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Editor’s note: Anticipating his death, Hume wrote <My Own Life> in April 1776 for inclusion in the next edition of his <Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects>. His instructions are given in letter to Adam Smith: “You will find among my Papers a very inoffensive Piece, called <My own Life>, which I composed a few days before I left Edinburgh, which I thought, as did all my Friends, that my Life was despaired of. There can be no Objection, that this small piece should be sent to Messrs Strahan and Cadell and the Proprietors of my other Works to be prefixed to any future Edition of them” (<Letters>, Greig, Vol. 2, p. 318). In March of 1777, Hume’s <Life> and Smith’s <Letter from Adam Smith, LL.D. to William Strahan, Esq.> (the latter of which describes the last four months of Hume’s life) were published under the title <The Life of David Hume, Esq. written by himself>. The pamphlet is prefaced with the following note by the editor:

M/R\ H/UME\, a few months before his death, wrote the following short account of his own life; and, in a codicil to his will, desired that it might be prefixed to the next edition of his Works. That edition cannot be published for a considerable time. The Editor, in the mean while, in order to serve the purchasers of the former editions; and, at the same time, to gratify the impatience of the public curiosity; has thought
proper to publish it separately, without altering even the

title or superscription, which was written in Mr. Hume’s own

hand on the cover of the manuscript.

In spite of the editor’s claim of not altering Hume’s piece, liberties were taken with spelling, punctuation and minor wording. This is evident from a comparison with the original manuscript of Hume’s <Life> which is in the Royal Society of Edinburgh (reprinted in Greig, Vol. 1, pp. 1-7). A pre-print of the Hume’s <Life> and Smith’s <Letter> appeared in <The Scots Magazine>, January 1777, Vol. 39, pp. 1-7. The <Scots Magazine> version is evidently based on the text of the published 1777 pamphlet, rather than the manuscript; for, although it departs slightly in punctuation, it retains the altered wording found in the 1777 pamphlet. Contrary to Hume’s wishes, his <Life> was not included in the subsequent edition of his <Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects>. The reviews of Hume’s <Life> reproduced almost the complete text of Hume’s autobiography within their reviews. The <Critical Review> concludes noting that "The whole of this narrative breathes ingenuousness, and a noble consciousness of integrity, not without that solicitude of literary, as well as moral fame, which we may suppose to have animated a writer, so distinguished, from his earliest years, for his ardor in the pursuits of philosophy and general learning" (1777, Vol. 43, pp. 222-227). The <London Review> relates that Hume held at sword’s point the editor of <The History of the Works of the Learned> for their 1740 review of the <Treatise> (see editor’s note to the Hume Archives edition of the review of the <Treatise>). The reviewer also expresses surprise that Hume fails to mention Beattie’s <Essay> since, "It were difficult to speak of this work with more contempt than, we are well assured, Mr. Hume entertained of it." Other published reactions to Hume’s <Life> quickly appeared, many of which were negative. Although most of the negative reaction was aimed at Smith’s <Letter> (see editor’s note to the Hume Archives edition of Smith’s <Letter>), criticism was also directed at Hume’s essay. For example, an anonymous author comments in the <Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement> (Vol. 36, 364-365) that, "Though I am in some degree an admirer of Mr. Hume’s character and of his writings, yet I am sorry to see that little biographical account of himself imposed on the public." The author sees the work as having "an obvious, although, perhaps, an undesigned tendency" to subvert a person’s "future and eternal welfare." The author concludes that the Life is "a dry, unsatisfactory narrative; as little answering its title as the expectation of the public." Hume's <Life> was published again in 1777, 1778, and in several 19th century editions of his collected works. The following is from the first 1777 edition.

* * * *

MY OWN LIFE

It is difficult for a man to speak long of himself without
Vanity; therefore, I shall be short. It may be thought an instance
of vanity that I pretend at all to write my life; but this Narrative shall contain little more than the History of my Writings; as, indeed, almost all my life has been spent in Literary pursuits and occupations. The first success of most of my writings was not such as to be an object of vanity.

I was born the 26th of April 1711, old style, at Edinburgh. I was of a good family, both by father and mother: my father’s family is a branch of the Earl of Home’s, or Hume’s; and my ancestors had been proprietors of the estate, which my brother possesses, for several generations. My mother was daughter of Sir David Falconer, President of the College of Justice: the title of Lord Halkerton came by succession to her brother.

My family, however, was not rich, and being myself a younger brother, my patrimony, according to the mode of my country, was of course very slender. My father, who passed for a man of parts, died when I was an infant, leaving me, with an elder brother and a sister, under the care of our mother, a woman of singular merit, who, though young and handsome, devoted herself entirely to the rearing and educating of her children. I passed through the ordinary course of education with success, and was seized very early with a passion for literature, which has been the ruling passion of my life, and the great source of my enjoyments. My studious disposition, my sobriety, and my industry, gave my family a notion that the law was a proper profession for me; but I found an unsurmountable aversion to everything but the pursuits of philosophy and general learning; and while they fancied I was poring upon Voet and Vinnius, Cicero and Virgil were the authors which I was secretly devouring.

My very slender fortune, however, being unsuitable to this plan of life, and my health being a little broken by my ardent application, I was tempted, or rather forced, to make a very feeble trial for entering into a more active scene of life. In 1734, I went to Bristol, with some recommendations to eminent merchants, but in a few months found that scene totally unsuitable to me. I went over to France, with a view of prosecuting my studies in a country retreat; and I there laid that plan of life, which I have steadily and successfully pursued. I resolved to make a very rigid frugality supply my deficiency of fortune, to maintain unimpaired my independency, and to regard every object as contemptible, except the improvement of my talents in literature.

During my retreat in France, first at Reims, but chiefly at La Fleche, in Anjou, I composed my <Treatise of Human Nature>. After passing three years very agreeably in that country, I came over to London in 1737. In the end of 1738, I published my Treatise, and immediately went down to my mother and my brother, who lived at his country-house, and was employing himself very judiciously and successfully in the improvement of his fortune.

Never literary attempt was more unfortunate than my Treatise of Human Nature. It fell <dead-born from the press>, without reaching such distinction, as even to excite a murmur among the zealots. But being naturally of a cheerful and sanguine temper, I very soon recovered the blow, and prosecuted with great ardor my studies in the country. In 1742, I printed at Edinburgh the first part of my Essays the world was favourably received, and soon made me entirely
forget my former disappointment. I continued with my mother and brother in the country, and in that time recovered the knowledge of the Greek language, which I had too much neglected in my early youth.

In 1745, I received a letter from the Marquis of Annandale, inviting me to come and live with him in England; I found also, that the friends and family of that young noble man were desirous of putting him under my care and direction, for the state of his mind and health required it. I lived with him a twelvemonth. My appointments during that time made a considerable accession to my small fortune. I then received an invitation from General St. Clair to attend him as a secretary to his expedition, which was at first meant against Canada, but ended in an incursion on the coast of France. Next year, to wit, 1747, I received an invitation from the General to attend him in the same station in his military embassy to the courts of Vienna and Turin. I then wore the uniform of an officer, and was introduced at these courts as aid-de-camp to the general, along with Sir Harry Erskine and Captain Grant, now General Grant. These two years were almost the only interruptions which my studies have received during the course of my life: I passed them agreeably, and in good company; and my appointments, with my frugality, had made me reach a fortune, which I called independent, though most of my friends were inclined to smile when I said so; in short, I was now master of near a thousand pounds.

I had always entertained a notion, that my want of success in publishing the Treatise of Human Nature, had proceeded more from the manner than the matter, and that I had been guilty of a very usual indiscretion, in going to the press too early. I, therefore, cast the first part of that work anew in The Enquiry concerning Human Understanding, which was published while I was at Turin. But this piece was at first little more successful than the Treatise of Human Nature. On my return from Italy, I had the mortification to find all England in a ferment, on account of Dr. Middleton’s Free Enquiry, while my performance was entirely overlooked and neglected. A new edition, which had been published at London of my Essays, moral and political, met not with a much better reception.

Such is the force of natural temper, that these disappointments made little or no impression on me. I went down in 1749, and lived two years with my brother at his country house, for my mother was now dead. I there composed the second part of my Essays, which I called Political Discourses, and also my Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals, which is another part of my treatise that I cast anew. Meanwhile, my bookseller, A. Millar, informed me, that my former publications (all but the unfortunate Treatise) were beginning to be the subject of conversation; that the sale of them was gradually increasing, and that new editions were demanded. Answers by Reverends, and Right Reverends, came out two or three in a year; and I found, by Dr. Warburton’s railing, that the books were beginning to be esteemed in good company. However, I had fixed a resolution, which I inflexibly maintained, never to reply to any body; and not being very irascible in my temper, I have easily kept myself clear of all literary squabbles. These symptoms of a rising reputation gave me encouragement, as I was ever more disposed to see the favourable than unfavourable side of things; a turn of mind which it is more happy to possess, than to be born to an estate of ten thousand a year.
In 1751, I removed from the country to the town, the true scene
for a man of letters. In 1752, were published at Edinburgh, where I
then lived, my Political Discourses, the only work of mine that was
successful on the first publication. It was well received abroad and
at home. In the same year was published at London, my Enquiry
concerning the Principles of Morals; which, in my own opinion (who
ought not to judge on that subject), is of all my writings,
historical, philosophical, or literary, incomparably the best. It
came unnoticed and unobserved into the world.

In 1752, the Faculty of Advocates chose me their Librarian, an
office from which I received little or no emolument, but which gave
me the command of a large library. I then formed the plan of writing
the History of England; but being frightened with the notion of
continuing a narrative through a period of 1700 years, I commenced
with the accession of the House of Stuart, an epoch when, I thought,
the misrepresentations of faction began chiefly to take place. I
was, I own, sanguine in my expectations of the success of this work.
I thought that I was the only historian, that had at once neglected
present power, interest, and authority, and the cry of popular
prejudices; and as the subject was suited to every capacity, I
expected proportional applause. But miserable was my disappointment:
I was assailed by one cry of reproach, disapprobation, and even
detestation; English, Scotch, and Irish, Whig and Tory, churchman
and sectary, freethinker and religionist, patriot and courtier,
united in their rage against the man, who had presumed to shed a
generous tear for the fate of Charles I. and the Earl of Strafford;
and after the first ebullitions of their fury were over, what was
still more mortifying, the book seemed to sink into oblivion. Mr.
Millar told me, that in a twelve-month he sold only forty-five
copies of it. I scarcely, indeed, heard of one man in the three
kingdoms, considerable for rank or letters, that could endure the
book. I must only except the primate of England, Dr. Herring, and
the primate of Ireland, Dr. Stone, which seem two odd exceptions.
These dignified prelates separately sent me messages not to be
discouraged.

I was, however, I confess, discouraged; and had not the war
been at that time breaking out between France and England, I had
certainly retired to some provincial town of the former kingdom,
have changed my name, and never more have returned to my native
country. But as this scheme was not now practicable, and the
subsequent volume was considerably advanced, I resolved to pick up
courage and to persevere.

In this interval, I published at London my Natural History of
Religion, along with some other small pieces: its public entry was
rather obscure, except only that Dr. Hurd wrote a pamphlet against
it, with all the illiberal petulance, arrogance, and scurrility,
which distinguish the Warburtonian school. This pamphlet gave me
some consolation for the otherwise indifferent reception of my
performance.

In 1756, two years after the fall of the first volume, was
published the second volume of my History, containing the period
from the death of Charles I. till the Revolution. This performance
happened to give less displeasure to the Whigs, and was better
received. It not only rose itself, but helped to buoy up its
unfortunate brother.

But though I had been taught by experience, that the Whig party were in possession of bestowing all places, both in the state and in literature, I was so little inclined to yield to their senseless clamour, that in above a hundred alterations, which farther study, reading, or reflection engaged me to make in the reigns of the two first Stuarts, I have made all them invariably to the Tory side. It is ridiculous to consider the English constitution before that period as a regular plan of liberty.

In 1759, I published my History of the House of Tudor. The clamour against this performance was almost equal to that against the History of the two first Stuarts. The reign of Elizabeth was particularly obnoxious. But I was now callous against the impressions of public folly, and continued very peaceably and contentedly in my retreat at Edinburgh, to finish, in two volumes, the more early part of the English History, which I gave to the public in 1761, with tolerable, and but tolerable success.

But, notwithstanding this variety of winds and seasons, to which my writings had been exposed, they had still been making such advances, that the copy-money given me by the booksellers, much exceeded anything formerly known in England; I was become not only independent, but opulent. I retired to my native country of Scotland, determined never more to set my foot out of it; and retaining the satisfaction of never having preferred a request to one great man, or even making advances of friendship to any of them. As I was now turned of fifty, I thought of passing all the rest of my life in this philosophical manner, when I received, in 1763, an invitation from the Earl of Hertford, with whom I was not in the least acquainted, to attend him on his embassy to Paris, with a near prospect of being appointed secretary to the embassy; and, in the meanwhile, of performing the functions of that office. This offer, however inviting, I at first declined, both because I was reluctant to begin connexions with the great, and because I was afraid that the civilities and gay company of Paris would prove disagreeable to a person of my age and humour: but on his lordship’s repeating the invitation, I accepted of it. I have every reason, both of pleasure and interest, to think myself happy in my connexion with that nobleman, as well as afterwards with his brother, General Conway.

Those who have not seen the strange effects of modes, will never imagine the reception I met with at Paris, from men and women of all ranks and stations. The more I resiled from their excessive civilities, the more I was loaded with them. There is, however, a real satisfaction in living at Paris, from the great number of sensible, knowing, and polite company with which that city abounds above all places in the universe. I thought once of settling there for life.

I was appointed secretary to the embassy; and in summer 1765, Lord Hertford left me, being appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. I was <charge d’ affaires> till the arrival of the Duke of Richmond, towards the end of the year. In the beginning of 1766, I left Paris, and next summer went to Edinburgh, with the same view as formerly, of burying myself in a philosophical retreat. I returned to that place, not richer, but with much more money, and a much larger income, by means of Lord Hertford’s friendship, than I left it; and
I was desirous of trying what superfluity could produce, as I had formerly made an experiment of a competency. But, in 1767, I received from Mr. Conway an invitation to be Under-secretary; and this invitation, both the character of the person, and my connexions with Lord Hertford, prevented me from declining. I returned to Edinburgh in 1768, very opulent (for I possessed a revenue of 1000L. a year), healthy, and though somewhat stricken in years, with the prospect of enjoying long my ease, and of seeing the increase of my reputation.

In spring 1775, I was struck with a disorder in my bowels, which at first gave me no alarm, but has since, as I apprehend it, become mortal and incurable. I now reckon upon a speedy dissolution. I have suffered very little pain from my disorder; and what is more strange, have, notwithstanding the great decline of my person, never suffered a moment’s abatement of my spirits; insomuch, that were I to name the period of my life, which I should most choose to pass over again, I might be tempted to point to this later period. I possess the same ardour as ever in study, and the same gaiety in company. I consider, besides, that a man of sixty-five, by dying, cuts off only a few years of infirmities; and though I see many symptoms of my literary reputation’s breaking out at last with additional lustre, I knew that I could have but few years to enjoy it. It is difficult to be more detached from life than I am at present.

To conclude historically with my own character. I am, or rather was (for that is the style I must now use in speaking of myself, which emboldens me the more to speak my sentiments); I was, I say, a man of mild dispositions, of command of temper, of an open, social, and cheerful humour, capable of attachment, but little susceptible of enmity, and of great moderation in all my passions. Even my love of literary fame, my ruling passion, never soured my temper, notwithstanding my frequent disappointments. My company was not unacceptable to the young and careless, as well as to the studious and literary; and as I took a particular pleasure in the company of modest women, I had no reason to be displeased with the reception I met with from them. In a word, though most men any wise eminent, have found reason to complain of calumny, I never was touched, or even attacked by her baleful tooth: and though I wantonly exposed myself to the rage of both civil and religious factions, they seemed to be disarmed in my behalf of their wonted fury. My friends never had occasion to vindicate any one circumstance of my character and conduct: not but that the zealots, we may well suppose, would have been glad to invent and propagate any story to my disadvantage, but they could never find any which they thought would wear the face of probability. I cannot say there is no vanity in making this funeral oration of myself, but I hope it is not a misplaced one; and this is a matter of fact which is easily cleared and ascertained.

April 18, 1776.