Hume's "Early Memoranda" and the Making of His Political Economy
Tatsuya Sakamoto
Hume Studies Volume 37, Number 2 (2011), 131-164.

Hume Studies
Volume 37, Number 2, 2011, pp. 131–164

Hume's "Early Memoranda" and the Making of His Political Economy

TATSUYA SAKAMOTO

Abstract: This essay argues that while the so-called "Hume's Early Memoranda" has long been regarded as Hume's juvenile work composed before *A Treatise of Human Nature*, there is significant internal and external evidence to the contrary. M. A. Stewart's recent thesis made a new attempt to move the period of composition to the early 1740s. I seek in the following essay to date the composition even later, in the latter half of the 1740s. Re-examined in this new light, the memoranda credibly emerges as a work of preparation for Hume's political economy to be published as *Political Discourses* in 1752. Historical and biographical details thus reconstructed around the process of Hume's composition of the memoranda reveal the hitherto-unrecognized complexity with which Hume's economic thought was gradually formed in close and profound connections with his moral, political and historical thinking.

1. The History of the Problem

1.1 The Problem Revived and Formulated by Mossner

In 1948 E. C. Mossner published a set of Hume's manuscript papers, preserved in the Royal Society of Edinburgh, in the essay "Hume's Early Memoranda: A Complete Text."[1] As the subtitle indicates, Mossner intended to publish the complete manuscript with his own historical introduction. John Hill Burton had made the first attempt to carry out a similar project in the past. However, while Burton

Tatsuya Sakamoto is Professor of Social and Economic Thought at the Faculty of Economics, Keio University, 2-15-45, Mita, Minato, Tokyo, 108-8345, Japan. E-mail: saka@econ.keio.ac.jp.

argued simply that the manuscript might have been related to Hume's various works, ranging over the *Essays, Moral and Political* (1741–1742), *Political Discourses* (1752) and even the *Natural History of Religion* (1757),[2] Mossner tried, instead, to establish the thesis that the memoranda as a whole ought to be regarded as Hume's juvenile work in his pre-*Treatise* years. Mossner attempted to strengthen his defense of this view by employing a more scientific means of dating, including the examination of manuscript papers and watermarks. Mossner's "Complete Text" had three important features.

First, Mossner not only published the complete text for the first time, but he also proposed a new way of organizing the manuscript papers. He divided the manuscript into three large groups and gave a title to each. The first, consisting of 9 entries, was called "Natural Philosophy"; the second group of 40 entries, "Philosophy"; and the third group of 269 entries, "General." While the first and second headings were written in Hume's own hand in the manuscript, the third ("General") was Mossner's invention. He intended that the added title would reproduce what had actually existed on the original first page of the third group but was lost afterwards.

Second, for easy reference and citation, Mossner gave numbers to all the entries contained in the memoranda. He could do so because the memoranda were not a consistent treatise, but an extensive compilation of quotations from ancient and modern authors—with a few of Hume's own comments. Mossner also made an elaborate attempt to identify the sources of the quotations. As a result, Mossner produced a list of thirty-six ancient and twenty-nine modern authors, including those Hume himself identified. This meant approximately 80 percent of the sources were identified.

Third, and most significant, Mossner presented a general view about the date of the composition and argued that "Burton's dating, at least of some part of the notes, is late" (493). Indeed, Burton had suggested a substantial link of the memoranda to Hume's essay on ancient population in the *Political Discourses* and even to Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776).[3] Mossner argued, by contrast, that the document as a whole was a very early work of Hume, composed between 1729 and 1740. Mossner reached this view from his strong belief that the document was written by the young Hume in the pre-*Treatise* years and, as such, reflected his desperate attempts to organize his still immature thoughts on various subjects. As will be shown, Mossner's belief in this fundamental character of the memoranda was not adequately grounded, but it shaped his general view of them. Hence the title of his essay, "Hume's *Early* Memoranda" [my italics].

Mossner's attempt to describe the *diplomatic* aspects of the memoranda, though presented as a new initiative, is now known to have been largely misguided. Mossner described the physical state of the memoranda as "the twenty-six sheets, containing a total of 318 memoranda" (492). In fact, it is a set of fourteen

sheets of the same notepaper (29cm x 18cm). Hume had written the so-called "General" memoranda on both sides of the first ten sheets (twenty pages), the "Natural Philosophy" memoranda on one side of the eleventh sheet (one page), and the "Philosophy" memoranda on both sides of the last three sheets (six pages). On the verso of the last sheet is written only one line, a Greek quotation from Epicharmus (530–440 B.C.), which, Mossner speculated, "Hume might have found in either Cicero or Polybius" (503). The reason why Mossner wrongly described the fourteen sheets as "the twenty-six sheets" is obvious. As M. A. Stewart notes, "Mossner seems never to have set eyes on the manuscript, since he did not know that the writing was double-sided." Stewart confirms this verdict by citing many other examples of Mossner's misreporting that would not have occurred if he had actually seen the document.[4]

Mossner's next challenge concerned watermarks. Once again, he did not use his own eyes to examine this significant evidence but depended, instead, on Norman Kemp Smith's report in his introduction to the *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*. Kemp Smith had remarked that his examination of the papers of the memoranda, conducted as part of his research on the origins of the *Dialogues*, indicated that "[t]he same watermarks . . . on the sheets of the memoranda occur also on paper used by them in the years 1734, 1739, and 1743, but not, so far as I have observed, on any later, definitely datable R.S.E. manuscripts."[5] This observation was presented in line with Kemp Smith's central argument that the writing of the *Dialogues* had started earlier than the *Treatise*. As it served his case, Mossner used Kemp Smith's report without verifying it.

My own research, carried out in 1986 and 1996 in the National Library of Scotland (where Hume's manuscript collections had been removed to), proved that what Kemp Smith described as "[t]he same watermarks" occurring before 1743 but not any later indeed look quite similar to each other. On closer inspection, however, they are not strictly identical, and they clearly differ from the watermarks commonly used on the memoranda papers.[6] My examination further confirmed that of the papers used for the sixteen letters written by Hume between 1727 and 1751 held in the National Library of Scotland, seven letters had watermarks, and none of them were identical with the watermarks on the memoranda papers.[7] By contrast, the memoranda's using the same fourteen sheets throughout and carrying the same pair of watermarks and countermarks strongly suggest that the document as a whole was compiled with a definitive purpose and within a concentrated period of time. Stewart reached a similar conclusion from his own research: "[t]here are no watermark matches, so far, for the memoranda" and "such a concentration of countermarks on the one hand, and watermarks on the other cannot have arisen by chance, or come together fortuitously over a period of years." Stewart revealingly concludes that "[w]e have to assume these were not loose sheets but the remains of a bound writing book" (278).[8]

Mossner had argued for the early dating of the memoranda not only on the basis of the diplomatic evidence mentioned above but also with support from Hume's early letters. One of them is the letter of June 4 of 1727 to an old friend, Michael Ramsay. Mossner took a certain passage in the letter to refer to the memoranda in progress. Hume wrote, "All the progress that I made is but drawing the Outlines, in loose bits of Paper; here a hint of a passion, there a Phenomenon in the mind accounted for, in another the alteration of these accounts; sometimes a remark upon an Author I have been reading, and none of them worth to any Body & I believe scarce to myself" (1:9). While Mossner's use of other early letters will be considered later, his conjecture about the referent of this letter is not convincing. First, as will be discussed below, the apparently random character of the work Hume describes in this letter is diametrically opposed to the systematic character of the memoranda in question. Second, what Hume calls the "loose bits of Paper" makes a clear contrast with the actual character of the memoranda, which Stewart described as part of "a bound writing book"(278).

Mossner's case gained support from Jean-Paul Pittion, who noted that the memoranda's "Philosophy" section included references to Pierre Bayle and argued, on both external and internal evidence, that the same section should be seen as evidence of "Hume's close reading" of Bayle's works in French periodicals published between 1703–1706.[9] Pittion further suggested that Hume would have had easy access to French periodicals during his stay in France (1734–1737). Seen as a study on how and when the memoranda were written, Pittion's article neglects the simple fact that the larger parts of the memoranda are dominated by themes and subjects (largely historical, political, and economic) not directly related to Bayle.

A view similar to Pittion's was presented by Mark Thornton, who related the memoranda to Richard Cantillon's economics rather than to Bayle's philosophy.[10] Thornton argues that Hume might have come across Cantillon's manuscript of the *Essai sur la nature du commerce en général*, to be published in 1755, during his stay in France from 1734 to 1737. He draws on various facts and sources (Bolingbroke, Montesquieu, and Pouilly, among others,) to support this argument. Among those facts are the first two entries of the "General" section of the memoranda: the first concerns the practice of infanticide in modern China and the second, the statement about "A pound of Steel" becoming of "10.000 £ Value." (Mossner did not identify these entries as citations from Cantillon.) Thornton argues that because the two topics appear in the published *Essai*, the passages in the memoranda provide strong evidence that Hume encountered Cantillon's manuscript during his stay in France. This certainly is an interesting conjecture, but Thornton developed this argument on the basis of Mossner's dating (though with a minor criticism that it neglected the important period of Hume's stay in France). Istvan Hont objects that "[i]t is more likely that they [Cantillon and Hume] used the same source" than that Hume cited from Cantillon.[11]

1.2 The Problem Developed and Reformulated by Stewart

Mossner's characterization of the memoranda as a pre-*Treatise* work was criticized in M. A. Stewart's detailed study, which was part of his comprehensive study of all of Hume's manuscripts, including the *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*. Publication of Stewart's "An Early Fragment on Evil" was an important byproduct.[12] In addition to pointing out inaccuracies and errors in Mossner's transcription, Stewart also criticized Mossner's reordering of the three sections. Stewart attempted to establish that the present order of the sections is exactly the order in which Hume actually compiled the memoranda. This claim was supported by his close inspection of the offsets of the ink that he discovered on some papers of the memoranda (277–278).

Stewart also made at least five noteworthy observations concerning changes in Hume's handwriting and spelling over time. First, he says, "It is incontestable that what predominates from the outset are the routine forms of Hume's mature hand, such as the mature 't' and 'f'"(279). Second, he notes that two types of handwriting are found in the memoranda. One is similar to what is found in Hume's earlier documents, written between 1739 and 1741, and the other is similar to that found in a certain letter written in 1743. Noting that the two sections "Natural Philosophy" and "Philosophy" consistently have a mature handwriting, Stewart concludes, contrary to Mossner's conjecture, that the two sections were written much later than the "General" section (280). Third, Stewart points out that "[a]ll three sections have exclusively "-our" rather than "-or" spellings" and this fact "points at a minimum to a post-1734 date" (280). Fourth, the first entry of the "Natural Philosophy" section has the "always" spelling rather than the Scottish "alwise," and the former was not used in Hume's writings before 1739. As Stewart says, "It is likely that Hume discovered his Scotticism by living in London" (311).[13]

Finally, Stewart draws attention to the Greek citations that appear only after entry 223 in the untitled section (280). Hume recalls in "My Own Life" that he "recovered the Knowledge of the Greek language," which he had "too much neglected" in his early youth, after publishing the *Essays, Moral and Political* (1741–1742).[14] (Mossner had noticed this fact but underestimated its importance as evidence against his theory.) Hume's recollection is consistent with the fact that a Greek citation appears for the first time in his published works in the *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding* of 1748 and in some footnotes of the 1748 edition of the *Essays*. This is strong proof that the Greek citation in the memoranda was likely written sometime after 1742.

In sum, Stewart's elaborate examination of the diplomatic aspects of the memoranda was an effective refutation of Mossner's pre-*Treatise* dating and moved the period of composition to a point in the post-*Treatise* years. While a similar view had been presented earlier by John Laird and James Moore,[15] Stewart's argument,

by presenting strong, multiple evidence, seriously undermined Mossner's theory and, in consequence, established the later-dating theory on a firm foundation. What concerns us here is Stewart's warning that "[w]e should not be projecting too far ahead." Stewart's final conclusion, as the "best guess," is that "the earlier memoranda are coterminous with the end of Hume's main work on the *Treatise* and reflect some of his reading in anticipation of other projects" (280). Notwithstanding his effective criticism of Mossner, Stewart continues to endorse Mossner's basic idea that the memoranda were Hume's preparation for the earlier works. Hence Stewart's position is that the memoranda, in principle, should be seen as a preparation for the *Essays* of 1741–1742.

Stewart draws the same conclusion from his analysis of the content of the memoranda. He is willing to admit that the larger part of the memoranda, the "General" section in particular, seem to "belong to a period when Hume's dominant interest has become political-economic" and even that "[i]f one were going on content alone, this balance of interest would suggest the beginning of the 1750s when Hume was still busy with his *Political Discourses*"(286). Nevertheless, Stewart rejects this early-1750s dating as too "simplistic." Stewart's view may thus be called "the earlier-1740s theory." The present essay, by contrast, attempts to establish the later-1740s theory on the basis of a new examination of internal and external evidence.

The later-1740s theory relies on four central claims, three of which rest on Stewart's observations. First, the memoranda as a whole were written in the post-*Treatise* years. Second, the fourteen sheets and twenty-eight pages of the memoranda had existed as part of a bound writing notebook, as demonstrated by Stewart's examination of watermarks and ink offsets. This also means that the three sections of the memoranda, and the 269 entries in the "General" section in particular, were written in the order in which they now exist. Third, the memoranda of fourteen sheets were an organized set of notes that were written within a relatively restricted period of time, not rambling comments as Mossner thought. The fourth claim follows from the others: Hume wrote the largest section of the memoranda (the "General" section) with a clear intention of, or as preparation for, writing a new political-economic work, which was to be published as the *Political Discourses* in 1752.

The later-1740s theory takes seriously Stewart's observation "that Hume's publications of the 1750s provide more points of contact with the memoranda than his publications at any other time" (286). A source of Stewart's hesitation about taking a full-fledged later-1740s theory is his observation that "while there are many affinities of subject matter, there are relatively few firm hits" (286). The argument and evidence that follow intend to demonstrate that this observation is not completely accurate. Careful examination of the "General" section in particular reveals not only a greater number of strong and firm "hits" with the *Political Discourses* than Stewart acknowledged but also many other firm "hits" with the

other published and not-yet-published works that we know were written during the same years.

2. Presentation of the Later-1740s Theory

2.1 The Memoranda and the Essays, Moral and Political

For establishing the later-1740s theory, the question to be resolved before anything else is the memoranda's obvious relation to the *Essays, Moral and Political* published in 1741 and 1742. The relation might strongly suggest that Hume started to compile the memoranda, at least in part, during the same period as he was writing the *Essays*. This would serve as strong evidence for Stewart's earlier-1740s theory and against my theory. In fact, there are at least six matches between the memoranda entries and the published essays. They are shown below as a comparative table. This table is based on both Mossner's version of the memoranda and on a microfilm copy of the original memoranda. Citations from the *Essays* are verified by consulting the original editions.[16] (The method of compiling comparative tables will be the same throughout this essay.)

While there is no doubt about the strength of the six matches, two of them deserve special attention. The first is entry 133, referring to Cicero's celebrated speech *On Behalf of Milo* (*Pro Milone*). Hume interpreted Cicero's argument in the oration as "a surprizing proof of the loose police of Rome, and of the number and force of these robbers" (94). Milo was accused of assassinating Clodius on the Appian Street in the daytime. Cicero spoke in Milo's defense, arguing that it was Clodius who had waylaid Milo with the intention of killing him but that Clodius himself was killed instead in the fighting that ensued between the two parties. The number of servants who were accompanying Clodius mattered to Hume in this context because the large number seemed to indicate the lack of safety in Rome. In the memoranda, the number was described as "above 60 Servants." In the 1741 and 1742 corrected editions of the *Essays*, it was given as "sixty slaves." This figure was amended in the 1748 edition to "thirty slaves."[17] In the 1748 amendment, Hume added a footnote in Latin: "*Vide Asc. Ped. in Orat. pro Milone*" ("See Asconius Pedianus's Oration for Milo").

This means that when he came across Asconius's famous commentary, Hume was made aware of the error of the old figure (sixty) that he had cited in the 1741 and 1742 editions. Hume added the note to indicate that the figure in the earlier editions was wrong, and he had made the mistake because he had not seen Asconius's commentary when he wrote the earlier editions. (Asconius [B.C. 9–A.D. 76] was a Roman grammarian and historian whose commentary on Cicero's speeches was a standard reference for eighteenth-century scholars.) Cicero's speech in defense of Milo did not mention the specific number of servants who were accompanying Clodius; it simply mentioned "Clodius's party." By contrast, Asconius's commentary

Comparative Table 1.

"Early Memoranda" (III "General") Numbering is Mossner's.	***Essays, Moral and Political*, 2 vols., 1741–1742.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
21. Gustavus Vaza is perhaps the only Instance of a Prince who humbld the Clergy while he aspir'd to arbitrary Power.	Essay IX "The Parties of Great Britain" Gustavus Vaza was, perhaps, the only ambitious monarch, that ever depressed the church, at the same time that he discouraged liberty. (p. 66)
75. Within the last 2000 Years almost all the Despotic Governments of the World have been improving & the free ones degenerating; so that now they are pretty near a Par.	Essay XII "Of Civil Liberty" ("Of Liberty and Despotism" in 1741 and 1742 editions.) I am apt to think, that, in monarchical governments there is a source of improvement, and in popular governments a source of degeneracy, which in time will bring these species of civil polity still nearer an equality. (p. 95)
133. There seems to have been a very bad Police in Rome. For Cicero says, that if Milo had waylayd Clodius he wou'd have waited for him in the Neighbourhood, where his Death might have been attributed to Robbers, by reason of the commonness of the Accident, and yet Clodius had above 60 Servants with him all arm'd. (My emphasis.)	Essay XII "Of Civil Liberty" This is a surprizing proof of the loose police of Rome, and of the number and force of these robbers; since CLODIUS was at that time attended by sixty slaves, who were completely armed, and sufficiently accustomed to blood and danger in the frequent tumults excited by that seditious tribune.(p. 183 of 1741 ed.; p. 185 of 1742 ed. My emphasis.The Miller edition does not note this change between the editions.) This is a surprizing proof of the loose police of Rome, and of the number and force of these robbers; since CLODIUS was at that time attended by thirty slaves, who were completely armed, and sufficiently accustomed to blood and danger in the frequent tumults excited by that seditious tribune.(p. 134 of 1748 ed.; p. 94 of Miller ed.; My emphasis.)
142. The Public in Athens pay'd 20 per Cent for Money. XENOPHONE.	Essay XII "Of Civil Liberty" The *Athenians*, though a Republic, paid Twenty *per Cent.* for Money, as we learn from XENOPHONE. (p. 186 of 1741 ed.; p. 188 of 1742 ed.; p. 620 of Miller ed.) The Athenians, though governed by a republic, paid near two hundred *per Cent.* for those sums of money, which any emergent occasion made it necessary for them to borrow; as we learn from XENOPHONE. (p. 136 of 1748 ed.; p. 95 of Miller ed.)
154. A Faction betwixt two Roman Tribes the Pollia & Papiria continu'd for 300 Years. Do.[Livy] bib. 8. Cap. 38.	Essay VIII "Of Parties in General" We find in the Roman history a remarkable dissension between two tribes, the POLLIA and PAPIRIA, which continued for the space of near three hundred years, and discovered itself in their suffrages at every election of magistrates. (added in 1742 ed. with a footnote quoting at length from Livy indicating the source as "T. Livii, lib. 8") (p. 57)
161. External Superstition punishd by the Romans. Lib. 39. Cap. 16. They were very jealous of the establish'd Religion. [Livy] Lib. 40. Cap. 29.	Essay VIII "Of Parties in General" The laws against external superstition, amongst the Romans, were very ancient. (added in 1742 ed.) (p. 61)

explicitly mentions the "thirty slaves." Hume seems to have drawn his conclusions about the "loose police" of Rome from this commentary rather than from Cicero's original text.[18] Hence, we can understand the significance for the dating the memoranda of Hume's adding the footnote. Hume's knowledge of Asconius when he wrote the memoranda is further proved by a reference, in entry 209, to Asconius's commentary on Cicero's speech for Cornelius.

The second remarkable match is entry 142. This is another case in which the same figure that appeared both in the memoranda and in the 1741 and 1742 editions (in this case,"Twenty *per Cent*") was amended in the 1748 edition (to "near two hundred *per Cent*"). In the 1748 edition Hume supplied a footnote in Greek to indicate that the source of this information was Xenophon's *Ways and Means*. This use of Greek in 1748 but not before is consistent with Hume's recollection, in his autobiography, that he had recovered Greek after the publication of the 1741 and 1742 editions of the *Essays*.

How should we explain these matches, in particular the two matches between the memoranda and the corresponding passages in the 1748 edition of the *Essays* that represent changes from the 1741 and 1742 editions? The most obvious answer would be to suppose that the memoranda had been used by Hume as a kind of database for writing the earlier editions of the *Essays*. This might easily explain why the six matches occurred and possibly clarify why we find the two parallel matches in entries 133 and 142. According to this theory, Hume used these two entries for writing the 1741 and 1742 editions, but when revising for the 1748 edition, he discovered the inaccuracy of the two figures and changed them, adding footnotes referring to Asconius and Xenophon. This explanation must surely strengthen Stewart's theory, which was presented without knowledge of these matches. In fact, Stewart was happy to acknowledge the six matches when they were pointed out to him in an early draft of this essay, since he sees them as providing conclusive evidence for his theory.[19]

2.2 Reversal of Chronology and the Later-1740s Theory

Even confronted with this difficulty for the later-1740s theory, I propose the reversal of the chronological order between the memoranda and the early editions of the *Essays*. My proposal includes three claims. First, Mossner and Stewart's common supposition of a strong association between the memoranda and not only the *Essays* but also the *Treatise* should be rejected at the outset. I suppose, instead, that the memoranda were compiled as groundwork for writing a new book on political economy, which was to be published as the *Political Discourses* in 1752. Second, while he was compiling the memoranda, Hume was also busy with revisions for the 1748 edition of the *Essays*. While making these revisions, Hume used *his own earlier editions* of the *Essays* as historical resources for the memoranda. The two problematic matches were the results of these concurrent activities. Third, during

that concurrent work, Hume was made aware of the two errors in the earlier editions of the *Essays* and duly corrected them in the proofs for the 1748 edition.

This hypothesis solves the initial problem confronting a later-1740s theory. There are, in addition, two external circumstances that strengthen the case for this theory. First, in all of the above six matches the relevant passages in the *Essays* appear in contexts that are unrelated to the new contexts in which those passages appear in the memoranda. This would not have happened if the memoranda were written as notes for the *Essays*, and it strongly suggests that the relevant passages in the memoranda were quoted from the original *Essays* with the intention of writing a different kind of work. Hume intended to use these quotations as useful historical resources for a new work with different themes and aims than those of the *Essays*. This is best illustrated by the two cases, 133 and 142, in which Hume corrected the original figures. In the original 1741 and 1742 editions, Cicero's pleading for Milo (referred to in entry 133) was taken as evidence of the lack of public safety in ancient societies in clear contrast with the high level of law and order in modern civilized societies. This historical reference to Cicero abruptly appears in the memoranda between the consecutive passages from entries 124 to 139, which quote French economic writers such as Saint Pierre, Savary, and Vauban and are focused on economic subjects (trade, commerce, money, and population) in modern France. The *Essays* address the fact, noted in entry 142, that the extremely high rate of interest in ancient Athens was caused by the lack of public funding of the kind widely established in modern republics on the principle of public trust. In contrast, the same entry appears in the memoranda as one of the three quotations (140 to 142) from Xenophon and Salmasius that refer to the population of ancient Athens. What is common to these two quotations is the fact that both are taken from their original contexts in the *Essays*—namely political discussions of the lack of public safety and public funding—into an entirely different context in the memoranda—namely, discussions of economic subjects (the modern French economy and the ancient population).

The second remarkable fact is that the memoranda contain at least four entries whose contents appear for the first time in the 1748 and 1753 editions of the *Essays*. The four matches are as follows:

Comparative Table 2.

"Early Memoranda" (III"General")	***Essays, Moral and Political*, 1748 ed. and 1753 ed.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
5. Polybius says that all Money Matters belong'd to the Senate. The Censors levy'd all the Taxes, & farm'd them out to the Roman Knights.	Essay VI "Of the Independency of Parliament" Polybius justly esteems the pecuniary influence of the senate and censors to be one of the regular and constitutional weights, which preserved the balance of the Roman government. Lib. vi. cap. 15. [Polybius, Histories 6.15.] (p. 46; One sentence in a footnote added in 1753 ed.)

"Early Memoranda" (III"General")	***Essays, Moral and Political*, 1748 ed. and 1753 ed.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
162. Three thousand condemn'd for Poysoning for one Summer. Lib. 40. Cap. 43.	Essay III "That Politics May be Reduced to A Science" Yet at this very time, the horrid practice of poisoning was so common, that, during part of a season, a Prætor punished capitally for this crime above three thousand persons in a part of Italy; [T. Livii, lib. 40. cap. 43.] (p. 25; One paragraph added in 1748 ed.)
212. Castelani & Nicolotti two mobbish Factions at Venice. Id.[St Didier]	Essay VIII "Of Parties in General" The Castelani and Nicolloti are two mobbish factions in Venice, who frequently box together, and then lay aside their quarrels presently. (p. 58, One sentence in a footnote added in 1748 ed.)
262. The Carthaginians took the half of all the Produce in Africa, & impos'd Taxes beside. Polybius. Lib. 1.	Essay III "That Politics may be reduced to a Science" The oppression and tyranny of the Carthaginians over their subject states in Africa went so far, as we learn from Polybius, that, not content with exacting the half of all the produce of the land, which of itself was a very high rent, they also loaded them with many other taxes. Lib. I. cap. 72. (p. 21; This sentence added in 1753 ed.)

Even if the number of matches is small, they surely provide a strong proof for the later-1740s dating. For the purposes of dating the memoranda, a striking fact about the thirty-six ancient authors referred to in the memoranda is that most of them (Didorus Siculus, Herodotus, Livy, Polybius, Strabo, Tacitus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, in particular) are referred to only in Hume's works that were published after 1748, including the 1748 edition of the *Essays*, the *Political Discourses*, the two *Enquiries*, and the *Natural History of Religion*. The exceptions are the authors of philosophical and literary classics, including Cicero, Demosthenes, Plutarch and a few others. This is additional evidence that the memoranda functioned as the common groundwork or database for writing these post-1748 publications, which further suggests that during this period Hume had a clear purpose of strengthening his knowledge of classical authors with an historical bent. The memoranda were the result of his intensive study.

Among the four matches in Table 2, it is chronologically natural to suppose that the two matches with the 1753 edition (5 and 262) were the results of Hume's reliance on the memoranda for the 1753 edition, rather than vice-versa. The problem is how to interpret the other two matches (162 and 212) with the 1748 edition. There are two possibilities. One is that the passages in the memoranda were entered before or during his revision for the 1748 edition of the *Essays* and used for the new edition. The other is that, conversely, Hume quoted them in the memoranda from his *published* 1748 edition of the *Essays*, exactly as he had done with the six passages in Table 1. While one cannot make any definitive decision between the two possibilities, I have reasons for accepting both: the first applies to entry 162 and the second, to 212.

Entry 162 is one of Hume's concentrated annotations and comments on the *Roman History* by Livy (Titus Livius, B.C. 59–A.D. 17). Entries on Livy (5, 145–165) in the memoranda constitute the single largest section among the thirty-six ancient authors in the memoranda. Except for entry five, the twenty-one entries from Livy are written consecutively and with a clear intention of summarizing Livy's views on the Roman constitution. In particular, Hume's attention is directed to topics such as the strong authority of the Senate (147, 150, 153, 156, 158), the balance of power (159, 163, 164, 165), and the structural lack of constitutional liberty (154, 160, 162). Hume certainly learned much from Livy. Yet he maintained a critical attitude, as he says of the historian that he was "somewhat loose" (155) and "thoughtless an Historian" (165). It seems as if Hume was forming his own views on Roman society and politics through an intellectual dialogue with Livy, with the help of Livy's original text but also sometimes consulting his own earlier writings. All these thoughts and ideas finally coalesced into the published essays in the *Political Discourses*, notably in "Of the Balance of Power" and "Of some Remarkable Customs." In particular, entry 162 about the three thousand condemned for poisoning is preceded by entry 161, which, on the present theory, was a quotation from the 1742 edition. If Hume wrote entry 161 using the 1742 edition, then the 1748 edition was not yet available to him when he wrote entry 162. This fact leads to the further conjecture that entry 162 was part of Hume's intensive study of Livy that was used for the 1748 revision of the *Essays*.

Circumstances are more complicated with entry 212. It is one of three quotations (210–212) and is identified by Hume as from "St. Didier," Limojon de St. Didier, the author of *La Ville et la République de Venise*, published in 1680. It is some distance from entry 162. In between there are nearly fifty entries (166–213), suggesting a certain interval of time and constituting a separate section with a different purpose from the Livy section (145–165). These entries include quotations from or comments on Herodotus (172–177), Plutarch (179–183), Thomas Hyde (184–192), Jean Le Clerc (194–196), François Michel Janiçon (198–201) and Diodorus Siculus (203–207, 213). Interspersed with Dutch and French economic and political subjects, religious topics are strongly emphasized. Hyde and Siculus in particular seem to have served Hume as two sources of information for the *Natural History of Religion* (1757) and the posthumously published *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*.[20] These circumstances make it less plausible that entry 212, a quotation from St. Didier, was simply quoted from the 1748 edition of the *Essays*. The one short sentence from St. Didier, which was added to the essay "Of Parties in General" in the 1748 edition with no reference to the author, gives the impression that it was added casually or even as a secondary citation. However, by the time he entered the three quotations with St. Didier's name in the memoranda, Hume's interest in St. Didier's discussion of the Venetian constitution must have been revived, possibly, but not necessarily, for the new purposes of the memoranda.

The fact that entry 212 occurs at the end of a long section on religion provides a key to understanding its place in the history of the memoranda. Beauchamp gives a plausible account of how the *Natural History* and the *Dialogues* could have been written or revised concurrently between 1749 and 1752. He says of the former, "Drafting, by contrast to note-taking of the sort found in Hume's early memoranda, was probably not begun before Hume finished *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* in 1748."[21] This means, on the one hand, that Hume's note-taking for the *Natural History* of the sort found in the memoranda could have started even before 1748. But more important is Beauchamp's identification of the memoranda as the common source of the two religious works. As such, the religious entries from Hyde and Siculus in the memoranda could have been written either before or after Hume finished the *Philosophical Essays* (*An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*). Firm matches between the memoranda in general and the *Natural History* are shown below. In considering these matches, we should remember Stewart's observation that the order of Mossner's three sections of the memoranda is not the order in which they were actually written, and therefore that entry II:13 was probably written after III:255.

Comparative Table 3.

"Early Memoranda"	***The Natural History of Religion* (1757)** Pagination by Beauchamp ed.
II-13. The most probable account we have of the Sentiments of the Ionic Sect is that Thales maintain'd the Origin of every thing from Water. Anaximander from the Infinity of Things: Anaximenes from Air; Anaxagoras from his Homaeomeries. Heraclitus of a different Sect from Fire.	So far was it from being esteemed profane in those days to account for the origin of things without a deity, that Thales, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, and others, who embraced that system of cosmogony, passed unquestioned; (p. 47)
III-192. The 10th part of the Sadder is not Morality but Ceremonies: Yet Liberality or Beneficence most strongly recommended. Id [Hyde].	The least part of the *Sadder*, as well as of the *Pentateuch*, consists in precepts of morality; and we may be assured also that that part was always the least observed and regarded. (p. 81)
203. Diodorus Siculus, in enumerating all the Opinions concerning the Origin of the World, never makes mention of Design or a Deity.	Diodorus Sculus, beginning his work with an enumeration of the most reasonable opinions concerning the origin of the world, makes no mention of a deity or intelligent mind (p. 46)
255. The Immortal Getes Theists & Unitarians. Id[Herodotus]. Lib. 4. Yet had such erroneous Notions of Zamolxis that they killd every five years a Man whom they send as a Messenger to him.	The Getes, commonly called immortal, from their steady belief of the soul's immortality, were genuine theists and unitarians. They affirmed Zamolxis, their deity, to be the only true God; . . . Every fifth year they sacrificed a human victim, whom they sent as a messenger to their deity, in order to inform him of their wants and necessities. . . . Such at least is the account which Herodotus gives of the theism of the immortal Getes. (p. 57)

3. Some Historical Evidence for the Later-1740s Theory

Let me summarize what I have said so far about the timeline for Hume's compiling the memoranda. At some point prior to the year 1748, Hume conceived the idea of writing a new book on political economy and started extensive reading and study of relevant works both ancient and modern. This led Hume to compile and organize useful references for the new work. Concurrently with this, Hume was busy revising the earlier edition of the *Essays, Moral and Political*. In fact, Hume turned to the earlier editions of the *Essays* for two purposes: one was for revision and the other, for reference. In this concurrent work, Hume quoted in the memoranda two mistaken figures that were taken from the earlier editions of the *Essays*: sixty servants in entry 133 and twenty percent in entry 142. Later, after he read Asconius, he noticed the errors and corrected them for the new edition of 1748. How Hume discovered and corrected the second mistaken figure ("twenty percent") is not known. It is possible that Hume had merely misquoted Xenophon's original account. Hume not only referred to his earlier editions of the *Essays* for the memoranda when he quoted from Livy in entries 154 and 161, he also wrote entry 162 based on his own intensive study and rereading of Livy, and used this entry and research in revisions for the 1748 edition. This means that by the time the new edition was published in February of 1748, the memoranda compilation must have progressed at least to entry 162. Since the Livy section extends to entry 165 in one consecutive block, the memoranda would have progressed at least to entry 165 by the time Hume departed for the second mission with St. Clair. After some time, entry 212 was written using the already published 1748 edition as a source. In addition, entry 262 must have been written long enough after the 1748 edition to explain the match with only the 1753 edition.

On this hypothesis, we can identify the approximate time at which Hume began to compile the memoranda. In all probability, Hume started the memoranda while he was staying at Ninewells between July and November of 1747. It was only during this short recess that Hume could have consulted his 1741 and 1742 editions of the *Essays* in connection with a new project and concurrently worked on revisions for the 1748 edition. He enjoyed the four months with his family, and his intellectual productivity during the period was remarkable. He first finished the *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*, then revised the 1748 edition of the *Essays* and, finally, published a small pamphlet defending the former Provost of Edinburgh, Archibald Stewart. Hume's self-evaluation of this period in his autobiography is certainly modest: he describes the first work as "little more successful than the Treatise of Human Nature" and the second as having "met not with a better reception"(xxxv). However, we have clear evidence to show that it was during this period that Hume's interest in starting a new work on political economy was ignited. That evidence is a set of letters written by Hume to his close

friends before and after his stay at Ninewells. These letters provide clear proof of a change of mind that occurred during this interval. This drastic alteration of Hume's mindset from a negative to a positive posture toward his future life and career helps to explain his remarkable productivity at home.

The first is to Henry Home of Kames; the letter is undated but it was probably written from Cork in the second half of January 1747.[22] In this letter, written shortly after his return from General St. Clair's abortive mission to Canada, Hume frankly discloses his mind to his close friend. He was wavering as to whether he should accept General St. Clair's invitation to Flanders. Indeed, he has "a great Curiosity to see a real campaign," but he is "deterr'd with the View of Expence" and "afraid, that living in a Camp, without any Character & without any thing to do, wou'd appear ridiculous." He also admits that "Had I any Fortune, which coul'd give me a Prospect of Leizure & Opportunitys to prosecute my historical Projects, nothing coul'd be more useful to me; and I shou'd pick up more military Knowledge, in one Campaign, by living in the General's Family & being introduc'd frequently to the Dukes, than most Officers coul'd do after many Years Service."

Even if the "historical Projects" here referred to had nothing to do with the memoranda, the letter suggests that Hume had a general wish or ambition to write a kind of history,[23] but at this moment, Hume had no "Fortune" with which to prosecute the historical project. He continues the letter by saying, "But to what can all this Serve? I am a Philosopher, & so, I suppose, must continue." While expecting something new to "present itself" by staying still in London, Hume is nonetheless positive about the prospect of returning "very cheerfully to Books, Leizure, & Solitude in the Country" because, as he sees it, "An elegant Table has not spoilt my relish for Sobriety: Nor Gaiety for study."

As J. Y. T. Greig once observed, Hume's experience in the first St. Clair mission marked "a further stage in the transformation of David Hume the philosophic recluse, into David Hume the man of the world."[24] However, the nature and extent of that "transformation" was limited at this stage. To be a philosopher and to be an historian were still regarded by Hume as alien to each other, and his inclination seems definitely placed on the side of philosophy. Hume's striking reference at the end of the same letter to "my Xenophon or Polybius in my Hand; which I shall willingly throw aside to be cheerful with you, as usual" does not mean that he chose at this moment to become an historian as opposed to being a philosopher. The two historians are mentioned only as proof that Hume was struggling to remain a philosopher in a broad sense. However, the passing reference to these authors certainly makes us suspect a possible relation to the memoranda, for the memoranda are full of references to them.

A similar state of mind is confirmed by another undated letter to Henry Home, presumably written five months later (end of June, 1747), also from London.[25] It shows that Hume's physical and mental condition at this time was far from ideal

for doing any substantial academic work. Hume confesses that he is "at a critical Season in Life" with no stable profession and income, and he predicts that "if I retire into a Solitude at present I am in danger of being left there, & of continuing a poor Philosopher for ever." After enumerating the merits and demerits of staying longer in London, Hume draws the conclusion that "the Balance of my Inclination lies the other way: Tho I confess, that I felt the Solitude in the Country [during the unhappy Annandale period] rather too great, especially as I was so indifferently provided of a Library to employ me." The last sentence is strong proof that the Annandale period was far from suitable for Hume to prosecute any substantial academic work. It also suggests that the Annandale library was equally far from satisfactory. This reduces the probability that the writing of the memoranda started as early as the Annandale period.[26]

The letters to Home allow us to reconstruct the state of mind in which Hume found himself immediately after his first mission with St. Clair and before he returned home to Ninewells in July 1747. Hume spent nearly six months in London having nothing to do except wait for something to come up. Enough time was certainly available to start some work again, and Hume was possibly starting to read "Xenophon or Polybius" as he mentions in the letter, but his mental wavering and anxiety were such that the period was not fitting for a full-scale new project as long as he stayed in London.

There is little evidence to indicate how Hume passed the short but productive period at Ninewells. *My Own Life* described the two years Hume spent with General St. Clair as "the only interruptions which my studies have received during the course of my life"(xxxv). However, this two-year period probably does not include the short interval Hume spent at home between the two expeditions. The fact that Hume intended to devote time to his new studies while at Ninewells is confirmed by a letter to his close friend James Oswald of Dunnikier, dated October 2 of 1747, in which Hume expresses his intention of "taking advantage of this short interval of liberty that is indulged us and of printing the Philosophical Essays I left in your hands"(1:106). Greig remarks that "Life at Ninewells must have been a good deal easier and pleasanter by this time,"[27] thanks to his brother's improvements of the estate, providing a much better environment for Hume's study.

A letter of vital importance to the dating of the memoranda, dated January 29, 1748 and addressed to James Oswald, was written from London immediately after Hume accepted General St. Clair's second invitation to Vienna and Turin (1:108–10). While Hume had made a clear distinction between philosopher and a man of the world in the above-mentioned letter to Henry Home, in this letter he sounds convinced of the possibility of uniting the philosopher, historian, and man of the world. Hume had said in the earlier letter, "living in a Camp, without any Character & without any thing to do, wou'd appear ridiculous." Here he says, "I shall have an opportunity of seeing Courts & Camps; & if I can afterwards, be

so happy as to attain leizure and other opportunities, this knowledge may even turn to account to me, as a man of letters, which I confess has always been the sole object of my ambition." Hume now seems positive about the "historical Projects" that in the earlier letter were mentioned only as a remote possibility that was dependent on his having sufficient funds. Here he says with confidence, "I have long had an interest, in my riper years, of composing some History; and I question not but some greater experience of the Operations of the Field, & the Intrigues of the Cabinet, will be requisite, in order to enable me to speak with judgement upon these subjects."

Even more significant for the purposes of the present essay is Hume's comment that follows in the same letter. He says, "But notwithstanding of these flattering ideas of futurity, as well as the present charms of variety, I must confess, that I left home with infinite regret, where I had treasured up stores of study & plans of thinking for many years. I am sure I shall not be so happy as I should have been had I prosecuted these." While Hume discovers a slight sense of regret about leaving much work unfinished at home, the frustration apparent in the earlier letter no longer exists. Hume is now convinced of the rightness of his decision and even foresees that in the long course of his career he will become the ideal man of letters, or the philosopher-historian. However, something lingers in his mind as yet unresolved. Because Hume expresses genuine excitement about his new prospects, the "infinite regret" he refers to would concern something specific as opposed to a general sense of dissatisfaction. What Hume regrets is leaving behind "stores of study & plans of thinking for many years" that he "had treasured up." The same sense of regret is revealed in the letter written eleven days later to Henry Home, when Hume refers to "an inward reluctance to leave my books, and leisure and retreat"(1:111). In the same letter Hume mentions a new edition of the *Essays* as well as the *Philosophical Essays* as "two works going on." It is certain that these two major works were among the "stores of study & plans of thinking for many years." However, even when almost finishing the two works, Hume wrote in the letter to Oswald that "I am sure I shall not be so happy as I should have been had I prosecuted these," which clearly indicates that something *else* was going on and remained unfinished. My conjecture here is that the writing of the memoranda was one of those things that had caused the sense of "infinite regret" in Hume's mind.

As Mossner pointed out, it is possible that the "two works going on" had already been started during the unhappy Annandale period. It would surely be odd if what Hume described as "stores of study & plans of thinking for many years" should have meant only work that was done during the short interval of four months spent at Ninewells, no matter how intensive and productive. It is unfounded, however, for Mossner to say that between leaving the Annandale family and the publication of the two works, Hume was "too much involved with other affairs to have much

freedom left for literary composition."[28] On the contrary, the Annandale period, even excepting the unhappy relation with Annandale himself, was full of depressing events for Hume, including the death of his mother, his unsuccessful pursuit of the Edinburgh chair, and the aftermath of the Jacobite rising. What Hume called the "indifferently provided" library was another impediment to Hume's literary activity. Regarding the memoranda in particular, it is unrealistic to suppose that the writing started during the Annandale period, in light of the present hypothesis that they were written as a bound book and during a relatively restricted period of time. A more reasonable conjecture is that Hume, after returning from the first expedition and struggling through anxiety concerning his future career, finally reached a new scene of life at home that enabled him to combine the two careers of philosopher and historian . The memoranda can be regarded as evidence of this new intellectual adventure. The complicated editorial interaction between the memoranda and the amendments for the new edition of the *Essays* can be taken to illustrate the struggle.

4. The Memoranda and the Formation of the *Political Discourses*

4.1 Matches between the Memoranda and the Political Discourses

According to the present theory, after the first mission with St. Clair, in about July of 1747 Hume started the composition of the memoranda at home. At the end of the year, after he had finished writing up to the end of the Livy section (entry 165), he accepted St. Clair's second invitation, and the writing of the memoranda was suspended for more than a year, until Hume returned home in the early summer of 1749.[29] This long suspension of work did not prevent Hume from achieving the marvelous intellectual productivity demonstrated by his writing of *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751), the *Political Discourses* (1752), the *Natural History of Religion* (1757) and the *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion* (1779). The memoranda entries present considerable conformity and textual matches with all these works, a fact that was recognized even by M. A. Stewart. Stewart, however, did not further pursue the possibility that the memoranda were connected to these later works. In fact, he cast doubt upon any substantial connection. The chief reason for this was his view that the publications in the 1750s demonstrate "relatively few firm hits"(286). That this is not the case has already been shown, at least to a certain extent. That evidence along with the detailed comparison between the memoranda entries and the *Political Discourses* presented below (in Table 4) will demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt the existence of a surprisingly large number of "firm hits."[30]

Comparative Table 4.

Early Memoranda (III "General")	***Political Discourses*, 1752 ed.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
	Essay XI "Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations"
1. Perhaps the Custom of allowing Parents to murder their Infant Children, tho barbarous, tends to render a State Populous, as in China. Many marry by that Inducement; & such is the Force of natural Affection, that none make use of that Privilege but in extreme Necessity.	China, the only country where this practice of exposing children prevails at present, is the most populous country we know of; and every man is married before he is twenty. (p. 399)
61. A ninth of the Children born in Paris sent to the *Enfans Trouves*.	It is computed, that every ninth child born at Paris, is sent to the hospital; (p. 400)
110. Ninety five Millions of People in the Roman Empire in the Reign of Augustus.	Suidas (August.) says, that the Emperor Augustus, having numbered the whole Roman empire, found it contained only 4,101,017 men (ἄνδρες).There is here surely some great mistake, either in the author or transcriber. But this authority, feeble as it is, may be sufficient to counterbalance the exaggerated accounts of Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus with regard to more early times. (p. 460)
140. 600 Slaves working in the Silver Mines of Athens yielded a Mina a day to their Master. Xenophon. He computes that 10.000 Slaves wou'd produce a Revenue of 100 Talents a year. 141. The Holydays in *Athens* made two Months in the year. Salmasius.	Ninthly, The whole census of the state of Athens was less than 6000 talents. . . . Now, the most vulgar slave could yield by his labour an obolus a day, over and above his maintenance, as we learn from Xenophon, who says, that Nicias's overseer paid his master so much for slaves, whom he employed in mines. . . . even though allowance be made for the great number of holidays in Athens. (p. 430)
221. Tis probable that the Roman Empire & even Italy was not so well peopled as Europe at present, because Pertinax by an Edict gave the waste Lands to the first Occupier, with Immunities. Herodian. Lib. 2. C. 15.	It appears from the same historian [Herodian], that there was then much land uncultivated, and put to no manner of use; and he ascribes it as a great praise to Pertinax, that he allowed every one to take such land either in Italy or elsewhere, and cultivate it as he pleased, without paying any taxes. Lib. ii. cap. 15. (p. 445)
223. The Antient common Soldiers of much better Rank (being Freemen) than the Moderns. In Xenophon [Anabasis.5.2.4?] The Captains got only double pay to the common Soldiers: The Colonels 4 times.	When Xenophon returned after the famous expedition with Cyrus, he hired himself and 6000 of the Greeks into the service of Seuthes, a prince of Thrace; and the essays of his agreement were, that each soldier should receive a daric a month, each captain two darics, and he himself, as general, four: A regulation of pay which would not a little surprise our modern officers. (p. 401–2)
228. There was above 10.000 Houses in Athens. Xen[ophon]. Mem[orabilia]. lib. 3.	*Secondly*, There were but 10,000 houses in Athens. Xenophon. *Mem.* lib. ii.[*Memorabilia* 3.6.14 in the Loeb edition.] (p. 428)

Early Memoranda (III "General")	***Political Discourses*, 1752 ed.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
	Essay XI "Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations"
234. The 30. Tyrants killd above 1500 Citizens untry'd. Id. Thrasybulus restoring the People, & Caesar's Conquest the only Instances in antient History of Revolutions without barbarous Cruelty.	There are only two revolutions I can recollect in ancient history, which passed without great severity, and great effusion of blood in massacres and assassinations, namely, the restoration of the Athenian Democracy by Thrasybulus, and the subduing of the Roman republic by Cæsar. (p. 407)
239. Timarchus was said by Aeschines to have been [left?] in easy Circumstances by his Father, because he had ten Slaves who gain'd him 2 Oboles apiece a day. A Proof that every Citizen of Athens upon an Averrage had not 20 Slaves.	Now Timarchus is said by Æschines to have been left in easy circumstances; but he was master only of ten slaves employed in manufactures. (p. 429)
241. The ten Ambassadors sent by Athens to Philip had 1000 Drachmas of Allowance for 6 Months, which Demosthenes calls a considerable Sum. [On the False Embassy]. 244. The Athenians gave 2 Drahmas a day to all their Soldiers at the Beginning of the Peloponisian War. [Thucydides, 3. 17.]	Demosthenes and Æschines, with eight more, were sent ambassadors to Philip of Macedon, and their appointments for above four months were a thousand drachmas, which is less than a drachma a day for each ambassador. But a drachma a day, nay sometimes two, was the pay of a common foot-soldier. [Demost. "On the False Embassy," sec. 158.] He calls it a considerable sum. (p. 402)
249.That Athens was not so populous as we shou'd naturally conclude from its Bulk describd by Thucidides, these Reasons prove. 1. There were about 10.000 Houses. Xen[ophon]. Mem[orabilia]. L. 3. P. 774. 2. There were but 20.000 Citizens, each of which upon an Averrage cou'd not have 20 Slaves. For. 1. No Rising or Suspicion of a rising is ever mention'd by this Historian. 2. Timarchus is spoken of by Aeschines as a rich man for possessing 20 Slaves; . . . 3. Chios is said by Thucidides to have had most Slaves except Sparta of any Greek City. Lib. 8. Page 581. Now the Helots were not very numerous as we learn from Plutarch. Besides Sparta had no Trade. 4. Xenophon says there was much empty [space] within the Walls. [On Sources of Revenue].	*Secondly*, There were but 10,000 houses in Athens. *Mem.* lib. ii.[*Memorabilia* 3.6.14 in the Loeb edition.] . . . *Fourthly*, No insurrection of the slaves, or suspicion of insurrection, is ever mentioned by historians; except one commotion of the miners . . . *Thirdly*, ... Yet Xenophon says, there was much waste ground within the walls. *Fifthly*, The treatment of slaves by the Athenians is said by Xenophon, and Demosthenes, and Plautus, to have been extremely gentle and indulgent: Which could never have been the case, had the disproportion been twenty to one. . . . Now Timarchus is said by Æschines to have been left in easy circumstances; but he was master only of ten slaves employed in manufactures . . . . *Tenthly*, Chios is said by Thucydides, to contain more slaves than any Greek city, except Sparta. (pp. 428–30)
256. Herodotus says there were 30.000 Athenians before the Medean War. Lib. 5.	[Athens] was as populous before the Median war as at any time after it, according to Herodotus. he makes the number of the citizens amount to 30,000. (p. 417)
265. Aristotle speaking of a Medium in the Number of Friends compares it to a City which cannot count of ten, nor yet of 100 thousand. NIK [Nicomachean Ethics]. [Bk. 9. 10].	We meet with a reflection in Aristotle's Ethics, ... What! impossible that a city can contain a hundred thousand inhabitants! Had Aristotle never seen nor heard of a city so populous? Lib. ix. cap. 10. His expression is ἄνθρωπος, not πολίτης; inhabitant, not citizen. (p. 447)

Early Memoranda (III "General")	***Political Discourses*, 1752 ed.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
	Essay X "Of Some Remarkable Customs"
26. In King William's Time the Press-Gang condemn'd for Murder for killing a Man in impressing him.	There is, however, one occasion, where the parliament has departed from this maxim; and that is, in the *pressing of seamen*. (p. 374)
147. The Roman Senate were oblig'd by Law to give their Authority to the *Comitia Centuriata* before the Suffrages were call'd. Do[Livy]. Lib. Cap. 12.	The legislative power was there lodged in the *comitia centuriata* and *comitia tributa*. In the former, it is well known, the people voted according to their *census*; (p. 371)
237. The γραφὴ παρανόμων a singular and a seemingly an absurd Law among the Athenians; by which a man cou'd be try'd & punishd for promulgating a bad Law to the People, the only Legislators. This shows a remarkable Diffidence which the People had in their own Judgement. Demosthenes was try'd & acquitted for his Law: [*On the Symmories*; *On the Crown*].	By the *γραφὴ παρανόμων, or indictment of illegality*, (though it has not been remarked by antiquaries or commentators) any man was tried and punished in a common court of judicature, for any law which had passed upon his motion, in the assembly of the people, if that law appeared to the court unjust, or prejudicial to the public. Thus Demosthenes, ... was he tried in a criminal court for that law, upon the complaint of the rich, who resented the alteration that he had introduced into the finances. He was indeed acquitted, upon proving anew the usefulness of his law. (p. 367)
267. The first Law, on the Establishment of the Oligarchy in Athens was the Abolishing of the γραφὴ παρανόμων [Indictment for proposing unconstitutional measures].	It is remarkable, that the first step after the dissolution of the Democracy by Critias and the Thirty, was to annul the γραφὴ παρανόμων, as we learn from Demosthenes κατὰ Τιμοκ. [Against Timocrates.] (p. 369)
	IV "Of Interest"
47. The Romans pay'd 12 per Cent Interest for money.	Lib. ii. [Dio(n) Cassius, Roman History 51.21.5: "loans for which the borrower had been glad to pay twelve per cent. could now be had for one third that rate"] (p. 305, note 4)
	Essay III "Of Money"
68. 3 times more Silver given for Goods in Lewis 15 than in Lewis the 12ths time. [Du Tot's] Reflexions Politiques. 69. The French Navy in 1681 consisting of 40.000 Men & 10000 in the Galleys cost only a Million Sterling. Id. 70. France had about 25. Millions Sterling of Gold & Silver in the Regents time. Id. 71. There are now in France 60 Millions a Year more pay'd for Offices than in 1500. Id. 72. The Interest of the public Debt above 45 Millions. Id. 73. In the Year 1709 the Revenues of the King of France 38 Millions; his Expence above 220. Id. 74. Bills of Exchange in France dont pass like Money or bank Notes. Id.	In the last year of Louis XIV. money was raised three-sevenths, but prices augmented only one. Corn in France is now sold at the same price, or for the same number of livres, it was in 1683; though silver was then at 30 livres the mark, and is now at 50. (p. 287) These facts I give upon the authority of Mons. du Tot in his *Reflections politiques*, an author of reputation. Though I must confess, that the facts which he advances on other occasions, are often so suspicious, as to make his authority less in this matter. However, the general observation, that the augmenting of the money in France does not at first proportionably augment the prices, is certainly just. (p. 287, n. 7)

Early Memoranda (III "General")	***Political Discourses*, 1752 ed.** Pagination is Miller edition's unless otherwise indicated.
	Essay III "Of Money"
129. There is computed to be 3000 Tun of Gold in the Bank of Amsterdam at 100.000 Florins a Tun. Id.	And in this view, it must be allowed, that no bank could be more advantageous, than such a one as locked up all the money it received, and never augmented the circulating coin, as is usual, by returning part of its treasure into commerce. (284) This is the case with the bank of AMSTERDAM. (284, n. 4, added in 1753–1754 ed.)
264. The common Reckoning in the Inns in Lombardy only about a farthing. Id. Lib. 2. C. 15. They bargaind only for the head, not for particular Provisions as in Greece, which Polybius reckons a great Proof of Plenty in that Country.	Polybius tells us [Lib. ii. cap. 15. Histories 2.15.] that provisions were so cheap in Italy during his time, that in some places the stated price for a meal at the inns was a *semis* a head, little more than a farthing! (p. 294)
	Essay V "Of the Balance of Trade"
230. The Census of the Athenians was 6000 Talents. Περὶ Συμμορίας [On the Symmories]. Query: Whether was this annual or the whole Stock. If the latter, their Forces must have been vastly high, since the twelfth Part was sometimes exacted. Id. [Demosthenes]. It was the Whole Stock as Polybius says expressly. Lib. 2. C. 63.	For we find, by the memorable census mentioned by Demosthenes [Περὶ Συμμορίας] and Polybius[Lib. ii. cap. 62.], that, in about fifty years afterwards, the whole value of the republic, comprehending lands, houses, commodities, slaves, and money, was less than 6000 talents. (p. 322)
258. The Athenians stor'd up three Myriads of Silver Talents & 3000 of unwrought Gold before the Peloponnesian War. Aesch[ines]. Epis[ulae]. Only 10000. Dem[osthenes]. Only a thousand Aesche[ines], sub finem. 7000 afterwards. Query: in whole 8000. They had 1200 talents a year. Id. They had 6000 Talents in bank, 600 a year says Thuc[ydides]. L. 2. P. 13. 4000 Talents were spent before.	For all the Greek historians [Thucydides, lib. ii. [13] and Diod. Sic. lib. xii. [40.] and orators agree, that the Athenians collected in the citadel more than 10,000 talents, which they afterwards dissipated to their own ruin, in rash and imprudent enterprizes. [*Vid*. Æschinis et Demosthenis *Epist*.] (pp. 321–22)
	Essay VII "Of the Balance of Power"
232. The Notion of the Ballance of Power seems to be containd in Demosthenes Oration [For the Megalopolitans] more clearly than in any antient Author.	Whoever will read Demosthenes's oration for the Megalopolitans, may see the utmost refinements on this principle, that ever entered into the head of a Venetian or English speculatist. (p. 333)
263. Polybius Lib. 1. relating that Hiero, tho an Enemy, assisted the Carthaginians in the Mercenary War, in order to preserve a Ballance against the Romans, adds [*in Greek*, that the stronger power should not be able to attain its ultimate object entirely without effort. In this he reasoned very wisely and sensibly for such matters should never be neglected]. Id. Chap. 83.	The only prince we meet with in the Roman history, who seems to have understood the balance of power, is Hiero king of Syracuse. Though the ally of Rome, he sent assistance to the Carthaginians, during the war of the auxiliaries; [Polybius Lib. i. 83.] (p. 337)

4.2 Progress of the Memoranda as Indicated by Hume's Letters

The so-called "General" section covers 20 pages out of the entire 28 pages of the memoranda and contains 269 entries. Most remarkable about this composition is a distinctive distribution of entries concerning ancient and modern authors. Using entry 165 to divide what, according to the present theory, Hume had compiled before his second departure to Europe and what he compiled after he returned home, it becomes apparent that entries before 165 overwhelmingly concern modern authors and sources. The number of ancient authors that Mossner had identified before entry 165 is only 6, covering 35 entries; this is out of the total of 27 identifiable authors and sources covering 105 entries. By contrast, entries after 165 are dominated by ancient authors, and the number of modern authors and sources that Mossner had identified after entry 165 is only 9, covering 28 entries. This is out of the total of 29 identifiable authors and sources covering 110 entries.[31] Broadly speaking, then, the first half of the memoranda comprises modern authors and the second half, ancient authors.

The character of the "General" section of the memoranda as a work on political economy is striking. In addition, quotations and comments relating to such various subjects as money, trade, the rate of interest, rent, population and taxation are generally arranged by author. This internal order of composition belies Mossner's characterization of the memoranda as of a rambling nature. As indicated in Table 4, there are at least thirty-three firm matches between the memoranda and the *Political Discourses* compared to the six matches between the memoranda and the early editions of the *Essays* shown earlier. The stronger connection is between the memoranda and the *Political Discourses*.

On the basis of the relative distribution of ancient and modern authors, the way in which Hume compiled the memoranda can be reconstructed as follows: Hume thought of writing a new work on political economy immediately after he returned home from his first mission with St. Clair. At Ninewells, he started compilation of the memoranda, with quotations and commentaries mainly about various modern authors whom he regarded as important for the subject. This continued until he reached entry 165, at which point he was invited for the second mission. The compiling work was suspended for more than a year but resumed when Hume returned home in the early summer of 1749. The new work mainly concerned the ancient authors. Some evidence for this conjecture can be found in a letter Hume writes to John Clephane, dated April 18 of 1750: "You would perhaps ask, how I employ my time in this leisure and solitude, and what are my occupations? Pray, do you expect I should convey to you an encyclopedia in the compass of a letter? The last thing that I took my hand from was a very learned, elaborate discourse, concerning the Populousness of antiquity; not altogether in opposition to *Vossius* and *Montesquieu*, who exaggerate the affair infinitely; but, starting some doubts,

and scruples, and difficulties, sufficient to make us suspend our judgment on that head"(1:140). Hume's account of his activities at this time completely agrees with the content of the essay on the populousness of ancient nations included in the *Political Discourses*.

The next letter of interest was written seven months later, on November 1 of 1750, to James Oswald of Dunnikier. It discusses in detail some theoretical points relating to the balance of trade and the relative superiority of rich countries over poor countries. This letter was probably written as a reply to Oswald's letter to Hume dated October 10 of 1749,[32] for Hume continues the same discussion and further elaborates on some theoretical points, all of which are reflected in the arguments of the published essay on the balance of trade in the *Political Discourses*. A passing reference in the same letter to the "*rentes* of the Hotel de Ville" in Paris concerns a theoretical issue on paper-credit as a "part of our public funds" that serves in places of money (1:144). This theoretical issue was to form one of the central elements of the essay on money in the *Political Discourses*. Here we are reminded that entry 126 of the memoranda, "Rents upon the Hotel de Ville amounting to 40 million a Year" was a quotation from Charles Dutot's *Reflexions politiques sur les finances, et le commerce* (1738). In Hume's published essay on money, Dutot's work is mentioned, together with J. F. Melon's and J. Paris-Duverney's, as the most important literature on the subject. (The "rents upon the Hotel de Ville" are not mentioned there, however.)

All these references suggest that from the early days at home after the second mission with St. Clair, Hume had been busy working not only on the population essay but also on the essays on the balance of trade and money. As the result of this intensive work and study, Hume came to confess in a letter to James Abercromby dated February 16 of 1751, "you suspect too much Study has made me crazy"(1:146). That Hume did not lose his sanity, however, is clear from the letter, written two days later to John Clephane, that reports his having finished writing "at an idle hour" a short pamphlet of satire to be published soon (1:149).[33] The letter also reveals that Hume was absorbed in polishing the population essay, because he asks Clephane about the trustworthiness of "Dr. Mead" (Richard Mead, 1673–1754) as a source of information concerning the plans of buildings in ancient Rome. In the published essay, Mead is replaced by "BARTOLI" (Pietro Santi Bartoli, 1635–1700), and this appears to be the result of Clephane's advice to Hume (438).

I now turn to a letter of decisive importance for the dating proposed in the present essay. This letter, addressed to Gilbert Elliot of Minto on February 18 of 1751, is divided into two parts, one discussing the methodological distinction between morals, politics and natural philosophy, with particular regard to the role of sentiment, and the other treating subjects related to Hume's study on ancient manners and customs. What is of concern here is the second part. Hume says, "I have amus'd myself lately with an Essay or Dissertation on the Populousness of

Antiquity, which led me into many Disquisitions concerning both the public & domestic Life of the Antients. Having read over almost all the Classics both Greek and Latin, since I form'd that Plan, I have extracted what serv'd most to my Purpose: But I have not a Strabo, & know not where to get one in the Neighbourhood. He is an Author I never read. I know your Library (I mean the Advocates') is scrupulous of lending Classics; but perhaps that Difficulty may be got over. I shou'd be much oblig'd to you, if you could procure me the Loan of a Copy, either in the original Language or even in a good Translation" (1:152–53).

Curiously enough, the special significance of this letter as decisive evidence for the dating of the memoranda seems to have been unnoticed or ignored by earlier commentators. For example, in dating the memoranda Mossner stresses the importance of Hume's earlier letter to a physician in March or April of 1734 in which he wrote, "I have scribbled many a Quire of Paper, in which there is nothing contain'd but my own inventions. This with the Reading most of the celebrated Books in Latin, French & English, & acquiring the Italian"(1:16). Mossner argues that the memoranda was what Hume referred to in that letter as the second category of activity and that it survived Hume's burning "not long ago" of "an old Manuscript Book, wrote before I was twenty," which is mentioned in the letter of March 10 of 1751 to Gilbert Elliot of Minto (1:154).[34]

4.3 The Strabo-pederasty Problem

The passage about Strabo in the letter to Gilbert Elliot of Minto on February 18 of 1751 has two important implications for dating the memoranda. First, the passage as a whole should be taken as direct evidence for the theory that the memoranda (the "General" section in particular) was prepared as part of Hume's historical and sociological research into ancient societies that was to take shape in the economic essays (the essay on ancient population in particular) of the *Political Discourses*. Given what has been discussed so far, it requires some effort to deny any substantial connection between this letter and the memoranda. Scholars before Stewart, however, did not make any mention of it. This was surely because the date of the letter is so late, and they interpreted the memoranda as Hume's juvenile work. Stewart refers to the passage, but only as demonstrating the fact that Hume recovered his facility in reading Greek in the early 1740s, exactly as Hume had recollected in his autobiography. If we read the above passage freed from the traditional assumption that the memoranda were Hume's juvenile work (or at best an early composition), its strength as evidence for the later-1740s theory is undeniable. The letter clearly shows that Hume was busy working on the populousness of ancient nations and purposefully extracting from a variety of Greek and Latin classics. This fits exactly what we have identified as the nature of the memoranda, and it surely fits the chronology proposed by the present theory.

Secondly, Hume's reference to Strabo (B.C. 64–21) in the letter to Elliot is even more striking because entry 3:214 reads "The Holydays in Tarentum exceeded the Working days. Strabo. Lib.6." This is the only reference to Strabo in the entire memoranda.[35] Does this mean that Hume is quoting Strabo? If the answer is positive, it confirms that the entry was written after Hume wrote his letter to Elliot. Stewart rejects this possibility and regards the reference to Strabo as an instance of Hume's typical reliance on secondary literature (285). This surely is possible. However, I explore another possibility: that Hume had actually neither read Strabo's original when he wrote to Elliot nor entered 214 without seeing the original. If both are true, this means that Hume had obtained a copy of Strabo before entering 214.

Hume's request to Elliot to allow him the use of a copy held in the Advocates' Library of Edinburgh sounds urgent. Now the National Library of Scotland, the Advocates' Library was a copyright library, renowned for its wealth of collections, including six copies of Strabo.[36] Because Hume was anxious to read a Greek or translated copy of Strabo's original, he made the above request to Elliot, whom he thought would help as a member of the advocates. As we have already seen, the memoranda entries are arranged systematically and not of a rambling nature as once supposed. The authors cited therein are arranged logically, and there is no reason to suppose that the memoranda are an indifferent mix of primary and secondary readings. On the contrary, Hume's proud remark strongly suggests that the memoranda were based upon primary sources. There is no reason to exclude the one entry from Strabo as an exception to this rule.

Elliot seems to have understood Hume's seriousness and quickly provided a copy of Strabo. In the letter dated March 10 of 1751, after extensive discussion of subjects related to the *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*, Hume simply expressed gratitude for Elliot's favor by saying, "I find, however, I have no more to say on it, but to thank you for Strabo"(1:157). When returning the copy, Hume's sense of gratitude seems to have even increased as shown by his concluding remark in the next undated letter: "I return Strabo, whom I have found very judicious & useful. I give you a great many Thanks for your Trouble" (1:158). Hume's reading of Strabo was reflected also in his letter to Mrs. Jean Dysart of Eccles dated 19 March 1751, where he writes, "Pray tell the Sollicitor, that I have been reading lately in an old Author called Strabo, that in some cities of ancient Gaul, there was a fixt legal standard establish'd for corpulency"(1:159). Undoubtedly Hume was absorbed in reading Strabo at this time, and the sole entry from Strabo at 214 of the memoranda could only mean that it was exactly at that time that Hume was starting to read Strabo seriously.

The special significance of Strabo for Hume can be proved by another noteworthy fact that has not been recognized before. Throughout Hume's published works, there are twenty-seven explicit references to Strabo; twenty-two in the *Political Discourses* (twenty-one in the essay on ancient population and one

in the essay on public credit), two in the *Natural History of Religion*, two in the *History of England*, and one in the essay on national characters in post-1753 editions of the *Essays*. It is curious, indeed, that twenty-one out of the total twenty-seven references appear in the population essay. More striking is that all twenty-seven references were made in works Hume published only after he wrote the letter to Elliot asking for a copy of Strabo. In the single passage in the *Essays*, Strabo is quoted as having rejected "in a great measure, the influence of climate upon men" and said "All is custom and education."[37] This consistent pattern of citation with respect to Strabo does not support the hypothesis that Hume depended merely on secondary literature when he wrote the passage on Strabo in the memoranda. In sum, Hume's only reference to Strabo in the memoranda serves as strong evidence that it was the very first citation Hume had made to this author and that he made it only after consulting the copy borrowed from Elliot.

There is one more interesting problem discussed in the February 18 letter to Elliot. Substantial discussion develops in two paragraphs about the subject of the ancient Greek practice of "pederasty." It is striking that Hume reveals his interest in the subject at entry 3:227 of the memoranda. It reads "In Barko Paederaesty was authoriz'd by the Laws, & a kind of legal Matrimony established upon that Relation." One of the six quotations from Xenophon (223–28), this entry is cited as from his book on the Republic of Lacedaemon (Sparta). While it is true that Hume's interest in peculiar habits and customs in ancient societies is also evident in the population essay, the issue of ancient pederasty had a more direct relevance to *A Dialogue* in *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, which was written concurrently with the *Political Discourses*. For understanding the precise origin and social role of pederasty among the Greeks, Hume, in this letter, mentions the works of Cicero, Homer, Thucydides, Plato, and Demosthenes, but Hume admits that his research has left him uncertain. His uncertainty about the issue derives from the fundamental question why in ancient Greece, where Solon established "public stews" (the place for legal prostitution), pederasty among males was allowed and even promoted as something honorable for the citizens. Hume concludes this topic by saying "I have put this down among my *Greek* Doubts" (1:152).[38] While Hume sees these doubts as "foreign to my Subject," he still wonders whether he should add "a Note containing these Arguments" in *A Dialogue*. In fact, a note was added which says, "The laws of Athens allowed a man to marry his sister by the father. SOLON's law forbid paederasty to slaves, as being an act of too great dignity for such mean persons."[39] Hume chose to add the note because it was fitting for the short work discussing the historical variability of manners and customs of human societies as its central theme.

Thus the February 18 letter to Elliot certainly provides a key to understanding the dating of the memoranda. When writing the letter, Hume's mind was occupied by two subjects apart from purely philosophical issues. One was the pederasty

problem, the other was the populousness of ancient nations, which resulted in his desire to read Strabo. It could not have been a mere coincidence that both issues are clearly reflected in entries 214 (Strabo) and 227 (pederasty) in close chronological order. This is further proved by the highly probable fact that the published work *A Dialogue* was being written concurrently with the memoranda.

5. Montesquieu, Wallace, and the Birth of Hume's Political Economy

Strabo is one of the most frequently mentioned authors in the published essay on ancient population. Hume made full use of Strabo's observations for refuting the widely prevailing view that ancient societies were more populous than modern ones. If one accepts the later-1740s theory, it may seem strange that the name of Strabo appears only once in the memoranda, while it is frequently mentioned in the published essay, but this simply means that when he wrote the letter to Elliot, Hume's compiling work in the memoranda had only progressed to some point before the Strabo entry and, further, that the memoranda do not reflect the entire results of Hume's detailed study of Strabo.[40]

The next question to be asked, then, is what prompted Hume in the first place to read the original Strabo with his own eyes and to procure his works with the help of Elliot and the Advocates' Library. That Hume showed no particular interest in Strabo before he began the compiling work of the memoranda is evident from the fact that Strabo's name had not appeared at all in his works before the *Political Discourses*. There must have been something or someone that sparked his interest in Strabo and made him eager to read the original text.

Here I suggest the decisive role of two predecessors of Hume's inquiry. One is Montesquieu, author of the *Lettres persanes* (1721) and the *De l'esprit des loix* (1748), and the other is Robert Wallace, the author of a classic treatise on ancient and modern populations (1753). The two senior scholars who were highly influential in different ways had a tremendous impact on the way in which Hume came to address the fundamental question of the relative superiority between ancient and modern civilizations, with a particular emphasis on the issue of population. Wallace was a moderate Presbyterian minister and played a central role in the social movement of the Scottish Enlightenment. Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des loix* marked a turning point in the development of social science in the Scottish Enlightenment.[41] No matter how different their respective roles, the two thinkers shared the view that ancient societies had populations superior to modern ones. As mentioned earlier, in the letter of April 18 of 1750 to his friend John Clephane Hume reported the progress of "a very learned, elaborate discourse, concerning the populousness of antiquity; not altogether in opposition to *Vossius* and *Montesquieu*, who exaggerate that affair infinitely." This critical view of Vossius and Montesquieu is confirmed at the beginning of the published essay (380). Hume's high respect for Wallace

as a scholar and a person coexisted with his sharp criticism of Wallace's position on the superior population of the ancient world. Hume began his essay with a footnote to acknowledge his indebtedness to Wallace's book (written earlier but published later than Hume's book), but with a clear indication that he had not been influenced by any of Wallace's central doctrines. Hume made only a few minor changes to the original manuscript in response to criticisms published in Wallace's appendix (380, 639).[42]

What concerns us here is not the fact of Hume's fundamental opposition to Montesquieu and Wallace. What has been overlooked in previous discussions is the fact that both Montesquieu and Wallace seem to have placed considerable confidence in Strabo as the most reliable source of information concerning ancient societies, and both relied heavily on Strabo's observations to prove their common thesis about the superior populousness of ancient nations. Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des loix* refers to Strabo in forty-five places, and this is a far greater number of references than to any other ancient author. Furthermore, the fact that the same author's much earlier *Lettres persanes* makes no mention of Strabo is consistent with the later 1740s theory because it shows, at least, that Hume could not have learned of the importance of Strabo from that earlier work. Wallace also had a high regard for Strabo as "a judicious author" and mentioned him, along with Caesar, as one of "the two of the most authentic ancient writers."[43] When Hume decided to refute the arguments developed by Montesquieu and Wallace on the populousness of ancient nations, he must have found it absolutely necessary to grapple with the original text of Strabo.

Mossner's detailed research proved that Wallace's original manuscript had been read at the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh before the Jacobite rising of 1745 and was later expanded into a learned dissertation. According to Mossner, Hume was allowed to read it in the summer of 1751. Using this date, Mossner suggested, on the grounds of Hume's February 18 of 1751 letter to Elliot, that Hume entered upon the subject of the ancient population "independently of Wallace." However, this chronological order is not fully documented by Mossner (262–63). Should it be the case that Hume read Wallace's manuscript not in the summer of 1751, as Mossner supposed, but before February of 1751, in accordance with the present theory, Hume must have been prompted to read Strabo by reading Wallace's manuscript.

The quotation from Strabo in entry 214 of the memoranda is simply, "The Holydays in Tarentum exceeded the Working days. Strabo. Lib.6." Strabo's original text says that among the inhabitants of Tarentum (now Taranto, Italy), who were flourishing, luxury and ease prevailed to such an extent that the number of holydays exceeded the number of days.[44] Wallace also cited Book Six of Strabo's *Geography* to confirm his central thesis that luxury would surely cause depopulation. He says, "Strabo, a judicious author, who lived under *Augustus* and *Tiberius*,

takes notice, in several places of his Geography, how much some mighty states and cities were decayed in his age, and how much the number of the citizens was diminished; particularly how that part of *Italy* near *Tarentum* was formerly full of people, and had 13 great cities."[45] Hume's essay on population does not make a direct reference to Tarentum, as Wallace's dissertation does, and Hume's refutation of Wallace's thesis was more theoretical than historical. Still, Hume certainly referred to Strabo's work far more frequently than to any other ancient writer's.

The problem of when, how, and for what purpose the so-called "Early Memoranda" was compiled by Hume is the kind of problem that will never permit any uncontroversial resolution. What is more certain is this: at least the so-called "General" section, the single largest section of the document, reflects Hume's strong and consistent desire to pursue his new intellectual adventure of writing a systematic discourse on political economy. Equally certain is the fact that this intellectual project not only coincided with but was also developed in conjunction with Hume's other new works on philosophy, morals and religion. These efforts resulted in the surprisingly large number of works that were published from 1748 to 1757 and even after his death. The memoranda are the mirror of the unusual intellectual growth Hume realized as the result of his studies at Ninewells during the periods specified in this essay.

NOTES

The original version of this essay was presented in May of 2003 at the Barnard College Workshop on Hume's Political Economy, organized by Carl Wennerlind and Margaret Schabas. Since then, I have benefited from many scholars' valuable advice and encouragement. I express my particular gratitude to Roger Emerson, Istvan Hont, David Fate Norton, Ian Simpson Ross, and Ryu Susato. Special thanks are due M. A. Stewart, who gave me useful comments and criticisms on an earlier draft of the present essay. For invaluable stylistic improvement, I am very grateful to the editors of *Hume Studies*,Corliss Swain and Saul Traiger. No matter how much I owe to these and other scholars, any errors are entirely my own.

1 E. C. Mossner, "Hume's Early Memoranda, 1729–1740: The Complete Text," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 9 (1948): 492–518. Page numbers from this article will be given in the text hereafter.

2 John Hill Burton, *Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: W.Tait, 1846), 1:95–96,124–35.

3 Burton, *Life and Correspondence*, 1:125–26.

4 See M. A. Stewart, "The Dating of Hume's Manuscripts," in *The Scottish Enlightenment: Essays in Reinterpretation*, ed. Paul Wood (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2000), 309. The remaining question is why Mossner would have written that the verso

quotation was "[o]n the reverse of the last sheet of this section." If he was helped by someone who could actually see the document, why did the helper not let him know of the more important fact that most of the memoranda were written on both sides of the sheets? This remains an open question, but it is a question of minor importance for this essay. Page numbers of Stewart's essay will be given in the text hereafter.

5 Norman Kemp Smith, Introduction to Hume's *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), 45.

6 To be specific, on the first eleven sheets of the memoranda were found exactly the same watermarks, with a size of 44mm x 41mm, at the center of each sheet, and the last three sheets showed the countermarks, with a size of 98mm x 70mm, at the center of each sheet.

7 Different watermarks were found on the following letter papers: (1) seven sheets of a letter addressed to Dr. G. Cheyne in March or April in 1734, published in *The Letters of David Hume*, 2 vols., ed. J. Y. T. Greig (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), 1:12–18, (2) two sheets to Michael Ramsay from Rheims on September 12, 1734 (1:19–21), (3) two sheets to Francis Hutcheson from Ninewells near Berwick on September 17, 1739 (1:32–35), (4) two sheets to William Mure of Caldwell on June 30, 1743 (1:50–52), (5) two sheets to William Mure of Caldwell on September 10, 1743 (1:52–54), (6) two sheets to Alexander Home from Portsmouth on May 23, 1746 (1:90), and (7) one sheet to Colonel Abercromby from Ninewells, near Berwick, August 7, 1747 (1:102–5). Among these letter papers, those listed as (4) and (5) above are identical and bear the same watermarks. The watermarks are similar to those on the memoranda but, on more accurate inspection, prove not to be the same. The same is true of (1). Volume and page numbers from the *Letters of David Hume*, ed. J. Y. T. Greig, will be given in the text hereafter.

8 Another manuscript, held in the National Library of Scotland, has exactly the same watermarks as are on the memoranda. It is entitled, by Hume's own hand, "An Historical Essay on Chivalry and modern Honour." Mossner published it and concluded that the essay was also written by Hume in his pre-*Treatise* years. (E. C.Mossner, "David Hume's 'An Historical Essay on Chivalry and modern Honour'," *Modern Philology* 45(1947): 54–60.) Should the present hypothesis hold, it would mean that the "Historical Essay" was also a work of the mature Hume. For various views on the "Historical Essay," see Ryan Hanley, "David Hume and the Modern Problem of Honor," *Modern Schoolman* 84 (2007): 295–312; Ryu Susato, "The Idea of Chivalry in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Case of David Hume," *Hume Studies* 33 (2007): 155–78; and John P. Wright, "Hume on the Origin of 'Modern Honour': A Study in Hume's Philosophical Development" in *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*, ed. Ruth Savage (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 187–209.

9 Jean-Paul Pittion, "Hume's Reading of Bayle: An Inquiry into the Source and Role of the Memoranda," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 15 (1977): 383.

10 Mark Thornton, "Cantillon, Hume, and the Rise of Antimercantilism," *History of Political Economy* 39.3 (2007): 453–80.

11 Istvan Hont, "The 'Rich Country-Poor Country Debate' Revisited: The Irish Origins and French Reception of the Hume Paradox," in *David Hume's Political Economy*, ed. Carl Wennerlind and Margaret Schabas (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), 319. However, Thornton's conjecture suggests another interesting possibility, consistent with

the dating proposed in the present essay: that Hume might have cited the two entries from Cantillon's widely circulating manuscript, not during his early stay in France, but during his later stay at Ninewells.

12 *Hume and Hume's Connexions*, ed. M. A. Stewart and John P. Wright (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994),160–70.

13 If this observation concerning Hume's change from "alwise" to "always" at about 1739 is correct, the "*Historical Essay*" mentioned in note 8 , poses a difficult problem for the late-1740s theory because that essay uses the "alwise" spelling in five places.

14 David Hume, *My Own Life*, in *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. Eugene F. Miller (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1987), xxxiv. References to this edition of the *Essays* will be given in the text hereafter.

15 John Laird, *Hume's Philosophy of Human Nature* (North Haven, CT: Archon Books, 1967 [1932]), 302. James Moore, "The Social Background of Hume's Science of Human Nature," in *McGill Hume Studies*, ed. D. F. Norton, N. Capaldi, and W. L. Robison (San Diego: Austin Hill Press, 1976), 35–36.

16 Original editions consulted are *Essays, Moral and Political* (Edinburgh: A. Kincaid, 1741); *Essays, Moral and Political, Second Edition Corrected* (Edinburgh: A. Kincaid, 1742); *Essays, Moral and Political, Third Edition, Corrected with Additions* (London: A. Millar, 1748); *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects, Volume One, Essays, Moral and Political, The Fourth edition, Corrected with Additions* (London: A. Millar, 1753).

17 However, Green and Grose and Miller misprinted Hume's number in their editions as "thirty slaves" from the 1741 edition onward, with no changes in the following editions. See David Hume, *The Philosophical Works*, 4 vols. (Darmstadt: Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1964), 3:161.

18 *Cicero: The Speeches with An English Translation*, ed. N. H. Watts (London: William Heinemann, 1964), 37. *Asconius: Commentaries on Speeches by Cicero*, ed. R. G. Lewis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 63. The edition that Hume might have seen when revising the 1748 edition was the 1745–1752 edition of *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, trans. William Guthrie, 3 vols. (London: 1745–1752). It incorporates Asconius's comment that "Clodius was on horse-back; his retinue consisted of about thirty slaves with swords; and every way prepared for an attack, which was the usual way of travelling in those days" (1:3–4). Conyers Middleton's *The History of the Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, 3 vols. (London:1741) also mentions the thirty slaves at 2:146. The remaining question is where Hume found the number "sixty" in the first place.

19 M. A. Stewart, "Hume's Intellectual Development, 1711–1752" in *Impressions of Hume*, ed. Martina Frasca-Spada and P. J. E. Kail (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 47.

20 *The Natural History of Religion; A Dissertation on the Passions*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 46, 56, 61, 69.

21 Editor's Introduction to *The Natural History of Religion*, xx.

22 *New Letters of David Hume*, ed. Raymond Klibansky and Ernest C. Mossner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 22–24.

23 E. C. Mossner speculates that "Hume's first trials in the writing of history were made during the unhappy Annandale period [1745–1746]." He wrote this in spite of knowing that a set of historical manuscripts once ascribed to Hume as written during this period were proven forgeries. See E. C. Mossner, *The Life of David Hume* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 175. See also Klibansky and Mossner, *New Letters of David Hume*, 23n2.

24 J. Y. T. Greig, *David Hume* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931), 149.

25 Klibansky and Mossner, *New Letters of David Hume*, 24–28.

26 Moritz Baumstark interprets Hume's remark on the indifferent provision of a library in the "country" as referring to his own library at Ninewells. However, Hume was more probably referring to the Annadale library. See, Moritz Baumstark, "Hume's Reading of the Classics at Ninewells, 1749–1751," *The Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 8 (2010): 64. Baumstark's article is relevant to the present essay, but it is based on Stewart's dating of the memoranda.

27 Greig, *David Hume*, 153.

28 Klibansky and Mossner, *The Life of David Hume*, 174–75.

29 I once argued that the second mission on the continent had an intellectual impact on Hume and could have influenced or inspired his writing the essay on national characters for the 1748 edition of the *Essays*, independently of Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des loix*, which was published in the same year. See Tatsuya Sakamoto, "Hume's Political Economy as a System of Manners," in *The Rise of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, ed. Tatsuya Sakamoto and Hideo Tanaka (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 90–92. See also Ian Simpson Ross, "The Emergence of David Hume as a Political Economist: A Biographical Sketch," in *David Hume's Political Economy*, ed. Carl Wennerlind and Margaret Schabas, 42.

30 It is important to always bear in mind, however, that the list is far from complete, for these are only the examples showing the highest degree of correspondence between the memoranda and the *Political Discourses*. Several times more cases of less certain but highly probable matches are found throughout the memoranda.

31 Ancient authors cited before entry 165 of the "General" section are as follows: Cicero (entries 89–91, 111, 116, 123, 133), Livy (5, 145–165), Suetonius (117), Tacitus (4, 104), Thucydidus (144), and Xenophon (140, 142). Modern authors after 165 are as follows: Barnevelt (entry 193), Ralph Cudworth (215), Thomas Hyde (184–192), F. M. Janiçon (198–201), J. Le Clerc (194–196), J. Potter (169–171), Sadder (191–192), Saint Didier (210–212), I. Vossius (216–217).

32 Reprinted from *Selections from the Family Papers Preserved at Caldwell* (Glasgow: 1754) in *David Hume: Writings on Economics*, ed. Eugene Rotwein (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), 190–96.

33 The pamphlet was published in 1751 as *Petition of the Grave and Venerable Bellman, or Sextons, of the Church of Scotland, To the Honourable House of Commons*. Mossner described it as "part of a considerable controversy of 1748–1751 on the clerical issue" (*The Life of David Hume*, 235–36).

34 Mossner, "Hume's Early Memoranda, 1729–1740: The Complete Text," 494.

35 I discovered this fact in 1986 and noted it clearly in my book, published in Japanese, Tatsuya Sakamoto, *Hume's Civilized Society: Industry, Knowledge and Liberty* (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1995), 176 (title translated from the Japanese).

36 [Thomas Ruddiman], *A Catalogue of the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, Part the first* (Edinburgh: 1742), 568.

37 *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*, 4 Vols. (London: A. Millar, 1753), 1: 283: footnote. See also Miller, *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*, 202n4.

38 For a modern study on this subject, see Clifford Hindley, "Xenophon on Male Love," *Classical Quarterly* 49 (1999): 74–99.

39 *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 113 n. 79. (Greig wrongly stated that the note was not inserted.) Graham pointed out the importance of the virtue of gallantry in A *Dialogue* and suggested that this work echoed the young Hume's essay on chivalry and modern honor. See Roderick Graham, *The Great Infidel: A Life of David Hume* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2006),185. However, the fact that the essay is written on exactly the same sheets as the memoranda (as I noted earlier), opens up a new possibility namely, that *A Dialogue* was not the echo of the juvenile work but was written at the same time as the historical essay on chivalry. One must note, however, that this possibility is challenged by Stewart's argument that the historical essay was written in the 1730s. See note 13.

40 Baumstark argues that Hume's reading of the classics at Ninewells in the early 1750s was both "more extensive and more significant than has hitherto been assumed" ("Hume's Reading of the Classics at Ninewells, 1749–1751," 73). My thesis does not contradict his central claim that the texts cited in the memoranda present "a fraction of the material Hume used in the *Political Discourses*" (66). The fact that Strabo appears only once in the memoranda may be a good example. My conclusion does not even preclude the possibility that Hume might have compiled *other sets* of similar kinds of memoranda as sources for the *Political Discourses* and other works written during the same period.

41 See James Moore, "Montesquieu and Hume," in *Montesquieu and His Legacy*, ed. Rebecca E. Kingston (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 179–93.

42 For an updated account of the Hume-Wallace relationship, see Yasuo Amoh, "The Ancient-Modern Controversy in the Scottish Enlightenment," in Sakamoto and Tanaka, *The Rise of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, 69–87.

43 Robert Wallace, *A Dissertation on the Numbers of Mankind in Ancient and Modern Times* (Edinburgh: Hamiliton and Balfour, 1753), 35, 40. Wallace refers to Strabo and his work at 35, 37, 40, 46, 47, 48, 57, 68, 69, and 78.

44 *The Geography of Strabo*, 8 vols. trans. Horace Leonard Jones (London: William Heinemann, 1967), 3:114–15. Strabo does not contrast festival days with working days, but only with 'days'.

45 Wallace, *A Dissertation on the Numbers*, 35–36.