

Editors' Introduction for Volume 42

The new editorial team, Ann Levey, Karl Schafer and Amy Schmitter, are very pleased to present this special double-issue of *Hume Studies*. It contains a wide variety of articles on subjects old and new, as well as an assortment of book reviews, commissioned by the new book review editor, David Landy of San Francisco State University. We are grateful to the many people who have helped us get this volume and our tenure as editors underway, including the preceding editors-in-chief, Angela Coventry and Peter Kail, and preceding book review editor, Annemarie Butler, as well as the previous editors-in-chief Corliss Swain and Saul Traiger, who offered invaluable advice about procedures, practices, and technological issues. For further technological advice and support, we are very thankful to Rick McCarty and his successor, Amyas Merivale, who have helped keep an outdated and sometimes cranky editorial site running. Rico Vitz too deserves many thanks, particularly for taking over financial matters when we were defeated by local regulations. We have been delighted to begin working with our copy editor, Corina David, and the good people at the Philosophy Documentation Center, particularly Diana Malsky, who translate the journal into physical and electronic print. Last and perhaps most importantly, we owe very great thanks to the many people who have worked on the content of the journal: both the many patient souls who submitted their work for consideration to the journal and the even greater number of people who generously answered our calls to referee papers (and often went through multiple rounds of review). There would be no journal without their largely thankless and anonymous labor.

The volume now before you offers articles on a mix of topics in Hume scholarship: some engage with long-standing issues of perennial interest, others break new ground both in topic and approach, many trace Hume's intellectual influences, and all offer material for and spurs to future research. Emilio Mazzi and Gianluco Mori's "'Loose Bits of Paper' and 'Uncorrect Thoughts': Hume's Early Memoranda

in Context” exhaustively tracks the sources and historical context of Hume’s early memoranda. Mazzi and Mori show that these notes pre-date the *Treatise*. But their analysis of transcription errors and other elements of the memoranda leads them to conclude that what we have are notes of notes, many of which are significantly later than the dated material. The wide range of subjects covered by the memoranda means that their account touches on topics ranging from metaphysics to history (with interesting comparisons to other articles in this volume, such as that by Kevin Busch). Their spadework also illuminates the deep influence of the Abbé du Bos and Pierre Bayle on surprisingly diverse areas of Hume’s thought. Mazzi and Mori argue that most previous commentators on the memoranda have gotten some aspects of the material right, but their comprehensive and thorough analysis puts the whole in a new light and should prove an invaluable source for scholars in the future.

In “Hume’s Perceptual Relationism,” Dan Kervick addresses our ideas of space and time in Book 1, part 2 of the *Treatise*, focusing on Hume’s declaration that a vacuum is inconceivable. Kervick shows that Hume develops a novel position that negotiates between Cartesian assertions of a plenum and Newtonian endorsements of empty space. Instead of choosing between a materially full notion of extension or a notion of extension unoccupied by matter, Kervick argues that Hume is committed to a form of “perceptual relationalism,” in which relations such as distance must be understood as irreducibly two-place, rather than a one-place feature of extension. It is a truly distinctive position, very much in keeping with Hume’s approach to understanding space through the phenomenology of ideas.

Kevin Ryan Busch’s “Hume’s Alleged Lapse on the Causal Maxim” turns to a familiar and ever-popular issue: Hume’s argument against the necessity of attributing a cause to every event. Busch situates his discussion as a response to a criticism by Harold Noonan that Hume moves illegitimately from arguing that any event need not require its actual cause to the possibility of that event existing without any cause whatsoever. Busch argues that Hume does not need to make this move, but also that he has the resources to do so validly. He suggests two alternate and incompatible readings of Hume’s argumentative strategy, while arguing that we do not need to decide between them for Hume’s argument to stand.

Matias Slavov also addresses aspects of Hume’s account of causation, but in “Hume on the Laws of Dynamics: The Tacit Assumption of Mechanism,” he focuses on the little-discussed topic of Hume’s understanding of motion and laws of dynamics. Important as Hume is for philosophy of science, he did not produce much natural science himself; however, Slavov carefully extracts five laws of dynamics Hume endorsed from a myriad of works. Whereas Kervick attributes an innovative understanding of our idea of space to Hume, Slavov sees Hume as adopting a somewhat old-fashioned picture of causation, owing as much to a Cartesian vision of mechanics as to Newton, and in fact incompatible with Newtonian mechanics

as it has since developed. At the same time, Slavov argues that Hume is no full-blown mechanist devoted to the corpuscularian hypothesis of Boyle and others. Rather, for Slavov, Hume's mechanist leanings appear mostly in his assumptions about the nature of causation at work in the laws of dynamics.

In "Skeptical Influences on Hume's View of Animal Reasoning," Richard J. Fry takes issue with a number of recent commentators, by arguing that the influence of skeptical authors on Hume's account of animal reasoning is limited. In particular, skeptical authors such as Sextus Empiricus, Michel de Montaigne and Bayle tended to argue that animals possess many of the cognitive abilities prized by humans. But, although Hume shares their view that like effects demand explanation by like causes, so too do non-skeptical philosophers such as Hobbes and Locke, who note the similarities between human and animal reasoning in the pursuit of natural scientific explanations (similarities both exploited and extended by Hume). And Hume's method of argument and aims in making use of human to animal analogies seem very different from the skeptics, since he tends to argue from accounts of animal abilities to analyses of human capacities. Thus, like Hobbes and Locke, his primary goal is a psychological account of human reasoning, based on assuming a continuity between animal and human reasoning—a finding that may be of interest for long-standing debates about the relationship between Hume's skepticism and his naturalism.

The next set of articles turns away from Hume's metaphysics, epistemology and natural philosophy to issues in his moral and political philosophy, including religion and education. In "On David Hume's "Forms of Moderation," Kelly M.S. Swope considers how to negotiate the relationship between the passions and imagination to produce moderation in moral and political deliberation. Swope's engaging paper focuses on the example of Themistocles's presentation of his plan to burn the fleets of Athens's neighbors. In this case, suppressing the details of the plan also suppressed the imagination's effect on the passions, so that when the Athenians heard that "nothing could be more advantageous," but also "nothing could be more unjust" (T 2.3.6), they rejected it unanimously. Swope identifies various forms of moderation that can generate something like the strength of mind that prefers calm passions and sentiments over the violent ones so that we can act according to our calmly considered motivations.

Jonathan Harold Krause considers "The Political Lessons of Hume's *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*" with an eye to its socio-political aims. Paying particular attention to the oft-neglected figure of Pamphilus, Krause argues that this work models a form of religious education that promotes political harmony and well-being. On his reading, the *Dialogues* shows how a skeptical religious education may reduce damaging fallout from religious belief, without completely eliminating religion from society. Krause's work pays particular attention to the dialogic form, the interactions between characters, and their projected histories of relationships

to make the case that Hume is more interested in religion as a kind of rhetoric with moral and political consequences than he is in its truth.

The last article in the present volume breaks new ground by using African-American Critical Thought and recent critical-historical methods in the study of religion to place Hume's thoughts on race and religion within the context of Anglo-colonialism and the transatlantic slave trade. In "The Impact of David Hume's Thoughts about Race for his Stance on Slavery and his Concept of Religion," Andre C. Willis relates Hume's comments on racial, religious and character types to early modern ideals of scientific taxonomy and method stemming from Linnaeus's *Systema Naturae*. While noting that racialization was central to European colonialism, Willis shows the fraught and complicated relationship between thinking about race and views on slavery among Scottish enlightenment thinkers. Willis then connects this discussion of race with Hume's account of the formation of religion and its varieties to show the deeply, if not explicitly, racialized nature of Hume's thinking about religion and its history. These are just a few of the topics in Willis's rich discussion. Whereas Mazza and Mori provide historiographic tools that illuminate Hume's writings and techniques, Willis presents a framework for thinking about important, difficult and often uncomfortable questions about the relations among Hume's approaches to race, slavery, religion, and history within the political and economic context of Anglo-colonialism. We look forward to future work in this area.

The book reviews included in this volume add yet further topics to the mix: Miren Boehm considers Tamás Demeter's monograph on Hume's place in Scottish Newtonianism; James Harris reviews Jia Wei's book on commerce and politics in Hume's *History of England*; Peter Thielke surveys a *festschrift* for Manfred Kuehn on Kant and the Scottish Enlightenment; and Danielle Charette covers Paul Sagar's history on sociability and sovereignty in modern political thought from Hobbes to Smith. Of course, no single volume could cover all of the issues that arise in Hume scholarship. We look forward to future issues with diverse arrays of articles on topics that are old favorites, on questions that are cutting-edge, and on everything in between.

Several of those issues are currently underway and should appear (relatively) quickly. We are currently putting together a special book issue devoted to a selection of important recent books; for each one, several critics will address aspects of the book, followed by responses from the author. That will be followed shortly thereafter by a regular issue comprising articles and a few book reviews; together these issues will constitute volume 43 and put us on our way to catching the volume dates up with the years in which they appear.

As we look to the issues to appear, the editors would like to thank the readership and authors of *Hume Studies* for their patience over the extended period since the last volume appeared. There is a steep learning curve to taking over the

editorship of a journal, particularly one operated as independently as *Hume Studies* is. We have also encountered a number of technical problems, some of which are irremediable with the current editorial software. Fortunately, the entire on-line journal site is now in the process of a thorough overhaul. With a reconstructed site and some experience under our belts, we hope soon to significantly improve the times for responses to submission and time to publication. We have already instituted some policies for speeding up processes for revision-and-resubmission, which we hope have clarified matters a bit for authors and referees. However, it is a fine tradition of *Hume Studies* that the editors and referees are willing to work with authors through multiple rounds of revision; we have no intention of abandoning this tradition, and remain committed to refining submissions thoroughly before publication. Again, we cannot do that without the generous cooperation of authors and referees. We are grateful to all who made this volume possible and to those who will enable future issues.

Ann Levey, *University of Calgary*

Karl Schafer, *University of California, Irvine*

Amy M. Schmitter, *University of Alberta*