**David Hume and the Jacobites[[1]](#footnote-1)**

David Hume (1711-76) was frequently labelled a tory during his lifetime and for two centuries after his death.[[2]](#footnote-2) The scholarly landscape was transformed in the middle decades of the twentieth century when Duncan Forbes influentially described Hume as a ‘sceptical whig’.[[3]](#footnote-3) This had the benefit of being Hume’s own self-labelling, although the limited and local context of his one-off remark, discussed in this article, needs to be highlighted. The ‘sceptical whig’ interpretation of Hume started out at least in part as an inside joke – ‘scientific whiggism’ was a joke about ‘scientific communism’ – and was intended as a way of transcending the tory-whig dichotomy.[[4]](#footnote-4) Unfortunately, it now risks growing into a new orthodoxy, with Hume being regularly called a whig by scholars.[[5]](#footnote-5) Whether this is the best way to think about Hume’s politics can be productively interrogated through the prism of his connections, both personal and intellectual, with Jacobitism.

Superficially, Hume and the Jacobites would seem to be poles apart, and even more so if we take Hume to be a whig. Hume is usually viewed essentially as a man of modern sensibilities. In the contemporary debate between advocates of ancient and modern learning, he favoured the latter camp.[[6]](#footnote-6) He was a religious sceptic and a defender of commercial modernity. By contrast, the Jacobites, with their attachment to monarchy and a deposed royal family to boot, are commonly seen as outdated, backward-looking, and nostalgic. Hume’s appointment as Keeper of the Advocates Library in Edinburgh in 1752 after the long tenure of the famous Jacobite Thomas Ruddiman would thus seem to be a symbolically important event by ushering in ‘Enlightenment’.[[7]](#footnote-7) Without denying that there is some truth to such an analysis, or suggesting that Hume was ever a Jacobite, this essay complicates a familiar picture. Many Scottish Jacobites and non-Jacobites co-existed harmoniously to a surprising degree in the eighteenth century, and Hume’s life and work provides an excellent case study for illustrating this. Like the intellectual history of Jacobitism itself, however, Hume’s relationship with this movement is a neglected topic, at least in proportion to its importance.[[8]](#footnote-8) When considering the various expressions of Jacobitism, we are led to dismiss any simplistic dichotomy between progressive and ‘Enlightenment’ whiggism, on the one hand, and nostalgic and conservative Jacobitism, on the other.

Jacobitism was a defining political question in Hume’s lifetime, and Scotland, the native land of the Stuart dynasty, was in many ways the nerve centre of the cause. Scotland was the centre stage of the two major risings of 1715 and 1745. In addition, Scots were involved in the assassination attempt of William of Orange in 1695, the minor risings in 1708 and 1719, and the Jacobite plots of 1703, 1716-17, 1721-23 and 1750-3, as well as the abortive French invasions of 1692, 1744 and 1759. As a recent survey summarised the dynamics within the three kingdoms, ‘whereas the English drank for Jacobitism and Irish dreamt of Jacobitism, the Scots died for Jacobitism.’[[9]](#footnote-9) In short, the Jacobite question would rarely have been far away from Hume’s mind, at least not before 1760.

In stark contrast with the old orthodoxy and Hume’s reputation in his lifetime, most specialist scholars now prefer to speak of his ‘utter lack of sympathy with the Jacobite cause’.[[10]](#footnote-10) It is true that Hume did not sympathise with the Jacobite *cause* in any meaningful sense*,* even though, as we shall see, he sympathised with the fates of individual Jacobites. I do not wish to give the impression that Hume was at any stage of his life committed to Jacobitism, as once suggested, without evidence, by Hugh Trevor-Roper.[[11]](#footnote-11) However, while Trevor-Roper was mistaken about Hume, he was right about his older friend Henry Home (later Lord Kames), who came from a Jacobite family. Trevor-Roper is also one of the few major historians who has taken seriously the Jacobite contribution to the Scottish Enlightenment.[[12]](#footnote-12) As the example of the young Kames illustrates, even though Hume was never himself a Jacobite, he certainly did not shy away from company with supporters of the Stuart cause.

Intellectual historians and even Scottish Enlightenment scholars have routinely misunderstood and overlooked Jacobitism. The all too familiar line is that ‘Scotland was firmly committed to the Hanoverian constitution’ after the Jacobite defeat at Culloden.[[13]](#footnote-13) This description is misleading since it underplays the plurality of opinions co-existing in Scotland in the eighteenth century, before and after the ‘Forty-five’. Furthermore, Jacobitism was not confined to the Highland clans, often described as ‘barbarian’ in both senses of the word (savage and foreign) by Lowland Scots such as John Home,[[14]](#footnote-14) but ‘permeated throughout Scottish society’.[[15]](#footnote-15) Hume, like Home, was typically Lowland in exhibiting little sympathy for the Highland clans, and he probably regarded them as uncivilised and equally, if not more, foreign as, say, Ireland, Wales and England. However, this does not apply to Lowland Jacobitism. In Edinburgh in the first half of the eighteenth century, the quasi-Jacobite *Caledonian Mercury,* printed by Ruddiman, competed with the whig *Evening Courant.* The former reported enthusiastically about the Jacobite advances during the ‘Forty-five’. After the Jacobite takeover of Edinburgh in September 1745, it was reported that ‘All the publick Offices continue their Business, nor is any Person molested or injured in Person or Property’.[[16]](#footnote-16) It also assisted the Jacobite propaganda campaign by printing Charles Stuart’s proclamations and reviving the controversy of the Glencoe Massacre of 1692.[[17]](#footnote-17)A humorous unpublished pamphlet from 1744 divided Edinburgh’s ‘ladies’ fairly evenly into Jacobites and whigs (despite its title).[[18]](#footnote-18) Shortly after the outbreak of the ‘Forty-five’, Robert Wallace wrote that ‘the number of the Jacobites in Scotland is so great and their interests so considerable that I will honestly confess it gives me a great deal of uneasiness’.[[19]](#footnote-19) In short, Jacobitism was very visible in lowland Scotland for an underground culture.[[20]](#footnote-20)

 As Hume’s writingsand private letters attest, eighteenth-century British public life was dominated by partisan division and party identification, in high politics as well as print culture. Whereas Hanoverian England was split into whigs and tories, categories with several subdivisions, Hume identified the main division in Scotland as between whig and Jacobite.[[21]](#footnote-21) Jacobitism was so common in Hume’s lifetime that any relatively broadminded Scot would have struggled to avoid any contact with adherents of the cause. What really made Hume stand out, however, was that he genuinely sought to treat both parties ‘coolly’ and ‘impartially’.[[22]](#footnote-22) Yet, with time he became especially impatient with whigs, who can usefully be viewed as his main targets, while he was in some interesting ways softer on tories and Jacobites.[[23]](#footnote-23) In the first section, some of Hume’s important Jacobite connections are surveyed. While most of these are known, they have rarely been examined in any detail. The second section considers Hume’s most sustained writings related to Jacobitism in the wake of the ‘Forty-five’. Finally, the third section looks at two Jacobite writers who engaged with Hume’s writings, especially his *History of England*. Disagreement along with striking areas of affinity are both highlighted.

**I**

**Hume’s Jacobite Connections**

Some of the earliest evidence of Hume’s association with a well-known Jacobite was his encounter with Andrew Michael Ramsay (1686-1743) in Paris in the 1730s, where Hume stayed before he moved on to Rheims and subsequently La Flèche, where he wrote *A* *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-40). Writing to a friend from Rheims in September 1734, Hume said that ‘the Chevalier Ramsay…receiv’d me when I was in Paris with all imaginable Kindness’. Ramsay provided Hume with ‘Letters of Recommendation to two of the best Families in Town’, which provided him with a social network in Rheims.[[24]](#footnote-24) To a separate friend, also called Ramsay and possibly the Chevalier’s nephew, Hume said that when he had ‘parted from Paris, the Chevalier Ramsay gave me a [*sic*] his Advice to observe carefully & imitate as much as possible, the manners of the French. For (says he) tho’ the English, perhaps, have more of the real Politeness of the Heart, yet the French certainly have a better way of expressing it.’ Hume went on to disagree with this statement, arguing that even ‘Porters & Coachmen here [in France] are civil’.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Ramsay had impeccable Jacobite credentials, as Hume would certainly have known. He briefly acted as tutor to the Pretender’s two young sons, Charles and Henry, in 1724. In 1735, he married the daughter of James Stuart’s secretary Sir David Nairne and was made a Jacobite baronet. Born into a mixed Episcopalian-Presbyterian household in Ayr in the west of Scotland, he became associated early on with Jacobite-leaning Episcopalians in the east of Scotland with an interest in mystical theology, including Lord Forbes of Pitsligo, whose estates were seized in the wake of the ‘Forty-five’.[[26]](#footnote-26) In 1710 he travelled to the continent, first to the Netherlands, and then to Cambrai in France, where he studied under Archbishop Fénelon. Within six months, Ramsay had converted to Catholicism. In 1723, he wrote an influential biography of Fénelon, a production in which, it has recently been argued, Ramsay manipulated the views of his former teacher for his own Jacobite intentions.[[27]](#footnote-27) In the 1720s, Ramsay wrote works on politics in French, which were quickly translated into English (often by the Jacobite Nathanial Hooke) and published in Edinburgh and London. Ramsay was still cited in the Jacobite press in the 1750s.[[28]](#footnote-28) When Hume met him in the 1730s, he was a celebrity on the back of his *Les voyages de Cyrus* (1727),[[29]](#footnote-29) his election to the Royal Society in 1729 and his DCL degree from Oxford University in 1730. Oxford was a stronghold of Jacobitism in England, and his cause had been promoted by William King of St Mary Hall.

Hume’s encounter with Ramsay in Paris was not his last exchange with the Jacobite man of letters. In May 1740, he sent his recently published *Treatise of Human Nature* to Ramsay.[[30]](#footnote-30) Although admitting that he had not read the work properly yet, Ramsay criticised Hume in a letter to Dr John Stevenson, where he described Hume as ‘far from being a true master of metaphysicks’. Despite this, he continuously refers to Hume as ‘our friend’. He also discusses Hume as a potential translator of his unpublished ‘Chinese Letters’, as suggested by his correspondent. Less than a year after this exchange about Hume, Ramsay died. There appears thus to have been little intellectual affinity between Ramsay and Hume. We should recognise, however, that Hume’s demolition of the ‘original contract’, to borrow Jeremy Bentham’s description,[[31]](#footnote-31) was prefigured in Ramsay’s political writings against Benjamin Hoadly in the late 1710s and early 1720s, of which Hume was likely aware. There is a sense in which Hume picked up the mantle from Ramsay in attacking ‘Lockean’ whiggism, even if he, unlike Ramsay, did so in order to provide a more philosophically robust foundation of the Revolution Settlement rather than to pave the way for a Jacobite restoration.

In 1737, Hume sent Henry Home (Kames) his essay ‘Of Miracles’, instructing him to ‘show it to no Body, except to Mr Hamilton’.[[32]](#footnote-32) This was a reference to the Jacobite poet William Hamilton of Bangour, a close friend of Home and likely also of Hume. Unlike Home, who appears to have changed allegiance during the ‘Forty-five’ (or possibly earlier), Hamilton joined Charles Edward Stuart as a soldier and a propagandist after the Jacobite takeover of Edinburgh.[[33]](#footnote-33) After the defeat at Culloden he went into hiding in the Highlands and later in France along with many other Jacobites. In May 1746, just over a month after Culloden, Hume wrote to his cousin Alexander Home: ‘For God’s sake, think of *Willy Hamilton.*’[[34]](#footnote-34) Hume shared his interest in Hamilton’s poetry with the young Adam Smith, whose first publication was a short, unsigned preface to an anonymous 1748 edition of Hamilton’s *Poems on Several Occasion* (two years before Hamilton’s pardon). Smith’s biographer plausibly proposed that it was Kames who suggested that Smith should write the preface.[[35]](#footnote-35) Felix Waldmann has recently made the reasonable suggestion that it may have been their shared interest in Hamilton’s poems which actually brought Hume and Smith together in the late 1740s, before their first known letters in 1752.[[36]](#footnote-36) In any event, the Hamilton connection demonstrates that Hume (and Smith) were part of the same Scottish intellectual culture as many known Jacobites.

 Hume’s perhaps closest Jacobite friend was Patrick Murray, Lord Elibank, who has given name to one of the last major planned Jacobite plots on English soil in 1751-2, even though his brother Alexander Murray was more actively involved.[[37]](#footnote-37) Hume shared his most important essay on the Jacobite question (‘Of the Protestant Succession’, discussed below) with Elibank ahead of publication. In a letter to Elibank, he joked that ‘I am afraid that your Lordship will differ from me with regard to the Protestant Succession, whose Advantages you will probably rate higher than I have done.’[[38]](#footnote-38) While not ignoring him completely, Hume kept his distance from Elibank’s brother Alexander Murray – or the earl of Westminster as the ‘Old Pretender’ had made him – in Paris when they both resided there in the 1760s,[[39]](#footnote-39) after Murray’s enforced exile. In a letter to Elibank, Hume was careful to stress that this was unrelated to Jacobitism, even though he worked for the British government at the time. He wrote to Elibank:

Shou’d I ascribe the Reason of this Conduct to Mr Murray’s former Behaviour and Principles, which had set him at War with the Government, which had banishd him his Country, which had made it impossible for him, as he confess’d himself, to appear in Lord Hertford’s[[40]](#footnote-40) House; shou’d I have recourse to these Reasons, your Lordship cou’d scarce answer them, and yet you wou’d see so little of my usual Character in this Conduct, that, I am afraid, you wou’d not be entirely satisfy’d.[[41]](#footnote-41)

 In other words, Hume was saying to Elibank that all these would have been entirely defensible reasons for him to avoid the company of Murray, but that Elibank himself knew that this would have been uncharacteristic of Hume. However, Hume’s behaviour had upset Murray, and Hume admitted to Elibank that ‘I believe I was in the wrong when I corresponded so little to Mr Murray’s Friendship, as it is a wrong I wou’d willingly repair, if his Violence wou’d give me an Opportunity.’[[42]](#footnote-42) The real reason for Hume’s uncharacteristic coldness appears to have been the fact that Murray tried to use Hume to get access to the British Embassy.[[43]](#footnote-43) Murray worried Hume when referring to his brother as Hume’s ‘former friend’, which was misleading since Elibank assured Hume that he was ‘mortified to think you could suspect me of siding with my Brother against you’.[[44]](#footnote-44)

 Alexander Carlyle, one of Hume’s friends among the moderate literati and staunch Hanoverian, described Elibank in a noteworthy passage:

Elibank was more enlightened and more profound [than Charles Townshend], and had a mind that embraced the greatest variety of topics, and produced the most original remarks. He was rather a humourist than a man of humour; but that bias of his temper led him to defend paradoxes and uncommon opinions with copiousness and ingenuity that was surprising…He was a Jacobite, and a member of the famous Cocoa-Tree Club [in London]…Soon after the Rebellion of 1745 he took up his residence in Scotland, and his seat being between Dr [William] Robertson’s church and John Home’s, he became intimately acquainted with both, who cured him of his contempt for the Presbyterian clergy, made him change *or soften down* [my italics] his original opinions, and prepared him for becoming a most agreeable member of the Literary Society of Edinburgh, among whom he lived during the remainder of his life admiring and admired. We used to say of Elibank, that were we to plead for our lives, he was the man with whom we would wish to converse for at least one whole day before we made our defence.[[45]](#footnote-45)

This description shows that some of what applies to Hume in the present article also applies to many others in Edinburgh’s intellectual circles, even if few non-Jacobites sailed as close to the wind as Hume. John Ramsay of Ochtertyre wrote that ‘For a number of years Lord Elibank, Lord Kames, and Mr David Hume were considered as a literary triumvirate, from whose judgment, in matters of taste and composition, there lay no appeal.’[[46]](#footnote-46) That one Jacobite, one former Jacobite, and one suspected Jacobite (which is what Hume became in the eyes of many after his *History,* as we see below) could have this standing in Scotland and Edinburgh in mid-eighteenth century tells us a great deal about the country and the city. Elibank’s friendship with Hume appears to have been more longstanding than his connection with Robertson, Carlyle and the other so-called ‘moderates’ which began after the ‘Forty-five’. Elibank called Hume ‘a friend of 30 years standing’ in July 1765.[[47]](#footnote-47)

 Another of Hume’s Jacobite friends and distant relative was George Keith, 10th earl Marischal, one of the prominent military commanders from the ‘Fifteen’. Marischal was equally, if not more, religiously heterodox as Hume. Hume told Boswell in the final months of his life that ‘“One of the men” (or “The man” – I [Boswell] am not sure which) “of the greatest honour that I ever knew is my Lord Marischal, who is a downright atheist. I remember I once hinted something as if I believed in the being of a God, and he would not speak to me for a week.”’[[48]](#footnote-48) Having fought in the ‘Fifteen’, Marischal had been in exile for most of his life when Hume met him in the late 1750s. In 1719, Marischal played a leading role in a failed Jacobite invasion with Spanish involvement.[[49]](#footnote-49) His commitment to the Stuart cause had probably begun to wane before Hume met him, however. The fact that he did not take part in the ‘Forty-five’, although he participated in the negotiations preceding it,[[50]](#footnote-50) was a big blow to the Stuart cause. Charles Edward Stuart wrote to his father from Perth in September 1745, just before the occupation of Edinburgh: ‘I find it a great loss the brave Lord Marischal is not with me, his character is very high in this country, as it must be wherever he is known, I’d rather see him than 1000 French’.[[51]](#footnote-51) In 1751, Marischal started working for Frederick the Great, first as Prussian ambassador to France, where he played a role, albeit an indecisive one, in Jacobite plotting,[[52]](#footnote-52) and then as governor of Neufchâtel. As the 1750s wore on, he distanced himself increasingly from the Jacobite court, and was pardoned by George II in 1759.

 Marischal’s pardon in 1759 enabled him to travel to London, where he met Hume, to whose mother’s family he was distantly related,[[53]](#footnote-53) and who was also staying in London at the time, overseeing the publication of the Tudor volumes of the *History of England.* In October 1762, Marischal described Hume as his ‘good and honored friend’.[[54]](#footnote-54) When Marischal was due to return to Scotland in 1763, his first visit to his native country in forty-eight years, Hume wrote from France to his close friend Adam Ferguson: ‘I had a letter from the Lord Marischal to-day, who tells me, that he is to pass the winter at Edinburgh. Wait often on him: you will like him extremely; carry all our friends to him, and endeavour to make him pass his time as agreeable as possible.’[[55]](#footnote-55) Marischal was a friend of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the one who suggested to Hume that the Genevan philosopher should settle in Britain following the continental outcry about *Émile* and the *Social Contract*. When Hume fell out dramatically with Rousseau three years later, Marischal was ‘much grieved’;[[56]](#footnote-56) he had indeed once hoped that the three of them would retire together in a ‘solitude à trois’.

In the 1760s, Hume asked Marischal for material about the Jacobite risings, at a time when he was still entertaining the possibility of continuing his *History* into the eighteenth century.[[57]](#footnote-57) Eight years later, Ferguson, who had met Marischal at Potsdam on a European tour, brought two fragments of Marischal’s memoirs to Hume.[[58]](#footnote-58) By this stage, Hume was in the last years of his life and had given up the thought of continuing the *History.* However, the episode gives us a hint about what kind of material Hume might have been interested in considering, if had he written a history comprising events such as the ‘Fifteen’. In a letter from Potsdam to Hume, Marischal said that ‘I wish I could see you to answer honestly all your questions, for tho I had my share of follys with others, yet as my intentions were at bottom honest, I should open to you my whole budget, and lett you know many things which are perhaps ill represented, I mean not truly.’[[59]](#footnote-59) We also know that Marischal had told Hume about Charles Edward Stuart’s visits to England in the early 1750s, his conversion to Anglicanism there, and his alleged presence at George III’s coronation.[[60]](#footnote-60)

If Hume had gone forward with his *History,* it is possible that it would have become even more offensive to whigs than his treatment of the seventeenth century. When in Paris, the Scots College gave him access to the memoirs of James II/VII,[[61]](#footnote-61) and he enthusiastically reported that ‘Father Gordon tells me, that there is the same place a great Collection of Letters wrote by K. James after the Revolution…Father Gordon thinks, that it will not be difficult, after the Death of the old Gentlemen at Rome [the ‘Old Pretender’] to procure his Son’s [Charles’s] Consent to the Publication of the whole; which may be of use to throw Light on the English History.’[[62]](#footnote-62) If he had followed Marischal’s suggestion, it is not unthinkable that he would have imputed the collapse of Jacobitism in the 1750s to the increasingly unattractive private character of the ‘Young Pretender’, of whom Marischal ‘had a very bad opinion’,[[63]](#footnote-63) and criticised in his autobiographical fragments delivered to Hume. The Oxford Jacobite William King, whose posthumous *Anecdotes* are a key source for the Elibank Plot in 1750-3, made such an analysis.[[64]](#footnote-64)

One of the Jacobites who engaged most closely with Hume’s work was Sir James Steuart (1713-80).[[65]](#footnote-65) Steuart was, like Hume, a native of Edinburgh, and a relative of William Mure of Caldwell, one of Hume’s ‘oldest and best friends’.[[66]](#footnote-66) On the grand tour of Europe in 1735-40, Steuart met the duke of Ormonde and Marischal in Avignon, and thereafter the ‘Old Pretender’ himself, as well as his son Charles, in Rome.[[67]](#footnote-67) In the run-up to the ‘Forty-five’ he acted as a Jacobite agent in France, in vain seeking foreign assistance for a planned invasion, which prevented him from returning to Britain for almost seventeen years. As late as 1749, he wrote to the ‘Old Pretender’ of his ‘duty and unshaken loyalty’ for ‘your Majesty’.[[68]](#footnote-68) During his enforced exile, Steuart turned to the study of political economy. In *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Oeconomy* (2 vols., 1766), he engaged closely with Hume’s *Political Discourses* (1752)*,* often to disagree, crucially on the question of balance of trade,[[69]](#footnote-69) but he also frequently repeated similar lines of arguments as Hume, whom he referred to as one of the ‘great masters of political reasoning’.[[70]](#footnote-70) Hume had in fact been one of the readers of the manuscript and, according to Steuart’s relative Mure, he was ‘exceedingly pleased with it’.[[71]](#footnote-71) Other evidence suggests that Hume was less impressed, chiefly with its form and style.[[72]](#footnote-72)

Although Steuart returned to Britain after the Peace of Paris in 1763, and Hume from Paris in 1765, Mure’s son bundled them together: ‘He [Hume] and our cousin the late Sir James Stewart [sic] of Coltness came home from Paris about the same time; and I remember, as a boy of five or six years old, being struck with the French cut of their laced coats and bags’.[[73]](#footnote-73) It is certainly possible that Mure’s son would have seen the two together. When Steuart journeyed back to Edinburgh from London in 1766 after having arranged the publication of his *Inquiry* with Andrew Millar, Hume’s publisher, he travelled in the company of Hume. By this time, Steuart had not yet been officially pardoned, but appears to have been permitted to live in Britain as long as he kept quiet. Steuart was finally pardoned in 1772, and, in the new climate in the reign of George III, he even became something of a government adviser when producing reports for the East India Company.[[74]](#footnote-74) Years earlier, Hume seems to have made efforts to help Steuart. An application was presented at a Cabinet meeting by Henry Seymour Conway in 1767 when Hume was his Under-Secretary in the Northern Department. William Rouet (or Raut), retired Glasgow professor in Oriental Languages at Glasgow and cousin of Mure, wrote to Steuart with the assurances that ‘D.H.’ would shortly give him good news.[[75]](#footnote-75) Although it did not turn out as planned, in a letter to Hume on 10 November 1767, Steuart acknowledged ‘The many proofs you have given me of your friendship’.[[76]](#footnote-76) In the same letter, Steuart showered compliments on Hume’s *History*:

The more I read your Historythe more I admire you. Don’t endeavour by anymore notes to show that there was no House of Commons until Henry III.: it is evident…Every writer before you has gone upon the hypothesis that the constitution was always what it was made at the Revolution [of 1688-9]. It has been, undoubtedly, and always must be, changing according to circumstances… Nor are we to imagine that our ancestors had any more right to make laws and regulations for us, than we have to alter them and substitute others in their place. This, I think, is true Whig principles; at least it appears consistent with common sense.[[77]](#footnote-77)

This is partly a polite set of compliments, but it is also a neat summary of Hume’s achievements as a historian. Like twentieth-century historians such as Forbes, Steuart realised that Hume’s demolition of the myth of the ancient constitution provided a new defence for the Revolution Settlement. According to the Jacobite Steuart at least, Hume’s *History* epitomised ‘true Whig principles’. Interestingly, after he had presumably shared the manuscript of the first volume of the *History* with friends*,* Elibank had called Hume ‘a moderate Whig’, while Robert Wallace referred to him as ‘a candid Tory’.[[78]](#footnote-78) It would appear that the Jacobites came the closest to the assessment of modern scholars following Forbes, although we must stress that Hume himself had ‘the impudence to pretend that I am of no party, and have no bias.’[[79]](#footnote-79) In any event, the publication of the *History,* as we see in section three,gave Hume the reputation of being a Jacobite. We then return to Steuart to see that he did not only have good things to say about Hume’s *History.* First, however, we look at Hume’s essays written in the aftermath of the ‘Forty-five’.

**II**

**Hume’s writings after the ‘Forty-Five’**

Hume’s early political essays, published in 1741-2, were primarily focused on English politics and debates. He started writing them upon returning to Scotland after an eighteen-month stint in London, preceded by several years of philosophical study in France. It is clear that Hume at this point in time had the London book market firmly on his mind. My contention is that his next batch of political essays, published in the wake of the ‘Forty-five’, were written with that event in mind, and against the backdrop of Jacobitism in particular. During the period of the rebellion, Hume refers cautiously to the event in his letters, written from Weldehall near St Albans in England, where he served as a tutor to the mad Marquess of Annandale. At the start of 1746, he wrote to Sir James Johnstone: ‘You seem uneasy that all my letters have been open’d, and so am I; but, as I think I have in all of them us’d the precaution to name no-body, and to date from no place, and even not to subscribe the letters, it can be of no consequence, and only proceed from the universal practice of opening all letters at present’.[[80]](#footnote-80) Johnstone’s daughter Margaret was married to Lord Oglivy who, like his father in the ‘Fifteen’, fought for the Stuarts in the ‘Forty-five’. In the aftermath, Margaret was imprisoned and later escaped.[[81]](#footnote-81)

For the 1748 edition of the *Essays, Moral and Political,* Hume removed some essays he regarded as ‘frivolous and finical’, and inserted three new ones.[[82]](#footnote-82) Of the new essays, one was ‘*against* the original Contract, the System of the Whigs, another *against* passive Obedience, the System of the Tories’, as Hume wrote in a letter to Charles Erskine, Lord Tinwald, a relative of John Eriskine, earl of Mar (the leader of the ‘Fifteen’).[[83]](#footnote-83) Tinwald was also an uncle of Hume’s friend, Sir Harry Erskine. Tinwald’s circle included many other Jacobites with Humean connections such as Matthew Sharpe of Hoddam and Sir John Erskine, the latter being the husband of Catherine St Clair, the sister of General James St Clair whom Hume served as secretary during the War of the Austrian Succession.

Hume had earlier identified toryism with Jacobitism,[[84]](#footnote-84) and after the ‘Forty-five’ it is clear that he began to use tory as a euphemism for Jacobite. Hume commented on the ‘Original Contract’ essay in a letter to Elibank:

I shall be very much mortify’d, if you do not approve, in some small degree, of the Reasonings with regard to the original Contract, which, I hope, are new & curious, & form a short, but compleat Refutation of the political Systems of Sydney, Locke, and the Whigs, which all the half of the Philosophers of the Nation have implicitely [*sic*] embrac’d for near a Century; tho’ they are plainly, in my humble Opinion, repugnant to Reason & the Practice of all Nations.[[85]](#footnote-85)

In addition, Hume had also completed yet another essay on the Protestant Succession, in which he ‘treat[ed] that subject as coolly and indifferently, as I would the dispute between Caesar and Pompey’.[[86]](#footnote-86) Hume said that ‘[t]he conclusion shows me a Whig, but a very sceptical one’, hence Forbes’s influential labelling of Hume.[[87]](#footnote-87) Hume discussed ‘Of the Protestant Succession’ with his friends, most of whom thought that it would be ‘extremely dangerous’ to publish, and therefore it did not appear until his next essay collection: the *Political Discourses* (1752). Significantly, Hume let the aforementioned Tinwald decide the fate of the essay in 1748:

I hope I have examin’d this Question [the Protestant Succession] as coolly & impartially as if I were remov’d a thousand Years from the present Period: But this is what some People think extremely dangerous, & sufficient, not only to ruin me for ever, but also throw some Reflection on all my Friends, particularly those with whom I am connected at present. I have wrote to Millar [Hume’s publisher] to send you the Sheets and I hereby make you entire Master to dispose of this last Essay as you think proper. [[88]](#footnote-88)

In his first batch of political essays published in the early 1740s, Hume made two contentions which the ‘Forty-five’ led him to revise. First, he had argued that Jacobitism was no longer a serious force in Scotland, and second that the theory of divine right of kings had been universally undermined.[[89]](#footnote-89) In the aftermath of the ‘Forty-five’, a literary controversy erupted between the Scottish minister George Logan and Thomas Ruddiman. The latter made use of divine right arguments in response to Logan’s challenge that the Scottish crown was not strictly hereditary.[[90]](#footnote-90) The Jacobite rebellion compelled Scottish writers in particular to respond to these arguments, which clearly had influenced a great number of people. Hume’s friend Henry Home (Kames) wrote an *Essay* collection during the Jacobite rising in which he treated ‘hereditary and indefeasible right’ in an extensive appendix.[[91]](#footnote-91) By concentrating on the legal side of the argument,[[92]](#footnote-92) Kames sought to refute the view that the succession to the British crown prior to the Glorious Revolution had been lineal. Hume expressed his approval of his friend’s *Essays,*[[93]](#footnote-93)although he would himself take a different approach and seek not only to refute the religious and philosophical underpinnings of tory-Jacobitism, but also whiggism. In addition to Kames and Hume, Robert Wallace wrote an *Address to the Jacobites* in 1745*,* which was never published. However, Wallace returned to the theoretical debate in *The Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance Considered* (1754), recycling many of his arguments about the advantages of the Glorious Revolution, this time in response to Lord Dun’s *Friendly and Familiar Advices* (Edinburgh, 1754), described by Hume as a ‘harmless, inoffensive Pamphlet’.[[94]](#footnote-94) Wallace prepared a second edition in 1762, which, although never published, demonstrates the longevity of debates about these matters in Scotland.[[95]](#footnote-95)

After 1707, Scottish patriotism and particularly antipathy to the union became as important as dynastic politics. An undated *Manifesto and Declaration By the Noblemen, Gentlemen, and Others, who dutyfully appear at this time in asserting the undoubted Right of their lawful Sovereign JAMES the 8th,* most likely printed in relation to the ‘Fifteen’, argued that ‘The late unhappy Union…has proved so far from lessening and healing the Differences betwixt his Majesties Subjects of Scotland and England, That it has widened and encreased them, and appears by experience so inconsistent with the Rights, Interest and Privileges of us and our good Neighbours and fellow subjects of England, that the continuance of it must inevitably ruin us and hurt them’.[[96]](#footnote-96) In short, the Scottish Jacobites wanted ‘to have our Laws, Liberties and Properties secured by free Parliaments of both Kingdom.’[[97]](#footnote-97) Wallace addressed concerns that Scotland had declined economically since the Union, by arguing that industry had increased at a faster pace than population growth in Scotland since 1688-9, in opposition to recently published pamphlets such as *Some Considerations on the Present State of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1744) and *The Present State of Scotland Consider’d: And Its Declining and Sinking Condition charged upon the Conduct of the Landed Gentlemen* (Edinburgh, 1745).[[98]](#footnote-98)

Hume steered clear of the economic question and instead focused entirely on the principles of passive obedience and divine right. Unlike Wallace and Kames, moreover, he coupled his philosophical attack on the ‘Tory doctrine’ with an equally assertive demolition of the ‘Whig system’, that is to say, the ‘original contract’. Hume’s precise arguments have been discussed at length elsewhere,[[99]](#footnote-99) and, for the sake of brevity, I will simply highlight what I take to be Hume’s intention behind this double attack on the two party systems of thought. In the first instance, he contended that both systems were in fact ‘just’, but not in the ways that the parties interpreted them. Secondly, both sets of practical consequences – passive obedience and resistance – were ‘prudent’, but not to the extreme to which each party carried them.[[100]](#footnote-100) If philosophically probed, both systems would fall apart. In other words, he sought to teach lessons of moderation to both parties, even though Jacobites rather than whigs seem to have been more appreciative of this enterprise. We only need to compare the respective reactions of Wallace and Steuart to Hume’s *History.*

These two essays were meant to be accompanied by a third and highly related essay on the Protestant Succession, which Hume intended to include in the 1748 edition of the *Essays,* but the publication of which he postponed until 1752. Like contract theory, Hume had already dealt with the topic in *Treatise* book III.[[101]](#footnote-101) In his earlier treatment, he had been clear that a disputed succession presented a near-intractable problem. When the principles deciding who should govern (most importantly long possession, present possession, and positive law) pointed in different directions: long possession for the Stuart family, and present possession and positive law (the Act of Settlement 1701) for Hanover, ‘an impartial enquirer, who adopts no party in political controversies’ would never be satisfied by any answer.[[102]](#footnote-102) This in itself was an astonishingly provocative statement from the point of view of anti-Jacobites.

Hume made several concessions to the Jacobite case in his contentious essay. He imagined himself a member of parliament between 1689 and 1714, the period between the Revolution and the Hanoverian accession. A restoration of the Stuart family at this time would have had the advantage of ‘preserv[ing] the succession clear and undisputed, free from a pretender’, Hume acknowledged.[[103]](#footnote-103) Bloodline was the most straightforward indicator of legitimacy in the minds of the multitude and strong feelings for the ‘true heir of their royal family’ were precisely what rendered monarchical government stable, according to Hume. It was foolish to place kings on the same level as the meanest of mankind, even if ‘an anatomist finds no more in the greatest monarch than in the lowest peasant or day-labourer; and a moralist may, perhaps, frequently find less.’[[104]](#footnote-104) Such reflections are largely pointless, Hume argued, since ‘all of us, still retain these prejudices in favour of birth and family’.[[105]](#footnote-105) He gave the rather trivial but telling example that everyone prefers to see plays about kings rather than sailors; views which Smith would later echo.[[106]](#footnote-106)

By comparison with the Stuarts, the Hanoverian succession ‘violate[d] hereditary right; and place[d] on the throne a prince, to whom birth gave no title to that dignity’.[[107]](#footnote-107) In contrast to his essays of the early 1740s, Hume was now prepared to defend the actions of the Stuart kings in the seventeenth century. Anticipating his later historical writings, Hume argued that James I and Charles I viewed England as a simple monarchy, based on the precedent of the Tudors and comparisons with other monarchs in Europe at the time. These ideas were bolstered by the flattery of courtiers, ‘and, above all, that of the clergy, who from several passages of *scripture…*had erected a regular and avowed system of arbitrary power.’[[108]](#footnote-108) On the other hand, Hume argued that a limited monarchy, which he saw as an important achievement, could never have been established within that royal line. The Stuart family was simply too bound up with the doctrine of divine right as he saw it. Indeed, the last Stuart monarch, Anne, revived the practice of the royal touch, or touching for the king’s evil, whereby the monarch touched subjects to cure scrofula, which William had previously discontinued because he viewed it as popish superstition.[[109]](#footnote-109) While Hume unsurprisingly regarded the royal touch as an ‘ancient superstition’, many educated and intelligent people still believed in the practice at the time, including Carte.[[110]](#footnote-110) According to Hume, ‘[t]he only method of destroying, at once, all these high claims and pretensions, was to depart from the true hereditary line, and choose a prince, who [was] plainly a creature of the public’.[[111]](#footnote-111) This ‘secured our constitutional limitations’.[[112]](#footnote-112) As in his essays from 1741, and *Treatise* book III, Hume thus ultimately defended the Revolution Settlement.[[113]](#footnote-113)

Be that as it may, Hume went on to consider that the Hanoverian monarchy had further disadvantages, chiefly the question of foreign dominions, which would engage Britain in intrigues and wars on the continent.[[114]](#footnote-114) From George I’s accession in 1714 up until the start of Queen Victoria’s reign in 1837, Britain shared its monarch with the German state of Hanover. Foreign influence had been a worry from the start of the reign of William III, who had largely relied on Dutch advisers and fought wars on the continent. As a response, the Act of Settlement 1701 barred foreigners from becoming privy councillors and members of parliament. The Act also forbade a monarch of England from engaging the nation in a war in defence of foreign territories without the consent of parliament. Nevertheless, shortly after the Hanoverian succession in 1714, disagreement over the influence of Hanover on British foreign policy brought about a split within the whig party.[[115]](#footnote-115) In 1715, Hanover became involved in the Great Northern War (1700-21) against Sweden. The main reason why the small state of Hanover was accepted into the alliance with Russia and other big powers was that George I had the British navy at his disposal. Britain’s naval engagement gave plenty of ammunition for oppositional attacks on the ministry. In the editions of the essay up until and including the one published in 1768, Hume remarked that ‘it would be difficult to show any harm we have ever received from the electoral dominions, except that short disgust in 1718, with [the Swedish king] CHARLES XII’.[[116]](#footnote-116) In the first half of the 1740s, the payment of Hanoverian troops in the War of the Austrian Succession was a major issue of political debate.[[117]](#footnote-117) Elsewhere in the *Political Discourses* (1752), Hume referred to the parliamentary ruling in 1742 to pay for 16,000 Hanoverian troops as a ‘factious vote’.[[118]](#footnote-118)

One major disadvantage of the House of Stuart, according to Hume, was their Catholicism. The Act of Settlement 1701 declared that ‘whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of this crown, shall join in communion with the church of England, as by law established.’[[119]](#footnote-119) The whole point behind the settlement was to secure the *Protestant* Succession, not the Hanoverian succession, which only became an alternative after Anne’s last surviving child died in 1700. Hume had earlier contended in 1741 that Catholicism was an enemy of civil liberty and here he argued that Catholicism ‘affords no toleration, or peace, or security to any other communion’.[[120]](#footnote-120) He now pointed out that almost all Jacobites regarded the Catholicism of the Stuarts as problematic, as much as Hanoverian loyalists admitted that foreign dominions presented a difficulty.[[121]](#footnote-121) He then picked up the gauntlet he himself had thrown down in the *Treatise,* saying that ‘[i]t belongs, therefore, to a philosopher alone, who is of neither party, to put all the circumstances in the scale, and assign to each of them its proper poise and influence’.[[122]](#footnote-122) He began by criticising the reign of the house of Stuart as a period when ‘the government was kept in a continual fever, by the contention between the privileges of the people and the prerogatives of the crown’, a domestic quarrel which allowed France to erect itself as a European superpower ‘without any opposition from us, and even sometimes with our assistance.’[[123]](#footnote-123) In contrast, in the sixty-year period after the Glorious Revolution, here referred to as a ‘parliamentary establishment’, ‘an uninterrupted harmony has been preserved between our princes and our parliaments.’[[124]](#footnote-124) In short, Britain in these years had enjoyed a longer period of glory and liberty than any other nation, according to Hume. This outcome stood in sharp contrast with the turbulence of the seventeenth century.

On the other hand, because of the exiled royal family, the same period had seen ‘two rebellions [the ‘Fifteen’ and ‘Forty-five’]…besides plots and conspiracies without number.’[[125]](#footnote-125)Britain had so far been fortunate, but Hume feared that ‘the claims of the banished family…are not yet antiquated’ and he had no reason to believe that the ‘Forty-five’ would be the last major Jacobite rebellion or invasion.[[126]](#footnote-126) As he had said in the *Treatise,* ‘a century is scarce sufficient to establish any new government, or remove all scruples in the minds of the subjects concerning it.’[[127]](#footnote-127) Hume believed that dynastic conflicts were even more dangerous than disputes between privilege and prerogative, because they could only be settled by war rather than debate and compromise.[[128]](#footnote-128) What is more, a prince with a disputed title would not dare arming his subjects and set up a militia, an institution of which Hume approved.[[129]](#footnote-129) Hume further argued that the ‘precarious establishment’ of the Hanoverians explained Britain’s eagerness to contract debt to support the regime, a hazardous way of raising money in Hume’s mind, as he expressed in ‘Of Public Credit’, also appearing for the first time in 1752.[[130]](#footnote-130)

The situation of Hanover was precarious because even if Hume believed that a parliamentary title may be more advantageous to a hereditary one in theory, he was clear that most people would not see it that way.[[131]](#footnote-131) Hume believed that bloodline was key in the eyes of the multitude. Why, then, had the Stuarts not been restored? The answer was that anti-Catholic sentiments in Britain were simply too strong, and for good reasons, according to Hume. In addition to being more expensive and less tolerant than Protestantism, the most important argument against Catholicism was that it was *Roman* Catholicism*,* which not only separated the head of church from the regal office, something Hume regarded as highly pernicious, but also bestowed the sacerdotal, or priestly, office on a foreigner – that is to say, the Pope – who had a separate and sometimes opposite interest to that of the British state.[[132]](#footnote-132) The Stuarts were aware of this problem. After landing in Scotland in 1745, Charles Edward Stuart pledged ‘not to impose upon any a religion they dislike, but to secure them all the enjoyment of those which are respectively at present establish’d among them, either in England, Scotland, or Ireland’.[[133]](#footnote-133) In desperation, Charles even converted to Anglicanism in the early 1750s, but this backfired since it was seen as unprincipled.[[134]](#footnote-134)

Although anti-Catholicism was the decisive factor for most people, Hume gave one final reason why he came down on the side of the Hanoverians, namely that they had attained longevity.[[135]](#footnote-135) Hume believed that the Hanoverians were now rightful kings according to the *imagination* of a slender majority.[[136]](#footnote-136) While it may have been difficult for an ‘impartial patriot’ to choose between Hanover and Stuart immediately after the Act of Settlement 1701, the Hanoverian settlement had now been more or less consolidated and it would have been highly unwise to restore the Stuarts by way of rebellion and civil war.[[137]](#footnote-137) Time had given legitimacy to the settlement, even if no one could have known that it would turn out to be beneficial from the outset. For Hume, a government had to be judged on its present merits; its foundation was to a large degree irrelevant. As he had set out in the *Treatise,* few, if any, governments in history had a better foundation for their authority than present possession, and a sudden change in government would naturally lead to bloodshed and confusion.[[138]](#footnote-138) In the final analysis, then, Hume’s intention was to undermine the Jacobite case.

We have to remember, however, that he did refute the speculative systems of both parties, and his approval of the Hanoverian monarchy was a balance-sheet assessment which boiled down to the avoidance of a bloody counter-revolution.[[139]](#footnote-139) Indeed, Hume himself said that he ‘very liberally abused both Whigs and Tories’ in ‘Of the Protestant Succession’.[[140]](#footnote-140) In comparison with establishment discourse in the aftermath of the ‘Forty-five’, his treatment of toryism and Jacobitism was fairly balanced and respectful. Furthermore, in the aftermath of the Jacobite rebellion, Hume was extremely critical of the vindictive behaviour of many whigs. In October 1747, Hume wrote a lesser known pamphlet in which he defended his friend Archibald Stewart, former Lord Provost of Edinburgh, who surrendered the city to the Jacobite army with virtually no resistance. As part of a wider crackdown on Jacobitism after Culloden, Stewart was imprisoned and tried.[[141]](#footnote-141) Hume’s argument was essentially that Stewart had done a noble deed by avoiding a bloodbath since Edinburgh was so poorly defended. As Stewart was acquitted before Hume had published the pamphlet at the start of 1748, he added a postscript, noting that the trial had become a party-political affair, and Stewart’s acquittal had been bemoaned by certainwhigs while celebrated by tories (meaning Jacobites).

In the postscript, Hume made a distinction between political and religious whigs: ‘The Idea I form of a political *Whig,* is that of a Man of Sense and Moderation, a Lover of Laws and Liberty, whose chief Regard to particular Princes and Families, is founded on a Regard to the publick Good’.[[142]](#footnote-142) By contrast, Hume believed that the characteristics of a religious whig were ‘Dissimulation, Hypocrisy, Violence, Calumny, [and] Selfishness’.[[143]](#footnote-143) According to Hume, ‘[t]his Species of *Whigs…*form but the Fag-end of the Party, and are, at the Bottom, very heartily despised by their own Leaders.’[[144]](#footnote-144) Because of this, he argued that the ‘religious *Whigs*…are much worse than the religious *Tories*; as the political *Tories* are inferior to the political Whigs.’[[145]](#footnote-145) In this context, Hume was evidently eager to point out, maybe as a provocation since his friend had already been acquitted by the time the pamphlet was published, that he regarded divine-right tories as more harmless than whig extremists: ‘[A] Zeal for Bishops, and for the Books of Common-Prayer, tho’ equally groundless, has never been able, when mixt up with Party Notions, to form so virulent and exalted a Poison in human Breasts, as the opposite Principles.’[[146]](#footnote-146) Hume concluded that all *political* whigs, unlike *religious* whigs, were pleased with the acquittal of Stewart because he was innocent, adding ‘I am charitable enough to suppose, that the Joy of many of the *Tories* flowed from the same Motive.’[[147]](#footnote-147) Since he refers to Scotland here, it is clear that he is using tory as a synonym for Jacobite in the wake of the ‘Forty-five’.

The postscript to the pamphlet thus offered a classic Humean paradox: the whigs may have had the soundest politics, but some of their supporters, the fanatic Presbyterians, were more violent and zealous than even the High-Church tories, who in Scotland would have been Episcopalians such as Ruddiman. As Hume had set out in ‘Superstition and Enthusiasm’, Protestant sects may have been conducive to civil liberty, but they were also extremely violent, as he would elaborate in his *History.* In other words, whigs were not necessarily more tolerant of their ideological opponents just because they were tolerant of various Protestant Dissenters (who were their supporters). Indeed, Hume evidently believed that the contrary was the case. ‘Passion and Party-Zeal’ when carried too far had little regard for justice, he bemoaned: ‘many of the *Whigs* have betrayed such a furious Zeal on this Occasion, that they are mortified, or rather indeed inraged to the last Degree, that an innocent Man has been found innocent’.[[148]](#footnote-148) At the same time, he was prepared to vindicate moderates in both parties. This episode and pamphlet can only strengthen our conviction that Hume sought to give a fair hearing to whigs and Jacobites alike, even as he was writing *against* both parties’ systems. On a personal level, he was as relieved as he was surprised that both whigs and tories (presumably his predecessor Ruddiman) supported his election as Keeper of the Advocates Library in Edinburgh in 1752.[[149]](#footnote-149) He had expected to be opposed by both sides.[[150]](#footnote-150)

**III**

**Hume’s *History* and Jacobite Historical Argument**

As Keeper of the Advocates Library, Hume gained access to one of Europe’s best collection of books. This enabled him to write the *History of England,* publishedin six volumes between 1754 and 1761. Reviewers of the work from Richard Hurd to Gilbert Stuart and Joseph Towers criticised it for defending a ‘Tory’ view of the royal prerogative.[[151]](#footnote-151) Against this backdrop, the *History* unsurprisingly led to accusations of Jacobitism,[[152]](#footnote-152) especially the first Stuart volume, in which Hume, in his own words, ‘shed a generous tear for Charles I’.[[153]](#footnote-153) From Hume’s point of view, these accusations were absurd since it was vulgar to think that ‘the Cause of Charles the I and James the 2 were the same, because they were of the same Family.’[[154]](#footnote-154) Modern historians have established that Hume’s overall intention was to defend the 1688-9 parliamentary settlement on a new philosophical grounding which did not rely on English exceptionalism and the myth of the ancient constitution.[[155]](#footnote-155) Present-day readers may struggle to understand how Hume could have been so misunderstood and why his *History* was so controversial. It only makes sense against the backdrop and memory of Jacobitism, and if this context is taken into consideration it is not difficult to comprehend how contentious Hume’s treatment of the Stuarts was.

 It is also clear that part of Hume’s intention was to shift political history away from anti-Jacobite propaganda. As he wrote to Elibank regarding Robert Wallace’s *Characteristics of the Present State of Great Britain* (1758), ‘I told him that…he ought not to have mentioned the four Reigns before the Revolution as arbitrary, but the five or six or seven or eight or nine; and that the stopping at that precise Period lookt like casting Reflections on a certain Family [the Stuarts].’[[156]](#footnote-156) He allegedly said in the final months of his life to James Boswell that ‘he became a greater friend to the Stuart family as he advanced in studying for his *History*; and he hoped he had vindicated the two first of them so effectually that they would never again be attacked.’[[157]](#footnote-157) He was said to have further remarked to Boswell that ‘[Samuel] Johnson should be pleased with my *History’,* whereupon Boswell told Hume that Johnson had said ‘Sir, the fellow is a Tory by chance.’[[158]](#footnote-158)

 After the partly hostile reaction to the *History,* Hume appears to have developed a stronger antipathy to whiggism. ‘Vulgar whigs’, to borrow Forbes’s terminology, were from then on his main intellectual antagonists, and the venom with which he treated them and the degree to which he ridiculed them, both in his private letters and published writings, stand in sharp contrast to his relatively respectful engagement with Jacobites. An important example is the historian Thomas Carte, whom he followed closely and relied upon to a great extent in his *History*.[[159]](#footnote-159) In a footnote added to a later edition of the last volume of the *History*, he singled out Rapin, Locke, Sidney and Hoadly as examples of ‘[c]ompositions the most despicable, both for style and matter, [which have] been extolled, and propagated, and read; as if they had equalled the most celebrated remains of antiquity.’[[160]](#footnote-160)

 Even though Hume had no Jacobite intentions of his own, it is clear that Jacobites appropriated some of the *History’s* arguments*.* In an unpublished manuscript, George Osborne, editor of the Jacobite journals *Mitre and Crown* and the *True Briton,* turned to ‘the ingenious mr Hume’ when he wanted to demonstrate that ‘when K James came to the Crown…it was natural for him to take the Government as he found it’.[[161]](#footnote-161) In a draft essay likely to have been written in 1759,[[162]](#footnote-162) Osborne, like Johnson, was clear that Hume was not one of his party. Indeed, he used Hume as an authority because he ‘cannot be suspected of the least Partiality to the Prerogative of the Crowns’.[[163]](#footnote-163) Similarly to Hume, Osborne was keen to demonstrate that ‘during a great part of those early Ages [of English history], the generality of the People were kept in a State of absolute Slavery & Bondage, and they & their families were bought & sold along with the farms they lived on, and as part of the stock belonging to them, pretty much in the manner the poor negroes are at present treated in our Plantations.’[[164]](#footnote-164) Osborne’s agenda was very different from Hume’s, however. Hume had been willing to cry a generous tear for the fate of Charles I, but Osborne argued that it was ‘the Indulgence of the Stuarts’ which afforded the English all their liberties they regarded as natural or at least ancient.

Hume had certainly not gone this far. In any event, Osborne used Hume’s charge against Elizabeth as a ‘tyrant’ not only to exonerate the Stuarts but to actively praise them. While Hume is usually interpreted to have argued, alongside court whig writers such as Lord Hervey,[[165]](#footnote-165) that British liberty was a post-Revolution phenomenon, Osborne argued that ‘we have the Authority of the ingenious mr Hume, That all the Liberties of Consequence which the English now enjoy have been obtained since the death of Elizabeth.’[[166]](#footnote-166) Perhaps deliberately, Osborne misinterpreted Hume’s larger point. According to Hume, the spark of liberty had been kindled by the Puritans under Elizabeth, but it was only in the Stuart era that it became a force to be reckoned with. This was not so much due to the indulgence of the Stuarts, but rather the formation of a parliamentary opposition to them from 1621 onwards. After the expulsion of James II/VII, British liberty could finally be established on a surer footing. Ironically, the main mechanism of stability was ‘corruption’ in the eighteenth-century sense of the term, meaning executive influence over the legislature.[[167]](#footnote-167) This corruption, often associated with Walpole, was the pet hate of the Jacobites and one of the clearest signs of the low state of contemporary affairs. Sir Robert Walpole was described as ‘At the head of the Treasury / a most Infamous plunderer. / Where he made this constant use of his power / to fetter the very minds, and conscience of men / Those whom he could engage, by his corrupt practices.’[[168]](#footnote-168) Hume himself was not above criticising Walpole, but he aimed at a balanced evaluation by also attacking the opposition to Walpole, under the intellectual leadership of Bolingbroke.[[169]](#footnote-169)

 We saw in the previous section that Hume’s friend Steuart complimented Hume’s *History* in a private letter. An extensive unpublished commentary demonstrates, however, that he was far from being an uncritical reader.[[170]](#footnote-170) In his notes on Hume’s *History,* written in the form of a draft pamphlet which was never published, Steuart lambasted Hume for relying too much ‘on his own bright Imagination’ as opposed to evidence.[[171]](#footnote-171) The crux of the disagreement was Hume’s belief in Mary queen of Scots’ involvement in the murder of her husband.[[172]](#footnote-172) Mary Stuart was an important Jacobite heroine; Jesuits of the *parti dévot* in France gave Charles Edward a cross which she had worn when she was beheaded as a symbolic gift.[[173]](#footnote-173) Steuart was much more prepared to emphasise Elizabeth’s intention of ruining the reputation of her rival, stressing that ‘I think the impartiality of an Historian should oblige him to declare the duplicity of Elizabeth’s Conduct’.[[174]](#footnote-174) He was particularly outraged that Mary was imprisoned during her trial and thus prevented from defending herself in person; in other words, she was ‘refused the privilege which belongs to the worst criminal’.[[175]](#footnote-175) It is known that Steuart and Hume had conversations on this subject, and it seems to have been an amicable disagreement with a great deal of banter.[[176]](#footnote-176)

Hume wrote in the second Tudor volume that there are ‘three events in our history, which may be regarded as touchstones of partymen. An English whig, who asserts the reality of the popish plot, an Irish Catholic, who denies the massacre in 164l, and a Scotch Jacobite, who maintains the innocence of Queen Mary, must be considered as men beyond the reach of argument or reason, and must be left to their prejudices.’[[177]](#footnote-177) This Jacobite was once identified as Elibank,[[178]](#footnote-178) who was indeed of a similar opinion as Steuart, and when they briefly fell out over Elibank’s brother, Hume actually feared that Elibank would ‘compose a Pamphlet against me on the Subject of Q. Mary and to publish it as a full Revenge upon me.’[[179]](#footnote-179) Despite this, Steuart is a more plausible candidate, even if William Tytler is likelier than either of them since he, unlike the other two, published his views on Queen Mary.[[180]](#footnote-180) The Marian controversy was one which clearly agitated many Scottish Jacobites, including Elibank and Steuart. Hume, on the other hand, who had no partiality towards the Stuart family as such, said to Elibank that ‘it will appear singular, that two Persons, who have always lived in great Intimacy, and who, methinks, wou’d not quarrel even about a living Mistress, shou’d break up their Friendship, on account of an old Strumpet, who has been dead and rotten near two hundred Years.’[[181]](#footnote-181)

Towards the end of the unpublished pamphlet, Steuart criticised other aspects of Hume’s Tudor volumes in a series of miscellaneous reflections. For example, he argued that ‘[Hume’s] Proposition, that toleration is the True Secret of mannaging [sic] religious factions, I believe will be found upon examination a little too general.’[[182]](#footnote-182) By contrast, Steuart believed that ‘If…a well timed, moderate severity (which does not degenerate into what is known by the name of Persecution, that is affecting the life, limbs or liberty of the person) can prevent the growth of a new opinion, I think such severity well timed, and quite consistent with the principle of good government.’[[183]](#footnote-183) He then went on to offer a Hobbesian approach to the management of religious factions, arguing that the state has the right to regulate all opinion with potential political impact. Spain and Portugal could *rightfully* outlaw Jews and even burn them, he argued, even though he would not approve *morally* of such severity. The inquisition, on the other hand, was wrongful persecution since it sought to ‘discover people’s private sentiments’.[[184]](#footnote-184) As could be expected, he also offered critical comments on questions of political economy, but additionally pointed out areas of agreement.[[185]](#footnote-185)

The most interesting part of Steuart’s notes is the final section, in which he tries to criticise Hume’s grand narrative, although he seems to be making a very similar point to Hume. Hume had argued that the increase in commerce and general wealth had in the sixteenth century had led to the diminution of the power of the nobility, which aided the crown and the people alike. In the Tudor era, as the great nobles sank, the monarch became more prominent. This is how Hume explained the triumph of absolutism in the sixteenth century, which made it perfectly natural for the Stuarts to act as if they were absolute monarchs in the following century. Steuart here suggested that the foundation for the ‘revolution’ and the beginning of the ascendency of parliament in the seventeenth century was laid in the sixteenth century, when general wealth increased and spread, in many ways echoing Hume even as he intends to criticise him.[[186]](#footnote-186) ‘This revolution will appear quite natural, when we see before us the causes which occasioned it. Wealth must give power, and Industry, in a Country of Luxury, will throw it into the hands of the Commons’, he stated.[[187]](#footnote-187) In this way, Steuart believed he could exonerate Charles I even more effectively than Hume had done: ‘the use they [the Commons] made of their new gotten power, was to overthrow the Constittution, according to the proverb, set a Beggar on horseback, he’ll ride to the devil.’[[188]](#footnote-188)

 Later in life, however, Steuart would come to Hume’s defence in a different context. Unlike some of Hume’s friends, including Adam Ferguson,[[189]](#footnote-189) Steuart was not pleased with James Beattie’s attack on Hume in his *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth* (1770). In 1775 he wrote a critique of the *Essay,* which he sent to Beattie.[[190]](#footnote-190) In his observations on Beattie’s performance, Steuart partially defended Hume’s mitigated scepticism against Beattie’s ‘common sense’: ‘I believe in the existence of a Supreme Being as much as Dr. Beattie; but I confess, I can no more conceive in what manner a spirit can create matter, than in what manner matter can create a spirit; and thereby I think it prudent, rational, and philosophical, to doubt, rather than to decide, concerning the existence of the substrata and essences’.[[191]](#footnote-191) He had characterised Hume’s position in the same way in the preceding paragraph.

**IV**

**Conclusion**

Jacobite and whig Britain are often portrayed as representing distinct worlds in the eighteenth century, one backward-looking and one forward-looking, one ancient and one modern. This may be true to some extent, especially with the benefit of hindsight, but we should not lose sight of the fact that they overlapped for a great part of the century. Moreover, as the example of Hume, paradoxically though it may seem, demonstrates, these two worlds did not only overlap temporally but also socially, culturally, and, at least to a degree, intellectually. David Allan has argued that ‘social harmony’ was a key ingredient in enabling ‘Enlightenment’ in Scotland.[[192]](#footnote-192) In the face of the ‘Fifteen’ and the ‘Forty-five’, it may seem absurd to suggest that Scottish Jacobites and whigs co-existed harmoniously. At the same time, it seems that we must conclude that for much of the time they actually did, at least at Hume’s rather elevated social level. Hume mixed happily with Kames (before his conversion), along with the Chevalier Ramsay, Hamilton of Bangour, Steuart, Elibank, Marischal, as well as others who have not been discussed in this article such as Sir Robert Strange.[[193]](#footnote-193) Many of these connections and friendships date from the 1730s, and none were ended because of the ‘Forty-five’. Hume seems to have been as little interested in converting these people to his own balance-sheet approval of the Hanoverian regime as he was in convincing his many friends among the Presbyterian clergy of his religious scepticism.[[194]](#footnote-194) Hume may be thought of as a singular exception, and in some ways he was, but many of his friends among the ‘Moderates’ were also close to Elibank. William Robertson even said in the Select Society after the ‘Forty-five’ that he ‘did not think worse of a man’s moral character for having been in the rebellion.’[[195]](#footnote-195)

 There are differences between Hume, the charming socialite, and Hume, the sharp writer. As a writer, Hume’s enterprise should be placed within the anti-Jacobite movement. If the deflation of the whig interpretation of Hume is replaced with a revival of a tory-Jacobite interpretation, we move backward rather than forward. Yet we must stress that the part Hume played within ‘anti-Jacobitism’ was characteristically sceptical and his contributions were distinctive and controversial. Indeed, they were so contentious that it did not seem outrageous to many, including his acquaintance Wallace,[[196]](#footnote-196) to suggest that Hume was a crypto-Jacobite. What singled Hume out was his willingness to make concessions to the Jacobite camp, and his readiness to see things both ways. This meant that Hume had no qualms about siding with Carte against whig historians, and that some Jacobites such as George Osborne could draw on Hume’s *History* for their own purposes. Hume was also deeply opposed to the vindictive behaviour of the whigs in the wake of the ‘Forty-five’, as we saw in his pamphlet in defence of Archibald Stewart. In May 1746, he wrote to his cousin Alexander Home, Solicitor-General for Scotland: ‘I have been told, that the Zeal of Party has been apt sometimes to carry you too far in your Expressions, & that Fools [presumably Jacobites] are afraid of your Violence in your new Office. Seek the praise, my dear Sandy, of Humanity & Moderation.’[[197]](#footnote-197) During his time as Under-Secretary in the Northern Department in the 1760s, Hume learned that George II had known about the Young Pretender’s whereabouts in London in the 1750s and said ‘I shall just do nothing at all; and when he is tired of England, he will go abroad again’. Hume, who rarely missed an opportunity to praise moderation in politics, believed that ‘this story, for the honour of the late King, ought to be more generally known.’[[198]](#footnote-198) For all these reasons, the whig label, even with the ‘sceptical’ qualification, can be as distracting as ‘tory’ to describe Hume’s politics, and we should take his own frequent assertions to be of neither party seriously. In short, scepticism and moderation ought not to be conceived of as partisan positions, according to Hume.

 Finally, Hume’s political writings are best understood when considered in their immediate political context.[[199]](#footnote-199) Much scholarly attention and many contextual studies have focused on English Walpolean politics, which is certainly appropriate with regard to Hume’s first political essays in 1741-2,[[200]](#footnote-200) but less so for his new essays in 1748, for which the Jacobite dimension and Scotland are more relevant. This essay has only scratched the surface of the interactions between Jacobitism and ‘Enlightenment’ culture. One area in need of further research is the Scottish Enlightenment’s preoccupation with feudalism, which must be understood in the context of the Jacobite question. As Adam Smith pointed out in the *Wealth of Nations,* Cameron of Lochiel ‘exercise[d] the highest criminal jurisdiction over his own people’ earlier in the eighteenth century, and ‘carried, in 1745, eight hundred of his own people into the rebellion with him.’[[201]](#footnote-201) Moreover, the militia issue should be understood in this same context,[[202]](#footnote-202) as well as the question of population growth, the latter being related to whether Scotland had prospered or declined since 1707. In other words, we can safely conclude that Jacobitism deserves to be moved from the background to the centre-stage of Scottish Enlightenment studies. This article has shown that Hume, despite his own lack of Jacobite commitment, is a conducive place to start.
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