Abstract: David Hume’s philosophy and economics are central to any account of the Scottish Enlightenment. It is now well-established that this enlightenment is characterised by a particular epistemological approach which distinguishes it from other, particularly rationalist, enlightenments. While a variety of explanations has been offered for this distinctive approach, little attention has been paid to the presence in Scotland of two quite different cultures: Highland (specifically, Gaelic) and Lowland. Most Enlightenment figures were, like Hume, lowland (the main exception being Ferguson). But it seems implausible that the proximity to a very different culture had no impact on enlightenment thought. Hume himself addressed issues of Gaelic culture in terms of the controversial Ossian poems, for example, and issues of economic development of the Highlands. The purpose of this paper is to conduct an initial exploration into how far it is possible to identify any Gaelic influences on Hume in particular, and Scottish Enlightenment thought in general. This requires in turn a characterisation of Gaelic epistemology, for which purpose we will draw on Foucault’s structuring of thought into epistemes. If we can understand Highland and Lowland thought in terms of different epistemes, then some further reflection is required on Foucault’s framework of sequential epistemes.
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Hume e o Iluminismo Escocês: Duas Culturas

Resumo: A filosofia e a economia de David Hume são fundamentais para qualquer consideração do Iluminismo Escocês. Está atualmente bem estabelecido que esse iluminismo se caracterizou por uma abordagem epistemológica particular que o distingue de outros, especialmente de iluminismos racionalistas. Enquanto muitas explicações têm sido oferecidas para essa abordagem distinta, pouca atenção tem sido dada para a presença na Escócia de duas culturas completamente distintas: Highland (especialmente a Gaélica) e Lowland. A maioria dos membros do Iluminismo pertencia, assim como Hume, à Lowland (a principal exceção foi Ferguson). No entanto, parece implausível que a proximidade a uma cultura tão diferente não tenha tido nenhum impacto no pensamento iluminista. O próprio Hume se referiu a questões da cultura Gaélica em termos dos controversos poemas Ossiânicos, por exemplo, e a questões de desenvolvimento econômico das Highlands. A proposta deste artigo é conduzir uma exploração inicial a respeito de se é possível identificar quaisquer influências Gaélicas sobre Hume em particular e sobre o pensamento Iluminista Escocês em geral. Isto, por sua vez, requer uma caracterização da epistemologia Gaélica, para o que nós recorreremos à estruturação do pensamento de acordo com epistemes tal como desenvolvida por Foucault. Se nós podemos entender o pensamento da Highland e da Lowland em termos de epistemes, então alguma reflexão posterior é requerida sobre a estrutura Foucauldiana de epistemes sequenciais.
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Introduction

The role of culture in economic performance is a topic attracting considerable interest in modern economics. How far do cultural differences explain differences in economic performance? This was a question of interest also during the eighteenth century when relations between rich countries and poor countries and the causes of growth differentials were debated (the ‘rich country-poor country debate’). As migration and trade opened up new economic relations between old and new countries, with their different cultures, it was important to understand the causes of the wealth of the relatively wealthy nations, whether and how such wealth would spread, and whether virtue could be preserved in the process.

But here we are concerned also with the role of culture in ways of thinking about the economy, or indeed about science more generally. The enlightenment was not a homogeneous development in philosophy, and the idea to be pursued here is that cultural background influenced the philosophy which developed in different contexts. While modern culture studies tend to focus on the influence of dominant cultures, we will focus instead on the possible influence of the different cultures in Scotland, one of which (Gaelic culture) was being deliberately suppressed as a matter of government policy. The hypothesis is that this cultural background helps us understand the particularity of the Scottish enlightenment. What is being offered, then, is a case study for a more general argument that epistemological traditions in any context can be understood partly by reference to cultural tradition.

It is now widely accepted among philosophers, and increasingly widely accepted among historians of economic thought, that there was a particular character to the Scottish enlightenment. Rather than being isolated individuals whose thought is best understood in relation to English and Continental thought, the key figures such as Hume and Smith have increasingly been studied in recent times in terms of their particular background and context in Scotland. That background was until recently widely understood in terms of two different cultures: Highland and Lowland. Such a cultural bifurcation is not so evident in other enlightenments, so that it seems reasonable to explore how far this aspect of the context could have been significant. Caffentzis (2001) and Emerson (2003, 2007) have considered Hume’s economic writings in relation to what was understood as the Highland problem. Yet the implications of potentially diverse strands of influence from the two cultures for the content of Hume’s views on science, or on enlightenment thought more generally, have not traditionally been explored.

The two-cultures depiction of the background to the Scottish enlightenment has itself been under increased scrutiny (notably by Macinnes, 1996; see Ireland could be said to be a similar case; see O’Brien (1995) for a comparison between Scotland and Ireland in terms of enlightenment.)
also Campbell, 1984, and Pittock, 2003). The ‘Whig’ history of traditional accounts portrayed the backward culture of the Highlands and Islands being superseded by the more modern culture of the Lowlands. But, according to Macinnes et al, this reflected a misunderstanding of the nature of Gaelic history. Indeed Pittock (2003) associates Whig history with the Scottish enlightenment, showing Hume himself to have adopted at times an Anglo-centric view of Highlanders as ‘most disorderly and least civilized’ (269). The dispute is about how the two cultures were represented. But there are, further, arguments that it is misleading to think of Scotland in terms of two cultures: on the one hand some argue that Scotland was a ‘mongrel’ culture, and on the other it is argued that there was a single common culture (Newton, 2000: 14). It is clear therefore that any consideration of the influence of the particular structure and history of Scottish society on the Scottish enlightenment must take account of different interpretations of that structure and history, not only in the modern literature, but also in the eighteenth century.

This paper therefore raises a series of questions: how to depict Highland and Lowland culture, how each was perceived in the eighteenth century, and what influence if any this aspect of the Scottish context had on the formation of Scottish enlightenment thought. That influence could have taken a variety of forms. In particular, an awareness of cultural difference (whatever form it took) could itself have been influential. But there is further the possibility that the nature of Gaelic thought itself was influential for the special character of the Scottish enlightenment. To provide satisfactory answers to these questions is a huge task. The purpose here is therefore simply to conduct a preliminary investigation which can give rise to hypotheses for future, more extensive, investigations. We will focus particularly on David Hume in this first instance, given his stature in Enlightenment thought. But the primary and secondary literatures are immense; this paper is a first scratch on the surface.

We start by considering accounts of the cultural backdrop against which Hume and his circle built their ideas. In the following section we attempt an initial characterisation of the different ways of thinking associated with the different cultures in Scotland, drawing on Foucault’s archaeology of knowledge. This part of the argument owes much to the pioneering work on Foucault and economics of Lima (2006). Hume’s philosophy is discussed in terms of this characterisation. Finally we consider Hume’s writing on economic improvement in the Highlands in terms of the difference in culture between his Lowland background on the one hand and the Highlands and Islands on the other.

This book, which explicitly presents Island history from the Gaelic perspective, was the inspiration for this study.
The Background to Eighteenth-Century Scotland

It is useful to start any discussion of culture with reference to language. Language is both an expression of culture and a preserver of culture; it is also a medium for the transmission of culture. Until the late sixteenth century, there were two indigenous languages: Gaelic, spoken predominantly (but not exclusively) in the Highlands and Islands, and Middle Scots, spoken (predominantly but not exclusively) in the Lowlands. Latin was the common international language of learning, centred on the (Roman Catholic) Church.

The Reformation took hold in Scotland in 1560, when Parliament abolished Papal jurisdiction and banned the celebration of mass, and efforts were made to enforce this through greater centralisation of power in Parliament. (Unlike much of the Lowlands, the Islands and much of the Highlands did not willingly embrace Protestantism.) For example, Scots Law, administered in English (in the form of Middle Scots), was extended throughout Scotland, supplanting the Celtic and Norse principles of law practised in the Islands in Gaelic (Campbell, 1984: 36). The Union of the Crowns in 1603 (whereby James VI of Scotland also became James I of England) further shifted the balance of power away from the Highlands and Islands. James moved with his court to London, thus removing a focal point for Scottish culture, in particular the arts, and starting the assimilation of Scottish culture into English culture. As Daiches (1964) points out, this process was evident in linguistic change. From speaking a distinct language (Middle Scots), Lowlanders moved to a series of regional Scots dialects of English. In the Islands, too, there were formal attempts to introduce English-speaking, with the Statutes of Iona of 1609 requiring the firstborn of clan chiefs to be educated in English-speaking schools (Campbell, 1984, chapter 6). Gaelic speaking however persisted in the Highlands and Islands until 1746 when, following the quashing of the last Jacobite rebellion, the use of Gaelic was outlawed for a time, along with other features of Gaelic culture.

The two last Jacobite rebellions (1715 and 1745) can be seen as an expression of national feeling which had been building up particularly since the Union Act and Treaty of 1706-07, which united the Parliaments, coinage, taxation and the monarchy. Support for the rebellions was therefore not confined to Highlanders and Islanders, as had been earlier resistance to encroachment of Lowland mores and institutions. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 had limited the power of the British monarchy relative to the two Parliaments; Daiches (1964) argues that a major factor behind the Union had been the fear that Scotland would revert to a separate monarchy and ally itself again with France. Edinburgh was occupied by rebel forces in 1745, and the rebel army got as far south as Derby. The Lowland intelligentsia would have been acutely aware of these events, and of the subsequent increase in repression of Highland and Island culture and attempts to ‘civilise’ the inhabitants. At the same time, as Philpson (1981) argues, the distancing of the Scottish intelligentsia from the
The forum of politics raised profound questions at a time when civic morality was seen as being tied up with involvement in politics.

The conventional depiction of Highlanders and Islanders as barbarians was evident at the time, and persisted until recently. This depiction provided reason for the stringent measures introduced following 1746, the contrast being drawn with the ‘civilised’ Lowlands. This view has however been challenged by historians taking the Gaelic perspective. In a manner fully in tune with modern views on historiography, Campbell (1984) and Macinnes (1996) depict a culture which was no more ‘barbaric’ than in the Lowlands or England, but which was systematically repressed. Indeed Campbell (1984: 36) argues that it was the loss of self-determination following the breakdown of the Lordship of the Isles during the Reformation period which galvanised the clans into a form of resistance movement; it was in this resistance that they earned their reputation for barbarism.

Following the partially successful assimilation of the Highlands and Islands, the dualistic Lowland perception of Scots culture took a turn in the eighteenth century towards romanticism (Daiches, 1964). While Gaelic literature had until then been seen as vulgar, it was now acclaimed. This was most notable in the episode of the ‘discovery’ in 1760 of an ‘ancient’ Gaelic poem allegedly by Ossian, which proved to have been a contemporary construction by James MacPherson. Interestingly, Campbell’s (1984) take on the episode is that the manuscript was neither genuine nor a fake, but rather a drawing on old folk tales in the longstanding oral Gaelic tradition which blends fact and fantasy. Hume himself was involved in the controversy (Mossner, 1943, chapter 4). This episode, which has loomed large in much discussion of Scottish history of that period (Allen, 1993, chapter 3), is interesting for our purposes, given the motivation of MacPherson’s Lowland sponsors in his search for a ‘Gaelic Homer’. In their attempts to reassert a Scottish identity following Union, they sought evidence of the ‘ancient Scottish spirit’ (Philipson, 1981: 34). This understanding that there was an ancient Scottish (rather than simply Gaelic) tradition implies that Gaelic culture was seen then as an integral part of Scottish culture. This sentiment is picked up also by Newton (2000: 14).

Scotland was a poor country; it was only with the industrial revolution in the nineteenth century that there was significant wealth creation. After the Reformation, the Scottish Church was a conservative influence, not only on the arts, but also on economic improvements (Daiches, 1964, chapter 1). There was a fatalism about the operation of markets which discouraged active attempts at exploiting opportunities. Further, luxury consumption, which might have been the motivation for and use of any surplus, was discouraged by the Church. But ideas for agricultural improvement were gradually being imported in the Eighteenth century from England and Holland by landowners such as Hume’s friend Lord Kames. Even in European terms the Honourable Society for Im-

---

1Cultural differences persist to this day.
provement in the Knowledge of Agriculture, founded in 1723, was pioneering. While this Society had foundered by 1745, the Select Society took up the role of forming policy (in the absence of a Scottish Parliament), especially for the arts. There was an active encouragement of the arts among the Church’s ‘Moderates’ among whom Hume found some of his close friends.

Economic improvement of the Highlands and Islands was regarded as an important mechanism for quelling social and political unrest there; as we shall see below, Hume was among those seeking solutions to what was understood as economic backwardness. Further, encouragement of the arts was seen as a way of ensuring that economic surplus was not devoted to military purposes (although ironically Highland regiments provided a disproportionate input of manpower in subsequent British military episodes). Highland landowners sought solutions in developing in turn the kelp industry, fishing and fish processing, and sheep farming, with attendant population movements. Analysis of this period is highly controversial, particularly due to the huge scale of out-migration, with difference of opinion as to how far the migration was forced and how far voluntary. Enclosure in the Lowlands also led to significant population clearances, but there is much less question of force than in the Highlands and Islands (Devine, 2005). But it is clear that there is a duality in the way in which improvement in the Highlands is treated as a separate issue from improvements in Scotland in general, even if only because a temporal sequence was perceived, with improvements coming to the Lowlands first, and then ‘trickling down’ to the Highlands.

If nothing else, then, Hume was aware of difference in stage of economic development from his knowledge of Scotland. Indeed, Caffentzis (2001) and Emerson (2003, 2007) are persuasive in arguing that Hume was much exercised by the Highland question, and that his Political Discourses are substantially addressed to that question. While this could not but influence Hume’s economics, we will consider first how far cultural differences in Scotland might have affected his philosophy. Hume’s thought can be traced back at least two centuries, that is, to influences which pre-dated the (perceived) duality which built up during the seventeenth century. We will bear in mind the possibility, noted above, that there was a commonality of that earlier Scottish culture in spite of language difference. We explore in the next section how we can characterise Highland/Gaelic culture and Lowland Scots culture in order then to identify the origins of Hume’s thought in relation to each.
Characterising Scottish Culture

The form of economic organisation in both Highlands and Lowlands developed from a feudal system where land was owned by the Church, and society operated by a network of obligations and rights. With the Reformation in the sixteenth century, the Church’s lands were broken up, paving the way for private property rights, as a step towards capitalism. Philipson (1981, p. 22-25) identifies Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun as father of the Enlightenment in Scotland. He pointed to the shift in power from landowners to the Crown, such that their civic and military responsibilities were now discharged through taxation. While the feudal system persisted (in the case of large estates up to the twentieth century) there were differences between Highlands and Islands and the Lowlands in that the clan system embedded obligations and rights within a clan structure, while in the Lowlands these relations were with respect to the feudal lord, whoever he might be. In other words, the process identified by Fletcher was delayed in the Highlands and Islands, even though the break-up of the Lordship of the Isles in the sixteenth century accelerated the catch-up. Nevertheless, society and communitarianism, while not tied to clan as in the Highlands and Islands, continued to be important in Lowland culture. There was also a difference in terms of stage of economic development, such that agrarian reform had progressed earlier in Lowlands (Devine, 2005). Finally, banking and the habit of using notes in payment developed first in the Lowlands, and spread with a lag in the Highlands and Islands. As with agricultural improvement, the spread was accelerated by public involvement in Highland improvement following the 1745 rebellion.

Whether simply as a result of lagged commercialisation, or because of an inherent cultural difference, the Highlands and Islands had a different character from the Lowlands in the eighteenth century, which some describe as ‘primal’ (see for example Newton, 2000, chapter 9). It was still essentially a gift society, where social bonds were particularly strong. There is not an extensive literature on Gaelic culture as such; the task of fully specifying it has not been undertaken to my knowledge. Yet what has been written about it indicates that it accords with Foucault’s (1966) ‘age of resemblance’. Foucault (1966, 1969) set out to characterise the broad epistemological background for thought over the centuries. The age of resemblance applies to the middle ages, and was replaced in the enlightenment period with the ‘age of representation’. This age in turn seems to apply up to a point with Lowland thought. Foucault’s analysis is open to discussion from a number of points of view. In particular, from our point of view, it is important how far ages necessarily follow each other, or how far they can co-exist – or even reverse order. Nevertheless, Foucault’s characterisation provides a useful framework for the simple purpose of understanding the difference in cultures.

In the age of resemblance, knowledge is the mirror of nature; the task is to identify and interpret the signs of nature given by God. Knowledge consists
of history. The emphasis is on connection between things. This captures the connectivity of Gaelic society, the absence of distinction between the real, the spiritual, superstition and fiction (as evidenced in the incidence of ‘second sight’ and in the oral tradition of story and song). As Newton (2000) explains, something akin to scientific method was employed, for example in the development of herbal medicines and in agricultural improvement. But there was strong resistance to the imposition from the Lowlands of technological developments which did not fit with historical experience (such as reliance on single crops, as when potato cultivation was forcibly introduced).

In the Lowlands, on the other hand, the urge to classify and analyse, and to emphasise distinctions rather than connections, was more akin to Foucault’s age of representation. True knowledge was not seen as accessible. Rather, uncertain knowledge was to be built up using the scientific method. This would seem to suggest that the Gaelic mode of thought was incommensurate with the Lowland mode of thought, as the implication of Foucault’s archaeology. But, while Foucault used Hume as archetypical of the age of representation, Lima (2004) argues that Hume departs from Foucault’s characterisation in several important respects. In the next section, we consider Hume’s philosophy in terms of Foucault’s framework.

Hume’s Philosophy and Gaelic Thought

Foucault’s archaeology of knowledge focuses our attention on the conditions of possibility of knowledge, and how these conditions have changed from one era to the next. Figures like Hume on the cusp of transition from one era to the next are thus of particular interest. Foucault provides a particular, and particularly profound, way of understanding the novelty of Hume’s thought in terms of the age of representation (or the classical age) by comparison with the previous age of resemblance. Indeed Hume displays many of the characteristics of the classical age, with his civic humanism, his theory of human nature and his study of science. But what is being suggested here is something different from Foucault’s sequential epistemes, in that Gaelic epistemology (insofar as the age of resemblance could be said to have an epistemology) could still be said to have some of the characteristics of the age of resemblance in Hume’s time. Hume’s philosophy differed significantly from enlightenment thought elsewhere, notably in France. The idea we pursue here is that this difference was due, in part at least, to influences on Hume, not only from the emerging age of representation, but also from the continuing age of resemblance, coexisting in enlightenment Scotland.

Hume’s thought explicitly departed from French rationalism in the Treatise (Hume 1739-40) where he expresses his dissatisfaction with that approach. Descartes had put deductive reason at the heart of his epistemology,
side self-evident truths arrived at by introspection (most notably cogito ergo sum). This approach encapsulated the characteristic dualism of the classical age, with sharp distinctions between reason and experience, and between certainty and superstition, rather than the more organic approach of the age of resemblance (see further Dow 1990). Further, according to this epistemology, knowledge was to be built in the form of universal truths. Hume on the other hand sought a starting-point for building knowledge, not in self-evident truths, but in conventional beliefs built up from a history of experience. As Hume (1739-40: 183, emphasis in original) put it: ‘all our reasonings concerning causes and effects are deriv’d from nothing but custom; and that belief is more properly an act of the sensitive, than of the cogitative part of our natures’. By this he did not mean conventional superstitious belief. In fact he railed against superstition on the grounds of inattention to actual experience to which reason was applied (ibid.: 271). Rather he meant belief built up from experience to which reason has been applied, and which has been tested in the face of new experience.

This approach accorded with the Scottish understanding of the Newtonian experimental method, which involved drawing provisional principles from experience and then considering them for possible modification in the light of new experience (see Montes 2006). The experiments in the case of the social sciences consisted of detailed study of a range of experiences from history. As Lima (2004) points out, this emphasis on history (Hume was first and foremost a historian) was more characteristic of the age of resemblance than the age of representation.

Hume’s emphasis on belief as the basis for knowledge encouraged his efforts to build a science of human nature as the basis for his epistemology, something which places him well within the classical age. But the content of this science displays features of the age of resemblance, again particularly in an absence of dualism. While the classical approach was to distinguish sharply between reason and other faculties, privileging reason, Hume emphasised other human faculties as primary. Thus sentiment provides the necessary prompting to action (including building knowledge). The imagination is required for the building of knowledge, not least in developing ideas, such as the idea of cause (just as it is required for social interaction). Imagination too is necessary for the communication of ideas to others, drawing on such rhetorical techniques as the use of analogy and metaphor. While the separation of the world of the mind from the world of experience is a characteristic of the age of representation, for Hume the separation was at the abstract level. In practice, sentiment, imagination and reason operated together in the organic fashion more associated with the age of resemblance.

The important features of Hume’s thought which distinguished him from other enlightenment figures (particularly those in the French tradition) can therefore be seen to be a carry-forward of characteristics of the age of resemblance. It
could be argued that Hume was more familiar with such ideas because Highland culture in many ways continued to display the epistemology of the age of resemblance. But the influence of Highland culture could be more than its content. It could be argued that Hume’s epistemology was influenced by the co-existence of different cultures, whatever their content. For example the argument could be made that Hume was influenced by his close knowledge of Scottish, English and French culture.

Awareness of different cultures can encourage the kind of scepticism which Hume displayed towards one system of thought as yielding universal truths. What is self-evident in one culture may not be self-evident in another. Sentiments may differ from culture to culture, and what appeals to the imagination in one culture may not appeal in another. Awareness of other cultures within a dominant culture (as in England or France) may simply encourage the notion of better or worse approaches to knowledge. But in a non-dominant culture like Scotland (particularly one which has just lost its locus of political power), awareness of other cultures encourages a scepticism towards ideas of universal truths. It also encourages the idea of context-specific knowledge, that principles should be treated as provisional, in the expectation that they may require modification in different circumstances (including different cultures).

Of course it could be argued that, within Scotland, Lowland culture dominated over Highland culture in the second half of the eighteenth century. But Hume in particular took a consistently non-dualistic, non-absolutist approach to the Highlands, as we can see when we consider his ideas on economic development. There was a tendency on the part of the authorities to dichotomise Highland/Gaelic and Lowland cultures, most evident in the increased efforts to eradicate Gaelic culture following the 1745 Rebellion. Hume, along with others, took a constructive approach to the post-Rebellion situation by considering methods of economic improvement in the Highlands. This humanist effort, another indicator of the increasing entrenchment of the classical episteme, encouraged some to advocate dramatic change in land use and economic organisation. But Hume was more cautious, paying attention to the particularities of Highland and Island culture as well as economic conditions.

Hume had direct knowledge of agricultural improvement from his own family’s recent experience in the Southern Uplands of Scotland. Indeed commercialisation had arguably only advanced there relatively recently, compared to the Highlands, where pecuniary rents and cattle trading had already by then been well-established. He was particularly aware of the need for tranquility (hence his horror at the Rebellions), such that improvements should only be introduced gradually and with attention to local habits and customs. As Philipson (1981: 30-1) puts it:

No commercial society could be stable, Hume thought, whose government did not recognise and respect the variety of its social and regional structure. No citizen...
could possibly think of himself as virtuous unless he acknowledged that his own happiness and that of society at large were interconnected, unless he realized the importance of pursuing political stability in respecting the regional integrity of the different communities of the kingdom.

This awareness of regional differences is a further reflection of the provisiosity of principles, and the need to adapt to the context at hand.

But habits and customs were not fixed. Hume saw commercialisation as a mechanism for changing habits in a positive direction, encouraging both more civilised behaviour as a result of formal employment, and also innovation in new techniques (Wennerlind, 2006). This attitude was evident also in his monetary theory, where he saw increasing money inflows as the outcome of increasing productivity, ie as part of a dynamic process. His emphasis on process and transformation of society reflects an organicist view of economic development, rather than the more common imposition of new policies from outside on rationalist grounds.

Conclusion

This study of epistemology in the Scottish enlightenment in terms of cultural background has suggested one set of factors which could be said to have produced the distinctive character of Scottish thought in that period. We have seen that Hume in particular was aware of cultural difference within Scotland as well as between Scotland and other countries. It has been argued that this awareness itself may have encouraged his preference for provisional, historically-based knowledge over the rationalist approach to enlightenment. But further it has been argued that the persistence within Scotland of thought more characteristic of what Foucault has defined as the age of resemblance, alongside the new classical mode of thought, further explains Hume’s particular epistemology.

It could be argued that any mixing of cultures can be fruitful in encouraging new ideas and new ways of thinking. But by using Foucault’s framework we can see that the mix in Scotland was one which crossed over from one episteme to another, and arguably this produced the distinctive and influential ideas of Scottish enlightenment philosophy and economics. Foucault himself did not allow for epistemes co-existing, but his specification of epistemes has allowed us to do so here. However the fact is that the ideas of the Scottish enlightenment, as presented here, were widely misunderstood, eg by Kant who was much more squarely located within the classical episteme. This outcome may serve to reinforce Foucault’s notion that epistemes are in general incommensurate; the exception explored here is an unusual context in which there was direct experience of two epistemes within one national culture.
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