

The French and English models of sociability in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Politics of “refined” culture in David Hume

Hiroki UENO*

* The final version of this paper appears in Annick Cossic & Emrys Jones (dir) *La Représentation et la réinvention des espaces de sociabilité au cours du long XVIIIe siècle* (Le Manuscrit, 2021).

1. The Enlightenment as a post-republican age; the public sphere as sociable spaces

The Age of Enlightenment has often been considered the age of sociability. Within a particular branch of the study of intellectual history — influenced by Jürgen Habermas’s *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* — Enlightenment sociability is situated amidst the proto-republican development of the public sphere. According to this approach, salons and cafés are interpreted as comprising the “public sphere of letters”, as venues which were yet to be politicised during the early Enlightenment, but nevertheless steadily and stealthily cultivated the radical and republican ideas that would ultimately culminate in the French Revolution.

This kind of historiographical appraisal of the “long eighteenth century” has, however, undergone revision through the considerable volume of historical scholarship produced according to the so-called “Cambridge Method”. In brief, the Cambridge school, in the broadest sense, tends to focus on the succession and continuity from Renaissance humanism to the Enlightenment. And while the classical humanist tradition exerted a notable innovating influence on the political thought underpinning the monarchy, one of its greatest impacts on early-modern Europe lay in the ascension of civic humanism or Neo-Roman political theory as a classical version of republicanism, in what is described by J. G. A. Pocock as the “Machiavellian Moment(s)”.¹ According to this historiographical portrait, the eighteenth century is regarded as the *post*-republican era in Europe — rather than *proto*-republican — while the theme of Enlightenment sociability concerns, in at least one respect, how to tame the revolutionary and religious enthusiasm and modern secular passions that permeated society following the various civil wars of the previous century.

For a number of intellectual historians in the Cambridge school, this “revisionist” framing of the Enlightenment is exemplified, above all, by the Scottish Enlightenment. Indeed, one of the key agendas among the Scots was the moderation or softening of the

¹ POCOCK, J. G. A., 1975. *The Machiavellian Moment*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, pp. vii-ix, 38-44, 52-66, 333-60.

passionate and even enthusiastic public sphere as an emerging “republic” (*res publica*). What was at issue within the Scottish Enlightenment was how best to polish and refine common sense and “public opinion”;² while the Moderates made every effort to reconcile the civilising or enlightening effects of knowledge with the shared sense and opinion of the common populace,³ there were surely more radical or sceptical thinkers — at least in the area of metaphysical argument — among whom David Hume and Adam Smith are included. It should be noted, however, that these two individuals were not necessarily “radical” in the sense discussed among political philosophers; rather, they might be characterised as “incrementalists” in terms of their moral and political philosophy, being very much interested in the cultural reformation or improvement of Scotland and Great Britain as a whole.⁴ By and large, the Scottish Enlightenment thinkers attempted to find a middle ground, both in order to distinguish themselves from the politically radical Fletcherians — who proclaimed Scottish independence from England — and in order to make full use of the public sphere — depoliticised after the Union of 1707 — in the form of sociable spaces where men of letters might gather and set about the task of gradually refining Scottish socio-political culture.⁵

This chapter shall elucidate Hume’s conception of the Enlightenment as establishing sociable culture and transforming the intellectual nature of the public spaces in Scotland. Importantly, Hume’s notion of sociability incorporates a particular type of cosmopolitanism, in that he not only attempts to import the post-Revolutionary English culture of politeness into “uncivilised” or “vulgar” Scotland, but also criticises the vulgar aspect of English Whiggism as well,⁶ by rehabilitating the French notion of sociability. This pan-European or Francophile perspective of the Scots could be associated with recent scholarship on Enlightenment sociability that tends to focus on the Franco-British

² PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 1970. “Scottish Public Opinion and the Union in the Age of the Association”, in Phillipson and R. Mitchison (eds), *Scotland in the Age of Improvement*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

³ SHER, Richard, 1985. *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Moderate Literati of Edinburgh*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, pp. 45-64, 187-212, 231-41.

⁴ As discussed later, Hume’s appraisal of the spirit of moderation and criticism of the enthusiasm found in party politics and religious cultism are explicitly linked, by Hume himself, with his manner or style of writing. See HUME, 1882 [1964]. “Preface to the original volume of *Essays, Moral and Political*,” in *David Hume: The Philosophical Works*, T. H. Green and T. H. Grose (eds), vol. 1, Aalen, Scientia Verlag.

⁵ PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 1979. “Hume as Moralist: A Social Historian’s Perspective,” in S. C. Brown (ed.), *Philosophers of the Enlightenment*, Brighton, Harvester Press; PHILLIPSON, 2011. *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian*, London, Penguin Books, ch. 2, pp. 27-34 especially; PHILLIPSON, 2011. *Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life*, London, Penguin Books, ch. 7, pp. 141-8 especially.

⁶ FORBES, Duncan, 1975. *Hume’s Philosophical Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 125ff especially.

connection.⁷ Historians are now interested in how Londoners and other people in Great Britain strove to forge their own particular form of sociability — often as an act of concerted will — in the face of the cultural (and political) hegemony of the French model of civilisation, with scholarly attempts to be distanced from the traditional and Franco-centric understanding of Enlightenment sociability.⁸ Nevertheless, the uniquely Scottish perspective tends to be lacking in the literature concerning “British” sociability.⁹ Indeed, once freed from a retroactive interpretation of eighteenth-century Scotland, the ideal of a Britishness wherein the Scots could collaborate on an equal footing with the English is revealed as having been far from a foregone conclusion; on the contrary, there were still to be found distinct types of sociability too divergent to be united in a single, integrated British model. The view from the Scottish nation — which was more or less suffering from an identity crisis¹⁰ — enables us to realise a dilemma surrounding British unionisms and Europeanism, and move on to the issue of how to tame unsociability within Englishness.¹¹

This paper is not destined, however, to conclude with a teleological “happy ending”, wherein British sociability was ultimately established through the contributions of the Scottish cosmopolitan culture. It shall be rather posited that the rise of popular culture merely served to heighten insular and Francophobic patriotism. In contrast with the pan-Europeanist and cosmopolitan leaning in Scotland, English democracy or populism appears to have been firmly entwined with its “Euro-sceptic” nationalism ever since the Age of Enlightenment, giving rise to Anglo-Scottish tensions that include how to value French culture and sociability as a model of civilised society. One of the points of divergence between the Franco-Scottish and peculiarly English modes is certain spatial

⁷ This theme has been investigated by the *Transversales* series (Paris, Editions Le Manuscrit), whose general editor is Annick Cossic. Of particular relevance to the current article are GALLERON, Ioana, 2016. “Stéréotypes et sociabilités” in volume V; and COHEN, Michèle, 2014. “Plaire en instruisant” in volume III.

⁸ CAPDEVILLE, Valérie and Alain Kerhervé (eds), 2019. *British Sociability in the Long Eighteenth Century: Challenging the Anglo-French Connection*, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, pp. 1-4.

⁹ For some notable exceptions to this trend, see RENDALL, Jane, 2008. “Gender and the practices of polite sociability in late eighteenth-century Edinburgh,” in Capdeville and Kerhervé (eds) *British Sociability*, pp. 164-5 especially; ALLAN, David, 2008. *Making British Culture: English Readers and the Scottish Enlightenment 1740-1830*, New York, Routledge, 2008.

¹⁰ PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 1981. “The Scottish Enlightenment,” in Roy Porter and M. Teich (eds). *The Enlightenment in National Context*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-40; SIMPSON, K., 1988. *The Protean Scot: the Crisis of Identity in Eighteenth-Century Scottish Literature*, Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press. On scepticism of the interpretation of the Scottish Enlightenment in terms of national identity, see SMITH, Craig, 2019. *Adam Ferguson and the Idea of Civil Society*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 5-7.

¹¹ LANGFORD, Paul, 2000. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650-1850*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, ch. 4 & 5, pp. 219-37, 258-65 especially.

characteristics of the public spheres. They include the relative importance of urban street culture in English industrial cities — whose atmosphere could sometimes be turbulent, if not outright subversive — being set in contrast to the polite culture in the French salons, with the former being more akin to the Parisian cafés of the Late Enlightenment. Further aspects of this new urban culture are represented by London club sociability, which constitutes strikingly exclusive spaces, as well as the development of spatial separation of domestic and public sociable spaces, accompanied by the gendered division of labour.

2. Sociability: English or French? Francophilia and pan-Europeanism in Hume

2.1 Addisonian model of sociability and the Scottish refinement as “Anglicisation”

The aspect of the cultural improvement in eighteenth-century Scotland has been extensively dealt with by Nicholas Phillipson as well as J. G. A. Pocock.¹² Great attention was paid by Phillipson to the social changes that took place in Augustan England and their influence on Scotland.¹³ His analytical concept of “Anglicisation” can, in a respect, be regarded as representing his prevailing concern with the transnational dimension of reconstructing the Scottish identity.¹⁴ In fact, the Scots’ efforts to establish a refined sociability ostensibly meant the introduction of developed cultures from *outside* Scotland.¹⁵ David Hume is a central figure in this historical context, according to Phillipson.

Phillipson’s fundamental view of Hume’s activities as a man of letters is that Hume tried to advance the Scottish moral culture through neo-Ciceronian and Addisonian manners.¹⁶ His essays and even voluminous historical literature can primarily be situated as far more sophisticated versions of *The Spectator* or *The Tatler*, even though Hume still kept in mind highly philosophical ambitions, as the originator of one of the most systematic

¹² POCOCK, J. G. A., 1985. “The Varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform” in *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 236-53.

¹³ PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 1993. “Politics and Politeness in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hanoverians” in Pocock (ed.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 211-6.

¹⁴ PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 1987. “Politics, Politeness, and Anglicisation of Eighteenth-Century Scottish Culture” in R. Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, Edinburgh, John Donald.

¹⁵ KIDD, Colin, 2014. “The Phillipsonian Enlightenment”, *Modern Intellectual History*, 11: 1, pp. 177-8. Cf. PHILLIPSON, “Scottish Public Opinion,” pp. 142-3.

¹⁶ PACKHAM, Catherine, 2013. “Cicero’s Ears, or Eloquence in the Age of Politeness”, *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 46: 4, pp. 502-4; BEAUCHAMP, Tom L., 1998. “Introduction”, in David Hume, *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*; T. Beauchamp (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. xiii-xvii, lxxvii-lxxx.

arguments in the Age of Enlightenment: *A Treatise of Human Nature*.¹⁷ As a material background to the changes in moral culture, the public sphere of letters in English cities underwent remarkable development, thanks in particular to a considerable increase in the freedoms of speech and the press.¹⁸ This trend was discernible in Edinburgh and certain other Scottish cities as well, where a variety of coffee houses, clubs, pubs, and societies emerged after the Union of 1707. Likewise, Hume's intellectual activities were not performed in the abstract and isolated "Dominions of Learning", but written and conversed about in these highly sociable spaces as the works of a moralist or an essayist.¹⁹

Hume certainly developed the Londoner's language of politeness and propriety — exemplified by Joseph Addison & Richard Steele— in Edinburgh, maybe as a "North Briton". In the wake of the debate over the Union of 1707, an increasing number of the Scottish literati tended to think of the deepening of the union between England and Scotland as inevitable in order to introduce sufficient security and the rule of justice to Scotland, and if so, the improvement in culture and manners was also likely to be required, drawing chiefly on the English model. Phillipson exemplified as distinctively English languages the civic or classical republican political thought and Addisonian politeness.²⁰ Regarding the latter in particular, it is easy to imagine that Anglicisation in manners and sociability as importing the English model of politeness could and did arouse anxiety concerning Scottish identity. In fact, at the beginning of his paper on Anglicisation of early eighteenth-century Scottish Culture, Phillipson introduced the uneasiness "the Scottish Enlightenment" has caused to Scottish intellectuals, saying that "it has always seemed to be connected with the commercialisation of Scottish society, its incorporation into the English state and lost national identity".²¹ The answer to this criticism is that Hume and other Scottish thinkers gave a greater contribution to the development of the Addisonian language. This was achieved particularly through connecting the practical morality of Addisonian politeness with the much more systematic analysis of moral sciences with a

¹⁷ HUME, David, 1994. *My Own Life*, in *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*, Eugene Millar (ed.), Liberty Fund, Indianapolis, p. xxxv. See HARRIS, James, 2015. *David Hume: An Intellectual Biography*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

¹⁸ On the development of Enlightenment culture as a republic of letters, see MEE, John, 2011. *Conversable Worlds*, Oxford, Oxford University Press; PRENDERGAST, Amy, 2016. *Literary Salons Across Britain and Ireland in the Long Eighteenth Century*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan; SHER, Richard B., 2006. *The Enlightenment and the Book*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 45-58.

¹⁹ HUME. "Of Essay Writing", *Essays*, pp. 534-5. (This essay appears only in its second edition.)

²⁰ PHILLIPSON. "Politics, Politeness and the Anglicisation," p. 288.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 226.

special emphasis on the theory of human sociable/unsociable nature.²²

2.2 An alternative sociable culture, or French civility

In spite of these readings of Hume in terms of Anglicisation or Britishness, it is also worthwhile emphasising here that post-Revolutionary England during the reign of Queen Anne was not the only source or exemplar for Scottish ambitions toward undertaking a new cultural “reformation”. This paper focuses, rather, on the influence of continental Europe and notably France,²³ which is, regrettably, often left out of Phillipson’s consideration — and which also might be the very point Pocock consistently attempts to avoid, owing to its contradiction of both his Euro-scepticism and his view of Hume as a North Briton.²⁴ We might even go so far as to suggest that the Franco-Scottish connection could be of more importance for the development of sociable culture in Scotland than any other external influence, since Anglophobic sentiments had long prevailed even among Scottish intellectuals.²⁵ Indeed, it was not the Jacobites alone who held sympathy for France and antipathy toward England following the Hanoverian Succession, but a considerable number of people who would ultimately support the Union of 1707 but had continued to maintain more-or-less the same (national) sentiments toward England and continental Europe — though such attitudes were far less extreme and not irreconcilable. In this sense, antagonism between the Scots and the English still had a certain impact on even moderate intellectuals in “enlightened” Scotland.

The pan-European (Dutch and French, in particular) connections were thus crucial all the more for the Scottish literati. Among them is Hume, of course, whose “experience was European rather than narrowly Scottish and British”.²⁶ Indeed, the primary reason for “dangerously sceptical” Hume finally attaining a stable reputation in Britain is that he was highly evaluated in Parisian salons, where he was dubbed “*bon David*”. Similarly, Adam Smith, who had become completely disillusioned with English intellectual culture as a

²² Ibid., p. 235-241. Cf. KIDD. “Phillipsonian Enlightenment,” p. 183.

²³ BROADIE, Alexander, 2012. *Agreeable Connexions*, Edinburgh, Birlinn, pp. 49-59 especially; JONES, Peter, 1982. *Hume’s Sentiments*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

²⁴ POCOCK. “Hume and the American Revolution: The dying thoughts of a North Briton” in *Virtue, Commerce*, p. 128.

²⁵ ROBERTSON, John, 2005. *The Case for the Enlightenment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 173-83.

²⁶ CHISICK, Harvey, 1989. “David Hume and the common people,” in Peter Jones (ed.), *The ‘Science of Man’ in the Scottish Enlightenment*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, p. 23. See also EMERSON, Roger, 1995. “Did the Scottish Enlightenment emerge in an English cultural province?”, *Lumen*, 15; BERRY, Christopher, 1997. *Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, p. 18.

student at Oxford, was fascinated with the polished society in Paris, going so far as to resign from his professorship at the University of Glasgow in order to attend his patron's grand tour and remain chiefly in France.

Given all the above, we might ask why the French impact on Scottish politeness has been relatively underrated? Part of the answer might lie in a retrospective distinction between modern civil society and the pre-modern court society. If this is taken for granted, the intellectual origins of Scottish modernisation were to be traced to the highly developed civil society in England, not to the absolute or despotic French monarchy, wherein people were dealt with as slaves without liberty. This type of view is influential even to the epoch-defining work of Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*. If modernity — quintessentially embodied in the French Revolution — was suppressed by the *Ancien Régime*, and cultivated only in the progressive cafés — as places of asylum for Enlightenment thinkers — it is natural to presume that the court society in Versailles and excessively aristocratic salons in Paris were largely irrelevant to the political public sphere, and even hostile to modernity.²⁷ In fact, Habermas posits the essential difference between the bourgeois public sphere — defined as “the sphere of private people com[ing] together as public”²⁸ — and the courtly “representative publicness,” which is regarded as belonging fundamentally to “the feudal society of the High Middle Ages” — wherein “[the manorial lord] displayed himself, presented himself as an embodiment of some sort of ‘higher’ power”.²⁹

Once liberated from this kind of progressivist or “Whig” view of modern history, it becomes much easier to discern a missing link between the French culture of *courtoisie* and Scottish civic culture or their ideal of civilised society.³⁰ Again, a prime example of this is

²⁷ ISRAEL, Jonathan, 2011. *Democratic Enlightenment*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 4. Although Antoine Lilti has criticised Israel's argument, he appears, at the same time, to share the critical view that the socio-cultural approach of Carnton, Chartier and Roche tends to overestimate the importance of salons as new sociable spaces in the development of the Enlightenment (and the Revolution). See, LILTI, Antoine, 2005. *Le Monde des salons: sociabilité et mondanité à Paris au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, Fayard; LILTI, 2009. “Comment écrit-on l'histoire intellectuelle des Lumières? Spinozisme, radicalisme et philosophie” in *Annales*, 64.

²⁸ HABERMAS. *Structural Transformation*, p. 27.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8. Among intellectual historians who employ the Cambridge method, Lawrence Klein tends to lay emphasis on the differentiation between courtly culture and urban polite culture in Augustan England, perhaps because the main target of his analysis is the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, whose “prime instrument was a resolute affirmation that the false ‘language of court’ had finally been ‘vanished’ from ‘the town, and all good company’” (SHAFTESBURY, Third Earl of, Anthony Ashley Cooper, 1900 [1709]. “An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour”, in *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions and Times*, J. M. Robertson (ed.), London vol.1 p. 46). See, KLEIN, Lawrence, 1993. “The Political Significance of ‘Politeness’ in Early Eighteenth-Century Britain,” in *Politics, Politeness, and Patriotism*, Washington, The Folger Institute.

³⁰ With respect to the intellectual relationship between the court society of Versailles and Parisian salons, the

Hume. In contrast to the “vulgar Whig” view that the Shaftesburian or Addisonian concept of politeness should be fundamentally distinguished from the French “false” politeness or “false delicacy” as an artificial virtue, Hume exhibits his admiration for French manners, without reservation, and dismisses the idea of a “real Politeness of Heart” attributed to the English, arguing that the French have “more real politeness”, as attested in a letter he wrote in Paris in 1734.³¹ Hume does not employ the terminology of Chevalier Ramsay — which draws quite a sharp distinction between inward politeness and superficial civility³² — but instead regards as essential the outward character of politeness or, more particularly, “the general rules of good breeding” that compel equals to hide their own pride — a passion that is pleasant to themselves but disagreeable to others.³³ Distinct from the Christian moralists and apologists who present humility as a (monkish) virtue and pride as a vice,³⁴ “good-manners” or “decency” is a highly sociable custom — according to Hume’s *Treatise*, Book III, published in 1740 — which rather serves to enhance an optimistic view of the moral qualities that are immediately agreeable or useful to *ourselves*, through cultivating the artificial means of showing ourselves as agreeable to *others* as well.³⁵ In fact, good manners are mentioned and distinguished from (Christian or servile) humility in the very section of “Of greatness of mind” that deals with “heroic virtue”. Often connected with “military glory”,³⁶ Hume maintains “that a genuine and hearty pride, or self-esteem, if well conceal’d and well founded, is essential to the character of a man of honour”.³⁷ Such an analysis is primarily based on his psycho-anatomy of human sociable nature, which is something

Habermasian clear distinction has been reconsidered by those historians influenced by the seminal works of Norbert Elias, such as Lilti, *Salons*; COWAN, Brian, 2012. “Public Space, Knowledge, and Sociability,” in Frank Trentmann (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Consumption* Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 251-266. Cf. PELTONEN, Markku, 2003. *The Duel in Early Modern England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press; HAMPSHER-MONK, Iain, 2002. “From Virtue to Politeness”, Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds), *Republicanism*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 85-92, 98-101.

³¹ David Hume to Michael Ramsay, 12 September, 1734, in HUME, 1932. *The Letters of David Hume* 2 vols, J. Y. T. Greig (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1: 19-21.

³² TOLONEN, Mikko, 2008. “Politeness, Paris, and Treatise”, *Hume Studies*, 34: 1, p. 25. This kind of Shaftesburian and quasi-Rousseauian criticism of the superfluity of civility or courtesy appears to be quite common also among the Scottish Moderates. See, AHNERT, Thomas, 2011. “The Moral Education of Mankind,” in Ahnert and Susan Manning (eds), *Character, Self and Sociability in the Scottish Enlightenment* New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

³³ HUME. *Morals*, pp. 269-70. Cf. FINLAY, Christopher, 2007. *Hume’s Social Philosophy: Human Nature and Commercial Sociability in A Treatise of Human Nature* London, Continuum, pp. 133-4.

³⁴ *Morals*, pp. 265-6, 270; HUME, 2007. *A Treatise of Human Nature*, David Norton and Mary Norton (eds), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2.1.7.8, 3.3.2.13. Cf. RUSELL, Paul, 2013. “Hume’s anatomy of virtue”, in Daniel Russell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 114-5.

³⁵ On artificiality of good-manners, see *Treatise*, 3.3.1.9.

³⁶ *Treatise*, 3.3.2.15; cf. 3.3.2.12.

³⁷ *Treatise*, 3.3.2.11, 3.3.2.8.; cf. HUME. “Of the Dignity or Meanness of Human Nature”, in *Essays*.

much more complex than the simple Addisonian assumption of natural politeness and virtuous sociability.³⁸

2.3 Englishness as “insularity”: a Scot’s cosmopolitan critique of vulgar Whiggism

What Hume denotes in the statements above is not merely that the French manner of sociability presented a viable alternative as a model for Scottish refinement and enlightenment, but also that — from this cosmopolitan perspective — the apparent politeness of the English model actually conceals something quite impolite and parochial to the point of barbarism. In spite of the close relationship between the enlightening of Scotland and its Anglicisation, Hume made several noteworthy comments regarding an unsociable and vulgar characteristic of the English culture. This parochialism attached to Englishness is not necessarily limited to the common populace either, but extends even to the literati and reading public who were familiar with the Addisonian language of politeness and yet still appear, to several of the Scots, to exhibit a hidden vulgarity in their Whiggism at times. Two aspects of English Whiggism that Hume criticised shall be the focus of discussion below: its insularity and masculine populism, which often manifested itself in Francophobic national sentiments and mercantilist interests; and the intellectual decline of Londoners and the ‘Oxbridge’ schools.

As mentioned earlier, Adam Smith was deeply disappointed in the level of education he encountered at the University of Oxford during his studies there. To the Scots who were well-informed as to the condition of the English universities, this serious decline in English intellectual culture appeared to be due to the pedantic scholasticism employed in theological arguments. This was in stark contrast to the Scottish universities, where innovative reforms in both the curriculum and organisation of the faculties system had been undertaken, and the importation of novel achievements from the Dutch Republic and other parts of Continental Europe was encouraged in fields such as natural jurisprudence.

Another important issue is the intellectual state of London. This pertains to the greater question of whether one can truly speak of an “English Enlightenment” to the same extent as the Scottish and French equivalents.³⁹ Certainly, if we take into account

³⁸ TOLONEN. “Politeness”, p. 27ff. Cf. *Treatise*, 3.3.2.17.

³⁹ In opposition to the classical view of the Enlightenment — whose model is based on the Parisian, anti-ecclesiastical *philosophes* — many studies have paid attention to the national context from which a variety of Enlightenments emerged. See, PORTER, Roy, 1981. “The Enlightenment in England”, in Porter and Teich (eds), *The Enlightenment in National Context*, pp. 1-18. Cf. COLLEY, Linda, 1992. *Britons: Forging the*

first-hand testimonies like that of Smith, the English Enlightenment is unlikely to have continued in any real sense after John Locke and Isaac Newton. In order to oppose this thesis, more than a few commentators have pointed to the “public sphere” — such as the coffee houses, print journalism, and epistolary communication⁴⁰ — that arose in metropolitan centres, and London in particular, which lacked universities. Indeed, a number of socio-cultural historians have recently started to address the idea of an Enlightenment movement in England (to be detected not merely in the form of the Dissenters, but also among the Anglican deists) more seriously, thereby distancing themselves from the Franco-centric framing of Enlightenment through the conception of “a family of Enlightenments” — in plural and without a definite article.⁴¹ Even if we accept this substitution, however, the **precise form of** English “Enlightenment” seems to have had quite a different nature from the Scottish and French equivalents, which promoted the moral ideals of sociability and moderation. To be sure, the likes of Defoe, Addison and (perhaps) Shaftesbury shared a similar morality, in essence, but the English public sphere tended to demonstrate a wilder, more bustling, or more violent atmosphere, in which ostensibly literary debates and even epistolary exchanges were subject to become politicised and radicalised. The spatial dimensions of this urban public sphere presented something too amorphous to embody the ideal of polite sociability, the latter of which Hume discerned in “a narrow circle” of “love and friendship” confined to those who share the same “delicacy of taste”.⁴²

In this sense, the “radical” branch of the English Enlightenment can be situated as something of an opponent to the spirit of moderation present in the Scottish Enlightenment and French model of sociability, which forces us to reconsider Jonathan Israel’s proposition that England was a stronghold of the moderate Enlightenment while the Dutch Republic identified as the primary cultivator of radical Enlightenment, as represented in intellectual movements such as Spinozism.⁴³ On the contrary, politically

Nation 1707-1837, New Haven, Yale University Press, p. 123.

⁴⁰ TROLANDER, Paul, 2014. *Literary Sociability in Early Modern England*, Lanham, University of Delaware Press.

⁴¹ POCOCCO, J. G. A., 1999. *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 9.

⁴² HUME. *Essays*, pp. 7-8 (“Of the Delicacy of Taste and Passion”). At the same time, the physically confined circles of taste have a different mode of connecting with each other, namely through correspondence as a continuation of face-to-face conversation. See, HAZARD, Paul, 1990 [1946]. *La Pensée européenne au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, Fayard, vol. II, chap. 9.

⁴³ ISRAEL, Jonathan, 2010. *A Revolution of the Mind* Princeton, Princeton University Press; ISRAEL, 2014, **pp. 92-117, 235n**. “Radical Enlightenment”, *Diametros*, 40, **pp. 91-2**. On the contrary, Venturi emphasised the gradually diminishing impacts of Dutch republicanism in face of the development of territorial (and civilized)

moderate intellectuals across Europe were most cautious of an English republican tradition that was frequently accompanied by irrational enthusiasm.⁴⁴ Hume, for instance, was greatly concerned about the destabilising effects of the mixed English constitution, compared with his relatively high evaluation of civilized European monarchies.⁴⁵ To sum up, even if what might be dubbed the “English Enlightenment” can be recognised in the eighteenth century, Hume would have identified it principally as an alignment with vulgar Englishness, not with the Enlightenment as a refinement of manners.⁴⁶

What Hume is primarily cautious of in regard to Englishness is its insularity, often bound up with chauvinism or parochial nationalism. While he experienced the exclusionary attitude of London society toward outsiders first-hand — as a Scot⁴⁷ — his criticism is neither merely personal nor ethno-phobic. The reason he is so critical of what appears to be the product of English insularity is that he thinks of the enthusiasm or fanaticism resulting from this insularity as the primary source of a potential vulnerability in the English government. In a letter penned to Gilbert Elliot from Edinburgh in 1770, Hume declares that “Our Government has become a Chimera; and is too perfect in point of Liberty, for so vile a beast as an Englishman, who is a Man, a bad animal too, corrupted by above a Century of Licentiousness”.⁴⁸ In his later years, Hume was extremely wary of city mobs and popular uprisings — as exemplified by the Wilkes affair — being what he refers to as “those insolent Rascals in London and Middlesex”.⁴⁹ Hume was obviously a strong opponent of a new popular movement bred particularly in London — as an industrial megalopolis — explicitly linking its masculine values and reckless enthusiasm with the frequent riots, barbarity and political disorder of his country.⁵⁰ This vulgar Englishness

monarchies in Europe. See VENTURI, Franco, 1971. *Utopia and Reform in the Enlightenment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, chap. 1.

⁴⁴ HAMMERSLEY, Rachel, 2010. *The English republican tradition and eighteenth-century France*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, pp. 1-8, 64-79.

⁴⁵ *Essays*, pp. 88-91; 125-127; cf. pp. 27-31. See also PHILLIPSON. *Hume*, pp. 50-60; 65.

⁴⁶ On a different form of Enlightenment, which was cultivated through unofficial or informal networks and institutions, see, RUSSEL, Gillian and Clara Tuite, 2006. *Romantic Sociability: Social Networks and Literary Culture in Britain, 1770-1840*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

⁴⁷ Hume both criticised London and admired Paris as follows: “Paris is the most agreeable Town in Europe, and suits me best; but it is a foreign Country. London is the Capital of my own Country; but it never pleas’d me much. Letters are there held in no honour; Scotsmen are hated”. Hume to Adam Smith, 5 September 1765, *The Correspondence of Adam Smith*, E. C. Mossner and I. S. Ross (eds), Indianapolis, Liberty Fund, p. 87.

⁴⁸ *The Letters of David Hume* 2: 216.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 2: 303.

⁵⁰ For the antithesis of republican enthusiasm in the Scottish Enlightenment, see MCDANIEL, Iain, 2013. *Adam Ferguson in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Roman Past and Europe’s Future*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, pp. 40-3.

should, from a Humean perspective, be cured through and superseded by the true Enlightenment spirit of moderation and its sociable practices.⁵¹

For Hume, the most worrying aspect of the English insular spirit was its belligerent Francophobia. This was not just blanket xenophobia, but deeply rooted in the English common culture, with Hume uncovering the same tendencies even in seemingly polite society. The reason Hume was regarded as a “cosmopolitan” or a “man of the world” is partly because of his impartiality toward the French monarchy and relative stance regarding the Anglo-centric viewpoint, as evident in the comments he made to Jean-Bernard Le Blanc, translator of the *Political Discourses*: “You wou’d have remark’d in my Writings, that my Principles are, all along, tolerably monarchical, & that I abhor, that low Practice, so prevalent in England, of speaking with Malignity of France”.⁵² Famously, it was precisely this distancing himself from the insular Francophobia of the English that led Duncan Forbes to label Hume a “scientific” or “sceptical Whig” who permitted the merits and demerits of the British monarchical republic and French civilised monarchy to be judged with composure. But, at the same time, it should not be ignored that Scottish cosmopolitanism was usually accompanied by the politics of culture and identity⁵³ — albeit in a refined form — and that Hume’s critique of the vulgarity and insularity of English culture was, to some degree, prompted by his position as a Scottish stranger or outsider — some measure of Anglophobic flavour notwithstanding. Having said that, the insular and Francophobic attitudes so pervasive even in English high society were experienced similarly by some of the more prominent and worldly English women of the day, such as Elizabeth Montagu. A founder of the Bluestocking Society, this great admirer of Hume continued to be critical of the English parochialism that appeared, to her, to be essentially connected with (phallogocentric) masculinity, which was not only readily apparent in English republicanism or radicalism, but also survived essentially unaltered in Addisonian sociable spaces. One of the foremost symbolic customs connected with this was the toast. Just as the Jacobites toasted (in secret) the persecuted kings of the House of Stuart, vulgar Whigs

⁵¹ The apparently commendatory view of the mixed English government as being free from “popular tumults or rebellion” — which actually is quite a conditional appraisal — is seen in his essay “Of the Liberty of the Press”; but the passages relevant to this appraisal were withdrawn after the 1770 edition. See HUME. *Essays*, pp. 604-5.

⁵² *The Letters of David Hume* 1:194.

⁵³ As distinct from the Stoic version of cosmopolitanism founded on human reason, its Scottish form is rather compatible with identity politics and patriotism. See MCDANIEL, Iain, 2015. “Unsocial sociability in the Scottish Enlightenment”, *History of European Ideas* 41, pp. 1-2.

also gave toast to English liberty (or independence) and its military glory — primarily against the French, whom they regarded as indentured slaves of a grand despot.⁵⁴ In stark contrast to the virtuous but often fanatical culture of the English “gentlemen”, Montagu described the Scottish literati as authentically gentle and polite, intellectually refined, and civilised — freed from the fanatic cult of manly virtues.⁵⁵ Indeed, the Scottish manners of conversation and discussion, amiable rather than respectable, often reminded Montagu of the French style of sociability.⁵⁶

3. Francophobia, Masculine Sociability, and Spatial Distinction

3.1 From Francophile to Francophobic nation

In eighteenth-century Scotland, the French model of sociability seems to have played as crucial a role in its cultural refinement as did the English model. As this chapter has argued so far, in the case of Hume, he rather took advantage of the cosmopolitan connotations surrounding the French connection, in order to gain emancipation from the obsessive idea that English culture should be the only model for the Scots to become sociable and enlightened. In fact, Hume’s criticism attempts to portray the apparent politeness of the post-Revolutionary English culture as little more than a façade, beneath which is concealed a decidedly vulgar impoliteness and parochialism, with links to the newly-arisen popular/populist movement gripping the nation, particularly in London. This perspective has led us to the issue of Englishness, namely the insularity and Francophobia present in England and seemingly incompatible with Francophilia on the part of the Scots. In this final section, I would like to briefly examine the validity of Hume’s portrayal of the English as a civilized but Francophobic nation. As Linda Colley has demonstrated in her seminal work, this characterization is not necessarily born out of Scottish prejudice, or simple

⁵⁴ DUTHILLE, Rémy Duthille, 2015. “Political Toasting in the Age of Revolution”, in Gordon Pentland and Michael Davis (eds), *Liberty, Property and Popular Politics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 73-8. Cf. Colley, *Britons*, pp. 51, 74.

⁵⁵ BAIER, Annette C., 1989. “Hume on Women’s Complexion”, in Peter Jones (ed.), *The ‘Science of Man’*; SEBASTIANI, Silvia, 2013. *The Scottish Enlightenment*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁵⁶ Being founded on his notion of civilized European monarchies, Hume’s criticism reveals that Addison’s quasi-republican admiration of the “ancient” liberty of England aggravated his vulgar prejudice toward France and Germany as despotic governments lacking in the rule of law. See HUME. “Of Liberty and Despotism” (later “Of Civil Liberty”), *Essays*, pp. 89-90. Cf. ADDISON, Joseph, 1965. *The Spectator*, Donald F. Bond (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3: 21.

jealousy of English gentlemen, but it is a matter worthy of scholarly attention. As she has attempted to disclose in equal measure, however, Francophobic patriotism is a historical phenomenon rather than the invariable nature of the English. As shall be addressed here, some of the physical and moral reconstructions of sociable spaces are crucial, even indispensable, aspects in the masculine reframing of a uniquely English national character. Hume's observation should, rather, be regarded as something describing the state of the English during a certain period, suggesting that there was more than one attitude toward France among varied peoples on the opposite side of the Channel.

The fact is that there actually was something quite similar to Scottish Francophilia in early-modern England, even until the eighteenth century. In order to become less rude and more civilized, one needs to become sociable; and in order to become sociable, the French would be the most suitable model.⁵⁷ This was true for upper-class people in early-modern England. To be sure, there were a number of social practices in vogue at the beginning of the long eighteenth century that were consciously intended to give rise to an English (which is not to say "British") model of sociability — as distinct from and sometimes in open opposition to its French model, as exemplified by the "club sociability" in London elucidated by Valérie Capdeville.⁵⁸ In the very midst of English high society, however, there were a number of discourses quite wary of the (quasi-)republican language of masculinity often employed by a decidedly English model of sociability, and such discourses chiefly relied upon French ideals in order to soften the potential rudeness of English (un)sociability.⁵⁹ These polite Francophiles in England included the likes of James Forrester, James Fordyce, Thomas Wilson, and John Constable, all of whom appeared to witness that "in eighteenth-century England, as in France since the seventeenth century, conversing with women was believed to enable men to acquire and develop the appropriate conduct of body and tongue, the politeness which fashioned them as gentlemen or *bonnêtes hommes*".⁶⁰

By the 1760s, however, the moral and intellectual landscape of the Anglo-French

⁵⁷ COHEN, Michèle, 2003. "French Conversation, or 'Glittering Gibberish'?", in Natasha Glaisyer and Sara Pennell (eds), *Expertise Constructed*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

⁵⁸ CAPDEVILLE, Valérie, 2016. "Clubbability: A Revolution in London Sociability," *Lumen*, 35, pp. 63-80.

⁵⁹ COHEN, Michèle, 1999. "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French", in Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen (eds), *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, London, Longman, p. 44.

⁶⁰ COHEN. "Manliness, Effeminacy", p. 44. See also pp. 46-48. For the (temporal) compatibility between Anglophile sociability and the ideal of moderation, see SOLKIN, David, 1993. *Painting for Money*, New Haven, Yale University Press, p. 93; cf. JONES, Emrys, 2018. "Houghton hospitality: Representing sociability and corruption in Sir Robert Walpole's Britain," *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 51: 2, pp. 236-7, 240.

relationship experienced a drastic shift. French polite manners of sociability started to appear clearly negative so that they lost their admirable status in English society as an ideal model for civilisation, whereas the previously often devalued traits of the English such as taciturnity and bluntness were found rather positive as a merit of the English nation. This undoubtedly denotes the increasing importance of masculine or manly virtues as well. As an adjunct to the case of blunt sincerity, evaluation of manliness was intrinsically linked with the perception of the English national character or identity, and portrayed in open contrast to the French. Once it became less important to refine what had once been thought of as the barbarous characteristics of English manners, in terms of politeness, the drawbacks of heterosexual sociability attained a more emphatic status than its merits. Accordingly, it appeared natural and obvious to the English populace during and after the Seven Years' War that it was this effeminacy or corruption of manly virtues that characterised the French model of sociability and politeness.⁶¹ Frequent intercourse between men and women in French sociable spaces — which is just as highly evaluated by modern cultural historians of the Enlightenment, such as Dena Goodman⁶², as it was by the English Francophile writers of the early and mid-eighteenth century — was now dramatically devalued in light of its corrupting effects on manliness.⁶³ In lieu of this possibly proto-feminist ideal of a public sphere of letters shared among the French, “homosociality”, as the very English model of sociability, emerged with a hegemonic and entitled status.⁶⁴ Of course, not all heterosexual interaction was morally criticised or prohibited under this masculine value system. Rather, it restricted communication between the sexes to a very specific and relatively closed domain — what could be dubbed “domesticity” — that was both conceptually and physically distinct from public sociable spaces. Compared to the French model, wherein men and women could meet each other in the public realms, the English masculine model required men to meet the same sex in public, and permitted them to meet only certain women, either at home or in another similarly designated domestic space that was carefully isolated from the anonymous

⁶¹ COHEN, Michèle, 1996. *Fashioning Masculinity*, London, Routledge. Cf. COHEN, 2005. “‘Manners’ Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity”, *Journal of British Studies* 44, p. 322.

⁶² GOODMAN, Dena, 1996. *The Republic of Letters*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

⁶³ One subsequent effect of this ideological change is criticism of the grand tour as an educational programme for the English upper class. For young men of quality, socialising with the *Beau Monde* during the grand tour was criticised as an activity entirely alien to the manly English character. See, COHEN, 2001. “The Grand Tour, Language, National Identity and Masculinity”, *Changing English: Studies in Reading and Culture*, 8: 2. Cf. NEWMAN, Gerald, 1987. *The Rise of English Nationalism*, New York, Palgrave MacMillan, p. 63ff.

⁶⁴ COHEN. “Manners Make the Man,” p. 329.

interactions of sociable spaces.

The idea of polite society had, according to Michèle Cohen's other argument, come to an end in English society by the end of the eighteenth century,⁶⁵ being replaced by the alternative moral ideal of "chivalry", which was distinguished from mere violent barbarism through the Gothic Revival and Romanticism.⁶⁶ The "revival" of chivalric manners can be interpreted as a response to "the anxiety of effeminacy"⁶⁷ possibly caused by the French-style sociability of politeness. The answer to this "dilemma of masculinity"⁶⁸ appears to be a kind of gendered division of labour and attendant segregation between the public and domestic spaces, all couched within chivalric gentlemanliness. To elaborate, when compared to the idea of sociable politeness wherein men stood to learn much from women with a particular emphasis on how to acquire the "art of pleasing", the chivalric morality urged men to display masculine prowess in the public sphere through the defence of women, who were in turn expected to remain in the private sphere. According to this ethos of chivalry, men as knights should deal with women as objects of sincere love,⁶⁹ not to please them with superficial courtesy, as the ideal of politeness intimated,⁷⁰ and since masculinity was indispensable as a means for men to protect their beloved, the moderation or softening of character encouraged in politeness was not a central value at all.⁷¹ Here, the reconstructed spatial distinction is a moral as well as a physical phenomenon, leading to public spaces being designated for gentlemen (albeit sometimes anonymously), with strictly segregated domestic spaces for heterosexual sociability.

3.2 Spatial distinction and masculine sociability in urban popular culture

The newly-arisen culture in England at the time seems to be what Hume was facing and struggling against during his time in the country. He might have had a somewhat or even greatly different impression of English sociability if he had visited there half a century before. As previously suggested, however, it should also be noted that an antipathy toward

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 313-4.

⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 315-6, 325; cf. GIROUARD, Mark, 1984. *The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman*, New Haven, Yale University Press, pp. 19-25.

⁶⁷ COHEN. "Manners Make the Man," p. 313.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Importantly, valorous deeds and heroic martial ventures — by which a knight was to earn his beloved's regard — have a tendency of "taking him far away from her rather than requiring him to spend time in her company" (ibid., p. 320).

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid..

something feminine or French already prevailed in some of the domains within English society by the late seventeenth century. Indeed, as Valérie Capdeville investigates, a club sociability that promoted the culture of homosociality and misogyny with questioning of a French-inspired model of sociability was already apparent in Restoration England,⁷² and continued to develop (even) under the reign of Queen Anne — also dubbed the “Augustan Era”.⁷³ Coffee houses and taverns were assuredly a hotbed of modern public opinion, supported by a prosperous printing culture that gained particular prominence after the lapse of censorship in 1695, leading to a freedom of expression and speech. This public opinion was not necessarily (if at all) refined or liberal, however, with the pamphlet wars arising from the novel printing culture often fuelling the political frictions between the Whigs and Tories.⁷⁴

Zealotry might have been mitigated by making clubs spatially exclusive in terms of social class, but their masculine culture remained almost unaltered.⁷⁵ On the other hand, it seems that even these Englishmen who were not able to join private and select clubs developed an equally masculine morality via the ascending popular culture, separately from the *haute société*. The main arena for such men was what is dubbed the patriotic societies, which held a lot in common with, but were obviously distinct from **gentleman clubs** in their openness to the public.⁷⁶ Importantly, the ascension of English radicalism and popular politics was inseparable from the evidently masculine culture shared among the rising urban “mobs”. “Wilkes and Liberty” is what Hume was extremely critical of, which was a good exemplar that demonstrated that the urban popular culture was, by then, irrevocably male chauvinistic, being haunted by the anxiety of effeminacy. Strikingly, these radicals emphasised the ideological contrast between a manly, virtuous common populace and a corrupted (and Frenchified) nobility, in order to reveal the people’s patriotism and public spirit, which were declared to be absent in the decadent and effeminate elites.⁷⁷

If the democratic or populist criticisms of oligarchy represent an evaluative contrast

⁷² COWAN, Brian, 2019. “‘Restoration’ England and the history of sociability”, in Capdeville & Kerhervé (eds), *British Sociability*, pp. 17-19.

⁷³ Valérie Capdeville, 2014. “London clubs or the invention of a home-made sociability”, in Valérie Capdeville and Eric Francalanza (eds), *La Sociabilité en France et en Grande-Bretagne au siècle des Lumières*. Tome 3: *Les Espaces de sociabilité*, Paris, Le Manuscrit.

⁷⁴ CAPDEVILLE, 2019. “Club sociability and the emergence of new ‘sociable’ practices,” in Capdeville & Kerhervé (eds), *British Sociability*, pp. 46-9.

⁷⁵ COLLEY. *Britons*, pp. 51-4.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88; cf. p. 94.

⁷⁷ See *ibid.*, p. 340.

between the common people and the ruling class, based on the patriotic language of masculinity, it is rather easy to understand the extent to which the cultural issues of Francophilia and Francophobia were inextricable from the aforementioned class struggle. One of the most effective rhetorical tools for radicals in inciting city crowds to criticise the ruling class was to represent their high culture as terribly effeminate and Frenchified, lacking in the manly virtuosity imaginarily attributed to ancient Britons' **manners**. For patriotic radicals, the Francophilia in elite manners symbolised their moral corruption, with their lazy and unproductive nature emphasised, rather than the positive notion of feminine moderation.⁷⁸ By contrast, the decidedly English culture of masculinity was believed to be well preserved in a popular culture whose hotbed lay in pubs and taverns, and perhaps in the distinctly English form of sociability cultivated in clubs to some extent as well.

6. Concluding remarks

Diverging from the French case, the English ruling class was relatively successful in avoiding being **branded** as *imperium in imperio* at the end. But **in so doing** their culture was forced to transform into something distinctly English or British rather than European.⁷⁹ As well as the Spartan ideals of informing education in segregated public schools,⁸⁰ the development of club sociability is a prime example of this. As Hume discovered in the 1760s, it was not only the pubs and taverns filled with common people, but also the ostensibly polite sociable gatherings held by the mixture of traditional and new elites that had steadily begun to show Francophobic sentiments and **a jealousy or exclusivity in relation to female initiative**. This might still be true, even though it was accompanied by the earnest attempt, considerably through interventions of Scots, to invent not merely an English but a so-called inclusive "British" culture.⁸¹

From the perspective of salons as carefully constructed sociable spaces, popular sociability in the English urban setting appeared to be too amorphous, readily spurring the faceless crowds on to a state of turbulence. In contrast, club sociability provided a setting

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 87-92; 164-70.

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 166-7; 172-8; 186-8.

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 167-70. Cf. JENKINS, Richard, 1980. *The Victorians and Ancient Greece*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

⁸¹ COLLEY. *Britons*, pp. 119-26, 140-3, 155-63, 338-44, 365-8.

for the amalgamation of the old and new elites that appeared to be a little too restricted and exclusive to be called sociable spaces. Common to both modes of sociability, however, is the element of male chauvinism, following on from the representation of the French as servile and effeminate. These characteristics are what several Scots within the Enlightenment tried to criticise as English insularity and from an arguably “European” viewpoint, often drawing on the Franco-Scottish connections. It should also be noted, however, that the Scots’ critique of English culture is not entirely impartial. It is, rather, more accurate to interpret their cosmopolitan — or pan-European — identity as being partially a consequence of the (transnational) politics of culture concerning refinement and civilisation among rival nations.

Select Biography

Primary Sources

HUME, David, 2007. *A Treatise of Human Nature*, David Norton and Mary Norton (eds), Oxford, Oxford University Press.

HUME, David, 1994. *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*, Eugene Millar (ed.), Liberty Fund, Indianapolis.

Secondary Sources

BROADIE, Alexander, 2012. *Agreeable Connexions: Scottish Enlightenment links with France*, Edinburgh, Birlinn.

COHEN, Michèle, 2005. “Manners’ Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity”, *Journal of British Studies* 44.

COLLEY, Linda, 1992. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

COWAN, Brian, 2012. “Public Space, Knowledge, and Sociability,” in Frank Trentmann (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Consumption* Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 251-266.

LANGFORD, Paul, 2000. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650-1850*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

MCDANIEL, Iain, 2015. "Unsocial sociability in the Scottish Enlightenment: Ferguson and Kames on War, Sociability and the Foundations of Patriotism", *History of European Ideas*, 41.

PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 1987. "Politics, Politeness, and Anglicisation of Eighteenth-Century Scottish Culture" in R. Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, Edinburgh, John Donald.

PHILLIPSON, Nicholas, 2011. *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian*, London, Penguin Books.

TOLONEN, Mikko, 2008. "Politeness, Paris, and Treatise", *Hume Studies*, 34: 1.