

**Identifying Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke  
as  
Bernard Mandeville's *Horatio*.**

Draft-article ACJ, August 2009

*Horatio* and *Cleomenes* are the two interlocutors in *The Fable of the Bees, Part II* (1729) [*Mensen spreken niet om begrepen te worden* (2007)] and *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War* (1732) [*De oorsprong van de eer en het nut van christelijkheid bij oorlog* (2009)]. *Cleomenes* is Mandeville's alter ego. *Horatio* has generally been looked upon as fictitious, in spite of Mandeville's statement that also *Horatio* would be a real character. We will argue here that *Horatio* is most likely Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751). In literature Henry St John is commonly referred to as Bolingbroke, a habit we'll follow here.

**Additional information:**

Mandeville and Bolingbroke, some remarks

*An Account of the True Author of two Infamous Libels* (1727)

Concerning Henry St John, or, Bolingbroke, see [Wikipedia](#), and several biographies on the internet, as well as the biography by H. T. Dickinson, published in Oxford DNB. As for Bolingbroke's own [bibliography](#), please note that most of his philosophical works were written and published after Mandeville's death in January 1733.

Interesting is also Paul Hazard's description of Bolingbroke in *La Pensée européenne au XVIIIème siècle, de Montesquieu à Lessing* (1946) (*European Thought in the Eighteenth Century from Montesquieu to Lessing*, tr. 1954).

**1. *Cleomenes and Horatio, a disintegrated friendship.***

Both characters, *Cleomenes* and *Horatio*, 'are real, as faithfully copied from Nature, as I have been able to take them', according to Mandeville.<sup>1</sup> He calls *Cleomenes* a friend of the author of *The Fable of the Bees*. This is an understatement, because *Cleomenes* is speaking Mandeville's sentiments, so that everything he advances should be looked upon as Mandeville's. *Cleomenes* is generally regarded as being Mandeville's alter ego.<sup>2</sup> *Horatio* is *Cleomenes*'s friend, whose character, as depicted by Mandeville, will be presented in section 7.

At first being friends, taking different routes, their friendship came to be disintegrated. '*Cleomenes* had been just such another, but was much reform'd'.<sup>3</sup> *Horatio*'s own ideas were opposite to those in Mandeville's *Fable*, but in Mandeville's opinion he would judge wrongly of these. '*Cleomenes* who loved and had a great Friendship for *Horatio*, wanted to undeceive him; but the other, who hated Satyr, was prepossess'd, and having been told likewise, that martial Courage and Honour itself were ridicul'd in that Book, he was very much exasperated against the Author and his whole Scheme: He had two or three times heard *Cleomenes* discourse on this Subject with others; but he would never enter into the Argument himself; and finding his Friend often

pressing to come to it, he began too look coolly upon him, and at last avoided all opportunities of being alone with him'.<sup>4</sup>

Mandeville specifies this disagreement further by telling how the first dialogue between *Cleomenes* and *Horatio* was occasioned by his *Fable of the Bees, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (1723). '*Horatio*, who had found great Delight in my Lord's *Shaftsbury's* polite manner of Writing, his fine Raillery, and blending Virtue with good Manners, was a great Stickler for the Social System; and wonder'd how *Cleomenes* could be an Advocate for such a Book as *The Fable of the Bees*, of which he had heard a very vile Character from several Quarters'.<sup>5</sup> So Mandeville seems to suggest that he doubts whether *Horatio* had really read this book.<sup>6</sup>

Mandeville had become used to criticisms, which he had answered in his *Vindication of the Book* (1723) and also, more or less, by publishing *A Modest Defence of Publick Stews* (1724) and *An Enquiry into the Frequent Executions at Tyburn* (1725). In the *Preface of The Fable of the Bees, Part II*, Mandeville relates about the continuing contemporary criticisms on the initial *Fable of the Bees*. Though he was not indifferent to his critics and intended to respond to them again some time, he remained silent, because 'hitherto I have not been accused of any thing, that is criminal or immoral'.<sup>7</sup> So only an unusual criticism, an accusation of being criminal or immoral, would possibly make Mandeville to give up his silence. And, as we will show, it is exactly this criticism that was set off in December 1726 and March 1727. He was attacked by one person, whom we will identify as Henry St John, viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751). Bolingbroke had been allowed, in 1725, to return to England, after an exile of ten years in France. For this attack Bolingbroke made use of two different media, the paper *The Craftsman*, which he started in December 1726, and an anonymous pamphlet, which was presumably published in the latter half of March 1727.

## **2. Walpole, Bolingbroke, Mandeville.**

Before we come to this assault, we must reflect a moment in very general terms on the political situation in England in the 1720's, while taking for being read English and international history after the Glorious Revolution (1688). It was 'New England', as had been developing after the Glorious Revolution. Robert Walpole (1676-1745) was prime minister. Few historical periods have received such intense scrutiny as the Walpole era, according to Gerrard.<sup>8</sup> It were Walpole and the New England, that Bolingbroke detested with all his fibres, a New England that was being caused, in Bolingbroke's opinion, by the implementation of Dutch financial systems of credit and stocks, and by the 'Dutch captivity'.<sup>9</sup>

And Mandeville was looked upon as Walpole's philosopher, according to Kramnick: 'Walpole's England (...) acquired a philosopher in Bernard Mandeville,(...) as an important formulator of new values for post-Revolutionary England'.<sup>10 10a</sup> We don't think this to be a quality that Mandeville would have approved of. But here we will pass over Mandeville's own critical judgment of Walpole and only stress his carefulness for staying out of all party politics. If Kramnick's point of view is accepted, it might have been expected that he would have shown that Bolingbroke had been almost as hostile to Mandeville as he was to Walpole. But while asserting that 'Bolingbroke's *Craftsman* singled out Mandeville in 1732 the apologist of the corrupt age',<sup>11</sup> Kramnick only refers to a letter from Bolingbroke to Chesterfield, in which Bolingbroke objected to the way Walpole accepted

the central thesis of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*.<sup>12</sup> Additionally Kramnick mentions three articles, only published in 1732 in *The Craftsman* and containing criticisms on Mandeville that do not seem impressive.<sup>13</sup> Yet we will bring forward evidence, being overlooked in the first numbers of *The Craftsman*, in which Bolingbroke did draw a bead nearly as fiercely on Mandeville as on Walpole. But since we did not turn to *The Craftsman* for research but after we had found a bitter attack on Mandeville in an anonymous pamphlet, we will treat this item first.

### **3. A pamphlet containing Bolingbroke's attack on Mandeville**

A letter from Austria's chancellor Count Sinzendorf and a memorial by Austria's resident in London, De Palm, both written and published in February and March 1727, exerted a remarkable impact on the international diplomatic tensions between England, Austria and Spain, which arose in the years after the conclusion of Treaty of Vienna (1725) between Austria and Spain. It was the Spanish negotiator John William Duke de Ripperda (1682-1737), a Dutchman,<sup>14</sup> who had broadcast that a secret part of this treaty would involve that Austria and Spain had agreed on giving back Gibraltar to Spain and on restoring the Jacobite Pretender James Francis Edward Stuart (1701-1766) to the British crown. Returning to Spain from Vienna, Ripperda succeeded in becoming Spanish first minister, but after a few months, in May 1726, he fell in disgrace. He fled to the house of the British ambassador, but was retrieved by the Spaniards and confined to prison. In the meantime he had informed British authorities fully about the secret agreements, and the British had obviously promised him a financial reward in exchange.<sup>15</sup>

Ripperda's talk occasioned the British king to a speech in the Second Parliament of George I, fifth session, on January 17, 1727. Sinzendorf's letter of February 20, 1727 was a reply to this speech. Both this letter and De Palm's memorial were taken to be so infamous for the king and the whole nation, that De Palm had to quit England immediately. The whole situation was largely discussed in both houses of British parliament, and all members, both Whigs and Tories, were unanimous.<sup>16</sup>

In order to indicate the general contemporary sentiment in England, we quote from the joint address of both houses to the king, on March 15, 1727: 'And we beg Leave to assure your Majesty, That no Amusements, by artful or evasive Denials, shall lead us into a false Security, or divert us from exerting our selves in Vindication of your Majesty's Honour, or from defending and supporting your Majesty against all your open and secret Enemies, both at Home and Abroad. And if any among your own Subjects have been so wicked as to countenance, encourage and abet the Disturbers of the publick Tranquillity, in this extravagant Insult upon your Majesty, or flattered them with Hopes, that an obstinate Perseverance in their destructive Measures could stagger the Firmness of the British Nation; We are resolved effectually to defeat all such groundless Expectations, and to convince the World, that the Intrigues of a Few cannot, in any Degree, abate or slacken that Vigour and Resolution, with which a true Love and Concern for our Country, a just Sense of its Interests, and an unshaken Loyalty to your Majesty have inspired us'.

It was in this threatening atmosphere, presumably in the last two weeks of March 1727, that an anonymous pamphlet, so far unnoticed, appeared. Its title is: *An Account of the True Author of two Infamous Libels, entitled, I. A Letter from Count Sinzendorf, etc. to Mr. De Palm, late Resident, etc. dated from Vienna, Febr. 20 N.S. 1727; II A Memorial presented by Mr. De Palm, etc. With an Appendix containing the said Libels,*

*with Proper Remarks, etc.* London: Printed for J. Smith near the Exchange MDCCXXVII. An annotated reproduction of this pamphlet is available on this website.

The pamphlet counts, after the title page, 16 pages, numbered 5-20, and the appendix, containing the pieces by Sinzendorf and De Palm, takes up 20 pages, numbered 21-40. These two pieces had already been published before, in *London Gazette*, of Saturday, March 4, 1727.<sup>17</sup> The structure of the pamphlet is remarkable. Starting with page 5, the first four pages are missing. The title page promises 'an Appendix, containing the said Libels, with proper Remarks', but these remarks are not to be found there. We will return to this aspect at the end of the next section.

Analysing the pamphlet's body and its publisher, it appears to bear Bolingbroke's marks so strongly, that its author can hardly be anyone but Bolingbroke. After having elaborated the character and career of the firstly Dutch and afterwards Spanish statesman Ripperda,<sup>18</sup> being by birth (p. 5) 'of the Religion of the Country, whose God is Gold', and of whose notorious character it might still be said that it could easily have been passed into a proverb,<sup>19</sup> Bolingbroke turns to Mandeville as follows (pp. 18 and 19).

'The Maxims of this Statesman are very remarkable, and very much resemble those of the pious Author of *The Fable of the Bees*, who, we are told, is of the same Country and Religion with our Duke; which indeed is not impossible, since the Air and Climate sometimes have the same Effect upon the Minds and Bodies of People; and we find that those Countries which are most famous for Monsters, are no less noted for Variety of Religions.

His First principle was, *That Mankind are naturally Villains*, and so we presume that he admitted himself as one of the Number; and, as a consequence of this, he tells us that the vilest and most hateful Qualities are the most necessary Accomplishments of a great Man, or a fine Gentleman; it is not to be wondered therefore that the *Beaumont* greatly admire the *Dutch* system just mentioned; tho' if we were to judge of his morals by his poetry, we need not be Criticks to prove them to be very wretched, and well suited to the Half-pen[n]y Sheet in which they first made their Appearance; and we cannot but agree with the Author when he says, *That he had not the least Design of being witty*. The rest of this Gentleman's Principles and maxims are so much of a Piece with those of his Countryman Dr. *M.* that the Wits and Beaux must be already acquainted with them, and the Curious may have Recourse to the Author'.

It seems plausible to us that this unrestrained criticism of being equated with Ripperda as a villain and as a foreigner, must have been very much alarming to Mandeville, taking into account the prevailing patriotic sentiments in England and what had been declared by the houses of parliament on March 15, 1727. The pamphlet may be regarded as an attempt to have Mandeville counted among the 'open or secret enemies at Home'.<sup>20</sup> Both his sincerity as an empirical author and his personal integrity as a psychosomatic specialist were seriously at stake. Bolingbroke struck Mandeville in the heart of his character, in his dear profession, his livelihood and his foreign identity.

#### **4. *The Craftsman, containing Bolingbroke's attack on Mandeville.***

The first number of Bolingbroke's *The Craftsman* appeared December 5, 1726. Bolingbroke called it 'my paper'. Its publisher was the same 'J. Smith near the Royal Exchange in London' who was to publish, a few months later, the anonymous pamphlet that we attribute to Bolingbroke.<sup>21</sup> There has been much discussion about the authorship

of the contributions to *The Craftsman*, but we prefer to follow Kramnick who concluded that 'there is a unity of ideas in *The Craftsman* during these ten years which reflects the hegemony of one mind - Bolingbroke's. It is not crucial that some of the ideas cannot be assigned with certainty. It is still Bolingbroke's *Craftsman*'.<sup>22</sup> The paper had 'one individual as the object of all its vilification and ridicule', i.c. Walpole.<sup>23</sup>

Already in no. 3, Monday, December 12, 1726, bearing Horace's motto 'Quod medicorum est, promittunt medici', Bolingbroke started describing Walpole as Doctor Robert King, who had invented 'one of the greatest Arcana<sup>24</sup> in Physick,(...) entitled *Catholicon AUREUM Basilicum*, or the *Royal GOLDEN Specifick*'. The advertisements for Dr King's 'golden specific' (i.e. money) were to become a running satire through the first four years of the paper.<sup>25</sup>

Bolingbroke introduces his Dr King as follows: 'But laying aside all these particulars for the present, I cannot help distinguishing, in this paper, one of the greatest *Arcana* in Physick, which either this or any age has produced, being justly entitled, *Catholicon AUREUM Basilicum*, or, The *GOLDEN Specifick*, which is so well known in all Courts of Europe, and so highly approved of by the Nobility and Gentry of this Kingdom, for its wonderful Virtues, in all *hypocondriacal* and *hysterical* Distempers, that is justly esteem'd the Universal Medicine; for it infallibly cures all degrees of the *Spleen*, *Vapors*, and *Melancholy*, be they of never so long duration, or from whatever causes they may proceed; whether from an ill state of health, indigestion, and sharp bilious humours; or from natural Gloominess and Saturnine disposition of Mind; or lastly, from misfortunes in the world, occasion'd either by unavoidable accidents, or by luxury, profuseness, and gaming: from all which, this inestimable medicine gives the Patient a safe and speedy relief, by rectifying the juices, purifying the blood, and strengthening the digestion, so that all black thoughts, direful apprehensions, and dismal foreboding fears are immediately removed; in the room whereof succeeds a new train of ideas, which renovate the whole animal oeconomy, exhilarate the heart, occasion brisk and sparkling imaginations, cheerful dreams, and the most lively and sanguine spirits. In a word, it recovers all persons, as it were by enchantment, from those incumbrances of mind, which occasion a dark and splenatick way of thinking, and puts them in a state of perfect serenity, gladness, and good humour. It is very pleasant to the palate, and may be taken without the knowledge of the most intimate friend, acquaintance, or bedfellow. To be had *only* of the inventor himself, Doctor ROBERT KING (who has obtained a patent for the *sole* vending thereof) at his own house over-against *Arlington-Street*, in Piccadilly; where he is to be advised with, in these distempers, every morning from *eight* till *twelve*, and at no other times, unless it be upon extraordinary occasions!'

This description of Dr King, alias Walpole, has entirely been formulated in terms of Mandeville's psychosomatic specialty, namely of his book *A Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions, Vulgarly Call'd the Hypo in Men and Vapours in Women* (1711).<sup>26</sup> Bolingbroke obviously identified Walpole and Mandeville with each other. As for this *Treatise* by Mandeville, which Burttt calls a 'respected' work,<sup>27</sup> it may be added here that only this book (not its revised edition of 1730, of which the title, *A Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Diseases*, is different) and *The Fable of the Bees* are mentioned by title in Mandeville's obituary notice.<sup>28</sup>

*The Craftsman* no. 6, Friday December 23, 1626, presents a continuation of Dr King's story. To our purpose, we restrict ourselves to two remarkable passages.

The first one, p. 49, suggests an imaginary dispute between Bolingbroke and Mandeville. After asserting that a certain learned fellow of the faculty of physick had thought fit, in a publick coffee-house, to call 'Dr King's (...) Royal Golden Specifick, for the Spleen and Vapours, a Quack-Remedy',<sup>29</sup> Bolingbroke continues: 'It is, methinks, a very hard case, that a Man cannot distinguish himself from the common herd of his profession, without gaining the character of an *Emperick*'. Again Bolingbroke is referring here to Mandeville and his *Treatise*, in which Mandeville availed himself of the pseudonym Philopirio, that is, 'a lover of experience, which I shall always profess to be'.<sup>30</sup> He makes Philopirio's interlocutor Misomedon state: 'But now you must resolve me one thing, which I have had a mind to ask you a great while: Speaking of the Emperick Sect Yesterday, you said, that, if they had held the knowledge of the Body and Nature immaterial to the Art of Physick, you would differ from them'.<sup>31</sup>

The second one, p. 52, connects Walpole as 'Dr King' with Ripperda. As said before, it is a fact that England rewarded Ripperda for his political intelligence. Talking about his Dr King, Bolingbroke states: 'He assured me, that de Duke *de Ripperda*, late prime Minister of the Kingdom of Spain, was, for some time, under his hands, and that he should not in the least have doubted of making a *perfect cure* of him, if he had not, on a sudden, unhappily fallen into disgrace; which it is not unlikely was partly occasioned by his correspondence with the Doctor, at a time when there were some differences between the two Courts; which, to the natural jealousy of the *Spaniards*, might give grounds of suspicion, and alarm them with apprehensions that some dangerous designs were carrying on, under the pretence of curing a common bodily infirmity.'

So it becomes visible that the idea of a Doctor Mandeville-Ripperda connection, which has been made explicit in the pamphlet, had been preceded by the idea of a Doctor King-Ripperda connection. Why this shift? Bolingbroke held Walpole partly responsible for Ripperda's fate, but this was not his real opinion on this issue. He called it all, in *The Craftsman* no. 33, March 31, 1727, a misunderstanding. His opinion was that Walpole was simply abusing 'Ripperda's chit-chat'<sup>32</sup> for his own purposes. But Bolingbroke stood all alone. However, on March 15, 1727, both houses of parliament, including Bolingbroke's political partner lord William Pulteney, had been unanimous in their support for Walpole.<sup>33</sup> So the moment did not appear to be opportune for Bolingbroke to repeat the tenor of what he had written a few months earlier, in December 1726, about Walpole's blame for the whole turmoil.

This political fact may have occasioned Bolingbroke to reconsider the pamphlet that he had likely prepared immediately after March 4, 1727, when the Sinzendorf and De Palm pieces had been published in the *London Gazette*. We would suspect Bolingbroke, no way changing his butt, to have removed those pages in which he described Walpole's alleged blame, and inserted the man who was, in his view, the prime-minister's or Dr Robert King's double: Dr Bernard Mandeville. This might account for the missing pages and remarks in the pamphlet, and for its concluding paragraph, page 20: 'As for the Remarks which were promised in our Title, we have indeed made such as were proper; for what better Answer can be given to such scurrilous, false, and impudent Libels than displaying the character of their Author. Are they fit to be reason'd with who presume to give the Lie to MAJESTY, who tell a Brave and Wise People, That they are *Fools* and *Asses*, and who endeavour, under specious pretences, to sow Discord between the best KING and the happiest Subjects in the whole World?'

*The Craftsman* contains in its first year some more allusions which may confirm Bolingbroke's disagreement with Mandeville, or, from Mandeville's point of view, Bolingbroke's misunderstanding. No. 32, March 27, 1727: 'As the blackest designs are often cover'd with the fairest pretentions, in order to prevent detection and impose on the Publick, so the best dispositions, and worthiest actions, are subject to ill-natur'd glosses and false representations. I have met with some modern philosophers, who maintain that *Courage* proceeds originally from *fear*, that *humility* is commonly founded in *pride*, and *liberality* to others derived from *self-love*; but the *political virtues* are more especially liable to invidious comments, which the malice of opposite parties is always ready to fix upon them; from whence it comes to pass, that the warmest *patriotism* and sincerest concern for the *publick Good*, are often set forth in the most opposite light, and imputed to *private pique*, *disappointment*, and *ambition*.' And in no. 43, May 5, 1727: 'The mind of man being naturally subject to Pride, Vanity and Ambition, it makes us all eager in the pursuit of Honours, Titles and Distinctions of preheminance, either in Dress or Appellation. For this Reason, a Monosyllable prefix'd to a Man's Christian Name, a Medal hung about his Neck, or a piece of colour'd Ribband cross his Shoulders are esteem'd of great value, and by some persons prefer'd even to Riches and Power; and, however trifling such ornaments, Badges or Titles may seem in the Eyes of a morose Cynick or an abstracted Philosopher; yet, when justly bestow'd, they are certainly very useful, expedient and necessary for the encouragement of Virtue, Patriotism, Fortitude and Merit of all kinds.'

But, in itself, these were no criticisms which would have worried Mandeville. And besides, Mandeville must have been aware that Bolingbroke might have taken the reproach at heart, which he had written in *Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church and National Happiness* (1720): 'An *English* Man who loves his Country, and complains of this Conduct (i.e. king George's conduct concerning Spain's invasion of Sicily in 1718), must be an arch Politician' (p. 344).

### **5. The name of Horatio**

It was not in *The Fable, Part II*, that Mandeville used the name *Horatio* for the first time. He referred to *Horatio* in *The Female Tatler*, nr. 109, from March 22 to March 24, 1710. There it says: "*Horatio* was a Man of Parts, an able Statesman, and lived in great Splendor, but too much indulging his Pleasures he was turned out and forced to live meanly upon a small Estate in the country. He might several times have been reinstated in his Post, if he could have truckl'd to one that had been inferior to him; but the Soul of *Horatio* was too big, he embraces his Poverty, and makes an admirable Treatise in Praise of a Country Life, and the satisfaction he found in it: He thanks his Misfortunes that they had brought him acquainted with Tranquillity, which otherwise he could not have tasted, and would now not part with for a Diadem. The Ministry is alter'd, *Horatio* is recall'd, forgets what he has writ, and is a great Courtier as ever."

That Bolingbroke was meant by *Horatio* or 'Horace', may be concluded from the way Bolingbroke's *The Craftsman extraordinary. Being remarks on a late pamphlet, intitled, Observations on the conduct of Great Britain, &c.* (1729) was announced in his paper.<sup>33a</sup> In *The Craftsman* no. 132, January 11, 1729, it says: 'In a few days will be

published, HORACE *against* ROBIN; or, *Some seasonable Remarks on the late Difference between the Authors of the LONDON and the BRITISH JOURNALS*'. As 'Robin' is Robert Walpole, 'Horace against Robin' means: 'Bolingbroke against Walpole'.

But the notion of Bolingbroke and Horace being parallels, was far more general. Just as Isaac Kramnick asserts that Bolingbroke was *The Craftsman*, so Jacob Fuchs explains that *The Craftsman* was Horace.<sup>33b</sup> The admiring reasons the Bolingbroke's circle had for comparing Bolingbroke with Horace, were obviously quite unlike the satirical reasons the Walpole camp, e.g. 'orator' John Henley (1692-1756) had for referring to him this way.<sup>33c</sup>

The name of 'Horatio' as referring to Bolingbroke was used by James Pitt alias 'Publicola'. Pitt was one of Robert Walpole's leading political writers in *The London Journal* against Bolingbroke and *The Craftsman*. His two *dialogues between Philocles and Horatio concerning Virtue and Pleasure* (formerly wrongly ascribed to Benjamin Franklin)<sup>34</sup> appeared in Robert Walpole's *London Journal* no. 504, March 29, 1729 and no. 529, September 20, 1729. In Pitt's dialogues, obviously inspired by Mandeville's *dialogues between Cleomenes and Horatio*, the character of *Philocles* is "Shaftesburian", and *Horatio* is Bolingbroke. It may be added here that Pitt may not have been happy with a possible misunderstanding of Mandeville's dialogues, in the sense that Mandeville seems to connect Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke as being about the same, by stating: 'Horatio, who had found great Delight in my Lord's *Shaftesbury's* polite manner of Writing, his fine Raillery, and blending Virtue with good Manners, was a great Stickler for the Social System'. In fact, Mandeville did not lump them together, since *Cleomenes* did advise *Horatio* to read also Shaftesbury again. Pitt's dialogues, however, in defending Shaftesbury, are not only aimed against Bolingbroke, but also critical against Mandeville as for his notion of self-denial.

(By using *Horatio* instead of *Horace*, Mandeville avoided a possible misunderstanding that he might mean the Roman poet Horace, whom he had called 'my friend Horace' in *A Search into the Nature of Society*, in *The Fable of the Bees*, i, ed. Kaye, p. 337.)

## **6. The name of Cleomenes.**

As for the name of *Cleomenes*, we find *Cleomenes*, king of Sparta, being mentioned in the context of *The Craftsman*, no. 31, March 27, 1727. Though *Cleomenes's* part in this article being more or less casual, his name was quite appropriate to being used by Mandeville, since it must have reminded Bolingbroke of John Dryden's play *Cleomenes, the Spartan Hero* (1692). The name of *Cleomenes* was a safe and particularly defiant<sup>35</sup> choice in view of Bolingbroke's appreciation for Dryden (1631-1700), to whom he paid a special tribute in 1697 by writing a poem of dedication.<sup>36</sup>

## **7. Horatio's character and Bolingbroke's biography.**

For brevity's sake referring to information in biographical literature about Bolingbroke, by e.g. Dickinson and Kramnick, and how he has generally been characterized, it is not difficult to recognize Bolingbroke in Mandeville's description of *Horatio*, which we deal with here next.

*Horatio* 'represents one of the modish People, but rather of the better sort of them as to Morality; tho' he seems to have a greater Distrust of the Sincerity of Clergymen, than he has of that of any other Profession, and to be of the Opinion, which is express'd

in that trite and specious as well as false and injurious saying, *Priests of all Religions are the same*'. This saying is by Dryden, from the same book for which Bolingbroke wrote his poem of dedication.<sup>37</sup> But by this saying Mandeville is also referring directly to *The Craftsman*, as Bolingbroke had based the name of his paper on a pamphlet by Thomas Gordon, entitled *The Craftsmen, A Sermon or Paraphrase upon several Verses of the 19<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles* (1720). 'Take notice (...) of the wide Difference that there is between these High Priests Church, and the Bible-Church! The Priests Church being a Trading Church, and Money being her End, and Grimace her Ware. (...) Whatever enlightened the People, marred the Market of the Priests. *By this Craft we have our Wealth*.' (p. 17). So the craftsmen are the crafty men, that is, the priests. And among these moneyed men, Walpole is Bolingbroke's prime craftsman.

Mandeville continues: 'As to his Studies, he is supposed to be tolerably well vers'd in the Classics, and to have read more than is usual for People of Quality, that are born to great Estates. He is a Man of strict Honour, and of Justice as well as Humanity; rather profuse than covetous, and altogether disinterested in his Principles'. Mandeville obviously refers here to Bolingbroke's 'inconsistencies in his character and the twists and turns in his career'(Dickinson), his desire for political power, to which his principles, including his ideology, had proven to be of minor or no importance. Dickinson states about his childhood and education: 'What can be tentatively pieced together, however, suggests that St John had an unusual background and education, a fact which might go so far to explain his lack of fixed principles and the suspicion with which he was regarded by many people. In his early years he clearly lacked a stable, integrated family background and was subjected to conflicting pressures'.<sup>38</sup>

Mandeville goes on: 'He has been Abroad, seen the World, and is supposed to be possess'd of the greatest part of Accomplishments, that usually gain a Man the Reputation of being very much of a Gentleman'.<sup>39</sup> 'Abroad' means exile and 'seen the world' refers to Bolingbroke's travels, in which, before 1708, Mandeville had apparently been a companion.

*Horatio* is *Cleomenes*'s antagonist, of whom Mandeville adds: 'If ever he offers anything that savours of Libertinism,<sup>40</sup> or is otherwise exceptionable, which *Cleomenes* does not reprove him for in the best and most serious Manner, or to which he gives not the most satisfactory and convincing Answer, I [i.e. Mandeville] am to blame, otherwise not'.<sup>41</sup> Fully served by his intellectual capacities and interests, power politics were always Bolingbroke's overriding drive, an obsession which apparently overruled social trustworthiness. Contrary to Bolingbroke, Mandeville was very keen on staying away from party politics.<sup>42</sup> In this respect it may be useful to reflect on *Horatio*'s involvement in party disputes, which causes *Cleomenes*'s reminder to *Horatio*: 'It is many years ago, you know, that it has been agreed between us never to enter into Party Disputes'.<sup>43</sup> As for himself Bolingbroke was not disgusted by money. A banker of his and his second wife was Sir Matthew Decker, a Dutchman who was naturalized and a friend of Bernard Mandeville's.<sup>44</sup> This may account for Decker's appearance in *The Fable of the Bees, Part II*.<sup>45, 46</sup>

## Notes.

1. *Fable* ii, p. 10. (N.B. Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, i and ii, ed. F.B. Kaye.)

2. *Fable ii*, p. 21.
3. *Fable ii*, p. 16.
4. *Fable ii*, p. 20. Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees, Part ii* (1729), deals with the subject of comparing the two opposite systems or schemes of Shaftesbury and Mandeville. The subject of martial courage and honour, in connection with the contrast between Christendom (see Dryden's quote in note 2) and Christianity, is treated of in *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War* (1732).
5. *Fable ii*, p. 20.
6. Mandeville used the same criticism against George Berkeley.
7. *Fable ii*, p. 4.
8. Christine Gerrard, *The patriot opposition to Walpole; Politics, poetry and national myth 1725-1742* (1994), Preface. She does not mention Bernard Mandeville.
9. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 47.
10. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 201.
- 10a. See also Samuel Wesley's poem on Walpole, Bolingbroke and Mandeville.
11. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 204. Kramnick refers to *The Craftsman*, nos. 291, 312, 320 (29 January, 24 June, 19 August 1732).
12. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 74. He quotes from this letter (British Museum, Add. MSS. 4948A, folio 422-425): 'Not content to neglect he ridiculed every public virtue. Not content to ridicule them, he established every opposite vice, and took off that remnant of shame which might have been improved to check, and under a better administration, to reform them'.
13. Paulette Carrive summarizes these articles, from 29 January, 24 June and 19 August 1732, in *La philosophie des passions chez Bernard Mandeville* (1983), ii, p. 699-700. Her conclusion that it is to these attacks in *The Craftsman* that Mandeville alludes to in *A Letter to Dion*, does not seem plausible, because *A Letter to Dion* is already mentioned in *The London magazine: or, Gentleman's monthly intelligencer*, in its Monthly Catalogue for May 1732, p. 105, item 46. In *A Letter to Dion* Mandeville refers to both Walpole's *The London Journal* and Bolingbroke's *The Craftsman*. As for the first paper, Mandeville might mean Francis Hutcheson's (1694-1746) *Three Letters to the London Journal* (June 1729), and as for the second Bolingbroke's attacks in 1726 and 1727.
- N.B. Simon Varey does not name Mandeville at all in *Lord Bolingbroke, Contributions to The Craftsman* (1982).
14. See the recent thesis by Sytze van der Veen, *Een Spaanse Groninger in Marokko. De levens van Johan Willem Ripperda (1682-1737)*, (2007).
15. Ripperda cashed in this excessive reward, after escaping from Spain in 1728 and obtaining refuge in England. See Sytze van der Veen, p.349
16. From: 'Second Parliament of George I: Fifth session - begins 17/1/1727', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons : volume 6: 1714-1727* (1742), pp. 372-398.
17. 'Letters relating to the Treaty of Vienna (1727)', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons : volume 8: 1733-1734* (1742), pp. 357-362.
18. Bolingbroke and especially Townshend had known Ripperda at least since 1713, for Ripperda had socially been circling around the parties involved in the negotiations which led to the Treaty of Utrecht. (Van der Veen, note 19, p. 550-1, refers to Stanhope to Townshend, 27-12-1725; Coxe, Walpole II, p. 578)

19. In *The Craftsman* no. 78, December 30, 1727, p. 363, there is an advertisement for 'Proper for New-Year's-Gifts to Children of Quality and Distinction: Political Cards describing, in beautiful and instructive Prints, the terrible, tragical Ends of *wicked Ministers* in all Ages and Nations; viz. (...) 6. The Duke *de Ripperda* in a dark Dungeon; with a Glass of *Poison* and a dagger before him.' Ripperda is no. 6 out of 7. He escaped from Spain in 1728.
20. It may be added here that it is mentioned in literature that Mandeville was a sort of protected by Lord Macclesfield. But if this protection would have existed at all, it should be remarked that Macclesfield had been forced to resign in 1725.
21. Simon Varey, *Lord Bolingbroke, Contributions to The Craftsman* (1982), p. xiv, notices that *The Craftsman* being popular, it was soon reprinted. This reprint took the form of a sequence of pamphlets, the first of which contained the essays from nos. 1 to 9. The pamphlet was entitled *The Craftsman: Being a Critique on the Times*, and was printed for J. Smith, near the Royal-Exchange. Varey states (p. xxix, note 11) that J. Smith's name appeared only in the colophon of each of the first fifteen issues of *The Craftsman*(...). Smith's last issue was for Monday, January 23, 1727. Varey suggests that 'J. Smith' could have been a fictitious name to cover a printer reluctant to attach his own name.
22. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 274, note 43.
23. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 19.
24. Secret; this word recurs in the pamphlet.
25. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 21.
26. *The Craftsman*, 3, p. 25-7.
27. Shelley Burt, p. 129, note 5. *A treatise of the hypochondriack and hysterick passions, vulgarly call'd the hypo in men and vapours in women* was reprinted in 1976 in the set *Classics in Psychiatry*.
28. *Fable* i, p. xxix, note 6.
29. See *A treatise of the hypochondriack and hysterick passions, vulgarly call'd the hypo in men and vapours in women* (1711), p. xii-xiii: 'From a Romantick Pretence, that neglecting their private Interest, Men ought only to labour for the Good of Others, it is become a fashion among the Censorious to give the name of *Quack-Bills* to all the Writings of Physicians, by which it is possible, that besides the common Welfare of the People, they can have any By-end of encreasing their Reputation and promoting their own Practice'. If such physicians are called Quacks, 'then I am one'.
30. Bernard Mandeville, *A treatise of the hypochondriack and hysterick passions, vulgarly call'd the hypo in men and vapours in women* (1711), p.xi.
31. Bernard Mandeville, *A treatise of the hypochondriack and hysterick passions, vulgarly call'd the hypo in men and vapours in women* (1711), p. 116-7. In the revised edition (1730), p. 128, refers to p. 55-7.
32. Bolingbroke, *The Craftsman extraordinary; containing an answer to the Defence of the enquiry into the reasons of the conduct of Great-Britain* (1729), p. 7. Name in full in Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, *A collection of political tracts* (1748), p. 151.
33. H.T. Dickinson, *Bolingbroke* (1970), p. 224: 'The opposition failed to widen the breach between Walpole and Townshend, because it too could not agree on a united policy but was also in contact with both the Austrians and Spaniards. Pulteney was on close terms with the Austrian ambassador, Count Palm, while Bolingbroke alarmed both

Pulteney and Wyndham by his efforts to get information from his friends in France'. 'Bolingbroke contented himself with negative criticisms of the ministry's conduct of diplomacy'.

33a. (Anon.) , *Observations on the conduct of Great Britain, with regard to the negociations and other transactions abroad* (1729). This is a ministerial pamphlet, by 'an eminent Courtier'.

33b. Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his circle* (1968), p. 274, note 43; and Jacob Fuchs, *Reading Pope's Imitations of Horace* (1989), p. 48-52. Fuchs observes that after *The Craftsman* no 182 (27 December 1729), which 'makes Horace more than a friend: he is an exemplar for the Craftsman', 'the opposition [being Bolingbroke c.s.] seems to lose whatever interest it once had in making Horace into an exemplar' (p. 49-50). Perhaps Mandeville's *Cleomenes-Horatio* dialogues in *The Fable of the Bees, Part II*, published in 1729, made Horace less expedient for Bolingbroke?

33c. John Henley must have referred to Bolingbroke in his academical oration of December 21, 1726, entitled *The Character and Stile of Horace, and the Advance of Latin Poetry*. John Henley's oration is mentioned in his *Oratory Transactions*, no. II, 1729. Later Henley initiated a pro-Walpole weekly called the *Hyp Doctor*, established in opposition to Bolingbroke's *The Craftsman*.

Its name *Hyp Doctor* may refer indirectly to Mandeville, taking into account both that Walpole had been described as 'Doctor Robert King', as mentioned above, see also note 26, and Mandeville's statement about 'the nation hypp'd' and the 'state hypochondriacks', in *Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness*, ed. 1729, p. 376. In literature it is suggested that Horace Walpole would have been meant by *Horace*. But Henley denied this. In his *Why how now, Gossip Pope?* (1736), p. 5, he states that he 'neither mentioned, nor could intend him' in this oration, adding that 'I can show the Manuscript, as it was, and as pronounced'.

34. Alfred Owen Aldridge tells in *Franklin's "Shaftesburian" dialogues not Franklin's* (in *American Literature*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (May, 1949), pp. 151-159), p. 151, that the *Horatio* in these dialogues is "a hedonist, egoist, and relativist, and loosely a spokesman for the philosophy of Bernard Mandeville". This is a mistake: *Cleomenes* is the spokesman of Mandeville's opinions or his alter ego in *The Fable of the Bees, Part II* (published early in 1729), and not *Horatio*. Aldridge doubted (p. 154) whether James Pitt could have been the author, but Simon Targett (*Oxford DNB*) has established that Pitt's earliest attributable essay appeared on 18 February 1728.

35. Dryden's *Cleomenes* first Lines: 'Dejected! no, it shall never be said, That Fate had power upon a *Spartan* soul: My mind on its own Centre stands unmov'd, And Stable as the Fabrick of the World, Propt on it self: still I am *Cleomenes*.'

36. John Dryden, *The works of Virgil containing his Pastorals, Georgics and Aeneis : adorn'd with a hundred sculptures / translated into English verse by Mr. Dryden*. (1697). This work contains a poem by Henry St John, called *To mr. Dryden*.

37. This saying refers to John Dryden, *The works of Virgil containing his Pastorals, Georgics and Aeneis : adorn'd with a hundred sculptures / translated into English verse by Mr. Dryden*. (1697).

38. H.T. Dickinson, *Bolingbroke* (1970), p. 1, including note 3.

39. *Fable ii*, p. 16.

40. Randolph Trumbach (p.81): 'In the first three decades of the century, however, the libertine mode was more likely to be Epicurean rather than Shaftesburean. The most brilliant example was Henry St John, the future Lord Bolingbroke, who turned twenty in 1698. Bolingbroke and Shaftesbury were apparently acquaintances, and it is clear from Bolingbroke's later mature writings after he had fallen from power that he had seriously taken up some of Shaftesbury's ideas. (Shaftesbury, for his part, regarded Bolingbroke as a genius corrupted by his desire for power). See on libertinism, Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, Randolph Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution* (1998), dl 1, p. 78-83.
41. *Fable ii*, p. 21.
42. See H.T. Dickinson, *The politics of Bernard Mandeville*, in Irwin Primer (ed.) *Mandeville Studies* (1975), p. 80-97.
43. *Fable ii*, p. 42.
44. H.T. Dickinson, *Bolingbroke* (1970), p. 151, 177.
45. *Fable ii*, p. 195. Jonathan Swift, who belonged to Bolingbroke's circle, calls Decker an 'abominable Rascall'. (In Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford, 11 January 1725, a letter, in J. Swift (OUP).
46. Decker lived at Richmond. In *The Fable of the Bees, Part II*, p. 265, Cleomenes (Bernard Mandeville, living then at Lambeth) says: 'I am obliged to dine at *Windsor* tomorrow; if you are not otherwise engaged, I can carry you, where the Honour of your Company will be highly esteem'd: My Coach shall be ready at Nine; you know you are in my way.' Horatio (Bolingbroke, owner of Battersea manor) answers: 'A fine Opportunity indeed of three or four Hours Chat.' So Mandeville may have had this route in mind: Lambeth - Battersea - Windsor.