Recognition, Sociability and Intolerance: A Study of Archibald Campbell (1691-1756)

Tim Stuart-Buttle[1]

Department of Politics, University of York, York, United Kingdom

tim.stuart-buttle@york.ac.uk

Recognition, Sociability and Intolerance: A Study of Archibald Campbell (1691-1756)

Abstract

We care deeply about what other people think of us, to such an extent that we may do seemingly irrational things in order to influence their opinion. This is not a new insight. The period ca.1650-1800 witnessed a concerted, if neglected debate about the implications of mankind's desire for recognition, which bore directly on discussions of sociability and toleration. Here Thomas Hobbes's writings acted as a powerful stimulus. Hobbes argued that even as the desire for recognition in mankind's natural condition induces individuals to seek society, recognition-seeking generates a mistrust and violence that precludes its realization. Political authority, allied to the ecclesiastical, is required to constrain men to recognize their mutual obligations to one another: vertical toleration is necessary for horizontal tolerance between individuals to be realizable. The Church of Scotland minister and Professor at St Andrews, Archibald Campbell (1691-1756) offered a comprehensive challenge to Hobbes's interpretation of the relationship between recognition and toleration. Campbell vindicated the desire for esteem from both a moral and a theological perspective: the pursuit of recognition induces us to accommodate our opinions and actions to those of others with whom we live. It gives rise to sociability and mutual fellowship. Yet Campbell accepted that the economy of esteem had been corrupted in 'civilized' societies, and implicated institutional religion in this development. Toleration, he concluded, could not hope to salve the wounds caused by the introduction of intolerance into human relations.

Keywords

Toleration; recognition; friendship; sociability; natural law; Christianity.

Introduction: esteem, hypocrisy and habituation

We care deeply about what other people think of us, to such an extent that we may do seemingly irrational things in order to influence their opinion. This is not a new insight, although it has received renewed attention in our own highly networked age.[2] The period ca.1650-1800 witnessed a concerted, if neglected, debate about the implications of mankind's desire for recognition, which bore directly on discussions of sociability and toleration.[3] This aspect of human nature raises disquieting concerns. The criteria by which the worth of people and things are evaluated in any given society might appear to be arbitrary. Further, if our concern for the applause of others suggests that all the world's a stage on which we play our parts,[4] are we all hypocrites, acting in ways that garner others' approval, even if they contravene our deepest moral and religious convictions? Neo-Augustinians like Blaise Pascal and Pierre Nicole could affirm this, whilst observing that dissimulation might have beneficial social and political consequences.[5] The desire for recognition, as Augustine argued, incentivized pagan individuals, ignorant of the true God, to perform acts of heroic patriotism. But at a more banal level, the concern to 'fit in' powerfully induces every self-loving individual to adhere to shared norms of propriety – even if such a self-serving motive strips the actions to which it leads of merit in the judgment of God, who can alone read men's hearts.[6] A society of atheists, Bayle suggested, is a possibility: a concern to secure praise and avoid contempt, along with the incentives provided by civil law, is sufficient to keep men on the straight and narrow.[7]

Yet suspicions remained that the causal relationship between outward action and internal opinion is more complex than a focus on hypocrisy alone can accommodate. The theory of religious intolerance was predicated upon this logic: although external coercion cannot reach the inner man, it might nonetheless reorient the will so as to open the understanding to better sources of information.[8] Even as his famous distinction between outward conduct and internal belief might be read as an endorsement of systemic hypocrisy, the success of Hobbes's educative mission in *Leviathan* arguably presupposes that our opinions *are* susceptible to such alteration by external discipline. For Hobbes, then, the question is not whether we are all actors reciting scripts that we learn by heart through processes of socialization, so much as what those scripts are and who author(ize)s them.[9] Might the social sanctions of praise and contempt, enforcing norms of conduct that develop endogenously through our mutual interactions, discipline us in ways that are reliably generative of social peace and mutual fellowship? Hobbes canvassed this possibility,[10] but argued forcefully in the negative: the desire for recognition ensures that the natural condition is one of competition, conflict and misery. An opposite interpretation was explored most comprehensively by a relatively neglected figure in early eighteenth-century Scotland: the Presbyterian minister and Professor of Church History at the University of St Andrews, Archibald Campbell (1691-1756).

A study of Campbell's writings – particularly *An Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue* (1733) – is illuminating for five reasons in particular.[11] First, Campbell presented his work (quite plausibly) as intervening in a debate about the desire for recognition and its consequences that had been ongoing practically since the inception of Occidental political philosophy.[12] Second, he nonetheless emphasized that the debate over recognition had recently been reanimated, and reoriented, primarily due to Hobbes's intervention. Campbell grasped what, until recently, scholars have overlooked: that Hobbes, rather than Rousseau,

was the first to claim that the fundamental problems of politics stem 'from the politics of recognition'.[13] Third, Campbell understood recognition to raise questions that bore directly upon toleration and tolerance. If our desire for esteem makes us radically sensitive to others' opinions, perhaps (as Hobbes argued) we cannot disagree peaceably: every sign of disagreement, however trivial, generates animosity. Toleration as political policy, and tolerance as self-control, are imperative if we are to live together in society. Disagreement is endemic; it cannot be overcome. But we might learn prudently to conceal it beneath the external veneer of mutual complaisance.[14] Campbell, however, argued that our concern for esteem leads us to accommodate our *opinions*, not merely our *actions*, to our neighbours': thereby generating a broad consensus regarding the propriety of modes of conduct that affect all members of our community (rather than merely our own well-being). Consequently, toleration and tolerance appear both less demanding and less necessary: required only in our discussions of purely speculative issues of no practical consequence. Fourth, Campbell's critique of Hobbes's interpretation of the desire for recognition and its implications for sociability was indebted to a number of Hobbes's English critics who are, like Campbell, neglected today and who, like Hobbes, worked within the framework of Protestant natural jurisprudence. This is significant, because Campbell's theory of sociability was predicated upon a more positive evaluation of the *theological*, rather than merely the moral character of the passion – self-love, as it takes the form of the desire for esteem – that animates our conduct as creatures who desire happiness. The rehabilitation of pride, or self-love, was not the sole achievement of secular ethical naturalists such as Hume and Smith.[15]

This, however, brings us to the fifth reason why Campbell's *Enquiry* merits close study. Campbell maintained that the economy of esteem had been corrupted in modern societies: whilst unnatural, intolerance had become ubiquitous. In explaining how this corruption had occurred, the Presbyterian minister directly implicated institutional religion – not least of a

Calvinist variant. The invasion of dogmatic theology into the public square, assisted by the Christian magistrate, had deformed esteem-relations between individuals, by teaching and incentivising them to evaluate one another according to their 'right opinion' (orthodoxy) on purely speculative questions on which disagreement was inevitable. Campbell fully accepted the insight of theorists of intolerance that external constraints and incentives have profound and lasting effects on the inner man. The 'orthodox' had succeeded only too well in their aim: to make men more concerned with the supposed truth of others' speculative opinions than with the propriety and merit of their moral actions and intentions. It was because of this pathogenesis of European societies – and *not* human nature itself, as he held both Hobbes and orthodox theologians who defended the doctrine of original sin to maintain – that toleration and tolerance had now become a regrettable necessity. For Campbell this represented the tragic subversion of God's providential plan for mankind, in which the desire for recognition is hardwired into our nature to induce us to live in mutual fellowship, peace and love.

Hobbes and Aristotle: self-love and love of others

Immediately upon its publication in 1733, Campbell's *Enquiry* was subjected to examination by the Church of Scotland's Committee for the Purity of Doctrine.[16] The Committee was particularly alarmed by Campbell's fundamental claim that self-love, as it takes the form of the desire for esteem, is 'a laudable Principle, in the Business of Moral Virtue'. It alone motivates us to the virtue and piety required of us by our Creator (*OMV* I.i.5-7).[17] The Committee raised two objections. First, self-love is indicative of post-lapsarian concupiscence: it cannot issue in virtue or piety because, as Augustine argued, it is a 'perverted imitation' of the true love (of God) that ought to motivate both.[18] Fallen man requires the (unmerited) assistance of divine grace if his affective economy is to be regenerated: something Campbell was accused of denying. Campbell had fallen into the error

of heathen philosophers like Cicero – whom he cited repeatedly – who was assailed by Augustine for advancing the 'pestilential opinion' that actions might be virtuous even when motivated by a concern for the 'fickle opinion of men' rather than 'pursued for the sake of the true good' (God's glory) (*OMV* II.x.450-55).[19] 'Self-love and Self-seeking', the Committee observed, 'are mentioned among the Sins forbidden in the first Commandment', which exhorts us to love God, not ourselves, with all our heart, soul and mind.[20] Self-love is 'a Passion most impious', 'highly dishonouring to God', and 'quite contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ'.[21]

The Committee's second objection concerned the practical implications of the desire for recognition, which it held to be 'every way destructive to the Peace and Happiness of Mankind'.[22] Esteem-seeking must be suppressed if we are to live together peaceably here and entertain any prospect of happiness hereafter. To this end, state and church must work together: the former imposing the constraints of civil law, the latter preaching God's word and opening men's hearts to His redemptive grace. Campbell, conversely, maintained that the desire for recognition provides 'a strong & large foundation of sociableness among men'.[23] It is the *cramping* of self-love demanded by the orthodox, rather than its free *indulgence*, that characterizes intolerant and uncivilized societies. In arguing that the desire for recognition precludes peace and fellowship, which relies instead upon the erection of sovereign authority allied to the ecclesiastical, Campbell warned his orthodox critics that their position was uncomfortably close to that of Hobbes and Mandeville. All portrayed mankind as a blemish on God's creation, animated by a craven self-love that precludes the possibility of mutual fellowship. The only difference is that, for Hobbes and Mandeville, the (partial) redemption of human nature would be a political achievement, whereas for the orthodox it also required supernatural regeneration. In taking issue with Hobbes, Campbell made it clear to his fellow ministers that other targets of his critique could be found rather closer to home.[24]

Campbell maintained that Hobbes's denial of natural human sociability was flawed, for two reasons above all. First, in setting up his argument against Aristotle's account of love (*philia*) as naturally uniting men together in fellowship, Hobbes had misconstrued the theory of friendship in the *Nichomachean Ethics*.[25] There, Aristotle ridiculed the idea that the solitary individual could lead a flourishing (*eudaimōn*) life. We rely upon others to provide us with those goods that we consider to be essential to our happiness, which are not confined to those things that we require for our physical well-being: 'Nobody would choose to have all possible good things on the condition that he must enjoy them alone; for man is a social being, and designed by nature to live with others'.[26] Society affords human beings the opportunity to exchange the greatest good of all – their mutual love – by consolidating the bonds of friendship: a relationship characterised by reciprocity and equality.[27]

Hobbes accepted that men would naturally desire society even if they enjoyed all the 'other goods' required for physical self-preservation. Taking himself to contradict Aristotle, however, Hobbes maintained that society 'is a product of love of self, not of love of friends'.[28] Even as it requires society for its satisfaction, self-love seeks a good of the mind – 'honour' and 'reputation' – the pursuit of which precludes the acknowledgement of mutual equality upon which friendship relies. Were Aristotle's theory true we would love all men equally, rather than exercise discretion in choosing some (those with the power to assist us) above others.[29] The desire for reputation explains this tendency: honour is a positional good, which 'is nothing if everybody has it, since it consists in comparison and pre-eminence'.[30] It is also a form of power. The desire for glory generates a competition for recognition in which there must be winners and losers; and, as in a competition for material goods, the strong and proud will seek to dominate others by coercive means.[31] This leads to relationships characterized by dominion and subjugation, and by flattery not friendship.[32] Substituting self-love and the desire for recognition for Aristotle's natural love of others, Hobbes concluded that even as we

need it to attain the ends set for us by our natural passions, we are born unfit for society. It is 'men's mutual fear', born primarily of the competition generated by recognition-seeking, and not 'mutual human benevolence' that provides the foundation for any 'large and lasting society'.[33] The sovereign is required to instil fear in those in whom the desire for recognition is strongest, thereby emancipating the modest from *their* fear of the vainglorious. All subjects are constrained (and educated) to acknowledge their mutual equality as subjects under the awful 'mortal God': the Leviathan, the king of the children of pride.[34]

Campbell, however, maintained that for Aristotle, as for most classical philosophers, friendship was the fruit of *self*-love, not some innate other-regarding affection: 'In the Opinion of this Philosopher [Aristotle], *Self-love* universally prevails, and gives Life to our kindest and most social Dispositions' (*OMV* II.viii.388).[35] Love of others results from our attempts to satisfy our self-love, which gradually expands outwards to include family, friends, neighbours, countrymen – and eventually mankind and God himself (*OMV* I.i.5-7; II.vi.324).[36] This explains why, initially, we do not love all mankind equally, because 'we affect and value other intelligent Beings in Proportion to their Benevolence towards us, or according as they contribute to give us *Pleasure*, or to advance our Happiness' (*OMV* II.vii.360). We value them, in other words, according to their willingness to do good unto us – that is, for Campbell, for their *virtue*. In emphasizing the importance of self-love, and particularly the desire for recognition in Aristotle's theory of sociability, Campbell indicated that Aristotle's position was actually close to Hobbes's. Human beings are animated by their desire for pleasure, and aversion to pain; and the greatest pleasure – a pleasure of the mind – is to have one's sense of self-worth affirmed by other intelligent beings (*OMV* I.iii.48-9). It is this desire for recognition that induces us to seek company with others, not natural benevolence. This explains why Campbell drew upon Aristotle to critique Francis Hutcheson's *An Inquiry into the Original of Beauty and Virtue* (1725), which defended

natural human sociability and benevolence from Hobbes's and Mandeville's 'neo-Epicurean' theories. For Hutcheson the desire for pleasure, including esteem, cannot issue in truly meritorious acts; such pleasure is merely an additional reward that accompanies virtuous actions performed from disinterested motives.[37] Hutcheson, '(in the Opinion of Aristotle, to the great Prejudice of Moral Virtue) rejects all Pleasure whatsoever', and thereby strips us of the one motive (the pleasure of esteem) that leads us to virtue (*OMV* II.vi.334).

In highlighting this common ground between Aristotle and Hobbes, however, Campbell endeavoured to expose a second flaw in the latter's theory of sociability. If Hobbes had been correct to identify the desire for recognition as often the most powerful of our desires – even trumping self-preservation – he had fundamentally misunderstood how esteem-seeking and -giving *works*. Campbell's theory presupposed that our desire for esteem leads us, naturally and necessarily, to accommodate our conduct to others' opinions of how we ought to act. Along with its behavioural implications, however, the desire for esteem has significant cognitive consequences. By according our fellow men the authority to judge the propriety and merit of our actions and character, we are habituated into ideas of what is estimable and contemptible that are not subjective, but rather generated by all members of society collectively as they converse, interact, and pursue their common interests. The desire for esteem habituates us into ways of acting *and reflecting on our actions* that take account of the concerns of our neighbours. This facilitates our willingness to acknowledge our mutual equality as human beings. In embracing self-love as the passion that leads us into society, but rejecting the conclusions Hobbes drew from this insight, Campbell was not alone. He was following in the footsteps of earlier English philosophers who endeavoured to undermine Hobbes's theory from within the framework of Protestant natural jurisprudence, and without recourse to natural human benevolence.

Esteem, interdependence and equality: Clarke of Hull, after Richard Cumberland

In his writings, Campbell nowhere refers to the recent publications of the obscure Hull schoolmaster, John Clarke (1687-1734). Yet he was aware of the convergence between their moral theories – if only because his close friend, John Simson, continually drew his attention to it.[38] Responding to the Committee, however, Campbell did foreground his debts to other English authors. The Committee accused Campbell of making 'Self-love to be the Standard of Moral Virtue, and not the Will or Law of God'. Campbell retorted that he had not written in the idiom of natural jurisprudence, and consequently did not discuss at any length 'the Nature and Sanction and Promulgation of a Law, the Right and Character of the Lawgiver, and the Obligation that other Beings are under to submit and obey'.[39] His vindication of self-love was, however, indebted to the insights of those who *had* written in this idiom. Campbell declared that his moral theory was 'well supported' by the Anglican bishop, Richard Cumberland (1632-1718), 'whose excellent Treatise concerning the Laws of Nature is an ample demonstration of the Truth of my Account of Moral Virtue'. Campbell referred to Cumberland's *De legibus naturae* (1672), which was formulated as a sustained critique of Hobbes. Campbell then mentions two further English philosophers, both of whom had published treatises of natural law that purported to be translated abridgements of Cumberland's prolix Latin original. The first was Samuel Parker's *Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and of the Christian Religion* (1681); and the second, James Tyrrell's *Brief Disquisition of the Law of Nature* (1692). These three authors, Campbell declared, 'who have acquired no contemptible Character in the learned World, and are counted to have done good Service to the Interests of Religion' emphasized that virtue and piety depend upon the enlargement of self-love that occurs as individuals come into contact – and seek one another's esteem – in society.[40]

In his publications of the mid-1720s – the period in which Campbell was drafting the *Inquiry* – Clarke accepted many of Hobbes's most important insights regarding human nature.[41] This included the claim that law is only 'brought home to mankind' and held to be obligatory *in foro externo* to the extent that its precepts are 'made a part of' an individual's sense of happiness. Law must appeal to the self-love of those subject to it. The performance of our moral duties must be pleasurable: it is 'the Desire for Pleasure, which *is* Self-love' that motivates us to virtue, contrary to Hutcheson's claims.[42] It is simply a fact of human psychology that 'no Man can desire, or be under a Concern for, the Happiness of others, but where it makes a part of his own'.[43] Clarke's vindication of self-love was predicated on two related presuppositions, which Campbell shared. First, for Clarke as for most Protestant natural jurists of voluntarist persuasions (including Hobbes), all law originates in the will of a superior. Particular acts are only deemed moral and obligatory because an authority promulgates them to their subjects and enforces them with sanctions. The authority in question is God; and His will is laid down for mankind in the form of natural law.[44] Second, and crucially, God has created human nature so as to ensure that virtuous actions tend to be rewarded with pleasure, and vicious ones with pain.[45] If we love ourselves first and best – as for Clarke was evidently the case – then God created us this way, and for a purpose.[46] The attempt to satisfy our self-love leads us to recognize the necessity of satisfying the self-love of others as a means to this end. Love of others is the outgrowth of the love of self, as parental affection illustrates; and the eventual (and natural) terminus of this love is God, whom we encounter by, through and *after* our affections have already extended to embrace our fellow men. Our love of self cannot be understood as 'a perverted imitation' of the love of God, as by Augustine. It comes first, and leads outwards (via a love of children, neighbours, countrymen etc.) to piety: a claim endorsed by Campbell.[47]

Clarke similarly maintained that those who decry self-love as an inherently immoral principle would strip mankind of the one motive that God had given us to live as He requires.[48] Here there was little to choose between Hobbes, Hutcheson, Mandeville and those rigid '*Calvinists*' who portray mankind as 'a parcel of poor, sorry, Self-ended Wretches, whose Behaviour has nothing of Virtue in it, nothing Amiable or Commendable at all' – because all demand that mankind perform the impossible deed of denying the self-love that alone animates their conduct.[49] If such a denial of self-love breeds hypocrisy and corrodes trust between men, so it also alienates man from God: because self-love alone leads to friendship on the one hand, and a sincere love of God on the other. If God really demands that we deny our self-love, then He asks of us something of which (due to His design) we are constitutionally incapable. Who could feel sincere love and gratitude to such an unreasonable ('*Epicurean*') deity? Our worship of Him would, like our expressions of friendship to our fellow men, have the character of base flattery rather than genuine esteem and affection.[50]

Clarke's publications were short *pièces d'occasion*, which had the effect of showing that neither the appeal to an autonomous faculty of reason (William Wollaston, Samuel Clarke) nor to a discrete faculty of the 'moral sense' (Hutcheson) could adequately overcome the insights into human psychology provided by Hobbes and Mandeville.[51] Unlike Campbell, Clarke did not invoke the authority of other philosophers, ancient or modern, who grounded morality in the enlargement of self-love. His debts to Cumberland, possibly mediated by Parker and Tyrrell, nonetheless seem clear. Cumberland's *De legibus* offered to explain how God's moral law – captured in the 'golden rule' of the Gospel to love one's neighbour as oneself, which Cumberland took as his epigraph – was 'brought home' to creatures who are first and foremost animated by their self-love. Cumberland did so with recourse to his most original contribution to natural law theory: his doctrine of natural sanctions.[52] The most conspicuous shortcoming of Hobbes's theory, for Cumberland, was its failure to consider

how, through their iterative mutual interactions, men's sense of their own interests would adapt to take account of the interests of other people. Just as mankind's encounters with the natural world taught them that some things are good for us as a species and others harmful – fire burns; some foodstuffs replenish, others poison – so the same process occurred in social life.[53] The individual learned that some actions – seizing another's food supply, or harming their child – would stimulate resentment, and possibly violent retaliation; others – coming to their aid should they fall victim to a third party, for example – would secure their goodwill, and possibly lead them to reciprocate should the opportunity arise.[54] Eventually, however, individuals would discover that the esteem of other rational creatures is *itself* the source of the most acute and enduring pleasure. To secure it, they would amend their behaviour, to bring it into line with the concerns and expectations of observing others.[55]

Cumberland, like Campbell, understood our desire for esteem within a framework of divine teleology: human nature has been created so as to make our happiness dependent upon the happiness of those with whom we live. As certain forms of conduct (refraining from stealing, protecting others from injury, showing liberality where possible, reciprocating good deeds) please every member of society, so such actions are consistent with the precepts of a natural law to which we all gradually recognize ourselves beholden. Insofar as respecting or transgressing these norms will incur the esteem or contempt of our neighbours, such judgments might be interpreted as natural sanctions enforcing the law of nature. This shows, as Clarke maintained, that the laws of nature are truly *laws* in our natural condition, as attended by sanctions that make compliance obligatory on creatures who cannot but pursue their happiness:

> The Laws of Nature have an *intrinsical* and essential *Proof* of their *Obligation*, taken from the *Rewards* or Increase of Happiness which attends the benevolent Person

> from the natural efficacy of his Actions, and follows the Man who studiously observes these Laws; and from the *Punishments*, or Degrees of Misery, which, whether they will or no, they call upon themselves, who either do not obey, or do oppose, the Conclusions of right Reason.[56]

In maintaining that pre-political communities might identify the precepts of natural law due to their evident utility, and individuals feel obligated to live accordingly due to the 'natural sanctions' enforcing them, Cumberland confronted a further challenge posed by Hobbes. Men might live according to natural law without any knowledge of its author: God. Hobbes had, after all, placed strict limits on the reach of natural theology: reason might identify the existence of an omnipotent first cause whom we fear, but could say nothing about its nature or attributes.[57] Campbell's theological writings advanced a similar point.[58] Cumberland maintained that we acquire our idea of God's infinite perfections – and come to *love*, not *fear* God – through our love of our fellow man, which occurs once our self-love expands outwards. Here again Augustine had it wrong: rather than loving man on account of our love of God, we love God on account of our love of self and our fellow men:

> It may indeed be *affirm'd*, that the *Knowledge* of our-selves and others, and also *Charity* and *Justice* towards Men, may be deduced from the Study of *God's Glory*. But the Knowledge and Love of ourselves and other Men *include a natural Perfection*, (in possession whereof some part of Human Happiness consists,) essential and proper to themselves, which we can come to the Knowledge of, *without deducing* it from *God's Honour*. Nay, we seem *first* to know and love *Man*, before the Mind raises it-self to the Knowledge and love of *God*, whose *Being*, and amiable Goodness are discovered from his Works, and chiefly from *Man*.[59]

For Cumberland, just as the commerce in esteem between individuals creates bonds of mutual friendship, so the same holds in our relations with God. Like the person possessed of enlarged self-love, and unlike the vainglorious Hobbesian esteem-seeker, God takes no pleasure in the servile flattery of those who revere Him solely for His power rather than His good-will. Indeed, we come to know God 'through' man in part because He shares that aspect of human nature that Campbell was determined to vindicate: our desire for esteem. As Cumberland noted, God, like man, desires to 'be lov'd and honoured'; and if God shares it, then 'it is certain, that the *desire to be belov'd*, implies *no Imperfection* in *Man*'.[60] To assert the contrary is to portray God in an Epicurean light, as utterly uninterested in us (and thus *unworthy* of our love and gratitude).[61]

Campbell on (mis)recognition

The theories of Clarke and Cumberland provide a better sense of what induced Campbell to mount his vindication of self-love, and especially the desire for esteem. Campbell endorsed Hobbes's insight that 'the Desire of *Esteem*, or of being regarded, is an Appetite that universally prevails over Mankind', whilst challenging the conclusions Hobbes drew from it (*OMV* I.iii.53). On Campbell's interpretation, Hobbes accepted that the 'Desire for Esteem' was inseparable from 'the Desire of Society'; but he argued that esteem-seeking nonetheless frustrates sociability by generating a competition that leads to 'one Man's treacherously imposing upon another'. The prideful individual demands recognition from others but is unwilling to reciprocate (*OMV* I.v.90). This destroys the mutual trust, affection and commitment to abide by shared norms upon which all society depends.

Campbell declared that Hobbes, unlike Aristotle, misunderstood how esteem relations operate. We simply cannot coerce others into showing us esteem because, as Clarke observed,

'[w]e are not at Liberty to love as we list'.[62] It would be futile for the esteem-seeker to attempt to coerce others, and similarly futile for the magistrate to compel subjects to value one another as he determines they ought. Esteem must be freely given as a gift, a true expression of goodwill (*OMV* I.viii.204).[63] Even when coerced, we cannot easily conceal our true judgments of another's merit; and for another's esteem to mean anything, I must believe it to be a sincere reflection of the merit they see in me. For the esteem-seeker there is no short-cut. If I desire your esteem, I must endeavour to deserve it by satisfying *your* sense of what is estimable, and not my own:

> If ever we expect to have the Favour and Commendation of those Beings with whom we are joined in *Society*, we must necessarily adapt our Behaviour to the *Gratification* of their *Self-love*, or their natural Desire of Well-being. This is the Method we must needs take; and there is manifestly no other Course whatsoever, which we can invent to our selves, or that can be proposed to us by others, that can at all serve our Purpose. (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 103-4)

Insofar as the desire for esteem compels us to accommodate ourselves to the self-love of others, it generates concord, not conflict; friendship, not flattery. It facilitates those ties of mutual love and affection that Aristotle held to be natural, and Hobbes and Mandeville deemed impossible:

> For as all rational Agents whatsoever are intirely under the absolute Government of Self-love, and can favour Nothing, at any Rate, but as it serves to gratify this Principle, or to assist and relieve their natural Desire of Well-being; so it is very obvious, that … we directly *strike in* with [others'] *Self-love*, and immediately

> conspire and *co-operate* with them in a joynt hearty Pursuit after their *Happiness*; whereby we become the *same*, in a manner, with themselves, they must love us, or, that they cannot but love us, as they do themselves; and highly esteem and applaud us. (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 142-3)

Campbell's language is revealing – 'conspire', 'cannot but' – because it discloses a conviction that God has, so to speak, hardwired the love of esteem into our nature. As *His* creatures we perform *His* will, without a great deal of reflection on our part, because:

> the *Desire* of *Esteem* universally determines us to pursue *Love* towards others, or to exert ourselves into all virtuous Actions whatsoever (for these are the only Means, that can effectually recommend us to the *good Opinion* and *Love* of others) so from hence we cannot but have the most elevated Apprehensions of the wonderful Goodness and wise Contrivance of the great *Parent* of Mankind, who, in the Nature of Things, has determin'd us to pursue *Virtue*, with a View to raise such Affections (*Love* and *Esteem*) in other *rational Agents*, as render them likewise *virtuous*, or morally good towards us. By which Means, there is made the best and ample Provision possible, to secure every one's Ease and Comfort; we are all deeply engag'd in a generous Contention, a noble Plot, to promote each other's Felicity. And if we follow this *divine Constitution* of Things, we shall all endeavour, to the utmost of our Power, to be joyful and happy in one another, through the whole Compass of our Duration. (*OMV* II.ix.448-9)

Those who are most concerned to secure recognition – for Hobbes, the most prideful, wilful and antisocial – are those who, for Campbell, are most obliged to accommodate themselves to others. They are the most interdependent of all, and the least self-willing, because their craving for recognition subjects their 'Ease to the Opinion of the World' (*OMV* II.ix.442-3). Here Campbell reversed Hobbes's contention that in our natural condition the desire for recognition precludes us from acknowledging our mutual equality. If we desire that others 'count us worthy' of happiness and 'conspire' with our efforts to attain it, this in turn requires *us* to count *others* worthy to judge our merit, and thereby to acknowledge them as 'being our *Equals*' (*OMV* I.ii.36; II.iv.313-14). We take pleasure in the esteem of all rational creatures – not merely those whom we consider to be our superiors (as for Hobbes). Even 'the meanest Mortal' can form judgments and 'entertain us with his good Opinion and Love', and we 'must, and do, esteem and value that Mind' that 'can form a Judgment of our Case, approve our being happy, and heartily concur with us in our Endeavours to be so' (*OMV* I.ii.36; II.viii.380; II.iv.313-4). Our desire for esteem compels us to recognize our shared (and equal) humanity, because as rational creatures we all have the power to form judgments and to gratify one another's self-love.

Campbell nonetheless observed that Hobbes's interpretation of the desire for recognition seemed plausible to contemporary readers. This was because, in modern societies, the economy of esteem had been subverted. Rousseau would later famously declare that Hobbes 'spoke of Savage Man and depicted Civil man'.[64] The less heralded figures of Cumberland and Campbell had already made this observation.[65] Paraphrasing, as would Rousseau, Book 2 of Aristotle's *Politics*, Campbell protested that 'it seems to me not a fair Way of dealing, to take our Notions of human Nature from those Individuals in civil Societies… in whom human Nature is most depraved and corrupted' (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 236). Campbell readily conceded that ''tis very certain, that, in politick Societies, where there

are so many Distinctions of Life', men 'lie much exposed to have the Balance of their Nature spoiled'. This resulted in a depraved '*second Nature*', which Hobbes mistook for the original (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 236). Campbell drew attention to 'the Shifts, Tricks, and Artifice of civilized Mankind': 'In short, if we will trace the Dispositions and Conduct of the human Species from their first uniting together in civil Societies, we shall find, that, from great Innocency and Integrity of Manners, they have gone aside, and increas'd in mutual Mischiefs, from one Generation to another' (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 245). In such 'civilized' societies, it is indisputable that the desire for esteem leads some individuals (or groups) to attempt to subjugate others. Where once the desire for recognition ensured that 'whatever was done to the Prejudice of any one Individual, was highly resented by the whole Species', this no longer holds true (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 242-3).

Campbell drew attention, as would Rousseau and Smith later, to the capacity of economic forces to subvert men's ability to value one another according to their moral achievements, rather than material endowments – even as he pushed back against Mandeville's simplistic identification of 'luxury' with vice (*OMV* I.ii.44-8).[66] But much the most important cause of corruption occurred when the magistrate decreed that 'a particular Set of Principles' – meaning theological principles – 'have, exclusive of all others, secular Advantages annexed to them'. This represented the invasion of dogmatic institutional religion, armed with the sanctions of civil law, into the public square. The enforcement of 'orthodoxy' made social esteem the preserve of those who subscribed to speculative 'Articles of *Religion*'. Even if dissenters were granted 'toleration', this word for Campbell had few positive connotations. To employ Rainer Forst's terminology, the introduction of 'vertical' toleration – which variously includes, contingently accommodates, or excludes different people from the realm of acceptability – had destroyed the 'horizontal' bonds of affection that had previously united all members of a community in equal fellowship.[67] Had the magistrate

not enforced conformity to 'abstracted … Points of Knowledge or Learning, that have no Influence on a Man's present Circumstances, I am apt to believe, that People [would] differ from one another, with a good Deal of Charity and mutual Forbearance'. It was only because intolerant ecclesiastics and magistrates had interfered with the economy of esteem that 'toleration' was required in the first place. Rather than a necessary means to foster sociability, the very notion of toleration – which asks us to forebear our fellow men, rather than to love and esteem them – indicated that the bonds that tie us together had already been ruptured. A climate of intolerance was created in which disagreement inevitably bred conflict, as Hobbes (falsely) assumed it must. Different sects learned that recognition (by the magistrate) required them 'to keep out, or dispossess the other [sect] of those Honours, Riches, and Preferments of which they are ambitious' (*OMV* I, "Appendix", 224-5), thus generating a competition for recognition that invariably oppressed the powerless and advantaged the powerful.

In such societies, self-love became 'narrow and contracted', with individuals concerned solely with their own advancement and that of their brethren. The modern age bred 'Enthusiasts', defined by Campbell as individuals who take themselves to enjoy direct friendship with God, and thereby to have no concern for the opinions and affection of their fellow mortals. Such individuals – among whom Campbell assuredly included his clerical inquisitors – cease to accord other men authority to judge of their merit and propriety. This renders them insensible to the kinds of intersubjective processes that enlarge self-love in necessary and beneficial ways. Enthusiasts are unsociable, and dangerous as a result: they refuse to acknowledge others who differ from them on purely speculative questions as their *moral* equals, worthy of respect as *rational creatures*.[68] If their self-love fails to expand to include all of mankind, it must fail to encompass its ultimate object: God, whom for all their protestations of piety they despise and flatter rather than love and honour. Such men stood accused by Campbell of wilfully subverting the '*divine Constitution* of Things', in which in

the course of our iterative social interactions our self-love '*creeps abroad, and stretches itself,* first *to one's Kindred,* next*, to those that are allay'd to us;* then*, it spreads among Friends;* after that, *among those that live in the Neighbourhood, and such as are Friends and Allies to the State; and* last of all*, it widens, and takes within its Compass the whole Race of Mankind*' (*OMV* I.vi.125 n.; citing Cicero, *De finibus*, Book V). Small wonder if, in responding to his orthodox critics, Campbell accused them of a hatred of mankind and God. Such false followers of Christ had introduced intolerance into the world; and for Campbell, toleration could not hope to salve the wound. As the criteria according to which members of society value one another has been corrupted, perhaps irreversibly, Campbell argued that there was only one place to look for correction: to Christ. Christ embraced his shame on the Cross, to teach mankind that sometimes shame*lessness* and heterodoxy ('other opinion') are necessary to pursue the life of virtue and to teach unwilling listeners in pathological and intolerant societies of the importance of mutual respect, love and understanding.[69]

Notes

[1] Drafts of this essay were presented at the *Early Career Workshop in the History of Political Thought* at the University of Helsinki, and the *Tolerance, Sociability and Solidarity in Scottish Philosophy* conference at the University of Lausanne. I am grateful to participants at both events for their acute criticisms, and particularly to Johan Olsthoorn and Adriana Luna-Fabritius. I am indebted to Giovanni Gellera, Christian Maurer, Robin Douglass, Heikki Haara and Tim Stanton for their invaluable critical feedback on an earlier version of this piece. The research for this paper was undertaken as a Research Fellow on the *Rethinking Civil Society: History, Theory, Critique* project, funded by a Leverhulme Trust Research Leadership Award to Professor Tim Stanton (RL-2016-044).

[2] Origgi, *Reputation*.

[3] Honneth, *Anerkennung*.

[4] Paraphrasing Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, II.vii.138.

[5] For broader discussion, see Runciman, *Political Hypocrisy*.

[6] Moriarty, *Early Modern French Thought*.

[7] Bayle, *Miscellaneous Reflections*, i.§145, 292-4.

[8] Goldie, "Theory of Religious Intolerance".

[9] Stanton, "Hobbes and Schmitt".

[10] *Leviathan*, ii, 1.11, 152: 'Desire of Praise, disposeth to laudable actions, such as please them whose judgement they value'. The problem, of course, is that we tend only to 'value' superiors whom we deem to have the power to assist us – and *not* all men equally.

[11] The *Enquiry* was published in a pirated edition as *Arete-logia* in 1728, by Alexander Innes: see the correspondence between Campbell and Innes in National Records of Scotland [NRS], Lawrie Papers, GD461/16. The 1733 edition was much enlarged, and the material reordered (see n.24).

[12] For a sense of these earlier discussions, see Williams, *Shame*; and Kahlos et al, *Recognition and Religion*.

[13] Hont, *Politics in Commercial Society*, 11-12. For Rousseau's claim, see Neuhouser, *Rousseau's Theodicy*.

[14] Skinner, "Social Control"; Bejan, *Mere Civility*, Chap. 3.

[15] For continuities between Campbell's moral theory, and those of Hume and Smith, see Sagar, "Sociability".

[16] For discussion, Skoczylas, "Archibald Campbell's *Enquiry*"; and Maurer, "Archibald Campbell" and "Doctrinal Issues".

[17] The *Enquiry* is divided into three treatises. References are given in parentheses to treatise, section and page number.

[18] Augustine, *City of God*, 19.12.

[19] Ibid, 5.14, 212-13.

[20] Committee (ed), *Remarks*, 2.

[21] Ibid, 19 (Campbell summarizes his critics' position).

[22] Ibid.

[23] This was John Simson's apt description of Campbell's thesis: Simson to Campbell, 26 Feb. 1732, in NRS GD461/15/3.

[24] Campbell's determination to engage directly with Hobbes is particularly apparent in the revisions to the 1733 edition of the *Enquiry*. The most substantive such additions are in Treatise I: the material at pp. 21-50, the whole of Section VIII, and the Appendix that follows (pp. 201-55) all engage almost exclusively with Hobbes's writings. This material was sufficiently extensive for John Simson – familiar with the earlier (1728) edition – to suggest that 'the Treatise against Hobbes' might make a second volume to the work: Simson to Campbell, (?)1731, in NRS GD461/15/13.

[25] Scholars tend to assume that Hobbes's denial that 'Man is an animal born fit [*aptum natum*] for Society' (*De cive*, 1.2) took aim at Aristotle's *Politics*; but Gooding and Hoekstra, "Hobbes and Aristotle", argue that he probably had the discussion of *philia* in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, Books VIII-IX primarily in mind. Campbell's critique of Hobbes implies a similar insight.

[26] Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*, IX.ix.3.

[27] Ibid., VIII.i.1-5.

[28] Hobbes, *De cive*, 1.2.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Abizadeh, "Hobbes on the Causes of War"; Cooper, "Vainglory"; and Slomp, *Thomas Hobbes*.

[32] For Hobbes and flattery, see Kapust, *Glib and Oily Art*, 64-95.

[33] Hobbes, *De cive*, 1.2, 24.

[34] Mitchell, "Equality"; Hoekstra, "Hobbesian Equality"; *OED*, s.v. 'awful', #1: 'Awe-inspiring'. The acknowledgement of equality is Hobbes's eighth law of nature in *De cive* (3.13), and ninth in *Leviathan* (ii.1.15).

[35] The place of self-love in Aristotle's theory of friendship remains contested: Annas, "Self-love".

[36] Campbell refers here to the Stoic doctrine of *oikeiosis*, which mediates the relationship between self and other: Engberg-Pedersen, *Stoic Theory*.

[37] For one clear statement to this effect, Hutcheson, *Inquiry*, II.ii.9; see Maurer, *Self-Love*, Chap. 4.

[38] See Simson's letter of 26 Feb. 1732, referencing 'the scheme of Mr Clarke of Hull, who goes on the same general notions with yours': NRS GD461/15/3.

[39] Committee (ed.), *Remarks*, 29-30.

[40] Ibid, 41-4.

[41] Clarke, *An Examination* (1725); and *Foundation of Morality* (1726).

[42] Clarke, *Foundation*, 64. In subsequent editions of the *Inquiry*, Hutcheson (silently) took account of certain of Clarke's and Campbell's criticisms: Turco, "Sympathy".

[43] Ibid, 55.

[44] Ibid, 10.

[45] Ibid, 16.

[46] Ibid, 37.

[47] Augustine, *City of God*, 19.12.

[48] By failing to grasp that Clarke's vindication of self-love is articulated with continual reference to God's will, Robert Shaver's interpretation is distorted in fundamental ways: *Rational Egoism*, 114-17.

[49] Clarke, *Foundation*, 110.

[50] Ibid, 21; *An Examination*, 43.

[51] Ibid, 104, where Clarke describes his short works as intended to 'prepare my way a little' to a more comprehensive '*Treatise upon Morality*', which he evidently failed to find the 'Leisure' to produce.

[52] For *De legibus*, see Parkin, *Science, Religion and Politics*.

[53] Cumberland, *Treatise*, "Introduction", xxi.270-1.

[54] Ibid, V.liv.632-7.

[55] Ibid, I.xviii-xx.316-20.

[56] Ibid, I.xii.308.

[57] Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ii, 2.31, 558.

[58] The limits to natural theology, for Campbell, prove *The Necessity of Revelation* (1739): Mills, "Campbell's *Necessity*".

[59] Cumberland, *Treatise*, V.xiii.523-4.

[60] Ibid, "Introduction", x.257.

[61] This was a point on which Clarke of Hull and Hutcheson disagreed: Tilley, "Francis Hutcheson".

[62] Clarke, *Foundation*, 84.

[63] See Tyrrell, *Brief Disquisition*, 314-58.

[64] Rousseau, *Early Political Writings*, 132. For discussion, see Douglass, *Rousseau and Hobbes*.

[65] Cumberland, *Treatise*, II.xxii.422; Tyrrell, *Brief Disquisition*, 314.

[66] For luxury see Hont, "Early Enlightenment Debate".

[67] Forst, *Toleration in Conflict*, passim.

[68] This is a central theme of Campbell's *Apostles no Enthusiasts* (1730), esp. 9-16.

[69] That Christ partook in an alternative economy of esteem, in which the praised and the praiseworthy are always consistent, is emphasized in both *Apostles no Enthusiasts* and the posthumously published *Authenticity of the Gospel-History Justified* (1759). For a contemporary work of political theory that revivifies the radical implications of shamelessness see Locke, *Democracy*.

Bibliography

Abizadeh, Arish — "Hobbes on the Causes of War: A Disagreement Theory." *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 2 (2011): 298-315.

Annas, Julia — "Self-Love in Aristotle." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 27, no. 1 (1988): 1-18.

Aristotle — *Nichomachean Ethics*. Translated by Harry Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Augustine, of Hippo — *The City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by Robert W. Dyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Bayle, Pierre — *Miscellaneous Reflections, Occasion'd by the Comet which Appear'd in December 1680*. 2 vols. London: J. Morphew, 1708.

Bejan, Teresa — *Mere Civility: Disagreement and the Limits of Toleration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Campbell, Archibald — *Arete-logia, or, An Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue*. London: B. Creake, 1728.

Campbell, Archibald — *The Authenticity of the Gospel-History Justified*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Hamilton, Balfour, and Neill, 1759.

Campbell, Archibald — *A Discourse proving that the Apostles were no Enthusiasts.* London: A. Millar, 1730.

Campbell, Archibald *An Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue*. Edinburgh: G. Hamilton, 1733.

Campbell, Archibald *The Necessity of Revelation: or an Enquiry into the Extent of Human Powers with Respect to Matters of Religion*. London: W. Bowyer, 1739.

Clarke, John (of Hull) *An Examination of the Notion of Moral Good and Evil, advanced in a late Book, entitled, The Religion of Nature Delineated*. London: A. Bettesworth, 1725.

Clarke, John (of Hull) *The Foundation of Morality in Theory and Practice considered*. York: T. Gant, 1726.

Committee of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (ed.) *Professor Campbell's further Explications with respect to some Articles of the former Charge.* Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and J. Robertson, 1736.

Committee of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (ed.) *Remarks upon some Passages in Books publish'd by Mr. Archibald Campbell… with his Explications on them*. Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and J. Robertson, 1735.

Cooper, Julie E. "Vainglory, Modesty, and Political Agency in Thomas Hobbes." *The Review of Politics* 72, no. 2 (2010): 241-69.

Cumberland, Richard *A Treatise of the Laws of Nature*. Translated by John Maxwell and edited by Jon Parkin. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2005.

Douglass, Robin *Rousseau and Hobbes: Nature, Free Will, and the Passions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels

The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis. Moral Development and Social Interaction in Early Stoic Philosophy. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990.

Gooding, Nicholas and Kinch Hoekstra

"Hobbes and Aristotle on the Foundation of Political Science." In *Hobbes's On the Citizen: A Critical Guide*, edited by Robin Douglass and Johan Olsthoorn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Forthcoming.

Hobbes, Thomas *De cive/ On the Citizen*. Edited by Richard Tuck, translated by Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hobbes, Thomas *Leviathan*. Edited by Noel Malcolm. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hoekstra, Kinch "Hobbesian Equality." In *Hobbes Today: Insights for the 21st Century*, edited by S.A. Lloyd, 76-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Honneth, Axel *Anerkennung: Eine europaïsche Ideensgeschichte*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2018.

Hont, István "The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury." In *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, edited by Mark Goldie and Robert Wokler, 377-418. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Hont, István *Politics in Commercial Society: Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith*, edited by Béla Kapossy and Michael Sonenscher. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Hutcheson, Francis *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue in Two Treatises*. Edited by Wolfgang Leidhold. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2004.

Kahlos, Ritva, Heikki Koskinen, and Ritva Palmen (eds.)

Recognition and Religion: Contemporary and Historical Perspectives (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019).

Kapust, Daniel J. *That Glib and Oily Art: Flattery and the History of Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Locke, Jill *Democracy and the Death of Shame: Political Equality and Social Disturbance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Maurer, Christian "Archibald Campbell and the Committee for Purity of Doctrine on Natural Reason, Natural Religion, and Revelation." *History of European Ideas* 42, no. 2 (2016): 256-75.

Maurer, Christian "Doctrinal Issues concerning Human Nature and Self-love, and the Case of Archibald Campbell's *Enquiry*." *Intellectual History Review* 26, no. 3 (2016): 355-69.

Maurer, Christian *Self-Love, Egoism and the Selfish Hypothesis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

Mills, Robin W. "Archibald Campbell's *Necessity of Revelation* (1739) – The Science of Human Nature's First Study of Religion." *History of European Ideas* 41, no. 6 (2015): 728-46.

Mitchell, Joshua "Hobbes and the Equality of the All under the One." *Political Theory* 21, no. 1 (1993): 78-100.

Neuhouser, Frederick *Rousseau's Theodicy of Self-Love: Evil, Rationality, and the Drive for Recognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Origgi, Gloria *Reputation: What It Is and Why It Matters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.

Parkin, Jon *Science, Religion and Politics in Restoration England: Richard Cumberland's De Legibus Naturae*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques *The Discourses and other Early Political Writings*. Translated and edited by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Runciman, David *Political Hypocrisy: The Mask of Power, from Hobbes to Orwell and Beyond*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Sagar, Paul "Sociability, Luxury, and Sympathy: The Case of Archibald Campbell." *History of European Ideas* 39, no. 6 (2013): 791-814.

Scokzylas, Anne "Archibald Campbell's *Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue*, Presbyterian Orthodoxy, and the Scottish Enlightenment." *Scottish Historical Review* 87, no. 223:1 (2008): 68-100.

Shaver, Robert *Rational Egoism: A Selective and Critical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Skinner, Quentin — "Hobbes and the Social Control of Unsociability." In *The Oxford Handbook of Hobbes*, edited by Aloysius P. Martinich and Kinch Hoekstra, 432-50. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Slomp, Gabriella — *Thomas Hobbes and the Political Philosophy of Glory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.

Tilley, John J. — "Francis Hutcheson and John Clarke: Self-Interest, Desire, and Divine Impassibility." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 57, no. 3:227 (2017): 315-30.

Turco, Luigi — "Sympathy and the Moral Sense: 1725-1740." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 7, no. 1 (1999): 79-101.

Williams, Bernard — *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.