottish universities and among the Dissenters. Unlike the Scots, the Dissenters were not concerned to assimilate to the dominant culture but instead emphasized free inquiry and saw the study of the vernacular as instrumental to such a pursuit. Miller's comparative analysis highlights the multiple origins of the discipline of English, and registers class and religious marginalities as well as geographical and cultural ones.

The great danger of the kind of linear, chronological framework Crawford sets up is that it will read history proleptically, assimilating

the eighteenth-century idea of lettres to a nineteenth-century idea of literature. Symptomatic of this kind of tunnel vision is the amount of time the essayists spend pinpointing dates and establishing priority, and the strongest chapters are those that resist this kind of influence studies. Fiona Stafford reminds us in her chapter on Hugh Blair that in the age of print culture, the author may become detached from his work so that the intention of the work is difficult to ascertain: "Evaluation of Blair's achievement is thus very difficult, because so many of the ideas that characterize his work were part of the general intellectual climate, making the attribution of particular thoughts, and thus of influence, somewhat speculative" (84). Blair's *Lectures* found wide circulation, both in England and in North America, and the number of printings it enjoyed is often cited by scholars as evidence of the appeal of the Scottish assimilationist model in other parts of the Empire. But Stafford reminds us that the applications to which Blair's writings were put do not in fact establish his original motivation in producing the *Lectures*. Instead, it was "the movement from orality into print that turned Blair's *Lectures* into the Anglicizing, institutionalizing project for which he has been criticized in the twentieth century by those who interpret his admiration for certain writers as contributory to the formation of a literary canon, in which a particular kind of English is the criterion of excellence" (81). Rather than understand Blair's work as "an instrument of cultural imperialism," Stafford suggests that the Scottish emphasis on developing linguistic skills had less to do with a lack of confidence than with a desire to communicate what were held to be significant Scottish intellectual accomplishments.

Chris Worth's chapter on Australia and New Zealand also questions the notion of Scottish/colonial underconfidence by pointing to "the dedication of teachers in the early years of the subject to equipping students to participate in but also to challenge a metropolitan culture that had, from the perspective of Sydney or Dunedin, to be conceived of in international terms or not at all" (207). Worth is interested in the way in which Scottish anxieties about access to English culture were exported and reconstituted in the colonies. He takes a more optimistic view of the discipline than Crawford, describing the relationship of dependency that coloured English Studies in Australia and New Zealand but also the "empowering role" that the discipline played in offering access to an international Anglophone literary culture which was not reducible to English culture. Worth has to work rather hard to link developments in Australia and New Zealand to Scottish influences, and it is a shame that more attention is not paid to the Canadian case in which the Scottish influence is much more easily traced. Franklin Court's chapter on North America surveys major developments at the northeastern American colleges and briefly differentiates them from Canadian developments, but provides little analysis.

Finally, Andrew Hook offers evidence that American Studies was a Scottish invention but has some difficulty establishing the influence of Scottish scholars of American literature on American academics.

SARAH PHILLIPS CASTEEL

WORKS CITED

- Crawford, Robert. *Devolving English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.  
 Miller, Thomas P. *The Formation of College English: Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the British Cultural Provinces*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1997.

~

Balachandra Rajan and Elizabeth Sauer, eds. *Milton and the Imperial Vision*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1999. Pp. viii, 376. \$58.00.

*Milton and the Imperial Vision* is the kind of book that is becoming increasingly common in Milton studies. It consists of a collection of fourteen essays by various hands framed by the editors' introduction and an afterword by Homi Bhabha. The obvious problem with works of this kind is the problem of coherence. How are they to distinguish themselves from the rather haphazard assemblages of critical essays that regularly appear in the various scholarly journals devoted to literary studies? Over the years editors have experimented with a number of solutions to this problem, the two most popular being a) to focus on a common text, as C. A. Patrides and Thomas Kranidas both did in *Approaches to Paradise Lost* and *New Essays on Paradise Lost* respectively, or b) to focus on a common theme, as Julia Walker and Mario di Cesare chose to do in *Milton and the Idea of Woman* and *Milton in Italy*. The present volume adopts the second of these solutions. In the words of its editors, it offers "a multivocal examination of the complex entanglements between literature and empire in Milton's poetry and prose" (2).

The topic of imperialism is a relatively recent one in Milton studies — as Rajan and Sauer acknowledge in the Introduction, their collection is riding the wave of interest generated by two recent book-length treatments of the subject, David Quint's *Epic and Empire* (1993) and J. Martin Evans's *Milton's Imperial Epic* (1996) — and as such it offers ample opportunities for new and original scholarly investigation. The sheer range and diversity of the essays in *Milton and the Imperial Vision* testify eloquently to the topicality of the subject, but they also reveal its essentially centrifugal character. As the editors themselves admit, this collection does not offer "a unified overview of 'Milton's imperialism'" (9). It offers, rather, "an exploration and an assessment of how much must be drawn into the world of involvement when the topic of Milton's imperialism is discussed" (9).

In order to impose some order upon such a loosely defined enterprise, Rajan and Sauer have divided *Milton and the Imperial Vision* into