



A University of Sussex PhD thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

**‘Providence and Political Economy’:
Josiah Tucker’s Providential Argument for
Free Trade**

Peter Xavier Price

PhD Thesis in Intellectual History

University of Sussex

April 2016

University of Sussex

Peter Xavier Price

Submitted for the award of a PhD in Intellectual History

‘Providence and Political Economy’: Josiah Tucker’s Providential Argument for Free Trade

Thesis Summary

Josiah Tucker, who was the Anglican Dean of Gloucester from 1758 until his death in 1799, is best known as a political pamphleteer, controversialist and political economist. Regularly called upon by Britain’s leading statesmen, and most significantly the Younger Pitt, to advise them on the best course of British economic development, in a large variety of writings he speculated on the consequences of North American independence for the global economy and for international relations; upon the complicated relations between small and large states; and on the related issue of whether low wage costs in poor countries might always erode the competitive advantage of richer nations, thereby establishing perpetual cycles of rise and decline. As a vehement critic of war in all its forms, Tucker was a staunch opponent of Britain’s mercantile system – a pejorative term connoting, amongst other things, the aggressive control of global trade for the benefit of the mother country so as to encourage imperial expansion throughout known parts of the world. Though recognising Tucker to be a pioneer of the anti-mercantilist free trade school, extant Tucker scholarship has tended to concentrate on the perceived similarities and dissimilarities between he and the classical economists, particularly Adam Smith. Yet whilst acknowledging the veracity of these various connections and claims, this thesis approaches Tucker from an alternative perspective. Placing Tucker in his proper historical context, the main purpose of this study is to explore the intellectual, political and theo-philosophical background to Tucker’s economic thought. Its most original and profound contribution consisting in a detailed and critical analysis of Tucker’s links with his ecclesiastical mentor Bishop Joseph Butler, its central concern is to argue the case for Butler’s crucial influence over Tucker’s free trade ideas – particularly in the guise of the neo-Stoic, Anglican providentialism that buttressed much of Butler’s own theories in the field of meta-ethics and moral philosophy.

*To the memory of my Father,
Peter Michael Price,
and
Grandmother,
Mary Florence Price.*

Acknowledgements.

This thesis has been many years in the making. Consequently, I have accrued many debts along the way. First and foremost, my sincere thanks go to my primary supervisor Richard Whatmore, who originally put to me the importance of Tucker, whose expertise and enthusiasm I have drawn lavishly from and been inspired by; and whose mastery in the art of ‘slackening or tightening the rope’ has afforded me both the freedom and direction that is required for intellectual nourishment and growth. My second thanks goes, fittingly, to my secondary – albeit unofficial – supervisor Donald Winch, who has offered a number of valuable insights and clarifications at different stages of the research, and whose support and confidence along the way has proved galvanising, convincing me of the worth of my task. In the latter stages of this thesis, I am also particularly grateful to Iain McDaniel, whose detailed feedback and unfailingly kind advice enabled me to tighten certain aspects of the work that might otherwise have been overlooked, thereby deepening my findings and pushing me over the finishing line.

I have benefitted greatly, too, from the stimulating intellectual environment that is the University of Sussex, and in particular all those participants and affiliates of the Sussex Centre for Intellectual History who have influenced and inspired me at different times and in many different ways, though they are likely unaware of it. This being said, I should like extend my sincere thanks to Knud Haakonssen, Cesare Cuttica, Rob Iliffe, Deborah Madden, Andy Mansfield, Sophie Bissett, Kris Grint, Darrow Schecter, Rose Holmes, Claudia Siebrecht, Claire Langhamer, Hester Barrow, Molly Butterworth, Fiona Allen, Christopher Warne; and lastly to all my First and Second Year students, particularly Lilian Rice, who reminded me of both the importance and fruitfulness of youthful curiosity.

The research conducted in preparation for this thesis could not have been carried out without the financial support of a number of institutions. I am firstly grateful to the University of Sussex for the Sussex Founders’ Scholarship Award, which provided the necessary platform to begin with the earliest stages of research; and which, moreover, allowed me to catalogue the late John W. Burrow Papers at the University of Sussex

Library, Special Collections (now The Keep, Brighton). In doing so, Burrow has certainly inspired me from beyond the grave. However, I should also like to thank those colleagues who supported, trained, or were simply present with me whilst on this placement, particularly Fiona Courage, Rose Lock, Adam Harwood, Jessica Scantlebury, Jo Baines, Alexa Neale and Anthony McCoubrey.

Special thanks must also go to the Arts and Humanities Research Council for providing the bulk of funding in support of this study. In addition, I am particularly grateful to the ARHC for granted a period of ‘secondment’ for six months as a Resident Scholar at the Library of Congress, Washington D. C. This was an experience that broadened the intellectual parameters of this thesis; and for my warm and memorable time spent there, it is only right that I thank the staff at the John W. Kluge Center, especially Mary-Lou Reker, Travis Hensley and Jason Steinhauer, alongside my fellow Research Fellows who are too numerous to list. On this score, however, profound thanks go to Oksana Marafioti, who shared this unique experience with me in ways that remain simply inexpressible. From this meeting, I was also able to write a significant portion of the thesis at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and I am therefore extremely grateful to her and the staff that harboured me there. Other aspects of this thesis were also made possible through comparably modest, though nonetheless highly significant, sources of funding, and I would like to thank in particular the Royal Historical Society and The Royal Economic Society for their generous financial support.

Last but not least, I thank my closest friends David Fendt and Luke Edwards, for pointing out in many amusing ways the ironies of life as I wrote this work. And above all, of course, I thank my family – especially Ludovica, Jeanne, Peter Leonard, Peter Smith, Jennifer, Harrison, Anne, Stephen, Mei-Mei, Iris, KC and Raymond. But for their support and unconditional love, I would have been left floundering long ago. This being said, my greatest debt and gratitude goes to my steadfast and loving mother. The fact that I end with her indicates that she is both the root and the pinnacle of all that I achieve, and hope to achieve in future.

Table of Contents.

List of Abbreviations.	8
Introduction.	12
I. Note on Method.	16
 Part I. The Theo-Philosophical Background.	 21
Chap. One: ‘Providence and Political Economy’.	22
I. Introduction: Divine Providence.	23
II. Political Economy.	26
III. The Conjunction Between Providence and Political Economy: Epicureanism, Stoicism and Augustinianism.	30
IV. Competing Visions of Providence.	36
V. The Relationship between Christian Stoicism and Protestant Natural Law.	39
VI. Concluding Remarks: Butler and Tucker’s Relevance to Modern Scholarship.	47
 Chap. Two: Christian Virtue, Commercial Society, and Eighteenth- Century Anglicanism.	 53
I. Introduction: The Eighteenth-Century Anglican Church.	56
II. The Thirty-Nine Articles and the <i>Book of Common Prayer</i> .	60
III. ‘The Point of Departure’: The Anglican Response to Commercial Modernity.	64
IV. Private Vices, Public Benefits: The Mandevillean Critique.	69
V. William Law’s Rejoinder.	75
VI. Concluding Remarks: Christian Virtue or Commercial Society?	78
 Part II. The ‘Butler-Tucker Axis’.	 82
Chap. Three: Sociability and Self-Love in Butler’s <i>Fifteen Sermons</i>.	83
I. Introduction: Butler’s Early Life, and the Tewkesbury-Leiden Connection.	84
II. The Butler-Clarke Exchange: Permeable Lines Between Establishment and Dissent.	90
III. ‘Conscience’ and ‘Reflection’ in <i>Fifteen Sermons</i> .	98
IV. The Pastoral Function of <i>Fifteen Sermons</i> .	103
V. Towards a Conception of Society: Butler on Anger, Empathy and Friendship.	108
VI. Concluding Remarks: The ‘Cements of Society’.	114

Chap. Four: In Defence of Orthodoxy: The <i>Analogy of Religion</i> and the Methodist Controversy.	118
I. Introduction: Tucker's Early Life and Meeting With Butler.	125
II. <i>The Analogy of Religion</i> I. Probability and Provability.	129
III. <i>The Analogy of Religion</i> II. Faith and Doubt.	134
IV. The Methodist Controversy I. Tucker, Whitefield, and the 'Marks of the New Birth'.	140
V. The Methodist Controversy II. Butler, Wesley, and the 'Virtuous Temper of Mind'.	147
VI. The Methodist Controversy III. <i>The Principles of Methodism</i> .	154
VII. Laodicean Rationalism.	161
VIII. <i>A Brief and Dispassionate View of the Trinitarian, Arian and Socinian Systems</i> .	167
IX. Concluding Remarks: The 'Butler-Tucker Axis'.	172
 Part III. Tuckerian Political Economy.	175
Chap. Five: The Economic Tracts.	176
I. Introduction: Appetites, Affections and Rational Agency.	178
II. 'That Noble and Interesting Science'.	184
III. Judicious Politics.	191
IV. Certain Proposals.	195
V. 'That Watchful Dragon': Tucker on the Relationship Between Self-Interest and Monopolisation.	200
VI. Concluding Remarks: The Economic Tracts in Context.	208
 Conclusion: 'The Providential Argument for Free Trade'.	215
I. Introduction: <i>Caritas</i> , and Butler's Continuing Legacy.	216
II. Education, Remedial Care and Duty to the Poor.	221
III. Free Trade, Humanitarian Principles and 'Moral Re-entry' in Tucker's Political Economy.	227
IV. Concluding Remarks: 'The Providential Argument for Free Trade'.	232
 Bibliography.	238
I. Manuscript Collections.	238
II. Primary Sources.	239
III. Secondary Sources.	245
IV. <i>ODNB</i> Articles.	258
V. Websites.	258

List of Abbreviations.

Apart from on those rare occasions when the text is brief enough to be set out in its entirety, the title of each work is provided in its abbreviated or shortened form; excepting its first mention, where its full title is provided before reverting back to its abbreviated/shortened form in all subsequent entries.

Butler, Joseph:

<i>Accession</i>	<i>A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords ... on Thursday, June 11, 1747, (London, 1747).</i>
<i>Charity Schools</i>	<i>A Sermon Preached ... on Thursday May the 9th, 1745, (London, 1745).</i>
<i>Fifteen Sermons 1726</i>	<i>Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel, (London, 1726).</i>
<i>Fifteen Sermons 1729</i>	<i>Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel, The Second Edition, corrected: To Which is added a Preface, (London, 1729).</i>
<i>Infirmary</i>	<i>A Sermon Preached ... for the Relief of Sick and Diseased Persons ... on Thursday, March 31, (London, 1748).</i>
<i>Martyrdom</i>	<i>A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords ... Jan. 30, 1740-1, (London, 1741).</i>
<i>SPG</i>	<i>A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; ... on Friday, February 16, 1738-9, (London, 1739).</i>
<i>Spital</i>	<i>A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor ... on Monday Easter-Week, 1740, (London, 1740).</i>
<i>The Analogy</i>	<i>The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature. To which are added Two brief Dissertations ..., (London, 1736).</i>

Tucker, Josiah:

<i>Apology</i>	<i>An Apology for the Present Church of England as by Law Established, Occasioned by a Petition ... to be laid before Parliament for Abolishing Subscriptions, (Gloucester, 1772).</i>
<i>Britain and Ireland</i>	<i>Reflections on the Present Matters in Dispute Between Great Britain and Ireland... (London, 1785).</i>
<i>Causes of the Poor</i>	<i>The Manifold Causes of the Increase of the Poor Distinctly Set Forth, (Gloucester, 1760).</i>

<i>Cui Bono?</i>	<i>Cui Bono? Or, an Enquiry, What Benefits can Arise ... from the Greatest Victories, or Successes, in the Present War? ... Addressed to Monsieur Necker, (Third Ed., Gloucester, 1781).</i>
<i>Dearness of Provisions</i>	<i>The Causes of the Dearness of Provisions assigned; with Effectual Methods for Reducing ... Them, (Gloucester, 1766).</i>
<i>Dr Kippis</i>	<i>Letters to the Rev. Dr Kippis, occasioned by his Treatise Entitled A Vindication of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers, with Regard to their Late Application to Parliament, (Gloucester, 1773).</i>
<i>Elements</i>	<i>The Elements of Commerce and the Theory of Taxes, (Privately Published, 1755).</i>
<i>Essay</i>	<i>A Brief Essay on the Advantages and Disadvantages which respectively attend France and Great Britain, with regard to Trade, [1st Ed., 1749; 2nd Ed., 1751] (3rd Ed., London, 1753).</i>
<i>Four Letters</i>	<i>Four Letters on Important National Subjects, Addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Shelburne (2nd Ed., London, 1783).</i>
<i>Four Tracts</i>	<i>Four Tracts on Political and Commercial Subjects, (Gloucester, 1774).</i>
<i>Hospitals and Infirmarys</i>	<i>Hospitals and Infirmarys, Considered as Schools of Christian Education for the Adult Poor ... towards a National Reformation of Common People, (Gloucester, 1746).</i>
<i>Humble Address</i>	<i>An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal to Those Respectable Personages in Great Britain and Ireland, (Gloucester, 1775).</i>
<i>Instructions</i>	<i>Instructions for Travellers, (Privately Published, 1757; Dublin, 1758).</i>
<i>Letter from a Merchant</i>	<i>A Letter from a Merchant in London to His Nephew in North America, (London, 1766).</i>
<i>Letter to a Friend</i>	<i>A Letter to a Friend Concerning Naturalizations, (2nd Ed., London, 1753).</i>
<i>Letter to Burke</i>	<i>A Letter To Edmund Burke ... in Answer to his Printed Speech..., (2nd Ed., London, 1775).</i>
<i>Life of George Whitefield</i>	<i>The Life and Particular Proceedings of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield ... the Genuine Account of that Gentleman, (London, 1739).</i>
<i>NFP I</i>	<i>Expediency of a Law for the Naturalization of Foreign Protestants: ... Part I ... Occasioned by the ... Naturalization Bill, (London, 1751).</i>
<i>NFP II</i>	<i>Expediency of a Law for the Naturalization of Foreign Protestants: ... Part II ... Containing Important Queries relating to Commerce ... and the Principles of the Christian Religion,</i>

	(London, 1752).
<i>Principles of Methodism</i>	<i>A Brief History of the Principles of Methodism</i> , (Oxford, 1742).
<i>Reflections on Turkey</i>	<i>Reflections on the Expediency of Opening the Trade to Turkey</i> , (London, 1753).
<i>Religious Intolerance</i>	<i>Religious Intolerance No Part of the General Plan Either of the Mosaic, or Christian Dispensation, Proved by Scriptural Inferences and Deductions</i> , (Gloucester, 1774).
<i>Seventeen Sermons</i>	<i>Seventeen Sermons on some of the Most Important Points on Natural and Revealed Religion, Respecting the Happiness Both of the Present and the Future Life</i> , (Gloucester, 1776).
<i>Shrove Tuesday</i>	<i>An Earnest and Affectionate Address to the Common People of England Concerning Their Usual Recreations on Shrove Tuesday</i> (Gloucester, 1753).
<i>Six Sermons</i>	<i>Six Sermons on Important Subjects</i> , (Bristol, 1772).
SPCK	<i>A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of Christ-Church, London on Wednesday May 7th, 1766 ... the time of the Yearly Meeting of the ... Charity Schools ... To which is annexed, An Account of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge</i> , (London, 1766).
<i>Spirituous Liquors</i>	<i>An Impartial Inquiry into the Benefits and Damages ... of Low-priced Spirituous Liquors</i> , (London, 1751).
TASS	<i>A Brief and Dispassionate View of the Difficulties Attending the Trinitarian, Arian, and Socinian Systems</i> , (Gloucester, 1774).
<i>Treatise</i>	<i>A Treatise Concerning Civil Government ... Part I. The Notions of Mr. Locke and his Followers. Part II. The True Basis of Civil Government Set Forth and Ascertained. Part III. England's Former Gothic Constitution Censured and Exposed; ... also the Scripture Doctrine Concerning the Obedience Due to Governors Vindicated and Illustrated</i> , (London, 1781).
<i>Two Dissertations</i>	<i>Two Dissertations on certain Passages of Holy Scripture ... wherein the Cavils and Objections of the late Mr. Chubb ... are particularly considered and refuted</i> , (London, 1749).

Introduction.

As is occasionally the case with certain historical figures, posterity has not been particularly kind to Josiah Tucker (1713-99).¹ Unknown to modern economists and demoted by economic historians, to those scholars who do recognise his name he has long been considered a mere forerunner to celebrated classical economists in the mould of Adam Smith (1723-90), Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1832), David Ricardo (1772-1823) and John Stuart Mill (1806-73). Yet the injustice is severe, for as he was to demonstrate on numerous occasions throughout his long life, Tucker was more than capable of rubbing shoulders with some of the most profound intellects of his day. So ‘independent in judgement’ was he, and so ‘fearless in expression’,² he was frequently engaged in debate with some of the more prominent members of the eighteenth-century *République de Lettres*: men of the calibre of David Hume (1711-76), Henry Home Lord Kames (1696-1782) and Edmund Burke (1729-97), to name but a very small few. A formidable intellectual adversary, and yet a welcome friend and ally, probably the most revered intellectual historian alive today, J. G. A. Pocock, once referred to him as a ‘florid, abusive and egocentric writer’ – and yet a ‘neglected genius’ for all that.³

¹ The earliest useful account of Tucker is Paul Leicester Ford’s article ‘Appendix II: Josiah Tucker and His Writings: An Eighteenth Century Pamphleteer on America’ in *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 2, No. 2, (Mar., 1894), pp. 330-47. Tucker’s bibliographical materials for this thesis have been collated from W. E. Clark, *Josiah Tucker Economist. A Study in the History of Economics*, (New York, 1903); Robert L. Schuyler’s introduction to *Josiah Tucker: a selection from his economic and political writings*, (New York, 1931) [see p. 5, nn. 5, 6 for further biographical points of interest]; W. George Shelton, *Dean Tucker and Eighteenth-Century Economic and Political Thought*, (London, 1981); the short introduction to J. Stern (ed.), *The Collected Works of Josiah Tucker*, 6 vols., (London, 1993), and finally Rory T. Cornish’s *ODNB* article.

Whilst being useful starting points, all of these sources are introductive rather than being interpretative, and offer little insight into the subjects of religion and providence, or their broader connections with Tucker’s political economy. Note, e.g., J. G. A. Pocock’s review of Shelton’s *Dean Tucker*, in which he states that it is a ‘useful if slightly monochrome account’ of a figure ‘on whom much remains to be done’, in *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 55, No. 1, (Mar., 1983), pp. 116-18. See also, Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet & Lois G. Schwoerer (eds.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 1993), p. 264, n. 46: ‘... a full-length examination of Tucker remains desirable’.

² The phrases are Schuyler’s, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 3.

³ Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1985), p. 161, & Pocock, ‘Religious Freedom and the Desacralisation of Politics: From the English Civil Wars to the Virginia Statute’ in Merrill D. Peterson & Robert C. Vaughan (eds.), *The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom*, (Cambridge, 1988), p. 68.

In the main, Tucker's contemporary reputation rested on his important contributions to economic thought. Acknowledged primarily as an early pioneer of the free trade school, at first glance much that has come to be associated almost exclusively with Smith's seminal *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776) [henceforth WN]—economic liberty, specialisation, the division of labour and so on—was already present in Tucker's economic tracts, written well over two decades earlier. Yet Tucker was also an unusual thinker of genuine distinction. Accordingly, his contemporaries took him very seriously. In 1755, for example, a two-part pamphlet of his was translated by Turgot (1727-81) and widely distributed among the Physiocrats.⁴ In addition, a number of his works graced the private library of Smith (even if the Scot is well known for his reluctance to acknowledge his intellectual debts).⁵ Finally, in the context of Tucker's vociferous views on North American independence, an editor of Benjamin Franklin's (1706-90) private papers even went so far as to claim that he was Franklin's '*bête noire*'.⁶ Yet despite Tucker's undoubtedly high standing among his contemporaries, in truth, Tucker's career encompassed a great deal more than merely his insights into domestic and foreign economic policy, undoubtedly important as they were. In fact, Tucker's purely economic works comprise perhaps only a third of his entire output, constituting the 'middle period' of a public career spanning almost five decades.⁷ Buttressed on either side by numerous writings on religion, naturalisation, toleration, education, poverty, charity and the origins and ends of civil government, these works supplement, if not undergird, Tucker's economic ideas to an astonishingly large degree – far more so than historians have hitherto been capable of acknowledging.

As Tucker's biographers have noted, the reasons for the clergyman's relative neglect are hardly ambiguous. In 1931, Robert L. Schuyler pointed out that the polemical character

⁴ The pamphlet Turgot translated was Tucker's two-part *Reflections on the Expediency of a Law for the Naturalization of Foreign Protestants*, (London, 1751-2) [henceforth *NFP I & NFP II*], published under the title *Questions importantes sur le commerce ...* (London, 1755). See Henry Higgs, *The Physiocrats*, (London; Macmillan, 1897), pp. 31-2, n.

⁵ James Bonar (ed.), *A Catalogue of the Library of Adam Smith*, (Macmillan, London & New York, 1894), p. 115; updated in Hiroshi Mizuta, *Adam Smith's Library: A Supplement to Bonar's Catalogue*, (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 147-8. For the 'parsimonious treatment [Smith] accorded to some of his predecessors and closest contemporaries', see Donald Winch, *Riches and Poverty: An Intellectual History of Political Economy in Britain, 1750-1834*, (Cambridge, 1996), Chap. 2: 'An excessive solicitude for posthumous reputation', at p. 35.

⁶ William B. Willcox (ed.), *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Vol. 23*, (Princeton, 1983), p. 69.

⁷ Tucker's first official publication arrived in 1739, and his last forty-six years later in 1785.

of much of his writing ensured that ‘the presuppositions and standards of later times ... affected his subsequent reputation’ – a fate sealed by the fact that his literary style lacked the ‘charm that conquers time’.⁸ Writing half a century later, W. George Shelton noted similarly that because of Tucker’s penchant for controversy, there has been a ‘tendency to give his thought less weight than it might have received if he had been more dispassionate and more systematic’.⁹ As Jeffrey Stern puts it far more laconically, then, though no less accurately, of Tucker’s writings – they ‘virtually died with him’.¹⁰ Yet it is with some irony, given that there is little ambiguity as to *why* Tucker’s ideas fell into obscurity, that a great deal of uncertainty continues to surround Tucker himself. For instance, some commentators, such as Bernard Semmel, have claimed that Tucker was a ‘free trade imperialist’; a theorist who turned a blind eye towards issues that had no direct bearing on the British national interest.¹¹ Others still, such as Shelton again, writing in full accordance with Tucker’s personal declaration that he himself wrote ‘in the best Enlightenment manner ... not as an Englishman, but as a Citizen of the World’, have described the clergyman as merely a ‘defender of the faith’, and ‘a well-wisher to all mankind’.¹² Most intriguingly of all, perhaps, is a remark made by Karl Marx (1818–83) in the first volume of *Das Kapital* (1867), in which he noted half-disparagingly and half-admiringly, though certainly noncommittally, that Tucker was ‘a parson and a Tory [sic], but, for the rest, an honourable man and a competent political economist’.¹³ And

⁸ Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, ‘Preface’, pp. 1, 4.

⁹ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, ‘Preface’.

¹⁰ Stern (ed.), *Collected Works of Tucker*, p. vii.

¹¹ Bernard Semmel, *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism: Classical Political Economy, the Empire of Free Trade and Imperialism 1750–1850*, (Cambridge, 1970), esp. Chap. 2. Cf., more recently, Nancy F. Koehn, *The Power of Commerce: Economy and Governance in the First British Empire*, (Ithaca and London, 1994), esp. Chap. 3. As Semmel himself acknowledged, this line of reasoning owed much to the historical trajectories laid out earlier by the likes of Schuyler and Klaus E. Knorr, both writing in the shadow of the Great Wars; of which the latter in particular declared that in spite of the fact that Tucker ‘incessantly ... claimed that the conduct of international trade was mutually beneficial to all nations involved’, nevertheless, it is ‘quite correct to say that he was, from bottom, a mercantilist’, in Klaus E. Knorr, *British Colonial Theories: 1570–1850*, (Toronto, 1944), p. 118; also Schuyler, *The Fall of the Old Colonial System: A Study in British Free Trade, 1770–1780*, (NY: Oxford, 1945).

¹² *Cui Bono? Or, an Enquiry, What Benefits can Arise ... from the Greatest Victories, or Successes, in the Present War? ... Addressed to Monsieur Necker*, (Third Ed., Gloucester, 1781) [henceforth *Cui Bono?*], pp. 4–5. Cf. Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, Chaps. 8 & 11; Brian W. Young, ‘Christianity, Commerce and the Canon: Josiah Tucker and Richard Woodward on Political Economy’, *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 22, No. 5/6, (1996), pp. 385–400, at p. 390. The second turn of phrase ‘well-wisher to all mankind’ alludes to Tucker’s description of himself in a letter from Tucker to William Seward, 29 Oct 1790.

¹³ Karl Marx, *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* [*Capital: Critique of Political Economy*], Vol. 1 (1867), Chap. 31: ‘Genesis of the Modern Industrial Capitalist’. Knorr makes the same mistake of describing Tucker as a ‘Tory’ as opposed to ‘Adam Smith, the economist and Whig’; when in truth the latter adequately describes both thinkers, see his *British Colonial Theories*, p. 195. This is precisely the

even Tucker's memorial tablet, erected on the east wall of the south transept of Gloucester Cathedral, is notable for its simultaneous accuracy and imprecision. Correctly lauding the Dean as one who was '[d]istinguished by a vigorous comprehensive and independent mind ... eminently conspicuous for political discernment on the important subject of national commerce', nevertheless, the claim that his publications were 'of a nature not soon to be forgotten', and that 'being dead he yet speaketh' and will not speak in vain', has proven to be well wide of the mark.¹⁴

As alluded to above, by far the most important reason for Tucker's persistent neglect lies in what may be termed the 'Tucker-Smith conundrum', by which it is commonly argued that Tucker's ideas were merely 'watered-down' or preparatory versions of the eminent Scot's. As Tucker's first significant biographer W. E. Clark put it, then, in 1903, Tucker 'undoubtedly helped to create and to extend the demand for larger commercial and industrial freedom', thereby 'preparing the British mind for a readier reception of ... a [seminal text such as] a [WN]'.¹⁵ Yet whilst in some respects this pronouncement of Tucker's influence is entirely justified, in truth, the relative oversimplification of Clark's line of inquiry merely points to yet another reason for Tucker's scholarly mistreatment: the hegemonic importance afforded to *WN* itself. Famously described by the Chicago economist George Stigler as 'that stupendous palace erected upon the granite of self-interest', the notion that the 'rational', 'secular', 'self-interested' and 'utility-maximising' roots of modern economics owes its intellectual provenance to *WN* is seemingly beyond dispute.¹⁶ However, in recent decades intellectual historians in particular have begun to challenge this viewpoint, seeking instead to place Smith's ideas in their proper context, and particularly in the context of fellow political economists of the day who were deemed to be important by contemporaries. This being the case, no thinker was as significant for the development of Smith's free trade ideas, and for eighteenth-century political economy more generally, than Tucker.

type of thinking Pocock was attempting to overturn when he wrote that 'if conservatism is the defense of the existing order, the conservatism of the eighteenth-century was the defense of a revolution'; by which he meant the *Whig* rather than *Tory conservatism* of the post-1688 Revolution Settlement, and which he attributes to Tucker amongst others. See 'Josiah Tucker on Burke, Locke and Price: A study in the varieties of eighteenth-century conservatism', in Pocock's *Virtue*, pp. 157-91, this citation at p. 158.

¹⁴ Cited in Clark, *Josiah Tucker, Economist*, p. 36.

¹⁵ Ibid. pp. 225-6. See also, e.g., Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 13; Ronald L. Meek, *Precursors of Adam Smith (1750-1775)*, (Dent, London, 1973), pp. 176-7 & Shelton, *Dean Tucker* pp. 49-52, 57, 60-1, 65-7, 91-2, 94, 96, 101, 110-11, 113, 163, 166, 258-60, 262-3.

¹⁶ George J. Stigler, 'Smith's Travels on the Ship of State', *History of Political Economy* 3, (1971), p. 265. Cf. Chapter One, p. 35, n. 46.

Like Smith, Tucker was an unstinting advocate of free trade. Yet where he differed from the Scottish philosopher was in his far weightier insistence on the *providential role* he felt economic liberty had to play in societal evolution – such that it might ultimately be capable of establishing perpetual peace. In light of this, the argument forming the basis of this thesis is that the important link between providence and free trade has so far been neglected in the history of political economy. Accordingly, the main thrust of this work concerns itself with Tucker’s unwavering faith in the workings of divine providence in generating economic liberty, and so a betterment in humanity’s material and thereby spiritual condition. Appositely, this thesis therefore seeks to reintegrate dominant theological perspectives in the history of eighteenth-century British political economy which have hitherto been downplayed or ignored in light of classical, liberal economic tradition.

I. Note on Method.

A pivotal figure in this study is Tucker’s ecclesiastical and spiritual mentor, Bishop Joseph Butler (1690-1752). A towering figure in the history of Anglophone moral philosophy and theology, acknowledgement of Butler’s influence on the development of eighteenth-century economic thought remains almost non-existent.¹⁷ In order to remedy this, this thesis seeks to explore, perhaps for the first time, the various connections between the two clergymen, culminating in a piecemeal assessment of Tucker’s economic adaptation and reformulation of Butler’s theo-philosophical thought, so as to refute the powerful Epicurean-Augustinian-materialism of Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and his eighteenth-century follower Bernard de Mandeville (1670-1733). Comprised of a series of interweaving narratives, this thesis is organised thematically rather than adhering to a strict chronological account of events. It does not wish nor claim, therefore, to provide an authoritative history of early-modern religious and economic thought in its entirety, nor of the English Church in the long eighteenth century replete with *all* the religious debates of the period. Neither does it attempt to relay purely descriptive or biographical accounts of Butler and Tucker’s lives and works, except

¹⁷ Bob Tennant, *Conscience, Consciousness and Ethics in Joseph Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, (Woodbridge, 2011), p. 157, n. 27.

where relevant. Rather, as a work of intellectual history, this study gathers those elements of early-modern and Anglican Church history which pertain to Butler and Tucker's roles as historical agents, acting in their beliefs, assumptions, values, judgements and so on, within the bounds of their own social, cultural and intellectual environment.

This being said, all of the chapters housed within this thesis are in part expository in nature, in part analytical in scope; and at times the present author has chosen to jump between the two modes of discourse. However, in order to aid the reader in terms of narrative intent, and likewise in the interests of thematic clarity, the thesis is divided into three parts – Part I: 'The Theo-Philosophical Background'; Part II: 'The Butler-Tucker axis'; and Part III: 'Tuckerian Political Economy'. Finally, since the intention of this study is to seek always to progress from the *general* towards the *particular*, each chapter begins with a general introduction, followed by the main body and content of the chapter itself, and is finally brought to a close with brief concluding remarks. Likewise, then, the same formula is adopted on macrocosmic scale when considering the study as a whole.

Chapter One, the first of two chapters detailing 'The Theo-Philosophical Background' to Butler and Tucker's ideas, is concerned above all with an explication of the context of current study at its broadest level. Here, then, introductory explanations of the two foremost terms housed within the title of the thesis, 'Providence' and 'Political Economy', are provided, and the historical and historiographical connotations surrounding their putative convergence during the early-modern period highlighted and discussed. In doing so, particular emphasis is placed on the early-modern debate between Epicureans, Augustinians and Stoics, and the related confrontation between 'self-interest' and 'sociability'-based arguments concerning human nature, which, the chapter argues, were the harbingers of eighteenth-century political economy. Set within this framework, Butler's Christian Stoicism is picked out – a theo-philosophical endowment, the chapter claims, from the sixteenth and seventeenth-century humanists and natural law jurists, Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) and Samuel von Pufendorf (1632-94). In conclusion, the claim is made that Butler and Tucker's ideas are important enough to warrant integration into a vast nexus of

contemporary scholarship emphasising the influence of classical philosophy on the early-modern and eighteenth-century mind.

The purpose of Chapter Two is to home in on the specific context of early eighteenth-century Britain, the immediate locale of Tucker and Butler. Here an effort is made to explain the unusual set of circumstances surrounding the Anglican Church at about the turn of the eighteenth century. England was a nation ecclesiastically divided along party political lines, and the chapter therefore explores the significance of the confrontation between religious orthodoxy and heterodoxy as an extension of this division, and the related issue of Establishment Church and State attempts to defend the burgeoning commercial order on the grounds that it fostered and was conducive to a specific brand of English Protestantism increasingly labelled a 'social religion'. Intended as preparation for Butler's ideas in Chapter Three and beyond, the main purpose of the chapter is to provide an account of the central controversies, historical and historiographical, resulting from the onset of 'commercial modernity' in post-Reformation England/Britain, particularly in the wake of the Glorious Revolution (1688-9). In conclusion, then, the chapter shows how the broader early-modern debate between Epicureanism, Augustinianism and Stoicism continued to inform these various debates.

In Chapter Three, the first of two chapters detailing the 'Butler-Tucker axis', we focus primarily on Butler himself. Here our main concern is to provide a detailed revisionist interpretation of Butler's most compelling work centring on the 'self-interest versus sociability' conundrum, *Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel* (1726; Second Ed., 1729), in which particular attention is paid to Butler's response to, acceptance of, and support for, modern commercial society. Beginning with Butler's dissenting heritage, his intellectual affiliations with the continental Reformation, and his eventual conversion to the Anglican Church via the Newtonian Boyle Lecturer Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), the chapter claims that Butler was a central figure in the establishment-turn towards 'social religion', such that his novel ideas on commercial sociability came in time to be the very seedbed for Tucker's later economic thought. Not insignificantly, throughout the chapter, emphasis continues to be placed on Butler's incorporation and utilisation of neo-Stoic providence, culminating in an account of the ways and means in

which this impinged upon his wider meta-ethics, and his pioneering treatment of the individual and collective social affections.

In Chapter Four we introduce more fully the concept of the ‘Butler-Tucker axis’, in which we begin to divulge in specific terms the intellectual and theological connections between the two clergymen. Briefly summarising Butler’s initial success and recognition in the wake of *Fifteen Sermons*, the chapter commences with a biographical introduction to Tucker’s early life up until his arrival in the commercial hub of Bristol, and thereby his introduction to Butler in 1739. Thereafter, the chapter shifts to an account of Butler’s most popular and enduring work in his own day, *The Analogy of Religion* (1736), in an effort to accentuate even further the bishop’s contemporary theological importance, his defence of the orthodox establishment, and the influence he exerted on the young Tucker. This having been asserted, the remainder of the chapter turns to Butler and Tucker’s travails with the early Bristol Methodists during the late 1730s and early 1740s, thereby enabling us to demonstrate with particular clarity Tucker’s faithful, and indeed consistent, adoption of the Butlerian ‘brand’ of establishment orthodoxy.

In the final chapter, which falls under the remit of ‘Tuckerian Political Economy’, we undertake a detailed examination of Tucker’s economic tracts. The culmination of the work conducted in previous chapters, here it is argued that the key to understanding Tucker’s economic thought lies not so much in his connection with Smith or the later classical economists, but rather with Butler. Beginning with an account of Tucker’s economic adaptation of Butler’s conceptions of sociability, self-love and divine providence, thereafter, the chapter moves on to a detailed examination of Tucker’s economic tracts in tandem, and concerns itself with the Anglican ‘social thinking’ that informed the various proposals and polities housed within them. In doing so, the chapter aims above all to make better sense of those concepts which made the transition from Butlerian meta-ethics to Tuckerian political economy. Accordingly, the chapter is brought to a close with an account of Tucker’s fundamentally important views on the relationship between self-love and monopolisation – Tucker’s most compelling engagement, the chapter contends, with the Epicurean-Augustinian-Stoic ‘self-interest-sociability’ conundrum.

The conclusion to the study is divided into two parts. Concerned above all with providing summaries of the key points raised throughout preceding chapters, in the first half, emphasis continues to be placed on Butler's legacy, especially via the importance he ascribed to the Christian virtue of *Caritas* within the wider Butlerian scheme. Continuing, then, with Tucker's likeminded endorsement of charitable education, moral duty to the poor and the politico-ethical liberty which he and his mentor believed sustained such Christian virtues, the study is thereby brought to a close with a forceful statement of Tucker's unique brand of political economy, wherein it is claimed that Butler's neo-Stoical maxims contributed directly to Tucker's status as perhaps *the* unique theorist of the eighteenth-century free trade movement.

Part I.

The Theo-Philosophical Background.

Part I.

The Theo-Philosophical Background.

Chapter One.

‘Providence and Political Economy’.

In Samuel Johnson’s (1709-84) famous *Dictionary* (1755), ‘providence’ is defined in three ways: first, as ‘[f]oresight; timely care; forecast; the act of providing’; second, as ‘the care of God over created beings; divine superintendence’; and third, as ‘[p]rudence; frugality; reasonable and moderate care of expence’.¹ These definitions are instructive, in that they provide the three main ways in which Tucker and his eighteenth-century British contemporaries would have understood the term. Yet somewhat puzzlingly, given that the phrase ‘*l’économie politique*’, or ‘political economy’, was first coined almost a century and a half earlier in the French court of Louis XIII (1601-43), this term does not make an appearance in Johnson’s work.²

Johnson’s neglect of the latter demonstrates the relative infancy of ‘political economy’ within the mid-eighteenth-century lexicon, not only in terms of theory but also practice. And indeed, Donald Winch once affirmed that the modern ‘science of economics’, of which political economy was its forerunner, cannot be said to have emerged until approximately 1750, when Tucker first began to write and publish his economic tracts.³ Yet by contrast, Johnson’s carefully worded, almost polyphonic, descriptions of ‘providence’ hint at the ubiquity of providentialist language in the early-modern (to modern) period. How and why, then, given that both ‘P’ terms do not necessarily appear to have much in common, is it plausible for them to be placed alongside one another? Moreover, in what ways did their coalescence impinge upon the increasingly influential free trade debates of the eighteenth-century and beyond? As we know, it is very much the task of this thesis to make some attempt at answering these difficult and complex questions. The purpose of this first chapter, however, is merely to set the ball rolling in the right direction.

¹ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, (London, 1755).

² Antoine de Montchrétien, *Traité de l’économie politique* [A *Treatise of Political Economy*] (Paris, 1615).

³ Winch, ‘The emergence of economics as a science, 1750-1870’, in C. M. Cipolla (ed.), *Fontana Economic History of Europe*, Vol. 3, (London, 1971), pp. 507-73. For Tucker’s economic tracts, see Chapter Five.

I. Introduction: Divine Providence.

Providence—or the Latin *providentia*; *pro*, ‘ahead’, and *videre*, ‘to see’—typically refers to the belief in a divine quality, whereby benevolent intervention in human and worldly affairs is deemed to be perceptible, and is moreover usually welcomed. In this sweeping cross-cultural and multi-denominational sense, providence has often been invoked by humans as a means of bringing a feeling of meaning, awe or wonder to their lives; either to demonstrate that humanity is cared for and that it matters, or even to justify those moments when humanity is believed to be under imminent threat of survival. To most if not all world religions, then, the belief in a divine, transcendent and/or supernatural presence, which both coordinates and ensures that earthly human life is in some way intelligible or comprehensible, is usually deemed to be of immense cultural and theological significance.

In this study, we are concerned with two very specific varieties of providence, both of which fall within the parameters of the Western tradition: firstly, the polytheistic Pagan; and secondly, the monotheistic Judeo-Christian. Leaving aside the former for the present, within the Judeo-Christian tradition, Divine Providence (or the *providentia dei* to give it its official theological title) is an extremely influential doctrine, which typically refers to the omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, or simply the divine wisdom of God Himself. Deriving its heritage from the early Church Fathers, and particularly the writings of St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), during the High-Middle Ages Christian conceptions of providence came in turn to be dominated by the scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas (1225-74). Linking, in his *Summa Theologiæ* (1265-74), God’s providence to traditional Aristotelian notions of prudence, Aquinas was most notable for maintaining the customary distinction between ‘particular’ and ‘general providence’ – the former concerned with God’s direct hand in human affairs (for example, miracles), and the latter concerned with God’s preservation and continuation of the world via secondary causes (such as those laws of nature which He had established at the Creation). This differentiation between general and particular providence was to remain a commonplace well into Tucker’s time, as can be gleaned from Johnson’s definitions above. Yet, importantly, it was in many respects the

emphasis on which was the more significant, or indeed the more plausible or believable, that altered substantially in the eighteenth century, as we shall see.⁴

According to Alexandra Walsham, the Lutheran Schism brought about a renewed elevation in the doctrine of divine providence, constituting a watershed moment in its history. For it was at this time, she argues, that providence came to be seen as an important manifestation of the Protestant emphasis on the ‘expulsion of all intermediaries between God and soul’, thereby ensuring that it was the ‘logical corollary of elevating divine grace above strenuous human effort’, and of ‘making it the sole criterion for human salvation’.⁵ In Walsham’s view, this perspective can be discerned in the theological writings of perhaps the most influential Reformer, John Calvin (1509-64). In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536) and *Defense of the Secret Providence of God* (1558), for example, Calvin had brought into sharp relief those questions surrounding Scriptural authority, free will, determinism and predestination, all of which were, and remain, significant intellectual and theological corollaries of Calvinist doctrine itself.⁶ In a similar vein, one of Calvin’s most important followers, Zacharias Ursinus (1534-83), put equal stock in the doctrinal value of providence when he co-authored the highly influential reformed document, the *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563). ‘What dost thou mean by the providence of God?’ asks its twenty-seventh question, and the typically Calvinistic rejoinder is as follows:

The almighty and everywhere present power of God; [Acts 17: 25-8] whereby, as it were by his hand, he [Heb. 1:3] upholds and governs heaven, earth, and all creatures; so that herbs and grass, rain [Jer. 5:24] and drought, fruitful [Acts 14:17] and barren years, meat and drink, [John 9:3] health and sickness, [Prov. 22:2; Job 1:21] riches and poverty, yea, and all things [Mat. 10:29-30; Eph. 1:11] come, not by chance, but by his fatherly hand.

As can be seen, then, during the Reformation period the doctrine of divine providence became ever more profoundly important on high-theological grounds. Yet even in terms

⁴ See also, e.g., in a specifically economic context, Charles Davenant, *An Essay on the East India Trade* [1696] in *The Political and Commercial Works of... Charles Davenant*, (London, 1771), Vol. 1, pp. 98-9: ‘Trade is in its Nature Free, finds it own Channel, and best directeth its own Course: and all Laws to give it Rules, and Direction, and to Limit, and Circumscribe it, may serve the Particular Ends of Private Men, but are seldom Advantageous to the Publick. Governments in Relation to it, are to take a Providential Care of the Whole, but generally to let *Second Causes* work their own way’; emphasis added.

⁵ Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, (Oxford, 2001), p. 9.

⁶ Ibid., p. 15. See also Ronald J. Vander Molen, ‘Providence as Mystery, Providence as Revelation: Puritan and Anglican Modifications of John Calvin’s Doctrine of Providence’, *Church History*, 47/1 (Mar., 1978), pp. 27-47, esp. pp. 29-33.

of the mundane, the Protestant reformulation of divine providence, described by Walsham as a type of ‘anthropocentrism’, also went on to transform perceptions of the direct relationship between God and humankind, in the sense that providence came increasingly to be viewed in terms of God’s relation to the cosmic, social order – in other words, to the physico-temporal world as humans live and breathe within it.⁷ Significantly in our context, this ‘anthropocentric turn’ had already been recognised by the likes of Keith Thomas and Jacob Viner in the mid-twentieth-century, both of whose classic works remain important to present-day scholars in that they continue to direct attention towards the significance of providence on the political, ideological, social, and of course economic structures of the early-modern period – particularly within England/Britain, our predominant locus of study.⁸

For our immediate purposes Viner’s work is especially germane, since it was he who attempted to explore in specific terms the link between providence and the *genesis of modern economic thought* (and so *economic man*): summarised most aptly in the phrase ‘The Cosmic Order in the Service of Man’.⁹ Concurring with Thomas’s view that during the early-modern period it was ‘for many men impossible that God did not constantly have man in his providential care’, Viner stated that though much ‘early theological doctrine, Christian and non-Christian ... was not expressly anthropocentric’, nevertheless, just as Walsham later described it, this perspective transformed during the post-Reformation period. Thus it ‘was in this area’, claimed Viner, ‘where, by virtue of new observations and discoveries, apparent discrepancies between Biblical texts and observed or reasonably inferable facts first became important’:

The general framework of providentialist doctrine thus was set up largely in terms of the relation of God to the physical order of the cosmos he had created, and on the part to

⁷ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, p. 15. Cf. Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age*, (Harvard, 2007), p. 178, which describes this phenomenon as ‘the sanctification of ordinary life’.

⁸ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth century England*, (Oxford, 1971), esp. Chap. 4: ‘Providence’ – e.g., pp. 131-2: ‘In the seventeenth century most economic writers were happy to teach that the poor had only themselves to blame; it was their idleness and improvidence which had landed them where they were. This was comfortable doctrine for the well-to-do, but it can hardly have appealed to that sizeable part of the population which never had any hope of dragging itself above subsistence level. The clergy therefore endeavoured to console these unfortunates with the doctrine of divine providence, stressing that there was a purpose behind everything ... It was a gloomy philosophy, teaching men how to suffer, and stressing the impenetrability of God’s will. At its most optimistic it promised that those who bore patiently with the evils of this world would have a chance of being rewarded in the next’.

⁹ Jacob Viner, *The Role of Providence in the Social Order*, (Princeton, NJ, 1972), pp. 1-26.

immortal life he had established for mankind. [...] The new optimism of the seventeenth century and later, which was to have an important impact on social thought, was in part a turning away from the Augustinian tradition in Christianity and from the doctrine of original sin.¹⁰

Viner's allusion here to the 'new optimism' of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries alongside its opposition to the 'Augustinian tradition' is especially relevant and portentous, since it provides us with a platform by which to turn our attention to the aforementioned alternative conceptions of providence, based not on the Judeo-Christian tradition but on the classical philosophies of ancient Greece and Rome. Yet before embarking on a narrative of these themes (which, as we shall see, are axiomatic in the context of Butler and Tucker's ideas), we turn momentarily to an examination of early-modern economic thought – initially by means of an elucidation of the term 'political economy'.

II. Political Economy.

The term 'political economy' was first coined in the early seventeenth century by the French economist, adventurer and courtier, Antoine de Montchrétien (c. 1575-1621), in his once highly influential *Traité de l'economie politique* [*A Treatise on Political Economy*] (1615). In it, Montchrétien's main concern was to challenge the pervasive, Aristotelian maxim that economic activity and politics were distinct and separate entities. As such, Montchrétien sought to advise King Louis XIII that the management of the household (derived from the Greek term *oikonomike*, or *oikonomia/oeconomia*) was in truth a useful model for the management of a polity. Accordingly, Montchrétien's treatise urged rulers and legislators to base their future policies on the assumption that statecraft increasingly entailed an understanding of how market economies were organised, and how they ought to function. In light of this, Montchrétien was arguably the first thinker to define economic activity in terms of it being a *publicly administered* and *policy-based* enterprise – a significant point, in that this conception of commercial activity and its attendant features bore a distinctly 'modern' flavour, which present-day economists, politicians and policy-makers would

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 5, 7. Cf. Marshall Sahlins *et al.*, 'The Sweetness of Sadness: The Native Anthropology of Western Cosmology [and Comments and Reply]', *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 37, No. 3, (Jun. 1996), pp. 395-428.

no doubt instantly recognise.¹¹

In recent decades, studies which either incorporate or centre-on the historical rise of political economy have proliferated, chiefly within the field of intellectual history.¹² Consequently, two towering works of contemporary scholarship, both of which ought to be viewed as by-products and exemplars of this new approach, are Istvan Hont's *Jealousy of Trade* (2005) and John Robertson's *Case for Enlightenment* (2007). Tracing in the latter the roots of political economy to late seventeenth and early-eighteenth-century Naples and Scotland, particularly via the writings of Giambattista Vico (1668-1774) and Hume, Robertson's central claim in *Case for Enlightenment* is that political economy was such a powerful force that it came to define enlightenment across the eighteenth-century transatlantic world.¹³ By contrast, though not necessarily contradictorily, Hont's main argument is that when 'jealousy of trade' between rival nations finally came to be seen as a 'reason of state' (a phenomenon which, to all intents and purposes, was 'inaugurated' by Montchrétien, as we have just seen, and which flourished most profoundly in the century between Hobbes and Marx), the era's singular synthesis of politics and economics contributed enormously towards the concept of the modern nation-state.¹⁴

Taken together, these two 'iconoclastic books' highlight in explicit terms the distinctiveness of the eighteenth century as an era in which contemporary thinkers sensed that the challenges they faced were epochal, particularly with regard to an inevitable embracement of commercial modernity at the putative expense of classical

¹¹ As such, Montchrétien's view represents perhaps *the* historical 'starting point' in what John Dunn calls the 'recovery and replenishment of political economy as it first emerged in early modern Western thought – namely, an inquiry distinctly concerned with the conduct, institutions, and values of market societies, but always ready to borrow from history, jurisprudence, moral philosophy and political theory', in John Dunn, (ed.), *The Economic Limits to Modern Politics*, (Cambridge, 1990), 'Preface', p. vii. See also, P. Bridal, 'Montchrétien, Antoine de', in *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics* [1987], (Palgrave Macmillan, Second Ed., 2008), vol. 3, pp. 546-7; Richard Whatmore, *Republicanism and the French Revolution: An Intellectual History of Jean-Baptiste Say's Political Economy*, (Oxford, 2000), p. 18; Taylor, *Secular Age*, p. 178.

¹² E.g., Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, esp. Chaps. 13, 14; *Virtue*, esp. Chaps. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10; Winch, *Adam Smith's Politics: An Essay in Historiographic Revision*, (Cambridge, 1978); *Riches and Poverty*; Istvan Hont & Michael Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1983); Dunn (ed.), *Economic Limits to Modern Politics*.

¹³ John Robertson, *The Case for Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples, 1680-1760*, (Cambridge, 2007).

¹⁴ Hont, *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation State in Historical Perspective*, (Cambridge, MA, 2005). Some of Hont's chapters are updated versions of older essays, which were contributions to Hont & Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth & Virtue*, & Dunn (ed.) *Economic Limits*.

authority and/or Christian tradition.¹⁵ Paying particular attention to political economy's distinctly 'modernising' features, then, Hont and Robertson's narratives dovetail with a number of broader developments within the field of intellectual history, which, since the middle decades of the twentieth century, have tended to revise perspectives on customary themes in the history of Western political thought:¹⁶ including the trope of Enlightenment (whether in the singular or plural);¹⁷ civic humanism and/or classical republicanism,¹⁸ natural law, natural rights, natural jurisprudence and moral philosophy;¹⁹ the early-modern debate between ancients and moderns;²⁰ positive and

¹⁵ For a valuable summary, see Knud Haakonssen & Whatmore, 'Essay Reviews: Commerce And Enlightenment', *Intellectual History Review*, 18 (2), 2008, pp. 283-303. The reference to their being 'iconoclastic' works is at p. 283.

¹⁶ See esp. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, (Oxford, 1946); Pocock, 'The History of Political Thought: a methodological enquiry', in P. Laslett and W. G. Runciman (eds.), *Philosophy, Politics, and Society*, 2nd series, (Oxford, 1962), pp. 183- 202; John Dunn, 'The Identity of the History of Ideas', *Philosophy* 43 (1968), pp. 85-104; Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory* 8 (1969), pp. 3- 53.

¹⁷ Robert Darnton, 'In search of the Enlightenment: Recent Attempts to Create a Social History of Ideas', *Journal of Modern History*, 43 (1): March 1971, pp. 113-32; Roy Porter & Mikulás Teich (eds.), *The Enlightenment in National Context*, (Cambridge, 1981); also Porter's introductory *The Enlightenment* (London, 1990; 2nd ed. 2001), & *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*, (Penguin: London, 2001); Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 47, No. 4, (Dec. 1975), pp. 601-21; 'Clergy and commerce: the conservative Enlightenment in England', in Raffaele Ajello et al. (eds.), *L'eta` dei lumi. Studi storici sul Settecento europeo in onore di Franco Venturi*, 2 vols. (Naples, 1985), I, pp. 523-62; 'Conservative Enlightenment and democratic revolutions: The American and French cases in British perspective', *Government and Opposition*, 24 (1989), pp. 81-105; Alastair Macintyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, (London, Duckworth, 1981); J. W. Yolton et al. (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Enlightenment*, (Oxford, 1991); Ulrich Im Hof, *The Enlightenment*, (Oxford, 1994); Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1995); Darnton, *Forbidden Bestsellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*, (New York, London, 1995); W. Schneiders (ed.), *Lexikon der Aufklärung* (Munich, 1995); Vincenzo Ferrone & Daniel Roche (eds.), *L'Illuminismo Dizionario storico* (Rome and Bari, 1997); M. Delon (ed.), *Dictionnaire européen des lumières*, (Paris, 1997); Edoardo Tortarolo, *L'Illuminismo. Ragioni edubbi della modernità*, (Rome, 1999); James Schmidt, 'What Enlightenment Project?', *Political Theory*, 28 (2000), pp. 734-57; Fania Oz-Salzberger, 'New approaches towards a history of the Enlightenment: can disparate perspectives make a general picture?', *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte*, 29 (2000), pp. 171-6; Thomas Munck, *The Enlightenment: a Comparative Social History 1721-1794*, (London, 2000); Margaret C. Jacob, *The Enlightenment: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston and New York, 2001); A. C. Kors (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, 4 vols., (New York and Oxford, 2003).

¹⁸ Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, 2 Vols., (Princeton, 1955); Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, (Chicago, 1958), & *On Revolution*, (New York, 1963); Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthmen*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1957); *Machiavellian Moment*; Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787*, (Chapel Hill, NC, 1969); Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 Vols., (Cambridge, 1978); *Liberty Before Liberalism*, (Cambridge, 1998); Markku Peltonen: *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*, (Cambridge, 1995); Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*, (Oxford, 1997).

¹⁹ See esp. Duncan Forbes, *Hume's Philosophical Politics*, (Cambridge, 1975); Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy: From Grotius to the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1996).

²⁰ Skinner, *Foundations*; Tuck, *Natural Right Theories: Their Origin and Development* (Cambridge, 1979). For the ways in which natural law and natural jurisprudence in some respects coalesced with, in

negative liberty, and so on.²¹ Though it is clearly beyond the remit of this present study to delve into the particulars of these complex debates (and in any event there are valuable summaries provided elsewhere),²² in many important respects, however, they do necessarily impinge on many of the narratives housed within the current work. Yet what marks Robertson and Hont's work out amongst them all, thereby rendering them particularly significant to us in the early stages of this thesis, is the primary importance they both ascribe to political economy as an agent – indeed *the principle agent* – in the historical shift towards a recognisably 'modern' world.

Political economy, understood, then, as the precursor to the modern science of economics, emerged in a seventeenth and eighteenth-century which saw, amongst many other 'paradigmatic shifts',²³ the advent of the modern nation-state, the gradual yet palpable shift away from mercantilism towards 'free trade based' arguments, and thereby nascent manifestations of what we now refer to as international relations. As Richard Whatmore has pointed out, this was consequently an age in which contemporaries increasingly acknowledged the imperativeness of striking a balance between national self-determination on the one side, and economic wellbeing on the other – a viewpoint which still predominates in the modern world.²⁴ Significantly however, unlike the Europe (or indeed the increasingly globalised markets) of today, both the seventeenth century in particular and the eighteenth century in general were centuries of unprecedented religious strife, in which the increasingly competitive commercial monarchies of the day tended to tie their projects for national defence to confessional allegiance. As we shall later see, as a direct result of these circumstances three states were to become particularly prominent. Firstly, the relatively small

others departed from, civic humanism, see Pocock, 'Cambridge paradigms and Scotch philosophers: a study of the relations between the civic humanist and the civic jurisprudential interpretation of eighteenth-century thought' in *Wealth and Virtue*, pp. 235-52, and in the same publication, Winch, 'Adam Smith's 'enduring particular result': a political and cosmopolitan perspective', pp. 253-69, esp. pp. 262-3.

²¹ Isaiah Berlin, *Two Concepts of Liberty: An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958*, (Oxford, 1958); Skinner, 'A Third Concept of Liberty', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 117 (2002), pp. 237-68.

²² See the introductions to Stefan Collini, Whatmore & Brian Young (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society & History Religion and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750-1950* (both Cambridge, 2000). See also Whatmore, 'Intellectual History and the History of Political Thought' in Whatmore & Young (eds.), *Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History*, (Palgrave; Basingstoke, 2006), pp. 109-29, including consultation of the endnotes.

²³ Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Chicago, 1962).

²⁴ Whatmore, 'Luxury, Commerce, and the Rise of Political Economy' in James A. Harris (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 2013), pp. 575-95.

Protestant Dutch Republic, which, from its inception in 1574, had ensured its own survival via means of commercial innovation and religious toleration. Secondly, the dominant and increasingly bureaucratic Catholic France, which, under Louis XIV (1638-1715), had offered Europe the prospect of religious unity, intolerance towards heretics, and the establishment of a *pax Francia* modelled along Roman lines. And lastly, Protestant England (Great Britain after the Parliamentary Act of Union with Scotland in 1707), which emerged out of its own civil wars in the middle decades of the seventeenth century to form a decisive politico-religious, military and commercial alliance with the Dutch in 1688-9, so as to quell the perceived threat of Gallican universal monarchy.

III. The Conjunction Between Providence and Political Economy: Epicureanism, Stoicism and Augustinianism.

It is by these means, then, that we begin to perceive the first seeds of ‘cross-pollination’ between the religious and the economic in the early-modern European world. Yet before proceeding, it is important to acknowledge that scholarly recognition of this phenomenon has hardly been unique. Perhaps the most famous and influential study drawing sustained attention to the relationship between Christian social thinking and economic activity was, of course, written over a century ago, in Max Weber’s (1864-1920) *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus* [*The Protestant Work Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*] (1904-5). In it Weber’s central—and, by now, familiar—claim was that during the post-Reformation period, the Protestant asceticism of the predominantly Calvinist sects generated rational, if *unintentional*, justifications for the acquisition of money, such that it ultimately came to be seen as a justifiable end in itself. Though the so-called ‘Weber thesis’ remains to this day notoriously difficult to quantify and qualify, it being ‘unproven yet unrefuted’ in the words of Whatmore,²⁵ the real virtue of Weber’s monumental study lay not in the fact that Weber settled the debate either way, but rather that his thesis inspired a great deal of twentieth-century scholarship picking up on where he left off.²⁶ From R. H. Tawney’s *Religion and the*

²⁵ Whatmore, ‘The Weber Thesis’: unproven yet unrefuted’, in William Lamont (ed.), *Historical controversies and historians*, (Routledge, 1998), pp. 95-108.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 104, draws particular attention to Weber’s fruitful ‘historical imagination’ – one of the most useful tools at the disposal of the intellectual historian, according to John W. Burrow. For discussion, see

Rise of Capitalism (1926), which essentially agreed with Weber's central claim about the Protestant sanctification of economic life;²⁷ to Joseph Schumpeter's classic *History of Economic Analysis* (1954), which spoke of the 'ease with which the economics of the [scholastic] doctors absorbed all the phenomena of nascent capitalism ... [serving] so well as a basis of the analytical work of their successors';²⁸ to more direct writings published in the latter decades of the twentieth century examining the role and influence of Christianity on post-Smithian classical economics.²⁹ All of these works (and more besides) have homed in on various aspects of 'religio-economic' history, so as to deepen our understanding of those theological processes that shaped, and arguably continue to shape, the socio-economic structures of the modern world.³⁰

Amongst these various studies, Viner once again deserves special mention. As early as 1927, for example, he had already begun to explore the theological dimensions to Smith's work;³¹ and shortly thereafter, Viner went on to develop his ideas by focussing on 'English theories of trade *before* Smith', noting in particular the significance of the puritan rejection of luxury, and what he called the 'providential harmony of interests' in early-modern mercantilist thought – a grounding principle, Viner maintained, in the genesis of modern economics.³² In Viner's view, this 'providential harmony of interests' was in fact a synonym for the type of Christian 'optimistic providentialism' we briefly touched on earlier, and was chiefly associated with the competing claims of

Cesare Cuttica, 'Eavesdropper on the Past: John W. Burrow (1935-2009), Intellectual History and its Future', in *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 40, No. 7 (2014), pp. 905-24.

²⁷ R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, (1926).

²⁸ Joseph Schumpeter, *A History of Economic Analysis* [1954], (London: Allen & Unwin Ed., 1982), p. 94.

²⁹ E.g., John Pullen, 'Malthus's theological ideas and their influence on his principles of population', *History of Political Economy*, 13/1 (1981), pp. 39-54; Salim Rashid, 'Richard Whatley and Christian political economy at Oxford and Dublin', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38/1, (1977), pp. 147-55; Anthony M. C. Waterman, 'The ideological alliance of political economy and Christian theology, 1798-1833', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 34/2 (1983), pp. 231-44; *Revolution, Economics & Religion: Christian Political Economy 1798-1833*, (Cambridge, 1991).

³⁰ For further twentieth-century scholarship in Weber's wake see, e.g., Werner Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* [*The Jews and Modern Capitalism*], (1911); Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* [*The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*] (1912); Marjorie Grice-Hutchinson, *The School of Salamanca: Readings in Spanish Monetary History, 1544-1605*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1952); Raymond de Roover, 'Scholastic economics: survival and lasting influence from the sixteenth century to Adam Smith', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 79/2 (1955), pp. 161-90.

³¹ Viner, 'Adam Smith and laissez faire', *Journal of Political Economy*, 35/2 (1927), pp. 198-232.

³² Viner, 'English Theories of Foreign Trade Before Adam Smith', *Journal of Political Economy*, 38/3 (June, 1930), pp. 249-301; 'English Theories of Foreign Trade Before Adam Smith (Concluded)', *Journal of Political Economy*, 38/4 (Aug., 1930), pp. 404-57. See also Viner's "'Possessive Individualism'" as Original Sin', *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, (1963), XXIX/04, pp. 548-59; emphasis added.

the Reformist sects, the new mechanical philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (which had its basis in natural theology), and with early forms of enlightenment.³³ These phenomena were all tantamount to what Viner called ‘the “secularization” of even religious thought’. Yet nevertheless, and crucially, Viner insisted that such ‘optimistic providentialism’ was not a characteristic of Augustinianism, since, according to that tradition, ‘the doctrines of the Fall of Man, the curse of Adam, the second Fall of Man and the Flood, were insurmountable barriers to acceptance of optimistic pictures of the destiny of man while on this earth’.³⁴ In light of this observation, the central question that ought to be raised at this stage is, why, given that Augustinianism was (and to large extent remains) *de rigueur* in the Christian tradition, was Viner so confident in ascribing to it a type of worldly optimism that, up until the early-modern period, it had habitually rejected?

The answer to this complex question lies, in the first instance, in an examination of alternative rival traditions within Western philosophy, which competed with the Judeo-Christian/Augustinian for prominence and influence – namely, Epicureanism and Stoicism. Originating in Greece in c. 300 BCE, both philosophies were typical of the Hellenistic schools in that they were rooted in the shared conception that philosophy was a way of life, rather than a mere systemisation of ideas. Nevertheless, the differences between the pair were far more marked than their similarities. According to the Stoics, the universe was a divinely ordered and rational whole in complete accord with nature, meaning in turn that the dictates of reason were considered to be of primary importance in matters relating to human conduct. Thus, as far as the Stoics were concerned, the key to leading the good life was in acting *virtuously*, above all by subduing the passions.³⁵ Contrariwise, however, Epicureans claimed that the notion of divine order was merely an abstract principle, and that, in truth, the arrangement of the universe was as a result of an incalculable number of atomic particles merging, dissolving and departing from one another, in an infinite array of ‘natural’ (or randomised) movements. In light of these points, Epicureans held that reason and virtue were not decisive facets of human conduct. Rather, true happiness lay

³³ See pp. 25-6 above.

³⁴ Viner, *Providence in the Social Order*, pp. 25-6.

³⁵ Based on the Stoic emphasis on the four cardinal virtues: justice, wisdom, courage and temperance, so as to achieve the state of *apatheia* – ‘things indifferent’.

in the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Only by *embracing* the passions, they argued, could it be possible for humankind to obtain this end. For they taught that it is the passions that lead humans away from all bodily discomfort, pointing them instead towards the path of tranquillity residing within the soul.³⁶

As is now well known, the teachings of Stoicism and Epicureanism enjoyed a great deal of exposure in the classical world, particularly in Augustan and early-imperial Rome. Having fallen by the wayside during the Christian millennium, however, it was not until the Renaissance period that a widespread renewal of interest in their ideas took root, via such humanists as the Stoically-inclined Justus Lipsius (an important figure whom we shall return to in Section V below) and the Epicurean-minded Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655), who began editing and circulating translations of ancient Stoic and Epicurean texts. By these means, new ideas based upon millennia old doctrine were disseminated across the continent, and whilst on the one hand this ancient revivalism can be said to have been somewhat short-lived, on the other, truncated and modified versions of Epicureanism and Stoicism were woven into the very foundations of the early-modern lexicon.³⁷ As Ben Dew has recently noted, then, the full significance of this early-modern reappropriation of Epicurean and Stoic thought has only very recently begun to emerge in contemporary scholarship.³⁸ This is notable in work of Jonathan Israel, who has maintained that in the work of seminal ‘irreligious’ seventeenth-century thinkers such as Benedict Spinoza (1632-77), Pierre Bayle (1647-1706) and Bernard de Fontenelle (1657-1757), the confrontation between Epicureanism and Stoicism anticipated what he has influentially termed the ‘Radical Enlightenment’.³⁹ As Dew

³⁶ The Epicureans called this the state of *ataraxia*. The relevant sections of the following texts are invaluable sources of information on traditional Epicurean and Stoic thought: Julia Annas, *The Morality of Happiness*, (Oxford, 1993), esp. chap. 5; Brad Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, (Cambridge, 2003); John Sellars, *Stoicism*, (California, 2006); James Warren, *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism*, (Cambridge, 2009); Tim O’Keefe, *Epicureanism*, (California, 2009).

³⁷ See Margaret J. Osler, ‘Early Modern Uses of Hellenistic Philosophy’, in Jon Miller & Inwood (eds.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 30-44, esp. at p. 30. Also Osler (ed.), *Atoms, Pneuma, and Tranquillity: Epicurean and Stoic Themes in European Thought*, (Cambridge, 1991); Catherine Wilson, *Epicureanism at the Origins of Modernity*, (Oxford, 2008); Neven Leddy & Avi S. Lifschitz (eds.), *Epicurus in the Enlightenment*, (Oxford, 2009).

³⁸ Ben Dew, ‘Epicurean and Stoic Enlightenments: The Return of Modern Paganism?’, *History Compass*, 11/6 (2013), pp. 486-95. Dew’s slightly ironic title alludes to Peter Gay’s infamous claim made in the 1960s, and much refuted in the decades since its pronouncement, that the eighteenth-century Enlightenment constituted the ‘birth of modern paganism’, in his *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*, 2 Vols., (New York, 1966-9).

³⁹ Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*, (Oxford, 2001). Interestingly, Israel juxtaposes radical Enlightenment with a distinctly Newtonian and Lockean

continues, however, the origins of Israel's account actually hearken back to the work of the French literary scholar Jean Lafond, who argued that during the second half of the seventeenth century, Epicurean thought merged with the third tradition of Augustinianism, so as to form a powerful critique of man as a passion-led creature whose innate selfishness came (albeit paradoxically) to be seen as the means to successful social flourishing.⁴⁰

At first glance, the thought of Epicureanism and Augustinianism in coalition seems implausible. As we have just seen, Epicureans believed that the key to happiness lay in embracing the passions, and that spiritual and material contentment could only be attained by these means. By contrast, Augustinianism was a theological position predicated on the belief that post-lapsarian humankind was *enslaved* by its passions, and that all human life on earth is therefore a sinful and squalid existence. Nevertheless, in the work of French Jansenists such as Pierre Nicole (1625-95), Blaise Pascal (1623-62), and Bayle's notorious disciple, Bernard Mandeville, Lafond demonstrated that rigorous Augustinianism could indeed be conjoined to the Epicurean tradition. Such thinkers admitted, for example, that humankind was frequently induced by the passions. Moreover, they were all intrigued by the capacity for human selfishness to effectuate meaningful social change in the exterior world. In light of these claims, antithetical Stoic ideals concerning virtuous conduct and rational abstinence seemed imprudent, if not even prideful, by comparison; and the resulting oscillation between these various interpretations of humanity—fallen, wretched and self-serving on the one side, or capable of extreme feats of elevation on the other—continued to dominate educated discussion well into the eighteenth century, as this study will show.⁴¹

'moderate, mainstream, 'providential' Enlightenment', esp. at p. 527. For the development of Israel's ideas, see his *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity and the Emancipation of Man, 1670-1752*, (Oxford, 2006); *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy*, (Oxford, 2010); *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750-1790*, (Oxford, 2011). For the specific claim of Spinoza's Epicurean and Stoic influences, see *Enlightenment Contested*, p. 51.

⁴⁰ Dew, 'Epicurean and Stoic Enlightenments', p. 289; Jean Lafond, *L'Homme et son Image: Morales et littératures de Montaigne à Mandeville*, (Paris, 1996), esp. 'Augustinisme et Épicurisme', pp. 353-4.

⁴¹ See Christopher Brooke, *Philosophical Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau*, (Princeton, 2012), for the argument that during the early-modern period, the Stoic position was frequently mistrusted among contemporaries on account of its supposed 'high-mindedness' and philosophical pride, particularly with regard to the claim that humanity was not irreducibly fallen, and that it was capable of living free from disturbance or sin. See, e.g., John Knox (1513-72), *The Works of John Knox*, D. Laing (ed.), (Edinburgh, 1846-64), V, pp. 32, 119: 'That which ye call scoffingly call Destiny and Stoical necessity [...] we call God's eternal election and purpose immutable'.

Building on the work of Lafond and Israel amongst others, then, much recent scholarship has concerned itself with attempted to demonstrate just how far-reaching the early-modern confrontation truly was between the Epicurean-Augustinian hybrid and its Stoic challengers. Additionally, emphasis is now increasingly placed on the extent to which this can be said to have impinged upon the development of political economy as a distinct discipline in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁴² Two prime examples of this pendulum-swing movement between two extremes can be evidenced, for instance, in the contrast between the work of Robertson and Pierre Force.⁴³ Tracing in the former the elaboration of Vico and Hume's economic ideas back to the Augustinian-Epicurean fideism of Bayle, Robertson maintains that it was Bayle who offered a critique of humanity whose standard of morality was once again based upon its selfish wants and desires – i.e., its passions.⁴⁴ Consequently, in the *Pensées Diverses* (1682) Bayle had reached the conclusion that a society of atheists might be just as virtuous as a society of idolaters; and in responding to this Baylean conception of human nature (via engagement with Mandeville), Robertson maintains that Vico, Hume, and a host of 'lesser' contemporaries fashioned an original account of human nature which placed self-interest at its core.⁴⁵ Contrariwise, however, in the work of Force an alternative account of human nature is accentuated instead, emphasising the rival Stoic current in the 'genealogy of economic science'. By recognising that human actions are shaped not by self-interest alone but by sympathy and pity also, Force maintains that it was Adam Smith, no less, who spoke the language of natural harmony between the interests of the individual and the interests of society at large – a cornerstone of the Stoic philosophy, as we shall shortly see.⁴⁶

⁴² Dew, 'Epicurean and Stoic Enlightenments', pp. 487, 490, 491, 493.

⁴³ Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*; Pierre Force, *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith: A Genealogy of Economic Science*, (Cambridge, 2003).

⁴⁴ Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*, esp. chaps. 3, 5-7.

⁴⁵ Ibid., prefatory summary on title page, where Robertson claims that the Epicurean philosophy therefore proved to be the 'midwife' of eighteenth-century political economy and the Enlightenment.

⁴⁶ Force, *Self-Interest Before Smith*, p. 2. In proposing this viewpoint, Force's stated objective is to overturn Stigler's influential assessment of the historico-intellectual roots of *homo economicus*, which Force believes overemphasises the role of self-love and/or self-interest. Cf. Stigler, 'Smith's Travels on the Ship of State', noted in our Introduction, p. 15.

IV. Competing Visions of Providence.

Of the two accounts provided above, clearly Robertson's is the more traditional and familiar in that it bases the roots of modern economic thought in pessimistic, sceptical or selfish interpretations of human nature: a largely cynical reading of the genesis of political economy normally associated with such thinkers as Pascal, François de la Rochefoucauld (1613-80), Nicole, Jean-François Melon (1675-1738), Hobbes, Mandeville, Hume, Charles de Secondat Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755) and Adam Smith (with qualifications).⁴⁷ Yet as we have just seen, the rival Stoic tradition increasingly picked out by the likes of Force alongside Peter N. Miller and Christopher Brooke, presents human nature in an altogether different light, centring not on its selfish qualities, but on humanity's innate propensity towards sympathy, benevolence, sentimentality, and the 'common good'.⁴⁸ Thinkers normally associated with this tradition include Lipsius, Anthony Ashley-Cooper, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), Francis Hutcheson, (1694-1746), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78), Charles Bonnet (1720-93) and Smith (again with qualifications).⁴⁹

Concerning the theo-philosophical fault lines dividing the two rival traditions, what is of particular interest to us in this study, however, is the providentialism which lay at the core of these differences.⁵⁰ In the initial case of Epicurean-Augustinianism, for example, it is important to note that classical Epicureans rejected, outright, Stoic claims to

⁴⁷ This hearkens back at least to the publication of Albert O. Hirschman, *The Passions and Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before its Triumph* [1977], (Twentieth Anniversary Ed., Princeton, 1997) – the classic account of how avarice, considered so contemptible in the Middle Ages, came to be viewed as central to human progress by the eighteenth-century.

⁴⁸ Peter N. Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, (Cambridge, 1994), esp. Chap. 1. Also his 'Hercules at the Crossroads in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Neo-Stoicism Between Aristocratic and Commercial Society' in Christian Mouchel & Colette Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, République des Arts*, (Geneva, Droz, 2008), pp. 167-92; cf. Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*.

⁴⁹ The difficulty in placing Smith is at least in-part attributable to the classic 'Adam Smith Problem': i.e., the disparity between the apparently mechanistic, rational and 'self-interested' economics of *WN*, as opposed to the 'sociable' meta-ethics of his earlier *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, (1758) [henceforth *TMS*]. See, e.g., August Oncken, 'The Consistency of Adam Smith', *Economic Journal* 7:27 (1897), pp. 443-50; David Smith & William Dixon, 'Das Adam Smith Problem: A Critical Realist Perspective', *Journal of Critical Realism*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2006), pp. 251-72; Dogan Göçmen, *The Adam Smith Problem: Reconciling Human Nature and Society*, (Macmillan, Tauris Academic Studies, 2007); Force, *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*, 'Conclusion', pp. 256-63.

⁵⁰ What follows in the remainder of this section is a paraphrase of Force, *Self-Interest Before Smith*, esp. Chap. 2 'Epicurean vs. Stoic Schemes', pp. 48-90. See also, Gilbert Faccarello, 'A tale of two traditions: Pierre Force's *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*', *The European Journal of the History of Economic Ideas*, 12/4, 2005, pp. 701-12.

universality, on account of the Epicurean denial of the existence of divine, rational order itself (a Stoic synonym for divine providence). Yet however that may be, when Epicureanism merged with the third tradition of Augustinianism during the seventeenth century, a particularly powerful brand of providentialist theology came to the fore, which, contrary to the Stoic emphasis on harmonic nature and reason and/or philosophical contemplation, stressed instead post-fallen humanity's abundant self-love and fear of death – by which means the human instinct for survival became a matter of indirect influence, in the guise of flattery, persuasion, coercion and so on. In this thoroughly negative reading of human nature, associated most fulsomely with the Epicurean-materialism of Hobbes, the means to human greatness ultimately depend upon human weakness (read as the passions). For within this scheme, the putative transition from 'selfishness' to 'society' is deemed to be of a fundamentally precarious, chaotic and 'anti-social' nature. Nevertheless, there is a providentialist explanation for this sequence of events, in that under such tumultuous circumstances, the formation of society can only be said to have come about 'from God, by miracle', in the words of the eighteenth century's most commanding proponent of the Augustinian-Epicurean position, Mandeville.⁵¹ As Gilbert Faccarello has pointed out, then, this viewpoint epitomises the 'countervailing passions principle' popularised by Albert O. Hirschman in his *Passions & the Interests* (1977), in which Hirschman spoke of those seventeenth and eighteenth-century thinkers who were at pains to '[devise] ...which passions were typically to be assigned the role of tamers, and which ones, on the contrary, were the truly 'wild' passions that required taming'.⁵²

By contrast, the early-modern appropriation of the Stoic conception of human nature tended to be far more optimistic than its neo-Augustinian/Epicurean analogue: a fact attributable to some of the central tenets of classic Stoic philosophy itself.⁵³ As we have

⁵¹ Bernard de Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* [1714, 1723], F. B. Kaye (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924), II, p. 205.

⁵² Faccarello, 'A tale of two traditions', p. 706; Hirschman, *Passions and Interests*, p. 31. Openly acknowledging the 'intellectual debt' he owes to Hirschman, Force restates the countervailing passions principle in specifically Augustinian-providentialist terms, in which 'the passions', he writes, 'can be checked by the other passions or even check themselves' – an example being the 'ruler driven by the passion of greed who will refrain from confiscating his subject's property because maximization of his own wealth is dependent upon the economic well-being of his subjects', in *Self-Interest Before Smith*, pp. 2, 135.

⁵³ Again, Force, *Self-Interest Before Smith*, pp. 86-90, notes some of the similarities between, and yet difficulties in ascribing with too much confidence, this type of Stoic 'optimism' with Viner's 'optimistic

seen, a core characteristic of the Stoic philosophy was the belief in a divinely ordered and rational universe, functioning in complete accordance with nature. Nevertheless, Stoic thinkers maintained that humans had a particularly important role to play within this scheme, based upon the idea that the human capacity for rational thought resulted in a distinctive relationship between (interior) humanity and (exterior) nature. Since, according to the Stoics, living in accordance with nature was deemed to be the *final end* of all rational endeavour, they therefore contended that it was only via humanity's utilisation of reason that it was truly possible to discover nature itself – and by this it was meant not only 'human nature' but also 'cosmic nature', of which human nature was but a small part. This radically teleological component of the Stoic philosophy is of fundamental importance to this study, then; the reason being that it is a stance which enjoins all rational creatures to view the world not from the limited standpoint of self-centeredness (or self-interest), but rather from the perspective of one's relation to a greater whole.⁵⁴ As various scholars affirm, then, there is an assortment of labels ascribed to this typically Stoic model: Stoic universalism; Stoic naturalism; cosmopolitan providence; the providential design model; or simply providential naturalism.⁵⁵ Yet perhaps the most faithful though difficult to translate into the modern vernacular, *oikeiosis*, loosely translated as 'approbation' or 'familiarisation', is a term denoting above all else the conceptual space existing within rational creatures between their 'self-interest' on the one side, and their 'concern for others' or 'benevolence', on the other.⁵⁶ In the eighteenth-century this concept has come to be associated most readily with Shaftesbury (and to a lesser extent his disciple Hutcheson), as for example

providentialism'. Cf. Viner, *Role of Providence in the Social Order*, pp. 5, 7, & pp. 25-6 of this study above.

⁵⁴ See Annas, *Morality of Happiness*, Chap. 5: 'The Stoics: Human Nature and the Point of View of the Universe'. Cf. Arthur Eyffinger, 'The fourth man', in Hans W. Blom & Laurens C. Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 117-156, at pp. 150-1: 'Along the line numerous issues have been discussed which had been at the core of the Stoic debate throughout the centuries: the nature of God and Creation; God's care for man; natural law vs. positive laws; mantic and providence; the paramount role of reason; the absoluteness of virtue; act and intention; emotions; suicide; the just ruler; the role of the personal example'.

⁵⁵ Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 24-6, 50-1, 61, 90-4; T. H. Irwin, 'Stoic Naturalism and its Critics', in Inwood (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Stoics*, pp. 345-64; Laurence Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', in Blom & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, pp. 271-317, esp. at p. 310, n. 202; Long, 'Stoicism in the Philosophical Tradition: Spinoza, Lipsius, Butler', in Inwood (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Stoics*, pp. 365-92, at pp. 374-5; also in another version of this essay, in Miller & Inwood (eds.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, pp. 7-29, at p. 13.

⁵⁶ C. O. Brink, 'Oikeiosis and oikeiotes: Theophrastus and Zeno on Nature in Moral Theory', *Phronesis* I (1956), pp. 123-45; S. G. Pembroke, 'Oikeiosis', in A. A. Long (ed.), *Problems in Stoicism*, (London, 1971), pp. 114-49; Troel Engberg-Pederson, *The Stoic theory of oikeiosis: Moral development and social interaction in early Stoic philosophy*, (Aarhus, 1990).

when Shaftesbury writes that

if, by the natural Constitution of any rational Creature, the same Irregularitys of Appetite which make him ill to *Others*, make him ill also to *Himself*; and if the same Regularity of Affections, which causes him to be good in *one* Sense, causes him to be good also in *the other*; then is that Goodness by which he is thus useful to others, a real Good and Advantage to himself. And thus *Virtue* and *Interest* may be found at last to agree.⁵⁷

As scholarship increasingly acknowledges, then, it is over this very specific issue of providence that the differences between Epicurean-Augustinian and Stoic currents of thought come most conspicuously to the fore. And, as Whatmore reiterates by way of summation, it was thereafter the discipline of political economy that ‘emerged’ in consequence of this intense ‘controversy’ between the ‘positive passions or virtues’ (i.e., the neo-Stoic tradition) on the one side, ‘and the negative virtues or vices’ (i.e., its Augustinian-Epicurean analogue) on the other.⁵⁸ As we shall see, it is very much this binary conundrum between two ‘Manichean’ extremes which informs much, if not all, subsequent discussion of Butler and Tucker housed within this study. Yet the point requiring particular emphasis in the remainder of this opening chapter is the Stoic—and more specifically the distinctly *Christian Stoic* (or ‘neo-Stoic’)—thread in the history of political economy, the nuances of which have remained largely unexplored in extant scholarship.⁵⁹

V. The Relationship Between Christian Stoicism and Protestant Natural Law.

By necessity, the Augustinian-Epicurean and Stoic conceptions of providence outlined above provide mere summaries of the vast penumbra of conflicting positions generated between various thinkers across centuries, and usually set against the backdrop of extreme confessional and sectarian conflict. Yet what they do serve to illustrate with particular clarity, at least for our introductory purposes, is the intriguing interplay

⁵⁷ Anthony Ashley-Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, *An Enquiry Concerning Virtue, or Merit* [1699], in *Characteristicks*, II, p. 16.

⁵⁸ Whatmore, ‘Luxury, Commerce, and the Rise of Political Economy’, in Harris (ed.), *Oxford British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*.

⁵⁹ Henceforth, the terms ‘neo-Stoicism’ and ‘Christian Stoicism’ are used interchangeably. It should be noted that Force’s ideas do flirt at times with neo-Stoicism as distinct from classical Stoicism, e.g., *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*, p. 80: ‘[The] neo-Stoic conception of Providence can be found in early eighteenth-century authors like Shaftesbury and Butler’ (but note how Force conflates Shaftesbury’s and Butler’s brand of neo-Stoicism here). Likewise, Robertson emphasises Christian Stoicism to a larger extent than most, in his *Case for Enlightenment*, esp. pp. 94-146.

between Hellenistic, Roman and Judeo-Christian ‘first principles’, all of which impinged upon notions of self-interest and sociability in the period leading up to and including Smith.⁶⁰ When it comes to the specific issue of Stoicism in the early-modern world, however, one further consideration that must be taken into account is the clear distinction that ought to be made between classical Stoic thought, and the types of Stoicism that were adopted by those early-moderns who attempted to ‘liberate’ it from its basis in heretical paganism. This need to distinguish between *classical Stoicism* as distinct from *Christian Stoicism* is aptly demonstrated, for example, by the marked differences between Shaftesbury (who in the eighteenth century is taken to be for the Stoic tradition what Mandeville was for the Epicurean-Augustinian) and his disciple Hutcheson, both of whom were notable devotees of the Stoic philosophy, and yet differed fundamentally on their opinion of the Christian revelation. According to Hutcheson, Christianity was thoroughly compatible with the study of human nature, morals, natural religion, jurisprudence and the ends of government.⁶¹ By contrast, Shaftesbury admonished orthodox Christianity as a ‘vulgar religion ... that sordid, shameful nauseous idea of Deity’.⁶² As we shall see, examples of discrepancies between such thinkers as these, who might otherwise agree in the general tone of their views, is by no means inconsequential in the context of Butler and Tucker’s ideas – which, unsurprisingly, given that both were clergymen, inclined far more towards Hutcheson (who was in fact an earlier admirer of Butler).⁶³ Yet what differentiated the likes of Hutcheson, Butler and Tucker from Shaftesbury and his freethinking followers is, we want to suggest, that each was operating—indirectly and in roundabout ways—under a specific type of Christian Stoicism associated with the sixteenth-century Flemish humanist, Justus Lipsius.⁶⁴

An accomplished classical scholar and philologist, in the late-sixteenth and early seventeenth century Lipsius had built his reputation on the publication of numerous editions of the works of his favourite Stoic authors, including Seneca, Epictetus and

⁶⁰ Again, it is the stated intention of Force’s *Self-Interest Before Smith* to examine the historical dynamics of these ‘first principles’.

⁶¹ See, e.g., an explicit statement of this position in William Leechman’s (1706-85) preface to Francis Hutcheson, *A System of Moral Philosophy*, 2 vols., (London, 1755), I, pp. xii-xiii, xxxvi.

⁶² Benjamin Rand (ed.), *The Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*, (London, 1900), p. 24.

⁶³ For the connections between Butler and Hutcheson, see esp. Chapter Four, pp. 118-24, 164-5 below.

⁶⁴ For earlier biographies, see Léontine Zanta, *La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVI^e siècle*, (Paris, 1914) & Jason Lewis Saunders, *Justus Lipsius: The Philosophy of Renaissance Stoicism*, (New York, 1955).

Tacitus amongst others. Out of the scattered fragments surviving from classical antiquity, Lipsius's main aim, however, was to reformulate a type of ancient Stoicism that was compatible with Christianity. In the context of the religious and civil wars then ravaging his adopted homeland of the Low Countries, Lipsius therefore drew heavily from the ancient Stoics in order to offer his readers consolidation in times of public calamity.⁶⁵ So successful were his ideas that in the years and decades following his death, a distinct form of Lipsian neo-Stoicism emerged throughout the academies and courts of Europe, having a profound and lasting impact on such thinkers as Michel de Montaigne (1533-92), Guillaume Du Vair (1556-1621), Pierre Charron (1541-1603), Francisco de Quevedo (1580-1645), and Robert Leighton (1611-84) amongst others. As A. A. Long has put it, then, Lipsius's 'unprecedented knowledge' of ancient Stoicism ensured that he exerted an immense 'cultural influence from about 1600 to 1750', thereby earning him an 'enormous vogue' in Skinner's corresponding view.⁶⁶ As if to emphasise the point, contemporaneously, Montaigne also praised Lipsius as one of the 'most learned men [then] alive'.⁶⁷

In recent years the importance of Lipsian neo-Stoicism has become increasingly acknowledged in scholarship.⁶⁸ Perhaps the most well known examples (and controversial, too, given their alleged affinities with National Socialism) relate to the twentieth-century analyses of Gerhard Oestreich and Otto Brunner; both of whose works contended that the Lipsian emphasis on discipline and order was effectively the harbinger of seventeenth-century absolutism, military innovation, and thereby the

⁶⁵ See esp. such writings as Lipsius's *De Constantia* [*On Constancy*] (Antwerp, 1584) (with reference to *oikeiosis* at I. XI); *Politicorum sive Civilis doctrinae libri sex* [*Six Books on Politics or Political Doctrine*] (Antwerp, 1589); *Manuductio ad Stoicam philosophiam* [*A Guide to Stoic Philosophy*] (with reference to *oikeiosis* at II. XIII), & *Physiologia Stoicorum* [*Physics of the Stoics*] (both Antwerp, 1604).

⁶⁶ Long, 'Stoicism in the Philosophical Tradition: Spinoza, Lipsius, Butler', in Inwood (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Stoics*, p. 379; & in Miller & Inwood (eds.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, p. 16. See also Skinner, *Foundations of Political Thought*, II, p. 278. Cf. more generally, Sellars, *Stoicism*, 'The Stoic Legacy: The Renaissance and early-modern philosophy', pp. 139-50.

⁶⁷ Montaigne, *Essais*, (Paris, 1580-95), 2.12; cited in Sellars, *Stoicism*, p. 143.

⁶⁸ See, e.g., Skinner, *Foundations of Political Thought*, II, pp. 278-83; Mark P. O. Morford, *Stoics and Neo-Stoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton, 1991); Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651*, (Cambridge, 1993), esp. pp. 45-63; A. McCrea, *Constant Minds: Political Virtue and the Lipsian Paradigm in England, 1584-1650*, (Toronto, 1997); A. Shifflet, *Stoicism, Politics and Literature in the Age of Milton*, (Cambridge, 1998); A. Moss, 'The Politics of Justus Lipsius and the Commonplace Book', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 59.3 (1998), pp. 421-36; E. D. Bom, M. Jannsens, T. van Hoont & J. Papy (eds.), *(Un)masking the Realities of Power: Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe*, (Leiden, 2011).

modern state.⁶⁹ Interestingly, this line of enquiry would go on to be adopted by Michel Foucault when he claimed that the ‘sixteenth century return to Stoicism [revolved] around the re-actualisation of the problem of how to govern oneself’ – in large part a reference to Lipsius’s thought.⁷⁰ More recently still, a recognisably Lipsian-Stoic tradition presents itself in the work of Christopher Brooke, where it plays a foundational role in his important account of the early-modern conflict between Augustinians, Epicureans and Stoics.⁷¹ Yet most intriguingly of all for our present purposes is the thesis of Peter N. Miller, who claims that Lipsius’s ideas on classically Stoic themes such as constancy, ethics, organisation, conversation and friendship held important ramifications for broader early-modern notions of ‘sociability’ itself. Deploying an interesting analogy between the Senecan account of ‘Hercules at the crossroads’ (i.e., the Stoic emphasis on ‘Choice’ as ‘Freedom’), and the notion that Lipsian neo-Stoicism was poised on the cusp between seventeenth-century ‘aristocratic society’ and eighteenth-century ‘commercial society’, Miller thereby concludes that Lipsian neo-Stoicism ought to be viewed as ‘a key – even *the* key – ingredient in the making of a modern society that is either ‘civil’ or ‘disciplining’’.⁷² Concurring, therefore, with Force’s view that in a nascent ‘modern society that was a continuous, churning, challenge’ Smith ‘turned to’ the Stoics for guidance, Miller suggests that the resulting Smithian dichotomy between the ‘partial’ and ‘impartial spectator’, a sort of psychologically-based prolegomenon to classical ‘Smithian economics’, was at least partially of Lipsian origin.⁷³

⁶⁹ See esp. the posthumously published Gerhard Oestreich, *NeoStoicism and the Early Modern State*, Brigitta Oestreich & H. G. Koenigsberger (eds.), tr. David McLintock, (Cambridge, 1982). For Oestreich and Brunner’s controversial links to Nazism, see Miller, ‘Nazis and Neo-Stoics: Otto Bruner and Gerhard Oestreich Before and After the Second World War’, *Past and Present*, 176 (2002), pp. 144-86.

⁷⁰ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York, 1979), pp. 135-8, 170 & Michael Senellart (ed.), *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-1978*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007), pp. 88-99. Cf. Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, pp. 16, 34-6.

⁷¹ Esp. Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, Chap. One: ‘Justus Lipsius and the Post-Machiavellian Prince’, pp. 12-36.

⁷² Miller, ‘Hercules at the Crossroads in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Neo-Stoicism Between Aristocratic and Commercial Society’, in Christian Mouchel & Colette Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, République des Arts*, (Geneva, Droz, 2008), pp. 167-92; & this citation in his ‘Nazis and Neo-Stoics’, p. 148. Cf. also Miller’s *Defining the Common Good*, pp. 8-11, 37-8. For more on ‘aristocratic sociability’ see Hugh Trevor-Roper, ‘The Great Tew Circle’ in *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays*, (London, 1987); Jonathan Dewald, *Aristocratic Experience and the Origins of Modern Culture: France, 1570-1715*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford, 1993) & again, Miller, *Peiresc’s Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century*, (New Haven and London, 2000), esp. chaps. 1-2.

⁷³ Miller, ‘Hercules at the Crossroads ...’, pp. 184, 186-9. Most scholars acknowledge that the ‘impartial spectator’ represents Smith at his ‘most Stoic’, e.g., Haakonssen & Whatmore, p. 300. For more, then, on

Whilst increasing emphasis on Lipsian neo-Stoicism has garnered much interest amongst historians of early-modern political thought, it is notable too that concern for Lipsius's ideas have now begun to cross the interdisciplinary divide. In a recent article in the *Review of International Studies*, for instance, Halvard Leira lends further credence to these various interpretations by highlighting the influence of Lipsius on present-day international relations. Claiming that he stood 'on the threshold of modernity', and that he therefore 'provides an important theoretical link and synthesis between earlier thinking on reason of state and natural law and later theories of absolutism and international law', Liera notes with particular clarity the significance of Lipsius on the early 'canonical IR-writers', Grotius and Pufendorf.⁷⁴ Famed for their theories in Protestant natural law, and for extending their views on modern forms of commercial sociability, in recent decades much scholarship has sought to address the enormous influence Grotius and Pufendorf exerted on eighteenth-century British society, and particularly the development of its political economy north of Hadrian's Wall.⁷⁵ In terms of their particular relevance to this study, however, what is of axiomatic importance as we move forward is increasing scholarly recognition of the Lipsian-Stoic legacy housed within Grotius and Pufendorf's thought, which, it is gradually acknowledged, became an important facilitator of Miller's transition from 'aristocratic to commercial society' (or what we may take to be a synonym for 'early-modernity to modernity').⁷⁶

Smith's 'partial' and 'impartial spectator' in the context of Butler and Tucker, and more specifically the former's influence on the Scot, see Chapter Four, pp. 121-3.

⁷⁴ Halvard Leira, 'Justus Lipsius, political humanism and the disciplining of 17th century statecraft', *Review of International Studies*, 34/04 (October 2008), pp. 669-92, these citations at p. 670-1.

⁷⁵ E.g., Forbes, *Hume's Philosophical Politics*, esp. Chaps 1 & 2; Tuck, *Philosophy and Government; Rights of War and Peace*, esp. Chaps. 3-4; Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, esp. pp. 26-31, 35-46; Hont, 'The Language of Sociability and Commerce: Samuel Pufendorf and the Theoretical Foundations of the "Four-Stages" Theory', in *Jealousy*, pp. 159-84; Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*, esp. pp. 136, 319, n. 100.

⁷⁶ See Blom & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, esp. Blom & Winkel, 'Introduction', pp. 3-20; Reinhard Brandt, 'Self-consciousness and self-care: on the tradition of oikeiosis in the modern age', pp. 73-91; Brooke, 'Stoicism and anti-Stoicism in the seventeenth century', pp. 93-115; Jon Miller, 'Innate ideas in Stoicism and Grotius', pp. 157-76; John W. Cairns, 'Stoicism, slavery, and law', pp. 197-232; Fiammetta Palladini, 'Pufendorf and Stoicism', pp. 245-55 (which challenges the extent of 'pure' Stoicism in Pufendorf's thought); Kari Saastamoinen, 'Pufendorf and the Stoic model of natural law', pp. 257-69; Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', pp. 271-317, esp. pp. 279-83. Also Oestreich, *Neo-Stoicism*, esp. Chap. 2; M. A. Stewart, 'The Stoic legacy in the early Scottish enlightenment, in Osler (ed.), *Atoms, Pneuma and Tranquillity*, pp. 272-96; Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 4, 42; Christopher A. Ford, 'Preaching Propriety to Princes: Grotius, Lipsius and Neo-Stoic International Law', *Case Western Journal of International Law*, Vol. 28, No. 2, (Spring, 1996), pp. 313-66; Jan Waszink, 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 39, No.

The significance of these connections cannot be overemphasised. As Christopher A. Ford notes, Grotius in particular has long been considered ‘the father’ of ‘modern constitutional law and contemporary international law’;⁷⁷ if not even an ‘early pioneer of innumerable pet causes’ associated with modernity – ‘human rights, international peace-keeping institutions, the law of the sea, the legal equality of all sovereign states, the supremacy of international law over national enactments, the protection of non-combatants of warfare, principles of *jus cogens* [i.e., pre-emptory norms/compelling law]’, and ‘humanitarian intervention’.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, as Ford spells out further: ‘the Stoic roots of Grotian natural law may be found in the person of ... Lipsius ... whose articulation of a distinctive “Neo-Stoic” political philosophy helped develop ideas that would become core elements of the Grotian scheme’.⁷⁹ Viewed from this perspective, it is very much by means of Grotius and Pufendorf’s ‘modernising’ variants of Protestant natural law that we note some of the core characteristics of the Stoic conception of providence coming to the fore in the early-modern world. Centring once again on the primacy of reason and nature, on the ‘innateness’ of Stoic *oikeiosis*, and on the cosmopolitan and universalistic potentiality of the human species, Jon Miller points out, for example, that the Stoic qualities replete within Grotius’s work consist above all in his endorsement of the natural sociability of man (or the *appetitus societatis*, ‘a primary source for Grotius’ natural law-theory’), and likewise in Grotius’s ‘Stoic insistence on the parallel micro- and macrocosmos, private and public spheres, and the concurring morals of *pater familias* and public sovereign’.⁸⁰ As Arthur Eyffinger adds further, then, within the Grotian system, even those qualities which cannot not be ‘drawn straight

2, (1996), pp. 151-68; Tuck, *Rights of War and Peace*, pp. 37, 39, 101; T. J. Hochstrasser, ‘*Socialitas* and the history of natural law: Pufendorf’s defence of *De Jure Naturae et Gentium*’, in his *Natural Law Theories in the Early Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 40-71, esp. pp. 41-2, 45, 58, 62-3, 65-6, 68, 70, 73; Hont, *Jealousy*, pp. 166, 175; Jon Miller, ‘Stoics, Grotius, and Spinoza and Moral Deliberation’, in *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, pp. 116-39; Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, esp. ‘Grotius, Stoicism and *Oikeiosis*’, pp. 37-58; Blom, ‘Sociability and Hugo Grotius’, *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 41, No. 5 (2015), pp. 589-604, esp. pp. 590-1, 600, 602, 603.

⁷⁷ Analogous, perhaps, to Smith’s prescribed moniker as “the father” of modern economics.

⁷⁸ Ford, ‘Preaching Propriety to Princes’, pp. 314 & esp. p. 315, nn. 9-17.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 317; cf. explicitly in Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, pp. 155, 159, 176, 185; also Blom & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, pp. 11, 97, 124, 198-9.

⁸⁰ Jon Miller, ‘Innate ideas in Stoicism and Grotius’, in *Grotius and the Stoa*, pp. 151, 163-5. Cf. in the same publication, Brooke, ‘Stoicism and anti-Stoicism in the seventeenth century’, p. 94: ‘[Like] Grotius, the Stoics taught that a natural instinct for self-preservation, which they called *oikeiosis*, could be used as a foundational principle for a science of the morality of human conduct’. For a convincing statement, however, of the Hebraic influence on Grotius’s natural law in tandem with its neo-Stoicism, see Meirvav Jones, ‘Philo Judeaus and Hugo Grotius’s Modern Natural Law’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 74, No. 3, (July, 2013), pp. 339-59.

from natural law doctrine' happen to be 'distilled from [the] *consensus gentium*'; a quasi-Stoic term denoting the 'agreement of the people', 'consensus', 'concord', or simply 'the common good' – or as Eyffinger otherwise puts it, 'the accumulated congruent experience of mankind as recorded in classical sources' (most notably Cicero's *De Finibus*, *De Officiis* and *De Legibus*).⁸¹

Like Grotius, Pufendorf's affinities with Christian Stoicism are palpable, though far subtler. Whereas Grotius was directly influenced by Lipsius, who was still alive when the former was young, according to T. J. Hochstrasser, Pufendorf's 'achievement above all' was to have 'evolved a tortuous path through [the] intellectual minefield' of Aristotelian Scholasticism and Protestant moral theology 'towards a [truly modern] science of natural law, that used Stoic ethics to reconcile the voluntarism of Hobbes with ... divine positive law'.⁸² Confronted, then, unlike Grotius, by the powerful scepticism of Hobbes, whose system was predicated on the belief that self-preservation was humanity's fundamental natural instinct, by necessity Pufendorf's incorporation of Stoicism was far more cautious than Grotius's. For one thing, Pufendorf was compelled to admit that the wellspring of the natural law was, indeed, based upon individual self-preservation and/or self-love; and on this basis he was forced to diverge from the Grotian *appetitus societatis* and adhere rather to Hobbes's neo-Augustinian-Epicurean model, erected upon human depravity and the passions.⁸³ Yet crucially, according to Pufendorf, this did not necessarily imply that self-love should be placed in direct opposition to Grotius's 'neo-Stoic' thesis.⁸⁴ On the contrary, as Hochstrasser points out further, Pufendorf himself described Hobbes as an Epicurean in the pejorative sense, and tended to use the 'shorthand labels of 'Stoic' and 'Epicurean'' not as 'crude reductive slogans', but as a 'mirror [for] the way he had encountered and transcended Hobbesian natural law within his own mind'. This being the case, it was above all Stoic moral theory which proved to be so 'very helpful' to Pufendorf 'in providing an answer to Hobbes'; by which means, adds Jon Parkin, it was possible for Pufendorf to at least attempt to 'tame the Leviathan'.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Eyffinger, 'The fourth man', in *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 126.

⁸² Hochstrasser, *Natural Law Theories*, p. 4.

⁸³ Blom & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 19.

⁸⁴ Hochstrasser, 'Socialitas and the history of natural law', in his *Natural Law Theories*, p. 63.

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 70, 73; Jon Parkin, 'Taming the Leviathan – Reading Hobbes in Seventeenth-Century Europe', in Hochstrasser & P. Schröder (eds.), *Early Modern Natural Law Theories: Contexts and*

Fittingly, then, it is with the figure of Pufendorf that we arrive at our conclusion to this opening chapter. A thinker whose writings incorporated from all varieties of providence explored within these pages, and yet (as far as this work argues) tended towards the neo-Stoic wherever possible, the key to understanding Pufendorf's specific brand of Stoicism – and thereby his 'auxiliary' importance to this study – therefore lies in acknowledging the intellectual dynamic that existed between him, Grotius and Hobbes, and the ancient sources which informed them.⁸⁶ For whilst Pufendorf admitted, ostensibly against Grotius and with Hobbes, that self-love/self-interest governed all human behaviour, and that this was a direct consequence of human weakness/human depravity, yet for Pufendorf (with Grotius and against Hobbes), in no way could this be said to be the wellspring of the natural law. Rather, in order to assist him in his theory about where it was the natural law did in fact derive from, Pufendorf's strategy was to call upon the 'sublime ... moral teachings ... of the Stoics'; by which means he attempted to invert the Hobbesian scheme by claiming that it is precisely because individual humans in a state of nature are so incredibly weak that they feel compelled to seek their own safety (*salvum*) *within society*.⁸⁷

This recourse to mutual co-operation, by which means it is possible for humans to survive and prosper despite the fact that they are most capable of inflicting damage upon themselves and their fellow kind, Pufendorf calls *socialitas* ('sociality'). Furthermore, according to Pufendorf it is this fundamental principle of natural law which every human is obliged to cultivate and preserve in the interests of the collective – though in the first instance, and crucially, by *caring for oneself*. Most importantly of all, however, whilst it can be said once again that within the Pufendorfian scheme self-preservation does indeed hold sway over all other human affections, *à la* Hobbes, nevertheless, it is Pufendorf's 'neo-Stoic' concern for the safety and preservation of the human species at large, obtainable solely by means of *socialitas*, and which in turns

Strategies in the Early Enlightenment, (Dordrecht, 2003), pp. 31-52, with the statement of Pufendorf's 'Stoic account of natural law' at p. 45. Cf. also in the same publication, Ian Hunter, 'The Love of a Sage or the Command of a Superior: The Natural Law Doctrines of Leibniz and Pufendorf', pp. 169-193, with minute reference to Pufendorfian-Lipsian neo-Stoicism at p. 177.

⁸⁶ Again, particularly via the figure of Cicero.

⁸⁷ Samuel von Pufendorf, *De jure naturae et gentium* [*Of the Law of Nature and Nations*, 1672], Jean Barbeyrac (ed.), (Amsterdam, 1734), II, 3, 15.

appears to be akin to Stoic *oikeiosis*, which constitutes the very bedrock of Pufendorfian natural law.⁸⁸

VI. Concluding Remarks: Butler and Tucker's Relevance to Modern Scholarship.

The overriding concern of this sweeping introductory chapter has been to define 'providence' and 'political economy', the two terms around which this study revolves, and to note the various ways and means in which the pair can be said to have 'coalesced' in the period leading up to our area of study, eighteenth-century British society. Observing in particular the early-modern appropriation of ancient Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian conceptions of providence, by these means we have been able to expand on some of the major historiographical debates of the last century or so, emphasising the prevalent role religion played in upholding the intellectual, social, and above all increasingly *economic* structures of the early-modern world. As Viner once contended, these phenomena can indeed be described in terms of a broad and yet gradual historical shift away from belief in 'particular' towards 'general' providence; read specifically, Viner suggests, as the transition away from Augustinianism towards a type of worldly 'optimistic providentialism' characterised by scientific rationalism, its concomitant in the new mechanical philosophy, and thereafter early forms of enlightenment.⁸⁹ Yet in utilising the findings of still more recent scholarship, demonstrating how Renaissance humanists and Reformation (not to mention Counter-Reformation) moralists co-opted rival conceptions of divine providence for their own ends, this has enabled us to build upon Viner's observations via comparative analysis of the resulting early-modern confrontation between 'optimistic' neo-Stoical representations of human nature, emphasising humanity's innate propensity for mutual intercourse and society; and its 'pessimistic' neo-Epicurean-Augustinian counterpart, which vested the prospect of peaceable society within the maxim that 'individual

⁸⁸ Palladini, 'Pufendorf and Stoicism', pp. 245-55, esp. pp. 245, 250; Saastamoinen, 'Pufendorf and the Stoic model of natural law', pp. 257-69, both in Blom & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*.

⁸⁹ Viner, *Role of Providence in the Social Order*, pp. 6-7: '... it was those branches of Christian faith which departed most widely from the Augustinian tradition who were most receptive to innovations in science and went furthest in accommodating their theology to the finding of scientists'.

acquisitiveness promotes the public good’ – or as Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) would later call it, the paradox of ‘unsocial sociability’.⁹⁰

Focussing latterly on a particular brand of Christian Stoicism associated with Lipsius and Grotius, these various lines of enquiry have led us to the figure of Pufendorf, arguably Lipsius and Grotius’s most significant ‘intellectual heir’. In doing so, we have finally been able to document (in perhaps its most crystallised form prior to the eighteenth century) the Epicurean-Augustinian-Stoic conundrum in the guise of Pufendorf’s attempts to grapple with and stifle the formidable scepticism of Hobbes. For as we have seen, though Pufendorf was forced to accept Hobbes’s claim that self-preservation was the quintessential force accounting for all human motive and conduct, this did not prevent Pufendorf from acknowledging in tandem the legitimacy of the Grotian *appetitus societatis*. Significantly in our context, then, in Hont’s view, it is precisely this tension within Pufendorf’s thought—i.e., between the Hobbesian and the Grotian scheme—which proved to be the catalyst for later explanations about the genesis of modern commercial society, especially in eighteenth-century Britain.⁹¹ Calling this the ‘pseudo-Aristotelian move’ of ‘twinning society and politics’, it is by these means, Hont insists, that the Pufendorffian scheme ought to be viewed as the ‘origin’ of the type of political economy articulated most profoundly in Hume and Smith’s intellectual world.⁹² Yet whilst entirely convinced by, and indeed indebted to Hont’s compelling narrative on this score, we would do well to consider one major qualification to the ‘Hontian scheme’, by which means it will finally be possible to draw Butler and Tucker into the wider debate.

⁹⁰ Immanuel Kant, *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht* [*Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View*, 1784], in Günter Zöllner & Robert B. Louden (eds. & tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant, Anthropology, History, and Education*, (Cambridge, 2007), p. 111: ‘[By] ‘antagonism’ [I mean] the *unsocial sociability* of human beings, i.e. their propensity to enter into society, which, however, is combined with a thoroughgoing resistance that constantly threatens to break up the society ... it is this resistance that awakens all the powers of the human being ... thus happen the first true steps from crudity toward culture ... thus all talents ... [and] taste is formed.’ For surveys of ‘unsocial sociability’ in an eighteenth-century British context, see Haakonssen & Whatmore, ‘Commerce and Enlightenment’, & Iain McDaniel, ‘Unsocial Sociability in the Scottish Enlightenment: Ferguson and Kames on War, Sociability and the Foundations of Patriotism’, *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 41, No. 5, (2015), pp. 662-82.

⁹¹ Esp. Hont, *Jealousy*, pp. 38-47, 159-84.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 45-6.

As Haakonssen and Whatmore have recently pointed out, a significant charge that may be reasonably levelled at Hont concerns his general lack of engagement with the various theo-philosophical strands which contributed not a little to the thesis he propounds – not least, Christian Stoicism.⁹³ Evincing above all in Hont's claim that Pufendorf's primary influence on eighteenth-century political economy was that he offered an account of commercial sociability *purged of theological considerations*, Hont notes correctly that this was because Pufendorf 'explicitly insisted on the separation of natural law from theology'.⁹⁴ Yet whilst this is undoubtedly true, an important underlying claim of this study is that, though Pufendorf was certainly at pains (like Grotius before him) to limit the hegemonic influence of Christianity within his scheme, nevertheless, there is good reason to believe that he *did* in fact consider human sociability in neo-Stoic terms, i.e., as a providential endowment from God. Kari Saastamoinen has argued this convincingly, for example, by claiming that Pufendorf's 'Epicurean-Augustinian' acceptance of the human passion for self-preservation was mollified by his 'neo-Stoic' theory about God's concern for the continuation and survival of the species as a whole:

In Pufendorf's theory the ultimate epistemological foundation of natural law, the one that gives us its end, is not human nature, but the idea that God wants the human species to survive ... That God wants the safety of the whole human species is taken for granted throughout his discussion on natural law. This is the normative principle which Hobbes' theory lacked, and which explains why we have an obligation to act peacefully even towards those who are able to hurt us ...⁹⁵

Likewise, Horst Denzer has shown that there are at least 310 references to Stoic authors in Pufendorf's *De Jure Naturae*, which Hochstrasser continues to see as evidence of Pufendorf's 'eclectic method in ... combining conceptual analysis of both a modern author (Grotius), and of ancient Stoic insights, to rebut central contentions from [Hobbes]'.⁹⁶

⁹³ For explicit statements, see Haakonssen & Whatmore, 'Commerce and Enlightenment', pp. 293, 303.

⁹⁴ Hont, *Jealousy*, p. 40. The by-product of this is that, insofar as Hont accepts *any* theological basis for the genesis of eighteenth-century political economy (and it is important to note that he hardly insists upon the point), it is the familiar Augustinian-Epicurean tradition of French Jansenists like Nicole, and not the Stoic, which Hont believes holds sway over subsequent eighteenth-century discussions about the roots of commercial modernity. In this respect Hont is therefore in broad agreement with Robertson's *Case for Enlightenment*, as well as more traditional 'self-interest'-based accounts of the genesis of modern economic science.

⁹⁵ Saastamoinen, 'Pufendorf and the Stoic model of natural law', in *Grotius and the Stoa*, pp. 257-69; citation at p. 267.

⁹⁶ Horst Denzer, *Moralphilosophie und Naturrecht bei Samuel Pufendorf* (Munich, 1972), p. 260; cited in Hochstrasser, 'Socialitas and the history of natural law', *Natural Law Theories*, p. 62, n. 72, which notes

Whilst it would be foolish, then, to disregard the fact that the theo-philosophical foundations of Pufendorf's thought remain a rather large bone of contention among various intellectual historians, nevertheless, the argument that Pufendorf's ideas were significantly indebted to neo-Stoicism harbours a number of important ramifications for forthcoming claims made within this thesis, and indeed for scholarship at large.⁹⁷ For one thing, in attempting to stack more evidence on the Stoic side of the early-modern 'Stoic versus Augustinian-Epicurean' scale, it is to be hoped that this study will contribute, however modestly, to future reappraisals of the extent to which the Stoic tradition can be said to have contributed to the development of eighteenth-century political economy.⁹⁸ For as Haakonssen and Whatmore have put it most succinctly, thus far it is very much the Epicurean-Augustinian tradition which holds the upper hand in this controversial and incredibly divisive historiographical 'battleground'.⁹⁹ Yet far more significant and indeed pressing in the immediate context is the fact that these wider debates present us with the perfect opportunity to set down a relatively small,

Denzer's 'detailed breakdown of citations according to [Stoic] authors as follows: Cicero: 155 references; Seneca: 109 references; Marcus Aurelius: 12 references; Epictetus: 34 references (including those derived through Arrian)'.

⁹⁷ For a completely contradictory account of Pufendorf, see, e.g., Hunter, *Rival Enlightenments: Civil and Metaphysical Philosophy in Early Modern Germany*, (Cambridge, 2001), esp. Chap. 4: 'Pufendorf's civil philosophy', pp. 148-96. As Hunter points out [at pp. xii, 7], his interpretation of Pufendorf revolves around his supposed 'desacralisation of civil governance', alongside an 'Epicurean anthropology' premised on the 'radical separation of moral theology from politics and law'. To the present author's mind, then, Hunter's Pufendorf is almost more Hobbesian than Hobbes himself, e.g., pp. 23-4: 'In Pufendorf's natural law we discover a political anthropology of man as a creature whose violent passions threaten his capacity for sociality, thereby necessitating the creation of a sovereign power capable of imposing the rules of sociability as law'. Cf. also Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', in *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 280, n. 31, which draws attention to Pufendorf's putative alignment with 'asocial sociability', which Dickey nonetheless disavows.

⁹⁸ Note, e.g., Robertson's suggestion that Epicureanism replaced Stoicism as the more 'intellectually reputable' of the two during the latter half of the seventeenth-century, in his *Case for Enlightenment*, p. 213.

⁹⁹ Haakonssen & Whatmore, pp. 300-1. Highlighting the Stoic influence on the particular score of Smith's 'impartial spectator', in the final analysis Haakonssen & Whatmore declare that: 'Smith owes a considerable debt to Epicureanism [...] The characterization of Smith as a Stoic seems simply to get the fundamental nature of his enterprise wrong. The Stoic argument is an argument from above, so to speak, that is to say, it begins from the premises that the world constitutes a closed system and that its components are determined by the laws of the system, from which it is concluded that the human components have to live a certain kind of life. Smith's order of argument is the very opposite – starting from below, as it were. In order to appreciate this, we have to make a distinction that was central to the ancient division between Stoics and Epicureans (and the relevance of which was forcefully revived by Hume). The former argued from the state of the universe to the determination of people. The latter simply argued that people empirically speaking lacked control over all but the trivial features of their environment, but they did not infer a doctrine of fate from this. It is quite clear that Smith in this matter does not follow the metaphysical line of the Stoics but the empirical Epicurean line, arguing from people's lack of control over their world'.

though hardly insignificant, piece of the narrative puzzle, highly conspicuous by its absence – namely, Bishop Butler’s influence on eighteenth-century commercial sociability, and not least on Tuckerian political economy.

Widely considered to be on a par with his Stoic contemporaries Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, recognition of the Stoic tendency within Butler’s thought has not been uncommon in the centuries since the publication of his major works in the first half of the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, it is only relatively recently that scholars have begun to pick up on the full significance of Stoicism to the wider Butlerian scheme. Terence Irwin has gone so far as to suggest, for example, that though Butler’s ‘moral outlook’ and ‘appeal to nature ... reasonably invites a comparison with Stoicism’, Butler’s ideas on human conscience might even be ‘strengthened, not weakened, by closer adherence to Stoic naturalism’.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, though more pertinently in terms of the thesis advanced in this study, A. A. Long draws Butler firmly within the neo-Stoic trajectory we have been tracing in these pages, claiming (we might say similarly to Pufendorf) that in order ‘to refute Hobbes and various contemporaries’ Butler’s ‘treatment of the two basic instincts – self-love and conscience – is too similar to the Stoic concept of *oikeiosis* to be adventitious’.¹⁰¹ As we shall see, by ‘various contemporaries’ Long is undoubtedly referring here to Mandeville, the stylised eighteenth-century ‘populariser’ of Hobbes, whose outlook, Brooke reiterates, had a ‘basically anti-Stoic orientation’.¹⁰² In light of this, one of our central tasks in the chapters to come is to argue (with Force, Miller and Brooke) in favour of a continuance of the neo-Stoic, providentialist trajectory, which clearly still held a great deal of currency in eighteenth-century Britain, as these scholars have shown.¹⁰³ In doing so, a further claim will also be made that it was above all Butler’s theo-philosophical opposition to Mandeville which ensured that it was he, rather than Shaftesbury or Hutcheson, who proved to be the most significant eighteenth-century ‘populariser’ of

¹⁰⁰ Irwin, ‘Stoic naturalism in Butler’, in Miller & Inwood (ed.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, pp. 274-300, citations at pp. 274, 297.

¹⁰¹ Long, ‘Stoicism in the Philosophical Tradition’, in *ibid.*, p. 9; also in Inwood (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Stoics*, pp. 368-9.

¹⁰² James Dean Young, ‘Mandeville: A Popularizer of Hobbes’, *Modern Language Notes*, 74/1, (Jan., 1959), pp. 10-13; Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, p. 155.

¹⁰³ As Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, p. 149, notes most explicitly, this neo-Stoic ‘Ciceronian heritage of prudence and natural law’ continued to thrive in mid-eighteenth-century Britain.

Christian Stoicism; such that his concomitant ideas on commercial sociability came in time to be the epistemological fount from whence Tucker's free trade ideas flowed.

In conclusion, it is important to note that thus far, only Laurence Dickey has made explicit the connection between Tucker's economics as 'a modernization of the *oikeiosis* process and a Christianization of it', and as a 'reinforcement' of 'Grotius and Pufendorf in their natural law versions of the sociability argument'. In Dickey's view, then, Tucker's economics are effectively the high-water mark of the neo-Stoic providentialist process, such that 'free trade begins for [Tucker] as an economic agent of self-preservation in the utilitarian sense', and 'eventually becomes an ethical agent of universal benevolence in a humanitarian sense'. Accordingly, for Dickey, it is very much this aspect of Tucker's thought which marks the clergyman out as a crucial figure in broader, traditional conceptions of a so-called 'humanitarian' and 'cosmopolitan' enlightenment – albeit of a peculiar sort that is yet to be 'integrated into the intellectual history of the period', as we have already argued in part.¹⁰⁴ Yet where the present work intends to build upon Dickey's thesis, thereby offering an original and substantive contribution to scholarship in the process, is in providing an alternative account of Butler's central role as the theo-philosophical conduit between the neo-Stoicism of Lipsius, Grotius and Pufendorf on the one side, and Tucker on the other; a point Dickey fails to mention, let alone account for (no doubt on account of constraints in time and space rather than ignorance).¹⁰⁵

Once again, then, it is very much this 'missing' part of the narrative that the present study intends to fill. Yet as we continue that process by turning now to the specific context of post-Reformation England/Britain and the advent of 'commercial modernity' at about the turn of the eighteenth century, it is well to remember that both Butler and Tucker considered themselves first and foremost to be *Anglican ministers*, over and above any alternative description of 'moral philosopher', 'metaphysician', 'political economist' – or indeed 'neo-Stoic'. And as we shall imminently see, as a consequence, our two clergymen were faced with their own sets of controversies and conundrums peculiar to the island nation they inhabited.

¹⁰⁴ Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', in *Grotius and the Stoa*, pp. 289, 310, 316.

¹⁰⁵ For a concise summary of the present work in relation to Dickey's ideas and *vice-versa*, see Conclusion, Section III, below.

Chapter Two.

Christian Virtue, Commercial Society, and Eighteenth-Century Anglicanism.

Towards the end of the Victorian era, two English clergymen and ecclesiastical historians, C. J. Abbey and J. H. Overton, remarked that the church of the previous century had been one of 'listlessness', 'moral poverty' and 'spiritual lethargy'.¹ Firm in the belief that their eighteenth century predecessors had been insufficiently equipped to meet the exacting standards of their own age, Abbey and Overton were undoubtedly foremost examples of what Peter Virgin has labelled the 'self-confident and self-assertive' Victorian 'mythology' of the Georgian Church.² Yet ever since the pioneering and rehabilitative work of Norman Sykes in the mid-twentieth-century, studies which centre on the eighteenth-century English Church have increasingly sought to reject the Victorian era's relative denigration of it.³ Liberated from the constraints and biases of what we now refer to as 'Whiggish history',⁴ present day historians attempt far more nuanced accounts of the complex relationship between eighteenth century church authority and the laity, alongside the tacit 'quasi-Erastianism' that undergirded it.⁵

¹ C. J. Abbey & J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, (London, 1887), I, pp. 113, 406, II, p. 4. Cf. Overton's *Life in the English Church 1660-1714*, (London, 1885), where he implies that the ills of the Church began with the Hanoverians. The eighteenth-century Evangelical Joseph Milner (1744-97) described this as the Church's penchant for 'reasoning to excess', in his *Essays on Several Religious Subjects*, (York, 1789), at p. 54.

² Peter Virgin, *The Church in an Age of Negligence: Ecclesiastical Structure and Problems of Church Reform 1700-1840*, (Cambridge, 1989), p. iv.

³ See Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century*, (Cambridge, 1934); *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768*, (Cambridge, 1959).

⁴ See Herbert Butterfield's seminal *The Whig Interpretation of History*, (London, 1931). In terms of its relevance to this study, see Young, 'Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian', *The Historical Journal*, 43, 3 (2000), pp. 849-868, esp. pp. 858-9.

⁵ Important surveys on eighteenth-century Anglicanism include, but are by no means limited to: G. R. Cragg, *Reason and Authority in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1964); G. V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church & State, 1688-1730*, (Oxford, Clarendon, 1975); E. Cruickshanks (ed.), *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1861*, (Edinburgh, 1982); J. A. I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730*, (Cambridge, 1992); William Gibson, *The Achievement of the Anglican Church, 1689-1800*, (Lewiston, NY, 1994); *The Church of England, 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, (Routledge, London & NY, 2000); Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke*, (Clarendon, Oxford, 1998); Jeremy Gregory, *Restoration, Reformation, and Reform, 1660-1828: Archbishops of Canterbury and their Diocese*, (Oxford, 2000); Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy 1716-1721*, (Woodbridge, 2007); Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*.

Surveying these works alongside the general religious landscape of Britain during the long eighteenth century, one pattern that frequently re-emerges is the persistent clash between religious orthodoxy and heterodoxy.⁶ Indeed, this was precisely the line of argumentation pioneered by J. C. D. Clark in 1985, when, in an era still dominated by *Marxisant* 'bourgeois-liberal' interpretations of eighteenth century English society, he had attempted to restore ecclesiastical history to a central place in the study of the period.⁷ Claiming that religious heterodoxy was 'conceptually basic to radicalism in the *ancien régime* sense', and echoing the earlier scholarly pursuits of the likes of M. C. Jacob and Pocock,⁸ Clark stressed the 'conservative', 'clerical', 'magisterial' and 'aristocratic' character of heterodoxy's ideological opposite, the *ancien régime* establishment. Yet in the process of doing so, Clarke also made one overridingly important point, which most if not all historians take for granted today. No matter what form opposition to the establishment took, he contended, by definition it always constituted a *religious act*. For the patrician class in eighteenth-century Britain was invariably Anglican, he concluded, Anglicanism therefore defined the elite, and so by extension non-Anglicans found themselves unanimously excluded from the state.⁹

Notwithstanding the powerful originality of Clark's work, a consensus is still yet to be reached regarding whether or not the established Anglican Church was, from c. 1688-1832, a fundamentally riven or united institution. Writing at the turn of the millennium, for example, William Gibson has concluded that the era's commitment to eirenicism ensured that 'unity and accord pervaded' the Church, and that a 'thorough reading of the work of the churchmen of the century' shows that 'divisions between them have been exaggerated'.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Gibson's view is very much in the minority; for the types

⁶ For an overview of some of these recent developments, see the editors' introduction to Sarah Mortimer & Robertson (eds.), *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy, 1600-1750*, (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

⁷ J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure, and Political Practice During the Ancien Régime* [1985], (Revised 2nd Ed., Cambridge, 2000). For *Marxisant* 'bourgeois triumphalist' interpretations of eighteenth-century English society, see Christopher Hill, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution*, (London, 1980); James R. Jacob, *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1981).

⁸ See, e.g., M. C. Jacob, *Radical Enlightenment*; Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject'; 'Clergy and commerce'; 'Conservative Enlightenment and democratic revolutions'.

⁹ Clark, *English Society 1689-1832*, pp. 277, 281, 283. In the words of William Gibson, this meant that 'Clark effectively reformulated eighteenth-century radicalism as a religious rather than a secular movement', in *Unity and Accord*, p. 15

¹⁰ Gibson, *Unity and Accord*, pp. 1, 3-4, 7, 24. Cf. John Walsh, Colin Hayden & Stephen Taylor (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 51:

of pejorative nouns and adjectives long synonymous with the Georgian Church—‘factionalised’, ‘materialistic’, ‘discordant’, ‘conflicted’—remain incredibly persistent in the historical memory. Writing along similar lines to Abbey and Overton, for instance, J. H. Plumb wrote as late as in 1950 of the ‘worldliness’ and ‘venality’ of eighteenth-century prelates.¹¹ Three decades later, Roy Porter quipped that the ‘year 1800 dawned with the Anglican Church ill-equipped to serve the nation. But who missed it?’¹² Only by 1993 did a far more balanced view emerge in the work of John Walsh and Stephen Taylor when they advised that the best way to view eighteenth-century Anglicanism was with equal doses of ‘cautious optimism’ and ‘cautious pessimism’. For the ‘debate about the Georgian Church has moved on little since the 1930s’, they observed. ‘The arguments of optimists and pessimists have a judgemental character that would be familiar to Sykes. Nonetheless, this debate has been highly productive’, they conclude, ‘in that we know much more about the condition of the Georgian Church’.¹³

Taylor and Walsh are indeed correct in claiming that we now know far more about the Church Butler and Tucker subscribed to. This having being said, the aim of this chapter is to take the (by now) normative ‘orthodox establishment-heterodox radical’ (or perhaps ‘optimistic-pessimistic’) model as its staging point. In doing so, its main purpose is to introduce the reader to the political, social and religious milieu Butler and Tucker were a part of, and indeed contributed to, with particular reference to the economic dimensions that were increasingly associated with it. It begins, then, with a brief general survey of the eighteenth-century Anglican Church, its internal and external clashes with heterodox freethinking, deism and dissent; followed swiftly by the important legacy of the English Reformation and the prominence of the Thirty-Nine Articles and *Book of Common Prayer*. Thereafter, its focus shifts towards the contemporary response to the challenge of commercial society at the turn of the eighteenth century, where it is claimed that the figure who did most to antagonise the orthodox establishment in terms of its defence of the burgeoning, and predominantly

‘[Historians] frequently distort the course of Anglican history by focusing on the writings of controversialists and extremists ...’

¹¹ J. H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century*, (Harmondsworth, 1950), pp. 43-4.

¹² Roy Porter, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century*, (Harmondsworth, 1982), p. 191.

¹³ John Walsh and Stephen Taylor, ‘Introduction: the Church and Anglicanism in the ‘long’ eighteenth century’, in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, pp. 1-64, at p. 3. This remains one of the most useful summaries of the history and historiography of eighteenth-century Anglicanism.

Whig, commercial order was of course Mandeville – the thinker whom Butler was largely responding to when he published *Fifteen Sermons* in 1726. Butler's sermons are reserved for fuller discussion in the chapter immediately following. In order to arrive at them sufficiently equipped, however, we conclude the present with a brief alternative Anglican response to Mandeville which also emerged in the 1720s: that of the High-Church mystic and non-juror William Law.

I. Introduction: The Eighteenth-Century Anglican Church.¹⁴

The 'orthodox-establishment/heterodox-radical' theses of Pocock and Clark *et al.* have proved extremely influential in the decades since their publication and proliferation.¹⁵ In particular, intellectual and literary historians such as Brian W. Young and Isabel Rivers have increasingly sought to emphasise the inter and intra intellectual diversity that this confrontation facilitated. According to Young, the richest debate occurred not between heterodox freethinkers and orthodox clergymen, but rather between established prelates themselves.¹⁶ Consequently, he views the eighteenth century as an era of flowering intellectual and theological debate revolving around the issue of subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, and the attendant issue of the moral, philosophical and theological legitimacy of the Church's canonical doctrines: in other words, its Trinitarianism.¹⁷ As Young puts it, 'it was the doctrine of the Trinity which was gradually sacrificed by some in favour of intellectual clarity and philosophical rather than theological respectability'.¹⁸ Yet be that as it may, such discussion could be, and very often was, construed as a slippery slope towards Arianism, Unitarianism and

¹⁴ Nicholar Tyacke has warned that the term 'Anglican' in the sense we interpret it today is a nineteenth-century invention. See his *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), p. vii. A similar point is made in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, p. 51, n. 137. Nevertheless, the terms 'Anglican', 'Anglicanism', 'Church of England', 'established Church' or 'establishment Church' have been adopted and used interchangeably throughout this thesis in reference to the same entity.

¹⁵ Consult Roger Lund (ed.), *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*, (Cambridge, 1995). Within Pocock's essay chapter entitled 'Within the margins: the definitions of orthodoxy', pp. 33-53, he aligns himself with Clark, at p. 36.

¹⁶ Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, p. 3 & *passim*. See also his 'A History of Variations: the identity of the eighteenth century Church of England', in T. Clayton & I. McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland: c. 1650-c. 1850*, (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 105-28, esp. at p. 128; also 'The Soul-Sleeping System': Politics and Heresy in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45/1 (1994), pp. 64-81. Gibson, *Unity and Accord*, p. 19, notes that Young 'achieves a synthesis' of Paul Hazard's claim that reason and religion were in conflict, and of Clark's thesis. For more on Hazard, see *The Crisis of the European Mind 1680-1715*, (London, 1953).

¹⁷ For more on the Articles, see the following section.

¹⁸ Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, p. 11.

Socinianism – the denial in various degrees of the divinity of Christ; or worse still Deism – the outright denial of the legitimacy of the Christian revelation; and thence to heresy and heterodoxy.¹⁹ Put very briefly, these various positions were all on-going manifestations of the Protestant sectarianism that had remained incredibly persistent throughout post-Reformation Europe.²⁰ Within the specific context of seventeenth and early eighteenth-century England/Britain, however, these sects were increasingly associated with the religious and political subversion of Church and State.²¹ As we shall see, one important consequence of this was that orthodox (and by the early 1700s this was a byword for ‘Whig’ or ‘latitudinarian’) clergymen who held potentially subversive views – and there were not a few among them – were well aware that it was ill advised to pronounce them publicly for fear of recrimination. As Young writes in summary of these state of affairs, then, the ‘Whig clergy were themselves often divided over doctrine and discipline’ precisely because of the risks involved; ‘controversy’, Young therefore concludes, ‘was endemic to Anglicanism in this period’.²²

In these last two points in particular, Rivers is in broad agreement with Young. According to her, however, the tensions that this facilitated were articulated in two specific ways. Firstly, in a general shift away from the ‘emotive’ preaching style of seventeenth-century English Puritans and Commonwealth ‘enthusiasts’, towards the plain rational and rhetorical language of the early latitude-men, such as Benjamin Whichcote (1609-83), John Tillotson (1630-1694) and John Wilkins (1642-1712) amongst others.²³ And secondly, in the development of eighteenth-century ideas on human nature that went beyond the religious sphere into the realm of moral philosophy and ethics.²⁴ Although both of these premises will prove to be incredibly important points of scholarly reference throughout the remainder of this study, it is the latter

¹⁹ Within the established Church, these various charges were usually levelled at the latitudinarians, who were particularly tolerant of the Protestant minorities. For Tucker’s definitions of Trinitarianism, Arianism and Socinianism, see Chapter Four, Section XIII.

²⁰ See Quentin Skinner’s classic *Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Volume Two: The Age of Reformation*, (Cambridge, 1978).

²¹ J. C. Davis, ‘Religion and the Struggle for Freedom in the English Revolution’, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 3, (Sep., 1992) pp. 507-30.

²² Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, pp. 3, 19.

²³ Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1770: Volume I: Whichcote to Wesley*, (Cambridge, 1990). Rivers also uses the term ‘slippery slope’ (from the previous paragraph) to denote the mutability of *all* English Protestantism in the post-Reformation period, at p. 9.

²⁴ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment ... Volume II: Shaftesbury to Hume*, (Cambridge, 2000).

which is of most concern to us at the present juncture. For it is here that Rivers also claims that the eighteenth-century British ethical landscape came to be dominated by the neo-Stoic deist, Shaftesbury, whose commitment to the study of a moral philosophy based upon human nature, she maintains, presaged such important thinkers as Samuel Clarke, George Berkeley (1685-1753), Francis Hutcheson, David Hume – and not least Butler himself.²⁵

Alongside the familiar authority of Locke, quite how far Shaftesbury's influence extended into the climes of eighteenth-century British intellectual thought constitutes a lesser, though at times important, sub-narrative to this thesis; the reason essentially being that he was an immensely divisive and controversial figure in his day.²⁶ Deemed to be the eloquent spokesperson for most, if not all, anti-Christian polemic, in a private letter dated to 1701, for example, Shaftesbury wrote with pride of his 'general Acquaintance ... with most of our Modern Authors and free-Writers, severall of whome I have a particular influence over'.²⁷ Here, Shaftesbury was referring to the deists Anthony Collins (1676-1729), John Toland (1670-1722) and Matthew Tindal (1657-1733), and particularly the latter two whom he was personally acquainted with.²⁸ All were heterodox thinkers and, broadly speaking, had therefore been notorious for arguing that natural rather than revealed religion was a sufficient basis for belief in God.²⁹ In the inevitable controversy that ensued between establishment orthodoxy and dissonant heterodoxy, Rivers draws important attention to the fact that both sides drew heavily from the philosophy of the ancients, and particularly the figure of Cicero and the Stoics, in order to provide ammunition for their respective causes.³⁰ Yet if the orthodox were far more inclined to emphasise the compatibilities between Stoicism and Christianity, as

²⁵ Ibid. pp. 15, 154: 'Shaftesbury's unique importance was as a developer ... of a new moral vocabulary which was to have a wide and lasting influence later in the century'.

²⁶ See Daniel Carey, *Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson: Contesting Diversity in the Enlightenment and Beyond*, (Cambridge, 2005), esp. Chap. 4.

²⁷ Robert Voitle, *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury*, (Louisiana, 1984), 'To Pierre Maizeaux, 5 August 1701', p. 90; cited in Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 14.

²⁸ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 14.

²⁹ See esp. John Toland, *Christianity Not Mysterious: A Treatise Shewing, That there is nothing in the Gospel Contrary to Reason, Nor Above It: And that no Christian Doctrine can be properly called A Mystery* (London, 1696); Anthony Collins, *A Discourse of Freethinking, occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Freethinkers* (London, 1713), & Matthew Tindal, *Christianity as Old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature* (London, 1730).

³⁰ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 2, 27-31. Rivers notes that post-1660 orthodoxy was the 'new' orthodoxy, in I, pp. 1-2.

Lipsius had done,³¹ by contrast the heterodox were far likelier to insist upon the sufficiency of the classical philosophers – replete with their pagan connotations. In light of this, Rivers highlights the ‘appeal [freethinking] writers made to the classical moralists, and the resulting conflict with Christian writers for possession of the ancients and what they meant’.³²

Given all that we have discussed in our preceding chapter, it should come as little surprise to the reader that both Butler and Tucker were important contributors to, and indeed beneficiaries of, this on-going debate. Nevertheless, at this stage we are forced to leave the subject of freethinking for now with one final observation. Above all, freethinkers had attempted to purge traditional Christianity of its supposed superstition and Priestcraft, so as to replace it with a free spirit of inquiry accentuating nature, reason and rationality above all else (whether along Stoic lines or not); and this they did in the hopes that their contemporaries would become ‘self-conscious and self-critical about the way in which traditional religious language and institutions function’.³³ The importance of this observation cannot be downplayed, for there is clearly much here which chimed with the trenchant desires of religious dissenters and non-conformists alike – groups who, for various reasons, had rejected the post-Restoration Church polity, and even the post-Revolution Settlement of 1689 which favoured them, on the grounds that their consciences would never enable them to submit to the authority of the established Church.³⁴

³¹ See Chapter One, Section V.

³² Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 2; also, I, p. 35, where Rivers claims that the most cited Stoic authors among the latitude-men besides Cicero were Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Plutarch, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Plotinus and Hierocles. Brooke adds that ‘Shaftesbury was ‘heir to this line of anti-voluntarist argument’, in *Philosophical Pride*, p. 111.

³³ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 83. See also Norman Torrey, *Voltaire and the English Deists*, (New Haven, Yale, 1930), esp. pp. 2-4, 202-3; Franco Venturi, *Utopia and Reform in the Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1971) esp. pp. 65-8, & *Italy and the Enlightenment: Studies in a Cosmopolitan Century*, tr. Susan Corsi, (London, 1972), esp. pp. 67, 85, 88, 98, 101-2. An indispensable study of the rise of reason and ethical rationalism in the seventeenth-century English Church, and of the challenge posed to it by deism and freethinking, is Frederick C. Beiser’s *The Sovereignty of Reason: The Defense of Rationality in the Early English Enlightenment*, (Princeton, NJ, 1996), see esp. Chap. 6: ‘Toland and the Deism Controversy’, pp. 220-65.

³⁴ This does not mean to say that deism and dissent were indistinguishable movements, the crucial difference being that the latter did not deny the authority of revelation or scripture unlike the vast majority of the former. There was, however, significant overlap between the two in a *political sense*. See, e.g., David Nicholls, ‘Deists, Dissenters and Free Thinkers’, in his *God and Government in an ‘Age of Reason’*, (Routledge, London & NY, 1995), pp. 128-60. The irony here is that in some respects, freethinking and deism was facilitated by the earlier emphasis placed on nature, reason and rationality *within* seventeenth-century Anglicanism, especially via early latitudinarianism and the Cambridge Platonists. Again, Shaftesbury was a connecting figure between these two movements.

As Nicholas Phillipson summarises, then, of the political outlook at the turn of the eighteenth century:

Fundamental questions about the relationship of the monarch to parliament, parliament to people and the Church of England to a protestant nation deeply penetrated by dissent, remained unanswered and would continue to fracture the politics of a notoriously volatile political nation.³⁵

Indeed, even as late as 1811, the North American patriot William Goddard (1740-1817) was still *anticipating* – note, in the future tense – that ‘the Church of England would *soon* find itself outnumbered by “Sectaries”’.³⁶ So harangued did established prelates perceive themselves to be, then, that throughout the long eighteenth century many felt it was their fundamental clerical duty to remain, in effect, on constant vigilance. As Walsh and Taylor aptly describe it, the Hanoverian Church found itself caught in the midst of a ‘*crise de conscience*’, whereby the best form of attack was no longer to ‘coerce’, but rather to ‘persuade’ – for some churchmen a thoroughly ‘traumatic’ experience.³⁷

II. The Thirty-Nine Articles and the *Book of Common Prayer*.

The deep roots of eighteenth-century religio-political enmity hearkened back to the heavily contested legacy of the Henrician Reformation, and particularly the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559.³⁸ For it was at this time that the two most important, and therefore *disputed*, charters of the Anglican faith were given form and substance.³⁹ The first of these, the Thirty-Nine Articles, we have already touched on. Issued in 1563 and ratified in 1571, upon their completion the Protestant monarch Elizabeth I (1533-1603) ensured

³⁵ Nicholas Phillipson, ‘Politeness and politics in the reigns of Anne and the early Hanoverians’, in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, pp. 211-45, at p. 211.

³⁶ Cited in D. Lovegrove, *Established Church, Sectarian People, Itinerancy and the Transformation of English Dissent 1780-1830*, (Cambridge, 1988), p. 124; emphasis added.

³⁷ Walsh, *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, ‘Introduction’, p. 16. Cf. Gregory, ‘Anglicanism and the arts: religion, culture and politics in the eighteenth century’, in Jeremy Black & Gregory (eds.), *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800*, (Manchester, 1991), pp. 82-109, at p. 84.

³⁸ Although, as Rivers points out in *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 2, the ‘underlying tensions were as old as Christianity’ itself.

³⁹ For useful discussions of the impact of the English Reformation on early-modern English political thought, see John Guy, ‘The Henrician Age’, in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, pp. 13-46 & in the same publication, Donald R. Kelley, ‘Elizabethan political thought’, pp. 47-79.

that adherence and subscription to them became legally binding.⁴⁰ Originally intended as definitive statements of the doctrines of the English Church, and particularly of its intention to act as a *via media*, or moderate ‘middle way’, between Reformed Calvinism and Roman Catholicism, it was this issue of subscription, so central to Young’s thesis, that returned time and again to the forefront of eighteenth-century debate, particularly during the 1760s and 70s.⁴¹

Be that as it may, A. M. C. Waterman has recently contended that the ‘definitive document’ of the post-Reformation Church of England was not the Articles, but rather the *Book of Common Prayer*, wherein the articles were printed. For it was the *Prayer Book*, Waterman insists, that was the truly ‘dominant symbol’ of ‘Establishment Culture’ in the long eighteenth century,⁴² it being something that ‘every church-going English man, woman and child’, he writes, ‘heard continually from earliest infancy to the last hours of their lives’.⁴³ Yet whilst it is indeed correct that the *Prayer Book* remained incredibly influential throughout post-Reformation England, it is important to note that it was for this very reason that its authority was often challenged, if not undermined, in the years, decades and centuries following its original publication. For indeed, ever since its editorial inception at the hand of Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556) in 1544, it had gone through numerous editions (1549, 1553, 1604 and 1662), each time being modified in accordance with the religio-political ‘tone’ of the Act of Uniformity accompanying it.

For instance, when in 1559 Elizabeth’s revisions attempted to install a liturgical ‘middle-way’ between the First (1549) and Second (1553) editions, her various concessions and condonements proved to be insufficient for a large number of courtiers

⁴⁰ Elizabeth had the Articles divided into four sub-sections: ‘The Catholic Faith’ (Articles I-VIII), ‘Personal Religion’ (IX-XVIII), ‘Corporate Religion’ (XIX-XXXI) and ‘Miscellaneous’ (XXXII-XXXVIII).

⁴¹ See esp. Young, ‘“Subscribe or Starve”: The Subscription Controversy and its Consequences’, in *Religion and Enlightenment in England*, pp. 45-80. In many respects the importance of subscription to the Articles was unsurprising, given that they were seen to be synonymous with English perceptions of national identity. According to Walsh, they were ‘the doctrinal mirror in which Anglicans ... officially viewed themselves’, and effectively ‘welded into the structure of the confessional state’, in his ‘The Thirty-Nine Articles and Anglican Identity in the Eighteenth Century’, in Christine d’Haussy (ed.), *Quand Religions et Confessions se Regardent*, (Paris, 1998), pp. 61-70, at p. 61. Cf. Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 103; Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 345-6.

⁴² ‘Establishment Culture’ is a term replete throughout Clark, *English Society, 1688-1832*.

⁴³ Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 36.

and clergymen, whether they be ‘Popish’ Lords on the one side who believed in the Real Presence of Christ at the Eucharist, or returning Marian Exiles on the other, who deemed the sacrament of transubstantiation to be utterly repugnant. Ironically, then, in many eyes the difficulty with the *Prayer Book* was not that it was too reformed or too traditional, but rather that it was *too moderate*.⁴⁴ Hence, whilst the seventeenth-century latitudinarian Bishop, Simon Patrick (1626-1707), may have claimed that Elizabeth had achieved a ‘virtuous mediocrity’ between ‘the meretricious gaudiness of the Church of Rome and the squalid sluttishness of fanatic conventicles’, elsewhere a Reformed party within the Anglican Church criticised the Book as ‘unperfect Boke, culled and picked out of that Popishe dunghill the Portuise and Masseboke, full of abominations’.⁴⁵ In light of these difficulties, the central—indeed *definitive*—question could be, and very often was, raised: if the origins of establishment Church doctrine were so ambiguous, from whence did its authority or legitimacy derive?⁴⁶

In Waterman’s view, the *Prayer Book* remained closer to Rome than Geneva. Rooted in Catholic ecclesiology, Pauline Soteriology and Athanasianism, he contends that the book was openly steeped in the notion that Christ was both human and divine, and therefore immanent in body and spirit. To ‘Puritan’ critics of the establishment, alongside the likes of early English Socinians such as Paul Best (c. 1590-1657) and John Biddle (1615-62),⁴⁷ these doctrines confirmed that the *Prayer Book* was intimately linked to (or rather tainted by association with) the pre-Reformation doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation and Episcopalian hierarchical polity – or that which Waterman calls the anti-voluntaristic ‘grand scheme of subordination’, and the ‘organicist conception of the state’.⁴⁸ Moreover, as in the case of Richard Hooker’s

⁴⁴ See Alan Cromartie, ‘Puritans and Anglicans’, in *The Constitutionalist Revolution: An Essay on the History of England, 1450-1642*, (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 115-47.

⁴⁵ S.P., presumed Simon Patrick, *A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitude-Men*, (1662), p. 4; F. Proctor & W. H. Frere, *The Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices*, (London, 1958), p. 114.

⁴⁶ The obvious recourse was to the primitive church, and on this head practically all European Protestants were united – a perception given renewed impetus following Lorenzo Valla’s (1407-57) discovery in the fifteenth-century of the fraudulency of *Donatio Constantini*, on solid philological grounds. See his *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio* [Discourse on the Forgery of the Alleged Donation of Constantine], (1440); also Jerry H. Bentley, *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples*, (Princeton, 1987), pp. 180-2; Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*, pp. 118-9.

⁴⁷ Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism*, (Cambridge, 2010).

⁴⁸ Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, pp. 32-39, 41-6, & Chaps. 2-4 generally. For further clarifications of the term ‘grand scheme of subordination’, see pp. 32-4, 41-3, 46-8, 50-1, 56-60,

(1554-1600) classically Anglican *Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie* (1594-1662), establishment culture, and all that it entailed, could be justified both spiritually and intellectually:⁴⁹

Without order there is no living in public society, because the want thereof is the mother of confusion, whereupon division of necessity followeth, and out of division inevitable destruction ... And if things or persons be ordered, this doth imply that they are distinguished by degrees. For order is a gradual disposition.⁵⁰

As Waterman puts it, then, ‘orthodox ... Christology *implies and is implied by* Catholic ecclesiology’.⁵¹ And once again, according to its critics, comprised of a vast and disparate array of freethinkers, deists, dissenters, non-conformists, Arians, Socinians and Unitarians, these notions confirmed that the *Prayer Book* and Thirty-Nine Articles transmitted an ecclesiology that was overwhelmingly Catholic (i.e., Nicean and Chalcedonian) in origin, whilst at the same time conveying a ‘biblical and patristic understanding of the Church as a divine society’; a providential and mystical extension of God’s person, whereby the individual’s salvation could only be obtained through the figure of Christ as the literal Godhead.⁵² Naturally, these state of affairs remained

61-3, 66, 68-9. At p. 196 and Chap. 4 generally, Waterman states that the principle can be ascribed to Samuel Johnson, William Paley & Tory doctrine. For a variation of these themes, see also Waterman’s chapter ‘The nexus between theology and political doctrine in Church and dissent’, in Haakonssen (ed.), *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 193-218. For anti-voluntarism as the correlate of seventeenth-century latitudinarian thought derived from the Stoics, see Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, pp. 109-11.

⁴⁹ This was done on both neo-Stoic and scholastic grounds of natural law, thereby rendering it an ‘eclectic and apologetic commentary’ of the Elizabethan settlement, according to Kelley, ‘Elizabethan political thought’, in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, pp. 63-4, 71, 78. See also Beiser, *Sovereignty of Reason*, Chap. 2: ‘Hookers Defense of Reason’, pp. 46-83.

⁵⁰ Richard Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie* [1594-1662], A. S. McGrade (ed.), (Cambridge, 1989), VIII, 2.1, p. 139, & cited in Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 33. In *A Treatise Concerning Civil Government*, (Gloucester, 1781) [henceforth *Treatise*], pp. 400-9, Tucker appeals to Hooker as a bastion of civilisation.

⁵¹ Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 47; emphasis added.

⁵² Ibid. Cf. Pocock, ‘Within the margins: the definitions of orthodoxy’, Lund (ed.), *Margins of Orthodoxy*, p. 38: ‘... the church as by law established and the church that was the continuing presence of Christ, promised to his Apostles at the Ascension and revealed to them on the Day of Pentecost’. As Pocock notes elsewhere, within England the divorce from Papal authority took on a uniquely providentialist character, encapsulated in the belief that theirs’ was an Elect Nation: divinely appointed by God and therefore *sacred* on the one side, and yet also acting within the perceived bounds of a public and temporal time-frame, and so *historically* and *civically minded* on the other. The resulting narrative, which revolved around the struggle between radical and conservative forces over the nation’s providential destiny, plays an important role in much of Pocock’s early work. See, e.g., *Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*, esp. Chaps. 1 & 2; *Machiavellian Moment*, pp. 337, 342, 343-7, 373, 396, 403. Cf. Brendan Bradshaw & Eamon Duffy (eds.), *Humanism, Reform and the Reformation: The Career of Bishop John Fisher*, (Cambridge, 1989), p. 195, n. 17. See also David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, (Cambridge, 2000), p. 10, which describes this concept of English exceptionalism as ‘a providential charter for insularity’.

unacceptable to independents and antinomians alike, contributing in large part to the persistent destabilisation of the era's politics, whether that be in the guise of Regicide (1648-9), Restoration (1660) or Revolution (1688-9). Unsurprisingly, this therefore cast a long and malignant shadow over the establishment well into the following century, as Pocock has magisterially summarised. For this oftentimes bitter wrangling, over that which Pocock calls an overt 'politics of Christology' in a country 'dynastically and ecclesiastically divided', resulted in a fractured eighteenth-century landscape of itinerant religio-political crisis, wherein the fault-lines between orthodoxy and heterodoxy became seemingly ever more firmly entrenched:

There arose a systematic and resolute identification of the religious with the social ... by which society was governed; ... with the paramount need to maintain that the spirit manifested itself, and even became incarnate, only through social channels, reasonable, humane, and obedient to authority, and never in ways subversive of the human and sociable order. Christ as saviour had been king as well as priest and prophet, and the Christian was enjoined to an unconditional subjection to the higher powers; Christ's role as saviour had been to add supernatural sanction to the natural authority of common social morality, through which ... the individual was to be saved. Doctrines of this kind were advanced in ecclesiastical as well as secular circles, but might reach a point at which the central tradition of Christianity began to be challenged. For if Christ came only to reinforce the law, in what ways did the function and the person of the Son differ from those of the Father?

[...] Problems of this order were in the making before the revolution of 1688, but were aggravated by the implications of that event and all that followed. There came to be an explicit, if only an occasional, association between strong support of the [Glorious] Revolution and Hanoverian succession, an ecclesiology which reduced the Church of England to a civil association, an epistemology which reduced the knowledge of God to the holding of opinions, and a theology which reduced Christ to something less than a co-equal and co-eternal person of the Trinity.⁵³

This, then, was the tumultuous religious and political climate both Butler and Tucker were born into, albeit one generation removed from each other, and from either side of the established-dissenting divide.

III. 'The Point of Departure': The Anglican Response to Commercial Modernity.

In adhering to the 'establishment-radical' model of Clark and Pocock *et al.*, Waterman's work is particularly novel and useful to us in that it draws sustained attention to the complex theological origins of classical British political economy, and more particularly

⁵³ Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, 5 Vols. [Vol. 6 forthcoming], (Cambridge, 1999-2011), I. pp. 22, 26, 27; emphases added.

still, the role of Anglican orthodoxy in contributing to its development.⁵⁴ In doing so, Waterman's arguments also dovetail with many of the broader themes we discussed in our forgoing chapter, regarding the conjunction between the historical development of political economy on the one side, and the varieties of providence (i.e., pagan, neo-pagan and Judeo-Christian) on the other; both of which tinted the religious and increasingly economic language of early-modern Europe. As we are now beginning to see, the English/British scene was characterised by political and religious heterogeneity to an extent unparalleled anywhere else on the continent – with the one significant exception of the Netherlands. Notoriously tolerant of heterodox views, and therefore a 'refuge' and 'haven of ... liberty and peace unknown in Europe',⁵⁵ the United Provinces was similarly famous for its innovations in and dependence upon trade and commerce – a legacy of their resistance and survival against Habsburg Spanish, and therefore Catholic, dominion during the Eighty Years War (1568-1648).⁵⁶ Indeed, so prosperous had the Netherlands become by the late seventeenth century that Simon Schama has described it as a state blessed with an 'embarrassment of riches', set amidst a veritable 'golden age'. In light of this, it has often been remarked that the Dutch found themselves in the vanguard of an early-modern, European-wide movement which witnessed the transition from what Daniel Roche calls an 'economy of salvation, scarcity and morality to an economy of happiness on earth, plenty and utility'.⁵⁷

In many important respects, the English followed swiftly in the Dutch wake. For indeed, the intellectual, politico-religious and commercial alliances formed between the two

⁵⁴ The crucial moment in Waterman's thesis is in reinterpreting Smith's *WN* as a work of establishment Newtonian natural theology. See, e.g., *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, Chap. 6: 'Wealth of Nations as Theology', pp. 88-106 & Chap. 7: 'The Sudden Separation of Political Economy', pp. 107-26. For Waterman's explicit acknowledgment of Clark's influence, see 'Preface', p. xi. For his indebtedness to Pocock, see Chap. 2: 'Why the "English Enlightenment" Was Different', pp. 16-30. As an acknowledged admirer of Pocock, Young's work may also be placed in the same bracket as these works; indeed, Gibson has stated that these scholars 'created a new synthesis in eighteenth-century thought', in *Unity and Accord*, p. 22.

⁵⁵ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 14. Here Rivers notes, e.g., the 'common bond' and 'impact' of the Netherlands on English freethinkers during this period, based upon this reputation. For further evidence, see Rivers' reference to Shaftesbury's many sojourns to the United Provinces at pp. 96-7.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Israel, *Empires and Entreports: The Dutch, the Spanish Monarchy and the Jews 1585-1713*, (Hambledon Press, London, 1990); *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall: 1477-1806*, (Clarendon; Oxford, 1995).

⁵⁷ Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, (NY, 1987); Daniel Roche, *A History of Everyday Things: The Birth of Consumption in France, 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 2000), p. 8. See also Karl Polanyi's classic *The Great Transformation* [1944], (Boston, 1957).

states in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-9, alongside their broader global and domestic ramifications, are increasingly debated in scholarship.⁵⁸ We shall turn to some of the ramifications of these debates in the remainder of this chapter, and still again in the specific context of Tucker's economic ideas in later stages of this thesis.⁵⁹ For the present, however, it is incumbent upon us to shift our immediate focus to the subject of broader Anglican attempts to come to grips with the nature of commercial society at the turn of the eighteenth century – the so-called 'point of departure' in early-modern history in Pocock's view – in anticipation of Butler's treatment of the subject in *Fifteen Sermons* and beyond.⁶⁰ For, by doing so, we shall also attempt to address that which Frank O'Gorman describes as those progressive and 'modernising elements upon which' eighteenth-century English society increasingly 'depended: industry, capitalism, commerce and new patterns of consumption'.⁶¹

As Paul Slack has recently demonstrated, the issues surrounding 'material progress and the challenge of affluence' were not consigned solely to eighteenth-century English/British society, but had already begun to concern various thinkers and policy-makers throughout the preceding century. 'Applause and anxiety with respect to material progress', writes Slack, 'were two sides of a single coin minted on evident facts'.⁶² On the one side were teleological-minded optimists such as the 'political arithmetician' William Petty (1623-87), who revelled in the juxtaposition between what he called 'the highest improvements of mankind in his mass with the rudest condition that man was ever in'.⁶³ Likewise were the sentiments of the English gardener and diarist John Evelyn (1620-1706), who wrote in 1674 that 'the *miracles* of Commerce' had already begun to teach the English 'religion, instructed us in polity, cultivated our

⁵⁸ See, e.g., Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, (Cambridge, 1991); Dale Hoak & Mordechai Feingold, *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-9*, (Stanford, 1996) (consult their bibliographies). Interestingly, although somewhat against the grain, Steven Pincus argues that James II 'inherited' as early as in 1685 an English society that was already 'going Dutch', in *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, (New Haven: Yale, 2009), Chap. 3, pp. 49-90, at p. 51.

⁵⁹ Specifically, Chapter Five, Section VII. The extent to which Anglo-Dutch relations played a central role in fostering much of Butler's thought will also be explored in Chapter Three, Section I.

⁶⁰ Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, p. 426.

⁶¹ Cited in Gibson, *Unity and Accord*, p. 9.

⁶² See Paul Slack, 'Material progress and the challenge of affluence in seventeenth-century England', *Economic History Review*, 62, 3, (2009), pp. 576-603, this citation at p. 577. Avner Offer has also used the term 'the challenge of affluence' in the parallel context of the twentieth-century post-war years, in *The Challenge of Affluence: Self-control and Well-being in the USA and Britain since 1950*, (Oxford, 2006).

⁶³ [H. W. E. Petty-Fitzmaurice] Marquis of Lansdowne (ed.), *The Petty papers*, 2 Vols. (London, 1927), II, p. 24.

manners and furnish'd us with all the delicacies of virtuous and happy living'.⁶⁴ On the other hand, however, were pessimists in the mould of the merchant Thomas Tryon (1634-1703), who appeared far more sceptical about the prospects for unbridled economic progress. Though Tryon praised what he called those palpable improvements in the 'arts, sciences and trades' which England so clearly depended on for its increasing prosperity, nevertheless, he was also concerned that the general shift in labour from agriculture to services left trade 'overstocked', and the 'generality of the people ... poor and miserable'.⁶⁵ Similarly, Daniel Defoe (1660-1731), who was otherwise an enthusiastic supporter of the new commercial apparati underpinning the English state, noted that despite rising national wealth, the disparity between the luxurious rich and the profligate poor was so great that a paradox of 'lazy diligence' now characterised the British Isles.⁶⁶

This tendency towards extremes remained prevalent well into Tucker's time, though with greater degrees of subtlety and sophistication, and with differing emphases, as shall be seen. Yet what is particularly notable for our present purposes is the fact that, amid these debates, the interests and concerns of Christian, and specifically *Anglican*, thinkers could be mapped surprisingly comfortably on to the new realities of the burgeoning market economy. So much so, in fact, that this has prompted some students of ecclesiastical history, such as Jeremy Gregory, to paint a picture of the Georgian Church which, rather than condemning commercial activity unreservedly on the basis that its interests were antithetical to the traditional tenets of Christianity, began instead to 'accept' that the 'commercialization of religion' necessitated entering the market-place'.⁶⁷ In Taylor and Walsh's view, this phenomenon reflected 'the tendency of a minority, in the cities at least, to 'shop around' in search of a full spiritual life'.⁶⁸ Yet in spite of the mercenary tones on display here, it would be wrong to describe this enterprise solely in terms of a seemingly exploitative market impinging upon the salvific role of the Established Church. On the contrary, in order to cement its privileged

⁶⁴ John Evelyn, *Navigation and commerce, their original and progress* [1674], in John Evelyn (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn*, (London, 1825), p. 633.

⁶⁵ Thomas Tryon, *A Brief History of English Trade*, (London, 1702), pp. 23, 43, 123.

⁶⁶ Daniel Defoe, *Giving alms no charity*, (London, 1704), pp. 24-6.

⁶⁷ Gregory, 'The eighteenth-century Reformation: the pastoral task of Anglican Clergy after 1689', in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, pp. 67-85, at p. 70.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, Taylor & Walsh, 'Introduction', pp. 24-5. It is precisely this type of activity that facilitated nineteenth-century accusations of the worldliness and materialism of the Georgian Church.

status, whilst at the same time attempting to re-assimilate dissenters and non-conformists back into the pale of the Church, for many establishment minds, ‘selling’ the Church was indeed perceived to be the best means of achieving this end.⁶⁹ As Jonathan Barry puts it, then, with regard to the *interdependent* relationship between commercial activity and the Georgian Church:

Both in practical terms and in the legitimation of new cultural activity, the Church's support was important, not least because of a long-lasting distrust of a totally commercial culture controlled by market forces alone. This *interdependence* lies at the heart of understanding eighteenth-century England as neither a confessional state ... nor a secular consumer society without any use for an established Church, but rather as a commercial society with genuine religious pluralism, that is with a genuine pluralism based on genuine religious allegiances.⁷⁰

Here, then, Barry reiterates that which we noted earlier via Pocock’s observation: that during the eighteenth century there was an increasing identification of the *religious with the social*.⁷¹ Yet set within this context, it is well to consider that whereas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Anglican notions of ‘the social’ were typically associated with the desire for order and harmony within ecclesiastical (and thence to social) polity, *à la* Hooker, by the early eighteenth century the *means of achieving* this end was increasingly seen to be dependent upon the modernising effects of trade and commerce. And all this, it should be noted, in spite of the fact that contemporary acceptance of these state of affairs was far from straightforward, in an era when the business of conspicuous consumption was still largely scorned, if not altogether shunned; a longstanding consequence of Christian doctrinal and eschatological distrust over the pursuit of earthly wealth-creation:

Within the tradition of Western Christianity the pursuit of wealth through commercial activity and trade has generally occupied a dubious moral position. Whether one looks to the teachings of Jesus and Paul, the writings of the early Church Fathers and medieval doctors, the way of life of the primitive Church and the early monastic orders, of the teachings of the various Protestant reformers ... the acquisition of wealth ... has generally been seen as a great moral evil that would inevitably corrupt the soul and destroy all basis for a genuinely

⁶⁹ See Gregory, ‘Anglicanism and the arts’ in Black & Gregory (eds.) *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800*, p. 85; cf. Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, p. 16.

⁷⁰ Jonathan Barry, ‘Cultural patronage and the Anglican crisis: Bristol c. 1689-1775’, in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, pp. 191-208, this citation at p. 208; emphases added. Barry’s case study is particularly useful in our context, since Bristol was the city of Tucker’s residence for the vast majority of his life.

⁷¹ Pocock, *Barbarism*, I. p. 22; cf., above, p. 65.

Christian life [...] The pious Christian, while living in this world, was always seen as one not totally *of* this world.⁷²

IV. Private Vices, Public Benefits: The Mandevillean Critique.

In order to deepen our understanding of Christian unease over, and yet acceptance of, commercial innovation and proliferation at the dawn of the eighteenth century, we move forward at this stage with Istvan Hont's broader observation that the era's flourishing debate on commerce and luxury constituted what he calls the 'central moral and political issue' of the 'European thought of the period'.⁷³ Entailing what Young elsewhere describes as a 'contest between Christian moral economy' on the one side 'and secular political economy' on the other,⁷⁴ these debates were arguably at their most potent in England/Britain for the important reason that, in order to fund the new Protestant monarch William III's (1650-1702) dynastic and increasingly gruelling wars of attrition against the might of Catholic France, the establishment's dependence upon commerce (and especially the National Debt from 1694 onwards) became deeply intertwined with the religio-political travails we have so far been documenting within this chapter.⁷⁵ In the main, these debates increasingly hinged upon a complex narrative emphasising the putative decline and corruption of England/Britain's liberties, virtues and morals, whether on neo-classical civic humanist grounds, or based upon the ascetic teachings of Christian and especially Augustinian tradition.⁷⁶ Again, the particulars of

⁷² Russell Nieli, 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue: The Mandeville-Law Dispute', *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Autumn 1989), pp. 581-610, at p. 582. This position is evinced above all in such biblical passages as *Matthew*, 6:19-21, 24: 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth ... Ye cannot serve God and Mammon'; and 1 *Timothy* 6:8-10: '... having food and raiment let us be therewith content ... For the love of money is the root of all evil'.

⁷³ Hont, 'The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury' in Mark Goldie & Robert Wokler (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 377-418, at pp. 379, 383. Cf. Christopher Berry, *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation*, (Cambridge, 1994); Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth Century Britain*, (Oxford, 2005), esp. pp. 31-7.

⁷⁴ Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon', p. 386.

⁷⁵ William's strategy of incorporating British forces into his grand alliance – predominantly made up of Protestant states, excepting the elephant in the room that was the Holy Roman Empire – embroiled his new subjects in a series of confessional, dynastic and pan-European wars: first, the War of the Grand Alliance/Nine Years War (1688-97), and second, the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14). For a narrative of these events in the context of European military, political and religious history, and in the context of commercial modernity, see Pocock, *Barbarism*, I, Chap. 4: 'The Hampshire militia and the problems of Modernity', pp. 94-120.

⁷⁶ Pocock, 'Cambridge paradigms and Scotch philosophers' in *Wealth & Virtue*, esp. pp. 235-40, 242; M. M. Goldsmith, 'Liberty, luxury and the pursuit of happiness', in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 225-52; Hont, 'Free Trade and the

these Janus-faced debates are the subject of greater attention in later chapters.⁷⁷ However, what is of most concern to us at this juncture is the fact that many contemporaries throughout England, and indeed across the continent, began to view the emergence of modern forms of commerce as both epochal and/or unwelcome, in the sense that they feared that there ‘might come, and perhaps already had come’, in the words of Slack, ‘self-indulgence ... moral and political corruption, a decline of deference and public spirit, social disorder, idleness, and disease’. Most damning of all to contemporary minds, however, and from whence all other vices flourished, was the persistent and ‘firmly rooted ... case against luxury’:

[A] sinful excess attacked in the official homilies of the Church for centuries and as great a threat to the fabric of the nation as the pollution of the metropolis ... [Luxury] brought with it the corruption and decadence that demolished commonwealths and buttressed absolutism, a Machiavellian theme given fresh prominence by writers in a civic republican vein throughout the century.⁷⁸

Settling in England in the 1690s, it was the Dutch-born physician and one time admirer-turned-critic of Shaftesbury, Mandeville, who swiftly became the most vilified figure within this discourse.⁷⁹ For it was Mandeville who more than any other proceeded to criticise the orthodox establishment via a heady mix of freethinking, alongside satirical and caustic attacks on the new, predominantly—though by no means exclusively—Whig, commercial order.⁸⁰ In doing so, Mandeville’s views jarred with numerous

Economic Limits to National Politics: Neo-Machiavellian Political Economy Reconsidered’, in *Jealousy*, pp. 185-266; Haakonssen *et al.*, ‘Commerce and Enlightenment’, pp. 283, 288.

⁷⁷ See particularly Chapter Five, Section VI.

⁷⁸ Slack, ‘Material progress ...’, pp. 576-7, 582. This is the context for the ‘paper war’ of c. 1698-1702, which Pocock maintains is synonymous with the broader Augustan-era ‘debate over land, trade and credit’, in *Machiavellian Moment*, p. 426. See, e.g., Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun (1655-1716), *A Discourse concerning Militias and Standing Armies* [1698], in *Political Works* [1737], Robertson (ed.), (Cambridge, 1997). For the continental scene, note also the widespread influence and significance of Francois Fénelon (1651-1715), *Les Aventures de Télémaque* [*The Adventures of Telemachus*, 1699], trans. Patrick Riley, (Cambridge Ed., 1994). In utilising these two figures we discern the convergence between the languages of Stoicism and Republicanism during the period, alongside their shared rejection of luxury. Cf. Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, pp. 149-53 & Pocock, ‘Cambridge paradigms and Scotch philosophers’ in *Wealth & Virtue*, p. 237: ‘[The civic humanist’s] morality was neo-Stoic ... His politics ... in principle republican, because the classical republic was the paradigmatic association for independent individuals desiring to affirm their virtue against corruption ...’

⁷⁹ For Mandeville’s attack on Shaftesbury, as well as his influence on and indebtedness to freethinking, see Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 173-5. Cf. Wendy Motooka, *The Age of Reasons: Quixotism, Sentimentalism, and Political Economy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (Routledge, 2013), pp. 95-100.

⁸⁰ For the Pocockean notion of the ‘Whig commercial order’ or the ‘Whig commercial aristocracy’, see esp. his *Virtue*, *passim*. For the suggestion that the new commercial order was not wholly ‘Whiggish’ since it was criticised by some Whigs whilst also garnering degrees of acceptance from across the

contemporary thinkers, including the non-conforming Defoe and William Law (whom we shall return to shortly), and most significantly for our immediate purposes, the Anglican establishment duo, Richard Steele (1672-1729) and Joseph Addison (1672-1719) – all adherents and propagators of the quasi-Stoic language of manners, sociability and politeness. Broadly speaking, these figures (particularly Addison and Steele) had argued that such axioms were hallmarks of free, civilised and above all *Christian* commercial polities; meaning that on this last point they diverged from, whereas on the others they skirted closely towards, the brand of sociability propounded by Shaftesbury.⁸¹ Hence, in Addison and Steele's various tracts and essays on manners, morals and taste (such as those housed within *The Tatler* (1709-11) and *The Spectator* (1711-14)), they attempted to paint an image of a specifically post-Augustinian city, founded upon human benevolence and sociability. Demonstrating that commerce could be utilised as a *vehicle for*, rather than *destroyer of* Christian virtue, their vision was to be achieved, so they argued, via the cultivation of natural theology, friendship and conversation, alongside a reverence for the dignity of human nature. 'How amiable is that affability and benevolence', gushed one issue of *The Spectator* in thoroughly Shaftesburian fashion,

with which [individuals might] treat [their] neighbours ... An agreement and kind correspondence between friends and acquaintances is the greatest pleasure of life ... [by] these and other wholesome methods ... There are many other rules which ... society [might establish] for the preservation of ... ease and tranquillity.⁸²

political divide, see Markku Peltonen, 'Politeness and Whiggism, 1688-1732', *The Historical Journal*, 48, (2005), pp. 391-414. With regard to Mandeville, Hont suggests that as a Dutchman he was a defender of the 'English economic and political regime created by the Glorious Revolution' on account of its 'foreign policy, against a Jacobite counter-revolution', see 'The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury' in Goldie & Wokler (eds.), *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, p. 389.

⁸¹ Phillipson has shown that while these figures shared Shaftesbury's Whiggism, his neo-Stoic appeal to Cicero (albeit 'Ciceronianism for the citizen, not the magistrate') and his faith in the naturally benevolent disposition of humankind, unsurprisingly, they were far from accepting of his deistic neo-Platonism, in 'Politeness and politics', Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, p. 224. Lawrence Klein counters that 'Shaftesbury wrote as a Whig in an environment in which party differences entailed differences in religious perspective', meaning that 'he was implicated in the new responsibility of the Whigs for the defence of the Established Church against its internal enemies ... an endorsement of the current order in church and state'. See his 'Shaftesbury, politeness and the politics of religion', in Phillipson & Skinner (eds.), *Political Discourse in Early-Modern England*, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. pp. 283-301, at p. 293.

⁸² *The Spectator* no. 424. Monday, July 7, 1712. Addison and Steele's participation in the coffeehouse and print culture of the period is an important signifier of Jürgen Habermas's well-known claim that there emerged a 'public sphere' in the eighteenth-century, in his *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* [1962], (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

Yet despite the confidence with which Addison and Steele set forth their (some would call utopian) scheme, again, it was Mandeville, writes Phillipson, who was ‘by far the most deadly critic of this language of manners and politeness’.⁸³ For as we have already seen, Mandeville broached the related subjects of human benevolence and commercial sociability from a diametrically opposed standpoint: i.e., from a Baylean, Hobbesian, neo-Augustinian and Epicurean perspective.⁸⁴

The specifics of Mandeville’s social analyses are complex, multifaceted and at times incredibly subtle; moreover, they have been scrutinised in detail and at length in a number of important studies, thereby rendering any attempt to replicate them here in their entirety redundant.⁸⁵ Yet with regard to our present purposes, the main strength of Mandeville’s position rested on his insistence that the contemporaneously influential maxim of self-preservation—in large part a consequence of the Stoic and Sceptical revivals of the Renaissance period, as Richard Tuck and Peter N. Miller in particular have shown—was in truth little more than a byword for the ineradicable compulsions of self-love (*amour-propre*).⁸⁶ Moreover, when stripped of its idealistic undertones, Mandeville alleged that self-love was merely tantamount to ‘avariciousness’. Comparable above all to Hobbes, then, in his dismissal of the notion that man was the

⁸³ Phillipson, ‘Politeness and politics’, in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, p. 227.

⁸⁴ See Chapter One, esp. Sections III-VI. As Robertson puts it in *Case for Enlightenment*, pp. 144-5, Mandeville ‘let the Augustinian-Epicurean cat out of the bag’, so that its suppression up to that point merely served to ‘magnify’ its ‘explosive force’ once it ‘finally struck’. For Robertson’s broader reading of Mandeville, in which he argues that the Baylean/Hobbesian/Augustinian/Epicurean hybrid greatly influenced Hume’s moral theory (and therefore eighteenth-century Scottish political economy more generally), see Chap. 6: ‘Hume, after Bayle and Mandeville’, pp. 256-324. For the most recent summary of Mandeville’s anti-Stoicism, see Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, pp. 153-9.

⁸⁵ Mandeville scholarship is indeed exhaustive. The best study still appears to be E. J. Hundert’s *The Enlightenment’s ‘Fable’: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*, (Cambridge, 1994); also Hundert’s ‘Sociability and self-love in the theatre of moral sentiments: Mandeville to Adam Smith’ in Collini, *et al.* (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society*, pp. 31-47. Further to this, see Hector Monroe, *The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville*, (Oxford, 1975); Thomas A. Horne, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, (London; Macmillan, 1978); Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, (Cambridge, 1985); Dario Castiglione, ‘Mandeville moralised’, *Annali Della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi*, 17 (1983), pp. 239-290; ‘Considering Things Minutely: Reflections on Mandeville and the Eighteenth-Century Science of Man’, *History of Political Thought* 7 (1986), pp. 463-488; Hont, ‘The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury’ in Goldie & Wokler (eds.), *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, II. ‘Mandeville’, pp. 387-95. Finally, see most recently Mikko Tolonen’s *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society*, (Oxford, 2013), which downplays Mandeville’s neo-Epicureanism/Augustinianism.

⁸⁶ Consult Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, Chap. 1: ‘The figure of Cicero’, pp. 21-87; Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, passim, & esp. p. 7 & Chap. 2: ‘Scepticism, Stoicism and *raison d’état*’, pp. 31-64, esp. p. 51. For the development of Tuck’s ideas, see *The Rights of War and Peace: Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant*, (Oxford, 1999).

zōon politikon, Mandeville instead cunningly sought to dispel the myth that either reason or religion (in any of its forms) was capable of controlling the irresistible ebb-and-flow of humanity's baser passions. Hence, in the most infamous of his works, *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (1714; 1723), Mandeville instead insisted that it was far more realistic and expedient for political authorities to concede that modern commercial societies flourished best via the combined avarice, pride and utility of its inhabitants.⁸⁷ Only in so doing, Mandeville alleged, could the state anticipate being 'flattered in peace, and feared in war'. For 'Moral virtues', he insisted, were nothing more than the 'Political Offspring which Flattery begot upon Pride':

Thus every part was full of vice/ yet the whole mass was a paradise [...] whilst luxury/ employed a million of the poor, and odious pride a million more/ envy itself and vanity, were ministers of industry [...] Thus vice nursed ingenuity/ which joined with time and industry [...] to such a height, the very poor/ lived better than the rich before.⁸⁸

Borrowing elements from seventeenth-century Jansenism and Hobbism, Mandeville's acerbic criticisms of commercial modernity—which (1) placed morality not anteriorly to society but rather as the product of artifice and convention; (2) emphasised the centrality of the passions within this scheme; and (3) argued that humans were innately self-centered, egoistic and selfish creatures—was clearly a dagger to the heart of the 'Addisonian City', and therefore to the commercial idealism of the orthodox establishment itself. Moreover, these views placed the Dutch thinker squarely at odds with Stoic, predominantly Shaftesburian (and later Hutchesonian) conceptions of human nature, which attempted to elevate the virtues of reason, benevolence and sociability above all else.⁸⁹ In light of these differences, alongside the controversies that inevitably arose as a result of them, eighteenth-century criticisms of Mandeville's scheme were incredibly profound, eliciting a wide range of responses from across the theological-philosophical spectrum: including from the Kirk, Hutcheson; from within the Anglican

⁸⁷ See also Mandeville's *The Grumbling Hive, or Knaves Turn'd Honest* (1705) & his contributions to *The Female Tatler* (1709-10).

⁸⁸ Mandeville, *Fable of the Bees*, Kaye (ed.), I, pp. 24-6, 51. J. A. W. Gunn states that Mandeville 'was hostile to the traditional view' of luxury, in *Beyond Liberty and Property: The Process of Self-Recognition in Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, (Canada, 1983), pp. 96-119. Contrast this with Hont & Ignatieff's 'Needs and justice in the *Wealth of Nations* ...', in *Wealth and Virtue*, pp. 1-44, where (at p. 6) they insist upon 'Mandeville's strongly Augustinian insistence on the corrupting influence of luxury'.

⁸⁹ See Klein, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England*, (Cambridge, 1994). Cf. Hundert, 'Sociability and self-love in the theatre of moral sentiments', Collini *et al.* (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society*, p. 43.

Church itself, Bishop Berkeley; later deists from across the English Channel such as Voltaire and Jean-Jacque Rousseau, and probably the two most lauded of the Scottish moralists, Hume and Smith, whose important relationship to Butler and Tucker we shall arrive at in due course.⁹⁰

Two further commentaries, or rather repudiations, of Mandeville are of particular concern to us in the remainder of this and in the following chapter. The first, described by Hundert and Waterman as perhaps the most ‘important’ and ‘powerful’ of Mandeville’s rejoinders, is of course Butler’s *Fifteen Sermons*.⁹¹ Comprised of sermons which for the most part had been preached between 1723-5 (the latest and second version of the *Fable* was published in 1723),⁹² as we shall see, Butler’s work was probably most similar in tone to the Anglicanism of Berkeley, and yet it also anticipated much that can be seen in Hutcheson, Hume, Smith, and of course Tucker himself.⁹³ Yet before turning our thoughts in this direction, we linger very briefly in the final sections of this chapter over a separate Anglican critic of Mandeville, William Law, who published three incredibly influential works opposing Mandeville’s ideas around the same time as Butler: one appearing in the same year as *Fifteen Sermons*, and two on either side. For as we shall see, though Butler and Law approached Mandeville from similar (that is to say overtly Christian) standpoints, the manner in which they conveyed their ideas was very different in tone and execution

⁹⁰ See esp. Chapter Four, pp. 118-124. Wittily, and in a general summation of Mandeville’s contemporary reception, the novelist and satirist Henry Fielding (1707-54) reconfigured the controversialist’s name so that it read ‘Man-devil’. For assessments of these various thinker’s responses to Mandeville’s ideas, see Paul Sakmann, *Bernard de Mandeville und die Bienenfabel-Controverse*, (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 197-212; Mandeville, *Fable*, Kaye (ed.), II, pp. 401-17; Horne, *Social and Political Thought of Mandeville*, pp. 76-95 & Hundert, *Enlightenment’s Fable*, esp. pp. 75-86, 96-115, 117-26, 153-68.

⁹¹ Hundert, *Enlightenment’s Fable*, p. 126; Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 110.

⁹² Hont argues that the first edition of the *Fable* was aimed at Fénelon, in ‘The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury’, *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, pp. 388-9. Brooke adds that the second edition was aimed at Shaftesbury, *Philosophical Pride*, pp. 153, 157.

⁹³ For an overt statement of the similarities between Butler and Berkeley, see Chapter Three, p. 116, n. 135.

V. William Law's Rejoinder.⁹⁴

Chastising Mandeville as an outright hedonist and debauchee, Law's main concern in the first of his three works, *Remarks upon a late Book, intituled, The Fable of the Bees* (1724), was to flatly reject what was essentially Mandeville's central claim: that man was so debased he had forsaken his higher rational and spiritual faculties. Arguing along classically Anglican-Thomist (and indeed Stoic) lines that man was not merely the sum-total of his instincts or passions for the simple reason that he has the rational capacity to 'dispute' them, Law conceded that humans were not perfectly 'refined and elevated' creatures, granted. Nevertheless, in Law's view this did not mean that humans were 'so addicted to an Animal Life' that they showed 'no Signs of an higher Principle within' them.⁹⁵ Interestingly, then, given that he can be read (as Young does) 'as a foremost opponent of Newtonian physico-theology',⁹⁶ Law invoked the recent, and by contemporary standards staggering, accomplishments of Sir Isaac Newton (1643-1727) as proof that there must surely be 'greater things conceived by some Men, than can be ascribed to mere passions'. 'That Reach of Thought, and strong Penetration', he remarked, 'which has carried ... *Newton* through such Regions of Science, must truly be owing to some higher Principle. Or will you [i.e., Mandeville] say, that all his Demonstrations, are only so many blind Sallies or Passions?'⁹⁷

To be sure, Law was acutely aware of the recalcitrant legitimacy of many of Mandeville's claims. Nevertheless, in rebutting the latter's position, his was an attempt to accommodate as best he could the patent reality that uninhibited economic progress might indeed be necessary should the state wish to fulfil its proper function. What this function entailed, precisely, was articulated by Bishop Berkeley over a decade later in *The Querist* (1735-7), when he claimed that it was the aim of every wise State to 'feed the hungry and clothe the naked by promoting an honest industry in its members', and that this was the solemn duty of any decent 'clergyman, who still thinks himself a

⁹⁴ The following summation of Law's position owes greatly to Nieli, 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue'.

⁹⁵ William Law, *Remarks upon a late Book, intituled, The Fable of the Bees* [1724] in *The Works of the Reverend William Law, A.M.*, 9 Vols, II, (London, 1762), p. 31.

⁹⁶ For Young's treatment of Law in the context of his opposition to Newtonianism, see *Religion and Enlightenment*, pp. 122-36, esp. pp. 132, 134; emphasis added.

⁹⁷ Law, *Remarks*, in *Works*, II, pp. 6-7.

member of the commonwealth'.⁹⁸ In Waterman's view, Berkeley's sentiments here are not to be dismissed, for they highlight what he considers to be the three most important characteristics of eighteenth-century economic thought: 'first, that wealth is a *good thing*; secondly, that wealth-creation is *always feasible*; and, thirdly, that measures to increase the wealth of nations are *consistent with, and may actually belong to, the Christian religion*'.⁹⁹ Aided by these useful delineations we can clearly see, then, that though Law was denouncing Mandeville's scheme in unabashed fashion in the *Remarks*, nevertheless, this work was written in a decidedly *pro-commercial* vein – an approach that was to be developed even further in *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection* (1726), and more vigorously still in *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1728).

Beginning the former of these two works with the insistence that it was the task of ordinary Christians to aspire to a life of holiness, devotion and piety in imitation of Jesus Christ, here Law's main strategy was to map the spirit of apostolic and patristic Christianity onto contemporary socio-economic circumstances.¹⁰⁰ As such, Law's main intention in *Christian Perfection* was to assert that all humans of all eras are enjoined by the Gospels to pursue a truly Christian way of life – one that is both pure and sanctified. As the title of the work further suggests, then, Law speculated that the means to achieving this end was to be found in what he called the innate 'perfection' of Christianity itself. In turn, this points to Law's wider attempts to draw attention to the perceived ill effects of deism and freethinking, the existence of which he firmly believed was symptomatic of the fact that the salvific role of Christianity was being undermined from *within* contemporary English commercial life. Since 'Christianity', he therefore wrote, 'is a Calling that puts an End to all other Callings' there is 'only one common Christianity which is to be the common Means of Salvation to all men'.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, because Law believed that this was to be achieved not merely within a cloister but rather via the daily occupations of ordinary life (daily occupations that

⁹⁸ George Berkeley, *The Querist: Containing several queries, proposed to the consideration of the Public* [1735-7], (Glasgow Ed., 1760), p. iv.

⁹⁹ Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 109; emphases added. All of these points need to be borne in mind as we continue to chart Law's ideas, and all the more when we finally turn to Butler and Tucker.

¹⁰⁰ This is asserted in Nieli, 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue', p. 599.

¹⁰¹ Law, *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection* [1726], in *Works*, III, pp. 1, 2, 67; emphasis added.

increasingly revolved around commercial transaction), the Christian way of life, he writes, ‘does not consist in any singular state or condition of life, nor in any particular set of duties, but [rather] in the holy and religious conduct of ourselves in every state of life’, i.e., the type of conduct Law placed at the very centre of all earthy endeavour.¹⁰²

Law’s general scheme of *Christian Perfection* was taken even further into economic territory in *A Serious Call*. Accepting that most occupations of ordinary life are morally permissible if approached with a ‘heavenly temper’, here Law proposed that any ‘serious’ attempt at reconciling the life of ‘worldly business’ with that of ‘holiness, devotion and piety’ meant adhering to the example of the devout individual who dedicated their life to the pursuance of moral perfection. For according to Law, ‘Most of the employments of Life’ were in fact ‘in their own nature lawful’ and ‘may [therefore] be made a substantial part of our duty to God’ if engaged ‘for such *ends*, as are suitable to *beings* that are to live *above* the world’. Hence, Law’s main strategy in *A Serious Call* was thus to demonstrate how it might be possible for the tradesman to go about his daily business without serving Mammon over God.¹⁰³ According to Law, in order to achieve this end, all the tradesman had to do was to hold fast to the impeccable moral standards of his faith, so that he would surely be considered ‘a saint in [God’s] shop ... wise and reasonable and holy’. Conversely, however, if the tradesman chose to labour ‘under other masters’ in pursuit of ‘riches and glory’, he could expect to receive no ‘title to a reward from God’. As far as Law was concerned, then, to ‘sell such things as are *innocent* and *useful* in life’ was, in essence, ‘agreeable to the will of God’; for it was by these means, Law contented, that ‘both himself, and others’ might be reasonably supported. However, if the tradesman ingratiated themselves in commerce from the motive of pure self-interest, and with the intention of retiring ‘from business to *idleness* and *luxury*’, he and his trade would lose ‘all its *innocency*’: a sin that was ‘so far from being an acceptable service to God, that it is only a more plausible course of [i.e., smokescreen for] *covetousness*, *self-love* and *ambition*’.¹⁰⁴ As Law noted in conclusion, then, in an overt appeal to Pauline Soteriology that Mandeville would surely have lambasted: ‘Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we must do all to the glory of God [1 *Corinthians* 10: 31]’. To which he also added that:

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Law, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* [1728], in *Works*, IV, pp. 20, 52.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 54.

This passage sufficiently shews, that all Christians are to live wholly unto God in every state and condition ... as unto the Lord, surely men of other *employments* and *conditions*, must be much obliged to go through their business ... not as pleasing their own minds, not as gratifying their own worldly passions, but as the servants of God in all that they have to do.¹⁰⁵

VI. Concluding Remarks: Christian Virtue or Commercial Society?

Beginning with the ‘orthodox-heterodox’ controversy and ending with the Mandeville-Law dispute, the purpose of this chapter has been to chart some of the major controversies, both historical and historiographical, which plagued and continue to complicate our understanding of the eighteenth century Anglican Church. Having done so, there are a few main points that require highlighting before proceeding. The first of these regards the clear doctrinal and theological ambiguity *within* the Georgian Church, which was in large part a consequence of the nebulous origins of the English Reformation itself, and which continued to pockmark the eighteenth century religio-political landscape. Secondly, then, with the onset of modern forms of commerce at the turn of the eighteenth-century, we have shown how the competing interests and claims of the establishment and dissent were drawn inexorably towards, and ultimately became deeply tangled within, the widening parameters of what Pocock has labelled the early eighteenth-century ‘debate over land, trade and credit’, the ‘rapidly developing style of political economy ... the dominant mode of Augustan political thought’.¹⁰⁶ By these means, it has next been possible to show how in the early-eighteenth-century, classically Anglican/Episcopalian notions of ‘the social’ metamorphised into ‘Whiggish’, neo-Stoic and Shaftesburian defences of commercial modernity – in spite of the fact that Shaftesbury was himself a freethinker, and certainly no Anglican. And lastly, therefore, in the guise of the freethinking Mandeville, we have shown how the broader early-modern confrontation between Stoics, Epicureans and Augustinians continued to thrive in the context of eighteenth-century British society – such that Mandeville’s powerful critique of the burgeoning Whig commercial order undermined establishment attempts to conjoin the neo-Stoic virtues of reason, benevolence and politeness amongst others with the new-fangled fiscal operations of the state.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 58-9.

¹⁰⁶ Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, p. 426. See Pocock’s *Virtue*, passim., for the eighteenth-century development of this ‘transitional’ or ‘transformative’ narrative.

In conclusion we return to William Law's response to Mandeville, in an attempt to highlight the significance of his ideas in relation to Butler and Tucker. By marking the clear boundary-lines of acceptable behaviour for those partaking in commercial activity, Law's central message across the above-cited works was to stress that the temporal pursuit of wealth was only permissible on the grounds that the tradesman was prepared to safeguard his own soul by denying himself the lure of his baser passions. Considered in isolation, this is an incredibly important point, since this was indeed the ostensibly neo-Stoic position that Butler and Tucker would also go on to adopt in their economic ideas – albeit with some major qualifications. The first of these concerns the fact that Law's opposition to Mandeville emerged from a specifically High Church standpoint, meaning that it was not necessarily in harmony with the Low Church, or Whig latitudinarianism, of Butler and Tucker, or indeed a thinker such as Berkeley.¹⁰⁷ On the one hand, then, this underscores the complex religio-political divisions from *within* the Anglican Church, as Young points out, let alone from without. Yet on the other, and perhaps the more significant, by the early eighteenth century Law's nonjuring stance was clearly no longer taken to be that of the establishment, thereby resulting in a profound contrast between Law's economic ideas and Butler-Tucker's, in which the latter clergymen placed far greater emphasis on what Nieli calls 'an ethic of productivity and economic dynamism' (and which Nieli further contends Law singularly failed to do).¹⁰⁸ Unsurprisingly, this divergence between Law and Tucker-Butler was rooted above all in their contrasting conceptions of what they considered to be the 'true' Christian faith, hearkening back in turn to their respective interpretations of the English Reformation. As we shall go on to discuss in Chapter Four, then, many of Law's ideas, couched as they were in Augustinian-rigorous (and arguably Calvinist as opposed to Arminian) terms, would go on to inspire the early Methodists; a point that is once more significant, in that Butler and Tucker's opposition to Whitefieldian and Wesleyan evangelism contributed enormously to the development of their own

¹⁰⁷ Phillipson notes, for example, that Addison and Steele's Whiggish tracts were written primarily as repudiations of High Church criticisms of the Revolution and of the 'new' establishment, in 'Politeness and politics', Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, pp. 224-7. Cf. Goldsmith, 'Liberty, luxury and the pursuit of happiness', in Pagden (ed.), *Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, pp. 240-2.

¹⁰⁸ Nieli 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue', p. 607. In the context of discussion on 'moderate' Christian thinkers such as Berkeley and Hutcheson, Hont equates 'an ethic of productivity and economic dynamism' to the simple 'idea of economic growth without luxury', in 'The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury', *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, pp. 401-3.

idiosyncratic brand of establishment orthodoxy, out of which, it shall be argued, Tucker's political economy finally emerged.¹⁰⁹

A last point of considerable interest with regard to the relevance of Law is the fact that some scholars have considered the *Remarks* to be 'the ablest of all the replies to Mandeville', thereby suggesting, in light of Hundert and Waterman's alternative claim that it was Butler's response that was the more 'important' or 'powerful', that he and Butler were in fact rivals for the accolade.¹¹⁰ It is not in the interests of the present author to pit one against the other by speculating on whether one was the more potent, or indeed the more successful. Rather, the point requiring emphasis in conclusion here is that, whilst it is certainly true that there are palpable similarities between Law and Butler in terms of their shared neo-Stoic appeal to 'higher principles', and in terms of their success in divorcing Christian tradition from what Nieli calls 'ancient and medieval economic prejudices', nevertheless, in the final analysis the differences between the pair are far more notable once one accepts that Law's message was buttressed in an overt type of Augustinian asceticism that Butler, and thereby Tucker, tended to avoid.¹¹¹ Turning to Nieli for a final time, then, whilst Law's appeal to 'Christian perfectionism' clearly pitted the Anglican divine against the more 'realistic' (which is Nieli's synonym for 'secular') social analyses of Mandeville, by doing so, Law essentially played into the latter's hands by appealing to the reverse side of the same neo-Augustinian coin.¹¹²

It is with these various observations, then, that we finally arrive at Butler himself, who,

¹⁰⁹ See esp. Chapter Four, Sections III-VII.

¹¹⁰ This is of course a value judgment, although useful to note in terms of historical posterity. For Hundert and Waterman's claim, see p. 75 above. For the view that Law's was the more important, see Mandeville, *Fable*, Kaye (ed.), II, p. 401. For a more recent reiteration of Kaye's stance, see Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon', pp. 386-7.

¹¹¹ Nieli, 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue', p. 607. For further claims to neo-Stoicism within the context of Law's anti-Mandevillian scheme, see pp. 581, 588, 595, 603-4, 606; also, Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon', pp. 386-7. Finally, Andrew Starkie observes that in the *Remarks* Law was offering a 'positive statement of Christian anthropology that portrayed man as consisting of both a rational soul and a physical body, but whose distinctive human characteristic as *imago dei* was rationality' – a clear reformulation of the neo-Stoic position, even if Starkie does not acknowledge it in these specific terms. See his 'William Law and the *Fable of the Bees*', *Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (2009), pp. 307-19, this citation at p. 310.

¹¹² Nieli 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue', pp. 581, 597, 606. Cf. Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Clergy', pp. 386-7. For discussion of the paradoxical similarities between Mandeville and Law's Augustinian rigorism, see Viner's introduction to his edition of Mandeville, *A Letter to Dion* [1732], (LA, California, 1953).

unlike Law, was far more willing to deal with the potent psychological features of Mandeville's arguments on their own terms. Accordingly, it is to Butler that we now turn our attention.

Part II.

The ‘Butler-Tucker Axis’.

Chapter Three.

Sociability and Self-Love in Joseph Butler's *Fifteen Sermons*.

In a recent discussion by A. M. C. Waterman, in which Adam Smith's *WN* is cleverly reinterpreted as a work of Newtonian natural theology, the economist-cum-intellectual historian identifies the intellectual and theological origins of the Scot's enduring classic, and thereby of classical political economy, in what he calls the late seventeenth and early-eighteenth-century 'quasi-Augustinian' debates we have so far been documenting within this thesis.¹ In the process of doing so, Waterman contends that the intellectual gulf between Mandeville on the one side and the Scottish moralists Hume and Smith on the other was bridged via the socio-commercial analyses of our two main protagonists, Butler and Tucker – both of whom were not 'deceived', as Law may have been, by Mandeville's claim that 'Private Vices' and 'Public Benefits' created an inevitable 'conflict between wealth-creation and Christian morality'.² For on the one hand it was Butler's 'shrewd mind' in *Fifteen Sermons*, Waterman writes, that initially rebuffed Mandeville's position as an 'improper construal of *self-love* as "vice"', thereby making it 'possible for Hume so to generalise Mandeville as to produce the "theory of spontaneous order" now seen as the characteristic contribution of the Scottish Enlightenment to social theory'. Whereas on the other, it was Tucker who went on to 'view the unintended but beneficent economic outcomes of "interested" action in a purely Butlerian way, as examples of divine Providence and as congruent with that Newtonian, natural theology which characterized the Scottish and English Enlightenments'.³

Whilst in light of these impressive claims it is incredibly tempting to jump headlong into a textual analysis of *Fifteen Sermons* in anticipation of Tucker's later economic

¹ Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, Chap. 6: 'Wealth of Nations as Theology', pp. 88-106 & Chap. 7: 'The Sudden Separation of Political Economy', pp. 107-26. See esp. pp. 104-5, 109-10 & 211. To reiterate, Waterman draws particular attention to the important role of 'Anglican social thinking' within this scheme. Cf. Chapter Two, Section II above.

² *Ibid.*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 110, 112. In this, Waterman is deferring to F. A. Hayek's 'Competition as a Discovery Procedure', in *New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas*, (London: Routledge, 1978), at p. 264, & Ronald Hamowy, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Theory of Spontaneous Order*, (Carbondale, IL, 1987).

ideas, it may prove beneficial to exercise some restraint at this juncture. For in order to comprehend the full range, subtleties and intricacies of Butler's thought, first it is contended that we must account for *where* it is his ideas came from. Accordingly, in an effort to remain consistent with the 'orthodox establishment-heterodox radical' model set down in the forgoing chapter, we will instead approach *Fifteen Sermons* via a detailed examination of Butler's dissenting background; a strategy that is justified on the grounds that Butler's enigmatic, if not simply unhappy, upbringing played a definitive role in augmenting his meta-ethical, philosophical and commercial ideas. By proceeding in this fashion it is to be hoped, then, that we will deepen our understanding of the complex relationship between establishment and dissent in Augustan England – and, moreover, of the ways and means in which this impinged upon Tucker's economic ideas in the chapters to come.

I. Introduction: Butler's Early Life and the Tewkesbury-Leiden Connection.

Joseph Butler was born to a Presbyterian father in Wantage, Hertfordshire, on 18 May 1692. Since he did not wish to become anything but a minister during his youth, we can safely presume that his education was always intended as preparation for a career in the Presbyterian, rather than the Anglican, Church.⁴ Accordingly, Butler was sent to Samuel Jones's (c. 1681-1719) dissenting academy in Gloucester at about the age of nineteen, which then moved to Tewkesbury shortly after his arrival.⁵ Born in Pennsylvania and educated in Wales and then at Shrewsbury Academy, the Presbyterian Jones had gone on to pursue his higher education at the University of Leiden in the United Provinces in 1706.⁶ Upon his return in 1712, his wide scholarship

⁴ For biographical and introductory materials to Butler, see Thomas Bartlett, *Memoirs of the life, character and writings of Joseph Butler*, (London, 1839); Terence Penelhum, *Butler*, (London, 1985); Christopher Cunliffe (ed.), *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought: Tercentenary Essays*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992) & Cunliffe's *ODNB* article. The interpretation of Butler exhibited throughout this study is particularly indebted to the recent Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, (2011).

⁵ Jones was forced to move from Gloucester to Tewkesbury in September 1712 when an ecclesiastical correction court accused him of teaching 'seditious and antimornarchical principles ... very prejudicial to the present Establishment in Church and State'. Furthermore, on 20 October 1714 a high church mob attacked Jones's house. See David L. Wykes's *ODNB* article: 'Gloucester RO, GDR B4/1/1056: articles presented against Samuel Jones of the Parish of St John the Baptist, Gloucester, 1712'; also cited in Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 30.

⁶ One example of the many 'ambitious youth of all countries' who went there to study, particularly during the seventeenth-century – according to Oestreich & Koenigsberger (eds.), *Neostoicism and the Early-Modern State*, p. 66.

garnered a correspondingly high reputation: so much so, in fact, that it went on to provide an incredibly influential Protestant education for a number of notable eighteenth-century English dissenters, such as Samuel Chandler (1693-1766), Jeremiah Jones (c. 1693-1724), Isaac Maddox (1697-1759), Andrew Gifford (1700-84), and Daniel Scott (1694-1759) amongst others. Not insignificantly, alongside Maddox, who was made Bishop of St. Asaph in 1738, Butler's closest friend at Tewkesbury, Thomas Secker (1693-1768), would also go on to become a prominent Anglican convert: he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1758.

According to Secker, Samuel Jones was quite the disciplinarian. Students rose every day at five and were expected always 'to speak Latin except ... amongst the family'. In exchange, Jones's library was well stocked, 'composed for the most part of foreign books ... very well chosen'.⁷ Crucially, Jones's curriculum and lecture materials were based upon his student notes from Leiden, and included the study of Heereboord's logic, mathematics, geography and the Bible.⁸ Consequently, Butler was the recipient of some of the most advanced Reformed education not only in England but also in the wider European Protestant world. We will go on to note, for example, that Butler's dissenting schooling was very much at odds with that of Tucker's at establishment Oxford, and so by far the more eclectic, meaning that he was exposed to ideas and concepts from a far wider variety of backgrounds and theological traditions.⁹ Again, this is attributable to Jones's days spent in Leiden, that notoriously eclectic institution, which, from its inception in 1575, had tended to emphasise the importance of classical humanism and the liberal arts in tandem with affairs of religion and the state.¹⁰ As the first Prince of Orange William I (1533-84) had put it at the university's opening, Leiden was to 'be a firm support and sustenance of freedom and good legal administration of the country, not only in matters of religion, but also with regard to the general welfare of the people; a 'good, adequate and celebrated school or

⁷ Cited in Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 31, 32.

⁸ Taken from Wykes's *ODNB* article: 'Samuel Jones' in a letter from Secker to Isaac Watts, 18 November 1711, in J. S. Macauley & R. W. Greaves (ed.), *The Autobiography of Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury*, (Kansas, 1988), pp. 3-4.

⁹ Eventually Butler also ended up at Oxford, much to his chagrin – for more on this see within this chapter, pp. 95-7. For Tucker's early life at Oxford, see also Chapter Four, Section I. As Rivers notes, eclecticism was 'characteristic of much eighteenth-century moral philosophy teaching' throughout the continent, in *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 192.

¹⁰ Willem Otterspeer, 'The University of Leiden: An Eclectic Institution', *Early Science and Medicine*, 6/4 (2001), pp. 324-33.

university'; and a place where young people could come to be educated and trained 'in both the right knowledge of God and all sorts of good, honourable and liberal arts and sciences, serving the legal administration of the countries'.¹¹

Merely four years after the founding of Leiden University, the father of early-modern neo-Stoicism, Justus Lipsius, was appointed professor of history there; a position he held for a period of eleven years during the university's initial growth and expansion. In the immediate context, this is particularly notable because of Lipsius's influence on Grotius and Pufendorf, the famous Dutch natural law jurists and pioneers of modern forms of commercial sociability. During the seventeenth century, Grotius and Pufendorf had also held distinguished positions at Leiden; the former entering the university when he was just eleven years old, and whose father was an early follower of Lipsius himself; and the latter spending many years there ruminating on the work of his intellectual predecessors, most notably Grotius and Hobbes, following his escape from captivity under Charles X of Sweden (1622-60) in the late 1650s.¹² As is now well known, then, it was Pufendorf who adjoined Hobbes's intellectual method with Grotius's modernised form of Roman (and particularly Ciceronian) jurisprudence, so as to arrive at an explanatory model detailing the reasons why, and how, individuals in the state of nature eventually opted to enter into society.¹³

Recent work by a number of distinguished scholars has convincingly shown the extent to which the Grotian and Pufendorfian (as well as Lockean and also somewhat antithetically the Hobbesian) natural law and social contractarian traditions contributed to the makeup of eighteenth-century British, and particularly 'north-British', intellectual thought.¹⁴ More recently still, however, a relatively small though important

¹¹ Cited in *ibid.*, pp. 324-5. For recent emphasis on the modernising, if not even secularising, themes present within Leiden, see Mark Somos, *Secularisation and the Leiden Circle*, (Leiden: Boston, 2011).

¹² Lipsius had the greater influence on Grotius since the former was still alive, though an old man, when the latter was young. See Oestreich & Koenigsberger (eds.), *Neostoicism*, pp. 36-7, & Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, Chap. 5.

¹³ See esp. Samuel von Pufendorf, *De jure naturae et gentium* [*Of the Law of Nature and Nations*, 1672], Jean Barbeyrac (ed.), (Amsterdam, 1734); *De officio hominis et civis juxta legem naturalem libri duo* [*On The Duty of Man and Citizen According to the Natural Law*], (London Ed., 1673).

¹⁴ Pocock, 'Cambridge paradigms and Scotch philosophers', in *Wealth and Virtue*, pp. 235-52, esp. 245-52; & in the same publication, Winch, 'Adam Smith's 'enduring particular result'', pp. 235-52. Elsewhere, see Tuck, *Natural Right Theories*; 'Modern Theory of Natural Law' in Pagden (ed.), *Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, pp. 99-119; *Philosophy and Government*; *The Rights of War and Peace*; Hont, 'The Language of Sociability and Commerce: Samuel Pufendorf and

body of complementary scholarship has remarked upon the important Stoic thread within Grotius and Pufendorf's thought, which, it is commonly argued, had been imparted to them by Lipsius.¹⁵ The particulars of these findings are beyond the scope of the present study to adequately summarise. Yet for our present purposes the main point that needs reiterating is that Grotius and Pufendorf embraced the Stoic conception of providence, which they then incorporated into their various influential political treatises.¹⁶ As was suggested in Chapter One, then, it is highly likely that on this head, both Butler and Tucker were following if not wholly than at least in part in the footsteps of the Dutch natural law jurists; and we can now see that it was the Tewkesbury-Leiden connection which proved the initial inlet by which their ideas came into Butler's mind.¹⁷

Yet it is not only Grotius and Pufendorf's influence that we have here to contend with. For though still steeped in the neo-Stoic culture both figures had helped to foster during their time at Leiden, the tenure of Butler's teacher, Jones, came a little after

the Theoretical Foundations of the "Four-Stages" Theory', in *Jealousy*, pp. 159-84; Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, passim., though esp. pp. 26-31, 35-46.

¹⁵ Cf. Chapter One, Section V of the present study, esp. p. 43. The most important resource in terms of the neo-Stoic interpretation of Grotius and Pufendorf is Blom & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, esp. the following within its pages: Blom & Winkel, 'Introduction', pp. 3-20; Brandt, 'Self-consciousness and self-care: on the tradition of oikeiosis in the modern age', pp. 73-91; Brooke, 'Stoicism and anti-Stoicism in the seventeenth century', pp. 93-115; Jon Miller, 'Innate ideas in Stoicism and Grotius', pp. 157-76; Cairns, 'Stoicism, slavery, and law', pp. 197-232; Palladini, 'Pufendorf and Stoicism', pp. 245-55 (which downplays the prevalence of Stoicism in Pufendorf); Saastamoinen, 'Pufendorf and the Stoic model of natural law', p. 257-69; Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', pp. 271-317, esp. pp. 279-83. See also Oestreich, *Neo-Stoicism*, esp. Chap. 2; Stewart, 'The Stoic legacy in the early Scottish enlightenment, in Osler (ed.), *Atoms, Pneuma and Tranquillity*, pp. 272-96; Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 4, 42; Ford, 'Preaching Propriety to Princes'; Waszink, 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 39, No. 2, (1996), pp. 151-68; Miller, 'Stoics, Grotius, and Spinoza and Moral Deliberation', in *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, pp. 116-39; Tuck, *Rights of War and Peace*, pp. 37, 39, 101; Hont, *Jealousy*, pp. 166, 175; Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, esp. 'Grotius, Stoicism and Oikeosis', pp. 37-58; Blom 'Sociability and Hugo Grotius', *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 41, No. 5, pp. 589-604, esp. pp. 590-1, 600, 602, 603.

¹⁶ However, T. J. Hochstrasser, *Natural Law Theories*, p. 45, counters that 'though the prospect is enticing, there is no evidence to warrant the claims of Oestreich and Krieger that 'the larger explicit role which Natural Law was to play in the unifying scheme in Pufendorf's later juristic works may be considered a probable effect of the Dutch period'. Although it is right', he continues, 'to associate neo-Stoicism with Lipsius' enduring intellectual legacy to Leiden, yet in none of his numerous autobiographical allusions does Pufendorf refer to this period of his intellectual life as formative'. For the claims of Oestreich and Krieger, see Oestreich, 'Justus Lipsius als Theoretiker des neuzeitlichen Machtstaates', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 181 (1956), p. 69; L. Krieger, *The Politics of Discretion: Pufendorf and the Acceptance of Natural Law* (Chicago, 1965), p. 68.

¹⁷ See again Chapter One, Section V above. Tucker could not have been any more explicit about Grotius's importance than when he placed him alongside Aristotle and Cicero for the ancients and Hooker for the moderns as one of the 'most eminent writers, that perhaps ever lived', in his *Treatise*, p. 400.

their time; meaning that he studied instead under the likes of Jacobus Gronovius (1645-1716), Jacobus Perizonius (1651-1715) and Hermanus Witsius (1636-1708) – scholars who were highly distinguished in their own right. Jones’s Tewkesbury lectures indicate that the syllabi of Gronovius, Perizonius and Witsius typically accentuated divinity, biblical exegesis and Scriptural history.¹⁸ Significantly, then, Witsius in particular was a follower, or perhaps even a successor, of Johannes Cocceius (1603-69), a German-Dutch theologian of the Reformed Church who had also resided in Leiden during the mid-seventeenth century.¹⁹ Siding, as Grotius had done, with the Arminian contingent in the post-Quinquarticular Controversy, Cocceius had been notorious for his opposition to militant predestinarianism, and especially the Calvinism of his great rival Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676). Yet despite their doctrinal differences, Cocceius begrudgingly admired Voetius, and incorporating traces of the latter’s neo-Stoic, humanist scholasticism into his own system of theology, he contributed to a branch of Reformed theology which later became known as covenant

¹⁸ See Samuel Jones, ‘Notes on Grotius: De jure belli et pacis’, Bristol Baptist College, G 95 A; ‘Annotations on Godwin’s Hebrew antiquities by the Rev Mr Jones of Tewkesbury’, Bristol Baptist College, G 95 b; ‘Andrew Gifford Remains: A collection of historicall sentences & practices, 1693 ...’, (2 Vols, vol I, 17th-18th Century), Bristol Baptist College, OS G95 A; ‘Domini Jones Logica Sive ars Ratiocinandi De methodo mathematica: The second book of Euclid’s elements: nota in strauchii breviarium chronologicum: scheme of disciplines digested into aphorisms by Dr Benion’, Bristol Baptist College, Ze1; ‘Gronovii nota quadam in Sophoclem: nota in Sophoclis Ajacem’, Bristol Baptist College, Ze2; ‘Notae in Godwini Mosen & Aaronem, Bristol Baptist College, Ze3-4; ‘Nota in Grotium de jure belli et pacis’, Lib. II & Lib III, Bristol Baptist College, Ze5-6; ‘De geographia praecognosconda; critica sacra praecognoscenda’, Bristol Baptist College, Ze7.

“NOTAE quaedam Criticae in [ad. versum 488] opera et studio V. C. S[amuelis] J[ones] in usum Academiae, Theocicuriensis”, [Tewkesbury, co. Gloucester], BL, Add MS 23919; “ANNOTATA V. C. S[amuelis] Jones, Academiae Theo-cicuriensis [Tewkesbury, co. Gloucester] Praesidis, in [Thomae] Godwini Mosen et Aharonem, Anno MDCCXII.”, BL, Add MSS 23915-23916; “PROLEGOMENON ad Observationes Criticas in Vetus Testamentum opera et studio V. C. S. Samuelis Jones, in usum Academiae Theocicuriensis [Tewkesbury, co. Gloucester] incept. anno MDCCXI.”, BL, Add MSS 23917-23918; “NOTAE in [Thomae] Godwini Mosen et Aaronem,” by Samuel Jones, BL, Add MSS 31211-31212; ‘NOTAE in [Thomae] Godwini Mosen et Aaronem [London, 1614, etc.], by Samuel Jones, schoolmaster at Tewkesbury’, BL, Add MSS 33774-33776.

“Annotationes in Godwini Mosen & Aaronem.” Autore Sam: Jones. 1719’, Congregational Library, I.g.1-6; ‘Samuelis Jonesii, Academiae inter Fratres Dissidentes Archididascali, in Godwini Mosen & Aaronem, Annotationes; in Duos Tomos divisae’, Dr Williams Library, 24.3, 4; ‘Prolegomena Critica sive Apparatus ad S. Scripturae Lectionem. In Usus Juventutis Academicae’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L228; ‘Untitled’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L38; ‘Untitled’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L54/4/55-56; ‘Untitled’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L54/4/57-60. ‘Logica, sive ars ratiocinandi, errores Burgersdicii, et Heereboordii investigans, patefaciens, & emendans. Autore S. Jones’, Leeds University Library, Special Collections, MS 174; ‘Notae in Dionysium’, University of Birmingham, Special Collections, MS 399; ‘Elementa Mathematica’ lectures by Samuel Jones, University of Birmingham, Special Collections, MS 400; ‘Praellectiones S. Jones in Godwini’, University of Birmingham, Special Collections, MS 401.

¹⁹ Charles Sherwood, *The Covenant Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, (Yale, 1956).

theology (or confederative or federal theology).²⁰ According to this doctrine, the unfolding of biblical history was seen as a series of covenants (i.e., compacts or agreements) between God and humankind; firstly under the Covenant of Grace and secondly under the Covenant of Works. However, in *De oeconomia foederum Dei cum hominibus libri quattuor* [*The Economy of the Covenants Between God and Man*] (1677), Witsius had introduced the idea of a possible third Covenant of Redemption, in reference to God's salvation of those who were deemed to be members of the Godhead.

In the context of current study, it is regrettably beyond the bounds of this study to draw out and explain in full the significance of these points. However, it is worth pausing for a brief moment to consider that within the reformed tradition, covenant theology is often perceived to be in direct opposition to dispensational theology, an alternative doctrine which interprets scriptural history on the basis of a putative series of dispensations (i.e., exemptions or privileges) that God has bestowed upon humankind. In *Seventeen Sermons on some of the Most Important Points on Natural and Revealed Religion* (1776) [henceforth *Seventeen Sermons*], Tucker exhibits an intriguing and eclectic mix of both systems, which the present author has strong reason to believe was both appended to and supportive of his economic thought. The implication of this, then, is that there runs a reformed (albeit Arminian rather than Calvinistic) trajectory from Cocceius and Witsius to Jones, and thereafter a dissenting trajectory from Butler to Tucker, that extant scholarship has barely considered, let alone accounted for. Again, it is highly regrettable that it will not be possible to pursue this intriguing line of enquiry in its entirety at this present juncture. Nevertheless, the reader would do well to remain mindful of these points throughout the duration of this thesis, in anticipation of future Tucker scholarship – a point we shall briefly return to in our concluding remarks to the study as a whole.²¹

²⁰ Voetius's neo-Stoicism was not of the same ilk as Lipsius's. Whereas Lipsius attempted to fuse and harmonise classical Stoicism with Christianity, Voetius drew upon Stoical maxims without necessarily adhering to or agreeing with them. At times, his tactic was thus to evoke Stoicism as a means to emphasise the superiority of Christian Aristotelianism and, hence, reformed Scholasticism. For discussion, see J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza*, (Brill, Leiden, 2010), p. 201; Herman Selderhuis (ed.), *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, (Brill, Leiden, 2013), pp. 38, 43 & Blund, *A Short Biography of Gisbertus Voetius*, (Sep. 2011). Accessed via: <http://witsius.wordpress.com/2011/09/17/a-short-biography-of-gisbertus-voetius-1589-1676/>.

²¹ See Conclusion, Section IV, pp. 235-6.

II. The Butler-Clarke Exchange: Permeable Lines Between Establishment and Dissent.

Whilst fully immersing himself in Jones's 'Dutch-style' teaching, Butler was also an avid reader of various contemporary English works, such as Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), Shaftesbury's ethics, and most significantly for our immediate purposes, Samuel Clarke's Boyle lectures.²² Butler's reading of Clarke is not especially striking, given that he was a towering figure in the early eighteenth-century intellectual landscape. A close friend – or, in the words of Leslie Stephen, a 'theological lieutenant' – of Newton, Clarke was considered to be Britain's leading metaphysician at the time, and was probably the most outstanding figure in British philosophy in the generation between Locke and Berkeley.²³ What certainly is remarkable, then, is that when Butler approached Clarke merely four months before the end of his tenure at Tewkesbury, the venerated figure felt moved enough to respond to a young dissenter whom he did not know personally. Clearly, this speaks volumes of Butler's latent philosophical acuity; and, indeed, the exchange was to prove extremely fruitful to Butler, for it was through their dialogue that Clarke was to sponsor his first official appointment of the Rolls Chapel lectureship at Chancery Lane in 1719, thereby resulting in the publication of the first edition of *Fifteen Sermons* in 1726.

Again, Clarke was clearly impressed by the precocious twenty-one-year old, for the first five letters and replies between them, dating from 4 November 1713 to 8 April 1714 (i.e., the 'Tewkesbury correspondence'), he had published in 1716.²⁴ Moreover, these letters would also appear alongside the published correspondence between him

²² Which, upon publication in two volumes, were entitled *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God: more particularly in answer to Mr. Hobbs, Spinoza and their Followers ...* (London, 1705), & *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation*, (London, 1706). Re: Locke and Shaftesbury, Brooke argues that Shaftesbury fused 'concepts derived from Stoic theory ... into a substantially Lockean epistemological and psychological framework ... an attractive argumentative strategy' for early eighteenth-century students like Butler, in *Philosophical Pride*, p. 119.

²³ Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, (London, 1876), I, pp. 119-31.

²⁴ As an addendum to the fourth edition of Clarke's *Being and Attributes of God*. The correspondence was entitled *Several Letters to the Reverend Dr. Clarke, from a Gentleman in Gloucestershire Relating to the First Volume of the Foregoing Sermons; ... with the Dr's Answers ...*, (London, 1716). Secker posted Butler's Tewkesbury letters to Clarke personally.

and Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716) in 1717.²⁵ In light of this, we will treat the Butler-Clarke exchange as an enlightening demonstration not only of the permeable lines between Establishment and Dissent in Augustan England, but also of the intellectual camaraderie that clearly existed between the two groups in a broader continental context (i.e., via Jones's Leiden heritage and Clarke's links with Leibniz).²⁶ This is highly significant, in that it results in a muddying of the fault-lines hitherto drawn between religious orthodoxy and heterodoxy during the early eighteenth-century, despite the wealth of evidence stating otherwise.²⁷ An especially pertinent example of this 'porousness' is the subtly inferred Arianism of Clarke's own *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity* (1712), the publication of which meant that the Boyle Lecturer was seldom free from accusations of heterodoxy himself. As a result, under the relatively toothless Blasphemy Act of 1698, the Lower House of Convocation demanded that Clark desist from writing on all such matters relating to Trinitarian doctrine in future. Clark duly obliged.²⁸

According to orthodox critics of Clarke, such as the High Church leaning Daniel Waterland (1683-1740), Clarke's primary offence was of course to deny – however surreptitiously – the legitimacy of Nicene and Athanasian Trinitarianism; the ancient foundational doctrines upon which Establishment ecclesiology were based.²⁹ As earlier discussed, this was an extremely sensitive issue in early eighteenth-century

²⁵ Clarke, *A Selection of Papers, which passed between the late Learned Mr Leibniz, and Dr. Clarke, In the Years 1715 and 1716*, (London, 1717). For useful discussion of this exchange, see Nicholls, *God and Government*, pp. 180-4. For Leibniz's criticism of the neo-Stoic and natural law theories of Pufendorf, see Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 46-9.

²⁶ It has been shown in Bartlett, *Memoirs of Butler*, p. 2, that the Presbyterian Butler family rented their house from the dean of Windsor, thus exemplifying the civility between Establishment and Dissent in Williamite and early-Augustan England. In some respects, this camaraderie ought to be viewed as an extension of the channels opened between English and continental Reformation by William Tyndale (1494-1536), and later by the Marian Exiles, during the sixteenth-century. For this suggestion, see Kelley, 'Elizabethan political thought', Pocock, *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, pp. 56-7 & n. 28.

²⁷ The definitive statement of the fault-lines existing between establishment and dissent in modern scholarship remains Haakonssen (ed.), *Enlightenment and Religion*. William Gibson's counter-claim in *Unity and Accord*, p. 1, however, is that establishment prelates and dissenters were not necessarily at loggerheads: that they 'lived in peace with one another [and] in many ways ... did not see themselves as separate and discrete'. This would seem to support Bartlett's position from the footnote immediately above.

²⁸ Anon., *A Full Account of the Late Proceedings in Convocation Relating to Dr. Clarke's Writings about the Trinity*, (London, 1714). See also, J. P. Ferguson, *An Eighteenth Century-Heretic: Dr. Samuel Clarke*, (Kington, 1976), & L. Stewart, 'Samuel Clarke, Newtonianism, and the Factions of Post-Revolutionary England', *JHI* 42 (1981), pp. 53-72.

²⁹ See Chapter Two, Sections I-II.

Britain, a time when the catastrophic seventeenth-century breakdown in royal sovereignty remained a persistent blot on the establishment landscape and memory.³⁰ Although the 1689 Toleration Act had finally conceded the dissenting right to ‘privacy in silence’,³¹ nevertheless, this still precluded non-conformists from receiving the full privileges of their establishment analogues, including the right to most positions of public office, as well as admission into the ancient universities (thus in part accounting for the rise of dissenting academies such as Jones’s during the period).³² In light of this, Clarke’s brand of latitudinarianism skirted dangerously close towards subverting the authority of the civil magistrate, and this was clearly far from welcome at a time when a vast array of heterodox thinkers had recently found themselves propelled to a level of unprecedented prominence. As Bob Tennant remarks, then, the ‘irony of a young Dissenter finding his way into the Church of England through dialogue with a priest officially suspected of heresy should not be far from our mind’.³³ Indeed, it may even be the case that Clarke welcomed and published the overtures of Butler as a means of displaying his commitment to religious orthodoxy, and of setting the record straight, as it were.³⁴

Whatever Clarke’s predicament, Butler’s decision to move away from Dissent and into Establishment Culture was by no means a foregone conclusion, nor one to be taken lightly. With this in mind, we must speculate that Butler was in fact experiencing some sort of ‘crisis of faith’ in deciding to write to Clarke in the first place, and that this may even have been the ‘Occasion’ he was hastily referring to, but did not explicitly

³⁰ Cf. Pocock, ‘Within the margins: the definitions of orthodoxy’, in Lund (ed.), *Margins of Orthodoxy*, pp. 38, 39: ‘[Eighteenth-century orthodox thinkers] lived with the memory of the civil wars as the nightmare from which it was struggling to awake, or if you prefer, to go to sleep again. Its dullest complacency was a blanket spread over that memory [...] there is hardly anything in the long eighteenth century which is not moved by the memory of these disasters and the knowledge that they could occur again’.

³¹ Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, p. 270.

³² Work on the intellectual rise and diffusion of the Dissenting Academies is in its relative infancy, and is the subject of ‘The Dissenting Academies Project’ headed by Rivers, David Wykes, Haakonssen & Whatmore, see <http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/academies.html>.

³³ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 23.

³⁴ *Ibid.* Clarke was hardly a solitary figure when it came to holding secretly heterodox views. Newton himself was one such further example, as was Locke, and Newton’s heir at Cambridge, William Whiston (1667-1752), who was expelled from the Lucian Chair in 1710 on charges of Arianism. For Clarke’s influence on later rational dissent, see Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, pp. 267-8, 330; Haakonssen (ed.), *Enlightenment and Religion*, pp. 26-7.

outline, in his unusually informal and candid opening letter.³⁵ By deciding on Clarke, Butler's choice of 'spiritual guide' came in the guise of a thinker whose intellectual exploits followed in a long line of natural theologian defenders of the faith, stretching back to the likes of Thomas Sprat (1635-1713), Richard Bentley (1662-1742) and William Derham (1657-1735) – names which are all indicative of the Newtonian, and thereby allegedly 'conservative' because 'established', roots of English Enlightenment.³⁶ By and large, these thinkers were committed to replacing the Thomist and Aristotelian scholastic theology of the pre-Reformation period with modern forms of scientific empiricism.³⁷ Moreover, they tended to base their arguments for the existence and nature of God on analogy and the design argument.³⁸ Yet what made Clarke distinctive amongst these various logicians, and which Butler clearly admired and was to assimilate into his own thinking, was his unusual attempts to introduce *a priori* metaphysics into his various accounts of the divine nature and the makeup of the created universe.³⁹

³⁵ This is the view of Tennant's *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 22-3. For Butler's first letter see Clarke, *Several Letters*, p. 3, Anon. to Clarke, 4 November 1713, where he begins the exchange with the following: 'I suppose you will wonder at the present trouble from one who is to you a perfect Stranger, tho' you are not so to him; but I hope the Occasion will excuse my Boldness'.

³⁶ For Newton's perceived influence on English Enlightenment, see Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* [1932], (Princeton Ed., 2009); Hélène Metzger, *Attraction universelle et religion naturelle chez quelques commentateurs anglais de Newton*, (Paris, Hermann & Cie, 1938); Berlin (ed.), *The Age of the Enlightenment*, (New York, 1956); M. C. Jacob, *Newtonians and the English Revolution*; J. R. Jacob, *Robert Boyle and the English Revolution*, (New York, 1978); Jacob & Jacob, 'The Anglican Origins of Modern Science: The Metaphysical Foundations of the Whig Constitution', *Isis*, 71 (2), June 1980, pp. 251-67; John Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the Age of Enlightenment: Science, Religion and Politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution*, (Cambridge, 1990); Young, 'Metaphysics before Physics: The Cambridge Critique Of Newtonian Religious Apologetic' in *Religion and Enlightenment*, pp. 83-119.

³⁷ Sprat maintained that the 'universal Disposition of the Age' was 'bent upon *rational religion*', and that to undermine the principle was to undermine the very strength of the established Church itself, in his *History of the Royal Society, for the Improving of Natural Knowledge*, (London, 1667), pp. 370-1, 374. For Sprat's links to John Wilkins and the early latitudinarians, see Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, pp. 39-40. Appealing to the Baconian method, Derham similarly concluded that '*the Works of the Lord are great*' – a sure sign that He had bestowed 'Curiosity', 'exquisite Workmanship' and 'Skill upon his Creatures ... the more expressly to proclaim their great *Creator*', in *Physico-Theology: Or, a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of GOD, from His Works of Creation*, (London, 1713), pp. 426-7.

³⁸ See R. E. Schofield, 'An evolutionary taxonomy of eighteenth-century Newtonianisms', *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 7 (1978), pp. 175-92, esp. pp. 177-8; Gascoigne, *Cambridge Age of Enlightenment*, esp. pp. 4, 278, 280-82; *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Philosophy*, pp. 53-4, 644, & within the same publication see esp. Stewart, 'Arguments for the Existence of God: The British Debate', pp. 710-30.

³⁹ Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, pp. 271, 277-86, 293, where Miller provides an account of the Ciceronian, Stoic natural law principles lying behind Clarke's thought, and moreover of his antagonism towards Hobbes's ideas. See also Young, 'Metaphysics before Physics' in *Religion and Enlightenment*, esp. pp. 84-5, 98, 100-3, 106-12, 115, 117.

The minutiae of the Butler-Clarke exchange are beyond the scope of the present work to explore, and in any case have been painstakingly summarised elsewhere.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, within the letters we can clearly see that though Butler is *satisfied* with Clarke's intellectual *objectives*, his primary aim is in fact merely to reach an *intellectual acceptance* of Clarke's claims. Hence in the first letter, Butler beseeches Clarke to explain himself beyond the publication of his Boyle lectures, which thus far 'have failed me', he writes, so that 'I almost despair'.⁴¹ He then cautiously puts to Clarke two points concerning the issue of necessity and self-existence and the unity of the divine nature, and these two themes play out over the duration of the Tewkesbury correspondence.⁴²

For example, when Butler states that ubiquity is not necessarily a quality of existence, or that 'there is a great difference between the order in which *things* exist, and the order in which I *prove* to my self that they *exist*',⁴³ Clarke responds that necessity need must 'operate ... everywhere and at all times alike', since

*Determination of a particular Quantity, or particular Time or Place of Existence of any thing, cannot arise but from somewhat external to the thing itself ... [i.e.,] the Will of an Intelligent and Free Agent.*⁴⁴

Likewise, when Butler asks in his previous letter whether necessity is causal, or if, contrarily, '*Affections which belong, and in the order of our Thoughts are antecedently necessary, to the Existence of all Things*', Clarke asserts that he 'apprehends' space 'to be a *Property* of the Self-existent Substance [i.e., God]'.⁴⁵ Thus, with each argument that Butler perceptively levels at Clarke (and by necessity we have only very lightly touched upon them here), the latter utilises Newtonian physics, i.e., the Newtonian conception of space as substance, as an explanatory tool to convince the former that *a priori* concepts such as self-existence and the existence of God are both demonstrable

⁴⁰ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 19-37. See also Aaron Garrett, 'Reasoning about Morals from Butler to Hume', in Ruth Savage (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*, (Oxford, 2012), pp. 169-86, at pp. 173-6.

⁴¹ Clarke, *Several Letters*, [Butler's first letter] Anon. to Clarke, 4 November 1713, p. 4.

⁴² Butler's caution becomes characteristic of his mature philosophy in that it augments his philosophical moderatism. Although far more bellicose than Butler in expressing his views, Tucker was also a moderate. For the difference in their linguistic styles, see Chapter Four, pp. 143-4.

⁴³ Clarke, *Several Letters*, [Butler's third letter] Anon. to Clarke, 5 December 1713, p. 18.

⁴⁴ Ibid., [Clarke's third reply] Clarke to [Butler], 10 December 1713, p. 20.

⁴⁵ Ibid., [Butler's second letter] Anon. to Clarke, 23 November 1713, p. 14; [Clarke's second reply] Clarke to [Butler], London, 28 November 1713, p. 17.

and accessible.⁴⁶ Although to the modern reader this no longer remains a plausible strategy, in Clarke and Butler's day empiricism and contingency were often 'excitingly' mapped onto the rational and *a priori* in such fashion.⁴⁷ Consequently, contrary to existing interpretations of the Butler-Clarke exchange, which claim that Butler was largely critical of Clarke's position,⁴⁸ it is far likelier that he was in fact genuinely satisfied, if not even comforted, by Clarke's responses. This appears to have been confirmed by Butler himself in a letter written three years later:

[Tho'] I did not see ye forces of your Argument for ye Unity of ye Divine Nature when I had done writing to you upon the Subject, yet by frequently considering what you have offered upon it, I am now fully satisfied that it is conclusive.⁴⁹

Upon leaving Tewkesbury in February 1714, Butler moved to London and likely introduced himself personally to Clarke, thereby solidifying their friendship. In one letter dated April 1714 (the only survivor of their 'London correspondence'), Butler even disclosed his recent decision to reject the Presbyterian Ministry, stating that 'there is [e]very encouragement (whether one regards interest or usefulness) now a days, for any to enter that profession [i.e., the Anglican ministry]; who has not got a way of commanding his assent to received opinions without Examination'.⁵⁰ Accordingly, Butler conformed to the Church of England in March 1715 under Bishop William Talbot (1658-1730), the father of his second patron besides Clarke, Edward Talbot (1693-1720); and he was then admitted at Oriel College on 17 March, eventually matriculating on 15 December 1715 under the label of 'commoner'.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Clarke is here reiterating some of the main points of his *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of Christian Revelation*, (London, 1706).

⁴⁷ For an account of Butler's so-called 'antiquated' approach to meta-ethics based upon present-day standards, see Ralph Wedgwood, 'Butler on Self-Interest, Virtue, and Human Nature', in Paul Bloomfield (ed.), *Moral and Self-Interest*, (Oxford, 2008), pp. 177-204.

⁴⁸ E.g., Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, p. 84.

⁴⁹ [Butler's ninth letter], J Butler to S Clarke, Oriel College, 10 October 1717, BL Add. Mss. 12101 (13).

⁵⁰ [Butler's sixth letter] BL Add. Mss. 12, 101 (13), J Butler to S Clarke, Hamlin's Coffee House (London), Tuesday morning [approx. 11 or 18 April 1714].

⁵¹ C. L. Shadwell, *Registrum Oriense: An Account of the Members of Oriel College, Oxford*, 2 Vols., (Oxford, 1902), II, *The Commensales, Commoners and Natellers admitted during the years 1701-1900*, p. 43. The Talbots advanced the Anglican careers of Butler, Martin Benson (1689-1752) and Secker, and it was this prospect of patronage that convinced Secker to abandon medicine and conform to the ministry in c. 1720-1. See Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 42, 49-50.

Despite Butler's clear conscience with regard to his own conversion to the established Church, the final set of published letters between him and Clarke (i.e., the 'Oxford correspondence') are highly indicative of the student's unhappiness at Oriel. Indeed, the fact that they were hastily written over a period of only eleven days, from 30 September to 11 October 1717, suggests that Butler had once again fallen foul of some sort of internal, be it intellectual or spiritual, conflict. In one exasperated letter dated 30 September 1717, for example, Butler wrote of his obligation to 'mis-spend so much time here in attending frivolous lectures and unintelligible disputations, that I am quite tired out with such a disagreeable way of trifling'.⁵² So desperate was he to escape, then, that at one point he even considered quitting Oxford for Cambridge to study law, under growing pressure from his father. This idea was swiftly rejected, however, on account of Butler's determination to pursue his meta-ethical and theological interests. Consequently, his only source of solace during this difficult period – aside, of course, from Clarke's letters – came in the guise of his close friend, Secker, who made frequent visitations sandwiched between supposedly intense bouts of correspondence, which are now lost. They 'talked [their] own Talk without controul', wrote Secker's biographer Bielby Porteus (1731-1809), on Trinitarian doctrine, the 'Inspiration of the Scripture' and the Thirty-Nine Articles.⁵³ It is highly likely, then, that it was during this period Butler convinced Secker to conform.⁵⁴

Tennant writes that Butler's typical 'response to a crisis' was to use theology and philosophy as a means to 'prepare [himself] for spiritual and career decisions – a practice that he was to make central to his account of the conscience'.⁵⁵ Viewed from this perspective, in Butler's troubled Oxford letters we witness the fledgling metaphysician's earliest attempts to lay down much of the groundwork for his mature philosophy and beyond. In the first letter in particular, Butler extends his views on the

⁵² [Butler's seventh letter] Butler to Clarke, 30 September [1717].

⁵³ Bielby Porteus, *A Review of the Life and Character of the Right Rev. Dr. Thomas Secker*, (Fifth Ed., London, 1797), p. 6; based on Sheffield City Archives, Bagshawe C. 330, f. 4: Secker to Elizabeth Secker Milnes, 26 July 1716.

⁵⁴ Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 32-3, 35-6. The influence of Clarke, via Butler, on Secker's thinking during this period was acknowledged by Secker himself. See *Autobiography of Thomas Secker*, p. 4: 'I studied various Theological subjects with various Fluctuations & changes of Mind: particularly the Doctrine of the Trinity, in which for some time I agreed very much with Dr. Clarke; the Inspiration of the Scripture, on which I inclined to the Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Holland; & Subscription to the 39 Articles, concerning which I afterwards had a long Correspondence with Mr. Butler ... who went to Oriel College ...'

⁵⁵ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 32.

issue of free will and virtue, subjects that were to become central to his wider thought. Here he makes three particularly important points that we need to consider before finally turning to *Fifteen Sermons* itself [editorial insertions provided for clarity]:

(1) ... That *Freedom and Action are Identical ideas*, and that Man is [therefore], properly speaking, an *Agent* or a *Free Being* ...; (2) [that] I do not see that it [necessarily] follows from thence that it is in our power *to act virtuously*; because the *physical* and *moral* nature of an action [come] under quite two different considerations ...; (3) [that] Virtue does not consist *barely in acting*, but [...] evidently supposes a *disposition in our nature to be influenced by those motives*, which [...] like the rest of our affections, seems to proceed from our *original frame and constitution*.⁵⁶

In this excerpt, Butler is clearly providing a nascent account of his theory of conscience, albeit rather clumsily since he has not yet fully mastered the philosophical implications of his own thought. However, unlike in the earlier and far cagier Tewkesbury correspondence, by this stage Butler finally appears confident enough to ascribe a moral function to human nature which he believes is part of what he calls the ‘original frame and constitution’ of humankind itself.⁵⁷ Crucially, this means that Butler is beginning to propose, in axiomatic terms, that to act immorally is in fact to act contrarily to nature (as in the Stoic philosophy), and therefore contrarily to God. Put another way, here Butler is speculating that the individual’s sense of ‘cognitive unease’ at the first sign of their falling short of acceptable moral behaviour is in fact their ‘conscience’ speaking to them. As we shall imminently see, this is a fundamentally important principle within Butlerian philosophy which carries through all the way to Tucker, in that it comprises the core of his definition of human nature itself: i.e., that to follow the course of nature, again in the Stoic sense, is to be a ‘conscious’ or ‘conscientious’ being. A further implication of this, therefore, is that in Butler’s view, freewill is an important, indeed an *inherent*, component of human moral agency.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ [Butler’s seventh letter] Butler to Clarke, 30 September [1717].

⁵⁷ *Prima naturae*, as Grotius had earlier remarked in the context of discussion over self-preservation and the acquisition of the necessities of life, in his *De jure belli ac pacis* [*On The Rights of War and Peace*], (Paris, 1625), ‘Prolegomena’.

⁵⁸ This is very much in the Arminian, Grotian, Cocciean, and Witsian vein, and chimes with Miller’s Stoic emphasis on ‘choice’ in his ‘Hercules at the Crossroads’, Mouchel & Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, Republique des Arts*, pp. 167-92.

The importance of Butler's early 'oscillation' between Establishment and Dissent cannot be taken for granted. For indeed, there are a number of crucial points within the Butler-Clarke dialogue which hint at some of the most important Butlerian concepts that would resurface in Tucker's later intellectual and economic thought: the acknowledgement of the importance of metaphysics without over-emphasising its influence; the recognition of the limitations of pure empiricism; the epistemic fusion of *a priori* and *a posteriori* knowledge in a pre-Kantian context; the about-turn regarding the usefulness and/or credibility of analogical argumentation (evinced above all in Butler's deployment of analogical argument in *The Analogy of Religion*);⁵⁹ the philosophical 'self-restraint' which leads Butler and Tucker towards moderation as a maxim in itself; and finally, that which has been described by Tennant as the avoidance of philosophical 'reification as a means to schematic neatness, even at the cost of conceptual fuzziness'.⁶⁰

III. 'Conscience' and 'Reflection' in *Fifteen Sermons*.

Having charted the genesis of Butler's philosophy in the context of his early life, we now finally find ourselves suitably placed to turn to his engagement with the so-called 'populariser' of Hobbes, Mandeville.⁶¹ As already noted, *Fifteen Sermons* has often been interpreted as a profound critique of Hobbesian and Mandevillian self-interest, and in immediate justification of this, Butler refers explicitly to Hobbes himself 'and this whole set of writers' in the affixed preface to the second edition of the work.⁶²

⁵⁹ See Chapter Four, esp. Sections II-III.

⁶⁰ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 15, 26, 49, this citation at p. 26. On the final two points, we might also suggest that these demonstrate Butler's 'Cocceian' rejection of the overly formal and inflexible Voetian brand of Reformed Scholasticism. For the background to this claim, see Charles S. McCoy, 'Johannes Cocceius: Federal Theologian', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 16/04 (Dec. 1963), pp. 352-70, esp. pp. 365-6. In final conclusion, note P. N. Miller's explanation of Clarke's scheme, which, 'drawing together reason, liberty, community and natural moral law, provided the basis for a series of philosophical tracts written over the next three quarters of a century ...' (and not least *Fifteen Sermons* itself), in his *Defining the Common Good*, p. 284.

⁶¹ James Dean Young, 'Mandeville: A Popularizer of Hobbes', *Modern Language Notes*, 74/1, (Jan., 1959), pp. 10-13.

⁶² *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. viii-ix. Tennant claims that in this passage there are 'references, explicit or implicit, to Clarke, Hobbes, Shaftesbury, Locke, Wollaston, Fénelon, (and possibly Guyon), Bossuet, the Epicureans, Rochefoucauld [...], Cicero and the Stoics', in *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 50-1. Brooke adds that 'Mandeville's name was an absent presence on any such list', *Philosophical Pride*, p. 165. Why Butler does not mention Mandeville here is rather puzzling, given Mandeville's contemporary reputation. It is possible, however, that he was simply attempting to avoid turning *Fifteen Sermons* into a polemical piece, or that he felt that Mandeville was such a Hobbiist that a refutation of Hobbes himself was sufficient enough.

With this in mind, we may suggest that Butler's initial aim in *Fifteen Sermons* is in fact three-fold: first, to refute Hobbesian *realpolitik*; second, to undermine the assumption that human conduct is universally selfish; and third, to challenge popular cynicism of the type that Mandeville so recently and devastatingly employed.

Beyond the flagrant philosophical potency of the first and second of these points, Butler is perhaps most concerned with the implications of the third: i.e., that popular cynicism offers a tangible excuse for vice that he claims is false and corruptive. According to Butler, then, in order to accept that human conduct is universally selfish—that is to say that self-interest holds way over *all* human affections—one is forced to admit that humanity is enslaved, in the neo-Epicurean and Augustinian sense, by its baser passions. Yet as we have already seen in the Butler-Clarke exchange, Butler does not feel able to accept this premise, and instead insists that self-love is in fact *beneficial*, since it 'manifestly prevent[s] numberless Follies and Vices'.⁶³ Furthermore, in Butler's view human selfishness cannot even be described as innately vicious, nor strictly speaking 'immoral', since no 'Passion God hath endued us with', he writes, 'can be in itself Evil'.⁶⁴ Contrariwise, since Butler believes that 'Self-love and Benevolence, Virtue and Interest are not to be opposed', i.e., should not be put in opposition with one another, he writes that 'Every thing is what it is, and not another Thing' – Butler's main point essentially being that existence is *unitary* rather than *dialectical*:

The Goodness or Badness of Actions does not arise from hence, that the Epithet, interested or disinterested, may be applied to them; [...] but from their *being what they are*; *Namely, what becomes* [i.e., what is appropriate to] *such Creatures as we are*, what the state of the Case requires, or the contrary.⁶⁵

Whilst Butler maintains, then, that 'Benevolence is the great Law of the whole moral Creation', he nevertheless also acknowledges that theorists should 'take Humane Nature as it is' and not what it might be, meaning that they should avoid speculative inquiries, 'these being Questions which we have not, that I know of, any thing at all to

⁶³ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. xxxi-xxxii.

⁶⁴ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 139; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 140.

⁶⁵ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xxix; emphases added. Cf. Pufendorf's similar claim that property and society arise naturally in process of time 'according as the Temper and Condition of Men, the Nature of things themselves, and the difference of place required', in *Of the Law of Nature and Nations*, IV. IV. XIII.

do with'.⁶⁶ In its place, Butler thinks that an alternative query therefore ought to be posed:

*Why or for what End such a Passion [i.e., self-interest] was given us [by God]: And this chiefly, in order to shew, what are the [human] Abuses of it.*⁶⁷

By proposing an inquest such as this, Butler believes that persons will be far better placed to understand why it is that they oscillate between virtue and vice – an incredibly significant point, since Butler is convinced that it is only when individuals abuse, or ‘frequently indulge a Passion in such Ways and Degrees’, that it becomes ‘quite another thing from what it was originally in our Nature’ [omissions not carried over from 1726 struck out, 1729 additions italicised]:⁶⁸

Every one of our ~~Faculties~~ *Passions and Affections* hath its *natural* Stint and Bound, *which may be easily exceeded; whereas our Enjoyments can possibly be but in a determinate Measure or Degree. Therefore such Excess of the Affection, since it cannot procure any Enjoyment, must in all Cases be useless ... This holds as much with regard to Self-love as to all other Affections.*⁶⁹

Judging by the excerpt immediately above, we can clearly see that for Butler the underlying conditions for virtue – and specifically Christian virtue – reside not so much in human *behaviour*, but rather in human *psychology*. As a result, Butler suspects that human behaviour is in truth a by-product of human action (or motive), rather than it being the other way round, and this revelation prompts him to explore the legitimacy of ascribing ‘goodness’ or ‘badness’ to actions via what he considers to be the *limited theoretical bounds* of merely (a) ‘interest’ or (b) ‘disinterest’. Hence, when Butler points out that ‘we may judge and determine that an Action is morally Good or Evil, *before* we so much as consider, whether it be interested or disinterested’, here he is stating quite unequivocally that humans are far more complex and, in a word,

⁶⁶ By ‘speculative inquiries’ Butler means pure – or *Cartesian* – metaphysics.

⁶⁷ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 137-9; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 137-9.

⁶⁸ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 139-40; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 140.

⁶⁹ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 210; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 212; Butler’s vast editing of the 1729 edition demonstrates the continual development of his ideas.

rational (again, in the Stoic sense) than the ‘interested-disinterested’ hypothesis would appear to suggest.⁷⁰

We earlier explored Butler’s nascent theory of conscience in his correspondence with Clarke. In *Fifteen Sermons*, however, Butler uses another term in tandem with conscience, i.e., ‘Reflection’, and frequently interchanges between the two (henceforth, then, we will do likewise). According to Butler, the principle of reflection holds ‘natural Authority’ over the others that also comprise human nature, such as the passions and the appetites.⁷¹ Thus, although the clergyman readily admits that reflection may be usurped by other affections, nevertheless, in his view it can never be *legitimately* overruled. The reason for this is because Butler thinks that reflection is in fact an inherently *rational* and *moral* faculty within human cognisance: a part of humanity’s ‘original frame and constitution’ as he earlier put it to Clarke.⁷² Because of this, Butler suggests that once assisted by the use of reason, reflection or conscience mediates between the individual’s private and public persona, and correspondingly, between their propensity towards virtue or vice. ‘[T]here is a superior principle of Reflection or conscience in every Man’, he therefore writes, ‘which distinguisheth between the internal Principles of his Heart, as well as his external Actions; Which passes Judgement upon himself and them’.⁷³ Nevertheless, in Butler’s view, reason is never sufficient for human action in and of itself:

Reason alone, whatever any one may wish, is not in Reality a sufficient Motive of Virtue in such a Creature as Man; but this Reason joined with those Affections which God has impress’d upon his Heart: And when these are allowed Scope to exercise themselves, but *under strict Government and Direction of Reason*, then it will act suitably to our Nature, and to the Circumstances God has placed us in.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xxix; emphasis added. Hence the following rhetorical question which Butler adds in 1729, at p. 219: ‘Is Benevolence less the Temper of Tranquillity and Freedom than Ambition and Covetousness?’

⁷¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xvi.

⁷² [Butler’s seventh letter] Butler to Clarke, 30 September [1717]. Cf. pp. 97, 98 above.

⁷³ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 35-6; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 35-6.

⁷⁴ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 86; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 88; emphasis added. For more on the role of reason and moral judgment in Butler’s thought, see Michael S. Pritchard, ‘Conscience and Reason in Butler’s Ethics’, *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy*, 9/3, (Fall, 1978), pp. 39-49 & Sahar Akhtar, ‘Restoring Joseph Butler’s Conscience’, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 14 (4), (2006) pp. 581-600.

Since Butler admits, then, that human nature is comprised not only of the principle of reflection, but also of the passions and appetites (other categories might include compassion, resentment, anger, benevolence, self-love and so on), he is convinced that it is in the act of *balancing* or *harmonising* each of them that we achieve a state of good psychological health.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, attaining such balance is far from straightforward, and in Butler's view can only be achieved via acceptance of the fact that reflection is, in the words of Jonathan Lavery, 'the *key* internal relation [...] the *executive principle* of the soul'.⁷⁶ This is incredibly important since, according to Butler, reflection is the one principle in human nature that enables us to discover the (humanly knowable) conditions for moral duty:

[The] very Constitution of our Nature requires, that we bring our whole Conduct before this superior Faculty [i.e., conscience/reflection]; wait its Determination; enforce upon ourselves its Authority, and make it the Business of our Lives, as it is absolutely the whole Business of a Moral Agent, to conform ourselves to it. This is the true Meaning of that ancient Precept, *Reverence thy Self*.⁷⁷

Accordingly, in Butler's view, acts of vice, which Mandeville had argued was the correlate of human nature, only occur when the individual's conscious is not performing its proper function: either because (a) the individual reflects insufficiently (i.e., not often enough, or not properly), or because (b) the individual's faculty of reflection has become corrupt (i.e., sophistical, pathological and/or irrational). In order to counter this, *Fifteen Sermons* exhorts the reader to be mindful of the fundamental difference between 'proper' and 'counterfeit' reflection. In Butler's view, failure to do so is dangerous, because a defective conscience inhibits the individual's innate capacity for virtue:

⁷⁵ As we shall see, the emphasis on psychological health becomes characteristic of Butler's philosophy, and is in part symptomatic of his attempts to deal with his privately troubled mind. For example, in later years Butler discusses the issue of individual and collective insanity with Tucker in the gardens of Bristol Cathedral. For more on this and the issue of Butler's fragile psychological state, see this chapter, n. 103 & Chapter Four, pp. 128-29.

⁷⁶ Jonathan Lavery, 'Reflection and Exhortation in Butler's Sermons: Practical Deliberation, Psychological Health and the Philosophical Sermon', *The European Legacy*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (2005), pp. 329-48, at p. 335. Cf. Wendell O' Brian, 'Butler and the Authority of Conscience', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 8/1, (Jan., 1991), pp. 43-57; emphases added. Regarding Butler's 'hierarchical' system, Rivers claims that after the 'ruling principle' of conscience, self-love is superior to benevolence, in *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 224. However, other scholars such as Lavery and Tennant argue that they are in fact equal, and this is the position that the present author concurs with.

⁷⁷ *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. xvi-xvii. Butler is likely referring to the Pythagorean maxim in the final sentence of this excerpt.

Truth, and real good Sense, and thorough Integrity carry along with them a peculiar Consciousness of their own Genuineness. There is a Feeling belonging to them, which does not accompany their Counterfeits, Error, Folly, Half-Honesty, partial and slight Regards to Virtue and Right, so far only as they are consistent with that Course of Gratification which Men happen to be set upon.⁷⁸

As a consequence, Butler's forceful rebuttal of the psychological egoism associated with Hobbes and Mandeville was vested above all in his belief that uninhibited selfishness (or pure self-interest) was, in the final analysis, a fallacious hypothesis; a theory distinct from and alien to true self-love: a 'Difference in *Nature* and in *Kind*', as he put it at one point. Contrarily, for Butler 'Reasonable' and 'cool' self-love was not tantamount to 'Selfishness'. Rather, self-love was a naturally and providentially endowed principle in humankind, one amongst many others that, though 'superior' to the passions, was nonetheless subordinated to the *primary principle of reflection*.⁷⁹ Considered in this light, Butler believed that egoistic selfishness—again, the unprincipled gratification of the individual's appetites as in the Epicurean philosophy—was a *perversion of nature*, beyond the bounds of proper human reflection. In large part, then, this was Butler's reasoning behind the individual's sense of 'cognitive unease' (as we earlier put it) at the very moment that they acted contrarily to nature, i.e., in a purely selfish manner. In modern terms we describe this as a sort of mental illness, 'to which', as Butler put it, 'some Men are liable, in the same Way as others are to *Epilepsie*, or any sudden particular Disorder'.⁸⁰ This being the case, for Butler, egoistic selfishness could never be described as a natural phenomenon, but rather as a perversion, a self-deception – a *sickness*.

IV. The Pastoral Function of *Fifteen Sermons*.

Having described Butler's philosophical aim in *Fifteen Sermons*, we need to pause momentarily to consider the arrangement, or rather the unifying thread, of the publication, and therefore its primary function. This is important because it augments the theological potency of Butler's argumentation, whilst at the same time beginning

⁷⁸ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 193; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 194. Cf. Lavery, 'Reflection and Exhortation in Butler's Sermons', pp. 336-7.

⁷⁹ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 39; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 39. According to Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 58-9, for Butler the terms 'coolness', 'cool', or 'cool self-interest' do not denote a sort of cold, detached or mechanical rationality, but rather 'warmth' (a term which might be overstating the case), 'moderation', if not even notions of 'comfort'.

⁸⁰ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 148; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 148.

to bridge the gap between his theo-philosophical thought and Tucker's political economy. Turning to the synoptic preface of the second edition, here Butler states that the reader should not 'look for any particular Reason for the Choice of the greatest part of these Discourses' since they are 'in great Measure accidental'.⁸¹ This, however, is slightly misleading. Obviously Butler has not plotted the work as a series of interconnected developments from start to finish. Yet we can clearly see that there is a uniformity of thought and design behind Butler's choice and arrangement of the sermons, indicative in turn of the fact that the clergyman made careful editorial decisions regarding which sermons to include for publication, and where to place them in the sequence.⁸² In light of these observations, we must speculate that – in the preface at least, but undoubtedly more generally – Butler is deliberately attempting to pass off the philosophical complexities of the *Fifteen Sermons*, in order instead to emphasise their role as an extension of his pastoral function.⁸³

This is by no means a moot point. The Rolls Chapel was a place of worship for 'masters, clerks and registrars of the Court of Chancery', and a 'chapel for the legal profession as well as a record repository'.⁸⁴ Therefore, although its services were open to the public, its core congregation was comprised of barristers and other such personnel from London's legal community⁸⁵ – individuals Butler undoubtedly believed could have a tangible and positive influence on society.⁸⁶ With this in mind, *Fifteen Sermons* appears be part of a wider project designed by Butler to direct the congregation and/or reader towards the path of *spiritual health* and *Christian virtue* (which are coterminous), especially via recognition of their own moral – and so by

⁸¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xxxiv.

⁸² E.g., by grouping Sermons I-III 'Upon Human Nature' at the beginning of the work, even though in all likelihood they would have been preached separately.

⁸³ According to Rivers, this is a hallmark of seventeenth-century latitudinarianism, whose adherents emphasised the 'importance of the oral medium of sermons by which their ideas were diffused'. Moreover, from the Restoration onwards Rivers states that sermons in London began to be delivered in a 'new, plainer, more simple' style, as Butler's work appears to be. *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, pp. 43, 49. For the developing 'didactic function' of preaching during the seventeenth-century, see also Mary Morrissey, 'Scripture, Style and Persuasion in Seventeenth-Century English Theories of Preaching', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 53, No. 4, (October 2002), pp. 686-706.

⁸⁴ Ben Weinreb, Christopher Hibbert *et al.* (eds.), *The London Encyclopaedia*, (Third Ed., London: Macmillan, 2008), p. 653; Cunliffe, *ODNB* article on Butler.

⁸⁵ William Stow, *Remarks on London*, (London, 1722), pp. 121-2. Garrett also makes this point, noting that Butler received his BCL in Oxford in 1721, meaning that he was trained in law as well as theology. See his 'Reasoning about Morals from Butler to Hume', in Savage (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*, p. 178.

⁸⁶ Again, this chimes with Rivers' remark that seventeenth-century latitudinarians preached to 'learned, wealthy, and politically important audiences', *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, I, p. 50.

extension rational and reflective – agency. As Lavery puts it, then, the sermons are expressly aimed at ‘every thoughtful Anglican who seeks a deeper understanding of the life their faith admonishes them to lead’, and Butler’s ‘authorial posture’ within this scheme is therefore that of a ‘guide and a teacher in this search’.⁸⁷

Here we must assert that the Rolls Chapel audience were far from learned specialists, but rather a relatively newly educated – we might also cautiously say ‘gentrified’ – class of thoughtful parishioners.⁸⁸ Consequently, Butler’s professional duty to them was to adopt a pastoral role that centred on persuasion rather than coercion – an approach that became increasingly synonymous with the eighteenth-century established Church, as we have seen.⁸⁹ Seen in this context, Butler’s sermons appear to be part-theoretical and part-exegetical: the former concerned with Butler’s explanations of human nature as outlined in our previous section (i.e., human motives, conduct, behaviour, etc.), and the latter concerned with Butler’s personal reading of Scripture, and how he believes this impinges upon ethical life within modern commercial society.⁹⁰ Naturally, these two elements coincide so as to form a powerful critique of Hobbesian and Mandevillian self-interest. Yet above all, Butler utilises both tools as a means of emphasising the defining Christian principles of ‘Benevolence’, ‘Neighbourly Love’ and ‘Love of God’, which he believes is particularly important in light of commercial modernity’s increasingly complex,

⁸⁷ Lavery, ‘Reflection and Exhortation in Butler’s Sermons’, p. 333. Rivers has discussed how freethinkers tended to deploy a two-fold method of ‘irony, equivocation and esotericism’ on the one side (i.e., truths which can only be told to the philosophic) and exotericism on the other (i.e., contenting the vulgar with ‘traditional lies’), so as to half-shield and half-proclaim their heterodox views – the act of hiding in plain sight, as it were; see *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II. pp. 31-50. The present author speculates that Butler is here attempting to negate that distinction; to draw esoteric, exoteric, philosophic and vulgar together, so as to place them under an open, transparent and above all *Christian* framework, whilst simultaneously challenging the freethinker’s methods and aims.

⁸⁸ However, Garrett notes that the Rolls congregation were comprised of ‘the most philosophical lawyers in England’ dealing not in common law but in equity. Interestingly, this meant that their ‘standard of judgment’ in legal matters ‘invoked, historically... conscience’, whether that be in terms of the conscience of the ‘decent person’, or the ‘King’s conscience’, both of which were seen as compasses by which to guide the judge’s verdicts. See ‘Reasoning about Morals from Butler to Hume’, Savage (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*, pp. 178-80.

⁸⁹ See Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, ‘Introduction’, p. 16; cf. Chapter Two, p. 60. As Wilkins put it in the preface to a later edition of the seventeenth-century latitudinarian ‘handbook’, *Ecclesiastes* [1645], (London, 1675): ‘*The great End of Preaching, being either to inform or perswade; This may be most effectually done by such rational ways of Explication and Confirmation, as are most fit and proper to satisfie mens judgements and consciences*’.

⁹⁰ E.g., in Sermon X. Butler cites the story of Nathan and David (II Samuel xii, 7) in order to emphasise the importance of theoretical detachment (i.e., ‘coolness’) for genuine reflection, while in Sermon XI, he appeals to the ‘golden rule’ of Romans xiii, 9, further developing this theme in Sermon XII, and so on.

ephemeral and yet irrevocable nature; of its status as a new and unforeseen ‘historical force’, as Pocock has often described it.⁹¹

It is by these means, then, that Butler couples (a) his meta-ethics and pastoral duty to the laity with (b) existing structures in Church and State – most notably, by expatiating on the Christian way of life:

[Unreasonable] Behaviour of Men towards each other ... prevents their applying to themselves those *Reproofs* and *Instructions*, which they meet with either in *Scripture* or *religious Discourses*, though exactly suitable to the State of their own Mind, and the Course of their Behaviour. [...] Whoever will consider the whole *Commerce of Humane Life*, will see that a great Part, perhaps the greatest Part, of the Intercourse between Mankind, *cannot be fixed to determinate Rules*.⁹²

[...] Therefore the Scripture, not being a Book of Theory and Speculation, but a plain *Rule of Life* for Mankind, has with the utmost possible Propriety put the principle of Virtue upon the Love of our Neighbour; which is that Part of the Universe, that Part of Mankind, that Part of our Country, which comes under our immediate Notice, Acquaintance, and Influence, and with which we have to do.⁹³

Nevertheless, although Butler appears here to be concurring with (or perhaps even acting as a spokesperson for) the prevailing Whiggish ideology of sociability and politeness, his reference to the impossibility of fixing human conduct to ‘determinate Rules’ moves the clergyman beyond Shaftesbury’s aristocratic notion of virtue, conceived as *inherent* balance and harmony, and instead towards a psychoanalytical explanation of the human condition which recognises that individuals *seek* balance and harmony via their conscience.⁹⁴ In large part, this is the wellspring of Butler’s antagonism towards that which he calls the ‘material deficiency’ in Shaftesbury’s broader definition of virtue: Butler’s argument essentially being that Shaftesbury fails to take ‘into Consideration [that] Authority, which is implied in the Idea of Reflex

⁹¹ E.g., Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, esp. Chap. 14 & pp. 467, 497, 499, 503, 512, 543; *Virtue*, pp. 48, 105, 133, 274 & *Barbarism and Religion*, 5 Vols., passim., esp. I., pp. 102-3.

⁹² *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 188-9, 190; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 188-9, 190; emphases added.

⁹³ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 229-30; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 235-6; emphasis added. Here, the appeal to the Stoic conception of *oikeiosis*, and of it being placed on equal parity with the authority of Scripture, is striking.

⁹⁴ Tennant also calls this ‘a democratic ethics’ in *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 73. The present author acknowledges the plausibility of this view, but remains hesitant to go so far as to describe Butler as a democrat, or democratic. For Shaftesbury’s Stoic espousal of *aristocratic republicanism* on the other hand, see J. B. Schneewind, *The Invention of Autonomy*, (Cambridge, 1998), p. 295 & Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, pp. 119-20, 163, 202. Cf. Miller, ‘Hercules at the Crossroads ...’.

Approbation or Disapprobation' – or in other words, inward reflection.⁹⁵ Hence although, as we know, like Butler Shaftesbury also attempted to challenge the Hobbesian/Epicurean-Augustinian selfish hypothesis along Stoic lines, nevertheless, for Butler the elevation of conscience, unlike Shaftesbury, constituted the very seedbed of virtue – a God-given faculty of the mind. As Rivers points out, then, it is this side of the clergyman that was at pains to 'redefine' contemporary terminology so as 'to give religious meaning to words that [had] been corrupted through misapplication to a temporal and material level'. In this sense, Rivers argues further, Butler was clearly following 'in the path of the seventeenth-century latitudinarian divines, particularly Wilkins, who devoted much energy to arguing that the religious life is profitable, advantageous, and in man's best interest'.⁹⁶

We shall return to Butler's conceptual and theological opposition to Shaftesbury, and freethinking more generally, in an examination of *The Analogy of Religion* (1736) in the follow chapter. Nevertheless, here we may briefly note that within *The Analogy*, where Butler states that natural religion may be the 'Foundation and principal Part of Christianity', but that it is not 'in any Sense the whole of it', Butler's main point is to stress that the apparent disparity between revealed religion and natural man is simply not to be resolved in this life.⁹⁷ Moreover, since Butler thinks that religious scepticism breeds immoderation, and likewise, since he believes that individuals who adhere to this way of thinking lack the self-discipline (i.e., the reason and/or reflective will) to temper their own belief system, *Fifteen Sermons* emerges as an extremely potent endorsement of the orthodox practice of the Anglican faith, in the very literal sense that Butler considers the ritualistic, legal, liturgical and ceremonial customs of the Thirty-Nine Articles and *Prayer Book* to be a 'buttress of good mental health'.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. xvii. Elsewhere, Butler has this to say of Shaftesbury's perceived inconsistency: 'What a wonderful Incongruity it is for a Man to see the Doubtfulness in which things are involved, & yet be impatient out of Action or vehement in it. Say a Man is a Sceptick, & add, what was said of *Brutus quicquid vult valde vult* [whatever Brutus willed, he willed intensely], and you say, there is the greatest Contrariety between his Understanding & his Temper that can be express'd in words'. BM Add. MS 9815 (26).

⁹⁶ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 224-5; cf. I, pp. 39-40, 44, 85-7. For further discussion of Butler's 'Laodicean Rationalism', or latitudinarianism, see Chapter Four, Section VII.

⁹⁷ *The Analogy*, p. 144; emphases added. For a deeper analysis of these points, and *The Analogy* more generally, see Chapter Four, Sections II-III.

⁹⁸ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 57. Walsh and Taylor, in concurrence with Waterman, claim that much of the devotional literature of the eighteenth-century was based on the *Prayer Book*, 'which was itself used not merely as a service book, but also as a manual for family and private

It is via these channels, then, that Butler displays his utter commitment to the Anglican Church and its canonical doctrines.⁹⁹ For there is a ‘Temper of Mind’, he writes, ‘made up of, or which follows from all three, Fear, Hope, Love; namely, Resignation to the Divine Will, which ought to be the habitual Frame of our Mind and Heart, and to be exercised at proper Seasons more distinctly, in *Acts of Devotion*’.¹⁰⁰ Accordingly, it is not difficult to see why Butler continues to assert within *Fifteen Sermons* the importance of rigorous self-examination and genuine reflection as the primary means to salvation. For even the ‘wisest and most knowing’, he claims, ‘cannot comprehend the Works of God, the Methods and Designs of his Providence in the Creation and Government of the World. Creation is absolutely and intirely out of our Depth, and beyond the Extent of our utmost Reach’.¹⁰¹ Convinced, therefore, of the primacy of Scripture and of Revelation (which *The Analogy* goes on to state even more compellingly, as we shall see), Butler insists that it is incumbent upon us to accept the ‘Incumbrances’ and ‘Inconveniencies’ of this life, and to hope for better in the one that is to come:

Fear, Resentment, Compassion and others; of which there could be no such Occasion or Use in a perfect State: But in the present we should be exposed to greater *Inconveniencies* without them ... They are *Incumbrances* indeed, but such as we are *obliged to carry about* with us, through this *various Journey of Life*.¹⁰²

V. Towards a Conception of Society: Butler on Anger, Empathy and Friendship.

Butler’s embracement and subsequent promotion of Anglicanism in *Fifteen Sermons* is a veritable keystone in his wider thought, since it indicates just how far he was willing to distance himself, intellectually speaking, from Old Dissent. Once again recalling Butler’s troubled Tewkesbury and Oxford years, for example, here we witnessed the

devotions’, in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, ‘Introduction’, p. 25. Butler would have likely encouraged this viewpoint, trusting that his sermons contributed to the spiritual wellbeing of the laity in similar fashion.

⁹⁹ E.g., in his appeals to the books of Revelation and Ecclesiasticus, which despite being non-canonical were also used in the *Prayer Book*. Butler quotes Ecclesiasticus at the end of Sermons IV & V, and Revelation at the end of Sermons VII & XV.

¹⁰⁰ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 274; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 280; emphasis added. The phrase ‘Temper of Mind’ is revisited by Butler, and becomes an important axiomatic premise of Butlerian orthodoxy. See esp. Chapter Four, Section V for more on this.

¹⁰¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 294-5; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 301.

¹⁰² *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 155-6; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 155-6; emphases added.

young student's internal mental and spiritual breakdown, which ultimately manifested itself in his decision to approach Clarke and convert to the established Church. Tellingly, however, the present author contends that this theme continued to resonate strongly in the homiletic, instructional and devotional *Fifteen Sermons*, particularly via Butler's efforts to convey his personal insight to those of his congregation who may be suffering similar pangs of doubt and distress to those which frequently troubled his own life.¹⁰³ No sermon illustrates this more effectively than Sermon VIII 'Upon Resentment' – probably the most startling of the sermons in that it accepts, if not even encourages, the principle of anger as a key component in Butlerian meta-ethics.¹⁰⁴

In order to comprehend Butler's sensitive handling of the principle of anger, first we must remind ourselves of the fact that part of Butler's 'pastoral function' was to act as a spiritual guide to those who were perhaps lost, *angry* or disdainful about their position in life; their position in relation to others (within an historically adolescent commercial society); and/or finally their relationship to God. Hence, in a rare salutary nod to Hobbes (and we must also be mindful of Pufendorf's influence here), Butler's moral philosophy acknowledges—and is perhaps even grounded in the assumption—that life is precarious and burdensome, that the human condition is ultimately one of 'chronic stress'.¹⁰⁵ This is precisely what Butler constantly alludes to, then, via his frequent concessions that human existence is often punctuated by moments of immoderation (i.e., intemperance, temptation, indolence, dejection, pride, etc.).¹⁰⁶ Considered in this light, Butler accepts that, whilst anger is *never condonable*, on the very specific grounds of self-preservation and/or self-defence, it is at the very least *understandable*¹⁰⁷ – a phenomenon is exemplified in Butler's eyes, for example, by the case of the injured individual who, in a state of anger, immediately declares fault in

¹⁰³ There is some evidence to suggest that Butler continued to suffer bouts of depression and isolation throughout his life. Tennant cites, e.g., his avoidance of Hume and Kames in 1737 and after (see following chapter), alongside the fact that he never made a speech in the House of Lords, as possible demonstrations of the 'reserve of the shy and the maladroitness of the insecure'. Elsewhere Butler is described as 'shy and un-self-confident', 'probably a lonely, disturbed and not very likeable man', and that there was a certain 'darkness and loneliness' to his 'inner life', *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 2, 124, 125, 142, 143.

¹⁰⁴ As Tennant puts it, whilst 'Butler is acutely aware of human anger ... as a theologian, [he] is not afraid of it'. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 58. Interestingly, this might be a rare case of Butler adopting a fragment of what Haakonssen & Whatmore call the 'empirical Epicurean line, arguing from people's lack of control over their world', in 'Commerce and Enlightenment', p. 301.

¹⁰⁶ E.g., *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 22, 94, 125-6, 150, 220-1, 233-4.

¹⁰⁷ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 141; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 141.

the injurious, even though they may simply be exaggerating the latter's so-called defect:

Anger ... or Hatred may be considered as another false Medium of viewing things, which always represents Characters and Actions much worse than they really are ... [In such] Cases of Offence and Enmity, the whole Character and Behaviour is considered with an Eye to that particular Part which has offended us, and the whole Man appears monstrous, without any thing right or human in him. [However,] Resentment should surely at least be confined to that particular Part of the Behaviour which gave Offence; since the other Parts of a Man's Life and Character stand just the same as they did before.¹⁰⁸

Because of situations such as these, then – situations that arise naturally in a naturally imperfect world – Butler thinks that even anger has its rightful place within the full range of affections requiring mediation through the conscience:

It cannot be imagined, that we are required to love [our enemies] with any peculiar Kind of Affection ... [But nevertheless, the injured party] ought to be affected towards the injurious Person in the same Way any good Men, uninterested in the Case, would be; if they had the same just Sense, which we have supposed the injured Person to have, of the Fault: *After which there will yet remain real Good-will towards the Offender.*¹⁰⁹

Hence, Butler thinks that anger plays the essential role of acting as a sort of *aid to deliberation*, so long as it does not manifest itself in any way 'contrary to the Religion we profess, and to the Nature and Reason of the thing itself'.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, in Butler's view, anger ought to be viewed as 'a *good Effect*, notwithstanding it were much to be wished that Men would act from a better Principle, Reason and cool Reflection'.¹¹¹ For if *correctly channelled*, Butler states that anger produces 'Fellow-feelings' in humankind, which is one of those '*common Bonds, by which Society is held together*'.¹¹²

A clear anti-Hobbesian statement, in essence, Butler's point here is that in order for feelings of benevolence to predominate in any given society, first the individual's cognition requires an antagonistic (though not dialectical, as we earlier noted) marker

¹⁰⁸ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 171; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 171. In modern terms we tend to describe this as a kind of 'defence mechanism'.

¹⁰⁹ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 168; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 153, 169; emphases added.

¹¹⁰ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 139; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 140.

¹¹¹ *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 153.

¹¹² *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 144; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 144; emphasis added. This anticipates Tucker's treatment of self-love. See esp. Chapter Five, Sections I & V.

against which to pit itself, and so as to become inherently perceptible. Hence, in the following cyclical example, Butler states that ‘anger’ which is mediated by ‘benevolence’ (via the conscience) creates friendship and empathy within the individual [first stage]; which in turn transforms into legitimate anger when, for example, a desperate friend’s plight is seen as precarious, frustrating or unjust [second stage]; thus precipitating ‘fellow-feelings’/empathy within humankind [third stage]; and so the process begins anew again [first stage], and so on.¹¹³ Because of this, in typical fashion, Butler attempts to accommodate both the theological and psychological in his analysis of anger, by placing it within the Christian framework: ‘... the Precepts to *forgive*, and to *love our Enemies*’, he claims, ‘do not relate to that general Indignation against Injury and the Authors of it, but [rather] to [fellow-feelings] ... when raised by private or personal Injury’.¹¹⁴ Moreover, by doing so, Butler goes on to deny the very existence of intrinsic hatred since, again, for him the prospect of hatred (including self-hatred) is merely a self-deception – a type of sociopathy borne out of misapplied or defective inward reflection:

[That] Mankind have ungoverned Passions which they will gratifie at any Rate, as well to the Injury of Others, as in Contradiction to known private Interest: *But that as there is no such thing as Self-hatred, so neither is there any such thing as Ill-will in one Man towards another.*¹¹⁵

It is in this way, then, that Butler’s utilisation of anger becomes what is essentially the catalyst for his belief that *friendship* forms both the basis and core of modern commercial society, albeit somewhat counter-intuitively [omissions not carried over from 1726 struck out, 1729 additions italicised]:

We ... feel the same Kind of Satisfaction and Enjoyment (whatever would be the Degree of it) from this higher Acquaintance *and Friendship*, as we feel from common ~~Friendships~~ *ones*; the Intercourse being real, and the Persons equally present, in both Cases. We should have a more ardent Desire to be approved by his better Judgement, and a ~~higher~~ *higher* Satisfaction in that Approbation, ~~than any thing of this Sort which could~~ *of the same Sort with what would* be felt in respect to common Persons, or be wrought in us by their

¹¹³ Once again, Tennant’s *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry* has proven invaluable in clarifying Butler’s position on this matter, esp. pp. 58-9.

¹¹⁴ *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 157; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 157; emphases added. This is a direct reference to Rom. Xiii. 9: ‘Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self’.

¹¹⁵ *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 18-9; emphasis added.

Presence ... remembering still that [God] is perfectly Good, *and our Friend as well as our Governour*.¹¹⁶

Here, Butler's emphasis on the fact that God is 'our friend' is an especially important addition to the 1729 edition, for it denotes that 'friendship' is both a temporal *and* eternal virtue; the 'intercourse' being equally 'real' and 'eternally present'.¹¹⁷ In substantive terms, the implication of this is that Butler is extending a conception of Christianity that is at once inclusive, reciprocal and egalitarian; in a word, 'commercial'.¹¹⁸ This is one of the most striking features of *Fifteen Sermons* in that it relates to Butler's broader theory that the complex (and by this Butler means something akin to the 'messiness' or 'disorderliness') of human affections are so numerous and so imperceptible within any given individual—and likewise again, but on a much larger scale when speaking of society—that from such 'Uncertainty', he concludes, 'it cannot but be, that there will be different Opinions concerning Mankind, or more or less governed by Interest'.¹¹⁹ Indeed, this is precisely what Butler is referring to in the above-cited passage regarding God's friendship when he speaks in terms of the 'Degree' of 'Satisfaction and Enjoyment' we each receive when contracting 'higher Acquaintance[s] and Friendship[s]' – Butler's main point being that we are *only obliged* to give and receive in direct proportion to that which we are *capable of* giving and receiving, based upon the natural 'Stint and Bound'¹²⁰ of our individual (private) and collective (public) affections:

[The] whole System, as I may speak, of Affections (including Rationality) which constitute the Heart, as this Word is used in Scripture and on moral Subjects, are each and all of them stronger in some [persons] than in others [... Therefore] The Case is here as in Scales: It is not one Weight, considered in itself, which determines whether the Scale shall ascend or descend; but this depends on the Proportion, which that one Weight hath to the other.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 264-5; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 270-1.

¹¹⁷ Butler's emphasis on the friendship between God and Man is an important extension of Cocceian and Witsian covenant theology.

¹¹⁸ These terms may be considered as bywords for a type of 'ethical democracy' attributed to Butler by Tennant, in *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 73, 78, 106. Again, this is possibly a step too far.

¹¹⁹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xxvii.

¹²⁰ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 210; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 212.

¹²¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 236-7; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 242-3. Cf. Pufendorf's utilisation of the scale argument with reference to the disparity between 'Self-love and the other Passions ...' in *Of the Law of Nature*, II. III. XIII, & II. III. X. For the notion of proportional reciprocity between rich and poor in the context of Butler and Tucker's espousal of charity, see also Conclusion, Sections I-II.

Consequently, Butler's distinctive brand of commercial sociability is grounded in a fundamentally important analogy between, on the one side, *social friendship amongst humans* (closest perhaps to Grotius's *appetitus societatis*, or Pufendorf's 'sociality'), and on the other *the daily practice of loving God* (*αγαπη*/love/agape); and once again we must stress that Butler's emphasis here is on humanity's 'original frame and constitution' (freewill), which is at liberty to express (outward persona) and/or entertain (inward persona) the full range and complex of social affections.¹²² Indeed it is this, Butler concludes, that makes us fully conscious, conscientious, rational, moral and 'accountable' agents. For though 'A Machine' may be 'inanimate and passive' he writes, on the other hand 'we are Agents':

Our Constitution is put in our own Power. We are charged with it: and therefore are accountable for any Disorder or Violation of it ... And ... this our Nature, *i.e.* Constitution is adapted to Virtue, as from the Idea of a Watch it appears, that its Nature, *i.e.* Constitution of System, is adapted to measure Time.¹²³

Hence in Butler's scheme, we see that the Christian precepts of 'love of God' and 'love of neighbour' are deemed to be self-evidently coterminous, whilst benevolence acts as the prime reflective principle by which to unify the two – though, of course, always under the direction of reason and conscience. Hence, when Butler states that the Christian religion 'does not demand new Affections, but only claims the Direction of those you already have, those Affections you daily feel', here he is claiming that it is in fact the *orthodox Anglican faith* that is the literal embodiment of the *Church militant here in earth*.¹²⁴ To put it yet another way, Butler insists that in an increasingly complex, metropolitan and commercialised world, the role of the established Church is to accept that 'friendship', *i.e.*, the extension and fulfilment of 'Mankind acting ... suitably to their Nature', is the interconnecting basis for a *flourishing society*.¹²⁵ In tandem, then, with his friend Bishop Berkeley, Butler insists

¹²² As we shall see, this notion of a 'complex' of affections resurfaces in Butler's Lockean-based dissertation *Of Personal Identity*, appended to *The Analogy*, and in Tucker's later observation that there are a 'great Difference of Talents' and a 'wonderful Variety of Strata in the human Mind', which he then goes on to claim is part-epiphenomenal and part-facilitative of economic activity itself. See *Four Tracts, Two Sermons* (1776), p. 67. For a reiteration of the 'sociality-agape' formula, again in the context of Butler and Tucker's espousal of the Christian virtue of *Caritas*, see Conclusion, Sections I-II.

¹²³ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. x.

¹²⁴ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 269; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 276. The 'Church militant here in earth' is the opening phrase to the Intercession in the Communion Service of the *Prayer Book*.

¹²⁵ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xv. As Butler later puts it in *The Analogy*, pp. 316-7: 'Examples of Gratitude, and the Cultivation of Friendship, [is] of general Good to the World'.

that it is in the interests of the Church, if not even the Church's fundamental clerical duty, to foster this state of affairs.¹²⁶

VI. Concluding Remarks: The 'Cements of Society'.

Having charted the background to and development of Butler's philosophy in this chapter, we can clearly see that religion, and more specifically the Anglican religion, becomes an indispensable component of, if not even a prerequisite for, the Butlerian conception of commercial society. By accepting that commercial society is a reality of modern existence, and yet by also acknowledging and utilising Hobbesian/Mandevillian terminology whilst at the same time attempting to turn it on its head, Butler was endeavouring to reformulate the 'interested-disinterested/sociability-self-love' conundrum in such a way that it was consistent with the tenets of the Anglican faith. Accordingly, within Butler's scheme, even traditionally 'unchristian' principles such as anger and resentment have an important role to play in contributing to the fabric of society, in the sense that they assist humans in their drive towards what we now refer to as a form of 'social consensus'.¹²⁷ Bearing this in mind, one of Butler's most important claims in *Fifteen Sermons* is to insist that the apparent disparity between sociability and self-love, self-interest and benevolence, is not some sort of vast vacuous no man's land. Rather, it was a conceptual space mediated by the God-given faculty of conscience, and thereby fully consistent with the principles of the Christian religion – 'it being evident', Butler reiterates once again in Sermon XII 'Upon the Love of Our Neighbour', 'that the Love of Others, which includes in it all Virtues, must necessarily be in due Proportion to the

¹²⁶ Butler's view that the Church is the prime institution responsible for promoting and nurturing friendship within commercial society is what sets him apart from the Scottish moralists, who are far less inclined to emphasise, or in most cases even acknowledge, the role of Christianity in this scheme. See, e.g., Allan Silver, 'Friendship in Commercial Society: Eighteenth-Century Social Theory and Modern Sociology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 95/6, (May, 1990), pp. 1474-1504, esp. pp. 1479-1485; Lisa Hill & Peter McCarthy, 'Hume, Smith and Ferguson: Friendship in commercial society', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 2/4, (1999), pp. 33-49. For Berkeley's similar emphasis on fostering commercial friendship, see Scott Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley: Virtue and Society in the Anglo-Irish Context*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), Chaps. 3, 5, 7. Cf. Chapter Two, p. 74, & below, p. 116, n. 135.

¹²⁷ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 144; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 144: 'anger is by no means Malice. No, it is Resentment against Vice and Wickedness ... it is one of the common Bonds, by which Society is held together'; emphasis added.

Love of ourselves'.¹²⁸

As we have seen, then, although in Butler's view self-love and sociability may appear to be opposites, in truth they are never in direct opposition with one another (or dialectical).¹²⁹ Consequently, Butler considers each to be equally important components of the fully integrated, and therefore *ethical* and *rational*, human being: i.e., of the individual who is fully aware, firstly, of the importance of the conscience, secondly of practicing proper reflection, and thirdly of mediating between their private and public persona. In consequence, for Butler, to be ethically good is simply to be a *social creature* – not necessarily in relation to any overt scale of utility, à la Mandeville or in the case of the later classical economists, but rather simply because it *innately is*, as the 'state of the Case requires' of it.¹³⁰ Conversely, to live in solipsistic isolation and in a constant state of selfishness is to exist in a state of desolation, beyond the ethical sphere itself:

Thus, when Benevolence is said to be the Sum of Virtue, it is not spoken of as a blind Propension, but as a Principle in reasonable Creatures ... to be directed by their Reason: For Reason and Reflection come into our Notion of a moral Agent ... It will teach us, that the Care of some Persons ... is particularly committed to our Charge by Nature and Providence; that there are other Circumstances ... which require that we do good to some, preferably to others. Reason, considered merely as subservient to Benevolence, as assisting to produce the greatest Good, will teach us to have particular Regard to these Relations and Circumstances; because it is plainly for the Good of the World that they should be regarded.¹³¹

¹²⁸ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 239.

¹²⁹ There is a strong case to be made here that Butler's formula is of Pufendorbian origin. Cf., *The Law of Nature and of Nations*, II, III, § xvi: 'Self-love and Sociableness ought by no means to be made opposites'.

¹³⁰ *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. xxix. As we have seen, the irony here is that Butler was often a melancholic, isolated figure, much like Shaftesbury, although surely not a selfish man. However, during the 1740s when he and Secker grew more distant, Secker claimed that Butler *was* indeed selfish. See *Autobiography of Thomas Secker*, p. 22 & Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 53: '[Butler] was a serious, & in Matters of Money a generous Man: but in other respects too selfish ... expecting everyone to befriend & serve Him; but seldom thinking himself qualified or obliged to serve others. And that selfish disregard increased in him greatly from his time of frequenting the Court. This Coldness of his produced a considerable Degree of it in me also towards Him'.

¹³¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 246-7; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 253-4. Butler's appeal to 'the greatest Good' hints at his espousal of utility, and probably leans more towards the Ciceronian relationship between *honestum* and *utile* (the good and the useful), which is then taken up and developed more fully in Tucker's economic thought. It is possible too that Butler was borrowing here from Hutcheson's statement that '*That Action is best, which procures the greatest Happiness for the Greatest Numbers*', in *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* [1725] (4th Ed., London, 1738), p. 181. However, for Butler, utility is always of secondary importance within his overall scheme.

As we noted earlier, according to Butler the communalism of society was best symbolised by the tenets of the established Church, in that he believed them to be the literal embodiments of the Church militant here in earth. It is by these means, then, that Butler attempted to bridge the gap between the temporal and the divine, so as to ensure that ‘love of thyself’ and ‘love of others’ naturally followed, although was clearly ancillary to, ‘love of God’:

As the whole Attention of Life should be to obey [God’s] Commands, so the highest Enjoyment of it must arrive from the Contemplation of [His] Character, and our Relation to it, from a Consciousness of his Favour and Approbation, and from the Exercise of those Affections towards Him which could not but be raised from his Presence.¹³²

This, then, is Butler’s tripartite apparatus of human conscience, leading the complex of individuals and all their affections inexorably towards feelings of ‘Joy, Gratitude, Reverence, Love, Trust and [mutual] Dependence’; in turn augmenting Butler’s notion of empathy or ‘Fellow-feeling’ within humankind, which ‘each individual has in behalf of the whole Species, as well as of himself’, so as to render the notion of ‘society’—indeed *commercial society*—inherently possible.¹³³

According to Butler, then, the practices of the Christian faith – ‘from whence arises our strongest Obligation to Benevolence’ – clearly trumped the immediate concerns of self-love.¹³⁴ Rather, in Butler’s scheme, ‘self-love’ and ‘love of others’ naturally coincided, so as to form what he coined ‘the Cements of Society’.¹³⁵ This metaphor—perhaps the most vigorously Stoic, and therefore anti-Hobbesian and anti-

¹³² *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 266; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 272.

¹³³ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 144; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 144.

¹³⁴ *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 288.

¹³⁵ *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 18; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 17. Jon Elster has come across the phrase, using it as the title for his *The Cement of Society: A Survey of Social Order*, (Cambridge, 1989); however, he does not appear to acknowledge Butler within its pages. Contemporaneously, the work most similar in sentiment to Butler’s ‘Cements of Society’ is Berkeley’s originally untitled essay, written thirteen-years prior to Butler’s sermons as a contribution to Steele’s short-lived *The Guardian* (London, 1713), and subsequently titled ‘The Bond of Society’, in A. A. Luce and T. E. Jessop (eds.), *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*, Vol. 7, (NY, 1948-56). Similarly steeped in Newtonianism and neo-Stoicism, in this essay Berkeley seeks to explain the natural affinity and ‘gravitational attraction’ between the natural and moral, material and social, worlds. It is here, then, that we discern a possible influence on Butler’s ‘anger-empathy-friendship’ formula, since it is likely he was fully aware of Berkeley’s work. For further discussion, see David E. Leary, ‘Berkeley’s Social Theory: Context and Development’, in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38/4, (Oct-Dec 1977), pp. 635-49; Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley*, Chap 3: ‘Science and Sociability: Berkeley’s “Bonds of Society”’, pp. 35-52; with references to Berkeley’s neo-Stoic incorporation of *oikeiosis* at pp. 39, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49.

Mandevillean statement housed within the entirety of *Fifteen Sermons*—is a cumulative representation of Butler’s meta-ethical thinking from the earliest days of his educative youth right down to the publication of his first major systematic work of philosophy.¹³⁶ Replete within the phrase are the Butlerian reformulations of the Stoic conceptions of benevolence, sociability, *oikeiosis* and cosmopolitan providence; and as we argued in our opening chapter, this adds weightier dimensions to the present study in that it repositions Butler – and even more so Tucker, as we shall see – away from the fringes of contemporary intellectual history discourse, and instead towards the epicentre of a nexus of scholarship that is incredibly vast, though as yet underdeveloped.¹³⁷

As we shall see in the chapters to come, these themes were to be developed by Butler’s followers, and not the least by Tucker himself, in ways that Butler ultimately did not live to see. This having being said, it is incumbent upon us to turn now to an examination of Butler’s initial influence among his contemporaries and thence to his introduction to Tucker, so that we may begin to gauge the extent of the latter’s indebtedness to the former. The novel suggestion we wish to make at this stage, however, and which is to be borne in mind throughout the remainder of this study, is that Butler’s important phrase, the ‘Cements of Society’, was essentially a conceptual prototype of, if not even a euphemism for, Tucker’s political economy.

¹³⁶ As Lindberg writes in ‘Stoicism in Political Humanism and Natural Law’, *(Un)masking the Realities of Power*, p. 73: ‘... Stoic self-control combined with Christian humbleness functioned in wider circles as *social cement*, providing discipline as well as comfort’.

¹³⁷ This is not intended as a statement of criticism, but rather of recognising potential. The vast corpora of literature on these themes are summarised in Chapter One, with a statement of Butler and Tucker’s importance in the concluding remarks, Section VI.

Chapter Four:

In Defence of Orthodoxy: *The Analogy of Religion* and the Methodist Controversy.

In *Fifteen Sermons*, Butler's rechristening of Mandevillian phraseology facilitated a paradigmatic shift in the language of eighteenth-century moral discourse. With Mandeville standing at one end of the spectrum and Law at the other, Butler's line of Anglican 'middling' reasoning came to influence a number of important thinkers who did not necessarily hold a firm foothold in either camp. As intimated earlier, one of the most important early admirers of Butler was the neo-Stoic Francis Hutcheson.¹ A thinker who, like Butler, came from Presbyterian stock and who had also corresponded with Clarke during his student days,² throughout his youth Hutcheson had likewise been influenced by the natural law theories of Grotius and Pufendorf, though he also took a keen interest in that pioneer of eighteenth-century Scottish jurisprudence, Gershom Carmichael (1672-1729).³ Yet despite these various influences and connections, Hutcheson was above all a self-proclaimed Shaftesburian, and though he clearly regretted Shaftesbury's defamations of the Christian faith, Hutcheson nevertheless declared that the Lord's ethics ought to be '*esteemed while any Reflection remains among Men*'.⁴ In fact, so widely-known was Hutcheson's devotion to Shaftesbury that the Irish Protestant and anti-Deist, Philip Skelton (1707-87) later accused the former of merely 'refining' on the latter's ideas.⁵ 'My Lord *Shaftesbury*, and his imitator *Hutcheson*,' Skelton noted scornfully in *The Candid Reader* (1741), 'have the present Generation of Obscurists entirely to themselves'.⁶

¹ See Chapter One, p. 40.

² For Hutcheson's letters to Clarke see William Leechman's (1706-85) preface to Hutcheson's *A System of Moral Philosophy*, 2 vols., (London, 1755), I, p. v; the originals have not survived.

³ See Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, Chap 2: 'Natural law and moral realism: The civic humanist synthesis in Francis Hutcheson and George Turnbull', pp. 63-99. For Carmichael – who was a predecessor of Hutcheson on the Chair of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow, a position created in 1727, and which Adam Smith would eventually hold – consult James Moore & Michael Silverstone, 'Gershom Carmichael and the natural jurisprudential tradition in eighteenth-century Scotland', in Hont & Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue*, pp. 73-87 & Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*, pp. 145-5, where Robertson notes that it was Carmichael who originally attempted to suppress, as best he could, the Augustinian-Epicurean-Baylean-Mandevillian synthesis.

⁴ Hutcheson, *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, 'Preface', p. xix.

⁵ Philip Skelton, *Deism Revealed*, 2 Vols., [1749] (2nd Ed., London, 1751), II, p. 234.

⁶ Skelton, *The Candid Reader*, (Dublin, 1744), p. 28.

As we shall see, Skelton was certainly not alone in drawing parallels between Shaftesbury and Hutcheson. Yet having read the first edition of *Fifteen Sermons* in 1726, Hutcheson felt compelled to modify a selection of his ideas first propounded in the *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (1725), particularly his belief in the supremacy of feeling, instinct and benevolence above all other human faculties.⁷ Consequently, in Hutcheson's ensuing accounts of human nature, he began instead to elevate the role of conscience within his scheme, praising Butler by declaring that the clergyman's enterprise was allied to his own. '[It] is a good omen of something still better on this Subject to be expected in the learned World', he wrote in *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* (1728), 'that Mr. Butler, in his Sermons at the *Rolls Chapel*, has done so much justice to the wise and good Order of our Nature, [so] that ... Gentlemen ... seem convinc'd of a *moral Sense*'.⁸ Indeed, so impressed was Hutcheson with Butler that in after years he and the Anglican clergyman are rarely mentioned in isolation from one another. As Hutcheson's biographer put it regarding the affinities between and widespread appeal of the two thinkers: 'Hutcheson's influence passed directly into men; [whereas] Butler's remained in his books'.⁹ Nevertheless it is also important to note, as Rivers has done, that '[Hutcheson] faded in the second half of the nineteenth-century, whereas [Butler] continued to grow right through the nineteenth'.¹⁰

Whatever the precise relationship between Butler and Hutcheson (and we shall touch upon this subject again towards the end of this chapter), Hutcheson's decision to praise the Anglican clergyman prompted a flurry of likeminded endorsements from a number of intellectuals based in Scotland. Consequently, from the 1730s onwards three important figures largely disassociated from the Anglican Church took a keen interest in Butler's ideas: namely, Henry Home Lord Kames, David Hume and Adam Smith.¹¹ Of the three, Hume was (and remains) notorious for his religious scepticism, thereby

⁷ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 163.

⁸ Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections, with illustrations upon the Moral Sense*, (London, 1728), p. xix.

⁹ William Robert Smith, *Francis Hutcheson: His Life, Teaching, and Position in the History of Philosophy*, (Bristol, 1992; facsimile of 1st Ed., 1900), p. 148. Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 163-4.

¹⁰ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 164.

¹¹ Smith was still in his teenage years during most of the 1730s and the early 1740s – his interest in Butler came later then, as we shall shortly see.

securing his reputation for being an atheist or infidel. Conversely, Kames and Smith were far more sympathetic of the view that theo-philosophical speculation and ethics were intertwined (which is also known as the ‘double-truth’).¹² As a trio, each concurred in various degrees with Butler’s psychologically-orientated analyses of human nature, whilst at the same time approving of the clergyman’s disavowal of the overly-prescriptive, casuistic and Augustinian arguments which characterised Mandeville’s and Law’s views.¹³ Indeed, so convinced was Hume that he and Butler’s philosophies were in some ways akin that in the build up to the publication of his first major work, the *Treatise of Human Nature* in 1739, he sought introductions to the clergyman over a period of several years, albeit unsuccessfully.¹⁴ Likewise, when in 1737 Home (who did not become Lord Kames until 1752) wrote to Butler ‘from an earnest desire ... to have some doubts removed ... [about] the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion’,

Dr Butler ... answered his letter with utmost politeness, and endeavoured, as far as he could, by writing, to satisfy Mr. Home’s inquiries, but modestly declined a personal meeting, on the score of his own natural diffidence and reserve, his being unaccustomed to oral controversy, and his fear that the cause of truth might thence suffer from the unskillfulness of its advocate.¹⁵

Although both Hume and Home appeared to have been thwarted, then, in their private overtures, this did not prevent the pair from acknowledging Butler’s importance in public – just as Hutcheson had done. In the *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion* (1751), for example, Home described ‘DOCTOR Butler’ as a ‘manly and acute writer’, who ‘hath gone farther than any other, to assign a just foundation for

¹² For an account of the difficulties regarding the sceptical unbelief of Hume on the one side and Kames and Smith on the other, see Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 257-62. Cf. Winch, *Riches and Poverty*, Chap. 2, where Winch discusses Smith’s reluctance to publish Hume’s more incendiary works after the latter’s death.

¹³ For Law’s ‘mystical’ opposition to the ‘rational’ Newtonianism of Butler’s mentor, Clarke, and thence to Butler himself, see Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, pp. 133-4. This resurfaces in Wesley’s disagreements with Butler, see esp. Sections V & VII of this chapter below.

¹⁴ Beiser, *Sovereignty of Reason*, p. xi, states that the ‘publication of Hume’s *Treatise* ... marks the close of the English Enlightenment in its early classical phase’.

¹⁵ Bartlett, *Memoirs of Butler*, pp. 80-1. Here, Bartlett dates the correspondence between Hume and Kames regarding Butler as follows: 2 December 1737; 4 March 1738; 13 February 1738, and 13 June 1742. This account conflicts with Ian Simpson Ross’s view that Butler did in fact meet Kames in London in 1737, see his *Lord Kames and the Scotland of his Day*, (Oxford; Clarendon, 1972), p. 35. Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 243. Nevertheless, even if this were the case, Butler would surely have agreed to a meeting only very reluctantly, which, either way, is yet another example of his ‘evasiveness and reticence’ discussed in our previous chapter, p. 109. n. 103. Cf. also Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 124; Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*, p. 302.

moral duty'.¹⁶ Likewise, in the *Sketches of the History of Man* (1774), published over two decades after Butler's death, Kames redeployed the Butlerian phrase 'Cements of Society', and declared it to be a collective noun for the foundational laws of nature:

The final cause that presents itself first to view respects man considered as an accountable being ... This branch of our nature is the corner-stone of the criminal law ... a strong *cement to society*. If we were not accountable to beings, those connected by blood or by country, would be no less shy and reserved, than if they were mere strangers to each other.¹⁷

Similarly in the case of Hume, in a famous and oft-quoted line from the introduction to the *Treatise of Human Nature*, he placed Butler alongside Mandeville, Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson as one of those 'late philosophers in *England* who have begun to put the science of man on a new footing'. Again, then, as Rivers has shown, Hume was particularly keen to impress both Hutcheson and Butler, 'the two most important living philosophers in his youth', meaning that during the early stages of his career he constantly invoked their work as a basis for his own developing view that a 'science of politics' was necessary and, moreover, beneficial to society and humanity at large.¹⁸

Alongside Kames and Hume, it is well to note at this stage Smith's likeminded recognition and endorsement of Butler, particularly in the first of his two major works, *TMS*, published in 1758. Simultaneously praising and lambasting Mandeville as a 'lively and humorous' though 'coarse and rustic' writer,¹⁹ Smith complimented Butler as a 'late ingenious and subtle philosopher' (*TMS* was first published six-years after Butler's death), and, in a section entitled 'Of licentious systems', he went on to reformulate the 'Mandeville-Butler dispute' in terms of 'partiality-impartiality', thereby

¹⁶ Henry Home, Lord Kames, *Essays on the principles of morality and natural religion. In two parts*, (Edinburgh, 1751), p. 61. Cf. Carey, *Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson*, p. 195, n. 143.

¹⁷ Kames, *Sketches of the History of Man*, 4 Vols., (Dublin Ed., 1774-5), IV., VI. 'FINAL CAUSES of the forgoing Laws of Nature', p. 39; emphasis added. Besides Kames' *Essays*, this work follows Butler in placing the source of human knowledge in something akin to conscience rather than reason, which Kames calls the 'sense'; furthermore, Kames believes this to be consistent with natural religion since, for him, morality is derived from nature.

¹⁸ E.g., Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* [1751], (New York, Prometheus, 2004), p. 139: 'I esteem the man whose self-love, by whatever means, is so directed as to give him concern for others, and render him serviceable to society'. Cf. 'Appendix II: Of Self-love', pp. 137-145. For Rivers' useful narrative, see *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 241-3. Another indispensable account of Hume's admiration for Butler during this period is Garrett's 'Reasoning about Morals from Butler to Hume', in Savage (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*, pp. 169-86.

¹⁹ Leslie Stephen and Russell Nieli describe Mandeville as a 'prurient' writer in this context. See Stephen, *History of English Thought*, II, p. 28; Nieli, 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue', p. 604.

utilising the philosophical contrast between the two terms as a basis for his own system.²⁰ Put very briefly, here Smith's strategy was to describe Mandeville's 'licentious system' as that which fashioned the 'indulgent and partial spectator': i.e., the individual who only yielded to the governance of a higher political authority because their vanity had been appealed to. Conversely, however, Smith's Butler-inspired 'impartial spectator', the individual of genuine 'self-command' who was capable of looking beyond their narrow self-interest and instead towards the public good, was the figure truly worthy of emulation.²¹ As the most recent editor of *TMS* Knud Haakonssen notes, then, Smith's conception of the 'impartial spectator' in this, and in other sections of the work, positioned the Scotch philosopher 'very close to ... Butler's account of conscience'. Furthermore, in Haakonssen's estimation this can be evinced above all in the following passage which, though lengthy, is worth citing in full because it accentuates the remarkable overlap between both thinkers [interpolations and italicisations provided for clarity and emphasis]:

Upon whatever we suppose that our moral faculties are founded, whether upon a certain modification of reason, upon an original instinct, called a moral sense, or upon some other principle of our nature [i.e., the Butlerian notion of conscience], it cannot be doubted, that they were *given us* [i.e., by the deity] for the direction of our *conduct in this life*. They carry along with them the most evident badges of this *authority*, which denote that they were set up within us to be the *supreme arbiters of all our actions, to superintend all our senses, passions, and appetites, and to judge how far each of them was either to be indulged or restrained* ... No other faculty or principle of action judges of any other. Love does not judge of resentment, nor resentment of love. Those two passions may be opposite to one another, but cannot, with any propriety, be said to approve or disapprove of one another [i.e., a reiteration of the Butlerian suggestion that existence is unitary rather than dialectical]²² ... Every sense is supreme over its own objects ... Each of those senses judges in the last resort of its own objects ... *The very essence of each of those qualities consists in its being fitted to please the sense to which it is addressed* [i.e., 'Every thing is what it is, and not another Thing ... what the state of the Case Requires']²³. It belongs to our moral faculties ... how far every other principle of our nature ought either to be indulged or restrained. What is agreeable to our moral faculties, is fit, and right, and proper to be done; the contrary wrong, unfit, and improper [i.e., 'The Goodness or Badness of Actions does not arise from hence,

²⁰ Smith, *TMS* [1758], Haakonssen (ed.), pp. 53, 363-4. Cf. Chapter One, p. 42.

²¹ Ibid., VI. II. IV: 'Of licentious systems', pp. 361-71; Cf. Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 112: 'the 'final (1790) recension of *TMS* remains consistent with Butler's treatment of self-love, and differ chiefly in omitting any reference to Dominical command'. Deferring once again to Rivers, she claims that Smith follows Marcus Aurelius, 'Shaftesbury, Butler, and Kames in developing the role of the impartial spectator', in *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 260, 305. The neo-Stoic inferences here are stark, for 'the *impartial* spectator' surely corresponds in part with the Stoic notion of *apatheia*, i.e., 'things indifferent' or 'equanimity' – a point advanced, to be sure, in Miller, 'Hercules at the Crossroads ...', pp. 186-9; cf. Chapter One, pp. 42-3.

²² Cf. *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. xxix, & Chapter Three, p. 99.

²³ Cf. Ibid.

that the Epithet, interested or disinterested, may be applied to them']²⁴ ... The very words, right, wrong, fit, improper, graceful, unbecoming, mean only what pleases or displeases those faculties.²⁵

As can be seen, then, the examples of Hutcheson, Kames, Hume and Smith are extremely instructive in that they provide telling reflections of the transposition of Mandevillean and Butlerian themes into what would later become Scottish (and supposedly secularising) tools of eighteenth-century moral theory and political economy. Yet if we briefly recall the introduction to this study, there we touched upon the fact that Tucker was well acquainted with the Scottish moralists in his own right, since Smith housed many of Tucker's tracts within his private library;²⁶ and yet even perhaps more significantly, Hume and Kames were to become correspondents of Tucker in the years following Butler's death.

In light of all that has been discussed in the intervening period, the suggestion we wish to make at the outset of this chapter is that it is entirely plausible, indeed entirely likely, that Tucker's economic ideas were taken seriously among the Scottish moralists precisely because of his earlier connections with the vaunted bishop. In doing so, the present author concurs with B. W. Young's observation that examples of intellectual exchange such as these constitute important microcosmic demonstrations of what he calls the 'simultaneous kinship and distance' existing between English and Scottish varieties of enlightenment.²⁷ Yet where this study attempts to build on Young's statement, and to contribute to extant scholarship in the process, is to demonstrate the fact that it was in fact *Butler's authority*—however reluctant he was to provide it, and in spite of the fact that he did not live to witness his own far-reaching influence—that was fundamentally important to this particular exchange.

Having advanced these claims, the purpose of the present chapter is essentially two-

²⁴ Cf. *Ibid.*

²⁵ Smith, *TMS*, Haakonssen (ed.), pp. 191-2. For Haakonssen's suggestion regarding Butler's influence on Smith, see p. 191 n. 54, where he claims that the present excerpt mirrors, above all, Sermon II 'Upon Human Nature' of *Fifteen Sermons*. For the historical context to the publication and reception of *TMS*, see Haakonssen's useful editorial introduction. Cf. Viner's *Role of Providence in the Social Order*, pp. 77-85, which also treats Smith's *TMS* along similarly Stoic lines, although no mention is made of Butler.

²⁶ See Introduction, p. 13 above. For a comprehensive list of Tucker's works that Smith owned see Mizuta, *Smith's Library*, pp. 147-8.

²⁷ Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon', p. 395.

fold, then. Firstly, it intends to build upon the previous chapter's account of *Fifteen Sermons* by surveying the enlargement and development of Butler's theo-philosophical thought in *The Analogy* (1736), wherein his focus shifts towards a more refined and yet forceful iteration of the Anglican faith, and of the relationship between natural and revealed religion. Crucially, then, the second strategy of this chapter is to utilise both Butlerian texts as a means of drawing Tucker's theology into discussion, demonstrating above all that Tucker's understanding and expressions of the Christian faith were shaped by Butler in such a way that he became, in effect, the bishop's most faithful follower.²⁸ To this end, we begin with a biographical introduction to Tucker's early life up until his initial meeting with Butler in 1739, before turning to discussion of *The Analogy* itself. Thereafter, our focus shifts to Butler and Tucker's brushes with the earliest manifestations of Methodism in the late 1730s and early 1740, which is treated in four distinct stages. Firstly, via an examination of Tucker's public dispute with George Whitefield in 1739; secondly, via Butler's private meetings with John Wesley later in the same year; thirdly, via an account of Tucker's *Principles of Methodism* published in 1742; and lastly, via discussion of the historical connotations surrounding the clash between 'mystical' evangelism and 'rational' latitudinarianism in the eighteenth century. Having done this, the chapter comes to a close with a compelling summation of Butler's theological influence over Tucker – which it is to be hoped will act as suitable preparation for a fuller investigation of Tucker's economics proper in Chapter Five and beyond; at which point some of the important arguments and influences of the Scottish Enlightenment will be reincorporated.

²⁸ In doing so, the present study attempts to go a step further than Waterman, and to a lesser extent Tucker's biographers, who acknowledge but do not sufficiently develop the argument that Tucker adopted a 'Butlerian view of the human condition', which he subsequently 'employed in specifically economic discourse'; this citation in Waterman, *Political Economy and Christian Theology*, pp. 111-2.

I. Introduction: Tucker's Early Life and Meeting With Butler.

Most biographical sketches and obituary notices claim that Tucker was born in 1712. It was however on 28th November 1713 that he came into the world, a child of Welsh peasant stock in the small town of Laugharne, Carmarthenshire.²⁹ Tucker spoke little of his boyhood years, at one point confessing that he despised genealogical lore as a result of his maiden aunt repeatedly foisting it upon him during his youth.³⁰ Nevertheless, it is possible that Tucker's permanent hostility towards Jacobitism may have been fashioned during this early period of his life, for the inhabitants of Aberystwith, Cardiganshire, whence his family moved when he was still very young, were bitterly divided between the House of Stuart and the House of Hanover. In adulthood Tucker was to ally himself with the latter.³¹

By all accounts, Tucker's father was extremely conscious of his son's well being. Accordingly, Josiah Tucker senior ensured that the younger Tucker received an extremely good education. Upon coming of age, he was initially sent to school in Ruthin, Denbighshire, north-eastern Wales, where he displayed a particular aptitude for the classics. He then matriculated at St. John's College, Oxford in January 1733, under the category of 'pleb' according to the *Alumni Oxonienses*.³² There Tucker received his Bachelor of Arts in 1736, Master of Arts in 1739 and Doctor of Divinity in 1755. Contemporary admirers noted that he was an individual of robust health, for some accounts have come down to us, perhaps apocryphally, claiming that he walked the one hundred and fifty mile journey annually from his home in Wales to Oxford. Apparently, when in one year his father attempted to provide him with the family's only horse, the young Tucker refused it. Having ensured that the beast was 'accordingly returned', noted the author of *Public Characters* in 1799, the year of Tucker's death, 'our student,

²⁹ In Gloucester Public Library, in a letter to [Dr. William] Adams [c. 1706-89], Nov. 14, 1776, Tucker writes that that he will be sixty-three years old, i.e., complete his 'grand-climacteric', on the 28th of that month, meaning that he must have been born in 1713. For a full list of biographical sources on Tucker's life and works, see Introduction, p. 12, n. 1.

³⁰ Gloucester Public Library, 'Tucker Letters', Tucker to Dr. Adams, 6 June 1779.

³¹ *Biography Mirrour*, (London, 1789), pp. 47-8.

³² It is interesting to note that Tucker was an 'establishment *pleb*', whilst Butler a 'dissenting *commoner*', perhaps indicative of the era's increasing 'social mobility'. This emphasis on the period's social mobility has been noted by Anthony Russell, *The Clerical Profession*, (London, SPCK, 1980), p. 31 & Geoffrey Holmes, *Augustan England: Professions, State and Society, 1680-1730*, (London, 1982), pp. 15-8.

for the remainder of the time he continued at the University, actually trudged backwards and forwards, with his baggage at his back!’³³

Unfortunately, there is little reliable information to go on regarding Tucker’s time at Oxford. His steadfastness must have served him well, however, for a number of reputed individuals, ranging from Secker and Smith to Edward Gibbon (1737-94), and, as we have already seen, Butler himself amongst others, remarked that it was an intellectually redundant, dull and lifeless institution.³⁴ In Book V of *WN*, for example, Smith wrote of his Oxford tenure that ‘the greater part of the publick professors have, for these many years, given up altogether even the pretence of teaching’, and in the corresponding view of the Oxford historian C. E. Mallet, eighteenth-century Oxford was a ‘world of drab ideals ... where scholars disinclined for study encountered teachers as indifferent as themselves [...] dreamers found enthusiasm discouraged, education deadened’.³⁵ Tucker probably would have agreed with some, if not all, of these sentiments. For in order to combat this rumoured educative lethargy, many years later he proposed donating fifty pounds annually for the rest of his life as a prize to the most gifted graduate students.³⁶ Nevertheless, there are also two further points worth mentioning here with regard to Tucker’s Oxford education. The first of these relates to Rivers’ claim that within the English universities, the study of reason was elevated above the moral teaching that was far more prevalent in Scotland and in the dissenting academies. A corollary of this, then, is the extent to which Shaftesburian and/or Hutchesonian thought may or may not be said to have infiltrated the Oxford syllabus. And yet since Rivers claims that their influence was only ‘of a limited kind’, the important implication of this is that Tucker’s

³³ Alexander Stephens, *Public Characters of 1798-9*, (London, 2nd Ed., 1799), p. 170.

³⁴ For Butler’s opinion on Oxford, see [Butler’s seventh letter] Butler to Clarke, 30 September [1717], cited in Chapter Three, p. 96 above. Secker also lamented that the tutors in Oxford and Cambridge ‘sadly neglected instructing their pupils in Theological knowledge ...’, cited in Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 80. For treatment of Gibbon’s views, see Pocock, *Barbarism*, I, ‘Gibbon at Oxford: A Crisis in Authority’, pp. 43-9.

³⁵ Smith, *WN*, V., I. III. II [Glasgow Ed., (Oxford University Press, 1976)], Vol. 2, p. 761; Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 258-9; C. E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford*, (Oxford, 1927), III, p. 133.

³⁶ Tucker, *Reflections on the Present Matters in Dispute between Great Britain and Ireland* [henceforth *Britain & Ireland*], (London, 1785), APPENDIX: pp. 35-41. £30 was to be given as first prize and £20 as second prize, and likewise again for the most gifted students at Cambridge. Further to this, Tucker proposed similar though smaller incentivisations for students in the ancient Scottish universities, at pp. 40-1.

brand of neo-Stoicism must have been fostered almost exclusively via his later association with, and close reading of, Butler.³⁷

Having taken holy orders in 1735 at the age of 22, Tucker entered the Church two years later when he received a curacy at St. Stephen's, Bristol. Later in the same year a minor canonry of Bristol Cathedral was also conferred upon him. Tucker's arrival in Bristol marked something of a turning point in the young clergyman's life, for at that time it had only very recently overtaken Norwich as the second city of Great Britain. A burgeoning metropolitan centre in its own right, Bristol's success was owing to the fact that it boasted large deposits of coal at nearby Kingswood, and that it had many newly built and therefore easily navigable roads. As a consequence, the Bristol market dealt in an abundance of domestic foodstuffs such as wheat, butter, milk and eggs, as well as raw industrial materials like timber, wool and iron. Even more importantly, however, because of its favourable geographic location, and particularly its close proximity to the sea, the city became an increasingly important hub for not only domestic but also foreign commerce – as its steady upturn in seaborne trade from 19,878 tonnes in 1700 to 76,000 in 1791 attests.³⁸ As Defoe put it in his 1724 *Tour*:

The Merchants of this City not only have the greatest Trade, but they trade with a more entire Independency upon *London*, than any other Town in *Britain*. And 'tis evident in this particular; viz., That whatsoever Exportations they make to any Part of the world, they are able to bring the full Returns back to their own Port, and can dispose of it there.³⁹

Clearly, then, the hustle and bustle of city-life in Bristol, which would have been completely at odds with the experiences of a young man who grew up in rural Wales, and who studied at Oxford, must have left an indelible mark on Tucker – one that must surely have influenced his economic ideas. As Shelton notes, the fact that Bristol's commerce suffered markedly during the many periods of global conflict that marred the eighteenth century also goes some way towards explaining Tucker's consistent aversion to war. Examples of this include the fact that the city's volume of trade fell dramatically at the height of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-8), i.e., between 1744 and 1747, and once again plummeted during the Seven Years' War (1756-63). Thereafter,

³⁷ See Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 190, 195-99.

³⁸ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 18-19.

³⁹ Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* [1724-27], Vol. II, (7th Ed., London, 1769), p. 306.

owing to American non-importation agreements in the aftermath of the Treaty of Paris in 1763, recovery was once again extremely slow, and this pattern of persistent economic downturn during times of war continued throughout the American and French Revolutions, with the debilitating effects of falling trade often resulting in even swifter declarations of bankruptcy.⁴⁰

In 1739, two years after his arrival in Bristol, Tucker was made rector of All Saint's Church, and it was here that he elicited the attentions of Butler, who subsequently chose him to serve as his private chaplain. Unsurprisingly given the nature of this thesis, this association was to have a profound and lasting impact on the young clergyman; and the two figures became steadfast friends, which remained the case until Butler's untimely death in 1752. Indeed, so impressed was Butler with Tucker that it was under the former's direction that the latter continued to rise within the Church. Tucker's next promotion came about through his bishop's recommendation, for instance, when, in 1749, he returned to St. Stephen's as its rector. Similarly, merely three years later a prebendal stall was granted to Tucker at St. David's in April 1752, and still again at Bristol Cathedral in October 1756. Finally, then, in July 1758, merely four years after Butler's death, Tucker undertook the office of Dean of the Cathedral of Gloucester. This was a position he was to hold for a remarkable forty-one years until his death in 1799.

During the thirteen years that they knew each other, Tucker and Butler spent a large amount of time 'discussing metaphysical and theological subjects'.⁴¹ Clearly, then, the former looked up to the latter, who was more than twenty-years his senior, as a spiritual mentor and guide.⁴² In fact, probably the most widely known anecdote of their shared time together comes from Tucker himself, in a tract written many years after the bishop's death. Here, Tucker remarked upon the fact that Butler used to enjoy many an

⁴⁰ All of Tucker's biographers note the influence of Bristol on the clergyman's economic thought. See Clark, *Josiah Tucker*, pp. 18-21, 172; Shuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, pp. 10-11; Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 19-21. Note too Emma Rothschild's 'Global Commerce and the Question of Sovereignty in the Eighteenth-Century Provinces', *Modern Intellectual History*, 1/ 01, (April 2004), pp. 3-25, esp. pp. 5-6, in which she explains that many of the most notable economic theorists of the eighteenth-century were provincials, including the likes of Turgot and Smith, and that this had an important bearing on the development of their ideas. In our context, this point is furthered by Pocock's observation that nearly all of Tucker's works were printed in Gloucester rather than in London, meaning that he 'wrote unsupported by any party connection'. See Pocock, 'Josiah Tucker on Burke, Locke, and Price', *Virtue*, p. 160.

⁴¹ Stephens, *Public Characters*, p. 171.

⁴² This recalls Clarke's filial treatment of Butler during his earlier years, though there is no evidence to suggest that Tucker suffered any crises of faith as Butler had done.

evening stroll in the gardens of Bristol cathedral, with his young chaplain at his side. On one such occasion when Butler stopped suddenly with something clearly troubling him, he asked: ‘What security is there against the Insanity of Individuals? The Physicians know of none: and as to Divines, we have no Data either from Scripture, or Reason to go upon Relative to this Affair.’ And yet when after a short while, Tucker realised that he could think of no fitting answer to the query, Butler replied that it must be possible, then, for ‘whole Communities and public Bodies [to] be seized with *Fits of Insanity*, as well as Individuals.’⁴³ Evidently, Butler’s presence of mind in this exchange left a significant impression on Tucker, for he was to recall the incident on numerous occasions thereafter in public, drawing parallels between Butler’s musings and, as he saw it, the madness of war.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, it is also notable in two fundamentally important respects. First, in that it is the only example of direct dialogue between the pair that has been preserved, meaning that in some respects the connections between them have to be inferred rather than boldly pronounced.⁴⁵ And second, in that it is a curious demonstration of Butler’s sensitivity to the question of psychological health in day-to-day life and deliberation – a practical and pastoral extension of Butler’s meta-ethical thought, which Butler continually encouraged and Tucker went on to embrace.

II. *Analogy of Religion* I. Probability and Provability.

When Tucker was first introduced to Butler, Butler was by then an extremely well respected figure in the Church of England. He had been ordained Bishop of Bristol a year previously in 1738, and the work for which he was most famous in his own lifetime, *The Analogy*, had also been published antecedent to that in 1736.⁴⁶ At this stage an examination of *The Analogy* is desirable, then, since it is a work which

⁴³ Again, all of Tucker’s main biographers remark upon this episode, see Clarke, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 25; Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, pp. 7-9; Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 14-16.

⁴⁴ See, e.g., *An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal to Those Respectable Personages in Great Britain and Ireland*, (Gloucester, 1775) [henceforth *Humble Address*], pp. 20-1 n., & *Cui Bono?*, Letter III, p. 32; Letter V, pp. 80-1.

⁴⁵ Upon his death Butler had his manuscripts burned; had they survived, there may have been further correspondence between he and Tucker for us to ruminate on. See codicil to Butler’s will, Durham University Library, MS SGD 35/12.

⁴⁶ As a consequence of reading *The Analogy*, the philosophically literate Queen Caroline (1683-1737) appointed Butler clerk of the closet. Upon her deathbed merely a year later, she recommended Butler to John Potter (c. 1674-1747), then Archbishop of Canterbury, thus precipitating Butler’s ordination as Bishop. Butler would also go on to become clerk of the closet to George II (1683-1760) in 1746 until his own death in 1752.

heightens our perception of Butler's Anglicanism, thereby acting as a further connecting bridge between his meta-ethics and Tucker's political economy. Additionally, as a major (if not *the* major) work of eighteenth-century Christian apologetic, *The Analogy* also assists us in situating the 'Butler-Tucker axis' within the context of broader contemporary defences of the clerical establishment, involving a wide array of orthodox and largely latitudinarian thinkers, such as White 'Weathercock' Kennett (1660-1728), Edward Chandler (c. 1668-1750) and Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761) to name but a very small few.⁴⁷ In regards to this point, a figure of particular importance to Tucker in later years was the pugnacious William Warburton (1698-1779), Tucker's Bishop of Gloucester from 1760 until Warburton's death. Warburton's two behemoths of orthodox scholarship, the *Alliance between Church and State* (1736) and *The Divine Legation of Moses* (1737-41) were extremely influential and contentious in their day, and remained so throughout the eighteenth century; and it is in these works, then, that we may detect some major discrepancies between Warburton's particular brand of orthodoxy and Butler and Tucker's – ultimately bringing Warburton and Tucker into conflict.⁴⁸ Though it is not possible to explore the particulars of this intriguing line of enquiry within the confines of this present study, nonetheless, it will be incumbent upon us to comment in our conclusion on some of the major implications of this exchange regarding the prospect of future Tucker scholarship.⁴⁹ For the present, however, we will have to content ourselves by pausing for a brief moment to consider that all four of Butler's *Fifteen Sermons* and *The Analogy*, and Warburton's *Church and State* and *The Divine Legation*, were published under the auspices of James and John Knapton, the so-called 'leading publishers of Whig churchmen in the earlier eighteenth century'. This is an incredibly intriguing point since, by implication, the Knaptons also acted as co-facilitators of what has been tentatively described by Tennant as 'Whiggish Enlightenment'.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, p. 279, writes that the analogical method was 'an inherently conservative device, legitimating the status quo'. Furthermore, Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 27, notes that after the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 'freethinking of all sorts ... was not thought to be successfully refuted by the orthodox until the mid 1730s' – his inference being until the publication of *The Analogy*.

⁴⁸ Pocock has described *The Divine Legation* as one of the two axiomatic works of conservative English enlightenment, alongside Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, in 'Clergy and Commerce ...', Ajello *et al.* (eds.), *L'eta' dei lumi*, I, pp. 523–62. Cf. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, p. 174.

⁴⁹ See Conclusion, Section IV.

⁵⁰ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 42-3. The small list of Anglican figures briefly listed above were also published under the auspices of the Knaptons; to which can also be added the names of Samuel Clarke and his brother John (1682-1757); John Jackson (1686-1763); Butler's replacement as

Butler's 'Advertisement' to *The Analogy* is steeped in Augustan and Shaftesburian irony, immediately reminding us, and indeed Butler's readers, of who it is he is addressing within its pages: i.e., those freethinkers, deists and general critics of the established Church whom we explored in Chapter Two.⁵¹ Butler begins therefore with the following observation:

Christianity is ... discovered to be fictitious among all People of Discernment ... to set it up as a principle Subject of Mirth and Ridicule, as it were, by Way of Reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the Pleasures of the World ...

And, in a later passage, he also adds the following clause, which is directly related:

Those Persons appear to forget, that Revelation is to be considered, as informing us of somewhat New, in the State of Mankind, and in the Government of the World; as acquainted us with some Relations we stand in, which could not otherwise have been known.⁵²

As Lori Branch puts it, then, and as Butler's own wording suggests, one of the central messages of *The Analogy* is to highlight Butler's 'despondency' over the era's 'zeal for negation' in all religious matters.⁵³

In the introduction Butler begins his counter-offensive by listing his line of argumentation for the whole of *The Analogy* in one incredibly long, though remarkably succinct, sentence:

That Mankind is appointed to live in a future State [i]; That There, every one shall be rewarded or punished [ii]; ... for all that Behaviour Here, which [signifies] Virtuous or Vitious, morally good or evil [iii]; That our present Life is a Probation, a State of Trial [iv], and of Discipline [v], for that future one; Notwithstanding the objection ... against there being any such moral Plan as this at all [vi]; ... as it stands so imperfectly made known to us at present [vii]; That this World being in a State of Apostacy and Wickedness ... this gave occasion for an additional Dispensation of Providence ... [Part II. i]; proved by Miracles [ii]; but containing in it many things ... not to have been expected [iii]; a Dispensation of

Bishop of Bristol, John Conybeare (1692-1755); Edward Stillingfleet (1636-99), and John Sharp (c. 1644/5-1714). Furthermore, continuing our theme of the camaraderie that existed between British and European Protestantism, the Knaptons also released important translations of Grotius, Leibniz and the French Cartesian Jacques Rohault (1618-72), as well as a dictionary of all current religions.

⁵¹ Esp. Collins and Tindal, according to Rivers, who also states that *The Analogy* was 'the most long-lived of the main attacks on the principles of freethinking', *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 17.

⁵² *The Analogy*, 'Advertisement', p. 153.

⁵³ Lori Branch, 'Bishop Butler', in Andrew Hass, David Jasper & Elisabeth Jay (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*, (Oxford, 2007), pp. 591-99, at p. 597.

Providence, which is a ... System of things [iv]; carried on by the Mediation of a divine Person ... in order to the Recovery of the World [v]; yet not revealed to all Men, nor proved with the strongest possible Evidence to all those to whom it is revealed; but only to such a Part of Mankind, and with such particular Evidence as the Wisdom of God thought fit [vi, viii].⁵⁴

Here we immediately perceive Butler's main aim in *The Analogy*, which is essentially to argue (as he had done in part in *Fifteen Sermons*) *the limits of human knowledge and reason*.⁵⁵ This is fundamentally important, because within *The Analogy* Butler's overall scheme is premised on two main points: (a) that just because we exist within the framework of the (ostensibly 'empirically-knowable') world, does not necessarily suppose that (b) we have the (cap)ability to comprehensively account for it. As a consequence, *The Analogy* makes two crucial counterpoints: (1) that the sufficiency of human knowledge should not necessarily be placed in terms of its approximation to empirical truth; but rather that (2) the sufficiency of human knowledge ought to be based just as legitimately on (the adequacy of) its relation to Christian revelation. To put it another way, here Butler is essentially arguing that it is impossible to arrive at any sort of systematic account of the natural world, including natural religion, in spite of what many 'modern philosophers' increasingly suppose –clearly 'a dagger in the heart of the European Enlightenment', according to Tennant.⁵⁶

With these points in mind, Butler makes it immediately clear his intention to present *The Analogy* as a thoroughly *anti-systematic* work:

It is not my Design to enquire further into the Nature, the Foundation, and Measure of Probability; or whence it proceeds that *Likeness* should beget that Presumption, Opinion, and full Conviction, which the human Mind is formed to receive from it, and which it does necessarily produce in every one; or to guard against the Errors to which, Reasoning from Analogy is liable. [For this] belongs to the Subject of Logick ...⁵⁷

Rather, in *The Analogy* Butler concerns himself with basing ontological investigation on *analogical argumentation*, thereby recalling much of his earliest correspondence with

⁵⁴ *The Analogy*, pp. ix-x. The helpful editorial insertions are Tennant's, in *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 77-8.

⁵⁵ Clearly, this is in part a continuation of the seventeenth-century latitudinarian tradition of the 'self-imposed limits' of rationalism. See Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 48.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁵⁷ *The Analogy*, pp. iii, iv.

Clarke.⁵⁸ However, in order to navigate the intricacies of this proposed scheme, Butler first inquires into the meaning of the word ‘probable’, which in the mid-eighteenth-century still meant something closer to its etymological root, ‘provable’. This having been established, we can now see that in *The Analogy*, Butler is in fact attempting to account for the *proof*, or perhaps more pertinently the lack thereof, behind Christian accounts of the Revelation:

... the *Proof of Religion* is said to be involved in such inextricable Difficulties, as to render it doubtful; and ... left [standing] upon doubtful Evidence. [... However] it is according to the Conduct and Character of the Author of Nature, to appoint [how] we should act upon Evidence [identical] to That, which this Argument presumes He cannot be supposed to appoint [how] we should act upon [... Therefore] as the Force of this Answer, lies merely in the Parallel which there is, between the *Evidence for Religion* and for our temporal Conduct; the Answer is equally just and conclusive, whether the Parallel be made out, by shewing, the Evidence of the former to be higher, or the Evidence of the latter to be lower.⁵⁹

Although the above excerpt is taken from the last chapter of *The Analogy* proper,⁶⁰ even in the very first sentence of its introduction, Butler posits a similar – to him an *axiomatic* – observation: i.e., that

Probable Evidence is essentially distinguished from demonstrative by this, that it admits of Degrees; and of all Variety of them from the highest moral Certainty to the very lowest Presumption.⁶¹

Because of this, Butler’s line of reasoning throughout the entirety of *The Analogy* is premised on the fundamentally important belief that, contrary to the spurious claims of the possibility of empirical certainty (especially via, and not in spite of the contemporaneous celebration of the Baconian Method), ‘evidence’ can never be truly

⁵⁸ See Chapter Three, Section II.

⁵⁹ *The Analogy*, p. 279; emphases added.

⁶⁰ *The Analogy*, II. VII: ‘Of the Objections which may be made against arguing, from the Analogy of Nature, to Religion’, pp. 275-88.

⁶¹ The intellectual climate in which *The Analogy* was conceived and published can be set against the orthodox Peter Browne’s (1665-1735) critique of Locke in *The Procedure, Extent, and Limits of Human Understanding* (London, 1728), and his complimentary *Things Divine and Supernatural Conceived by Analogy with Things Natural and Human*, (London, 1733), the latter of which refutes the deistic conclusions that can be drawn from Locke’s theory of knowledge. For useful discussion, see Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 82-6, where he also highlights the influence of Berkeley’s *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher. In Seven Dialogues ... Containing an Apology for the Christian Religion, against those who are called Free-thinkers*, 2 vols., (London, 1732) & more generally, Nicholas Malebranche (1638-1715). Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 62-5 where she notes Bishop William King’s (1659-1720) analogical *Divine Predestination and Fore-knowledg, consistent with the Freedom of Man’s Will* (Dublin; London, 1709). Typical contemporary refutations of Cartesianism are also worth mentioning here.

absolute, since, according to Butler, notions of ‘truth’ are inherently bound by that which temporal society deems to be ‘appropriate’ and/or ‘acceptable’.⁶²

To put it yet another way, in *The Analogy* Butler’s main strategy is thus to point out that in a society comprised of individuals who are inherently lacking in knowledge – for such is always the case with earthly creatures – ‘evidence’ and so-called ‘truth’ are *always insufficient*. Contrariwise, Butler posits that evidence or experience is in fact *relative*: for ‘Probable Evidence’, he writes, ‘affords but an *imperfect kind of Information*; and is to be considered *as relative* only to *Beings of limited Capacities*’ – again, such as humans inevitably are.⁶³ By implication, throughout *The Analogy* Butler continually states that though probabilistic argumentation may be an extremely useful guide for human conduct, nevertheless, it can never be a truly adequate substitute for true knowledge. This is because, according to Butler, full or complete knowledge is simply impossible to obtain in this present life:

[Nothing] which is the possible object of Knowledge, whether past, present, or future, can be probable to an infinite Intelligence [i.e., to God]; since it cannot but be discerned absolutely as it is in itself, certainly true, or certainly false. But, to Us [i.e., lesser finite beings], Probability is the very Guide of Life.⁶⁴

III. *Analogy of Religion II: Faith and Doubt.*

With *The Analogy*’s initial premise put in place, Butler proceeds with an explanation of what it is he intends to achieve by it. ‘[Instead of] ... forming imaginary Models of a World, and Schemes of governing it’, he therefore declares in overtly anti-Cartesian tone, ‘[let us instead] turn our Thoughts to what we experience to be the Conduct of Nature with respect to intelligent Creatures’.⁶⁵ Viewed from this perspective, the crux of *The Analogy* – similar to *Fifteen Sermons* in this respect – is to remind the reader of the *sufficiency of faith and trust in God*. For it is in the realm of ethics, Butler insists, rather than in the dichotomous conflict between dogmatic metaphysicians on the one side and

⁶² *The Analogy*, p. i.

⁶³ *The Analogy*, p. iii; emphases added.

⁶⁴ *The Analogy*, p. iii.

⁶⁵ *The Analogy*, p. viii. Note here that Butler describes humans as ‘intelligent’ (i.e., ‘rational’) creatures in a neo-Stoic vein, despite the fact that true knowledge is, in his view, unobtainable in this life.

uncompromising empiricists on the other, that human conduct ought truly to be based.⁶⁶ Furthermore, and crucially, since Butler argues that human reliance on ‘probability’ is frequently subjected to cases of ‘anomaly’ (which is analogous to *Fifteen Sermons*’ contention that existence is punctuated by moments of ‘immoderation’),⁶⁷ Butler claims that acceptance of doubt is in fact a practical necessity in day-to-day experience: a naturally-endowed corollary of our partial ignorance, despite the fact that there may be probabilities ‘so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the Truth’.⁶⁸ As Tennant summarises, then, for ‘Beings of limited Capacities [again, such are human beings] *all* epistemological and inductive mental capacity is probabilistic’; and it is this very point that Butler is attempting to advance within *The Analogy*, even at the cost of turning his back on certain elements of his Newtonian and Clarkeian heritage:⁶⁹

It is ... but an exceeding little Way, and in but a very few Respects, that we can trace up the natural Course of things before us, to general Laws. [Therefore] it is only from Analogy, that we conclude, the Whole of it to be capable of being reduced into them; only from our seeing, that Part is so. It is from our finding, that the Course of Nature, in some Respects and so far, goes on by general Laws, that we conclude this of the Whole.⁷⁰

In setting up the argument of *The Analogy* in such fashion, above all Butler is endeavouring to refute even the most dogged religious sceptic by admitting, again, (a) the limits of human knowledge, but that (b), based upon this very standard the probability of the existence of God, miracles and of the Christian Revelation simply cannot be refuted easily – that is to say, *cannot be refuted with any degree of certainty*. In effect, this is the full depth (or rather simplicity) of Butler’s argumentation when he insists, as we saw in our previous chapter, that even ‘though natural Religion is the

⁶⁶ In other words, Butler is stating that the claims of empiricists or rationalists are equally indemonstrable when considered in terms of the totality of this *and* the afterlife.

⁶⁷ E.g., *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 22, 94, 125-6, 150, 220-1, 233-4. Cf. Chapter Three, p. 108.

⁶⁸ *The Analogy*, p. iii.

⁶⁹ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 95; emphasis added.

⁷⁰ *The Analogy*, p. 189. Note Butler’s denial here that even Newton’s laws contain within them the full scope of reasonably inferable knowledge. Here we must acknowledge that Sermon XV of *Fifteen Sermons* was entitled ‘Upon the Ignorance of Man’, demonstrating in turn that Butler’s forceful and expressive defence of Anglican orthodoxy in *The Analogy* was in fact an extension of an enterprise begun (unbeknownst to him at the time) in the first of his letters to Clarke, continued and developed in the first and second editions of *Fifteen Sermons*, and so brought through to successful completion in the latest of his works. In fact, Tennant argues that many of the chapters in *The Analogy* were reworked sermons that did not make it into the final publication of *Fifteen Sermons* itself, particularly the appended dissertation *Of the Nature of Virtue*. Consequently, although the language of *The Analogy* is palpably more esoteric than that of *Fifteen Sermons*, Butler is nevertheless constantly attempting to ground it in such a way that it remains consistent with his pastoral function – and duty – to the laity, just as his earlier work had done. For further discussion, see Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 79-82, 113.

Foundation and principal Part of Christianity, it is not in any Sense the whole of it'.⁷¹

To which we may now also add the following clarification of Butler's viewpoint:

*Christianity is a Republication of natural Religion ... It instructs Mankind in the moral System of the World ... it teaches Natural Religion, in its genuine Simplicity; free from those Superstitions, with which, it was totally corrupted [i.e., by Roman Catholicism] ... Revelation is farther, an authoritative Publication of natural Religion, and so affords the Evidence of Testimony for the Truth of it.*⁷²

This being the case, in *The Analogy* Butler claims that the two kingdoms of heaven and earth are *equally relevant*, in the sense that, again, both cannot be reduced to general laws:

God's miraculous Interpositions may have been, all along in like manner, by *general* Laws of Wisdom ... Unknown indeed to us: but no more unknown, than the Laws from whence it is, that Some die as soon as they are born, and Others live to extream Old-age ... which ... we cannot reduce to any Laws or Rules at all, though it is taken for granted, that they are as much reduceable to general ones, as Gravitation.⁷³

In essence, then, this is what Butler meant in *Fifteen Sermons* when he alluded to the daily practice of loving God – since, simply put, for Butler both the temporal and divine are considered as one.⁷⁴ This is elaborated upon even further in *The Analogy* via Butler's continued insistence that true Christianity is in fact an everyday – and by this,

⁷¹ Cf. Chapter Three, p. 108.

⁷² *The Analogy*, p. 144; emphases added. This excerpt 'originate[s] in a relatively recent sermon aimed at Tindal' according to Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 80. Interestingly, William Law's contemporaneous refutation of Tindal in *The Case of Reason, Or Natural Religion, Fairly and Fully Stated. In Answer to a Book entitl'd, Christianity as Old as the Creation*, (London, 1731) also bears some similarity to *The Analogy*. This is intriguing, given that Law and Butler are usually placed at opposite ends of the 'mystical-rational scale' in eighteenth-century study. For discussion see Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, pp. 127-9. Essentially, Law argues that Tindal overestimates the primacy of reason as the correlate of nature/natural religion. For the similarities between Law and Hume's critiques of reason, although clearly in differing contexts from each other, see also p. 129, n. 26. Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 82-3 n. 301 & p. 289.

⁷³ *The Analogy*, p. 190. In Butler's use of the analogy of gravitation, here we discern once again his Newtonian influences. Nevertheless, as Christopher Cunliffe's *ODNB* article explains, Butler 'constantly directs attention to the way that we *ordinarily think* and insists that we cannot and should not proceed differently in matters of religion. In religion as in ordinary life what is needed for reasonable belief is not certainty but enough probability to warrant action'. Likewise, Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 87, states that Butler 'proposes' in *The Analogy* that we look 'at the world not through a telescope or microscope but at a normal, human level of magnification' – and again, there are clear parallels here with Butler's concern for the laity in *Fifteen Sermons*, who constitute said 'normal, human level of magnification'.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 269; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 276; Chapter Three above, p. 114.

he means a sort of routine – ‘determinate Course of Life’; a ‘*practical*’ religion, he insists, albeit a ‘*Scheme imperfectly comprehended*’.⁷⁵

Persons who speak of the Evidence of a Religion as doubtful, and of this supposed Doubtfulness as a positive Argument against it, should be put upon considering what That Evidence indeed is, which they act upon with regard to their temporal Interests. For, it is ... in many Cases, absolutely impossible, to balance Pleasure and Pain, Satisfaction and Uneasiness, so as to be able to say, on which Side the Overplus is ...⁷⁶

These are also the means, then, by which Butler refutes the claims of arguably the most influential deist, Shaftesbury, alongside his most fulsome intellectual heirs. For quite apart from disliking Shaftesbury and his ethics on a personal level, Butler insists that deists and freethinkers of his ilk *misunderstand nature*, thereby rendering the type of philosophy and ethics they deploy as manifestly unsound, and overly presumptive.⁷⁷ Hence, although Butler acknowledges that such thinkers may dismiss the plausibility of the central Christian narrative, describing it as ‘a long Series of intricate Means’, ‘round-about Ways’ and ‘many perplexed Contrivances’, nevertheless, he also turns the argument on its head once again (a favourite tactic of his, judging by his earlier treatment of Hobbes and Mandeville) by observing that ‘Mystery is as great in Nature, as in Christianity’:

The Change of Seasons, the Ripening of the Fruits of the Earth, the very History of a Flower, is an instance of this [mystery]: And so is human Life [...] Men are impatient and for precipitating things: but the Author of Nature appears deliberate throughout his Operations; accomplishing his natural Ends, by slow successive Steps. And there is a Plan of things

⁷⁵ *The Analogy*, p. 278 &, e.g., I. IV: ‘Of Christianity, considered as a Scheme or Constitution, imperfectly comprehended’, pp. 185-93.

⁷⁶ *The Analogy*, pp. 215-6. Butler’s reference to ‘practical religion’ is probably an allusion to Archbishop Thomas Tenison’s (1636-1715) call for Anglicans to devote themselves to the practical uses of religion rather than political partisanship. Since Ingram claims, e.g., that Archbishop Secker used Tenison as his archiepiscopal model, it is not unreasonable to suggest that this approach might also have been adopted by Butler. See Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 115 & n. 6.

⁷⁷ In his private notes Shaftesbury called orthodox Christianity a ‘vulgar religion ... that sordid, shameful nauseous idea of Deity’, see Rand (ed.), *Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of ... Shaftesbury*, p. 24. See also, e.g., Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 120-1: ‘Whereas Butler opposes Hobbes’s doctrine, we have noted several times ... a dislike of Shaftesbury which is more personal. Shaftesbury’s influence was all-pervasive in the culture of the early eighteenth-century ... [which Butler thinks has a] corrosive effect [because of its] aristocratic and narcissistic thinking. The concept of doubt is not only alien to [Shaftesbury] and his followers [such as Hutcheson and the deists/freethinkers], but is theoretically impossible: doubt would be an ugly denial of the ‘lovely rules’’. As Brooke further notes in *Philosophical Pride*, p. 119, Shaftesbury argues that humanity’s propensity towards virtue is based on eudemonism – which Butler (and later Kant) denies. In this, Butler may have been following Clark’s observation in his *Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion*, p. 171, that ‘He who Dies for the sake of Virtue, is [not] really any more Happy, than he that dies for any fond Opinion or any unreasonable Humour or Obstinacy whatsoever’.

beforehand laid out, which, from the Nature of it, requires various Systems of Means, as well as Length of Time, in order to [carry on] its several Parts into Execution.⁷⁸

Put another way, here Butler insists that *human existence* in the material world, which is to say the food, clothing and shelter we seek; the affection and friendship we crave; if not the very air we breathe, is *contingent upon faith*, because without faith, humans are subject to the whims and fancies of *fortuna*.⁷⁹

Whilst Butler admits alongside freethinkers, then, that the ancient philosophers (the ‘Bulk of Mankind in the heathen World’, as Butler puts it) may have had legitimate access to natural religion, nevertheless, Butler also insists that the contemporary deist insistence on the sufficiency of their wisdom is completely erroneous.⁸⁰ Indeed, since the ancients lacked what Butler calls the ‘positive Institutions’ of Christianity, consequently it is only ‘in Scripture’, he insists in a tellingly Trinitarian passage, that ‘are revealed the Relations, which the Son and Holy Spirit stand in to us [...] the general Duty to be paid to the Son and holy Ghost ... the religious Regards of Reverence, Honour, Love, Trust, Gratitude, Fear, Hope’.⁸¹ By extension, Butler is therefore claiming that it is only via the reinforcing habits and customs of Christian orthodoxy that the implications of natural religion fully reveal themselves.⁸² Even more interestingly, Butler goes on to state that the human affections, mediated by the conscience, are essentially ‘the means of drawing’ what he calls ‘revealed religion into the ordinary practices of daily life’ – meaning in turn, according to Tennant, that in Butler’s thought, the City of God metaphor is ‘applied to the mind as well as the Church’.⁸³ This claim is further supported by *The Analogy*’s reiteration of perhaps *Fifteen Sermons*’ central claim: i.e., the notion that ethical consciousness can and ought to be realised via sociability between humans on the one side (human nature), and

⁷⁸ *The Analogy*, pp. 191, 2.

⁷⁹ These are noticeably Tuckerian expressions, particularly with regard to the human ‘necessaries of life’, such as food, raiment and dwelling. See Tucker’s *Elements*, pp. 41-2, discussed in Chapter Five below, p. 192.

⁸⁰ *The Analogy*, pp. 147-8. For the full context to this debate, see Rivers’ treatment in *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, Chap. 1: ‘The true religion of nature: the freethinkers and their opponents’, pp. 7-84.

⁸¹ *The Analogy*, pp. 151, 152; emphasis added. Cf. *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 144; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, pp. 144.

⁸² See Tucker’s similar observation in *Seventeen Sermons*, p. 16: ‘The like Observation may be made with Respect to *Natural Religion*, and the Powers and Light of Reason. For, not only in particular men, but whole Nations and Countries have been for several Ages past, and many are at this Day in the grossest Ignorance of the most important Points of moral Duties’.

⁸³ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 119.

between humankind and God on the other (revelation). For as we have seen, though *Fifteen Sermons* deals predominantly, though not exclusively, with the former of these two points, conversely, in *The Analogy* Butler devotes his full attention to the latter, thereby connected the two works, and ensuring that they are closely akin.

This complex interplay between the social relationship between God and humanity on the one side (i.e., the main concern of *Fifteen Sermons*), and the attendant issue of the clash between religious orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and of natural and revealed religion, on the other (i.e., the main concern of *The Analogy*), is fundamentally important, and one that was to have a profound influence on Tucker's thought. Yet as we alluded to at the outset of discussion of *The Analogy*, there are a number of fundamental idiosyncrasies within Butler's brand of orthodoxy which placed him at odds not only with contemporary non-believers or non-conformists, but also with other Anglican defenders of the establishment who were writing similarly during this period; particularly in our case, Warburton.⁸⁴ Again, it is regrettable that we will only be able to hint at the importance of the relationship between the three clergymen in our concluding remarks to the whole. This being the case, we are forced to end our examination of *The Analogy* at this juncture with a final observation regarding Butler's ultimate purpose in publishing the work, encapsulated in the following query. If, according to Butler, the search for absolute empirical certainty or true knowledge (be it religious or secular) is both a theoretical and practical impossibility, what authority, he asks, do deists, sceptics and freethinkers have 'to deny religion the right to occupy space in civil society'?⁸⁵ Butler's answer to this rhetorical question is, of course, that they do not have that right; and in making such a statement as this, essentially the bishop reduces his entire theophilosophical system to the following: that the apparent disparity between natural and revealed religion presupposes doubt, and that *because* rather than *in spite* of the fact that we are *rational beings* (once again in the Stoic sense), presupposing *doubt* necessarily presupposes a commensurate measure of *faith*:

[There] may be People who will not accept of such imperfect Information from Scripture. Some too have not Integrity and Regard enough to Truth, to attend to Evidence, which keeps the Mind in Doubt, perhaps Perplexity, and which is much of a different Sort from what they

⁸⁴ This lends credence to Young's central claim that contemporary debate and disagreement flowered *within the walls* of the established Church, in his *Religion and Enlightenment*, passim.

⁸⁵ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 121-2.

expected. And it plainly requires a Degree of Modesty and Fairness, beyond what every one had, for a Man to say, not to the World, but to Himself, that there is a real Appearance of somewhat of great Weight in this Matter, though he is not able thoroughly to satisfy himself about it ... It is much more easy, and more falls in with the Negligence Presumption and Willfulness of the Generality, to determine at once, with a decisive Air, There is nothing in it. The Prejudices arising from that absolute Contempt and Scorn, with which this Evidence is treated in the World, I do not mention. For what indeed can be said to Persons, who are weak enough in their Understanding, to think This any Presumption against it; or, if they do not, are yet weak enough in their Temper to be influenced, by such Prejudices, upon such a Subject [?]⁸⁶

As we shall imminently see, such pious thinking was to impress itself firmly upon the mind of his young chaplain.

IV. The Methodist Controversy I: Tucker, Whitefield and the ‘Marks of the New Birth’.

Having explored *Fifteen Sermons* and *The Analogy*, we are now possessed of a nuanced account of Butler’s theological *schema*, and particularly the ways in which his orthodoxy, meta-ethics and moral philosophy are tightly interwoven. Although laborious, such a piecemeal examination of Butler’s ideas and texts has been necessary, for in this and in the following chapters, we will go on to note the remarkable extent of his theological reach into the core of Tucker’s political economy. Before embarking on this path, however, we return to Tucker at this stage, in an effort to garner a clearer idea of his own theology, alongside the ways in which it coalesced with Butler’s independent of his later economic concerns (admittedly they were rarely, if ever, independent; yet for the sake of thematic clarity, we will keep his economics and theology separate for the present). As already alluded to, this we will approach via Butler and Tucker’s important relationship with George Whitefield and John Wesley, the leaders of what Rivers has called the ‘most significant challenge’ to Anglican orthodoxy in the mid-eighteenth-century – Methodism – and one that was significant precisely because it did not emerge from the typically hostile climes of deism or dissent.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ *The Analogy*, pp. 255-6. Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 14, dismisses Butler’s scheme as a ‘rather feeble resort to equal probability’, but this surely says more about the sensibilities of the late twentieth-century mind as opposed to those of Butler’s era.

⁸⁷ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 205.

Also referred to as the Evangelical Revival, the most significant feature of the Methodist movement was John Wesley (1703-91) and George Whitefield's (1714-70) insistence on 'reinterpreting' the Reformation doctrines of justification and regeneration, and of 'rechristening' them as the spontaneous and *internal* 'Marks of the New Birth'. For, in turn, Whitefield and Wesley emphasised that which they believed to be the invisible operations of the Spirit, meaning that they repudiated works as a condition (rather than a necessary outcome) of justification, and attempted instead to bring 'feeling' and 'emotion' to the forefront of religion.⁸⁸ Taken together, these elements constitute what Rivers describes as the 'complex and subtle attempt to resolve the problem that dominated English thought from the time of the Reformation, the relationship between religion and ethics'.⁸⁹ Furthermore, in the case of Wesley in particular, she claims that throughout his adult life he felt that true religion was increasingly under attack from 'two distinct quarters': first from those who 'laid too much stress on faith, feeling, experience and inward religion'; and second, from the propagators of the 'religion of reason', typically and familiarly including deists and freethinkers, but more especially those clerical moralists who 'overvalued reason' and 'insidiously undermined Scripture from within by misinterpreting and misapplying it'.⁹⁰

Of the two groups, it can be argued (and indeed it was argued among certain contemporaries) that the likes of Tucker and Butler belonged to the latter category (particularly in light of Butler's appeals to 'cool reason' and rational agency in *Fifteen Sermons*). For as the anti-Butlerian and quasi-Arian Archdeacon Francis Blackburne (1705-87) was to later put it in mocking tones, those who overemphasised reason in their religion risked reducing the role of revelation to 'no higher office than holding the

⁸⁸ See esp. Wesley, Sermon 18. 'The Marks of the New Birth' in *The Works of John Wesley*, F. Baker *et al.* (eds.), Vol. I, *Sermons*, A. C. Outler (ed.), p. 418.

⁸⁹ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, Chap. 5, this citation at p. 207. For further scholarship on eighteenth-century Methodism see Rupert Davies, *Methodism*, (Harmondsworth, 1963); J. D. Walsh, 'Origins of the Evangelical Revival', in Bennett & Walsh (eds.), *Essays in modern English Church History*, (A. & C. Black, 1966); 'Methodism at the End of the Eighteenth Century' in Davies & Gordon Rupp (eds.), *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain*, Vol 1., (London, Epworth Press, 1965); Alan C. Clifford, *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theory 1640-1790: An Evaluation*, (Oxford, 1990), esp. Chaps. 4, 5, 10; Gregory, *Restoration, Reformation, and Reform, 1660-1828*, 'The Church and Methodism', pp. 223-32.

⁹⁰ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 207. We shall return to this second point in Section VII below.

candle to it'.⁹¹ This, then, was what Blackburne was clearly insinuating regarding Butler's brand of orthodoxy, and it is worth pausing briefly to consider here that Tucker's *Apology for the Present Church of England ... Occasioned by a Petition ... Abolishing Subscriptions* (1772) [henceforth *Apology*] was written in riposte to Blackburne, the architect of said petition. In any event, Rivers details the three major phases in the genesis of (predominantly Wesleyan) Methodism: firstly, its origins in Oxford from c. 1725-35; secondly, Wesley's visit to the German Moravians in 1738, sandwiched between his voyage to and settlement in Georgia from 1735-7, and his return to England and arrival in Bristol in 1739; and lastly, the longer period from the 1740s until Wesley's death in 1791, comprised of his initial breach with the Moravians and the Calvinists in the 1740s, and thereafter his repeated repudiations of antinomian and establishment criticisms of his theology.⁹² By necessity, our present examination brings us into contact with the second and beginning of the third of these stages, particularly from 1739 to 1742, when Methodism was still very much in its infancy. It should clearly go without saying, however, that it is chiefly Butler and Tucker, rather than Wesley and Whitefield, whom we are concerned with in the pages that follow; and that it is merely owing to the fact that the latter's ideas serve to accentuate the former's that we are able to utilise them here.

As we have just mentioned, by 1739 Whitefield was a resident of Bristol. Shortly returned from his missionary work in America, it was at this time that he began his infamous evangelising activities in Butler's diocese. Whitefield was becoming particularly well known for preaching unorthodox field sermons in an increasingly zealous manner, and in one letter dated April 1739, he even described his pulpit style as that of a 'madman'.⁹³ Two months previously, on 15 February 1739, Whitefield had begun a correspondence with Butler requesting the bishop's permission to preach at St Mary, Redcliffe.⁹⁴ Treating Whitefield 'with the utmost civility' according to Wesley's journal, Butler was surprisingly lenient regarding Whitefield's admitted breaches of

⁹¹ Francis Blackburne, *Works, Theological and Miscellaneous*, 7 Vols., (Cambridge, 1805), I, cxx, 315, lxxxiv.

⁹² Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, pp. 208-9.

⁹³ *Letters of George Whitefield for the Period 1734-42*, (Edinburgh, 1776), Whitefield to Wesley, 3 April, 1739, p. 405.

⁹⁴ The approach was initially rebuffed by the president of Bristol Cathedral, Carew Reynell, who threatened Whitefield with excommunication. See Whitefield, *Journals*, (Edinburgh Ed., 1960), p. 214 & his *A Continuation [of the Journal]*, (London, 1739), p. 25.

canon law, on account of the charitable activity he felt Whitefield was promoting in his diocese in spite of his infelicities.⁹⁵ Yet whereas Butler reserved most of his attention for Wesley (the subject of the following section), perhaps because of their earlier Oxford connection, Tucker was far less willing to let Whitefield off as lightly. Consequently, in two issues of the *Gentleman's Magazine* dated May-June 1739, Tucker's first known appearance in public, he queried Whitefield regarding his controversial style of proselytization – an exchange that is worth examining at length for its demonstration of Tucker's 'initiation' of sorts into late-Augustan, Whig 'print-culture'.⁹⁶

The dispute between Tucker and Whitefield had its roots in Whitefield's claim that during his university days he had read the Scottish Episcopalian Henry Scougal's (1650-78) *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*; 'a Book worth its Weight in Gold' as Whitfield had put it, and one which had immediately opened his eyes to the prospect of 'rapturous conversion'.⁹⁷ Years later, when Whitefield had settled among Butler's parishioners, this prompted Tucker to respond in a broadsheet dated 16 April 1739 with the following:

This abstract of the life of Mr. Whitefield with his tenets of the new birth and principles of religion (being the substance of what he was endeavouring to propagate in private, and instill into some of my parishioners) was told me by a gentleman present at [a recent] conversation ... The contents I afterwards carried to Mr. Whitefield to know from his own mouth, if he did maintain such positions; who acknowledg'd them to be his doctrine, and set his hand to the paper of which this is a true copy.⁹⁸

Leaving aside the immediate subject at hand for a brief moment, in this first public appearance by Tucker's hand we discern a far more animated, confrontational and

⁹⁵ Whitefield, *Journals*, p. 276. As we shall see in our Conclusion, the emphasis on charity is an important lynchpin of the Butler-Tucker axis.

⁹⁶ *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. IX (1739), [May issue] pp. 238-43; [June issue] pp. 292-7. Tucker dates his entry for the second installment as 14 June 1739. Tucker's dealings with Methodism have been dealt with rather glibly in both Clark, *Dean Tucker*, p. 52 & Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, pp. 8-9. However, Shelton's *Dean Tucker* devotes more energy to the episode – see Chap. 2: 'Bristol and the Methodist Controversy', pp. 17-36 – and accordingly, the present author has cited from this source where appropriate.

⁹⁷ *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. IX, pp. 238-9. For Wesley's edition of Scougal's work, see Rivers (ed.), *Books and their Readers in 18th Century England*, (Leicester, 1982), p. 156. For the importance of Scougal's work over a period of 150 years, see also her 'Scougal's *The Life of God in the soul of man*: The fortunes of a book, 1676-1830' in Savage (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*, pp. 29-55.

⁹⁸ Cited in Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 23 & p. 274 n. 8, where Shelton states that a copy of the broadsheet may be found among Secker's papers at Lambeth Palace.

disputative style compared to that of his bishop. In part, this is attributable to the fact that Butler tended to avoid polemics in a way that Tucker curiously took to. Yet more than that, this is also indicative of Butler's tendency towards calculated restraint in philosophical and religious matters, traceable back to his earliest and cagiest letters to Clarke. Ultimately, then, it is this bellicosity which takes Tucker away from Butler's far more systematic, cautious, and subtle approach, thereby providing Tucker with a distinct voice of his own, particularly from the economic tracts onwards (see following chapter). And indeed, whilst on the one hand this may simply reveal the differences in their respective temperaments, on the other, it might also be an important marker of Tucker's confident establishment upbringing, as opposed to Butler's self-conscious and 'awkward' dissenting heritage. On this matter, readers are left to judge for themselves. Nevertheless, regarding Tucker's own opinion of his writing style, many years later when the Blue Stockings Society poet Hannah More (1745-1833) suggested that he might polish it, Tucker responded with something to the effect that it was substance over style that he most coveted. 'Oh, no, they don't expect a fine style from me', he reportedly told her. 'All that I care for are the authenticity of my facts, and the truth of my principles'.⁹⁹

In the related article entitled '*QUERIES to Mr. Whitefield, by the Rev. Mr T-CK-R, Minister of All Saints, Bristol; not answer'd*', Tucker next asks Whitefield to respond and expand upon three questions put to him regarding the nascent Methodist conception of the 'new birth' – as follows [editorial insertions provided for clarity]:

- I. What are those *Principles, Doctrines, Articles of Faith, Motives, &c.*, which this *extraordinary Light* reveals; ... and by what *Mark* ... [do] you *distinguish* them from the *Delusions of Fancy*, or worse *Temptations*?
- II. What are those *particular Duties* you are enabled to perform ... [that enable you] *An Extraordinary Intercourse with the Deity*?
- III. If I am mistaken in my Conjectures ... be so kind as to mention in a *particular* and *determinate* Manner ... to what *Purposes* you apply it, or it *applies* you ...?¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ William Roberts, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*, 4 vols., (2nd Ed., London, 1834), I, p. 210. This may be a sly dig at Shaftesbury or Hutcheson's more pleasing styles, but there is no evidence to support the claim. In any case, we ought to contrast Tucker's self-assured response here with Butler's more reticent personality: recall, e.g., Butler's reluctance to deal with Kames and Hume on the score that the 'cause of truth might thence suffer from the unskillfulness of its advocate', see above, p. 121.

¹⁰⁰ *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, pp. 242-3.

However, in the following June issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Tucker notes that Whitefield neglected to respond, and that he had even gone so far as to '[prevent] the printing of them' in the *Bristol Journal*.¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, Tucker next claims that one of Whitefield's supporters appeared in public shortly thereafter, accusing Tucker of being worse than the 'most *arrant Deist*' for having 'no manner or Notion of Divine Revelation ... to the great Dishonour of your Ministerial Character'.¹⁰²

Unsurprisingly, Tucker's response to this attack was stoical. He defended his motives and pastoral integrity with a latitudinarian castigation of Whitefield's enthusiasm, likening his '*extraordinary Illuminations*' to 'a Flame of Fire, Hot Water, or the Motions of the Foetus in the Womb' – all of which Tucker claimed were 'blasphemous and enthusiastical Notions'. Here, of course, Tucker was upholding the moderatism of the established Church. But more than that, his accusations also placed Whitefield directly at variance with the explicitly Butlerian conceptions of 'coolness', 'deliberation' and 'reasonableness' – terms we explored in our previous chapter.¹⁰³ With still greater urgency, Tucker notes that Whitefield's 'Notions' are being 'propagated with too much Success, amongst several well-meaning, but *ill-judged* People': in other words a laity similar to, though far less sophisticated than, say, those in attendance at the Rolls Chapel, and so all the more susceptible to impressionability. This being the case, Tucker feels that it is his 'Duty as a Clergyman, and a Christian, to prevent ... the spreading of such dangerous Principles, which strike at the Root of all Religion, and make it the Jest of those *who sit in the Seat of the Scornful*.'¹⁰⁴ With this final expression it should be noted that Tucker is here undoubtedly echoing Butler's earlier description in *The Analogy* of those who make religion the 'Subject of Mirth and Ridicule'.¹⁰⁵ In light of this, we can clearly see Butler already at work in the young clergyman, who besides defending the establishment Church in the conventional manner, is also stating that in terms of the Methodist 'disconnect' from the tenets of the established faith (and contrarily, then, to the claims of Whitefield's anonymous

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 294. There is no further evidence to confirm or disprove Tucker's claim.

¹⁰² Ibid., pp. 292-4; *Life of George Whitefield*, pp. 36-41, at p. 37. From this point onwards parts of the exchange are reprinted in both the *Gentleman's Magazine* and *Life of George Whitefield*; henceforth, then, we will cite from both where applicable. Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 26, speculates that this individual may have been a close friend of Whitefield's, a certain Rev Mr Hutchins, about whom we know nothing.

¹⁰³ See Chapter Three, pp. 104. n. 79, 106, n. 90.

¹⁰⁴ *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, p. 294; *Life of George Whitefield*, p. 42.

¹⁰⁵ *The Analogy*, 'Advertisement'.

supporter), it is in fact Whitefield's position rather than his own that bears the greater resemblance to those who call themselves deists or freethinkers.¹⁰⁶

Following on from this exchange, Tucker informs us that he was 'reviled and insulted' in the street by a number of Whitefield's supporters who labelled him 'an enemy of God and His religion' – the first, though by no means the last, time Tucker was to be subjected to bouts of violence for expressing his views in public.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, Tucker's answer to a direct query made by Whitefield's anonymous supporter, regarding his own position on the issue of regeneration and rebirth, is put it in such a way that it is unmistakably modelled on Butler:

That there is an *ordinary*, constant, and regular Operation or Providence of the Deity, *concurring* with, and *aiding* our weak Endeavours, *checking* evil Thoughts, and inspiring good and virtuous, is a Fundamental Principle of all Religion, natural and revealed ...

To which Tucker adds that those fortunate enough to have been baptised in the Christian faith are always able to call upon divine assistance in order to *progressively* cast off their original corruption [interpolations provided for clarity]:

... Nay, every Orthodox Christian will affirm farther, that this ... is promised in a greater Degree to all within the Pale of the Church, provided they improve their ten Talents [Matt 25: 14-30], proportionably, than to those who are *Strangers* to the *Covenant of Grace* [...] The Person therefore who is baptiz'd into the Christian Faith ... recommends himself by *these Means* to a divine Favour and Assistance, [and] is enabled to go on from Strength to Strength, to cast off by Degrees [the] Original Corruption of his Nature, and so, *progressively*, according to the Nature of *Free Agents*, and *probationary Creatures*, has his inward Constitution (All the Faculties and Powers of his Mind ...) thus recover'd, rectify'd and improv'd. And this great Change, or rather this *changing State*, commencing in at our Baptism, and gradually encreasing with our own Endeavours, is, by a figurative Way of Expression, very frequent in the holy Scriptures, call'd *Regeneration*, or a *New Birth*.¹⁰⁸

Here the original dispute ends with a final reply from Whitefield's supporter, in which Tucker is advised to 'meddle no more with Controversy' since he does not have 'a Head

¹⁰⁶ In *Life of George Whitefield*, p. 48, Tucker claims that the 'Deists seem strongly inclined to favour [Whitefield's] Cause, and [therefore] foment the Division [within the established Church]'.

¹⁰⁷ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 26. This is something that Butler's diffidence and reserve appears to have protected him from.

¹⁰⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, p. 296; *Life of George Whitefield*, pp. 49-50. Note Tucker's reference to Covenantalism, as in the 'Covenant of Grace'.

turned for the Management of a Dispute'.¹⁰⁹ As Shelton notes, 'no advice has been so thoroughly rejected by anyone', for this was merely Tucker's 'opening barrage in a lifetime devoted to controversial writing'.¹¹⁰ Yet in more substantive terms, Tucker's involvement in this early debate is extremely important that it points to a developing orthodox mind that, though youthful, is nonetheless filled with intellectual vigour, and equally draws inspiration from Butler at a time when the contemporaneous dispute between religious heterodoxy and orthodoxy was at its height. Indeed, at the very point where Tucker speaks of the 'Fundamental Principle[s] of all Religion, natural and revealed', he provides a footnote comprised of a list of influential contemporary orthodox works by the likes of William Wollaston (1659-1724), Conybeare, and of course Butler himself; all of whom Tucker thinks corroborate his view of the established faith.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, in Whitefield's so-called obstinacy, Tucker reports that the Methodist retorted in person that these were all merely 'Defences of the outward, or Historical Part of Religion; and that the Authors *knew nothing of the internal and saving Faith*'.¹¹² From Tucker's perspective, then, Whitefield appeared evermore determined to differentiate himself from the established Church – seemingly by any means, as we shall see in Section VI below.

V. The Methodist Controversy II: Butler, Wesley and the 'Virtuous Temper of Mind'.

The reason why Tucker deemed it so important to catechise Whitefield and to request an account of his theology was because of his clear concern regarding the vigour of Whitefield's potentially unorthodox views.¹¹³ Moreover, since the founding Methodist was known to be a powerful orator, there is also a sense in which Tucker identified Whitefield with the mischiefs of demagoguery, a general concern of his that became

¹⁰⁹ Printed only in *Life of George Whitefield*, under the title 'An Answer to Mr. Tucker's Defense of His Queries: In a Second Letter to that Gentleman', at p. 58.

¹¹⁰ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 28.

¹¹¹ The works Tucker cites are William Wollaston, *The Religion of Nature Delineated* (London, 1722) (whose Stoicism Butler had referred to in *Fifteen Sermons*); *The Cure of Deism: Or, The Mediatorial Scheme by Jesus Christ The Only True Religion* (London, 1736), by Elisha Smith (perhaps the pseudonym of an unknown author); John Conybeare, *Defence of Reveal'd Religion* (London, 1732); a 'Sermon on the Harmony of Natural and Revealed Religion' by a Mr. Hart; and finally Butler's *Analogy*, perhaps saving the most influential for last.

¹¹² *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, p. 296, n.; *Life of George Whitefield*, p. 49, n.

¹¹³ On the importance of catechising in the established Church, see Gerald Bray, *Anglican Canons, 1527-1947*, (Woodbridge, 1998), p. 349 & Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 81.

evermore engrained as the eighteenth century progressed. In this, Tucker thought similarly to Butler's old friend Secker, by then a long time Anglican convert and at that time Bishop of Oxford.¹¹⁴ In a letter dated September 1739, for example, Secker complained to his brother that the Methodists, and 'particularly Mr Whitefield, seem blown up with a vanity which I fear hath and will lead them into mighty wrong behaviour'; and in the following year he and Whitefield continued to exchange icy letters.¹¹⁵ Above all, however, as Anglican prelates, the likes of Tucker, Secker and Butler – and of course Whitefield and Wesley themselves – were obliged to uphold the legal and administrative obligations of the established Church, comprised not only of the *Prayer Book* and the Thirty-Nine Articles, but also the Homilies, statute law and the Church's canons, many of which the two latter clergymen appeared to be abjuring. It was this, then, more than anything that troubled the established Church regarding the growing popularity of the Methodists, and, again, as we shall see in the following section, Tucker's *Principles of Methodism* (1742) was the first orthodox account of the burgeoning sect deemed necessary precisely on this account.

Before detailing the contents of Tucker's publication, however, we turn at this stage to the parallel exchange between Butler and Wesley, in an effort to bring the matters we are discussing in this chapter into even sharper focus. Like Whitefield, Wesley arrived in Bristol from America in April 1739, and immediately took to the former's style of open air preaching.¹¹⁶ Unsurprisingly, this meant that he too soon came into contact with the Bristol authorities. Consequently, Wesley and Butler agreed to meet on numerous occasions in the summer of 1739 to discuss Wesley's theology, in much the

¹¹⁴ Secker probably conformed in 1720 or 1721, according to Porteus, *Life and Character of Secker*, pp. 4-5, 7 & Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 37-8, which would support the claim that Butler convinced him of the equanimity of the established Church while at Oxford in the mid-to-late-1710s. Secker remained close with Butler until their relationship soured in the 1740s, before reconciling shortly before Butler's death in 1752. Indeed, it was Secker who had recommended his old friend to Queen Caroline as early as 1732, and who had also helped to edit both *Fifteen Sermons* and *The Analogy*. Regarding the former, Secker wrote: 'I took much Pains in making [Butler's] meaning easier to be apprehended. Yet they were called obscure'. As for the latter, Secker stated: 'I was somewhat serviceable to [Butler] in the Method & Thoughts of this Book; but very much in making the Language of it more accurate & intelligible, which cost me a great deal of time & pains'. See *Autobiography of Thomas Secker*, pp. 10, 16 & again, Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 52-3. This corresponds with Tucker's description of Butler five years after the bishop's death as 'that deep, sagacious Author' who would probably be even more popular 'were his manner of Writing a little more pleasing and alluring', in *Instructions* (1757-8), p. 6.

¹¹⁵ LPL, MS 1719, f. 15: Secker to George Secker, sr., 11 Sept [1739]; LPL, MS 1123/I, ff. 132-43. Cited in Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 223-4.

¹¹⁶ Although older than Whitefield, Wesley was considered his protégé, and was presented as such at this stage.

same way that Tucker had attempted with Whitefield, though on these occasions in private. In one such meeting dated to 18 August 1739, for example, a formal examination of Wesley took place regarding a recent accusation he had made, to the effect that Tucker was doctrinally heterodox.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, it is in fact a meeting held two days previously on 16 August that is of immediate concern to us, for it was here that Butler uttered his famous and oft-quoted admonishment of Whitefield: ‘Sir, the pretending to extraordinary revelation and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing!’¹¹⁸

Waterman has suggested that with this comment, Butler was chiding Wesley on the very specific grounds that he appeared to be undermining Articles VI, VIII, XVII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII and XXVIII of the faith.¹¹⁹ While this may very well have been the case, Tennant qualifies this position by noting that Butler actually ‘approached the problem [of Wesley] as primarily political’ rather than theological, in the sense that he was inclined to raise only those ‘questions which were covered by specific statute law as well as by the canons’. In other words, here Tennant speculates that a ‘pedantic or aggressive’ Butler might have chosen to examine Wesley more stringently than he did, and that he was possibly exercising deliberate discretion in light of his own emergence from Old Dissent (incidentally, this might also explain why contrarily, Tucker was far terser with Whitefield). Consequently, even if Butler was ‘faced with rebellion from within the Church itself’, Tennant argues that it was a conscious decision on the part of Butler to act ‘professionally disapproving but not intentionally punitive’, meaning in turn that he was not expressly ‘disapprov[ing] of mystical experience’ *per se*, but rather of Wesley’s broader ‘ecclesiastical presumption’.¹²⁰ Further to this, it is entirely plausible that Butler’s subsequent advice to Wesley that he should ‘go hence [from this

¹¹⁷ We shall return to this at pp. 154-5 below.

¹¹⁸ R. P. Heitzenrater, *The Elusive Mr. Wesley, John Wesley His Own Biographer*, 2 vols., (Nashville: Abington, 1984), Vol. I, p. 114. Wesley himself also recorded accounts of his meetings with Butler, see his *Works*, Thomas Jackson (ed.), (Third Ed., London, 1831), Vol. XIII, pp. 499-501.

¹¹⁹ Waterman, *Christian Theology and Political Economy*, p. 28: ‘It is “horrid” because it undermines several of the thirty-nine Articles of Religion ... to which Whitefield and Wesley had assented ... It is “very horrid” because it blasphemes the uniqueness and sufficiency of the revelation of God in Christ’.

¹²⁰ This corresponds with Lori Branch’s view that Butler’s *Analogy* espouses tolerance, in the sense that Butler maintains that true religion should not be dealt with in dogmatic ‘either or’ dichotomies. Additionally, Branch claims that Butler therefore rejects the idea that faith is purely ‘rational or irrational’, or completely ‘logical or mystical’ – for as we saw in Chapter Three, in Butler’s view existence is unitary rather than dialectical. See Branch, ‘Bishop Butler’ in Hass *et al.* (eds.), *Oxford English Literature and Theology*, p. 591.

diocese]’ was not spoken in terms of a reprimand on theological grounds, as is typically believed, but rather as a warning that he was ‘chiefly at risk from statute law’.¹²¹

If what Tennant calls the ‘constitutional’ aspect of Butler and Wesley’s meeting demonstrates the former’s tolerance of the latter, on the other hand, their ensuing discussion on specifically theological issues brings the Butlerian conception of Christianity, as opposed to the Wesleyan, overwhelmingly to the fore. The altercation is a first-hand account taken from Wesley’s own hand, and so is worth citing in full:

Butler: Why, Sir, our faith itself is a good work; it is a virtuous temper of mind. *Wesley:* My Lord, whatever faith is, our Church asserts, we are justified by faith alone [*sola fide*]. But how it can be called a good work, I see not: It is the gift of God; and a gift that presupposes nothing in us, but sin and misery. *Butler:* How, Sir? Then you make God a tyrannical Being, if he justifies some without any goodness in them preceding, and does not justify all. If these are not justified on account of some moral goodness in them, why are not these justified too? *Wesley:* Because, my Lord, they “resist his Spirit,” because they suffer Him not to “work in them both to will and to do.” They cannot be saved, because they will not believe. *Butler:* Sir, what do you mean by faith? *Wesley:* My Lord, by justifying faith I mean, a conviction wrought in a man by the Holy Ghost, that Christ hath loved him, and given himself for him; and that, through Christ, his sins are forgiven. *Butler:* I believe some good men have this, but not all. But how do you prove this to be the justifying faith taught by our Church? *Wesley:* My Lord, from her Homily on Salvation, where she describes it thus: “A sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that through the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God.” *Butler:* Why, Sir, this is quite another thing. *Wesley:* My Lord, I conceive it to be the very same.¹²²

Within this dialogue can be seen the clear attempts made by Butler to remain scrupulously faithful to, and consistent with, both the tone and message of *Fifteen Sermons* and *The Analogy*. In particular, the opening statement that the Anglican faith is analogous to a ‘virtuous temper of mind’ (in other words, that it is a ‘psychologically-oriented’ religion) is absolutely key, since it is here that Butler replicates the earlier claim made in *Fifteen Sermons* that the religious ‘Temper of Mind’ is analogous to ‘Resignation to the Divine Will ... the habitual Frame of our Mind and Heart ... in Acts of Devotion’.¹²³ For, by likening faith to both ‘good works’ and ‘temper of mind’ in such fashion, Butler is reiterating in an overtly theological context the central theme of

¹²¹ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 132-3, 134-5. Tennant lists the canons Wesley was in possible breach of as: ‘[re 1640] numbers 1.1 and 1.2 A (the monarch’s supremacy over the Church); 4 (doctrinal orthodoxy); 5.1 (schism and sectaries); 5.3 (conventicles); 6 (subscription); 8 (orthodox preaching)’; [& re 1603] numbers ‘50 (preaching unlicensed); 71 (private preaching); 72 (casting out devils); 73 (private conventicles of ministers)’.

¹²² Wesley, *Works*, Jackson (ed.), Vol. XIII, pp. 499-501.

¹²³ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 274; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 280. Cf. p. 109, above.

Fifteen Sermons more generally – i.e., that faith resides both ‘inwardly’ (temper of mind; self-interest; private sphere) and ‘outwardly’ (good works; sociability; public sphere). Consequently, here Butler is repeating the claim that the Christian faith, and thereby meta-ethics in a broader sense, implies the mediation of the private and social relations of humankind.¹²⁴ Viewed from this perspective, then, Butler’s conversation with Wesley can and ought be read as a further pronouncement of the overall Butlerian scheme, in that the bishop now posits in his maturity that *faith itself is dualistic-unitary*, and furthermore, that both ‘temper of mind/inward faith’ and ‘good works/outward faith’ share the same ontological value. In Tennant’s view, this therefore results in a peculiarly Butlerian (re)-formulation of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* as *via media*; one that proves ‘equal to meeting the test of doctrinal orthodoxy, even if, as [apologetic, it is not a classic formulation] of it’.¹²⁵

In tandem, then, with Tucker’s earlier Butlerian criticism of Whitefield, it is plain to see that these various exchanges place the orthodox pair squarely at odds with the Methodist insistence that salvation consists in a one-off conversion experience. For as we saw in the *The Analogy*, although Butler accepts that it is *faith* and *not reason* that constitutes the basis for human ethics, as an aside, Butler also insists that faith, whilst *presupposing doubt*, happens to be the product of both ‘good work’ and ‘temper of mind’, in the very specific sense that faith rests on good moral conduct sustained by frequent religious practice. In substantive terms, this clearly entails deferring to orthodox Church liturgy, the Thirty-Nine Articles and the *Prayer Book* on all points, because Butler (and so by extension Tucker) believes that the Church is the legitimate body that has been put in place by God to assist individuals in their personal and social journey of faith. Unsurprisingly, therefore, this problematises Wesley and Whitefield’s various claims because, according to both Butler and Tucker, the tenets of Methodism, and particularly the ‘rapturous conversion’ synonymous with it, happen to undermine the very validity of the structural and institutional support of the established Church

¹²⁴ Nevertheless, as the closing passage of *Fifteen Sermons* makes clear, this always involves ‘implicit submission’ to God: ‘... in all Lowliness of Mind we set lightly by Ourselves: *That we form our Temper to an implicit Submission to Divine Majesty*; beget within ourselves an absolute Resignation to all the Methods of his Providence in his Dealings with the Children of Men: That in the deepest Humility of our Soul we prostrate ourselves before Him ... *FINIS*’, *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, p. 312; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, p. 318; emphasis added.

¹²⁵ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 137-8.

itself.¹²⁶ Put another way, Tucker and Butler insist that Methodism is what we now call ‘anti-social’ precisely because, in the words of Shelton, Wesley threatens to cause ‘with one pass of his wand the Church of England to disappear like a phantasm’;¹²⁷ and if we recall, according to Butler’s *Fifteen Sermons*, the Anglican Church is coterminous with the *societal aspects* of human existence, thereby rendering it the church militant here in earth. Conversely, however, Wesley takes ‘the whole world as his parish’.¹²⁸

Hence, although Butler does not deny that rapturous conversion may be legitimate, or at least suited to some men (since he concedes that it may be their personal understanding of faith), nevertheless, Butler also insists that he has little to no personal experience of it, and that in his opinion, it is far more appropriate to teach that salvation consists in ‘process’ rather than ‘event’ – a clear reiteration of *The Analogy*’s insistence that God ‘appears deliberate throughout his Operations; accomplishing his natural Ends, by *slow successive Steps*’.¹²⁹ What is more, this position is fully consistent with Tucker’s earlier claim, made in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* regarding the issue of regeneration and rebirth, where he highlights the established Church’s role in imparting ‘divine Favour and Assistance’ on those who desire to ‘*progressively*’ ‘cast off by Degrees’ their ‘Original Corruption’.¹³⁰ Even more significantly, this is a position that Tucker would go on to clarify in Sermon IV of *Seventeen Sermons* (1776), which in all likelihood was an anti-Methodist homily preached at or around this time:

... nevertheless, as the *Notion of Sudden and Instantaneous Conversions*, and the *Pangs of the New-Birth*, has been, and may still be held by some *well-meaning* Christians, to be a *Doctrine of the Gospel* [...] if it be necessary, or at least expedient, that *some Sort of Men* should be wrought on by *quick Impulses*, or *sudden Shocks*, it is equally certain, that *others* may be converted by *more gentle Methods*, and *gradual Convictions*: *Examples of which* are plentifully recorded in the Scriptures.¹³¹

¹²⁶ This chimes with Tucker’s later claim that the established Church is a ‘venerable Structure’, and that it ought not to be pulled down on account of a few creeds and articles being less than perfect, in *Apology*, p. 55. Cf. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, pp. 69-70.

¹²⁷ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 30.

¹²⁸ Rivers, in *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, p. 4 – a modification of Wesley’s phrase in his journal dated to 11 June 1739 ‘I look upon all the world as my parish’.

¹²⁹ *The Analogy*, p. 192; emphasis added.

¹³⁰ *Gentleman’s Magazine*, IX (1739), p. 296.

¹³¹ *Seventeen Sermons*, Sermon IV: I John iii. 7 and 8: ‘Let no Man deceive you: *He, that doeth Righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous:--He, that commiteth Sin, is of the Devil*’, pp. 63-78, this citation at pp. 67, 71. Butler and Tucker’s appeal to ‘gradation’ is also consistent with the Hookerian model of Episcopalian polity; cf. Hooker, *Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, McGrade (ed.), VIII, 2.1, p. 139 & Chapter Two, p. 64.

It has been suggested by Tennant that the final meeting between Butler and Wesley, which took place two days later on 18 August 1739 and in which Wesley accused Tucker of doctrinal heterodoxy, may have been called in 'retaliation' for the recent publication of Tucker's *Life of George Whitefield*.¹³² Yet whilst it is highly unlikely that Butler contributed to the composition of that particular text, it is probable that he assisted Tucker on another work on Methodism alongside the sermon which so offended Wesley, on account of its supposedly heretical views regarding atonement for original sin (both of which remain unpublished).¹³³ Yet since on this occasion Wesley's complaint was deemed to be a formal one, this necessitated an official Church response, with attendant procedures. Therefore, unlike in the informal meeting of 16 August, on this occasion Wesley was faced by a panel consisting not only of Butler and Tucker, but also the president of Bristol Cathedral Carew Reynell (c. 1693/4-1745) and a minor canon John Sutton.

As befitting the occasion, Butler's tone was far more authoritative, if not even hostile. Here for example, he clearly demarcates Wesley ('you') from the established Church ('my clergy'), his point essentially being that Wesley is acting in isolation (self-interest), outside the acceptable bounds of the Anglican community (sociability):

Nay, Mr Wesley, *you* did bring it as a matter of complaint. For when I said, '*You* have no right to make complaint against *my clergy*,' *you* said *you* 'thought everyone had a right to complain against those who taught false doctrine'.¹³⁴

Thereafter, then, Butler proceeded to defend the integrity of Tucker (clearly indicative of the former's personal regard for the latter given that the two had only shortly met), on the very specific grounds that Wesley appeared 'guilty of great want of candour and Christian charity'; these being two characteristics that the bishop was clearly unwilling, or unable, to overlook. In any case, since by his own admission Wesley could not be 'exact as to the [offending] words' in Tucker's sermon, he was eventually driven to retract his complaint, and thereafter the matter came to rest. However, since Butler

¹³² Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 138-9. The contents of this meeting remained unpublished until the appearance of Baker's 'John Wesley and Bishop Joseph Butler: A Fragment of John Wesley's Manuscript Journal 16th to 24th August 1739', *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, Vol. XLII (May 1980), pp. 93-100.

¹³³ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 139. Butler's influence on the publication of *Principles of Methodism* is fully acknowledged by Tucker himself, as we shall shortly see.

¹³⁴ Baker, 'John Wesley and Bishop Joseph Butler: A Fragment ...', p. 99; emphases added.

chose not to pursue the matter any further regardless of the fact that Wesley ‘was clearly neither in the right nor a loyal Whig’, in Tennant’s view, this showed considerable ‘forbearance’ on the bishop’s part. This is by no means an insignificant point, for as we shall see, meaningful and practicable demonstrations of ‘Whig toleration’ such as these, rather than mere tokenistic gestures, were to become a further defining characteristic of the ‘Butler-Tucker axis’.¹³⁵

VI. The Methodist Controversy III: *Principles of Methodism.*

‘As is so often the fate with sectarian movements’, Shelton notes, ‘Methodism began to suffer from schism very soon after its birth’.¹³⁶ Indeed, late in 1739, merely a few months after his meetings with Butler, Wesley finally broke away from the Moravians at the Fetter Lane Society and formed the first official Methodist Society in Moorgate, known as the Foundery. For with the publication of Wesley’s sermon entitled *Free Grace* earlier in the same year, he had finally begun to challenge Whitefield’s admittedly moderate but increasingly Calvinistic tendencies, claiming that they both discouraged holiness and encouraged fatalism.¹³⁷ As Rivers notes, this position ‘was to remain the essence of [Wesley’s] primarily practical objection to Calvinism’,¹³⁸ and the resulting exchange between the two clergymen – clearly mirroring the dispute between Calvinists and Remonstrants during the Synod of Dort (1618-9) – resulted in the irrevocable split between the one-time brothers-in-arms.¹³⁹ Although in ensuing years attempts at reconciliation were frequently made between the pair, the fact that their followers displayed far more partisanship than they meant that their differences could never be reconciled. Nevertheless, both men remained on civil terms, and shortly before his death in 1770 Whitefield requested that his old friend and adversary provide his funeral sermon – a request that was obliged.¹⁴⁰ Yet however that may be, in the early 1740s, when the divisions between Whitefield, Wesley and their disciples remained inconclusive, this provided the established Church with the perfect opportunity to

¹³⁵ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 140.

¹³⁶ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 30.

¹³⁷ Wesley, *Sermons*, Outler (ed.), II, pp. 341-3.

¹³⁸ Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, Chap. 1, & esp. pp. 9-12, provides a useful summary of the consequences of the clash between Calvinism and Arminianism, particularly on the religious language of educated seventeenth and eighteenth-century Britons.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 212.

document their travails – thereby resulting in the publication of Tucker’s *Principles of Methodism* in 1742.

Tucker begins the preface to *Principles of Methodism* with an apology for the tract appearing ‘so late, and as it were, at the close of the Controversy’ (since the tracts appeared three years after Wesley and Whitefield’s initial split), and he then proceeds with a recital of the events leading to its publication. A year previously in 1742, he writes, the archbishop of Armagh Hugh Boulter (1672-1742) had requested that an ‘*eminent Person*’ draw up ‘an authentick account of the divisions and quarrels of the Methodists’. That ‘eminent person’ being none other than Butler, based upon his dealings with Whitefield and Wesley, alongside the publication of the *Life of George Whitefield* in 1739, Tucker notes that his bishop was ‘*pleased to think favourably of me, as being a person well acquainted with their principles and proceedings, and therefore the better qualified to make an Essay towards giving a Satisfactory Answer to his Grace’s Inquiries*’.¹⁴¹ Whether Tucker was in truth the better qualified of the two is debateable, yet this is beside the point. Clearly the bishop was here advancing his chaplain’s interests in the capacity of a senior figure assisting a young protégé in the early stages of their career – a particularly useful demonstration of Butler’s charitable and benevolent disposition, and, moreover, of the necessary extrusion of his moral philosophy into daily life and professional conduct.

As Tucker notes in the preface, the main purpose of *Principles of Methodism* is to document the discrepancies between the Methodists, and to account for the ‘divisions and quarrels’ then afflicting them. He therefore begins the work by attempting to delineate the various theological ‘strands’ from which Methodism itself is ‘woven’.¹⁴² Noting that Wesley had expressly acknowledged the High-Church enemy of Mandeville and Tindal, William Law, as Methodism’s influential ‘*schoolmaster to bring them unto Christ*’, from the outset Tucker states that this was the first of the Methodist’s mistakes.¹⁴³ For Law’s theology, he claims, some of which we have discussed in

¹⁴¹ *Principles of Methodism*, ‘Preface’.

¹⁴² Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 31.

¹⁴³ For Law’s influence on Methodism see Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 218 & cf. this study, Chapter Two, p. 81. As we touched on there, it was Law’s mystical allusion to Christian ‘perfectionism’ that the Methodists found so appealing; hence Young describes him as the ‘supreme representative’ of eighteenth-century mysticism in *Religion and Enlightenment*, p. 122.

Chapter Two, is little more than a ‘*crude mixture*’ of those ‘two famous Systems’, Calvinism and Arminianism; the former for Law’s acceptance of total depravity, and the latter for his concession that humankind is bestowed with the ‘*Paradisiacal* state still subsisting; by virtue of which’, Tucker goes on to explain, ‘we can *co-operate* with the Grace of God’. From both schemes, Tucker writes, Law ‘builds up a new one of his own, borrowing such materials from each that he approved of, and rejecting the Rest ... sometimes lean[ing] towards the *Calvinists*, and sometimes towards the *Arminians*, without directly falling in with either’.¹⁴⁴ Yet in the process of doing so, Tucker pins the Butlerian conception of Christianity firmly to the Arminian mast, since, he points out, the Arminian account of ‘*restor’d Grace*’ coincides with such Butlerian concepts as ‘*Conscience*’ (reflection); ‘*infused Habit*’ (good works); the ‘*beginnings* of virtue in the mind’ (temper of mind), and finally the ‘*seeds* of religion’ (which is the established Church):

Therefore this ... *Inward Gospel*, or *Christ within us*, This *principle of Holiness*, *Capacity of obtaining Salvation*, *Instinct of Goodness*, This *moral Sense*, *taste*, or *relish*, *Conscience*, *new Creation*, *infused Habit* ... is *strictly and truly* the *beginnings* of virtue in the mind, the *seeds* of religion, which are afterwards left to us to cultivate and improve, or a *substratum* left for us to build upon.¹⁴⁵

Next, Tucker turns to the transposition of Law’s ‘*crude* and *undigested* notion of a system’ on to Whitefield and Wesley’s ‘medley of principles’.¹⁴⁶ In particular, Tucker draws attention to Whitefield’s earliest preaching of the doctrine of the ‘new birth’, which, he writes, elicited mixed responses upon first being heard. For example, when critics thought that Whitefield was teaching ‘a branch of the *Calvinistical System* revived’, here Tucker notes that ‘the poor man was in a maze’, for he ‘knew nothing of *Calvinism* nor could he tell how to support his own side independently of it’. Conversely, when Calvinists defended him on this very same point, Tucker writes that Whitefield was so ‘glad to find his expressions countenanced by so many great men’ that it encouraged him to read further into the tenets of Calvinism itself. In consequence, ‘through a *Blunder* on his side, and a *Mistake* of the Question on all sides, Mr *Whitefield* fell in love with the *Calvinistical* party’, without becoming an ‘*Adept*’ at their

¹⁴⁴ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 7-9, 12.

¹⁴⁵ *Principles of Methodism*, p. 11. Note once again Tucker’s allusion to the structural integrity of the Church of England, which it is ‘left for us to build upon’. Cf. n. 127 of this chapter, above.

¹⁴⁶ *Principles of Methodism*, p. 12.

theology, and neither at the expense of his original allegiance to Law.¹⁴⁷ This meant, therefore, that upon his arrival in America, Whitefield once again became confused when the Pennsylvanian Presbyterians challenged the Arminian traits in his system.¹⁴⁸ Nevertheless, Tucker ends the opening sections of *Principles of Methodism* with a pertinent summary of Whitefield's theological *schema*: 'excepting the particular of the *inherent*, or *inward* Christ', he writes dismissively, 'he [Whitefield] is now, in all other [four] points, a thorough paced *Calvinist*'.¹⁴⁹

Having explained Whitefield's position rather glibly,¹⁵⁰ Tucker's attention – and indeed the bulk of the tract – switches to Wesley's historical trajectory; much of which is now well known, of course, even if this was not necessarily the case in 1742. Here Tucker explains that upon his arrival in Georgia in 1735, Wesley had 'met with some *Moravian* Teachers, who infused some strange particularities into him about the *Assurances* of *Grace* and *Justification*'. Returning to England two years later, Tucker next alleges that it was the German-born Moravian Peter Böhler (1712-75) who was thereby responsible for convincing Wesley that 'conversion was an *instantaneous* work', and that 'faith ... *alone* justifies'.¹⁵¹ Detailing thereafter the origins of the Moravians themselves, Tucker notes that they 'are nothing more than a small number of Peasants' located at Herrnhut, Saxony, under their 'Count', 'Bishop' and 'Temporal Lord', Nicolaus Zinzendorf (1700-60) – the inference clearly being that they are a strange and rustic minority sect.¹⁵² He then proceeds to cite liberally from Wesley's *Journal* regarding the many influences from his travels that the clergyman has retained for his own system, the many

¹⁴⁷ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 12-3.

¹⁴⁸ In a tract entitled *An Extract of Sundry Passages taken out of Mr Whitefield's Printed Sermons, Journals and Letters together with some Scruples proposed in proper Queries rais'd on each Remark*, (London, 1741).

¹⁴⁹ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 16-21; at pp. 18-9, Tucker draws particular attention to Whitefield's confusion between Law's ideas and Quakerism.

¹⁵⁰ It is probable that Tucker neglected to linger over Whitefield because he had already published the detailed *Life of George Whitefield* three years previously.

¹⁵¹ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 21-2. Wesley confirms the veracity of this claim in the second part of his *Journal*, esp. the entries for 18 February, 4 March & 24 May, *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.*, N. Curnock (ed.), (London, 1909-16), I, pp. 440, 442, 465; Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I., p. 209.

¹⁵² *Principles of Methodism*, p. 24.

inconsistencies existing between each of them, and of course the many inconsistencies that Wesley's theology bears as a direct result.¹⁵³

This is the *Sound* and *orthodox* Divinity Mr Wesley so much longed after, and took such Pains to acquire,---And were it necessary, I believe an hundred other Absurdities might be fully and fairly made out, by deducing one article from another, and comparing them together. But what is already done, I suppose is enough for a sample of these *Discordia Semina Rerum*. --- Only let me observe, that upon his return from *Germany* he seemed to *improve* in the Spirit of Inconsistency.¹⁵⁴

In an effort to remain fair and judicious, Tucker does acknowledge, however, Wesley's attempts at 'reconciling these *jarring Elements*, and reducing them into some kind of order and uniformity'. Yet because Tucker does not accept that Wesley has succeeded in this endeavour, he therefore reduces (in the pejorative sense) the latter's theology to the following three-stage system:

- I. Before *Justification*; In which state we may be said to be *unable* to do anything *acceptable* to God: Because then we can *do nothing*, but *come to Christ* ...
- II. After *Justification*; The moment a man comes to Christ, then he is justified, and born again ... in an *imperfect* sense ... He has Christ *with* him, but not Christ *in* him ... But being exposed to various temptations, he may, and will fall again from this condition, and be *unjustified* again, if he doth not attain to a more excellent Gift. *viz.*
- III. *Sanctification*; the last highest state of *Perfection* in this *Life*. --- For then are the faithful born again in the full and perfect Sense. --- Then have they the indwelling ... Spirit. --- Then is there given unto them a new and clean Heart. [For] They have obtained a compleat Victory ... the time of their *Probation* is ended.¹⁵⁵

Here, Tucker's delineation of the third stage in Wesley's scheme is especially important, since it is perhaps the earliest orthodox definition of the Wesleyan appeal to Christian perfection; a doctrine which, borrowing heavily from William Law, stressed that the fulfilment of *perfection in God's love* was readily obtainable here on earth.¹⁵⁶ In

¹⁵³ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 25-34. Tucker's list includes Böhler and Zizendorf, and the German Moravians Michael Linner (1692-1760), David Nitschman (c. 1694/5-1772), Albinus Theodorus Feder and the brothers Augustine and Zacharius Neuffer.

¹⁵⁴ *Principles of Methodism*, p. 35.

¹⁵⁵ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 36-7. Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 234, where she states similarly that the Wesleyan pursuit of perfection can be identified in the stages of '[1] repentance, faith, justification (i.e. the individual's pardon and acceptance by God, assurance (his recognition that he is justified), [2] the new birth (the beginning of sanctification), and [3] sanctification, otherwise holiness or perfection'.

¹⁵⁶ Thereby rendering it the most controversial doctrine of the Methodist movement itself, according to Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, pp. 244-50. For Wesley's specific sermons on 'Christian perfection', see his *Christian Perfection*, (London, 1741); *Farther Thoughts Upon Christian Perfection*,

this way, Tucker's tract can therefore be seen to *anticipate* the century-long Methodist controversy, especially via his insistence that the notion of Christian perfection is simply 'pushing matters to an extreme one way, as the *Calvinists* do another [i.e., via the latter's doctrine of total depravity]':

These words, and indeed the constant tenor of their preaching, and writing do certainly imply, as if *such a Perfection* was attainable, and ought to be attained by every one in this Life, before he can be received to happiness in the next, as is free, not only from *wilful* Sins, from sins of *deliberation* and *choice* ... but also from all *moral* frailties, weaknesses and imperfections *i.e.* from such slips and failings in our duty, arising from *surprize*, hurry of temptation, or any other *pitiable* circumstance, that are really and properly *Sins of Infirmary*.¹⁵⁷

In other words, here we see Tucker once again expounding the general moderatism of the establishment, whilst also adhering to the view that human existence in the material world is one of toil, immoderation or anomaly – a world full of 'Incumbrances indeed', as Butler had written in *Fifteen Sermons*, 'but such as we are obliged to carry about with us, through this various Journey of Life'.¹⁵⁸

Although like Butler, then, Tucker is far more disposed towards the optimism of Arminianism as opposed to the pessimism of Calvinism (recall, for example, Tucker's description of humans as 'free agents' and 'probationary', rather than predestined, creatures in the *Gentleman's Magazine* and *Life of George Whitefield*), nevertheless, according to Tucker, to move beyond optimism towards fanaticism or enthusiasm is, as we know, the resounding fallacy of any upholder of the eighteenth-century political and religious establishment.¹⁵⁹ Worse still, if such enthusiasm has been arrived at via a mixture of unsound and unstudied maxims, Tucker thinks that a '*civil war*' must necessarily ensue; and this is precisely his explanation as to the dispute then presiding between Whitefield, Wesley and their followers. For, according to Tucker, since Wesley in particular never '*renounced* Mr *Law's* system' but also went on to embrace the 'Moravian reveries', he claims that Wesley thereby constructed a theology whereby 'Mr *Law* laid the groundwork, and the Brethren at *Hernhuth* raised the superstructure' – both

(London, 1763) & *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection, As Believed and Taught by the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, From the Year 1725, to the Year 1765*, (Bristol, 1766). For Law's Christian perfectionism, see Chapter Two, Section V.

¹⁵⁷ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 38-9.

¹⁵⁸ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 155-6; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 155-6.

¹⁵⁹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, p. 296; *Life of George Whitefield*, pp. 49-50.

of which were utterly incompatible with one another.¹⁶⁰ Consequently, Tucker is certain that ‘the divisions and separations of the Methodists is a thing which all people of coolness, and a moderate penetration [i.e., the orthodox thinker] did foresee, and expect would come to pass’:

For indeed they had on both sides, such a *medley* of all sorts of principles (*Calvinism, Arminianism, Quakerism, Quietism, Montanism*, all thrown together) that each had room enough to *please his own fancy*, and had enough besides to *hold in common* with the rest of his brethren. – And thus they might have run on, at least for a longer space of time (and especially had they been persecuted) in a continual round of rapture and inconsistency, without ever discovering whether they agreed, or disagreed with each other.¹⁶¹

With these points in mind, Tucker brings *Principles of Methodism* to a close with a final, definitive account of the Wesleyan and Whitefieldian schism, and more importantly, of the position of the established Church in relation to both churchmen. Moreover, by doing so, Tucker reiterates the Butlerian account of Christian orthodoxy, involving scrupulous adherence to Scripture *in tandem* with Church liturgy, canon law, the Prayer Book and the Thirty-Nine Articles:

If there are no *Conditions*, or *Qualifications* required previous to *Justification*, if we may soon be justified, without having attended to the means of *Grace* ... as by attending to them, to what use, or purpose can they further serve? ... Or what advantage are we to receive from the performance of them? [...]

[Either Wesley] must give up the Doctrine of *imputed Righteousness*, and make *Gospel Holiness* to be a necessary Qualification antecedent to Justification; or else, if he holds to *Imputation*, he must strike off the *Necessity* of any Religious performances as *previous* and *requisite* to attain it. In short, there is no holding, or mixing both together; they are so incompatible, and contradictory to each other.¹⁶²

To which Tucker finally concludes with reference to his and Butler’s earlier episodes with Whitefield and Wesley:

¹⁶⁰ As Young puts it in *Religion and Enlightenment*, p. 151: ‘Any attempt at characterizing John Wesley’s thought has to confront its essential feature—its eclecticism’.

¹⁶¹ *Principles of Methodism*, p. 39; emphases added. Note once again the deployment of Butlerian terminology, as in ‘coolness’ and ‘moderate penetration’. Interestingly, in stating here that events would have ‘run on’ had the Methodists ‘been persecuted’, Tucker is in fact making two related points. First, that the Methodist quarrel was analogous, albeit on a microcosmic scale, to the previous century’s wars of religion (since Tucker believed that both phenomena bred religious enmity, violence, and the prospect of non-resolution). And secondly, that since the eighteenth-century established Church was benevolent enough not to condone persecution, Tucker believed that this was example enough of its moral and theological supremacy over the minority sects.

¹⁶² *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 45, 46-7.

This, I hope, is a plain, uniform, and consistent Scheme; and yet the Substance of this Doctrine I have endeavoured to explain over and over in my Conversation with the *Methodists*; but either I am very unhappy and obscure in my Expressions, or they are strangely presupposed by a wrong *Association* of Ideas, which they could not sever from each other; for so it was, that they seldom understood me, or could be made Sensible of my Meaning.¹⁶³

VII. Laodicean Rationalism.

As we steadily approach the conclusion to this chapter, it is worth briefly turning at this stage to Wesley's reply to Tucker, published towards the end of 1742 and entitled *The Principles of a Methodist*. Here Wesley's tone is far more conciliatory, referring to Tucker in the preface as '*a Brother who is my own Soul*', and that he '*Desire[s] ... in every Word I say, to look upon Mr. Tucker as in his Place; and to speak no Tittle concerning the one in any other Spirit, than I wou'd speak concerning the other*'.¹⁶⁴ A far cry, then, from having accused Butler's young chaplain of doctrinal heterodoxy merely three years previously, Shelton speculates that Wesley's tract 'disagrees very little' with what Tucker had to say about the Methodists, and in some respects this is indeed accurate.¹⁶⁵ For instance, regarding Tucker's three-stage definition of the burgeoning sect,¹⁶⁶ Wesley willingly declares that he desires 'not a more Consistent Account of my Principles, than [Tucker] has himself given'. Likewise, in Part I of Wesley's *Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion* (1745), alongside a later sermon entitled 'The Scripture Way of Salvation' (1765), Wesley goes on to give similar accounts of his theology to that which Tucker provided in 1742.¹⁶⁷ Yet be that as it may, upon closer inspection it is plain to see that Shelton's points do not go far enough, and that there are in fact some rather stark differences in their respective positions. An initial example of this concerns Tucker's charge regarding William Law's influence on the Methodists – an influence Tucker disavows based upon his belief in the impossibility of temporal Christian perfectionism – to which Wesley responds that in any case, the influence itself 'is not *proved*'. 'I had been Eight Years at *Oxford*', he writes, 'before I read any of Mr. Law's Writings: And when I did, I was so far from

¹⁶³ *Principles of Methodism*, p. 51.

¹⁶⁴ John Wesley, *The Principles of a Methodist. Occasion'd by a late Pamphlet intituled, A Brief History of the Principles of METHODISM*, (Bristol, 1742), 'Preface'.

¹⁶⁵ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 35.

¹⁶⁶ *Principles of Methodism*, pp. 36-7, which we listed above at p. 159.

¹⁶⁷ Wesley, *Principles of a Methodist*, p. 29. For *A Farther Appeal* and 'The Scripture Way', see *Works*, XI, *The Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion*, Cragg (ed.), (Oxford, 1975).

making them my *Creed*, that I had Objections to almost every Page'.¹⁶⁸ Likewise, then, concerning the Moravians, Hernhuth and Böhler, Wesley refutes the semantics of Tucker's various accusations, drawing evidence from his journals as proof of the chronological veracity of his conversion experience(s).¹⁶⁹

By far the most significant example of the dissimilarities between Tucker and Whitefield can be seen, however, in the first section of *Principles of a Methodist*, which Wesley dedicates to a staunch defence of his belief in sinless Christian perfection, and the doctrine of *sola fide*. There, for example, he writes that

the true Christian Faith, is not only to believe the Holy Scriptures and the Articles of our Faith are true; but also, To have *a sure Trust and Confidence to be saved from everlasting Damnation by CHRIST*, whereof doth follow a Loving Heart, to obey his Commandments.

In Wesley's eyes, then, to 'be a *Perfect Man* [i.e., to achieve Christian perfection]' is to be '*sanctified throughout, created anew in JESUS CHRIST*: Even to have a Heart so All-flaming with the LOVE OF GOD'. Moreover, in continuing his defence against charges of doctrinal heterodoxy (which was something Wesley had to grapple with for the rest of his life), Wesley concludes with a rather half-hearted attempt at establishment moderatism: 'If there be any Thing Unscriptural in these Words, any Thing Wild or Extravagant, any Thing contrary to the Analogy of Faith or the Experience of Adult Christians, let them *smite me friendly and reprove me*'.¹⁷⁰

[That] I may say many Things which have been said before, and perhaps by *Calvin* or *Arminius*, by *Montanus* or *Barclay*, or the Archbishop of *Cambrai*, is highly probable. But it cannot thence be infer'd, That I hold a "*a Medley of all their Principles*" ...

[Perhaps], when I shall have receiv'd farther Light, I may be convinced that "Gospel-Holiness (as Mr. *Tucker* believes) is a Necessary Qualification, antecedent to Justification ..." ... [But until then] I will endeavour, impartially, to consider, what shall be advanced in Defence of it.¹⁷¹

The most important point to glean from Wesley's various responses here is his denial of the claim that his theology is contrary to the 'Analogy of Faith' – a clear allusion, we may suggest, not only to Romans 12: 6 or more pertinently still the Westminster

¹⁶⁸ Wesley, *Principles of a Methodist*, p. 14.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., pp. 16-9.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 1-13; these citations at pp. 7, 12, 13.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 31-2.

Confession, but also Butler's *Analogy*.¹⁷² This is both interesting and significant in that despite Wesley's affirmations to the contrary, in an entry from his *Journal* written shortly after the publication of *The Analogy* itself, he had criticised Butler's work by claiming that it was too difficult for the layperson to understand – precisely those members of society who Wesley believed were most in need of spiritual aid:

I doubt [*The Analogy*] too hard for most of those for whom it is chiefly intended. For *Freethinkers*, so called, are seldom *close thinkers*. They will not be at the pains of reading such a book as this. One that would profit them must dilute his sense, or they will neither swallow nor digest it.¹⁷³

As we can see, then, in spite of the fact that both clergymen clearly attempted to bridge the gap between Church and laity, learned and unlearned, in their own respective ways, Wesley's rather overt censure of Butler's *Analogy* only serves to accentuate the differences between their doctrinal positions.¹⁷⁴

Here we are to remind ourselves of the overriding Wesleyan scheme: i.e., to bring inward emotion—or as Wesley himself calls it, the 'Heart so all-flaming'—to the forefront of religion: '*ad populum*', he writes elsewhere,

to the *bulk of mankind* – to those who neither relish nor understand the art of speaking, but who notwithstanding are competent judges of those truths which are necessary to present and future happiness.¹⁷⁵

Above all, in doing so, Wesley is mistrustful of what he calls those 'fair pictures' of human nature, which elevate reason and rationality at the expense of the spirit, and which have become so pervasive 'it is now quite unfashionable to talk otherwise, to say any thing to [their] disparagement'.¹⁷⁶ According to Rivers, such 'fair pictures are seductive and dangerous'. For if, as Wesley later puts it in *The Arminian* (1790), 'mankind are faultless by nature, naturally endued with light to see all necessary truth, and with strength to follow it', revelation is but a 'mere fable; one that we can do

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁷³ *Journal of Wesley*, Curnock (ed.), V, p. 265.

¹⁷⁴ For Butler's strategy, see esp. Chapter Three, Section IV. The remainder of discussion on Wesley in this section is heavily indebted to Rivers', *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, Chap. 5: 'John Wesley and the language of Scripture, reason, and experience', pp. 205-53.

¹⁷⁵ Wesley, *Sermons*, Outler (ed.), 'Preface', I, pp. 103-4; emphasis added.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., II, Sermon 44: 'Original Sin', pp. 172-3; Cf. Sermon 128: 'The Deceitfulness of the Human Heart' (1792), IV, esp. p. 151.

perfectly well without'.¹⁷⁷ Once again, then, it is this position which pits the Wesleyan scheme squarely against the Butlerian, albeit somewhat paradoxically. For quite aside from the differences between them in their earlier Bristol meetings, here we discern Wesley's attempts to rally against those he believes tend towards atheism, rather than atheists themselves – Butler potentially, if not *extraordinarily*, numbered among them.

This is fundamentally important, because whilst on the one hand Wesley does not think it possible for there to be many, if any, *true atheists* in existence (even among those who call themselves deists and freethinkers),¹⁷⁸ on the other, by implication, his scheme is directed towards those moralists who he believes undermine Christianity from within, either wantonly or unwittingly, thereby rendering them little better, if not even more dangerous, than any atheist could ever be.¹⁷⁹ With this general observation, Wesley is not explicitly pointing his finger at Butler *per se*, but rather at the likes of Butler's fellow neo-Stoic, Hutcheson, whom Wesley at one point describes as that 'smooth-tongued orator of Glasgow, one of the most pleasing writers of the age!'¹⁸⁰ According to Wesley, Hutcheson is particularly dangerous because he paints a picture of humankind that is at once prelapsarian and Shaftesburian, and yet masquerading as Christian. Hence, although he admits in his journal that Hutcheson 'is a beautiful writer', nevertheless,

... his scheme cannot stand unless the Bible falls. I know both from Scripture, reason, and experience that ... [it] is not true that no man is capable of malice, or delight in giving pain; much less that every man is virtuous, and remains so long as he lives; nor does the Scripture allow that any action is good which is done without any design to please God.¹⁸¹

Furthermore, as a consequence of the type of influence Hutcheson, and of course Shaftesbury, appeared to be exerting on the eighteenth-century intellect, Wesley states that 'almost all men of letters' throughout contemporary Europe (and in one of his final sermons he referred explicitly to 'the great triumvirate, Rousseau, Voltaire and David Hume') have constructed a 'fashionable' religion that stands 'on its own foundation,

¹⁷⁷ Wesley, *Works*, Jackson (ed.) Cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, II, pp. 229-30.

¹⁷⁸ Wesley, *Sermons*, Outler (ed.), IV, Sermon 130: 'On Living without God' [1790], p. 171. This is no doubt symptomatic of the fact that open admissions of atheism were rare. See Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 44.

¹⁷⁹ We noted this above at p. 142.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, III, Sermon 106: 'On Faith' [1788], p. 499.

¹⁸¹ *Journal of Wesley*, Curnock (ed.), V, pp. 492-5.

independent of revelation whatever'. Whether it is called 'humanity', 'virtue', 'morality', or what you please', he concludes, 'it is neither better nor worse than atheism'.¹⁸²

We must tread extremely carefully here. Clearly, Butler was neither a sceptic nor an unbeliever in the mould of Shaftesbury, Voltaire, Hume or the like, and neither did Wesley believe him to be so. Yet however that may be, as in the case of the professedly Christian Hutcheson, what Wesley was ultimately wary of was that which could be *inferred* from the Butlerian method: specifically, its neo-Stoic elevation of reason and rationality, alongside its concomitant basis in Newtonian physico-theology.¹⁸³ Essentially, then, Wesley's position with regard to Butler rested on his general, though *deep*, mistrust of the contemporary overestimation of reason, which, in spite of our claims to the contrary in our examination of *Fifteen Sermons* and *The Analogy* above, Wesley believes Butler espouses over and above the Christian mysteries; and which, if correct or justified, renders the doctrine of the fall obsolete.¹⁸⁴ It is by these means, then, that Wesley continued to tread Law's Augustinian-rigorous (and thereby arguably Calvinist) path, by insisting that reason could never be sufficient to restrain the passions.¹⁸⁵ For indeed, according to Wesley, the frequent overreach of humanity's passions was simply *unavoidable* because of the fall: 'a plain, glaring, apparent condition of human kind', he wrote.¹⁸⁶

It is in the context of the Butler-Wesley debate, then, that Clifford Johnson once referred to bishop Butler as a 'Laodicean Rationalist'; Laodicean being a synonym for 'latitudinarian', as John Gascoigne reliably informs us, and a pejorative one among many contemporaries at that.¹⁸⁷ One of the early centres of the primitive church,

¹⁸² Wesley, *Sermons*, Outler (ed.), IV, Sermon 120: 'The Unity of the Divine Being' [1790], pp. 68-9. As Rivers puts it, although Wesley concedes that the 'majority recognise that religion consists of two parts, duty to both God and our neighbour', nevertheless as far as he is concerned the problem arises when 'they forget the first and put the second for the whole duty of man'. *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 230.

¹⁸³ In this, we are to recall Christopher Brooke's central thesis that early-modern neo-Stoics were frequently scorned as a set of prideful, if not arrogant, writers 'insofar as [they denied] human dependence on God', *Philosophical Pride*, p. 10 & passim.

¹⁸⁴ Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, draws sustained attention to Butler's reputation for rationalism over Christian mysticism – not all of which is entirely warranted.

¹⁸⁵ E.g., Wesley, *Sermons*, Outler (ed.), II, Sermon 62, 'The End of Christ's Coming' [1781].

¹⁸⁶ Wesley, *Works*, Jackson (ed.), p. 234.

¹⁸⁷ Clifford Johnson, 'Joseph Butler, Laodicean Rationalist?', *Modern Language Studies*, Vol 4, No. 2 (Autumn, 1974), pp. 78-85; Gascoigne, *Cambridge Age of Enlightenment*, p. 248.

Laodicea on the Lycus was established during the Apostolic Age (c. 33-100 AD), and it was one of the Seven Churches of Asia addressed by name in Rev. 3. 14-22, to whom John wrote at the behest of Christ:

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.

In this passage, the suggestion behind John's words was that the Laodiceans, being 'neither cold nor hot', lacked the necessary zeal to be proper Christians. In short, this explains why the term 'Laodicean' was so often used by religious enthusiasts during the seventeenth and eighteenth century to criticise the latitudinarians, particularly those within the Great Tew Circle and the so-called Cambridge Platonists, who had stressed the role of reason, and had argued along suspiciously Stoic lines that Christianity was above all a 'social, practical and moral' religion.¹⁸⁸ As Patrick Müller has recently put it, then:

[The] latitudinarian emphasis on the divine residue in Man [contained] a self-reflective moment, reminiscent of the Golden rule. In men's commerce with their fellow humans, empathy [was] the key to proper conduct ... The Latitudinarians' psychology was [therefore] shrewd enough to discern that fellow-feeling [could not] be durably imparted without appeals to experience and self-interest.¹⁸⁹

Here, then, is a remarkably concise summary of Butler's position, in profound contradistinction to Wesley's view that a latitudinarian was 'one that fancies all religions are saving',¹⁹⁰ and that speculative latitudinarianism itself was 'an indifference to all opinions' – the 'spawn of hell'.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ Pocock, *Barbarism*, I, p. 21.

¹⁸⁹ Patrick Müller, *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne and Goldsmith*, (Zugl., Münster, 2009), p. 105. For Butler's espousal of the 'Golden Rule' and its applicability to modern forms of commercial sociability, see Chapter Three, p. 106, n. 90.

¹⁹⁰ Wesley, *Complete English Dictionary*, (London, 1753).

¹⁹¹ Wesley, *Sermons*, Outler (ed.), II, p. 92, No. 39, 'Catholic Spirit' [1755].

VIII. *A Brief and Dispassionate View of the Trinitarian, Arian and Socinian Systems.*

At this late stage, it is well for us to turn once again to Tucker, and to demonstrate his unwavering allegiance to Butlerian ‘rational religion’ in a non-economic context. This is evinced above all, at least in overtly theological terms, in Tucker’s account of the makeup of eighteenth-century British Protestant sectarianism, presented in *TASS* (1774).¹⁹² In this pamphlet written in the aftermath of the 1772 Subscription Controversy, Tucker’s main concern is to ‘reason analogically’ (a euphemism for the Butlerian method) so as to systematise the differences between Trinitarians, Arians and Socinians, and to point out the sufficiency of the former as opposed to the faults of the latter two. Clearly, then, in this respect we are adding very little to what we already know regarding Tucker’s commitment to the established Church. What certainly is of interest, however, is the *manner* in which he shows this commitment.

Initially we may take note, at the beginning of the work, of Tucker’s reference to Butler’s dissertation *On Personal Identity*, which was appended to *The Analogy*. There, Butler had incorporated elements of Berkeleian mathematics in order to refute the Lockean conception of the self, which Locke had argued was dependent upon a *posteriori* consciousness (experiential memory) as opposed to a *a priori* substance (body or soul).¹⁹³ Reiterating his commitment to Clarke’s ‘immaterial substance’ theory, which we briefly explored in Chapter Three,¹⁹⁴ Butler aligned himself with the second explanation. Therefore, ‘When it is asked’, he wrote, ‘wherein personal Identity consists, the Answer should be the same, as if it were asked, wherein consists Similitude or Equality; that all Attempts to define, would but perplex it’.¹⁹⁵ For,

¹⁹² The full title reads *A Brief and Dispassionate View of the Difficulties Attending the Trinitarian, Arian, and Socinian Systems*, (Gloucester, 1774). It is a tract which receives short-shrift in Clark, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 54; Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 180, and is completely ignored by Schuyler.

¹⁹³ John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, (London, 1690), II. XXVII: ‘On Identity and Diversity’. For the importance of Locke’s formula on what has been described as the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century ‘hermeneutics of heresy’, see Starkie, *Bangorian Controversy*, Chap. 6, esp. pp. 126-7. For further discussion of Locke on self-identity in terms of the background to Hume’s philosophical reading of Berkeley, consult Talia Mae Bettcher, ‘Berkeley and Hume on Self and Self-Consciousness’, in Jon Miller (ed.), *Topics in Early Modern Philosophy of Mind*, (Springer, 2009), pp. 193-222, at pp. 195-9.

¹⁹⁴ See Chapter Three, Section II.

¹⁹⁵ *The Analogy: Of Personal Identity*, p. 301.

though Consciousness does thus ascertain our personal Identity to Ourselves, yet to say, that Consciousness makes personal Identity, or is necessary to our being the same Persons, is to say, that a Person had not existed a single Moment, nor done one Action, but what he can remember ... Consciousness of personal Identity presupposes, and therefore cannot constitute, personal Identity, any more than Knowledge in any other Case, can constitute Truth, which it presupposes.¹⁹⁶

In simplified terms, Butler's main argument here is that consciousness presupposes identity, and not the other way round, as Locke assumes. Nevertheless, again, it is not the bishop's proposition that is of most importance to us *per se*, but rather Tucker's unstinting acceptance and assimilation of it in *TASS*. Although Tucker begins this short work with the requisite Protestant emphasis on *sola scriptura* (i.e., by advising that the reader should look no further than the 'Proofs from various Passages of Scripture, in Favour of a Trinity of Persons, in the undivided Essence of the Godhead'),¹⁹⁷ nevertheless, he immediately concedes that to 'proceed a Step farther' beyond Holy Writ it is to necessarily 'embark' on 'endless Difficulties and Perplexities'. Hence – and here we must bear in mind that the following excerpt is a direct reference to Butler's *On Self-Identity* argument – Tucker writes that

We cannot, for instance, conceive, much less define, what is the Cause of *personal Identity*,--or what is *Essence*: And therefore we cannot by any Powers of Reason hitherto discovered, pretend to say, whether such a Trinity of *co-equal* Personalities, or personal Identities, can *co-exist* in one undivided Essence, *or not*.

It is precisely in light of these inherent 'difficulties and perplexities', then, that Tucker next draws upon Butler's earlier refutation of Locke, so as to demonstrate, in explicit terms, where he himself stands on the matter:

Indeed, Mr. *Lock* once attempted to assign the Cause or Substratum of personal Identity; but failed most egregiously, by mistaking the Effect for the Cause [And it is here that Tucker refers the reader to Butler's *Of Personal Identity*, in a footnote] ... Self-Consciousness, the Cause assigned by Mr. *Lock* may be allowed to be a good *Proof* of Personal Identity; but it cannot possibly be the Cause of it; inasmuch as it is itself on the Effect, or Operation of some other Cause, hitherto undiscovered. In short, I must exist, but I can be conscious of my Existence. And therefore Self-Consciousness can be nothing more than the Effect of some hidden Cause.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁶ *The Analogy: Of Personal Identity*, p. 302.

¹⁹⁷ *TASS*, p. 3. To which Tucker also recommends Archbishop William Wake's (1657-1737) *The Principles of the Christian Religion Explained: In a Brief Commentary Upon the Church Catechism*, (London, 1699). Tucker reprints Section IX of this work at the end of *TASS* for the reader's benefit.

¹⁹⁸ *TASS*, p. 4.

To reiterate, what is of interest to us here is not so much the veracity or falsity of the argument itself, but rather the extent to which Tucker defers to Butler's authority on the matter, and the extent to which he takes for granted the legitimacy of his late bishop's claim.¹⁹⁹ This is of fundamental importance as we move forward, for two related reasons. Firstly, because Tucker was clearly not as capable a metaphysician as Butler;²⁰⁰ and that secondly, as a consequence, throughout his works Tucker was content to secure his epistemology in Butler – almost without fail. Indeed, as for the present case of *TASS*, although Tucker readily admits that the dispute about self-identity 'encrease[s] our Difficulties' regarding proof of the Trinity, as opposed to 'removing them', interestingly and surprisingly, in Tucker's view, it is in fact Butler's position rather than Locke's which complicates matters – and rightly so. Accordingly, in *TASS* Tucker is happy to defer to the 'Butlerian-analogical' (or 'probability-provability') method, which is repeated time and again throughout his works, though in various guises. Hence, 'when we come to *reason analogically* on each of these Heads', Tucker resolves in reference to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, 'we find, either that our usual Rules of reasoning are all inadequate to this Purpose, and cannot assist us'.²⁰¹ Again, then, just as in *The Analogy*, Tucker accepts as axiomatic that presupposing a *measure of doubt* necessarily presupposes a *commensurate degree of faith*, and it is on this footing that the main argument of *TASS* proceeds.

Beginning with the orthodox Trinitarian position, in a quasi-Socratic and familiarly Butlerian confession of ignorance, Tucker immediately concedes that it is precisely because all the 'primary Attributes of God are absolutely above the Reach of our Mental Powers' that the Trinitarian

judges it to be wiser and more prudent, as well as the more modest Part, to accept the Doctrine in the *gross*, without entering into any curious Disquisitions about it, or pretending to fathom such bottomless Depths by the short Line of his scanty, imperfect Reason.

¹⁹⁹ By 1774 (if not earlier) Tucker was very much politically opposed to Locke, and it may well be that this played a motivational role in him acting so one-sidedly here.

²⁰⁰ An example of this is Tucker's claim that he is not 'metaphysician enough to comprehend what INFINITY really means', a point made in recollection of a discussion he had with Hume in the context of the 'Rich Country-Poor Debate' (which is in itself an extension of Butlerian metaphysics). See *Four Tracts, Together with Two Sermons, On Political and Commercial Subjects*, (Gloucester, 1774), p. 41.

²⁰¹ *TASS*, pp. 4-5.

Once again, then, just as Butler had earlier proposed, here Tucker states that it is precisely because humans are limited, finite creatures that they must necessarily ‘fail, and become unserviceable, *to a great Degree*’, especially when attempting to explain such weighty matters as ‘the Existence, Powers, and Distinctions ... the infinite and incomprehensible Source of all Things’. Moreover, no matter how advanced humans may believe themselves to be in terms of rational enquiry, their ‘*usual Rules of reasoning*’—and by this Tucker means any reasoning based on nature—will always remain ‘*inadequate*’ to the task; even more so if said task is to elucidate the ‘*exact Meaning*, or [ascertain] the *precise [Idea]*’ of something as inherently mysterious as the Trinity. Because of this, Tucker concludes that the Trinitarian can and ought to be defended on Butler’s ‘equal-probability’ basis, since it is God’s prerogative to reveal the true nature of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, when, or indeed *if*, He deems the time is right or necessary:

... from the Instance of Antipodes here brought, it may at least be deemed *possible*, That the Doctrine of the Trinity of co-equal Persons in one undivided Essence may become, in some future Period of our Existence, as intelligible to us all, as that of the Antipodes is at present to Men of Letters.²⁰²

Having defended the Trinitarian position, Tucker moves swiftly on to criticism of the Arian and Socinian systems – and, as ever, on Butlerian terms. Beginning with the Arian System, Tucker insists that an adherent of this creed harbours the following ‘Bias on his Mind’: i.e., that because he attempts to reason away the doctrine of the Trinity according to ‘the common Course of *other* Things [again, the laws of nature]’, he immediately concludes that there simply ‘cannot be *that* Co-equality, and Co-eternity of Persons in the Trinity’. Because of these frustrations, the Arian therefore ‘resolves to examine all those Texts over again, which are usually brought in Support of Trinitarian doctrine’,

and then by the Help of Subtile Criticisms, strained, and farfetched Comments and Glosses, he at last discovers, or fancies that he discovers, that these Texts may be so understood as to imply a Supremacy of the first Person over the second and the third,---not only in Point of

²⁰² TASS, ‘The Trinitarian System’, pp. 5-8. Cf. *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 309: ‘Other Orders and Creatures may perhaps be let into the secret Counsels of Heaven, and have the Designs and Methods of Providence in the Creation and Government of the World communicated to them; but this does not belong to our Rank or Condition. *The Fear of the Lord*, and *to depart from Evil*, is the only Wisdom which Man should aspire after, as His Work and Business’.

Order and Oeconomy, but also of ~~Self~~ Existence,---Omnipresence,---Omniscience,---Eternity, and the like.

‘[H]aving proceeded thus far’, however, Tucker insists that the Arian’s ‘Labours are ... far from being at an End’. ‘For every Step he advances presents him with fresh Difficulties, and new Embarrassments’; and the more that this happens, the more he ‘must in his Turn act on the *defensive Side*’. Hence, by taking the Butlerian conception of the self for his model yet again, Tucker proposes the following. According to the logic of the Arian, how is it possible, he asks, for the ‘second Person in the Trinity’ to be *both* the ‘Heavenly Father’ *and* ‘but a mere Creature’? – a notion that

not only strains the Scripture-Expressions to his Senses, which they do not naturally convey; but also involves himself in such Intricacies ... as even on the Footing of Human Reason, would render his Scheme not a Jot more eligible than the other.

What is more, ‘by representing our Lord in so inferior a Character, as that of a *Deputy-Divinity*’, Tucker concludes that the Arian evidently saps the Foundation of the whole Doctrine of Redemption, Satisfaction, and Atonement’.²⁰³ Here, then, we witness Tucker’s attempts to *rehabilitate*, and not merely *criticise*, those deistic tendencies within the broad church, which Butler had also targeted specifically in *The Analogy*.²⁰⁴

Finally, we see the Butlerian method at work yet again in Tucker’s definition of the Socinian system. The Socinian ‘seems to be a disinterested Spectator on both Sides’, he writes, notwithstanding the fact that he feels the ‘Weight of the Objections’ on either end. However, since the inclination of the Socinian is not to be temperate or moderate, unlike the Trinitarian, Tucker insists that he tends to presume ‘weakly, perhaps *arrogantly* ... that he can devise a third [scheme], which is encumbered with no Difficulties at all’. Consequently, according to Tucker, the Socinian ‘boldly pronounces the Holy Spirit to be *no distinct Person*, but only a mere Quality, Emanation, or Attribute of the Diety’, to the apparent defamation of Revelation. For if the Socinian system ‘be really true’, Tucker posits, ‘the Scriptures of Course must be false’, meaning that ‘Christ and his Apostles [ought to] be ranked among the greatest Hypocrites and Imposters that ever appeared on Earth’. Crucially, then, since Tucker cannot

²⁰³ TASS, ‘The Arian System’, pp. 8-10.

²⁰⁴ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 15.

countenance a notion such as this, and likewise, since he claims that the Socinian ought not to either, he concludes that it is surely the Trinitarian System which should prevail. For while the ‘Trinitarian System hath confessedly great Difficulties, which human Reason cannot pretend to master’, nevertheless, the ‘Arian hath full as great’, worsened by the distortion of ‘several very plain Passages of Scripture from their natural and genuine Signification’. As for Socinianism, ‘it not only strips the Christian Believer of all Hopes and Comforts in a Covenant of Grace founded in Christ’s *proper* Atonement, but also sinks the Gospel into a System of mere [human] Morality’. To which Tucker summarises and concludes, once more in overtly Butlerian tones:

What then is a rational, a modest, and a pious Man to do in such Cases as these, where Dangers and Difficulties surround him on every Side? Undoubtedly he will reject the Socinian System, if he chuses to retain the Essentials of the Christian Covenant, and to avoid representing the Author of it, as no better than an infamous Imposter. Moreover with Respect to the Arian, he will weigh deliberately, and consider well, Whether this System, with all its Boastings, has any real and solid Advantages over the Trinitarian [...] Therefore, if this should prove to be the case ... he is justifiable ... in adhering to his former Persuasion or Belief of a Trinity in Unity; notwithstanding all the Cavils which have been or may be raised against it. Nay, in Respect to those very Mysteries, about which such loud Clamours have been excited, he will coolly reflect, that ... it would be difficult for him to shew a just Reason, why he should reject the like Mysteries, when coming from Revelation ... [As] he is sensible that his Abilities are limited, he will not attempt to push his Enquiries, either in this, or any other Respect, farther than such confined Abilities can safely carry him. [...] we believe enough for our present State and Condition,---because this alone is able to make us wise unto Salvation.²⁰⁵

IX. Concluding Remarks: The ‘Butler-Tucker Axis’.

Throughout this chapter, we have attempted to chart the development of Butler’s brand of establishment orthodoxy from *Fifteen Sermons* to *The Analogy*, and Tucker’s subsequent adoption of it in his earliest religious and polemical writings (aside, latterly, from *TASS*). Based upon what little evidence survives from their direct dealings with one another, in light of all that we have discussed in the forgoing pages, nevertheless, it is surely not too difficult to speculate upon the content of the ‘metaphysical and theological subjects’ they discussed during their frequent turns about the gardens of Bristol Cathedral.²⁰⁶ For it seems clear to the present author that, much like Butler and Secker’s earlier ruminations in Oxford during their respective youths, Butler and Tucker

²⁰⁵ *TASS*, ‘The Socinian System’, pp. 11-14.

²⁰⁶ Stephens, *Public Characters*, p. 171.

must also have ‘talked their own talk without controul’ on Trinitarian doctrine, the ‘inspiration of the Scripture’ and the Thirty-Nine Articles – in other words, on the sufficiency and suitability of orthodox Christology.²⁰⁷ It is for these very reasons, then, that Butler and Tucker’s various confrontations with Whitefield and Wesley are particularly fascinating; which, though already treated separately in extant scholarship, have never before been explored in tandem. For when considered as thematically similar and complimentary episodes, it is plain to see that the doctrinal wrangling between the two sets of Churchmen constituted the initial ‘fertile ground’ by which the Butlerian-Tuckerian brand of Christian orthodoxy was able to take root and flourish: a specific type of establishment Anglican moderatism which went well beyond the prevailing Whiggish ideology of politeness, as shall be argued subsequently.

This having been asserted, it is fitting to end the present chapter with Wesley’s later concession, set down in a private letter dated 1778, that though the established Church was by no means evangelical, to its supposed detriment, nevertheless, at the very least it was not ‘anti-evangelical’ – as in the case of Calvinism:

Calvinism is not the gospel; nay, it is farther from it than most of the sermons I hear at [the established] church. These are frequently un-evangelical; but those are anti-evangelical ... Nay, I find more profit in sermons on either *good temper* or *good works* than in what are vulgarly called gospel sermons.²⁰⁸

For here we witness, quite remarkably, Wesley’s re-articulation of the Butlerian ‘temper of mind-good works’ formula in somewhat conciliatory terms, thereby hinting at the considerable influence Butler must surely have exerted on broader eighteenth (and indeed nineteenth) century conceptions concerning Anglican self-identity – our inference being, once again, that given the nature of the relationship between the pair, Tucker’s political economy must have been a further extension of this.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁷ Porteus, *Life and Character of Secker*, p. 6; Cf. Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 32-3, 35-6 & this study, Chapter Three p. 97.

²⁰⁸ *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.*, J. Telford (ed.), 8 vols, (London, 1930), VI, p. 326; emphasis added.

²⁰⁹ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 174, goes so far as to state that by the late-eighteenth-century, even ‘at national and local levels voluntary societies were increasingly united in adopting Butler’s voice’.

In light of this tentative suggestion, then, it is incumbent upon us shift our immediate attention to Tucker's economic tracts, in an effort to explore the plausibility of a type of political economy that was curiously *Anglican* in origin. In the forthcoming and final chapter, then, we focus predominantly on Tucker over Butler; notwithstanding the fact that Butler's ideas remained an ever-present influence on his young protégé's mind.²¹⁰

²¹⁰ E.g., *Instructions*, p. 6: 'As to Bishop *Butler* himself, he certainly pursues a Method the fittest in the World to put to silence the superficial, licentious Extravagancies of modern Times; were his manner of Writing a little more pleasing and alluring. For by demonstrating, that there is a System actually carrying on by the Author of the Universe, both in the natural and moral World, he confutes the Sceptics on one Extreme; and by proving how imperfectly this System is yet comprehended by us, he checks that Arrogance, and Self-sufficiency on the other, which are too natural to young Minds, just tinctured with a Smattering of Knowledge.'

Part III.

Tuckerian Political Economy.

Chapter Five.

The Economic Tracts.

By and large, Tucker's writings were far less methodical than Butler's, which is unsurprising, perhaps, given that he lived for longer and wrote on a far wider variety of subjects than did his mentor. The inherent difficulty with this, however, is that in many respects Tucker's works appear to lack coherence, meaning that his ideas have remained notoriously difficult to interpret and/or comprehend – a point advanced in the introduction to this study.¹ The phrase Tennant deploys in order to describe certain elements of Butler's philosophy, i.e., 'conceptual fuzziness', is particularly useful in this context, although the present author speculates that Tucker displayed this characteristic far more overtly than did his bishop – at least on the surface.² Though it is impossible to dispel these difficulties in their entirety in what remains of this study, a start can at least be made via a detailed examination of Tucker's purely economic tracts, the *Essay* (1749) and the *Elements* (1755), which proved to be important exceptions to the rule in that they were undoubtedly far more methodical than the vast majority of his writings.

Before proceeding, there are two important points we need to reconsider regarding the present-day reception of Tucker's economic thought. Invariably, these revolve around the relationship between him and Adam Smith, and, synchronously, the prevalence of teleological 'Whiggish' histories of political economy, 'of which', according to Young, 'the secular canon of the late-18th and early-19th centuries is the inevitable conclusion'.³ Firstly, then, it is important to note that Tucker was not writing in 'anticipation' or 'foreshadowing' of Smith, whom he would scarcely have known in the 1740s and 1750s when the economic tracts were formulated and written. If anything, Smith's reluctance to acknowledge Tucker's influence reveals far more about the dissimilarities in their

¹ See Introduction, pp. 13-5. Noted too in Semmel, *Free Trade Imperialism*, p. 15.

² For Tennant's description, see Chapter Three, p. 99.

³ Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon', p. 395.

personalities as opposed to their similarities as economic theorists.⁴ Yet whilst it is true that Smith owned many of Tucker's publications, and that consequently there are many resemblances which can (and indeed frequently are) drawn between them, so far as is possible, this study resists the temptation to follow suit, on the grounds that the present author does not believe this to be the most fertile means of gauging Tucker's historical significance. In a scathing review of Shuyler's introductory biography to *Josiah Tucker* in 1931, Viner alluded to much the same himself when he claimed that it was a 'stab in the dark' to exaggerate Tucker's influence on Smith 'without lending plausibility to it by concrete and detailed evidence'.⁵ This being the case, we will do well to heed Viner's words, and only mention Smith when absolutely warranted.⁶

A second matter very much aligned to the former, and which is essentially a reiteration of this thesis' opening statement, is that, since Tucker's economic ideas have so often been crudely mapped onto those of Smith, this has resulted in a chronic lack of engagement with the clergyman's providentialism. A significant example of this problem can be discerned even in the work of Waterman, whose ideas we have cited liberally and justifiably throughout this study. For though, as we saw in Chapter Three, Waterman acknowledges the role of providence within the broader Butlerian-Tuckerian scheme,⁷ at the same time, even he appears to downplay the true extent of its significance by remarking that the *Essay* houses 'no ... trace of theological language; less indeed than in the *WN*' – the inference clearly being that Tucker's ideas are largely dependent on Smith's for their significance:

⁴ This is in stark contrast to Tucker's willingness to acknowledge his intellectual debts. See, e.g., *Instructions*, pp. 5-9, where, interestingly in our context, Tucker lists a number of thinkers whose 'Reasoning is, for the most Part, grounded on Bishop *Butler's Analogy* ...'

⁵ Viner, 'Review of Schuyler's *Josiah Tucker*', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 40, No. 3, (Jun., 1932), pp. 416-8.

⁶ Having said this we must equally bear in mind Butler's demonstrable influence over Smith's *TMS* (evidence presented in Chapter Four, pp. 122-4 above), and that it is therefore this Butlerian component of Tucker's thought which might also have influenced Smith. For a tentative yet valuable statement of the possible overlap, then, between Tucker's *Elements* and Smith's *TMS*, published merely three years later, and for the suggestion that Smith may therefore have managed to procure a copy of the *Elements* (even if not listed in Mizuta's *Adam Smith's Library*) see Waterman, 'The Changing Theological Context of Economic Analysis since the Eighteenth Century', *History of Political Economy*, 40/5, (2008), pp. 121-42, at pp. 129-30.

⁷ See Chapter Three, p. 84

Much is made of the fact that there is no mention in *WN* of “Jesus”, or “Christ”, or ‘the son’, and no direct reference to ‘God’ or ‘Providence’. But in truth there is little difference between Smith’s language of social explanation and that of Josiah Tucker.⁸

Though it is to be conceded that Waterman’s stance is somewhat mitigated by his attempt to redefine *WN* as a work of Newtonian natural theology, thereby bridging the theological gap between Tucker and Smith to a larger extent than most, the present author contends that he simply does not go far enough in this direction. This being said, the main purpose of this chapter is to prompt a comprehensive revisionist account of Tucker’s economic thought – one that places far greater emphasis on its basis in Butlerian Anglicanism as opposed to its alleged expectation of classical economics.⁹ To this end, the chapter begins with a brief biographical account of the circumstances leading to the publication of the economic tracts, followed by a detailed summation of Tucker’s adoption and reformulation of the Butlerian conceptions of sociability, self-love and benevolence. At this point, it turns to a piecemeal examination of the various proposals and politics housed within the *Essay* and *Elements* themselves in support of this interpretation; whereupon its focus shifts towards what is perhaps the most important feature of Tucker’s wider economic thought: his views on the relationship between self-interest and monopolisation. This having been asserted, the chapter is brought to a close via discussion of the economic tracts in wider historical and historiographical context.

I. Introduction: Appetites, Affections and Rational Agency.

Throughout the 1740s, Tucker moved away from anti-Methodist polemic and began instead to turn his attention towards economics – doubtless on Butler’s encouragement, according to Tennant.¹⁰ The initial fruit of Tucker’s labour was the publication of the *Essay on Trade* in 1749, a tract that ran through numerous editions, thereby winning its author an unparalleled reputation for assiduity and learning in all matters relating to trade and commerce. When, for example, a shortened version of the work was published

⁸ As earlier noted in Chapter One, Section IV. For Waterman’s muddled suggestions, see *Political Economy and Christian Theology*, pp. 112, 113, 265, n. 50; these citations are taken from a variation of this chapter published as “The beginning of ‘boundaries’: The sudden separation of economics from Christian theology”, in Guido Erreygers (ed.), *Economics and Interdisciplinary Exchange*, (London, Routledge, 2001), pp. 41-63.

⁹ This is not to say that Tucker’s economics had no bearing on classical economics, but merely that in order to properly understand them, it makes little sense to read him *backwards* from Smith *et al.*

¹⁰ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 146-7.

in French in 1754, it swiftly reached the eyes of François Quesnay (1694-1774), thus accounting for Tucker's initial influence among the Physiocrats.¹¹ Indeed, sixteen years later Turgot would write personally to Tucker to remark upon the intellectual solidarity he felt existed between their respective enterprises. 'I find in your works', Turgot exclaimed, 'that our principles on liberty and on the main objects of political economy are much in accord',

I confess I cannot help being astonished that, in a nation enjoying the liberty of the press, you should be almost the only author who has known and felt the advantages of a free commerce, and who has not been seduced by the puerile and suicidal allusion of a commerce fettered and exclusive.¹²

As Turgot's sentiments suggest, the chief characteristic of the *Essay* lay in the multitude of social and political reforms Tucker felt were necessary in order to secure Britain's commercial interests. So intriguing were these ideas that upon reading them, Bishop Thomas Hayter (1702-62) inquired as to the possibility of eliciting further instruction for his royal pupil, no less than the Prince of Wales and future King George III (1738-1820). Subsequently, Bishop Conybeare advised Hayter that Tucker was indeed the leading authority on the subject, and the resulting project which came of this recommendation was begun in 1752 at the latest. Showing far greater promise than the *Essay*, and potentially outstripping its predecessor in terms of length, depth and breadth of vision, according to Shelton the *Elements of Commerce* (1755) was intended to be Tucker's 'great work'.¹³ Yet since it never progressed beyond its second part (which itself remained incomplete), unfortunately, it was impossible to publish it in any official capacity.¹⁴ Nevertheless, in 1755 Tucker ensured that sixty to seventy copies of it were drawn up in its partially completed state, set with wide margins for commenting from friends.¹⁵

¹¹ The translator was Plumard d'Angeul writing under the pseudonym of Sir John Nicholls, and was entitled *Remarques sur les avantages et les désavantages de la France et la Grande Bretagne par rapport au commerce*, (Leyden, 1754).

¹² W. Walker Stephens, *The Life and Writings of Turgot*, (New York, 1971), 'Turgot to Tucker, 12 Sep 1770', pp. 291-2.

¹³ See Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, Chap. 6: 'The 'Great Work''.

¹⁴ Tucker to Lord Townshend, April 5, 1752, in *The Manuscripts of the Marquess Townshend*, Hist. MSS. Comm., Eleventh Report, Appendix, Part IV, p. 374: '... if I can finish a task which is now set me; viz. to write a treatise upon the principles of commerce for the use of the Prince of Wales, and to be entitled, *The Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes*'.

¹⁵ Some sections of the *Elements* would also appear in *Instructions*, and *The Case of Going to War* (Gloucester, 1763).

One such figure whom Tucker presented with an original copy was Hume, who was to act, in fact, as the primary intermediary between Tucker and Turgot in the 1760s. Hume obviously considered the *Elements* to be an enterprise of great merit, for in a letter to the aforementioned Physiocrat dated to 1768, he wrote that he was ‘sorry’ to find that Tucker had ‘little intention of finishing and giving to the public this valuable work’ – before revealing Tucker’s reasons for abandoning the project:

He [Tucker] was extremely discouraged with the bad reception given to this pamphlet against War [i.e., *Causes of the Poor* (1760), intended to be a section of the *Elements*], of which he sends you two copies. There was not fifty copies sold; tho’ surely it merited a much better fate. But it was wrote, as I told him, when the public were intoxicated with their foolish success [i.e., during the Seven Years’ War]; and a pamphlet, if it does not take during the first moment, falls soon into oblivion, and very often indeed, tho’ it does take. But this is not the case with a greater work to which the public sooner or later does justice.¹⁶

Unfortunately for Tucker, Hume’s confidence with regard to the inevitable success of the *Elements* was misguided. As of today only three physical copies of the work are now known to be in existence. However, as Schuyler notes, there can be little doubt that if the *Elements* had been finished and distributed in its entirety, Tucker’s name would be far more recognisable today as one of the most important founders of the modern science of economics.¹⁷

By far the most important section to begin with in terms of both economic tracts is the ‘Preliminary Discourse’ to the *Elements*, in which Tucker lays out what can only be described as a general synopsis of his entire socio-political and economic thought. Moreover, here we also acquire a real sense of the clergyman’s pioneering treatment of political economy as a burgeoning *science* – or, more precisely, the Butlerian variant of that which Hume had recently begun to call the ‘science of man’.¹⁸ Beginning along noticeably Pufendorfian lines, Tucker states that mankind ‘hath the Appetites of an *Animal*’. However, as rational agents, Tucker insists that humans also have ‘the Temper

¹⁶ J. Y. T. Greig (ed.), *The Letters of David Hume*, (Oxford, 1932), II, p. 183, Hume to Turgot, 8 July 1768. In this, Hume may have been casting a wistful eye back to his own personal travails in attempting to publish the *Treatise of Human Nature* in the late-1730s, which was not immediately popular. For further suggestions as to why Tucker didn’t complete the *Elements*, see also Tucker’s *Four Tracts*, pp. ix–xi, & Scottish Records Office, Tucker to Kames, 18 Oct 1761: ‘War, conquests and colonies are our present military system and mine is just the opposite. Were I to publish [the *Elements*] at this juncture, the best treatment I could receive is to be taken for a knave or a madman’.

¹⁷ Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 4.

¹⁸ Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* [1739], L. A. Selby-Bigge (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), p. xxi. Cf. Chapter Four, p. 121.

and Affections’ of social beings.¹⁹ By the ‘gracious Contrivance of the Author of Nature’, Tucker states (in unmistakably Stoic terms) that providence has so ordained that humans require *mutual assistance* in life so that they may procure ‘Improvements’ within society. This is important to them, because just as nature intends that we seek food in order to appease our appetite of hunger, so too does it intend that we seek to better the society in which we live in order to ‘gratify’ our corresponding ‘*social Instincts*’. Tucker calls this our ‘Prerogative’ – that is to say, our ‘Set of *social* and benevolent Affections’ – and what is more he insists that it is this characteristic which most distinguishes us from the beasts.²⁰

With these opening lines it is clear, then, that Tucker is making a forthright allusion to Butler’s insistence in *Fifteen Sermons* that the prospect of society is a fortuitous outcome of unintended consequences. As we saw in conclusion to Chapter Three, Butler’s phrase for this sequence of events was termed the ‘Cements of Society’ – a product, no less, of the will of Divine Providence itself:

[As] Persons without any Conviction from Reason of the desirableness of Life, would yet of Course preserve it merely from the Appetite of Hunger; so by acting merely from Regard (suppose) to Reputation, without any Consideration of the Good of others, Men often contribute to publick Good: In ... these Instances they are *plainly Instruments in the Hands of another, in the Hands of Providence, to carry on Ends, the Preservation of the Individual and Good of Society, which they themselves have not in their View or Intention.*²¹

[...] Men are so much one Body, that in a peculiar Manner they feel for each other, Shame, sudden Danger, Resentment, Honour, Prosperity, Distress ... from the social Nature in general, from Benevolence, upon the Occasion of natural Relation, Acquaintance, Protection, Dependance, each of these being distinct Cements of Society.²²

However, in the *Elements* Tucker both qualifies and furthers Butler’s initial premise by admitting far more readily than does his mentor that society is potentially the chief cause of all our woes, and therefore a double-edged sword. For though society may be the ‘best Means of procuring a Supply for [our] *animal* or *natural* Wants’, so too, Tucker insists, does it entice us towards the path of our desirous, passionate and

¹⁹ Note Tucker’s specific identification of human sociability with the Butlerian ‘*Temper of Mind*’.

²⁰ *Elements*, ‘A Preliminary Discourse, Setting Forth The natural Disposition, or instinctive Inclination of Mankind towards Commerce’, pp. 1-13, at pp. 1-2, 6. For Pufendorf’s similar treatment of the disparities and similarities between animal and human nature, see *Of the Law of Nature and Nations*, II.I.III, & II.I.VI. Cf. Hont, *Jealousy*, pp. 169-70.

²¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 12; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 12; emphasis added. Cf. Chapter Three, Section VI. As we know, Force refers explicitly to this as a variant of ‘neo-Stoic providentialism’, citing this very passage in *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*, pp. 81-2.

²² *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 17-8; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 16-17.

multitudinous ‘*artificial Needs*’ – and here it must be stressed that Tucker is equating human artifice with the Butlerian concept of ‘defective conscience’: a direct offspring of our own and others’ misdirected self-love.²³ In Tucker’s view, self-love is ‘narrow and confined in its Views’, and if left with no ‘Direction or Controll’ it will eventually ‘defeat its own Ends’ until ‘even *Self-interest* is a *Loser*’.²⁴ However, if directed into its proper channels, he insists that it will serve the public good in ways which far exceed individual enterprise [interpolations for clarity].²⁵

[The] *first* ... Wants of Mankind [are] much better supplied by dividing the general Labour into different Branches, than if each Individual depended on himself alone for the Supply of [them.] And this Portioning out of Labour [gives] rise to different *Trades* and *Manufactures* ... the *Rudiments of Commerce* [... Therefore] as our present *secular* Happiness appears to arise from the Enjoyment of superior Wealth, Power, Honour, Pleasure, or Preferment, SELF-LOVE, the great mover of created Beings, determines each Individual to aspire after these *social Goods*, and to use the most probable Means of obtaining them.²⁶

Clearly, then, this is a specifically Butlerian-Tuckerian variant of the division of labour, which up until the mid-eighteenth century had had numerous historical precedents ranging all the way from Plato to Petty. However, in the modern world it has come to be associated almost exclusively with Smith’s *WN* – as, for example, when Smith famously writes that ‘[by] pursuing his own interest [the individual] frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it’.²⁷

As far as Tucker is concerned, then, the real question is not whether self-love is *immoral* or *amoral*, or interior or anterior to society *à la* Mandeville, but rather: in what ways can it be manipulated or coerced into serving the public good? Unsurprisingly, Tucker calls upon the Butlerian tempering agents of ‘REASON and REFLECTION’ in

²³ For Butler’s notion of ‘defective conscience’, see Chapter Three, pp. 103-4, 112. There is also a case to be made here for Tucker incorporating, firstly, (via Butler) Pufendorf’s notions of *natura*, *indigentia* and *cultura*: i.e., the processes by which humankind creates ever-renewing needs and wants, in his *Of the Law of Nature*, II.II.II., & *De officio hominis* ... [*Of the Duty of Man*...], II. I. IV. And secondly, we may also note elements of Hume’s conception of artifice, in the sense that Hume sees ‘artificial’ virtues or vices (e.g., justice and injustice) as necessary to, and in part epiphenomenal of, those social circles which lie either beyond the family, or even within intimate friendships – in other words to society at large. See esp. Hume’s *Treatise of Human Nature*, III. II. II., & for further discussion, Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, p. 104-10, 198.

²⁴ *Elements*, ‘Preliminary Discourse’, pp. 7-8.

²⁵ This echoes Butler’s insistence that once correctly channelled, anger is one of those ‘*common Bonds, by which Society is held together*’, *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, p. 144; *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. 144. Cf. Chapter Three, p. 111.

²⁶ *Elements*, ‘Preliminary Discourse’, pp. 5-6.

²⁷ Smith, *WN*, IV.II. xi, [Glasgow Ed., (Oxford, 1976)], Vol. 1, p. 456.

order to help solve this riddle, by which means he concludes that the responsibility of wise government is not to extinguish self-love—for this would be counter-intuitive, if not even ‘impossible’—but rather to encourage it: for ‘the very Being of Government and Commerce depend upon the *right Exertion* of this vigorous and active Principle’.²⁸ Hence, by diverting the pursuits of self-love from ‘vicious or improper Objects’ and instead towards those that are ‘commendable and virtuous’, Tucker maintains that the state will eventually be ‘blessed with Plenty’ and ‘abound in Commerce’, since the several ‘Pursuits, Interests and Happiness’ of all its members will duly coincide.²⁹ Most importantly of all, however, Tucker is convinced that this ‘System’, as he calls it, will function with superior efficacy if, and when, populated by ‘good Christians’:

Now this politic Direction of the Pursuits of various Individuals in one common End, the Study of Philosophers, and the Aim of every wise Legislature, will be found to be nothing more than a strict and scrupulous Observance of Christian Morality. For this *truly* Social System furnishes us with the strongest Motives towards restraining inordinate Self-Love, having so linked our Duty and Interest with that of the Community ... [so that] a Man cannot act the Part of a *good Christian* without being good and useful, and a public Blessing, in every other Relation of Life.³⁰

It is both interesting and significant to note here Tucker’s continuing identification of Christianity with the *societal aspects* of earthly existence. For it is by these means, we may suggest, that he continues to refute the rigorist neo-Augustinianism (and quasi-Calvinism) of Mandeville and Law, just as Butler had done. For though, again, on the one hand Mandeville had concerned himself with chastising the ‘good Christian’ as one that simply had no purpose within modern commercial society, whilst Law urged much the same but from an utterly divergent standpoint, by contrast, in Butler and Tucker’s view, Christianity was the very lynchpin of a successful commercial society itself.³¹ Yet what was it, precisely, that constituted the ‘good Christian’ in Tucker’s eyes, thereby rendering him an active and productive member of a virtuous, Christian commercial polity? Was it something akin to the Addisonian City?³² Or was it, in the words of

²⁸ *Elements*, ‘Preliminary Discourse’, p. 8. Note here how Tucker takes for granted that Commerce and Government are interrelated, if not indistinguishable.

²⁹ *Elements*, ‘Preliminary Discourse’, pp. 9-10.

³⁰ *Elements*, ‘Preliminary Discourse’, p. 8. ‘Inordinate self-love’ is an overtly Butlerian phrase, e.g., *Fifteen Sermons 1726*, pp. 209-10: ‘Immoderate Self-love does very ill consult its own Interests; and, how much soever a Paradox it may appear, it is certainly true, that even from Self-love we should endeavour to get over all *inordinate Regard to, and Consideration of ourselves*’; emphasis added.

³¹ For Mandeville and Law, see Chapter Two, Sections IV-VI.

³² See Chapter Two, pp. 72-3, 75.

Laurence Dickey, a peculiarly Tuckerian appeal to ‘religious incentive’?³³ In order to answer such important questions as these, we are required to turn now to a revisionist examination of the *Essay* and *Elements* in tandem.³⁴

II. ‘That Noble and Interesting Science’.

From the outset *The Essay* had a two-fold aim. In the first instance, Tucker utilised it as a means by which to voice his strong concerns regarding the critical European balance of power, in *stridently economic terms* (more on this in Section VI). In this way, it was a tract highly indicative of the fact that Tucker recognised the era to be one dominated by competitive commercial monarchies, in which, as he put it, ‘the Politicks of Princes are ever *fluctuating* and *changing*’.³⁵ Yet more than that, the *Essay* was also Tucker’s opportunity to set down an empirically based scientific *exposé* of the inner-workings of political economy, the like of which had never before existed.³⁶ Hence, in its introduction he beseeched men of ‘a *liberal* and *learned* education’ to ‘engage in the Study’ of political economy as if it were a ‘noble and *interesting* Science’.³⁷ This was clearly important to him, since he believed the future ‘*Riches ... Strength ... Glory ... Morals* and *Freedom*’ of Britain to be dependent upon it.³⁸ More significantly still, however, Tucker remained convinced that in a complex and antagonistic – dare we say Hobbesian – world (a world of ‘chronic stress’ as we described it in Chapter Three),³⁹

³³ Dickey, ‘Doux-commerce and humanitarian values’, in *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 315.

³⁴ With a modest number of interpolations from the likes of *NFP I & II, Instructions, Causes of the Poor* and others, since they cover similar ground. In fact, the *Instructions* was explicitly intended to be a section of the *Elements*, and only appeared publically in a Dublin edition dated 1758, while the present author argues that other tracts mentioned are clearly auxiliary to the economic tracts. For the most useful, if somewhat linear, extant accounts of the *Essay* and the *Elements*, see Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, Chaps. 4 & 6.

³⁵ *Essay*, p. 93.

³⁶ Cf. Clark, *Josiah Tucker*, pp. 73-4; Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker*, p. 13. It should be noted that Tucker nowhere defines or labels this ‘new’ science ‘political economy’, while Waterman in *Political Economy and Christian Theology*, p. 107, states that the ‘origin of “political economy” as a distinct inquiry, clearly to be demarcated from Christian theology, is the publication of Malthus’s first *Essay on Population* of 1798’. Nevertheless, we are also to be reminded that Winch dates the emergence of economics as a science to about 1750 in his ‘The emergence of economics as a science, 1750-1870’, Cipolla (ed.), *Fontana Economic History of Europe*, Vol. 3, pp. 507-73 – the *Essay* being first published in 1749.

³⁷ *Essay*, ‘The Introduction’, pp. i-xii, at pp. iv-vi. Again, here we must stress that Tucker’s identification of political economy as a *science* is very much in the Butlerian vein.

³⁸ *Essay*, p. iv.

³⁹ Chapter Three, p. 110.

political economy would prove to be of immeasurable remedial benefit to humankind, particularly when supervised by those at the '*Helm of government*':⁴⁰

Providence having intended that there should be a mutual Dependence and Connection between Mankind in general, we find it almost impossible for any particular People to live, with tolerable Comfort, and in a *civilized* State, independent of *all* their Neighbours.⁴¹

The central line of reasoning Tucker attempted to convey in the *Essay* was his belief that Britain had by far the greater economic *potential* as compared to France, her most significant continental rival, but that as things stood the latter was in by far the more advantageous position.⁴² This was because France, Tucker claimed, had taken advantage of the orderliness of her '*excellent Roads ... navigable Rivers and Canals*'; of her close proximity to the kingdom of Spain; of her willingness to incorporate foreigners, specifically merchants and manufacturers, and because of her ability to reap the rewards of failed English monopolies such as the Turkey Company.⁴³ Yet in spite of all this, Tucker was not entirely pessimistic in his outlook. He remained confident that Britain lacked only the *nous* rather than the *capacity* to improve and develop her economic capabilities. Before any practicable diagnoses could be made, however, Britain first had to recognise her many shortcomings: chief among them, in the clergyman's view, being Britain's failure to replicate the French subordination of the lower ranks of her society, so as to procure a large population of good, honest workers:

If [the lower class] are *subject* to little or no *Controll*, they will run into *Vice*, Expense ... *Poverty* and *Disease*; and so they become a *loathsome Burden* to the *Publick* [...] *Nothing is more visible, than the great difference between the Morals and Industry of the manufacturing Poor in France, and in England*. In the former, they are *sober, frugal*, and

⁴⁰ This reference to political economy's 'remedial benefit' is intimately linked to Butler's broader notion of psychological health or sickness. Accordingly, we shall note Tucker and Butler's adoption of medical metaphors in our Conclusion, Section II.

⁴¹ *Essay*, p. ii, viii. This is a clear reiteration of the Stoic assertion made, e.g., by Libanius of Antioch (c. 314-92), who suggested that God had 'distributed his gifts over different regions' so that 'men might cultivate a social relationship [when] one would have need of the help of another'. Cited in Viner, *Role of Providence in the Social Order*, p. 36, where Viner continues that Libanius's 'emphasis on the universal brotherhood of man reveal[s] a late Stoic influence' which 'contributed to Christian theology [the] idea ... that God intended commerce to operate as a unifying factor for all mankind'.

⁴² For more on the rivalry between Britain and France during the long-eighteenth-century, see Section VI. below. Cf. also *NFP II*, pp. 30-1, SECTION XIV: *The Birth-right of an Englishman*, where, citing from *The Examiner*, No. XXV. Jan. 25, 1710, Tucker writes: 'WHAT is the Birth-right of an *Englishman*?—Is it a Right or Privilege to be poor and miserable, while his Neighbours are increasing in Wealth and Commerce? [...] WHO are the Persons that would attempt to deprive *Englishmen* of their Birth-right?—Such who propose to make *England* rich and flourishing, the Center of Trade, and a Magazine for other Nations?'

⁴³ *Essay*, pp. 13-22. Cf. *Reflections on Turkey* (1753).

laborious: They marry, and have *Flocks of Children*, whom they bring up to *Labour*. In the latter, they are given up to *Drunkenness and Debauchery*: The Streets swarm with *Prostitutes*, who spread the *Infection*, till they are carried to an *Hospital*, or their *Grave*.⁴⁴

Here, Tucker's sentiments bring us neatly on to an important and recurrent theme in his economic thought: his espousal of a large, virtuous and industrious population.⁴⁵ So important was this subject to Tucker that the whole of Part I of the *Elements* was dedicated to the pursuance of the subject.⁴⁶ Although the significance of a thriving population had already been recognised by some seventeenth-century mercantilists, such as Philipp von Hörnigk (1640–1714), what made Tucker especially unique on this head was his insistence that a sizeable population was compatible with, or moreover *contingent upon*, the principles of the Christian religion.⁴⁷ In a roundabout way, evidence of this can be gathered in the very first chapter of the *Elements*, in which Tucker states that marriage is the 'express Appointment of Divine Providence', and that it should therefore be encouraged at all costs (or made 'more *fashionable*' as he puts it).⁴⁸ In doing so, Tucker believes that this will have the twofold effect of increasing the nation's population whilst reinforcing the Christian emphasis on the sanctity of marriage – a point stated rather more brusquely in the *Essay*:

The *Marriage State* ... is not sufficiently encouraged among Us: and ten Thousand *common Whores* are not so fruitful (setting aside the *Sin* of the *Parents*, the *Diseases* of the *few Children* that are *born*, and their want of a proper and virtuous Education) ... as *fifty* healthy young married Women, that are *honest* and *virtuous*: By which Means, the State is defrauded of the Increase of upwards of 199 Subjects out of 200, every year.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ *Essay*, pp. 14, 36–7. In the context of discussion over extra-European colonisation, Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, pp. 156–7, notes that though eighteenth-century Britons still 'feared the French' they nonetheless could not help but look 'to her with some admiration' for her tendency towards 'efficient and strict' management, as Tucker clearly does so here.

⁴⁵ Cf. *NFP II*, p. 19: 'WHAT are the Riches of a Country?—Land? Money? or Labour? What is the Value of Land, but in Proportion to the Numbers of People? What is Money, but a Common Measure, Tally, or Counter, to set forth or denominate the Price of Labour in the several Transfers of it?'; pp. 23–4: 'SECTION X. *The Improvements of Lands depend upon the Increase of People*.'

⁴⁶ *Elements*, I, 'Containing certain Polities for Increasing the Number of People', pp. 11–40. The most notorious argument against a larger population is of course Malthus's *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, (First Ed., London, 1798).

⁴⁷ See, e.g., the third of Hörnigk's nine points in his *Österreich Über Alles, Wenn Sie Nur [Austria Over All, If She Only Will]*, (1684): 'There will be need of people, both for producing and cultivating the raw materials, and for working them up ... attention should be given to the population, that it may be as large as the country can support', cited & trans. in Arthur Eli Monroe (ed.), *Early Economic Thought: Selected Writings from Aristotle to Hume* [1924], (NY, Dover Ed., 2006), pp. 223–43. It is unclear whether or not Tucker was familiar with Hörnigk.

⁴⁸ *Elements*, pp. 16, 28.

⁴⁹ *Essay*, pp. 90–1; Cf., *Instructions*, p. 29. It is worth noting here that Butler bore no children, and that he also took no wife. Conversely, Tucker married more than once; firstly to Ruth Woodward, and secondly to Mrs Crow, whom he married in 1781. Tucker's union with Woodward, which would have occurred at

Hence, in the remainder of *Elements* I. I., Tucker sets forth numerous suggestions aimed at discouraging bachelorhood, whilst simultaneously privileging those who *are* married.⁵⁰ The last of these, entitled ‘That all Men for the first twelve Calendar Months after Marriage, shall be exempted from serving any Offices ... [and be] freed from paying all *personal* Duties and Taxes Whatsoever’, is particularly noteworthy in our context, since Tucker bases its legitimacy on the ancient Jewish constitution – a typically Butlerian appeal to Scripture that resurfaces in his mature thought.

In regard to this [point], be it remembered, That it is a Transcript of a Part of that admirable Polity which *Moses* introduced by Divine Command into the *Hebrew* Constitution; whereby the little Territory of *Palestine* (not much larger than the Principality of *Wales*) became the most populous and the best cultivated Country on the Face of the Globe.⁵¹

In *Elements*, I. II, then, Tucker continues his account of the importance of a thriving population, though in the differing context of his support for the ‘*Admission of Wealthy and Industrious Foreigners*’ on the grounds that they promote greater industry and ‘more Employment for the Natives’.⁵² This concurs with an earlier section of the *Essay* listing the ‘principle disadvantages’ to Britain’s trade, in which Tucker states that by working ‘*cheaper or better*’ than the natives, foreigners ensure that the public is the

some point in the late-1730s or early-1740s, is something of a mystery, since Tucker never spoke of her in any correspondence, unlike in the case of Mrs. Crow, whom he was very affectionate towards. What we do know, however, is that Woodward was seventeen years Tucker’s senior, that she died on 17 November 1771, and that Tucker acted as stepfather and educator to her son, the future Bishop of Cloyne, Richard Woodward (1726-94); a pastor who, according to Wesley, was ‘one of the most easy, natural preachers’ he ever heard, in Wesley’s *Journal*, III, (London Ed., 1827), p. 422.

⁵⁰ E.g., *Elements*, I. I. ‘A Law ... That no Persons shall either elect, or be elected to any Post of Honour or Profit throughout the Kingdom, but those who either are, or have been married’, p. 17; I. IV. ‘That *married* Men shall be *free*, not only to work as Journeymen, but also to set up all Sorts of *mechanic* Trades in every City and corporate place whatever, without *Fee* ...’, pp. 19; I. VI. ‘That Men shall not be allowed to work at, to set up, or carry on certain Trades, which properly belong to Women—unless they *marry*, and so may be considered as *Assistants* to their Wives’, p. 12.

Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 95, contends that Tucker’s views on marriage and bachelorhood present the clergyman ‘at his most meddlesome’; that ‘to take away the bachelor’s franchise is an example of how Tucker’s vein of common-sense ran out in the enthusiasm of the moment’; and that there may have been some sort of ‘psychological connection’ between Tucker’s interest in marriage and the fact that he was ‘never able’ to father children – in spite of there being no evidence to suggest that Tucker longed for children of his own. This being said, the present author is not convinced by this at all. Surely it is far likelier that these views on marriage and children were simply important components of the overall Tuckerian scheme, in the sense that the etymological root of the word ‘economics’ is, of course, *oekonomia/oikonomia*, the management of the household (of which *oikeiosis* is also a derivative), wherein the relationship between male and female, mother and father, daughter and son, plays a definitive role. This hearkens back to Aristotle’s *Politics* and Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, as well more recently in Tucker’s time, Lipsius and Grotius.

⁵¹ *Elements*, I. VI., p. 22.

⁵² *Elements*, pp. 30-1.

‘*Gainer*’, the ‘Price of Labour is continually beat down, *Industry* ... encouraged, and an *Emulation* excited’.⁵³ In yet another later section of the *Essay*, Tucker makes particular reference to the case of the French Huguenots who had ‘fled the Persecution of *Lewis XIV* [1638-1715], and taken refuge in *England*’ in the wake of the Edict of Fontainebleau in 1685. Although Tucker notes that there was a great ‘Outcry against them’ at the time amongst the English, subsequent events had since conspired to disprove British fears: ‘These *Huguenots*, have been so far from being a *Disservice* to the *Nation* that they have partly *got*, and partly *saved*, in the Space of fifty Years, a Balance in our Favour of, at least, FIFTY MILLIONS sterling’.⁵⁴

In fact, according to Tucker, this impressive figure demonstrated that the greatest hindrance to French commercial interests actually resided in her ‘arbitrary and despotick’ government – in other words her militant Gallicanism, which had ‘added to [her] many other Absurdities, a Spirit of *Cruelty* and *Persecution* so *repugnant* to the *Scope* and *Tendency* of the *Gospel*’.⁵⁵ Conversely, Tucker believed that the British had by far the greater advantage in this respect, because of her ‘*free Government*’ and ‘*Liberty of Conscience*’ in all religious matters, meaning that ‘Every Man is permitted to worship GOD in the Way he thinks the *right* and *true*, without *Fear* or *Reserve*’.⁵⁶ If, for example, the Roman Catholics of Britain were necessarily placed ‘under some *legal Discouragements*’, this was only because the Legislature considered them to be a *political* rather than *religious* sect. Furthermore, under the presiding moderate Whig government of Henry Pelham (1696-1754), Tucker stated that they were now in fact ‘free’ to ‘Exercise their Religion’, so long as they give ‘*no Disturbance to the State in Civil Affairs, by siding with its Enemies*’. ‘This, surely’, Tucker writes, ‘is but a *reasonable Demand*: And here the Matter seems to rest’.⁵⁷

⁵³ *Essay*, p. 42. Cf. *NFP II*, pp. 33, 43: ‘WHAT is the Publick Good? Is it not, for the most Part, the Result of Emulation among the Members of the same Society? And what would become of Industry, Temperance, Frugality, and the Desire of Excelling, if there were no Emulation? [...] And is not the raising of Emulation a much more humane and gentle Method, more agreeable to the Genius of a free People, and in all Respects most conducive to the Publick Good?’

⁵⁴ *Essay*, pp. 88-9.

⁵⁵ *Essay*, pp. 23-4.

⁵⁶ Given all that we have discussed in previous chapters, whenever Tucker refers to ‘conscience’ throughout his various works, as in the phrase ‘*Liberty of Conscience*’ in the present example, he is doing so with an eye fixed firmly on the Butlerian conception of the term.

⁵⁷ *Essay*, pp. 33-4.

Tucker's allusion here to the Roman Catholics being a political rather than religious sect is both interesting and significant in that it suggests that he was moving well beyond the pervasive Whig latitudinarianism of his day, which, though relatively lenient towards the Protestant minorities, still remained largely hostile towards Catholics.⁵⁸ In this, Tucker was undoubtedly deferring to Butler's view (explored in the Bristol meetings with Wesley in Chapter Four) that Whig toleration was not merely a matter of perfunctory gesture, but was intended rather to be universal in scope.⁵⁹ Indeed, in the Durham charge of 1751 Butler went even further in this direction when he defended those 'external' forms of religion deemed by the vast majority of contemporaries to be synonymous with Papalism, ancient Paganism and even Islam:

That which men have accounted Religion in several Countries of the World, generally speaking, has had a great and conspicuous Part in all Publick Appearances, and the Face of it been kept up with great Reverence throughout all Ranks, from the highest to the lowest; not only upon occasional Solemnities, but also in the daily Course of Behaviour. In the Heathen world, their Superstition was the chief Subject of Statuary, Sculpture, Painting, and Poetry. It mixt itself with Business, Civil Forms, Diversions, Domestick Entertainments, and every Part of common Life. The Mahometans are obliged to short Devotions five Times between Morning and Evening. In Roman-catholick Countries, People cannot pass a Day without having Religion recalled to their Thoughts, by some or other Memorial of it; by some Ceremony or public religious Form occurring in their Way: Besides their frequent Holidays, the Short Prayers they are daily called to, and the occasional Devotions enjoined by Confessors. By these Means their Superstition sinks deep into the Minds of the People, and their Religion also into the Minds of such among them as are serious and well-disposed.⁶⁰

In the above-cited, Butler's main point is to stress his dissatisfaction at the original Reformer's reduction of the liturgy to its bare essentials, thereby removing the most visible aspects of religion from the daily lives of the laity – meaning furthermore, as Butler put it, that the people had 'no customary Admonition, no public Call to recollect the Thoughts of GOD and RELIGION from one Sunday to another'.⁶¹ Unsurprisingly, this apparent sympathy for Romanism's 'promotional' or 'outward' displays of faith, which Butler felt Anglicanism ought to adopt more extensively in order to promote 'the

⁵⁸ See Martin Fitzpatrick, 'Latitudinarianism at the parting of the ways: a suggestion', in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833*, pp. 209-27, at pp. 209-10; Colin Hayden, *Anti-Catholicism in eighteenth-century England, c. 1714-80: A political and social study*, (Manchester, 1993), pp. 180-94; Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, pp. 305, 321-2; Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, pp. 47-8.

⁵⁹ See Chapter Four, Section IV. This is a particularly forthright example, we may suggest, of a convergence between Stoic universalism and eighteenth-century Whiggism, which is yet to be explored in extant scholarship.

⁶⁰ Butler, *A Charge Deliver'd to the Clergy, at the Primary Visitation of the Diocese of Durham*, (Durham, 1751), pp. 14-5.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

reality and power' of true religion, caused public outrage: so much so that in the wake of his death, Archdeacon Blackburne and the dissenting minister Caleb Fleming (1698-1779) accused Butler of having died a Roman Catholic.⁶² Disregarding, as we ought to, Blackburne and Fleming's rather spurious accusation of Butler's crypto-Catholicism, there is nonetheless an important point worth gleaning from this exchange – and that is the boldness and openness with which Butler's admits that some religious customs from traditionally 'hostile' cultures ought to be incorporated and acculturated into the Anglican liturgy based upon their intrinsic worth and merit.

Why so important in regards to Tucker's economic tracts? The answer lies in the subtle parallel that might be drawn here between Butler's emphasis on 'ecclesiastical acculturation' on the one side, and Tucker's inclusive views on immigration and religious toleration (both Catholic and 'antinomian') on the other. For in the present author's estimation, this is further validation of the forthright moderatism and toleration that set the orthodox pair apart from many of their establishment (and at times even dissenting) analogues. To be sure, continuing in this vein, Tucker was to develop his ideas on the interrelated subjects of religious toleration, naturalisation and population in far greater detail in such tracts as *NFP I & II*, and *A Letter to a Friend concerning Naturalizations*, all of which were written at the height of controversy surrounding the proposed 1751 Naturalization Bill and the Jew Bill of 1753. Once again, it is regrettably beyond the bounds of the present study to explore these works in any level of detail. Suffice it to say in the context of present discussion, however, that within each of these tracts, Tucker implores the British public to treat foreign Protestants and Jews on the same footing as dissenters and Roman Catholics: that is to say, with forbearance and due consideration. Furthermore, in a later tract entitled *Religious Intolerance No Part of the General Plan* (1774), Tucker would go on to develop a still more sophisticated analysis of the virtues of toleration by way of detailed and critical scriptural exegesis:

Now the Question before us is plainly this; whether Force, Violence, or Compulsion of any Kind, are prescribed in the Scriptures, as proper Means to be used by the Worshippers of the

⁶² Secker vehemently defended the memory and reputation of his old friend against these charges, in his *Autobiography*, pp. 58, 61, 178. For a detailed summary of this controversy, see Samuel Hallifax (ed.), *The Works of Joseph Butler D.C.L., late Bishop of Durham*, (NY, 1860), pp. xlv-xlvii. In wider context, see also Young, 'A history of variations ...', in Claydon & McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity*, pp. 116, 117; Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 144-5; Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 108.

true God, either for the original Propagation, or for the subsequent Defence and Preservation of true Religion? [...]

But there is not an Instance to be produced in the Annals of the World, of any State having been weakened, much less destroyed, by annexing a general a universal Toleration to the civil Establishment of Religion.

The Inference from all this is plain and cogent: The Religion of the Gospel is a Religion of Peace and Love; and those, who think otherwise, know not what Manner of Spirit they are of. Sound policy, and a Regard for the Interest both of Church and State, all unite in this Point: And to crown all, we have no other Method of proving, that we love God, than by first demonstrating, that we love one another. For he that loveth not his Brother whom he hath seen [...] how can he love God, whom he hath not seen? This Command therefore have we from above, That he who loveth God, love his Brother also.⁶³

III. Judicious Polities.

In *Elements* II. I. Tucker persists with his comparative analysis of the form of government most conducive to a thriving commercial polity. Here for example he observes that in free countries, commerce and industry can best be fostered by the establishment of a 'JUDICIOUS POLITY', whilst conversely in their despotic equivalent, stunting 'PENAL LAWS' are arbitrarily enforced. Predictably, Tucker rejects the latter because he believes they bring with them an incontrovertible necessity for absolute power 'too great a Trust to be reposed in Man'. Contrariwise, only 'in the Hands of that Great Being whose *Wisdom and Goodness are over all his Works*', can they be truly and wisely imposed.⁶⁴ Further to this, Tucker suggests that since the business of penal laws is not to '*incline and incourage*', as in the case of judicious polities, but rather to '*terrify or punish*', the one, he writes, is 'to *deter* the multitude from offending', the other to lead them 'by their own *free choice* to virtuous Industry'.⁶⁵ 'This being the Case', he remarks, 'it is easy to see which Method deserves the Preference'.⁶⁶

⁶³ *Religious Intolerance*, pp. 13, 42-3.

⁶⁴ *Elements*, p. 10. This is yet another clear reference to Butler's insistence that humans are creatures of limited capacities, and that human government ought therefore to be based on supernatural sanction.

⁶⁵ Note Tucker's reference to the Arminian, Witsian and Butlerian notion of freewill/choice here.

⁶⁶ *Elements*, p. 10. Cf. *Causes of the Poor*, p. 6, 17: 'The Taxes themselves for the Support of the Poor are not founded upon a right, judicious Principle: Nor doth the Legislature seem to have had any other End in View in laying them on, than just to raise as much Money as the Case required. [...] to aid and assist the good Intentions of the Legislature ... operate more effectually towards the Good of the community than mere penal Laws, Informations and Prosecutions, from long Experience, are known to do. And what is laid in relation to this particular Head, is applicable to all others of a like Nature'.

Unsurprisingly, Tucker is not the least bit reticent when it comes to proffering his own ideas about what constitutes a judicious polity. Most of these centre upon the ways and means to improve the relationship between the landed and merchant interest, thereby ensuring that the prosperity of both is mutual and interlinked.⁶⁷ This point is perhaps one of the most important when it comes to understanding Tucker's 'microeconomic' ideas. For since, according to Tucker, the prospect of commercial employment is always divisible into two main categories, husbandry and manufacturing, the 'immediate Object of the one', he insists, is to 'provide *Food*' and of the other to 'procure *Raiment*' and '*Dwelling*'. Consequently, it is 'from the *CONCURRENCE of three*', Tucker argues, that '*every other Trade, Calling, or Profession derives its Origin and Support*'.⁶⁸ Again, the broader significance of these points cannot be overemphasised. For contrary to historical, and indeed contemporary (predominantly Fénelonian and general Augustan) perceptions regarding the historical ambiguity and even *hostility* between merchant and landowner, as far as Tucker is concerned, the self-interest of both cannot be but mutually intertwined.⁶⁹ As he had earlier put it in the introduction to the *Essay*, then, such '*supposed Distinctions*' were 'the most *idle and silly*, as well as *false and injurious*, that ever *divided Mankind*'.⁷⁰

Proceeding on this footing, Tucker's expansive list of polities within *Elements*, I. II. ranged from turning tithes into glebes,⁷¹ to increasing the production and output of raw materials such as timber,⁷² to registering the title deeds of houses and landed estates.⁷³

⁶⁷ Cf. *NFP II*, p. 25: 'SECTION XI. *The Landed and the Commercial Interests of the Kingdom center in the same Point*'.

⁶⁸ *Elements*, pp. 41-2; emphasis added. Cf. Chapter Four, pp. 137-8 & n. 79, where we noted Butler's belief in the unavoidable relationship between human faith and the necessities of life. A typical example might simply be the case of the husbandman who hopes for a high yield at harvest time.

⁶⁹ See Hont, 'Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury', in *Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, esp. 'Fénelon', pp. 383-7. For more on the topic of 'money versus land' in the specific context of post-1688 England and Britain, see Klein, 'Property and politeness in the early eighteenth-century Whig moralists. The case of the *Spectator*', in Brewer & Susan Staves (ed.), *Early Modern Conceptions of Property*, (Routledge, NY, 1996), pp. 221-33. Also, Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, p. 154, deepens our understanding of Tucker's 'anti-Fénelonian' stance by equating Fénelon's reforms with Jacobite politics, which, to all intents and purposes, would require the 'powers of an absolute monarch' – something that Tucker rejected.

⁷⁰ *Essay*, pp. ix, xi. Clearly, then, Tucker's aspirations for economic reform necessitated a substantial about-turn on this deeply divisive head.

⁷¹ *Elements*, 'A Polity for changing Tithes into Glebes', pp. 56-62. Tucker's various appeals to the Mosaic Law are striking in this section. For more on the contemporary context regarding tithes, see Gregory, *Restoration, Reformation, and Reform, 1660-1828*, 'Tithes', pp. 147-59.

⁷² *Elements*, 'A Polity for increasing Buildings in low, fenny or marshy Grounds, and rendering them healthy', pp. 62-8.

In the context of current study, however, there are two among them which are of particular importance. The first, entitled ‘A Polity for dividing large Estates’, was an extension of Tucker’s belief (as well most recognisably as Smith’s in *WN*) that primogeniture had outlasted its usefulness in a post-feudal age.⁷⁴ Alternatively, Tucker suggested that land should be divided equally between all children; or, failing that, that the eldest son should receive half of the estate, with the remainder being divided equally among the rest of the siblings. In Tucker’s view, this would result in the preservation of what he called the ‘*comparative* Dignity of the Family’, whilst also encouraging ‘the eldest Sons, or Representatives of great Families, to study Frugality and Oeconomy more than they do at present’. Even more significantly, however, Tucker believed that, given time, the emergence of several smaller estates would ensure the better cultivation of land, in turn increasing the number of landowners and equalising property holdings. Consequently, Tucker hoped that this would raise a ‘respectable number of independent Families’ throughout the kingdom, who would then go on to stimulate further economic growth on a national scale.⁷⁵

In the general tone of these views, Tucker was presumably echoing Kames’s recently published *Essays upon Several Subjects concerning British Antiquities* (1747), wherein Kames had claimed that hereditary succession was contrary to the laws of nature.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, it is worth noting here that Kames and Tucker were hardly unique in propounding these ideas. For indeed, opposition to feudal and patriarchal property rights had long been in the air by the time the economic tracts were compiled, not least most famously in Locke’s *Two Treatises*, as James Tully has shown.⁷⁷ Alongside the present example of the *Two Treatises*, then, and – as ever – Smith’s *WN*, it is worth pausing momentarily here to note Smith’s important *Glasgow Lectures on Jurisprudence* (1762-3) which would also go on to reiterate many of Tucker’s thoughts on this matter⁷⁸ – as

⁷³ *Elements*, ‘A Polity for creating Plenty of Timber’, pp. 68-77; VI. ‘A Polity for Registering the Title Deeds of Houses and Landed Estates’, p. 77.

⁷⁴ Cf. Smith, *WN*, III. II, esp. [Glasgow Ed., (Oxford, 1976)], Vol. 1, pp. 381-5.

⁷⁵ *Elements* II. I. I., pp. 44-7. Cf., *Instructions*, pp. 29-30.

⁷⁶ Kames, *Essays upon Several Subjects concerning British Antiquities*, (Edinburgh, 1747), p. 193. For commentary, see Moore, ‘Natural rights in the Scottish Enlightenment’, in *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, pp. 291-316, esp. pp. 305, 313.

⁷⁷ James Tully, *A Discourse on Property: John Locke and his adversaries*, (Cambridge, 1980), esp. pp. 134, 143, 146, 169.

⁷⁸ See Smith, *Lectures on Jurisprudence* [1762] in R. L. Meek, D. D. Raphael & P. G. Stein (eds.), *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith*, 7 Vols., (Oxford, 1978), V, pp. 49, 70. See also Winch, *Adam Smith’s Politics*, pp. 67, 141.

would too, though with far greater adherence to the ‘doctrine of proportionality’ (i.e., the emphasis on the balance between investment and consumption), Thomas Malthus.⁷⁹ It is in citing such examples as these then, that Tucker may be described with some justification as an important progenitor of classical economic theory – even if it is all too easy to overstate the influence.

The second polity of the *Elements* which is of particular significance to us, entitled ‘A polity for inclosing Commons and Common Fields’, was essentially Tucker’s plea for common wastelands to be treated, improved and put to better use.⁸⁰ Whilst at first glance this appears to be a relatively elementary point, it is in truth an exceptionally important one, since it was here that Tucker first set down in explicit terms the maxim that territorial acquisition could never constitute a *jus ad bellum*, either on political or theological (i.e., Augustinian and/or Thomistic natural law) grounds. ‘What need is there for any State or Kingdom [to] engage in OFFENSIVE WARS, to enlarge their Dominions’, Tucker asserts, ‘while so great a Part of what they already possess, remains uncultivated and unimproved?’⁸¹ Similarly to his views, then, on the importance of a thriving population, within the immediate context of the clergyman’s anti-militarism, Tucker’s paramount concern here for resource allocation and land cultivation is yet another crucial indicator of the clergyman’s Butler-inspired, neo-Stoic concern for the interconnections between humanity and nature; of the spatiotemporal and metaphysical environment lying between the two, and, moreover, of humanity’s ethical improvement which ought to result from rational inquiry into it.⁸²

With regard to the issue of war on a general level, and not merely the conditions necessary for a *just war*, it should also be noted in conclusion to the present section that Tucker’s position in the above-cited resonates even more strongly in light of the fact that the *Elements* was published on the eve of the Seven Years’ War – a conflict in which, according to the likes of David Armitage and Peter N. Miller, long-standing

⁷⁹ Malthus, *Principles of Political Economy*, (London Ed., 1820), VII. VII. For the secondary literature on Malthus in an intellectual history context, see Winch, *Malthus*, (Oxford, 1987) [for the ‘doctrine of proportionality’, see esp. pp. 18, 55, 107], & Stefan Collini, John Burrow & Winch, *That Noble Science of Politics*, (Cambridge, 1983), p. 83.

⁸⁰ *Elements*, ‘A Polity for inclosing Commons and Common Fields’, pp. 47-55.

⁸¹ *Elements*, p. 55.

⁸² For discussion of these specific neo-Stoic themes in a broader eighteenth-century context, see Force, *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*, pp. 73-4, 80, 83-4, 232.

debates surrounding the issue of global empire came spectacularly to a head.⁸³ As if to emphasise the point, in the advertisement to the complimentary *Causes of the Poor* (1760) Tucker would reiterate his abhorrence for the Seven Years' War, and for armed conflict more generally, by identifying the enterprise with the vagaries of monopolisation:⁸⁴

[The] Arts of Peace are but little attended to, and less understood in Times of War [...] to excite that Man (who perhaps is called your Enemy) to greater Industry and Sobriety, to consider him as a Customer to you, and yourself as a Customer to him, so that the richer both of you are the better it may be for each other; and, in Short to promote a mutual Trade to mutual Benefit—this is the kind of reasoning which is as unintelligible at present, as the notion of the Antipodes at the time of Galileo.⁸⁵

As we shall see, both this anti-war and anti-monopolistic stance remained a definitive component of the broader Tuckerian scheme, as an eighteenth-century Europe seemingly addicted to war showed little sign of abating.⁸⁶

IV. Certain Proposals.

Just as Tucker set out an exhaustive list of polities in the *Elements*, so too did he earlier conceive of a number of important proposals within the *Essay*, individually and collectively designed to heighten productivity, limit wasteful expenditure, and to eradicate what he called the 'shock' and 'scandal' of the most '*unparalleled Lewdness and Debauchery reining among Us*'.⁸⁷ The more perfunctory among these included a proposal for setting up woollen and silk manufacturers in the west and south-west of

⁸³ This is described as the transition from Britain's 'first' to its 'second Empire' in Armitage, *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, pp. 171, 193-4. Miller also claims that the 'Seven Years War brought to a close the early-modern phase of European expansion' which appeared in 'retrospect as the high-water mark of reason of state economics. The policy of national aggrandizement based on transmarine colonies, commercial expansion and naval support had, seemingly, been vindicated and confirmed', he concludes, in *Defining the Common Good*, p. 170 & Chap. 3 passim. In other words, Miller labels this the age of 'colonial crisis', esp. at pp. 18, n. 165, 63, 202, 353, n. 6, 354, 415.

⁸⁴ For more on monopolisation, see Section V below.

⁸⁵ *Causes of the Poor*, p. iv. A variant of this passage is reprinted in *Four Tracts*, p. 97 & *Case of Going to War*, p. 58. Note Tucker's Butlerian allusion to the antipodes in reference to humankind's limited capacities (and, by extension, that war is an unnecessary by-product of such ignorance). The antipodes metaphor is repeated in the context of Tucker's defence of Establishment Trinitarianism in *TASS* (1774), p. 8, as we saw in Chapter Four, p. 170.

⁸⁶ As Ingram puts it in *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, p. 17: '[The eighteenth-century was] a world defined by God and by war ... far more than any -ism or -isation, war transformed eighteenth-century England'. In virtually all of his mature writings, Tucker continually describes those who are enthusiastic for war and conquest as 'mock-patriots'.

⁸⁷ *Essay*, 'CERTAIN PROPOSALS For remedying many of the above-mentioned INCONVENIENCES and encreasing the TRADE and CREDIT of GREAT BRITAIN', pp. 50-139, citation at p. 130.

England in an effort to rival the French;⁸⁸ a proposal for encouraging trade between Britain's plantations in the colonies and the mother country, to the mutual benefit of both;⁸⁹ the creation of new roads and canals between Britain's major cities for the efficient transportation of manufactured goods;⁹⁰ the employment of public inspectors to review the quality and quantity of such goods;⁹¹ and finally, numerous sumptuary laws and taxes intended to counter the ill-effects of luxury, vice, extravagance, bachelorhood and childless widows.⁹²

Yet again, however, just as in the case of the *Elements*, there are a number of specific proposals housed within the *Essay* which are especially pertinent to this study. The first of these relates to what Tucker calls the '*prodigious Expence of Electioneering*', in anticipation of Tucker's prominent role in the political campaigns of Bristol during the general election of 1754.⁹³ Essentially, this was Tucker's proposal to alter the qualification of voting to the forty-shilling freehold that had been established during the reign of Henry VI (1421-71).⁹⁴ By ensuring that this figure would become the 'requisite Sum of a Freeholder', and likewise a £200 stock in trade in order to qualify tradesmen to vote, Tucker argued that the 'Manufacturing Part' of the nation (i.e., the industrious poor) would be left undisturbed from their work, as opposed to their running '*roving*' during election time.⁹⁵ Moreover, by doing so, Tucker hoped that the prestige of voting

⁸⁸ *Essay*, 'To set up Woollen and Silk Manufactures in the West of *England*, and South-West of *Ireland* ... in order to rival the *French*', pp. 63-5.

⁸⁹ *Essay*, 'To encourage a Trade with our own Plantations, in all such Articles as shall make for the mutual Benefit of the Mother Country and her Colonies', pp. 92-105.

⁹⁰ *Essay*, 'To cut some Canals between our great Towns of Trade, for the Conveniency and Cheapness of Carriage', pp. 116-8.

⁹¹ *Essay*, 'To have publick inspectors into all our Manufactures', pp. 121-2.

⁹² *Essay*, 'To lay certain Taxes on the following Articles of Luxury, Vice, or Extravagance; which Taxes shall be applied to the general Improvement of Commerce', pp. 127-39.

With regard to this last proposal, cf. *Causes of the Poor*, IV, pp. 16-24. Another particularly interesting proposal was Tucker's plea to establish 'a POLICE for the Prevention of Smuggling', which pre-empted the creation of the first official policing body in Britain, the Thames River Police, by nearly half a century. See *Essay*, pp. 105-11. The Thames River Police was formed by Patrick Colquhoun (1745-1820) and the mariner John Harriot (1745-1817) in 1798; see Colquhoun, *A Treatise on the Commerce and Police of the River Thames ... suggesting Means for preventing the Depredations thereon, by a Legislative System of River Police*, (London, 1800)].

Other 'modernising' polities in the *Essay* include 'To raise a Fishery in the Northern Coast of Scotland, by giving a DOUBLE PREMIUM for some Years, till the Trade is sufficiently established ...', pp. 118-9; 'To establish Civil Governments at Gibraltar and Port-Mahone, and make them Free Ports', pp. 120-1; 'To alter the Method of collecting our Duties upon particular Sorts of Goods imported', pp. 122-7.

⁹³ See esp., Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, Chap. 6.

⁹⁴ In 1749 Tucker calculated this to be the equivalent of £20 per annum, allowing for the decline in the value of money.

⁹⁵ Cf. *Causes of the Poor*, p. 7: 'THE Affair of Electioneering ... and the Qualifications for voting ... have a fatal Tendency towards increasing the Numbers of the Poor; both as they introduce Idleness,

itself would increase to such an extent that it would become a ‘Matter of *Honour*’ and ‘Reputation’, if not ‘even a ‘*Privilege*’, impervious to ‘*Bribery and Corruption*’. By these means, Tucker felt that the ‘Spirit of *Emulation and Industry*’ would be raised within the specifically republican portion of the mixed constitution, rather than exalting what he called the ‘bad Purposes of *influencing*’ – a democratic and/or demagogic characteristic that Tucker ever mistrusted.⁹⁶

The next proposal of interest to us is Tucker’s suggestion for courts to be erected throughout Britain’s manufacturing regions, each to be supplemented with guardians responsible for the ‘*Morals of the manufacturing Poor*’: an explicit reiteration of Tucker’s belief that the labouring classes required direction from a higher authority.⁹⁷ In order to qualify as a guardian, Tucker advised that members would be required to possess no fewer than twenty employees each; to subscribe approximately two guineas or more annually for the maintenance of said court; and that guardians would be expected to marry in order to set a good example to their workers. In return, guardians would perform the important role of limiting the number of alehouses within their district, of punishing those who arranged leisure activities such as cock fighting and cudgel playing, of removing women suspected of bad Character; in short, of disciplining those who brought any ‘Temptations to draw People together’.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, in order to encourage what he called ‘Industry, Probity and practical Religion’ among the workers, whilst also reiterating that he did not ordinarily endorse penal decrees, Tucker put forward two further roles for the guardians which he believed were by far the more important.⁹⁹ Firstly, that they would be obliged to incentivise young prospective couples to marry with a nominal fiscal reward, to be paid a full year and a day after marriage. And second, that they would be expected to reward the ‘*remarkably diligent and industrious*’ with a copy of the Bible, neatly bounded and gilded; or other such suitable

Extravagance, and Dissoluteness in the lowest Class of People ... they destroy, or weaken that Power, which the Laws of every Country ought to have for correcting or punishing such Evils’.

⁹⁶ *Essay*, pp. 37-8, 50-3; cf. *Instructions*, p. 48.

⁹⁷ *Essay*, ‘To erect certain Courts in all manufacturing Places of the Kingdom, where the chief Dealers themselves shall petition for them, with the Title of GUARDIANS of the *Morals of the manufacturing Poor*’, pp. 53-8.

⁹⁸ Cf. *Causes of the Poor*, pp. 18-20.

⁹⁹ As we have suggested, the appeal to ‘practical Religion’ is possibly of Tenisonian, and definitely of Butlerian, origin. Cf. Chapter Four, p. 137, n. 76.

(that is to say ecumenical) theological works, such as Bishop Francis Gastrell's (1662-1725) *Christian Institutes* (1707).¹⁰⁰

In this last point, Tucker was evidently deferring to Butler's insistence in his *Charity Schools* (1745) sermon that the poor deserved the right to (a predominantly Christian) education, specifically by 'keeping up' what Butler had called 'a Sense of Religion in the lower Rank' via the distribution of 'religious Books'.¹⁰¹ Indeed, Tucker later elaborated on this theme himself in a number of supplementary tracts published in the 1750s and 1760s dealing almost exclusively with domestic social and political reform; most notably his Butlerian identikit *Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of Christ-Church ... [for] the Yearly Meeting of the ... Charity Schools*, (1766) [henceforth *SPCK*] and *Causes of the Poor*. The latter of these works should be immediately familiar to the reader, since it was here that Tucker returned to the idea of those 'hereditary, legal, and perpetual Guardians of the Poor' who were to reside within such proposed charity 'Districts' (explored immediately above).¹⁰² We shall be obliged to return in part to these tracts amongst others, alongside Tucker and Butler's broader views on the poor, their right to education, and the Christian emphasis on charity, in our Conclusion.¹⁰³

The final two proposals of the *Essay* which concern us relate to Tucker's views on the Irish Question: the first, a scheme to incorporate the British Isles together into one kingdom 'as to Parliament, Trade and Taxes'; and the second to extend taxation upon Ireland herself in order to relieve the English, after some five years, of at least one third of the burden.¹⁰⁴ As far as Tucker was concerned, the benefits of this scheme were obvious:

This Proposal of *Incorporation* has long been the Wish of every generous *disinterested Patriot* of both Kingdoms. And indeed, inexpressibly great would be the Benefit on *both Sides*. The *Irish* would share in their Advantages of *our Trade*, and *we* in *theirs* [...]

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *Causes of the Poor*, pp. 34-5. To be more precise, in this pamphlet Tucker proposes that poor houses and charity schools should be furnished with 'four copies' of Gastrell's *Christian Institutes*, amongst others. Note, furthermore, Tucker's espousal of incentivisation alongside his deployment of reward mechanisms, clearly pointing to his optimistic outlook when it came to socio-economic policy.

¹⁰¹ *Charity Schools*, pp. 13, 15, 20.

¹⁰² In *Causes of the Poor*, esp. p.12.

¹⁰³ See esp. Conclusion, Sections I-II.

¹⁰⁴ *Essay*, 'To incorporate both the British Isles together, and to make One Kingdom in all Respects, as to Parliament, Trade and Taxes', pp. 58-62; 'To lay by Degrees the English Taxes upon Ireland', p. 62.

[Therefore by] this *mutual* Benefit, neither Kingdom would be looked on as *Foreign* to the other ... [rather] all that *unnatural* War between the Commerce of the two Nations would be at an End.¹⁰⁵

As for the prejudicial objections of those whose self-interest blinded them to the advantages of such a scheme, Tucker adopted the analogy of partitioning parts of England into commercially hostile regions (for example, a north-south divide upon the River Thames), stating that though the '*private Interest*' of each would almost certainly breed mistrust, suspicion and antipathy as to the other side's motives, nevertheless, when it came to the 'upright' individual who placed the 'Welfare of the Community *truly at Heart*', no such fear would ever be necessary. 'One Thing is plain and obvious', he therefore wrote, '... *Self-Interest*, the *Bane* of all Publick Good, is *driven to hard Shifts*, in order to *cover* such *Views* as she dare not *openly avow*'.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, even 'here, methinks', Tucker reiterates, 'I hear SELF-INTEREST making an Outcry, "*They would run away with our Trade.*" But pray, let me calmly ask, *Who* would run away with it? Or *where* would they run to? Why truly to our *own People*, our *own Countrymen*'.¹⁰⁷ Hence, in a final plea to common sense Tucker insists that since the two kingdoms of Britain and Ireland are, to all intents and purposes, already as one, it is only right and proper to treat them accordingly:

Is *Ireland* to be looked upon as a distinct Kingdom?'—more is the Pity: For as the two Kingdoms have but one *common Head*,—one *common Interest* both in *Church* and *State*,—the *same* Friends,—and the *same* Enemies; they ought to have been long since *consolidated* together.¹⁰⁸

As we can see, then, large swathes of Tucker's socio-political and economic reforms were well before their time, not least when it came to the issue of Anglo-Irish relations. Yet it was not until the younger Pitt called upon Tucker's services in the 1780s that the clergyman would write again in any detail upon this particular subject in his final published work, *Britain and Ireland* (1785). Nevertheless even as early as the *Essay* of 1749, Tucker's position with regard to the worthiness of the so-called 'Celtic fringe' was incredibly consistent with his wider neo-Stoic, cosmopolitan ideals; a subject we touched on earlier in this chapter in the parallel context of Tucker's outlook on the dual-

¹⁰⁵ *Essay*, pp. 58-9.

¹⁰⁶ *Essay*, p. 61.

¹⁰⁷ *Essay*, pp. 59-60.

¹⁰⁸ *Essay*, p. 60.

issues of toleration and naturalisation.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, two further proposals housed within the *Essay* briefly aforementioned – one to encourage the naturalisation of all Protestants irrespective of place of birth, and the other to invite distinguished foreigners to travel at their leisure within the kingdom – is yet further evidence of Tucker’s inclusive stance on this matter.¹¹⁰ As for the judicious polities and certain proposals of the economic tracts, however, in the previous sections we have demonstrated time and again that Tucker tended to offer *pragmatic solutions* to what he considered to be *straightforward obstacles*. This is yet another important Tuckerian characteristic, discernable throughout (and indeed beyond) his economic writings, and which was arguably present even in his earlier treatment of Whitefield and the Methodists. In this respect, there is possibly (though merely anecdotally at this stage) something of the Ciceronian *sensus communis* in Tucker’s wider thought; a term which resonates strongly in the Stoically-inclined philosophies of Shaftesbury and (to a lesser extent) Kant, as well as Tucker’s immediate British contemporary Thomas Reid (1710-96).¹¹¹ As Tucker would later put it himself, then, in response to the poet and philanthropist Hannah More’s declaration that the subjects upon which he wrote went far beyond her comprehension: ‘Pish! No such thing! Common sense will ever appeal to common sense’.¹¹²

V. ‘That Watchful Dragon’: Tucker on the Relationship Between Self-Interest and Monopolisation.

On account of both economic tracts, Tucker placed by far the greatest emphasis on the important issue of the improvidence of large monopolies, public companies and corporate charters. Even as early as the first edition of the *Essay*, for example, he persistently remarked upon the subject, at one point redefining the trio as ‘the *Bane and*

¹⁰⁹ Cf. pp. 191-2. For early-modern English subjugation of the Celtic fringe as the possible harbinger of later notions of British Empire, see Armitage, *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, Chap. 1, pp. 1-23, explicitly at p. 6.

¹¹⁰ *Essay*, ‘To encourage Foreign Merchants and Tradesmen to settle among Us, by a general Naturalization Act for all Protestants’, pp. 84-92; ‘To invite Foreigners of Distinction to travel among Us’, pp. 111-5. Cf. *NFP I & II, Instructions*.

¹¹¹ See, e.g., Shaftesbury, *Sensus Communis: An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour*, (London, 1709), reprinted in *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times. In Three Volumes*. Vol. I, (London, 1711); Thomas Reid, *An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense*, (London, 1764); Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der Urteilkraft* [*Critique of the Power of Judgement*, 1790], I. II. § 40, ‘On taste as a kind of *sensus communis*’, in Paul Guyer (ed.), Paul Guyer & Eric Matthews (tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, (Cambridge, 2000). For discussion, see also Sophia Rosenfield, *Common Sense: A Political Philosophy*, (Harvard, 2011), esp. Chaps 1, 2, 6.

¹¹² Roberts, *Memoirs of Hannah More*, I, p. 210.

Destruction of a Free Trade', at another as 'a *Prostitution of the Trade and Welfare of the Publick to the merciless Ravages of greedy Individuals*'.¹¹³ As ever, Tucker believed that misplaced self-interest, 'that watchful Dragon' as he described it, was responsible for this state of affairs: and 'nothing I can say', he remarked, 'will have Charm enough to lay him asleep'.¹¹⁴ Ultimately, then, Tucker's views on the relationship between self-love and monopolisation play an essential role in acquiring a wider understanding of the clergyman's economic ideas, since it was on this subject more than any other that he defined his vision for a truly freer trade. Once again, it is our prerogative to argue that this too was steeped in Butlerian epistemology: as can be seen, for example, in the very opening pages of the *Essay*, where Tucker reiterates Butler's 'sociability-self-love' formula as applied to the domestic market:

[As] the *private interest* of the *Landed Gentleman* arises from the *General Commerce* of the Place [i.e., London, and the kingdom as a whole], he can have no *partial Views* in relation to Trade, nor can reap any Advantage from *Monopolies, Exclusive Companies*, or such like destructive *Artifices*. The *more* Persons there are employed in *every Branch of Business*, the *more* there will be to *consume the Produce of his Estate*: so that he will have no Temptations to complain, That the Trade is over *stocked*, or wish the *Promotion of this Trade*, in order to the *Declension of that*. In short, his *own Interest* is *connected* with the *Good of the Whole*; so that he cannot but be extremely *well qualified to understand and promote* it, if he will please to make Use of the Advantages he is happily possessed of.¹¹⁵

It is on this Butlerian footing, then, that Tucker proceeds with each and every one of his anti-monopolisation arguments. The rich, Tucker argues, procuring monopolies on account of their greed and selfishness, continue to drive the price of labour up, thereby denying the poor (their right to) access to employment.¹¹⁶ In Tucker's eyes this is a disastrous situation to be in, because it exposes the lower ranks to the familiar vices of idleness, licentiousness and debauchery, and thereby amounting to little more than an immense drain on the resources (and patience) of the nation.¹¹⁷ Customarily, Tucker's solution to this problem lay in bringing about 'Examples of Industry and the good Effects of it, before their Eyes'. Only by enlarging trade, he insisted, thereby

¹¹³ *Essay*, pp. 40-1, 73-4. Cf. *NFP II*, p. 26: '[If] all Fetters and Shackles upon Trade are taken off, if there be a brisker Circulation and a surer Market, where will these Advantages terminate but upon the Landed Interest? [...] And are they not the *Dupes* of those *monopolizing* Tradesmen, who have set up a low, personal Interest of their own in Opposition to that of the Publick?'

¹¹⁴ *Essay*, p. 66.

¹¹⁵ *Essay*, p. xii.

¹¹⁶ If we recall, in Butler's view, greed and selfishness were affections lying beyond the ethical sphere. E.g., *Fifteen Sermons 1729*, p. xxix; cf., Chapter Three p. 116.

¹¹⁷ *Essay*, p. 53 n.: 'The Complaints against the Morals of the manufacturing Poor become louder every Day and certainly demand, if any Thing doth, the *serious* Attention of the *Legislator*'.

transforming commercial activity into a truly inclusive and dynamic enterprise, could this downward spiral be abated, and the ‘deep-rooted’ and ‘habitual *Laziness* of a People’ finally conquered.¹¹⁸ Hence was it imperative, he argued, to ‘*lay open and extend our narrow and restrained Companies*, which hurt the Trade of *Great Britain* more essentially with respect to *France*, than any other Company can do’.¹¹⁹

In order to strengthen his case against monopolies, in both economic tracts Tucker paid particular attention to Britain’s three main powerhouses of global trade, the Turkey Trade, the Hudson’s Bay and the East India Companies.¹²⁰ Describing the first of the three as outmoded in light of the fact that the Hanseatic League was no longer in operation, Tucker declared that the Turkey company had ‘excluded’ British subjects ‘from having any Commerce with the whole *Turkish* Empire’, to the nation’s obvious detriment. Likewise, defending the ‘Virtue of a free Trade’ in the supplementary *Reflections on Turkey* (1753), here he explained in no uncertain terms that the aims of the Turkey Company were completely at variance with those of the ‘welfare of the publick’:

The *Turky* Company is a Monopoly in every Sense,—as no private member is allow’d to fit out a ship *when* he pleases, or to export and import what *Quantities* of Goods he would chuse, — As the Trade is confin’d to the single *expensive* Port of *London*, — as the Freedom of the Company is limited to Merchants by Profession, and has been obstructed under frivolous Pretences, — and as the Members themselves are fetter’d with By-laws.¹²¹

¹¹⁸ *Essay*, p. 67. One ought to be mindful here of Tucker’s adoption of Butler’s ‘inclusive’ and ‘reciprocal’ brand of Christian commercial sociability, discussed in Chapter Three above, esp. pp. 113.

¹¹⁹ *Essay*, pp. 40-1, 65-6. Tucker’s main concern was that, since the aim of all exclusive companies was to undersell the individual to the point of ‘breaking’ them (whether this be in a free trade scenario or not), though this meant that the individual ‘*Engrosser*’ might one day retire, Tucker was nevertheless adamant that the company itself would continue mulcting the public indefinitely, see *Essay* pp. 70-4, with the following citation at pp. 70-1: ‘In the 1st Place’, these *exclusive* companies cannot trade, if they *were* inclined, upon so *easy* terms, as *private* adventurers *would do*, were the Trade *laid open* [...] For [the] Reason [that] it has been *always* found, that if *private* adventurers ... shall be *permitted* to *engage* in the *same* trade, they will infallibly carry it away from the Company’.

¹²⁰ See esp. *Essay*, pp. 65-84 & *Elements*, II. II. I. ‘A Polity for opening such Exclusive Companies, as relate to our Home-Trade, or Domestic Commerce’, pp. 79-93 & II. ‘A Polity for opening those Exclusive Companies, which relate to Foreign Trade’, pp. 93-135. Cf. ‘Appendix’ to the *Elements*, pp. 135-168.

¹²¹ *Reflections on Turkey*, pp. 4, 5-6: ‘... the Interest of private Adventurers is to sell as *cheap* as possible, in order to get Custom by rivaling each other. Thus the Publick is benefitted by Emulation, as it promotes the Circulation of Labour and universal Plenty; — but is hurt by Monopolists, who are a Check to Industry, to the Circulation of Labour at home, and the Exportation of it abroad; and whose only View, whatever may be pretended, is to sacrifice the general Interest of the Kingdom to that of a few Individuals’. In the Appendix to the second edition of this pamphlet, Tucker notes the first edition’s success among free traders, and its subsequent vilification by the monopolists who called it ‘a lie from beginning to end’, at p. 21.

Similarly, again, in the case of the Hudson's Bay Company (which had already been the subject of a parliamentary inquest in 1748), Tucker lamented the fact that 'the Interest' of so many Britons was being '*sacrificed ... for the Sake of a single One*'.¹²² Yet even more interestingly and significantly, Tucker went on to admonish the Hudson's Bay Company's ill treatment of the natives, who, as '*savage as they are*', Tucker explained, still 'have the NATURAL LOGICK of *feeling* when they are *well* or *ill used*'. In fact, Tucker continued, the natives were not so different from the Europeans in a great many other respects too:

[The] *Indians* are an *idle, lazy* Race of People; and having no *artificial* Wants to gratify, have no *Ambition* to spur them on to take more Pains. It is true, They have no *such* artificial Wants as We have; They do not want *sumptuous* Houses and Gardens, *rich* Furniture, or *Coaches* and *Chairs*:—But they [do] want *Beads, Bells*, little *Looking-Glasses, Rings*, and such *Trinkets*; (besides many Articles of their Cloathing, Bedding, Hunting, Fishing, and Fowling) and are as *Impatient* to be *gratified* in these Respects as we *can* be in *ours*. In these Things, therefore, they are *as* covetous and ambitious as the *Rest of Mankind*.¹²³

In this passage, Tucker's main point is to stress that it is precisely *because* the Indians are not as civilised as their European counterparts that they do not have – as yet – many *artificial wants*. This is a double-edged term in that, whilst on the one hand this indicates Tucker's endorsement of what Smith would later call 'the paradox of commercial society' (i.e., the idea that the labouring poor of richer nations enjoyed conditions of ease and plenty that the kings of savage nations could only dream of), yet on the other, the price of this was that civilised societies were far more susceptible to corruption precisely because they depended upon the multiplication of their population's artificial wants in order to increase in wealth and prosperity.¹²⁴ (And if we recall, if left unchecked Tucker equated the artificial wants of mankind with the Butlerian notions of (a) misdirected self-love and (b) defective conscience).¹²⁵ This is

¹²² *Essay*, p. 41.

¹²³ *Essay*, pp. 79-80.

¹²⁴ Cf. *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', p. 6: '... *artificial* Needs are more or less extensive according to the several Ranks and Stations in Society, the different Improvements, Customs, Education and other Qualities of Mankind'. For a detailed continuation of these themes, see discussion in Conclusion, Sections III-IV below. For Smith's formulation, see e.g., *WN*, I. I., [Glasgow Ed., (Oxford, 1976)], Vol. 1, pp. 23-4.

¹²⁵ For Butler's views on this, see Chapter Three, pp. 103-4, 112; for Tucker's reiteration see this chapter, Section I. Perhaps the earliest statement of Tucker's 'artificial wants' theory is provided in a footnote to *NFP II* (1753), p. 10: 'THE *natural* Wants of Mankind can be but few [...] as far as would answer the Purposes of *Animal* Life. But as such a State would be little different from that of the *Brutes*, most of those *moral Obligations*, which now constitute *social* Virtue, or *relative* Duty, would have been *unknown*,—If therefore it was the Wisdom of Providence, that there should be Relations and Subordinations in Society, the *artificial* Wants of Mankind will ever be found to be relative to their

highly significant, in that it is in this context that we discern Tucker's nascent engagement with (or perhaps more accurately, *influence upon*) eighteenth-century—predominantly Scottish—conjectural history, about which much more will have to be determined in future Tucker scholarship.¹²⁶ Suffice it to say for now, however, that in the parallel context of dialogue over the vitiations of the East India Company, Tucker reiterates his views on this matter by refuting the recent claim made by Montesquieu, who had claimed that the Indians simply had no interest in European goods; Tucker arguing instead that they were just as likely to buy items if they were *cheap*, in the same way that Europeans did.¹²⁷ A further consequence of this, therefore, is Tucker's view that the spirit of monopolisation, which tended to block channels of free trade between richer and poorer nations, continued to inhibit global economic development via the stultification of a swathe of potential markets left untapped throughout the known world.¹²⁸

Beyond that which we have shortly documented, the minutiae of Tucker's objections to the Turkey, Hudson's Bay and East India Companies are dealt with in informative – though at times rather perfunctory – fashion in Clark and Shelton's respective biographies, such that we need not elaborate on them here.¹²⁹ As should by now be clear to the reader, however, what is of most concern to us as we steadily approach the conclusion to this chapter is the theo-philosophical content which lay behind Tucker's stance. In order to proceed, then, we return at this stage to the 'Preliminary Discourse' to the *Elements*, particularly the section in which Tucker spoke in terms of self-love being both 'narrow' and 'confined' in its views, such that if left with no 'Direction or Controll' it would eventually 'defeat' itself until 'even *Self-interest* is a *Loser*'.¹³⁰ For as we have just noted, in the section of the *Essay* in which Tucker advises that Britain ought to extend her '*narrow and restrained Companies*' as a matter of national interest,

Stations; and the better any Person discharges the Duties of that Sphere of Life he belongs to, the more he will be enabled to contribute to the present Happiness of Society, by promoting a *regular* and *permanent* Circulation of Industry and Labour, though the several Ranks he is connected with. This is an *essential* Point, in which Mankind differ from the Brute Creation'.

¹²⁶ Briefly touched on in our Conclusion, pp. 233-5.

¹²⁷ *Essay*, pp. 80-1. Cf. Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, *De l'esprit des lois* [*Spirit of the Laws*], (Geneva, 1748), XXI. I.

¹²⁸ E.g., *Reflections on Turkey*, p. 3: 'Many of those Countries, *Spain* in particular, which used to admit great Quantities of *English* Merchandise, are now setting up Manufactures of their own, and laying Burdens on ours, to prevent their Introduction: So that it is become more expedient than ever, to seek out as many *new* markets as we can'.

¹²⁹ Esp. Clark, *Josiah Tucker*, pp. 132-3; Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 20, 61-3, 66.

¹³⁰ *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', pp. 7-8.

two virtually identical adjectives are also utilised in the context of the clergyman's opposition to monopolies.¹³¹

The implication of this is absolutely clear. In Tucker's view, unbridled self-love and monopolisation are direct correlates – the latter being dependent upon the former for its existence.¹³² Returning once more and crucially, then, to the *Elements*' 'Preliminary Discourse', here we note yet again an explicit statement of the Tuckerian link between self-love and monopolisation, i.e., that 'Self-Love is narrow and confined in its Views'; to which we may now add Tucker's farther observation that self-love 'admits of no *Sharers* or *Competitors*, where-ever it can *Exclude* them':

Therefore, when you see a set of Individuals forming *Combinations* and *exclusive Societies* ... the Members of this exclusive Company are still *Rivals* and *Competitors* among themselves ... [for] the Mass of Mankind ... *as far as they have Power* ... will always regard the present Moment, and be blind in respect to distant Consequences. Hence it is, that *Monopolies* are formed, and *Charters* granted, under the ridiculous and absurd Pretence of the Public Good, when, in Fact, private Advantage is the only Point aimed at. Hence it is, that unjust Combinations are sanctified by positive Laws, and those very Exclusions are stiled RIGHTS and LIBERTIES, by which other Men have their *Rights* taken from them, and are *denied* the Liberty of being useful to themselves, and serviceable to their Country.¹³³

Here Tucker speaks in relatively disparaging terms of the 'Mass of Mankind', which can and ought to be contrasted with Butler's far more affable analogue 'Cements of Society'.¹³⁴ Extrapolating from this, in Tucker's view, the practicable transition from humanity understood as a *mass* of individuals (or in contemporaneous parlance the pre-societal 'state of nature') towards a *collection* of 'inclusive, reciprocal and egalitarian' personalities (as we earlier described it in the context of Butler's ideas in Chapter Three) is a particularly troublesome one to make.¹³⁵ In this, we are to be reminded that

¹³¹ *Essay*, pp. 65-6.

¹³² Dickey, 'Doux-Commerce and Humanitarian Values', in *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 312.

¹³³ *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', p. 6. Tucker intends to juxtapose this passage with another set down two paragraphs prior, at pp. 5-6: '[The] *first* ... Wants of Mankind [are] much better supplied by dividing the general Labour into different Branches, than if each Individual depended on himself alone for the Supply of [them] And this Portioning out of Labour [gives] rise to different *Trades* and *Manufactures* ... the *Rudiments of Commerce*'.

¹³⁴ Cf. *Causes of the Poor*, p. 8: 'For the Mass of Mankind are every-where more attached to old Customs than to the Truth and Reason, or the Usefulness of Things'. The apparent tensions between Tucker's 'Mass of Mankind' phrase and Butler's 'Cements of Society' will be reconciled in the Conclusion following.

¹³⁵ Chapter Three, p. 112. This was a position that even the normally phlegmatic Smith began to lament towards the end of his life. See, e.g., the sixth edition of *TMS* [first ed. 1758] (1790), Haakonssen (ed.), I. III. III., p. 73, in which Smith replaces a discussion on stoicism with a chapter on 'the corruption of our

Tucker was clearly far more aware, or perhaps willing to admit the ferocity, of the compulsions of self-love – a perception clearly heightened by the fact that he lived in a far more material and metropolitan world than the one even Butler grew up in, merely a generation prior. Consequently, Tucker was undoubtedly far more at pains to emphasise the destructive, and certainly powerful, force that self-love evidently was/is:

INDEED I grant, that the Social Instinct of *Benevolence* is some Check upon this selfish *monopolizing* Principle; but it is so very feeble, that it would be quite ineffectual to prevent the Mischiefs arising from inordinate Self-Love, were there no stronger Curb to rein it in: For the Love of Self is implanted in Mankind much more strongly than the Love of Benevolence; according to the English Proverb, *Self knows no Fellow*.¹³⁶

Significantly, then, it is in this very specific respect that Tucker's conception of self-love edged away from the 'harmonious' Stoicism of Butler and instead towards the Epicurean-Augustinianism of Mandeville – for whom as we know, and in the words of Hundert, socio-commercial activity was merely the outcome of 'the reciprocal features of the dynamics of self-regard'.¹³⁷ For indeed, in keeping with one of the central tenets of the Augustinian tradition, according to the likes of Mandeville, the affection of self-love was deemed to comprise – in effect – the *entirety of human nature*; meaning in turn, as Force summarises, that 'the first principle of human behaviour is [invariably] a boundless and tyrannical desire for universal domination'.¹³⁸

On initial observation, then, this stark description does indeed appear to be remarkably consistent with Tucker's 'self-love → monopolisation' formula; and indeed, Tucker's acknowledgement that self-love accounted for most, if not all, human/earthly conduct remained unchanged well into his mature writings, as is evinced in the *Seventeen Sermons* (1776):

Now all *earthly Masters* want the Assistance of their Servants in One Degree or other ... Profit, you see, Profit, and Advantage to *themselves* are their chief Aim; and Self-Interest their ruling Motive---But can this be the Case in regard to *God*? ... Surely no!¹³⁹

moral sentiments', claiming that the 'wise' and virtuous' were but a 'small party' compared to 'the great mob of mankind'.

¹³⁶ *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', p. 7.

¹³⁷ Hundert, 'Sociability and self-love in the theatre of moral sentiments', Collini *et al.* (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society*, p. 43.

¹³⁸ Force, *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*, p. 46.

¹³⁹ *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 56-7.

However, as we hone in on our conclusion to this chapter (and the study as a whole), it is worth recalling here Pufendorf's likeminded concession to Hobbes of the primacy of individual self-preservation, such that the Dutch jurist was forced to invert the Hobbesian scheme by declaring that it was God who willed humans to seek their own safety *within* society.¹⁴⁰ For in doing so, the suggestion we wish to make at this closing juncture is that the Grotian-Hobbesian-Pufendorfian (and thereby the Augustinian-Epicurean-Stoic) conundrum played itself out once again in the guise of the economic tracts, and more particularly still in the form of the Butler-Mandeville-Tucker dynamic. For whilst Tucker was forced to acknowledge the primacy of Mandevillean self-love, just as in the case of Pufendorf and the Hobbesian 'self-interested' variant in the seventeenth century, likewise did Tucker turn ever towards the Butlerian neo-Stoic scheme for guidance – again, just as Pufendorf did so with Grotius.

In contradistinction to Mandevillean pessimism, then, which placed self-interest at the core of all earthly endeavour, the point requiring emphasis here is that the Butlerian conception of self-love—though a powerful and necessary component of human nature, granted—remained *but one component of the plurality of the affections as a whole*, always subordinated to reason and reflection/conscience.¹⁴¹ Moreover, it was precisely this conception that Tucker went on to embrace within his economic thought. Hence it is that it is 'REASON AND REFLECTION', writes Tucker, must be called upon to 'Aid the *social* and *benevolent* Principle'; thereby returning him swiftly and decisively to the naturalistic Stoic model of rational order.¹⁴²

... when the *auxiliary* [i.e., supporting or assisting] Motives of *Reason* are called in Aid of *social* Love, or diffusive Benevolence, this latter becomes, in a good degree, a *Counter-Agent* to inordinate Self-Love. So that the *Circulation of Commerce* may be conceived to proceed from the *Impulse* of two distinct Principles of Action in Society, analogous to the *centrifugal* and *centripetal* Powers in the Planetary System.¹⁴³

Therefore, whether the spirit of monopoly be at best in the guise of individual acquisitiveness in the form of pure self-interest; a company swallowing the trade of its potential competitors so as to halt (whether intentionally or innocuously) the circulation of produce, labour or money; or, at worst, neo-Machiavellian imperialism in the form of

¹⁴⁰ See Chapter One, Sections V-VI.

¹⁴¹ Asserted in Chapter Three, pp. 102-3, 113.

¹⁴² *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', p. 7.

¹⁴³ *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', p. 8.

economic aggrandisement under the pretence of national self-defence,¹⁴⁴ as far as Tucker was concerned, in essence monopolisation was deemed to be the very embodiment of unfettered self-love writ large in the globalised commercial sphere. This being said by way of conclusion, perhaps *the* central task of the economic tracts was to offer the practicable means by which to purge self-love of its far-reaching, and potentially catastrophic, consequences:

[It] might be questioned whether it would be right to attempt even to *diminish* [self-love]: For all Arts and Sciences, and the very Being of Government and Commerce, depend upon the *right Exertion* of this vigorous and active Principle. And were it once restrained, or greatly weakened, human Nature would make but feeble Efforts towards any thing great or good. Nay, in such a Case, the social Temper itself would want a Spur; and all the benevolent Affections being destitute of their proper Incitement, would be very faint and languid in their Operations. Consequently, the main point to be aimed at, is neither to extinguish nor enfeeble Self-Love, but to give it such a Direction, that it may promote the public Interest by pursuing its own: And then the Spirit of Monopoly will operate for the good of the Whole ... And if this is the proper Business of *Reason*, consider'd in the Abstract; the Reason or *public Wisdom* of a *State*, or *Community* is particularly called upon to pursue such a Plan ... Divert therefore the Pursuits of Self-Love from vicious or improper Objects, to those that are commendable and virtuous; Grant no Privileges to Indolence and Ignorance; Give no Assistance to the ingrossing Schemes of Monopolists; but raise a general Emulation among all Ranks and Professions in things relating to the public Good; and let superior Industry and Skill, Integrity and Virtue, receive all your Incouragement, because they alone deserve it.¹⁴⁵

VI. Concluding Remarks: The Economic Tracts in Context.

Shelton correctly notes that Tucker ‘nowhere explains’ why he chose the ‘particular format’ of a comparative analysis between Britain and France when attempting to promulgate his economic ideas.¹⁴⁶ Equipped, however, with over three decades of scholarship which has come to light since the publication of Shelton’s biography in 1981, today Tucker’s tracts emerge as stridently economic commentaries, and indeed by-products, of the eighteenth-century European states-system – specifically, the system that arose as a result of the decisive Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. For Pocock in particular, Utrecht is deemed to be an important marker in the process of European enlightenment. For it was at this time, he argues, that various contemporaries began to conceive of Europe as a ‘confederation, or polity of independent sovereign states ... held together

¹⁴⁴ Hont, ‘Free Trade and the Economic Limits to National Politics: Neo-Machiavellian Political Economy Reconsidered’, in *Jealousy*, pp. 185-266.

¹⁴⁵ *Elements*, ‘Prefatory Discourse’, p. 7.

¹⁴⁶ Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 51.

by the ties of common commerce'. Considered in this light, 'Utrecht Enlightenment' is thus taken to be one important component of a broader 'Pocockean' narrative which sees the long eighteenth-century as a period of profound intellectual crisis, encapsulated above all by the ideological clash between ancients and moderns, and set amidst the constant threat of international and commercial war:¹⁴⁷

The 'cosmopolitan' and 'European' character of 'Enlightenment' thus pluralised ... is complicated, by an intensification of the patterns of exchange and interaction which it is shown to have contained ... [enabling us to distinguish amongst others] ... *Utrecht Enlightenment, consisting in a reorganisation of the European states system*, ideologically aimed at superseding universal monarchy, wars of religion and papal supremacy, in a historical series extending so far back as a supersession of the ancient by the modern and forming the grand narrative of Enlightened historiography ...¹⁴⁸

It is very much against this revised historiographical backdrop, then, that Tucker's full choice of title for the *Essay—A Brief Essay on the Advantages and Disadvantages Which respectively attend Britain and France With Regard to Trade*—takes on a singular clarity. For the central discursive narrative to have emerged in the wake of Utrecht was that of the unlikely ascent of England/Britain *at the expense* of her traditionally superior Gallic rival, during what is increasingly labelled a 'Second Hundred Years War'.¹⁴⁹ As discussed in Chapter Two, the Anglo-Dutch Union of 1688-9 played a crucial role in fostering this state of affairs. For it was precisely as a result of the religio-political machinations of that union that the (hitherto largely peripheral) British Isles had been propelled to a level of unprecedented prominence in international affairs. As is now well known, then, in substantive terms England/Britain's rise rested on two significantly Dutch imports: firstly, her experiment with mixed monarchy; and secondly (and perhaps more significantly) on that which Addison famously eulogised as

¹⁴⁷ An excellent summary of the eighteenth-century 'ancients versus moderns' debate, and the influence it has exerted on the theory and practice of contemporary intellectual history, can be found in Whatmore, 'Intellectual History and the History of Political Thought', in Whatmore & Young (eds.), *Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History*, pp. 109-129.

¹⁴⁸ Pocock, *Barbarism*, I, pp. 138-9; emphasis added. Cf. *Machiavellian Moment*, esp. Chaps XII, XIII & 'Afterword', pp. 572-3.

¹⁴⁹ See Arthur H. Buffinton, *The Second Hundred Years' War, 1689-1815*, (NY, 1929); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, [1992], (Yale University Press Ed., 2005); François Crouzet, 'The Second Hundred Years War: Some Reflections', *French History*, 10 (4), (1996), pp. 432-50; Robert Tombs & Isabelle Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and British from the Sun King to the Present*, (London, 2006), esp. 'Part I: Struggle', pp. 5-305; Whatmore, 'Neither Masters nor Slaves': Small States and Empire in the Long Eighteenth Century' in Duncan Kelly (ed.), *Lineages of Empire, The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought*, (Oxford, 2009), pp. 53-81.

that ‘beautiful Virgin seated on a Throne of Gold ... Her name ... *Publick Credit*’.¹⁵⁰ As Pocock has consistently shown, then, in tandem with the historical rise of a new ‘rentier’ class of public creditors, the onset of professionalised standing and mercenary armies, as well as increasing reliance on the National Debt, these governmental and fiscal innovations enabled England/Britain to defeat the substantial threat of France, thereby cementing her position as one of the most significant grandees of the post-Utrecht world.¹⁵¹ Yet despite Britain’s military successes during this period, as well as her embracement and utilisation of the commercial apparatuses that had, in large part, engendered it, much of the literature of the eighteenth-century (some of it as wishful as it was analytical in nature) centred on the growing expectancy that Britain would likely fall *because* rather than *in spite of* her reliance on public credit.¹⁵² As Whatmore succinctly words it, then, in the event of this happening the further expectation was that seventeenth-century style ‘French dominance would return, and that the natural order of politics would be restored’.¹⁵³

As we have shown in preceding chapters, from the likes of Augustan thinkers like Shaftesbury, Addison and Steele to Mandeville, Law and Berkeley, and not least Butler himself amongst others, the ramifications of these various projections and prognostications caused widespread consternation and uncertainty among the various thinkers of the day, who each accepted to varying degrees and oftentimes from

¹⁵⁰ Joseph Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 3, 3 March 1711. Cf. Goldsmith, ‘Liberty, luxury and the pursuit of happiness’ in Pagden (ed.), *Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*, p. 241. We have discussed the implications of Dutch-style commerce on intra-eighteenth-century English/British society in Chapter Two, Section III.

¹⁵¹ E.g., Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, Chaps. XII–XIV; *Virtue*, pp. 176, 177, 195, 237; *Barbarism*, I, p. 109 & Chap. 4. For England’s development as a fiscal-military state in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth-century, the following works are indispensable: P. G. M. Dickson, *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit*, (London: Macmillan, 1967); Jonathan Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1680–1783*, (Harvard, 1990), esp. Chap. 5; Henry Roseveare, *The Financial Revolution, 1660–1760*, (London: Longman, 1991).

¹⁵² Most notoriously in the guise of Hume’s prophesying, in which he warned that ‘either the nation must destroy public credit, or public credit will destroy the nation’ in his *Essays, Moral, Political and Literary* (First Ed. Edinburgh, 1742; 1748; 1752), II. IX. ‘Of Public Credit’. For further discussion, see Hont, ‘The Rhapsody of Public Debt: David Hume and Voluntary State Bankruptcy’, in *Jealousy*, pp. 325–53.

¹⁵³ Whatmore, ‘Burke on Political Economy’ in David Dwan & Christopher J. Insole (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Edmund Burke*, (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 80–91. It is important to note that the ‘rhapsody’ of public debt was not confined solely to the British context, despite the fact that the British model remained very much in the forefront of contemporary European thought. Indeed, increasing pan-continental reliance on public credit generated much pessimism and uncertainty about the prospect of imminent European-wide collapse, a quandary neatly encapsulated once again by Hume when he invoked the image of corrupt European monarchs and states ‘fighting ... amidst their debts, funds, and public mortgages’ to ‘cudgel-playing fought in a China shop’. See once more his *Essays*, II. IX. ‘Of Public Credit’. Accordingly, for the French context in relation to Britain’s fiscal example in the run up to the 1789 Revolution, see the highly informative Sonenscher, *Before the Deluge*, esp. pp. 1–21, 41–66.

antithetical positions the *transformative nature* of modern forms of trade and commerce. As is now well known, then, in Hirschmann's classic formulation he describes this phenomenon in broad terms as 'Money-Making and Commerce as Innocent and *Doux*', or simply the 'Doux-commerce' theory; Hirschman's argument essentially being that the advent of commercial society at about the turn of the eighteenth century constituted a 'civilising' or 'modernising' moment in human history, emphasising the 'noneconomic and nonconsumptionist motives that are behind the struggle for economic advancement'.¹⁵⁴ Similarly, Pocock has labelled this the 'commerce, leisure, cultivation' argument, whereby, in short, commerce is seen as the civilising agent by which to refine the passions into manners, albeit at the expense of those political virtues and liberties that the ancients so venerated.¹⁵⁵

Again, then, it is in the context of these interweaving and concentric debates that Tucker's economic tracts emerge today as worthy specimens, if not even foremost examples, of what Whatmore calls the 'great age of comparative study in political economy'; political economy being, in Whatmore's words, 'the archetypal science of reform, premised on the unavoidability of commercial society as an element of human progress, and *encompassing in consequence international relations as the correlate of domestic reform*'.¹⁵⁶ Viewed from this perspective, Tucker's various and sundry reforms

¹⁵⁴ Hirschman, *Passions & Interests*, pp. 56-63, 108. Cf. Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', in *Grotius and the Stoa*, pp. 272-6, & Conclusion, Section III below.

¹⁵⁵ In other words, the classical republican ideal of robust and autonomous city-states upheld and protected by citizen militias, governed from above by landed elites whose political wisdom ensured the moderation of its laws. In his 'Cambridge paradigms and Scotch philosophers' in *Wealth and Virtue*, p. 239, Pocock describes these various conundrums as 'the great ambivalences of the dialogue between [ancient] virtue and [modern] commerce'; or, more simply put, the 'virtue-commerce tension' resulting in an 'immensely rich and multi-faceted civil or social humanism which it was intended to replace' (p. 251); significantly, Pocock links his ideas to Hirschman's *le doux commerce* theory, at p. 241. As Dickey summarises by way of antithesis, the 'modern' defence of commercial society depended on the idea that the expansion of trade and consumerism was not necessarily detrimental to the moral well-being of European societies, and that this enabled its citizens to realise themselves more fully as *human* – though not necessarily *political* – beings, in his 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 277.

¹⁵⁶ Whatmore, 'Burke on Political Economy' in *Cambridge Companion to Burke*, pp. 81, 83; emphasis added. Cf. Rothschild, 'Global Commerce and the Question of Sovereignty in the Eighteenth-Century Provinces', *Modern Intellectual History*, pp. 3, 5, 6, 24, 25. Here Rothschild suggests that during the 'third quarter' of the eighteenth-century the 'relationship between the local and the global, or between the "local situation" of individuals and the great interconnected worlds of the statesmen, was at the heart of the economists' theories [...] The economists were interested, in their own provincial circumstances, in the communications between local and global events [...] Like the distinction between political observation and political or economic theory, the frontier between the nation and the world was much less well identified for them than it is for us [...] It was perhaps this juxtaposition of the provincial and the oceanic, the immediate and the universal, of power and of the limits of power, that was itself ... a source of prodigious imagination'.

housed within the *Essay* and the *Elements* position the clergyman firmly within the modern camp in the contemporaneous dispute between ancients and moderns – a point that is to be advanced in the conclusion that follows.¹⁵⁷ In summary of the present, however, the main purpose of this chapter has been to present a vision of Tucker's economic tracts that were steeped in the Anglican moral psychology imparted to him via Butler, enabling us to highlight in turn, and in precise terms, those concepts which made the initial transition from Butlerian meta-ethics to Tuckerian political economy. In doing so, the overriding concern of the present author has been to highlight, firstly, the processes by which the neo-Stoic elements housed within Butler's thought found tangible expression in Tucker's major and minor economic policies; and secondly, via Tucker's crucial identification of self-love with the spirit of monopolisation, the ways in which the theo-philosophical and socio-commercial implications of the Mandeville-Butler (or neo-Epicurean-Augustinian versus neo-Stoic) dispute took on far greater resonance in an increasingly metropolitan, globalised and indeed material world.¹⁵⁸

This having been asserted, it becomes increasingly apparent that the economic tracts constituted, at their most fundamental, the transposition of Butler's theo-philosophical framework into the realm of international, globalised politics; in turn being representative, this study argues, of a type of expansive Stoic universalism that (particularly) Butler and (to a large extent) Tucker adhered to. Here, then, the Butlerian scheme of harmonising the inward and outward persona, and thereby of reconciling self-love and sociability, is given tangible shape and form in terms of substantive Tuckerian economic policy. Yet even more significantly, in the process of doing so, and in an intriguing repetition of the Grotian-Hobbesian-Pufendorfian quandary, the Butlerian system is augmented by the construction of an entirely original, indeed *Tuckerian*, dialectic; one that remains constantly pensive, wary and vigilant of the primacy of Mandevillian self-love (i.e., Tucker's self-love/self-interest = monopolisation formula), and yet always seeks reassurance, assistance and guidance from the Butlerian (i.e., sociability/benevolence = free trade).¹⁵⁹ Crucially in our context, Dickey has described this as 'a modernization of the *oikeiosis* process and a

¹⁵⁷ Pocock, *Virtue*, p. 132.

¹⁵⁸ A point made by William Seeley in *The Expansion of England*, (London, 1883), p. 147, when he described eighteenth-century Britain as a "materialist" (or mercantilist) empire created for the benefit of the metropolis'; cited in Armitage, *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, p. 18.

¹⁵⁹ This will be explored in greater detail in the conclusion imminently following.

Christianization of it'; whereby Tucker, Dickey argues, 'reinforces in the name of Christian morality and Christian providentialism what Cicero had philosophically sanctioned in his discussion of *oikeiosis* and Grotius and Pufendorf in their natural law versions of the sociability argument'.¹⁶⁰ Yet, as already pointed out in conclusion to our opening chapter, whilst the present author concurs unreservedly with Dickey's hypothesis on this point, what we have attempted to demonstrate in this study is not merely Butler and Tucker's *Christianisation* of the Stoic providential position, but rather their specific *Anglicisation* of it – a central contention that will be reiterated further in what immediately follows.

It has become commonplace among distinguished intellectual historians such as Hont and Robertson to affirm that perhaps the single overriding goal of politics for eighteenth-century 'moderns' (so far, of course, as there can be said merely to be *one*) was the desire for economic stability and security as a means towards achieving perpetual peace.¹⁶¹ Moreover this, it is commonly argued, was the one characteristic that differentiated such thinkers from neo-classical civic humanists, who venerated the patriotic and martial virtues as prerequisites of liberty above all else.¹⁶² As if to underscore Tucker's affiliation with the former 'modernist' camp, in his conclusion to the *Essay*, the clergyman signed off with a warning. Trade and commerce, he said, and not war, was now the true measure by which a nation would stand or fall:

I WILL only add one Reflection more [...] That if we would still keep on our Trade at a *Foreign Market*, we must, at least, be upon an *equal Footing* with *other Nations* [...] This being the State of the Case, it necessarily follows, That we must always have an Eye upon the Practices and Proceedings of our *Rivals*, and take our Measures accordingly, as far as regards this mutual Emulation ... [For] every Country in *Europe* now begins to understand the Maxims of Trade, and apply themselves to Commerce.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', *Grotius and the Stoa*, p. 316; cf. Chapter One, Sections V-VI.

¹⁶¹ Significant contemporary examples of this pan-European drive toward perpetual peace can be found at, though are by no means limited to, works published at either end of the century, e.g., the Abbé de Saint-Pierre's (1658-1743) *Projet pour rendre la paix perpétuelle en Europe*, [*Project for Perpetual Peace in Europe*, 1713], (London Ed., 1714) [written in the immediate aftermath of Utrecht]; & Kant's *Zum ewigen Frieden* [*Toward Perpetual Peace*, 1795] in Mary J. Gregor & Allen W. Wood (eds. & tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1996).

¹⁶² Summarised most succinctly in Haakonssen & Whatmore, 'Commerce And Enlightenment', esp. p. 286.

¹⁶³ *Essay*, 'Conclusion', pp. 140-7. Note that Tucker calls the French (and other Europeans states) 'rivals' rather than 'enemies', a conscious attempt at subverting established perspectives on what we now call 'international relations', and traditional notions of warfare between states. This is made even more interesting by the fact that he calls *domestic* Tories 'enemies'.

This having been said, it would surely have been little surprise to find copies of the economic tracts resting behind that famous pulpit at *L'Athénée Royal* in 1816, when the anglophile Benjamin Constant (1767-1830) famously declared the pacifistic force of modern commerce. 'War is all impulse, commerce, calculation', he said. 'Hence it follows that an age must come in which commerce replaces war. We have reached this age'.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁴ Benjamin Constant, *The Liberty of Ancients Compared with that of Moderns* [Paris, 1816], in Biancamaria Fontana (ed.), *Constant: Political Writings*, (Cambridge, 1998), p. 313.

Conclusion.

The Providential Argument for Free Trade.

In the important passage in *Fifteen Sermons* where Butler spoke of the ‘Cements of Society’, there he had also stated that it was the ‘lowest of the people’ rather than their ‘Governors’ who were the ‘inventers’ and ‘maintainers’ of the ‘ties’ that bind society together:

There is such a natural Principle of Attraction in Man towards Man, that having trod the same Tract of Land, having breathed in the same Climate ... becomes the Occasion of contracting Acquaintances and Familiarities [...] Thus Relations merely nominal are sought and invented, not by Governors, but by the *lowest of the People, which are found sufficient to hold Mankind together in little Fraternities and Copartnerships*: Weak Ties indeed, and what may afford Fund enough for Ridicule, if they are absurdly considered as the *real Principles of that Union*; but they are in Truth merely the Occasions, as any thing may be of any thing, upon which our Nature carries us according to its own previous Bent and Bias.¹

Butler’s insight here is fascinating, because it casts an alternative light on Tucker’s perceived opinion of the poor, in which it is typically suggested that he was hostile and scornful of the labouring populace.² Yet Butler’s words are even more significant in the wider context, in that they also demonstrate with particular clarity some of the main themes of the neo-Stoic, providentialist thread we have been attempting to convey throughout this study – in particular, Butler’s allusion to the ‘attraction’ humans feel for one another, such that they ‘contract acquaintances and familiarities’, this being an eradicable propensity grounded firmly within the dictates of human ‘nature’. Yet more significantly still for the purposes of these closing pages is Butler’s important insinuation that it is in fact the poor, and not their governors, who constitute the rock upon which any successful society might be properly established (the present author’s allusion to St. Peter [Matt. xvi., 13-9] is both tentative and deliberate).

¹ *Fifteen Sermons* 1726, pp. 17-8; *Fifteen Sermons* 1729, pp. 16-7; emphasis added.

² E.g., Clarke, pp. 115-20; Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, pp. 40-1, 46, 53-4, 57-9.

In these concluding remarks, then, we wish to deploy Butler's views on the poor here as a springboard for final analysis, with the greatest emphasis being placed on Butler and Tucker's ideas on the social 'responsibilities' and 'reciprocities' between rich and poor, whether that be *between* or *within* states. This being said, what follows is divided into two parts. In the first half (Sections I-II) we focus primarily on the domestic poor *within* eighteenth-century Britain, demonstrating the extent to which the alleviation of their plight was deemed to be of central importance to the wider Butlerian-Tuckerian scheme, especially via their emphasis on the Christian virtue of *Caritas* (charity). In the second half (Sections III-IV), we utilise these findings in order to expand upon our previous analysis of the economic tracts, exploring in particular Tucker's corresponding views on the relationship between rich and poor countries, and how he intended his free trade ideas to play out in the global commercial sphere. By closing in this manner, one of our overriding concerns is to endorse and extend upon Whatmore's analysis that eighteenth-century political economy constituted the 'archetypal science of reform, premised on the unavailability of commercial society as an element of human progress, and encompassing in consequence international relations as the correlate of domestic reform'.³ Yet where we wish to further Whatmore's assessment in final conclusion is in accentuating the Butlerian, neo-Stoic framework within which the Tuckerian variant operated.

I. Introduction: *Caritas*, and Butler's Continuing Legacy.

As we have explored in our previous and final chapter, Tucker was clearly far terser than his mentor when it came to expressing his opinion of the lower classes, even going so far as to suggest that in spite of France's despotic, arbitrary government, she nevertheless enjoyed substantial commercial advantages over Britain, on the grounds that she ensured the sobriety, frugality and industry of her lower ranks.⁴ In addition to the economic tracts, however, Tucker continued to voice his concerns regarding the plight of the poor in a variety of lesser-known, though important, supplementary works, published from the 1740s to the 1760s – including *Hospitals and Infirmeries* (1746), *Spirituuous Liquors* (1751), *NFP I & II* (1751-2), *Shrove Tuesday* (1753), *Causes of the*

³ Whatmore, 'Burke on Political Economy' in *Cambridge Companion to Burke*, pp. 81, 83. Cf. Chapter Five, p. 211.

⁴ E.g., *Essay*, pp. 14, 36-7; Cf. Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, p. 52.

Poor (1760), *Dearness of Provisions* and *SPCK* (both 1766). Lamenting in particular the ‘mob behaviour’ of the poor (especially during election time),⁵ Tucker was quick to point out, however, that the responsibility for the ills of the commonwealth should not be placed solely on the shoulders of the lower orders, but just as readily upon the ambiguities and excesses of the post-Revolution Settlement itself.⁶ Echoing Hume’s view regarding the ‘infinitely complicated’ nature of ‘all political questions’ when ‘moderation’ is lost amongst the ‘violent animosities’ of ‘party zealots’,⁷ according to Tucker, it was precisely this bitter factionalism amongst the higher echelons (over what Mark Goldie has called the ‘fragility’ of Britain’s newly-acquired liberty; and encapsulated more broadly by J. P. Kenyon as the debate over ‘Revolution Principles’)⁸ which ensured a negative ‘trickle-down’ effect on the lower classes:

In short, the present Corruption and Degeneracy, which prevail throughout all Ranks, from the highest to the lowest, are but too easily accounted for ... Liberty and Prosperity, the two greatest Blessings upon Earth, are greatly abused in these Times, and are converted by too many into Licentiousness, and *the doing in every respect whatever is right in their own eyes*.⁹

As Tucker put it far more brusquely elsewhere, then, the poor were now free to become quite literally ‘*drunk with the Cup of Liberty*’.¹⁰ Yet however scathing Tucker’s

⁵ See, e.g., Shelton, *Dean Tucker*, Chap. 5.

⁶ For discussion on this point, centring on the significance of post-1688 British party politics, see Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, pp. 483-4, 489, 524-5; J. A. W. Gunn, *Factions no More: Attitudes to Party in Government and Opposition in Eighteenth-Century England*, (London, 1972); Gary Stuart De Krey, *A Fractured Society: The Politics of London in the First Age of Party, 1688-1715*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); David Stasavage, ‘Partisan Politics and Public Debt: The Importance of the ‘Whig Supremacy’ for Britain’s Financial Revolution’, *European Review of Economic History* 11 (2007), pp. 123-53; Steve Pincus, 1688, pp. 279, 280, 294, 301-2, 367.

⁷ Hume, *Essays*, I. III. ‘That politics may be reduced to a Science’. Cf., David Lieberman, ‘The mixed constitution and the feudal law’ in *Cambridge Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, pp. 317-46, esp. p. 329.

⁸ Goldie, ‘The English system of liberty’, *Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, pp. 42-3. Goldie’s utterance of the phrase ‘fragility of liberty’ is at p. 41. For older, alternative statements of these themes with regard to ‘English Enlightenment’, see Venturi, *Utopia and Reform*, pp. 47-69; Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment*, pp. 29-64, 65-87, 109-41; J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* [1977], (Cambridge, 1990 Ed.).

⁹ This citation is recycled in a number of publications (thereby hinting at its importance to Tucker), first appearing in *Hospitals and Infirmarys*, p. 10, and repeated in *SPCK*, p. 24, *Six Sermons*, p. 73 n. & *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 104-5.

¹⁰ *Hospitals and Infirmarys*, p. 8, 11; Reprinted as Sermon XI. in both *Six Sermons* (1772) & *Seventeen Sermons* (1776); citations in the former at pp. 71, 74; & the latter at pp. 102, 105. For further discussion of the contemporary situation, see Ernest L. Abel, ‘The Gin Epidemic: Much Ado About What?’, *Alcohol & Alcoholism*, 36/5, (2001), pp. 401-5.

opinions of the poor appear here, and indeed in many of the aforementioned tracts of the period, it is important to note that just as in the case of the *Essay* and *Elements*, Tucker was not merely attempting to *diagnose problems* but also *promote remedies* for their improvement. Considered in this light, it is very much in this vein that these works ought to be considered as closely akin to the economic tracts – particularly the various politics and proposals housed within them.¹¹ Yet in the interests of brevity, what is of most importance as we proceed at this late juncture is the consistent emphasis Tucker places on what he calls the ‘Article [sic] of Religion and of Christian Education ... the first in Dignity and real Importance’. This is significant, then, in that it returns us once again to Butler’s continuing legacy, for whom social and political reform was deemed to be the natural extension of the Christian virtue of *Caritas* (charity/love).¹²

From the outset, it is important to note that Butler and Tucker were hardly unique in their theological espousal of charity. According to the classical tenets of Christianity, *Caritas* signifies far more than mere ‘charity’ or ‘love’ in the conventional sense, but rather that species of *αγαπη* [love] described by St Paul as absolutely necessary for maintaining the Christian way of life (I Cor 13:1-4). Hence, in Pope Benedict XVI’s recent encyclical entitled *Caritas in Veritate* [*Charity/Love in Truth*] (2009), *Caritas* continues to be invoked in modern times as that quality which shapes ‘everything’, and

¹¹ For the policies and proposals of Tucker’s economic tracts, see esp. Chapter Five, Sections III-IV. Particular examples in the tracts examined in this conclusion are too exhaustive to list in their entirety. However, there are a select few among them worth tarrying over briefly. In *Spirituuous Liquors*, pp. 5, 7-15, 21-2, for example, Tucker sets out a list of replies to popular objections regarding the present legislation on gin-drinking (prior to Pelham’s reforms), whereupon his familiar responses range from introducing *Lex Maritalis* so as to encourage sobriety; to redirecting corn away from the distilleries and instead towards pig farms to be used as feed (thereby representing a better use of land and allocation of resources); to encouraging, as a last resort, ale-drinking as opposed to the consumption of spirits, since Tucker believes that ale does not generate what he calls an ‘*instantaneous drunkenness*’, as in the case of liquor.

Similarly, in *Causes of the Poor*: ‘SECT. III. General PROPOSALS’, pp. 10-16, Tucker attempts to improve poor-law administration by encouraging parishes to unite into larger, more efficient poor-relief districts under the authority of local guardians – a similar proposal to that which we visited in the *Essay* (see Chapter Five, pp. 197-8). This has been described as ‘an interesting anticipation of the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834-47’ by Sidney & Beatrice Webb in their classic *English Local Government: Poor Law History: Part I: The Old Poor Law*, (London, 1927), p. 267. Finally, in *Dearness of Provisions* [‘I. The unequal Division of Farms ...’, pp. 6-22; ‘II. ... the Bounty upon Exported Corn’, pp. 22-31; ‘III. The Scarcity of Live Cattle ...’, pp. 31-46], Tucker submits that the size of farms ought to be reduced and divided more equitably, thereby reducing the price of cattle, whilst also reducing the tax on grains.

In each of these examples, then, we witness all of Tucker’s favourite Stoic interests and concerns in a politico-economic context: resource allocation, property equalization, discipline, cost-effectiveness, the relationship between humanity and nature, ethics, and so on.

¹² *Causes of the Poor*, p. 34. We have made passing references to Butler’s espousal of charity in Chapter Three, p. 112, nn. 120, 121; Chapter Four pp. 142, n. 95, & Chapter Five, p. 198.

that, in conjunction with *veritate* [truth], it harbours the capacity to ‘show us the way to true development’.¹³ As Waterman reminds us, then (albeit in a roundabout way), the three overriding ‘senses or aspects’ of Christian conceptions of *Caritas*—i.e., (1) ‘*Caritas* as love of God’, (2) ‘as love of neighbour’, and (3) ‘as love of self’—are remarkably consistent with Butler’s ‘Anglicanised’ conception of modern commercial sociability, explored in Chapter Three.¹⁴ Yet even more interesting is Waterman’s further declaration that historically, *Caritas* has often been viewed as ‘*the cement that holds society*’: that familiarly recurrent phrase from Butler’s *Fifteen Sermons*.¹⁵ As Tucker puts it in *NFP II*, then, the ‘*Gospel Doctrine of Love and Charity, and mutual forbearance*’ is tantamount no less to one’s ‘Duty towards Man’.¹⁶ Likewise, in *Infirmary* Butler calls charity that ‘heartly Love to our Fellow-creatures, as produceth a settled Endeavour to promote, according to the best of our Judgement, their real lasting Good, both present and future’.¹⁷ This being said, it is incumbent upon us to turn at this late juncture towards discussion of the relationship between *Caritas* and economics within Tucker’s thought, so as to strengthen our understanding of the Anglican providentialism which lay at the core of the overarching Butlerian-Tuckerian scheme.

In substantive terms, Butler’s handling of charity features most prominently in his ‘six occasional sermons’, comprised of *SPG* (1739); *Spital* (1740); *Martyrdom* (1741); *Charity Schools* (1745); *Accession* (1747) and *Infirmary* (1748).¹⁸ In each of these sermons, Butler’s insistence on equating charity with public policy is so *fervent* (as we shall shortly see, this is a term he himself adopts from Scripture) that it becomes, to all intents and purposes, a Butlerian precept of its own.¹⁹ Tennant suggests that if he had lived beyond 1752, it is highly likely that Butler would have furthered these embryonic ideas so as to create a coherent set of principles revolving around them, just as he did in

¹³ Pope Benedict XVI. [Joseph A. Ratzinger], *Caritas in Veritate*, (2009), pp. 2, 3, 52.

¹⁴ The Butlerian formula is set out in Chapter Three, pp. 116-7.

¹⁵ Waterman, ‘The relation between economics and theology in *Caritas in Veritate*’, *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics*, 6/2, (Autumn, 2013), pp. 24-42, esp. pp. 33, 37-8. In linking modern Catholic orthodoxy with Butler and Tucker’s emphasis on *Caritas* and economics, Waterman reiterates his belief in the Catholic tendencies, or the ‘Christian organicism’, of the Anglican Church – explicitly at pp. 27, 29, 32, 33. Cf. Chapter Two, Section II.

¹⁶ *NFP II*, p. ix.

¹⁷ *Infirmary*, p. 5.

¹⁸ For an in-depth discussion of these sermons, to which this section owes a great deal for assistance, see Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, Chap. 5: ‘Six Sermons’.

¹⁹ Interestingly, the term ‘fervent’ is a favourite of Wesley’s also, noted in Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 151.

Fifteen Sermons and *The Analogy*. Since he did not, however, the present author suggests by way of conclusion that Tucker's economic tracts were in large part intended to fill this vacuum; meaning in turn (in yet another reiteration of the central thrust of argumentation within this study) that they were a further transposition of Butler's science of social psychology into the arena of institution-building, social organisation – and not least economic development.²⁰

Although it is not possible to delve into Butler's sermons at any great length in this conclusion, suffice it to say that Butler's main concern in each of them is to arrive at a dual-theory of modern (that is to say post-1688) liberty that is at once political *and* ethical.²¹ Restating in *Martyrdom* (1741), for example, one of *Fifteen Sermons*' central messages, i.e., that it is Scripture that extols the societal aspects of human life 'injoyed under civil Government' (specifically, again, the post-1688 mixed system of governance), Butler admonishes the 'Pride, and Uncharitableness' of all forms of hypocrisy (i.e., that which lies *beyond* the civil and ethical sphere).²² Likewise, then, in *Infirmity* (1748) Butler states that 'Preheminence' of 'Fervent Charity' (Butler's adoption of this term was alluded to above) is both a 'Grace' and a 'Virtue', by which persons can 'even merit Forgiveness of Men'.²³ Here, then, the inference is absolutely clear. In Butler's view, 'Fervent' charity is the formal, public expression of good social practice. For if, Butler argues, the social affections of each and every individual are to be properly utilised and/or fulfilled, particularly in the ethical sense, it is imperative that the individual attempt to offer practicable benefits to those in need, in what he calls a

²⁰ Tennant describes the 'six occasional sermons' as Butler's 'complex statement of a gestating social theory', grounded in an 'extended consideration of the relationship between the inner and the outer, between the individual (self-love, property, religious experience, language as exploration) and society (benevolence, institution-building, religion as social love, language as social instrument) [...] the political application of Butler's concepts of ethical identity and charity ... [the] practical public expression of the affection of benevolence'. Ibid., pp. 147, 149,

²¹ This is declared explicitly in Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 149. The persistent emphasis on 'coterminous harmony' in Butler's thinking is a mark of the continued application of his neo-Stoical maxims derived from *Fifteen Sermons*, e.g., the idea that existence is unitary rather than dialectical.

²² *Martyrdom*, pp. 2, nn. 3-4; based on 1 Peter ii. 16, 'And not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God'. This sermon is abbreviated in such a way as to draw attention to the fact that it was preached on 'the day appointed to be observed as the day of the Martyrdom of King Charles I'. Clearly, then, Butler is far removed from his dissenting heritage at this stage of his life.

²³ *Infirmity*, p. 4.

‘Moderate Way of considering Things’.²⁴ In Butler’s view, then, it is precisely these societal structures which augment notions of politico-ethical liberty, under the umbrella of British constitutionalism. Yet even more crucially in the context of Tucker’s economics, it is also by these means that Butler makes clear his concern not only for the purely political, social or of course religious questions of the day, but ‘more particularly still Persons in Trade and Commerce’; in other words, those members of Butler’s audiences whose duty he believes it is to promote frugality, industry and—above all—the *charitable redistribution of money amongst the poor*.²⁵ Here, then, Butler’s tentative steps into economic territory are palpable; and it is important to note that *Infirmity* was preached merely two years prior to the publication of Tucker’s *Essay*, such that the overlap between the two works is extremely difficult to ignore. In fact, in the earlier *SPG* (1739) Butler had gone even further in this direction when he claimed that ‘advantageous Commerce’ was tantamount, no less, to the ‘Profession of Christianity’.²⁶ Based on such examples as these, it is therefore not difficult to see why Tennant claims that ‘virtually all of the non-political matter, considered narrowly, of the six sermons may be drawn into discussion of the *application of charity to economic activity*’.²⁷ Yet as we shall imminently see, Tucker was almost identical to Butler in pursuing and advocating comparable systems of Christian charity.

II. Education, Remedial Care and Duty to the Poor.

In the opening to *Dearness of Provisions* (1762), Tucker reiterates Butler’s position with astonishing faithfulness to his mentor’s vision. Beginning with the observation that the ‘distresses of the poor ... merit the attention of the legislature *beyond all other subjects whatever*’, Tucker proceeds with a thoroughly Butlerian account of the social responsibilities, or rather reciprocities, between rich and poor [italicisations for emphasis]:

²⁴ *Infirmity*, pp. 4, 12. This sermon, preached before the governors of the London Infirmity, is based on 1 Peter iv. 8, ‘And above all things, have fervent charity among yourselves; for charity shall cover the multitude of sins’.

²⁵ *Infirmity*, p. 24. In this, Butler may be following the latitudinarian tendency to take note ‘of the material interests of their city audiences by applying mercantile language to religion’ – in other words, to emphasise the fact that ‘religion is fitted to man in his worldly state’; see Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment*, I, p. 58. This may be contrasted, then, with William Law’s High-Church denial of this position, explored in Chapter Two, Section V above.

²⁶ *SPG*, p. 12.

²⁷ Tennant, *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 154; emphasis added.

THE industrious Poor, to the sweat of whose brows *we* are indebted for most of the conveniences and blessings *we* enjoy, have an indubitable right to *our* assistance. When these afflicted, miserable, and wretched people cannot, by *their* honest labour and assiduity, provide for the comfortable maintenance of themselves and helpless families, *we* are unjust and cruel to *them*, *we* must be divested of all humanity, of all concern for *their* happiness and welfare, if *we* embrace not every opportunity of contributing towards *their* relief.²⁸

Note Tucker's authorial stance in this excerpt, in which he speaks in terms of 'us' and 'them', 'we' and 'their'; suggesting that he is deeply aware of the sharp demarcations existing between rich and poor, and, moreover, of the social obligations that exist between them in spite, and not because, of their differences. Granted, Tucker differs from Butler in one crucial respect, in that he tends to consider the poor much more readily in terms of their social utility.²⁹ Yet be that as it may, this does not detract from Tucker's overriding message. 'The hardships they suffer', he continues, 'on account of extravagant prices of all sorts of provisions, is scarcely tolerable'. Furthermore, he reiterates, since the 'greatness and power' of Britain 'depend upon the industry, courage, and bravery of the lower class of people', it is therefore the 'interest' and 'duty' of the rich 'to treat them with tenderness and humanity', and to do everything in their 'power to render their lives comfortable and happy'. This being the case, Tucker concludes that it is a combination of welfare and pragmatism that ought to prevail:

OUT of *pity* therefore to these *valuable members* of society, and to contribute to the public utility, I shall endeavour to point out the causes, and, at the same time, propose *proper remedies* for this national evil.³⁰

²⁸ *Dearness of Provisions*, pp. 3-4.

²⁹ *Dearness of Provisions*, p. 4; emphasis added. Tucker frequently refers to the poor as 'those *useful* members of society'. However, he is also concerned about the correlation between the 'bad' behaviour of the poor and the 'oppressive' dearness of the provisions and the necessities of life. See, e.g., 'IV. But the taxes laid upon the Poor are heavier, and of a more oppressive Nature than those laid upon most other Denominations of People of better Circumstances and higher Rank', pp. 46-52; at p. 51: 'Hunger, we know, will break through stone walls; and if the Poor are oppressed with it much longer, it is greatly to be feared that they will assemble in a riotous manner more generally than they have done hitherto, and fill the land with a ravage and destitution.'

³⁰ *Dearness of Provisions*, p. 5; emphases added. Tucker may be borrowing from Hutcheson's espousal of utility in a section on 'Moral Good and Evil' in his *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* [1725], p. 181. Whether this is directly or via Butler, or indeed if at all, is difficult to say.

Going as far back as the opening pages of the *Essay*, medical, curative and healing (as well as pestilent, infirm and diseased) metaphors were replete throughout Tucker's writings during this period.³¹ This is no coincidence. As previously discussed, Butler's system was predicated on the harmonious mental and spiritual health of the individual, and thereby society at large.³² Furthermore, as we have just seen, Butler's formulation and utilisation of *Caritas* was both the *theoretical* and *policy-based* extension of this concept:

Medicine and every other Relief, *under the Calamity of bodily Diseases and Casualties* ... are natural Provisions, which God ... have granted in common to the Children of Men, whether they be poor or rich: to the Rich by inheritance, or Acquisition; and by their Hands to the disabled Poor.³³

Hence, when Tucker writes in *Dearness of Provisions* that there are 'other motives' that 'powerfully incline us to acts of beneficence and generosity in favour' of the poor, here we may suggest that he is appealing to the specifically Butlerian conceptions of 'conscience' and 'charity', both of which are deemed to be mutually reinforcing.³⁴ No tract demonstrates this idea with greater efficacy than Tucker's aptly titled 'Charity School sermon', *SPCK* (1766), an almost verbatim replication of Butler's sermon preached on the same subject over two decades earlier in 1745 (conveniently abbreviated as *Charity Schools*).³⁵ Here Butler had placed particular emphasis on the importance of instilling a virtuous education in the state's citizenry, claiming for

³¹ See e.g., *Essay*, pp. ix, 40, 141; *Spirituuous Liquors*, p. 22; *NFP I*, p. 48; *NFP II*, p. 13; *Letter to a Friend*, p. 36. See also, esp., *Causes of the Poor*, pp. 8-9: 'To cure a Disorder is something; but to cure, and at the same Time to prevent a Return, is much better'. In other words, this is the body politic metaphor in play, which might hearken back to the medical metaphors provided by Queen Elizabeth in her 'golden speech' of 1601, where she emphasises (royal) authority, duty, social order, and the *common health* – as well as the *commonwealth*. See Kelley, 'Elizabethan political thought', in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, p. 75.

³² Clearly, this did not preclude the importance of physical health, and the ancient adage '*Mens sana in corpore sano*' [a sound mind in a sound body] immediately springs to mind. Indeed, Tucker's *Hospitals and Infirmarys*, Butler's *Infirmary* and the numerous sermons given by the likes of Maddox and others is testament to the emphasis placed on bodily health by orthodox ministers at about mid-century. In this we are to be reminded that Maddox was also a fellow pupil of Butler's at Tewkesbury, and that both Butler and Secker (and again possibly Maddox) considered careers in medicine before opting for the ministry. For these suggestions see Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, pp. 30, 32, 37, 40 & regarding Secker in particular, Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity*, pp. 35-44.

³³ *Infirmary*, p. 7.

³⁴ *Dearness of Provisions*, p. 4; emphasis added.

³⁵ This contradicts the claim made in R. Thompson's *Classics or Charity? The Dilemma of the Eighteenth-Century Grammar School*, (Manchester, 1971), p. 67, that by the 1730s religion ceased to play an important role within the charity schools.

example that ‘Children have as much Right to ... proper Education’ as they do to ‘ensure’ that ‘their Lives [are] preserved’. If ‘this is not given them by their Parents’, he continues, it thereby ‘devolves upon *all Persons*’ and ‘becomes the *Duty of all*, who are capable of contributing to it’.³⁶ Moreover, since Butler insists that the Anglican faith is a ‘practical’ religion (which, as we have seen, was a fully-established precept in *The Analogy*, and was possibly modelled on Archbishop Tenison),³⁷ he concludes that charitable education is all the more consistent with ‘a Frame of mind and Course of Behaviour suitable to the Dispensation we are under, and which will bring us to our final good’.³⁸

From the outset, Tucker’s *SPCK* concurs with this position. According to its author, the importance of education is ‘an undeniable Truth, even were we to extend our Views no farther than the present Life’.³⁹ Hence in Tucker’s view, education teaches humanity not only the ‘divine Principles of Christianity’, but also, and familiarly, ‘those of common Honesty, of Sobriety, and Industry’. Yet even more crucially, in this sermon Tucker insists upon the particular imperativeness of a virtuous, Christian education both *within* and *because of* the modern commercial era, in light of what he calls those ever-expanding, increasingly anonymous, and therefore socially fracturing ‘Streets of this great Metropolis’.⁴⁰ Likening city-life in particular to a ‘School of Corruption’, the problem Tucker identifies is the fact that it is precisely those less affluent members of society who, in an effort to advance their position in life, are forced to ply their trade in the city municipalities, and so are far more susceptible to its numerous temptations:

[What] one Virtue would have been taught them, either by Precept or Example, in this School of Corruption? Or what sort of Vice can you imagine that to be, however shocking in its Nature, however injurious to Society, or dangerous to the Public, in which they would not

³⁶ *Charity Schools*, p. 5; emphases added.

³⁷ See Chapter Four, p. 137, n. 76.

³⁸ *Charity Schools*, p. 8; emphases added.

³⁹ *SPCK*, p. 5.

⁴⁰ Tucker is referring to London in the particular here, the venue for the annual Charity school sermons; however, he might just as well be referring to any number of proto-industrial cities in Britain (Bristol immediately springs to mind), or indeed across Europe. In the context of Smith’s ideas, Winch describes this phenomenon as the realisation amongst contemporaries of ‘a commercial world increasingly characterized by impersonal and anonymous relationships – a world of hidden interdependencies rather than of direct dependency, the leading characteristic of its feudal predecessor’, see Winch’s ‘Adam Smith’s ‘enduring particular result’’, in *Wealth and Virtue*, p. 265.

have been initiated, and to which they would not have been habituated as soon as their Ages and Abilities would permit?⁴¹

Tucker's descriptions here of the 'great Metropolis' of London immediately conjure images of desolation, loneliness and alienation, thereby anticipating nineteenth-century commentaries regarding the exploitative and ultimately 'dehumanising' effects of industrial growth and urban expansion.⁴² This being said, it is worth noting that it was Tucker's earlier reading of rising mortality and falling birth rates during the 1740s—a demographic tool synonymous with modern industrial development—which prompted him to set down perhaps his most explicitly anti-Mandevillean statement in the *Essay*:

[How] terrible do the Effects of *Vice*, *Lewdness*, and *Debauchery* appear to the general Interests of a Kingdom, when seen from this Point of View [i.e., of rising infant mortality]? What an Absurdity, therefore, was it in the Author of *The Fable of the Bees*, to say, *That Vices are Publick Benefits!* It is *Virtue* alone, which can make a Nation flourish. And Vice of every kind is, either *immediately*, or in its *Consequences* injurious to Commerce.⁴³

As if to sharpen the contours that divided the Mandevillean scheme from the Butlerian-Tuckerian, then, it is extremely notable that Mandeville himself had denied the value of charity and education in his *Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools* (1723), in which he claimed that even ostensibly 'altruistic' acts of charity were reliant upon individual and collective self-regard – much like its commercial analogue. According to Mandeville, then, this was just as true for familial relations as for any wider societal bond:

What we do for out Friends and Kindred, we do partly for our selves: When a Man acts in behalf of Nephews or Nieces, and says they are my Brother's Children, I do it out of Charity; he deceives you; for if he is capable, it is expected from him, and he does it partly for his

⁴¹ *SPCK*, p. 7.

⁴² The allusions to Butler's bouts of depression and isolation immediately spring to mind, cf. Chapters Three & Four of this study. Again, somewhat ironically given Butler's dislike of elements of his philosophy, there are also some parallels here with Shaftesbury's temperament, e.g., *An Enquiry Concerning Virtue, or Merit* [1699], in *Characteristicks*, II. p. 171: 'Now if Banishment from one's Country, Removal to a foreign Place, or any thing that looks like Solitude or Desertion, be so heavy to endure; what must it be to feel this *inward Banishment*, this real *Estrangement* from human Commerce; and to be after this manner in a Desart, and in the horridst of Solitudes, even when in the midst of Society?'

⁴³ *Essay*, p. 130, n. For notions of alienation in the eighteenth-century personality, see Pocock, *Machiavellian Moment*, p. 501; *Virtue*, pp. 117, 121, 270. Nineteenth-century views on alienation are of course synonymous with Marx, esp. the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (1844), and, alongside Friedrich Engels (1820-95), *The German Ideology*, (1845-6). For an interesting discussion of alienation – or *allotriosis* – as the conceptual opposite to Stoic *oikeiosis*, see Annas, *Morality of Happiness*, p. 262. Cf. Brooke, *Philosophical Pride*, p. 43.

own Sake: If he values the Esteem of the World, and is nice as to Honour and Reputation, he is obliged to have a greater Regard to them than for Strangers, or else he must suffer in his Character.⁴⁴

Yet in sharp contrast to Mandeville's scepticism, in both Butler's *Charity Schools* and Tucker's *SPCK*, we can clearly see the pair's attempts to promulgate the idea that charitable education ought to be considered the remedial means towards a *healthier nation* – both in the psychologically inward (private) and socially outward (public) senses.⁴⁵ This, we may suggest, is what Butler also alludes to in *Martyrdom* when he claims that it is the laws, customs, institutions and cultural structures of society that strengthen the various bonds and affections that comprise individual and collective human nature – particularly via *industry* (good works/commercial activity) and *habitation* (temper of mind/education). Hence, there is a 'Law of Reputation', Butler writes, and by this he means a type of emulation derived from education and knowledge, which enforces and upholds the 'civil Laws' of society, such that the individual may choose to progressively shun the primacy of self-love in favour of those virtues which they do not, and moreover cannot, possess on their own.⁴⁶

Likewise, towards the end of *SPCK* Tucker insists that charitable education ought to function as a type of buttress for the constitutional liberties of Britons, in tandem with the promotion of the moral government of God:

[We] are not bound in Duty to command Success; but ... we are bound in Duty to pursue such Measures as may probably be attended with Success ... we must make the best Use we can of the Means we have; and after having done our Duty, and implored the Divine Benediction upon our Endeavours, we must leave the Event to Providence.⁴⁷

As we have attempted to show, then, it is very much by these means that Butler and Tucker continue to insist upon the importance of instilling a 'proper and virtuous

⁴⁴ Mandeville, *An Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools* in *Fable of the Bees*, (Second Ed., London, 1723), pp. 285-370, citation at pp. 285-6.

⁴⁵ As we explored in the *Essay*, this received particular treatment in Tucker's proposal entitled 'To erect certain Courts in all manufacturing Places of the Kingdom, where the chief Dealers themselves shall petition for them, with the Title of GUARDIANS of the *Morals of the manufacturing Poor*', pp. 53-8. See also Chapter Five above, pp. 197-8.

⁴⁶ *Martyrdom*, p. 6. Cf. Tennant, *Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 159.

⁴⁷ *SPCK*, p. 22.

Education’ within the labouring classes,⁴⁸ – above all, by espousing programmes of social and political reform which can and ought to be referred to as ‘charitable enterprises’.⁴⁹ And as we can now see more clearly in addition to our discussion of the economic tracts in Chapter Five, Tucker’s endorsement and cultivation of the science of political economy was undoubtedly one such *charitable enterprise*, in the multiple senses of the term – if not even its quintessence.

III. Free Trade, Humanitarian Principles and ‘Moral Re-entry’ in Tucker’s Political Economy.

The purpose of the first half of this extended conclusion has been to establish, firstly, the watertight connection between the Butlerian-Tuckerian emphasis on charity, education, moral duty to the poor on the one side with British Constitutionalism, politico-ethical liberty and toleration on the other; and secondly, to argue that Tucker’s political economy was effectively both an offspring of, and bridging agent between, the two wings of this dualistic model. This having been asserted, in the final sections of this work, it is incumbent upon us to weave the various strands under investigation throughout this study into one coherent whole, before advancing some further suggestions as to where Tucker scholarship ought to go next.

In order to assist us in this task, at this penultimate stage we are required to return in greater detail to Laurence Dickey’s ‘Doux-commerce and humanitarian principles’. As previously discussed, Dickey’s particular value to this study lies in the fact that he positions Tucker’s free trade ideas squarely within the parameters of traditional conceptions of a so-called ‘humanitarian’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ Enlightenment.⁵⁰ Drawing primarily from the work of Hirschman and Pocock,⁵¹ and therefore also grappling with the ideas of the likes of Hont and Robertson amongst others, in the first instance, Dickey’s thesis reemphasises political economy’s role as the quintessential ‘civilising’ or ‘modernising’ agent in the early-modern world; particularly via (1) political

⁴⁸ Explicitly stated, e.g., in *Essay*, pp. 90-1; *Instructions*, p. 29.

⁴⁹ As Tennant does, in *Butler’s Philosophy and Ministry*, p. 161.

⁵⁰ See Chapter One, p. 52.

⁵¹ Dickey, ‘Doux-commerce and humanitarian values’, in *Grotius and the Stoa*, I. ‘The Historiographical Problem’, pp. 271-2; Hirschman’s *Doux-Commerce Thesis* pp. 272-6; ‘Pocock on Commerce and the ‘Ideology of Manners’’, pp. 276-9. At p. 277, Dickey asserts that Pocock’s ideology of ‘commercial humanism’ is indistinguishable from Hirschman’s *doux-commerce* thesis.

economy's facilitation of the development of the arts and sciences; (2) its tendency towards refining, softening or polishing the manners of a given society; and (3) most importantly in our context, its capacity to enlarge the moral purpose of the state's citizenry towards universal benevolence.⁵² As Dickey spells out further, all of these characteristics ought to be viewed in similar terms to the neo-Stoic concepts we have been exploring throughout this thesis—'*oikeiosis*, sociability, 'humanitarian virtues'', and so on—and likewise can be said to be of Ciceronian, Grotian and Pufendorfian origin.⁵³ Yet what is of special interest to us in the context of these closing pages is Dickey's singular insistence on defining eighteenth-century political economy, and particularly its increasing espousal of free trade relations between competing commercial nations, as what he calls the 'humanitarian agent of universal benevolence' – 'an important step', he writes, 'to securing peace and, eventually to promoting true friendship among the trading nations of the world'.⁵⁴

It is at this point that Dickey draws Tucker into the debate. Contending that the 'typical liberal western view of trade's role in the civilising process' is tantamount to laissez-faire economics and the theory of spontaneous order, Dickey acknowledges that unlike Hume, Benjamin Vaughan (1751-1835), Richard Price (1723-91), John Adams (1735-1836), Dugald Stewart (1753-1828), Benjamin Franklin and Jonathan Shipley (1714-88) amongst others, Tucker simply *does not* belong within this camp.⁵⁵ For whilst certainly being a 'leading thinker in the free trade movement', according to Tucker the prospect of 'economic universalism' was simply not possible *without some sort of mechanism in place to guide the transition*. As a case in point, Dickey points to Tucker's views on the increasingly complex relations between rich and poor countries during the eighteenth century. Here Tucker's main argument is that, in light of the primacy of the principle of national self-preservation as the correlate of individual self-love, broad/spurious 'liberal' appeals to humanitarian values are simply not enough to sway policymakers into recognising the mutual benefits that would likely arise from fostering economic

⁵² Ibid. Here Dickey's reiteration of the formula is broadly as follows – (a) Commerce → Prosperity → Leisure → Human Self-Realisation → Multiplication of Desires → Cultivation of the Arts; or put more simply (b) Commerce → Leisure → Cultivation of Manners.

⁵³ Ibid., '*Oikeiosis*, Sociability and the Humanitarian Virtues', pp. 279-83.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 'Free Trade as the Humanitarian Agent of Universal Benevolence', pp. 283-8, citation at p. 284. For Dickey's summation of Viner's contribution, see also pp. 286-8.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 'The Laissez-Faire Argument Against 'Jealousy' in Trade', pp. 290-300.

friendship between richer and poorer nations.⁵⁶ Yet accordingly for Dickey, it is precisely this issue which marks Tucker out as perhaps *the* unique thinker of the eighteenth-century free trade movement. For as Dickey correctly contends, Tucker's distinctive answer to the interminable 'self-love-sociability' conundrum was, of course, to vest an unusual degree of optimism in the role religion ought to play in maintaining 'a system of natural liberty in the face of the vagaries of market fluctuation'.⁵⁷

In specific terms, and unsurprisingly given the subject of this thesis, Dickey describes this as the Tuckerian appeal to 'Christian Providentialism', whereby the *moral choices* of civilised, and especially rich and powerful nations begin to take precedence in international affairs. Viewed from this perspective, the Tuckerian scheme enjoins all individuals and institutions—civil, jurisprudential, religious—to act as 'socialising agents' (in what we may now claim to be of neo-Stoic/Anglican origin), gradually lifting the *consciousness* of peoples and policy-makers (in what we may now claim to be of specifically *Butlerian origin*) to a level of *religious maturity*, so as to override narrow considerations of national economic self-interest.⁵⁸

Can you suppose, that Divine Providence has really constituted the Order of Things in such a Sort, as to make the Rule of national self Preservation to be inconsistent with the fundamental Principle of universal Benevolence, and the doing as we may be done by? I must confess, I never could conceive that an all-wise, just, and benevolent Being would contrive one part of his plan to be so contradictory to the other.⁵⁹

As should now be clear to the reader, then, it is very much this 'religious dimension' to Tucker's thought that corresponds most conspicuously with the neo-Stoic providential naturalism so imperative to this study – or that which Dickey terms the point of 'moral re-entry' within the Tuckerian scheme.⁶⁰ Claiming that the transition from free trade 'as

⁵⁶ Ibid., 'Humane Trade Policy and the Rich Country/Poor Country Problem', pp. 288-90. For further discussion, see esp. Semmel, 'The Hume-Tucker Debate and Pitt's Trade Proposals', *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 300 (Dec., 1965), pp. 759-70; B.T. Elmslie, 'Retrospectives: The Convergence Debate Between David Hume and Josiah Tucker', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Autumn, 1995), pp. 207-16; Hont 'The Rich Country-Poor Country' Debate in the Scottish Enlightenment', in *Jealousy*, pp. 267-322.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 'Religion and Moral Re-entry in Josiah Tucker's Critique of Laissez-Faire Liberal Economics', p. 290.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 'Economic Liberalism and Christian Providentialism: Tucker on Rich Country/Poor Country', pp. 300-10. Dickey links Tucker's ideas directly to Ciceronian *oikeiosis* at p. 300, n. 135.

⁵⁹ *Four Tracts*, p. 20.

⁶⁰ Dickey, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', 'Providential Naturalism: Free Trade and Moral Re-entry in Tucker's Theory of Sociability', pp. 310-17, with the term cited at p. 314.

an economic agent of self-preservation' towards free trade as an 'ethical agent of universal benevolence in an humanitarian sense' is only possible for Tucker if rooted in a *religious conception of sociability*, Dickey's main point is thus to stress why it was that Tucker taught that rich and civilised countries ought to act magnanimously towards their poorer neighbours, in an attempt to expand the circle of human sociability via acts of international trade (and in direct opposition, too, to neo-Machiavellian values of 'reason of state' in the global economic sphere).⁶¹

Nevertheless, there is a yet further distinction that ought to be made as we approach the close of this study. Forced to acknowledge major aspects of the cynicism of Mandeville (just as Pufendorf had done in the similar case of Hobbes in the previous century), the Tuckerian system was constructed around the human (Epicurean-Augustinian) desire for self-preservation – granted. Yet cunningly, Tucker's solution to this problem lay in acknowledging the social utility of self-love, considered merely as an agent of what he termed '*secular Happiness*'. Tantamount to the 'artificial wants' mechanism of the *Elements* (which we explored in Chapter Five), this is essentially Tucker's theory about the '*Rudiments of Commerce*', or what is more familiarly known today as the division of labour, in which the wants and desires of individuals multiply in direct proportion to the opportunities that arise out of mutual commercial exchange – a phenomenon that is all the more perceptible, therefore, in rich countries where the arts and sciences have become advanced.⁶² Naturally, this entailed a great deal of sensitivity on the part of Tucker towards those ethical problems that tended to arise as a result of increasing luxury and corruption in modern commercial societies. This explains too, then, why the clergyman was so at pains to emphasise the importance of moralising the state's citizenry, which Tucker felt was the most effective 'counter-agent' to, or 'panacea' for, the luxury problem. As he himself put it in Sermon VIII of the *Seventeen Sermons* in a homily dedicated to the issue of luxury, and which reverts once more to the Butlerian analogy of psychological disease and cure: though the individual (and likewise again the body politic) ought always to 'observe a due Regimen', 'never deviate from the Paths of Virtue', and 'never impoverish himself by Luxury, nor impair his Faculties by Debauchery'; yet if this cannot be at all avoided, 'he [should] rightly apply the proper

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 310-11.

⁶² Ibid., pp. 311-12. See esp. *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse' – the term '*secular Happiness*' at p. 6, & also Chapter Five, Section I of this study above for a more detailed explanation.

Medicines (that is, frame good Laws, and see them duly and wisely executed) ... [so as to] recover from this dangerous Disease'. Hence Tucker writes by way of conclusion:

[Whoever] will limit his Pleasures, Diversions, or Expences, by these Regulations, he is not a luxurious but a temperate Man. He doth not abuse the good Things of Providence, but rightly uses them, according to the gracious Design of the Donor. Nay, were he to do less [...] he would be the *covetous* Man, whom God abhorreth; a Man, who, by not using the World enough, does not promote that Circulation of Labour and Industry in it which he ought to do. He is therefore injurious to Society by a *Defect*, as the other was proved to be by an *Excess*.⁶³

Again, then, it is this central component of Tucker's thought which distinguishes him from the 'laissez-faire' free traders of the eighteenth century listed above, who were far more optimistic about the prospect of a naturally-occurring, ostensibly 'spontaneous', free market mechanism. Labelling Tucker a 'qualified providential naturalist' in consequence, Dickey's crucial moment of 'moral re-entry' within the Tuckerian scheme therefore presents itself in the clergyman's 'Providential plan from economic self-preservation towards ethical self-perfection', in turn [transferring] the responsibility for achieving universal benevolence from God or an automatic market mechanism to human beings of 'higher character' in advanced civilizations'. Considered in this light, it is very much by these means that Christianity becomes for Tucker both a 'humanistic' and, in light of all we have recently discussed, a 'practical' or 'charitable' religion; the main function of which is to encourage individuals to become active 'participants in the providential plan for human redemption' (in what we may take to be a further salutary nod to Tucker's Pufendorfian-Augustinianism).⁶⁴

Put yet another way, Tucker's unique brand of political economy was based around the idea that wise government was tantamount to what Dickey calls a 'political delivery system', attempting to foster those 'religious and moral values' intended by Tucker to act as '*Counter-Agent[s]* to inordinate Self-Love'.⁶⁵ This, then, was precisely the point of the economic tracts; evidenced most fulsomely for example in Tucker's vehement criticisms of the spirit of monopolisation, alongside his likeminded endorsement of the

⁶³ *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 157-8, 162.

⁶⁴ Dickey, 'Doux-Commerce and Humanitarian Values', p. 314.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 315; *Elements*, 'Preliminary Discourse', p. 8.

prospect of opening and extending Anglo-Irish commercial relations.⁶⁶ Borrowing once more from Stoic principles of *oikeiosis*, Tucker was well aware of the fact that the benevolent affections weakened as they extended further and further away from the immediate locale, in what Tucker termed ‘social Love [i.e., agape/αγαπη], or *diffusive Benevolence*’.⁶⁷ Accordingly, then, for Tucker, the complex transition from ‘self-love/monopolisation to ‘sociability/free trade’ in both the domestic and international context—or what might otherwise be described as the trajectory from individual self-preservation towards the prospect of universal benevolence—could only be achieved in his mind via the Butlerian appeal to ‘REASON and REFLECTION’ on behalf of society’s collective conscience; by which means, Tucker insisted, human beings would eventually be free to choose between inordinate self-love on the one side, or a mature life of Christian morality on the other.⁶⁸

Now the Great End of Government is to promote the Good and Happiness of the Governed: And if you ask, How is this to be done? I will answer, That this is best effected by causing each Individual to conduct himself in such a Manner, as shall contribute to the general Good ... And what is this, but Religion appearing under another Shape? Religion is the basis, Civil Government is the Superstructure; and neither can be completely established, without the friendly Assistance and Helping hand of the other.⁶⁹

IV. Concluding Remarks: The Providential Argument for Free Trade.

Throughout this study, there have been three core arguments advanced which require highlighting in conclusion. The first of these, revolving around the ‘theo-philosophical background’ to Tucker’s economics, concerns the neo-Stoic providentialist trajectory first introduced in Chapter One and repeated time and again in subsequent chapters, thereby constituting the widest context within which Tucker’s ideas operated. Thereafter the second, which we have labelled the ‘Butler-Tucker axis’, documented the transposition of said neo-Stoical maxims from Bishop Butler’s mature thought to the youthful Tucker’s; analysed, furthermore, through the prism of the orthodox-establishment/heterodox-radical debate so peculiar to eighteenth-century British commercial society. Lastly, therefore, and summarised most aptly in the phrase

⁶⁶ Which Dickey also notes in *ibid.*, pp. 301-2, 312, 315.

⁶⁷ *Elements*, ‘Preliminary Discourse’, p. 8; emphasis added.

⁶⁸ Dickey, ‘Doux-Commerce and Humanitarian Values’, pp. 315-6. For ‘Reason’ and ‘Reflection’ in Tucker’s economics, see again Chapter Five, Sections I & V.

⁶⁹ *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 137-8.

‘Tuckerian Political Economy’, we have endeavoured to show the extent to which Butler’s novel ideas on commercial sociability nestled themselves firmly within Tucker’s developing theories in political economy, with special attention paid to Tucker’s Stoic-inspired emphasis on the interconnections between rich and poor at the domestic level, flowing outwards in ever-expanding ‘circles’ in the global economic sphere, and so finally pointing towards the prospect of ‘economic universalism’, and in time, perpetual peace.

In the context of Smith’s economic ideas, Fonna Forman-Barzilai has recently elaborated on the aforementioned links between the Stoic tradition and the eighteenth-century free trade movement, concentrating most fully and familiarly on Stoic *oikeiosis*, and thereby setting down in piecemeal fashion the various relationships between, and transitions from, what she calls ‘The Circle of the Self’ to ‘The Circle of Society’, thence to ‘The Circle of Humanity’ and finally to the notion of the ‘Commercial Cosmopolis’.⁷⁰ Though Forman-Barzilai notes the influence Butler’s neo-Stoicism exerted on Smith, it is once again extremely telling, however, that Tucker’s name does not merit even one mention in this otherwise enlightening narrative.⁷¹ As we have noted in the introduction to this present study, then, generic links made between Tucker and Smith’s free trade ideas have long been a commonplace, and these are certainly justifiable on many grounds. Yet in light of all that has been discussed in the intervening period, the following questions are surely worth raising at the close of study. How many of these scholarly assertions have considered the neo-Stoic tradition to be a fruitful starting point for enquiry into the relationship between the pair? And more significantly still, how many have acknowledged, let alone accounted for, the extent of Butler’s role as the intermediary figure indicating the points of agreement and disagreement between them?

It is precisely for these reasons, then, that this study has placed – for the first time – Butler’s ideas on commercial sociability at its core. Since our most significant intellectual premise rests not merely on Butler and Tucker’s ‘Christianisation’ of the neo-Stoic providentialist process, as Dickey correctly asserts, but rather their

⁷⁰ Fonna Forman-Barzilai, *Adam Smith and the Circles of Sympathy: Cosmopolitanism and Moral Theory*, (Cambridge, 2010).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 12, 37-40, 42-45, 47-9, 78, n. 11, 231-2, for mentions of Butler.

Anglicanisation of it, future Tucker scholarship will therefore require us to explore and revise, in far greater detail than has previously been attempted, Tucker's mature theories on government, war, empire and the established Church and State – subjects which were all deeply intertwined with the so-called age of 'colonial crisis' in the latter half of the eighteenth-century, as Peter N. Miller has put it.⁷² Characterised by Tucker's polemic against a putatively 'Lockean-inspired' radical republicanism taking root in the North American colonies, supported by rational dissent at home, and which he therefore identified as a new variant of that religious enthusiasm which proved so catastrophic to the seventeenth-century social order,⁷³ our chief point of interest will thereby consist in Tucker's attempts to grapple with, and incorporate, predominantly Scottish conjectural history – the preeminent tool utilised by leading thinkers of the day to explain the origins of modern civil, and therefore commercial, society; and, moreover, for defining the parameters within which government could be said to be legitimate.⁷⁴ Garnering through scholarly innovation a heightened sense of their own 'historicity', and thereby of their unique place on the cusp of modernity within 'secular' historical time, it is by these means, according to Pocock, that 'Smith and Tucker present the response to the American Revolution of essentially conservative Whig Enlightenment at its most intellectually adventurous; at the high point of its grasp of history'.⁷⁵ Yet however that may be, and as this study has attempted to convey throughout, the 'simultaneous kinship and distance' B. W. Young discerns between Scottish and English varieties of Enlightenment, in which – *indeed* – Smith and Tucker 'sit uneasily' alongside each other, surely requires further development.⁷⁶

As shall be argued at a future date, then, this is attributable above all to the fact that Tucker's rendition of conjectural history was both typical and idiosyncratic, in the sense that whilst on the one side, like Smith *et al.*, he too was concerned with accounting for

⁷² Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, pp. 18 n. 165, 63, 202, 353 n. 6, 354, 415. Cf. Armitage, *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*.

⁷³ See esp. Pocock, 'Josiah Tucker on Burke, Locke and Price: A study in the varieties of eighteenth-century conservatism', in *Virtue*, pp. 157-91.

⁷⁴ Other than fleeting allusions in the economic tracts, Tucker's most conspicuous engagement with what is variously labelled Scottish 'philosophical', 'conjectural' or 'stadial' history, or the 'four-stages theory' of human societal development, can be found in his *NFP I & II*, *Apology*, *Letter to Burke* and the *Treatise*.

⁷⁵ For discussion see Pocock, 'Political thought in the English-speaking Atlantic, 1760-1790', in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought*, (i) 'The imperial crisis', pp. 246-82, (ii) 'Empire, revolution and an end of early modernity', pp. 283-317; citation at p. 294.

⁷⁶ Young, 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon', p. 395.

the rise of civil society in terms of stages of development from rudeness and rusticity to refinement and enlightenment; yet on the other, Tucker's demonstrably weightier insistence on the role divine providence played in human history, and particularly his belief that the English Reformation constituted the progressive march towards enlightenment, ensured that for him, the development of the science of man (or *homo economicus*) was not merely a result of unintended historical consequences, which was broadly-speaking the Scottish view, but rather a direct corollary of God's divine intervention in human affairs.⁷⁷

And yet in the final analysis, there is a still further distinction to be made between Tucker and the Scottish moralists. Centring on the clergyman's likeminded attempts to construct a narrative of human history based on 'sacred history' in tandem with Scotch philosophical history, this will return us once more to Butler's dissenting heritage, and particularly the ex-Presbyterian's indebtedness to continental Witsian 'covenant theology'. As explored briefly in Chapter Three, within the reformed tradition, covenant theology is often perceived to be in direction opposition to 'dispensational theology' – the former sharing closer affinities with English dissent, and the latter with the Established Church.⁷⁸ Inevitably, then, such inquiry will direct us swiftly back to Tucker's immediate intellectual locale, i.e., the clash between orthodox prelates and heterodox freethinkers (including, in the latter half of the century, rational dissenters), whose differences regarding the sufficiency of natural or revealed religion continued to pockmark the contemporary intellectual landscape. Interestingly, then, in doing so, we shall be obliged to incorporate the views of perhaps the most rambunctious orthodox thinker of the day, William Warburton, who became Tucker's superior in the capacity of Bishop of Gloucester from 1758 until his death in 1779.⁷⁹ In his two most enduring works of orthodox scholarship, the *Alliance between Church and State* (1736) and *The Divine Legation of Moses* (1737-41), Warburton had advanced a theory of providence

⁷⁷ On this score, it is notable that there was at least one Scottish Enlightenment thinker who thought in overtly providentialist terms – namely William Robertson. For discussion see Phillipson, 'Providence and progress: an introduction to the historical thought of William Robertson', in *William Robertson and the Expansion of Empire*, Steward J. Brown (ed.), (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 55-73. It is notable too, then, that Tucker was an avid reader of Robertson. For implicit and explicit references made to the Scot, see Tucker's *Treatise*, pp. 170, 201, 376. Cf. Pocock, 'Tucker on Burke, Locke and Price', *Virtue*, pp. 177, n. 90; 179, n., 105; 181, n. 112; 188.

⁷⁸ Chapter Three, pp. 88-9.

⁷⁹ For Warburton's theological importance, see Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*, Chap. 5: 'William Warburton: A Polemic Divine'; Robertson, *Case for Enlightenment*, pp. 280-3.

which, we shall argue, tended to refute elements of Witsian (and thereby Butlerian and Tuckerian) covenantalism, instead leaning more towards the dispensational.⁸⁰ In consequence, we will contend that it was this which accounted for Tucker and Warburton's famous clash over the fundamental role of Church and State; Tucker stressing on the one hand the providential role he felt the two elements ought to play *in tandem* over saving human souls, particularly via the government's cultivation of political economy; whilst Warburton arguing on the other that this was the *sole* business and jurisdiction of the Church as opposed to the civil magistrate.⁸¹ In light of these bold claims, Warburton's *bon mot* that Tucker 'made trade his religion and religion his trade' will take on a far greater degree of profundity, bringing into even sharper relief the extent to which the Georgian Church can be said to have been at war within itself.⁸² In final conclusion, then, it will be incumbent upon us to examine the deep historical connotations which lay behind Tucker and Warburton's differences, whether secular or sacred, alongside the ways in which this further impinged upon Tucker's ambitious plans for the economic liberation of humankind.

In *Seventeen Sermons*, which is particularly notable in that it harbours an intriguing and eclectic mix of both covenantalism *and* dispensationalism, and yet is a work that has barely warranted any attention from Tucker's biographers, Tucker labels this 'the divine Oeconomy'.⁸³ Yet as this thesis has shown, the reader has every reason to be confident that this turn of phrase is yet another bold pronouncement of the Butlerian/neo-Stoic 'cements of society' – upon which Tucker's political economy was erected, and upon which he intended its future progress:

And how are the Ends both of Religion and Government to be answered, but by the System of universal Commerce?—Commerce, I mean, in the large and extensive Signification of that Word; Commerce, as it implies a general System for the useful Employment of our Time; as it exercises the particular Genius and Abilities of Mankind in some Way or other, either of Body or of Mind, in mental or corporeal Labour, and so as to make Self-interest and

⁸⁰ For background information to this claim, see Gascoigne, 'The Wisdom of the Egyptians' and the Secularisation of History in the Age of Newton', in Stephen Gukroger (ed.), *The Uses of Antiquity: The Scientific Revolution and the Classical Tradition*, (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991), pp. 171-212, with particular reference to Warburton at pp. 200-3.

⁸¹ This interpretation of Warburton's scheme is derived from Taylor, 'William Warburton and the Alliance Between Church and State', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 43, No. 2, (April, 1992), pp. 271-86.

⁸² Cf. Chapter Two, Sections I-II above.

⁸³ *Seventeen Sermons*, p. 26.

Social coincide. And in pursuing this Plan, it answers all the great Ends both of Religion and Government; it creates social Relations; and it *serves as a Cement to connect together the Religious and Civil Interests of Mankind* [italicisations added]. It is a Friend to both, when rightly understood, and is befriended by them.

AND thus I have endeavoured to proceed, Step by Step, in tracing the several Links of this universal Chain: We must consider Things apart; we have no Capacities to take in *one universal Whole*; nor is it the Province of human Nature to see every Part of the grand Machine in Motion at once [i.e., Butler's 'limited capacities' argument]. But even these transient and imperfect Surveys of the Designs of Providence, as exemplified in the Christian Plan, are enough to fill us with the most awful Impressions of that Being [i.e., Tucker's allusion to neo-Epicurean-Augustinian pessimism], whose Mercies are over all his Works, and whose continued Aim in every Instance, is to pronounce the Good and Happiness of his Creatures. [...]

... [This, then,] is the Foundation, not only of distributive Justice, but of universal Benevolence, of Charity, Compassion,---and, above all, of Liberty of [i.e., Butlerian] Conscience. Apply now this Maxim to the Affairs of Government, and see the Effects of it, were it Universally to take Place,---Liberty would then subsist without Licentiousness; Subordination would be preserved without Tyranny or Oppression; and both the *Governors* and *Governed* would in all Respects be the safer, the better, the happier for each other. Apply it in the next Place to the System of Commerce; and then Monopolies and Exclusions would immediately be at an End;---a general Encouragement would be given to the Diligent and Industrious of all Professions; a general Emulation would excite their genius and improve their Abilities; and every Man would find his own Account in doing to his Neighbour, as he wishes to be done himself.⁸⁴

⁸⁴ *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 139-41.

Bibliography.

I. Manuscript Collections.

Bristol Baptist College.

- Jones, Samuel, 'Notes on Grotius: De jure belli et pacis', Bristol Baptist College, G 95 A.
- . 'Annotations on Godwin's Hebrew antiquities by the Rev Mr Jones of Tewkesbury', Bristol Baptist College, G 95 b.
- . 'Andrew Gifford Remains: A collection of historicall sentences & practices, 1693 ...', (2 Vols, vol I, 17th-18th Century), Bristol Baptist College, OS G95 A.
- . 'Domini Jones Logica Sive ars Ratiocinandi De methodo mathematica: The second book of Euclid's elements: nota in strauchii breviarium chronologicum: scheme of disciplines digested into aphorisms by Dr Benion', Bristol Baptist College, Ze1.
- . 'Gronovii nota qua[e]dam in Sophoclem: nota in Soph[o]clis [A]ljacem', Bristol Baptist College, Ze2.
- . 'Notae in Godwini Mosen & Aaronem, Bristol Baptist College, Ze3-4.
- . 'Nota in Grotium de jure belli et pacis', Lib. II & Lib III, Bristol Baptist College, Ze5-6.
- . 'De geographia praecognosconda; critica sacra praecognoscenda', Bristol Baptist College, Ze7.

British Library.

- Butler, Joseph, BM Add. MS 9815 (26).
- . [Butler's ninth letter], J Butler to S Clarke, Oriel College, 10 October 1717, BL Add. Mss. 12101 (13).
- . [Butler's sixth letter] BL Add. Mss. 12, 101 (13), J Butler to S Clarke, Hamlin's Coffee House (London), Tuesday morning [approx. 11 or 18 April 1714].
- Jones, Samuel, "NOTAE quaedam Criticae in [ad. versum 488] opera et studio V. C. S[amuelis] J[ones] in usum Academiae, Theocicuriensis", [Tewkesbury, co. Gloucester], BL, Add MS 23919.
- . "ANOTATA V. C. S[amuelis] Jones, Academiae Theo-cicuriensis [Tewkesbury, co. Gloucester] Praesidis, in [Thomae] Godwini Mosen et Aharonem, Anno MDCCXII.", BL, Add MSS 23915-23916.
- . "PROLEGOMENON ad Observationes Criticas in Vetus Testamentum opera et studio V. C. S. Samuelis Jones, in usum Academiae Theocicuriensis [Tewkesbury, co. Gloucester] incept. anno MDCCXI.", BL, Add MSS 23917-23918.
- . "NOTAE in [Thomae] Godwini Mosen et Aaronem," by Samuel Jones', BL, Add MSS 31211-31212; 'NOTAE in [Thomae] Godwini Mosen et Aaronem [London, 1614, etc.], by Samuel Jones, schoolmaster at Tewkesbury', BL, Add MSS 33774-33776.

Dr. Williams Library.

- Jones, Samuel, "Annotationes in Godwini Mosen & Aaronem." Autore Sam: Jones. 1719', Congregational Library, I.g.1-6.
- . 'Samuelis Jonesii, Academiae inter Fratres Dissidentes Archididascali, in Godwini Mosen & Aaronem, Annotationes; in Duos Tomos divisae', Dr Williams Library, 24.3, 4.

- . ‘Prolegomena Critica sive Apparatus ad S. Scripturae Lectionem. In Usum Juventutis Academicæ’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L228.
- . ‘Untitled’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L38.
- . ‘Untitled’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L54/4/55-56.
- . ‘Untitled’, Dr Williams Library, MS NCL/L54/4/57-60.

Durham University Library.

Codicil to Butler’s will, Durham University Library, MS SGD 35/12.

Gloucester Public Library.

Tucker, Josiah, Gloucester Public Library, in a letter to [Dr. William] Adams [c. 1706-89], Nov. 14, 1776. Scottish Records Office.

Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Josiah Tucker Manuscripts (1781).

Sheffield City Archives.

Sheffield City Archives, Bagshawe C. 330, f. 4: Secker to Elizabeth Secker Milnes, 26 July 1716.

University of Birmingham.

- Jones, Samuel, ‘Notae in Dionysium’, University of Birmingham, Special Collections, MS 399.
- . ‘Elementa Mathematica’ lectures by Samuel Jones, University of Birmingham, Special Collections, MS 400.
- . ‘Praelectiones S. Jones in Godwini’, University of Birmingham, Special Collections, MS 401.

University of Leeds.

Jones, Samuel, ‘Logica, sive ars ratiocinandi, errores Burgersdicii, et Heereboordii investigans, patefaciens, & emendans. Autore S. Jones’, Leeds University Library, Special Collections, MS 174.

II. Primary Sources.

- Addison, Joseph, *The Spectator*, No. 3, 3 March 1711.
- Anon., *A Full Account of the Late Proceedings in Convocation Relating to Dr. Clarke’s Writings about the Trinity*, (London, 1714).
- Anon., *An Extract of Sundry Passages taken out of Mr Whitefield’s Printed Sermons, Journals and Letters together with some Scruples proposed in proper Queries rais’d on each Remark*, (London, 1741).
- Berkeley, George, ‘The Bond of Society’, published in *The Guardian*, (London, 1713), in Luce, A. A., and Jessop, T. E. (eds.), *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*, Vol. 7, (NY, 1948-56).

- . *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher. In Seven Dialogues ... Containing an Apology for the Christian Religion, against those who are called Free-thinkers*, 2 vols., (London, 1732).
- . *The Querist: Containing several queries, proposed to the consideration of the Public* [1735-7], (Glasgow Ed., 1760).
- Blackburne, Francis, *Works, Theological and Miscellaneous*, 7 Vols., (Cambridge, 1805), I.
- Browne, Peter, *The Procedure, Extent, and Limits of Human Understanding* (London, 1728).
- . *Things Divine and Supernatural Conceived by Analogy with Things Natural and Human*, (London, 1733).
- Butler, Joseph, *A Charge Deliver'd to the Clergy, at the Primary Visitation of the Diocese of Durham*, (Durham, 1751).
- . *Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel*, (London, 1726).
- . *Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel, The Second Edition, corrected: To Which is added a Preface*, (London, 1729).
- . *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature. To which are added Two brief Dissertations ...*, (London, 1736).
- . *A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; ... on Friday, February 16, 1738-9*, (London, 1739).
- . *A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor ... on Monday Easter-Week, 1740*, (London, 1740).
- . *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords ... Jan. 30, 1740-1*, (London, 1741).
- . *A Sermon Preached ... on Thursday May the 9th, 1745*, (London, 1745).
- . *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords ... on Thursday, June 11, 1747*, (London, 1747).
- . *A Sermon Preached ... for the Relief of Sick and Diseased Persons ... on Thursday, March 31*, (London, 1748).
- Clarke, Samuel, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God: more particularly in answer to Mr. Hobbs, Spinoza and their Followers ...*, (London, 1705).
- . *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation*, (London, 1706).
- . *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of Christian Revelation*, (London, 1706).
- . *Several Letters to the Reverend Dr. Clarke, from a Gentleman in Glocestershire Relating to the First Volume of the Foregoing Sermons; ... with the Dr's Answers ...*, (London, 1716).
- . *A Selection of Papers, which passed between the late Learned Mr Leibniz, and Dr. Clarke, In the Years 1715 and 1716*, (London, 1717).
- Collins, Anthony, *A Discourse of Freethinking, occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Freethinkers*, (London, 1713).
- Colquhoun, Patrick, *A Treatise on the Commerce and Police of the River Thames ... suggesting Means for preventing the Depredations thereon, by a Legislative System of River Police*, (London, 1800).
- Constant, Benjamin, *The Liberty of Ancients Compared with that of Moderns* [Paris, 1816], in Fontana, Biancamaria (ed.), *Constant: Political Writings*, (Cambridge, 1998).
- Conybeare, John, *Defence of Reveal'd Religion* (London, 1732).
- Cooper, Thomas, *Certaine Sermons, wherein is contained the defence of the gospel now preached*, (1580).
- d'Angeul, Plumard [under the pseudonym of Sir John Nicholls], *Remarques sur les avantages et les désavantages de la France et la Grande Bretagne par rapport au commerce*, (Leyden, 1754).
- Davenant, Charles, *An Essay on the East India Trade* [1696] in *The Political and Commercial Works of ... Charles Davenant*, (London, 1771), Vol. 1.
- Defoe, Daniel, *Giving alms no charity*, (London, 1704).

- . *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* [1724-27], Vol. II, (7th Ed., London, 1769).
- Derham, William, *Physico-Theology: Or, a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of GOD, from His Works of Creation*, (London, 1713).
- Fénelon, Francois, *Les Aventures de Télémaque* [*The Adventures of Telemachus*, 1699], trans. Patrick Riley, (Cambridge Ed., 1994).
- Fletcher, Andrew of Saltoun, *A Discourse concerning Militias and Standing Armies* [1698], in *Political Works* [1737], John Robertson (ed.), (Cambridge, 1997).
- Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. IX (1739), [May & June issues].
- Grotius, Hugo, *De jure belli ac pacis* [*On The Rights of War and Peace*], (Paris, 1625).
- Hart, [Mr.], 'Sermon on the Harmony of Natural and Revealed Religion' [Further publication information unknown].
- Hörnigk, Philipp von, *Österreich Über Alles, Wenn Sie Nur* [*Austria Over All, If She Only Will*], (Austria, 1684).
- Hooker, Richard, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie* [1594-1662], A. S. McGrade (ed.), (Cambridge, 1989).
- Hume, David, *A Treatise of Human Nature* [1739], Selby-Bigge, L. A. (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896).
- . *Essays, Moral, Political and Literary* (First Ed. Edinburgh, 1742; 1748; 1752).
- . *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* [1751], (New York, Prometheus, 2004).
- Hutcheson, Francis, *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* [1725] (4th Ed., London, 1738).
- . *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections, with illustrations upon the Moral Sense*, (London, 1728).
- . *A System of Moral Philosophy*, 2 vols., (London, 1755).
- Johnson, Samuel, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, (London, 1755).
- Kames, Henry Home, Lord, *Essays upon Several Subjects concerning British Antiquities*, (Edinburgh, 1747).
- . *Essays on the principles of morality and natural religion. In two parts*, (Edinburgh, 1751).
- . *Sketches of the History of Man*, 4 Vols., (Dublin Ed., 1774-5).
- Kant, Immanuel, *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht* [*Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View*, 1784], in Zöller, Günter & Louden, Robert B., (eds. & tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Anthropology, History, and Education*, (Cambridge, 2007).
- . *Kritik der Urteilstkraft* [*Critique of the Power of Judgement*, 1790], in Guyer, Paul (ed.), Guyer, Paul & Matthews, Eric (tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- . *Zum ewigen Frieden* [*Toward Perpetual Peace*, 1795], in Gregor, Mary J. & Wood, Allen W. (eds. & tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1996).
- King, William, *Divine Predestination and Fore-knowledg, consistent with the Freedom of Man's Will* (Dublin; London, 1709).
- Knox, John, *The Works of John Knox*, D. Laing (ed.), (Edinburgh, 1846-64), V.
- Law, William *Remarks upon a late Book, intituled, The Fable of the Bees* [1724] in *The Works of the Reverend William Law, A.M.*, 9 Vols., II, (London, 1762).
- . *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection* [1726], in *The Works of the Reverend William Law, A.M.*, Vol. III, (London, 1762).
- . *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* [1728], in *The Works of the Reverend William Law, A.M.*, 9 Vol. IV, (London, 1762).
- . *The Case of Reason, Or Natural Religion, Fairly and Fully Stated. In Answer to a Book entitl'd, Christianity as Old as the Creation*, [1731] in *The Works of the Reverend William Law, A.M.*, 9 Vols., II, (London, 1762).
- Lipsius, Justus, *De Constantia* [*On Constancy*] (Antwerp, 1584).

- . *Politiorum sive Civilis doctrinae libri sex* [Six Books on Politics or Political Doctrine], (Antwerp, 1589).
- . *Manuductio ad Stoicam philosophiam* [A Guide to Stoic Philosophy], (Antwerp, 1604).
- . *Physiologia Stoicorum* [Physics of the Stoics], (Antwerp, 1604).
- Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, (London, 1690).
- Maddox, Isaac, *The Expediency of preventive Wisdom. A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, the Aldermen and Governors of the Several Hospitals of the City of London ... With a Dedication and an Appendix Concerning Spirituous Liquors*, (London, 1750).
- . *An Epistle to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor. Alderman and Common-Council, of the City of the City of London ... with an Appendix ... concerning the pernicious and excessive Use of Spirituous Liquors*, (Third Ed., London, 1751).
- Malthus, Thomas Robert, *Principles of Political Economy*, (London Ed., 1820).
- Mandeville, Bernard de, *The Grumbling Hive, or Knaves Turn'd Honest* (London, 1705).
- . *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* [1714, 1723], F. B. Kaye (ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924).
- . *An Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools in The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, (Second Ed., London, 1723).
- . *A Letter to Dion* [1732], Viner, Jacob (ed.), (LA, California, 1953).
- Marx, Karl, *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* [Capital: Critique of Political Economy], Vol. 1 (1867).
- Milner, Joseph, *Essays on Several Religious Subjects*, (York, 1789).
- Montaigne, Michel de, *Essais*, (Paris, 1580-95)
- Montchrétien, Antoine de, *Traité de l'economie politique* [A Treatise of Political Economy], (Paris, 1615).
- Patrick, Simon (S. P. presumed), *A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitude-Men*, (1662).
- Porteus, Bielby, *A Review of the Life and Character of the Right Rev. Dr. Thomas Secker*, (Fifth Ed., London, 1797).
- Pufendorf, Samuel von, *De jure naturae et gentium* [Of the Law of Nature and Nations, 1672], Barbeyrac, Jean (ed.), (Amsterdam, 1734).
- . *De officio hominis et civis juxta legem naturalem libri duo* [On The Duty of Man and Citizen According to the Natural Law], (London Ed., 1673).
- Roberts, William, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*, 4 vols., (2nd Ed., London, 1834), I.
- Saint-Pierre, Abbé de, *Projet pour rendre la paix perpétuelle en Europe*, [Project for Perpetual Peace in Europe, 1713], (London Ed., 1714).
- Seeley, William, *The Expansion of England*, (London, 1883).
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley-Cooper, 3rd Earl of, *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times. In Three Volumes*, (London, 1711).
- Skelton, Philip, *The Candid Reader*, (Dublin, 1744).
- . *Deism Revealed*, 2 Vols., [1749] (2nd Ed., London, 1751), II.
- Smith, Adam, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* [1758], Haakonssen, Knud (ed.), (Cambridge 2004).
- . *Lectures on Jurisprudence* [1762] in Meek, R. L., Raphael, D. D. & Stein, P. G. (eds.), *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith*, 7 Vols., (Oxford, 1978).
- . *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* [1776] in Campbell, R. H., Skinner, A. S., & Todd, W. B. (eds.), *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith*, 2 Vols., (Oxford University Press, 1976).
- Smith, Elisha (pseudonym of an unknown author), *The Cure of Deism: Or, The Mediatorial Scheme by Jesus Christ The Only True Religion*, (London, 1736).
- Sprat, Thomas, *History of the Royal Society, for the Improving of Natural Knowledge*, (London, 1667).
- The Spectator* no. 424. Monday, July 7, 1712.

- Stephens, Alexander, *Public Characters of 1798-9*, (London, 2nd Ed., 1799).
- Stow, William, *Remarks on London*, (London, 1722).
- Tindal, Matthew, *Christianity as Old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature*, (London, 1730).
- Toland, John, *Christianity Not Mysterious: A Treatise Shewing, That there is nothing in the Gospel Contrary to Reason, Nor Above It: And that no Christian Doctrine can be properly called A Mystery*, (London, 1696).
- Tryon, Thomas, *A Brief History of English Trade*, (London, 1702).
- Tucker, Josiah, *The Life and Particular Proceedings of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield ... the Genuine Account of that Gentleman*, (London, 1739).
- . *A Brief History of the Principles of Methodism*, (Oxford, 1742).
- . *Hospitals and Infirmaryes, Considered as Schools of Christian Education for the Adult Poor and as Means Conducive towards a National Reformation of Common People*, (Gloucester, 1746).
- . *Two Dissertations on certain Passages of Holy Scripture ... wherein the Cavils and Objections of the late Mr. Chubb ... are particularly considered and refuted*, (London, 1749).
- . *A Brief Essay on the Advantages and Disadvantages which respectively attend France and Great Britain, with regard to Trade*, [1st Ed., 1749; 2nd Ed., 1751] (3rd Ed., London, 1753).
- . *An Impartial Inquiry into the Benefits and Damages ... of Low-priced Spirituous Liquors*, (London, 1751).
- . *Expediency of a Law for the Naturalization of Foreign Protestants: ... Part I ... Occasioned by the Late Naturalization Bill*, (London, 1751).
- . *Expediency of a Law for the Naturalization of Foreign Protestants: ... Part II ... Containing Important Queries relating to Commerce ... and the Principles of the Christian Religion*, (London, 1752).
- . *A Letter to a Friend Concerning Naturalizations*, (2nd Ed., London, 1753).
- . *Reflections on the Expediency of Opening the Trade to Turkey*, (London, 1753).
- . *An Earnest and Affectionate Address to the Common People of England Concerning Their Usual Recreations on Shrove Tuesday* (Gloucester, 1753).
- . *The Elements of Commerce and the Theory of Taxes*, (Privately Published, 1755).
- . *Instructions for Travellers*, (Privately Published, 1757; Dublin, 1758).
- . *The Manifold Causes of the Increase of the Poor Distinctly Set Forth*, (Gloucester, 1760).
- . *The Case of Going to War*, (Gloucester, 1763).
- . *A Letter from a Merchant in London to His Nephew in North America*, (London, 1766).
- . *The Causes of the Dearness of Provisions assigned; with Effectual Methods for Reducing ... Them*, (Gloucester, 1766).
- . *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of Christ-Church, London on Wednesday May 7th, 1766 ... the time of the Yearly Meeting of the ... Charity Schools*, (London, 1766).
- . *An Apology for the Present Church of England as by Law Established, Occasioned by a Petition ... to be laid before Parliament for Abolishing Subscriptions*, (Gloucester, 1772).
- . *Six Sermons on Important Subjects*, (Bristol, 1772).
- . *Letters to the Rev. Dr Kippis, occasioned by his Treatise Entitled A Vindication of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers, with Regard to their Late Application to Parliament*, (Gloucester, 1773).
- . *Four Tracts on Political and Commercial Subjects*, (Gloucester, 1774).
- . *Religious Intolerance No Part of the General Plan Either of the Mosaic, or Christian Dispensation, Proved by Scriptural Inferences and Deductions*, (Gloucester, 1774).
- . *A Brief and Dispassionate View of the Difficulties Attending the Trinitarian*,

- Arian, and Socinian Systems*, (Gloucester, 1774).
- . *An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal to Those Respectable Personages in Great Britain and Ireland*, (Gloucester, 1775).
- . *A Letter To Edmund Burke ... in Answer to his Printed Speech...*, (2nd Ed., London, 1775).
- . *Seventeen Sermons on some of the Most Important Points on Natural and Revealed Religion, Respecting the Happiness Both of the Present and the Future Life*, (Gloucester, 1776).
- . *Cui Bono? Or, an Enquiry, What Benefits can Arise ... from the Greatest Victories, or Successes, in the Present War? ... Addressed to Monsieur Necker*, (Third Ed., Gloucester, 1781).
- . *A Treatise Concerning Civil Government ... Part I. The Notions of Mr. Locke and his Followers. Part II. The True Basis of Civil Government Set Forth and Ascertained. Part III. England's Former Gothic Constitution Censured and Exposed; ... also the Scripture Doctrine Concerning the Obedience Due to Governors Vindicated and Illustrated*, (London, 1781).
- . *Four Letters on Important National Subjects, Addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Shelburne* (2nd Ed., London, 1783).
- . *Reflections on the Present Matters in Dispute Between Great Britain and Ireland ...* (London, 1785).
- Valla, Lorenzo, *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio* [Discourse on the Forgery of the Alleged Donation of Constantine], (1440).
- Wake, William, *The Principles of the Christian Religion Explained: In a Brief Commentary Upon the Church Catechism*, (London, 1699).
- Warburton, William, *The Alliance Between Church and State: Or, the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test Law Demonstrated*, [First Ed., 1736], (4th Ed., 1766).
- . *The Divine Legation of Moses ... In Two Parts*, [1st Ed., 1737-41], (4th Ed., London, 1755).
- Wesley, John, *Christian Perfection*, (London, 1741).
- . *The Principles of a Methodist. Occasion'd by a late Pamphlet intituled, A Brief History of the Principles of METHODISM*, (Bristol, 1742).
- . *Farther Thoughts Upon Christian Perfection*, (London, 1763).
- . *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection, As Believed and Taught by the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, From the Year 1725, to the Year 1765*, (Bristol, 1766).
- . Sermon 18. 'The Marks of the New Birth' in *The Works of John Wesley*, Baker, F., et al. (eds.), Vol. I, *Sermons*, A. C. Outler (ed.).
- . *Journal*, III, (London Ed., 1827).
- . *Works*, Thomas Jackson (ed.), (Third Ed., London, 1831), Vol. XIII.
- . *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.*, N. Curnock (ed.), (London, 1909-16).
- . *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.*, J. Telford (ed.), 8 vols, (London, 1930), VI.
- . *Works*, XI, 'The Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion', Cragg (ed.), (Oxford, 1975).
- . Baker, F. (ed.), 'John Wesley and Bishop Joseph Butler: A [previously unpublished] Fragment of John Wesley's Manuscript Journal 16th to 24th August 1739', *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, Vol. XLII (May 1980), pp. 93-100.
- Wilkins, John, *Ecclesiastes* [1645], (London Ed., 1675).
- Whitefield, George, *Letters of George Whitefield for the Period 1734-42*, (Edinburgh, 1776).
- . *A Continuation [of the Journal]*, (London, 1739).
- . *Journals*, (Edinburgh Ed., 1960).
- Wollaston, William, *The Religion of Nature Delineated* (London, 1722).

III. Secondary Sources

- Abbey, C. J & Overton, J. H., *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 Vols., (London, 1887).
- Abel, Ernest L., 'The Gin Epidemic: Much Ado About What?', *Alcohol & Alcoholism*, 36/5, (2001), pp. 401-5.
- Akhtar, Sahar, 'Restoring Joseph Butler's Conscience', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 14 (4), (2006) pp. 581-600.
- Annas, Julia, *The Morality of Happiness*, (Oxford, 1993).
- Arendt, Hannah *The Human Condition*, (Chicago, 1958).
- . *On Revolution*, (New York, 1963).
- Armitage, David, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- Bac, Martin, *Perfect Will Theology: Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism against Suarez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza*, (Brill, Leiden, 2010).
- Bailyn, Bernard, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).
- Baron, Hans, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, 2 Vols., (Princeton, 1955).
- Barry, Jonathan, 'Cultural patronage and the Anglican crisis: Bristol c. 1689-1775', in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 67-85.
- Bartlett, Thomas, *Memoirs of the life, character and writings of Joseph Butler*, (London, 1839).
- Beiser, Frederick C., *The Sovereignty of Reason: The Defense of Rationality in the Early English Enlightenment*, (Princeton, NJ, 1996).
- Bennett, G. V., *The Tory Crisis in Church & State, 1688-1730*, (Oxford, Clarendon, 1975).
- Berdell, John F., 'Innovation and Trade: David Hume and the Case for Freer Trade', *History of Political Economy*, 28/1 (1996), pp. 107-26.
- Bentley, Jerry H., *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples*, (Princeton, 1987).
- Berg, Maxine, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth Century Britain*, (Oxford, 2005).
- Berlin, Isaiah, *Two Concepts of Liberty: An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958*, (Oxford, 1958).
- . (ed.), *The Age of the Enlightenment*, (New York, 1956).
- Berry, Christopher, *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation*, (Cambridge, 1994).
- Bettcher, Talia Mae, 'Berkeley and Hume on Self and Self-Consciousness', in Miller, Jon (ed.), *Topics in Early Modern Philosophy of Mind*, (Springer, 2009), pp. 193-222.
- Biographical Mirrour*, (London, 1789).
- Black, Jeremy & Gregory, Jeremy (eds.), in *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800*, (Manchester, 1991).
- Blom, Hans W., 'Sociability and Hugo Grotius', *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 41, No. 5, pp. 589-604.
- Blom, Hans W., & Winkel, Laurens C. (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004).
- Bom, E. D., Janssens, M., van Hoont, T., & Papy (eds.), J., *(Un)masking the Realities of Power: Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe*, (Leiden, 2011).
- Bonar, James (ed.), *A Catalogue of the Library of Adam Smith*, (Macmillan, London & New York, 1894).
- Branch, Lori, 'Bishop Butler', in Hass, Andrew, Jasper, David & Jay, Elisabeth (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*, (Oxford, 2007), pp. 591-99.
- Bradshaw, Brendan & Duffy, Eamon (eds.), *Humanism, Reform and the Reformation: The Career of Bishop John Fisher*, (Cambridge, 1989).
- Brandt, Reinhard, 'Self-consciousness and self-care: on the tradition of oikeiosis in the modern age', in Blom, & Winkel, (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 73-91.

- Bray, Gerald, *Anglican Canons, 1527-1947*, (Woodbridge, 1998).
- Breuninger, Scott, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley: Virtue and Society in the Anglo-Irish Context*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- Brewer, Jonathan, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1680-1783*, (Harvard, 1990).
- Bridal, P., 'Montchrétien, Antoine de', in *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics* [1987], (Palgrave Macmillan, Second Ed., 2008), Vol. 3.
- Brink, C. O., 'Oikeiosis and oikeiotes: Theophrastus and Zeno on Nature in Moral Theory', *Phronesis* I (1956), pp. 123-45.
- Brooke, Christopher, 'Stoicism and anti-Stoicism in the seventeenth century', in Blom, & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 93-115.
- . *Philosophical Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau*, (Princeton, 2012).
- Buffinton, Arthur H., *The Second Hundred Years' War, 1689-1815*, (NY, 1929).
- Butterfield, Herbert J., *The Whig Interpretation of History*, (London, 1931).
- Cain, Peter J., 'Bentham and the Development of the British Critique of Colonialism', *Utilitas*, 23/01, (March 2011), pp. 1-24.
- Cairns, John W., 'Stoicism, slavery, and law', in Blom, & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 197-232.
- Carey, Daniel, *Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson: Contesting Diversity in the Enlightenment and Beyond*, (Cambridge, 2005).
- Gascoigne, John, *Cambridge in the Age of Enlightenment: Science, Religion and Politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution*, (Cambridge, 1990).
- . 'The Wisdom of the Egyptians' and the Secularisation of History in the Age of Newton', in Stephen Gaukroger (ed.), *The Uses of Antiquity*, (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991).
- Castiglione, Dario, 'Mandeville moralised', *Annali Della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi*, 17 (1983), pp. 239-290.
- . 'Considering Things Minutely: Reflections on Mandeville and the Eighteenth-Century Science of Man', *History of Political Thought* 7 (1986), pp. 463-488.
- Cassirer, Ernst, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* [1932], (Princeton Ed., 2009).
- Champion, J. A. I., *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730*, (Cambridge, 1992).
- Clark, E. W., *Josiah Tucker Economist. A Study in the History of Economics*, (New York, 1903).
- Clark, J. C. D., *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure, and Political Practice During the Ancien Régime* [1985], (Revised 2nd Ed., Cambridge, 2000).
- Clay, Christopher, 'The Greed of Whig Bishops'? Church Landlords and their Lessees, 1660-1760, *Past and Present*, 87 (1), (1980), pp. 144-86.
- Clifford, Alan C., *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theory 1640-1790: An Evaluation*, (Oxford, 1990).
- Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, [1992], (Yale University Press Ed., 2005).
- Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History*, (Oxford, 1946).
- Collini, Stefan, Burrow, John & Winch, Donald, *That Noble Science of Politics*, (Cambridge, 1983).
- Collini, Stefan, Whatmore, Richard, Young, Brian (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society: British Intellectual History 1750-1950*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- . *History, Religion and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750-1950*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- Cragg, G. R., *Reason and Authority in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1964).
- Cromartie, Alan, *The Constitutionalist Revolution: An Essay on the History of England, 1450-1642*, (Cambridge, 2006).
- Crouzet, François, 'The Second Hundred Years War: Some Reflections', *French History*, 10 (4), (1996), pp. 432-50.

- Cruikshanks E. (ed.), *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1861*, (Edinburgh, 1982).
- Cunliffe, Christopher (ed.), *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought: Tercentenary Essays*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992).
- Cuttica, Cesare, 'Eavesdropper on the Past: John W. Burrow (1935-2009), Intellectual History and its Future', in *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 40, No. 7 (2014), pp. 905-24.
- Darnton, Robert, 'In search of the Enlightenment: Recent Attempts to Create a Social History of Ideas', *Journal of Modern History*, 43 (1): March 1971, pp. 113-32.
- . *Forbidden Bestsellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*, (New York, London, 1995).
- Davies, Rupert, *Methodism*, (Harmondsworth, 1963).
- Davis, J. C., 'Religion and the Struggle for Freedom in the English Revolution', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 3, (Sep., 1992) pp. 507-30.
- De Krey, Gary Stuart, *A Fractured Society: The Politics of London in the First Age of Party, 1688-1715*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).
- Delon, M. (ed.), *Dictionnaire européen des lumières*, (Paris, 1997).
- Denzler, Horst, *Moralphilosophie und Naturrecht bei Samuel Pufendorf*, (Munich, 1972).
- Dew, Ben, 'Political Economy and the Problem of the Plebs in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *History Compass*, 5/4 (2007), pp. 1214-35.
- . 'Epicurean and Stoic Enlightenments: The Return of Modern Paganism?', *History Compass*, 11/6 (2013), pp. 486-95.
- Dewald, Jonathan, *Aristocratic Experience and the Origins of Modern Culture: France, 1570-1715*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford, 1993).
- Dickey, Laurence, 'Doux-commerce and humanitarian values', in Blom, & Winkel, (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 271-317.
- Dickson, P. G. M., *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit*, (London: Macmillan, 1967).
- Dunn, John, 'The Identity of the History of Ideas', *Philosophy* 43 (1968), pp. 85-104.
- Dunn, John (ed.), *The Economic Limits to Modern Politics*, (Cambridge, 1990).
- Elster, Jon, *The Cement of Society: A Survey of Social Order*, (Cambridge, 1989).
- Elmslie, Bruce Truitt, 'The Convergence Debate Between David Hume and Josiah Tucker', *The Journal of American Perspectives*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Autumn, 1995), pp. 207-16.
- Engberg-Pederson, Troel, *The Stoic theory of oikeiosis: Moral development and social interaction in early Stoic philosophy*, (Aarhus, 1990).
- Evelyn, John, *Navigation and commerce, their original and progress [1674]*, in John Evelyn (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn*, (London, 1825).
- Eyffinger, Arthur, 'The fourth man', in Hans W. Blom & Laurens C. Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 117-156.
- Faccarello, Gilbert, 'A tale of two traditions: Pierre Force's *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*', *The European Journal of the History of Economic Ideas*, 12/4, 2005, pp. 701-12.
- Ferguson, J. P., *An Eighteenth Century-Heretic: Dr. Samuel Clarke*, (Kineton, 1976).
- Fitzpatrick, Martin, 'Latitudinarianism at the parting of the ways: a suggestion', in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 209-27.
- Forbes, Duncan, *Hume's Philosophical Politics*, (Cambridge, 1975).
- Ford, Christopher A., 'Preaching Propriety to Princes: Grotius, Lipsius and Neo-Stoic International Law', *Case Western Journal of International Law*, Vol. 28, No. 2, (Spring, 1996), pp. 313-66.
- Forman-Barzilai, Fonna, *Adam Smith and the Circles of Sympathy: Cosmopolitanism and Moral Theory*, (Cambridge, 2010).
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York, 1979).
- . Senellart, Michael (ed.), *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007).
- Ferrone, Vincenzo & Roche, Daniel (eds.), *L'Illuminismo Dizionario storico* (Rome and Bari, 1997).

- Force, Pierre, *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith: A Genealogy of Economic Science*, (Cambridge, 2003).
- Ford, Paul Leicester, 'Appendix II: Josiah Tucker and His Writings: An Eighteenth Century Pamphleteer on America' in *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 2, No. 2, (Mar., 1894), pp. 330-47.
- Garrett, Aaron, 'Reasoning about Morals from Butler to Hume', in Savage, Ruth (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*, (Oxford, 2012), pp. 169-86.
- Gay, Peter, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*, 2 Vols., (New York, 1966-9).
- Gibson, William, *The Achievement of the Anglican Church, 1689-1800*, (Lewiston, NY, 1994).
- . *The Church of England, 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, (Routledge, London & NY, 2000).
- Goldie, Mark & Wokler, Robert (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, (Cambridge, 2006).
- Gregory, Jeremy, 'Anglicanism and the arts' in Black & Gregory (eds.) *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800*, (Manchester, 1991), pp. 82-109.
- . 'The eighteenth-century Reformation: the pastoral task of Anglican Clergy after 1689', in Walsh *et al.* (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 67-85.
- . *Restoration, Reformation, and Reform, 1660-1828: Archbishops of Canterbury and their Diocese*, (Oxford, 2000).
- Göçmen, Dogan, *The Adam Smith Problem: Reconciling Human Nature and Society*, (Macmillan, Tauris Academic Studies, 2007).
- Goldsmith, M. M., *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, (Cambridge, 1985).
- . 'Liberty, luxury and the pursuit of happiness', in Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 225-52.
- Gould, Eliga H., 'American Independence and Britain's Counter-Revolution, *Past and Present*, 154 (1), (1997), pp. 107-141.
- Grice-Hutcheson, Marjorie, *The School of Salamanca: Readings in Spanish Monetary History, 1544-1605*, (Oxford; Clarendon, 1952).
- Greig, J. Y. T. (ed.), *The Letters of David Hume*, 2 Vols., (Oxford, 1932).
- Gunn, J. A. W., *Factions no More: Attitudes to Party in Government and Opposition in Eighteenth-Century England*, (London, 1972).
- . *Beyond Liberty and Property: The Process of Self-Recognition in Eighteenth Century Political Thought*, (Canada, 1983).
- Guy, John, 'The Henrician Age', in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 13-46.
- Haakonssen, Knud, *The Science of a Legislator: The Natural Jurisprudence of David Hume & Adam Smith*, (Cambridge, 1989).
- . *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy: From Grotius to the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1996).
- . (ed.), *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (Cambridge, 1996).
- . (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Adam Smith*, (Cambridge, 2006).
- . (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth Century Philosophy*, (Cambridge, 2006).
- Haakonssen, Knud & Whatmore, Richard, 'Essay Reviews: Commerce And Enlightenment', *Intellectual History Review*, 18 (2), 2008, pp. 283-303.
- Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* [1962], (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).
- Hallifax, Samuel (ed.), *The Works of Joseph Butler D.C.L., late Bishop of Durham*, (NY, 1860).
- Hamowy, Ronald, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Theory of Spontaneous Order*, (Carbondale, IL, 1987).

- Hatcher, John, 'Labour, Leisure and Economic Thought Before the Nineteenth-Century', *Past and Present*, 160 (1998), pp. 64-115.
- Hayden, Colin, *Anti-Catholicism in eighteenth-century England, c. 1714-80: A political and social study*, (Manchester, 1993).
- Hayek, F. A., *New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas*, (London: Routledge, 1978).
- Hazard, Paul, *The Crisis of the European Mind 1680-1715*, (London, 1953).
- Heitzenrater, R. P., *The Elusive Mr. Wesley, John Wesley His Own Biographer*, 2 vols., (Nashville: Abington, 1984), Vol. I.
- Higgs, Henry, *The Physiocrats*, (London; Macmillan, 1897).
- Hill, Christopher, *Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution*, (London, 1980).
- Hill, Lisa & McCarthy, Peter, 'Hume, Smith and Ferguson: Friendship in commercial society', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 2/4, (1999), pp. 33-49.
- Hirschman, Albert O., *The Passions and Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before its Triumph* [1977], (Twentieth Anniversary Ed., Princeton, 1997).
- Hoak, Dale & Feingold, Mordechai, *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-9*, (Stanford, 1996).
- Hochstrasser, T. J., *Natural Law Theories in the Early Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- Hochstrasser, T. J & Schröder, P. (eds.), *Early Modern Natural Law Theories: Contexts and Strategies in the Early Enlightenment*, (Dordrecht, 2003).
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *Augustan England: Professions, State and Society, 1680-1730*, (London, 1982).
- Hont, Istvan, *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation State in Historical Perspective*, (Cambridge, MA, 2005).
- . 'The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury' in Goldie & Wokler (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 379-418.
- Hont, Istvan & Ignatieff, Michael (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1983).
- . 'Needs and Justice in the *Wealth of Nations*: an introductory essay', in Hont & Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 1-44.
- Horne, Thomas A., *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, (London; Macmillan, 1978).
- Hundert, E. J., *The Enlightenment's 'Fable': Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*, (Cambridge, 1994).
- . 'Sociability and self-love in the theatre of moral sentiments: Mandeville to Adam Smith' in Collini, et al. (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society*, (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 31-47.
- Hunter, Ian, *Rival Enlightenments: Civil and Metaphysical Philosophy in Early Modern Germany*, (Cambridge, 2001).
- Im-Hof, Ulrich, *The Enlightenment*, (Oxford, 1994).
- Ingram, Robert G., *Religion, Reform and Modernity in the Eighteenth Century: Thomas Secker and the Church of England*, (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Inwood, Brad (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, (Cambridge, 2003).
- Irwin, T. H., 'Stoic Naturalism and its Critics' in Inwood (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Stoics*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 345-64.
- Israel, Jonathan, *Empires and Entrepôts: The Dutch, the Spanish Monarchy and the Jews 1585-1713*, (Hambledon Press, London, 1990).
- . (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, (Cambridge, 1991).
- . *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall: 1477-1806*, (Clarendon; Oxford, 1995).

- . *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*, (Oxford, 2001).
- . *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity and the Emancipation of Man, 1670-1752*, (Oxford, 2006).
- . *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy*, (Oxford, 2010).
- . *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750-1790*, (Oxford, 2011).
- Jacob, James R., *Robert Boyle and the English Revolution*, (New York, 1978).
- . *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1981).
- Jacob, James R. & Jacob, Margaret C., 'The Anglican Origins of Modern Science: The Metaphysical Foundations of the Whig Constitution', *Isis*, 71 (2), June 1980, pp. 251-67.
- Jacob, Margaret C., *Newtonians and the English Revolution* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1976).
- . *The Enlightenment: A Brief History with Documents*, (Boston and New York, 2001).
- Jeremy, David J. (ed.), *Religion, business and wealth in modern Britain*, (London, 1998).
- Johnson, Clifford, 'Joseph Butler, Laodicean Rationalist?', *Modern Language Studies*, Vol 4, No. 2 (Autumn, 1974), pp. 78-85.
- Jones, Meirvav, 'Philo Judeaus and Hugo Grotius's Modern Natural Law', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 74, No. 3, (July, 2013), pp. 339-59.
- Kelley, Donald R., 'Elizabethan political thought', in Pocock *et al.* (eds.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 47-79.
- Kenyon, J. P., *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* [1977], (Cambridge, 1990 Ed.).
- Klein, Lawrence E., *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England*, (Cambridge, 1994).
- . 'Property and politeness in the early eighteenth-century Whig moralists. The case of the *Spectator*', in Brewer, John & Staves, Susan (ed.), *Early Modern Conceptions of Property*, (Routledge, NY, 1996), pp. 221-33.
- Knorr, Klaus E., *British Colonial Theories: 1570-1850*, (Toronto, 1944).
- Koehn, Nancy F., *The Power of Commerce: Economy and Governance in the First British Empire*, (Ithaca and London, 1994).
- Kors, A. C. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, 4 vols., (New York and Oxford, 2003).
- Kramnick, Isaac, *Bolingbroke and His Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1968).
- Kuhn, Thomas, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Chicago, 1962).
- Lafond, Jean, *L'Homme et son Image: Morales et littératures de Montaigne à Mandeville*, (Paris, 1996).
- Lavery, Jonathan, 'Reflection and Exhortation in Butler's Sermons: Practical Deliberation, Psychological Health and the Philosophical Sermon', *The European Legacy*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (2005), pp. 329-48.
- Leary, David E., 'Berkeley's Social Theory: Context and Development', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38/4, (Oct-Dec 1977), pp. 635-49.
- Leddy, Neven & Lifschitz, Avi S. (eds.), *Epicurus in the Enlightenment*, (Oxford, 2009).
- Leira, Halvard, 'Justus Lipsius, political humanism and the disciplining of 17th century statecraft', *Review of International Studies*, 34/04 (October 2008), pp. 669-92.
- Lloyd, Sarah, 'Cottage Conversations: Poverty and Manly Independence in Eighteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 184 (2004), pp. 69-108.
- Long, A. A., 'Stoicism in the Philosophical Tradition: Spinoza, Lipsius, Butler' in Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 365-92.
- Lund, Roger (ed.), *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*, (Cambridge, 1995).

- Macauley, J. S. & Greaves, R. W. (ed.), *The Autobiography of Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury*, (Lawrence, Kansas, 1988).
- Macintyre, Alastair, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, (London, Duckworth, 1981).
- Mallet, C. E., *A History of the University of Oxford*, (Oxford, 1927), III.
- McCoy, Charles S., 'Johannes Cocceius: Federal Theologian', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 16/04 (Dec. 1963), pp. 352-70.
- McCrea, A., *Constant Minds: Political Virtue and the Lipsian Paradigm in England, 1584-1650*, (Toronto, 1997).
- McDaniel, Iain, 'Unsocial Sociability in the Scottish Enlightenment: Ferguson and Kames on War, Sociability and the Foundations of Patriotism', *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 41, No. 5, (1996), pp. 662-82.
- Meek, Ronald L., *Precursors of Adam Smith (1750-1775)*, (Dent, London, 1973).
- . *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage*, (Cambridge, 1975).
- Metzger, Hélène, *Attraction universelle et religion naturelle chez quelques commentateurs anglais de Newton*, (Paris, Hermann & cie, 1938).
- Miller, Jon, 'Stoics, Grotius, and Spinoza and Moral Deliberation', in Miller & Inwood (eds.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 116-39.
- . 'Innate ideas in Stoicism and Grotius', Blom, & Winkel (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 157-76.
- . (ed.), *Topics in Early Modern Philosophy of Mind*, (Springer, 2009).
- Miller, Jon & Inwood, Brad (eds.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, (Cambridge, 2003).
- Miller, Peter N., *Defining the Common Good*, (Cambridge, 1994).
- . *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century*, (New Haven and London, 2000).
- . 'Nazis and Neo-Stoics: Otto Bruner and Gerhard Oestreich Before and After the Second World War', *Past and Present*, 176 (2002), pp. 144-86.
- . 'Hercules at the Crossroads in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Neo-Stoicism Between Aristocratic and Commercial Society' in Christian Mouchel & Colette Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, République des Arts*, (Geneva, Droz, 2008), pp. 167-92.
- Mizuta, Hiroshi, *Adam Smith's Library: A Supplement to Bonar's Catalogue*, (Cambridge, 1967).
- Monroe, Arthur Eli (ed.), *Early Economic Thought: Selected Writings from Aristotle to Hume [1924]*, (NY, Dover Ed., 2006).
- Monroe, Hector, *The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville*, (Oxford, 1975).
- Moore, James, 'Utility and Humanity: The Quest for the *Honestum* in Cicero, Hutcheson, and Hume', *Utilitas*, 14/03, (November 2002), pp. 1-24.
- . 'Natural rights in the Scottish Enlightenment', in Goldie & Wokler (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 291-316.
- Moore, James & Silverstone, Michael, 'Gershom Carmichael and the natural jurisprudential tradition in eighteenth-century Scotland', in Hont & Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 73-87.
- Morford, Mark P. O., *Stoics and Neo-Stoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius*, (Princeton, 1991).
- Morrissey, Mary, 'Scripture, Style and Persuasion in Seventeenth-Century English Theories of Preaching', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 53, No. 4, (October 2002), pp. 686-706.
- Mortimer, Sarah, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism*, (Cambridge, 2010).
- Mortimer, Sarah & Robertson, John (eds.), *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy, 1600-1750*, (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

- Moss, A., 'The Politics of Justus Lipsius and the Commonplace Book', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 59.3 (1998), pp. 421-36.
- Motooka, Wendy, *The Age of Reasons: Quixotism, Sentimentalism, and Political Economy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (Routledge, 2013).
- Müller, Patrick, *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne and Goldsmith*, (Zugl., Münster, 2009).
- Munck, Thomas, *The Enlightenment: a Comparative Social History 1721–1794*, (London, 2000).
- Nicholls, David, *God and Government in an 'Age of Reason'*, (Routledge, London & NY, 1995).
- Nieli, Russell, 'Commercial Society and Christian Virtue: The Mandeville-Law Dispute', *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Autumn 1989), pp. 581-610.
- O' Brian, Wendell, 'Butler and the Authority of Conscience', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 8/1, (Jan., 1991), pp. 43-57.
- Oestreich, Gerhard, *NeoStoicism and the Early Modern State*, Oestreich, Brigitta & Koenigsberger, H. G. (eds.), tr. McLintock, David, (Cambridge, 1982).
- Offer, Avner, *The Challenge of Affluence: Self-control and Well-being in the USA and Britain since 1950*, (Oxford, 2006).
- O'Keefe, Tim, *Epicureanism*, (California, 2009).
- Oncken, August, 'The Consistency of Adam Smith', *Economic Journal* 7:27 (1897), pp. 443-50.
- Osler, Margaret J. (ed.), *Atoms, Pneuma, and Tranquillity: Epicurean and Stoic Themes in European Thought*, (Cambridge, 1991).
- . 'Early Modern Uses of Hellenistic Philosophy', in Miller & Inwood (eds.), *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 30-44.
- Otterspeer, Willem, 'The University of Leiden: An Eclectic Institution', *Early Science and Medicine*, 6/4 (2001), pp. 324-33.
- Outram, Dorinda, *The Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1995).
- Overtan, J. H., *Life in the English Church 1660-1714*, (London, 1885).
- Oz-Salzberger, Fania, 'New approaches towards a history of the Enlightenment: can disparate perspectives make a general picture?', *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte*, 29 (2000), pp. 171–6.
- Palladini, Fiammetta, 'Pufendorf and Stoicism', in Blom, & Winkel, (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), pp. 245-55.
- Pagden, Anthony (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, (Cambridge, 1987).
- Peltonen, Markku, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*, (Cambridge, 1995).
- . 'Politeness and Whiggism, 1688-1732', *The Historical Journal*, 48, (2005), pp. 391-414.
- Pembroke, S. G., 'Oikeiosis', in A. A. Long (ed.), *Problems in Stoicism*, (London, 1971), pp. 114-49.
- Penelhum, Terence, *Butler*, (London, 1985).
- Pettit, Philip, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*, (Oxford, 1997).
- Petty-Fitzmaurice, H. W. E., Marquis of Lansdowne (ed.), *The Petty papers*, 2 Vols. (London, 1927), II.
- Phillipson, Nicholas, 'Politeness and politics in the reigns of Anne and the early Hanoverians', in Pocock et al. (eds.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 211-45.
- Pincus, Steven, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, (New Haven: Yale, 2009).
- Plumb, J. H., *England in the Eighteenth Century*, (Harmondsworth, 1950).
- Pocock, J. G. A., *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1957).

- . 'The History of Political Thought: a methodological enquiry', in P. Laslett and W. G. Runciman (eds.), *Philosophy, Politics, and Society*, 2nd series, (Oxford, 1962), pp. 183-202.
- . *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*, (Chicago, 1971).
- . *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*, (Princeton, 1975).
- . 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 47, No. 4, (Dec. 1975), pp. 601-21.
- . 'The Limits and Divisions of British History In Search of an Unknown Subject', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (Apr., 1982), pp. 311-36.
- . 'Cambridge paradigms and Scotch philosophers: a study of the relations between the civic humanist and the civil jurisprudential interpretation of eighteenth-century social thought', in Hont & Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 235-52.
- . Review [of Shelton's *Dean Tucker and Eighteenth-Century Economic and Political Thought*, (London, 1981)], *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 55, No. 1, (Mar., 1983), pp. 116-18.
- . *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1985).
- . 'Clergy and commerce: the conservative Enlightenment in England', in Raffaele Ajello et al. (eds.), *L'eta' dei lumi. Studi storici sul Settecento europeo in onore di Franco Venturi*, 2 vols. (Naples, 1985), I., pp. 523-62.
- . 'Religious Freedom and the Desacralisation of Politics: From the English Civil Wars to the Virginia Statute' in Merrill D. Peterson & Robert C. Vaughan (eds.), *The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom*, (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 43-73.
- . 'Conservative Enlightenment and democratic revolutions: The American and French cases in British perspective', *Government and Opposition*, 24 (1989), pp. 81-105.
- . 'Political thought in the English-speaking Atlantic, 1760-1790', in Pocock et al. (eds.), *Varieties of British Political Thought*, (i) 'The imperial crisis', pp. 246-82, (ii) 'Empire, revolution and an end of early modernity', pp. 283-317.
- . 'Within the margins: the definitions of orthodoxy', in Lund (ed.) *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*, (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 33-53.
- . 'Enthusiasm: The Antiself of the Enlightenment', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No.1/2, *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850*, (1997), pp. 7-28.
- . 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 104, No. 2 (Apr., 1999), pp. 490-500.
- . *Barbarism and Religion: Vol. I: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-1794*, (Cambridge, 1999).
- . *Barbarism and Religion: Vol. II: Narratives of Civil Government*, (Cambridge, 1999).
- . 'The Union in British History', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, Vol. 10 (2000), pp. 181-196.
- Pocock, J. G. A., Schochet, Gordon J. & Schwoerer, Lois G. (eds.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought: 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 1993).
- Polanyi, Karl, *The Great Transformation* [1944], (Boston, 1957).
- Pope Benedict XVI. [Ratzinger, Joseph A.], *Caritas in Veritate*, (2009).
- Porter, Roy, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century*, (Harmondsworth, 1982).
- . *The Enlightenment* (London, 1990; 2nd Ed. 2001).
- . *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*, (Penguin: London, 2001).

- Porter, Roy & Teich, Mikulás (eds.), *The Enlightenment in National Context*, (Cambridge, 1981).
- Pritchard, Michael S., 'Conscience and Reason in Butler's Ethics', *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy*, 9/3, (Fall, 1978), pp. 39-49.
- Proctor, F. & Frere, W. H., *The Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices*, (London, 1958).
- Pullen, John, 'Malthus's theological ideas and their influence on his principles of population', *History of Political Economy*, 13/1 (1981), pp. 39-54.
- Rashid, Salim, 'Richard Whatley and Christian political economy at Oxford and Dublin', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38/1, (1977), pp. 147-55.
- Rivers, Isabel, (ed.), *Books and their Readers in 18th Century England*, (Leicester, 1982).
- . *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1770: Volume I: Whichcote to Wesley*, (Cambridge, 1990).
- . *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1770: Volume II: Shaftesbury to Hume*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- . 'Scougal's *The Life of God in the soul of man*: The fortunes of a book, 1676-1830', in Savage (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*, (Oxford, 2012), pp. 29-55.
- Rand, Benjamin (ed.), *The Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*, (London, 1900).
- Rashid, Salim, 'Economics and the Study of its Past', *World Development*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 207-18.
- Robbins, Caroline, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthmen*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1959).
- Robertson, John, *The Case for Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples, 1680-1760*, (Cambridge, 2007).
- Roche, Daniel, *A History of Everyday Things: The Birth of Consumption in France, 1600-1800*, (Cambridge, 2000).
- Roover, Raymond de, 'Scholastic economics: survival and lasting influence in from the sixteenth century to Adam Smith', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 79/2 (1955), pp. 161-90.
- Roseveare, Henry, *The Financial Revolution, 1660-1760*, (London: Longman, 1991).
- Rosenfield, Sophia, *Common Sense: A Political Philosophy*, (Harvard, 2011).
- Ross, Ian Simpson, *Lord Kames and the Scotland of his Day*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).
- Rothschild, Emma, 'Global Commerce and the Question of Sovereignty in the Eighteenth-Century Provinces', *Modern Intellectual History*, 1/ 01, (April 2004), pp. 3-25.
- Russell, Anthony, *The Clerical Profession*, (London, SPCK, 1980).
- Saastamoinen, Kari, 'Pufendorf and the Stoic model of natural law', in Blom, & Winkel, (eds.), *Grotius and the Stoa*, (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 2004), p. 257-69.
- Sahlins, Marshall, 'The Sweetness of Sadness: The Native Anthropology of Western Cosmology [and Comments and Reply]', *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (1996), pp. 395-428.
- Sakmann, Paul, *Bernard de Mandeville und die Bienenfabel-Controverse*, (Leipzig, 1897).
- Saunders, Jason Lewis, *Justus Lipsius: The Philosophy of Renaissance Stoicism*, (New York, 1955).
- Savage, Ruth (ed.), *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain: New Case Studies*, (Oxford, 2012).
- Schama, Simon, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, (NY, 1987).
- Schmidt, James, 'What Enlightenment Project?', *Political Theory*, 28 (2000), pp. 734-57.
- Schneewind, J. B., *The Invention of Autonomy*, (Cambridge, 1998).
- Schofield, R. E., 'An evolutionary taxonomy of eighteenth-century Newtonianisms', *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 7 (1978), pp. 175-92.
- Schumpeter, Joseph, *A History of Economic Analysis* [1954], (London: Allen & Unwin Ed., 1982).

- Schuyler, Robert L., *Josiah Tucker: a selection from his economic and political writings*, (New York, 1931).
- . *The Fall of the Old Colonial System: A Study in British Free Trade, 1770-1780*, (NY: Oxford, 1945).
- Schneiders, W. (ed.), *Lexikon der Aufklärung* (Munich, 1995).
- Selderhuis (ed.), Herman, *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, (Brill, Leiden, 2013).
- Sellars, John, *Stoicism*, (California, 2006).
- Semmel, Bernard, *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism: Classical Political Economy, the Empire of Free Trade and Imperialism 1750-1850*, (Cambridge, 1970).
- . 'The Hume-Tucker Debate and Pitt's Trade Proposals', *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 300, (Dec., 1965), pp. 759-70.
- Shadwell, C. L., *Registrum Oriense: An Account of the Members of Oriel College, Oxford, II, The Commensales, Commoners and Natellers admitted during the years 1701-1900*, (Oxford, 1902).
- Shaver, Robert, 'Virtues, Utility, and Rules', in Haakonssen (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Adam Smith*, (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 189-213.
- Shelton, W. George, *Dean Tucker and Eighteenth-Century Economic and Political Thought*, (London, 1981).
- Sherwood, Charles, *The Covenant Theology of Johannes Cocceius*, (Yale, 1956).
- Shifflet, A., *Stoicism, Politics and Literature in the Age of Milton*, (Cambridge, 1998).
- Silver, Allan, 'Friendship in Commercial Society: Eighteenth-Century Social Theory and Modern Sociology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 95/6, (May, 1990), pp. 1474-1504.
- Skinner, A. S., *A System of Social Science: Papers Relating to Adam Smith*, (Oxford, 1979).
- Skinner, Quentin, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory* 8 (1969), pp. 3- 53.
- . *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 Vols., (Cambridge, 1978).
- . *Liberty Before Liberalism*, (Cambridge, 1996).
- . 'A Third Concept of Liberty', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 117 (2002), pp. 237-68.
- Slack, Paul, 'Material progress and the challenge of affluence in seventeenth-century England', *Economic History Review*, 62, 3, (2009), pp. 576-603.
- Smith, David & Dixon, William, 'Das Adam Smith Problem: A Critical Realist Perspective', *Journal of Critical Realism*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2006), pp. 251-72.
- Smith, William Robert, *Francis Hutcheson: His Life, Teaching, and Position in the History of Philosophy*, (Bristol, 1992; facsimile of 1st Ed., 1900).
- Sombart, Werner, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben [The Jews and Modern Capitalism]*, (1911).
- Somos, Mark, *Secularisation and the Leiden Circle*, (Leiden: Boston, 2011).
- Sonenscher, Michael, *Before the Deluge: Public Debt, Inequality, and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution*, (Princeton, 2007).
- Starkie, Andrew, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy 1716-1721*, (Woodbridge, 2007).
- . 'William Law and the Fable of the Bees', *Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (2009), pp. 307-19.
- Stasavage, David, 'Partisan Politics and Public Debt: The Importance of the 'Whig Supremacy' for Britain's Financial Revolution', *European Review of Economic History* 11 (2007), pp. 123-53.
- Stephen, Leslie, *The History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 Vols., (London, 1876).
- Stephens, W. Walker, *The Life and Writings of Turgot*, (New York, 1971).
- Stern, J. (ed.), *The Collected Works of Josiah Tucker*, 6 vols., (London, 1993).
- Stewart, L., 'Samuel Clarke, Newtonianism, and the Factions of Post-Revolutionary England', *JHI* 42 (1981), pp. 53-72.

- Stewart, M. A., 'The Stoic legacy in the early Scottish enlightenment', in Osler (ed.), *Atoms, Pneuma, and Tranquillity: Epicurean and Stoic Themes in European Thought*, (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 272-96.
- . 'Arguments for the Existence of God: The British Debate', in Haakonssen (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth Century Philosophy*, (Cambridge, 2006). pp. 710-30.
- Stigler, George J., 'Smith's Travels on the Ship of State', *History of Political Economy* 3, (1971), pp. 265-77.
- Sykes, Norman, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century*, (Cambridge, 1934).
- . *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768*, (Cambridge, 1959).
- Tawney, R. H., *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, (1926).
- Taylor, Charles, *A Secular Age*, (Belknap, Harvard, 2007).
- Taylor, Stephen, 'William Warburton and the Alliance Between Church and State', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 43, No. 2, (April, 1992), pp. 271-86.
- Tennant, Bob, *Conscience, Consciousness and Ethics in Joseph Butler's Philosophy and Ministry*, (Woodbridge, 2011).
- Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth century England*, (Oxford, 1971).
- Thompson, R., *Classics or Charity? The Dilemma of the Eighteenth-Century Grammar School*, (Manchester, 1971).
- Tolonen, Mikko, *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society*, (Oxford, 2013).
- Tombs, Robert & Tombs, Isabelle, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and British from the Sun King to the Present*, (London, 2006).
- Torrey, Norman, *Voltaire and the English Deists*, (New Haven, Yale, 1930).
- Tortarolo, Edoardo, *L'Illuminismo. Ragioni edubbi della modernità*, (Rome, 1999).
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays*, (London, 1987).
- Troeltsch, Ernst, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen [The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches]* (1912).
- Tuck, Richard, *Natural Right Theories: Their Origin and Development* (Cambridge, 1979).
- . *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651*, (Cambridge, 1993).
- . *The Rights of War and Peace: Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant*, (Oxford, 1999).
- Tully, James, *A Discourse on Property: John Locke and his adversaries*, (Cambridge, 1980).
- Tyacke, Nichol, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).
- Vander Molen, Ronald J., 'Providence as Mystery, Providence as Revelation: Puritan and Anglican Modifications of John Calvin's Doctrine of Providence', *Church History*, 47/1 (Mar., 1978), pp. 27-47.
- Varty, John, 'Civic or Commercial? Adam Ferguson's concept of civil society', *Democratization*, 4:1, (1997), pp. 29-48.
- Venturi, Franco *Utopia and Reform in the Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1971).
- . *Italy and the Enlightenment: Studies in a Cosmopolitan Century*, tr. Susan Corsi, (London, 1972).
- Virgin, Peter, *The Church in an Age of Negligence: Ecclesiastical Structure and Problems of Church Reform 1700-1840*, (Cambridge, 1989).
- Viner, Jacob, 'Adam Smith and laissez faire', *Journal of Political Economy*, 35/2 (1927), pp. 198-232.
- . 'English Theories of Foreign Trade Before Adam Smith', *Journal of Political Economy*, 38/3 (June, 1930), pp. 249-301.
- . 'English Theories of Foreign Trade Before Adam Smith (Concluded)', *Journal of Political Economy*, 38/4 (Aug., 1930), pp. 404-57.
- . 'Review of Schuyler's *Josiah Tucker*', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 40, No. 3, (Jun., 1932), pp. 416-8.

- . ‘“Possessive Individualism” as Original Sin’, *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, (1963), XXIX/04, pp. 548-59.
- . *The Role of Providence in the Social Order*, (Princeton, NJ, 1972).
- Voitle, Robert, *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury*, (Louisiana, 1984).
- Warren, James, *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism*, (Cambridge, 2009).
- Walsh, John, ‘The Thirty-Nine Articles and Anglican Identity in the Eighteenth Century’, in Christine d’Haussy (ed.), *Quand Religions et Confessions se Regardent*, (Paris, 1998).
- Walsh, John, Hayden, Colin & Taylor, Stephen (eds.), *The Church of England c. 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Walsh, J. D., ‘Origins of the Evangelical Revival’, in Bennett & Walsh (eds.), *Essays in modern English Church History*, (A. & C. Black, 1966).
- . ‘Methodism at the End of the Eighteenth Century’ in Davies & Gordon Rupp (eds.), *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain*, Vol 1., (London, Epworth Press, 1965).
- Walsham, Alexandra, *Providence in Early Modern England*, (Oxford, 2001).
- Waszink, Jan, ‘Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism’, *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 39, No. 2, (1996), pp. 151-68.
- Waterman, Anthony M. C., ‘The ideological alliance of political economy and Christian theology, 1798-1833’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 34/2 (1983), pp. 231-44.
- . *Revolution, Economics & Religion: Christian Political Economy 1798-1833*, (Cambridge, 1991).
- . ‘The beginning of ‘boundaries’: The sudden separation of economics from Christian theology’, in Guido Erreygers (ed.), *Economics and Interdisciplinary Exchange*, (London, Routledge, 2001), pp. 41-63.
- . *Political Economy and Christian Theology Since the Enlightenment: Essays in Intellectual History*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
- . ‘The Changing Theological Context of Economic Analysis since the Eighteenth Century’, *History of Political Economy*, 40/5, (2008), pp. 121-42.
- . ‘The relation between economics and theology in *Caritas in Veritate*’, *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics*, 6/2, (Autumn, 2013), pp. 24-42.
- Warren, James, *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism*, (Cambridge, 2009).
- Wedgwood, Ralph, ‘Butler on Self-Interest, Virtue, and Human Nature’, in Paul Bloomfield (ed.), *Moral and Self-Interest*, (Oxford, 2008), pp. 177-204.
- Weinreb, Ben, Hibbert, Christopher, Keay, Julia, Keay, John (eds.), *The London Encyclopaedia*, (Third Ed., London: Macmillan, 2008).
- Wennerlind, Carl C., ‘David Hume’s Monetary Theory Revisited: Was He Really a Quantity Theorist and an Inflationist?’, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 113, (February 2005), pp. 223-37.
- Whatmore, Richard, ‘The Weber Thesis’: unproven yet unrefuted’, in Lamont, William (ed.), *Historical controversies and historians*, (Routledge, 1998), pp. 95-108.
- . *Republicanism and the French Revolution: An Intellectual History of Jean-Baptiste Say’s Political Economy*, (Oxford, 2001).
- . ‘Intellectual History and the History of Political Thought’ in Whatmore & Young (eds.), *Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History*, (Palgrave; Basingstoke, 2006), pp. 109-29.
- . ‘Neither Masters nor Slaves’: Small States and Empire in the Long Eighteenth Century’ in Duncan Kelly (ed.), *Lineages of Empire, The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought*, (Oxford, 2009), pp. 53-81.
- . ‘Shelburne and Perpetual Peace: Small States, Commerce, and International Relations within the Bowood Circle’, in *An Enlightenment Statesman in Whig Britain: Lord Shelburne in Context, 1737-1805*, (Boydell & Brewer, 2011), pp. 249-73.
- . ‘Burke on Political Economy’ in Dwan, David & Insole, Christopher J. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Edmund Burke*, (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 80-91.

- . 'Luxury, Commerce, and the Rise of Political Economy' in James A. Harris (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 2013), pp. 575-95.
- Whatmore, Richard & Young, Brian (eds.), *Palgrave Advances in Intellectual History*, (Palgrave; Basingstoke, 2006).
- Willcox, William B. (ed.), *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Vol. 23*, (Princeton, 1983).
- Wilson, Catherine, *Epicureanism at the Origins of Modernity*, (Oxford, 2008).
- Winch, Donald, 'The emergence of economics as a science, 1750-1870', in Cipolla, C. M. (ed.), *Fontana Economic History of Europe, Vol. 3*, (London, 1971), pp. 507-73.
- . *Adam Smith's Politics: An Essay in Historiographic Revision*, (Cambridge, 1978).
- . 'Adam Smith's 'enduring particular result': a political and cosmopolitan perspective' in Hont & Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 253-69.
- . *Malthus*, (Cambridge, 1987).
- . *Riches and Poverty: An Intellectual History of Political Economy*, (Cambridge, 1996).
- Wood, Gordon, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776- 1987*, (Chapel Hill, NC, 1969).
- Yolton, J. W. et al. (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Enlightenment*, (Oxford, 1991).
- Young, Brian W., 'The Soul-Sleeping System': Politics and Heresy in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45/1 (1994), pp. 64-81.
- . 'Christianity, Commerce and the Canon: Josiah Tucker and Richard Woodward on Political Economy', *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 22, No. 5/6, (1996), pp. 385-400.
- . *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke*, (Clarendon, Oxford, 1998).
- . 'A History of Variations: the identity of the eighteenth century Church of England', in T. Clayton & I. McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland: c. 1650-c. 1850*, (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 105-28.
- . 'Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian', *The Historical Journal*, 43, 3 (2000), pp. 849-868.
- Young, James Dean, 'Mandeville: A Popularizer of Hobbes', *Modern Language Notes*, 74/1, (Jan., 1959), pp. 10-13.
- Zanta, Léontine, *La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle*, (Paris, 1914).

IV. ODNB Articles.

- Cunliffe, Christopher, *ODNB* article 'Joseph Butler'.
- Wykes, David L., *ODNB* article: 'Samuel Jones'.
- Cornish, Rory T., *ODNB* article 'Josiah Tucker'.

V. Websites.

- Blund, *A Short Biography of Gisbertus Voetius*, (Sep. 2011). Accessed via: <http://witsius.wordpress.com/2011/09/17/a-short-biography-of-gisbertus-voetius-1589-1676/>.
- 'The Dissenting Academies Project'
<http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/academies.html>.