GERARD CARRUTHERS AND LIAM MCILVANNEY

Introduction

The temptation to tell, not just a history but the 'story' of Scottish literature has often been a strong one. Three watershed dates – 1560, 1603 and 1707 – invite us to plot the trajectory of Scottish literature against the nation's mutating constitutional status. The Protestant Reformation, the Union of the Crowns and the Union of the Parliaments: There is a sense in which each of these events represents a realignment and, arguably, an impairment of native cultural identity. Taken together, these events have been read as staging posts on a process of regrettable Anglicization in post-medieval Scotland. Alternatively, this timeline can be presented more positively as the story of Scotland's growing 'modernity', the emergence of a peripheral European nation into the embracing lingua franca of English. The complex arguments that swirl around Scotland's historical 'losses' and 'gains' are often coloured by particular political and cultural perspectives. We might ask, however, if these events necessarily lend themselves to one singular, overarching conclusive cultural interpretation. The Reformation has been read, most famously by twentieth-century poet Edwin Muir, as promoting an 'alien' English language and relegating Scots to a congeries of dialects.[1] For Muir, this linguistic catastrophe forecloses the possibility of an integrated, nationally confident 'Scottish literature' worthy of the name. But does a national literature require a national language? What makes a 'regional' dialect unfit for literature? Muir bemoans the cultural depredations of Calvinism but ignores the vital new prose tradition that emerges with John Knox. Alongside Knox, we might class David Lyndsay, James VI, William Drummond of Hawthornden, James Thomson, Robert Burns, Walter Scott, James Hogg, Margaret Oliphant, Robert Louis Stevenson, Hugh MacDiarmid and Muriel Spark as writers whose works are informed by the ethos and theology of Scottish Presbyterianism. Are these writers simply to be dismissed, by the inevitable logic of Muir's position, as a wrong turn in the river?

What haunts Edwin Muir, a critical follower of the ideas of T. S. Eliot, is the idea of a 'national tradition' in which literary and cultural lines remain

continuous or unbroken through history. In the twenty-first century, we are more comfortable with the idea of discontinuities, of a plurality of 'traditions' rather than a singular 'tradition'. That a Catholic tradition – involving writers like William Dunbar, Alexander Geddes, Compton Mackenzie, Fionn Mac Colla, George Mackay Brown and (once again) Muriel Spark – co-exists and commingles with the Protestant tradition is an index of vitality, not of debilitating division. This brings us to another question: Need a literary culture have a solid 'centre', whatever that might be? Might it not be the case that cultures operate with a warp and woof, through debate and dialogue, and across contested rather than settled identities? In recent years, literary critics, in Scotland as elsewhere, have warned against 'essentialism', or taking a dogmatic line on what constitutes a culture and the criteria for belonging to a culture. Nevertheless, when it comes to Scottish literature (as with any other literature qualified by a national prefix) the problematic question of belonging or 'canonicity' inevitably arises. How are we to define 'Scottish literature'?

A relaxed and inclusive understanding of Scottish literature's canon is an observable late twentieth-century phenomenon. In 1998 there appeared an anthology, *The Triumph Tree: Scotland's Earliest Poetry AD 550–1350*, edited by Thomas Owen Clancy.[2] Including translations of texts originally written in Gaelic, Latin, Norse, Old English, Welsh and Scots, this anthology teaches us about a 'Scottish literature before Scottish literature', an idea developed by Clancy in his chapter in the present volume. Clancy reminds us of the relative latecoming of the Scots language to the Scottish cultural scene and of the long geographical uncertainty of 'Scotland'. Before these things began to take modern national, even 'nationalist', shape in the medieval period, what we now call Scotland had a very different if nonetheless rich creative literature. The dominant pre-twelfth-century language of Scotland, Gaelic, belongs, with its literature, to an Irish-Scottish world that straddles the North Channel. Its texts are 'Irish' as well as 'Scottish'. In other words, Gaelic is part of 'Scottish' cultural heritage but its full historical story transcends 'Scotland'.

The homogenization of language, literature and nation, it might be contended, can be traced as a serious project to the medieval period. Alessandra Petrina draws attention in the present volume to the dating by some critics of medieval Scottish literature's beginning to John Barbour's *The Bruce* (1375). She points to around 140 years from this moment, lasting until Gavin Douglas's *Eneados* (1513) where, undoubtedly, strong continuity features. We might say that this continuity is both constructed to some extent but is also natural, in the sense that successful Scottish literature clearly was inspiring subsequent texts or tradition. This period of the Scots 'Makars' sees a literature

written in Middle Scots that is formally and thematically dynamic and in dialogue with the literatures of England, France and the ancient classical world. Douglas's experimental adaptation of Virgil's *Aeneid* along with Robert Henryson's new – and in many ways re-written – version of Aesop's *Fables*, show Scotland 'writing back' confidently to the centre of classical civilisation. Within this internationalism, however, we need to be aware of Scottish literature from the fourteenth century staking out distinctively national territory. Barbour's *Bruce* is one of several medieval Scots epics celebrating resistance to English military incursions. In 1314, King Robert the Bruce had defeated the English at the Battle of Bannockburn, a decisively successful event that led to the drafting of the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320. This was an address in Latin from the nobility of Scotland to the Pope suggesting that the Holy Father should recognise Scotland as an ancient and venerable nation, implicitly rejecting English claims to suzerainty.[3] Again, we see Scotland writing to the centre of civilization (in this case Roman Christianity).

Bruce's grandson, King Robert II, enthroned in a safer Scottish kingdom than his grandfather had experienced, awarded Barbour £10 in recognition of his nationalist epic. Here, in a quite direct way, we see literature involved in what might be called nation building. Barbour's *The Bruce*, written in Scots, implicitly transposes the struggle between Christian Crusaders and Muslims into the battle between righteous Scots and barbarous Englishmen. In drawing on conventions of romance and chivalry, as well as the epic mode in general, *The Bruce* asserts, as did the Declaration of Arbroath, that the Scots are a cultured and civilized people. At the same time, it propagates the martial myth of the 'fighting Scot', the freedom-loving 'barbarian' who will resist colonization even against overwhelming odds. The Declaration of Arbroath had made great play of the resistance to Roman conquest by a tribe of north Britons under the leadership of Calgacus, chief of the Caledonii in the first century AD; it is an idea also to the fore in Mel Gibson's hugely popular film *Braveheart* (1995), celebrating that other great iconic fighting hero, William Wallace. These competing versions of Scotland and Scottish literature – civilized and primitive – recur many times in the post-medieval period.[4]

Gavin Douglas's *Aeneid*, a virtuoso performance of Scots-language poetic craftsmanship in dialogue with classical literature of the ancient world, might be seen to represent the high watermark of medieval Scottish literary confidence. It was written, however, in 1513, the year of the disastrous Battle of Flodden where the English routed the Scots, killing James IV and the flower of the Scottish nobility. In enmity and friendship, Scotland historically has felt the powerful pull of England. If Flodden did not completely bring Scotland into the orbit of her southern neighbour, the Reformation a few decades later in the sixteenth century certainly did, as newly Calvinist

Scots jettisoned the 'Auld Alliance' with France in favour of closer ties with Protestant England. If this 'British' development countermanded a fully independent Scottish culture, another important cultural transformation was presenting itself. Under the leadership of John Knox, the Scottish Reformation was iconoclastic and puritanical, relegating 'profane' literature to a status far beneath the word of God. As a result of this Calvinist mentality, the reformers of Scotland were more hostile to drama than in many other places and so Edwin Muir has a point when he laments the stunted nature of the Scottish theatrical tradition from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, especially when compared to England. We also see notorious censorship and bowdlerization in *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis* (1567), in which three reform-minded brothers, the Wedderburns, adapt Scottish folksongs and other ballads, shoehorning into these texts allegorical religious readings that evacuate any profane, worldly, bodily concerns. As Sarah Dunnigan observes in this volume, Scotland's break with European Catholicism is decisive, and it should be pointed out too that Scotland's Presbyterian Reformation is more radical than that experienced by England which maintains a church of Episcopal authority. While it marginalizes secular poetry, The Scottish Reformation gives rise to an intense kind of Protestant devotional poetry in the later sixteenth century, exemplified by Alexander Hume. In recent years, revisionist commentators have 'reclaimed' not only the prose writings of John Knox for Scottish literature, but the positive qualities of the intellectual trajectories initiated by the Reformation, which might be seen to feed into the achievement of the Scottish Enlightenment and other later periods of Scottish culture.[5] There is no doubt, however, that the cultural legacy of the Scottish Reformation remains a focus of intense controversy.

Traditionally, Scotland's seventeenth century has been viewed as a cultural wasteland. Hard on the heels of the Reformation, the Union of Crowns of 1603, when James VI of Scotland moved south to become James I of England, represents for many a further erosion of Scottish culture. While in Scotland, James's royal court provided a sanctuary for the 'profane' arts menaced by militant Calvinism. The latest in a line of artistically minded Stuart sovereigns, James authored fine sonnets and *The Essayes of a Prentise in the Divine Arte of Poesie* (1584). In James's absence, it has been argued, Scotland's 'Renaissance' is more fleeting and less fruitful than elsewhere in Europe. Perhaps this is part of the reason, as Sarah Dunnigan suggests, that the term is applied somewhat anachronistically to Scotland in the 1920s when the French critic, Denis Saurat, appropriates the term to label the poetic 'revival' led by Hugh MacDiarmid. Recent revisionist criticism has suggested that Scotland's sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Renaissance was more significant than some previous narratives attest, but

it is undoubtedly true that the term 'Scottish Renaissance' denotes a twentieth-century phenomenon.

A key question arises in the twenty-first century to countervail the critical narrative of seventeenth-century absence: Did Scottish literature require a resident monarch in order to prosper? There is no doubt that literature flourished under James VI. There is no doubt, too, that the nation's literary culture was deeply affected by the fact that so many Scottish writers and artists migrated to London with James, and so we have here the diagnosis of a phenomenon that is marked throughout Scottish literary history: the migration, to England or to further afield, of the Scottish writer. James Thomson, James Boswell, Thomas Carlyle, Robert Louis Stevenson, Muriel Spark, W. S. Graham, Douglas Dunn, Alastair Reid, Andrew O' Hagan: The list of 'exiled' Scottish writers is a long one. Is the work of these individuals any less Scottish, however, due to their non-residence? Might we think not of a 'native' culture, but instead of a migratory, diasporic Scottish literary culture, embracing England, Ireland, America, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere (discussed in its furthest flung vestiges by Gerard Carruthers in Chapter 19)?

If anything, Scottish criticism has been less suspicious about Scottish literature overseas (the spreading of Scottish culture) than it has been about Scottish literature in England (the recession of Scottish culture). How can Scottish literature seemingly be decanted with relative ease to New Zealand, but not to England? The answer of course lies in the 'British problem', the notion that to succeed in England, Scottish writers compromise their Scottishness. This is why a poet like James Thomson, whose *The Seasons* (1726–30) is one of the most influential landscape texts across the European arts for a century and a half, is seldom taught in courses on Scottish literature. Many of the other writers listed here also struggle to hold their place in the canon of Scottish writing. Muriel Spark, perhaps the most critically and commercially successful Scottish writer of the twentieth century, is far from being accepted, one of her senior Scottish contemporaries, the novelist Robin Jenkins, going so far as to claim that it is 'very difficult … to accept' Spark as 'Scottish'.[6] But why shouldn't Scottish writers cater for an audience beyond their home country? Why shouldn't they write about non-Scottish things, or rather more generally human things? Few critics would be willing to stipulate that Scottish writers should confine themselves to Scottish subjects, but the sometimes begrudging recognition of a Thomson or a Spark seems to proceed from such an assumption.

A long line of Scottish criticism has tended to look witheringly on the slide towards Britishness facilitated by the Reformation, the Union of Crowns and, most crucially, the Union of Parliaments. The year 1707 supposedly

cements and spreads what David Daiches calls the Scottish 'crisis of identity', or what David Craig refers to as an 'alienation from things native', as witnessed by everything from David Hume's anxious purging of 'Scotticisms' from his prose to the construction of Edinburgh's neoclassical New Town.[7] A split or bifurcation is diagnosed in Scottish literary culture between the languages of Scots and English, which is harmful to both sides: Authentic Scots-language literature is ghettoized, starved of a fuller, nourishing culture; neoclassical, English-language literature in Scotland is also undernourished, being too synthetic or programmatic, the result of attempts by 'enlightened' Scots to force too rapidly a cosmopolitan culture on the nation. The result is a literature that lurches between a robust but often bluff and rude demotic (as in the songs and epistles of Robert Burns) and a sterile, etiolated gentility (as in Henry Mackenzie's mannered *Man of Feeling*, 1771).

Such texts have been read as markers of a fractured, deviant, 'neurotic' culture. A little earlier in the eighteenth century, James Macpherson's 'Ossian' poetry (1760–2) inscribes in Scottish literature an attempt at cultural engineering that is inauthentic to the extent of forgery. Around the Ossian texts, a notorious literary dispute arose between activists of the Scottish Enlightenment including David Hume and England's foremost man of letters, Samuel Johnson. Hume, at least initially, endorsed Macpherson's claim to be disinterring and translating into English the genuine remains of old poetic texts in 'Erse' or Gaelic, dealing with ancient, pre-Christian warriors in the northwest part of Scotland. Johnson gleefully cried fraud. Whatever the precise truth of the Ossian texts, and the debate is not completely over today (though Macpherson was probably more creator than archaeologist of the texts), these poems, as much as Thomson's *The Seasons*, played a huge part in the European artistic imagination for at least a century following their appearance. Foreshadowing Romanticism, the Ossian texts popularised romantic landscape and sublime emotion, portraying the Celt as primitive noble savage. Despite this, there have been critics – perhaps regarding Macpherson as one of the 'sham bards of a sham nation', in Muir's description of Burns and Scott – who question the very existence of an authentic Scottish Romanticism. Given the global impact of Macpherson, Burns and Scott, however, we might be less concerned with authenticity than with appraising the achievement and legacy of these writers. As Murray Pittock also shows in the present volume, the idea of the Enlightenment and Romanticism standing in outright opposition to one another is an overdetermined critical binary that ought to be confined to the past. As Pittock points out, the universalism of the Enlightenment (its civilized cosmopolitan outlook) exists with reference to its observation of particularism (the local and even the primitive), the latter feature being a powerful motor of Romanticism. Dialogues about past

and present, less developed and more sophisticated societies, are the concern of both Enlightenment and Romanticism in Scotland, as Pittock exemplifies through a reading of *Rob Roy* (1817) by Walter Scott, a writer who breathes deeply the cultural air of both milieux.

The opening poem in Robert Burns's first volume of verse, *Poems, Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect* (1786), features a talking dog named Luath in allusion to Macpherson's Ossian poems. Burns's dog speaks Scots, not Gaelic, and Burns's poem nicely illustrates something of the plural cultural valency of Macpherson's poetry. Published in English, expressing a Gaelic sensibility, promoted by Scottish Enlightenment intellectuals and adapted by vernacular poets, Macpherson's Ossian poetry attests to the inter-connection of Scotland's literatures and languages. While *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature* devotes a separate chapter to 'The Gaelic Tradition', we are conscious that Gaelic literature has developed in dialogue with – and not in isolation from – literature in English and Scots. As Peter Mackay shows in Chapter 8, the first secular publication in Scottish Gaelic, Alexander MacDonald's *Aiseirigh na Seann Chànain Albannaich* (1751), contains translations from the Scots of Allan Ramsay as well as poems in conscious emulation of Thomson's *The Seasons*. Similarly, the spiritual poems of Dugald Buchanan, as in his *Laoidhe Spioradail* (1767), draw on Robert Blair and James Thomson as well as on the hymns of Isaac Watts. Later, in the twentieth-century Scottish Literary Renaissance and its aftermath, Gaelic literature and sensibilities would inflect the Scots verse of Hugh MacDiarmid and the limpid English lyrics of Norman MacCaig. As Mackay observes, 'Gaelic isolationism' is in short supply in a poetry that has from the first been involved in processes of translation and adaptation; instead, we have to do with a 'tradition of cultural negotiation, flexibility and relocation'.

The same suppleness can be witnessed in nineteenth-century Scottish literature, including Edinburgh's emergence as perhaps the world's most important metropolitan centre of periodical culture and the nation's remarkable output of short stories and novels by Walter Scott, John Galt, James Hogg and others. As Ian Duncan shows in Chapter 7, these writers are at the cutting edge of a radically new kind of anthropological 'fiction open to the intellectual currents of the age: including those that were breaking up the historical novel's philosophical foundation'. The Victorian period in Scottish literature and culture was for many years disparaged as an age of stultification and dearth, a long, dull diminuendo in which Scottish writers turned their backs on the new industrial realities and cultivated the bucolic inanities of 'cabbage-patch' fiction, if they didn't – as in the case of Thomas Carlyle and other 'exiled' writers – turn their backs on Scotland itself. In recent years, this picture has been revised, partly by the recovery of previously neglected

bodies of work such as the vigorous tradition of vernacular newspaper fiction uncovered by the research of William Donaldson or the oeuvres of Victorian women writers like Margaret Oliphant and Jane Carlyle, and partly by reassessments of the extant canon, as in the partial rehabilitation of the 'Kailyard' fiction of J. M. Barrie, S. R. Crockett and Ian Maclaren. Moreover, the contention that Scotland's Enlightenment wanes in the years after 1830 has been challenged by Cairns Craig, whose work has recovered the Scottish contexts and currents in the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton and Edward Caird, the psychology of Alexander Bain, the thermodynamics of William Thomson (Lord Kelvin), the mathematical physics of James Clerk Maxwell and the social anthropology of William Robertson Smith and J. G. Frazer. Not only does this intellectual ferment amount to a 'second Scottish Enlightenment', it palpably impinges on fictions like George MacDonald's *Phantastes* (1858), Robert Louis Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* (1886) and J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* (1906).[8] In Chapter 10, Andrew Nash interrogates the work of these writers, while also pointing to the significance of Victorian Scotland's poets of urban life, from Alexander Smith to James Thomson and John Davidson to which a renewed Scottish criticism ought to attend.

Far from ignoring modernity, Scotland's writers have made it one of their most vital concerns. The new industrial city is tackled by urban novelists from Scott to Kelman, as Liam McIlvanney shows in Chapter 15. A 'global consciousness of modernity' defines the work of Robert Louis Stevenson, as presented by Penny Fielding in Chapter 11. Of course, resistance to narratives of modernity has also characterised a strain in Scottish writing, one that insists on bringing back to disquieting life the conflicts and preoccupations of bygone ages. As David Punter shows in Chapter 9, this Scottish Gothic strain has provided a psychological scepticism in the face of the 'progress' of Scotland, and of the world, to the extent that 'if we were to search for an antonym to Gothic, it would not be realism but modernity'.

A conscious swithering between realism and fantasy, between the modern and the archaic is central to the poetry of Hugh MacDiarmid, the towering figure of twentieth-century Scottish literature and prime mover in the inter-war Risorgimento known as the Scottish Literary Renaissance. Scott Lyall's chapter takes advantage of recent advances in MacDiarmid scholarship (including the ongoing Carcanet edition of his writings and the greatly expanded body of letters and correspondence) to offer a fresh assessment of MacDiarmid's achievement. The chapter presents a MacDiarmid who is recognizably modernist (in his localism and materialism, his preoccupation with psychology and his perception of the act of poetry as 'deriving entirely from words') and at the same time distinctly conservative (in a verbal and formal archaism that takes us 'Back to Dunbar!'). We find a hugely ambitious

'project' in MacDiarmid's voluminous writings, from the early Scots lyrics and ballads, through the heterogeneous philosophical epic *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle* (1926) to the later modernist experiments in 'synthetic English'. MacDiarmid's importance as a cultural activist and provocateur is second to none in twentieth-century Scotland. Though Norman MacCaig described him as a 'torchlight procession of one', however, MacDiarmid was not the only significant writer of the period. MacDiarmid had precursors in the field of vernacular Scots poetry (including Charles Murray, Violet Jacob, Marion Angus and Helen Cruickshank), as well as successors in the 'Second Wave' of Scottish Renaissance poetry (William Soutar, Sydney Goodsir Smith and Robert Garioch). MacDiarmid's belief that poetry was the superior literary genre notwithstanding, the twentieth-century renaissance is also a fertile site of literary fiction, from the experimental vernacular narratives of Leslie Mitchell ('Lewis Grassic Gibbon') to the epic mythopoeia of Neil Gunn and Naomi Mitchison and the regional novels of Nan Shepherd and Willa Muir. We might also note various forms of resistance to the 'Renaissance' project, for instance in the comic scepticism of Eric Linklater, who lampoons the Scottish Renaissance in his 1934 satire *Magnus Merriman*, and in Edwin Muir, whose doubts over Scots as a viable literary language in *Scott and Scotland* (1936) prompted a famously bitter spat with MacDiarmid.

MacDiarmid's campaign for 'synthetic Scots', though it facilitated the first and second waves of the Scottish Literary Renaissance, grew less central, not merely to the poetry of MacDiarmid himself, but to that of the younger poets who emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. Scottish poets found they could be comfortably Scottish in any or all of Scotland's three indigenous languages. But whether writing in English, Scots or Gaelic, Scottish poets of the 1960s and 1970s shared with MacDiarmid a perception of language as embodied worldview, and a sense of the poetic act as finding its origin in language. Edwin Morgan, the most eclectic, energetic and experimental of the post-MacDiarmid Scottish poets, takes language as his subject and starting point in his concrete poetry, his 'sound' poetry, his 'emergent' poems and in his copious translations (from Russian, Hungarian and French, among other languages). Iain Crichton Smith (Iain Mac a' Ghobhainn), writing metaphysical poetry of the highest order in both English and Gaelic, explores his perception that 'we are born inside a language and see everything from within its parameters: it is not we who make language, it is language that makes us'. Crichton Smith's perception is shared by poets as diverse as Norman MacCaig and Tom Leonard. We might argue, then, that W. S. Graham's query – 'What is the language using us for?' – not only anticipates the insights of structuralism, but articulates the common sense of poets writing in a country with three mother tongues.

INTRODUCTION

In the past three decades, Scotland has witnessed a remarkable literary resurgence. New modes of urban writing, working-class writing and women's writing have altered the landscape of Scottish literature. Much of the energy of this new mood has been political. 'POLITICS WILL NOT LEAVE ME ALONE' complains the protagonist of Alasdair Gray's novel, *1982 Janine* (1984). It would be truer to say of contemporary Scottish writers that they will not leave politics alone, and the renaissance of Scottish writing has been bound up, in complex ways, with the country's successful progress towards constitutional change. In the 1970s, the assertive Scottishness of Alan Spence, Liz Lochhead, John Byrne and others accompanied the rise to electoral respectability of the Scottish National Party. The failure of political autonomy (in the abortive Scotland Act of 1978, defeated in a controversial referendum) proved the catalyst for a 'declaration of cultural autonomy', as Scottish literature entered a phase of unprecedented vigour and accomplishment. A Scottish resistance to the 'alien' values of the Thatcher administration was asserted, as much in the novels and poems of the period as in the overt political activism of writers like James Kelman, William McIlvanney and Alasdair Gray. Surveying Scottish fiction of the 1980s and 1990s, Irish novelist Colm Tóibín argued that Scottish novels were being written, 'as in Ireland in the old days, to replace a nation'. This is true of the vernacular fiction of Kelman, Galloway and Welsh, the 'agitprop ceilidhs' produced by theatre companies like 7:84 and Wildcat, the politicized Gothic of Iain Banks and Emma Tennant, the topical detective fiction of Ian Rankin and the nationally attuned poetry of Edwin Morgan, Robert Crawford, Douglas Dunn and Kathleen Jamie.

The 1980s also saw a rejection of the rhetoric of deformity and fragmentation that until then had been the house style of Scottish cultural analysis. Scottish culture (and the very phrase risked oxymoron) was viewed as shattered, fissured, radically split – between Scottishness and Britishness, emotion and intellect, Highland and Lowland, Scots and standard English. A culture with such deep linguistic and cultural fault lines appeared hopelessly incoherent. It couldn't begin to express what Edwin Muir called 'a whole and unambiguous nationality'. From Edwin Muir in the 1930s to Tom Nairn in the 1970s, this vision of Scottish cultural debility held more or less undisputed sway. It began to be challenged from the late 1980s by a group of Edinburgh-based academics and commentators, whose ranks included Craig Beveridge, Ronald Turnbull, David McCrone, Lindsay Paterson and Cairns Craig. For these writers, the 'divided' state of Scottish culture was entirely commonplace, and it was the model of an 'organic', homogenous national culture that must be questioned. This model was inappropriate not just to Scottish but to Irish, American, Caribbean culture. If Scottish culture