AN ANALYSIS OF SELF-LOVE AND SYMPATHY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO BERNARD DE MANDEVILLE AND ADAM SMITH

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

IŞIL ÇEŞMELİ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

JANUARY 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr.Tülin GENÇÖZ
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Kurtuluş DİNÇER	(Hacettepe U., PHIL)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN	(METU, PHIL)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul R. TURAN	(Ankara U., PHIL)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Samet BAĞÇE	(METU, PHIL)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış PARKAN	(METU, PHIL)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Işıl ÇEŞMELİ

Signature :

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF SELF-LOVE AND SYMPATHY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO BERNARD DE MANDEVILLE AND ADAM SMITH

Çeşmeli, Işıl

Ph.D., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan

January 2017, 213 pages

Self-love and sympathy as two antagonistic views regarding human nature occupied an important place in eighteenth century philosophical milieu. First view, inherited from Thomas Hobbes was defended passionately by Bernard de Mandeville. In *The Fable of the Bees* Mandeville depicts main dynamics of civil society by anatomizing human nature, moral motivations of individuals and the structure of politics. His notoriety among eighteenth century moralists was due to his famous motto "private vices public benefits" and his assertion of selfishness as the basic motive of human nature. Adam Smith, contrary to Mandeville's moral egoism, defends sympathy as a ground of moral judgments and draw attention to altruistic characteristic of human nature in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759).

Although Smith propounds a completely different theory that of Mandeville in his earlier work it seems very surprising that he mentions self-love as a basic motive of human beings in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776). In this study, the role of

self-love on Smith's moral theory and economic system and possible effects of Mandeville's doctrines will be discussed. On the basis of differences between Mandeville's and Smith's theories of morals and Smith's stance against moral egoism this study aims to show that Smith's system cannot be considered as a reconstruction of Mandeville's social theory and system of morals. This study also demonstrates that when Smith's works are examined thoroughly it will follow that Smith succeeds in overcoming Mandeville's moral egoism by reconciling sympathy with self-love.

Keywords: Self-love, Sympathy, Moral egoism, Virtue, Vice

ÖZ

BERNARD DE MANDEVILLE VE ADAM SMITH'E GÖNDERMELERLE BEN-SEVGİSİ VE DUYGUDAŞLIK İNCELEMESİ

Çeşmeli, Işıl

Doktora, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan

Ocak 2017, 213 sayfa

İnsan doğası hakkında iki karşıt görüş olan ben-sevgisi ve duygudaşlık onsekizinci yüzyıl felsefe çevrelerinde önemli bir yer teşkil etmiştir. Thomas Hobbes'dan miras kalan birinci görüş Bernard de Mandeville tarafından hararetle savunulmuştur. *Arıların Masalı*'nda Mandeville, insan doğası, bireylerin ahlaki motivasyonu ve siyasetin yapısını açımlayarak toplumun ana dinamiklerini tasvir eder. Mandeville'in "kişisel erdemsizlikler kamusal faydalar" olarak bilinen ünlü düsturu, bencil insan doğası iddiası onsekizinci yüzyıl ahlak felsefecileri arasındaki kötü şöhretinin nedenidir. Adam Smith, Mandeville'in ahlaki egoizminin tersine, duygudaşlığı ahlaki yargıların temeline koyar ve *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda (1759) insan doğasının özgeci karakterine dikkat çeker.

Fakat Smith'in önceki eserinde tamamen Mandeville'den farklı bir kuram ortaya koymasına rağmen sonraki eseri *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde (1776) insanoğlunun ana dürtüsünün ben-sevgisi olduğunu iddia etmesi oldukça şaşırtıcıdır. Bu

çalışmada, Smith'in ahlak kuramı ve ekonomik sisteminde ben-sevgisinin rolü ve olası Mandeville etkileri tartışılacaktır. Mandeville ve Smith'in ahlak kuramları arasındaki farklılıklar ve Smith'in ahlaki egoizme karşı duruşundan yola çıkarak bu çalışma Smith'in sisteminin Mandeville'in sosyal kuramı ve ahlak sisteminin yeniden inşası olamayacağını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma ayrıca eserleri etraflıca incelendiğinde Smith'in duygudaşlık ve ben-sevgisini uzlaştırarak Mandeville'in ahlaki egoizminin üstesinden geldiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ben-sevgisi, Duygudaşlık, Ahlaki egoizm, Erdem, Erdemsizlik

To Memory of my Mother

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Şeref Halil Turan who introduced me Bernard de Mandeville and Scottish Enlightenment and encouraged me to carry out my doctoral research abroad. This dissertation would never have been possible without his endless support, guidance, advices and comments. I would also like to thank the Members of my Examining Committee Prof. Dr. Kurtuluş Dinçer, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Samet Bağçe, Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul Rufayi Turan and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan for their comments and suggestions.

I am also grateful to Dr. Craig Smith for his hospitality, guidance and comments. He provided me with full support during my visit to University of Glasgow. Thanks are also due to my beloved friends Nil Avcı and Özlem Ünlü for their friendship and motivation. Whenever I needed them they were always there for me.

Special thanks are also due to my husband Hakan Çeşmeli for his patience, encouragement and unconditional support. He made things easier for me at every stage of my dissertation. He always helped me to survive the hardship and never gave up believing in me.

Finally, I would like to thank The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for its generous grant, 2214-A International Research Fellowship Programme for Doctoral Students, which provided me with an opportunity to carry out my doctoral research at University of Glasgow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FB I	*The Fable of the Bees Vol I*
FB II	*The Fable of the Bees Vol II*
FT	*By a Society of Ladies: Essays in The Female Tatler*
IBV	*An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*
LD	*A Letter to Dion*
OH	*Inquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*
THN	*A Treatise of Human Nature*
TL	*Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on The Fable of the Bees in Six Letters*
TMS	*The Theory of Moral Sentiments*
WN	*An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Those who read Plato's *Republic* know the most passionate interlocutor in the first book. Thrasymachus, a passionate and vigorous interlocutor, participates in conversation with his radical definition of justice *(dikaiosunê)* and undertakes to unmask hypocrisy and manifest perverted meaning of justice. He represents a serious challenge by defending the thesis that justice is nothing else but the advantage of the stronger. Rulers as stronger body of the society make laws for their advantage and they expect obedience from the ruled. As a "modern Thrasymachus" Bernard Mandeville commits himself to show artificial roots of morality and expose hypocrisy and fraud of mankind.

Mandeville's assertion of selfishness as a primary motivation of man denotes the revival of Hobbesian pessimistic thesis in the eighteenth century. Even if we are familiar to Hobbes's portrayal of man as a selfish being Mandeville's design of a prosperous society composed of vilest characteristics and basest passions of mankind like avarice, envy, pride, love of luxury, prodigality, vanity, jealousy, lust seems to be more radical. It is also interesting that Mandeville acts with suspicion towards underlying motives of every philanthropic conduct.

A famous Mandeville scholar E.J. Hundert nicely presents Mandeville's infamous thesis which he strived to refine and passionately defended throughout his works. For Mandeville, society, says Hundert, "is an aggregation of self-interested individuals necessarily bound to one another neither by their shared

civic commitments nor their moral rectitude, but, paradoxically, by the tenuous bonds of envy, competition and exploitation."[1]

Mandeville's famous paradox "private vices, public benefits" which is also the subtitle of his famous work; *The Fable of the Bees* gives underlying moral motives of emerging commercial society in the eighteenth century. Hateful qualities of mankind like love of luxury, pride, envy, lust, avarice and prodigality lead somehow to prosperous and flourishing societies. Before *The Fable of the Bees* and even his famous poem "Grumbling Hive: or, Knaves *Turn'd Honest*" Mandeville's career starts with *The Pamphleteers: A Satyr* (1703) written in verse style. Immediately afterwards, he published some translations under the title of *Some Fables after the Easie and Familiar Method of Monsieur de la Fontaine* (1703) and then an enlarged version (*Aesop Dress'd*) with addendum of his two fables; "The Carp" and "The Nightingale and Owl" appeared in 1704. As it is seen he was keen on translating and writing parables mainly based upon anthropomorphic and didactic characteristics with moral lessons. Considering the literary genre of his early career it is not surprising to see a didactic story based on figure of the bees in "The Grumbling Hive."

Mandeville published his famous poem "The Grumbling Hive: or Knaves *turn'd Honest*" as a pamphlet in 1705 long before the publication of *The Fable*. He investigates self-regarding motives and selfish moral conduct of human species in it with a metaphoric way of expression. He narrates vicious bees of a prosperous hive by giving moral motivation and private vices and self-interested pursuits of them which eventually turn into general flourishing. Mandeville published the first volume of *The Fable* in 1714. It consisted of "The Grumbling Hive", twenty explanatory Remarks of the poem in prose and an essay entitled

[1] Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees and Other Writings*, ed. E.J. Hundert (Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1997), x.

"An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue." Two more essays appeared in the second edition of *The Fable*'s first volume titled "An Essay on Charity and Charity Schools" and "A Search into the Nature of Society." It is also worth mentioning that before *The Fable*, Mandeville wrote a series of essays in *The Female Tatler* (1709-10). Targeted to Richard Steele's *The Tatler* with its satiric content, *The Female Tatler* was a challenge to civic humanism and virtues which were defended by Isaac Bickerstaff, Esq. in *The Tatler*. Some passages in *The Female Tatler* reveal Mandeville's immature but unaltered views regarding human nature, origin of society, sociability of mankind and inextricability of vice and economic progress in civil society. Mandeville also published series of dialogues between an elderly lady and her niece in *The Virgin Unmask'd* in 1709.[2] Even if it is seen as one of the minor works of him it consists of Mandeville's inquiry on female honour, love, marriage and the role of women in society based on the narration of spokeswomen. It also includes two long stories narrated by Aunt Lucinda to her niece Antonia in order to give a moral lesson in the end.

Mandeville uses dialogue as a literary technique in almost all his works. Dialogues regarding social and moral issues take place between two or more interlocutors. Starting with the second volume of *The Fable* in most of his works Cleomenes and Horatio engage in Mandeville's dialogues in order to speculate and discuss opposed ideas concerning related topics. Most of the time, while Cleomenes represents voice of Mandeville Horatio stands for a representative of *Beau Monde* and a supporter of Lord Shaftesbury.

The roots of Mandeville's selfish theory can be found in moral doctrines of some seventeenth century French philosophers. Earlier, the theme "self-love" came

[2] The original title of this work is *The Virgin Unmask'd: or, Female Dialogues Betwixt an Elderly Maiden Lady, and her Niece, On several Diverting Discourses on Love, Marriage, Memoirs, and Morals, &c. Of the Times.*

into question as a result of sceptical approaches and doctrines of Pierre Bayle, La Rochefoucauld and Pierre Nicole in the seventeenth century. They analysed moral behaviour in order to first manifest then criticize underlying motives of Christian virtue. They all agreed that public approval was at the bottom of virtuous acts. From their sceptical point of view, men do not act out of virtuous motives. Since they always seek for approval and applause in society their acts, genuinely empty of moral content, is masked victoriously. Mandeville's purpose is precisely same with French sceptic philosophers. Having inhaled the sceptical air, Mandeville questions real motives behind our moral conduct. He sets to work by anatomizing passions at the first stage. He informs his readers that unlike most writers who "are always teaching Men what they should be, and hardly ever trouble their Heads with telling them what they really are" he himself aims to give anatomy of passions by identifying how they in the first place are excited and then govern mankind (FB I; 39). To this end, he focuses on self-regarding passions of mankind and engages in showing their favourable effects on society. More importantly, he questions moral justification of commercial world by giving *sine qua non* moral dynamics of modern societies throughout both volumes of *The Fable*.

Is it possible to enjoy comforts of life and indulge in luxury and at the same time act out of virtuous motives? The very beginning of *The Fable*'s first volume serves as Mandeville's answer to this crucial question. For him, this is out of question. Accordingly, he designs his fable within this scope with the purpose of showing how vicious passions of individuals lead to a prosperous society. In other words, his satire serves the purpose of showing how "Vileness of the Ingredients that all together compose the wholesome Mixture of a well order'd society" (FB I; 6). As all fables show folly of mankind and urge people to self-analysis and lessoning in the end, in that vein, Mandeville exposes how ridiculous and unreasonable to desire for living in a flourishing society and pursue all benefits and still

complain and grumble about vices. At the same time, Mandeville wishes that after reading this fable when people look at the mirror they should bewail and regret.

It is known that Mandeville's early writings and even the first edition *The Fable* attracted little attention but after with the inclusion of "An Essay on Charity and Charity Schools" and "A Search into the Nature of Society" in its second edition Mandeville became the target of severe criticisms and attacks of his contemporaries. Most of the eighteenth century scholars like William Law, Richard Fiddes, John Dennis, George Bluet, Francis Hutcheson and Bishop Berkeley criticized him not only for extolling and advocating but also encouraging vices such as luxury, lust, avarice, envy and vanity. Besides, he was accused of mocking Christian charity. E.J. Hundert states that "*The Fable of the Bees* decisively shaped the Enlightenment's encounter with what Mandeville insisted were the unique and uniquely disturbing paradoxes of modernity."[3] Therefore, not only Mandeville's contemporaries but also next generation engaged in defeating his doctrines concerning moral psychology, social, political and religious theories.

Hutcheson, as one of the most passionate critics of Mandeville, establishes his theory of moral sense in *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* before his direct attack to Mandeville's notorious theses. As he is entirely opposed to moral egoism propounded by Mandeville in *The Fable* he defends mankind's capacity for benevolent actions whose roots can be found in disinterested motives and judgments of them. He also published six letters consisting of his critiques on Hobbes's view concerning laughter and Mandeville's doctrines about nature of morality and adherent relationship

[3] Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees and Other Writings*, xix.

between private vices and public benefits. These letters were later compiled under the head of *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees*.

After Hutcheson, David Hume presents his theory of passions and mechanism of sympathy in *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Although like Mandeville he engages in dissecting passions for proper ground of morals he puts some distance between his and Mandeville's theory regarding the origin of moral distinctions. He investigates artificial roots of virtue and vice which was stated earlier in *The Fable*. Hume discusses Mandeville's characterisation of virtue and vice as the inventions of skilful politicians and maintains that human beings have natural capacity for moral approbation and blame. On the other hand, it is significant to state an aspect of Hume's theory which would exactly be the source of inspiration for Smith theory of morals. In *Treatise* Hume propounds a theory of sympathy based on communication of sentiments between actor and spectator.

Along with Hutcheson and Hume, Adam Smith focuses on the nature of sentiments and he comes up with a theory regarding morals based upon sympathy. In *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (TMS) sympathy is identified as the basis of our moral judgments. His design of sympathy first directs to prove that human beings cannot be supposed entirely selfish like Mandeville asserted before in *The Fable* and secondly, shows that sympathy as a fellow-feeling with others' sentiments, not limited to feeling of pity and commiseration, cannot be originated from a selfish principle. He generates a framework based on sympathetic identification and with crucial elements like power of imagination and the idea of impartial spectator he aspires to have a firm basis for the origin of morality.

In TMS, Smith discusses some basic points of Mandeville's theory in a chapter entitled as "Of Licentious Systems." He criticizes Mandeville's rigorism regarding morals and also accuses him of annihilating the difference between

vice and virtue in *The Fable*. However, Smith's portrayal of sympathy as the basis of moral judgments in TMS and self-interest as the basic motive in *The Wealth of Nations* (WN) has been disputed over a century. Did Smith change his mind after the publication of TMS? Does he investigate two separate aspects of human nature in TMS and WN? Is Smith's self-interest as a motivating force of economic agent in WN said to be revival of Mandevillean egoism? If not, does Smith appropriate Mandeville's moral egoism? The aim of this study is to examine Mandeville's proposal regarding human nature and morals and then look into counter-views propounded by important figures of Scottish Enlightenment like Hutcheson, Hume and Smith. Besides, it also aims to investigate in what respects Smith' moral theory bears resemblance to Mandeville's theory and differs from it.

For this purpose, the following chapter is about Mandeville's analysis of basic motivating force of mankind both in the state of nature and civil society. Besides, in order to make Mandeville's famous expression "skilful politicians" clear, first his view concerning the origin of moral distinctions in both volumes of *The Fable* and then differing views of contemporary Mandeville scholars will be discussed. Following differing views, the most reasonable account will be identified. This chapter also covers artificial roots of virtue depicted in the first volume of *The Fable*, Mandeville's inquiry on possibility of virtue and Mandeville's theory of sociability against Anthony Ashley Cooper (Lord Shaftesbury) as well as anatomy of some useful vices given in "The Grumbling Hive."

Chapter III and IV focus on Francis Hutcheson and David Hume in order to gain insight about theories of "moral sense" and "sympathy." First, Hutcheson's doctrine of moral sense and theory of benevolence will be analysed with reference to *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* and then the grounds which lead to his antagonism to Mandeville and his rejection of Mandeville's moral egoism will be examined in the light of *Thoughts on Laughter*

and Observations on the Fable of the Bees. In chapter IV, the theory of passions and mechanism of sympathy propounded by Hume in *A Treatise of Human Nature* will be expounded and then in the next chapter within the scope of Hume's mechanism of sympathy, details of Adam Smith's theory of sympathy will be discussed.

Chapter V is devoted to gain a general overview on Adam Smith's moral philosophy (his theory of sympathy, imagination, impartial spectator, virtue) and his reaction to selfish hypothesis of Mandeville which is specifically mentioned in "Of Licentious Systems". It also includes a part which gives Smith's view about the consequences of vanity and emulation in the society with a parable about poor man's son and an emphasis of a specific chapter added in the sixth edition of TMS under the title of "Of the Corruption of our Moral Sentiments." This chapter also analyses the origin of famous "The Adam Smith Problem" from points of various Smith scholars. Given contemporary solutions to the problem and definition of self-love and self-interest in TMS and WN a new frame will be formed and a comparison will be made between Smith's and Mandeville's views about self-regarding passions. Furthermore, the significance of a new part entitled "Of the Character of Virtue" which added in the sixth edition of TMS before Smith's death will be presented. By this way, Smith's moral prescription to harmful moral effects of commercial society will be examined with a special emphasis on his four virtues given in this new part: prudence, beneficence, justice and self-command. Finally, this chapter will be concluded by aligning the results arrived through contrasting and comparing moral theories of Adam Smith and Bernard Mandeville.

CHAPTER II

BERNARD MANDEVILLE ON HUMAN NATURE AND ORIGIN OF MORALITY

2.1. The Dark Side of Human Nature

It is widely known that Mandeville owes his notoriety to one of his theses that all human beings are selfish and any actions out of altruism spring from selfishness. As mentioned before, this meant for Mandeville's contemporaries a dark picture which portrayed entirely selfish human beings aggregating in the society for their selfish ends. In this sense, both volumes of *The Fable* and also *Inquiry into the Origin of Honor and the Usefulness of Christianity in War* give Mandeville's notorious account regarding nature of mankind. He sketches a picture which describes underlying motives of all civilized and uncivilized acts of human society. As well as his selfish theory, Mandeville's motto; private vice, public benefits, was completely opposed to accepted doctrines in the eighteenth century moral and religious discourse. His attempt to unearth the dark side of human nature and his relentless effort for positing mankind as driven solely by selfish passions and motives despite harsh criticisms and accusations indicate that he does not have faith in mankind's natural capacity for genuinely virtuous and altruistic actions. Mandeville addresses the significance of selfish nature of mankind in the second volume of *The Fable*:

> Man centers every thing in himself and neither loves nor hates, but for his own Sake. Every individual is a little World by itself, and all Creatures, as far as their Understanding and Abilities will let them, endeavour to make that Self happy: This in all of them is the

> continual Labour, and seems to be the whole Design of Life (FB II; 178).

Mandeville tries to show how passions govern mankind and how the self becomes the object of all these passions throughout his entire corpus. He questions underlying motives of our actions and shows that primary interest of mankind is nothing short of pleasing himself. Either educated or uneducated, says Mandeville, man acts in accordance with his selfish instincts even seemingly altruistic act of man springs from self-regarding passions. Then question arises: how is it possible for an altruistic act to emanate from a selfish instinct or passion? As an answer, Mandeville states that while helping others who are in need seems to be an altruistic behaviour, in fact we help others out of pity and compassion in order to relieve our feelings of anxiety and uneasiness. Sometimes it is an unconditioned and instinctive behaviour. For instance, as an eyewitness of a three year-old girl's crying and screaming due to approach of an enormous and starveling animal toward her, regardless of who, everybody will naturally attempt to offset the danger and rescue baby from the possible attack. Such an unconditioned behaviour, says Mandeville, does not indicate that it originates from virtue or feeling of humanity. As even "a Highwayman, a House Breaker or a Murderer" is not bereft of this feeling of uneasiness, it would be wrong to presume it to be done out of virtuous and altruistic motives (FB I; 256).

Besides that, in "An Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools" Mandeville defines charity as one of the varieties of selfish moral conduct that seems to be done out of feeling of commiseration or pity consisting in sympathy for calamities and tragedies of others. It is, however, done again in order to relieve the feeling of uneasiness and disturbance caused by seeing a fellow creature in a destitute and miserable condition or situation. For instance, when a beggar asks for alms he brings his bodily deformity and disability into the forefront in order to raise our pity and commiseration, overdraws misfortunes and agonies happen to him in

heart-wrenching manner and puts his prayers out for us. At the same time he is also well-qualified in flattering our pride with exaggerated words. As a result, we give alms in order to relieve our distress and beside this, it is an undeniable fact that we feel a secret pleasure for being flattered with groundless compliments. This is the reason that "thousands give Money to Beggars from the same Motive as they pay their Corn-cutter, to walk easy" (FB I; 259). [4]

Similarly, acts of an educated man also spring from self-love because his good acts are either from love of praise or fear of blame. Mandeville sketches a portrait of a gentleman in the second volume of *The Fable*. In this way he, as a matter of fact, intends to expose how hidden passion of excessive love of ourselves quite in a different shape lies behind genteel behaviour, politeness and good-breeding and how it is accomplishedly kept hidden owing to strong desire and need for praise, approval and applause and in other respects fear of shame in the society. Therefore, it seems that all apparent acts are done either in order to satisfy natural selfish impulses, or of the self-regarding passion of pride.

Mandeville also goes further and claims that even a mother's love of her infant is a passion like others which "center in Self-Love, so it may be subdued by any Superior Passion, to sooth that same Self-Love, which if nothing had interven'd would have bid her fondle her Offspring" (FB I; 75). This quotation first makes the reader think that how Mandeville draws such a sharp conclusion regardless of thinking a mother's love as selfless. But he goes in further detail and maintains that emotional attachment between mother and baby is not so powerful during pregnancy. It follows that women feel natural love after birth instead of pregnancy period. Even if after birth, states Mandeville, mother's love is still

[4] Malcolm Jack states that for Mandeville "pity is an indulgence, an act of self-satisfaction and there is therefore nothing inherently virtuous about acts that result from it." Malcolm Jack, *Corruption and Progress: The Eighteenth Century Debate* (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 48.

weak, the level of her love increases after the signs of baby's expression or manifestation of its feelings and its response to the affection of mother. It seems that for Mandeville even a natural affection of a mother disguises the idea of pleasing herself.

In the second volume of *The Fable*, we see a more detailed analysis of self-regarding nature of human beings in the sense that Mandeville draws his readers' attention to fine details by distinguishing self-love from self-liking specifically in the Third Dialogue. He underlines the fact that although self-love and self-liking are innate in human beings, self-love is an instinct for self-preservation and self-liking arises from overvaluing ourselves and it is a strong desire to be approved and esteemed. Approval and applause of others reinforce and strengthen the feeling of self-liking. Cleomenes, spokesman for Mandeville most of the time, says the following:

> Self-love was given to all Animals, at least, the most perfect, for Self-Preservation, is not disputed; but as no Creature can love what it dislikes, it is necessary, moreover, that every one should have a real liking to its own Being, superior to what they have to any other (FB II; 129).

Due to Horatio's curiosity regarding the distinction between self-love and self-liking, Cleomenes elaborates the subject and explains why they do not encapsulate one another.[5] His conviction is that every creature has an instinct to preserve itself and at the same time it has esteem for itself and overvalues itself. This instinct although also possessed by animals with different degrees of

[5] Kaye gives a footnote about Mandeville's distinction between self-love and self-liking and mentions the possibility that Bishop Butler's criticisms may have possibly made Mandeville distinguish self-love from self-liking (FB II; 129). Elsewhere, another author also elaborates the issue regarding Mandeville's distinction between self-love and self-liking with reference to Bishop Butler that according to him Mandeville refines his theory in the second volume of *The Fable* after Bishop Butler's objection. Jerrold Seigel, *The Idea of the Self: Thought and Experience in Western Europe since the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 115-6.

perfection is manifested in man "with Diffidence, arising from Consciousness or at least an Apprehension" (FB II; 130). This is the reason why man needs good opinions of others and is keen on approval of them. Mandeville emphasizes the fact that "whatever Nature's Design was in bestowing this Self-liking on Creatures; and, whether, it has been given to other Animals besides ourselves or not, it is certain, that in our own Species every individual Person likes himself better than he does any other" (FB II; 137).

As Malcolm Jack mentions in *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, unreflective behaviour is differentiated from purposive one in *The Fable* that "the former explains causally by way of a mechanical theory of passions; the latter he explains in terms of motives which stir people to act."[6]In this sense, self-love as an instinct of self-preservation fits into first explanation and self-liking which motivates and directs men to gain applause and approval is the spring of purposive behaviour. Since self-liking seems to direct someone to purposive act, at times because of its strength it overrides the instinct of self-preservation that in the first volume of *The Fable* Lucretia's suicide is given as an example of this instinct. Mandeville holds the idea that even if famous Roman heroine's stance and courageous defence against physical abuse at the risk of her life shows that she highly esteems her virtue, her suicide after her tarnished reputation is "a certain sign that she valued her Virtue less than her Glory, and her life less than either" (FB I; 210). In *The Origin of Honour* the discussion concerning the distinction between self-liking from self-love turns out eventually the same as is the case with suicide of Lucretia.[7]

[6] Malcolm Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville* (New York: Garland, 1987), 79.

[7] See also Mandeville's comments on suicide in *Origin of Honor* (OH; 3).

Although Mandeville's definition of self-liking makes his readers think it as the dominant passion of individual in civil society, he portrays different manifestations of self-liking in the state of nature as well as in civil society in the second volume of *The Fable*. The instinct of self-liking manifests itself in the shape of "desire for superiority" in a savage state unless savage man is destitute of things what is necessary for his sustenance. Mandeville says the following:

> Man himself in a savage State, feeding on Nuts and Acorns, and *destitute of all outward Ornaments, would have infinitely less Temptation, as well as Opportunity, of shewing this Liking of himself, than he was when civiliz'd;* yet if a hundred Males of the first, all equally free, were together, within less than half an Hour, this Liking in question, though their Bellies were full, would appear in the Desire of Superiority, that would be shewn among them; and the most vigorous, either in Strength or Understanding, or both, would be the first, that would display it. If, as suppos'd, they were all untaught, this would breed Contention, and there would certainly be War before there could be any Agreement among them; unless one of them had some one or more visible Excellencies above the rest. I said *Males*, and *their Bellies full*; because if they had Women among them, or wanted Food, their Quarrel might begin on another Account. (FB II; 132, emphasis added.)

Thus, in the state of nature self-love as an instinct of self-preservation makes savage man do everything for his sustenance, protection and security. On the other hand, self-liking makes him "seek for Opportunities, by Gestures, Looks and Sounds, to display the Value that he has for himself" (FB II; 133). He is keen on being at the centre of others' attention and has strong desire to be approved and appreciated.

As for advantages of self-liking, apparently Horatio does not find any benefits of self-liking to men either in savage or civilized state and wonders whether it is possible for Cleomenes to give any instances regarding any benefits of self-liking. Although it is quite understandable for Horatio the advantages of self-love that

the instincts of self-preservation prompt man to act for his safety and maintenance he seems a little sceptical about advantages of self-liking. First, Cleomenes reminds him of a significant point which is really important in the sense that it takes us to the initial thesis of Mandeville that "many virtues […] may be counterfeited to gain Applause, and the good Qualities a Man of Sense in great Fortune may acquire, by the sole Help and Instigation of his Pride" (FB II; 134). Then, he starts to mention the advantages of self-liking. Although Cleomenes's panegyrics that gratification of self-liking is useful for health because it causes pleasure and satisfaction, Horatio's contention regarding self-liking is exactly the opposite that in any society as it leads to disappointments, sorrows and misfortunes because men definitely suffer from this passion. Cleomenes goes on with a further statement regarding self-liking:

> It is so necessary to the Well-being of those that have been used to indulge it […] It doubles our Happiness in Prosperity, and buoys us up against the Frowns of adverse Fortune. It is the Mother of Hopes, and the End as well as the Foundation of our best Wishes: It is the strongest Armour against despair (FB II, 135-6).

On the other hand, as Cleomenes states if our self-liking ceases then, "all our Hopes are extinct, and we can form no Wishes but for the Dissolution of our Frame" (FB II; 136). In the Third Dialogue of the second volume of *The Fable*, as the conversation between these two interlocutors advance they touch upon another significant subject. Following Cleomenes's elaboration of self-liking, Horatio draws the conclusion that self-liking is synonymous with pride. In fact just like Horatio's conclusion, initially in Remark M of the first volume of *The Fable* Mandeville defines pride as a dominant passion of human beings which arises from overvaluing oneself more than any impartial person could value or appreciate. In other words, it purports excessive self-esteem.

It is important to remind that even if Mandeville seems to give same definition about pride and self-liking he treats them as if they are not same and gives the difference between them with respect to the severity of self-regarding passion in second volume of *The Fable* and *The Origin of Honor*. In the second volume, the spokesman for Mandeville maintains that self-liking is the cause of pride. The very similar conversation between Cleomenes and Horatio takes place in *The Origin of Honor* with some additional details and nuances that pride is defined as excessive mode of self-liking[8], it, says Cleomenes, arises "when this self-liking is excessive and so openly shown as to give offence to others […] it is counted a Vice and call'd Pride" (OH; 3). He also reminds the fact that "when it is kept out of sight, or it is so well disguis'd as not to appear in its own Colours, it has no Name, tho' Men act from that and no other Principle" (Ibid). Here, again he warns Horatio that assuming self-liking and pride as synonymous means to confuse the cause with the effect. This clearly means that self-liking which is a natural instinct excites desire for approval and good opinions of others about us when it is well-regulated but if it is immoderate and may cause displeasure to someone or blame it is called pride. This indicates that same cause may lead different effects.[9]

Because of Horatio's curiosity about why some people are affected in different degree by the same passion and dominance of pride in some people than others, Cleomenes sheds some light on this subject that although we are born with this passion; in other words, it belongs to our nature, we differ from each other in physical and sensual qualities. Likewise, the reason of difference in degrees of

[8] Malcolm Jack states that Mandeville's description of self-liking as desire for approval and applause and pride as excessive mode of self-liking seems to be "a slight refinement" of the usage of amor propre in French tradition. Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 8.

[9] See also Hector Monro, *The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), 117.

pride can be ascribed to circumstances and education.[10] The crucial point, says Cleomenes:

> Where passions are most gratify'd and least controul'd, the Indulgence makes them stronger; whereas those Persons, that have been kept under, and whose Thoughts have never been kept under, and whose Thoughts have never been at Liberty to rove beyond the first Necessaries of life; such as have not been suffer'd or had no Opportunity to gratify this Passion, have commonly the least share of it (FB II; 122).

Mandeville, all in all, underlines the significance of managing our passions and in order to achieve a desirable progress he puts emphasis on education which should be started in early developmental stage. He claims that "[t]he Rules […] consist in a dexterous Management of ourselves, a stifling of our Appetites and *hiding the real sentiments of our Hearts* before others" (FB I; 68; emphasis added). It seems bizarre to the sceptical interlocutor that education, then, serves the purpose of making man accomplished at in hiding the external signs of pride. However, Cleomenes clarifies that education does not mean any restraints or restrictions on our pride but rather it purports to indulge this passion out of sight or learn to disguise the unconcealed signs of pride with a secret pride. Symbols of pride are quite apparent in our appearance, expression, attitude and behaviour because they are in "a prancing Horse or a strutting Turkey-cock" (FB II; 125). They can easily be observed by other people and seen as detestable in the society. Therefore, the crucial thing to be done is to "substitute other Symptoms, equally evident with the first, but less offensive and more beneficial to others" (FB II;

[10] In the second volume of *The Fable* Mandeville mentions that although both untaught man in the state of nature and civilized one are affected with the same passions as well, the degree of gratification to them differs. Mandeville maintains that "Well-bred people behave themselves in the Choice of Diet and the taking of their Repastes, very differently from Savages; so they do in their Amours; but Hunger and Lust are the same in both. An artful man, nay, the greatest Hypocrite, whatever his Behaviour is abroad, may love his Wife and Children at his Heart, and the sincerest Man can do no more. My business is to demonstrate to you, that the good Qualities Men compliment our Nature and the whole Species with, are the Result of Art and Education" (FB II; 305-6).

126). These symptoms are sometimes nice cloths, ornaments, furnishings and equipages and sometimes titles by which we can make ourselves admired and esteemed by others.

Besides, in the second volume, as Mandeville's intention is to show how imperfections of man can be well-hidden, so the Second Dialogue starts with his spokesman's sketch of a portrait of a gentleman. Cleomenes gives general characteristics of him that "[t]ho' Money is his [Gentleman] Idol, and he is covetous in his Heart, yet his inward Avarice is forc'd to give way to his outward Liberality, and an open Generosity shines through his Actions"(FB II; 63). Horatio objects this portrayal because depicting human nature utterly wicked and looking for hidden motives under all actions sounds as if sketching a caricature rather than a portrait. Then, Cleomenes enunciates his real aim of drawing such a portrait as to demonstrate how "a most beautiful Superstructure may be rais'd upon a rotten and despicable Foundation" (FB II; 64). He asserts that pride as the dominant passion, makes this superstructure possible. Men always have strong desire to be thought of well and approved by others and strive for being admired and applauded by others. It is also the vainglory instead of benevolence, good sense or feeling of humanity which forces us to control or govern all other passions. We want to keep hidden all our hateful appetites and passions including excessive self-liking and at the same time it is possible to conceal all these passions by means of pride. Therefore, an artful education which necessarily requires great pains to restrain and conceal the feeling of pride makes possible for one to be accepted into society.

However, starting with the statement that there lies pride at the bottom of every action with a strong habit of hypocrisy is obviously against Horatio's better judgment because taking this into account necessitates us to agree on that "the most noble, the most gallant, and the best-bred Man would be the proudest;

which is so clashing with daily experience that the very reverse is true" (FB I; 65). On the other hand, the significant point Cleomenes in fact tries to express and also in the first volume earlier Mandeville already highlighted is that what really matters is to hide all passions including pride under the mask of good manners, good breeding and politeness instead of subduing them.

The origin of good manners and politeness, says Mandeville, is based upon the main instinct that every individual is endowed with viz. self-liking. More precisely, assuming man in a savage state, Mandeville claims that it is indispensable for two equals, to express the symptoms of high value for themselves because external symptoms of self-liking cannot be suppressed or kept hidden. As for the negative effects of this passion; that is to say, disturbance and uneasiness "whatever Strugglings and unsuccessful Tryals to remedy them might precede, must necessarily produce at long run, what we call good Manners and Politeness" (FB II; 138).

As mentioned earlier Mandeville states throughout his works that we naturally value ourselves more than anyone else in the world therefore esteem for others can never excel the high opinion for ourselves. But in the society, the esteem which we pretend to have for others, which is in fact not genuine but factitious is named as "good manners and good-breeding." Mandeville characterizes that "this laudable quality is commonly known by the name of good Manners and Good-breeding, and consists in a Fashionable Habit, acquir'd by Precept and Example, of flattering the Pride and Selfishness of others, and concealing our own with Judgment and Dexterity" (FB I; 77).

Thus, in the light of Mandeville's definition of good-manners and good-breeding a gentleman can be sketched as a man who is known for his genteel and courteous manners in the society and at the same time can also be described who is successful to hide his pride well enough that nobody could realize his genuine

motives for his genteel behaviour. Both volumes of *The Fable* include Mandeville's portrayal of the characteristics of a gentleman one of which is depicted in Remark C in the first volume and the other is narrated by Cleomenes in the second one. But specifically in Remark C, Mandeville tries to differentiate virtue from good manners. He marks off good breeding with the following statement that "Virtue bids us subdue, but good Breeding *only* requires we should hide our Appetites" (FB I; 72; emphasis added).

He points out the fact that even if a gentleman and vulgar can have same violent inclinations to a woman, a gentleman never behaves in this manner but quite in a different way: his introduction and presentation himself to lady's father, his attempts to gain lady's appreciation and admiration end up with a marriage or a romantic relationship. So, nobody questions what is going on between the young couple because it is generally considered that they do nothing to be ashamed of. This portrayal, says Mandeville, demonstrates that "by being well bred, we suffer no Abridgement in our sensual pleasures, but only labour for our mutual Happiness and assist each other in the luxurious Enjoyment of all worldly Comforts" (FB I; 73). The problem about this alleged fine gentleman is that he is not as sincere as a savage man regarding the practice of self-denial. In addition, he "gratifies his Appetites after the manner the Custom of the Country allows of, has no Censure to fear" (Ibid). As Mandeville emphasizes in the second volume of *The Fable*, the doctrine of good manners encapsulates various principles by which we can hide outward signs of pride instead of conquest it.

In the Second Dialogue of the second volume, Mandeville gives wide coverage to the picture of a gentleman, resident of a magnificent house with not only a vast garden full of nice and delightful objects but also tremendous furnishings, art collections and sculptures indoors which are manifestations of its owner's opulence. Besides, there is nothing ill-natured and abhorrent in his manners and

it is not possible to observe any rudeness or obscenity in his gestures and language. He is also so attentive about his appearance with temperate but nice cloths as well as having admirable characteristics like being charitable to the poor and generous to his employees, having strong bond of friendship with his neighbours, tenants and subordinates. What is more, he does have great accomplishments in his business life due to his sense of punctuality, discretion and justice.

For Horatio, such a design of a gentleman gives rise to strong admiration because of fine mixture of material well-being, appearance and certain character traits. Even so, Cleomenes's main purpose of portraying such a gentleman with an admirable character is to expose how a nice superstructure can be raised on a rotten foundation, in other words; how our seemingly good actions can originate from ill principles. It is his conviction that "such a clear and beautiful Stream could flow from so mean and muddy a Spring as an excessive Thirst after Praise, and an immoderate Desire of general Applause from the most knowing judges" (FB II; 74-5). But with a firm resolution and perseverance, all appetites which are subordinate to our pride can be subdued in every case. In fact, a gentleman either conceals his pride and his strong desire for applause or he is very accomplished to master these passions by covering them skilfully. Mandeville gives the hypocrisy of a courtier as an example that

> when he appears in State, assumes an Air of Modesty and Good Humour; and while he is ready to burst with Vanity, seems to be wholly Ignorant of his Greatness; well knowing, that those lovely Qualities must heighten him in the Esteem of others, and be an addition to that Grandeur, which the Coronets about his Coach and Harnesses, with the rest of his Equipage, cannot fail to proclaim without his Assistance (FB I; 132).

This quotation implies Mandeville's contention that if it is concealed well, pride fails to be noticed by others. Mandeville also mentions the significance of

necessary steps for "a moderate education" in the Fourth Dialogue of the second volume. After pointing out again the necessity of early education he gives some rules for good manners[11]:

> In a tolerable Education, we are so industriously and so assiduously instructed, from our most early Infancy, in the Ceremonies of bowing, and pulling off Hats, and other Rules of Behavior; that even before we are Men we hardly look upon a mannerly Deportment as a Thing acquired, or think Conversation to be a Science. Thousand things are call'd easy and natural in Postures and Motions, as well as Speaking and Writing, that have caus'd infinite Pains to others as well as ourselves, and which we know to be the Product of Art" (FB II; 149-50).[12]

Mandeville also states that it is crucial to learn how to pretend to value for others rather than ourselves. Although taking off hat or saying "your humble servant" are considered as signs of civility they are, in fact, originated from flattery.

> These are evident signs and convincing proofs to a superior, that we have a mean Opinion of ourselves in respect to him, that we are at his Mercy, and have no thought to resist, much less to attack him; and therefore it is highly probable, that saying, Your Servant, and pulling off the Hat, were at first Demonstrations of Obedience to those that claim'd it (FB II; 151-2).

---

[11] In the Sixth Dialogue of second volume of *The Fable* Cleomenes mentions significance of early education by indicating similarities between horses and human beings (FB II; 270).

[12] While teaching good manners the art of flattery is a part of education because it has a bewitching effect on mankind. Children and fools are affected and easily believe praise but ingenious or clever ones have to be directed with tact and circumspection and "the more general the Flattery is, the less it is suspected by those it is levell'd at" (FB I; 52). Like politicians, teachers and parents flatter or praise their children and students while educating them. In this manner, children are easily managed and they learn how to perform an action properly. Mandeville illustrates that "When an aukward Girl, before she can either Speak or Go, begins after many Intreaties to make the first rude Essays of Curt'sying, the Nurse falls in an ecstasy of Praise […] The same is echo'd over by the Maids, whilst Mama almost hugs the Child to pieces; only Miss *Molly*, who being four Years older knows how to make a very handsome Curt'sy […] These extravagant Praises would by any one, above the Capacity of an Infant, be call'd fulsome Flatteries, and, if you will, abominable Lies, yet Experience teaches us, that by the help of such gross Encomiums, young Mises will be brought to make pretty Curt'sies, and behave themselves womanly much sooner, and with less trouble, than they would without them" (FB I; 53-4).

Besides, the art of good manners is not limited to a number of ceremonies or addressing mentioned above. Our superiors, says Mandeville, receive several titles like Grace, Highness, Lord, Sir, Monarch which are the actual indicators of our compliments and also good methods to disguise our pride.

Mandeville likens the simple stratagem of act of leaping applied when throwing a projectile to good manners and genteel behaviour in the way that men find themselves jumping without being aware of any scientific explanation about how leaping is made use of while throwing an object in the same vein men who practice good manners in the society never consider the origin of politeness and even know its real worth for society (FB II; 141).

It still very hard for Horatio to believe such kind of man acting out of excellency of his nature and possessing many virtues in fact has self-regarding motives. This leads him to question the rarity of virtuous individual because it is quite apparent from the portrait of a gentleman that it seems impossible to act out of good motives and qualities. Cleomenes, spokesman for Mandeville, mounts an argument concerning vicious motives of a fine gentleman in order to convince Horatio that most people may be ignorant about underlying motives they act from. In early education with the help of reward, punishment and fear of shame we are taught how to put precepts of others first instead of following our inclinations and appetites. Earlier in the first volume of *The Fable* Mandeville defines shame as opposite passion of pride and states that these two passions "in which the seeds of most virtues are contained, are realities in our Frame" (FB I; 67). It is the sense of shame, states Mandeville, which makes mankind sociable and has the seeds of politeness (FB I; 67).[13]

[13] Nicholas Phillipson states that "[f]or Mandeville all our passions, benevolent and selfish alike, had a single purpose: to serve and gratify our pride and what he later called 'self-liking', and it was pride and its companion, shame that explained the ultimate paradox of human nature --- that man,

Furthermore, if good and polite manners become habits, in the course of time one may forget the underlying motives of his actions. There are two reasons for this forgetfulness: The first one is that "Pride blinds the Understanding in Men of Sense and great Parts as well as in others, and the greater Value we may reasonably set upon ourselves, the fitter we are to swallow the grossest Flatteries in spight of all our Knowledge and Abilities in other Matters" (FB II; 79). The second reason is that it is hardly probable for most of us to be able to search into ourselves and have courage to dig our real motives. In addition to such an ability, willingness is also essential but even so, "enquiring within, and boldly searching into ones own Bosom, must be the most shocking Employment, that a Man can give his Mind to, whose greatest Pleasure consists in secretly admiring himself" (FB II; 80).

2.2. Mandeville's Skilful Politicians

After revealing selfish nature of man, Mandeville touches upon another significant subject. He questions the possibility to govern or canalize selfish instincts and inclinations in "An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue" included in first volume of *The Fable*. He maintains that although human beings are selfish it is possible to make them tractable by a dominant power; therefore in this way they might be easily subjugated in a proper way. Unless there are constraints, states Mandeville, men like untaught animals will be concerned with following their own inclinations or satisfying their natural appetites regardless of consequences. So, it was considered as the task of lawgivers and other wise men to use the idea of "man's superiority" to animals and make mankind believe that there is a reward in return for their practice of self-denial. Lawgivers convinced

---

the most selfish and wilful of animals, was also the most sociable and docile" Nicholas Phillipson, *Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life* (England: Penguin Books, 2011), 48.

mankind to believe that "it was more beneficial for everybody to conquer than indulge his Appetites and much better to mind the public than what seemed his private interest" (FB I; 42).

As a result of circumspection, careful and intimate examination of man's nature and also with the help of eulogies to human species, lawgivers and moralists succeeded to enchant human beings. Lawgivers achieved their goals by using a powerful instrument; flattery:

> Making use of this bewitching Engine, they extoll'd the Excellency of our Nature above other Animals, and setting forth with unbounded Praises the Wonders of our Sagacity and Vastness of Understanding, bestow'd a thousand Encomiums on the Rationality of our Souls, by the Help of which we are capable of performing the most noble Atchievements (FB I; 43).[14]

Furthermore, they exercised influence over men with a story which had a certain stimulative power on them. The story depicted by them was about two completely different groups of human species. The first group comprised of low-minded people who ran after "immediate Enjoyment, were wholly incapable of Self-denial and without regard to the good of others, had no higher Aim than their private Advantage" and the other kind, unlike members of the first group, consisted of high-spirited people who were able to perform self-restraint and master their natural appetites instead of indulging them (FB I; 44). The members of this group were

[14] Mandeville gives the art of flattery as an example in Roman and Greek Empires. He propounds that despite excessive number of their deities they instructed people how to conquest their appetites and passions and made them recognize magnanimity, courage, resolution with the help of self-denial. According to Mandeville this indicates that even in a pagan society without divine moral law, effective policy may contribute to rise of moral virtues (FB I; 51). In *Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life* Phillipson maintains that " [i]t was a story about 'the witchcraft of flattery', about the never-ending comedy of lives devoted to exploiting others and discovering that we have been exploited in return, about the way in which we become caught in a web of culture and language that ensnares and socializes us all." Phillipson, *Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life*, 48.

> free from sordid Selfishness, esteem'd the Improvements of the Mind to be their fairest Possessions and setting a true value upon themselves took no Delight but in embellishing that Part in which their Excellency consisted […] and making a continual War with themselves to promote the Peace of others, aimed at no less than the Publick Welfare and the Conquest of their own Passion (Ibid).

By this means, lawgivers and other wise men imposed socially approvable and blameable characteristics upon mankind. Although, states Mandeville, man is not separable from his essence that is to say, he is "extraordinary selfish and headstrong as well as cunning" and knows how to conceal and hide it subtly, it is hardly possible for many of them to conquest and master natural appetites and inclinations. Since, only men in the second class who are courageous enough to endure many inconveniencies and torments accomplish to master their natural appetites, handle and overcome their natural inclinations, prefer the good of other in defiance of their self-interests (Ibid). Even though it was a long slog, the lawgivers would not fall back

> an Inch from the fine Notions they had receiv'd concerning the Dignity of Rational Creatures; and having ever the Authority of the Government on their side, with all imaginable Vigour assert the esteem that was due to those of the second Class, as well as their Superiority over the rest of their kind (FB I; 45).

The ones who only indulged and only satisfied their appetites were also stamped as same with others but "whenever they check'd their Inclinations or but followed them with more Circumspection, they avoided a world of Troubles, and often escaped many of the Calamities that generally attended the too eager Pursuit after Pleasure" (FB I; 47). As depicted by Mandeville, after their enchanting exhortations and sermons related to public-spiritedness, politicians collected the fruits of self-denial. The lawgivers having gift of persuasion also offered reward for those who preferred the good of others instead of their own. In other words, self-denial or restraining natural inclinations was successfully

rewarded by them. They organized society through the instruction of honour as the highest good and shame as the worst of all evils. Hence, those who acted for public good were rewarded by honour and those who indulge and gratify appetites and desires rather than the good of others were punished by shame. Therefore, says Mandeville, moral virtues, imposed upon by "skilful politicians" were "political offspring which flattery begot upon pride" (FB I; 51). In other words, politicians made use of dominant passion of human nature in order to maintain the order and the safety of society for their own ends.

This recalls a similar theory to mind that Mandeville's thesis regarding the artificial origin of morality bears a resemblance to the governing idea which had been defended passionately by Thrasymachus in the *Republic*. In the first book Thrasymachus mounts an argument that morality was an artefact and it served for the advantage of ruling class. Echoing Thrasymachus, Mandeville plainly states that "the first Rudiments of Morality, broach'd by skilful Politicians, to render Men useful to each other as well as tractable, were chiefly contrived that the Ambitious might reap the more Benefit from, and govern vast Numbers of them with the greater Ease and Security" (FB I; 47).[15]

In the second volume of *The Fable*, Mandeville rather gives an evolutionary account regarding morals.[16]At the end of the Fourth Dialogue he gives a hint to

[15] Goldsmith also states that "[s]ociety and morality are set up by clever, selfish vicious, cynical superior beings manipulating selfish, vicious, but susceptible and gullible, inferiors. It is a trick played on fools by knaves." Maurice M. Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits: Bernard Mandeville's Social and Political Thought* (USA: Cybereditions Corporation, 2001), 62.

[16] Some Mandeville scholars use "evolutionary account of morals" as an expression in order to indicate Mandeville's view concerning how our moral distinctions were evolved for ages. Darwin's theory of evolution is not insinuated by this usage. For the expression of "evolutionary account of morals", see Eugene Heath, "Carrying Matters Too Far? Mandeville and The Eighteenth Century Scots on the Evolution of Morals," *The Journal of Scottish Philosophy*, 12, no.1 (2014): 95-119. Christina Petsoulas, *Hayek's Liberalism and its Origins: His idea of spontaneous order and the Scottish Enlightenment* (London & New York: Routledge, 2001). Edward J. Hundert, *The Enlightenment's Fable: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 46-7.

his readers about what he will be engaging in the next dialogue. In this dialogue his spokesman, Cleomenes, opens up a conversation concerning how untaught creatures became civilized beings. He speaks of Sir William Temple's account about formation of societies in *An Essay upon the Original and Nature of Government* which, says Cleomenes, would provide an insight about that subject. As it is worth hearing, he reads a passage from Temple's work to Horatio by which he intends to show savage men's efforts for necessary sustenance of his offspring. As Temple puts forth, raising children and taking care of a family in the first place require providing food for them in various ways such as gathering fruits, taming animals or hunting the wild ones and then teaching his grown-up children how to maintain a family just as he himself did once. Besides, as the elder of his family instructing the idea of good and ill to his children falls to him. In this way, his children will learn to head for virtuous behaviour and abstain from vicious one. Following that, the Fifth Dialogue starts with the unfinished conversation, shortly before revolved around Temple's account in *Essay*.

As a reply for Horatio's contention about irreconcilability between Temple's account and Biblical account about origin of man Cleomenes utters his doubt about the adequacy of the history of ancient times after the Flood. He states:

> Holy Writ has acquainted us with the miraculous Origin of our Species and the small Remainder of it after the Deluge: But it is far from informing us of all the Revolutions, that have happen'd among Mankind since: The Old Testament hardly touches upon any Particulars, that had no Relation to the Jews (FB II; 198).[17]

He also mentions the existence of savage people in Europe who are not able to use Letters and at the same time not governed by any rules or laws. But on the

[17] Goldsmith interprets this passage as follows: "Objections to the adequacy of the Biblical account as the complete truth (such as the problems about the other inhabitants of Cain's city and Adam's unnamed progeny) are introduced by Cleomenes, not to attack the Bible's truth, but to isolate it from a naturalistic account of human development." Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 66.

other hand, what seems bizarre to Cleomenes regarding Temple's account of savage man is that instead of defining the character of savage man as wild, riotous and quarrelsome Temple is inclined to portray man in the state of nature as stable and rightminded.

It is Cleomenes's conviction that although men love their offspring like other creatures, due to "accidents" and "misfortunes" that men are exposed to in the savage state on the subject of nurturing their offspring and "therefore the Children of Savages must very often be put to their Shifts, so as hardly to remember, by the time that they are grown up, that they had any Parents" (FB II; 200). The orphans, who manage to survive, master themselves and become wilder than other ones that grow mature in the care of their parents.

As for how societies had come into the world, Cleomenes states that societies spring from private families which succeed to endure difficulties and accidents in the state of nature. "Self-preservation bids all Creatures gratify their Appetites, and that of propagating his Kind never fails to affect a Man in Health, many Years before he comes to full Growth" (Ibid). Therefore, it is quite certain to have a great number of descendants for a savage man. The patriarch provides necessary food for his children from infancy to preadolescence. After this period, even though his love to his sons gets suspended when he brushes up against their stubbornness and disobedience and he gets angry because of such manners, but his anger ceases shortly due to his feeling of pity to his sons. In order to avoid pain and win their father's affections, sons, in the state of nature, learn how to respect to the elder of the family. Here, it seems that Mandeville points out how a patriarch manages his family well and in return how he is reverenced by his children in early stages of society.

The desire of dominion even in savage men which "is a never-failing Consequence of the Pride […] makes Men not only claim a Right to their

Children, but likewise […] they have a great Share of Jurisdiction over their Grand-Children" (FB II; 204). Mandeville's spokesman also states that if such a desire did not exist it would be impossible for us to be formed into a society. Man's pride always provides him with continuity of his authority. Savage man, first, makes his children learn how to get and supply food and "savage children, as they got Strength, would endeavour to imitate every Action they saw their Parents do, and every Sound they heard them make" (FB II; 203). In this way, Cleomenes's portrayal indicates small groups consisting of private families in the savage state.

Although their conversation is still far from the subject of origin of civil society, Horatio wonders whether savage families have the notions of right and wrong. Cleomenes states that through education and experience a man of sense is able to come up with a distinction between right and wrong and he can find out what is approvable or not by other members of the society. He adds that "not only Men of great Accomplishments, and such as have learn'd to think abstractly, but all Men of middling Capacities, that have been brought up in Society, will agree in this, in all Countries and in all Ages" (FB II; 222). But as for man in the state of nature, it is Cleomenes's contention that we cannot expect them to be familiar with the same notions of right and wrong due to very small community they live in (only consisting of his family members). Because, in addition to faculties of judgment and reason, a man learns difference between right and wrong through education and living in a society and observing other people either his superiors or his equals.

When we think together the desire of superiority and the ability to act according to the notions of right and wrong, we cannot expect man early in his life to have tendency to act out of reasonable judgment without receiving any education or instruction. Thus, Cleomenes draws the inference that "Notions of Right and

Wrong are acquired; for if they were as natural, or if they affected us, as early as the Opinion, or rather the Instinct we are born with, of taking every thing to be our own, no Child would ever cry for his eldest Brother's Play-things" (FB II; 223-4).

In order to be more precise regarding the formation of moral distinctions, manners, arts and sciences Cleomenes, then, portrays the first step to society, in other words, how small savage groups (or private families) grow into larger and stronger ones. First of all, the basic instinct of self-preservation makes human beings unite against the danger of wild animals. This is the first motive that impels men to associate with others instead of feeling love for others. Therefore, it would not be wrong to say that collaboration between savage men is nothing but out of necessity. Horatio endorses what Cleomenes portrayed before concerning hardship that savage men confronted and their vulnerable and defenceless position against wild beasts when they were all alone. So Horatio draws an inference:

> Mankind might subsist and survive to multiply, and get the Mastery over all other Creatures that should oppose them; and as this could never have been brought about, unless Men has assisted one another against Savage Beasts, it is possible, that the Necessity Men were in of joyning and uniting together, was the first Step toward Society (FB II; 242).[18]

[18] Cleomenes again underlines the first motive which leads savage people to unite. He states "the common Danger they were in from wild Beasts: Tho' you own'd the probability of its having been the first Motive of their uniting" (FB II; 251). Horatio and Cleomenes come to a mutual understanding after a long conversation concerning probable harms and injuries caused by wild animals. He seems to be determined and reiterates the point that "as all our Knowledge comes *a posteriori*, it is imprudent to reason otherwise than from Facts. That there are wild Beasts, and that there are savage Men, is certain; and that where there are but few of the latter, the first must always be very troublesome, and often fatal to them, is as certain; and when I reflect on the Passions, all Men are born with, and their Incapacity, whilst they are untaught; I can find no Cause or Motive, which is so likely to unite them together, and make them espouse the same Interest, as that common Danger they must always be in from wild Beasts, in uncultivated Countries; whilst they live in small Families, that all shift for themselves, without Government and Dependence upon one another …" (FB II; 261).

However, Horatio seems to be unconvinced about the first motive to social life and rejects the idea that the fear from wild beasts bands people together. He is still extremely optimistic about the nature of human beings and considers that "the bonds of friendship" instead of fear from beasts might be very likely the first motive to unite them. Once the agreement is settled between these two interlocutors concerning the first motive, in the Sixth Dialogue Cleomenes gets straight to the point in haste. He gives his account regarding the second step to society right from very beginning of the dialogue. He claims that the fear from wild beasts gives its place to the fear which comes from savage man's fellows. It means that the savage man still has to get through another danger after common danger is removed by uniting together against wild beasts.

The second danger arises from human beings' primary passions of pride, ambition and the feeling of dominion. Since different groups and families live together as a precaution of possible attack from wild beasts, the desire for superiority would most likely induce the quarrels between them. As a result of these conflicts they split up groups and bands "that would all have their different Leaders, and of which the strongest and most valiant would always swallow up the weakest and most fearful" (FB II; 267).

Although this seems to be a portrayal of uncivilized man's state Mandeville's spokesman also points out that in spite of considerable increase in knowledge and more experience in progress of time, civilized nations' "mutual Contentions would be continually spoiling their Improvements, destroying their Inventions, and frustrating their Designs" (FB II; 267). While making contracts may keep parties out of injuring each other, Cleomenes still thinks that adherence to a contract depends on as long as the interest of each party lasts. As for Horatio it is not religion that makes them honour the contract also Cleomenes agrees with Horatio's opinion that "Religion could do no more among them, than it does

among civilis'd Nations; where the Divine Vengeance is seldom trusted to only, and Oaths themselves are thought to be of little Service, where there is no human Power to enforce the Obligation, and punish Perjury" (FB II; 268). The same feeling of dominion or ambition which makes man rank foremost among other people as a leader also inspires him to govern and at the same time makes him be desirous of being obeyed by other people. Besides this strong feeling, age long examination of human nature is necessary for a leader because of the fact that as a result of it he would find out various ways to reduce conflicts, restrain and also punish certain acts of mankind. But for Cleomenes, commitment to any contracts based on verbal tradition is highly questionable. Therefore, he states:

> Verbal reports are liable to a thousand Cavils and Disputes, that are prevented by Records, which every body knows to be unerring Witnesses; and from the many Attempts that are made to wrest and distort the Sense of even written Laws, we may judge, how impracticable the Administration of Justice must be among all Societies that are destitute of them. Therefore the third and last Step to Society is the Invention of Letters. No Multitudes can live peaceably without Government; no Government can subsist without Laws; and no Laws can be effectual long, unless they are wrote down (FB II; 269).[19]

While portraying three steps to society Mandeville still sticks to his original thesis that man who loves himself more than anything in the world and not separable from his essence is only able to be governed by a dominant force with written laws after a careful examination of his nature.[20] He reiterates what he earlier stated concerning dark side of human nature, that is to say; it is impossible for man to give up tracing his natural impulses, basically ill-natured,

---

[19] See Robertson's book for a summary of Mandeville's portrayal of three steps to society. John Robertson, *The Case for Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680-1760* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 273-275.

[20] Malcolm Jack defines the business of lawgivers as "psychological exercise" because first of all they have to understand human nature and then figure out how it would be possible to guise and control it. Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 45.

without a subjugating force. Because of extreme optimism about human nature, Horatio makes an analogy between human beings and horses which reflects that he still refuses to think dark side of human beings and all mankind should not be judged as vicious due to some vicious ones in multitude. As a reply to Horatio's characterization of horses and human beings as being naturally tameable and gentle, Cleomenes maintains:

> All men uninstructed, whilst they are let alone, will follow the Impulse of their Nature, without regard to others; and therefore all of them are bad, that are not taught to be good: so all Horses are ungovernable that are not well broken; for what we call vicious in them is, when they bite and kick, endeavour to break their Halter, throw their Rider, and exert themselves with all their Strength to shake off the Yoke, and recover that Liberty which Nature prompts them to assert and desire (FB II; 270).

In this way, he again highlights the significant point which was earlier stated by Mandeville in the first volume of *The Fable* that natural good characteristics attributed horses as well mankind is essentially product of "education" or "management" (FB II; 270). Therefore, because of man's natural tendency to fall into vices lawgivers take into consideration two main points "first, what things will procure Happiness to the Society under their Care; secondly, what Passions and Properties there are in Man's Nature, that may either promote or obstruct this Happiness" (FB II; 275). The origin of society, as Mandeville dwells on, is based upon interdependence results from the instinct of self-preservation and self-liking and also a literary language which enables lawgivers to impose on restraint of self-regarding passions by written laws.[21]The last step, invention of

[21] Maurice Goldsmith states that "there is no possibility of a social contract or a Machiavellian founder-legislator forming humans into a society. The process is a gradual one, requiring a long period of time." Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 71. Besides, Malcolm Jack remarks that "The transition from the state of nature to civil society is explained in terms of socio-economic and psychological factors not in terms of moral or legalistic obligations." Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 48-9.

letters, is very important in the sense that it provides with laws to be more effective which are basically "remedies against human Frailties […] Antidotes, to prevent the ill Consequences of some Properties, inseparable from our Nature, which yet in themselves, without Management or Restraint, are obstructive and pernicious to Society" (FB II; 283).

How long it took for a savage man to civilize is not expressed clearly but Mandeville himself mentions gradualness of this process of evolving and reminds his readers that civilized society is product of "joynt Labour of several Ages" (FB; 322).[22] Cleomenes elucidates Horatio why they could not be certain about course of proceeding through a well civilized nation. Given the fact that "the Family descending from such a Stock, would be crumbled to pieces, re-united, and dispers'd again several times, before the whole or any part of it could be advanced to any degree of Politeness" it would hardly be possible for them to give an exact answer concerning how many ages it did take for forming a civilized society (FB II; 318).

Mandeville also supports his thesis that not only the formation of language (from signs, gestures to sounds for savage people) but also the development of art and sciences need certain length of time and they evolve slowly.[23] In order to raise a nation, skilful government is essential "to preserve Peace and Tranquillity among Multitudes of different Views, and make them all labour for one Interest" (Ibid). This task is so demanding because of the fact that "it is the Work of Ages to find out the true Use of the Passions, and to raise a Politician, that can make every Frailty of the Members add Strength to the whole Body and by dextrous

[22] Cleomenes reminds Horatio of the arts of ship-building and politeness that he had already mentioned in the Third Dialogue in order to express how arduous these arts are and how much time they require (FB II; 141).

[23] See also Mandeville's early view regarding the development of arts and sciences in *The Female Tatler*.

Management turn *private Vices into publick Benefits*" (FB II; 319).[24] Thus, the two requirements needed for a fine government are wisdom on human nature and extended period of time. At first glance, theories regarding how savage societies transformed into civil ones and how moral distinctions showed up in the second volume of *The Fable* make quite an impression that Mandeville comes up with a completely new account which somewhat seems to be incompatible with his former view in the first volume of *The Fable*. Because it seems that artificial nature of morality gives its place to a naturalistic explanation by this way, Mandeville seems to lessen the role of politicians in the second volume. Those who read Mandeville's books might get confused about his usage of "skilful politicians". While reading both volumes of *The Fable* it can be realized that in the first volume Mandeville clearly points out that politicians or moralists take a significant part in invention of moral distinctions and canalizing vices into public benefit.[25]

However, in the second volume Mandeville elaborates that organizing society has a historical perspective that the society was not formed suddenly; it was a gruelling task because of the fact that its formation took long time to ascertain true and proper use of passions. In both volumes of *The Fable* and also in *Origin of Honor* Mandeville disregards the role of religion on notion of good and evil and moral distinctions as well. As he does not want to enter into an argument and bother some authorities, he seems to be very meticulous and attentive while taking religion out of the picture; for instance, in "An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue" in the first volume he states:

---

[24] See also (FB I; 369).

[25] Eugene Heath gives some quotations from both volumes of *The Fable* that lead readers to infer that Mandeville uses skilful politicians literally but on the other hand Heath gives some opposite remarks which affirm that Mandeville defends spontaneous order in the formation of society. Eugene Heath, "Mandeville's Bewitching Engine of Praise," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 15, no.2 (1998): 205-226.

> I speak neither of Jews or Christians, but Man in his State of Nature and Ignorance of true Deity; and then I affirm, that the Idolatrous Superstitions of all other Nations, and the pitiful Notions they had of the Supreme Being, were incapable of exciting Man to Virtue, and good for nothing but to aw and amuse a rude and unthinking Multitude (FB I; 50).

Furthermore, in *Origin of Honor* Cleomenes, the spokesman for Mandeville says that "how unanimous so ever, therefore, all Rulers and Magistrates have seem'd to be in promoting some Religion or other, the Principle of it was not of their Invention. They found it in Man…" (OH; 28). In recent Mandeville scholarship there is an ongoing debate about whether Mandeville used politicians and wise men in literal sense or he actually meant the evolutionary process of society whole time, in other words, he used them figuratively all the time. It is also interesting to notice that Mandeville's contemporaries had criticized him only by taking into consideration that Mandeville's skilful politicians and wise men were literal instead of paying attention to evolutionary process portrayed in the second volume.[26] It seems that evolutionary part proposed by Mandeville in the second volume of *The Fable* has been a late attention or interest.

For some contemporary Mandeville scholars, his view regarding "skilful politicians" seems to be ambiguous when the first volume of *The Fable* and the second one taken together. According to them, it is hardly possible to evaluate both volumes of *The Fable* as embodied because they do not clearly reflect unified view of Mandeville. But on the other hand, some scholars believe that Mandeville uses "skilful politicians" as a metaphor from the very beginning; that is to say, in the first volume of *The Fable* he already describes evolutionary

[26] Critiques of Mandeville's contemporaries (William Law, Richard Fiddes, John Dennis, George Bluet, Francis Hutcheson and Bishop Berkeley) will be mentioned in detail at the end of Chapter I of this dissertation. Goldsmith underlines that Mandeville's contemporaries took seriously what he said regarding morality and development of society in both volumes of *The Fable*. Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public* Benefits, 60-1. See also Heath, "Carrying Matters Too Far?,"95-119.

process of development of civil society. Scholars who claim that Mandeville uses politicians in literal sense come up with a thesis that Mandeville had two different theories regarding the formation of society and evolution of morals one of which was portrayed in the first volume through the management of skilful politicians and artificial roots of morality and the other one is the theory that explicates how morals has been evolved through centuries. Some of the scholars in this group agree that it is highly probable that Mandeville changed his mind after the publication of the first volume. On the other hand, some others in this group believe that Mandeville came up with a refined theory in the second volume.[27] In *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society* Mikko Tolonen maintains that second volume of *The Fable* should not be interpreted as a continuation of the first volume.[28] Rather, says Tolonen, it is better to seize upon the first volume and the second one separately because of the fact that Mandeville gives up his original thesis concerning skilful politicians in the second volume. Tolonen says the following:

> I believe that Mandeville dropped these axioms in Part II, in which moral distinctions are no longer seen as artificial tricks played by politicians upon ignorant people. The role of politicians is different,

[27] Kaye evaluates Mandeville's statements concerning the invention of moral distinctions in "An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue" that "Mandeville did not really believe that virtue was 'invented' on particular occasions; he was at pains several times to qualify the false impression created by his *Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue*. (FB I; 47; footnote). Kaye also gives some parts of the dialogues based on the conversation between Horatio and Cleomenes in *Origin of Honour* in order to support his thesis. See (OH; 40-1).

[28] Tolonen clearly states that even if both volumes share the same title each volume should be interpreted as if it has different thesis from another volume. Tolonen contends that "Even if scholars have noted that there are differences between the two different parts (or volumes as Kaye likes to call them), Part II is customarily read as an elaborated defence of the original *Fable* that is thought to reveal its real meaning, perhaps naturally from our perspective, because they share the same title and are said to be two volumes defining a single thesis. In fact, the two parts are different works and intended as such because they are intellectually separate. Supplementing textual and intellectual analysis with a description of the publishing history of Mandeville's works has made this clear." Mikko Tolonen, *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013), 39.

> the definition of self-preservation changes, fear is no longer staunchly emphasized and, what is more, Mandeville admits that all human actions cannot be reduced to self-love and self-preservation.[29]

As it is seen from Tolonen's statement in the second volume Mandeville comes up with a new theory concerning the basis of our moral distinctions and he also presents us self-liking and pride in addition to self-love (self-preservation) in order to explicate what lies beneath all actions of mankind. Elsewhere, Tolonen touches briefly upon this subject again. He states along the same line that in the second volume of *The Fable* Mandeville drops his previous thesis concerning moral distinctions as inventions of skilful politicians. This means for Tolonen that Mandeville's adherence to Hobbist doctrine about the first rudiments of morality and fear as one of the basic instincts that makes savage people to be tamed properly give its place to conjectural development of society. Tolonen believes that Mandeville changed his mind after criticisms which he received in 1720s.[30]

Besides, another contemporary scholar, Mark Platts, takes Mandeville's "skilful politicians" as literal and based on what Mandeville states in the first volume Platts infers that "for Mandeville, then, morality (in one sense of that term) is essentially a political, not just a social, phenomenon."[31] In other words, "morality is a human contrivance prompted by the desire which arises to render men 'more and more tractable': prompted by the desire, that is, to exercise institutionalized power over other men."[32]For Platts, this inference can be derived from

[29] Ibid., 43.

[30] Mikko Tolonen "Politeness, Paris and the Treatise," *Hume Studies* 34, no.1 (2008): 23-4.

[31] Mark Platts, *Moral Realities: An Essay in Philosophical Psychology* (London & New York: Routledge, 1991), 138.

[32] Ibid.

Mandeville's statements concerning the possibility of subduing instincts and inclinations by "skilful management of wary politicians" instead of any religion.

On the other hand, as mentioned above some scholars believe that in both volumes of *The Fable* Mandeville sticks to same thesis and he uses skilful politicians figuratively. He uses it as a metaphor with which he connotes the social process in civil society. Maurice Goldsmith gives specifically wide coverage to this subject in *Private Vices, Public Benefits: Bernard Mandeville's Social and Political Thought*. If Mandeville's account regarding the construction of society is not received as a satire or mockery but a serious theory, says Goldsmith, attributing to much task to politicians and moralists such as using tricks in order to arrange society, manipulating men's behaviour with some invented virtues like honour and courage, stabilizing the order in the society and looking out for public benefits will make Mandeville's theory less convincing. [33] Accordingly, Goldsmith suggests that we do not need to take Mandeville's account of skilful politicians literally just as how Mandeville's contemporaries had put forward before. He claims:

> They [contemporary opponents of Mandeville] took Mandeville's account of the origin of society and of morality seriously and literally, devoting some attention to show that the story was impossible, sometimes because human beings had never been savage animals, sometimes because Mandeville's account attributed contradictory qualities to his natural men or impossible feats to his skilful politicians.[34]

For Goldsmith it would be helpful to understand Mandeville's account properly if we examine his earlier remarks on this subject in *The Female Tatler.* It can be inferred, says Goldsmith, that in No. 62 of *The Female Tatler* while Mandeville

[33] Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 59.

[34] Ibid., 61.

mentions the development of arts and sciences he specifically emphasizes on their development in very slow degrees. Thus, on the basis of Oxford Gentleman's remark concerning the fact that the development of arts and sciences has taken a long time indicates that "Mandeville could and did conceive of social institutions without having to suppose that they sprang full-blown from the brain of some inventive public benefactor."[35]

By giving some reasonable grounds in his own way Goldsmith claims that the skilful politician in *The Fable* is "an elliptical way of pointing to a gradual development whose stages we may not know but which we can reconstruct conjecturally and therefore "the skilful politician is a Mandevillean fictive literary device, deployed as occasion suggests to cover individual actions, public policies, institutions and historical developments that cannot be assigned to particular individuals."[36]Besides all these, while analysing Mandeville's account about the origin of society in *The Fable*, Goldsmith reiterates the point that Mandeville again uses skilful politician as a device in order to indicate how social institutions have developed gradually.[37] In this way, it appears that Goldsmith sticks to his original thesis that Mandeville's "skilful politician" should be interpreted as a device for gradual process in society or "genetic account of social institutions" not only in *The Female Tatler* and but also in both volumes of *The Fable*.[38]What is

---

[35] Ibid., 62.

[36] Ibid., 62-3.

[37] In *Reflections on Human Nature*, Arthur Lovejoy states that "[t]he transformation of the amoral beast that man originally into a being capable of morality was not accomplished all at once through the conscious contrivance of a few 'wise men', but was in reality, Mandeville recognizes, a long and gradual process." Arthur O. Lovejoy, *Reflections on Human Nature* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), 176.

[38] Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 64. J.A.W. Gunn, on the one hand, appreciates Goldsmith's reminder that Mandeville uses "politician" for both moralist and statesman but on the other hand Gunn does not agree with Goldsmith about Mandeville's figurative usage (a metaphor for society), because by this means Goldsmith completely disregards literal usage of "politician".

more, Goldsmith states that the second volume of *The Fable* and *Origin of Honour* offer us elaborated, refined and strengthened forms of Mandeville's main thesis offered in his earlier works.

On the other hand, apparently Malcolm Jack attempts to reconcile the theories of these two groups in *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*. Jack suggests that Mandeville's theory of social evolution in the second volume should be taken as a supplement of his theory regarding "lawgivers and wise men" in the first volume. By this way, says Jack, Mandeville's theory seems to be less controversial. By avowing a shift in Mandeville's interest to the evolutionary account of society in the second volume Jack seems to affirm that Mandeville had different and separate views in each volume of *The Fable*. However, Jack maintains that sketching a conjectural history does not mean that Mandeville leaves his earlier theory aside rather it indicates that Mandeville is well aware of "a vital role for the political 'cementing' that myth could achieve, but he had expanded and refined his understanding of the long and complex history of man's emergence as an animal capable of political organization."[39] Moreover elsewhere Jack states that Mandeville was aware of the difficulty of lawgivers' task because first they had to have extensive knowledge about human nature in order to engage in mastering human frailties and passions and had to subdue men by persuasion and art of flattery. In this sense, evolutionary progress of society simplified their task.[40] In other words, "The politicians, faced with the

---

J.A.W. Gunn, *Beyond Liberty and Property: The Process of Self-Recognition in Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983), 102-3.

[39] Ibid., 48. Elsewhere, Jack earlier states that second volume of *The Fable* is an expansion in the sense that "it becomes apparent that the process of 'making ' men moral creatures, that is the public consideration of actions as virtuous or vicious in terms of the myth, is in fact a long drawn out and gradual process." Malcolm Jack, "Review of Progress and Corruption in the Eighteenth Century Mandeville's Private Vices, Public Benefits and The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no.2 (1976): 372.

[40] Jack, *Corruption and Progress,* 55.

immensely complicated task of binding men in social purpose, must study human nature carefully before they can develop their craft. But they are aided by the gradual development that will come about as a result of external circumstances." [41]

In addition to this ongoing debate a passage at the end of the first volume of *The Fable* has led to another controversy. In this passage Mandeville says that "I […] *conclude with repeating the seeming Paradox, the Substance of which is advanced in the Title Page; that Private Vices by the dextrous Management of a Skilful Politician may be turned into Publick Benefits*" (FB I; 369).[42] The idea of spontaneous order and the intervention of government have led this controversy between contemporary scholars of economics.[43] Apart from the problem originated from economic

[41] Ibid., 59.

[42] There is also another passage which evokes the one above: "it is a great while, before that Nature can be rightly understood; and it is the Work of Ages to find out the true Use of the Passions, and to raise a Politician, that can make every Frailty of the members, add Strength to the whole Body, and by dexterous Management turn *private Vices into public Benefits*" (FB II; 319).

[43] In the "Introduction" of *A Letter to Dion* Jacob Viner objects to the statements which affirm that Mandeville is the father of laissez-faire doctrine and precursor of Adam Smith. (See also Kaye's comments in the "Introduction" of *The Fable*). Viner underlines that unlike Adam Smith, Mandeville puts great emphasis on the role of government for the prosperity and welfare of society and its regulation on economic activity. Viner also claims that "[i]n his text, Mandeville repeatedly stated that it was by "the skilful Management of the clever Politician" that private vices could be made to serve the public good, thus ridding the formula of any implication of laissez-faire." Bernard Mandeville,) *A Letter to Dion* with an Introduction by Jacob Viner (US: CreateSpace, 2013), 18-19. But on the other hand, for F. Hayek Mandeville was the first who came up with a wider theory of spontaneous order encompassing within language, morals, law, market and money. Hayek disavows Viner's theory and offers one which is quite the opposite of Viner's that we, says Hayek, should take the quotation above as Mandeville's allusion. Therefore, this does not necessarily mean that Mandeville is in favour of government intervention. Hayek quotes a passage (FOB II; 353) from the second volume of *The Fable* which in fact indicates that Mandeville is an advocate of laissez faire. Hayek also backs up his theory with Nathan Rosenberg's reply to Viner. Friedrich Hayek, "Dr. Bernard Mandeville" in *The Trend of Economic Thinking: Essays on Political Economists and Economic History,* ed. W.W. Bartley III and Stephen Kresge (US: Routledge, 1991), 84-87. For further comments on this subject see Nathan Rosenberg, "Mandeville and Laissez-Faire," *Journal of History of Ideas* 24, no. 2 (1963): 183-194. See also Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits,* 123. Ronald Hamowy, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Theory of Spontaneous Order* (USA: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987), 8-10.

assumptions, I believe that in the second volume Mandeville comes up with a refined theory about moral evolution of society in order to show how man became a moral being. To set some examples concerning the subject, in the Third Dialogue of the second volume the conversation about good manners and politeness between Horatio and Cleomenes leads to some further implications after Horatio's question: "What Moralist or Politician was it that could teach Men to be proud of hiding their Pride?" (FB II; 128). Cleomenes's reply leaves a room for doubt because of the fact that the effort of politicians and wise men in the first volume turns into the industry of men in the second. In other words, Mandeville's famous definition of virtue as the "political offspring which flattery begot upon pride" gets into form in the next volume that in order to explain the origin of manners, one should not trace to politicians and lawgivers instead, human nature itself should be detached and examined. By the same token, Cleomenes underlines:

> The restless Industry of Man to supply his Wants, and his constant Endeavours to meliorate his Condition upon Earth, have produced and brought to Perfection many useful Arts and Sciences, of which the Beginnings are of uncertain Era's, and to which we can assign no other Causes, than human Sagacity in general, and *the joynt Labour of many Ages*, in which Men have always employ'd themselves in studying and contriving Ways and Means to sooth their various Appetites, and make the best of their Infirmities […] When I have a Mind to dive into the Origin of any Maxim or political Invention, for the Use of Society in general, I don't trouble my Head with enquiring after the Time or Country, in which it was first heard of, nor what others have wrote and said about it; but I go directly to the Fountain Head, human Nature itself, and look for the Frailty or Defect in Man, that is remedy'd or supply'd by that Invention: When Things are very obscure, I sometimes make Use of Conjectures to find my Way (FB II; 128).

Keeping in mind Mandeville's thesis about ineffectiveness of religion on morality which is supported by the efforts of politicians in the first volume of *The Fable*

then gives its place to evolutionary process. In the first volume there is no misunderstanding or no metaphorical use which Mandeville appeals because it is clearly said that lawgivers and other wise men undertake a task in the establishment of society by making people believe that it should be the main interest of each member of society to choose public benefit instead of private one. By doing so, public spirited actions were praised as noble but on the other hand all selfish type of actions were condemned as brutish. As a matter of fact, the instinct of self-liking rather than being motivated by other regarding passions was at the heart of achievement of lawgivers and other wise men. Also in the second volume while differentiating natural and acquired qualifications of mankind, Mandeville alludes to "lawgivers and wise men" by "flatterers of our species". He states:

> By diligently observing what Excellencies and Qualifications are really acquired, in a well-accomplish'd Man; and having done this impartially, we may be sure that the Remainder of him is Nature. It is for want of duly separating and keeping asunder these two things, that Men have utter'd such Absurdities on this Subject; alledging as the Causes of Man's Fitness for Society, such Qualifications as no Man ever was endued with, that was not educated in a Society, a civil Establishment, of several hundred years standing. But the Flatterers of our Species keep this carefully from our View: Instead of separating what is acquired from what is natural, and distinguishing between them, they take Pains to unite and confound them together (FB II; 301).

It is true that when both volumes of *The Fable* are read successively it may appear that there is a change in Mandeville's mind but I agree with Malcolm Jack in the sense that sketching conjectural history does not mean Mandeville sets the role of politicians aside. As it is seen above still in the second volume Mandeville emphasizes the effects of politicians and wise men on individuals in society.

Besides, as Malcolm Jack points out Mandeville's three steps towards society shows that human beings who are sociable potentially have to be morally and politically managed. He adds that "[t]he 'steps' toward society show the necessary but not sufficient conditions for the politicization of human life."[44]And Jack also suggests that although Mandeville has two different accounts they can be amalgamated with each other and considered as a wide-ranging theory regarding evolution of society. In order to illustrate this he says the following:

> Throughout his account of the rise of primitive society, Mandeville stresses its gradualness. Since each stage is a long drawn-out process, man will have lapses into anarchy as well as advances into social order. The development of civilization is, on the one hand, a series of adaptations on the part of man to the random course of natural history; on the other, his attempt to build upon what he has learned. The politicians, faced with the immensely complicated task of binding men in social purpose, must study human nature carefully before they can develop their craft. But they are aided by the gradual development that will come about as a result of external circumstances.[45]

Furthermore, Mandeville also describes the role of politician in the second volume of *The Fable* same as the first volume that main task of a politician is "to promote, and, if he can, reward all good and useful Actions on the one hand, and on the other, to punish, or at least discourage, every thing that is destructive or hurtful to Society. To name Particulars would be an endless Task. Anger, Lust and Pride may be the Causes of innumerable Mischiefs that are all carefully to be guarded against" (FB II; 321).

In fact, it can be inferred from all these controversial views that perspectives either departs the thesis that Mandeville gave up his earlier theory and came up

[44] Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 42.

[45] Jack, *Corruption and Progress*, 59.

with a new one or put forward the fact that all the time Mandeville's use of "skilful politicians" referred an evolutionary process and also the theories that aim to reconcile both views, I believe, lead to the same result as another. In other words, either contrivance of politicians or product of joint labour of many ages in all of his works Mandeville points out artificial roots of morality.

2.3. (Im)Possibility of Virtue

In "An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue" Mandeville gives definition of virtue as "every performance, by which man, contrary to the impulse of nature should endeavor the benefits of others or the conquest of his own passions out of rational ambition of being good" (FB I; 48-9). In other words, either man should act out of self-denial for the sake of public benefit or restraining passions should be man's rational choice of preferring good. However, Mandeville expresses the difficulty of conquest of passions. Since man is "extraordinary selfish and headstrong as well as cunning animal" and not separable from his essence, entire conquest of passions and appetites seems to be impossible (FB I; 42). Besides, he claims that it is impossible to subdue passions by reason because it is not potent enough to restrain strong and severe self-regarding passions.

Mandeville's definition of virtue leads to some different comments. For instance, according to the editor of *The Fable*, F. B. Kaye Mandeville neither believes man's capacity to act in favour of public benefit nor hegemony of reason to conquest his passions; therefore, "in the light of this formula he could find no virtue…no actions even the most beneficial- dictated entirely by reason and quite free from selfishness […] therefore, of his rigoristic formula, everything was vicious."[46] At

[46] Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefit*, vol 1, ed. F. B. Kaye (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1988), xlviii.

first glance, Kaye's comment seems to be plausible. However, in his works, Mandeville does not have any direct expression regarding the fact that everything is vicious. On the contrary, he admits that virtue exists. In the second volume of *The Fable* Horatio wants Cleomenes to admit that there is no virtue in the world. As a reply, Cleomenes underlines the rarity of virtuous men and he expresses the fact that there are less than anyone thinks or expects.

What is more, Cleomenes insists that even Horatio himself hardly imagines that there are many virtuous men (FB II; 336).[47] Besides, Mandeville gives examples of indifferent actions which are done from the feeling of and out of self-preservation. He states that "there is no Merit in saving an innocent Babe ready to drop into the Fire" (FB I; 56). From his point of view "[t]he Action is neither good nor bad, and what Benefit soever the Infant received, we only obliged to ourselves; for to have seen it fall, and not strove to hinder it, would have caused a Pain, which Self-preservation compell'd us to prevent …" (Ibid). It is true that indifferent acts exist according to Mandeville but after all of his statements regarding selfish nature of human beings it will be ridiculous to anticipate other regarding passions like benevolence and humanity. So, man who does not think otherwise but to please only himself is not expected to act out of rational choice for acting good or innate feeling of humanity.

In the second volume of *The Fable*, Horatio seems to be confused in the Third Dialogue concerning the impossibility of virtue without self-denial. Cleomenes gets clear on this issue that the doctrine "no virtue without self-denial" can be attributed to Ancients, but quite the opposite was claimed by Lord Shaftesbury

[47] See also Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 90. Philip Harth, "The Satiric Purpose of The Fable of the Bees," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 2, no.4 (1969): 326.

(FB II; 108).[48] In other words, Lord Shaftesbury dissents from ancient philosophers and some of his contemporaries in the sense that men, according to Lord Shaftesbury, are good by nature and they are naturally inclined to perform virtuous acts. Horatio also questions whether there is possibility of being good or virtuous by choice. Cleomenes acknowledges that men can be virtuous by choice but he clarifies that "they [men] are directed in that Choice by Reason and Experience, and not by Nature […] not by untaught Nature" (FB II; 109). Thus unlike Shaftesbury's conviction Mandeville points out that it is impossible for men to perform naturally virtuous acts. In other words, "no action is such, which does not suppose and point at some Conquest or other, some Victory great or small over untaught Nature (Ibid).

It is Horatio's contention that the victory may be gained by the help of education which leads men to virtuous acts if provided at an early age. However, Cleomenes points out that since our infancy we are taught how to conceal or mask our instincts and passions instead of restraining them and on that account the victory cannot be obtained over our nature. This means that our passions remain unchanged, while we are gratifying our appetites we will seem to act virtuously. And accepting that virtue is possible without self-denial is "a vast Inlet to Hypocrisy" thus; this will give men "a greater Opportunity of counterfeiting the Love of Society and Regard to the Publick, than ever they could have receiv'd from the contrary Doctrine, *viz*. that there is no Merit but in the Conquest of the Passions nor any Virtue without apparent Self-denial (FB II;

[48] Shelley Burtt states that "Mandeville's portrayal of man as "irredeemably selfish" and "inevitably lacking in virtue" disregards not only rational virtue but also innate feeling of benevolence as Shaftesbury claimed before." Shelley Burtt, *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688-1740* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 132.

109). [49]Earlier education, therefore, is nothing but training and exercising how to hide our appetites from others successfully.

In *Moral Realities: An Essay in Philosophical Psychology* Mark Platts touches upon a significant point by differentiating real virtue from counterfeited one. He states that for Mandeville virtue is only possible with self-denial however the motives of our actions lie in the heart of self-love and self-liking and so passing over the supposed possibility of divine grace, it follows that 'real Virtue' is for men an impossibility.[50]Shelly Burtt also maintains that Mandeville follows Augustine in the sense that he affirms the incapability of natural man to virtuous actions and "argues, as did the fifth-century bishop, that while virtue is real, it is not and never was of this world."[51]Therefore, in order to sketch a moral being, it can be concluded that one should only imagine an agent who is directed by only his selfish passions and "a vast gulf between worldly success and otherworldly virtue informs the whole of Mandeville's work." [52]Furthermore, according to Hector Monro, from Mandeville's point of view due to men's incapability of restraining their passions and performing good acts out of rational choice, even if there is self-denial "it would seem a fabrication and a fraud" therefore; it is impossible to call it "real virtue."[53]

In addition to all these interpretations, John Robertson claims that Mandeville's definition of virtues as self-denial leads to "expose the hypocrisy at the heart of

[49] See also (FB I; 331).

[50] Platts, *Moral Realities*, 141.

[51] Burtt, *Virtue Transformed*, 133.

[52] Ibid., 134.

[53] Monro, *The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville*, 185.

the way men and women lived in a great city such as London."[54]As it is seen Mandeville strictly holds the idea that real virtue is impossible without self-denial and admits the rarity of virtue but he is still dubious about sincerity of men due to underlying motives of their actions. Horatio's reasoning regarding restraining our appetites and passions as prerequisite for real virtue and self-denial as the most important demand of Christianity discloses the fact that "nothing is more necessary than Sincerity and that the Heart should be pure" (FB II; 127). According to Mandeville even if there is a seeming self-denial man can pretend to act virtuously under the mask of hypocrisy.[55] Because we all have "strong Habit of Hypocrisy, by the Help of which we have learned from our Cradle to hide *even from ourselves* the vast Extent of Self-love and all its different Branches" (FB I; 135; emphasis added). This quotation shows that not only does Mandeville underline the habit of hypocrisy but also self-deception of mankind.

In *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville* Malcolm Jack identifies self-deception with "cognitive derangement" which implies that we deceive ourselves about underlying motives of our acts, in other words it is our "escape into illusion which Mandeville regards as an important factor in the success of man as a social being."[56] Jack states that cognitive derangement has three features: first one is "blindness of man". This means that due to self-liking, man bereft of capability of impartial judging overestimates himself. The second form is "ignorance of man" which is, says Mandeville, inability to recognize one's real

[54] Robertson also gives the case of luxury as an example that although by definition luxury is vice it can be easily seen that it is the engine of manufacture and commerce because of the endless desire of every people in large cities. Robertson, *The Case for Enlightenment*, 267-8.

[55] Mandeville rules out the role of religion in the distinction between virtue and vice in the first volume of *The Fable* (FB I; 50). See also John Robertson's analysis concerning this subject. Robertson, *The Case for Enlightenment*, 267.

[56] Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 19-20.

motives hidden behind.[57] Third feature is "bullheadedness of man". Man is "extraordinary selfish and headstrong as well as cunning animal" says Mandeville and not separable from his essence, entire conquest of passions and appetites is hard to achieve. Mandeville also affirms Bayle's thesis and says that "[what] Mr. *Bayle* has endeavour'd to prove at large in his Reflexions on Comets: That Man is so unaccountable a Creature as to act most commonly against his Principle" (FB I; 167).

Headstrong and cunning man acts against his principle and learns how to conceal and hide his passions subtly. If one is able to conceal his lust, pride and selfishness, he accomplishes to keep himself a distance from the feeling of shame. Therefore, under the word of virtue, there lies a habit of hypocrisy and perfect disguise of passions. As stated before, pride, says Mandeville, which is a predominant passion and the main spring of man's acts can be concealed by experience and education. In the second volume of *The Fable* after depicting his doubt about the sincerity of mankind Cleomenes infers that men "grew in concealing the outward Signs and every symptoms of Pride, the more entirely they became enslaved by it within" (FB II; 17). Mandeville does not believe that man acts from the excellence of his nature rather underlying motives of his action are "excessive thirst after praise and an immoderate desire of general applause from the most knowing judges" (FB II; 74).[58] Mandeville also asserts that in *Beau Monde* individuals who are well educated in concealing their pride "can hardly fail a genteel Behaviour" (FB, II; 80).

[57] See also (FB II; 78-80). Nicholas Phillipson also underlines the role of self-deception and hypocrisy in the formation of standard of taste, virtue and justice. Phillipson, *Adam Smith,* 48-9.

[58] See also *The Female Tatler* No. 80.

As stated before, Mandeville portrays that education in manners should begin early in life in order to secure that the habit of hypocrisy will be profoundly entrenched. He maintains:

> If People had been used to speak from the Sincerity of their Hearts, and act according to the natural Sentiments they felt within, 'till they were Three or Four and Twenty, it would be impossible for them to assist at this Comedy of Manners, without either loud Laughter or Indignation; and yet it is certain, that such Behaviour makes us more tolerable to one another than we could be otherwise (FB I; 79).

Moral education enables society to function in a canorous way. Men hide their passions due to the fact that he knows others will disapprove if they know which passion lies beneath his action exactly. Men only ostensibly act from self-denial and they are always in struggle to feed their pride. Of course, it is essential to conceal his pride in order to win approval of others. By the same token, Mandeville says the following:

> Good manners have nothing to do with Virtue or Religion; instead of extinguishing, they rather inflame the Passions. The Man of Sense and Education never exults more in his Pride than when he hides it with the greatest Dexterity; and in feasting Applause, which he is sure all good Judges will pay to his Behaviour, he enjoys a Pleasure altogether unknown to the Short-sighted, surly Alderman, that shews his Haughtiness glaringly in his Face, pulls off his Hat to no Body, and hardly deigns to speak to an Inferior (Ibid).

According to Mandeville, the motives of self-interest are in every nook and cranny where human conduct endures. He states that the reward of glory "consists in a superlative Felicity which a Man, who is conscious of having perform'd a noble Action, enjoys in Self-love, whilst he is thinking on the Applause he expects of others" (FB I;55).

2.4. Mandeville on Human Sociability

Mandeville also questions man's natural sociability in the second volume of *The Fable* and asserts that man is sociable not because of his good nature, love of his species or his strong desire for company but his hateful qualities make him fit in a society. In fact, from the very beginning in the Preface of the "The Grumbling Hive" he maintains that anatomical research of mankind's passions reveals this fact and he assures that man's "vilest and most hateful Qualities are the most necessary Accomplishments to fit him for the largest, and […] the happiest and most flourishing Societies" (FB I; 4). Therefore, it is Mandeville's contention that his "Six Penny Pamphlet" or "Story told in Dogrel" is an attempt to expose the worst qualities and defects of mankind and at the same time reveal how they lead public welfare and benefit (FB I; 4-5).

As it is seen in the Fourth Dialogue of the second volume of *The Fable*, Horatio opens up a conversation regarding sociability of man and elaborates this subject. He investigates that whether an alternative theory to Lord Shaftesbury's theory in *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times etc* about sociability of man exists or not. According to Cleomenes, this is not a complicated subject due to the fact that an average person who knows enough about human nature is able to draw conclusion that "the cause of sociableness in man, that is his fitness for society" (FB II; 177). Horatio questions whether human beings are born with a natural affection to love their species or hatred or aversion to each other. As an answer Cleomenes says:

> I believe neither. From what appears to us in human Affairs, and the Works of Nature, we have more reason to imagine that the Desire as well as Aptness of Man to associate, do not proceed from his Love to others, than we have to believe that a mutual affection of the Planets to one another, superior to what they feel to Stars more remote, is not

> the true Cause why they keep always moving together in the same solar system (FB II; 178).

It is Cleomenes's conviction that by virtue of two reasons man is called sociable; "First, because *it is commonly imagin'd*, that he is naturally more fond, and desirous of Society, than any other Creature. Secondly, because it is manifest, that associating in Men turns to better Account, than it possibly could do in other Animals, if they were to attempt it" (FB II; 180; emphasis added). Cleomenes's statement that "it is commonly imagined" leads to prepossession because by saying this Cleomenes does seem to certify what he actually says. He explicates in order to be on the safe side:

> All Men born in Society are certainly more desirous of it than any other Animal; but whether Man be naturally so, that's a Question: But, if he was, it is no Excellency, nothing to brag of: The Love Man has for his Ease and Security, and his perpetual Desire of meliorating his Condition, must be sufficient Motives to make him fond of Society; considering the necessitous and helpless Condition of his Nature (FB II; 180).

This means that man's love of ease, security and his desire of improving his condition lie at the heart of man's sociability. Although this reminds Horatio of Hobbes's portrayal of mankind's condition as necessitous and helpless in the state of nature Cleomenes puts right Horatio's mistake by clarifying what he actually means before. According to him, the more knowledgeable and prosperous men are, the more destitute and helpless they are.

Man always has desire of meliorating his condition and pursues to fulfil his needs and wants. Then, it would be reasonable to say that man fits into the society out of respect for satisfaction of his selfish needs. According to Mandeville, even though men may be considered to be fond of society than any other animal it is hardly possible to say that men excel animals in love of their own species. Besides, when the nature of body politic is considered it will be seen

that it is not love of our species that enhance and sustain society. We should refrain from saying that "man is a sociable creature" due to the fact that it will definitely denote that it a natural characteristic of men that "we have a certain Fitness, by which great Multitudes of us co-operating, may be united and form'd into one Body" (FB II; 183). Then taking this assumption much further Mandeville states that the alleged fondness of man to his own species should not be considered as the origin of societies but "government" is the key which makes societies possible.[59]

In other words, first of all in order to form a community, men should be made governable by reaping the benefits of "fear" and "understanding." In the first place, says Mandeville, susceptibility of fear rather than the sense of courage is needed to make man tractable but on the other hand in order to prevent danger of impulsive behaviour out of fear or direct them to consider what will happen afterwards a degree of understanding is essential. To be governable as completely distinct from being submissive implies "an Endeavour to please and a Willingness to exert ourselves in behalf of the Person that governs" (FB II; 184). Given the difference between being submissive and governable Mandeville draws the conclusion that "there is not one Creature so tame, that it can be made to serve its own Species, but Man, yet without this (making him governable) he could never been made sociable" (FB II; 184).

It is Cleomenes's contention that "nature had design'd Man for Society, as she has made Grapes for Wine" (FB II; 185). This means that man does have a natural

[59]In the first volume of *The Fable* while sketching his outline of anti-Shaftesbury theory of sociableness Mandeville underlines the fact that "for if by Society we only mean a Number of People, that without Rule or Government should keep together out of a natural Affection to their Species or Love of Company, as a Herd of Cows or a Flock of Sheep, then there is not in the World a more unfit Creature for Society than Man; a Hundred of them that should be all Equals, under no Subjection, or Fear of any Superior upon Earth, could never Live together awake Two Hours without Quarrelling, and the more Knowledge, Strength, Wit, Courage and Resolution there was among them, the worse it would be" (FB I; 347-8).

capacity which makes them fit easier into a society. But according to Horatio, the truth that wine is invention of man also implies that making wine necessitates certain kind of human integrated process. Cleomenes strongly agrees with Horatio in the sense that formation of society also necessitates certain kind of skill due to the difficulty of banding together different kinds of man who naturally have no desire to associate with each other.

Cleomenes endorses Horatio's argument that capacities of mankind as well as the characteristic of sociability is the work of God or the author of nature but it is the "human sagacity" which enables to make use of human capacities efficiently. (FB II; 185-6). In other words, in order to make wine, grapes given by divine providence is not enough but human skill is necessary to procure the vintage. Cleomenes speaks highly of perfect works performed by humankind and as an illustration he gives that with the help of the raw materials provided by nature "the Quarry yields Marble, but it is the Sculptor that makes a Statue of it. To have the infinite Variety of Iron Tools that have been invented, Nature has given us nothing but the Oar, which she has hid in the Bowels of the Earth" (FB II; 188). [60]

Cleomenes reiterates the significant point regarding the sociability of mankind by highlighting specifically facts with an analogy. He says the following:

> Every Grape contains a small Quantity of Juice, and when great Heaps of them are squeez'd together, they yield a Liquor, which by skilful Management may be made into Wine: But if we consider, how necessary Fermentation is to the Vinosity of the Liquor, I mean, how essential it is to its being Wine, it will be evident to us, that without

[60] In this case, it would not be wrong to draw two inferences like Horatio's : "First, that the Fitness of Man for Society, beyond other Animals, is something real; but that it is hardly perceptible in Individuals, before great Numbers of them are joyn'd together, and artfully manag'd. Secondly, that this real Something, this Sociableness, is a Compound, that consists in a Concurrence of several Things, and not in any one palpable Quality, that Man is endued with, and Brutes are destitute of" (FB II; 188).

> great Impropriety of Speech, it cannot be said, that in every Grape there is Wine (FB II; 188).

Cleomenes's analogy provides Horatio with an opportunity to draw a parallel between vinosity of wine and sociability of man. Although fermentation has a significant place in acquisition of vinosity of wine it does not mean that every grape has certain characteristic to be wine. The same goes for mankind in the sense that just as grapes men become sociable only by living in a society with the help of skilful management, so when we look into society we cannot say for sure that every man has a certain characteristic which enables him to fit in society. Mandeville does not discuss the subject of human sociability for the first time in the second volume of *The Fable*. We can trace back to the first volume as well as *The Female Tatler* in order to have proper understanding regarding this subject. Earlier in the first volume Mandeville's arguments regarding human sociability were specifically targeted to Lord Shaftesbury's theory in his essay entitled "A Search into the Nature of Society". This essay seems to be devoted to refute Lord Shaftesbury's thesis that he defended throughout his *Characteristics.* Mandeville avows that his system and Shaftesbury's are unequivocally opposite to each other and he directly attacks Shaftesbury's doctrines.[61] According to Mandeville unlike other moralists and philosophers who agreed on the impossibility of virtue without self-denial, Shaftesbury claims that man has a natural capacity to being virtuous. Mandeville ridicules the original thesis of him with following lines that Lord Shaftesbury "seems to require and expect Goodness in his Species, as we do a sweet Taste in Grapes and China Oranges, of which, if any of

[61]According to Louis Dumont, what lies at the heart of Mandeville's and Lord Shaftesbury's theory is that "for Mandeville, the individual is logically prior to society: where Shaftesbury starts from the whole, Mandeville starts from the element." Louis Dumont, *From Mandeville to Marx: The Genesis and Triumph of Economic Ideology* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1977), 65.

them are sour, we boldly pronounce that they are not come to that Perfection their Nature is capable of" (FB I; 323).[62]

Taking into Shaftesbury's account about man's natural fondness of society, says Mandeville, means that we should, in the first place, agree on the statement that man is born with this affection and every action done in respect to public good or welfare is entitled as virtue. By means of constant characteristics of virtue and vice in all countries and every age and portraying man of good sense who is capable of governing himself with reason and understanding Shaftesbury tries to show the path not only to *Pulchrum & Honestum* but also morality which is, says Mandeville, quite apparently opposite to his system that he passionately defends in *The Fable*. Mandeville goes further and states cynically:

> His notions I confess are generous and refined: They are high Compliment to Human-kind, and capable by the help of a little Enthusiasm of Inspiring us with the Noble Sentiments concerning the Dignity of our exalted Nature: What Pity it is that they are not true: I would not advance thus much if I had not already demonstrated in almost every Page of this Treatise, that the Solidity of them is inconsistent with our daily Experience (FB I; 234).

An attentive Mandeville reader can easily find out that human sociability is also one of the main topics in *The Female Tatler*. When both volumes of *The Fable* and some of the dialogues in *The Female Tatler* are considered together it is highly possible to infer that for Mandeville it is impossible for man to be made for society. In particular, in Number 62 of *The Female Tatler*, three interlocutors with different views regarding human sociability shows several accepted views about

[62] At the end of the second volume of *The Fable* Mandeville still attacks Shaftesbury and states that "the Ideas he had form'd of the Goodness and Excellency of our Nature, were as romantick and chimerical as they are beautiful and amiable" (FB II; 357). Shelly Burtt claims that "Mandeville intends his social theory as a bracing corrective to this panglossian illusion. Its primary concern is to show that the benevolent and virtuous affections cherished by philosophical optimists as the bedrock of society are both illusory and superfluous." Burtt, *Virtue Transformed,* 132.

the subject including Mandeville's approach. As one of the interlocutors, Arsinoe points out that man, by nature, is less suited to live in a society than animals. Herds and flocks which are associated each other without design can live peacefully with their own kind, but same does not go for men because of their pursuit of "feuds, frauds, enmities and depredations" against one another (FT; 97). Thus, it is impossible for men who are less inclined to be sociable to live in peace without government and laws (Ibid).

On the other hand, Lucinda with a look on the bright side tries to refute Arsinoe's thesis that while animals enjoy living together because of care of man and simplicity of their diet; men, endowed with reason, learn how to make world more comfortable for themselves with industry, arts and sciences. As a spokesman of Mr. Bickerstaff Lucinda states that unlike "unpolished nations of Africa and America" men in civilized countries "are generous enough to labour and exert themselves for the benefit of others" (FT; 98). The conversation takes a new dimension with the participation of Oxford Gentleman. He remarks that man is a sociable creature not because of his some good qualities or his love of company. Men who have self-regarding passions as well as different appetites and wants can only be made subservient to one another by skilful management (FT; 99). Oxford Gentleman states:

> The greatest and most immediate Benefactors to Human Society, are the idle Favourites of blind Fortune, that having more money left them than they know what to do with, take no other Care than to please themselves, and studying as well to create new appetites as to gratify those they feel already, are given over to all sensuality (Ibid).[63]

[63] Goldsmith points out that *The Fable* is combination of these three views expressed in *The Female Tatler*. According to him, "The Oxford gentleman's view of human nature as marked by self-love and vanity is super-imposed on Arsinoe's Hobbesian description of man's basic characteristics. The device used to turn these characteristics against each other is Lucinda's public-spirited benefactors." Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 54-5. But on the other hand, in Malcolm Jack claims that it can be inferred from the conversation between Arsinoe, Lucinda and Oxford

Oxford Gentleman's analysis reminds us of Mandeville's main thesis given in "The Grumbling Hive."

2.5. Vicious Bees of the Prosperous Hive

Since the publication of *The Female Tatler* coincides between the appearance of "The Grumbling Hive" and the first volume of *The Fable*, it is not surprising to see Mandeville defends the same themes and the details of his motto are narrated by Oxford Gentleman in *The Female Tatler*. [64] Throughout the poem he tries to show that hateful qualities of mankind provide public benefits.

Through Mandeville's intriguing narration, the poem depicts a prosperous hive in which bees perform artful works either by honourable or dishonourable ways. While some of the bees do physical labour in tough and severe conditions and live without comforts and amenities, some of them live in luxury, ease and lavishness. This hive also consists of some bees that support themselves with drudgery of others and reap profit by tricky and dishonest means. Mandeville entitles these "knaves". These are "sharpers, parasites, pimps, players, pick-pockets, coiners, quacks and soothsayers" (FB I; 19). On the other hand, deceit is everywhere and there is no profession without cheat and fraud, industrious ones are also entitled as knaves. Lawyers, Physicians, Priests, Soldiers, Ministers and Kings deserve the same title due to searching and striving for their own self-interest. But at the end all vices do something for public good or benefit. These

---

Gentleman in No: 62 of *the Female Tatler* that even if Mandeville "is concerned to refute theories which idealize human nature […] he merely enlists the Oxford gentleman to provoke his opponents" Jack, *Corruption and Progress,* 31.

[64] Malcolm Jack states that the role of some passions such as pride, greed and avarice in economic life is emphasized in *the Female Tatler* as well as in "The Grumbling Hive". Besides, Jack regards Oxford Gentleman as an earlier spokesman for Mandeville. Jack, *Corruption and Progress,* 29.

vices cause paradoxically positive effects on the employment of poor and growth of national prosperity.

Although bees live in their hive with abundance, ease and luxury and also vice is governed with dexterous management, some of the bees are not content with their situation. They curse politicians and the way of earning their living. Then, politicians begin to preach and sermonize just like playing blind men. They disapprove and blame the vices hypocritically by failing to see their own. They crave for honesty and cry to *Jove* shamelessly. Later on, with full of indignation, *Jove* rids the hive of fraud and "honesty fills all their Hearts" (FB I; 27). The former prosperity of hive suddenly disappears and also vices such as lust, greed, avarice, pride and luxury vanish quickly. Now, everybody is poor but honest. Doctors try to treat illnesses and use their own drugs to heal folk. Idleness oozes away and having purified from vices, the priests really employ themselves sanctities. Everyone in this hive begins to live modestly and frugally. All trades become superfluous. However, as a result of honesty, poverty emanates into the society, nobody wants to strive against foreigners unless their country's liberty is staked and all arts, crafts, trade, sea-faring and manufacture are intermitted. Therefore, the hive loses its splendour and magnificence through loss of vices.

The story of vicious bees of the prosperous hive depicted in "The Grumbling Hive" is a perfect simile of human society in the sense that "the vilest and hateful qualities of man are the most necessary accomplishments to fit him for the society" (FB I; 34). Mandeville's famous paradox "private vices, public benefits" which is narrated in the poem strikingly and later explained in detail in Remarks is in fact a "satirical weapon" by which Mandeville aims to show "commitment

to asceticism and hedonism at the same time."[65] He points out both simple virtuous way of life and flourishing society that makes use of certain vices.

On the other hand, lest wrong inferences are drawn about his famous motto, Mandeville underlines that although vice is conjoined to powerful and wealthy societies, vices that lead any members of society to commit a crime should be punished. He shows his hand with a clear statement:

> When I assert that Vices are inseparable from great and potent Societies, and that it is impossible their wealth and Grandeur should subsist without, I do not say that the particular Members of them who are guilty of any should not be continually reprov'd, or not be punished for them when they grow into Crimes (FB I; 10).

In other words, he does not mean that all vice is beneficial to society and he does not encourage vice and wickedness. Actually, his definition of vice is twofold: useful vice which is beneficial to society and should be encouraged and harmful vice which is detrimental to society and should be discouraged. Useful vice and justice should be tied and lopped by laws. He likens this case to a vine that for a good qualified and tasty wine, dry and curved shoots of vine should be tied and cut. Mandeville narrates this in a rhymed form:

> Do we not owe the Growth of Wine
> To the dry shabby crooked Vine?
> Which, while its Shoots neglected stood,
> Chok'd other Plants, and ran to Wood;
> But blest us with its noble Fruit,
> As soon as it was ty'd and cut (FB I; 36).

[65] Jack, *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 90. Elsewhere, Jack maintains that "Mandeville's description of the way in which society functions emerges a corollary of the central polemic of the poem, which is the ridicule of the suggestion that ascetic self-denial leads to public good. To show up the absurdity of this puritanical ethic, he employs the traditional satiric weapons of lampoon and irony." Jack, *Corruption and Progress,* 23.

When it comes to "useful" or "good-natured" vices as it is inferred from the poem they encapsulate pride, lust, avarice, prodigality, greed, envy and jealousy. Although avarice or greed for wealth is considered as vice and everybody condemns it, says Mandeville, "the true Reason why every Body exclaims so much against it, is, that almost every Body suffers by it; for the more the Money is hoarded up by some, the scarcer it must grow among the rest, and therefore when Men rail very much at Misers there is generally Self-Interest at Bottom" (FB I; 100-1). Strong desire for acquisition of money that everybody in society suffers from leads to two opposite ends: parsimony or profuseness. As pointed out in Remark I, both ends are directly associated with commerce or economic progress in society. Based on the story about Florio, extravagant son of a miser man who borrows a loan with thirty percent interest from greedy Cornaro, Mandeville highlights the fact that avarice is the vice that "hinders Misers from parting with what they have, and makes them covet it only to hoard up" (FB I; 102). But he also reminds the fact that eventually a spendthrift would spend money which his father saved his whole life. On the other hand, strong desire for wealth and riches sometimes may end in spending lavishly accumulated to splendid households, equipages and enjoyments which at the end have a positive impact on economy and commerce.

Much as frugality was used to be known as a Spartan virtue and prodigality quite the opposite, in "The Grumbling Hive" it seems that Mandeville speaks highly of this vice and sketches a society that makes the most of it. In other words, it follows from the poem that although prodigality, too much indulgence of extravagance, satisfaction of pleasures and keenness on spending money lavishly, had always been condemned as sin or vice because of its poisonous nature and degenerating effect on souls, is surprisingly but persuasively depicted by Mandeville as "aggregable good-natur'd Vice that makes the Chimney smoke, and all the Tradesmen smile" and the prodigal man is described as "a Blessing to

the whole Society" (FB I; 103). Mandeville explicates prodigality's positive effect on society in a peculiar way. According to him, it is prodigality that keeps people out of idleness and indolence because consuming stupendous wealth sets people up in business. Unlike prodigality, frugality which is suitable for small and poor societies but pernicious to large and trading nations, says Mandeville, is "an idle dreaming Virtue that employs no Hands, and therefore very useless in a trading Country, where there are vast Numbers that one way or other must be all set to Work" (FB I; 105).

Mandeville goes further and likens body politic to "a bowl of punch" in this way he aims to explicate how some vices are *sine qua non* for a prosperous and wealthy nation. He gives necessary ingredients of this punch:

> Avarice should be Souring and Prodigality the Sweeting of it. The water I would call the Ignorance, Folly and Credulity of the floating insipid Multitude; while Wisdom, Honour, fortitude and the rest of the sublime Qualities of Men, which separated by Art from the Dregs of Nature the fire of Glory has exalted and refin'd into a Spiritual Essence, should be an Equivalent to Brandy (FB I; 105).

He warns that for an excellent liqueur, portions should be moderate and also no ingredients should be missing, in a sense; a tolerable liqueur should not be only too sour but also should not include too much sugar. In "The Grumbling Hive" he also underlines another good-natured vice, namely envy; which means feeling of discontent and discomfort due to others' happiness or good fortune. In Remark N Mandeville clarifies the stanzas regarding envy included in "The Grumbling Hive":

> Envy it self, and Vanity,
> Were Ministers of Industry;
> Their darling Folly, Fickleness,
> In Diet, Furniture and Dress,
> That strange ridic'lous Vice, was made

The very Wheel that turn'd the Trade (FB I; 25).

Even if envy is generally described as one of the vices and depravity of our nature and most of the people suffer from it, states Mandeville, like self-liking or pride it can be hidden successfully by means of our habit of hypocrisy. For mankind, by nature, it is hardly possible to wish well for others because of the fact that when something bad happens to them, they wish others to go through same bad experience as well and also if something desperately wanted to be possessed is figured out at the end that it is possessed by someone else as a matter of course leads to a great sorrow and anger.

Furthermore, in some cases, it may cause a secret pleasure or delight to see something bad happens to someone who is envied desperately. For such frailty of our nature Mandeville makes an observation that "we envy a Man for being Rich, an then perfectly hate him: But if we come to be his Equals, we are calm, and the least Condescension in him makes us Friends; but if we become visibly Superior to we can pity his Misfortunes" (FB I; 140). Envy when motivated by emulation and at the same time managed to be kept hidden by means of committing self-denial in a society it does promote wealth and well-being of this nation. And so "the Fickle Strumpet that invents new Fashions every Week; the haughty Dutchess that in Equipage, Entertainments, and all her Behaviour would imitate a Princess […] are the Prey and proper Food of a full grown Leviathan" (FB I; 355).

In addition to these useful vices, as mentioned before Mandeville reveals the fact that self-liking and pride, the dominant passions of human nature, manifest themselves not only in men's good manners and politeness and in addition to it, there are explicit symptoms of pride in clothing, furnishing, equipages and titles as well. Besides all these, it is also significant to mention Mandeville's designation of pride which is possessed by every single individual in a society

and primarily dominates men is *sine qua non* for a prosperous and a flourishing society. Pride, says Mandeville, is also a passion which makes men more passionate, ambitious and at the same time more industrious which are indeed necessary and beneficial qualities for a wealthy society. Besides, it is again pride which promotes and supports the trade. Mandeville says the following:

> Clothes were originally made for Two Ends, to hide our Nakedness, and to fence our Bodies against the Weather and other Outward Injuries: To these our boundless Pride has added a third, which is ornament; for what else but an excess of stupid Vanity, could have prevail'd upon our reason to fancy that ornamental, which must continually put us in mind of our Wants and Misery, beyond all other Animals that are ready clothed by Nature herself? (FB I; 127).

Hence, it is out of pride that individuals prefer fine and expensive clothes rather than simple ones or they strive to imitate others who are above their rank. As a simple illustration, Mandeville gives that on great holidays or specific occasions it can be easily observed that not only the dresses of women of lower and middle classes but also their manners and attitudes are completely different from their casual dresses and ordinary manners. Their fancy and fashionable clothes, polite and elegant behaviour do not reflect their genuine identity. After anatomizing pride with regard to ordinary people in the society Mandeville comes up with an advice and asks a crucial question:

> Tho' every Body allows, that as to Apparel and manner of living, we ought to behave our selves suitable to our Conditions and follow the Examples of the most sensible, and prudent among our Equals in Rank and Fortune: Yet how few, that are not either miserably Covetous, or else Proud of Singularity, have this Discretion to boast of? (FB I; 129).

The answer is already quite obviously expressed by himself in "The Grumbling Hive" and Remark M covers the idea that almost all of us try to conceal our status by imitating our superiors. For instance, men belonging to working class

strive to be received like a merchant in the society, thus first wage most likely is spent on clothes that provide them such an opportunity to get dressed like merchants. In addition to that, from a poor worker's wife to a merchant's lady, women; when symptoms of pride, envy and emulation are at work, do their utmost in order to imitate other women belonging to upper class (Ibid).

The endless desire for raising oneself above the crowd and everlasting emulation do not only lead to more consumption but also provide employment for the poor. All these, points Mandeville, lead us to an interesting conclusion that pride "spurs to Industry and encourages the skillful Artificer to search after further Improvements" (FB I; 130). Mandeville is well-prepared for possible objections and provides a counter argument against those who interpose that increase in trade due to fondness of fashion and expensive habits about dressing cannot be attributed to pride. He elucidates his readers a crucial point by adhering to his original thesis:

> I answer, that it is impossible, that those who trouble their Heads to little with their Dress, could ever have wore these rich Clothes, if both the Stuffs and Fashions had not been first invented to gratify the Vanity of others, who took greater delight in fine Apparel, than they; Besides that every Body is not without Pride that appears to be so; all the symptoms of that Vice are not easily discover'd; they are manifold, and vary according to age, humour, circumstances, and often constitution of the people (Ibid).

For individuals who enjoy fancy clothing, grandiose furnishing and luxurious manner of living without pride in them Mandeville claims that if this becomes general characteristic of a whole society first emulation ends and eventually trade dies. Furthermore, as for virtuous man Mandeville avows that "for to say, that if all Men were truly virtuous, they might, without any regard to themselves, consume as much out of zeal to serve their neighbours and promote the Publick

Good, as they do now out of Self-Love and Emulation, is a miserable shift and an unreasonable supposition" (FBI; 133).

> Thus every Part was full of Vice,
> Yet the whole Mass a Paradise;
> […]
> And Virtue, who from Politicks
> Had learn'd a Thousand Cunning Tricks,
> Was, by their happy Influence,
> Made Friends with Vice: And ever since,
> The worst of all the Multitude
> Did something for the Common Good (FB I; 24).

In Remark F, Mandeville explicates the actual reflection of the stanzas given above and he gives couple of examples in order to show how virtue and vice have to become friends in a commercial society. He maintains that it is impossible even for industrious people who strive to maintain their family in a decent way not to be affected by vice because they "get a Livelihood by something that chiefly depends on or is very much influenc'd by the Vices of others, without being themselves guilty of or accessory to them …"(FB I; 85). For instance, although a tradesman who sells cloth and corn to foreign countries and in return purchases spirits, encourages agricultural and manufactory sectors in his country "yet it is not to be denied but that his greatest Dependence is Lavishness and Drunkenness" and in the same vein, says Mandeville, drapers, tailors, furniture dealers and upholsterers would be unemployed or "starv'd in a half a Year's time, if *Pride* and *Luxury* were at once to be banished the Nation" (FB I; 85).

Mandeville then elaborates another subject regarding public benefit. What he calls as "a strange paradox" is that although thieves, pickpockets, highwayman and housebreakers who do nothing for a livelihood but only steal money, savings, jewels and valuable household goods of other members of the society

are the most dangerous members of a society, in fact they somehow provide public benefit. As nobody asks them where the money spent lavishly by them comes from "the worst of all multitude" circulate the money throughout the country by spending it in order to satisfy their sensual appetites. Mandeville exemplifies that and asks a significant question about this subject "A Highwayman having met with a considerable Booty, gives a poor common Harlot, he fancies, Ten Pounds to new-rig her from Top to Toe; is there a spruce Mercer so conscientious that he will refuse to sell her a Thread Sattin, tho' he knew who she was?" (FB I; 88). A possible scenario is also given by Mandeville that tailors, shoemakers and different tradesmen would gain benefits and make money from this expenditure. Mandeville states that "events, may in a hundred Places, see Good spring up and pullulate from Evil, as naturally as Chickens do from Eggs" (FB I; 91).

The main design of the fable, says Mandeville, is to expose "the impossibility of enjoying all the most elegant comforts of life that are to be met with an industrious, wealthy and powerful Nation, and at the same time be bless'd with all the virtue and innocence that can be wished for in a Golden Age" (FB I; 7). Mandeville's intention is to expose corruption of mankind by showing their indulgence of passions and revealing hypocrisy "as practice by those outwardly respectable people who decry crime and luxury while enjoying the utmost the public benefits which depend on private vices for their existence."[66] In "The Moral" part of the poem he says:

> Then leave Complaints: Fools only strive
> To make a Great an Honest Hive
> T' enjoy the World's Conveniences
> Be fam'd in War, yet live in Ease,
> Without great Vices, is a vain

[66] Harth, "The Satiric Purpose of The Fable of the Bees," 328.

EUTOPIA seated in the Brain (FB I; 36).

Apparently, adhering to his original thesis, private vices cause public benefits, Mandeville aims to expose man's folly in The Moral part of "The Grumbling Hive." Because the reason of such absurdity and unreasonableness, says Mandeville, is that

> desirous of being an opulent and flourishing People, and wonderfully greedy after all the Benefits they can receive as such, are yet always murmuring at and exclaiming against those Vices and Inconveniences, that from the Beginning of the World to this present Day, have been inseparable from all Kingdoms and States that ever were fam'd for Strength, Riches, and Politeness, at the same time (FB I; 7).

For this reason, he advises mankind to stop both indulging all vices and at the same time complaining about them. Mandeville also underlines the fact that that he never defended immorality rather always took a stand for encouragement of virtues and denunciation of vices.

2.6. Criticisms after *The Fable of the Bees*

Although the first appearance of "The Grumbling Hive: or Knaves *turn'd Honest*" as a pamphlet and the first publication of *The Fable* attracted little attention, the inclusion of "An Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools and "A Search into the Nature of Society" in *The Fable* triggered harsh criticisms and finally Mandeville became the target of attacks of his contemporaries. His book was even declared as a public nuisance by the Grand Jury of Middlesex. Mandeville's contemporaries' critiques specifically coincide after the addendum of "An Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools" into 1723 edition of *The Fable*. Generally, Mandeville was accused of mocking Christian charity and advocating and encouraging sins like love of luxury, greed and avarice. Mandeville was also

blamed for endorsing and encouraging lavishness, prostitution, drunkenness and dishonesty. William Law was the first critic who was very offensive about arguments exposed in *The Fable* and published his *Remarks upon A Late Book Entituled The Fable of the Bees* in 1724 as immediate as possible after Mandeville's Vindication in 1723. [67]After having observed false assertions made daringly in *The Fable* regarding corruptive nature of mankind, virtue and vice, Law's intention was to correct false notions propounded by Mandeville thus far and expose perfection of human nature his own way.

In this context, Law specifies these false notions as follows. First of all, Mandeville equates mankind with animals who are nothing but only interested in pursuing their appetites and inclinations. Secondly, Law criticizes artificial moral virtue seemingly imposed by politicians and moralists on mankind through the instrument of flattery. Having said that Law infers from Mandeville's theory of morals that man is nothing short of an animal and morality is completely fabrication and artifice. This much is certain from Law's book and worth noting that he disregards Mandeville's ironic and cynic stance. In other words, although Mandeville aims to portray the nature of vice and virtue in order to divulge hypocrisy and self-deception of mankind Law accuses him of being a vigorous advocate of immorality.

As it turns out Law takes every postulation seriously and exerts himself to generate counter arguments. Mandeville, says Law, tries to "deliver from the *Sagacity* of Moralists, the Encroachments of Virtue, and to replace him in the Rights and Privileges of Brutality"[68] The doctrine from heaven which expresses

[67] The original title of William Law's book is *Remarks upon A Late Book Entituled The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits in A Letter to the Author to which is added, A Postscript, containing an Observation or two upon Mr. BAYLE.*

[68] William Law, *Remarks upon A Late Book Entituled The Fable of the Bees* (London: Prince's Arms, 1724), 6.

human beings' relation to God and also signifies excellency of their nature incites them to act of being worthy of their creator. Accordingly, principle of moral actions does not originate from tricks of cunning politicians or moralists rather from God himself and his revelations. In addition to these, for Law it is nothing but only absurdity assuming man in the state of nature by ignoring either any divine religion. Unlike Mandeville's conviction which depends on the assumption that man is savage and barbarous and destitute of morality and religion, Law shows the impossibility of such a state of nature by adducing evidence from Scripture.[69]

After William Law, Richard Fiddes, historian and clergyman, criticizes Mandeville by focusing specifically on "An Inquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue" and "A Search into the Nature of Society" in the Preface to *General Treatise of Morality* (1724).[70] Like William Law, Fiddes concentrates on the role of lawgivers and the nature of morality depicted by Mandeville in the former essay. Fiddes states that by using dominant passion of mankind, namely; vanity or desire of praise, which can be instructed by lawgivers by using honour and shame as imaginary reward and punishment Mandeville gives the origin of morality only in narrow sense. Fiddes does not deny the power of pride or vanity in man's actions but at the same time he also does not deny man's capacity of performing good actions out of generous motives. For Fiddes, assuming that man is incapable of acting out of good motives is the other way to affirm that he is bereft of reason and prudence.

---

[69] For evidences of William Law against Mandeville's theory of state of nature see Law, *Remarks upon A Late Book Entituled The Fable of the Bees,* 10-4.

[70] The original title of Richard Fiddes' book is *A General Treatise of Morality, Form'd upon the PRINCIPLES of Natural Reason only.*

Thus, says Fiddes, the argument regarding the engine of flattery used to control vicious side of mankind is fruitless in the sense that it means disregarding man's desire of performing generous and noble action that man is actually capable of and at the same time it is misinterpretation of man who is depicted to be a creature purely and simply thinks nothing else but the applause of others. Again along the same line with William Law's religious theory against Mandeville, Fiddes points out the relation between moral virtue and Christianity. He asserts that one who wants to ascertain the roots of morality should look into God.

Besides, Fiddes is also interested in refuting Mandeville's criticisms directed to Lord Shaftesbury in "A Search into the Nature of Society." As mentioned before, Mandeville is strictly opposed to Shaftesbury's doctrine concerning immutable nature of virtue and vice in all ages, times and countries. Unlike Shaftesbury, Mandeville is insistent to say that moral virtues and vices are contingent because of their artificial origin. However, it is Fiddes's conviction that Mandeville's arguments concerning different notion of virtue and vice based upon his analogy about divergence in works of painters and masters of art are improper and inconclusive due to the fact that even if there seems to be difference in works of art in fact they all originate from same rules of arts.

Furthermore, Fiddes maintains that beauty is not dependent on common view unlike Mandeville's assertion that what is beautiful in one country is not same in the other. In addition to these, as Mandeville's opponent Fiddes argues against the relativity of nature of moral acts with respect to custom, fashion, mode and opinion. He claims:

> Prejudices imbibed in Infancy, the Force of Custom or Example, or perhaps, some complexional Disposition, may hinder Men from

> examining moral Subjects, in certain Instances, with that Attention and Impartiality, which are requisite to the Discovery of Truth.[71]

Therefore, according to him, it follows that an actor can fulfil a moral duty under sound and true moral foundation which is based upon the perfection of human nature and in the light of reason unless he is ignorant, prejudiced and free from error. Famous dramatist John Dennis, another critic of Mandeville, sets himself a goal to refute Mandeville's thesis regarding the benefits of luxury to economic growth of a nation in *Vice and Luxury* (1724). [72]In the book, along same perspective with Law and Fiddes, Dennis concentrates on religious side of the argument but on the other hand, unlike them, Dennis is interested in exposing ill effects of luxury which was formerly promoted by Mandeville in *The Fable*. Firstly, according to Dennis, Mandeville's impious doctrine which basically indicates his renouncement of religion of his country and even his denial of natural religion is "an open attack upon the Publick Virtue and Publick Spirit of *Great Britain*, of which the Christian religion is the infallible Source; as Publick Virtue and Publick Spirit are the surest Guardians of Liberty."[73] He states that negative effects of pernicious treatises on religious ideas, laudable and impertinent views which are explicitly incompatible with Christian charity and significant increase of luxury and vice impair efficacy and sanctity of Christian religion and also cause corruption and moral decay in society.

Dennis also specifically gives wide coverage to his observations on Mandeville's objections against charity schools in the Preface. It is Mandeville's conviction that

---

[71] Richard Fiddes, *A General Treatise of Morality, Form'd upon the PRINCIPLES of Natural Reason only* (London: Judge's Head, 1724), lvii.

[72] The original title of John Dennis's book is *Vice and Luxury Publick Mischiefs: or; Remarks on a Bool Intituled, The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices Publick Benefits.*

[73] John Dennis, *Vice and Luxury Publick Mischiefs: or; Remarks on a Bool Intituled, The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices Publick Benefits* (London: Lamb, 1724), x.

knowledge and instruction provided for the children of the poor do preclude them for performing their duty as the poor but in fact society is in need of ignorant and working poor population for economic growth; namely, low-cost labour. Dennis maintains that Mandeville's remarks on the education of children of the poor are untenable because fundamentally in charity schools primary purpose is not only to teach the principles of Christianity to the children of the poor but also to direct them to virtuous acts.

In addition to the subject of charity schools, Dennis focuses on different aspects of *The Fable* as well in the rest of his book. *The Fable*, says Dennis, is nothing but panegyric of vice and luxury as it is also understood from the subtitle of the book (*Private Vices Publick Benefits*), but as a matter of fact private vices can purely and simply lead public mischiefs rather than benefits. Dennis mounts a counter argument concerning the beneficial effects of vice and luxury on public that unlike Mandeville's contention, they take quite a toll on public liberty of a nation. Based upon his citation from Algernon Sidney's *Discourses Concerning Government* (1698), Dennis lays stress on the fact that for a popular government which is subject to laws and looks out for equality of its citizens, vices means to be mischiefs that do not only ruin the individual but also impair the state. Great lawgivers in the world like Moses, Solon and Lycurgus, says Dennis, formed their governments and legislated in the light of religion and virtue. Thus, the subtitle of *the Fable* turns upside-down religious and moral definition of virtue and vice.

Private vices such as avarice, pride, vanity, luxury which supposedly turn into public benefits in the Fable, in fact are far from public benefits when examined Old Testament. Especially luxury and pride, reported in Old Testament, as the causes of enslavement are condemned vigorously. Against Mandeville's praise of luxury Dennis mentions banishment of luxury in society which once before

enforced as a government policy in Sparta and resulted in flourishing. Dennis also discusses luxury specifically in a separate part by concentrating on Remark L which comprises Mandeville's doctrines regarding beneficial effects of luxury on society in *The Fable.*

Dennis's *Vice and Luxury* also encapsulates another part consisting of Dennis's remarks on "The Origin of Moral Virtue." For him, the famous statement "moral virtue is the political offspring which flattery begets upon pride" is completely ridiculous because of the fact that "all the great Lawgivers of the World have been perfectly convinc'd, that Religion has always been, and always will be the chief Band of Human Society, and the only Fountain of Moral Virtue." [74] Here, Dennis's reference point is that notions of good and evil and distinctions between vice and virtue are certainly not contrivances of lawgivers, moralists or philosophers rather they originate from divine laws which are greater than positive laws.

In 1725, George Bluet (or Blewitt) published a book entitled *An Enquiry whether a General Practice of Virtue Tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Discouragement of a People.* It includes series of accusations against *The Fable* mostly in the same vein with other contemporary critics of Mandeville. But, Bluet's book seems to include more elaborate analysis and criticisms including themes like religion, public stews, charity schools as well as origin of virtue, formation of society, sources of national wealth and Mandeville's theory concerning the benefits of luxury.

In his *Enquiry*, Bluet, first of all, tries to show how Mandeville is mistaken in such a notorious thesis concerning the usefulness of vices and their contribution to national wealth. For Bluet, national wealth "consists wholly in the Product of the Soil improv'd by Skill and Labour, and the Returns of it by Trade" and labour

[74] Dennis, *Vice and Luxury,* 33.

provides benefit to public "as long as there is any room for the further Improvement of their Soil, or beautifying the Product of it, or extending their Commerce."[75] Bluet is at pains to denounce that Mandeville's thesis about hive of fraud, roguery and indecency is absurd because given that England is implied in the first stanzas of "The Grumbling Hive" one might easily draw a conclusion that without practice of vices and wickedness, uncultivated land in England, rivers available for seafaring and some neglected branches of trade are definitely opportunities for providing employment with thousands of people in the country.

Secondly, Bluet points out the absurdity of Mandeville's argument regarding skilful politicians. It is ridiculous that, says Bluet, on the one hand, Mandeville speaks of the distinction between virtue and vice as contrivance of lawgivers or politicians and propounds their main purpose to make men useful to each other but on the other hand Mandeville seems to be preoccupied with representing abject and hateful characteristics of human nature as the sources of wealth and prosperity of people. It is Bluet's inference:

> Whoever these politicians were, or in what Age and Country soever they lived, they were certainly (according to his Scheme) but sorry Bunglers at their Work; the introducing such a Distinction, or concurring in the Production of Moral Virtues, being only creating, according to him, so many Sources of Distress and Poverty to a People.[76]

It is also senseless to expect laws to be enforced in order to punish vices if we accept Mandeville's statement that vices lead to a prosperous society. As he is strongly against Mandeville's notorious motto, in the next section of his *Enquiry*,

[75] George Bluet, *An Enquiry whether a General Practice of Virtue Tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Discouragement of a People* (London: King's Head, 1725), 15.

[76] Bluet, *An Enquiry,* 22.

Bluet undertakes to refute Mandeville's theory regarding luxury as a significant task. He maintains that luxury as the excess of pleasure and comfort or extravagant expenditures when compared to circumstances of other people is "*a private Vice and a publick Prejudice*."[77]Excessive indulgence in comfort and pleasure might affect mental and physical well-being adversely. Bluet refers to luxury what is excessive for health or extravagant and lavish for fortune; on the other hand, "nothing is truly and properly *Luxury* that is consistent with Man's Health or Fortune, or that is not attended with the Commission of some other Crime, or the Neglect of some other Duty."[78] He also underlines the fact regarding the imbalance between importation and exportation that if imports exceed exports in a country this shows people's propensity and eagerness to spend their money on other countries' products. This simply means that they are fond of luxury and extravagance. As opposed to Mandeville's conviction of frugality as a starving virtue Bluet gives Netherlands as an instance that the practice of frugality made Dutch wealthier than before. On the other hand, he touches upon the pernicious effects of luxury and abundance of money on economies of Spain and Portugal.

Following his critique of luxury, Bluet focuses on Mandeville's stance with respect to the principles of morality. By focusing on the doctrines of ancient sceptics such as Theodorus of Cyrene, Aristippus and Pyrrho, Bluet dwells upon similarities between views of Mandeville and them. In this context, as Bluet cites Theodorus and Aristippus propounded that "Theft, Adultery and Sacrilege were proper in their Season, there being Turpitude in such things in their own Nature, separate from Opinion" and "there was nothing just or excellent, or shameful in its Nature, but as Law and Custom made it so; that no such thing as Kindness, Friendship, or Beneficence, and that they were only practiced upon a selfish

[77] Ibid., 37.

[78] Ibid., 38.

Principle, and that they had no Being without it."[79] Mandeville is of the same mind with Pyrrhonian sceptics in the sense that he affirms their common view concerning the relativity of customs, traditions and conducts of life among different cultures and societies. Besides, Mandeville, just like them, defends the idea that there is no certainty in virtue and vice and people follow the general rules, customs and laws of society which they belong to. Such an endeavour, says Bluet, turns upside down the certainty in morals and annihilates the distinction between right and wrong, virtue and vice. Thus, it follows that the acts like adultery, lying, murder, knavishness, lewdness, drunkenness and theft are not evil and wicked in their nature but their shamefulness and wickedness depend on people's judgments.

Mandeville's standpoint regarding the relation between morality and religion in *The Fable* sparks Bluet's interest as well as his other contemporaries. His critical perspective on Mandeville's definition of virtue leads Bluet to highlight the fact as follows:

> It is indeed a much less Crime, not only against his fellow Creatures, but the Divine Being itself, to burlesque or deny Revelation, than to root up and destroy the first Principles of Virtue and Goodness, to decry Morality as the Invention of the *worst* of Men for the better *Indulgence* of their *Lusts*, as the *Offspring of Flattery begot upon Pride*, or in other Words the Offspring of Roguery begot upon Folly; or at best as an Engine of State to serve the Purposes of Ambition, ad to make Slaves of Mankind; to say there is no such Thing in reality as any *pulchrum & honestum*, no real Worth and Excellency in Things, no Pre-eminence of one above another; but that all depends upon the Mode and Fashion.[80]

[79] Ibid., 86-7.

[80] Ibid., 104-5.

Bluet cannot content himself with the exposure of Mandeville's aim which is far more destructive than denying revelation or making a mockery of texts from Holy Scripture, he soon after criticizes Mandeville's views concerning charity schools. Bluet accentuates main purposes of charity schools as providing poor children with cloths, teaching them how to read and write and also giving religious education to them. Although these kinds of schools, established for that end, were usually seen as the most successful and useful projects of the era the author of *The Fable*, says Bluet, puts forward a scandalous view in his "Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools" that a nation gets wealthier thanks to poor laborious people therefore; it is necessary for the happiness of society to leave the poor and the uneducated as they are. According to Bluet, Mandeville "seems to lament the want of slaves."[81]In other words, what Mandeville does is to promote usefulness of slavery and poverty for a flourishing society.

It is Mandeville's contention that there is no need to encourage the poor who is ill-adapted for creditable employment while there is abundance of dirty and hard labour appropriate for them. "For as the Children are placed out to better Employments than they ought to be, in a few Years there will be a want (suppose) of the Black-Guard, Scavengers, and Night-workers."[82] Bluet tries to show on what grounds Mandeville cannot be right. Scarcity of workers who employ in hard and dirty labours -- unlike Mandeville's determination that it would bring about adverse impact on economy—leads to high profits in businesses. For instance, says Bluet, "there was scarcity of chimney-Sweepers; the Price of their Work must immediately rise, and the Business itself would in some

[81] Ibid., 186.

[82] Ibid., 188.

Proportion become creditable as it grew profitable."[83] Besides, such a scarcity makes labour valuable and also leads to encouragement to the others. It is also completely absurd to assert that the promoters of charity schools are in a struggle for placing charity school children to the trades in London who under other conditions can only be employed in husbandry and come up with an accusation that charity schools destroy nurseries of the poor. It is not possible to blame charity schools for the scarcity of hands in husbandry. Acquired good qualifications in charity schools which enable young people to be employed in reputable labour do not lead them to scorn hard and dirty labours. Because, unless charity children find better employment or due to necessity they know that they can earn their living by means of hard labours.

It seems pretty obvious that *The Fable* was highly influential in the eighteenth century intellectual milieu and Mandeville became the bugbear of the era. Criticisms never came to an end and after Bluet's book; Francis Hutcheson made vigorous efforts in order to refute theories of Mandeville. Hutcheson initially set to work by forming a frame for his moral theory against Mandeville in his first book (*An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*) and next he published six letters against Hobbes's laughter and Mandeville's *Fable* in 1726. Hutcheson's theory regarding morals and his letters will be analysed in detail in the next chapter of this dissertation.

After Hutcheson, a late criticism to *The Fable* comes from George Berkeley with his *Alciphron; or, The Minute Philosopher* (1732). Even if the whole book does not focus solely on Mandeville's notorious theses defended in *The Fable*, the second of seven dialogues is specifically devoted to reveal them. In *Alciphron*, with other three interlocutors (Euphranor, Crito and Alciphron) and the narrator (Dion) in

[83] Ibid., 192.

the dialogues, Lysicles as one of the spokesmen for the representatives of freethinking but especially supporter of Mandeville's doctrines defends and discusses with others Mandeville's main points in the second dialogue. Berkeley's modern free-thinkers and Cicero's minute philosophers are used in the same sense and one of the interlocutors, Crito, underlines this in the first dialogue:

> The modern free-thinkers are the very same with those Cicero called minute philosophers; which name admirably suits them, they being a sort of sect which diminish all the most valuable things, the thoughts, views, and hopes of men; all the knowledge, notions, and theories of the mind they reduce to sense; human nature they contract and degrade to the narrow low standard of animal life …[84]

After having defined free-thinkers as the members of this sect cited above in detail the second dialogue starts with Lysicles's objection to the common view among legislators, ecclesiastics and even some philosophers which is based upon pernicious effects of vices on societies. They either impose upon mankind the necessity to keep themselves away from vices for the sake of their well-being or remind believers of consequences of indulging vices in afterlife. Such false notions, says Lysicles, were corrected by "great philosophers, who have undeceived the world, and proved to a demonstration that private vices are public benefits."[85] Lysicles refers some particular instances in order to show how vices lead to happiness in society. Although drunkenness and gaming are generally thought as vices they paradoxically promotes economy and provide people with employment. For instance, drunkenness "increases the malt tax, a principal branch of his majesty's revenue, and thereby promotes the safety,

---

[84] George Berkeley, *Alciphron; Or, The Minute Philosopher* in *The Works of George Berkeley* vol. 2, ed. Alexander Campbell Fraser (London & New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2005), 48-9.

[85] Ibid., 70-1.

strength, and glory of the nation."[86] Furthermore, a great number of people such as the brewer, the maltster, the dealer of barley, the ploughman are employed by this means. Lysicles progresses further and gives examples of a poor girl and a highwayman. He contends that when a penniless girl becomes the mistress of a rich man, she does not only make a contribution to money circulation by spending money extravagantly but also employs tire woman, laundress and seamstress for her own service.

After Lysicles's unusual and shocking statements since he seems to be confused and unconvinced, Euphranor, the spokesman for Berkeley, asks whether anyone finds these principles acceptable and reasonable in the world in spite of their oppositeness to accepted laws, education and religious principles. Despite prejudices of middle class, says Lysicles, men of good breeding and ingenious men accept these principles. However, by means of a different reasoning Euphranor draws a conclusion that since sober man is healthier and lives longer than a drunkard, it is highly possible for him to consume more drink and circulate more money in his long life.[87]

In addition to alleged public benefits of vices given in *The Fable*, for Crito, another interlocutor, Mandeville's theory regarding beneficial consequences of London fire for the employment of workers from different business segments such as smiths, carpenters, bricklayers and masons also seems to be shocking. It is also pernicious to make such a view public. Because, states Crito, "it hath opened a new way of thinking to our incendiaries, of which the public hath of late begun

[86] Ibid.

[87] Euphranor's point is similar to Francis Hutcheson's reasoning against Mandeville's doctrine concerning luxury consumption. Hutcheson's *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees* which includes his critiques against Mandeville's theses will be addressed in the next chapter in detail.

to reap the benefit."[88]Euphranor and Crito give a series of examples from ancient history in order to show why Mandeville's notions are so inadmissible and radical and how vices like avarice and love of luxury had destructive effects on dissolutions of nations before. However, it is still Lysicles's contention that it is impossible for a nation to flourish without vices. Although flourishing society is said to contain great number of happy people and riches is only seen as a means but not an end for a happy and prosperous society Lysicles believes the opposite that riches can be alone sufficient for happiness and flourishing. He maintains that "give them riches and they will make themselves happy, without that political invention, that trick of statesmen and philosophers, called virtue."[89] Starting off a basic assumption that both mankind and brutes are basically and naturally predisposed to pursuing their sensual inclinations and appetites, Lysicles seems to define happiness as fulfilment of our appetites and attainment of sensual pleasure. But for Crito, minute philosophers who analyse the nature of man by departing from exact similarities between brutes and mankind seek for a demonstration that mankind naturally has no sense of virtue. Although natural pleasures include pleasure of reason, imagination and sensation, libertines fall into error on the ground of taking into account only sensual pleasures.

Dion narrates parables about young women and men, admirers of minute philosophy, in order to show how their life were ruined after being accepted to celebrated society of free-thinkers. These stories seem to be exaggerated and humiliating, especially the morals of them aim to indicate tragic consequences of being a member of minute philosophy. For instance, Dion narrates the story about Cleon, the elder of two brothers as follows:

---

[88] Berkeley, *Alciphron,* 79.

[89] Ibid., 86.

> I have often reflected on the different fate of two brothers in my neighbourhood. Cleon, the elder, being designed an accomplished gentleman, was sent to town, and had the first part of his education in a great school: what religion he learned there was soon unlearned in a certain celebrated society, which, till we have a better, may pass for a nursery minute philosophers. Cleon dressed well, could cheat at cards, had a nice palate, understood the mystery of the die, was a mighty man in the minute philosophy; and having shined a few years in these accomplishments, he died before thirty, childless and rotten …[90]

From beginning of the second dialogue the basic principle of minute philosophy that Euphranor and Crito are obsessed with and criticize harshly at every turn is portrayal of mankind as nothing short of slave of passions. The minute philosophers like Mandeville define mankind's happiness as indulgence of their appetites, desires and passions. Besides, their assumption regarding usefulness of vices to the public is to exempt man from obeying religious principles and dictates of conscience.

Mandeville writes *A Letter to Dion* (1732) in response to Bishop Berkeley's critiques immediately after the publication of *Alciphron*.[91] In *A Letter to Dion* Mandeville defends himself against Berkeley's charges and at the same time he aims to correct misunderstanding and misrepresentation of his main thesis (private vices public benefits) defended himself in *The Fable*. First of all, Mandeville accuses Berkeley (Mandeville calls him Dion) of not having read *The Fable.* He states that if Berkeley had read it "he would not have suffer'd such lawless Libertines as *Alciphron* and *Lysicles* to have shelter'd themselves under my Wings; but he would have demonstrated to them, that my Principles differ'd

[90] Ibid., 105.

[91] It is also worth mentioning that Berkeley's *Alciphron* --the last critique after Hutcheson's comments on *The Fable* -- was published after the second volume of *The Fable* and *Origin of Honour*. While analysing the Second Dialogue of *Alciphron* it is interesting to see that Berkeley does only concentrate on Mandeville's thesis on human nature and his notorious motto which are the main subjects of first volume of *The Fable*.

from theirs, as Sunshine does from Darkness" (LD; 24). Mandeville rectifies Berkeley's misconception that from his assertion regarding the inseparability of vices with flourishing society impunity of crimes cannot be inferred. He cites a passage from *The Fable* that "in all Societies, great or small, it is the Duty of every Member of it to be good, that Virtue ought to be encouraged, Vice discountenanc'd, the Laws obey'd, and the Transgressors punish'd" (FB I; 229).

As mentioned before in several passages in *The Fable*, the main purpose of the book, says Mandeville, is to expose how mankind is so accomplished in indulging vices and artfully disguising them. He also reiterates one of the main ideas of the book as questioning the sincerity of hearts of moderate people who live in abundance and prosperity and at the same time practice of self-denial. In other words, he undertakes to expose scarcity of true self-denial. However, what his contemporaries refuse to believe is that "*The Fable of the Bees* was a Book of exalted Morality" (LD; 43). Unlike a fair and impartial man, the one who is guilty of gratifying all extravagancies and conveniences but still offended at Mandeville due to his portrayal of fashionable manners and way of living as indulgence of vices would certainly be in pains to prove the opposite or blame Mandeville for assaulting Christian morality. Mandeville believes that ill-reputation of his book is due to false reports based on misconception, superficial reading and ignorance of his Vindication. Likewise, Dion's comments and criticisms do not reflect the truth because they originated from false comments and reports.

As for luxury, Mandeville clarifies what he actually meant in *The Fable* that since people are more delighted with enjoyments which are attached to this wicked world they act as if this vice is necessary for their happiness. Besides, it is an undeniable fact that "the more curious and operose Manufactures are, the more Hands they employ; and that with the Variety of them, the Number of Workmen must still encrease" (LD; 38-9). Luxury eventually leads to encouragement in

different areas of trade on account of our fondness of gratifying our pride and vanity. Mandeville contends that it is contradictory "to wish for the Encrease of Trade and Navigation, and the Decrease of Luxury at the same Time" (LD; 67). It is hardly possible to overlook such a paradox resultant juxtaposition of private vices and prosperity of a society. For instance, when possibility of moderate consumption of wine, silk, sugar and tobacco is claimed and desire of these things is not presumed as vice in this case for Mandeville "either no Degree of Luxury ought to be call'd a Vice, or that is impossible to give a Definition of Luxury, which Every body will allow to be a just one" (LD; 60). Besides, in *The Fable*, speaking of Spartan frugality as their way of life the intention, says Mandeville, is to manifest the fact that this is neither wanted nor desired by Englishmen (LD;51).

Mandeville also clarifies the meaning of his subtitle "private vices public benefits" in the sense that even if it is not a complete sentence without including a verb in *The Fable* as well as in his Vindication, states Mandeville, he himself specifically articulated what his motto actually meant. The absence of a verb, then was filled up and so took its final form by this means that "*Private Vices*, by the dextrous Management of a skilful Politician, might be turn'd into *Publick Benefits*" (LD; 55). [92] Thus, in order to answer the accusations regarding the implication of subtitle (encouragement of vices for a flourishing society) Mandeville highlights the fact vices of mankind might turn into public benefits under some restraints and regulations. It also turns out in *A Letter to Dion* that Mandeville appears to drop his radical ideas like benefits of a robbery to the employment of locksmith.

[92] In *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees* (1725) Hutcheson comes up with five probable propositions which can be inferred from the subtitle of *The Fable* and accuses Mandeville of giving vague explanation. It is not clear to infer from the passage above whether Mandeville only answers Berkeley's criticisms or at the same time Hutcheson's accusation concerning the ambiguity which Mandeville generated by the subtitle.

It seems that in *A Letter to Dion* Mandeville does not answer only Berkeley's criticisms at the same time he concentrates on refuting common ideas that majority of his contemporaries came up with before Berkeley and reiterates the same points as he did before in the second volume of *The Fable*. As it is known that in the second volume of *The Fable* (1729) Mandeville comes up with a different theory from what he earlier generated in the first volume concerning the formation of society. Unlike his other contemporaries only Berkeley was fortunate to include Mandeville's theories which were put forward in the second volume but it looks like he disregarded the second volume due to unknown reasons. Therefore, it would not be wrong to say that the comments and criticisms of Mandeville's all contemporaries only target to his earlier perspective. The most fundamental accusations based upon the first volume of *The Fable* were that Mandeville unhesitatingly promoted vice by having declared private vices to be public interest and he also mocked the virtues of Christian religion. Mandeville seems to be in pains to disprove the arguments categorically from beginning to end of *A Letter to Dion*. His resentment not only to Berkeley but also his other contemporaries often makes him highlight misconception and misinterpretation of *The Fable* and complain about superficiality of their arguments against him.

He frequently reminds his readers that he never meant to encourage vices neither in the poem nor in his Remarks. What was certainly unnoticed by Berkeley and at the same time his contemporaries is that they first of all took every statement in *The Fable* literally and ignored Mandeville's satiric and ironic stance. It is also Mandeville's contention that they distorted the subject because they certainly got the point wrong concerning his's remarks on justice which serves lawgivers and politicians not only to prevent and punish certain crimes and harmful vices abut also maintain law and order in society.

CHAPTER III

FRANCIS HUTCHESON'S CRITICISM OF SELF-LOVE AND HIS THEORY OF MORAL SENSE

3.1. Hutcheson's Theory of Moral Sense in *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*

Anyone who knows Hutcheson as an opponent of Mandeville is not surprised when they see the original subtitle of his *Inquiry*. The original subtitle of the first edition of *Inquiry* is: *An Inquiry into the original of our ideas of beauty and virtue; in two treatises. In which the principles of the late Earl of Shaftesbury are Explain'd and Defended, against the Author of the Fables of the Bees: and the Ideas of Moral Good and Evil are establish'd, according to the Sentiments of the Antient Moralists* (1725). As it is seen from the original title that Hutcheson directly acknowledges that he will defend Shaftesbury's ideas regarding morals and aims to defeat Mandeville's egoistic theory. However, direct mention of Mandeville is rarely seen throughout the treatise.

Unlike Hutcheson, before the publication of *Inquiry*, Mandeville expresses his distaste for Shaftesbury's moral sense not only in "A Search into the Nature of Society" but also in the second volume of *The Fable*. As mentioned in previous chapter, in "A Search into the Nature of Society" Mandeville criticizes Shaftesbury's theses about natural sociability, mankind's kind affections and permanent realities of virtue and vice in all ages and all countries. He insists on uncertainty regarding morals and unlike Shaftesbury he also wants to show that virtue is not possible without self-denial. Like a Pyrrhonist, Mandeville gives

some examples about different cultures he tries to prove that customs, traditions and conducts of life are not universal. He also points the obstinacy of custom on man and indicates how it can shape actual human practices. By presenting the dominance of custom he actually aims that there is not a single standard for a virtuous act. He ridicules Shaftesbury's doctrine and says that "the hunting after this *Pulchrum & Honestum* is not much better than a Wild-Goose-Chace" (FB I; 331). However, as a leading proponent of Shaftesbury's thesis and against Mandeville's thesis concerning the relative nature of virtue and vice Hutcheson proposes a theory based upon a moral faculty which is motivated by the sentiment of benevolence and leads an agent to promote the public benefit.

Hutcheson's moral theory in *Inquiry* is based upon other-regarding sentiments of moral agent and stands against the rationalist and egoistic theories of morals. He aims to prove that disinterested moral judgments arise from disinterested feelings and motives of the agent. Second Treatise of *Inquiry* begins with his definition of moral and natural good. According to him, moral goodness "denotes our Idea of some Quality apprehended in Actions, which procures Approbation and Love toward to the Actor, from those who receive no Advantage by the Action" (IBV; 85). On the other hand, first idea of natural good arises from the pleasure in perceptions of any kind of object. The objects which cause the excitement of this pleasure either mediately or immediately are called good. "Those objects which may procure others immediately pleasant are called advantageous: and we pursue both kinds from a view of interest, or from self-love" (IBV; 86). Hutcheson also says:

> Such Objects as we know, either from Experience or Sense, or Reason, to be immediately, or mediately Advantageous, or apt to minister Pleasure, we are said to pursue from Self-Interest, when our Intention is only to enjoy this Pleasure, which they have the Power of exciting. Thus Meats, Drink, Harmony, fine Prospects, Painting, Statues, are perceiv'd by our Senses to be immediately Good; and our Reason

> shews Riches and Power to be mediately so, that is, apt to furnish us with Objects of immediate Pleasure: and both Kinds of these natural Goods are pursu'd from Interest, or Self- Love (Ibid).

Moral and natural good affect man in a different way that man of honesty, generosity and kindness is approved by others and evokes admiration and love; on the other hand, man who possesses natural goods like houses, lands, health and strength does not procure love but rather hatred and envy (IBV; 85). Although moral and natural good both give pleasure, moral good is not reducible to natural good. If so, we should have the same feeling toward two men "one of whom serves us from Delight in our Happiness, and Love toward us; the other from Views of Self-Interest, or by Constraint" (IBV; 90). And even if we receive equal benefits and advantage from both, we have different perceptions for the former action that the power of which is called moral sense. It is a superior sense that we perceive pleasure "in the contemplation of such actions in others, and are determin'd to love Agent, (and much more do we perceive Pleasure in being conscious of having done such actions ourselves) without any View of further natural Advantage from them" (IBV; 88). Human beings have moral sense like aesthetic sense (a separate faculty in the mind) that is engaged in assessments of moral approval and merit.

Moral sense is also a sense that "by which we perceive virtue and vice, and approve and disapprove them in others" (Ibid). Hutcheson insistently reminds his readers that moral judgments should be independent from self-interest or personal benefit. Although having either Mandeville or Hobbes in his mind, Hutcheson does not name; rather, he uses general expressions instead such as "a late witty Author" for Mandeville, "some moralists who will rather twist Self-Love into a thousand Shapes" and "these Gentlemen" for both (IBV; 93-97). But it is clear that throughout Section I and Section II of Second Treatise Hutcheson tries to keep his distance between himself and Mandeville through ruling out

seemingly benevolent actions performed out of personal advantage. Virtuous actions, says Hutcheson, do not spring from self-love or any motives of personal interest no matter how they cause public happiness. Hutcheson also dwells on Mandeville's thesis concerning lawgivers by paraphrasing specific passage from *The Fable*. Unlike the witty author's conviction, says Hutcheson, panegyrics of lawgivers do not arise out of their admiration of acts of mankind but instead, they encourage them in order to make them tractable and more useful for society. Since mankind is very fond of praise, they are inclined to perform acts which they know to be praised. By encouraging people through the instrument of encomiums lawgivers lead them to admire and imitate others instead of pursuing their own advantage.

Hutcheson ridicules Mandeville's theory that "So easy a matter to him, to quit judging of others by what we feel in ourselves! --- for a Person who is wholly selfish, to imagine others to be public-spirited!" (IBV; 98). In opposition to egoistic thesis, Hutcheson believes that in human nature there exists benevolence which is antecedent to self-interest and influences man to love of others. It also lies at the heart of moral good. Hutcheson states love and hatred as the most significant affections in morals, the rest of affections are modifications of those two. Love and hatred are sentiments we feel toward others. He subdivides love into two: love of benevolence and love of complacence or esteem. Since love of benevolence "the very name excludes self-interest", man is never called benevolent who is useful to others at the same time has pursuit of self-interest (IBV; 103). According to Hutcheson not only do morally good actions flow from motivations of benevolence but also our moral sense leads to moral approbation of actions motivated by benevolence.

3.2. Hutcheson's Attack on Hobbes and Mandeville in *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees*

After the appearance of *The Fable*'s second edition (1723) one of the direct responses comes from Francis Hutcheson with *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees in Six Letters*.[93] First three letters are dedicated to Hutcheson's comments on Hobbes's account of laughter. Besides, his critiques of Mandeville's doctrines in *The Fable* embody the last three letters. In the first letter on Hobbes's account of laughter, Hutcheson focuses on Hobbes's basic thesis concerning human nature and infers that as Hobbes asserts that all actions spring from self-love then laughter can be defined as a feeling of joy behind which self-love lies.

Laughter is defined by Hobbes as "a sudden glory" which emerges from "some sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves by comparison with the infirmity of others" (TL; 2-3). When Hobbes's thesis about laughter as a kind of manifestation of self-love is considered as right then, says Hutcheson, it follows that "there can be no laughter on any occasion where we make no comparison of ourselves to others, or of our present state, or where we do not observe some superiority of ourselves above some other thing; and again it must follow, that every sudden appearance of superiority over another, must excite laughter, when we attend to it" (TL; 5). However, as Hutcheson underlines, laughter may arise from pleasantry, parody and burlesque and in this way satiric stance and wit of the person inspire others and evoke admiration. Furthermore, Hutcheson tries to refute Hobbes's account by claiming the opposite that opinion of superiority does not arouse laughter; but instead, incites the feeling of sadness and weeping.

[93] Hutcheson published six letters in the *Dublin Weekly Journal* against Hobbes and Mandeville, later these letters were collected under the title of *Thoughts upon Laughter and Remarks upon The Fable of the Bees* (1725).

In the second letter, Hutcheson sets out to differentiate his own view from that of Hobbes. In this context, he gives circumstances which naturally give rise to laughter. It is Hutcheson's conviction that burlesque essentially involves banding together not only contrast between "ideas of grandeur, dignity, sanctity, perfection and ideas of meanness, baseness and profanity" but also resemblance in the principal idea (TL; 24). As he states "we also find ourselves moved to laughter by an overtraining of wit, by bringing resemblances from subjects of a quite different kind from the subject to which they are compared" (Ibid). He gives Samuel Butler's heroic poem *Hudibras* as an illustration of wit together with satires of Homer and Virgil. Hutcheson accentuates that laughter arises as a result of training to find affinity between the dignified and the base as well as apparent congruity between them. Moreover, laughter may arise from in the wake of an oversight or a mistake concerning the related subject. For instance, "if the most ingenious person in the world, whom the whole company esteems, should thro' inadvertent hearing or any other mistake, answer quite from the purpose, the whole audience may laugh heartily, without the least abatement of their good opinion" (TL; 29). This instance indicates that small mistakes and misfortunes which excite laughter do not address any contempt and feeling of superiority. In other words, those who laugh to any accidental incident that befalls to a dignified man do not see themselves superior to that man.

Hutcheson focuses on the proper use and positive effects of laughter in the third letter. He states that perception of something ludicrous or ridiculous which excites laughter leads to drive away the feelings of stress and sorrow. Laughter is a pleasure and remedy for sorrow and unhappiness which is implanted in us by God.[94]Besides, he addresses the social side of laughter by focusing upon its

[94] In "Hutcheson's *Reflections Upon Laughter*" Elizabeth Telfer claims that Hutcheson's stress on providential status of laughter and his warning about dangers of it remind readers that most probably Hutcheson had Addison's *The Spectator* in mind. Because, says Telfer, "Addison, in one of

contagious character in community. Hutcheson contends that "laughter, like other affections, is very contagious; our whole frame is so sociable, that one merry countenance may diffuse cheerfulness to many …" (TL; 37). In addition to these, he alerts his readers to probable dangers of laughter that misfortunes, crimes and calamities of other people cannot be motives for ridicule. Man of sense does not feel amused when witnessing pangs and torments of sufferers and also not laugh at the perpetrator and the guilty because he is well aware of the fact that "the guilty will take laughter to be triumph over him as contemptible; the miserable will interpret it as hardness of heart, and insensibility of the calamities of another" (TL; 43). It can be concluded that Hutcheson's three letters on Hobbes's account of laughter reveal that Hobbes's definition of laughter is unmerited in the sense that he relates laughter to feelings of superiority. Unlike him, Hutcheson aims to show that laughter arises from congruity as well as bringing together resemblances instead of feeling of superiority stemming from disdain and contempt. Furthermore, he underlines that laughter given by providence is a kind of cure for sorrow and distress. Mankind relishes it unless it does arise from ridiculing infirmity and calamity of others.

As stated earlier, Mandeville's last three letters were targeted to Mandeville's doctrines given in *The Fable*.[95] In very first sentence of his first letter, Hutcheson draws his readers' attention to the subtitle "private vices public benefits" of *the Fable*. He states in the first paragraph that the main purpose of these letters is not to answer Mandeville's basic argument in *The Fable* rather "to show it to be

---

his *Spectator* papers on the subject, had been rather ambivalent about the basic value of laughter, quoting a suggestion that is essentially belongs to man's fallen nature and lamenting the bad use people make of it." Elizabeth Telfer, "Hutcheson's *Reflections Upon Laughter*," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53, no.4 (1995): 363.

[95] E.J. Hundert mentions Hutcheson's obsession of Mandeville with the following words: "Francis Hutcheson, of whom it was said that he could give no lecture from his chair at Glasgow without criticizing Mandeville, was infuriated by the implications of *The Fable*'s attack on the possibility of benevolence..." Hundert, *The Enlightenment's Fable,* 57.

unanswerable" (TL; 57). He speaks of possible implications of Mandeville's notorious motto and accuses him of not being precise about it. Apparently, for Hutcheson "private vices public benefits" does not imply one single clear and distinct proposition. It is highly probable to infer five distinct propositions from it. He gives these probable propositions as follows:

> Private vices are themselves public benefits; or, private vices naturally tend as the direct and necessary means to produce public happiness; or, private vices by dexterous management of governors may be made to tend to public happiness; or private vices natively and necessarily flow from public happiness; or lastly, private vices will probably flow from prosperity thro' the present corruption of men (TL; 58).

It is Hutcheson's conviction that those who read some passages in *The Fable* surmise quite easily that "private vices public benefits" may purport any of five propositions. Furthermore, against Mandeville's portrayal of private and public happiness Hutcheson scrutinizes the subject concerning happiness and widens the scope of the topic in his own way. He differentiates appetites from affections in order to form an outline for his definition of "happiness". Desires of mankind, says Hutcheson, are not limited to necessaries of life and men also have desire for external objects such as furniture, dress and houses. Apart from natural appetites while satisfying their desires for objects human beings encounter uneasiness. "In order to make society happy", states Hutcheson, "it must be necessary either to gratify all desires or suppress or at least to regulate them" (TL; 64). Since both universal gratification and universal suppressing is not fully possible for public happiness the best way is to regulate every desire "by forming just opinions of the real value of their several objects, so as to have the strength of our desires proportioned to the real value of them, and their real moment to our happiness" (Ibid). Therefore happiness consists in gratifying unavoidable appetites like thirst

and hunger and regulating desires by "correcting false opinions or by breaking foolish associations of ideas" (TL; 61).

Hutcheson tries to enlarge his theory about regulation of passions by concentrating on several vices given in *The Fable*. He states that vices like luxury, intemperance and pride promoted by Mandeville is depicted as means for national prosperity but rather they can have destructive effects either on individual's well-being, his family or even his country. Hutcheson believes in the possibility of equal consumption without these vices. He is also against Mandeville's rigorous definition of luxury in *The Fable*. Mandeville defines luxury with following words:

> If every thing is to be luxury (as in strictness it ought) that is not immediately necessary to make man subsist as he is a living creature, there is nothing else to be found in the world, no, not even among the naked savages; of which it is not probable that there are any but what by this time have some improvements upon their former manner of living; and either in the preparation of their eatables, the ordering of their huts, or otherwise added something to what once sufficed them. This definition everybody will say is too rigorous; I am of the same opinion; but if we are to abate one inch of this severity, I am afraid we shan't know where to stop (FB, I; 107).

Against Mandeville, Hutcheson holds the idea that since intemperance, luxury and pride are relative to constitution of body or circumstances "it is impossible to fix one invariable quantity of food, one fixed sum in expenses" (TL; 82). Boundaries of temperance, frugality and moderation can be fixed if man knows that eating, drinking and any other expenses do not damage his health and fortune and not impede his religious duties. Therefore, "prudence, not self-denial, was the essence of Hutcheson's vision of the virtuous consumer."[96] Michael Brown's determination regarding Hutcheson's reflection on self-denial

[96] Michael Brown, *Francis Hutcheson in Dublin, 1719-1730* (Ireland: Four Courts Press, 2002), 119.

in the quotation above appears to be just and right in the sense that what Hutcheson suggests is completely contrary to Mandevillean idea of self-denial given in *The Fable*. Hutcheson, indeed, believes that it is possible for mankind to act virtuously in the light of certain virtues without practising complete self-denial. In this sense, he gives the description of acts of a prudent man.[97]

After constructing the idea of consumption within the limits of moderation and temperance, Hutcheson supports his argument against Mandeville by giving views of ancient moralists and Christian law. He states that except Cynic philosophers all ancient moralists advise controlling and regulating "our opinions and imaginations about the pleasures above necessity" and they recommend use of them "when it is not inconsistent with the offices of life" (TL; 84). Besides, Christian law condemns wealth and power if desires for them are too violent to hinder religious duties.

In his third letter, Hutcheson criticizes Mandeville's style and accuses him of terrifying his readers with his "open vanity" and "pretences to the deepest knowledge" (TL; 102).[98] In the opening passage of *The Fable* in order to evoke admiration of readers Mandeville assures that he examines "chief organs and nicest springs of our machine" along with the spirits which constitute passions. Hutcheson ridicules Mandeville's study of passions and ironically asks: "who will not stand in awe of that author who describes the nature and symptoms of human passions; detects their force and disguises; and traces self-love in its darkest recess beyond any other system of ethics?" and "who, after all this and

[97] In the last chapter of this dissertation again as a counter view to Mandeville's theory about self-denial, prudence as one of the principal virtues in commercial societies will be mentioned through the eyes of Adam Smith with reference to his earlier work *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*.

[98] For Robertson, the third letter indicates that Hutcheson is at the end of his tether because he addresses "*ad hominem* abuse." Robertson, *The Case for Enlightenment*, 285.

much more egotisms and affections in every page needs be told by and author that his vanity he could never conquer?" (TL; 104-5).

Furthermore, Mandeville, says Hutcheson, gives many instances from ancient Greek and Roman history and classical literature in order to secure his erudition. All these instances cannot be evidences of his "immense tritical erudition", because it is not possible to know all these "without having spent many years at a Latin School" (TL; 108). In the rest of the third letter Hutcheson is in a struggle for showing inconsistency and ambiguity of Mandeville's definition of virtue and vice. He first elaborates definition of vice and states that defining vice as "gratifying appetite without regard to the public" is an open-ended definition in the sense that it may be understood as "doing detriment to the public by gratifying appetite" (TL; 110). But throughout *The Fable*, Mandeville defends passionately the thesis that private vices cause public benefit; therefore, it leads an inconsistency.

Mandeville's definition of virtue is also contradictory because of the fact that initially he defines it as "endeavor the benefit of others contrary to the impulse of nature" then states that "moral virtues are the offspring of flattery begot upon pride." Hutcheson states that "virtue, then, which was before contrary to the impulse of nature, now is become following the strongest impulse of nature" (TL; 111). In the last part of the third letter Hutcheson tries to confute Mandeville's thesis with an opposite one. He does not deny the fact that mankind has self-love or desire of private good but he also underlines mankind's kind affections and other-regarding passions. According to Hutcheson, men naturally have kind affections toward others in the sense that they feel delighted with the happiness of others and feel unhappy with the misery of them. He cannot make sense of Mandeville's denial of other-regarding passions of human nature. Mandeville's disbelief concerning the possibility of benevolence seems to be object of ridicule.

Hutcheson states that Mandeville "has probably been struck with some old fanatic sermon upon self-denial in his youth, and can never get it out of his head since" (TL; 122).

Francis McKee claims in his article that the aesthetic content of Mandeville's critique on Shaftesbury in "A Search into the Nature of Society" which also then forms part of the content of Hutcheson's reply in *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees* distinguishes Hutcheson's criticism from other contemporary critics. In other words, according to MacKee "[t]he focus on aesthetics by both writers makes their quarrel unique among the criticisms of *the Fable of the Bees*."[99] In addition to this aspect, Hutcheson's direct or indirect criticism of Mandeville's egoism can be seen in his entire corpus. This is another difference between Hutcheson and other contemporaries of Mandeville that nobody except Hutcheson engages in refuting Mandeville's doctrines systematically. Besides, even Hutcheson's inaugural lecture on human sociability seems to be a reply to Mandeville's theory in the second volume of *The Fable*.[100] Hutcheson is strongly against the theory which puts forward sociability as an artifice; conversely, like Shaftesbury he traces mankind's social sentiments and affections in order to show their natural capacity for sociability.

Hutcheson's attempt to compile letters on Hobbes and Mandeville under the same title following their publication in *Dublin Weekly Journal* seems not to be a coincidence because of the fact that despite their accounts on different subjects Hutcheson aims to reveal how both Hobbes and Mandeville degrade every act of mankind to selfish motive. He tries to show that even laughter, which in fact

---

[99] Francis McKee, "Francis Hutcheson and Bernard Mandeville," *Eighteenth Century Ireland* 3(1988): 125.

[100] Francis Hutcheson, "Inaugural lecture on the social nature of man" in *Francis Hutcheson: Two Texts on Human Nature*, ed. Thomas Mautner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). 124-147.

arises from the perception of something ludicrous or ridiculous and always drives away the feelings of stress and sorrow, can be reduced to the idea of superiority. Likewise, after digging down deep to human nature Mandeville accounts for the possibility of happiness of individual and prosperity of society, foundations of morality and even the origin of sociability with indulgence of selfish passions and motivations. Mandeville's self-centred individuals who desire nothing but only their own satisfactions revive as sociable and benevolent agents in Hutcheson's system.

CHAPTER IV

DAVID HUME'S THEORY OF PASSIONS AND MECHANISM OF SYMPATHY IN *A TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE*

4.1. Hume's Theory of Passions

After Hutcheson, David Hume comes up with a refined theory based on Hutcheson's theory of morals. Hume, like Hutcheson, gives feelings or sentiments prominence and investigates their role on our moral judgments. However, unlike Hutcheson, Hume does not accept a separate faculty as "moral sense" rather; he puts mechanism of sympathy as a ground of his moral psychology general framework of which is first given in *A Treatise of Human Nature*.

As for Hume's association with Mandeville, a significant detail in *Treatise* regarding Hume's reflection on Mandeville is worth mentioning. Although Mandeville was seen as a nemesis with his theory of selfishness and paradoxical subtitle specifically by Hutcheson, Hume's attitude towards Mandeville does not seem to be as hostile as him. From the very beginning of *Treatise* Hume mentions Mandeville among "some late philosophers in *England,* who have begun to put the *science of man* on a new footing, and have engaged the attention, and excited the curiosity of the public" (THN; xvii; emphasis added). For Hume, "science of man" does not only encompass the features of human nature including impressions, ideas, passions, sentiments, sympathy but also comprise morals, politics, economy, religion and social theory. Even if Hume's project seems to be more complex than that of Mandeville we can regard both of them as anatomists

of passions. Considering the field of morals even if they both set to work by anatomizing passions unlike Mandeville, Hume does not reduce all passions to selfishness.

Hume considers himself as an anatomist and underlines his specific task by giving the difference between an anatomist and a painter for the first time in his letter to Hutcheson (17th September 1739). As a reply to Hutcheson's observation about absence of "a certain warmth in the cause of virtue" in *Treatise* Hume mentions two distinct ways of examining mind that an anatomist tries to "discover its most secret springs and principles" on the other hand a painter tries to "describe the grace and beauty of its actions"[101] Although they are not associated with each other, a painter can benefit from an anatomist's good advice. In *Treatise*, Hume does not strive to glorify moral sentiments rather, he engages in anatomizing sentiments heedfully and dexterously. In this sense, he starts to investigate the nature and characteristics of the passions and the mechanism of sympathy in Book II of *Treatise*. He defines passions as impressions of reflection which are different from impressions of sensation. By impressions of sensation or original impressions, he means all bodily pleasures and pains which emerge from the constitution of the body and from animal spirits. Reflective or secondary impressions spring from some of the original impressions. The subject regarding secondary or reflective impressions is main

[101] David Hume, *The Letters of David Hume*, vol.1, ed. J.Y.T. Grieg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), 32. In the final paragraph of *Treatise* Hume also says the following regarding the distinction between the anatomist and the painter: "The anatomist ought never to emulate the painter; nor in his accurate dissections and portraitures of the smaller parts of the human body, pretend to give his figures any graceful and engaging attitude or expression. There is even something hideous, or at least minute in the views of things, which he presents; and 'tis necessary the objects shou'd be set more at a distance, and be more cover'd up from sight, to make them engaging to the eye and imagination. An anatomist, however, is admirably fitted to give advice to a painter; and 'tis even impracticable to excel in the latter art, without the assistance of the former. We must have an exact knowledge of the parts, their situation and connexion, before we can design with any elegance or correctness. And thus the most abstract speculations concerning human nature, however cold and unentertaining, become subservient to practical morality; and may render this latter science more correct in its precepts, and more persuasive in its exhortations" (THN; 621).

concern of Hume, he deeply investigates this type of impressions in Book II and he also extends his research by dividing reflective impressions (passions) into two classes. The calm passions which comprise the sense of beauty and deformity fall into the first category. The second category which consists of passions of pride and humility, love and hatred, grief and joy are denominated violent passions.

Violent passions are divided into two types: direct passions and indirect passions. This subdivision indicates that direct passions stem from either pleasure and pain or from good and evil. Likewise, indirect passions have the same mechanism but they can also arise from the combination of other qualities. Indirect passions comprise pride, humility, ambition, vanity, love, hatred, pity, malice and generosity. On the other hand, desire, aversion, grief, joy, hope, fear, despair and security are counted as direct passions (THN; 277). After a brief division of passions, Hume undertakes a deep examination about some of the indirect passions like pride and humility, love and hatred.

He states that although pride and humility are generally seen as contrary to each other, they have common object. The object of these passions is "self." The degree of the idea about us causes either a joyful pride or a miserable humility. Hume states that "whatever other objects may be comprehended by the mind, they are always consider'd with a view to ourselves" he also adds that "otherwise they wou'd never be able to either to excite these passions, or produce the smallest increase or diminution of them. When self enters not into consideration, there is no room either for pride or humility" (Ibid). Hume puts emphasis on the role of the self as an object of these passions but he says that self should not be considered as the cause of these opposite passions because of the fact that while pride and humility have same object, if the self was the common cause for these passions "it cou'd never produce any degree of the one passion, but at the same

time it must excite an equal degree of the other; which opposition and contrariety must destroy both" (THN; 278). Therefore, since a man cannot be considered as both humble and proud, pride and humility have to possess different causes. Each one has an annihilating effect on the other; that is to say, if pride gains strength humility loses its effect or vice versa.

After clarifying the position of the self as an object of pride and humility, Hume designates the possible causes of pride as justice, wit, courage, learning and good-sense and opposite ones for humility. Besides, "our country, family, children, relations, riches, houses, gardens, horses, dogs, cloaths" may be counted as causes of either pride or humility. Hume divides the cause of passions into two parts that one of them is called the quality and the other is named subject (THN; 279). He gives an example in order to clarify the division of the cause of pride and humility that a man possessing a beautiful house is the object of pride, beauty is the quality and the house is the subject of pride (Ibid).

In addition to pride and humility, Hume concentrates another set of indirect passions: love and hatred. Although love and hatred fall into the same category with pride and humility, there is a difference between these two sets of passions in the sense that although the object of pride and humility is the self "of whose thoughts, actions and sensations we are intimately conscious", the object of love and hatred is "some other person of whose thoughts, actions and sensations we are not conscious" (THN; 329). As for another difference between these two sets of passions Hume says the following:

> The passions of love and hatred are always followed by, or rather conjoin'd with benevolence and anger. 'Tis this conjunction, which chiefly distinguishes these affections from pride and humility. For pride and humility are pure emotions in the soul, unattended with any desire and not immediately exciting us to action. But love and hatred are not contemplated within themselves, not rest in that emotion which they produce, but carry the mind to something

> farther. Love is always follow'd by a desire of the happiness of the person belov'd, and an aversion to his misery. As hatred produces a desire of the misery and an aversion to the happiness of the person hated. So remarkable a difference betwixt these two sets of passions pride and humility, love and hatred, which in so many other particulars correspond to each other, merits our attention (THN; 367).

On the other hand, like pride and humility, the object of love and hatred is not the cause. If the object of love and hatred was also their cause, those passions would be produced in equal degree and they would annihilate each other. He underlines another similarity between love and hatred, pride and humility that although love and pride are agreeable hatred and humility are painful.

He also mentions direct passions which arise directly from pleasure or pain and from good or evil. When we remove pleasure and pain principle in production of these passions we automatically rule out love and hatred, pride and humility and then only direct passions which proceed from good or evil are left. These direct passions are called desire and aversion, grief and joy, hope and fear. These passions are originated by the good or evil principle but certainty or probability play a crucial role in denomination of these passions. For instance, certain or probable good produces joy while grief or sorrow proceed from certain or probable evil. The degree of uncertainty has a role in the production of hope or fear. However, Hume does not concentrate on direct passions specifically and he seems to be unconcerned about the details of this type of passions because of the fact that he thinks that "none of the direct affections seem to merit our particular attention, except hope and fear" (THN; 439). Additionally, he mentions the supportive role of indirect passions on direct ones. That is to say, by increasing desire or aversion to an object, indirect passions give additional force to the direct passions. He gives an instance:

> A suit of fine cloaths produces pleasure from their beauty; and this pleasure produces the direct passions, or the impressions of volition

> and desire. Again, when these cloaths are consider'd as belonging ourselves, the double relation conveys to us the sentiment of pride, which is an indirect passion; and the pleasure, which attends that passion, returns back to the direct affections, and gives new force to our desire or volition, joy or hope (Ibid).

Furthermore, Hume presents an additional principle in the formation of direct passions that they "frequently arise from a natural impulse or instinct, which is perfectly unaccountable" (Ibid). But Hume warns the reader that even if these passions do not arise from good or evil they are able to produce good and evil.

4. 2. The Origin of our Moral Distinctions

In *Treatise* Hume defends the power of passions over reason in the field of morality. It seems senseless, says Hume, to name someone as virtuous who only follows the dictates of reason. He insists that morality is not object of reason and "reason is, and ought only to be the slave of the passions, and can never pretend to any other office than to serve and obey them" (THN; 415). He also discusses whether our moral principles have natural ground or they proceed from education. It is Hume's contention that "every passion, habit or turn of character (say they) which has a tendency to our advantage or prejudice, gives a delight or uneasiness; and 'tis from thence the approbation or disapprobation arises" (THN; 295).

He affirms that morality is grounded on pleasure and pain and in the heart of virtue pleasure lies and in vice uneasiness does. This means that pleasure and pain are not only inseparable from virtue and vice but they generate the nature of virtue and vice.[102] Hume points out the dependence of our moral distinctions on

[102] The significant place of the feelings of pleasure and uneasiness of the person affected by the action shows that Hume departs from Hutcheson's theory of morals which encloses virtue with benevolence.

pleasure and pain that "whatever mental quality in ourselves or others gives us a satisfaction, by the survey or reflexion, is of course virtuous; as every thing of this nature, that gives uneasiness, is vicious (THN; 574-5). Therefore, every quality in others and us causes indirect passions based on satisfaction or uneasiness it gives. On the one hand, quality which gives pleasure causes either pride or love and on the other quality which produces uneasiness gives rise either to humility or hatred. It follows that "in every case, therefore, we must judge of the one by the other; and may pronounce any quality of the mind virtuous, which causes love or pride; and any one vicious, which causes hatred and humility" (THN; 575).

Hume then questions the origin of our moral distinctions. As discussed in the second chapter of this dissertation that even if a revised version of *The Fable* posits an improved theory in the second volume concerning the origin of our moral distinctions, it seems that Hume predicates on the main hypothesis about origin of moral distinctions given in the first volume *The Fable*. He rejects the idea that all moral distinctions are invented by skilful politicians. It was Mandeville's contention that lawgivers made men believe that conquering their appetites, desires and passions was more beneficial than indulging them. Actions emerging from the indulgence of one's appetites without regarding the public good were entitled as vices. On the other hand, virtues were defined as actions contrary to one's natural impulses regarding the benefit of others.

Having Mandeville in mind, Hume states that "some philosophers have represented all moral distinctions as the effect of artifice and education, when skilful politicians endeavour'd to restrain the turbulent passions of men, and make them operate to the public good, by the notions of honour and shame" (THN;578). Such kind of system, he adds, "is not consistent with experience" (Ibid). He rejects the idea founded on a basis that all virtues and vices either

serve public benefit or loss. Because, says Hume, there are some other virtues which are useful to agent rather than public. Hume's second point which reveals the basic difference between Mandeville's and Hume's theory of morals is about moral approbation and blame. He claims:

> Had not men a natural sentiment of approbation and blame, it cou'd never be excited by politicians; nor wou'd the words laudable and praiseworthy, blameable and odious, be any more intelligible, than if they were a language perfectly unknown to us, as we have already observ'd (THN; 579).

Hume highlights the fact that although such a system which proposes artificial origin of all moral distinctions is considered as erroneous "moral distinctions arise, in a great measure, from the tendency of qualities and characters to the interest of society, and that 'tis our concern for that interest, which makes us approve and disapprove them" (Ibid).

Hume partially agrees with Mandeville by confirming that virtues and vices are not completely natural. Some of them are totally independent from the contrivances of men but some of them "produce pleasure and approbation by means of artifice or contrivances, which arises from the circumstances and necessities of mankind" (THN; 477). The second class of virtues which include justice, allegiance, chastity and modesty are called artificial virtues. Hume defines each of these virtues and explicates how they depend on the social structures. It is also noteworthy that artificial virtues can differ from society to society. For instance, justice, says Hume, "is a moral virtue, merely because it has that tendency to the good of mankind; and, indeed, is nothing but an artificial invention to that purpose" (THN; 577). Another type of virtues, on the other hand, originates naturally and have universal characteristic. This type is called natural virtues and it covers generosity, compassion, charity, meekness, gratitude, friendship, modesty, beneficence, prudence, frugality, assiduity,

enterprise, dexterity, temperance, industry, courage, ambition, pride, good sense, wit and humour. Besides, Hume states that many natural virtues are also called social virtues. Like artificial virtues, these natural virtues such as beneficence, charity, generosity, equity, moderation and clemency are ranked among the qualities which have aptitude to the good of society and mankind.

4.3. The Mechanism of Sympathy

The concept of sympathy is central to Hume's theory of morals. He uses sympathy completely different from its lexical meaning. Sympathy is generally known as a feeling or expression of pity, compassion or commiseration for the distress of the other. However, Hume does not mean feeling of pity or commiseration; rather, he defines sympathy as an ability to receive emotions or sentiments of others by communication even if they are contrary to our own (THN; 316). No matter how our sentiments or emotions are different from that of others, due to the quality of human nature, we are inclined to sympathize with other people. Hume states that "the minds of men are mirrors to one another, not only because they reflect each other's emotions, but also because those rays of passions, sentiments and opinions may be often reverberated, and may decay away by insensible degrees" (THN; 365). Hume gives an instance regarding wealth and power in order to clarify the meaning of reverberation of sentiments. He contends that the possessor of riches always feels satisfaction and pleasure. A sentiment resembling the original one in vivacity and force is produced through the instrument of imagination. Accordingly, it follows that reflected satisfaction of the beholder gives rise to love and esteem for the possessor of wealth and power. It is through sympathy that we can enter into sentiments of the rich and the poor and "one of the most considerable of these passions is that of love and

esteem in others, which therefore proceeds from a sympathy with the pleasure of the possessor" (Ibid).

Hume mentions external signs as facilitators of sympathetic reflection. Sympathy is not a sentiment or passion rather it is a mechanism which ensures the transference of feelings and sentiments of one person to another one. Hume states that not only good-tempered people are affected by disposition of their fellows but even the most arrogant people are affected by the disposition of their friends, relatives or fellow citizens to some degree. The mechanism of sympathy works with the effects of external signs of the actor like countenance, facial expressions, gestures, manners or ways of speaking. These external signs conduct the idea of sympathy with conversion it into impression and by certain degree of vivacity the equal sentiment is produced in spectator. Hume states that since we have a formation about our own person with the impressions and the ideas we are able to have ideas and impressions for other objects that are related to us as vivid as that of ourselves. In this case, the relations of resemblance and contiguity are important "especially when by an inference from cause and effect and by the observation of external signs, we are informed of the real existence of the object, which is resembled or contiguous (THN; 317-8).

Since human beings resemble each other to some degree they encounter analogous feelings and passions in similar circumstances and the way of expressing these feelings and passions is almost in the same manner. Hume says that "nature has preserv'd a great resemblance among all human creatures, and that we never remark any passion or principle in others, of which, in some degree or other, we may not find a parallel in ourselves" (THN; 318). Hence, because of the noticeable resemblance among all human beings, everyone is capable of entering sentiments and emotions of others and then adapting them with ease. In addition to this common aspect of human nature, there are other

factors that expedite sympathy such as "similarity in our manners or character, or country, or language" (Ibid). Beside the relation of resemblance, Hume points out the function of the relation of contiguity. According to him, the sentiments of people who are remote from us have little impact on us; therefore, an entire communication between ourselves and others requires the relation of contiguity. Hume also states that "the relations of blood, being species of causation, may sometimes contribute to the same effect; as also acquaintance, which operates in the same manner with education and custom; as we shall see more fully afterwards" (Ibid). Furthermore, the causal relation in the formation of sympathy is essential in the sense that we first form the idea of what others feel in a specific situation. By the principle of resemblance or contiguity we associate ourselves to others. Since our vivid impression regarding what we would feel about the situation and the idea about the feeling of others facilitate the mechanism of sympathy. Hume explains the procedure of sympathy as follows:

> 'Tis indeed evident, that when we sympathize with the passions and sentiments of others, these movements appear at first in our mind as mere ideas, and are conceiv'd to belong to another person, as we conceive any other matter of fact […] 'Tis also evident, that the ideas of the affections of others are converted into the very impressions they represent, and that the passions arise in conformity to the images we form of them (THN; 319).

Since facial expressions, gestures or tones of voice are effects of one's passions, we form the idea of these passions in our mind then they are converted into impressions. At the same time Hume gives an example in order to clarify this procedure:

> Were I present at any of the more terrible operations of surgery, 'tis certain, that even before it begun, the preparation of the instruments, the laying of the bandages in order, the heating of the irons, with all the signs of anxiety and concern in the patient and assistants, wou'd have a great effect upon my mind, and excite the strongest sentiments of pity and terror. No passion of another discovers itself immediately

> to the mind. We are only sensible of its causes or effects. From these we infer the passion: And consequently these give rise to our sympathy (THN; 576).

As mentioned earlier the communication of passions via sympathy is possible by enough proportion and intensity of vivacity and force. Here, Hume puts an emphasis on power of imagination that "the stronger the relation is betwixt ourselves and any object, the more easily does the imagination make the transition, and convey to the related idea the vivacity of conception, with which we always form the idea of our own person" (THN; 318). He also adds the following:

> The bare opinion of another, especially when inforc'd with passion, will cause an idea of good or evil to have an influence upon us, which wou'd otherwise have been entirely neglected. This proceeds from the principle of sympathy or communication; and sympathy, as I have already observ'd, is nothing but the conversion of an idea into impression by the force of imagination (THN; 427).

In addition to the facilitative effect of imagination in transference of the ideas and impressions, Hume also underlines the union between affections and imagination in the sense that "wherever our ideas of good or evil acquire a new vivacity, the passions become more violent; and keep pace with the imagination in all its variations" (THN; 424). There is also effect of the relation of contiguity or distance in space and time on the imagination that the things which are contiguous or close to us in either space or time are conceived in more lively or vivid way unlike the things which are remote to us in space or time. But Hume warns us about the fact that sympathy is not restricted to the present moment we are still able to communicate the feelings of others by the help of imagination. Hume gives an example:

> For supposing I saw a person perfectly unknown to me, who, while asleep in the fields, was in danger of being trod under foot by horses, I shou'd immediately run to his assistance; and in this I shou'd be

> actuated by the same principle of sympathy, which makes me concern'd for the present sorrows of a stranger. The bare mention of this is sufficient. Sympathy being nothing but a lively idea converted into an impression, 'tis evident, that, in considering the future possible or probable condition of any person, we may enter into it with so vivid a conception as to make it our own concern; and by that means be sensible of pains and pleasures, which neither belong to ourselves, nor at the present instant have any real existence (THN; 385-6).

Another aspect of sympathy is given in *Treatise* that our relations or acquaintances naturally have a strengthening effect on the production of sympathy. Hume highlights the fact that custom and relation enable us to participate deeply in the sentiments of others and "whatever fortune we suppose to attend them, is render'd present to us by the imagination, and operates as if originally our own (THN; 389). We feel delighted and pleased for the pleasures of our relatives and fellow-citizens and feel sorrow for their misfortunes. According to Hume, since sympathy is a very powerful mechanism of human nature, it produces our moral sentiments and generates many other virtues. It also lies at the basis of moral approval and disapproval in the sense that qualities spring from sympathy gain approbation due to their tendency for the benefit of other people therefore; one who possesses these qualities is rendered as a good citizen in the society. On the contrary, one who has opposite qualities is naturally disapproved and rendered as dangerous for the society. Hume underlines sociability by this characteristic of sympathy that "'tis that principle, which takes us so far out of ourselves, as to give us the same pleasure or uneasiness in the characters of others, as if they had a tendency to our own advantage or loss" (THN; 579).

As depicted before, regarding the mechanism of sympathy Hume states that not only biological make up of all human beings is similar but also every human being more or less experiences similar passions in similar circumstances or

situations as other people do. However, the elements stated above which facilitate sympathy might lead to someone to infer that Hume gives the framework of "partial sympathy." Because, he first contends that the relation of contiguity facilitates the mechanism of sympathy and he underlines that we can sympathize more who are similar in our manners, character, country or language. The things which are contiguous or close to us in either space or time are conceived in more lively or vivid way unlike the things which are remote to us in space or time. At this point, Hume clarifies a crucial point that while we have a capacity to sympathize with strangers, because of the relation of contiguity we sympathize more with people who are contiguous to us like our relatives, companions or countrymen but "we give the same approbation to the same moral qualities in China as in England" (THN; 581). In other words, the same moral qualities either in China or in England seem equally virtuous in the eye of a judicious spectator. Hume offers such a notion in order to show the possibility of an impartial or unbiased moral judgment which does not vary in accordance with the sentiments of a spectator formed by the relations of resemblance and continuity. Hume explicates that "the sympathy varies without a variation in our esteem. Our esteem, therefore, proceeds not from sympathy" (Ibid). That is to say, since approbation of moral qualities arises from satisfaction, pleasure or moral taste and we sympathize with person who is contiguous to us, then we can infer that we cannot feel same pleasure from virtues of our friend and a person who is in a different country. But we do feel equal esteem for both persons.

Hume also propounds that we are inclined to sympathize with a person who possesses beneficial character traits to society. However, due to accidents or misfortunes, this person may be unable to give his good character traits prominence. At this point, Hume states that "virtue in rags is still virtue; and the love, which it procures, attends a man into a dungeon or desert, where the virtue

can no longer be exerted in action, and is lost to all the world (THN; 584). He means that we still love the good-tempered person who does not have opportunity to act beneficially to his friends and country. Hume adds that "if sympathy were the source of our esteem for virtue, that sentiment of approbation cou'd only take place, where the virtue actually attain'd its end, and was beneficial to mankind" (Ibid). Therefore, He clarifies that the goodness of an end accords with means which lead to produce that end.

As the most powerful principle of human nature and the basis of our moral judgments sympathy is extolled by Hume in *Treatise*. It is alone capable of giving us "the strongest sentiments of approbation, when it operates alone, without the concurrence of any other principle" (THN; 618). Hume's theory of passions and sympathy is significant in two respects. Firstly, he advances Hutcheson's theory of moral sense and origin of disinterested moral judgments by offering the feelings of pleasure and displeasure arising from sympathy on the basis of moral approbation and disapprobation which in fact seems to be an obvious departure from Hutcheson's theory of benevolence. It is obvious that like Hutcheson, even if not too harsh and hostile, Hume tries to show the superiority of morality based upon sentiments to moral rationalism and also egoistic theory of Hobbes and Mandeville. Secondly, *Treatise* was a seminal work for Smith because, just before its publication, Mandeville became notorious among his contemporaries because of his moral egoism, at the other extreme Hutcheson stand with his theory of moral sense. What Hume offered to Smith was "an approach that was 'entirely new' and one which would form the basis for a 'science of man', constructed on genuinely experimental principles."[103]Adam Smith's systematic investigation on the nature of sentiments and his elaborated theory of sympathy in *Theory of Moral Sentiments* shows that he starts off with Humean principles. In the light of given

[103] Phillipson, *Adam Smith,* 66.

characteristics of Hume's mechanism of sympathy above, in the next chapter, the original sides of Adam Smith's theory of sympathy portrayed in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* will be discussed.

CHAPTER V

ADAM SMITH'S THEORY OF SYMPATHY

5.1. The Theory of Sympathy

In *A Treatise of Human Nature* not only does Hume address sympathy as the most powerful principle of human nature and the mechanism of reflecting our sentiments but also claim that our moral judgments arise from it. As one of the proponents of empiricist tradition along with Hutcheson and Hume, Adam Smith also associates his moral theory to feelings or sentiments. Our moral decisions and judgments, says Smith, do not arise from rational calculation; rather, they emerge from feelings or sentiments. Even if Smith's moral theory basically originates from sentiments, when examined in detail, it differs from both Hutcheson's and Hume's doctrines of morals with some certain respects. Smith offers more systematic and comprehensive theory than Hutcheson and Hume. His specific concern to overcome the systems that reduce morality to selfishness leads him to build his theory of sympathy on more solid basis.

Smith is generally known as the father of economics and he is notable for his economic theory in the *Wealth of Nations*. In fact he was a professor of morality at University of Glasgow and published a book entitled *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) long before *the Wealth of Nations*, which encapsulated his doctrines regarding morals and went through six editions with some refinements, improvements and addendums during his lifetime. The first chapter of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (TMS) entitled 'Of Sympathy' indicates the primary concern of his moral theory. The very opening passage of TMS

clearly gives the main idea of which Smith will defend throughout the book. It indicates that man is not solely motivated by self-love but fortune and happiness of others also motivate individuals. Smith states that "[h]ow selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature, which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it (TMS; 9). This citation shows two facts about Smith's position concerning human nature that firstly, Smith denies mankind's being entirely selfish and secondly by asserting altruistic nature of mankind he directly opposes to those (Hobbes and Mandeville) who claim human nature is entirely selfish. In this way, Smith sketches completely a different picture from the dark one formerly drawn by Mandeville in *The Fable* by manifesting the mankind's natural capacity of fellow-feeling for happiness and misery of the others in TMS.

Smith defines sympathy as our capacity for fellow feeling with others. Like Hume, he claims that sympathy is the guiding and principal sentiment and constitutes ground for our moral judgments. This means that Smith does not use sympathy in usual fashion; it has a special meaning and characteristic due to its capacity to form our judgments about others as well as ourselves.[104] He also carefully distinguishes sympathy from the feelings of pity and compassion. Alternatively, some contemporary Mandeville and Smith scholars like Pierre Force and Jack Russell Weinstein associate Smith's sympathy to Mandeville's and Rousseau's pity. Starting from the first paragraph of TMS Force and Weinstein

[104] D.D. Raphael underlines the fact that Smith's usage of sympathy is unusual in the sense that he uses it to mean "not just sharing the feelings of another, but being aware of that one shares the feelings of another." Raphael also claims that "as often happens when a philosopher takes of common usage and employs it in a special sense, he sometimes forgets his own prescription and slips back into the normal meaning but in general Smith is clear enough about what he is doing." D. D. Raphael, *Adam Smith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 29.

show some expressions and try to match them with Mandeville's definition of pity.[105]

It is true that Mandeville only defines pity as a disinterested feeling even a highwayman or murderer is not without it but he also reminds his readers of a little mischievous character of pity. Earlier, La Rochefoucauld interprets pity and compassion as a manifestation of self-love. In *The Maxims*, he says:

> Pity is often a feeling our own ills, prompted by the ills of other people. It is a clever way of anticipating the misfortunes that could possibly befall us: we help other people so that they will be obliged to help us when comparable circumstances arise; and the services we render them are, strictly speaking, good deeds that we do for ourselves in advance.[106]

Mandeville, in *The Fable*, appropriates La Rochefoucauld's interpretation in the sense that he defines pity as "the most gentle and the least mischievous of all our passions" (FB, I; 56). Yet, natural act performed by compassion or pity, which consists in sympathy for calamities and tragedies of others is not a sign of our fellow-feeling but "frailty of our Nature" and "the weakest minds have generally the greatest Share of it, for which Reason none are more Compassionate than Women and Children" (Ibid). Despite pity's resemblance to virtue, without "considerable mixture of it" it may lead evil (Ibid). Mandeville says that it might

---

[105] Pierre Force, *Self-Interest before Adam Smith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 20-47. Jack Russell Weinstein, *Adam Smith's Pluralism* (New Haven; London: Yale University, 2013), 31. However, on the other hand, for most of Adam Smith scholars Smith's sympathy is neither synonymous with pity and compassion nor it is restricted to them. As an instance, Thomas Wilson differentiates Smith's usage from daily use of sympathy. He stresses Smith's broad use of sympathy. Thomas Wilson, "Sympathy and Self-Interest," in *The Market and The State: Essays in Honour of Adam Smith,* ed. Thomas Wilson and Andrew S. Skinner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 73-4. Besides, Dennis C. Rasmussen expresses the fact that sympathy for Smith is not limited to fellow-feeling with sorrow of other as it for Rousseau. Dennis C. Rasmussen, *The Problems and Promise of Commercial Society: Adam Smith's Response to Rousseau* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008), 63.

[106]La Rochefoucauld, *Collected Maxims and Other Reflections*, trans. E.H., A.M. Blackmore and Francine Giguere (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 75.

lead to the destruction of "the Honour of Virgins" and corruption of "the Integrity of Judges" and also adds Mandeville "whoever acts from it as a Principle, what good soever he may bring to the Society, has nothing to boast of but that he has indulged a Passion that has happened to be beneficial to the Publick" (Ibid).

But on the other hand, Smith's sympathy has a broader meaning than the feeling of pity and commiseration.[107] Besides, while sympathy in TMS is the ground for moral judgments, pity in *The Fable* is not used as a basis for moral judgments. D.D. Raphael also states that Smith's usage of sympathy is different from the common usage of compassion in the sense that apart from sharing burdens of others Smith's sympathy gives a "socializing agent in a different way."[108] As it follows from TMS that "Pity and compassion are words appropriated to signify our fellow-feeling with the sorrow of others. Sympathy, though its meaning was, perhaps, originally the same, may now, however, without much impropriety, be made use of to denote our fellow-feeling with *any passion whatever*" (TMS; 10; emphasis added).

Thus, this means that Smith uses sympathy in a very broad sense. Geoffrey Sayre-McCord also underlines the fact that Smith's broad use of sympathy is a way to differentiate between sympathy, compassion and pity.[109] Smith gives wide coverage to nature and characteristics of sympathy throughout TMS. He signifies sympathy as a natural fellow-feeling and points out its innateness in human nature by giving a set of instances. To illustrate, says Smith, "when we

---

[107] See also Glenn R. Morrow, *The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith* (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969), 31.

[108] Raphael, *Adam Smith*, 31.

[109] Geoffrey Sayre-McCord, "Hume and Smith on Sympathy, Approbation, and Moral Judgment," in *Sympathy: A History*, ed. Eric Schliesser (USA: Oxford University Press, 2015), 212.

see a stroke aimed and just ready to fall upon the leg or arm of another person, we naturally shrink and draw back our own leg or our own arm; and when it does fall, we feel it in some measure, and are hurt by it as well as the sufferer" (TMS; 10). And he gives other examples:

> The mob, when they are gazing at a dancer on the slack rope, naturally writhe and twist and balance their own bodies, as they see him do, and as they feel that they themselves must do if in his situation. Persons of delicate fibres and a weak constitution of body complain that in looking on the sores and ulcers which are exposed by beggars in the streets, they are apt to feel an itching or uneasy sensation in the correspondent part of their own bodies (Ibid).

His instances and his portrayal of sympathy as a natural feeling also indicate that he obviously constructs his theory against selfish hypothesis. Smith tries to portray man as having a certain natural feeling of sympathy or fellow-feeling for another. Smith's persistence and determination about our certain fellow feelings with others seems that he aims to annihilate the description which degrades all human behaviour to selfishness.

Smith links sympathy with additional elements in order to enforce his theory and take a firm stand against possible criticisms. One of the crucial elements or components assigned by him is "imagination." According to Smith, we are naturally concerned with the fortune of others by a mechanism of sympathy; so, this takes us to imagine how we would feel and behave if we were in the same boat with others. He states that "as we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the manner in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation" (TMS; 11). The spectator does not feel the actor's feeling but he imagines himself in actor's situation and he becomes the same person with the actor. Thus, the spectator is able to form any idea regarding the actor's sensations. Of course, imagined sentiments of the spectator are not identical with the actual ones. But even if,

says Smith, they are generally in weaker degree than the sentiments of the agent, more or less agreeing and correspondent sentiment can emerge in any concerned spectator.

As stated before Smith maintains that sympathy can arise from whatever the passion is and this follows that we can have fellow-feeling with any passion. Smith does not rule out the spontaneous occurrence of sympathy in some instances that spectator can sympathize joy as well as grief of any actor without having any knowledge about his circumstance and situation. When this is the case, facial and bodily expressions give the spectator a clue of pleasant or painful emotion that the actor experiences. However, sometimes, says Smith, physical expressions of some passions do not lead to any sort of sympathetic reflection. For instance, sympathizing with furious behaviour of an angry man is not possible because of the fact that spectator cannot put oneself into actor's shoes and experience pretty much the same passions that excite such furious behaviour. It is Smith's contention that most of the time, "the general idea of good and bad fortune […] creates some concern for the person who has met with it" rather than furious expressions or outrageous behaviour of an angry man (TMS; 11).

Thus, Smith points out another crucial characteristic of sympathy, that it in fact "does not arise so much from the view of the passion, as from that of situation which excites it" (TMS; 12). He elaborates situation-oriented sympathy with some instances in order to clarify the structure of sympathy that he proposes. Situation of poor man, despite he does not have any complains about his circumstances and even seems to be contented about his current situation, make a spectator naturally enter into his unfortunate situation. Because any spectator who has a feeling of humanity cannot help imagining how he would feel if he was in such a destitute and miserable situation. Likewise, a mother can

sympathize with her sick baby's suffering and sorrow by imagining how a disorder brings about helplessness and misery to a sufferer. In addition to all these examples, Smith's situation-oriented sympathy also enables to sympathize with the dead. In this case, we imagine how miserable it is

> to be deprived of the light of the sun; to be shut out from life and conversation; to be laid in the cold grave, a prey to corruption and the reptiles of the earth; to be no more thought of in this world, but to be obliterated, in a little time, from the affections, and almost from the memory, of their dearest friends and relations (TMS; 12).

Smith also clarifies that fellow-feeling with any passion or sympathy cannot be connected to a selfish principle and supports his theory by giving mechanism as follows. What he says is that we are naturally concerned with the fortune of others by a mechanism of sympathy and by means of imagination, actual sympathy occurs when sentiments of the spectator and those of agent correspond or coincide. Even if, at first sight, sympathizing with others seems to be founded in self-love (putting oneself in other's situation), but it arises from an imaginary change of situation and person.

> When I sympathize with your sorrow or your indignation, it may be pretended, indeed, that my emotion is founded in self-love, because it arises from bringing your case home to myself, from putting myself in your situation, and thence conceiving what I should feel in the like circumstances. But though sympathy is very properly said to arise from an imaginary change of situations with the person principally concerned, yet this imaginary change is not supposed to happen to me in my own person and character, but in that of the person with whom I sympathize. When I condole with you for the loss of your only son, in order to enter into your grief I do not consider what I, a person of such a character and profession, should suffer, if I had a son, and if that son was unfortunately to die: but I consider what I should suffer if I was really you, and I not only change circumstances with you, but I change person and characters. My grief, therefore, is entirely upon your account, and not in the least upon my own. It is not, therefore, in the least selfish (TMS; 317).

In other words, Smith tries to correct misapprehension about the mechanism of sympathy by underlining the precondition of the "imaginary change of situations and selves" and takes a clear position for possible criticisms and keep his distance from Hobbes and Mandeville again. As stated earlier, for Augustan moralists self-love is always hidden under sympathizing misfortunes of others because spectator imagines "himself" to be reduced in such a situation instead of being the agent. That is exactly the opposite of what Smith offers while depicting his theory of sympathy. Smithian sympathy, as David Marshall states, encapsulates "a loss of self, a transfer and metamorphosis."[110]

Smith also specifies another characteristic of sympathy which he firmly believes that is again opposed to selfish theory. Sympathy, bringing someone else's case home to our own breast, says Smith, gives a certain pleasure and delight. Even if he does not mention specific names in the text regarding this subject, by speaking of "those who are fond of deducing all our sentiments from certain refinements of self-love" Smith most probably has Hobbes and Mandeville in mind (TMS;13). For the proponents of selfish theory, since all sentiments spring from self-love, it cannot entail for a spectator to feel pleasure or pain when he sympathizes or fails to sympathize with an agent.

According to Smith there are two sets of qualities attributed to moral judgments of human beings for which sympathetic identification has a significant role. The first is propriety and impropriety of an action which means "the suitableness or unsuitableness in the proportion or disproportion which the affection seems to bear to the cause or object which excites it" (TMS; 18). The other one is merit or demerit which denotes that whether our action deserves praise or blame. Smith states that if a spectator finds the sentiments that he is involved corresponds to

[110] David Marshall, "Adam Smith and the Theatricality of Moral Sentiments," *Critical Inquiry* 10, no. 4(1984): 600.

his own then he judges those sentiments as appropriate. On the contrary, if spectator's feelings do not correspond to actor's he disapproves it. Therefore, there lies concord and dissonance of sentiments in the heart of moral approbation and disapprobation.

When spectators judge the propriety of an actor's reaction to a situation, they put themselves in his shoes or enter into situation by means of imagination and see whether under the same situation they would have the same sentiment and reaction. For instance, when we see a stranger passing by us in the street with all evidence of the deepest grief on his face and soon afterwards we are told that he has just learned his father's death, even if he and his father are entirely stranger to us, we naturally enter into his sorrow by picturing out the proper feeling from our experience that how losing someone who is very precious and close to us would make us feel. In such a case, we approve the sorrow and grief of the actor due to correspondence of same sentiments regarding the situation and frankly sympathize with him (TMS; 18). Unless the spectator is insensitive to misfortune and grief that the agent is going through or intolerable to his suffering some correspondence of sentiments between the spectator and the sufferer is indispensable.

However, since imagined sentiments of the spectator are generally in weaker degree than the sentiments of the actor, in order to produce a sympathetic concord between them, an adjustment is required. Actor who desires sympathy succeeds this concord by "lowering his passion to the pitch, in which spectators are capable of going along with him" and placing himself in a spectator of his own situation (TMS; 22). Thus, the harmony in society is enabled with the correspondence of sentiments by means of such concords. Smith also highlights the necessity of moderation for the propriety of passions. Weak, excessive or

violent passions obstruct sympathetic reflection because under these circumstances the spectator can hardly go along with the sentiments of the actor.

Smith also considers merit and demerit as another quality regarding our moral judgements. Unlike propriety and impropriety, merit and demerit lead the spectator to judge the action of the agent as praiseworthy or blameworthy. Good or ill outcome of an action also entails whether it deserves reward or punishment. An action that is worthy of reward excites gratitude; on the other hand, if it appears to deserve punishment then the feeling of resentment arises. For instance, we sympathize with a man's gratitude to his benefactor from whom he receives support and benefit. Likewise, we sympathize with a man's sorrow and grief as well as his displeasure and aversion in consequence of distasteful occasion that befalls him. This means that in this case we both sympathize with the sufferer's distress and his resentment against the individual responsible for his injury. Smith clarifies another point that apart from gratitude and resentment there are also some other passions like love, esteem, hatred and dislike which arise from our habitual approbation and disapprobation. Love and esteem lead us to feel pleased with happiness and satisfaction of the person involved. On the other hand, we might feel pleasure of seeing other man's distress that we hate or dislike. These negative feelings are different from resentment in the sense that resentment incites our desire to see someone who is object of our resentment to be punished (TMS; 68-9).

Smith also states that if the spectator's sentiments do not correspond with the agent; in other words, if there is no propriety in sentiments of the agent then it is hardly possible for the spectator to enter into gratitude or resentment of the person who receives benefit of or suffers from agent's action. We cannot enter into someone's gratitude that receives certain benefit if we do not approve the motives of his benefactor. This means that we can have direct sympathy with the

sentiments of the agent and indirect one with the person who receives the benefit.

After giving necessary standards of our moral judgments for others based on sympathetic reflection Smith draws attention to another significant subject. He asserts that we do not only have natural disposition to judge others but we also judge ourselves. Then a question arises: how do we learn to become spectators of our own sentiments and conduct? According to Smith, we learn how to judge ourselves from judging others by means of same sympathetic process. The precondition to form any judgment regarding our own sentiments and motives is to depart from our natural station and behold them from a certain distance from ourselves. This can be achieved only by looking at them from the eye of other people.

In the first stage, we imagine other people sympathizing with us and consider their judgments concerning us. Our desire for sympathetic concord with others who observe and assess our conduct leads a certain balance and regulation over our feelings and actions. We try to observe how other people see us and we try to moderate our behaviour and lower the tone. Thus, it means that our first judgments regarding ourselves are shaped in the light of approval and disapproval of others. Since it would be impossible to have a reflection of our own sentiments, character, conduct and even our appearance in a solitary place, others are essential to objectify these. Smith says:

> To a man who from his birth was stranger to society, the object of his passions, the external bodies which either pleased or hurt him, would occupy his whole attention. The passions themselves, the desires or aversions, the joys and sorrows, which those objects excited, though of all things the most immediately present to him, could scarce ever be the objects of his thoughts. The idea of them could never interest him so much as to call upon his attentive consideration. The consideration of his joy could in him excite no new joy, nor that of his

> sorrow any new sorrow, though the consideration of the causes of those passions might often excite both (TMS; 110-111).

Only in society one can find the mirror which reflects propriety and impropriety of his passions. In society, says Smith, man

> will observe that mankind approve of some of them, and are disgusted by others. He will be elevated in the one case, and cast down in the other; his desires and aversions, his joys and sorrows, will now often become the causes of new desires and new aversions, new joys and new sorrows: they will now, therefore, interest him deeply, and often call upon his most attentive consideration (TMS; 111).

As society provides people with certain awareness in the sense that individuals approve some of their sentiments and passions and disapproves some of others, it constitutes the first stage of forming our moral judgments regarding ourselves. Thus, we are able to examine our own passions and conduct first, by presuming ourselves as spectator of our own conduct and second, imagining possible effects of our behaviour. While we are judging our own conduct we achieve a standard through process of internalization of social responses and at the same time we learn how to be a spectator of own sentiments and conducts.

Although social responses ensure a standard for propriety and impropriety of our behaviour, most of our fellows are limited in their knowledge or misinformed about our situation. Therefore, we imagine a fair and impartial spectator who would examine our own conducts and judge from an objective standpoint. If an agent can judge himself from the standpoint of this ideal spectator who is well-informed and at the same time disinterested with us, he can achieve an objective criterion for self-assessment. As stated earlier, according to Smith, imagination plays a significant role in forming our moral judgements concerning others, in the same vein; imagination plays large part in judging ourselves. In the first place, imaginary change of position takes place,

that is; actor imagines himself as spectator and then he consider how a spectator, entirely disinterested and unbiased, would judge his behaviour. By means of this impartial spectator, the individual becomes his own judge. Judgement of the impartial spectator becomes our moral standard in time. Smith states:

> I divide myself, as it were, into two persons; and that I, the examiner and judge, represent a different character from that other I, the person whose conduct is examined into and judged of. The first is the spectator, whose sentiments with regard to my own conduct I endeavour to enter into, by placing myself in his situation, and by considering how it would appear to me, when seen from that particular point of view. The second is the agent, the person whom I properly call myself, and of whose conduct, under the character of a spectator, I was endeavouring to form some opinion. The first is the judge; the second the person judged of (TMS; 113).

The inner judge or inner voice of man which is the internalized impartial spectator is "reason, principle, conscience, the inhabitant of the breast, the man, the great judge and arbiter of our conduct" (TMS; 137). Formation of ideal moral judge within us not only enables us to get certain distance from partiality of others and ourselves but also it leads to restriction and management of our self-love.

According to Smith, if one acts in accordance with the principles of the impartial spectator he can get free from the passions which distract the social harmony. One of these passions which impartial spectator humbles is self-love. "We learn the real littleness of ourselves, and of whatever relates to ourselves, and the natural misrepresentations of self-love can be corrected only by the eye of this impartial spectator" (Ibid). Smith associates the correction of misrepresentations of self-love to the correction of misrepresented proportions of the distant objects seen through a window. We transport ourselves to a different situation through our imagination in order to judge their real proportions. In the same way, we

put ourselves in a certain distance in order to see the real significance of our small interests. Thus, impartial spectator saves us both from the misguidance of society and subjectivity that our passions cause without resulting in social disharmony.

The figure of impartial spectator understood as conscience also answers the most basic criticism of Smith's moral theory exemplified by Sir Gilbert Elliot's question how impartial spectator's perspective can be justified to be different from conventional rules. In the second edition of TMS in his reply to Elliot, Smith says:

> You will observe that it is intended both to confirm my Doctrine that our judgments concerning our own conduct have always a reference to the sentiments of some other being, and to shew that, notwithstanding this, real magnanimity and conscious virtue can support itself under the disapprobation of all mankind.[111]

This means that even if conscience seems to be a social product there is possibility to assume it as independent from public opinion.[112]

In the sixth edition of TMS, Smith mentions a case, unjust execution of Jean Calas for murder of his son in Toulouse (1762), as an example to indicate how unreliable public opinion might be at times. Although Smith did not witness Jean Calas case, he was informed of the incident at the time of his visit to Toulouse (1764-6) with his pupil, Duke of Buccleuch. Three years after his execution innocence of Calas was declared in consequence of a new trial. It seems that Smith was highly impressed by last words of Calas before his

---

[111] Adam Smith, *The Correspondence of Adam Smith,* ed. E. C. Mossner and I. S. Ross (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1987), 49. (Letter 40: 10 October 1759).

[112] See also Raphael, *Adam Smith*, 33-37. Elsewhere, D. D. Raphael maintains that Gilbert Elliot's objection contributes to improvement of Smith's impartial spectator theory in the second edition of TMS. D. D. Raphael, *The Impartial Spectator: Adam Smith's Moral Philosophy (*Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 37.

execution. Calas said following the monk's encouragement him to confess his crime that "My Father […] can you yourself bring yourself to believe that I am guilty?" (TMS; 120).

Smith is well aware of the fact that even if the seeds of conscience are planted in society through approval and disapproval of others once after it takes form in society we become abler to judge ourselves in a higher tribunal. Put differently, the voice of society gives its place to the voice of our conscience. With "impartial spectator" says Haakonssen, "instead of the propriety of social morality, of the actual spectators, we are thus led to try and judge ourselves in terms of an 'absolute' propriety for each given situation."[113] By appealing to the impartial spectator which is settled in human breast moral agents are able to judge their own actions and set their own moral standards for their moral judgments. The impartial status of this ideal spectator does not only liberate agent from external constraints imposed by society but also from the internal constraints caused by selfish desires and inclinations. So it enables the agent to be autonomous in forming his moral principles and be governed by self-imposed rules.

5.2. Mandeville's Licentious System

In the Part VII of TMS entitled as "Of Systems of Moral Philosophy" Smith investigates several systems of morality in order to unfold the principles of morals. Starting off from the systems of ancient philosophers Smith examines the nature of virtue by classifying accounts into three which respectively put forward that virtue consists in propriety, prudence and disinterested benevolence.

[113] Knud Haakonssen, *The Science of a Legislator: The Natural Jurisprudence of David Hume and Adam Smith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 56.

Although each of these three theories differs from each other regarding the principle that lies in the heart of propriety and impropriety of any feeling, what is common in all is that they promote praiseworthy action and in other respects disapprove what is blameable. However, he counts in Mandeville's system none of these three categories. Rather, Smith gives wide coverage to his system in a new chapter in which as distinct from the other systems he examines the one which "seems to take away altogether the distinction between vice and virtue, and of which the tendency is, upon that account, wholly pernicious" (TMS; 308). Smith designates Mandeville's system as a "licentious". But this is not the first time that Smith mentions Mandeville's selfish system. Earlier, in his letter to the Edinburgh Review (1756) he reviewed Rousseau's *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*. His review includes a comparison between *The Fable of the Bees* and Rousseau's *Second Discourse*. Smith sees the second volume of *the Fable* as a source of inspiration for Rousseau with a set of nuances; that is, he says for *Second Discourse*:

> Whoever reads this last work with attention, will observe, that the second volume of the Fable of the Bees has given occasion to the system of Mr. Rousseau, in whom however the principles of the English author are softened, improved, and embellished, and stript of all that tendency to corruption and licentiousness which has disgraced them in their original author.[114]

He compares Mandeville's depiction of mankind's condition in the state of nature with that of Rousseau and concludes that in the first glance there are some differences between two theories. For instance, although Mandeville's primitive man is depicted as vulgar and miserable in the second volume of *the Fable*, Rousseau sketches happy picture in *Second Discourse* while portraying primitive man's condition in the state of nature.

---

[114] Adam Smith, "A Letter to the Authors of the Edinburgh Review," in *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, ed. W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982), 250.

Besides, as Smith indicates that the feeling of "pity" makes different sense for each author. On the one hand, even if pity is natural to man and seems to be harmless when compared to other passions, states Mandeville, in fact it denotes the frailty of human nature. But on the other hand, pity is depicted as an amiable passion possessed by mankind in their happiest stage; namely, state of nature, with a degree of perfection. But on the other hand, Smith shows some commonalities between these two authors. They both consider "the same slow progress and gradual development of all talents, habits, and arts which fit men to live together in society" and agree with the nature of law of justice which is imposed by cunning politicians in order to gain control over civilized men.[115]Mandeville and Rousseau are also of the same mind concerning corruptive and destructive nature of civilizing process.

As it is stated above, Smith mentions some key concepts of Mandeville's system while comparing it with that of Rousseau long since TMS; his direct attack to his system coincides with TMS. Smith's Mandeville critique is included in Chapter IV of Part VII and entitled as "Of Licentious Systems." In this chapter, not alone does Smith criticize Mandeville's basic argument that all actions of mankind spring from either selfish passion or vanity and desire for applause, but his rigorism regarding morals as well. For Smith, Mandeville assumes that whatever done from a sense of propriety is done from a love of praise and applause. He aims to reduce individuals to praise-seeking beings.

Against Mandeville, Smith asserts that the desire of doing what is honourable and noble has nothing to do with vanity. Love of well-grounded reputation and desire for what is really estimable cannot deserve the name as vanity; rather these are the best passions of the human nature called the love of true glory and

[115] Smith, "A Letter to the Authors of the Edinburgh Review", 250-1.

love of virtue.[116] Every man is naturally inclined to desire not only what is approved and praised but also desire what is approvable and praiseworthy. Although since they both are for acquiring approval and esteem there seems to be a similarity between love of true glory and the desire of praise and applause, they differ from each other in the way that love of true glory is "a just, reasonable, and equitable passion, while the other is unjust, absurd and ridiculous" (TMS; 310).

Unlike Mandeville, it is Smith's conviction that mankind is capable of acquiring what is honourable and estimable.[117] In the first stage, says Smith, we learn by experience that not all our feelings and actions are always approved and praised by everyone. We determine the real merits of our actions by distinguishing what is actually approved and what is worth to be approved. Being proper object of praise does not entirely depend upon public approval but a higher tribunal. Man's jurisdiction is founded altogether in the desire of praise and in the aversion of blame without impartial spectator. On the other hand, with it, jurisdiction of man is based on the desire of praiseworthiness and in the aversion of blameworthiness. Even if our action is not praised by anyone, we are capable of acting in a praiseworthy manner which deserves exact approval of impartial spectator. Therefore, assessment of worthiness through the eyes of impartial spectator opens the way to the real love of virtue. It is also an answer to Mandeville's selfish thesis because in the first volume of the Fable he says that

---

[116]Hanley identifies the love of praise, the love true glory and the love virtue with three stages of self-love. He asserts that "the love of praise, the love of true glory, and the love of virtue represent an incipient version of the account of the substance of and relationships between the three ethical virtues of prudence, just magnanimity, and proper beneficence that are the focus of TMS VI." Ryan Patrick Hanley, *Adam Smith and the Character of Virtue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 98.

[117] In the first volume of *The Fable* Mandeville admits that "if Reason in Man was of equal weight with his Pride, he could never be pleased with Praises which he is conscious he don't deserve" (FB I; 63).

"[T]he vast Esteem we have of ourselves, and the small value we have for others, make us all very unfair judges in our own cases" (FB; 80).

Contrary to Mandeville's thesis, vanity as being pleased with groundless applause or loud acclamations is a "proof of the most superficial levity and weakness" and "foundation of the most ridiculous and contemptible vices" (TMS; 115). Smith condemns man of vanity who seeks praise even though he does not deserve it. He asserts that "it is only the weakest and most superficial of mankind who can be much delighted with that praise which they themselves know to be altogether unmerited" (TMS; 117). Besides, he is a man of vanity who expects praise for the "frivolous ornaments of dress and equipage, or […] frivolous accomplishments of ordinary behaviour" (TMS; 309). Smith also adds that "*The empty coxcomb* who gives himself airs of importance which he has no title to, *the silly liar* who assumes the merit of adventures which never happened, *the foolish plagiary* who gives himself out for the author of what he has no pretensions, are properly accused of this passion" (TMS; 309, emphasis added).

The man who desires praise and approbation in spite of being unworthy of them even so feels no satisfaction; that is to say, he always desires a lot more praise than he actually deserves. At the same time, trivial desire for praise leads to jealousy and incredulity in the sense that vain man will always feel as if he is not praised enough. Earlier in TMS, Smith asserts that vanity of a foolish liar and coxcomb originates in "an illusion of imagination, that it is difficult to conceive how any rational creature should be imposed upon by it" (TMS; 115). They are incapable of looking into their motives and conduct due to lack of impartial perspective; so, they fool themselves as though they are the real objects of applause and worthy of praise and approval. Unlike vain man, a wise man

> feels little pleasure from praise where he knows to be praiseworthy, though he knows equally well that no praise is ever bestowed upon

> it. To obtain the approbation of mankind, where no approbation is due, can never be an object of any importance to him. To obtain that approbation where it is really due, may sometimes be an object of no great importance to him. But to be that thing which deserves approbation, must always be an object of the highest (TMS; 117).

Furthermore, for Smith, another point worth mentioning regarding Mandeville's system is that in the light of his theory which assumes all motives of man as entirely selfish, it can be concluded that the main and only concern of man is his own happiness rather than that of others. Even if man seems to be interested in happiness or sorrow of others in fact underlying of motive of his action is still selfish. Mandeville does not give a comprehensive definition for sympathy but in the first volume of *The Fable* while defining love he specifies the basic motive that lies in the heart of feeling of sympathy with anyone else. He states that love which signifies certain affection to the person we love involves well-wishing for him. "We give an easy Construction to his Words and Actions, and feel a Proneness to excuse and forgive his Faults, if we see any; his Interest we make on all Accounts our own, even to our Prejudice, and receive an inward Satisfaction for sympathizing with him in his Sorrows, as well as Joys" (FB I; 142). Even if this passage indicates that Mandeville affirms man's capacity for sympathy with others he adds right after that "when we are sincere in sharing with another in Misfortunes, Self-Love makes us believe, that the Sufferings we feel must alleviate and lessen those of our Friend, and while this fond Reflexion is soothing our Pain, a secret Pleasure arises from our grieving for the Person we love (Ibid). Therefore, for Mandeville even if sympathizing with someone we love seems not to be impossible we cannot save ourselves from the bondage of self-love.

Smith also rejects Mandeville's system of morals and he is strongly opposed to moral rigorism of Mandeville because of the fact that he labels every passion as being vicious. Even his portrayal of virtue as complete self-denial is not a conquest but "no more than a concealed indulgence of our passions" (TMS; 312).

As a matter of fact, says Smith, by means of such an assertion that every passion originally inheres in vanity Mandeville achieves to deduce his famous motto; that is, private vices are public benefits. Tracing Mandeville's strict definition of luxury Smith aims to show how indulgence of luxury serves public benefit in Mandevillean sense. Luxury is defined in Remark L in the first volume of *The Fable* as everything which is not immediately essential for the subsistence of mankind.

In the light of this definition Smith infers the fact that "there is vice even in the use of a clean shirt, or of a convenient habitation" (TMS; 312). Then, it is a natural consequence for Mandeville to assume that even if taste and indulgence for dresses, furniture, equipages and architecture seem to be agreeable they all deserve the name luxury which paradoxically leads to public benefit. But for Smith, by asserting impossibility of entire conquest of passions even so it would have detrimental effects on commerce and industry is to take the easy way out just as Mandeville does. In other respects, at the end of the chapter named "Of Licentious Systems" Smith admits the fact that "how destructive soever this system may appear, it could never have imposed upon so great number of persons, nor have occasioned so general an alarm among those who are the friends of better principles, had it not in some respects bordered upon the truth" (TMS; 313). However, right after, Smith points out that although once Descartes's "vortices" were believed to exist, after a century it turned out that they never actually existed. When it comes to origin of our passions and moral sentiments, says Smith, it is not that easy to convince people of a moral account just as Mandeville did which is incompatible with actual moral experience.

5.3. Corruption of Our Moral Sentiments

Smith's critique of Mandeville's system shows that Smith neither sketches an entirely perfect picture about human nature nor entirely agrees with Mandeville. While he is portraying mankind's capacity of fellow-feeling for others he does not rule out mischiefs of vanity and mankind's inclination of boasting of riches and being ashamed of poverty. He maintains that admiration of all superfluities or extravagances that the rich enjoys, emulation of power and strong desire for higher ranks and wealth cannot be counted as struggle to earn a simple living and they are also not real motives for bettering our condition; rather they are means that make us be realized, appreciated, approved and applauded in the society. For this reason, says Smith, it is the vanity which mankind actually minds. In this respect he asks: "For to what purpose is all toil and bustle of this world? What is the end of avarice and ambition, of the pursuit of wealth, of power, and preheminence? Is it to supply the necessities of nature?" (TMS; 50).

Smith speaks of detrimental effects of ambition, emulation and avarice and unworthiness of them. He narrates a story about poor man's son to show how strong ambition in order to attain the conditions of rich ends up with disappointment. Poor man's son who was never pleased with his living conditions and always full of admiration the conveniences that the rich enjoys, finally achieves the standards of the rich in the old age at the expense of contentment and tranquillity which he had in the prime of his life. He finds out the fact late in his life that

> wealth and greatness are mere trinkets of frivolous utility, no more adapted for procuring ease of body or tranquillity of mind than the tweezer-cases of the lover of toys; and like them too, more troublesome to the person who carries them about with him than all the advantages they can afford him are commodious (TMS; 181).

It is Smith's contention that great pleasure which attainment of wealth and greatness gives mankind is in fact a deception as once toils and zeal are considered to be worth acquiring such wealth and greatness eventually turn out to be endeavours for nothing but only frivolous and trifling desires. This parable indicates that Smith does not refer to a simple attempt or effort to better one's material condition but aims to insinuate individuals like poor man's son, devoted themselves to attain higher ranks and acquire great wealth throughout their lives and "enchanted with the distant idea of this felicity" (TMS; 181), in the end, become the victims of their fantasies and cannot get away from the attraction of a great illusion. But, on the other hand, Smith admits that most of us desire to acquire such greatness and wealth and he says:

> And it is well that nature imposes upon us in this manner. It is this deception which rouses and keeps in continual motion in the industry of mankind. It is this which first prompted them to cultivate the ground, to build houses, to found cities and commonwealths, and to invent and improve all the sciences and arts, which ennoble and embellish human life … (TMS; 183).

As it is seen from the passage that the deception which makes us desire more wealth and greatness leads to major developments in not only but also industry knowledge. Besides, Smith's passage echoes Mandeville's theory because it can also be inferred from the passage that such a deception will enable people to accumulate their wealth and as a consequence it will generate an increase in general prosperity. After the message given in this passage, Smith uses "invisible hand" as a metaphor in TMS while depicting vanity and greed of landlord who cultivates his land more than he can consume. It shows how the action of a "proud and unfeeling landlord" who does not have "a thought for the wants of his brethren" ends with a positive unintended outcome (TMS; 184). Smith also adds:

> The rich only select from the heap what is most precious and agreeable. They consume little more than the poor, and in spite of their natural selfishness and rapacity, though they mean only their own conveniency, though the sole end which they propose from the labours of all the thousands whom they employ, be the gratification of their own vain and insatiable desires, they divide with the poor the produce of all their improvements. They are led by an *invisible hand* to make nearly the same distribution of the necessaries of life, which would have been made, had the earth been divided into equal portions among all its inhabitants, and thus without intending it, without knowing it, advance the interest of society, and afford means to the multiplication of the species (TMS; 184-5, emphasis added).

Smith contends that it is neither intention of rich landlord nor his motivation out of feeling of benevolence or humanity but his concern for his land leads to an interesting result. Since it is impossible even for him to consume much more than the rest of the other people, rich landlord's efforts concerning his land will be same with others as if the earth was allocated to equal portions.

Even if Smith admits positive and unintended outcomes of pursuit of wealth and vanity in the sixth edition of TMS (1790) he adds a new chapter in Part I entitled as "Of the Corruption of our moral sentiments, which is occasioned by this disposition to admire the rich and the great, and to despise or neglect persons of poor and mean condition." At first glance, this title gives his readers a clue that after the publication of WN with several editions this chapter seems to indicate Smith's concern about moral justification of commercial society.

Smith states that admiring the rich and despising the poor, "though necessary both to establish and to maintain the distinction of ranks and the order of society, is, at the same time, the great and the most universal cause of the corruption of our moral sentiments" (TMS; 61). It is Smith's conviction that although mankind does not only desire only to be respected but to be respectable, in most cases they are inclined to respect the rich instead of the virtuous. Besides, mostly the

destitution of the poor and the humble is despised rather than the hateful characteristics of the rich. Smith speaks of two opposite ways for acquiring the admiration and respect of others; "the one, by the study of wisdom and the practice of virtue; the other, by the acquisition of wealth and greatness" (TMS; 62). In the light of this observation Smith regrets to say that a clear majority of mankind is prone to admire wealth and power because of strong motivation of emulation and ambition. Even if the vain man is much more admired than the wise "[i]t is scarce agreeable to good morals, or even to good language, perhaps, to say, that mere wealth and greatness, abstracted from merit and virtue, deserve our respect" (Ibid). Thus, Smith maintains that the moral justification of a commercial society can be given through "middling and inferior stations of life" because of the fact that "real and solid professional abilities, joined to prudent, just, firm, and temperate conduct, can very seldom fail of success" (TMS; 63). As it is seen from the chapter, although Smith is worried about moral justification of commercial society, he reaches a compromise by proposing a status which can enable individuals to act in virtuously at reasonable degree.

5.4. The Adam Smith Problem

Although in TMS Smith distances himself from Mandeville by opposing his characterization of man as solely motivated by selfish instincts, who runs after praise rather than praiseworthiness, in *The Wealth of Nations* (WN) he refers to self-interest as a basic motive of individuals in commercial societies. Smith's two seemingly conflicting views in TMS and WN also sow the seeds of a well-known problem called "The Adam Smith Problem" which was originally put forward by German scholars in the nineteenth century. Thus Smith became the target of polemics at the end of the nineteenth century. The main contradictory passages

in TMS and WN which indicate two opposed views have been quoted over a century. Two famous passages below are sparkles of the debate:

> How selfish so ever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature, which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it (TMS; 9).

> Man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren, and it is in vain for him to expect it from their benevolence only. He will be more likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and show them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them…It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages (WN; 27).[118]

German Scholars like Bruno Hildebrand and Karl Knies, representatives of the Older Historical School of Economics as well, who accepted that there was a problem criticized Smith's notion of self-interest in WN by indicating some probable adverse outcomes of egoism for social and ethical sides of political economy. Karl Knies came up with a theory having affirmed the positive effect of the relationship between Smith and French materialist philosophers on his WN. According to Knies, in 1764, during his residence in France, Smith was said to encounter French materialist philosophers like Helvetius and Holbach. Since, this date also coincided with period between publications of TMS (1759) and WN (1776) he argued that a change in Smith's thought regarding human nature was highly probable.

Another German economist, Lujo Brentano held the idea that Smith's explicit rejection of selfish hypothesis in TMS, and then corroborating the same hypothesis in WN, indicated the influence of Helvetius whom he met in Paris. He

[118] Hereafter, this passage will be mentioned shortly as "butcher-brewer-baker passage."

stated that in WN "he [Smith] holds entirely to the views of the book of Helvetius upon the nature of man, and regards selfishness as the only motive of human action. The consequences of this dogma of selfishness permeate almost all parts of his work."[119]

The level of criticism increased with the participation of Witold von Skarżyński in 1878. He uttered his doubts regarding the authenticity of Smith's work both in moral philosophy and political economy. Skarżyński articulated that Smith not only inherited his moral theory from Francis Hutcheson and David Hume but also was highly influenced by French Physiocrats' theories of economy. In fact earlier in his memoirs, *Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith* (1795) Dugald Stewart stated that Smith's lectures had already covered the topics which were then discussed extensively in WN. Stewart says:

> In the last part of his lectures, he [Smith] examined those political regulations which are founded, not upon the principle of *justice*, but that of *expediency* and which are calculated to increase the riches, the power, and the prosperity of a State. Under this view, he considered the political institutions relating to commerce, to finances, to ecclesiastical and military establishments. What he delivered on these subjects contained the substance of the work he afterwards published under the title of An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.[120]

Therefore, Dugald Stewart's testimony indicated that there was no way to explain alleged inconsistency between Smith's works by propounding his changing interest. However, this testimony did not still seem to be convincing for German scholars and some scholars tried to reconcile sympathy and self-

---

[119] Lujo Brentano, *The Relation of Labor to the Law of Today*, trans. P. Sherman (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1891), 64.

[120] Dugald Stewart, *Biographical Memoir of Adam Smith* (New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1966), 12. See also Dugald Stewart, "Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith" in *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, ed. W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982), 275.

interest and some others endeavoured to show integrity in Smith's works. Earlier an attempt in order to reconcile two distinct parts of human nature in Smith's works had come from H.T. Buckle. He asserted that Smith used contradictory concepts or two different anthropological views in TMS and WN which belonged to separate fields (ethics and economics). Hence, the anthropological views in TMS hardly help us to understand self-interest principle in WN. In *History of Civilization in England* Buckle states the following:

> In the Moral Sentiments, he [Smith] investigates the sympathetic part of human nature; in the Wealth of Nations he investigates its selfish part. And as all of us are sympathetic as well as selfish; in other words, as all of us are looking without as well as within, and as this classification is primary and exhaustive division of our motives to action, it is evident, that if Adam Smith had completely accomplished his vast design, he would at once have raised the study of human nature to science.[121]

Buckle's contention was that Smith presented two different sides of human nature in his treatises each of which had complementary characteristic to other even if each belonged to distinct spheres. He affirms that "In the Moral Sentiments, he ascribes our actions to sympathy; in his Wealth of Nations, he ascribes them to selfishness. A short view of these two works will prove the existence of this fundamental difference, and will enable us to perceive that each is supplementary to the other; so that, in order to understand either, it is necessary to study both."[122]

Against German scholars' conviction regarding irreconcilability between two divergent views about human nature and Smith's French connection, in 1896 Edwin Cannan's publication of some lecture notes of Smith at the time of his

[121] Henry Thomas Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, vol.3 (London: Longman, Green, And Co., 1873), 305.

[122] Ibid., 309.

teaching at the University of Glasgow entitled as *The Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms ; delivered in the University of Glasgow by Adam Smith, reported by a Student in 1763* showed his formulation of all his basic doctrines before the publication of WN and also his idea that economic relations motivated by self-interest were contemplated before his journey to France.[123]Thus, this was not the evidence only which strongly confirmed Dugald Stewart testimony but also put an end to French connection theory.[124] In 1897 August Oncken's article "The Consistency of Adam Smith" argued against the assessment of Smith's WN as carrying the spirit of materialism.[125]In this direction Oncken first showed James Bonar's *A Catalogue of the Library of Adam Smith* (1894), and John Rae's *Life of Adam Smith* (1895) as evidences in addition to Cannan's publication of Smith's lecture notes in order to enable the readers to gain clear understanding about both of Smith's works. Oncken touched upon The Adam Smith Problem from a different standpoint instead of focusing on historical context he tried to correct misunderstanding about materialism in WN. By pointing out butcher-brewer-baker passage in WN he drew attention what Smith actually meant. He did not think that Smith disregarded the feeling of benevolence at all; rather, self-love and benevolence were explained broadly with virtues of prudence and beneficence in the sixth edition of TMS.

---

[123]For a detailed account about this subject see also Russell Nieli, "Spheres of Intimacy and the Adam Smith Problem," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47, no.4 (1986): 614.

[124]Knud Haakonssen and Donald Winch also underlines that Edwin Cannan's publication confuted what French connection theorists claimed before. They remark that "There were formidable and obvious obstacles to such an interpretation. For instance, Smith continued to revise and re-issue the two works during his lifetime without hinting any discrepancy between them." Knud Haakonssen and Winch Donald, "The Legacy of Adam Smith" in *The Cambridge Companion to Adam Smith,* ed. Knud Haakonssen (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 370.

[125] August Oncken, "The Consistency of Adam Smith," *Economic Journal of London* 7, no. 4 (1897): 43-50.

Besides, Oncken said the following in order to defeat the theory that affirmed Smith's affinity to Helvetius' materialist viewpoint. "If the *De l'Esprit* of Helvetius had really made so great an impression upon him, he would not only have named but would also have discussed it in the revised edition of the *Theory*, and that in juxtaposition to his remarks on Mandeville."[126]And Oncken added that if Smith mentioned Helvetius in TMS he most probably would have fallen into chapter entitled as "Licentious Systems" (Part VII in TMS).

In recent years, for many scholars "The Adam Smith Problem" seems to be dismissed by means of some serious attempts to understand what Smith actually meant by self-love and sympathy. It no longer seems that the character and the motive of the economic agent in WN conflict Smith's moral theory in TMS. As a twentieth century scholar, in *The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith* (1923) Glenn Morrow analyses The Adam Smith Problem and presents his own solution concerning the subject. After dismissing German scholars' French connection theory by indicating same reasons as Cannan and Oncken did before, he mentions his appreciation to Buckle whose attempt was the first one directed to the solution of the problem and also thinks highly of Oncken's effort. However all attempts in order to get a unified view dissatisfy Morrow. He says the following in order to dissolve the problem in his own way:

> If we should find self-interest repudiated and benevolence substituted as the sole constituent of morality, we would be justified in bringing the charge of inconsistency. But this is not the case. On the contrary, Smith parts company with the system of Hutcheson and refuses to define virtue solely in terms of benevolence. The frequent misunderstanding on this point is due to a superficial reading of the doctrine of sympathy in *the Moral Sentiments* …[127]

---

[126]Ibid., 48.

[127] Glenn R. Morrow, *The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith* (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969), 8.

Thus, Morrow suggests that first we should understand the meaning of self-interest and sympathy in Smith's both works. Smith's usage of self-interest as prudence indicates that if it is restrained by the principle of justice it has beneficial effects not only in economic field but also within moral sphere. Therefore, says Morrow, "the charge that there exists a radical opposition between ethical and the economic theories is thoroughly unjustified."[128] Elsewhere Morrow makes similar point and claims that although there are two seemingly different and conflicting sentiments in TMS and WN there is a unity between them. He points out some important virtues like "prudence, frugality, industry, and self-justice" which are important means for regulating individuals' conduct in both moral and economic sphere. And Morrow adds:

> The important consideration is that these self-interested activities must be regulated by justice […] In short, unregulated self-interest is no more advocated in the *Wealth of Nations* than it is in the *Moral Sentiments*, whereas in the latter work the moral value of the inferior virtues, when properly regulated, is fully recognized.[129]

In addition to Morrow's attempts, against German scholars' contention, D. D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie, the editors of Glasgow Edition of TMS initially state that no difference in Smith's view concerning ethics and no change of mind but only some improvements can be observed when 1759 (the first) and 1790 (the sixth) editions of TMS are examined together. The publication of the first edition of WN (1776) coincides with first and sixth edition of TMS; if a change of mind came into question Smith would most probably reflect this change in the sixth edition of TMS. Furthermore, in the light of butcher-brewer-baker passage in WN Raphael and Macfie, in the same camp with Oncken, assert that this passage does

---

[128] Ibid.

[129] Glenn R. Morrow, "Adam Smith: Moralist and Philosopher," *Journal of Political Economy* 35, no. 3 (1927): 330-331.

not indicate Smith's disbelief in benevolent side of mankind. They interpret that self-love and sympathy serve for different purposes, that is to say, the former motivates individual but the latter conducts and governs; therefore they are not comparable. They also add that "sympathy is the core of Smith's explanation of moral *judgment.* The motive to action [namely self-interest] is an entirely different matter" (TMS; Intr. 21-22). Therefore, Raphael and Macfie do not see a contradiction between these two sentiments and they evaluate it as a "pseudo problem based on ignorance and misunderstanding" (TMS; Intr.20).

In an article entitled as "Adam Smith: The Development of a System" (1976), Andrew Skinner, one of the editors of the Glasgow Edition of WN, predicates that the emergence of problem is based upon misunderstanding sympathy and self-interest in Smith's works. He states that our capacity of sympathy in judging ourselves as well as others is linked with some virtues like the virtue of humanity and self-command. In economic sphere self-regarding actions of an agent while bettering his condition also necessitates social reference and moral approval. In his point of view, present arguments have an interest in "providing evidence of Smith's awareness of 'system' together with an account of the psychology which lies behind certain important branches of economic activity."[130]

In those years, Donald Winch also certifies that "cross-references" and "overlapping systems" are indicators which ensure the result that The Adam Smith Problem is no longer a problem.[131] However, Winch warns the readers that although a fundamental incompatibility between TMS and WN has been overcome this does not imply "there are no problems involved in establishing the

---

[130] Andrew S. Skinner, "Adam Smith: The Development of a System," *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 23, no. 2(1976): 115.

[131] Donald Winch, *Adam Smith's Politics: An Essay in Historiographic Revision (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 10.

precise nature of the conciliation between these works."[132] Winch also adds that even if Smith's moral theory in TMS comprises social behaviour extensively and motivation and conduct of an economic agent can also be explained by applying this broad theory, "it does not provide a warrant, however, for regarding the *Theory of Moral Sentiments* as a court of higher appeal on all disputed matters […] and it would not be true to "use to use it purely as an ad hoc source to fill in gaps in the opinions presented in the *Wealth of Nations*."[133]Apparently, Winch is assured that basic incompatibility between two views given in TMS and WN is over, but on the other hand he has certain doubts about exact resolution of the problem. Current solutions, says Winch, seem not to guarantee the fact that in future there will never be problem again.

Thus, it can be concluded that at the end of 1970's The Adam Smith Problem has been overcome as a result of serious attempts of some Adam Smith scholars. They are of the same mind that the alleged problem leads nothing but only a sterile discussion. As Knud Haakonssen specifies in 1981 that attempts to make distinctions suchlike between Smith's sympathy and self-interest "make it futile to take any more rides on that old hobby-horse."[134] Even if the old debate is already out of date or seems to fade away because of the fact that there has been a consensus regarding what Smith actually meant by self-interest and sympathy in TMS and WN in recent years several disagreements have emerged concerning Smith's other views and made contemporary readers think whether a new Adam Smith Problem has been rising within a different context.

---

[132] Ibid., emphasis added.

[133] Ibid., 10.

[134] Haakonssen, *The Science of a Legislator,* 197.

5.5 Smith and Mandeville on Self-Regarding Passions

What Raphael and Macfie suggest in the "Introduction" of TMS, a proper understanding of Smith's usage of sympathy, self-love, self-interest and selfishness, seems to be in parallel with the purpose of this dissertation. I believe that once these terms are well understood they will help to designate Smith's position and distance to Mandeville's theory of selfishness. Initially, in order to understand the motive of Smith's moral and economic agent, it is essential to clarify his usage of self-love in both of his works.

In Part VI entitled as "Of the Character of Virtue" in TMS, Smith enumerates virtues which either affect our happiness or that of other people. Before focusing on self-regarding virtue (namely prudence), Smith mentions "self-preservation" as the basic instinct of mankind. As Smith states that every man first cares for fulfilling his basic appetites like hunger, thirst, chooses agreeable sensations and avoids disagreeable ones as "nature first recommends to the care of every individual" (TMS; 212). Smith's definition of self-preservation reminds us of Mandeville's account of self-love. As stated in the first chapter of this dissertation, despite his ambiguous use of self-love in the first volume of *The Fable* Mandeville distinguishes self-love from self-liking specifically in the second volume. He defines self-love as an instinct for self-preservation. Therefore, it follows that there is a difference between Mandeville's and Smith's use of self-love. What self-love purports for Mandeville is named by Smith as "self-preservation." Smith states that instincts of self-preservation are not selfish or self-interested. But he warns his readers against probable negative effects of it that if one seeks to satisfy his basic needs at the expense of others or when it becomes excessive then the instincts of self-preservation also have to be balanced.

In TMS Smith gives Stoic definition of self-love that everyone "is first and principally recommended to his own care; and every man is certainly, in every respect, fitter and abler to care of himself than any other person" (TMS; 219). However, in the most parts of TMS, it is quite apparent that Smith treats self-love as a feeling which always needs to be restrained or humbled.[135] He states that even if everyone first prefers his happiness to others, man does not act according to this principle. Smith says the following:

> Though every man may, according to the proverb, be the whole world to himself, to the rest of mankind he is a most insignificant part of it. Though his own happiness may be of more importance to him than that of all the world besides, to every other person it is of no more consequence than that of any other man. Though it may be true, therefore, that every individual, in his own breast, naturally prefers himself to all mankind, yet he dares not look mankind in the face, and avow that he acts according to this principle (TMS; 83).

Immediately afterwards, Smith adds that man also has the capacity to judge himself from the eyes of others and so he knows that it is hardly possible for others to go along with the idea of his preference of himself. Since this will seem as excessive and immoderate to others, man seeks to humble and discipline his self-love by means of lowering it as if any person can go along with it, what is more, the impartial spectator can get into principle of his conduct. A recent article entitled "Adam Smith and Self-Interest" offers a comprehensive analysis of self-regarding passions treated in Smith's works. The author, Eugene Heath

[135] For a detailed analysis and outlook for Smith's usage of self-love, selfishness and self-interest see also Eugene Heath, "Adam Smith and Self-Interest," in *The Oxford Handbook of Adam Smith*, ed. Christopher J. Berry, Maria Pia Paganelli and Craig Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 241-264.

contends that "Smith uses the term 'self-love' to indicate a tendency about which one ought to be worried rather than a tendency one ought to cultivate."[136]

In addition to all these, it is also worth noting that Smith's usage of self-love seems to be interchangeable with self-interest in WN.[137] Smith uses self-love as our desire to better ourselves and our condition. The interchangeability can be understood from the fact that characteristics of self-love differs in WN in the sense that it means one's concern for his needs and desire for the best material outcome for oneself. Even if Smith says in butcher-brewer-baker passage in WN that "we address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love …" here, Smith refers to self-interest by self-love. He maintains that since man is affected by social and economic systems therefore, desire to better our condition turns into seeking material interests in a commercial society. But, what Smith offers is not seeking our interest through dishonesty, avarice and greed. As Samuel Fleischacker asserts that "[T]o claim that Smith endorses the notion of self-interest governs all human relationships is severely to misread WN, especially in its relationship to other theories of human motivation at the time."[138] Such an assertion, says Fleischacker, is applicable to theories of Hobbes and Mandeville

---

[136] Eugene Heath, "Adam Smith and Self-Interest," in *The Oxford Handbook of Adam Smith*, ed. Christopher J. Berry, Maria Pia Paganelli and Craig Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.247.

[137] In the "Introduction" of Glasgow Edition of TMS, Raphael and Macfie states that "Smith recognizes a variety of motives, not only for action in general but also for virtuous action. These motives include self-interest or, to use the eighteenth century term, self-love. It is this, not 'selfishness' that comes to the fore in WN. Smith distinguished the two expressions, using 'selfishness' in a pejorative sense for such self-love as issues in harm or neglect of other people." Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, ed. D. D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982), p.22 (introduction).

[138] Samuel Fleischacker, *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion* (Princeton: Princeton University, 2004), p.84.

rather than that of Smith; as a matter of fact "considerable energy in TMS to *refuting* this aspect of Hobbes and Mandeville" was consumed by Smith.[139]

In addition to the butcher, brewer and baker passage in WN there is also another significant passage in which Smith speaks of how the desire of bettering our condition ends up. He says:

> With regard to profusion, the principle, which prompts to expence, is the passion for present enjoyment; which, though sometimes violent and very difficult to be restrained, is in general only momentary and occasional. But the principle which prompts to save, is the desire of bettering our condition, a desire, which, though generally calm and dispassionate, comes with us from the womb, and never leaves us till we go into the grave. In the whole interval which separates those two moments, there is scarce perhaps a single instant in which any man is so perfectly and completely satisfied with his situation, as to be without any wish of alteration or improvement, of any kind (WN; 341).

This means that Smith does not rule out profuseness caused by immediate desires and enjoyments but on the other hand he contends that saving lies at the heart of bettering our condition. It follows from the passage that neither the pursuit of instant material interests as actual human motive nor everlasting selfishness from the cradle to the grave are defended in WN rather Smith portrays an economic agent who is able to act from prudential regard and has the capacity to hold off his immediate impulses. In *Economics as a Moral Science: The Political Economy of Adam Smith* Jeffrey Young also states that "the frugal, self-interested man of WN is, also the prudent man of TMS and self-interest in both is

[139] Fleischacker also claims that Smith's view in WN does not indicate that he gave up his earlier view regarding human motivation. Fleischacker, *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations,* 84.

to be understood as 'proper regard for self' that degree of self-love which elicits the approval of the impartial spectator because it does no harm to others."[140]

It is true that in TMS Part VI "Of the Character of Virtue" which is entirely a new chapter, included in its sixth edition and before Smith's death in 1790, Smith prescribes a bundle of virtues as a treatment for commercial societies and gives a formula for human perfection.[141] These virtues are prudence, benevolence, justice and self-command which not only balance conduct of individual but also have regulating effect on commercial societies.

Self-command is a cardinal virtue by means of which Smith stresses capability of self-government and autonomous character of the individual. Self-command as our ability to control and regulate our selfish affections is shared by all mankind, only with different degrees. It is the power of self-disciplining. According to Smith, self-command is not only the greatest virtue, but it is such a virtue that "from it all the other virtues seem to derive their principal lustre" (TMS; 241). In that sense self-command can be understood as the necessary condition for having a virtuous life. For Smith, virtue consists in propriety of actions and this propriety is decided on the ground that the reasons or incentives of actions are right ones. While impartial spectator enables the individual to see himself from a certain distance and discover the real incentives of his actions, the virtue of self-command enables him to moderate the passions whose violent feature directs

---

[140] Jeffrey T. Young, *Economics as a Moral Science: The Political Economy of Adam Smith* (UK: Edward Elgar, 1997), 24.

[141] Andrew Skinner states that "it is only in the Moral Sentiments that we confront a full treatment of the complex psychology of self-love." Skinner claims that such a treatment is seen throughout TMS but he considers specifically Part VI as a perfect example of this treatment. Andrew S. Skinner, "Adam Smith: ethics and self-love," in *Adam Smith Reviewed*, ed. Peter Jones and Andrew Skinner (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 144. In addition to Skinner's comments, Ryan Patrick Hanley also suggests "Of the Character of Virtue" as a treatment of self-love. See Ryan Patrick Hanley, *Adam Smith and the Character of Virtue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 93.

him wrongly in his actions. Through self-command, individual gains more authority over the incentives of his actions.

While Smith describes a happy and flourishing society which is connected with the band of social passions like love, friendship, gratitude and esteem in TMS he does not mean that weaker degree of these affections leads to disintegration in society. Rather, he states:

> Society may subsist among different men, as among different merchants, from a sense of its utility, without any mutual love or affection; and though no man in it should owe any obligation, or be bound in gratitude to any other, it may still be upheld by a mercenary exchange of good offices according to an agreed valuation (TMS; 86).

In that case, Smith accentuates another virtue which is necessary for regulation and control social and economic relations in the society. Justice is the main frame of the foundation of a society "of which the observance is not left to the freedom of our own wills, which may be extorted by force, and of which the violation exposes to resentment, and consequently to punishment" (TMS; 79). Even if Smith defines three kinds of justice (commutative, distributive and Platonic sense) in TMS he gives primacy to commutative justice both in Part II of TMS and WN. Smith uses justice almost in every occasion in the meaning of "negative justice" which implies abstinence from breach of person, reputation and estate of others. As it is a negative virtue it can be fulfilled by "by sitting still and doing nothing" (TMS; 82). Justice, says Smith, is a necessary condition for the maintenance of a society and it differs from benevolence in the sense that like benevolence it does not depend on individuals' generosity and "society may subsist, though not in the most comfortable state, without beneficence; but the prevalence of injustice must utterly destroy it" (TMS; 86).

Smith states that in case of injustice, resentment and hatred as the unsocial passions and also aspects of demerit have significant role in our judgments about

the offender and we also sympathize with the feelings of the injured. Unlike other social virtues whose practice is generally left to our own choice, justice necessitates a strict obligation because "we feel ourselves to be in a peculiar manner tied, bound and obliged to the observation of justice"(TMS; 80). Although Nature prompts man to act both beneficently and justly, is not a characteristic of virtue of beneficence to enforce the punishment which is merited after injury, rather this characteristic is attributed to justice because "Nature has implanted in the human breast that consciousness of ill-desert, those terrors of merited punishment which attend upon its violation, as the great safe-guards of the association of mankind, to protect the weak, to curb the violent, and to chastise the guilty" (TMS; 86). Unlike Hume, Smith states that utility cannot be ground for particular acts of punishment and thus cannot be the principle of justice. He states:

> That it is not a regard to the preservation of society, which originally interests us in the punishment of crimes committed against individuals […] the concern which we take in the fortune and happiness of individuals does not, *in common cases*, arise from that which we take in the fortune and happiness of society (TMS; 89; emphasis added).

Rather than utility "sympathetic indignation" forms the basis for the account of punishment of crimes committed against individuals. But, says Smith, "upon some occasions, indeed, we both punish and approve of punishment, merely from a view to the general interest of society, which, we imagine, cannot otherwise be secured. Of this kind are all punishments inflicted for breaches of what is called either civil police, or military discipline" (TMS; 90). He gives the case of sentinel as an example for this situation. The execution of a sentinel who falls asleep on guard duty is considered as 'just and proper' taking into account remote consequences of crime (Ibid). However, Smith takes this as an exceptional

case because we reluctantly approve such a punishment for the sake of preserving society.

In WN, Smith also dwells upon justice as one of the duties of government. He enumerates three duties of government. First and second duties are respectively protecting the society from violence and foreign invasion and "exact administration of justice" which are based upon the principle of commutative justice. The third duty, constructing and preserving public works and institutions, is the justification of public benefit or utility (WN; 687-8). Smith again distinguishes justice from utility/expediency within the context of the role of government by taking them in terms of not only their being "product of different sentiments but different modes of thinking about what we ought to do" (TMS; 263). He gives two passages from WN in order to highlight the conceptual distinction between justice and expediency. In one of the passages Smith clearly mentions the difference between expediency and general rules of justice but says Smith there would be some instances that justice could be sacrificed. It can be clearly seen from the passage that

> To hinder […] the farmer from sending his goods at all times to the best market, is evidently to sacrifice the ordinary laws of justice to an idea of public utility, to a sort of reasons of state -- an act of legislative authority which ought to be exercised only, which can be pardoned only in cases of the utmost necessity (WN; 539).

Even if this passage shows Smith's strong commitment to the laws of justice, he endorses the exercise of legislative authority to sacrifice the laws of justice for public utility in case of extreme emergency or necessity.

In *The Fable*, justice is not mentioned as a virtue but ascribed to the duty of lawgivers. Justice is administered prevent the prevalence of harmful vices in society. Mandeville points out the necessity of enforcing it in the moral of "The Grumbling Hive" with following verses that "Vice is beneficial found/ When it's

by Justice lopt and bound" (FB I; 37). In Remark O, Mandeville clarifies this subject that wealth, property of individuals should be secured by means of laws of justice, besides that men who are guilty of crimes such as murder, theft and house-breaking should be "aw'd by rugged Officers, strong Prisons, watchful Jailors, the Hangman and the Gallows" (FB I; 164). Earlier, in "The Grumbling Hive" some verses show Mandeville's feeling of distrust on legal system:

> JUSTICE her self, fam'd for fair Dealing,
> By Blindness had not lost her Feeling;
> Her Left Hand, which the Scales should hold,
> Had often dropt 'em, brib'd with Gold;
> And, tho' she seem'd Impartial,
> Where Punishment was corporal,
> Pretended to a reg'lar Course,
> In Murther, and all Crimes of Force;
> Tho' some, first pillory'd for Cheating,
> Were hang'd in Hemp of their own beating;
> Yat, it was thought, the Sword she bore
> Check'd but the Desp'rate and the Poor;
> That, urg'd by meer Necessity,
> Were ty'd up to the wretched Tree
> For Crimes, which not deserv'd that Fate,
> But to secure the Rich and Great (FB I; 23-4).

As so in vicious but prosperous hive depicted in the poem, Mandeville does not believe the impartial administration of justice in morally corrupt society consisted vicious human beings. In addition to self-command, beneficence and justice Smith mentions another virtue; prudence. Unlike Hutcheson's thesis that self-regarding passions cannot be motives for virtuous actions, Smith asserts that prudential regard to one's own interest can be a virtue. According to Smith prudence, as another principal virtue, treats the vices caused by commercial vanity. Individual's care for health, fortune and reputation is the object of this virtue. Prudence advises us to bear our prosperity with mere moderation and it teaches us to avoid envy. Prudent man has characteristics of esteem of modesty,

discretion and good conduct. He is also supported by the entire approbation of impartial spectator. Hundert states that as opposed to Mandeville, even if virtue may include self-interested motives they are "neither anti-social nor perverse in Smith's account."[142] He also says that Smith's theory of morals aims to "show how self-interest, mitigated by sympathy and self-command can result in prudent and sometimes beneficent actions."[143] Thus, it can be inferred that neither in TMS nor in WN Smith's notions of self-love and self-interest are depicted as malicious motives of one but as motives of moral and economic agent that are disciplined or restricted as may be required.

5.6 Does Smith appropriate Mandeville's Moral Egoism?

Some contemporary scholars claim that not only Smith's moral theory based on sympathetic identification but also his portrayal of underlying motives of commercial societies have the traces of Mandeville's doctrines which form general framework of *The Fable*. However, it is not just that simple to reckon Smith as a defender of Mandeville's thesis. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, Smith sets up his moral theory on an entirely opposite assumption from theorists of moral egoism in the sense that from his point of view mankind is capable of sharing feelings of joy and sorrow of others and interested in fortune of them. Besides, Smith achieves to keep his distance to selfish theory and save his theory of sympathy from selfish basis by forming it within the scope of imaginary change of situation and self.

Moreover, Smith's moral theory is also supported with an element which enables the moral agent to restrict and humble his self-love. It is, says Smith, through the

[142]Hundert, *The Enlightenment's Fable*, 224.

[143] Ibid.

approbation of our conscience we can find not only the right path for proper moral judgments and acts but also we can also compare the interests of ourselves and those of others. In *The Fable* Mandeville admits that "the vast esteem we have of ourselves and the small value we have for others make us all very unfair judges in our own cases (FB I; 80). Therefore, it can be inferred that Smith's ideal spectator which is impartial and indifferent is in sharp contrast to Mandeville's partial spectator in *The Fable*. For Goldsmith, the mechanism in TMS "involves transmuting social approval and disapproval into true moral gold through Smith's impartial spectator"[144] Hundert also states that "Mandeville's society which has morally threatening quality as a masquerade has been tamed by indifferent and impartial spectator of Adam Smith."[145]

It is also worth noting four features of Smith's moral philosophy accentuated by Samuel Fleischacker in *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations*. I believe that some of them can be used to direct counter arguments against the moral theory of Mandeville. First, according to Smith a morally good sentiment is not a variety of benevolence rather it is related to the approval of the impartial spectator to this sentiment. This means that Smith's theory of morals is between Mandeville's selfishness and Hutcheson's benevolence. Because Smith neither holds that benevolence is the main feature of human nature nor defends Mandeville's moral agent who is too indulgent for self-regarding passions and incapable of impartial judgment regarding his sentiments and actions.

Secondly, Smith's moral theory is not compatible with utilitarianism due to the fact that motivation of a vicious sentiment does not lead to a morally good action

---

[144] Maurice M. Goldsmith, "Regulating Anew the Moral and Political Sentiments of Mankind: Bernard Mandeville and the Scottish Enlightenment," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49, no. 3 (1988): 604.

[145] Hundert, *The Enlightenment's Fable,* 227.

even it has excellent or beneficial consequences. This is a counter argument against Mandeville's famous motto "private vices, public benefits". Mandeville does not only depict positive public results of private actions throughout "The Grumbling Hive" and in explanatory remarks in *The Fable* he defines virtue as what is useful for public welfare and national happiness. Third, Smith's moral theory reflects the social conception of the self, in other words, "all of our feelings, self-interested and benevolent, are *constituted* by a process of socialization."[146] As mentioned earlier, Smith regards society as a mirror concerning our moral judgments. In the first stage, it has a significant role in forming our first judgements about our moral conduct. We can also find out only in society whether our sentiments correspond or be in harmony with others. Smith says:

> The great pleasure of conversation and society […] arises from a certain correspondence of sentiments and opinions, from a certain harmony of minds, which, like so many musical instruments, coincide and keep time with one another. But this most delightful harmony cannot be obtained unless there is a free communication of sentiments and opinions. We all desire, upon this account, to feel how each other is affected, to penetrate into each other's bosoms, and to observe the sentiments and affections which really subsist there (TMS; 337).

But the role of society and aim of socialization differ in *The Fable* in the way that man's socialization cannot be explained in the light of his love of his species or his strong desire for company. Mankind's hateful qualities, says Mandeville, make them fit in a society; in other words, man's love of ease, security and his desire of ameliorating his condition lead to socialization. Besides, only in society a man can learn how to conceal his pride because under good manners and politeness a secret indulgence of self-regarding passions lies. At the same time

[146] Fleischacker, *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations*, 47.

Mandeville claims that "the Necessities, the vices and imperfection of Man, together with the various Inclemencies of the Air and other Elements, contain in them the Seeds of all Arts, Industry and Labour" (FBI ; 366).

Finally, Smith holds that whole procedure of sympathy (sharing of sentiments between parties, balance and fine adjustment between the feelings of the actor and the spectator) which basically generates the general task of moral development or process of self-transformation is not compatible with the pursuit of social status and material stuff.[147]

Some contemporary scholars attempt to assimilate Smith's "invisible hand" metaphor into Mandeville's "private vices, public benefits". Before comparing Smith's and Mandeville's view within this context the usages of invisible hand in Smith's works are worth mentioning. Nowadays, Smith's famous metaphor is generally assigned a meaning by most of the economists in order to describe the driving force of "free market economy." In fact, Smith uses invisible hand only three times in his corpus. The term "invisible hand" is first mentioned in his essay entitled "The History of Astronomy". He says the following:

> Fire burns, and the water refreshes; heavy bodies descend, and lighter substances fly upwards, by the necessity of their own nature; nor was *the invisible hand* of Jupiter ever apprehended to be employed in these matters. But thunder and lightning, storms and sunshine, those more irregular events, were ascribed to his favour, or his anger …[148]

Here, Smith uses Jupiter's invisible hand in order to show that occurrence of irregular events in nature was ascribed to gods by savage people. This usage differs from the other two in the sense that while here Smith means unexpected

---

[147] Ibid.

[148] Adam Smith, "The History of Astronomy" in *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, ed. W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982), 49, emphasis added.

and extraordinary events caused by invisible hand of Jupiter betoken the disturbance in the order of nature in TMS and WN he seems to mention invisible hand to point out the positive effects of unintended actions to natural order.

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, in TMS Smith uses invisible hand in order to show how actions of selfishly motivated landlord unintentionally provide benefits with the poor. Smith indicates the greed of landlord with a proverb "the eye is larger than the belly" which purports that landlord cultivates his land as if he will consume all harvest by himself (TMS; 184). However, the food consumed by the landlord is same in amount with the labourers. The goods seem to be almost equally distributed as a result of the landlord's unintentional service to the labourers. Therefore, the invisible hand in TMS "is the mechanism by which a benign spontaneous order, one that is in society's interests in general, can be produced by the self-regarding actions of individuals."[149]

Smith's perspective here seems to be similar with that of Mandeville regarding paradoxical result because they both get through to beneficial outcomes out of self-regarding motives. However, Smith neither avows nor alludes that whatever done out of private vices always leads to public benefit in TMS and WN. When the context of the invisible hand in TMS is examined it is seen that Smith is concerned with showing the ruining effects of admiration the condition of the rich through the parable regarding poor man's son. Although Smith admits that such deception of mankind spins the wheel of industry, he never extols the pursuit of wealth and greatness in the society. In a similar vein, the invisible hand in WN purports how self-interested action of a merchant ends up with public benefits. Smith says the following:

[149] Craig Smith, *Adam Smith's Political Philosophy: The Invisible Hand and Spontaneous Order* (London: Routledge, 2006), 84.

> By preferring the support of domestick to that foreign industry, he [the merchant] intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an *invisible hand* to promote an end which was no part of his intention. Nor is it always the worse for the society that it was no part of it. By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it (WN; 456; emphasis added).

This passage indicates merchant's preference to invest his money to domestic industry because of his concern about the security of his capital which consequently creates employment and does something for the public benefit. The usages of the invisible hand in TMS and WN resemble each other in the sense that in both works the consequence of landlord and merchant's actions are entirely unintended. However, they differ from each other with respect to scope of the chapters that in Book IV of WN Smith uses the metaphor while discussing the actions performed out of self-interest in mercantile system of economy. On the other hand, in TMS Smith tries to show how "selfishness and rapacity" of landlord ends up with almost just distribution of goods (TMS; 184).

It follows from Smith's two usages of invisible hand in TMS and WN that Smith does not use the metaphor in order to reveal how public benefits originate from the indulgence of vices. But, on the other hand, even if both Smith's and Mandeville's expressions manifest a paradox, unlike Smith; Mandeville's famous paradox in *The Fable* implies that "public benefits are brought about in the absence of *genuine* moral conduct."[150]

In "Envy and Commercial Society" Thomas A. Horne states that "Smith, in fact, is at pains to deny the necessary connection between the rise of wealth and the decline of virtue, and finds at least three reasons why a wealthy commercial

[150] Petsoulas, *Hayek's Liberalism and its Origins,* 92.

society may escape vice and actually promote virtue."[151] Horne enumerates these three reasons as follows. First of all, while Smith focuses on the significance of self-interest in economic relations he does not imply its necessity in other spheres. Secondly, Horne suggests that Mandeville tries to "avoid the identification of self-interest and vice by showing that many forms of self-interest are either virtuous or morally neutral."[152]The approval of impartial spectator is a necessary criterion for Smith in order to demarcate moral value of self-interest. Thirdly, Smith suggests some moral standards for the moral justification of commercial society.

In TMS, as mentioned earlier, Smith analyses mankind's strong desire and pursuit of approval, applause, rank and wealth and he identifies all these as delusions and he sees mankind's efforts to attain them as futile. Unlike Mandeville's portrayal in *The Fable*, man is described as a moral agent who is capable of acting according to what is approvable and praiseworthy. Even though Smith does not deny that mankind's desire for wealth and material stuff promotes national prosperity his general point of view clearly differs from what Mandeville's verses tell us in "The Grumbling Hive":

> Thus Vice nurs'd Ingenuity
> Which join'd with Time and Industry
> Had carry'd Life's Conveniencies,
> It's real Pleasures, Comforts, Ease,
> To such a Height , the very Poor
> Liv'd better than the Rich before (FB I; 26).

As it is remarked in *Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life* by Phillipson Mandeville's analysis of society indicates that "all system of taste, morality and politics, all

[151] Thomas A. Horne, "Envy and Commercial Society: Mandeville and Smith on "Private Vices, Public Benefits," *Political Theory* 9, no. 4 (1981): 561.

[152] Ibid., 562.

philosophy and art, all progress in the arts, sciences and commerce, all language even, were driven by need, by a hunger for social approval and by the ever-contemptible delusion that our self-regarding actions were virtuous and for the public good."[153] Thus, as stated earlier in the first chapter of this dissertation, Mandeville draws attention that sincerity of seemingly virtuous person comes into question due to mankind's self-deception and their characteristics of hypocrisy. Nicholas Phillipson gives a general overview regarding Smith's moral theory and summarizes:

> The *Theory of Moral Sentiments* was Smith's extraordinary attempt to develop a coherent and plausible account of the processes by which we learn the principles of morality from the experience of common life without descending into wanton religious scepticism, Mandevillian cynicism or Rouseaunian despair. It would mean making careful experimental studies of the experiences which shape our moral understanding and teach us our duties, of the process of social exchange, and of the ways in which we learn how to evaluate our own conduct as well as that of others; above all, it would mean attending to the effects that these processes had on the human personality. It was an enterprise which meant thinking again about the principle of sympathy on which all forms of human communication ultimately depended.[154]

Then, it can be inferred that as it is seen Smith's theory regarding morals and his critique of Mandeville's system, his sketch of a moral agent is entirely different from Mandeville. What Smith succeeded in TMS is to anatomize successfully our moral experiences and duties which are originated and shaped in society and give an account about both being a moral agent and a spectator. He portrays the moral agent who is self-determined, self-governed and who has a certain self-legislative power over his desires and selfish inclinations.

---

[153] Phillipson, *Adam* Smith, 48-9.

[154] Ibid., 148.

Firstly, he downplays the determinative roles of passions in formulation his notion of sympathy and in explaining the sympathetic process in moral evaluations. Then he claims that by appealing to the impartial spectator which is settled in human breast, moral agents are able to judge their own actions and set their own moral standards for their moral judgments. The impartial status of the ideal spectator does not only emancipate agent from confinements and restrictions imposed by society but also from the internal constraints caused by selfish desires and passions. So it enables the agent to be autonomous in forming his moral principles and be governed by self-imposed rules. Both the qualities of the sympathy and the possibility that the agent forms an indifferent perspective and becomes his own judge introduce a sense of autonomy into moral sphere. Moreover, Smith emphasizes that when the individual has the power of self-command, he can control his passions and moderate them to the point that he can act from right reasons and behave properly to achieve the right things in his life.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

A thorough examination of *The Fable of the Bees* and *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* reveals the fact that both Mandeville and Adam Smith set the same objective regarding morals. As Mandeville specifies it in the Introduction of "An Enquiry into the Origin of Moral Virtue" that unlike most writers who commit themselves to teach how mankind ought to be, his original purpose is to engage in anatomizing human nature in order to show what human beings really are in the same way as an anatomist performs on a carcass. In the same vein, Smith clarifies that he does not aspire for teaching people how they should act. He states that his objective in TMS is not associated with "a matter of right" but rather "a matter of fact" (TMS; 77). To that end, Smith pledges himself to analyse moral experience of individuals in order to manifest what lies beneath the principles of moral approbation and disapprobation. However, it is quite remarkable that although Mandeville and Smith both start off with the same objective they come through different consequences regarding human nature.

In *The Female Tatler*, a series of conversation fleshed out either from Lucinda's drawing room or that of Artesia aim to unearth the exact opposite view which planted before through the praises of civic virtues in Steele's *The Tatler*. General perspective concerning the nature and the progress of society quoted from one of the interlocutors, Oxford Gentleman, in *The Female Tatler* makes us surmise that for his entire career Mandeville sticks to his main thesis that all human beings are selfish and the underlying motive of either naïve or educated altruistic acts is nothing but self-love or pride. Every line of Mandeville's verse satire on virtue

and morality is attributed not only to expose corrupted nature of mankind, their indulgence of vices like avarice, lust, envy, love of luxury, pride, scam and imposture in all callings but also show how paradoxically all these vices lead to opulent and flourishing societies. Although Mandeville points a moral part to manifest the folly of mankind and unreasonableness of complaining about vices while enjoying all worldly comforts all his contemporaries seems to ignore the didactic message given in "The Grumbling Hive" and accused Mandeville of degrading all actions of mankind to selfishness and encouraging vices which were condemned by Christianity.

On the other hand, although Smith predicates on the same objective just as Mandeville Smith's conclusion about underlying motives of human nature is that no matter how selfish human beings are considered they are also motivated by happiness and fortune of others as well. In TMS Smith defines sympathy as man's capacity of fellow-feeling for happiness and misery of others. But it means more than a feeling for Smith; it is rather a mechanism which is central to our moral judgments concerning both others and ourselves. Smith was not the first who brushed up Mandeville's dark picture about human nature, before him, Hutcheson and Hume aimed to manifest mankind's natural capacity to act out of other regarding passions in their systems of morals.

Firstly, in *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* Hutcheson affirms the possibility of cultivation of virtues in a society by following the footsteps of Lord Shaftesbury and rejecting Mandeville's attempt to undermine all virtues of mankind. In all his treatises regarding morals Hutcheson propounds the theory of moral sense and defends that mankind is capable of disinterested motives, desire for the good of others and benevolent actions. Even if Smith's theory of morals is different from that of Hutcheson in some respects, his basic approach towards selfish theory of Hobbes and Mandeville is similar

with Hutcheson's systematic rejection of these theories in the sense that he even devotes the very first sentence of TMS to the disavowal of selfish system. However, unlike Hutcheson, Smith propounds that although one's regard to his/her own interest might be considered not a proper motive for a virtues action "[t]he habits of oeconomy, industry, discretion, attention and application of thought […] at the same time are apprehended to be very praise-worthy qualities, which deserve the esteem and approbation of everybody" (TMS; 304). This means that Smith does not rule out possibility of virtue out of self-regarding motives.

In addition to Hutcheson's theory of moral sense, Hume comes up with a refined theory which also forms the basis for Smith's theory scrutinized in TMS. Even if Hume agrees with Hutcheson concerning the power of benevolence he envisages a different theory of morals founded upon the doctrine of sympathy. Moral approval and disapproval, says Hume, depend on the feelings of pleasure and uneasiness produced as a result of sympathetic identification. The doctrine of sympathy as a ground for moral judgments provides the inspiration and prompts Smith to anatomize moral sentiments just like Hume's attempt in *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Although Hume's and Smith's theories of morals are basically built on the dominant role of sentiments or feelings and at the core of their theories there lies sympathy which can originate with any passion whatever, Smith theory of sympathy differs from that of Hume in certain respects. Smith offers a more elaborated and systematic account of sympathy and has a serious concern to isolate sympathy from selfishness in order to preclude any claims which assert alleged resemblance between them. Unlike Hume, Smith propounds that sympathy arises from situation instead of the view of passion. Thus, sympathizing with the dead is possible in terms of Smithian theory of sympathy. Smith was also interested in forming an objective ground for moral judgment by means of the theory of impartial spectator. This means that, Smith

takes a step forward Humean version of sympathy with some additional concepts.

It is significant to remind that none of these three philosophers disregarded selfish motives of human nature but at the same time neither of them considered self-love as the only motive which directs mankind to act. In TMS, Smith seems to be in pains to show that sympathy cannot arise from a selfish principle. In this sense, he elucidates the fact that sympathy arises from the correspondence of sentiments of the spectator and those of the agent through the medium of imaginary change of situation and person. In other words, in order to judge the propriety of an action the spectator changes his person and character with the agent and see under the same condition he would feel the same sentiments. Such a transformation of situation and self clearly indicates that Smith keeps his distance from Mandeville's egoistic thesis which reduces actions done by the feeling of sympathy to selfish moral conduct.

Sympathetic identification, as Smith gives general framework in TMS, is central to our moral judgments. Propriety and impropriety of a sentiment or action depends entirely on concord or dissonance of sentiments of the spectator with those of the actor. Besides, we also judge merit and demerit of the actor's reaction to his/her situation that is to say; as a result of sympathetic identification we see whether we would be affected and feel the same gratitude and resentment as the actor.

All human beings not only have natural disposition to sympathize with others but to judge themselves by means of same sympathetic process. In order to judge ourselves, says Smith, we should depart from our natural station and look our sentiments and conduct from the eyes of other people. Since only in society we can observe how other people see us and judge our conduct, the role of society

become more of an issue for forming our first moral judgments concerning our moral sentiments and conducts.

Mandeville and Smith differ from each other in society's role on individual's moral behaviour. On the one hand, Mandeville claims that in society men learn how to hide their self-regarding passions in order to win approval of others. Therefore, moral education which originates in family enables men to fit into the society under the mask of hypocrisy. On the other hand, Smith believes that for men society is the great school for forming proper moral judgments regarding others and also themselves. Individuals learn how to be the spectators of their own sentiments and conducts by means of social responses. They achieve a moral standard through internalizing social responses and imagining an impartial spectator who would judge their conduct from an objective standpoint. Then, an objective moral standard for self-assessment is achieved by means of an internalized impartial spectator which is inner judge of man viz. conscience. Smith's theory about the faculty of conscience shows that man has a certain capacity to correct misrepresentations of self-love and even sometimes misguidance of society. But Mandeville fails to address an impartial standard for disinterested moral judgments. In fact, he admits that because of man's high esteem for himself and small value for others man becomes partial spectator regarding his own sentiments and conducts.

Although Smith admits that Mandeville's system "bordered upon truth" he in fact considers it as "wholly pernicious" and "in almost every respect erroneous" (TMS; 308-313). He also adds that Mandeville who portrays human nature in "lively and humorous" manner in fact have "coarse and rustic eloquence" which can only have impact upon only inexperienced people (TMS; 308). Smith never denies the power of selfish passions on our actions but what he strongly argues against is Mandeville's rigorism which is based upon the idea that all conducts of

mankind are utterly and only motivated by self-regarding passions. Furthermore, even though selfishness is defined as the basic passion which underlies all passions and is necessary for the function of the society in *The Fable*, for Smith, it is not the basic and only principle for properly functioning society. Smith admits the fact that while mankind's dispositions to admire all superfluities or extravagances that the rich enjoys, to emulate the power and to desire higher ranks arise from an enchantment of a delusion they, in other respects, direct them to acquire wealth and greatness. Here, although Smith echoes Mandeville's inference concerning the benefits of self-regarding passions to economy he is still concerned about potential mischiefs of vanity and purports that strong desire for applause and approval results in corruption of our moral sentiments.

Against Mandeville's portrayal of man who only desires to gain approval and applause of others in order to satisfy his pride, Smith propounds that man is naturally inclined to desire not only what is approved and praised but also desire what is approvable and praiseworthy. Even if it is true that individuals are mostly delighted with praise and approval of others they are also capable of distinguishing what is praised and what really deserves praise. He states that "[i]t is only the weakest and most superficial of mankind who can be much delighted with that praise which they themselves know to be altogether unmerited" (TMS; 117). Strong desire for praise, applause and approval is the effect of pride and vanity.

It is Smith's contention that recovery from delusion and bondage of vanity and pride is only possible by strong desire for what is really praiseworthy at the end which becomes the source of inspiration for real love of virtue. At this point, he puts forward conscience, a "much higher tribunal", "supposed impartial and well-informed spectator" and "the man within the breast", which enables us to restrain and humble our pride (TMS; 130-1). This is Smith's answer to

Mandeville. In the Sixth Dialogue of second volume of *The Fable* after manifesting mankind's impotency for restraining their passions and inclinations without the management of an external force, Mandeville states that naturally "all men are partial in their judgments when they compare themselves to others; no two Equals think so well of each other, as both do of themselves" (FB II; 271). It means that it is not possible for Mandeville's proud and vain man either to observe or to judge his own sentiments and conduct from an impartial point of view.

As Mandeville's task of anatomizing morals which aims to dissect the most subtle parts of human nature reveals selfishness of mankind as the basic motivation for their moral conduct virtue is unsurprisingly defined as every action performed out of self-denial for the sake of public benefit or out of a rational choice. Considering the impotency of reason and impossibility of mankind's natural preference of others Mandeville's portrayal of artificial origin of virtue shows the fact that virtue is a mere self-denial imposed on mankind by lawgivers through the art of flattery. He does not believe that mankind is naturally inclined to perform virtuous acts; so, says Mandeville, men can only be virtuous only by choice. Accordingly, Mandevillean version of virtue is understood as "the Political offspring which Flattery begot upon Pride" (FB I; 51). As mankind is headstrong, hypocrite and insincere, they learn how to pretend to act out of virtuous motives. Then, performance of self-denial implies a successful concealment of selfish passions and feeding the dominant passion, pride, secretly.

As it annihilates the difference between virtue and vice, in Part VII of TMS, Smith designates Mandeville's system as "licentious." Contrary to Mandeville, Smith discusses different accounts of virtue in TMS and states that according to some authors "the virtuous temper of mind does not consist in any one species of

affections, but in the proper government and direction of all our affections, which may be either virtuous or vicious according to the objects which they pursue, and the degree of 'vehemence' with which they pursue them. According to these authors, therefore, virtue consists in propriety" (TMS; 266). For Smith, too, virtue consists in propriety of actions and this propriety is decided on the ground that the reasons or incentives of actions are right ones. As for the measure for propriety Smith points out that "precise and distinct measure can be found nowhere but in the sympathetic feelings of the impartial and well-informed spectator" (TMS; 294).

Sympathy is a decisive mechanism through which moral judgments regarding propriety/impropriety and merit/demerit of actions are formed. In TMS, a virtuous man is characterized as one who has excellent character traits, natural inclination for other-regarding affections and acts out of proper motives. Four virtues; namely, prudence, benevolence, justice and self-command are not only praised by Smith due to their perfective effects on the moral agent but also their therapeutic characteristic on commercial societies.

The virtue of self-command enables the moral agent to moderate the passions whose violent feature directs him wrongly in his actions. It specifically controls and regulates selfish passions. In addition to self-command, by exercising the virtue of justice, we obey the rules of justice no matter how we feel or how others expect us to behave. On the other hand, when the individual has the power of self-command, he can control his passions and moderate them to the point that he can act from right reasons and behave properly to achieve the right things in his life.

Any attempts in order to show connection between Smith's theory of self-interest in WN and Mandeville's egoistic theory fail because of the fact that contrary to pride, vanity, avarice and greed Smith offers prudential self-interest which

means individual's care for his fortune, health and reputation within the boundaries of modesty, temperance and discretion. As Hundert states in *The Enlightenment's Fable* that "Smith's purpose was to argue, against Mandeville that men exhibit the whole range of combinations of self-love and sympathy suited for engaging in a wide spectrum of possible forms of civil life.[155] The content of "Of the Character of Virtue" which was included in the sixth edition of TMS shows Smith's ongoing struggle to formulate a system in which morality, economy and politics are closely united. Furthermore, an additional chapter "Corruption of our moral sentiments" shows how vanity, avarice and ambition cause the corruption of our sentiments in commercial society.

As a consequence, although Mandeville's undaunted confession of selfishness as a basic motive of moral practice and his famous paradox "private vices public benefits" which shows necessary relationship between moral corruption and economic progress are said to revive in Adam Smith's moral and economic discourse in fact altruistic nature of mankind and other regarding sentiments as the basis of moral conduct in TMS and individualistic efforts to better one's condition within the boundaries of prudence in commercial society manifest that Smith tries to postulate a comprehensive system in which economics and politics are strongly attached to moral principles.

This dissertation shows that Adam Smith does not advocate unrestrained or unregulated self-interest neither in TMS nor in WN. He points out that human nature is not entirely selfish and human beings are capable of restraining their selfish affections. Ideal man in a commercial society is prudent and self-disciplined and also capable of interacting and competing in the light of dictates of justice, law and morality. He also intends to show that strong commitment to moral and ethical foundations does not slow down economic activity. He gives

[155] Hundert, *The Enlightenment's Fable*, 224-5.

principal virtues which have regulatory effect not only on individual as well as well-being of a society. In this way, he reconciles sympathy and self-love by linking them up with moral experience of the individual and his character in commercial societies.

REFERENCES

Berkeley, George. *Alciphron; Or, The Minute Philosopher* in *The Works of George Berkeley*. Vol.2. Edited by Alexander Campbell Fraser. London & New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2005.

Bluet, George. *An Enquiry whether a General Practice of Virtue Tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Discouragement of a People.* London: King's Head, 1725.

Brentano, Lujo. *The Relation of Labor to the Law of Today*. Translated by P. Sherman. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1891.

Brown, Michael. *Francis Hutcheson in Dublin, 1719-1730*. Ireland: Four Courts Press, 2002.

Buckle, Henry Thomas. *History of Civilization in England*. Vol. 3. London: Longman, Green, And Co, 1873.

Burtt, Shelley. *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688-1740*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Dennis, John. *Vice and Luxury Publick Mischiefs: or; Remarks on a Bool Intituled, The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices Publick Benefits*. London: Lamb, 1724.

Dumont, Louis. *From Mandeville to Marx: The Genesis and Triumph of Economic Ideology*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Fiddes, Richard. *A General Treatise of Morality, Form'd upon the PRINCIPLES of Natural Reason only.* London: Judge's Head, 1724.

Fleischacker, Samuel. *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University, 2004.

Force, Pierre. *Self-Interest Before Adam Smith*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Goldsmith, Maurice M. *Private Vices, Public Benefits: Bernard Mandeville's Social and Political Thought*. USA: Cybereditions Corporation, 2001.

Goldsmith, Maurice M. "Regulating Anew the Moral and Political Sentiments of Mankind: Bernard Mandeville and the Scottish Enlightenment." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49, no. 3 (1988): 587-606.

Gunn, J.A.W. *Beyond Liberty and Property: The Process of Self-Recognition in Eighteenth-Century Political Thought.* Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983.

Haakonssen, Knud. *The Science of a Legislator : The Natural Jurisprudence of David Hume and Adam Smith*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Haakonssen, Knud, and Winch Donald. "The Legacy of Adam Smith." In *The Cambridge Companion to Adam Smith,* edited by Knud Haakonssen, 366-94. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Hamowy, Ronald. *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Theory of Spontaneous Order*. USA: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

Hanley, Ryan Patrick. *Adam Smith and the Character of Virtue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Harth, Philip. "The Satiric Purpose of The Fable of the Bees." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 2, no. 4 (1969): 321-340.

Hayek, Friedrich. "Dr. Bernard Mandeville." In *The Trend of Economic Thinking: Essays on Political Economists and Economic History*, edited by W.W. Bartley III and Stephen Kresge, 74-97. US: Routledge, 1991.

Heath, Eugene. "Mandeville's Bewitching Engine of Praise." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 15, no. 2 (1998): 205-226.

Heath, Eugene. "Adam Smith and Self-Interest." In *The Oxford Handbook of Adam Smith*, edited by Christopher J. Berry, Maria Pia Paganelli and Craig Smith, 241-264. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Heath, Eugene. "Carrying Matters Too Far? Mandeville and The Eighteenth Century Scots on the Evolution of Morals." *The Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 12, no.1 (2014): 95-119.

Horne, Thomas A. "Envy and Commercial Society: Mandeville and Smith on "Private Vices, Public Benefits." *Political Theory* 9, no. 4 (1981): 551-569.

Hume, David. *The Letters of David Hume*. Vol.1. Edited by J.Y.T. Grieg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Edited by L.A. Selby-Bigge, second ed. P.H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clerendon Press, 1978.

Hundert, Edward J. *The Enlightenment's Fable: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Hutcheson, Francis. *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees in Six Letters.* Glasgow: Robert& Andrew Foults, 1901.

Hutcheson, Francis. "Inaugural lecture on the social nature of man." In *Francis Hutcheson: Two Texts on Human Nature*. Edited by Thomas Mautner, 124-147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Hutcheson, Francis. *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*. Edited by Wolfgang Leidhold, general ed. Knud Haakonssen. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2004.

Jack, Malcolm. "Review of Progress and Corruption in the Eighteenth Century Mandeville's Private Vices, Public Benefits and The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no.2 (1976): 369-376.

Jack, Malcolm. *The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville*. New York: Garland, 1987.

Jack, Malcolm. *Corruption and Progress: The Eighteenth Century Debate*. New York: AMS Press, 1989.

La Rochefoucauld. *Collected Maxims and Other Reflections*. Translated by E.H., A.M. Blackmore and Francine Giguere. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Law, William. *Remarks upon A Late Book Entituled The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits in A Letter to the Author to which is added, A Postscript, containing an Observation or two upon Mr. BAYLE*. London: Prince's Arms, 1724.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. *Reflections on Human Nature*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1961.

Mandeville, Bernard. *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and The Usefulness of Christianity in War*. London, 1732.

Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefit.* Vol I. Edited by F. B. Kaye. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1988.

Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits.* Vol II.Edited by F. B. Kaye. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1988.

Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees and Other Writings.* Edited by E.J. Hundert. Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 1997.

Mandeville, Bernard. *By a Society of Ladies: Essays in The Female Tatler*. Edited by M.M. Goldsmith. Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1999.

Mandeville, Bernard. *A Letter to Dion.* With an Introduction by Jacob Viner US: CreateSpace, 2013.

Marshall, David. "Adam Smith and the Theatricality of Moral Sentiments." *Critical Inquiry* 10, no.4 (1984): 592-613.

McKee, Francis. "Francis Hutcheson and Bernard Mandeville." *Eighteenth Century Ireland* 3, (1988): 123-132.

Monro, Hector. *The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.

Morrow, Glenn R. "Adam Smith: Moralist and Philosopher." *Journal of Political Economy* 35, no.3 (1927): 321-342.

Morrow, Glenn R. *The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969.

Nieli, Russell. "Spheres of Intimacy and the Adam Smith Problem." *Journal of History of Ideas* 47, no. 4 (1986): 611-624.

Oncken, August. "The Consistency of Adam Smith." *Economic Journal of London* no. 7(1897): 443-50.

Petsoulas, Christina. *Hayek's Liberalism and its Origins: His idea of spontaneous order and the Scottish Enlightenment*. London & New York: Routledge, 2001.

Phillipson, Nicholas. *Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life*. England: Penguin Books, 2011.

Platts, Mark. *Moral Realities: An Essay in Philosophical Psychology*. London & New York: Routledge, 1991.

Raphael, D.D. "Impartial Spectator." In *Essays on Adam Smith*. Edited by Andrew S. Skinner and Thomas Wilson, 83-99. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Raphael, D. D. *Adam Smith*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Raphael, D. D. *The Impartial Spectator: Adam Smith's Moral Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.

Rasmussen, Dennis C. *The Problems and Promise of Commercial Society: Adam Smith's Response to Rousseau*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.

Robertson, John. *The Case for Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680-1760*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Rosenberg, Nathan. "Mandeville and Laissez-Faire." *Journal of History of Ideas* 24, no. 2 (1963): 183-194.

Sayre-McCord, Geoffrey. "Hume and Smith on Sympathy, Approbation, and Moral Judgment." In *Sympathy: A History*. Edited by Eric Schliesser, 208-246. USA: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Seigel, Jerrold. *The Idea of the Self: Thought and Experience in Western Europe since the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Skinner, Andrew S. "Adam Smith: The Development of a System." *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 23, no. 2 (1976): 111-132.

Skinner, Andrew S. "Adam Smith: ethics and self-love." In *Adam Smith Reviewed*. Edited by Peter Jones and Andrew Skinner, 142-167. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nations.* Vol I. Edited by R. H. Campbell, A.S. Skinner and W.B. Todd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nations.* Vol II. R. Edited by H. Campbell, A.S. Skinner and W.B. Todd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Smith, Adam. "A Letter to the Authors of the Edinburgh Review" In *Essays on Philosophical Subjects.* Edited by W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce, 242-254. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edited by D. D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982.

Smith, Adam. *The Correspondence of Adam Smith*. Edited by E. C. Mossner and I. S. Ros.s Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1987.

Smith, Craig. *Adam Smith's Political Philosophy: The Invisible Hand and Spontaneous Order*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Stewart, Dugald. *Biographical Memoir of Adam Smith*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1966.

Stewart, Dugald . "Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith." In *Essays on Philosophical Subjects.* Edited by W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce, 269-351. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982.

Telfer, Elizabeth. "Hutcheson's *Reflections Upon Laughter*" *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53, no. 4 (1995): 359-369.

Tolonen, Mikko. "Politeness, Paris and the Treatise." *Hume Studies* 34 no.1(2008): 21-42.

Tolonen, Mikko. *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013.

Young, Jeffrey T. *Economics as a Moral Science: The Political Economy of Adam Smith*. UK: Edward Elgar, 1997.

Weinstein, Jack Russell. *Adam Smith's Pluralism*, New Haven. London: Yale University, 2013.

Wilson, Thomas. "Sympathy and Self-Interest." In *The Market and The State: Essays in Honour of Adam Smith.* Edited by Thomas Wilson and Andrew S. Skinner, 73-99. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Winch, Donald. *Adam Smith's Politics: An Essay in Historiographic Revision*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Çeşmeli, Işıl
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Phone: +90 312 210 31 52
email: aksoyisil@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MS	METU Philosophy	2006
BS	METU Philosophy	2002
High School	Kütahya Lisesi / Yabancı Dil Ağırlıklı Lise	1997

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2010-2011	Ahi Evran University Department of Philosophy	Research Assistant
2011-Present	METU Department of Philosophy	Research Assistant
2014-2015	University of Glasgow / School of Social and Political Sciences	Visiting Affiliate Scholar

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English, Basic Spanish

PUBLICATIONS

1. Çeşmeli Işıl. "Is Adam Smith Heir of Bernard Mandeville?" In *Bernard de Mandeville's Tropology of Paradoxes: Morals, Politics, Economics, and Therapy.* Edited by Edmundo Balsemão Pires and Joaquim Braga, 113-125. Springer, 2015.

PRESENTATIONS

1. "Moral Autonomy in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*", The Third International Seminar of the Mediterranean Society for the Study of the Scottish Enlightenment, *Scottish Enlightenment and Freedom*, May 28-30, 2014, İzmir- Turkey.

2. "Ossian in Turkey: Literary Reflection of James Macpherson's *The Poems of Ossian*", 4th International Conference of the Mediterranean Society for the Study of Scottish Enlightenment, *Scotland and Mediterranean. Translating the Enlightenment,* June 2-4, 2015, Thessaloniki- Greece.

3. "Vicious Bees of the Prosperous Hive: An Investigation on Mandeville's *The Fable of the Bees*", XI. European Conference on Social and Behavioral Sciences, September 1-4, 2016, Rome-Italy.

Appendix B: TURKISH SUMMARY

BERNARD DE MANDEVILLE VE ADAM SMITH'E GÖNDERMELERLE BEN-SEVGİSİ VE DUYGUDAŞLIK İNCELEMESİ

On sekizinci yüzyıl ahlak felsefesi öğretilerine bakıldığında İskoç Aydınlanma felsefesinde insanın özgeci ve iyiliksever doğasını temel alan, bu yolla ahlaki duygu ve yargıların özünü açımlayan ve ben sevgisi tezini sistemli bir şekilde eleştiren bir gelenekle karşılaşırız. Bilhassa Francis Hutcheson, David Hume ve Adam Smith ahlak duyusu, duygudaşlık ve iyilikseverlik üzerinde odaklanmış ve bu filozoflar bencil insan doğası hakkında iddiaları şiddetle reddetmiştir. Fakat tanınmış eseri *Arıların Masalı*'nda (*The Fable of the Bees*) insan doğası, bireylerin ahlaki motivasyonu ve siyasetin yapısı çerçevesinde sivil ve ticari toplumun ana dinamiklerini tasvir eden Bernard Mandeville (1670-1733), dönemin siyaset ve ahlak düşünürleri tarafından ortaya atılan görüşleri ters düz etmiştir.[156] Mandeville'in "kişisel erdemsizlikler kamusal faydalar" olarak bilinen ünlü düsturu, ben sevgisinin insan doğasının temelini oluşturduğu tezi ve ben sevgisinin toplum gönenci üzerindeki olumlu etkisi konusundaki gözü pek itirafı on sekizinci yüzyıl ahlak felsefecileri arasındaki kötü şöhretinin nedeni olmuştur. Kendi çağdaşları tarafından sert bir şekilde eleştirilmiş hatta bazı düşünürler tarafından *Arıların Masalı* hiçbir şekilde doğruyu yansıtmayan tüm dönemlerin en kötü şöhretli kitabı ilan edilmiştir.

[156] Bu bölümde Mandeville, Hume ve Smith'in kitaplarından ve ikincil kaynaklardan yapılan alıntıların çevirisi bana aittir ve kaynakça bölümündeki İngilizce eserlere atıf yapılmaktadır. Alıntılarda birincil kaynaklar için şu kısaltmalar kullanılacaktır: *The Fable of The Bees* Vol. I (FB I), *The Fable of the Bees* Vol II (FB II), *A Treatise of Human Nature* (THN), *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (TMS), *The Wealth of Nations* (WN).

Bu çalışmanın amacı *Ulusların Zenginliği (The Wealth of Nations)* adlı eseri ile tanınan ve politik ekonominin babası olarak görülen Adam Smith'in ilk eseri olan *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda *(The Theory of Moral Sentiments)* ahlak alanında söylediklerine ışık tutmak, *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde bireyin temel motivasyonu olarak öne sürdüğü öz-çıkar her ne kadar onu Mandeville'in sistemine yaklaştırıyor gibi görünse de eserleri bir bütün olarak incelendiğinde Smith'in aslında Mandeville'den farklı bir ahlaki birey ve ticari toplum portresi çizdiğini göstermektir. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın genel çerçevesi Mandeville'in ticari toplumların ahlaki motivasyonu ve insan doğası hakkındaki çarpıcı analizi, Francis Hutcheson başta olmak üzere dönemin düşünür ve filozoflarının Mandeville eleştirisi, Hutcheson'ın Mandeville'den tamamen farklı olarak ahlak kuramını ahlak duyusu ve iyilikseverlik üzerine temellendirişi, Hutcheson'dan etkilenerek Hume ve Smith'in duyguları ahlakın temeline koyup duygudaşlığı (sympathy) ön plana çıkararak ahlaki yargıların özünü açıklayan kuramlarının detaylarından oluşmaktadır. Özellikle çalışmanın son bölümü *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda Smith'in Mandeville eleştirisini, ben-sevgisi (self-love), öz-çıkar (self-interest), kendini koruma güdüsünün (self-preservation) Smith'in ahlaki ve ekonomik kuramındaki yerini ve Smith'in Mandeville'in bencillik ile temellendirilmiş ahlak sisteminin üstesinden gelip gelemediğini içeren tartışmayı kapsamaktadır.

Mandeville Homurdanan Kovan (The Grumbling Hive) şiirinde ve akabinde yayınlanan *Arıların Masalı (The Fable of the Bees)* adlı kitabında insanın temel motivasyonun ben sevgisinden başka bir şey olmadığını iddia eder. Aslında Mandeville'in sadece Hobbes geleneğinin takipçisi olduğunu söylemek yetersiz kalır çünkü on yedinci yüzyıl Fransız septik geleneğe bakıldığında Mandeville'in Pierre Bayle, Pierre Nicole ve La Rochefoucauld gibi Fransız filozoflarının ahlak öğretilerinden izler taşıdığı aşikârdır. Bu filozoflar insanın ahlaki eylemlerinin temelinde toplum tarafından onay görme, övülme ve alkışlanma isteğinin

yattığını öne sürmüş, aslında erdem tanımının altında insanın bencil isteklerini başarılı bir şekilde gizleyebilmesinin yattığını iddia etmişlerdir. Mandeville bu filozoflardan etkilenerek *Arıların Masalı*'nda ahlaki eylemin temelinde yatan dinamikleri, önce parçalara ayırarak diğer bir deyişle bireylere indirgeyerek daha sonra toplum geneline adapte ederek derinlemesine incelemiştir. Aslında Mandeville, Homurdanan Kovan'ın basıldığı tarihte Richard Steele'in *The Tatler* adlı mecmuasında Bay Isaac Bickerstaff karakteri aracılığıyla okuyucuya aktardığı sivil erdemlere karşılık *The Female Tatler* isimli mecmuada yazdığı köşe yazılarında Lucinda, Arsinoe ve Oxford Gentleman gibi karakterlerin ağzından henüz olgunlaşmamış ama kariyerinin devamında da değişmeyecek olan sivil toplum ve ahlak üzerine görüşlerini okuyucusuna aktarır.

1714 yılında yayınlanan *Arıların Masalı*'nın ilk cildi, Homurdanan Kovan şiirini içerdiği gibi aynı zamanda şiirde Mandeville'in önemli gördüğü bazı noktaları açıklamak amacıyla nesir şeklinde yazdığı yirmi tane yorum, "Ahlaki Erdemin Kökenine Dair bir İnceleme", "Hayırseverlik ve Hayır Okulları Üzerine bir Deneme" ve "Toplumunun Doğasına Dair bir Araştırma" isimli de üç denemeyi de içermektedir. Kitabın ikinci cildinde ve sonraki eserlerinde Mandeville söyleşmeye bağlı anlatım yolunu tercih eder ve genellikle karşılıklı konuşmalar Horatio ve Cleomenes isimli iki karakter arasında gerçekleşir. Çoğu zaman Horatio, Shaftesbury ve kibarlar dünyasını Cleomenes ise Mandeville'i temsil eder.

Mandeville'in edebi kariyeri fabl yani kısa masalımsı öykülerle başlamış, La Fontaine'in fabllarının İngilizce çevirisi ile başlayan edebiyat yolculuğu kendi fabllarını yazmasıyla devam etmiştir. Hem şiir hem de kitabın isminden de anlaşıldığı gibi Mandeville bir kovan ve arı kolonisi teşbihi ile insan toplumunu hicveder ve özellikle Homurdanan Kovan'ın kıssadan hisse bölümünde ahlaki mesajını okuyucuya iletir. Sonuç tıpkı La Fontaine'nin fabllarındaki gibidir yani

insanın ikiyüzlülüğünün ve budalalığının ifşa edilmesidir. Mandeville'in özellikle altını çizdiği nokta dünyanın nimetlerinden faydalanıp, lüks ve zenginlik içinde yaşarken erdemsizlikler hakkında mızmızlanma veya homurdanmanın ne denli anlamsız olduğudur.

Mandeville eserlerinde bir araya gelme sebebi sadece bencil dürtüleri ve kişisel menfaatleri olan insanların oluşturduğu karanlık bir toplum resmi çizer. Gerek şiirde gerekse *Arıların Masalı*'nda serimlediği insanın bencil doğası en ilkel toplumlardan en uygar toplumlara tarihin her evresinde varlığını korumuş fakat farklı şekillere bürünmüştür. O insanoğlunun yardımseverlik duygusu ile gerçekleştirdiği en naif eyleminin bile temelinde insanın kendi acıma ve merhamet duygusunu rahatlatmak amacı olduğunu savunur. Örneğin, vahşi ve aç bir hayvanın küçük bir çocuğa doğru ilerlediğini gören herkes çocuğu hayvanın olası saldırısından kurtarmaya yani tehlikeyi uzaklaştırmaya yönelik bir girişimde bulunur. Mandeville'e göre bu eylem öyle bir acıma duygusu ile gerçekleşir ki o anki durumun vahameti kişinin kendi durumu ve şartlarının önüne geçer, çünkü bu duygudan ne haydut ne hırsız ne de bir katil yoksundur. Fakat bu duygu ile gerçekleştirilmiş eyleme erdemden kaynaklı ya da ahlaka uygun demek yanlış olur (FB I; 256).

"Hayırseverlik ve Hayır Okulları Üzerine bir Deneme"de Mandeville erdem olarak kabul gören hayırseverliğin özünde de aslında insanın başkalarının acınası ve muhtaç durumundan duyduğu sıkıntı ve rahatsızlık hissinin teskin edilmesi olduğunu iddia eder. İyilikseverlik veya hayırseverlik duygusu ile yapılmış görünen yardım, örneğin dilenciye verilen para; aslında Mandeville'in deyişiyle dilencinin ön plana çıkardığı fiziksel özrü ve biçare durumunun bizde sebep olduğu acıma duygusunu rahatlatmak içindir. Bununla birlikte dilencinin para ya da yardım isterken dua etmesi, gereksiz övgüleri ve abartılı sözlerle iltifat etmesi ister istemez kendini bu kadar seven insanın gururunu okşar ve

kendini daha iyi hissetmesine sebep olur (FB I; 257-8). Diğer taraftan Mandeville, modern toplumlarda bireylerin iyi eylemlerinin altında şiddetli bir övgü isteği ve kınanma korkusu olduğunu söyler. Özellikle *Arıların Masalı*'nın ikinci cildinde kibar ve soylu davranışların, nezaket ve görgü kurallarının altında yine kişinin kendine duyduğu aşırı sevginin yattığı ve bir şekilde bunun başarıyla saklanabildiğini göstermek amacıyla Mandeville okuyucularına bir beyefendi portresi çizer. Toplum içinde övgü, onay ve alkış için duyulan güçlü arzu ve kınanma korkusu kişinin kendine olan aşırı sevgisi ve bencil dürtülerini herkesten saklamasını fakat gizli bir şekilde tatmin etmesini sağlar. Mandeville'in portresini çizdiği beyefendi paraya, üne ve şöhrete olan aşırı düşkünlüğüne, hırslı ve açgözlü olmasına rağmen çevresindeki insanlar tarafından son derece gönlü zengin, eli açık, kibar, saygılı ve yardımsever olarak bilinir.

Burada Mandeville'in göstermek istediği şey kusurların başarı ile gizlenebilmesinin mümkün olduğudur. Onun deyişiyle çok güzel bir yapının çürük ve kötü bir temelden yükselmesi mümkündür (FB II; 64). Kibarlık, görgü kuralları ve terbiyenin özünde insanın bencil tutkularını başarılı bir şekilde saklayabilmesi yatar, insan alttan alta tutkularını tatmin edip kendini şımartırken bunun en ufak belirtisini dahi toplum içinde gün yüzüne çıkarmamalıdır, başarılı bir şekilde saklayabilmeyi öğrenmelidir. Bunu başaran kişi öyle bir zaman gelir ki gerçek bencil güdülerini unutur ve ikiyüzlülüğü öyle bir hale gelir ki kendi dahi içtenlik ve samimiyetle eylediğine inanır.

Arıların Masalı'nın ilk cildinde bencillik ve ben-sevgisi eş anlamlı olarak kullanılsa da ikinci ciltte ben-sevgisi kendini koruma dürtüsü (self-preservation) anlamına gelmektedir. Ayrıca bu ciltte kendine gereğinden fazla değer verme ve sürekli onay görme arzusu kendini beğenme duygusu (self-liking) olarak tanımlanır. Daha önce ilk ciltte Mandeville'in yaptığı kibir (pride) tanımı ile kendini beğenme duygusu aynı gibi görünse de gerek ikinci ciltte gerekse

Onurun Kökeni isimli eserde Cleomenes kibirden, kendini beğenme duygusunun daha şiddetli ve aşırı hali olarak bahseder. Herkeste doğuştan var olan bu tutkulardan kendini koruma güdüsü yani kişinin yaşam sürekliliği için gerekli besin, korunma ve emniyet ihtiyacını giderme isteği kendini beğenme duygusu ve kibir ile karşılaştırıldığında mekanik, daha masum, dikkatsiz ve özensiz şekilde tatmin etme isteği duyduğumuz tutkulara denk düşer. Diğer taraftan kişinin kendine hak ettiğinden fazla değer yüklemesi, üstünlük duygusu, övgü ve onay arzusu kişiyi bir hedefe ulaşmaya yönlendirir.

Mandeville'e göre insanoğlunun bencil dürtü ve eğilimlerinin kontrol altına alınması ancak egemen bir güç ile mümkündür. Herhangi bir kısıtlama olmazsa sonuçlarına bakmaksızın doğal dürtü ve isteklerini tatmin etmekle meşgul olan insanoğlu ancak kanun koyucu ve bilge kişilerin insanların hayvanlardan üstün olduğunu dair ikna edici çabaları sonucunda nefsinden feragat karşılığında sunulan hayali ödül sayesinde bencil dürtülerini dizginlemeyi başarabilir. Kanun koyuculara atfedilen bu görev bencil, kurnaz ve asi insanoğlunu toplumda kabul gören ve görmeyen davranış özelliklerini kazanmaya sevk etmektir. Mandeville şöyle der: "insanların birbirine faydalı ve kolay kontrol edilebilir hale getirilmesi için hünerli siyasetçiler tarafından ortaya konan ahlakın birinci esası çok sayıda insanın daha kolay ve emniyetli bir şekilde yönetilebilmesini sağlar" (FB I; 47). İlk ciltte karşılaştığımız ahlaki ayırımlara yön veren hünerli siyasetçiler ikinci ciltte yerini ahlaki ayırımların yıllar içinde evrilerek son halini almasına bırakır. Mandeville'in doğal durumdan sivil topluma geçişte bahsettiği üç evre sadece dilin formasyonu, bilim ve sanatların gelişimini değil ahlaki ayrımlarımızın evrilerek zamanla ve yavaş bir şekilde son halini nasıl aldığını gösterir. İlk evre vahşi hayvanlardan gelebilecek tehlikelere karşı insanların bir araya gelmesidir. Burada Mandeville'in altını çizmek istediği nokta şudur; başkalarına duyulan sevgi insanları ilk bir araya getiren duygu değildir, onun yerine korku insanın başkaları ile ilişkide bulunmasını sağlayan ilk duygudur. İlkel insan toplulukları

için kibir, üstünlük duygusu ve hırs ise birbirlerinden gelebilecek ikinci tehlikeyi oluşturur. Vahşi hayvanlardan korunmak için bir araya gelen ilkel insanlar arasında ilk ayrışmalar insanoğlunun yadsınamaz bencil tutkularının baskın hale gelmesiyle ortaya çıkar. Güçlü ve baskın karakterde olan liderlerle farklı insan toplulukları ortaya çıkar. Bu iki evre bize insanın özünde bir toplumsallaşma güdüsüne sahip olmayışı, bencil tutkularından bir türlü kopamayışı ve ancak baskın bir güçle idare edilmesinin mümkün olduğunu göstermektedir. Üçüncü evre, yazının icadı, en önemli evredir. Mandeville'in de söylediği gibi "insanın zaaflarına deva [...] idare ve dizginleme olmaksızın topluma tehlikeli olan insan doğasının bazı ayrılmaz özelliklerinin yarattığı kötü sonuçları önlemede panzehir" olan yazının icadı yasaların daha etkili hale gelmesini sağlayan şeydir (FB II; 283). Mandeville'in uzun uzadıya *Arıların Masalı*'nın ikinci cildinde ortaya koyduğu sosyal ve ahlaki kuramı ile ilk ciltte yer alan hünerli siyasetçiler kuramı konusunda son dönem Mandeville yorumcuları arasında fikir ayrılıkları bulunmaktadır. Bazılarına göre ilk ciltte önemli yere sahip hünerli siyasetçiler yerini ikinci ciltte başka bir ilkeye bırakmıştır.[157]Bu bize Mandeville'in düşünce sisteminde meydana gelen değişikliği göstermektedir. Diğer taraftan bazı yorumculara göre Mandeville daha ilk ciltte metaforik bir anlatım yolu seçmiş aslında tam da ikinci ciltte üzerinde önemle durduğu evrilerek son halini alan ahlaki ilkeleri kastetmiştir.[158] Yani hünerli siyasetçiler Mandeville'in uzun yıllar içinde yavaş yavaş evrilen sosyal, kültürel ve ahlaki değerleri mecazi bir yolla tasvir etmesidir. Bu konu ile ilgili üçüncü görüşe göre *Arıların Masalı*'nın iki cildinde de Mandeville'in ortaya koyduğu iki görüş birbirini tamamlar

[157] Bkz. Mikko Tolonen, *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013), 39-43.

[158] Bkz. Maurice M. Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits: Bernard Mandeville's Social and Political Thought* (USA: Cybereditions Corporation, 2001), 59-63.

niteliktedir.[159] Yani *Arıların Masalı*'nın iki cildinin yayınlanma tarihi arasında ne Mandeville'in düşünce sisteminde değişiklik olmuş ne de hünerli siyasetçiler kısa yoldan evrilen ahlaki ve sosyal değerler yerine kullanılmıştır. Mandeville'e göre insanoğlunun uzun ve karmaşık tarihini ve evrilerek ortaya çıkan değerleri anlamak için kanun koyucuların rolünü yadsımak yerine tamamlayıcı etkiye sahip olduğunu kabul etmek gerekir. Bu görüşe göre, insanoğlunun tutku ve zaaflarının kontrol altına alınabilmesi ve toplum yararına eylemlerin ortaya çıkabilmesi için siyasetçilerin müdahalesi ve yüzyıllar sonunda son halini alan değerler ve ahlaki ayrımların oluşumu birbirini tamamlayan niteliktedir. En makul olan üçüncü görüşe ek olarak şunu söyleyebiliriz; Mandeville'in *Arıların Masalı*'nın ikinci cildinde konjonktürel bir kuramla ortaya çıkması kanun koyucuların rolünü bir tarafa koyduğunu ya da tamamen bu görüşten vazgeçtiğini göstermez. Aslında Mandeville'in niyeti ister kanun koyucuların girişimleri ve çabaları ister yüzyıllar süren çabanın ürünü olsun ahlakın yapay köklerine işaret etmektir. Yani insanoğlu doğuştan bir ahlaki duyguya sahip değildir.

Hristiyan ahlak anlayışında da olduğu gibi erdem Mandeville tarafından insanoğlunun bencil dürtülerini ve eğilimlerini zapt etmesi yani nefsinden feragat etmesi ve toplumun yararını gözetmesi, erdemsizlik ise bu dürtülere yenik düşmesi olarak tanımlanmıştır. Mandeville'e göre erdem ve erdemsizlik kanun koyucular tarafından tanımlanmış, ödül ve ceza yolu ile topluma empoze edilmiştir. Bu tanım üzerinden aslında anlatılmak istenen şey şudur: Kanun koyucular tarafından bencil dürtü ve eğilimlerine gem vurmakta başarılı olanlar onur ile ödüllendirilir bu konuda başarısız olanlar kınama ile cezalandırılır. Fakat Mandeville'e göre insanoğlunun özünden vazgeçmesi ya da benliğinden feragat etmesi mümkün olmadığından bireyler bencil dürtülerini gizleme yoluna

[159] Bkz. Malcolm Jack, The Social and Political Thought of Bernard Mandeville (New York: Garland, 1987) 48.

giderler (FB I; 41-57). Burada aslında gözler önüne sermek istediği şey insanoğlunun önlenemez riyakârlığıdır çünkü ona göre toplumda her birey benliğinden feragat etmiş gibi görünerek aslında kendi bencil dürtülerinin peşinden gidecektir. *Arıların Masalı*'nın ilk cildinde gerçek erdem insanın kendini kandırması, riyakârlığı ve dik başlılığından dolayı mümkün görünmese de ikinci ciltte Mandeville'in katı görüşleri biraz daha yumuşatılmış bir halde karşımıza çıkar. Fakat Cleomenes erdemli insanların varlığından Horatio'ya bahsederken az sayıda gerçekten erdemli insan olduğunun ve hatta hala eylemlerinin altındaki samimiyetten şüphe duymamız gerektiğinin de altını çizer.

Arıların Masalı'nda kendi bencil dürtülerin başka birşey düşünmeyen, riyakâr insan tasarımı ve Homurdanan Kovan'da her türlü erdemsizliğe sahip fakat dört başı mamur bir arı kovanı teşbihi ile insan toplumunu etkileyici bir anlatımla tasvir eden Mandeville'in niyeti aslında şiirin kıssadan hisse bölümünde de bahsettiği gibi insanı alçaltan vasıflarının ve eğilimlerinin aslında müreffeh ve dört başı mamur bir toplumun olmazsa olmaz şartı olduğu vurgusunu yapmaktır. Yani ona göre kişisel erdemsizlikler olarak addedilen lüks düşkünlüğü, para hırsı, düzenbazlık, ihtiras ve kibrin kamu yararına sebep olduğu ve erdemsiz fakat refah içinde yaşayan bir toplumun erdemli fakat yokluk çeken bir topluma yeğlenir.

Mandeville'in yukarıda verilen insan doğası hakkındaki görüşleri, ticari toplumların ahlaki motivasyonunu şiir vasıtası ile eleştirisi dönemin William Law, Richard Fiddes, John Dennis, George Bluet, Francis Hutcheson ve George Berkeley gibi filozof, düşünür ve tarihçileri tarafından ironik ve satirik tarafı tamamen göz ardı edilmiş gerek şiirde gerekse kitapta Mandeville'in söyledikleri kelimesi kelimesine ciddiye alınmıştır. Aslında "Hayırseverlik ve Hayır Okulları Üzerine bir Deneme" ve "Toplumunun Doğasına Dair bir Araştırma"'nın *Arıların Masalı*'na eklenmesine kadar ne Homurdanan Kovan'ın kitapçık halinde

basılması ne de Arıların Masalı'nın ilk baskısı bu düşünürlerin dikkatini çekmiştir. Bu makaleleri eklemesi ile birlikte Mandeville Hristiyan erdemi olan hayırseverlik ile alay etmekle ve lüks düşkünlüğü, para hırsı, ihtiras gibi erdemsizlikleri övmekle suçlanmıştır.

İnsan doğası bu kadar karanlık mıdır? Ya da insan sadece kendi refah ve mutluluğunu düşünen bencil bir varlık mıdır? Bu sorulara iyimser cevaplar İskoç aydınlanma geleneğinden bir grup filozof tarafından verilmiştir. İskoç Aydınlanma felsefesinin önemli düşünürlerinden aynı zamanda Glasgow Üniversitesi'nde Adam Smith'in hocası olan Francis Hutcheson Mandeville'in ahlaki egoizmine karşılık insan doğasında var olan ahlak duyusunu (moral sense) ahlak felsefesinin temeline koyarak insan eylemlerinin sadece bencil dürtülere indirgenemeyeceğini savunmuştur. Ona göre ahlaki iyi karşıdaki insanın onay ve sevgisini kazanan davranışı simgeler, çünkü insan tarafsız (disinterested) duygu, güdü ve ahlaki yargı yetisine sahiptir. *Güzellik ve Erdem Duygularımızın Kaynağı Üzerine bir Soruşturma (An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue)* adlı eserinde Hutcheson karanlık insan doğası tasarımlarının tam tersine iyilikseverliği (benevolence) ortaya atar. Ona göre erdemli davranışın temelinde her ne kadar toplumun yararı ve mutluluğuna sebep olsa da öz-çıkar ve bencil dürtü olamaz. Ahlaki iyinin özünü oluşturan iyilikseverlik öz-çıkarı önceler.

Aslında *Güzellik ve Erdem Duygularımızın Kaynağı Üzerine bir Soruşturma'*nın alt başlığında okura her ne kadar Hutcheson'ın Mandeville'e karşı Shaftesbury'nin ahlaki kuramını savunacağı fikri verilse de Hutcheson *Kahkaha Üzerine Düşünceler ve Arıların Masalı üzerine İncelemeler (Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees)* adlı altı mektuptan oluşan eserinde hem Hobbes'a hem de Mandeville'ye sert eleştirilerde bulunur. Ona göre Mandeville lüks düşkünlüğü, ölçüsüzlük, kibir ve para hırsı gibi erdemsizliklerin toplumda

yıkım ve yozlaşmanın tam da tersine gönence sebep olduğunu ortaya atarak hem antikçağ filozoflarından bu yana tavsiye edilen tutku ve eğilimleri kontrol altına alma düşüncesi hem de Hristiyan ahlakı öğretilerine ters düşmüştür. Bunun yanında Hutcheson Mandeville'in sistemindeki tutarsızlara işaret ederek *Arıların Masalı*'nda ortaya konan erdem ve erdemsizlik tanımına karşı çıkmıştır.

David Hume ise *İnsan Doğası Üzerine bir İnceleme (A Treatise of Human Nature)* adlı eserinde Hutcheson'un izinden giderek ahlaki ayrımların ve eylemlerin kaynağının akıl değil duygular olduğunu savunur. Ahlak alanında aklın yetkinliği Hume için sorgulanması gereken bir husustur. Ona göre "akıl tutkuların kölesidir ve sadece öyle olmalıdır ve asla onlara hizmet etmek ve uymaktan başka görevi yoktur" (THN; 415). Hume ahlaki yargılarımızın temeline duygudaşlığı (sympathy) koyar. Ona göre duygudaşlık bir duygudan öte bir mekanizmadır. Smith'den önce Hume duygudaşlığı sözlük anlamından farklı şekilde kullanır. Yani, Hume'a göre duygudaşlık insanların sıkıntı ve üzüntüsü için duyduğumuz acıma ve merhamet hissinden öte bizim hislerimizden farklı olsa dahi başkasının duyguları ve bizim duygularımız arasında kurduğumuz duygusal iletişimden doğar. En iyi huylu insandan en kibirli insana insanoğlu doğuştan başkasının duygularını paylaşma yetisine sahiptir. Duygudaşlık mekanizmasını tetikleyen şeyler failin çehresi, yüz ifadesi, jest ve mimikleri ile tavırları yani içinde bulunduğu durum ve duygunun dışa yansıyan özellikleridir. Failin bu tür dışa yansıyan özellikleri gözlemcinin az çok kendinde deneyimlediği özellikler olduğu için benzeşim ve yakınlık kurması zor olmaz. Çünkü insanlar benzer durumlarda benzer duyguları hisseder ve benzer tepkiler verirler. Yakınlık (contiguity) ve benzerlik (resemblance) gibi özellikler Hume'un ahlak kuramında da önemli yer teşkil eder. Yakınlık ve benzerlik duygu ortaklığı ve duygudaşlığı tetiklerken, imgelem (imagination) vasıtası ile duyguların aktarımı mümkün hale gelir.

Aynı şekilde Adam Smith *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı (The Theory of Moral Sentiments)* isimli ilk eserinde duygu ortaklığı (fellow-feeling) ya da duygudaşlığın (sympathy) insan doğasının önemli elementlerinden biri olduğunu belirtmiş, başkalarının mutluluğu ve refahının bireyi motive edici etkisi olduğunun altını çizmiştir. Kitabın daha ilk paragrafında Smith şöyle söyler:

> İnsan her ne kadar bencil düşünülse de, onun doğasında bazı apaçık ilkeler vardır ki, bunlar onu diğerlerinin talihine ilgi duymaya iter ve görüp haz duymasının dışında hiçbir şey elde etmemesine rağmen, diğerlerinin mutluluğunu onun için zorunlu hale getirir. Şefkat veya merhamet bu türden bir ilkedir, gördüğümüzde veya çok canlı bir şekilde tasavvur etmemize yardımcı olunduğunda başkalarının ıstırabı için hissettiğimiz duygudur (TMS; 9).

Görüldüğü üzere Smith insanı bencil bir varlık olarak tanımlayan düşünürlerin (Hobbes ve Mandeville) aksine insanın başkalarının ıstırap ve mutluluğuna da ortak olduğunu söyler. Her ne kadar Smith ilk cümlesinde insanın diğerkâmlığını açıklarken şefkat ve merhamet duyguları ile örneklendirse de Smith'in duygudaşlık kavramını Mandeville ve Rousseau'da rastladığımız acıma ve merhamet duygusu ile eş anlamlı düşünmek doğru değildir. Her ne kadar Mandeville'e göre acıma duygusu diğer duygularla karşılaştırıldığında bir haydut ya da bir katilde bile var olan tarafsız bir duygu gibi görünse de özünde bu duygu başkalarının başına gelen felaket yahut talihsizliklere karşı duyulan duygu ortaklığından ziyade insan doğasının bir zaafıdır (FB I; 56). Hatta bazen kötü sonuçlara da sebep olabilir.[160] Smith'in duygudaşlığın herhangi bir duygu ile mümkün olduğunu belirtmesi duygudaşlığı acıma ve merhamet duygusundan çok daha geniş anlamda kullandığının göstergesidir. Yani insan başkasının acısı ve ıstırabını paylaşabildiği derecede sevinç ve mutluluğuna da ortak olabilir.

[160] Mandeville ceza hukukunda acıma ve merhamet duygusunun hakimlerin yargısında yozlaşmaya yol açabileceği örneğini verir (FB I; 56).

Aslında Smith'in duygudaşlık kuramı David Hume'un *İnsan Doğası Üzerine Bir İnceleme* isimli kitabında genel çerçevelerini verdiği duygudaşlık kuramının yeniden yapılandırılmış ve detaylandırılmış halidir. Smith aynı Hume gibi duygu ortaklığı kavramını insan doğasının ve ahlaki eylemlerin temeline koymuş fakat "tarafsız gözlemci"(impartial spectator) kavramını ekleyerek kendi kuramını özgün ve daha tutarlı hale getirmiştir. Bunun yanında Smith'in asıl amacı imgelem (imagination) ve tarafsız gözlemci unsurları ile bütünleştirerek duygudaşlık mekanizmasını tamamen benmerkezci sistemin dışında bırakmaya çalışmaktır. Ona göre, bütün insanlarda ortak bir duygu olan başkalarının acısını ve sevincini paylaşma duygusu gözlemcinin (spectator) kendisini imgelem yolu ile failin (actor) yerine koyması ve onun durumunda ne hissedeceğini ya da ne düşüneceğini onun benliğine bürünerek sorgulamasıdır. Smith bunu şöyle açıklar:

> Duygudaşlık [...] hiçbir şekilde bencil bir ilke olarak kabul edilemez. Ben sizin kederinizi veya haksızlık karşısındaki öfkenizi paylaştığım zaman, duygulanmam gerçekten de ben-sevgisine dayanıyormuş gibi görülebilir; çünkü bu sizin durumunuzun iyice anlaşılmasından, kendimi sizin yerinize koymamdan ve dolayısıyla benzer koşullarda benim ne hissedeceğimi tasavvur etmemden kaynaklanır. Ama her ne kadar en uygun şekilde, duygudaşlığın asıl ilgili kişiyle ilgili durumların hayali bir değişiminden kaynaklandığı söylenirse de, yine de bu hayali değişimin benim kendi kişiliğimde ve karakterimde olduğu farz edilmez, zira yakınlık duyduğum kişinin karakter ve kişiliğine geçtiğim için meydana gelen bir değişimdir. Biricik oğlunuzu yitirdiğiniz için size başsağlığı dilediğim zaman, sizin kederinize katılmak için ben, bir oğlum olsaydı ve o talihsiz bir biçimde ölecek olsaydı ne çekeceğimi düşünmem; fakat gerçekten siz olsaydım nasıl acı çekeceğimi düşünürüm ve ben yalnızca sizinle durumları değiştirmem, aynı zamanda kişileri ve karakterleri değiştiririm (TMS; 317).

Bu paragraf aslında Smith'in Mandeville'e bir cevabı gibidir, yani açık bir şekilde duygudaşlığın temelinde bencil duyguların olabileceğine karşılık gelebilecek yorumları çürütür. Gerçekten de gözlemcinin kendi benliğinden sıyrılıp failin

benliğine bürünerek duygudaşlık kurması Smith'in kuramını daha dayanıklı bir hale getirir. Smith'e göre duygudaşlığın tam anlamıyla ortaya çıkması gözlemcinin duygularının failin duyguları ile örtüşmesiyle mümkündür. Aynı zamanda failin duruma karşı tepkisine bakarak gözlemci failin eyleminin ahlaka uygunluğuna dair yargıda bulunur. Toplum içinde insanlar kimi zaman fail kimi zaman gözlemci olarak hem onay verme hem de onay görme isteği içinde olurlar. Başkalarının onayını kazanma isteği kimi zaman problem haline gelir, buna karşılık olarak Smith önemli tespitte bulunur. İnsan sadece onay görme ya da övgü almayı arzulamaz neyin onay görebileceği ya da neyin övgüye layık olabileceğini de arzular. Böylelikle Mandeville'in sadece onay ve övgü peşinde koşan insan tasarımından kendini uzaklaştırmayı başarır. Neyin övgüye şayan olabileceği konusunda Smith "tarafsız gözlemci" kavramı ile nesnel bir ölçüt getirerek duyguların ve eylemlerin nasıl daha istikrarlı hale geleceğini açımlar. Ona göre bir fail önce kendi duygu ve eylemlerinin toplumdaki herhangi bir tarafsız gözlemci tarafından nasıl yargılanacağını öğrenir. Böylelikle kişi eylemlerini tarafsız bir bakış açısıyla belli bir mesafeden değerlendirebilmeyi başarır. Aynı zamanda Smith tarafsız gözlemciyi kişinin vicdanı anlamında da kullanır. Vicdan insanın kendi eylemlerini yargılama kapasitesidir. Smith, vicdanı "bir üst yargıç" ya da "yüreğin içindeki adam" olarak tanımlar (TMS; 130). Toplumsallaşma yolu ile şekillenen kişi vicdanı ahlaki edimlerde kişiyi denetleyen bir mekanizma haline gelir.

Smith'e göre kişinin doğru ahlaki yargılara ulaşabilmesi ancak toplum içinde yaşayıp öğrenmesi ile mümkündür. Neyin onay göreceği ve görmeyeceğini, neyin övgüye layık olup neyin olmadığını öğrenmek deneyimle mümkün olduğundan ıssız bir yerde tek başına yaşayan bir insanın duygu ve davranışlarının nasıl değerlendirileceği ve yargılanacağına dair bir ölçütü olmayacaktır (TMS; 110). Tarafsız gözlemci olarak vicdan sadece bizim nesnel yargılara ulaşmamızı sağlamaz aynı zamanda bizi hem ben-sevgimizin aldatması

ve yanlış yönlendirmesinden kurtarır hem de bazen karşılaşabileceğimiz öznel yargıları doğru değerlendirmemiz için bir bakış açısı sunar.

Smith *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın " Ahlak Felsefesi Sistemleri Hakkında" isimli yedinci bölümünde çeşitli ahlak sistemleri üzerinde durur. Erdemin doğası ona göre uygunluk (propriety), basiret (prudence) veya iyilikseverlik (benevolence) temeline dayandırdığı üç farklı ahlak sistemine yoğunlaşarak incelenebilir. Fakat o Mandeville'in sistemini bu üç ahlak sisteminden hiçbirine dâhil etmez. Mandeville'in sistemini "erdem ve erdemsizlik arasındaki farkı tamamen ortadan kaldıran temayülü tamamıyla tehlikeli" olan "Ahlaksız Sistem" (Licentious System) olarak tanımlar (TMS; 308). Aslında bu Smith'in Mandeville'in sisteminden ilk bahsedişi değildir. *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın ilk baskısından üç yıl önce Edinburgh Review (1756) isimli dergiye gönderdiği mektup Rousseau'nun *Eşitsizliğin Temelleri Üzerine Söylem*'i hakkında bir inceleme yazısı niteliğini taşır ve Mandeville ile arasındaki bazı benzerlik ve farklılıklardan yola çıkarak Rousseau'nun sistemi üzerine bazı eleştirilerde bulunur. Smith'e göre *Eşitsizliğin Temelleri Üzerine Söylem*'de *Arıların Masalı*'nın ikinci cildinde Mandeville'in ortaya koyduğu ilkelerin "yumuşatılmış, geliştirilmiş ve süslenmiş" hali ile karşılaşırız.[161] İlk bakışta her ne kadar iki düşünür arasındaki benzerlikler göze çarpsa da Mandeville'in doğal durumdaki bayağı ve sefil insan tasviri Rousseau'nun mutlu insan tablosundan oldukça farklıdır. Bunun yanında acıma veya merhamet duygusunun bu iki düşünür tarafından algılanış biçiminin benzer ya da aynı olduğunu söylemek çok doğru olmaz. Mandeville'e göre acıma duygusu bir zaaf iken Rousseau için insanlığın en mutlu evresinde yani doğal durumda sahip olduğu hoş ve samimi bir duygudur. Diğer taraftan iki düşünür de yetenekler, alışkanlıklar ve sanatların gelişiminde aynı yavaş ve kademeli süreçten bahsederler. Ve uygarlaşma

[161] Adam Smith, "A Letter to the Authors of the Edinburgh Review" in *Essays on Philosophical Subjects,* ed. W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982), 250.

sürecinin yozlaşmış ve yıkıcı doğası konusunda hemfikirdirler.

Smith, Mandeville'in bazı görüşlerine karşılaştırma bağlamında mektubunda yer verse de onun doğrudan Mandeville eleştirisine *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın yukarıda adı geçen bölümünde rastlarız. Mandeville'in insanoğlunun tüm edimlerinin altında yatan bencillik, kibir ve alkışlanma arzusu çıkarımı ve onun ahlaki rigorizmi Smith'in eleştirisinin hedefi olur. Smith bireylerin bencil dürtülerinden, toplum tarafından onay ve övgü görme isteklerinden sakınmalarının mümkün olduğunu savunur, iyilikseverlik, ortak duygudaşlık ve tarafsız gözlemcinin ahlaki mükemmelliğe ulaşmada önemini vurgular. Toplumun bireyler için bir ayna olduğunu neyin gerçekten onay ve övgüye layık olduğunu toplum içinde yaşayarak öğrendiğimizi söyleyen Smith'in kişi vicdanını belli bir süreçten sonra eylemlerini denetleyen bir üst yargıç olarak tanımlaması Mandeville'e verilmiş bir cevap niteliğindedir. Mandeville'in kendinden başka kimseye değer vermeyen ve yalnız kendi dürtüleri peşinde koşan taraflı gözlemcisi Smith'in sisteminde başkalarının ve kendisinin ahlaki eylemlerini objektif bakış açısı sayesinde yargılayabilen tarafsız gözlemci olarak karşımıza çıkar.

Arıların Masalı'nda kişilerin eylemlerinin altında yatan kibir, aşırı gurur ve kendini beğenme duygusu Smith tarafından şiddetle eleştirilir. Smith'e göre aşırı gurur ve kibir "sığlık ve zayıflığın" kanıtıdır (TMS; 115). Kibirli insan aslında hak etmediği halde övgü ve onay peşinde koşar, uçarı zevkleri onun övünç kaynağıdır, sıradan davranışlarından anlamsız başarılar çıkarır. Diğer taraftan, vücudumuzu kapatmaya yarayan giysiler ve temel ihtiyaçlarımız dışında her şeyi lüks olarak tanımlayan Mandeville'e cevap olarak Smith "giydiğimiz bir temiz gömlek ya da bizim için kullanışlı her şeyde erdemsizlik vardır" der (TMS; 312). Mandeville'in erdem ve erdemsizlik arasında farkı tamamen ortadan kaldıran, erdemli görünen eylemin bile bencil dürtülerden kaynaklandığını iddia

eden, insanı sadece övgü ve onay peşinde koşan bir varlığa indirgeyen katı kuramı kabul edilemez niteliktedir. Ayrıca, Smith'e göre tutkularımızı tam anlamıyla dizginlememizin mümkün olmadığını olsa bile bunun ticaret ve endüstriye zarar vereceğini söyleyen Mandeville için bu kolay bir çıkış yolundan başka bir şey değildir. Mandeville'in iddiasının tam tersine Smith'in *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda tasarladığı insan, eyleminin ahlak kurallarına uygunluğunun farkında olabilecek kapasiteye ve öz-denetim özelliğine sahiptir. Smith bize tamamen iyimser bir insan doğası resmi çizmez fakat Mandeville'in resmettiği gibi insan bencil tutkularının da kölesi değildir. Her ne kadar Smith kibri ve gösterişi ağır şekilde eleştirse de ve bunları ahlaki duygularımızda yozlaşmaya sebep duygular olarak tanımlaması da Mandeville'in aslında okuyucularına çok önceden anlattığı gibi bu bencil tutkuların toplum gönenci üzerinde olumlu etkisini yadsımaz. Yine de ticari toplumun ahlaki temelleri konusundaki endişesini her fırsatta dile getirir ve öldüğü yıla kadar *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın yenilenen baskılarında yeni bölüm ve kısımlar ekleyerek ticari toplumlara ahlaki bir reçete sunmaya çalışır.

Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı'nda ahlaki yargıların temeline duygudaşlığı koyan Smith'in *Ulusların Zenginliği'*nde öz-çıkarı (self-interest) insanoğlunun en temel dürtüsü olarak görmesi bazı Smith yorumcuları tarafından Smith'in sisteminde bir tutarsızlık olarak yorumlanmıştır. On dokuzuncu yüzyıl sonlarında bazı Alman düşünürlerin ortaya attığı bu çelişki bir asırdan fazla süredir yorumcular tarafından tartışılmakta olup "Adam Smith Problemi" (Das Adam Smith Problem) olarak literatürde yerini almıştır. Bu tartışmanın fitilini ateşleyen bölümlerden biri yukarıda alıntıladığımız *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın ilk cümlesi diğeri *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nin en meşhur pasajıdır:

> Yemeğimizi, kasabın, biracının ya da fırıncının iyilikseverliğinden değil, kendi çıkarlarını gözetmelerinden bekleriz. Onların insan sevgisine değil ben-sevgisine sesleniriz. Kendi ihtiyacımızı değil,

> onların kendi çıkarını dile getiririz. Bir dilenciden başka kimse, yalnızca hemşehrilerinin iyilikseverliğine güvenmek yolunu seçmez (WN; 27).

Aslında Adam Smith Problemi Smith'in ahlaki kuramının temelini oluşturan duygudaşlık kuramının *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı* adlı eserinde Mandeville'in ahlaki egoizmini dışlayan yapıda olmasına karşın *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde ticari toplumlarda insanın en temel ve birincil motivasyonu olan öz-çıkar kavramını temel almasını onu Mandeville'in hararetle savunduğu tezine yaklaştırıp yaklaştırmadığını sorgulamamıza da sebep olur. Bu problemin algılanış ve yorumlanış biçimi ışığında, getirilen olası çözümler Mandeville ve Adam Smith benzerliklerini ve ayrılıklarını da su yüzüne çıkarmaktadır. Bazı yorumcular Smith'in birbirine zıt görüşlerinin ortaya çıkış sebebini *Ulusların Zenginliği*'ni yazmadan önce Fransa'ya yaptığı ziyarete bağlamaktadırlar. Bu yorumculara göre ilk eserinde duygudaşlığı egoizm hipotezine karşılık şiddetle savunan Smith ahlaki eylemleri ben-sevgisine indirgeyen görüşü ile tanınan dönemin Fransız filozoflarından Holbach ve Helvetius'tan etkilenmiş ve bu etkinin sonucu olarak *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde bireylerin en temel motivasyonunun bireysel çıkar ve ben sevgisi olduğunu savunmuştur.[162] Bu iddia bir süre sonra şiddetli tartışmalara yol açmış Smith'in öğrencisi Dugald Stewart'ın *Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith* (1795) kitabında anlattığı gibi *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nin Smith'in Fransa ziyaretinden önce Glasgow Üniversitesi'ndeki ders notları derlemesi olduğu kanıtlanarak bu problem kısmen bertaraf edilmiştir.

Diğer taraftan Smith yorumcuları Smith'in duygudaşlık ve öz-çıkarı uzlaştırıp uzlaştıramadığını tartışmaya devam etmiştir. Bazı yorumcular Smith'in *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı* ve *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde ortaya koyduğu iki zıt görüşün yani duygudaşlık ve bireysel çıkarın aslında bir problem olamayacağını çünkü

[162] Bkz. Lujo Brentano, *The Relation of Labor to the Law of Today*, trans. P. Sherman (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1891).

Smith'in insan doğasının iki farklı karakterinden bahsettiğini öne sürmüştür. *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın Glasgow Üniversitesi baskısına editörlük yapan A. L. Macfie ve D. D. Raphael Smith'in sisteminde tutarsızlık olduğu görüşünü reddetmiş ben-sevgisi ve duygudaşlığın farklı amaçla kullanıldığına işaret etmişlerdir. Onlara göre Smith ben-sevgisini insanı motive eden dürtü, duygudaşlığı da insan kılavuzluk eden ve ahlaki yargılarının temelini oluşturan duygu anlamında kullanmıştır (TMS; 21-2; Intro). Diğer taraftan Smith'in iki farklı ve birbirine zıt duyguyu bir bütünlük içinde ele aldığını söyleyen yorumcular vardır. Glenn Morrow'a göre *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda Smith egoist öğretiyi yererken iyilikseverliği göklere çıkarmıştır. Bunun yanında sağgörü, tutumluluk, adalet duygusu,çalışkanlığı hem bireylerin ahlaki düsturu hem de ticari toplumlarda bireysel çıkar dürtüsünü kontrol altına alan erdemler olarak vermiştir. Morrow'a göre bu durumda başkalarının zararı pahasına bireysel çıkara dayanan eylem Smith tarafından savunulmamaktadır.[163]

Son yirmi yıl içinde "Adam Smith Problemi" birçok yorumcu ve düşünür tarafından yeniden incelenip değerlendirilmiş, Smith okumalarının daha tutarlı yapılması durumunda bu problemin bir problem olma durumundan çıkacağı savunulmuştur. Smith'in *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde temel aldığı bireysel çıkar dürtüsü en naif haliyle Stoacı felsefe geleneğinden gelen kendini koruma (self-preservation) ve kendi durumunu iyileştirme (self-betterment) güdüsü olarak mı yoksa başkalarının zararı pahasına bireysel çıkar duygusu olarak mı tanımlanmalıdır sorusuna karşılık olarak birçok yorumcu ikinci tanımı saf dışı bırakmıştır. Buna gerekçe olarak Smith'in *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nden sonra ticari toplumlara ve bireylere reçete olacak mahiyette erdemler önerdiği savunulmaktadır. *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın Smith'in ölümünden hemen önce yayınlanan altıncı baskısında eklenen "Of the Character of Virtue" (Erdemin

[163] Glenn R. Morrow, "The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith," *Cornell University Studies in Philosophy* 13(1923): 166-167.

Karakteri Hakkında) adlı bölümde Smith'in sağgörü, basiret (prudence) , adalet duygusu (justice), iyilikseverlik (benevolence) ve öz-denetim (self-command) gibi erdemleri sivil ve ticari toplumlarda bireysel çıkar ve bencillik dürtüsünü tedavi edici, toplum ilişkileri ve ahlaki edimleri dengeleyici unsur olarak koyması aslında kendinden sonra gelecek olası eleştirilere verdiği bir cevap niteliğindedir.

Bazı yorumcular her ne kadar Smith'in ahlak kuramında Mandeville izleri olduğunu iddia etse de Smith'in ahlaki egoizmi olumladığını ve Mandeville'in tezinin savunucusu olduğunu söylemek doğru değildir. Mandeville ve Smith'in kuramları arasındaki paralellikleri ya da farklılıkları görebilmek için Smith'in duygudaşlık, ben-sevgisi, bencillik ve öz-çıkar gibi kavramları hangi bağlamda kullandığının doğru anlaşılması gerekir. Bu yolla Smith'in Mandeville'e olan mesafesini anlamak mümkündür. Smith kendini koruma güdüsünü (self-preservation) insanın en temel güdüsü yani açlık, susuzluk, korunma ve emniyet gibi temel ihtiyaçların giderilmesi anlamında kullanmıştır. Bu güdü *Arıların Masalı*'nın ikinci cildinde Mandeville'in ben-sevgisi (self-love) tanımı ile aynı anlamdadır.

Diğer taraftan Smith tarafından kişinin kendini düşünmesi, kendi mutluluğunu başkalarının mutluluğuna tercih etmesi şeklinde tanımlanan ben-sevgisi (self-love) *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı'*nda dizginlenmesi ve kontrol altında tutulması gereken bir duygu olarak anılır. "Adam Smith and Self-Interest" isimli makalesinde Eugene Heath şöyle söyler: "Smith ben-sevgisi terimini geliştirilmesi gereken bir eğilimden ziyade endişelenilmesi gereken bir eğilime işaret etmek için kullanır."[164]

[164] Eugene Heath, "Adam Smith and Self-Interest" in *The Oxford Handbook of Adam Smith*, ed. Christopher J. Berry, Maria Pia Paganelli and Craig Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 247.

Şunu da hatırlatmak gerekir ki Smith ben-sevgisini *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde öz-çıkar ile eş anlamlı kullanır. Daha önce alıntılanan kasap-fırıncı-biracı pasajında "onların insan sevgisine değil ben-sevgisine sesleniriz" derken Smith öz-çıkarı kasteder. Burada Smith, kişinin kendi durumunu iyileştirme (self-betterment) itkisinden söz eder. *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı* ve *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde ne ahlaki fail ne de ticari toplumda ekonomik birey sahtekâr, açgözlü ve servet tutkusu ile yanıp tutuşan tamahkâr insan olarak tasvir edilir. *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda Smith'in ön plana çıkardığı basiretli (prudent) insan *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nin tutumlu, kendi durumunu iyileştirmeye çalışan insanıdır. Smith'in *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nın son edisyonunda genel çerçevesini verdiği dört erdemden öz-denetim (self-command) ise hem kişinin bencil tutkularını dizginlemesini ve kontrol altında tutmasını hem de eylemlerinin sorumluluğunu almasını sağlayan erdemdir.

Smith'in mutlu ve dört başı mamur toplum tasarımı ile duygudaşlık, sevgi, iyilikseverlik, dostluk, kadirşinaslık ve saygı gibi duyguları ön plana çıkarması bu duyguların zayıf olduğu bir toplumda bozulma ve çözülme olacağı anlamına gelmez. Çünkü ona göre uyumu ve düzeni sağlamaya yarayan adalet gerek ahlaki gerekse ekonomik alanda toplum için en gerekli erdemdir. Adaleti, Smith, riayeti özgür irademize bırakılmayan ve ihlal edildiği takdirde kızgınlık, hınç ve cezaya maruz bırakan toplumun temel direği olan bir erdem olarak tarif eder (TMS; 79).

Adalet duygusu insan yüreğine doğuştan yerleştirilmiş bir duygudur; yani hepimiz haksızlık ve şiddetten rahatsız oluruz, toplumda terör ve vahşete sebep olan davranışların cezalandırılmasını isteriz. Smith'in başkasının canına, malına ve itibarına zarar vermekten kaçınma olarak tarif ettiği yukarıdaki alıntıdan da anlaşılan adalet diğer erdemlerden farklıdır. Örneğin bu erdem iyilikseverlik gibi kişilerin kendi seçimine bırakılmamış ve ihlal edildiğinde bir zarara yol

açmasından dolayı doğal olarak infialle sonuçlanan bir erdemdir. Aynı zamanda yine diğer erdemlerden farklı olarak kişi öylece oturup hiç birşey yapmadan adaletli olabilir (TMS; 82). Bunların yanında Smith adaletin önemini *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde de vurgular, ona göre adaletin tesis edilmesi devletin üç hayati görevinden biridir. *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda olduğu gibi adaleti yine denkleştirici adalet (commutative justice) anlamında kullanır. Smith şöyle der:

> Doğal özgürlük sistemine göre, egemenin yerine getirmekle yükümlü olduğu üç görev vardır; gerçekten büyük önem arzeden fakat herkesin anlayabileceği kadar da basit üç görev: birincisi, toplumu başka devletlerin saldırı ve istilasından koruma; ikincisi, mümkün olduğunca toplumun her üyesini diğerinin haksızlığına veya baskısına uğramaktan koruma yani adaleti tam anlamıyla uygulama görevi; üçüncüsü, herhangi bir kişiye ya da kişilere çıkar sağlamayacak nitelikte kamuya faydalı işler yapıp ve tesisler inşa etmek ve bunların bakımını sürdürmek ... (WN; 687-8).

Sonuç olarak, ahlaki yozlaşma ve toplum gönenci arasındaki olmazsa olmaz ilişkiyi işaret eden Mandeville'in ünlü düsturu "kişisel erdemsizlikler kamusal faydalar"ın Smith'in ahlaki ve ekonomik kuramında hayat bulduğu iddiası *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*'nda Smith'in ahlak kuramının temelini oluşturan duygudaşlığı ve *Ulusların Zenginliği*'nde basiret ve öngörü sınırları içinde kendi durumunu iyileştirmeye çalışan ekonomik birey tasarımını göz ardı etmek demektir. Mandeville'in katı erdem tanımı ve bencil insan doğası tasarımı Smith tarafından bencil insan doğasını yadsımayan aynı zamanda da saf özgeci insan doğasından da oluşmayan ahlaki kuramı ile yumuşatılmıştır.

İnsan dürtülerini denetleyebilen, bencil eğilimlerini kontrol alma yetisine sahip ve toplum içinde övgüye şayan eyleyebilme kapasitesine sahip bir varlık olarak tasvir edilmiştir. Smith'in eserleri bütün olarak incelendiğinde aslında onun ahlaki ilkelere bağlı geniş kapsamlı bir ekonomi ve siyaset kuramı önerdiği

görülür. Smith tarafından ticari toplumlarda tutumlu, basiretli, kendini disipline edebilen, ahlak kuralları, adalet ve yasaları temel alarak diğer bireylerle etkileşimde bulunan kişi ideal insan olarak tarif edilmektedir. Mandeville'in bencil tutkularının kölesi olan insan ve bireylerin erdemsizlikleri ile beslenen ticari toplum betimlemesi daha olumlu ve iyimser ahlaki birey ve toplum tasviri ile Smith tarafından daha ılımlı bir hale getirilmiştir.

Appendix C: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Çeşmeli
Adı : Işıl
Bölümü : Felsefe

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : An Analysis of Self-Love and Sympathy with Special Reference to Bernard de Mandeville and Adam Smith

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☒

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☒
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: