



Mark G. Spencer

### Hume's Last Book Review: A New Attribution?

*Hume Studies* vol. 44, no. 1 (2018), pp. 52-64.

Your use of the HUME STUDIES archive at <http://www.humesociety.org/hs/> indicates your acceptance of HUME STUDIES' Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.humesociety.org/hs/termsofuse.asp>.

HUME STUDIES' Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of the journal, or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the HUME STUDIES archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

For more information on HUME STUDIES contact: [editors@humestudies.org](mailto:editors@humestudies.org)

# Historiography

# Hume's Last Book Review? A New Attribution

MARK G. SPENCER

*Abstract:* This essay argues for a new Hume attribution. It does so by pursuing an endnote—related to the Rev. Thomas Percy's *The Regulations and Establishment of the Household of Henry Algernon Percy, the Fifth Earl of Northumberland*—that Hume added to the 1773 edition of his *History of England*. Establishing the contexts of Hume's elaborate endnote—including his later revisions to it and his correspondence with Percy, Adam Smith, William Strahan, and others—leads us to an anonymous book review of Percy's volume, published in Gilbert Stuart's *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*. If the argument presented here is right, that review is Hume's. Appearing in January 1774, it is also the last known book review that Hume published.

Writing from Edinburgh in February 1770, Hume—always revising his *History of England*—beseeched Adam Smith (1723–90), his friend in Kirkcaldy, “[b]e sure to bring over the Northumberland Household Book.”<sup>1</sup> The book referred to was *The Regulations and Establishment of the Household of Henry Algernon Percy, the Fifth Earl of Northumberland*, a privately printed volume of sixteenth-century source material published by the Rev. Thomas Percy (1729–1811). From the Rev. Percy's celebration of the earl and Tudor nobility, Hume worked up an involved endnote for what would be the 1773 edition of his *The History of England, from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the revolution in 1688*. Commentators typically give short shrift to Hume's

---

Mark G. Spencer is Professor in the Department of History, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada, L2S 3A1  
Email: mspencer@brocku.ca

encounter with Percy's *Household Book*, even passing over it silently.<sup>2</sup> But, pursuing it sheds new light on Hume as historian. It also leads to a new Hume attribution.

In January 1773, before the new edition of Hume's *History* was publicly released, Percy—who had seen an advance copy—wrote to the author, complaining his endnote was too harsh on the earl and imploring, especially, that Hume read Percy's "Preface" to the *Household Book*. Doing so, Percy supposed, would set Hume straight.<sup>3</sup> "I take for granted," Percy wrote, "that, when you drew up this analysis, you had not seen what I have offered in vindication of the earl's housekeeping, in a preface and notes, which I have lately printed. I have desired Dr Blair to send you his copy; and if you think a book worth your acceptance, I will take an opportunity of forwarding one to you."<sup>4</sup> Percy pleaded with Hume: "review your Analysis, and drop whatever seems particularly harsh or severe."<sup>5</sup>

Hume straightaway wrote to chastise William Strahan (1715–85), his printer, who had "been guilty of a small Indiscretion in allowing a Copy of my new Edition to go out before the Publication: For I had a Letter yesterday from Mr Piercy, complaining tho' in obliging terms, of the Note with regard to the old Earl of Northumberland[']s House-hold Book; as if it were a Satyre on that particular Nobleman, which was by no means my Intention: I only meant to paint the manners of the Age. I reply'd to him, that I fancy'd it was too late to correct my Expressions; for that the Work was probably in the hands of the public. I hope it is; or at least beg it may be soon."<sup>6</sup>

On the same day, 16 January 1773, Hume wrote a lengthy letter to Percy in which he professed his innocence; while also repeating much of the text and the spirit of his endnote. Hume explained, "It never was my Idea, that the Earl of Northumberland was more *niggardly* or more *statelily* than other Men of his Rank in England: On the contrary, the chief Curiosity of his Household Book is, that, by giving us a general Insight into the Manners of the Age, it throws a great Light upon that Period."<sup>7</sup> "My Notion is," wrote Hume,

that the uncultivated Nations are not only inferior to civiliz'd in Government, civil, military, and ecclesiastical; but also in Morals; and that their whole manner of Life is disagreeable and uneligible to the last Degree. I hope it will give no Offense (and whether it do or not, I must say it) if I declare my Opinion, that the English, till near the beginning of the last century, are very much to be regarded as an uncultivated Nation; and that even *When good Queen Elizabeth sat on the Throne*, there was very little good Roast Beef in it, and no Liberty at all. The Castle of the Earl of Northumberland, and no doubt that of the Earl of Warwick, the *King Maker* and others, was no better than a Dungeon: No Chimney to let out the Smoak; no Glass Windows to keep out the Air; a glimmering Candle here and there, which could scarce keep their Ragamuffins of Servants

and Retainers from breaking their Shins or running foul of each other: No Diet but salt Beef and Mutton for nine Months of the Year, without Vegetables of any kind: Few Fires and these very poor ones.<sup>8</sup>

“For my Part,” Hume continued,

I shoud rather chuse, for the Gratification of every Appetite and Passion, except that of Pride, to be a Footman in the present Family of the Duke and Dutchess of Northumberland, than to be at the head of it in the Reign of Harry the VII and VIII; And even on the head of Pride, I shoud expect in that humble station, from the courtly Demeanor of these two noble Persons better treatment, than the first of their Vassals at that time thought themselves entitled to. If these be Truths, why shoud they be conceald? Why still exalt Old England for a Model of Government and Laws; Praises which it by no means deserves? And why still complain of the present times, which, in every respect, so far surpass all the past?<sup>9</sup>

Hume attempted to appease Percy, claiming “I shoud certainly endeavour to rub off any rough Corners which you observe in my Extracts, if I were not sensible that it is now too late: For the Bookseller told me, that his new Edition was ready for publication, and waited only till I shoud give him the Errata, which I sent about a month ago: So that the Book, I presume, is now in the hands of the Public.”<sup>10</sup> Hume was here being disingenuous. As late as 30 January 1773, he sent additional errata to Strahan, directing: “Be so good as to insert it in its proper place; as I suppose the Errata is not printed.”<sup>11</sup>

Hume was disingenuous, too, in another regard in his letter to Percy. “If I had perus’d your Preface,” Hume claimed to Percy, “I might perhaps alter my Opinion in these particulars. I have a great Curiosity to see it and shall apply to Dr Blair for it.”<sup>12</sup> There is every reason to think that Hume had not only “perused” Percy’s “Preface”—recall, he had asked Smith to bring a copy of Percy’s book to him at the very time that he was making revisions to his *History*, in the winter of 1770—but that he knew it well. Indeed, a close reading of the text of Hume’s endnote suggests it was directed pointedly at Percy’s account. Hume’s note, we shall see, was a gloss on Percy’s “Preface”; it offered an interpretation of the *Household Book* that was the complete opposite of what Percy intended his volume to demonstrate about the earl and his times.

In his “Preface,” Percy had touted: “Here we see the great magnificence of our old nobility, who seated in their castles, lived in a state of splendour very much resembling and scarce inferiour to that of the Royal Court.”<sup>13</sup> “Among other instances of magnificence,” he maintained, “we cannot but remark the number of PRIESTS that were kept in household, not fewer than ELEVEN, at the head of

whom presided a Doctor or Batchelor of divinity, as dean of the chapel.”<sup>14</sup> Percy admired the earl’s “compleat SYSTEM OF ANCIENT OECONOMICS,” marveling over “the plenty and liberality of the Earl’s housekeeping”: “It is remarkable that they should be obliged to carry all the Beds, Hangings, and Furniture along with them whenever they removed”; at times, “his dress, furniture, equipage and attendance was more like that of a prince than a subject.”<sup>15</sup>

Hume’s endnote was attached to this sentence in his *History*: “And it must be acknowledged, in spite of those who declaim so violently against refinement in the arts, or what they are pleased to call luxury, that, as much as an industrious tradesman is both a better man and a better citizen than one of those idle retainers, who formerly depended on the great families; so much is the life of a modern nobleman more laudable than that of an ancient baron.”<sup>16</sup> For the full effect, one really must read in its entirety Hume’s densely printed note of five pages, but a brief summary incorporating select quotation might go something like this:

“The duke of Northumberland has lately printed a household book of an old earl of that family, who lived at this time: The author has been favoured with the perusal of it; and it contains many curious particulars, which mark the manners and way of living in that rude, not to say barbarous age; as well as the prices of commodities. I have extracted a few of them. . . . The whole expence of the earl’s family is managed with an exactness that is very rigid, and seems even somewhat niggardly; insomuch, that the number of pieces, which must be cut out of every quarter of beef, mutton, pork, veal, nay stock-fish and salmon, are determined, and must be entered and accounted for by the different clerks appointed for that purpose.” Hume provided a detailed computing of a meagre diet that consisted mostly of salted meat, along with “One hundred and sixty gallons of mustard . . . allowed in a year; which seems indeed requisite for the salt beef.” The diet for most in the household had “few or no vegetables” and was “very bad and unhealthy.” “So,” wrote Hume, “there cannot be any thing more erroneous, than the magnificent ideas formed of *the Roast Beef of Old England*. We must entertain as mean an idea of its cleanliness [too] . . . No sheets were used: This linen was made into eight table-cloths for my lord’s table; and one table-cloth for the knights. . . . This last, I suppose, was washed only once a month. . . . The drinking, however, was tolerable,” Hume quipped, “viz. ten tun and two hogsheads of Gascogny wine, at the rate of four pounds thirteen shillings and four pence a tun.” “My lord and lady have set on their table for breakfast at seven o’clock in the morning a quart of beer; as much wine; two pieces of salt fish, six red herrings, four white ones, or a dish of sprats. In flesh days half a chyne of mutton, or a chyne of beef boiled, p. 73, 75.” “Here is an article,” wrote

Hume quoting from Percy: “*It is desired that from henceforth no capons to be bought but only for my lord’s own mess, and that the said capons shall be bought for two-pence a piece, lean, and fed in the poultry; and master chamberlain and the stewards to be fed with capons, if there be strangers sitting with them, p. 102.*” “Here is another article. *Item, It is thought good that no plovers be bought at no season but only in Christmas and principal feasts, and my lord to be served therewith and his board-end, and none other, and to be bought for a penny a piece, or a penny halfpenny at most, p. 103.* Woodcocks are to be bought at the same price. Partridges at two-pence, p. 104, 105. Pheasants, a shilling; peacocks the same, p. 106.” Fires were limited, animals underfed and, when traveling, inns “could afford nothing tolerable.” Hume explained with a snicker: “My lord passes the year in three country-seats, all in Yorkshire, Wrysel, Leckenfield, and Topclyffe; but he has furniture only for one: He carries every thing along with him, beds, tables, chairs, kitchen utensils, all which, we may conclude, were so coarse, that they could not be spoilt by the carriage: Yet seventeen carts and one wagon suffices for the whole. . . . One cart suffices for all his kitchen utensils, cooks beds, &c. . . . One remarkable circumstance is, that he has eleven priests in his house, besides seventeen persons, chanters, musicians, &c. belonging to his chapel: Yet he has only two cooks for a family of 223 persons<sup>17</sup>. . . . Their meals were certainly dressed in the slovenly manner of a ship’s company. It is amusing to observe the pompous and even royal style assumed by this Tartar chief: He does not give any orders, though only for the right making of mustard; but it is introduced with this preamble, *It seemeth good to us and our council.*” etc.<sup>18</sup>

On one hand, then, Hume’s endnote did read—as he insisted to Percy it was intended—as an assessment of Tudor England’s unenviably primitive living conditions. Yet, on the other hand, we see Percy had good reason for perceiving satire in Hume’s rendition. Only Hume’s satire was not directed at the *historical* Percy, earl of Northumberland and keeper of the *Household Book*. It was directed at the *present* Percy whose “Preface” celebrated the past in fanciful ways wholly unsupported by his historical monument.<sup>19</sup>

On 30 January 1773, Hume followed up with another letter to Strahan: “I find you must reprint all that Note about the Northumberland House-hold Book. The Alterations I make are very little material; but being requir’d in a very obliging manner by Dr Piercy, and, I suppose, by the Family, I could not now refuse them, without giving them great Offence, which I wish to avoid.”<sup>20</sup> But, by then, it seems it was too late to reprint “that Note.” It was allowed to stand in place. For readers of the eight-volume edition of 1773 it was prominent; much less for today’s readers who most often encounter it mid-volume in the *History’s* six-volume modern

reprinting. In 1773, it fell as the very last passage—and Hume's footnote to his end-note as the very last lines—readers met before “END OF THE THIRD VOLUME.”<sup>21</sup>

Hume's revisions were incorporated, in a manner; as “ERRATA” printed at the end of Volume Eight. He was right that he introduced “very little material” revision. Mostly providing additional context, he offered only two, minor deletions, including “dele these words; *This last, I suppose, was washed only once a month.*”<sup>22</sup> But, that was not the end of the story. Hume later changed his mind about even granting that slight revision. The deleted line conspicuously returned in the last authorial edition of the *History*.<sup>23</sup> Would one be surprised to find Hume contesting Percy's *Household Book* elsewhere too?

On 13 December 1773, Gilbert Stuart (1742–86), co-editor of the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, reported in a letter to John Murray (1737–93), his London business associate and friend: “Hume (Dav.d) gives an essay, for No. 3.”<sup>24</sup> What was it? None have hitherto considered the question. Formulating an answer requires additional context. An initial hint was provided in “NOTES to our CORRESPONDENTS,” the concluding section of issue No. 2 (December 1773). There, the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review's* editors helped to whet readers' appetites for No. 3:

An ingenious correspondent has favoured us with that curious and rare work,<sup>25</sup> *The Regulations and Establishment of the household of Henry Algernon Percy, the fifth Earl of Northumberland, at his Castles of Wresill and Leginfield in Yorkshire; and we shall endeavor to prepare an account of it.*

Most readers will easily slip past the substitution of *Piercy* for *Percy*. The Rev. Thomas Percy would not have.<sup>26</sup> He was no doubt mortified to see his book's main character named in that fashion. And, that spelling has Hume's fingerprints all over it.

Hume not only referred to the Rev. Percy and the earl as “Piercy” in his correspondence with Strahan and others, but also in letters to Percy himself. Eventually, Percy insisted that Hume spell the family name *Percy*, not *Piercy*. All to no avail, it must have seemed. Finally, the disgruntled clergyman wrote to Hume on 22 January 1773, in the midst of their exchange about Hume's use of the *Household Book*:

In the first place, I think I have discovered merit enough in the old earl to entitle him to be mentioned in your note by name (viz. Henry Algernon Percy, fifth Earl of Northumberland,) for his patronising literature and arts in an illiterate age certainly raises him above his contemporaries; and here, by the by, let me just hint that the name is not, nor ever was, properly written *Piercy*. The first of the family, who came over at the Conquest, wrote his name *Willm. de Percy* (or rather *de Perci*,) from the place of his residence in Normandy. *Percy* is the name at this day of a town in

Lower Normandy, near St Lo, and probably was the original possession of the family. In Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum* is preserved an ancient charter of this first Lord Percy, containing a grant of lands to the abbey of Whitby, in Yorkshire, founded by him, in which he writes his name himself *Willielmus de Perci* (*vide* vol. i. p. 72, 847.) I have now before me an original charter of his grandson, which begins with these words—"W. de Perci omnibus hominibus suis Francis et Anglis, salutem," &c. By degrees they dropt the *de*, and wrote it uniformly Percy. As for the idle story of Hector Boetius, that this family had the name of Piercy from piercing the eye of King Malcolm III. at the siege of Alnwick castle, it is a wild fable. There are charters extant of theirs with the name of De Percy before that event, and they had not the least connexion with, or interest in, Alnwick castle till two hundred years after King Malcolm's death, in the reign of King Edward I. This trifling digression I hope you will pardon; for as to the orthography of a name it is, after all, not worth a moment's consideration.<sup>27</sup>

The very next week, we have seen, a shameless Hume wrote to Strahan nonchalantly about "Piercy" and "the Family."

The *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* tackled Percy's book in No. 3, as promised.<sup>28</sup> Four pages of extracts from the *Household Book* were prefaced by these four paragraphs of commentary:

THE nobility of England enjoyed, in antient times, the most important privileges. Many of them exercised the authority of sovereigns within the limits of their property. They made laws and enforced them; struck money, and imposed taxes; exerted the powers of justice and mercy; and even declared war against each other, of their private authority.

At a period, when their greatness had received a check, and was less dangerous to society and government, the work before us offers a curious proof of their magnificence. Their household, it appears, was arranged to an exact resemblance with the royal establishments. The Earl of Northumberland had his secretary; his grooms of the chamber; his comptroller; clerk of the kitchen; chamberlain; treasurer; and other officers; and to these he issued out warrants to signify his pleasure and commands. What may seem very singular, he had even an establishment of clergy. The number of priests was not fewer than eleven; a striking mark of his own superstition, or that of his age.

In this calendar of his method of living and expence, we may learn his amusements and accommodations, the provisions made for his table, the prices and rates of many articles of use and convenience, and the lowliest precautions of his domestic policy. The picture is minute and faithful; and may lead to instructive reasonings concerning antient manners, and the value of money.

The following extracts will exhibit a specimen from which the reader may form a judgement of this historical monument. To enter upon an examination of the topics of it, which appear most interesting, would, we find, involve us in details, that would greatly exceed the bounds which ought to confine our articles.

For the satirical review to work, attentive readers needed to peruse the extracts. There, they would find no “important privileges,” no earl who “issued out warrants to signify his pleasure and commands,” no “amusements and accommodations.” Rather, the “calendar” of the earl’s “method of living and expence” demonstrated a meagre and parsimonious existence, just as it did in the endnote in Hume’s *History*.

Looking to the passages extracted in the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, it is immediately striking how much overlap there is with what Hume had referenced in his *History of England*, and in his private correspondence with Percy. Percy’s *Household Book* ran to 464 pages; yet, both the review and Hume’s note gave particular attention to targeted sections, such as the provisions discussed on pages 75–77 and 102–106. As we have seen, the volume-concluding endnote in Hume’s *History* provided much paraphrase and short quotation but also two extended quotations from the *Household Book*, set in italics. In the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, both of those extended quotations were also reproduced.

Extended quotation #1:

Here is an article, *It is desired that from henceforth no capons to be bought but only for my lord's own mess, and that the said capons shall be bought for two-pence a piece, lean, and fed in the poultry; and master chamberlain and the stewards to be fed with capons, if there be strangers sitting with them*, p. 102. (Hume, *History* [1773], 3:462–63)

Fyrst it is devysed that from hensforth no *Capons* to be bought bot onely for my Lordes owne mees and that the said capons shall be bought for ijd. a peace leyn and fed in the pultry and that Maister chambreyln and

the Stewards be served with capons if theyre be straungers syttyng with them. (*Edinburgh Magazine and Review* [Jan. 1774], 152)

Extended quotation #2:

Here is another article. *Item, It is thought good that no plovers be bought at no season but only in Christmas and principal feats, and my lord to be served therewith and his board-end, and none other, and to be bought for a penny a piece, or a penny halfpenny at most*, p. 103. (Hume, *History* [1773], 3:463)

Item it is thought good that no *Plover* be bought at noo season but oonley in Chrystmas and princypall feestes and my Lorde to be servyde therewith and his doordend and non other and to be bought for j d. a pece or j d. ob. at moste. (*Edinburgh Magazine and Review* [Jan. 1774], 153)

Intriguingly, both of those articles Percy had singled out in his correspondence with Hume. He had objected to Hume about his endnote: “You have given one or two particular articles, viz., as relating to the capons; but unless we know all the circumstances, we cannot judge whether they were ridiculous or otherwise: there might (for aught we know) have prevailed great abuses, which it was necessary to check by express prohibitions.”<sup>29</sup>

It is difficult not to see other parallels. An emphasis on the earl’s eleven priests, for instance. What Percy interpreted as a magnificent extravagance (“we cannot but remark the number of PRIESTS that were kept in household, not fewer than ELEVEN”), Hume’s endnote cast in absurd contrast with the earl’s two cooks (“One remarkable circumstance is, that he has eleven priests in his house, besides seventeen persons, chanters, musicians, &c. belonging to his chapel: Yet he has only two cooks for a family of 223 persons”), and the review castigated as a lamentable product of the superstitious times to which the earl belonged (“The number of priests was not fewer than eleven; a striking mark of his own superstition, or that of his age”).

Hume, of course, would be careful to cover his tracks as he had done in all of his reviews cast anonymously. But what the review dubbed “the lowliest precautions” of the earl’s “domestic policy,”<sup>30</sup> had a clear parallel in Hume’s endnote: “The whole expence of the earl’s family is managed with an exactness that is very rigid, and seems even somewhat niggardly.”<sup>31</sup> The review’s wording here approached the gentler expressions Hume employed in the 1778 edition of his *History*. There, the phrase “somewhat niggardly” was abandoned: “The whole expence of the earl’s family is managed with an exactness that is very rigid, and, if we make no allowance for ancient manners, such as may seem to border on an extreme.”<sup>32</sup> Still, Hume’s proof in 1778 remained the same as in 1773: “that the number of pieces,

which must be cut out of every quarter of beef, mutton, pork, veal, nay stock-fish and salmon, are determined, and must be entered and accounted for by the different clerks appointed for that purpose." The extracts reprinted in the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* could not have been better chosen if they were hand-picked to exhibit that theme.

So, Stuart maintained that Hume gave an essay, hitherto unidentified, to the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* for the January 1774 issue.<sup>33</sup> Internal and circumstantial evidence, overlaid with the contexts established above, provides convincing reasons for thinking Hume reviewed Percy's *Household Book* for that issue of the periodical. Should a compelling case be made for another's contributing the review, then attribution to Hume might be revisited.<sup>34</sup> In the meantime, one might reasonably submit that the review of Percy's *Household Book*—a work with which Hume engaged in similar ways, before and after the review was published—be added to Hume's canon. For, even if it is not the essay in No. 3 to which Stuart referred, we have uncovered ample additional evidence pointing to Hume as the reviewer of the Rev. Percy's *Household Book*.

The last review we know Hume attempted to publish in his lifetime was of Volume Two (published in 1774 but circulated before then) of the Rev. Robert Henry's *History of Great Britain, from the Invasion of it by the Romans under Julius Caesar. Written on a new Plan*, 5 vols (1771–85). That review was also destined for the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*; intended for the very same issue, it was suppressed by the magazine's editors.<sup>35</sup> Had Hume's two anonymous reviews been published together in the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* their satirical elements would have notably dovetailed.<sup>36</sup> Reading them as a set would have underscored another common theme. Both reviews were designed to encourage contemporaries to draw comparisons between antient and modern manners.

Strikingly, Hume's main point about the *Household Book* remained the same in his endnote (all versions); in his correspondence with Percy, and Strahan, about it; and in what we have come to see was his review of the book for the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*. In the *History*, Hume wrote that the earl's *Household Book* "contains many curious particulars, which mark the manners and way of living in that rude, not to say barbarous age." To Percy he maintained, "the chief Curiosity of his [the earl's] *Household Book* is, that, by giving us a general Insight into the Manners of the Age, it throws a great Light upon that Period." "I only meant to paint the manners of the Age," he wrote to Strahan. And, as he put it in the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, reading the *Household Book* would "lead to instructive reasonings concerning antient manners." To conclude, there is little surprise in finding such a quintessentially Humean sentiment expressed so artfully in what may very well be the last book review that our philosophical historian ever published.

## NOTES

1 For their assistance in various ways that have made this piece better than it otherwise would have been, I thank Roger L. Emerson, Marc Hanvelt, James A. Harris, David R. Raynor, Mikko Tolonen, William Zachs and the editors of *Hume Studies*.

Hume to Adam Smith, 6 February 1770, in Greig, *Letters*, 2: 215.

2 Percy and his book go unnoticed in standard biographies of Hume by E. C. Mossner, Roderick Graham, and James Harris, for instance.

3 Thomas Percy to Hume, 5 January 1773 [Percy had misdated the letter “1772”], in Burton, *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 317–20.

4 Burton, *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 318. Six years earlier, in 1767 while in London, Hume had replied to the Rev. Hugh Blair’s (1718–1800) effort to have the Rev. Percy introduced to him: “If you can . . . decline without harshness any Letter of Recommendation, it would save Trouble both to him and me” (Greig, *Letters*, 2: 134). It is probable that Hume had been impressed by neither Percy’s *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry translated from the Islandic Language* nor his *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*. Both rode the Ossian wave which did not sweep away Hume.

5 Burton, *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 320.

6 Hume to William Strahan, 16 January 1773, in Greig, *Letters*, 2: 267–68.

7 Hume to Thomas Percy, 16 January 1773, in Klibansky and Mossner, *New Letters*, 197.

8 Klibansky and Mossner, *New Letters*, 198.

9 *Ibid.*, 198–9

10 *Ibid.*, 199.

11 Hume to William Strahan, 30 January 1773; Greig, *Letters*, 2: 268.

12 Klibansky and Mossner, *New Letters*, 198. In his reply of 22 January 1773, Percy pressed: “I only beg the favour of you to revise your note, and to alter such passages as may appear (though perhaps to an inattentive reader) to bear hard, *not* upon the general state of manners in that age, which I am not concerned for, but against this particular household and family” (Burton, *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 321).

13 Percy, “Preface,” *Household Book*, vi.

14 *Ibid.*, vii.

15 *Ibid.*, xiii, xv, xx.

16 Hume, *History* 3 (1773): 400.

17 Hume here provided a footnote to his endnote: “In another place, mention is made of four cooks, p. 388. But I suppose, that the two servants, called in p. 325, groom of the larder and child of the scullery, are in p. 388. comprehended in the number of cooks.”

18 Hume, *History* 3 (1773): 460–4, “NOTE [O].”

19 Victor G. Wexler, one of the few to study this episode, found that “Hume’s satire is undeniable, but his goal went beyond making Percy uncomfortable: the past had to be understood in a disenchanting manner in order for the present to be appreciated, and modernization encouraged.” Wexler, *David Hume and the “History of England,”* 57.

20 Hume to William Strahan, 30 January 1773, in Greig, *Letters*, 2: 268.

21 Hume, *History* 3 (1773): 464.

22 Hume, *History* (1773), vol. 8: unnumbered page, “ERRATA,” for “VOL. III.”

23 See Hume, *History* 3 (1773): 462, “NOTE [O].”

24 Quoted in William Zachs, *Without Regard to Good Manners*, 64 [original in Hughenden Papers, Bodleian Library]. Zachs remarked, “this piece has not been identified.”

25 A footnote here read: “A few copies of it only were thrown off for the use of the Duke of Northumberland and his friends.” That seems not to be true, as Percy eagerly distributed copies to others, including Hume; see Norton and Norton, *The David Hume Library*, where the *Household Book* is recorded as “A Presentation Copy from Bishop Percy, to David Hume The Historian” (24, 120; item #959).

26 Surely, he would also have noticed that his own name was not mentioned in the citation.

27 Burton, *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 322–323.

28 *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* 1.3 (1774): 150–154.

29 Burton, *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 319–320.

30 *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* 1.3 (1774): 150.

31 Hume, *History* 3 (1773): 460.

32 *Ibid.*, 461.

33 We have also come to see why Stuart could easily have referred to Hume’s “review” of the *Household Book* as an “essay.” After all, the “review” did not mention Thomas Percy as editor, or compiler, or as an author of the “Preface.” Thomas Percy is completely absent from the “review” of his book. Hume’s account reads more like a brief essay based on the earl’s *Household Book*—just as his endnote had in 1773 and would in 1778—rather than a review of it. As well, Stuart perhaps was being slightly sarcastic; he was apt to be so.

34 Potential candidates might include Hugh Blair or Adam Smith, for instance. Yet, there is no evidence, even circumstantial, to support either as the review’s author. Besides, Blair would not mock eleven priests, and Smith would have no patience with an earl’s household.

35 It survives in manuscript page proofs and is at the core of the author’s forthcoming study of Hume as book reviewer.

36 The two pieces would have been published back-to-back. The pagination on the page proofs of Hume’s canceled review of Henry’s *History* shows it would have run from page 141 to part way through page 150, where the *Household Book* review begins.

## WORKS CITED

- Burton, John Hill, ed. *Letters of Eminent Persons addressed to David Hume*. Edinburgh: William Blackstone and Sons, 1849.
- Graham, Roderick. *The Great Infidel: A Life of David Hume*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2004.
- Greig, J. Y. T., ed. *The Letters of David Hume*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Harris, James A. *Hume: An Intellectual Biography*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Hume, David. *The History of England, from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the revolution in 1688*. London: T. Cadell, 1773.
- Klibansky, Raymond and Ernest C. Mossner, eds. *New Letters of David Hume*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Mossner, E. C. *The Life of David Hume*. Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Norton, David Fate and Mary J. Norton. *The David Hume Library*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 1996.
- Percy, Thomas, Rev. *The Regulations and Establishment of the Household of Henry Algernon Percy, the Fifth Earl of Northumberland*. London: A. Brown (1905), 1770.
- Percy, Thomas, trans. *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry translated from the Islandic Language*. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1763.
- Percy, Thomas, Rev. *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*. London: J. Dodsley, 1765.
- Smellie, William and Gilbert Stuart. *Edinburgh Magazine and Review. By a Society of Gentlemen*. Edinburgh: Printed for W. Creech, 1773–1774.
- Wexler, Victor G. *David Hume and the "History of England."* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1979.
- Zachs, William. *Without Regard to Good Manners: A Biography of Gilbert Stuart 1743–1786*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.