A Bibliography for Hume's *History of England*: A Preliminary View

Roger L. Emerson and Mark G. Spencer

Hume Studies Volume 40, Number 1 (2014), 53-71.

Hume Studies
Volume 40, Number 1, 2014, pp. 53–71

A Bibliography for Hume's *History of England*: A Preliminary View

ROGER L. EMERSON AND MARK G. SPENCER

Abstract: Recent years have witnessed a renewed scholarly interest in David Hume's *History of England* (1754–1762), and this essay adds to that interest by analyzing the sources that Hume used in the *History*. Unfortunately, Hume did not provide a bibliography or guide to those sources, and no scholar has produced one since. We have been preparing a bibliography for publication and the following essay is a preliminary view of some of what it will show. It demonstrates that Hume consulted and used more varied sources, and used them in more skillful ways, than commonly has been assumed.

Hume's *History of England* (1754–1762) has received a good deal of attention over the years, but no one has ever systematically studied his sources.[1] Instead, scholars have worried about Hume's biases, his portraits of figures like Charles I (1600–1649), and his alleged scorn for mere antiquarianism, which resulted in a readable but superficial history (Wexler, *Hume and the "History"*). The most exciting monograph dealing with his *History of England* in recent years sees it as a step in the process which led to nineteenth-century historicism (Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*). Others have seen him in the context of narrativity but have paid little attention to the sources of the facts worked into that narrative.[2] Discussions of the relation of Hume's *History of England* to philosophy, to sentiments, and to his essay on the study of history overshadow his reading and use of books and manuscripts.[3] For

Roger L. Emerson, Department of History, University of Western Ontario, Lawson Hall Rm 2201, London, Ontario, N6A 5B8. E-mail: emerson@uwo.ca; Mark G. Spencer, Department of History, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St. Catharines, Ontario, L2S 3A1. E-mail: mspencer@brocku.ca.

some it is sufficient that he spent little time in archives and had no reputation as an antiquary but a fine reputation as a writer dependent upon the accounts of others.

The view that Hume was a casual, if not a careless and even dishonest, historian when it came to his use of sources, became entrenched in the nineteenth century and is now the standard way of seeing things. In 1826, Sir Francis Palgrave (1788–1861) argued in his review of a new London edition of Hume's *History* that, while Hume's footnotes provide "a cabalistic array of names, and syllables, and figures," Hume's readers ought not to be "betrayed" into the false "belief that the history has resulted from a careful comparison of testimonies" ("Anglo-Saxon History," 250). Palgrave alleged that while "it might be anticipated that the author of the Essay on Miracles would have prefaced his historical inquiries by carefully scrutinizing the value of his authorities," Hume the historian proceeded "without any selection," without "any attempt at discrimination": "Hume has not even observed the obvious rule of avoiding to adduce secondary evidence when an original witness can be obtained" ("Anglo-Saxon History," 249–250). In an essay first published in 1828, Lord Macauley (1800–1859) declared that Hume made no attempt to be fair. When sources supported his case, Hume "applauded and encouraged." When they did not, he "denied," "extenuated," or "passed by without notice." Hume's account on the whole was nothing but "a vast mass of sophistry" ("History," 152–53).

Others saw things in similar ways, including Hume's nineteenth-century American critics. In the influential *North American Review*, Edward Brooks (1800–1866) commented on Hume's "strange inconsistency" and his "sophistry and misrepresentations" when it came to his use of sources.[4] Some provided more details. Historian Henry Hallam (1777–1859) wrote in the *Edinburgh Review* that since it "had not been the occupation of [Hume's] life to investigate the early annals of England," it is not surprising that when he found a valuable source, such as Thomas Carte (1686–1754), he kept it "before his eyes" rather than attempting "to weave a new web of a texture which he would, perhaps, himself have felt to be inferior" ("Review of Lingard," 16). Hallam's assessment of Hume's use of Carte proved influential. Charles K. Adams (1835–1902), who noted it in *A Manual of Historical Literature*, also observed that "Hume was not an historical investigator in any true sense of the term" (*Manual of Historical Literature*, 469).

This account of Hume as an historian who showed little scholarly concern with his sources was carried through to the twentieth century by J. B. Black (1883–1964), J. Y. T Greig (1891–1963), Harry Elmer Barnes (1889–1968), and others. Black did so, in part, by repeating several of Macauley's criticisms (*Art of History*, 92–93). For Greig, Hume was a lazy historian who "undertook [his] task lightly, and performed it in the same spirit," even writing his *History* "with his feet up on the couch" (*David Hume*, 267).[5] In his influential survey, *A History of Historical Writing*, Harry Elmer Barnes maintained that, when one compares Hume to his contemporary

eighteenth-century historians, Hume pales (*History of Historical Writing*, 152–64). Hume gathered far less material than Voltaire (1694–1778); William Robertson (1721–1793) was "[a] much abler technical historian" (*History of Historical Writing*, 156). Hume the historian provided little to advance the discipline of history: "Hume read mainly the easily accessible chroniclers and histories, being especially and unfortunately influenced by Clarendon's history of the great Civil War. His history is not only defective in scholarship, but at times even failed to provide an orderly narrative, dropping into unorganized memoranda of events" (*History of Historical Writing*, 155). In short, "Hume's mentality far outran his talents or industry as a professional historian" (*History of Historical Writing*, 155).

More recent scholars, even quite good ones, have seen things in similar ways. For Joseph Levine (1933–2008), for instance, Hume lacked Edward Gibbon's (1737–1794) "scholarly patience." Hume did not take the time to read carefully and extensively in his sources; he was a popularizer of history, not a serious historical scholar (*Autonomy of History*, 167; see also 171n57). In Michael Bentley's survey of modern historiography, one of the "surprises" of Hume's *History* "lies in the degree to which Hume forgot his own doctrines" when it came to weighing evidence in the writing of history (*Modern Historiography*, 12). He "forgot about so much that it becomes tempting to see neither an enlightened nor an unenlightened historian in Hume so much as a bad one *tout court*" (*Modern Historiography*, 12). Despite the commentary related to Hume's historiography (and even with occasional hints that Hume's use of sources was more involved[6]), there has been no attempt to look seriously at Hume's sources. It is surely time to do so.

Hume did not provide a bibliography or guide to his sources since it had not yet become fashionable to include them in books—and he was a very fashion-conscious man. Indeed, he did not even annotate the first two volumes of the *History of England* until after the others had appeared and he had been chided by both critics and friends for not doing so.[7] After all, Voltaire had begun to produce notes for his historical publications and William Robertson, in the first edition of his *History of Scotland* (1759), discussed his principal sources in the preface to the book.[8] Knowing Hume's sources will help us to see what Hume was up to as an historian, but no one has produced a bibliography for the volumes. We have been preparing such a list for publication, and the following essay is a preliminary view of some of what it will show.[9]

The task of providing a bibliography now is complicated. Hume's footnotes do not contain all the references to his sources. He used sources which are not cited but whose use can be easily inferred from the unannotated text. Matteo Maria Boiardo (1434–1494) and Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (1547–1616) might reasonably find a place on the list, since they influenced Hume's work as an historian of chivalry and the middle ages, but neither appears in the *History of England*. Sometimes he tells us in the text that his account follows *X*'s well-known source, but he gives no

notes. Other references are put into the text or appear in discussions contained in notes. His citations to works are usually short title references naming either the author or book but often not both. He frequently refers to the same item but gives different short titles. Sometimes he seems to have garbled the titles. Seldom did he give places of publication or the dates of the editions used. He also seems to cite the same text in different editions. Whose edition of Gildas's (c. 500–570) *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae* (an account of the conquest of Britain by the Romans) did he use? Sometimes he did not bother with page numbers. Moreover, the citations in the Stuart volumes are fewer than for the others, reflecting his initial omission of footnotes from the two volumes first published. Our list of books tries to include all those noted in the *History of England* and those which it can be inferred that he used, but not others, such as poems he had read as a young man. There were other relevant volumes which we know Hume read and used elsewhere which could be included here as well. Among them are books cited in his collections of published *Essays* or in his correspondence. We have tried to list in the bibliography only the books he used in the *History of England* or admitted to using. Working up our list, we have made no effort to trace how the number of Hume's citations grew over the years. Our bibliography and the figures we give are based on the last edition, which he corrected prior to his death in 1776. It has now become the standard edition because of William Todd's 1983 edition of it for Liberty Fund to which our page references refer. Using it also allows us to include works which he read and noted as he revised his text after the early publications of the work.

Hume had absorbed and read a good deal of history as a child and young man (Emerson, "Hume's Intellectual Development: Part II").[10] He also knew where to look for sources. There were many old books which noted sources, such as Bishop John Bale's (1495–1653) *Scriptorum Illustriu Maiorus Brytannie . . . Catalogus* (a history of English writers), published in 1557, and similar French works such as André Duchesne's (1584–1640) *Historiae Normanorum scriptores Antique, res ab aillis gestas explicantes, ab annum 838 ad annum 1220* (a history of the Norman writers) from 1630–1649. More are noted below. Such volumes were collections of chronicles and documents with some discussions of related works. There were also the citations of sources in the standard well-known histories such as those of White Kennett (1660–1728) (*Complete History of England*, 3 vols., 1706; new edition 1719), Laurence Echard (c.1670–1730) (*History of England*, 4 vols., 1707–1718), Paul Rapin de Thoyras (1661–1725) (*History of England* [to 1689], 7 vols., 1723–1725), Tobias Smollett (1721–1771) (*The History of England*, 1757) and Catharine Macaulay (1731–1791) (*History of England*, 8 vols., 1763–1783). Hume read them all in some fashion since he commented on them.[11]

More valuable were the historical bibliographies of books and manuscripts on England (1696), Scotland (1702) and Ireland (1724) published by Bishop William Nicolson (1655–1727).[12] Those, with revisions, were collected and printed in one

volume as *The Historical Library* in 1732. Nicolson listed books and surveyed and located manuscript sources, sharply commenting on some of the materials. Many of the Scottish items cited by the Bishop, both books and manuscripts, were in the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh and, thus, readily available to Hume. Nicolson's bibliographies marked the points of departure for eighteenth-century national historians—English, Scottish, and Irish. Nicolson had sent many copies of his Scottish bibliography to Scotland, where it was criticized by local antiquaries such as Sir Robert Sibbald (1641–1722), who himself wrote a bibliography which Hume would have found useful for Scottish-English relations.[13] Such men were hoping for better national histories and were finding the sources for them. They made the tasks of Hume, Robertson, and others much easier.

Hume's position as Librarian of the Advocates' Library from 1752 to 1757 gave him access to 30,000 well-catalogued volumes (Hume's figure) and many manuscript collections.[14] About 20 manuscripts or collections, notably materials related to Mary Queen of Scots (1542–1587), are cited in his notes and texts. He probably used more of the Advocates' Library's manuscript sources than he cited, or than might be expected given the accounts which assume he used few. He also used material possessed by his friends the Elliots of Minto and James Primrose, 2nd Earl of Rosebery (1690–1755), who had a collection of manuscripts at Barnbougle Castle near Dalmeny. Hume may have used the Hamilton Papers, which had earlier been available to Bishop Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715), who wrote a family history of the ducal house. The manuscripts Hume cited, like broadsides and pamphlets, often came out of large collections which he would have perused to find the items he quoted or otherwise used. His citations do not take account of much that he also saw.

Hume's search for sources also took him farther from home. He wrote to Andrew Millar (1707–1768) in December of 1759: "I find the Advocates Library very well provided with Books on this Period; but before I finish I shall pass a considerable time in London, to pursue the Manuscripts in the Museum"—which had only recently been opened to scholars. Hume secured his permission to use the library of the British Museum for six months on 3 March 1759 and again on 31 July 1761 (BM Central Archive, Minutes of Trustees' Standing Committee). The Museum by then had added to the "Old Royal Library" (given in 1757), the Cottonian Collection,[15] the Harleian Manuscripts,[16] the papers of the noted antiquary Thomas Madox (1666–1727),[17] numismatic objects, and a few artifacts ranging over the whole of English history. Working at the Museum on six-month tickets like his were other historians, some of whom he must have met in the reading room. Among them in the years 1759–1761 were the Rev. John Jortin (1698–1770), the Rev. Dr. John Blair (?–1782)*, the Rev. John Douglas (1721–1807)*, William Blackstone (1723–1780)*, Owen Ruffhead (1723–1769)*, Daniel Wray (1701–1783), and Principal William Robertson*. (Those marked with an '*' were cited in the *History*

of England.) Contemporaries would have seen those men as good historians or antiquaries. At least three were critics of Hume's work.

As an early user of the British Museum, Hume read more than books when he annotated his first two volumes and presumably took notes for the revision of later editions. Again his finding list would have been Nicolson's and the catalogue of the books and manuscripts the King had given at the Museum's founding. He probably rummaged in unnamed collections for a possible continuing volume which might have taken his story to 1714.[18]

The British Museum was not his only English source. The Rev. John Douglas, a Shropshire vicar and a Scot whom Hume had surely met earlier, provided him with access to some letters of Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon (1609–1674), and to others written by the Earl of Glamorgan, later the Marquis of Worcester (1601–1667).[19] Dr. John Campbell (1708–1775), author of *The Lives of the Admirals* (1742), showed him some papers of the Marquis de Courcelles, French ambassador to James VI and I. Those allowed him to criticize William Robertson's account of Mary Queen of Scots using texts Robertson had misunderstood (Wexler, *Hume and the "History,"* 63–65). After the mid-1750s, Hume's growing literary celebrity—based largely on the publication of his Stuart volumes—assured him of access to collections such as those of Phillip Yorke, Lord Royston, later the 2nd Earl of Hardwicke (1720–1790), and of the Percy Earls of Northumberland. It was their "Household Book" which Hume used to show the living conditions of the fifteenth-century English aristocracy. Friends at the Treasury, such as James Oswald (1715–1769), provided Hume with data compiled or on record there.[20] Jeremiah Dyson (1722–1776), Clerk of the House of Commons and then an MP, was also useful.[21] At Christ's College, Cambridge, Hume used other papers. He is likely to have seen more manuscripts, since he cites a couple of items such as the "Annales monasterii de Theokesberia" [1066–1263], first printed in the Rolls Series in 1864.[22] He was either working from a manuscript or repeating without acknowledgment a passage he had found elsewhere.[23]

Hume's celebrity was equally useful in France, where his diplomatic status helped gain him entry into official state archives. His most memorable use of French manuscripts was the publication of information contained in the "Memoirs of James II," then held by the Scots College in Paris and now lost.[24] This manuscript gave insight into the secret foreign policy of Charles II (1630–1685) and his ability to use French money to get around the parliamentary reluctance to vote him the taxes he felt he needed. The "Memoirs" shed light on the king's personal beliefs, his domestic aims, and the constraints on his foreign policies, all of which Hume put to use in fleshing out Charles's character and his abilities as a king. Hume generously made this material available to his friend Sir John Dalrymple of Cranstoun (1726–1810), Baron of the Scottish Court of Exchequer. Dalrymple used it in a book on British and Irish history published in 1771. Hume's official connections also made

it possible for him to see the papers detailing royal expenses (see *History of England*, 2:181); the correspondence of Paul Barillon d'Amoncourt, the Marquis de Branges (1630–1691), Louis XIV's ambassador to England from 1677 to 1688 (*History*, 6:443), and probably other items not mentioned by him. All of this helped him to give a more adequate and novel account of English-French relations in the seventeenth century than had hitherto appeared.

Hume cited at least 426 writers in the notes or text. The number of authors is still a bit uncertain for several reasons. We have not traced the names of a handful of unknown and anonymous authors, and our list may include some authors who appear under their own names but also as, for example, "the chronicler of . . . ." Some works had multiple authors, although Hume might mention only one—in some cases, because the facts of authorship were not known until much later. As it stands now, Hume's source list for the Tudor and Stuart volumes is about as long as the list to be abstracted from William Robertson's *History of Scotland*, which covers roughly the same period.[25] The two writers were equally learned, but Robertson is often seen as the more "professional" if not as a better historian—as he was when dealing with the Europe of Charles V. Our present author list is a long one that will probably marginally increase.

Collectively Hume's authors wrote or edited at least 530 titles varying in length from 6 pages to over 24 volumes in folios sometimes running to more than 800 pages per volume. The bibliography for the *History of England* shows, clearly, a greater familiarity with historical sources than is often attributed to Hume. It also suggests that he had been diligently reading history long before he became the Librarian of the Advocates' Library.[26] Had he not been, even such a "quick-study" as he was, could not have mastered so much material in the short time he said it took him to write the book.[27] In addition to these sources are collections such as *The Statutes of the Realm* or the *Journals of Parliament* which lack a single author and whose editors are not known to us. Hume is unlikely to have read all that material, but he would have turned many of the pages.

It is difficult to determine how many works Hume read closely, but it is clear that he was an erudite man who read or skimmed a great deal. Some of his reading was organized for him by the great collections which had appeared from the reign of Elizabeth I (1533–1603, reigned from 1558).[28] He sometimes cited only one or several items from a massive set, as in the case of *Collection of Voyages and Travels* edited by John Locke (1632–1704) and published by Awnsham Churchill (d. 1728) in 1704. He knew of other works contained in collections he used but did not cite them. That was especially the case with collections of chronicles where he cited some but not others, and with collections of pamphlets, such as the *Harleian Miscellany*, where he did the same thing. Did he read all the works of James VI and I in the *Works of James*, or did he read only a few in separate editions but cite the *Works* because it was at hand? We do not yet know, but some of those problems will

be solved by tracing the page number references Hume gives. There are at least 25 more relevant titles of books which we know he was familiar with and which are not cited. In his own library, as somewhat conjecturally reconstructed by David and Mary Norton, more titles appear. That brings the total number of books in a possible bibliography for the *History of England* to about 550, not counting the works contained in multiple volume sets.

One striking thing about Hume's scholarship is its modernity and its reliance on controversial texts. Of the books whose publication dates we know, perhaps 11 percent of an estimated 335 were published before 1650, but more than half were published after 1700, and 30 percent after 1730. The first figure tells us that history was not a major literary concern in Britain before 1600 and that published histories were somewhat discouraged because they were usually supportive of often suspect political or religious factions and thus likely to cause disturbances. William Camden's great works *Britannia* (1586) and *Annals of Queen Elizabeth* (1615 and 1628), almost authorized books and carefully written to offend no one too much, had an unlikely publication history. His readers were warned that he was somewhat gilding his lilies. Even so, he was not allowed to publish in his own lifetime all of his work on the Queen he so admired. A Latin edition first came out in Leiden, with a complete English translation appearing only in 1630, some years after the author's death.[29] Camden's friends formed the first English antiquarian group—which had been discouraged out of existence by James VI and I by 1614 (Piggott, *Ancient Britons*, 14). That group included a number of Camden's former pupils at Westminster School, including Sir Robert Cotton (1571–1631), whose anti-royalist and Puritanical views led to his being denied the use of his own library by King Charles I in 1626. In such circumstances, and they did not change much until c.1665, history did not flourish, although it continued to be done. Hume's sources reflect those facts just as they would have confirmed his view of the darkness of the dark ages, when very few works were written.

Between roughly 1650 and 1730, there was a boom in English antiquarian publications. Many chorographies were also published, but those seem not to have interested Hume much. Most of that scholarship served religious or political ends. It had as its purpose disputing Roman Catholic claims and the political claims of kings or those who opposed them. Dr. Robert Brady (?–1700), a Royalist historian whom Hume much admired, was active on both fronts. Some of that activity reflected the easing of restrictions on publication. After the lapse of censorship in 1695, more tolerant governments allowed even more historical material to appear. Still, it is pertinent to note that George Hickes (1642–1715) did much of his important work on the Anglo-Saxons from 1690 to 1715, while in hiding as a sought-after non-juror and supporter of the ousted King James II and VII. The works produced by Thomas Hearne (1678–1735) served the same causes and cost Hearne his posts at Oxford. Hume benefited from the works of such scholars but

had to be critical of what he used.[30] Scholars like Brady, Hickes, Hearne, or Edmund Gibson (1669–1748) made available many more medieval sources and produced specialized studies of language and of institutions such as the courts, the Exchequer, towns, and monasteries. That scholarship came in waves and informed the work of Rapin, Echard, and others whose histories Hume sought to and did replace. They and Hume used the seventeenth-century memoirs and accounts as they appeared after the deaths of the men who wrote them. However, Hume's was the first history of England to make extensive use of the many chronicles edited and published in collections from c.1660–1740.[31] Those works, and the commentaries on them by men such as Thomas Gale (1636–1702), Edward Stillingfleet (1635–1699), Edmund Gibson and others who were later involved in founding the Society of Antiquaries (1717–) revolutionized the study of early England.[32] Without their work, what Hume wrote about the Britons, Anglo-Saxons and the period up to c.1500 would have been impossible. Hickes and others allowed him to relate the Angles and Saxons to other northern nations and to work in a bit of what today looks like anthropology. The works of Thomas Hearne, who edited over 30 chronicles and other sources, allowed Hume a better insight into the medieval period than had been possible earlier. Much of that material came out after Echard and Rapin had published their histories.

Hume could not always bring himself to name the antiquaries and editors of chronicles because he so disagreed with their divine right politics or high Toryism (or both), or—on the other side—with their absurd beliefs in Whig theories of limited monarchical power and "the Saxon yoke" which Whig historians believed had been imposed on free men by the Norman Conquest. Hume read them all with an eye to using their facts for different ends. In their multi-volume collections, which often contained a number of texts, he probably did a lot of skimming. Hume is unlikely to have read the material in the early sections of most chronicles—those works often began with the Creation. They were, and are, only valuable for the parts dealing with the compilers' lifetimes. Many of the 225 or so works from the seventeenth century were of that sort.

Hume may have had contempt for the medieval chroniclers, but he used about 100 of their works. About half of the volumes printed in the eighteenth century were books of that variety—editions prepared by Hearne and other scholars usually concerned with religion and royalist politics. Increasing numbers of texts generally provided Hume with more than one source for events in the middle ages, often from both Saxon and Norman sources, and later from the perspectives of competing parties, such as those opposed in the various civil wars. Hume had about six sources for many of the medieval reigns and more at his disposal when he described the religious convulsions after Henry VIII (1491–1547) broke with the Roman Church in the 1530s.[33] Hume weighed evidence of that sort in his text,

and many of his notes provide a running commentary on his informed judgments about where the balance of probability was to be found.

There were other categories of new material, which he used more than men before him, who often did not have such information available to them. Among those sources were many works of reference. Here one finds publications such as Arthur Collins's *Peerages*,[34] John Campbell's *Lives of the Admirals* (1742–1744), and other collections dealing with towns, counties, or institutions like the Exchequer. He could have found more of those, but some are there—although not many for Scotland and Ireland. He used the 24-volume *Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England* (1751–1763), written "By Several Hands" (London, 1751–1763), and Thomas Rymer's *Foedera* (London, 1704–1735), which in 20 folio volumes printed the most important treaties of the western European countries. We certainly do not think Hume read all those from cover to cover, but he drew upon them just as he did the similar collections of state trials and histories of the church and other bodies. He mined economic data from many books, ranging from *Doomsday Book* and the Earl of Northumberland's "Household Book," to works on trade, such as the travel accounts of Richard Hakluyt (1562–1616) or the Italian historian Giovanni Villani (d.1348).[35] He cited Thomas Mun's *England's Treasure by Foreign Trade* (1664) and William Petty's *Political Arithmetick* (1690), but his history of England was also informed by writers he had used in political economic essays but did not note in the *History of England*.[36] Of course he also consulted more up-to-date English books, such as that by the South Sea Company's Chief Clerk, Adam Anderson (1693–1765). For forty years, Anderson had observed the British economy from the perspective of one of its greatest companies. Hume's grasp of the events of the seventeenth century, which figured so prominently in his political theory, did not rest only on the works he cited in his essays.

Hume's bibliography is not crowded with foreign sources, but he seems to have tried to find at least French sources for most of the period his *History of England* covered. Indeed, taken altogether, his French materials would have allowed him to do a *History of France*. Some of this was necessary, since the history of the Angevins and Plantagenets is as much about Gascony, Anjou, and Normandy as Great Britain. And most English rebels until Hume's own time were tied in one way or another to France. English claims to much of France were not given up until very much later. Seeing things from a French perspective made his work more even-handed and sometimes provided motives which Englishmen might not have seen or wished to recognize. That would have impressed some of his continental readers.

Such seeming impartiality was less the case with religious issues. When he had a chance, there is usually something attacking Rome and still superstitious Anglicans; both were played off against more moderate Protestants and enthusiasts. His sources here, and the turns taken by events in England, made his *History of England* less eager than one of his essays to applaud the republican nature of a

possible established church. But then he was writing about the English and not the Scots—and not dealing with an ideal commonwealth.

It is not clear how much of the foreign material Hume read in its original language. He cites works in Latin, English, French, Italian, and Spanish (at least two sources). He certainly listed some works which could have helped him with the degenerate forms of late Latin. He had similar books on Anglo-Saxon and Old English and perhaps tried to read a bit of Anglo-Saxon, Old English, and Norman French. There are times when it looks as if he was doing so, but most of his sources were in English, modern French, and Latin. Books like that of James Anderson (1662–1728) on diplomatics would also have helped him to decipher old documents.[37]

The twenty or so published accounts which made it into the bibliography after the publication of the first edition of the *History of England* show that he kept up with current scholarship and was interested in improving his text. Some of that attention was prompted by criticisms he had received. He replied to the supporters of Mary Queen of Scots, added some things to his accounts of the Civil Wars, and made other changes. He also cut from his text much Scottish material, since most of it was in Robertson's *History of Scotland*, but, in the end, the *History of England* was more than a history of England. Also relegated to the notes was some of the social history which had been in the text of the first editions. Still, the *History of England* began and ended with accounts of vastly different cultures—the Britons and the England of 1688. The basic structure of the *History* may be regnal, but readability and analysis required that he not write mere annals. Hume skillfully wove together the source materials from the time he was writing about and other materials which dealt with particular themes and topics and ranged a bit more widely over time.

When one adds all of this together, it is clear that the standard interpretation of Hume's use of sources needs significant revision. The account of Hume as a lazy historian popularized in the nineteenth century by Sir Francis Palgrave and others is not an accurate one. Palgrave said that the "only glimpse" we have of Hume's use of sources is "through a story told by a late venerable Scottish crony" who reportedly remarked: "Why, mon, David read a vast deal before he set about a piece of his book; but his usual seat was the sofa, and he often wrote with his legs up; and it would have been unco fashious to have moved across the room when any little doubt occurred" (*Collected Works*, 9:315). That is an entertaining little anecdote, but a bibliography for Hume's *History of England* tells a much different story.

APPENDIX

An Abstract of the Sources

In the bibliography we have not included books like Bolingbroke's *Remarks on the History of England* which Hume owned, read, and probably used but did not refer to or cite (Norton and Norton, *David Hume Library*, 77).[38] As noted above, he was not good about listing materials he used, and when he did, it was not in a formal, standardized way. Sometimes he gave titles only; sometimes only authors. Sometimes that information is in the text rather than in a note. Some of his abbreviations such as "Har. misc." do not appear on the Past Masters disk when sought—so not all such electronic searches will bear fruit. Sometimes he casually names a source in letters and not in the *History*. At other times, it is clear he is using a particular work which he does not name or to whose author he makes no reference—as in "Machiavel's" *Discourses on Titus Livy*—which were used but not named.

The first column in the table below gives the time period in which we take the works to have been written, but it is not always precise. The time of composition of a few works is not known. Hume used at least one forgery which he probably thought older than it was. Some works stretched over the boundaries set. In that case we have listed a work under the latest date. Not every volume is noticed here, since it is hard to see how to classify collections that run over centuries like the *Journals of the House of Commons*, *Acts of Parliament of England*, or *Scotland*, the 24-volume *Constitutional History of England*, or Thomas Rymer's *Foedera*. The excluded volumes come to at least 102 volumes, many in folios. The collections issued by Parker, Usher and Lloyd, Camden, Savile, Spelman, Twysden, Wharton, Fulman and Gale, Sparke, Salmon, Madox, Rymer, Duchesne, DeTillet, and others have been counted because they contain some important commentary. We have also counted the works contained in them that Hume cited. That may account for the discrepancy between the two lists—as might our carelessness. We have counted in the publications column the last volume in some sets such as those on the peerage and *Biographia Britannica*. Some publication dates have been determined by using the dates of volumes used by Hume as determined by Hilson, Stockton, and the Nortons in their "catalogue" of his library, and by any other useful sources which have come to hand. Some dates have been estimated when there seems to have been only one edition or when we know the date of the volumes held by the Advocates' Library and the National Library of Scotland. The following table cannot make high claims to accuracy, but it gives a rough idea of Hume's erudition and scholarship. This is a work in progress, and we hope to do better in the future.

TABLE 1: Works Counted by Date of Authorship and Publication

Written In	Number	Percentage	Published In	Number	Percentage
400 BCE–200 BCE	0	0			
199 BCE–1 BCE	2	0			
1–200 CE	8	2			
201–700	10	2			
701–800	2	0			
801–900	3	1			
901–1000	3	1			
1001–1100	6	1			
1101–1200	31	6			
1201–1300	12	2			
1301–1400	13	3			
1401–1500	16	3	1436–1500	0	0
1501–1600	75	14	1501–1600	7	1
1601–1650	89	17	1601–1650	31	6
1651–1700	136	26	1651–1700	112	21
1701–1730	47	9	1701–1730	85	16
1731–1763	36	7	1731–1763	88	17
1764–1776	3	1	1764–1776	12	2
Unknown	32	6	Unknown	191	36
Totals	**528**	**100**		**526**	**100**

NOTES

1 A minor exception here is Arthur Sherbo who, forty years ago, noticed some of Hume's reading in the British Museum ("Some Early Readers in the British Museum"). J. C. Hilson also gave a chapter to "Hume and His Sources" in "Some Literary Aspects."

2 See, for instance, Pocock, "David Hume and the Philosophical History of England."

3 See Phillipson, *Hume*. For a classic discussion of Hume as "philosophical historian," see Norton and Popkin, *David Hume: Philosophical Historian*. More recently, see Perinetti, "Philosophical Reflection on History."

4 See Spencer, *Hume and Eighteenth-Century America*, 296–97. Brooks was critical of Hume's historical scholarship in other writings too, such as his important review essay for the *North American Review* in 1829 on "Constitutional History," reprinted in Spencer, *Hume's Reception in Early America*, 2:119–33.

5 In a footnote, Greig attributes this anecdote to Henry Mackenzie (1745–1831), remarking that "Mackenzie says that this is literally how [Hume] wrote the book—which may or may not be true. Metaphorically, it is indisputable" (*David Hume*, 267n).

6 Some, such as Lionel Gossman (*Medievalism*) and David Wootton ("David Hume: The Historian"), have presented Hume as more of a scholar. See Wootton's "David Hume: 'The Historian,'" which has a section on Hume's "Historical Criticism," 453–58. For a recent effort to unpack the historical sources of one of Hume's essays, see Box and Silverthorne, "Most Curious and Important of all Questions."

7 But Hume also found that a useful exercise. He wrote to his publisher, Andrew Millar, on 18 December 1759: "I came to Town about six Weeks ago, & have been very busy during this time, in adding the Authorities to the Volumes of the Stuarts. I find this a very laborious, but not unentertaining Occupation. I find myself oblig'd to read over again almost all my old Authors; & besides adding the References, I take an Opportunity to correct a few Mistakes, to add some new Facts, & to make Improvements on the whole" (Greig, *Letters*, 1:316).

8 Hume used those too and cited most of them in his notes or text.

9 We conclude this essay with an appendix that tabulates some of this.

10 The essay "Hume's Intellectual Development: Part II" is followed in *Essays on David Hume, Medical Men and the Scottish Enlightenment: "Industry, Knowledge and Humanity"* by Emerson's "Hume's Histories," a look at his conjectural and natural histories which glances at their ties to his social theories and philosophy.

11 Of course, Hume could not have read all of Macaulay's 8 volumes, which continued to come out after Hume's death in 1776, but he referred in a footnote to volume 4, which was first published in 1768.

12 Nicolson personally knew all the prominent English and Scottish antiquaries and historians of his time and had spent time examining archives, including those in Scotland, which he visited in 1699. See James, *North Country Bishop*, 87.

13 Sibbald's papers at the National Library of Scotland [NLS] contain many items and letters on bibliography and history. He was in touch with most Scottish and many

English historians, including Nicolson. Sibbald's letters are to be found principally in [NLS] Advocates MSS. 33.5.15; 33.5.18 and 33.5.19. Sibbald's bibliography is *An Account of the Writers Ancient and Modern . . . of North Britain, called Scotland* (1710); it was accompanied by a *Description of the Islands of Orkney and Zetland with the Maps of Them* (1711).

14 The Advocates' Library, the largest in Scotland at the time and one of the largest in Britain, is described by Hillyard, "The Keepership of David Hume," 103–18. Other sections of that book describe the manuscripts held in his time. Hume's comments on manuscripts generally can be found on the searchable disk of this works. He prized the classical ones and was probably being ironic when he characterized the work of David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes (1726–1792), as but the publishing of "historical Manuscripts, of little or no Consequence." Hailes's work on Scottish and other British sources enabled him to continue the chronology of Scottish history past 1100, which is roughly where Fr. Thomas Innes (1662–1744) had stopped. Both Hume and Robertson relied on Hailes for the dating of some events. In 1754, Dalrymple had been one of the curators of the Advocates' Library who had reprimanded Hume for the buying of unedifying literature. Hume neither liked nor respected him.

15 This was the collection of papers, documents, and other items collected by Sir Robert Cotton. A catalogue was printed in 1696 and again in 1732, after a house fire had seriously damaged the collection.

16 *The Harleian Miscellany or, A Collection of Scarce, Curious, And Entertaining Pamphlets And Tracts, as well In Manuscript As In Print, Found In The Late Earl Of Oxford's Library, Interspersed With Historical, Political, And Critical Notes*, was edited by William Oldys (1696–1761) and Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) between 1744 and 1753. Hume's citations to this large, newly published collection are very few and not always easy to find (even with the help of InteLex's searchable Past Masters disk of his book). Hume's scanty use of this may have been resented by Johnson, who also disliked him on other grounds.

17 Madox had worked in Treasury offices, written on the Exchequer, and became Historiographer Royal in 1714. He was a fine antiquary and the editor of works useful to Hume.

18 Hume to Andrew Millar, 10 March 1763, in Greig, *Letters*, 1:378.

19 Douglas attacked Hume's views of miracles in 1752 and became Bishop of Carlisle in 1787. Despite disagreements, they seem to have been friends.

20 Oswald had been aiding him since 1753; see Greig, *Letters*, 1:178–79.

21 Hume to Andrew Millar, 8 April 1762, in Greig, *Letters*, 1:354.

22 See British Library Catalogue. Other similar works include Wace's *History of the Dukes of Normandy* (c.1180), and Galfridus de Vinosalvo's *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis* . . . (c.1215).

23 It is unclear how much Hume cited from other works in passages which look as if he was citing a work he had read. His citations to *Doomsday Book* (1086), for instance, are almost certainly taken from others, such as the works of Robert Brady. But, the book itself was kept in his time at the Chapter House in Westminster, where he could have seen it. The whole work was not published until after his death. The work of Roger of

Wendover was not published in Hume's time either, so he was surely using the work of others in citing it. There are other such instances.

24 There is a modern edition of some of this from another manuscript: *Memoirs, 1652–1660*. The Scots College manuscript was destroyed during the French Revolution when the College was broken up.

25 Robertson's work appeared in 1759 and used many of the same materials but less critically—which evoked Hume's criticisms of his work on Mary Queen of Scots.

26 His most recent biographer says he had been making historical "sketches" while with the Marquis of Annandale in 1746 and that in 1750 he had access to the library of Dr. Richard Meade. See Graham, *Great Infidel*, 219. Graham also thought Hume slighted social history, about which he might have written more.

27 In "My Own Life," Hume suggests it took him only from 1752 to 1762 to write the *History of England*. That seems false. Too much credence has been given to that work, which shortened the time of his historical research and writing and makes him look hastier than he was. It may even be that Hume's statements there contributed to the negative assessments of his scholarship with which this essay began. ("My Own Life" was printed as a sort of "preface" to most editions of the *History*.)

28 Among the most important of those collections were the books listed below by Archbishop Matthew Parker, Sir Henry Savile, William Dugdale, Abraham Wheloc [Whelock, Whelocke], Sir Roger Twysden, William Fulman and Thomas Gale, Henry Wharton, and Joseph Sparke—to name only the most prominent. Together they published many of the chronicles used by Hume.

29 Camden (1551–1623) was a very great historian, conscious of his classical predecessors, of the need to be critical of sources, and of the difficulties of writing honest works in his time. His dilemmas are well discussed in Camden, *History of Princess Elizabeth*.

30 To a lesser extent, this also occurred abroad. Hume was probably the first English historian to use the works of Ludovico Antonio Muratori and some of the works which appeared in France. For the first, see Dooley, *Italy in the Baroque*, 622–28. For the second, see Gossman, *Medievalism*. This work also has materials on some of the historians whom Hume met in France such as Charles DuClos and Charles de Brosses.

31 The editors and their works have been well treated in many works, none of which give much notice to Hume's use of this material. See, for example, the following and their bibliographies: Piggott, *Ancient Britons*; Kendrick, *British Antiquity*; Douglas, *English Scholars 1660–1730*; numerous books by Joseph Levine touch on this topic, including *Humanism and History*.

32 Some of those writers are discussed by Hodgen, *Early Anthropology.*

33 Many of the medieval kings with whom he dealt were covered in one or more newly published chronicles.

34 This appeared in a one-volume edition in 1709 and in a 2nd edition of three volumes in 1735. Collins (1682–1760) published a baronetage in 1720 and a number of family histories.

35 *Nuova Cronica* (a history of Florence, 1346–1364), continued by Matteo and Filippo Villani, one of the first histories to devote space to economic matters and statistics.

36 One example is Mirabeau, *L'ami des hommes*.

37 We do not know how much Hume studied to be a lawyer, but lawyers were adept at reading old charters and documents, which is one of the reasons historians all over Europe were recruited from their ranks. For someone like Lord Hailes, who worked much on medieval Scotland, being able to read the charters was a professional need. Anderson was a Writer to the Signet and had training which proved useful in writing *Diplomata Scotiae*, which was published posthumously in 1729. It is full of information about seals, styles, coinage and the value of Scottish money, and how to date and authenticate documents. An introduction to it was written and published separately in 1739 by Thomas Ruddiman. Hume would have known that book, which he is likely to have read, but he did not specifically cite it.

38 We have included the *Dissertation on Parties*, which Hume did not cite but clearly was using.

WORKS CITED

Adams, Charles K. *A Manual of Historical Literature*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882.

Barnes, Harry Elmer. *A History of Historical Writing*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1938; second revised edition, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963.

Bentley, Michael. *Modern Historiography: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Black, J. B. *The Art of History: A Study of Four Great Historians of the Eighteenth Century*. New York: F.S. Crofts, 1926.

Box M. A. and Michael Silverthorne. "The 'Most Curious & Important of All Questions of Erudition': Hume's Assessment of the Populousness of Ancient Nations." In *David Hume: Historical Thinker, Historical Writer*, edited by Mark G. Spencer, 225–54. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.

Brooks, Edward. "Constitutional History." *North American Review*, 1829. Reprinted in Mark G. Spencer, ed., *Hume's Reception in Early America*, 2 vols, 2:119–33. Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2002.

Camden, William. *William Camden, The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England: Selected Chapters*, edited with an introduction by Wallace MacCaffery. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Dalrymple, John. *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*. Edinburgh, 1771.

Dooley, Brendan, ed.. *Italy in the Baroque: Selected Readings*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1995.

Douglas, David. *English Scholars 1660–1730*, second revised edition. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1951.

Emerson, R. L. "Hume's Histories." In *Essays on David Hume, Medical Men and the Scottish Enlightenment: "'Industry, Knowledge and Humanity,"* 127–54. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009.

Emerson, R. L. "Hume's Intellectual Development: Part II." In *Essays on David Hume, Medical Men and the Scottish Enlightenment: "Industry, Knowledge and Humanity,"* 103–25. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009.

Gossman, Lionel. *Medievalism and the Ideologies of the Enlightenment: The World and Work of la Curne de Sainte-Palaye*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

Graham, Roderick. *The Great Infidel: A Life of David Hume*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2004.

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

Greig, J. Y. T., ed. *The Letters of David Hume*, 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932, reprinted in 2011.

Hallam, Henry. "Review of John Lingard's *A History of England*" *Edinburgh Review* 53 (1831):1–43.

Hillyard, Brian. "The Keepership of David Hume." In *For the Encouragement of Learning: Scotland's National Library 1689–1989*, edited by Patrick Cadell and Ann Matheson, 103–18. Edinburgh: HMSO, 1989.

Hilson, J. C. "Hume and His Sources." In "Some Literary Aspects of David Hume's *History of England*," M.Litt., University of Edinburgh, 1970.

Hodgen, M. T. *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964.

Hume, David. *The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to The Revolution in 1688*, 6 vols, edited by William B. Todd, Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, Inc., 1983.

Hume, David. "My Own Life." In Hume, *The History of England*, 1:xxvii–xxxiv.

James, Francis G. *North Country Bishop: A Biography of William Nicolson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.

Kendrick, T. D. *British Antiquity*. London: Methuen, 1950. Reprinted, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.

Levine, Joseph. *The Autonomy of History: Truth and Method from Erasmus to Gibbon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Levine, Joseph. *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Macauley, Thomas Babington. "History." In *The Works of Lord Macauley, Complete*, 8 vols, 5:152–53. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1873.

Memoirs of James II: His Campaigns as Duke of York, 1652–1660. Translated by A. Lytton Sells, with an Introduction by Sir Arthur Bryant. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.

Minutes of Meetings of the Trustees' Standing Committee. British Museum Library Archives. Microfilm, CE-3, 6 vols, 1754–1779.

Mirabeau, Marquis de. *L'ami des hommes, ou Trait de la population*, 5 vols. Paris, 1755.

Norton, David Fate, and Mary Norton. *The David Hume Library*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Bibliographical Society with the National Library of Scotland, 1996.

Norton, David Fate, and Richard H. Popkin, eds. *David Hume: Philosophical Historian*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1965.

Palgrave, Francis. "Anglo-Saxon History." *Quarterly Review* 34 (1826): 248–98.

Palgrave, Francis. "Hume, and His Influence upon History." *Quarterly Review* 73 (1844): 536–92. Reprinted in *The Collected Works of Sir Francis Palgrave*. Vol. 9 *The Collected*

Historical Works of Sir Francis Palgrave, K.H.: Reviews, Essays, and Other Writings, Part 1, 305–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Perinetti, Dario. "Philosophical Reflection on History." In *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Philosophy*, 2 vols, edited by Knud Haakonssen, 2:1107–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Phillips, Mark Salber. *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain 1740–1820*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Phillipson, Nicholas. *Hume*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. Reprinted as *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Piggott, Stuart. *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination: Ideas from the Renaissance to the Regency*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1989.

Pocock, J. G. A. "David Hume and the Philosophical History of England." In *Barbarism and Religion: Narratives of Civil Government*, 2:163–257. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Some Early Readers in the British Museum." In *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 6 (1972): 35–55.

Spencer, Mark G. *David Hume and Eighteenth-Century America*. Rochester: Rochester University Press, 2005.

Spencer, Mark G., ed. *David Hume: Historical Thinker, Historical Writer*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.

Spencer, Mark G., ed. *Hume's Reception in Early America*, 2 vols. Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2002.

Wexler, Victor G. *David Hume and the "History of England."* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1979.

Wootton, David. "David Hume: The Historian." In *The Cambridge Companion to Hume*, 2nd ed, edited by David Fate Norton and Jacqueline Taylor, 447–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.