

Responses to Hume's *Treatise* in the *Bibliothèque raisonnée*, 1739-41

David Fate Norton, McGill University
Dario Perinetti, Université du Québec à Montréal

The earliest response to Hume's *Treatise* was a short *notice* of the work published in the French-language journal, *Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savans de L'Europe* (*BR*) in its spring 1739 issue. One year later, the *BR* published a review of vol. 1 of the *Treatise*, and then in spring 1741, published the only known review of vol. 3. We undertake to show 1) that the author of the *BR notice* was Pierre Des Maizeaux (1673-1745); 2) that the two *BR reviews* were very likely written by a single author; and 3) that the author in question was most likely Armand Boisbebeau de La Chapelle (1676-1746). After setting out our reasons for these conclusions, we offer brief accounts of these two founding members of the society of Hume scholars.

A substantially abridged copy of this paper will be presented at the conference.

Responses to Hume's *Treatise* in the *Bibliothèque raisonnée*, 1739-41

Hume's ascerbic summary of the reach of the *Treatise of Human Nature* is well known. The *Treatise*, he said, 'fell *dead-born from the Press*; without reaching such distinction as even to excite a Murmur among the Zealots'¹ But as research has shown, Hume's claim is not the last word on the early reception of the *Treatise*.² It is true that the work was not a publishing success, nor was it received as the revolutionary work Hume thought he had written, but it was certainly not entirely ignored. There was a significant early response to the *Treatise*, and much of it was in French.

The early continental reception of Hume's *Treatise* was constituted, so far as can now be determined, of notices and reviews in three French-language journals published in Holland and in two German journals. In the absence of responses or commentaries directly addressing the newly published book, understanding the reception of the *Treatise* involves searching out the views underlying the rigid and sometimes uninformative style of these notices and reviews. Notices were usually brief descriptive announcements of new publications, providing a sketch of the aim and contents of a book in a paragraph or two. Reviews in the Franco-Dutch journals were normally made up of excerpts and paraphrases of the book reviewed. They were, and were intended to be, digests or abridgements, and with some notable exceptions, they contained few criticisms by the reviewer. In the relevant journals, the reviews were anonymous. Obviously, then, learning the identity of a given reviewer may provide contextual information relevant to the interpretation of any observations or criticisms made by the reviewer.

We are here concerned with the responses to the *Treatise* published in the Amsterdam-based French-language quarterly, the *Bibliothèque raisonnée* (*BR*), 1739-41.³ The materials found in the *BR* include the first published account of the *Treatise*, a short notice that appeared in the spring 1739 issue (vol. 22), a review of vols. 1 and 2 in the spring 1740 issue (vol. 24), and a review of vol. 3, the only review of that volume, in the

¹*My Own Life*.

²See D. F. Norton, 'Historical Account of *A Treatise of Human Nature*, from its Beginnings to the Time of Hume's Death', Sect. 7, in *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. D. F. Norton and M. J. Norton, 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, in press); see also note 65 below, and E. C. Mossner, 'The Continental Reception of Hume's *Treatise*, 1739-1741', *Mind* 56 (1947), 31-43.

³The *Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savans de L'Europe* [*BR*], was published by the Amsterdam firm of Wetstein and Smith from 1728-41, and by Wetstein alone from 1742-53. See Bruno Lagarrigue, *Un temple de la culture européenne (1728-1753): l'histoire externe de la Bibliothèque raisonnée* [*L'Histoire externe*], (Nijmegen: [?], 1993), 7-35.

spring 1741 issue (vol. 26). Commentators have attributed these responses to Pierre Des Maizeaux and Francis Hutcheson, but in doing so have left open questions about these attributions and their significance.

Our aims in this paper are limited. We undertake to confirm that the author of the *BR notice* was Pierre Des Maizeaux (1673-1745). We then argue that the two *BR reviews*, Hume's own contribution to the first aside, were likely written by one author; and that this author was most probably Armand Boisbelean de La Chapelle (1676-1746). After setting out our reasons for these conclusions, we offer brief accounts of these two founding members of the society of Hume scholars.

Vols. 1 and 2 of Hume's *Treatise* were published in late January 1739. The notice of the *Treatise* appeared in the *BR* issue for April-June 1739. A substantial portion of each issue of the *BR* was devoted to literary news, and news of this kind from London typically came first. In the second issue of 1739, the lead item in the news from London was this brief summary and comment:

A gentleman, a Mr. *Hume*, has published *A Treatise of human Nature: being an Attempt, &c.* That is, *Traité de la Nature humaine; où l'on essaye d'introduire la Méthode expérimentale de raisonner dans les sujets de Morale*. In 8vo. 2 vol. This work is divided into two volumes, of which the first, concerning the Understanding, contains four Parts each divided into several Sections. The first Part concerns ideas, their origin, composition, abstraction, connection, &c.; the second, the ideas of space and time; the third, knowledge and probability; and the fourth, scepticism [*Pyrrhonisme*] and the other systems of philosophy. The second volume, concerning the passions, contains three Parts. The first Part is concerned with pride and humility; the second with love and hatred; and the third with the will and the direct passions. Those who desire something new will find what they want here. The author argues on his own terms, he goes thoroughly into things, and he follows new ways of thinking. He is very original.⁴

This notice was the work of Pierre Des Maizeaux. We can confidently make this attribution for three reasons. (1) From the inception of *BR* in 1728 through 1741, Des Maizeaux regularly provided the journal with its literary news from London, and was virtually the only individual entrusted with that task. (2) On 27 September 1740, William Smith,⁵ who from 1728-41 oversaw *BR* for the publisher, sent to Des Maizeaux an itemized list of the contributions, to vols. 22-4 of *BR*, for which he was to be paid. The items listed include the

⁴All translations are our own.

⁵It was to this 'Mr. Smith' that Hume referred when he wrote to Hutcheson about the *Abstract* (Letter of 4 March 1740, *Letters*, 1: 37-8). On the identification of Smith, see David Raynor, 'Hume and Berkeley's *Three Dialogues*', in *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment, Oxford Studies in the History of Philosophy*, ed. M. A. Stewart, vol. 1, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 231-50, at 248n; James Moore and M. A. Stewart, 'William Smith (1698-1741) and the Dissenters' Book Trade', *Bulletin of the Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland [BPHSI]*, 23 (1993), 20-7; and 'A Scots-Irish Bookseller in Holland: William Smith of Amsterdam (1698-1741)', *Eighteenth-Century Scotland: The Newsletter of the Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society [ECS]*, 7 (1993): 8-11.

column containing the notice of the *Treatise*.⁶ (3) We know Hume revealed his identity as author of the *Treatise* to Des Maizeaux, and this accounts for the fact that the author of the notice has this information.⁷

The *BR* gave more substantive attention to the *Treatise* on two other occasions. In the spring of 1740 it published a 6000-word review principally of vol. 1; one year later it published a 4200-word review of vol. 3.

There is no direct evidence of the authorship of these two reviews (it was *BR* policy that reviews be anonymous, and virtually all were),⁸ but there are indications that they were written by the same individual.

⁶British Library Add. MS 4288 fo. 158, letter of Wm. Smith to Des Maizeaux.

⁷Hume had probably come to know Des Maizeaux at the Rainbow Coffee House where Hume lived c. 1737-8, and which Des Maizeaux frequented. He wrote to Des Maizeaux: 'Whenever you see my Name, you'll readily imagine the Subject of my Letter. A young Author can scarce forbear speaking of his Performances to all the World: But when he meets with one, that is a good Judge, & whose Instruction and Advice he depends on, there ought some Indulgence to be given him. You were so good as to promise me, that, if you cou'd find Leisure from your other Occupations, you woud look over my System of Philosophy, & at the same time ask the Opinion of such of your Acquaintance as you thought proper Judges. Have you found it sufficiently intelligible? Does it appear true to you? Do the Style & Language seem tolerable? These three Questions comprehend every thing; & I beg of you to answer them with the utmost Freedom & Sincerity. I know 'tis a Custom to flatter Poets on their Performances; but I hope Philosophers may be exempted: And the more so, that their Cases are by no means alike. When we do not approve of any thing in a Poet, we commonly can give no Reason for our Dislike, but our particular Taste; which not being convincing we think it better to conceal our Sentiments altogether. But every Error in Philosophy can be distinctly markt, & prov'd to be such; & this is a Favour I flatter myself you'll indulge me in with regard to the Performance I put into your Hands. I am, indeed, afraid, that it wou'd be too great a Trouble for you to mark all the Errors you have observ'd. I shall only insist on being informd of the most material of them, & you may assure yourself will consider it as a singular Favour' (Letter of 6 April 1739, *Letters*, 1: 29-30). If Des Maizeaux replied to this letter, his reply has been lost, and so we do not know if he brought any errors to Hume's attention.

It is also likely that Des Maizeaux wrote the *BR* notice of *Abstract*, but he does not attribute this work to Hume. That notice reads: 'Some having found the *Treatise of Human Nature* of Mr. *Hume* a little too abstruse, a pamphlet has been published to help them understand it: *An Abstract of a Book lately published, entituled a Treatise of Human Nature &c.* That is, *Extrait d'un Livre publié depuis peu sous le titre Traité de la Nature humaine &c. où le principal sujet de ce Livre est plus amplement éclairci & expliqué.* In 8.' See *BR* 24.2 (1740), 481-2.

⁸See 'Avertissement des Libraires', *BR* 1.1 (1728), xi. Lagarrigue is able to say only that the two reviews are not by Des Maizeaux; see *L'Histoire externe*, 74, 317. The *BR* policy of anonymity was carried to the point that on at least some occasions the principal contributors and Charles La Motte, corrector or sub-editor of the journal, were unaware of the authorship of the reviews. Even after he had begun contributing to the *BR*, La Chapelle wrote to Des Maizeaux saying that people have attributed to him certain 'malignant' articles in that journal, but goes on to deny writing these reviews and then to complain about the mediocrity of the authors of *BR* and to express his doubts that a journal with multiple authors can be of value (BL Add. Mss. 4282 ff. 81-2, letter of 25 Feb. 1729). On the occasion of the review of the second edition of Boullier's *Essai philosophique sur l'ame des bêtes* the publishers appear to have engaged in an elaborate scheme intended to disguise the fact that La Chapelle was the author of this review, for Smith instructed Charles La Motte to write to Des Maizeaux regarding his desire for a review of the work and asking Des Maizeaux to edit the text if he does not write it himself. Moreover, Wetstein and Smith later sent a letter to Des Maizeaux telling him that the review in question had been well received. But in the meantime Wetstein informed still another

(1) The author of the review of vol. 3 is familiar with the earlier volumes of the *Treatise*, and with the review of vol. 1 and the allegation of obscurity made there: he observes that the author of vol. 3 has tried (without notable success) to make his views clearer than he had in vol. 1.

(2) The two reviews also reveal significant similarities of language. For example, both take Hume to have described *all* ideas by the phrase, ‘faint and languid’, used only once (at *Treatise* 1.1.3.1) to characterize ideas of the imagination in contrast to those of the memory. Both reviews then turn ‘faint and languid’ into ‘languissantes & foibles’. And although the phrase ‘faint and languid’ is not used anywhere in vol. 3, the second review uses the same French phrase, ‘languissantes & foibles’ in its translation of the Advertisement to vol. 3 – so that while Hume there says only that he means ‘by ideas *the fainter perceptions*’, the reviewer has him saying ‘by *ideas* I mean only languishing and weak perceptions’ (‘par des *Idées* je n’entends que des perceptions languissantes & foibles’).

(3) The two reviews show a similarity of reviewing style. The great majority of reviews in the *BR* are descriptive extracts. The reviews of the *Treatise* mix description and quotation with objections or criticism.

We grant that these are not conclusive reasons, but, as a working hypothesis, we assume that the two reviews had a single author. In the further course of our discussion we add to the evidence for this hypothesis.⁹

Through its first phase (1728-41), the period in which it was under the direction of William Smith, the *BR* was, with rare exception, written by its three regular contributors, Des Maizeaux, Jean Barbeyrac (1674-1744), and La Chapelle.¹⁰ Each of these three must be considered a possible author of the *Treatise* reviews.

correspondent that this review had been written by La Chapelle; see note 40 below; Lagarrigue, *Histoire externe*, 73n, 141, 322.

⁹Moore and Stewart also suppose, in the papers cited in note 4, that the two reviews had a single author.

¹⁰The rare exceptions are reviews known to have been written by L. Baulacre (no. 576 in the list found in *L’Histoire externe*, 288-354); J.-P. Bernard (no. 880, and perhaps also no. 1185); P.-Fr. Le Courayer (nos. 752-4, a self-review, and 1045-6); J. Rousset de Missy (no. 422, and perhaps also nos. 322, 324); T. de Saint Hyacinthe (no. 565, and perhaps also nos. 729, 830, 861). Five other individuals, C. Chais, J. J. Wetstein, J. Gagnier, P. Massuet, and a certain Taché, *may* have written, respectively, reviews 504, 657, 783, 873, and 926-7, while J. Vernet is known to have written no. 1167, a review of his own book. Neither Lagarrigue nor we have found any grounds for associating these individuals with the reviews of the *Treatise*. From 1728-41 the *BR* also published about a dozen original articles by, among others, Voltaire, Barbeyrac and La Chapelle, as well as about thirty-five ‘Lettres ou d’Avertissements’. See *Histoire externe* 276-84, items 1-139.

In addition, it has been suggested that the reviews were written by Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746).¹¹ We also consider this hypothesis.

Pierre Des Maizeaux. Whoever wrote the first *BR* review, he had at his disposal, and made ample use of, a copy of Hume's *Abstract*, for about two-thirds of the review is constituted of a (sometimes loose) translation of that pamphlet. This fact was first pointed out by John Yolton, who then went on to suggest that Des Maizeaux could easily have had a copy of the *Abstract* and used that as the basis of this review.¹² Regrettably for this hypothesis, the letter establishing that Des Maizeaux wrote the brief notice of the *Treatise* that appeared in vol. 22 of *BR* also indicates that it is unlikely that he wrote the review published in vol. 24. Wm. Smith does not include that review in the list of items for which Des Maizeaux is to be paid. This is not surprising, for Des Maizeaux's contributions to *BR* were nearly always limited to his accounts of the literary news in London. He appears to have written no more than a half-dozen reviews. In addition, critical passages of the sort found in this review are uncharacteristic of Des Maizeaux's work. Neither the reviews that can be attributed to him, nor in his longer works on Bayle, Saint Evremond, and others, did Des Maizeaux go beyond mere reportage to criticism or analysis.¹³

Jean Barbeyrac. According to Wm. Smith, Barbeyrac wrote two-thirds of the reviews in *BR*.¹⁴ But despite this substantial level of contribution, it is unlikely that Barbeyrac is the author of the *BR* reviews of the *Treatise*. We reach this conclusion for a variety of reasons.

(1) These reviews are not among the 124 in the *BR* that scholars are now able to attribute to Barbeyrac.¹⁵ Neither are they like the great majority of reviews that are Barbeyrac is thought to have written. The typical Barbeyrac review is an extract, a careful summary, with copious scholarly notes (especially to

¹¹The attribution of this review to Hutcheson was first made by James Moore in his unpublished but widely circulated paper, 'William Smith and the Reviews of Hume's *Treatise* in the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*' ['William Smith and Hume's *Treatise*'] (Conference on Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Enlightenment, Univ. of Victoria, 1993) At least one scholar has supposed this attribution likely to be correct and of considerable significance. John Robertson, referring to this unpublished paper, says: 'It seems that Hutcheson was almost certainly the author of the successive critical reviews of Books I and III of the *Treatise of Human Nature* . . . [in] the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée* . . . reviews which made a point of exposing the differences between Hume's work and Hutcheson's.' This hypothesis, Robertson goes on to point out, is part of Moore's larger claim that the relation of Hutcheson to Hume 'was not one of influence, but of fundamental opposition'. Robertson then goes on to conclude from Moore's 'radical reassessment of Hume's relation to Hutcheson' that there are likely to be other flaws in standard accounts of Scottish moral philosophy. See 'The Scottish Contribution to the Enlightenment', in Paul Wood (ed.), *The Scottish Enlightenment: Essays in Reinterpretation* (Rochester: Rochester University Press, 2000), 37-62; at 47. See also by Robertson 'The Scottish Enlightenment', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 108 (1996), 817. The attribution of the review to Hutcheson is also repeated in the papers by Moore and Stewart cited in note 4.

¹²John W. Yolton, 'Hume's *Abstract* in the *Bibliothèque raisonnée*', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 40 (1979), 157-8.

¹³See *L'Histoire externe*, 70-4, and the information about reviews no. 342-3, 352-4, pp. 293-4.

¹⁴Letter of 25 June 1737, British Library Add. MS 32416 fo. 36, cited by Lagarrigue, *L'Histoire externe*, 24n.

¹⁵See *L'Histoire externe*, 52. In correspondence with us Dr. Lagarrigue has indicated his grounds for adding two further reviews (items 592 and 1096 in his list), bringing the total attributable to Barbeyrac to 124.

classical sources), without negative comment.¹⁶ As we have said, the *Bibliothèque raisonnée* reviews of the *Treatise* raise a number of critical objections, and the number of notes in these reviews is of modest proportions, and only one is to a classical source (Sextus Empiricus on causation).

(2) Barbeyrac, when faced with an anonymous work, seems invariably to have made a point of providing his readers with the identity, or likely identity, of the author of that work.¹⁷ Des Maizeaux had identified the author of the *Treatise* in *BR 22*. We suppose Barbeyrac would have made use of this information had he been author of these reviews.

(3) Barbeyrac said that he was motivated to write reviews because he wanted the books for his library.¹⁸ His extensive library was catalogued in the year of his death and auctioned the following year. Neither the *Treatise* nor the *Abstract* are listed in that catalogue.¹⁹

On the basis of this evidence, it is unlikely that Barbeyrac wrote the reviews, but no direct evidence rules out this possibility.

Francis Hutcheson. The attribution of the *BR* reviews to Hutcheson, the hypothesis of James Moore, begins with Hume's one extant comment on the *Abstract*:

My Bookseller has sent to Mr Smith a Copy of my Book, which I hope he has receiv'd, as well as your Letter. I have not heard yet what he has done with the Abstract. Perhaps you have. I have got it printed in London; but not in *the Works of the Learned*; there having been an Article with regard to my Book, somewhat abusive, printed in that Work, before I sent up the Abstract.²⁰

¹⁶There are at least two exceptions among the reviews attributed to Barbeyrac: the review of J.-A. Turretin, *De sacrae scripturae interpretandae*. and that of J. de Heiss, *Histoire de l'Empire*, items 1146 and 675-6 in Lagarrigue's list. See *L'Histoire externe*, 49-52, 121-2, 209-10, 316, 350.

¹⁷See, for example, the reviews, attributed to Barbeyrac, of *L'Etat & les délices de la Suisse; Christianity as old as Creation; Memoires concernant la theologie la morale; Enquiry into the Life and Times of Homer; Examination of the Scheme of Church-Power; and Institution d'un prince*, in, respectively, *Bibliothèque raisonnée*, 4 (1730), 128-50; 5 (1730), 251-82; 10 (1733) 96-110; 15 (1735), 243-86; 16 (1736), 418-63; and 26 (1741), 427-57. (Reviews numbered 1093, 1131, 273, 376, 591, and 566 in the list compiled by Lagarrigue, *L'Histoire externe*, 288-354.)

¹⁸Letter of 29 May 1742, cited by Moore, 'William Smith and the Reviews of Hume's *Treatise* in the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*' ['William Smith and Hume's *Treatise*'] (Conference on Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Enlightenment, Univ. of Victoria, 1993), 36

¹⁹The sale catalogue of Barbeyrac's library was issued as *Bibliotheca Barbeyraciana* (Groningen, 1744). The auction began 30 March 1745. A search (necessarily incomplete) of the auction catalogues of those involved directly or indirectly with the *Bibliothèque raisonnée* or other French-language journals in Amsterdam has failed to find the *Treatise* or the *Abstract*. However, the library of one Greffier Fagel, auctioned in 1802, did contain a copy of vols. 1 and 2 of the *Treatise* and the *Abstract*. See *Bibliotheca Fageliana, a catalogue of the valuable and extensive Library of the Greffier Fagel, of the Hague* (London: 1802), 88, items 1945, 1959. These items are now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. A further search for such auction catalogues could yield interesting results.

²⁰Letter of 4 March 1740, *Letters of David Hume*, 1: 37-8.

Moore gives three reasons for his attribution:

(1) He argues that it was Hutcheson who sent to his old friend Wm. Smith a manuscript of the *Abstract*, and that at the same time he sent Smith the critical comments that constitute up to one-third of the review of Book 1. These critical comments are said to be ‘in every case consistent with what is known of Hutcheson’s logic and metaphysics as set out in his . . . Latin compends and in his better known English writings and correspondence’²¹

(2) He argues that when Wm. Smith ‘undertook to review book 3 of the *Treatise* . . . he again consulted Hutcheson’. It would have been odd (we are told) if he had not done so given Hutcheson’s stature as a moral philosopher. In addition, ‘None of the reviewer’s concerns are intelligible if one supposes that the review was written by Barbeyrac or La Chapelle, the regular contributors to the journal: their moral philosophies, like [Wm.] Smith’s were natural law theories, modeled on Pufendorf, Locke, and Cumberland. The critical perspective of the reviewer, on the other hand, was particularly and peculiarly Hutcheson’s . . .’²²

(3) ‘There is enough correspondence in Dutch and French archives . . . to rule out the usual contributors as author of these reviews.’²³

We are unconvinced by these reasons.

(1) We suggest that the most likely reading of Hume’s admittedly meagre remarks about the *Abstract* leads to the conclusion that it was Hume himself who sent a manuscript of the *Abstract* to Wm. Smith. In this remark Hume first hopes two things: that ‘Mr Smith’ has received the copy of the *Treatise* sent by his publisher, John Noon, and that he has received a letter sent by Hutcheson. He then says: ‘I have not heard yet what he has done with the *Abstract*. Perhaps you have’. This may indicate that Hume himself, because he sent the *Abstract* to Smith, had reason to hear from Smith about it. Because he had not so heard, he wonders if Hutcheson had. In short, Hume seems to be saying: ‘John Noon sent the *Treatise*; you (Hutcheson) sent a letter; I sent the *Abstract*; I haven’t heard if any of these missives has reached its objective; have you?’²⁴

²¹Moore and Stewart, *ECS* 10; details regarding these materials are not provided in the *ECS* essay, but Moore sketches perceived correspondences between Hutcheson’s writings on metaphysics and logic and the criticisms of *Treatise* I found in the first *BR* review in his ‘William Smith and Hume’s *Treatise*’ (see pp. 13-16). His brief remarks do not convince us that the criticisms made by the first reviewer are distinctively Hutchesonian.

²²Moore and Stewart, *ECS* 10.

²³*BPHSI*, 25. No references to this correspondence are provided in this paper. Elsewhere Moore makes the apparently quite different claim that ‘there is no evidence, no mention of the two reviews in any of the surviving correspondence of these men,’ of, i.e. Barbeyrac, Des Maizeaux, or La Chapelle (‘William Smith and Hume’s *Treatise*’, 16).

²⁴The anonymous reviewer may also have had a printed copy of the *Abstract* that had been sent to Wm. Smith by Noon, for the latter had been sending books for review in the *Bibliothèque raisonnée* since its inception in 1728. Indeed, Noon had more books reviewed in the *Bibliothèque raisonnée* than any other British publisher. It would be surprising, then, if Noon, who had sent the two volumes of the *Treatise* to Smith, had not also sent him a copy of the *Abstract*, perhaps via Des Maizeaux, or possibly through the French bookseller, Nourse. Moreover, it is indisputably the case that a notice of the publication of the *Abstract* appeared in the spring 1740 issue of the *Bibliothèque raisonnée*, the issue in which the review of vols. 1 and 2 appeared. Consequently, it may be that both Hume and Noon sent copies of the *Abstract* to Smith.

(2) Moore asks us to suppose that on two occasions Hutcheson pretended to be giving assistance to Hume, a young philosopher who had sought that help, but then blind-sided him with covert criticisms sent to Smith. In the first instance the scenario would have been of this kind: ‘Yes, David Hume, I’ll help you publicize your work. You make a copy of the *Abstract* for my old friend Wm. Smith, and send it to him, and in the meantime I’ll write to him and encourage him to publish it in *BR*. I did this for my colleague Robert Simson, and Smith published word-for-word what Simson wrote and I sent him.’²⁵ But this time, instead of sending Smith a positive letter or the exact words of the *Abstract*, Hutcheson is supposed to have sent a critical letter – to have listed the faults of the book he is recommending for review.

The second scenario would have gone like this: Hutcheson offered to recommend Vol. 3 of the *Treatise* to his own publisher, Thomas Longman. Hume asked for this letter, and Hutcheson wrote it, this being a safe inference to draw from the fact that Longman did publish vol. 3 of the *Treatise*. But then, having given Hume this substantial assistance, Hutcheson is again supposed to have blind-sided his younger colleague by covertly criticizing, in the *BR* review, the same book that he had recommended to Longman. Both these scenarios attribute to Hutcheson a deviousness or duplicity inconsistent with his known moral character.²⁶

(3) As we show below, at least one regular contributor to *BR*, La Chapelle, was both capable of, and experienced at, reviews in several ways like those of vols. 1 and 3 of the *Treatise*. That is, contrary to Moore’s claim, the critical portions of the *BR* reviews of the *Treatise* are well within La Chapelle’s interests and capabilities.

(4) Comprehensive study of the relevant archival material has turned up only one letter bearing on the authorship of these reviews, namely, the letter from Smith to Des Maizeaux cited above.²⁷

(5) We take it that all parties agree that the review of vol. 3 of the *Treatise* is a critical, not a positive, review of that work – all agree that the review raises substantive objections to Hume’s moral philosophy. But we note that just insofar as this review is critical of Hume’s moral philosophy, it is on at least three occasions equally, if sometimes indirectly, critical of the moral philosophy of Hutcheson.

(a) The review raises doubts about philosophical attempts to provide a foundation for morality. The ‘metaphysician who undertakes to demonstrate the principles of natural right’, we are told, ‘wastes his time and his effort’. Such abstract approaches, because they are understood by so few, can be of limited benefit. More importantly, it is suggested that this method may be ‘really harmful to religion, in spite of the intention

²⁵Hutcheson’s letter to Smith, describing Simson’s work on conic sections, was published in *BR* 14.2 (1735), 476-83. A draft of this letter, in Simson’s hand, is in the Glasgow University Library, MS. Gen. 196; see Moore and Stewart, *BPHSI*, 27.

²⁶Hume wrote to Hutcheson: ‘I must trouble you to write that Letter you was so kind as to offer to Longman the Bookseller . . . Tis in order to have some Check upon my Bookseller, that I wou’d willingly engage with another, & I doubt not but your Recommendation wou’d be very servicable to me, even tho you be not personally acquainted with him’ (*Letters of David Hume* 1: 38). On Hutcheson’s character, see W. R. Scott, *Francis Hutcheson* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1900), 57-77, 131-45.

²⁷See *L’Histoire externe*, especially 49-75, 317 (items 688-9). Our own study of relevant manuscript materials has been far less comprehensive than that of Dr. Lagarrigue, who has examined more than 7000 unpublished letters of individuals associated with *BR* or with those responsible for it (*L’Histoire externe*, 47).

of the philosophers that use it'.²⁸ Those familiar with Hutcheson will know that he often describes his own philosophical enterprise as something very like that to which the reviewer objects. In his *Inquiry into the Original of our Idea of Beauty and Virtue* (1725), for example, he several times indicates that he is concerned to 'discover', as he puts it, the 'general foundation' of the difference between moral good and evil. In the title of part 2, sect. 3 of this work he tells his readers that, 'The sense of *Virtue*, and the various *Opinions* about it, [are] reducible to one *general Foundation*'.²⁹ In his later *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* (1728), Hutcheson attempted to forestall just such criticism as this reviewer makes, saying: 'If any should look upon some Things in this *Inquiry into the Passions*, as too subtile for common Apprehension, and consequently not necessary for the Instruction of Men in *Morals*, which are the common business of Mankind', let them bear in mind that some have claimed that we have no '*kind, generous Affections*' and that these misleading moralists need to be rebutted. In the introduction to the second part of this work Hutcheson reveals a continued interest in the metaphysics of morals.³⁰

(b) As the review progresses the initial general suspicion of philosophical morals is replaced by a more narrowly focused dissatisfaction. The reviewer is displeased that Hume, having raised the issue of the foundation or source of moral distinctions, denies that the foundation is found in reason and rejects the views of both Clarke and Wollaston as unsound. The author of the *Treatise* 'approves none of what is most approved on this subject'³¹ Hutcheson, too, had rejected the rationalist views of Clarke and Wollaston, and hence again by implication the review is as critical of Hutcheson as it is of Hume.³²

(c) Following a substantial sketch of Hume's arguments showing that moral distinctions cannot derive from reason, the review takes up the positive moral theory of the *Treatise*. Those, the reviewer says, who wonder how this skillful metaphysician explains virtue and vice are told should know that he supposes that:

In a word, according to our author, the mind, as much as the body, has a taste, and that this taste helps it to distinguish that which is right from that which is wrong, in the same manner as we at first glance distinguish that which is beautiful from that which is ugly. It is a matter of sentiment: reasoning has no place in it.

If one wishes to know in what consists the difference between the impressions that right makes on this mental taste, and those made by the wrong, one can instruct oneself only

²⁸*BR* 26, 413.

²⁹*Inquiry*, pp. 101; see also 125, 150, 156.

³⁰*Essay*, pp. v, 205-12. In addition, Hutcheson's important correspondence with Gilbert Burnet was aptly published under the title *Letters between the Late Mr. Gilbert Burnet and Mr. Hutchinson, concerning the True Foundation of Virtue or Moral Goodness* (see n. 33)

³¹*BR* 26, 415-16.

³²For Hutcheson's explicit criticism of Clarke and 'many late Authors' who share his rationalist account of morality, see his *Essay, Illustrations upon the Moral Sense* 2.1, and the *Letters* exchanged with Burnet. For his objections to Wollaston, see *Illustrations* 2.3.

by returning into oneself. What is right gives pleasure and is approved; what is wrong produces pain and is blamed. There is the key to the whole mystery!³³

This is followed by an attempt to restate Hume's theory in 'ordinary language', and then by a lengthy paragraph criticizing him for offering nothing more than an unimproved version of the useless, demonstrably defective moral sense theory of Hutcheson:

In ordinary language, what we have just read amounts, if I am not mistaken, to this. In order to express with precision the difference between right and wrong, it is necessary to state the question in these terms. Why is it that our mind, on a simple view of certain actions, is touched by a sentiment of pleasure that makes it approve them, whereas on the view of other actions it is touched by a contrary sentiment? Many people would be satisfied to reply that it is because we are so made, but for the liking of our author, this is not philosophical enough. It is necessary to say that things happen in this way because our mind, besides its other faculties, has a mental taste that to him is partly natural, but also partly artificial – that is to say, which in part follows from the constitution of our nature, and in part is the product of education, example, conventions and of human laws [*des constitutions humaines*]. With the help of this taste our mind first knows, by the pleasure or pain it experiences, that which is morally good and morally bad, and thus, spared from reasoning, this sentiment suffices for it to choose, without doubt, to embrace virtue and avoid vice.

That is the whole system of our author. When Mr Hutcheson proposed it in his *Recherches sur l'origine des Idées que nous avons de la Vertu & du Bien moral*,³⁴ able people found in it three great flaws.³⁵ Firstly, they did not approve of this supposition of a new mental faculty, intended only to enable our mind to discern right from wrong. They saw this as absolutely useless, and claimed that the mind, given its indisputable capacity to reflect and sense, is adequately furnished with all that which is necessary for it to distinguish good from the evil. Secondly, they observed that in this system the perception of objects is confounded with the sentiments that result from it. On this, Mr. Burnet raised objections that up until now have remained unanswered.³⁶ Thirdly, and last, they did not conceal that this *mental taste*

³³BR 26, 421-2.

³⁴Reviewer's note: '*An Inquiry concerning the Original of our Ideas of Virtue and Moral Good*. 8°.' As David Raynor has pointed out to us, the title cited is that of the second part of Hutcheson's longer work, *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (London, 1725).

³⁵'Voilà tout le Système de notre Auteur. Quand Mr. Hutcheson le proposa dans ses *Recherches sur l'origine des Idées que nous avons de la Vertu & Bien moral*, d'habiles gens y trouvèrent trois grand défauts' (BR 26.2, 423).

³⁶The review here cites, in a note, the '*Letters between the late Mr. Gilbert Burnet and Mr. Hutcheson, concerning the True Foundation of Virtue*' (1735), and then goes on to report: 'No philosophical controversy has ever been conducted, by both parties, with so much spirit, candour and politeness, as in these letters of Messrs. Burnet and Hutcheson. One

[*Goût spirituel*], or this *moral sentiment*, whatever one wishes to call it, is clearly linked to fanaticism, and can at least very easily open the door to the excesses of enthusiasm. Dr. Berkeley sharply exposed this difficulty in his *Alciphron*,³⁷ and made it clear that nothing would be more arbitrary than the ideas of right and wrong if these depended on such an inner taste. I do not understand how is it that our author did not find it appropriate to examine the objections of these scholars. They would have opened a beautiful field for his speculations, and for his profound metaphysics. Perhaps is it modesty, perhaps even prudence. How can one add anything to the [p. 425] ingenious efforts that Mr. Hutcheson has opposed to Mr. Burnet's reflections on this topic?

In short, Hume is severely criticized for offering an over-complicated theory, the theory of a moral sense, when no theory is needed, *and when, furthermore, any competent philosopher would already know that this theory, a theory explicitly attributed to Hutcheson, has been shown to be: (i) useless and redundant; (ii) philosophically confused (it confounds the perception of objects with the sentiments such perception produces); and (iii) a tool of enthusiasm or even fanaticism.* The reviewer goes on to criticize Hume for failing to attempt to rescue this sorry theory, but for present purposes we point out that the reviewer's criticism of Hutcheson is here neither indirect or implicit. The shortcomings of Hume's theory of moral perception are precisely the substantial shortcomings of Hutcheson's theory. We suggest that it is highly unlikely that Hutcheson would have criticized Hume by pointing out that the moral theory of the *Treatise* has exactly the same flaws that competent critics have found in Hutcheson's own theory.³⁸

(4) The reviewer supposes the author of the *Treatise* is an Englishman, something that Hutcheson, who cared about such things (despite the many years he spent in Scotland, he thought of himself as an Irishman), is unlikely to have done.

can without reservation offer them as a perfect model for this kind of dispute.' Two remarks are in order here. First, we seriously doubt that Hutcheson would have written such an adulatory account of his own behavior. Second, Hutcheson broke off the correspondence with Burnet, which first appeared in the *London Journal* in 1725, so that he could prepare a less hurried response. This he gave in his *Illustrations upon the Moral Sense* 1728), where, he says, he had 'endeavour'd to leave no Objections of his unanswer'd' (*Essay*, xxi). The publication of the cited edition of the letters between Burnet and Hutcheson was reported *BR* 16.1 (1735), in the *Literary News* from London.

³⁷Reviewer's note: '*Alciphron; or, The Minute Philosopher*. Dial. III.'

³⁸Moore offers an explanation of how this passage, critical of Hutcheson's theory, could have been written by Hutcheson himself: He says: 'This was a remarkable intervention by a reviewer who was consistently critical of the author for his lack of modesty. Would Hutcheson have demanded such unswerving loyalty, not to say adulation? Certainly, Hutcheson did not discourage discipleship of this kind among his followers in Dublin. [This claim is supported by a brief note: 'See the contributions of Arbuckle and others to the *Dublin Weekly Journal*, 1725'] An obsequious deference to the leader was characteristic of the correspondence addressed to the patron of the "friends of virtue" in Dublin, [to, that is, the] Viscount Molesworth. If Hume was indeed a faithful follower of Hutcheson's, as he seemed to be pretending, why had he not defended his mentor from his critics? The implication of the reviewer's rhetorical questions was clear. Hume merely appeared to be a follower of Hutcheson's. In fact he was nothing of the kind.' ('William Smith and Hume's *Treatise*', 25)

Armand de La Chapelle. If the two reviews have one author, he is most likely to have been La Chapelle. We have positive grounds for this conclusion. It is not just that we have shown the reviews unlikely to have been the work of Des Maizeaux, Barbeyrac, or Hutcheson.

(1) The hypothesis that La Chapelle reviewed the *Treatise*, a work on moral philosophy, is consistent with what we know about the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*. Wm. Smith as director of *BR* thought La Chapelle an informed and spirited scholar,³⁹ and would surely have known of his interest in moral philosophy. La Chapelle had translated a part of the *Tatler*, Richard Bentley's *Remarks upon a Late Discourse of Free-thinking*, and Humphrey Ditton's *Discourse concerning the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. This last work includes a lengthy discussion of the nature of moral certainty and belief. In his translation of the work La Chapelle adds notes referring to Toland, Locke, Hobbes, Stillingfleet, Pierre-Daniel Huet, Fontenelle and Descartes.⁴⁰ In the *Bibliothèque angloise*, La Chapelle had reviewed Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* and Blewitt's critique thereof (*An Enquiry whether a General Practice of Virtue Tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Disadvantage of a People?*), as well as Wollaston's *Religion of Nature Delineated* and *An Enquiry into the Cause and Origin of Natural Evil* by John Clarke (brother of the more famous Samuel Clarke). He also discussed Hutcheson's account of the idea of beauty.⁴¹ In *BR* he reviewed two editions of Boullier's *Essai philosophique sur l'ame des betes* (the second edition of which is also concerned with moral certainty and belief),⁴² F.-A.

³⁹On being informed that La Chapelle was ill, Smith wrote to Des Maizeaux on 2 December, 1738: 'If I lose him [La Chapelle], I will lose the person I trust the most among the French clergy, in his quality as a man of spirit, a scholarly man, and a man of honour, a skilful journalist and excellent translator.' Fortunately, as Smith's letter goes on to say, La Chapelle quickly recovered and participated actively in the *BR* during the final four years (1738-41) of Smith's directorship of the journal. See British Library Add MS 4288 ff. 150-1. *L'Histoire externe*, 278-354, items 51, 365, 403, 452, 550-2, 846, 857-9, 1082, 1201, and possibly 1007 and 1015, in the list provided by Lagarrigue, are La Chapelle's known contributions to *BR* during this four year period.

⁴⁰Humphrey Ditton, *La Religion chrétienne démontrée par la Résurrection de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ*, trans. Armand de La Chapelle (Amsterdam, 1728); see pp. 85, 164-5, 280, 282, 302, 304, 308, 309, and 325.

⁴¹The *Bibliothèque angloise, ou Histoire littéraire de Grande Bretagne [BA]* (1717-28). Of the fifteen volumes of the *Bibliothèque angloise*, the final ten were written by La Chapelle. The review of Clarke is found in *BA* 7 (1720), 472-501 and 9 (1721), 420-73; of Wollaston, in *BA* 12 (1725), 369-446 and 13 (1725), 1-97; of Mandeville, in *BA* 13 (1725), 97-125; of Blewitt in *BA* 13 (1725), 198-225; of Hutcheson, a Notice of the *Inquiry* in 'Nouvelles littéraires', *BA* 13 (1725), 280-2, and a response to Hutcheson in 'Nouvelles littéraires' *BA* 13 (1726), 509-18.

⁴²J. J. Wetstein, co-publisher of *BR*, attributed these reviews of Boullier to La Chapelle. In a letter to the abbé Jourdain, 30 September 1737, about vol. 19 of *BR*, Wetstein says: 'Mr. la Chapelle, qui est l'auteur du premier article dans la *Bibliothèque raisonnée* [of the first article in issue 19.1] aussi bien que du premier extrait sur l'ame des Betes n'épargne pas son confrère Boullier' (BNP, AR 63, fo 161r, cited by Lagarrigue, *L'Histoire externe*, 73n. In the same note, Lagarrigue also cites in evidence of La Chapelle's authorship of these reviews MS. C13, pp. 9-10, Bibliothèque Wallonne, Amsterdam).

Deslandes's *Histoire critique de la philosophie*, and Christian Wolff's *Theologia naturalis*.⁴³ La Chapelle had the background and interest to write both reviews of the *Treatise*.

(2) The orientation of the *BR* reviews of the *Treatise* is consistent with La Chapelle's known philosophical interests and views, which are not, *pace* Moore, marked by a commitment to natural law theories. La Chapelle's translation of Ditton's *Discourse concerning the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* reveals his interest in theories of belief and moral certainty, and in the problems emerging from a probabilistic approach to non-demonstrative knowledge. His review of the second edition of Boullier's *Essai philosophique sur l'ame des bêtes* confirms this interest, and finds him drawing a distinction between 'to know' (*savoir*) and 'to believe' (*croire*), where the former is the result of 'evidence that strikes us personally' (*qui nous frappe nous-mêmes*) and the result of testimony.⁴⁴ He objects to Boullier's attempt to ground the certainty of matters of fact in the principle of sufficient reason, favouring instead Ditton's view that the certainty of belief is the product of an implicit *obligation*.⁴⁵ Testimony, when properly given, is generally reliable, and scepticism with respect to it would result in a total destruction of social institutions.⁴⁶ La Chapelle was also interested in probability and statistical tables, as an article showing acquaintance with the work of William Petty on the rate of mortality in London shows.⁴⁷ Among the known regular and occasional reviewers of the *BR*, La Chapelle was the one most interested in, and most competent to discuss, the theory of belief found in vol. 1 of the *Treatise*.

The reviews La Chapelle wrote while still resident in London (until 1725) and focusing on British books show him to have taken an interest in British moral philosophy. This interest extended to discussions in the *Bibliothèque Angloise* of works by Wollaston and Hutcheson, two moral philosophers whose names reappear in the review of *Treatise* 3. We note that La Chapelle's positive reviews of the works of John Clarke and Wollaston have a parallel in the positive attitude toward rationalistic moral theories in the *BR* discussion of vol. 3.

(3) The style of the reviews of the *Treatise* is recognizably that of La Chapelle. The *BR* reviews of the *Treatise* are *critical* reviews. Of the *BR* contributors during the first phase of the journal (1728-41), La Chapelle was the one most likely to include critical or negative comment in his reviews, and appears to have been the only one who openly advocated the inclusion of such comment. It is, he said, 'necessary that the criticism of a journal be a little argumentative (*raisonnée*); it is necessary to include discussion and proofs, and

⁴³These reviews are attributed to La Chapelle by Lagarrigue; see *L'Histoire externe*, 297, 307, 354. During the period it was under Smith's direction (1729-41), *BR* reviewed very little philosophy. For details, see the Appendix at the end of the paper.

⁴⁴*BR* 19.1 (1737), 12.

⁴⁵Humphrey Ditton, *A Discourse concerning the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 2nd edn. (London, 1714), 72-3.

⁴⁶*BR* 19.1 (1737), 22-3.

⁴⁷'Avis important sur les Calculs d'Arithmetique Politique, qui regardent la Ville de Londres', *Bibliothèque raisonnée* 25.1 (1740), 164-70. La Chapelle likely has in mind the work by William and Charles Petty, *Several Essays in Political Arithmetick* (London, 1699).

then how is one to avoid raillery and banter if the occasion lends itself to that?⁴⁸ As a result, La Chapelle's reviews typically include critical remarks and digressions, a feature found in the two reviews of Hume's *Treatise*.

La Chapelle's critical attitude typically manifested itself in two criticisms: objections to what he found to be obscure and confusing language, and to unfounded pretensions of originality. Philosophers often fail, he said, to reach the appropriate equilibrium between satisfying the specialist and reaching a larger public. Reviewing Deslandes's *Histoire critique de la philosophie* in 1739, he wrote:

If there is a risk in public speech it is particularly at this juncture. Does one want to be content with stating superficial and ordinary remarks with simplicity? Scholars get bored, close the book and do not open it again. Does one want, on the contrary, to elevate oneself? One becomes unintelligible to ordinary readers, they get tired and discouraged. It is necessary to be skillful enough to strike the exact balance.⁴⁹

Deslandes's *Histoire critique* failed to come close to this exacting standard. There La Chapelle found 'manners of speaking so unnatural' that they 'cause an extreme pain'.⁵⁰ Reviewing Christian Wolff's *Theologia naturalis* in the same year, he observed that it is difficult 'to grasp the truth when it is lost in the labyrinth of a long chain of complicated propositions'.⁵¹ Compare these objections with this passage from the review of *Treatise 3*:

It is sometimes unfortunate to have too much genius and penetration. If one does not bring oneself near enough to the level of the vulgar, one is not understood, and then it is wholly in vain that one delivers to them all these speculations, for their beauties, being too sublime, remain unperceived. Nevertheless, when one intends to reform the ideas of almost all humankind, and to open paths new even to the eyes of philosophers, it would be only natural before all things to forge a language that is simple and clear, which anyone could easily understand. Without this it is impossible to communicate one's ideas, and even more difficult to have them appreciated [*de les faire goûter*].⁵²

⁴⁸'Il faut donc que la Critique d'un Journal soit un peu raisonnée; il y faut de la discussion, & des preuves, & comment est-ce alors que l'on peut éviter la raillerie & le badinage si l'occasion s'en presente?' (BR 3.2 (1729), 380

⁴⁹'Si jamais *la parole a ses perils*, c'est en particulier dans cette rencontre. Veut-on se borner à énoncer avec simplicité des observations superficielles & communes? Les Savans s'ennuyent, ferment le Livre, & n'y reviennent plus. Veut-on au contraire s'élever? On se rend inintelligible à la plupart des Lecteurs, on les fatigue & ils se dégoûtent. Il faut donc être assez habile pour saisir un juste milieu' (BR 20.2 (1738), 267.

⁵⁰BR, 20.2 (1738), 269.

⁵¹BR, 20.2 (1738), 287.

⁵²BR 26.2 (1741), 412-13.

La Chapelle also appears to take pleasure in showing that an author's pretensions to originality are ill-founded. One of the earliest casualties of this rhetorical weapon was Hutcheson, of whose *Inquiry* he gave a short notice in *Bibliothèque Angloise*. La Chapelle accused Hutcheson of plagiarizing from Jean-Pierre Crousaz. Not only did Hutcheson 'daringly repeat the original' (*se débiter hardiment pour l'Original*), but he also pretended to be 'the first to have clarified the chaos that hitherto reigned in this philosophical field.'⁵³ Boullier's *Essai philosophique* received the same treatment. Where Boullier pretends to open new philosophical paths by producing a treatise on moral certainty, La Chapelle points out that the matter is far from being novel and that Humphrey Ditton had written an excellent book (a book La Chapelle had translated into French) dealing extensively with this topic, a book that Boullier has not so much as mentioned.⁵⁴ Wolff's lack of originality is similarly revealed. The German philosopher is 'persuaded that no one before him has produced a clear and solid demonstration of the existence and attributes of God'. Not so, according to La Chapelle: Wolff's system has already been taught by 'skillful Jesuits' who had followed St. Augustine.⁵⁵

The review of vol. 3 of the *Treatise* is consistent with this pattern. Although there is some concession to the originality of the author,⁵⁶ the reviewer goes on to point out, as we have seen above, that Hume's account of the moral sense is simply Hutcheson warmed over. He also says that Hume's account of justice is simply 'Hobbes's system clothed in a new fashion'.⁵⁷

(4) There are some characteristic linguistic similarities between La Chapelle's earlier reviews and the reviews of the *Treatise*. La Chapelle is fond of 'candidly' (*ingenuement* or *avec ingénuité*) admitting his ignorance about some of the issues raised by the authors he is reviewing.⁵⁸ There is also a unique similarity between the concluding words of La Chapelle's review of the *Fable of the Bees* and a remark near the end of the review of vol. 3 of the *Treatise*. Concluding the earlier review La Chapelle says:

⁵³BA 13.1 (1725), 281.

⁵⁴La Chapelle observes that it is 'un peu surprenant, que Mr. B[oullier] qui paroît aimer assez à citer, ne fasse mentions nulle part de l'excellent Traité de Mr. Ditton, sur la Résurrection de J.C. où il traite de l'Evidence morale avec beaucoup de netteté & de précision, & dans un ordre admirable. Mr. B[oullier] n'a pas pu ignorer qu'il y a un tel Livre: cependant il ne fait pas semblant de le connoître; sans doute afin de ne pas paroître contredire ce qu'il dit dans son Epître Dédicatoire à Mr. De Fontenelle, que la *matière* de la Certitude morale est presque neuve' (BR 19.1 (1737), 45. Cf. Humphry Ditton, *A Discourse concerning the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (London, 1712); and *La Religion Chrétienne démontrée par la Résurrection de Notre Seigneur*, trans. Armand de La Chapelle (Amsterdam, 1728).

⁵⁵BR 20.2 (1738), 286-7.

⁵⁶BR 26.2 (1741), 415.

⁵⁷BR 26.2 (1741), 427. La Chapelle had earlier objected to Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* for much the same reason that he objects to Hume's account of justice. See *Bibliothèque angloise* 13.1 (1725), 97-125.

⁵⁸See e.g. *Bibliothèque Angloise* 9.2 (1721), p. 441; BR 20.2, (1738), p. 270; and ¶11 of the review of vol. 3 of the *Treatise*. La Chapelle is also fond of the term *l'Anonyme*, a term he uses four times to refer to the anonymous author of the *Treatise* in the review of vols. 1 and 2 of that work. This term is not used by Barbeyrac when referring to anonymous authors; see reviews 273, 376, 566, 591, 602, 606, 681, 1093, 1131-2, and 1144 in Lagarrigue's list, pp. 289-350.

En voilà sans doute assez, & peut-être beaucoup trop, pour faire connoître la Morale de l'Auteur, ses principes, ses vûes, son stile et sa maniere de raisonner.⁵⁹

In the latter he remarks:

Mais en voilà plus qu'il n'en faut pour donner une idée de la Morale du profond Auteur de toutes les belles découvertes, que le *Traité sur la Nature Humaine* contient.⁶⁰

Taken together, these considerations lend substantial support to the hypothesis that it was La Chapelle who wrote the *BR* review of *Treatise* 3.

Who were Pierre Des Maizeaux and Armand de La Chapelle? Both were Huguenots born in France in the decade before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and both left France when still young.

Pierre Des Maizeaux was born near Auvergne, the son of a Calvinist pastor. He and his family moved to Avenches, in Switzerland in 1685, and Pierre went on to study at Basel (1688?), at the Lyceum in Berne (1690), and finally at the Academy in Geneva. (1690). Having decided not to become a pastor (a decision for which his father never forgave him), and having done distinguished work for teachers with connections to Pierre Bayle, Des Maizeaux went to Holland in 1699. He there met not only Bayle, but also Jean Le Clerc and Benjamin Furly. The latter two had close connections with John Locke, and all three with Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury. By the summer of 1699 Des Maizeaux was in England with letters of recommendation to both Locke and Shaftesbury. He was thereafter supported financially by, among others, Shaftesbury, Joseph Addison, and Anthony Collins. From 1710, until Collins's death in 1729, Des Maizeaux spent long periods with Collins and is thought to have had a hand in the development of the latter's defense of free-thinking (*A Discourse of Free-thinking*, 1713). Thereafter Des Maizeaux was instrumental in the publication of the collected works of Bayle (*Oeuvres diverses*, 4 vols., 1727-31) and of a new translation of his *Historical and Critical Dictionary* (London, 1734-8), to which Des Maizeaux prefixed a lengthy biography of Bayle. To sum up: Des Maizeaux spent his early years among those who dissented from the established religion of France, and then dissented from them. Much of his adult life was spent in close association with English dissenters and free-thinkers. Bearing these associations in mind, we may conclude that Des Maizeaux's comment about vols. 1 and 2 of the *Treatise* ('Those who desire something new will find what they want here.

⁵⁹'This is certainly enough, and perhaps too much, to reveal the morals of this author -- his principles, his views, his style, and his manner of reasoning' (*Bibliothèque Angloise* 13.1 (1725), 124).

⁶⁰'But this is indeed more than is necessary to give an idea of the morals of the profound author of all the beautiful discoveries contained in the *Treatise of Human Nature*' (*BR* 26 (1741), 427).

The author argues on his own terms, he goes thoroughly into things, and he follows new ways of thinking. He is very original.’) is not so bland as it may now seem.⁶¹

Armand de La Chapelle was born at Auzillac, in Saintonge (now Charente Inférieure). He studied first at the College of Bordeaux, but after 1685 was sent to London to study with Isaac Dubourdies, pastor of one of the French churches there. By the time he was eighteen his studies of church history and theology had qualified him to become a pastor. After two years in Ireland, he was in 1707 named pastor at Wandsworth, near London, and in 1711, to three united churches in London. In 1725 he accepted a call to the pastorate of the Walloon church at The Hague. In the meantime, he had in 1719 become editor of the *Bibliothèque angloise*, and he continued to produce that journal until its demise in 1727. The following year he joined the editorial team of *BR*, and continued this connection until 1742, when Wm. Smith ceased to be director of that journal. Some of his contributions to *BR*, insofar as they are relevant to this paper, have been sketched above.⁶²

It cannot be said that La Chapelle was, like Des Maizeaux, a confidant of free-thinkers. But La Chapelle was a religious dissenter, and he took the view that even libertine views should be published and discussed. He told his readers that Mandeville’s *Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue* undermines ‘the foundation of morals, which suppose an essential difference between vice and virtue’, and that Mandeville’s commentary on his poetic *Fable of the Bees*, which draws heavily from Montaigne, Bayle, and others, ‘makes things worse, if that is possible’. It does this because its author, having shown ‘the corruption of humankind’, does not condemn, but eulogizes this condition. La Chapelle then explains why he is going on to report on some of Mandeville’s most licentious passages:

I do not know whether reasonable readers will appreciate my effort. I mean readers who have conscience and religion. Those lacking these will doubtless be charmed at finding here a system of libertinage and the commonplaces of debauchery. But that which will please those individuals can only scandalize other people. Would I not do better to follow the taste of the latter? Some will, perhaps, answer ‘yes’ to this question. Nevertheless, would you believe me if I very sincerely and with all the simplicity of my heart, said that this answer does not appear to me to be sufficiently thought out? It is my settled view (*sentiment*) that what we call *dangerous* books are dangerous only because of the mysterious air we give them. If instead of banning them, or of talking only secretly about them, we would meet them with good responses – with, that is, solid and well-written responses, for those two things are equally necessary – what would happen? The libertine works would get all the contempt they deserve, and truth, crowned with a new victory, would only be more triumphant. I know only of bad

⁶¹These biographical details are drawn from Joseph Almagor, *Pierre Des Maizeaux (1673-1745), Journalist and English Correspondent for Franco-Dutch Periodicals, 1700-1720* (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1989), 1-5. Des Maizeaux also translated into French a part of Shaftesbury’s *Characteristics*, and published, in both French and English, the collected works (to which he contributed a biography) of another free-thinker, Saint Evremond.

⁶²These biographical details are drawn from D. F. Bond, ‘Armand de la Chapelle and the First French Version of the *Tatler*’, in C. Camden, ed., *Restoration and Eighteenth-century Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1963]), 161-84, at 161-6.

causes that gain or can gain from the suppression of books and arguments from the opposite point of view. If I had to justify this, I think I would not be short of proofs. I may be wrong, but that is nonetheless my opinion and not until I am led to change it will I scruple to review *dangerous* pieces, while taking care to interweave with them my observations in order to show their weakness, or including the refutations that others have published.⁶³

Although it is not obvious that La Chapelle found Hume's *Treatise* to be dangerous, he did 'interweave' into his reviews of it his own observations and criticisms. In doing so he gave us the first philosophically significant response to Hume's science of human nature.

Post-Script. It was only a few months before his death in August 1776 that Hume made his famous comment on the fate of the *Treatise*:

Never literary Attempt was more unfortunate than my *Treatise* of human Nature. It fell *dead-born from the Press*; without reaching such distinction as even to excite a Murmur among the Zealots.

Those who cite this famous remark all too often overlook the historical context Hume gives it. Just prior to saying the *Treatise* fell dead-born, he had said:

In the end of 1738, I published my *Treatise*; and immediatly went down to my Mother and my Brother, who lived at his Country house and was employing himself, very judiciously and successfully in the Improvement of his Fortune.

And just after, he goes on to say:

But being naturally of a cheerful and sanguine temper, I very soon recovered the blow, and prosecuted with great ardour my studies in the country. In 1742, I printed at Edinburgh the first part of my *Essays*: the work was favourably received, and soon made me entirely forget my former Disappointment.⁶⁴

In other words, when Hume said that the *Treatise* fell dead-born from the press, he was speaking about exactly the period, 1739-41, in which the *Treatise* was noticed and reviewed in *BR*, and thus we know that the *Treatise* did not come into the world unnoticed. It was, for its time, widely reviewed. There were three notices and five reviews of the *Treatise*, as well as a substantive (and critical) letter to the editor of *Commonsense*.⁶⁵ One of

⁶³*Bibliothèque angloise* 13.1 (1725), 110-12. M. A. Stewart has reminded me that La Chapelle's view is in some respects similar to that expressed by John Milton in his *Areopagitica*.

⁶⁴*My Own Life*.

⁶⁵There were five notices of vols. 1 and 2 of the *Treatise*, and also two brief notices of the *Abstract*. For details about these items, see D. F. Norton, 'An Historical Account of *A Treatise of Human Nature*, from its Inception to the Time

the reviews, and one we know Hume had read, that in the *History of the Works of the Learned*, does at times appear to be at least the murmuring of a zealot.

What, then, are we to make of Hume's 'dead-born from the Press'? Are we to conclude that he did not value these reviews? That he did not count them as genuine notice of the *Treatise*? That by 1776 he had forgotten about them? That a dead-born *Treatise* suited well the literary history of himself that he hoped to promote?⁶⁶ Whatever may account for Hume's famous claim, the *Treatise* did receive significant attention in the years immediately following its publication. And the most complete coverage of it was that published in the *Bibliothèque raisonnée*, and written, if we are correct, by Pierre Des Maizeaux and Armand de La Chapelle.

Appendix

During the thirteen years that *BR* was directed by Wm. Smith it reviewed approximately 465 books (Lagarrigue, *Histoire externe*, 202). Of these, just over twenty could be, sometimes using the term loosely, classified as *philosophy*. Further divided into present categories, these works were:

Five works in logic (in the 18th-century sense): Locke, *Essay concerning humane understanding*, trans. Coste; Mein, *Two Dissertations Concerning Sense, and the Imagination*;⁶⁷ two works by Crousaz, *Examen du pyrrhonisme* and *Logique*; and Hume's *Treatise*, vol. 1.

Six works in moral theory: Barbeyrac, *Traité de la morale des pères de l'église*; two editions of Boullier's *Essai philosophique sur l'ame des betes*; Mandeville, *Fable of the Bees*; Roebuck, [*Philosophical Dissertation on Suicide*]; Hume, *Treatise*, vol. 3.

Five works on natural law, three of which could be classed as moral theory: Pufendorf's *Le droit de la nature et des gens* and his *Les devoirs de l'homme et du citoyen*. The other three were by Heineccius: *Historia juris civilis romani, ac germanici*; *Elementa juris naturae et gentium*; and *Elementa juris civilis secundum ordinem Institutionem*.

Seven works in the philosophy of religion: Ditton, *La religion chrétienne démontrée par la resurrection*; [anonymous] *Essay philosophique sur la Providence*; Tindal, *Christianity as Old as the Creation*; Turnbull, *Philosophical Enquiry Concerning the Connexion Between the Doctrines and Miracles of Jesus Christ*; [anonymous] *Memoires concernant la theologie et la morale*; Cudworth, *Systema intellectuale huius universi seu De Veris Naturae Rerum*; and Wolff, *Theologia naturalis methodo scientifica pertractata*.

Three miscellaneous works: Du Fresnoy, ed. *Refutation des erreurs de Benoit de Spinosa*; D'Argens, *Lettres morales et critiques sur les differens etats et les diverses occupations des hommes*; Deslandes, *Histoire critique de la philosophie*.

Four general works having some philosophical content: Bacon, *Opera omnia*; and three works by or about Bayle, all edited and reviewed by Des Maizeaux: *Lettres de Mr. Bayle*, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, and *Lettres a Bayle*.

of Hume's Death', Sect. 7.

⁶⁶This last possibility is one implication of the M. A. Stewart's suggestion that in *My Own Life* Hume was pushing 'the line he wished to promote for posterity'. See 'Two Species of Philosophy', in P. Millican, ed., *Reading Hume on Human Understanding* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press), 67-95, at 81.

⁶⁷On this work see James G. Buickerood, "'The whole exercise of reason": Charles Mein's Account of Rationality', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62 (2002), 639-58.

Vol. 27 of *BR*, an index to the 26 volumes published under the direction of Wm. Smith, lists only nine books under the heading ‘Livres de Philosophie’. These are the two editions of Boullier’s *Essai philosophique sur l’ame des betes*; Mein, *Two Dissertations*; Locke, *Essay concerning Humane Understanding*; Crousaz, *Examen du pyrrhonisme* and *Diverses ouvrages*; Roebuck, [*Philosophical dissertation on suicide*]; Deslandes, *Histoire critique de la philosophie*; Hume, *Treatise of Human Nature*.⁶⁸

⁶⁸We are indebted to Bruno Lagarrigue and David Raynor for comments on a version of this paper that includes a new translation of the *BR* review of vol. 3 of the *Treatise*, and that have enabled us to clarify our discussion here.