THE ANALYSIS OF THE INTERDEPENDENCE BETWEEN FREEDOM AND RELIGION THROUGH THE WORKS OF JOHN BROWN (1715—1766)

JOHN BROWN (1715-1766)'UN ESERLERİNDEKİ ÖZGÜRLÜK VE DİN İLİŞKİSİNİN ANALİZİ

Pervin YİĞİT[1]

Abstract

In eighteenth century, England and France were considered as the super powers of the world. Due to this competition between them, each empire was trying to preserve their establishment. Apart from political conditions, philosophical and social values that had been changing under the light of Enlightenment were regarded as perils to social order of the kingdoms in Europe. This led some intellectuals and religious men of the period to work on the maintenance of their societies. John Brown (1715-1766) as a religious man was also involved in this mission. Yet, his early works were mostly focus on morality and individuality. In this paper, his early works are analyzed in detail in order to indicate his moral theory which was constructed independently from the principles of Protestantism and Anglicanism. Afterwards the differences between his early works and the later works are examined and the political worries of the English establishment are explained through them. In this paper it is argued that English establishment aimed to defend the maintenance of their society by making religion as a political instrument in the conditions of the eighteenth century as could clearly be seen in Brown's works.

Keywords: John Brown, morality, virtue, Anglicanism, England

Öz

On Sekizinci yüzyılda, İngiltere ve Fransa dünyanın en güçlü iki devletiydi. Aralarındaki bu rekabetten ötürü de, her biri kendini korumaya çalışıyordu. Siyasi durum dışında, Aydınlanma'nın etkilediği değişiklikler ile farklı bir boyut kazanan felsefik ve sosyal değerler de Avrupa'da halihazırda var olan sosyal düzene karşı bir tehdit oluşturuyordu. Bu da dönemin bazı entelektüellerini ve din adamlarını toplumlarını korumak için çalışmaya itti. John Brown (1715-1766) da bu dönemin bir din adamı olarak buna dahil oldu. Fakat, onun ilk eserleri ahlak ve bireysellikle ilgiliydi. Bu makalede, Brown'un ik eserleri detaylı olarak incelenecek ve Brown'un Protestanlık ve Anglikanizm'den bağımsız olarak kurduğu ahlak kuramı tartışılacaktır. Sonrasında ise ilk eserleri ve sonrakiler arasındaki farklara yoğunlaşarak dönemin İngitere'sinde hakim olan siyasi kaygılar açıklanmaya çalışılacaktır. Böylece, onsekizinci yüzyıl koşullarında İngiltere'nin topumsal düzenini koruması için dinin siyasi bir araç olarak nasıl kullanıldığı gösterilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: John Brown, ahlak, erdem, Anglikanism, İngiltere

[1] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Psikoloji Bölümü, pervin.yigit@neu.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-8060-8563

> The religious Principle of Protestant Christianity seems to have taken the Lead, even of the Love of civil Freedom. The Dread of Popery was, at least, equal to That of arbitrary Power: The national Honour and Conscience coincided with, and confirmed the Christian Principle: These three united Powers raised Liberty to the brightest Throne she [Great Britain] ever sat on (Brown, 1765:93-94).

Eighteenth-century Great Britain is defined with these words in a sermon by John Brown (1715-1766) in 1765. John Brown was not only a theologian, but also an influential author, poet and moralist in this era. Although he had started writing in 1740's on liberty and religion, the relationship between Protestant Christianity and liberty shown above was clarified after he had engaged in writing on political issues in 1750's. He appeared as a political reformist with his book; An Estimate of the Manners and the Principles of the Times in 1757. The book was so popular that it had contributed his reputation as the sobriquet Estimate Brown (Crimmins, 2004). However, "liberty" in Brown's works before the publication of his political ideas and "liberty" in his works that were produced as a political reformist in 1750's were different. The aim of this paper is to analyze how the concept of liberty went through some changes and turned to be an instrument to restraint social and public life by means of religion in eighteenth century England. In other words, how liberty used to protect monarchy in Great Britain with the help of religion in the given era is examined by means of John Brown's works in this paper.

Freedom in John Brown's works; for the sake of individual or for the sake of the monarchy?

In Brown's Essays on the Characteristics (1751) and Estimate I and II (1757-1758), liberty was introduced as the opposition to the dominance of the passions and the tyranny of Catholicism. In this light, Protestantism as the rational religion was introduced as the foundation of Great Britain's liberty and liberty had appeared under the restrictions of religion.

It is the case that the situation of Britain in the eighteenth-century led Brown to publish his Estimate. In the given period, the British Establishment was under the threats of intolerance, superstition, religious enthusiasm, deists and atheists. The church was losing its political and social significance and thus, for Anglicans, the rational religion and the power of the church had to be preserved as the guards of the national unity in eighteenth-century Britain.[2] The religious controversies and thus the political worries of Anglicans brought Brown to focus on the moral issues. According to Brown the moral structure of the kingdom had to be examined in the conditions of the given century. The character of the kingdom was degenerated because of the corruption in principles and manners. Although, for Brown, the liberties of the English nation were found in the "natural Climate, Stock, and Soil" (Brown, 1765:18-19), the virtue to secure their liberties were corrupted in the absence of salutary manners and principles (Brown, 1757a). The moral character of the nation could preserve the nation's spirit of freedom and thus the stability of Great Britain (Brown, 1757a) Therefore, for Brown, the maintenance of the political society and also the happiness of the subjects depended on the moral part of the political state,

---

[2] For more on the situation of Britain, see Plummer, Alfred. The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century (New York: Methuen, 1910), 91; Walsh, John & Taylor, Stephen "Introduction: the Church and Anglicanism in the 'long' eighteenth century" in The Church of England 1689-1833: from toleration to Tractarianism, edited by John Walsh, Colin Haydon and Stephen Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 51-56; O'Gorman, Frank. The Long Eighteenth Century British Political and Social History 1688-1832 (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1997), 165; Sykes, Norman. Church and State in England in the eighteenth century (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1934), 285; Sykes, Norman. *Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, 1669- 1748: a study in politics and religion in the eighteenth century* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926), 148.

namely the manners and the principles (Brown, 1757b). These manners and the principles which provided the internal unity of the state were regarded as the one of the most important pillars of the society against external threats (Brown, 1757b). Under the light of these facts, Brown had introduced the necessity of religion and Protestant principles to avoid the internal destruction within the establishment and to provide national liberty for Great Britain.

Brown's theory in Estimate had provided liberty for the nation under the control of religious principles. Nevertheless, the liberty through engagement in political life was not the main issue in his early works. It should be said that Brown tried to establish a link between truth, virtue and freedom by means of the rectifying character of reason on passions in his early works. His subject was to achieve a virtuous, free and happy life. In order to do it, he defended a moral sense theory based on reason. Virtue, truth and liberty were all discussed in the framework of the happiness of the subjects. Afterwards, they became the necessary concepts to maintain the political state. That is, the aim to achieve individual freedom was replaced by the one to suppress individual freedom and reach national freedom.

In his later works, virtue as the public virtue was founded in the idea of God and served for the happiness for all. It was achieved by the restrictions of subject's liberty in political life. At this point, morality became a political issue contributing to social order and Brown's insistence on religion as a political tool had taken the place of his moral sense theory appeared in his early works. In his words; it was necessary "to [re]establish the public Happiness of Mankind on the solid Basis of Virtue, which is the End of Religion itself" (Brown, 1758:69). Briefly, religion turned to be an alternative to his moral sense theory in his later works in order to preserve the monarchy in Britain.

In this respect, Brown's early works were considered as more "liberal" than his Estimate. Robert Anderson, the author of the Works of the British Poets, claimed that Brown had liberal ideas even in divinity and he did not pay attention to the doctrines of Christianity (Anderson, 1795). Likewise, William Clarke and Robert Shelton Mackenzie also stated that his liberal opinions in his early works had undergone a considerable change "when his works betrayed a strong bias towards authority" (Clarke & Shelton, 1833:330). Moreover, Yigit and Özkutlu recently suggested that the individualistic approach of Brown was replaced by social aspect and Anglican worries (Yigit & Özkutlu, 2017). That is to say, Brown's defense of national liberty through religion, namely Anglicanism (Brown, 1757a) led him to be criticized as giving up his liberal ideas mentioned before 1750's.

The concept of liberty in the early works of John Brown

Brown's first work Honour: A Poem was published in 1743. This poem should be examined firstly to understand how Brown enlarged the concept of virtue as a social virtue in his later works. The main object of this poem was to indicate the relationship between truth and virtue. In order to do that, first of all he investigated the foundation of honour. For him, everyone wanted to find honor but each saw honor in different situations; "The Soldier views her in shining Blade; The Pedant 'midst the Lumber in his Head" (Brown, 1757a:72). However, for Brown, honor could only be found in truth, virtue and honesty. In addition to this, Brown's insistence on reason firstly had appeared at this point. He asserted that men should take reason as their guides to find honor in virtue. Passions could deceive humankind as people "fall down and worship what themselves have made [by passions]" (Brown, 1757a:7). Therefore, people should "discard Self-Love; set Passion's Glass aside" to find true honor. Brown also talked about heroes in history to

mention the significance of reason. He saw tyrannical heroes as "baleful Comets flaming in the Skies" whose vices "cloud the Splendor of the brightest Line" (Brown, 1757a:13). In order to differentiate those tyrants from honored people, the eye of reason was required.

After defending the superiority of reason over passions, he indicated that virtue and truth were same but they differed in name (Brown, 1757a). According to Brown, humankind should achieve virtue to ascend to truth (Brown, 1757a). This naturally brought Brown to claim that anything vicious could not be truth. Brown considered truth as eternal. In the same manner, virtue should also be stable and immortal. This means, for Brown, that honor lying in virtue should have a fixed nature like truth because all of them were discovered by means of reason.

His emphasis on reason could also be seen in his Essay on Satire which was published in the same year. It was a eulogistic essay about Alexander Pope[3] but it also contained criticisms of passions. For Brown, passions were unbridled and destructive to humankind. People should discard from the chains of passions to be virtuous. Brown stated that, only those people

> whose eye, from passion's film refined,
>
> Can see true greatness in an honest mind;
>
> Can see each virtue and each grace unite,
>
> And taste the raptures of a PURE delight (Brown, 1745:6).

In those early works, he tried to point out the nature of truth and virtue by emphasizing the role of reason. After the suppression of the Jacobite Rebellion in 1746, Brown had indicated his ideas on religion in detail and endeavored to establish a link between truth, virtue and religion (Brown, 1746). Brown was the vicar of Morland in Westmorland when the rebellion broke out. As a passionate supporter of Hanoverian rule, he had stayed in Carlisle and acted as a volunteer during the rebellion (Crimmins, 2004). After the rebellion had failed, he preached two sermons to justify a Protestant regime which, for Brown, could promote religious and commercial freedom against the Catholic tyranny.

His object was to establish a link between Protestant principles and civil liberty. He had defended the Protestantism and the balance between its rationality and faith against the attacks of Catholicism. Before criticizing the oppression of Catholicism, he underlined the necessity of religion for subjects to achieve free and virtuous lives (Brown, 1746). On the contrary to atheism which led people to be licentious and vicious, Brown stated that religious truth could "elevate the human Soul, and raise it to a Love of Freedom" (Brown, 1746:14-15). However, Brown pointed only the truth of Protestantism out as the religious truth because for him, the true Christianity was Protestantism (Brown, 1746). The Catholic principles could be the instruments of oppression and could not be seen as true Christian Principles. According to Brown the head of the Catholic Church,

> is the great Enemy of Truth and Freedom, the great Patron of Tyranny and Falsehood, he may at least in a secondary and figurative Sense be justly accounted Anti-Christ (Brown, 1746:17).

763

---

[3] Alexander Pope (1688-1744), was a Catholic poet and the author of famous "An Essay on Man" (1734-5). He got on social terms with the first Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole. He was also friend of Henry, St. John (Viscount Bolingbroke) and William Warburton (1698-1779) to whom he left the copyright of his printed works. The *Characteristics* of Brown as the refutation of Earl of Shaftesbury's *Characteristics* was originally the idea of Pope. See 75-76n. For more on Pope, see Howard Erskine-Hill "Pope, Alexander (1688-1744)", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2008).

Brown censured Catholicism for being superstitious and thus regarded it as the source of irreligion and licentiousness. For him, it "invert[ed] all the Dictates of Morality" (Brown, 1746: 39-40), enslaved its votaries, and promoted corruption by destroying the virtuous and just. Moreover, Brown gave the example of France to strengthen his point;

> That neighbouring Kingdom, so often the unworthy Object of our Envy and Imitation, is in a state of deep and confirmed slavery (Brown, 1746:45).

To him, the infidelity and the vice of Catholic monarchy caused France to lose its freedom and virtue (Brown, 1746). Although France was a powerful Kingdom, Brown did not consider it as the kingdom of liberty (Brown, 1746). Conversely, in Great Britain, Protestantism provided "a surer and nobler Foundation of Liberty than any ancient Heathens were ever possessed of" (Brown, 1746: 18). The Protestant principles assisted by reason "gave Mankind a juster and more enlarged Conception of each other's Rights" (Brown, 1746:18). In other words, the principle was superior to passion and impulse, and people had respect to other's rights in Protestantism. For Brown people could achieve freedom only in the possession of their rights. In brief, he stated that only the knowledge of pure religion, Protestantism, would make the subjects free (Brown, 1746).

Under the light of these ideas, Brown indicated how Protestantism could provide commercial freedom in Great Britain. To him, liberty alone could flourish commerce, however Catholicism would only destroy the rights of men, their occupations and it would "thin'd the Land" (Brown, 1746:21). In the case of the replacement of Protestantism by Catholicism, subjects would have lost their rights and privileges and become the subjects of the master, exorbitant taxes, vile policy and calamity. Brown stated, by referring to English nation,

> You must have been doomed to be regarded as so many Droves of Cattle, the Property of a giddy and despotic Master, who would only have watched the Opportunity of selling your Lives to his own Advantage, and then dragg'd you forth to the Slaughter (Brown, 1746:21).

Evidently, Brown added 'religion' to the previous chain which was composed of virtue, truth and freedom. Religion, for him, "is the natural Parent of Integrity and Virtue" (Brown, 1746:35), and it must be inculcated into people to maintain social order. Although he had examined religion as a political instrument in his Essays on the Characteristics (1751) in detail, he mentioned the sanctions of religion and their rectifying role in society in these sermons. The dominance of reason over passions was explicit in his first works, and afterwards he added that religion should also be used to resist the solicitations of the senses and passions which were strongly urging demand (Brown, 1746). Brown laid special emphasis on the enforcement of religious sanctions as he believed that they were "infinitely more powerful than these [human laws]; because the Good it promises, and the Evil it threatens, are infinitely greater and more lasting" (Brown, 1746:33). Therefore, religion and its "the Sanctions of future Rewards and Punishments, from which it derives its Force, must be very strongly impressed on the human Mind" (Brown, 1746:32-33), to maintain social and political order.

This brought Brown naturally to indicate that true religion, Protestantism, was the source of virtue, truth and freedom in Great Britain. It was reasonable for Great Britain to overcome the threat of superstition and tyranny, namely the enemies of liberty, by means of the laws of the gospel (Brown, 1746). It could be stated that, Brown's pessimist view of future indicating that Britain would collapse in a foreign war or by national bankruptcy had not appeared before 1757, namely before the publication of the Estimate. In his early works, he indicated that Great Britain

could be a peaceful and free kingdom on the condition that Protestantism was preserved. It is worth quoting him to clarify this point;

> if we practice those Truths we know, and rightly use that Freedom we enjoy, we shall be established as on a Rock; we shall still rise above the Waves that threaten us; tho they toss themselves, yet shall they not prevail; tho' they roar, yet shall they not pass over us (Brown, 1746:48).

It is the case that Brown introduced to use protestant principles in maintaining the social order by emphasizing the liberty of Protestantism. These sermons highlighted the interdependence between civil liberty and Protestantism and they also explained Brown's remedy for Great Britain against the threat of Catholicism in the eighteenth-century.

Six years after his first work, his poem on Liberty was published. Brown indicated his contentment about freedom which emerged in peace after the War of the Austrian Succession had ended. In this poem, he talked about truth, virtue and freedom like his previous works. After he considered truth and virtue as same in 1743, he regarded truth and freedom as twin-born sisters in 1749. Brown stated that

> the Pride of Peace, shall FREEDOM smile,
>
> And show'r her Glories o'er BRITANNIA's Isle:
>
> There, clad in Heaven's own Lustre, TRUTH shall shine,
>
> And call forth VIRTUE'S awful Form divine (Brown, 1749:6).

At this point, he underlined that freedom could not be possible if there was falsehood and vices. It could be said that he was criticizing the significance of selfish pleasures in the theories of Earl of Shaftesbury and Bernard Mandeville which were explicitly refuted in Brown's Essays on the Characteristics two years later. In this respect, Brown also highlighted the necessity of true pleasures in achieving virtue in his other sermon preached in 1750. To Brown, "no true and lasting pleasure is, or can be obtained, without the Practice of VIRTUE" (Brown, 1750:2). Although some vices would pretend to conduct people to true pleasure, it could be realized that their pleasures were only delusions because they would necessarily be followed by fatal circumstances in the end. For Brown, the vices could only "destroy the Health of the Body, and all the Powers of the Mind" (Brown, 1750:3). Therefore the misery and ruin were unavoidable unless the appetite was honest, true, lovely, and praise and virtuous.

In this sermon, Brown (1750) also criticized the maxims of luxury and pleasure which were dominant in the present time. He stated that people could not obtain delight from a false pleasure. An appetite provided false pleasure was exhausted immediately after it was satisfied (Brown, 1750). In Brown's words,

> as new Objects rise before us, we renew our Pursuit, find ourselves again deceived, and thus pass our Time between Expectation and Disappointment (Brown, 1750:6).

Thus, the mind could not satisfy itself truly when the kingdom sunk in a degree of effeminacy and luxury. Under the dominance of the maxims of luxury, for Brown, "the inward Peace and Balance of the Mind is destroyed, and the distracted Heart set at Variance with itself" (Brown, 1750:8). Clearly, virtue was essential and sufficient for true pleasures to be emerged. However, for Brown, the seeds of virtue existed in the nature of human mind had to be cultivated. At this point, Brown introduced religion as the external aid for the growth of virtue in human

765

mind. So far, he explained the similarity between truth and virtue, the co-existence of truth and liberty and the necessity of religion as the foundation of them. Now, it is time to investigate his later works to grasp how he defended religion as a political instrument in achieving a well ordered society.

The definition of liberty as a political reformist

The prevalent thoughts in the given era which were regarded as actual threats to political and social order in Great Britain could be seen in the works of many intellectuals like John Locke, Earl of Shaftesbury, John Toland, Lord Bolingbroke and David Hume. To illustrate, Locke in his A Letter Concerning Toleration introduced to separate the principles of the state and church. For him, the state aimed to protect external interests of people like the interests relating to life, liberty and welfare, whereas church dealt only with internal interests like salvation and tried to regulate men's lives "according to the rules of virtue and piety" (Locke, 1740:16). This divorce between the state and the church was considered as a direct threat to the Anglican Establishment. Similarly, for Anglicans Shaftesbury's insistence on finding the foundation of ethics in the constitution of the human nature instead of God had harmed the moral order as well. In addition to this, John Toland, the author of Christianity not Mysterious, or, a Treatise showing, that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to Reason nor above it, and that no Christian doctrine can properly be called a Mystery was another peril for the Anglican state. Briefly he emphasized that although reason and the gospel were not contradictory, they seemed in contradiction with each other due to the conception of human beings and he added that people adored what they could not comprehend. His aim was to achieve civic virtue, social harmony, liberty and preservation of human reason (Toland, 1702). His claims about the rationality in the doctrines of Bible and the supremacy of rationality over religious doctrines were regarded as criticisms against religion. Although he defended himself in a letter he wrote to a member of the House of Commons in Ireland and stated that his only purpose and duty was to defend Christianity (Toland, 1702), his work was seen as a danger for Anglicanism.

766

Moreover, Lord Bolingbroke advocated the superiority of human knowledge and opposed to the idea of revealed religion. He had questioned the scripture authority and claimed that the Old Testament could not be the product of Holy Ghost as it was impossible for it to be transmitted through ages (Bolingbroke, 1749; Bolingbroke, 1752). He was against the idea of gaining knowledge by apriori reasoning and he advocated that man could not achieve knowledge of God's moral attributes by reasoning aposteriori. Obviously, for him, the moral values were not found in the idea of God, rather they were invented by humankind (Bolingbroke, 1754). It is not hard to see that such an elimination of God from social life could harm the Anglican establishment in the given period.

Furthermore Hume also stated that human beings were not able to discover any attributes of God and the principles of action that govern them even if the Divine Being had those attributes (Hume, 1748a). For him, it is not possible to suppose or infer the existence of any attributes of God as the cause of everything since such a reasoning goes "beyond what has immediately fallen under our Observation" (Hume, 1748a:224-225). Human beings, by reasoning, could achieve the fact that virtue, honest, wisdom and power were the most valuable qualities but they adapted them to the idea of God (Hume, 1748a:223-224). God, for Hume, was only a product of human imagination. He also argued that the idea of religion enslaved people because;

WHERE the deity is represented as infinitely superior to mankind, this belief, tho' altogether just, is apt, when joined with superstitious terrors, to sink the human mind into the lowest submission and abasement, and to represent the monkish virtues of mortification, penance, humility and passive suffering, as the only qualities, which are acceptable to him (Hume, 1748b:65).

It is the case that Hume's rejection of God as the moral governor of the universe could lead moral disintegration and contribute to the public mischiefs in the state. For the Anglican critics like William Warburton, those thinkers mentioned above paved the way to the destruction of religion in particular and of kingdom in general. William Warburton (1698-1779) was a religious controversialist and one of the most popular Anglican writers of the century. Warburton aimed to attack and refute those arguments to prevent their harmful effects.[4]

For Warburton, the divorce between ethics and religion was a direct threat to social order in the eighteenth-century. The elimination of God and religious principles in morality harmed the enforcements of unwritten laws and destroyed the public peace. Thus, Warburton censured Earl of Shaftesbury for being opposed to Christianity and making a separation between ethics and religion. Actually, Warburton believed that the ideas of this "inveterate Rancour" (Warburton, 1738:23) had to be rejected. After the publication of the Essay on Satire, Warburton stated that Brown "ha[d] a genius for poetry and ha[d] acquired a force of versification very uncommon" (Warburton, 1809:200). This is the reason why, for Warburton, Brown seemed to be the best person to be encouraged to write a critique on Shaftesbury's views on religion.[5] In fact, this idea was recommended to Warburton by Alexander Pope (Warburton, 1809). According to Pope, Shaftesbury's Characteristiks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times which was published in 1711 "had done more harm to Revealed Religion in England than all the works of Infidelity put together" (Warburton, 1809:36). In order to defend Anglicanism, Warburton wanted to contact with Brown to encourage Brown to disprove Shaftesbury's theory (Gilpin, 1819). Accordingly, Brown wrote Characteristics under the superintendence of Warburton in 1751. As Yigit insisted that, Brown's political and social ideas had begun to change after his intimacy with Warburton (Yigit, 2017).

In Characteristics, Brown's main object was to indicate the universally motivating character of religious principles in achieving common good in a political society (Brown, 1751). In order to do this, he introduced the necessity of reason and religious principles. Human beings had selfish passions and they had to be regulated in the light of reason and religion. Thus, the harmony between selfish passions and the common good could be reached. This coexistence of morality and religion, for Brown, had contributed to the stability of the state and the happiness for all (Brown, 1751).

767

---

[4] William Warburton (1698-1779) was a religious controversialist and one of the most popular Anglican writers of the century. He had a significant role in the appearance of John Brown. For more on Warburton's biography, see Young, B. W, "Warburton", in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford, 2007). For Warburton's attacks to Toland, Bolingbroke and Hume see Warburton, William. *A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy, Compleat, in four letters to a friend* (London: A. Millar, 1756); Warburton, William. "Thoughts on Various Subjects" in *A Selection from Unpublished Papers of the Right Reverend William Warburton* (London: John Bowyer Nichols and Son, 1841); Warburton, William. *Remarks on Mr. DAVID HUME's Essay on the Natural History of Religion* (London: T. Cadell, 1757) and Warburton, William. "The Nature and Condition of Truth" in *The Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion occasionally opened and explained in a Course of Sermons,* v. I (London: J. and R. Tonson, 1753), 1-43.

[5] According to W.D. Templeman, Warburton wanted "to extend the scope of battle by having Brown attack all of Shaftesbury's work that had been directed against religion". See Templeman, William, Darby. Warburton and Brown Continue the Battle over Ridicule, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 17/1 (1953), 30.

At this point, Brown had to talk about the nature of virtue to provide a solid basis for his moral theory. His ideas on virtue and its relation with truth and freedom were explicit in his early works. The most significant point among them was Brown's emphasis on the stability of their natures. Bearing this in his mind, he attacked Shaftesbury's relativity of virtues in Characteristics. In order to provide the permanent nature of virtues and vices, Brown regarded the faculty of reasoning as the common guidance of all the creatures of God (Brown, 1751). Firstly, he defended the superiority of the faculty of reasoning. Secondly, he argued for the existence of God, criticized atheism and finally he advocated the cooperation of religion with morality for maintaining common good under the light of fixed virtues. Brown refuted both Shaftesbury and Mandeville to reinforce his moral sense theory.

According to Shaftesbury, an individual was a complex of appetites, passions and affectations (Cooper, 2001). His emphasis on passions as the foundation of human nature brought him to state that the happiness of people lied in their selfish passions. For him,

> [w]here else can it[the happiness and advantages of people] lie, than in my Pleasure; since my Advantage and Good must ever be pleasing; and what is pleasing, can never be other than my Advantage and Good (Cooper, 2001:190).

Actually, Shaftesbury believed that what pleased man became his own good and this idea inevitably led him to achieve relativity of vices and virtues; the most dangerous threat to moral order for Brown. Likewise Shaftesbury, Bernard Mandeville tried to destroy the permanent natures of vices and virtues (Mandeville, 1772). He stated that virtues and vices were not permanent realities since they differ from age to age and from nation to nation. Moreover, for Mandeville human beings were incapable of being "blessed with all the virtue" (Mandeville, 1772:iv). Since human beings were defined by their vices rather than virtues, those vicious members of the society would be "made subservient to the grandeur and worldly happiness of the whole" (Mandeville, 1772:v). As he wrote in The Grumbling Hive: or Knaves Turn'ed Honest, all the vicious, profligate, inactive, mischievous were doing something for the common good. To illustrate, the society could receive benefit from the robbery when money was circulated, and from avarice and prodigality when people spend more (Mandeville, 1772). Luxury was also defended by Mandeville as he saw it as significant in the growth of the country. For him, luxury encouraged people to buy new cloths, build new houses and use new materials even if the old ones were enough to serve (Mandeville, 1772). Mandeville claimed that even the "most profligate [women] of the sex, did contribute to the consumption of superfluities" (Mandeville, 1772:166). The vices became to be blessings to the whole society and could improve it in Mandeville's system, and this is the reason why The Fable of The Bees is summarized as follows: "private vices [were] public happiness" (Mandeville, 1772:55).

In this respect, Brown regarded Shaftesbury and Mandeville as perils to social order of Great Britain and he attacked their ideas regarding the dominance of the senses and the relativity of virtues and vices in his Characteristics. It will be beneficial to look at the definition of passions for Brown;

> THE Passions are no more than the several Modes of Pleasure and Pain, to which the Author of Nature hath wisely subjected us, for our own and each others Preservation (Brown, 1751:12).

To Brown, the passions and senses were seen as the sources of all ideas in human mind. However, it is the case that only the "apparent, not real Good and Evil are universally the Objects

768

of all our Passions" (Brown, 1751:14). Therefore the difference between the realities and appearances could not be discovered by the guidance of the passions; rather reason was required to correct passions and to determine what is true, false, good or evil (Brown, 1751). According to the passions, the object of joy is apparent good, the one of fear is apparent danger and one of anger is apparent injury. In order to distinguish them from realities, reason as the "superior and corrective Power" (Brown, 1751:40) should examine circumstances, separate ideas and correct the passions. Evidently, passion as the criterion to test the truth was not able to give the realities without the province of reason (Brown, 1751).

Brown endeavored to provide the stable nature for virtues and vices by means of introducing reason as the only guide. For him, human beings had equal reason to claim that the nature of virtue and vice was "fixed, certain, and invariable" (Brown, 1751:145). Actually, their permanent nature was to contribute to public happiness which Brown tried to achieve through his moral theory. According to him, there must be certain actions that could produce happiness for all under the same circumstances (Brown, 1751). To reinforce this point, he added that

> All Ages and Nations having without Exception or Variance maintained that Humanity, Fidelity, Truth, Temperance, and mutual Benevolence, do as naturally produce Happiness… That Cruelty, Treachery, Lying, Intemperance, Inhumanity, Adultery, Murder, do as naturally give Rise to Misery (Brown, 1751:143).

For him, on the one hand, virtues like humanity and honesty would contribute to public happiness in all times and nations. On the other, vices like inhumanity and lying would destruct common wealth. In this light, he regarded anything which contributed to the happiness for all as virtue and he saw anything destructive to common good as vices. Brown summed up his point in those words;

769

> whatever tends to the Good of all, is by the consent of all, denominated Virtue; that whatever is contrary to this great End, is universally branded as Vice; in the same Manner, as whatever nourishes the Body is called Food; whatever destroys it, Poison (Brown, 1751:143).

Regarding the question of virtue, Brown's goal was not to explain which actions were the virtuous and which ones were the vices. Rather, he tried to answer "what makes Virtue to be what it is" (Brown, 1751:112). Briefly, his subject was the nature of the virtue. Mankind would agree on the idea that honesty is a virtue. But, what makes honesty a virtue? According to Shaftesbury, virtue was the conformity of our actions with moral sense (Cooper, 2001). However, for Brown,

> To say that Virtue consists in acting according to the fair, the handsome, the sublime, the beautiful, the decent, the moral Objects of Right and Wrong, is really no more than ringing changes upon Words (Brown, 1751:117).

To say honesty is a virtue and virtue is honesty did not explain what makes honesty as a virtue. Brown introduced the happiness for all at this point and claimed that an action which did not contradict with the greatest public happiness could "assume both the Name and the Nature of virtue" (Brown, 1751:135). Evidently, virtue or truth of a morally good action did not reside in the action itself, but emerged from its consequences. An action could not be evaluated without taking its possible consequences into consideration and what is to be morally worthy was necessarily related with the action's ability in the production of happiness for all. It is worth quoting him to clarify this point

the Idea of Virtue hath never been universally affixed to any Action or Affection of the Mind, unless where this Tendency to produce Happiness was at least apparent(Brown, 1751:133).

Obviously, for Brown, virtue had to be in conformity with the public good. Since the contribution to common good and the greatest happiness were same, the actions derived their moral beauty from their ability to serve for the happiness for all (Brown, 1751).

After explaining the nature of virtue and vice, and the necessity of reason to attain their permanent nature, Brown had to introduce the idea of God and religion to strengthen his moral theory against the threat of Shaftesbury's theory which had eliminated God. To Brown, every individual's comprehension of happiness that emerged from the various mixture of sense, imagination and passion would naturally differ since this mixture gave a different complexion of mind. The various opinions of mankind were "not universally and clearly connected with the Happiness or Misery of Mankind" (Brown, 1751:144). Therefore, laws were also required to teach men how to practice virtue. For Brown, common laws could "establish general Happiness of Society, by making the acknowledged Interest of every Individual to coincide and unite with the public Welfare" (Brown, 1751:209). In the same manner, religious laws could also enforce people for the same end. To Brown, the internal enforcement for people to achieve virtue and thus the common good was provided by religious laws because;

as human Laws cannot reach the Heart of Man; as they can only inflict Punishment on Offenders, but cannot bestow Rewards on the Obedient; as there are many Duties of imperfect Obligation which they cannot recognize; as Force will sometimes defy, and Cunning often elude their Power; so without some further Aids, some Motives to Action more universally interesting, Virtue must still be betrayed and deserted (Brown, 1751:209-210).

To Brown, although men had reason to conclude what was virtuous, the motive of religion to virtue was stronger. The religious principles were common to mankind and universally prevail (Brown, 1751). In this light, only religion could "convince Mankind, that their own Happiness universally depends on procuring, or at least not violating the Happiness of others" (Brown, 1751:210).

Therefore, the selfish passions of man had to be curbed by the idea of God and religious laws. At this point, he also talked about the existence of God;

The *Goodness* of the Deity is seen in the designed End or Purpose of the Creation, which is, the Happiness of all his Creatures; His *Wisdom* is seen, in the proper Means employed for the Accomplishments of this Great End; His *Power* fulfils what Goodness had intended and Wisdom contrived, by putting these Means in Execution. Hence then alone we obtain the idea of *Divinity*, from a *Union* of perfect *Goodness*, *Wisdom*, and *Power* (Brown, 1751:272).

Men could naturally conclude the existence of God as the creator of Nature and the laws for welfare since God had given a necessary passion and equal reason to mankind (Brown, 1751). For Brown, besides the idea of God, the fear of God was "absolutely necessary to [human's] Happiness" (Brown, 1751:251). On the contrary to Shaftesbury who saw the idea of God as a visionary and groundless panic, Brown underlined that the object of the fear of God was real. For Shaftesbury the idea of God was unable to give rise to virtue by means of sanctions. Nevertheless, for Brown, God and the religious principles could not be mean, slavish and

770

unworthy as long as they were considered in their true light. Therefore, unlike Shaftesbury, the fear of God in Brown's theory was the sure basis of human ethical behavior and it did not degrade human beings; rather it prevented them from evil (Brown, 1751).

Religion, for Brown, was also considered as a motive that led self-love to human happiness. He attacked Mandeville and Shaftesbury again. For Mandeville, the idea of God was incapable of teaching man the way to virtue and to a mighty kingdom because it was impossible for a society to exist without the vices of men. The vices were both necessary and beneficial for the society (Mandeville, 1772). However, for Brown vices would inescapably lead misery and ruin in the end, and they could never contribute to the public happiness.

Moreover, for Shaftesbury, the assistance of any external institution was pointless in motivating people to public virtue (Cooper, 2001). To him, men were capable of ethical virtue and political solidarity by virtue of their natural sociability. The public spirit would come from their social feeling and there was no need for any external institution to lead them to serve for public happiness and to make them see each other as equal agents (Cooper, 2001). Nevertheless, Brown thought that any natural motive or obligation could be to vice, not to virtue (Brown, 1751). Clearly, he stated that "where the selfish or malevolent Affections happen to prevail, there can be no internal Motive, or natural obligation to Virtue" (Brown, 1751:184).

Thus, for Brown, the idea of God was necessary for human beings to be encouraged to behave virtuously, namely according to public happiness. The "freedom of God" (Brown, 1751:316) alone could form the man's moral character because only "the great, universal, religious Principle, a rational obedience to the Will of God, will raise [man] to his utmost Capacity of moral perfection" (Brown, 1751:235). Obviously, religion was required to achieve true happiness; public happiness. It will be beneficial to quote Brown to clarify this point:

> Religion proposes true Happiness as the End and Consequence of virtuous Action: This is granted. It proposes it by such Motives as must influence Self-Love, and consequently has given the best Means of procuring it. Yet, it seems, Self-Love being not restrained, but made stronger, will make Mankind miss of true Happiness. That is, by leading Self-Love into the Path of true Happiness, Religion will inevitably conduct it to false; by commanding us to cherish our public Affections, it will certainly inflame the private ones (Brown, 1751:216).

In societies, religion was to direct the passions to proper objects and replace the selfish interests with the common interest. Although both the prejudices for or against religion would arise in human mind, it was the reason's task to control them and direct the mankind to religious principles (Brown, 1751). For Brown, religion was "unhinging Society to the utmost of his Power" (Brown, 1751:248) and religious sanctions were more important than civil laws for a society.

Under the light of these ideas, he gave the examples of Greece and Rome to emphasize the reason of their declines. For Brown, they were corrupted after religion had lost its efficacy. An irreligious and vile Kingdom would necessarily sink in servitude and misery in the following era (Brown, 1751). Although he acknowledged the difficulty in seeing the future effects of irreligion on society in the present state (Brown, 1751), Brown had estimated the future threats and wanted to take precautions for preventing religion from a possible decline. He aimed to preserve religion in order to maintain the permanence of the state. It is not hard to feel Brown's pessimism about the future of Great Britain in his Characteristics.

It could be stated that, Characteristics is worthy of attention with regard to the principle of utility and the defense of religion in politics. Brown had examined virtue in detail in his previous works, but unlike them, he had explained the nature of virtues by means of the principle of utility in Characteristics. Brown put his utilitarian theory on the solid basis of the idea of God and advocated religion as a political tool to achieve a peaceful society. On the contrary to his other works which stressed freedom, religion had appeared to be the main concept in this work. Freedom was defined as "the only permanent Basis on which Religion or Virtue can be established" (Brown, 1751:5). Clearly, the link between freedom and religion was supported in detail. It was religion which had the ability to cultivate public virtue, public happiness and to shape the manners and the principles. It was seen as the motive in formation of people's moral character. Therefore, religion was introduced as the pillar of the political society and the remedy for the future threats like the internal moral destruction in a state.

In 1753, Brown had preached another sermon; On the Use and Abuse of Externals in Religion and strengthened his ideas on religion again. Briefly, Brown stated that men were "imperfect, and embod'd State" (Brown, 1753:7). The aid of religion was required to keep men in the right way due to this weakness in human nature. For Brown, "without publick Religion, Mankind in general would relapse into a State of Barbarism and a total Forgetfulness of all Religion" (Brown, 1753:7). Having mentioned its role in the maintenance of a political society, he restated its relation with virtue which was seen as one of its ends (Brown, 1753).

After the publication of those essays, poems and sermons discussed above, Brown wrote two tragedies; Barbarossa and Athelstane. At this point, it could be beneficial to talk about Athelstane due to Brown's insistence on freedom. Brown explicitly regarded freedom as the most important element of Great Britain. He called Britons "the sons of Freedom" (Brown, 1756:1) in this tragedy and focused on the preservation of the nation by means of reason. While he was trying to warn Britons against France, he suggested Britons to be friends of freedom against the threat of expiring liberty (Brown, 1756). Actually, his love of freedom took attention as an opposition to Catholicism again.

772

In the following year his most popular work, An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times went to press. Brown's main object was "the Permanency or Duration of the State" (Brown, 1757b:195). Therefore, he published Estimate to awaken the nation to maintain the internal strength of Great Britain. To Brown, Great Britain was;

> a political Constitution, superior to all that History had recorded, or present Times can boast: A religious Establishment, which breaths universal Charity and Toleration. A Spirit of Liberty yet unconquered; a general Humanity and Sincerity, beyond any Nation upon Earth: an Administration of Justice, that had even silenced Envy. These are Blessings which every Englishman feels, and ought to acknowledge (Brown, 1758:36).

Nevertheless, for Brown, it was going to lose its strong, free, hardy and courageous character (Brown, 1757b). He thought that the reasons of this corruption had to be explained to find the cure (Brown, 1758). Brown's emphasis on virtue, moral order and sanctions brought him to analyze the situation of Great Britain in terms of morality. For him, "the most effectual Way to render Kingdoms happy, great, and durable, [was] to make them virtuous, just, and good" (Brown, 1757a:70). It is obvious that the stability of the state depended on the preservation of

moral values (Brown, 1758). Under the light of his ideas mentioned in previous works, he defended a moral regeneration for Great Britain.

Although the discussion of Estimate and Brown's reformation plan centered in morality is the scope of another paper, it is necessary to state that Brown's insistence on religion and its role in the reformation of eighteenth-century Britain stated in the given book are worthy of attention. It appears that the Protestant principles were introduced as the only element that could secure the state. It is perhaps true to state that his main goal became the defense of Protestantism in the following years. In 1765, Brown indicated that man by nature was

> at once selfish and social; compassionate and resentful; docile, either to Good or Evil; and hence, capable of acquiring new Habits, new Passions, new Desires, either to the Welfare or Destruction of his Fellow Creatures (Brown, 1765:22).

Religion, namely Anglicanism was considered as compulsory to compel selfish appetites of individuals to yield to common good. People should be motivated to behave according to laws by means of religious principles (Brown, 1765). It is the case that, he established a link between freedom of the subjects and the rational religion, Protestantism after the Jacobite Rebellion. However, religion was never introduced as an alternative to his doctrine of morality until the appearance of the Characteristics in 1751. Afterwards, religion and the defense of Anglicanism became his main issue with the publication of the Estimate in 1757.

The superiority of reason and the dominance of virtue and freedom in personal morality were replaced by the power of religion in maintaining the moral and political order, and thus the preservation of happy and free Great Britain. In Brown's theory, morality was a social morality. In other words, the virtuous people who formed a society led it to operate rationally. The virtuous subjects could contribute to the moral climate of the society. Therefore, private morality should accord with public morality for the maintenance of the common good. Obviously, the state should enforce such a harmony and for Brown, religion seemed to be the best instrument to achieve it. People who behaved according to their selfish passions should be directed to the way to virtue. The accordance between the passion and virtue in human beings could eliminate the possible conflict between the selfish interest and the common interest. Brown had used religion to direct people towards common interest, public virtue and thus a stable Great Britain.

773

Conclusion

Actually, the anxiety of Warburton about the future of Great Britain could be regarded as the reason of his call of John Brown for national moral regeneration. It is the case that Brown's ideas had undergone a vital change after his intimacy with Warburton. The critics who censured Brown for giving up his liberal opinions seemed to be right because Brown's ideas on freedom, truth and virtue and the necessary interdependence between them were replaced by his emphasis on religion and his aim to prevent future threats from Great Britain in his later works.

An anonymous author in Catalogue of the most celebrated Writers claimed that Brown's motivation to publish Estimate was his ambition in getting a bishopric which he never obtained (Anonymous, 1772). Regardless of his aim, it could be stated that Brown's main subject became to defend religion to restrain people's freedom to provide national liberty of Great Britain.

It appears that Brown's ideas in his early works were more liberal and individualistic, while he turned to defend national liberty for the sake of Great Britain afterwards. That is, he had changed his liberal opinions into the idea of national liberty because of the conditions of Great

Britain in the given century. The prevalent religious controversies; the threats of free thinkers, deists, atheists, dissenters and Catholics had triggered the idea of introducing reformed projects for Great Britain among which Brown's Estimate is worthy of attention.

He introduced the necessity of Protestant principles in order to provide national liberty for the kingdom and to prevent the establishment from internal destruction. Political theory of Brown provided liberty for the nation under the light of Protestant principles. However, the liberty in political life was not his main aim in his early works. In this paper it is argued that being a political reformer was not the whole essence of Brown as the analysis of his early works indicates the moral aspects of his thought rather than his political philosophy. He tried to construct a moral sense theory based on reason and made virtue, freedom and happiness interconnected in his theory. Nevertheless, these parts of the chain turned to be the necessary concepts in maintaining the political state. Regarding Brown as the "Estimate Brown" is a complete misunderstanding and underestimating his moral theory. Understanding national freedom in political arena without grasping individual freedom mentioned in his early works would remain inadequate to examine Brown in detail.

Brown as a political reformer, need to be analyzed in detail under the light of his arguments mentioned in early works in order to grasp his unified moral, religious and political philosophy which became clear after he had appeared as a political reformer.

REFERENCES

Anonymous (1715). *The Necessity of Peace and Union Among the Members of the Church of Englan,* London.

Anonymous (1772). *Letters Concerning The Present State Of England: ParticularlyRespecting The Politics, Arts, Manners, And Literature Of The Times,* London.

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount (1749). ―On the Spirit of Patriotism‖ in *Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism : On the Idea of a Patriot King and on the State of Parties at the Accession of King George the First,* Dublin.

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount (1752). "Concerning the true use and advantages of it" in *Letters on the Study and Use of History*, v.I. London.

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount (1754). *The Philosophical Works of the Late Honourable Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke*, v. IV, London.

Brown, John (1743). *Honour: A Poem,* London.

Brown, John (1745). *An Essay on Satire: Occasion'd by the Death of Mr. Pope,* London.

Brown, John (1746). *The Mutual Connexion between Religious Truth and Civil Freedom; between Superstition, Tyranny, Irreligion, and Licentiousness,* London.

Brown, John (1749). *On Liberty: A Poem* (London, Brown, John. *On the Pursuit of False Pleasure,* London.

Brown, John (1751). *Essays on the Characteristics,* London.

Brown, John (1753). *On the Use and Abuse of Externals in Religion,* London.

Brown, John (1756). *Athelstan: A Tragedy,* London.

Brown, John (1757a). *An Estimate of The Manners and Principles of The Times,* London.

Brown, John (1757b). *An Estimate of The Manners and Principles of The Times,* Vol. II, London.

Brown, John (1758). *An Explanatory Defence of The Estimate of The Manners and Principles of The Times,* London.

Clarke, William and Mackenzie, Robert Shelton (1832). *The Georgian Era: Memoirs of the Most Eminent Persons, who have Flourished in Great Britain,* London.

Cooper, Anthony Ashley, Third Earl of Shaftesbury (1732). *Characteristicks of Men,Manners, Opinions, Times* 5th edition, London.

Crimmins, James E (2004). "Brown, John (1715–1766)", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Oxford.

Erskine-Hill, Howard (2004).. "Pope, Alexander (1688–1744)", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Oxford.

Hume, David (1748a). "Of Practical Consequences of Natural Religion" in *Philosophical Essays Concerning Human Understanding,* London.

Hume, David (1748b). "Of Liberty and Necessity" in *Philosophical Essays Concerning Human Understanding,* London.

Locke, John (1740). *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, London.

Mandeville, Bernard (1772). *Fable of the Bees: or Private Vices, Public Benefits,* Edinburgh.

O'Gorman, Frank (1997). *The Long Eighteenth Century British Political and Social History 1688-1832,* Oxford.

Plummer, Alfred (1910). The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century, New York.

Sykes, Norman. *Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, 1669- 1748: a study in politics and religion in the eighteenth century* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926).

Sykes, Norman (1934). *Church and State in England in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge.

Templeman, William, Darby (1953). Warburton and Brown Continue the Battle over Ridicule, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 17/1 pp. 17-36.

The Gentleman's Magazine (1819).vol. 89, London.

Toland, John (1702). "Mr. Toland's Letter to a Member of the House of Commons in IRELAND, Dublin, September 3, 1697 in *Christianity, not Mysterious: or, a TREATISE Showing, That there is nothing in the GOSPEL Contrary to REASON, Nor above it: And that no Christian Doctrine can be properly call'd a MYSTERY*, London.

Walsh, John and Taylor, Stephen (1993). "Introduction: the Church and Anglicanism in the long eighteenth century" in *The Church of England 1689-1833: from toleration to Tractarianism,* edited by John Walsh, Colin Haydon and Stephen Taylor, Cambridge.

Warburton, William (1738). "Dedication" in *The Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated on the Principles of a Religious Deist,* London.

Warburton, William (1753). "The Nature and Condition of Truth" in *The Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion occasionally opened and explained in a Course of Sermons*, v. I, London.

Warburton, William. *A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy, Compleat, in four letters to a friend* (London, 1756).

Warburton, William (1757). *Remarks on Mr. DAVID HUME's Essay on the Natural History of Religion,* London.

Warburton, William (1809). *Letters from a late eminent prelate to one of his friend,* London.

Warburton, William (1841). "Thoughts on Various Subjects" in *A Selection from Unpublished Papers of the Right Reverend William Warburton,* London.

Yigit, Pervin (2017). John Brown as an Independent Character from Warburton, *Journal of History Culture and Art Research, 6(4)*, pp. 55-68. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v6i4.1037.

Yigit, Pervin & Özkutlu, Seyit (2017). Protestantism as the Guarantee of National Liberty in the Eighteenth-Century Britain. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 6(6), pp. 313-327. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v6i6.1284.

Young, Brian (2004). W. "Warburton (1698-1779)", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Oxford.