History of European Ideas

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rhei20

Adam Smith on the public provision of education

J. L. Z. Rauwald

To cite this article: J. L. Z. Rauwald (09 Feb 2024): Adam Smith on the public provision of education, History of European Ideas, DOI: 10.1080/01916599.2024.2313830

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2024.2313830

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 09 Feb 2024.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 13

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rhei20

HISTORY OF EUROPEAN IDEAS
https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2024.2313830

Adam Smith on the public provision of education

J. L. Z. Rauwald

Faculty of History, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

ABSTRACT
Although Adam Smith's thoughts on education have attracted significant scholarly attention, his ideas on how the primary education of children should be funded has been relatively neglected. I re-examine Smith's nuanced position and argue that Smith had a more flexible view of education funding than has hitherto been recognised. By extending the Scottish educational model, Smith proposed a direct contribution of government to the costs of educating poor children. In addition, his discussion of scholarships indicate that he favoured further indirect subsidies to education. These significant subsidies were designed to ensure that education was accessible and affordable to most people in society, who would only have to contribute a small sum. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that for pupils whose family were unable to support their education, Smith might have favoured a full payment of their fees. Situating Smith's intervention on education funding within the context of the English and Scottish educational systems reveals a discussion of the role of government in society. The Smithian state that emerges from such a reading actively intervenes where necessary to prevent 'a publick evil' (WN V.i.f.60).

KEYWORDS
Adam Smith; education; education funding; Scottish enlightenment

Education is a central theme in Adam Smith's (1723–1790) work. Smith had a wide-reaching understanding of education that was not restricted to formal learning: with every social interaction, people could improve their ability to make accurate moral judgements and thereby better understand social norms. Ultimately, social learning, learning societal norms and moral conduct through social interactions, was, for Smith, also fundamental to live a happy life. While Smith primarily considered social learning in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), he explored formal educational institutions in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776).[1] These were no less important: formal education was Smith's principal remedy to the adverse consequences of the division of labour in a commercial age.

Smith's examination of education in WN has garnered significant scholarly attention. The bulk of the literature seeks to understand why education was so important to Smith and what role it could play in commercial society. The funding arrangements for these schools are often only mentioned incidentally. Most scholars contend that Smith favoured a public provision of primary education. Andrew Skinner and Craig Smith claim that Smith advocated a compulsory system of education.[2] Samuel Fleischacker and Dennis Rasmussen argue that Smith's educational proposals were aimed at the poor.[3] This is echoed by Emma Rothschild, who explains that the 'circumstances of commercial society impose the need for government expenditure on education' and that Smith proposed a

CONTACT J. L. Z. Rauwald jlzr2@cam.ac.uk Fitzwilliam College, Storeys Way, Cambridge CB3 0DG, UK

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

'plan of universal public education'.[4] Similarly, Lisa Hill explains that Smith advocated 'a publicly funded, compulsory education system', which was not dissimilar from what 'a social democrat might propose'.[5] J.R. Weinstein emphasises that the provision and accessibility of education was a duty of the sovereign for Smith.[6] This broad scholarly consensus may be one reason for the lack of detailed studies of Smith's view of the funding arrangements for educational institutions.

James Otteson has recently reconsidered Smith's view of how education should be funded and aimed to refute this broad 'scholarly consensus that Smith advocated government-funded education, at least at lower-school level'.[7] He claims that Smith did not advocate a public provision of education. According to Otteson, Smith discusses the potential benefits of such a provision 'but he ultimately does not endorse it'. Quite the contrary, as Smith also raises the downsides of such a public provision of education, Otteson 'suggests that his final position may have inclined against it'.[8] He contends further that Smith may have preferred an educational system funded by donations rather than government intervention.[9]

Otteson's challenge suggests that Smith's position may have been more nuanced than the scholarly consensus indicates. I seek to re-examine Smith's nuanced position on how primary education should be funded. He did not favour government interference or direct financial support of the education of children from wealthy families. Rather, he focused on the education of poor children. I will suggest that Smith was following the Scottish educational system by favouring a subsidised model for primary education, which made education financially accessible to families of common labourers. I suggest that in circumstances in which families could not afford the school fees for their children, the government should intervene, according to Smith. As such, Smith was not in favour of free education for all children. The subsidy that Smith advocated, however, was both direct and indirect and therefore very significant. The remaining fee that parents or families would be charged would likely be very small.

This paper firstly outlines the Scottish and English educational systems during Smith's lifetime, as they inform his discussion of pedagogy. Smith's close adherence to the Scottish educational system and his perceived shortcomings of the English system uncover a discussion of the role of the state in educational policy.[10] After this contextual foregrounding, the rest of the paper examines Smith's discussion of education. Section two explores his ideas on education through the prism of his philosophy of history. Section three outlines Smith's educational proposals for the children of poor labourers. Section four explores Smith's ideas on how education should be funded. Section five discusses Otteson's suggestion that education could be subsidised through charitable donations. In the *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, Smith compares the educational opportunities of children in Scotland with those in England.[11] With this comparison in mind, the paper will conclude with a reflection on whether Smith thought a reliance on the benevolence of the economically successful in society for the education of predominantly poor children was prudent.

I. Education in England and Scotland in the eighteenth century

M.G. Jones described the eighteenth-century in England as the 'age of benevolence'. For Jones, the most remarkable and extensive form of philanthropy were the charity schools, through which hundreds of thousands of deprived children received a basic education.[12] These schools, and the eighteenth century more widely, Jones claimed, 'was marked by a very real sense of pity and responsibility for the children whose physical and spiritual interests were lamentably neglected'. By educating these young children, the charitable donors hoped to 'build up a God-fearing population and, at the same time, would inculcate the children against the habits of sloth, debauchery and beggary, which characterised the lower orders of society'.[13] Therefore, charity schools performed an important moral role in society. In his *Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools* (1723), Bernard Mandeville (1670–1733) likewise called attention to this moral facet of charity schools. As Mandeville explained, proponents of charity schools contended that.

> Children that are taught the Principles of Religion and can read the Word of God, have a greater Opportunity to improve in Virtue and good Morality, and must certainly be more civiliz'd than others, that are suffer'd to run at random and have no body to look after them.[14]

These schools would thereby benefit society at large by reducing viciousness.[15] Mandeville questioned the effectivity of these schools and more importantly, argued that for the working poor to be happy, they had to remain ignorant.[16] Educating the poor was therefore contrary to their interest and the interest of the society for Mandeville. Smith, as we will see, had a very different view of the role of education in commercial society. Nevertheless, Mandeville's critique is insightful for two reasons: firstly, it illustrates the inherently moral function of charity schools in eighteenth century England; and, secondly, it sheds light on a discourse that critiqued the effectivity of these schools.[17]

As in England, the moral function of education was also at the heart of the Scottish schooling. Scottish protestant reformers from the late sixteenth century were in favour of the provision of schools to foster the public good by encouraging talented children and by preserving religiousness.[18] The most important of these reformers was John Knox (c. 1514–1572), whose *Book of Discipline* (1560 and 1578) provided a blueprint for what was to become the Scottish educational system.[19] As in England, improving literacy was fundamental to achieving these moral aims, as they made the Bible accessible to everyone.[20] However, the means of establishing these schools differed in Scotland, where the provision of education was founded on state legislation.[21] The main acts that formed the Scottish educational system were passed by the Scottish Parliament between 1616 and 1696. By the end of the seventeenth century, burgh councils or landowners had to fund teachers and schools, which made education much more affordable for the poor. And yet, Robert Houston explains that 'education was not free, it was not compulsory and it was not universal until the very end of the nineteenth century'.[22] According to Smout, the model of funding was one of the pillars of Scots' appraisal of the educational system: if education were to be free 'that would have made it like charity, and therefore undervalued by those who received it'. Instead, it was a subsidised system; most of the cost of primary education was covered by municipal funds in burghs and a tax on heritors (landowners) in rural areas. This subsidy 'meant that it could be cheap, and children could receive at least elementary education for a trifling sum'.[23] Importantly, Knox had also noted that the poorest children should receive this education for free.[24] Moreover, the legal foundation on which this educational system was built meant '[t]hat the law could be invoked to set up a school and to ensure the continuous payment of a master's salary'.[25]

However, the provision of education varied considerably across parishes in Scotland. In Kirkmaiden, a parish in southern Scotland, for example, the local school taught 'English, writing, arithmetic, book-keeping, navigation, and a little Latin'.[26] The teacher received a salary of 2 pounds and 8 shillings in Sterling from the Earl of Stair, the patron, and two other heritors. In addition, they received small amounts from the students: for writing and arithmetic 1s.6d., for instance. The poorest children in this parish benefitted from the charity of Andrew McMurray left 100 pounds Sterling 'which is to be applied to the benefit of the schoolmaster, [and] for educating 20 poor boys, natives of this parish'.[27] In the parish of Ayton, local government funds seem to have been used to directly fund the education of 'poor children'.[28] By contrast, in Kingskettle in Fife, the poorest did not seem to benefit from such charity. The teacher's salary in Kingskettle was 22 pounds and therefore significantly higher than in Kirkmaiden. The costs to students for classes was also higher than in Kirkmaiden, with writing costing 1s.8d. and arithmetic costing 2s.. Moreover, students in Kingskettle did not have the option to learn book-keeping and navigation.[29] Donald Withrington noted that there were numerous disputes about whether to include potentially more useful subjects, such as book-keeping and geometry.[30] Although Kirkmaiden and Kingskettle are only two case-studies, the picture of education in Scotland in the eighteenth-century is marked by diversity in cost and subjects taught. It is also important to note that this 'national' system of education did not extend to the Highlands, where

education was mostly dominated by charity schools.[31] Instead of representing a cohesive national system of education, the Scottish system may therefore better be characterised as an ideal, which varied considerably across different parishes.

Nonetheless, the educational system in Scotland was widely regarded to be superior to England's in the eighteenth century.[32] In *The Adventures of Roderick Random* (1748), Tobias Smollett (1721–1771) commented on the cheapness of primary education in Scotland:

> It now remains, to give my reasons for making the chief personage of this work a North-Briton; which are chiefly these: I could at a small expence bestow on him such education as I thought the dignity of his birth and character required, which could not possibly be obtained in England, by such slender means as the nature of my plan would afford.[33]

Daniel Defoe (c. 1660–1731) also heaped praise on Scotland's school system because it improved literacy rates among the poor. By contrast, he asked 'how full of Ignorance are the dark Villages in our Land of Light, and how many thousand Parishes are there in England, where a third Part of the People can neither write nor read?'.[34] Perhaps, then, it is unsurprising that Smith – as we will see – closely followed the Scottish model that was based on legislation rather than charity.

II. Smith's thought on education through the prism of his philosophy of history

Smith framed his discussion on the importance of education within his stadial theory of history.[35] Until the early agricultural age, men were required to work in varied occupations, which exerted their minds and bodies. As a result of this constant exertion, hunters, shepherds, and early farmers remained inventive to overcome obstacles.[36] Moreover, every member of these rude states of society was a warrior and a statesman, allowing them to judge the actions of others and of their leaders accurately. Hence, '[h]ow far their chiefs are good judges in peace, or good leaders in war, is obvious to the observation of almost every single man among them.'[37] Smith notes that during these rude states of society, '[e]very man does, or is capable of doing, almost every thing which any other man does, or is capable of doing.'[38] The heights of knowledge and skill attained during the later stages of society may not be reached during these early states of society, but '[e]very man has a considerable degree of knowledge, ingenuity, and invention; but scarce any man has a great degree.' While this 'degree of knowledge' is not equivalent to that attained in commercial society, it 'is generally sufficient for conducting the whole simple business of the society'.[39] In other words, differences in knowledge and abilities are less developed at this stage of society. By contrast, 'in a more civilized state', the 'degree of knowledge' improves, but so do differences between members of a society.[40] The central point Smith makes here is that during the early part of a society's social development, the necessary education of individuals in society takes care of itself:

> In some cases the state of the society necessarily places the greater part of individuals in such situations as *naturally* form in them, without any attention of government, almost all the abilities and virtues which that state requires, or perhaps can admit of.[41]

Through their varied occupations and activities, people 'naturally' – and without the need for government support – learn to make public judgements and attain a satisfactory degree of knowledge and ingenuity. Campbell, Skinner, and Todd explain that '[i]t was essential to Smith's position that only the *unusual* encourages thought'.[42] The varied ways of life of all members of these early societies ensured that they were constantly confronted with the unusual and thereby preserved and developed their capacity for thought.

Smith claimed that this capacity was challenged during the commercial age. In such societies, where the division of labour is developed extensively, 'the mind' of workers falls 'into that drowsy stupidity, which, in a civilized society, seems to benumb the understanding of almost all the inferior ranks of people'.[43] The variety of occupations pursued by individuals in the rude states of society, is replaced by a variety among the society at large in the commercial age; in commercial societies, people pursue one occupation, but there are countless different occupations and scarce anyone

performs the same tasks.[44] According to Smith, this benefits the degree of knowledge attained by a society, but restricts this attainment 'to the contemplation of those few, who, being attached to no particular occupation themselves, have leisure and inclination to examine the occupations of other people'.[45] Through the 'great […] variety of objects' scholars can study, their understandings are enhanced significantly. Smith contends that the superior knowledge of these scholars 'may contribute very little to the good government or happiness of their society' unless they 'happen to be placed in some very particular situations'.[46] Even if they are placed in such situations, Smith's conclusion on the effect of most people losing their capacity for thought is damning: 'Notwithstanding the great abilities of those few, all the nobler parts of the human character may be, in a great measure, obliterated and extinguished in the great body of the people.'[47]

Smith further elaborated on the adverse effects of the division of labour in perhaps one of the most famous sections of WN. As a result of the monotonous labour performed by workers, they lose the 'habit' to exert their minds, causing them to become 'as stupid and ignorant as is possible for a human creature to become'. They can no longer discuss anything beyond their workplace or immediate needs and lose the strength to cope with irregular lives, such as that of soldiers. Importantly, the corruption of the mind also undermines their capacity to make accurate public judgements:

> The torpor of his mind renders him, not only incapable of relishing or bearing a part in any rational conversation, but of conceiving any generous, noble, or tender sentiment, and consequently of forming any just judgment concerning many even of the ordinary duties of private life. Of the great and extensive interests of his country, he is altogether incapable of judging; and unless very particular pains have been taken to render him otherwise, he is equally incapable of defending his country in war.[48]

The development of the division of labour therefore undermines the capacity of labourers to make public judgements, according to Smith. This inability to make accurate judgements extended to the private sphere, too. Labourers are so ingrained in their step of the work process that they cannot even speak to their neighbour about their work as it is too specialised, leading to social isolation.[49] In LJ, Smith notes that this focus on one's work process 'confines the views of men'. Smith claimed that '[w]hen the mind is employed about a variety of objects it is some how expanded and enlarged'.[50] This confinement of the mind may contribute to the social isolation of labourers. This could challenge the continual social interaction that was fundamental to preserving the capacity to make accurate moral judgements, according to Smith. For him, this is problematic because this capacity is necessary to lead a virtuous and consequently happy life.[51]

Corruption was also not limited to the mind, according to Smith. He noted that '[i]t corrupts even the activity of his body, and renders him incapable of exerting his strength with vigour and perseverance, in any other employment than that to which he has been bred'. Smith concludes that the 'dexterity' of the labourer at his employment 'seems, in this manner, to be acquired at the expence of his intellectual, social, and martial virtues'.[52] Notwithstanding the significant benefits of the division of labour to productivity, its potentially adverse effects on labourers are therefore considerable.

Reflecting and drawing upon Smith's comments on the psychological effects of commerce, Mary Wollstonecraft (1759–1797) noted that commerce transformed men 'into machines' and thereby 'renders the mind entirely inactive'.[53] For Smith, these effects were at least partially remediable; if remedied, he – unlike Wollstonecraft – thought 'the division of labor and luxury economy could in the long term mean that the poor would be better off in absolute terms than in a more equal society'.[54]

For Smith, education was the principal tool with which the devastating psychological effects of the division of labour in commercial society could be prevented. As outlined above, the education of the people in earlier states of society did not need to be supported, as they learned everything they needed naturally through their varying occupations. On the contrary,

> [i]n other cases the state of the society does not place the greater part of individuals in such situations, and some attention of government is necessary in order to prevent the almost entire corruption and degeneracy of the great body of the people.[55]

For Smith, whether government action was required to educate the people was therefore tied to the development of society and to the associated development of the division of labour. *How* Smith thought government should intervene in commercial society will be examined next.

III. Smith's educational proposals

Smith claimed that '[t]he education of the common people requires, perhaps, in a civilized and commercial society, the attention of the publick more than that of people of some rank and fortune'.[56] The education of children from well-off families did not require government action because, according to Smith, affluent parents gladly supported their children's education until their late teens. Should these children not receive a proper education, 'it is seldom from the want of expence laid out upon their education; but from the improper application of that expence'.[57] Government should not intervene merely because parents spend available funds on incompetent teachers. Even if their education were to prove deficient, the occupations of 'people of some rank or fortune […] are not, like those of the common people, simple and uniform'.[58] Perhaps they would thereby learn to deal with unusual obstacles through their work naturally. Moreover, the drawbacks of the division of labour would not affect them as significantly. Affluent individuals continued to pursue complex occupations that 'exercise[d] the head more than the hands'. The wealthy also had more leisure time, giving them the opportunity to educate themselves in adult life.[59] On the contrary, the poor.

> have little time to spare for education. Their parents can scarce afford to maintain them even in infancy. As soon as they are able to work, they must apply to some trade by which they can earn their subsistence. That trade too is generally so simple and uniform as to give little exercise to the understanding; while, at the same time, their labour is both so constant and so severe, that it leaves them little leisure and less inclination to apply to, or even to think of any thing else.[60]

Government should therefore support the education of poor children. The poor did not have the time to pursue further education in adulthood, as they depended on their employment for their subsistence. At the same time, they need this education more because they experience the damning effects of the division of labour more intensely.

While poor children could not receive as extensive an education as the wealthy, they could – and should – be taught 'the most essential parts of education […] to read, write, and account' in childhood before they became workers, according to Smith.[61] Closely following the Scottish educational system, Smith proposed schools to be established in every parish or district, which could provide this basic education to children. Intervening in an ongoing debate about which subjects schools should teach, Smith rejected the value of learning 'a little smattering of Latin', which was commonplace in Scottish schools in the eighteenth century.[62] Rather, Smith this to be replaced by classes 'in the elementary parts of geometry and mechanicks'. Should this proposal be implemented, Smith claimed 'the literary education of this rank of people would perhaps be as complete as it can be'.[63] Smith initially claimed that the public could *encourage* this education 'by giving small premiums, and little badges of distinction, to the children of the common people who excel in them'.[64] These likely fostered emulation among the pupils.[65] However, Smith went further by noting that '[t]he publick can *impose* upon almost the whole body of the people the necessity of acquiring those most essential parts of education'.[66] This imposition could be enforced by only allowing those that had undergone 'an examination or probation in them' to 'obtain the freedom in any corporation, or be allowed to set up any trade either in a village or town corporate'.[67]

The education of the republics of Ancient Greece and Rome aimed to preserve the practice of military exercises and the martial spirit, which 'in the progress of improvement […], unless government takes proper pains to support it, goes gradually to decay'. Smith claimed the defence and thus

the continued existence of the state rested upon this martial spirit.[68] Through the encouragement and imposition of gymnastic and military exercises, the republics of Ancient Greece and Rome could preserve their citizens' martial spirit.[69] These ancient republics facilitated these gymnastic exercises by creating a space, where they could be practiced, and by naming teachers, who were, however, wholly paid by their pupils.[70] They also presented particularly talented pupils with 'badges of distinction' and offered premiums to these students to encourage them and others to excel. Finally, they *de facto* obliged all citizens to undergo these exercises, as everyone had 'to serve a certain number of years, if called upon, in the armies of the republick' and without having undergone the training they 'could not be fit for that service'.[71] Smith explained that cowardice, the inability to defend or revenge oneself, was a deficiency of 'one of the most essential parts of the character of a man'.[72] Smith compared the devastating effect of cowardice on the mind to the effect of a body losing some of its limbs. Indeed, Smith claimed, cowardice had an even more significant effect, as 'happiness and misery, which reside altogether in the mind, must necessarily depend more upon the healthful or unhealthful, the mutilated or entire state of the mind, than upon that of the body'.[73] Smith considered the happiness of the people to be an important political aim; as he wrote in TMS, '[a]ll constitutions of government […] are valued only in proportion as they tend to promote the happiness of those who live under them. This is their sole use and end'.[74] Anything that impairs this happiness likewise undermines the sovereign's purpose. In WN, Smith contended that remedying the defects of cowardice 'would still deserve the most serious attention of government' even if the martial spirit did not influence a society's ability to defend itself. To further exemplify his point, Smith compares the effects of cowardice on the mind to a plague or pandemic. Government should act to prevent any potential great 'publick evil'.[75]

According to Smith, '[t]he same thing may be said of the gross ignorance and stupidity which, in a civilized society, seem so frequently to benumb the understandings of all the inferior ranks of people.'[76] Defence posed an external political threat; corruption, enthusiasm, and superstition an internal threat. That Smith compared government action to preserve martial spirit (and thus defence) with necessary government action to counteract the effects of the division of labour underlines just how important he thought educating poor children was. Indeed, Smith claims that the effects of the division of labour may be even more devastating than those of cowardice:

> A man, without the proper use of the intellectual faculties of a man, is, if possible, more contemptible than even a coward, and seems to be mutilated and deformed in a still more essential part of the character of human nature.[77]

The government should therefore ensure that 'the inferior ranks of people […] should not be altogether uninstructed' even if it did not benefit from this education itself.[78] However, Smith argues the government would benefit significantly from the instruction of poor children:

> The more they are instructed, the less liable they are to the delusions of enthusiasm and superstition, which, among ignorant nations, frequently occasion the most dreadful disorders. An instructed and intelligent people besides are always more decent and orderly than an ignorant and stupid one. They feel themselves, each individually, more respectable, and more likely to obtain the respect of their lawful superiors, and they are therefore more disposed to respect those superiors. They are more disposed to examine, and more capable of seeing through, the interested complaints of faction and sedition, and they are, upon that account, less apt to be misled into any wanton or unnecessary opposition to the measures of government.[79]

Earlier in the section on education, Smith commented on the folly of superstition by explaining how 'great phenomena of nature' (e.g. lightning and thunder) had originally inspired wonder and curiosity of their causes: 'Superstition first attempted to satisfy this curiosity by referring all those wonderful appearances to the immediate agency of the gods'.[80] According to Smith, people initially thought 'the invisible hand of Jupiter' intervened to cause these seemingly supernatural events.[81] Science, 'the great antidote to the poison of enthusiasm and superstition', could enable people to overcome these supernatural explanations and find the true natural causes of these events.[82] Smith echoed the warnings of David Hume (1711–1776) when he claimed that superstition and

enthusiasm could cause political instability.[83] Smith ends the article on the education of youth by providing the most consequential reason for government to ensure everyone has at least a basic education:

> In free countries, where the safety of government depends very much upon the favourable judgment which the people may form of its conduct, it must surely be of the highest importance that they should not be disposed to judge rashly or capriciously concerning it.[84]

As discussed above, making accurate public judgements was learned by people naturally through their varied occupations in early states of society. However, as society developed, this trait was lost. As is well known, Smith thought that to ensure common people do not succumb to 'faction and sedition', government must make basic education accessible to everyone in society. The comparison with the role of education in preserving the martial spirit (and therefore defence) in Ancient Greece and Rome, signals that Smith thought primary education was important not only to the individuals concerned but also society at large. For Smith, education had two principal aims: first, furnishing children with the intellectual tools to counteract the misery of corruption; second – and potentially more important – to avert a potential political crisis which could ensue as a result of this corruption. Otteson recognises the former, but overlooks the latter. This latter point, however, is crucial in understanding Smith's reasoning for the public provision of education.

IV. Smith on the funding arrangements for the education of poor children

Education was therefore very important to Smith. The main point of my paper, however, is to explore Smith's ideas on how it should be funded. I will suggest that Smith had a more flexible view of education funding than many recognise:[85] if families could pay for their children's education, they should; if they could only pay some money toward their schooling, then they should receive a subsidy; if, however, they could not afford anything, the child should still receive an education, but one that was wholly supported by the government.

At the end of his discussion of both the education of youth and that of peoples of all ages, Smith summarises his views on how defence, justice, local government spending, roads and communication, and education should be funded. Before discussing funding for education, I will briefly consider each of these in turn. Defence, as it benefits everyone in society, 'should be defrayed by the general contribution of the whole society, all the different members contributing, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities'.[86] As such, not all members of society will contribute the same amount, but rather everyone would contribute a share proportionate to their income or wealth. Justice should, where possible, be paid for by the parties involved and should only be paid for by the government 'for the conviction of those criminals who have not themselves any estate or fund sufficient for paying those fees'.[87] Local government spending should, according to Smith, be funded locally. For Smith, '[i]t is unjust that the whole society should contribute towards an expence of which the benefit is confined to a part of the society'.[88] Finally, roads and communications can be paid either by those who use them or by everyone. Smith explains that these are undoubtedly 'beneficial to the whole society'. However, as someone immediately and directly benefits from them when using them, these can also be funded by tolls. This, according to Smith, 'discharge[s] the general revenue of the society from a very considerable burden'.[89]

Hereafter, Smith summarises his view on how education should be funded:

> The expence of the institutions for education and religious instruction, is likewise, no doubt, beneficial to the whole society, and may, therefore, without injustice, be defrayed by the general contribution of the whole society. This expence, however, might perhaps with equal propriety, and even with some advantage, be defrayed altogether by those who receive the immediate benefit of such education and instruction, or by the voluntary contribution of those who think they have occasion for either the one or the other.[90]

Similarly, then, to roads and communications and justice, Smith notes that education is useful to society at large. As such, it can be funded wholly by the government (1). However, it can also be

paid for entirely by those benefitting from this education and perhaps 'even with some advantage' (2). Smith had also noted at the very beginning of his section on the education of youth that '[t]he institutions for the education of the youth may, in the same manner, furnish a revenue sufficient for defraying their own expence.'[91] Finally, it could also be funded through voluntary contributions of people who believe they require education or instruction (3). Two important points must be stressed here. Firstly, as noted above, Smith's summary of public services funding comes after not only his article on the education of youth, but also his discussion of the education of peoples of all ages. In this latter section, Smith examines how small religious sects could create a fruitful space for social learning for newly urbanised adult labourers in a commercial society.[92] These religious sects would be small and independent; each preacher would be paid for by their congregation.[93] The government's role would be restricted to preventing 'them from persecuting, abusing, or oppressing one another'.[94] With regards to the education of people of all ages, therefore, Smith clearly argued that they should be funded by voluntary contribution (3).[95] Secondly, in the above quoted passage, Smith does not directly address the education of poor children. Instead, he speaks generally about funding of education, which includes the education of the children of the wealthy and university education. These go beyond the primary education he argued could be made compulsory. For both, Smith argued the individuals should pay at least a share and thus these could be attributed to (2) and (3). This paper, however, focuses on the education of poor children.

On schools for the children of common labourers, Smith wrote:

> The publick can facilitate this acquisition by establishing in every parish or district a little school, where children may be taught for a reward so moderate, that even a common labourer may afford it; the master being partly, but not wholly paid by the publick; because if he was wholly, or even principally paid by it, he would soon learn to neglect his business.[96]

Following the Scottish system, Smith proposes that the government should *establish* a school in every district or parish. Smith does not explain how this would be done, but considering his general agreement with the Scottish system, it seems likely he would follow its model: central government mandated that each district must have a school and local government was tasked with establishing, providing and at least partially funding these institutions. Smith notes that only a portion of the teacher's salary was to be funded by the students themselves. The costs of the building and a part of the teacher's income was to be government funded.

Smith's comments on teachers' income also agree with the Scottish model. Teachers are no different to other workers in that 'the exertion of the greater part of those who exercise it, is always in proportion to the necessity they are under of making that exertion'.[97] According to Smith, the effort of workers is always greatest when they fully depend on the income from this employment. Competition further enhances this exertion: 'Rivalship and emulation render excellency, even in mean professions, an object of ambition, and frequently occasion the very greatest exertions.'[98] Applying this to the educational sector broadly, Smith notes that secure salaries for teachers disconnect their pay for their performance, enhancing the natural laziness of man rather than the exertion.[99] Smith illustrated the undesirable effect of decoupling performance and pay by examining two different university systems. At universities where professors were at least mostly reliant on the fees of their students, the '[r]eputation in his profession is still of some importance to him, and he still has some dependency upon the affection, gratitude, and favourable report of those who have attended upon his instructions'. He can gain 'these favourable sentiments […] in no way so well as by deserving them, that is, by the abilities and diligence with which he discharges every part of his duty'.[100] By contrast, at universities where professors were wholly paid through secure salaries, '[h]is interest is, in this case, set as directly in opposition to his duty as it is possible to set it.'[101] Hence, Smith claimed that at the University of Oxford, which he attended from 1740 to 1746, 'the greater part of the publick professors have, for these many years, given up altogether even the pretence of teaching'.[102] Smith also applies this to schools in England: 'In England the publick schools are much less corrupted than the universities. […] The reward of the schoolmaster in most

cases depends principally, in some cases almost entirely, upon the fees or honoraries of his scholars.'[103]

According to Smith, teachers were therefore more industrious when they relied on the continued custom of their students. This does not necessarily imply that he thought only those that could afford an education should receive one. Smith argued the cost of education should be kept so low that common labourers should be able to afford it. As noted above, this was one of the central points which Scots thought made their school system superior to the English.[104] Importantly, however, Smith did not apply this cost of education to every individual student. He merely states that the teacher should not be paid by a salary and that he should depend on the contributions of the individual students. If there were a handful of pupils in a class which were wholly government-funded – as was the case in the parish of Ayton in southern Scotland – this threshold could still be reached.[105]

In addition to this direct funding of the education of poor children, Smith also discussed the effect of scholarships and bursaries for future teachers in a section on the effect of government policies on wages and specifically on how certain policies artificially enhance competition above its natural level and thereby reduce the wages of affected professions below their natural level.[106] This indirect subsidy to education is often overlooked. Smith contended that there are five factors that determine the natural wages of different occupations: an occupations agreeableness; the difficulty of learning the skill to fulfil a role; the constancy of employment; the trust that is placed in the employee; and, finally, the probability of succeeding in the role.[107] On education specifically, Smith noted that similar to machinery, investment in education must be recuperated in good time.[108] Smith explains that because '[e]ducation in the ingenious arts and in the liberal professions, is still more tedious and expensive […] The pecuniary recompense, therefore, […] ought to much more liberal: and it is so accordingly'.[109] Without any interference in this natural balance of wages, an unskilled day labourer should earn less than a teacher, as it requires more skill to be teacher and much trust is placed in these individuals.

Instead of leaving things to perfect liberty, Smith claimed that Europe followed the mercantile system. This significantly interfered with the natural order and the balance of wages: while Smith argued that the circumstances discussed above occasioned some variances in wages across different employments,

> the policy of Europe, by not leaving things at perfect liberty, occasions other inequalities of much greater importance. It does this chiefly in the three following ways. First, by restraining the competition in some employments to a smaller number than would otherwise be disposed to enter into them; secondly, by increasing it in others beyond what it naturally would be; and, thirdly, by obstructing the free circulation of labour and stock, both from employment to employment and from place to place.[110]

Mercantile policy distorts the natural tendency of self-interested individuals to promote the public good. Smith famously described merchants acting self-interestedly as 'led by an invisible hand' to unintendedly promote the public good. Through their self-interested employment of stock in the most profitable sector and their preference for domestic trade, they promoted the country's opulence, which benefits everyone.[111] Thus, without government intervention,

> the private interests and passions of men naturally lead them to divide and distribute the stock of every society, among all the different employments carried on in it, as nearly as possible in the proportion which is most agreeable to the interest of the whole society.[112]

However, 'the different regulations of the mercantile system, necessarily derange more or less this natural and most advantageous distribution of stock'.[113] Smith was unconvinced that political intervention could improve the state of things. He claimed a 'man of system' trying to impose his 'ideal plan of government' on a country, amounted to an attempt to 'arrange the different members of a great society with as much ease as the hand arranges the different pieces upon a chess-board'. Legislators forget 'that the pieces upon the chess-board have no other principle of motion besides that which the hand impresses upon them', whereas 'in the great chess-board of human society, every

single piece has a principle of motion of its own, altogether different from that which the legislature might chuse to impress upon it'.[114]

Smith's general disapproval of government intervention in the balance of wages make his comments on scholarships and their effect on the wages of teachers remarkable. According to Smith,

> [i]t has been considered as of so much importance that a proper number of young people should be educated for certain professions, that, sometimes the publick, and sometimes the piety of private founders have established many pensions, scholarships, exhibitions, bursaries.

These, however, 'draw many more people into those trades than could otherwise pretend to follow them'.[115] As a result, the wages of these young scholars and teachers are reduced below their natural level. Smith notes that before printing was developed, men of letters were wholly dependent on the income they gained through teaching. This complete reliance on a measly wage of an overcrowded labour market meant men of letters were so poor that '[t]he different governors of the universities before that time appear to have often granted licences to their scholars to beg'.[116] Smith contrasts the wages of men of letters with those of physicians and lawyers. Without interference men of letters should earn a similar wage. The difference is occasioned by 'the trade of the one' being 'crowded with indigent people who have been brought up to it at the publick expence; whereas those of the other two are incumbered with very few who have not been educated at their own'.[117] Smith concludes this section on the effect of scholarships and bursaries by claiming that:

> This inequality is upon the whole, perhaps, rather advantageous than hurtful to the publick. It may somewhat degrade the profession of a publick teacher; but the cheapness of literary education is surely an advantage which greatly over-balances this trifling inconveniency. The publick too might derive still greater benefit from it, if the constitution of those schools and colleges, in which education is carried on, was more reasonable than it is at present through the greater part of Europe.[118]

For Smith, scholarships and bursaries thus make education more affordable for everyone. This is a significant benefit for society that weighs heavier than the financial injury caused to the public teachers. Smith therefore advocated both direct and indirect public funding of education. Even if Otteson were correct in claiming that Smith argued the public should pay at most half of the costs of the direct costs of education, the indirect subsidy made through scholarships already significantly reduced the cost of instruction.[119] What remained to be paid was therefore a small amount that was enough for workers to afford the education of their children and interest them in the instruction they received. This underlines how close Smith's proposal was to the Scottish schooling system of the eighteenth century. Otteson critiques the view that 'Smith's putative endorsement of publicly funded education […] is a departure from, perhaps an inconsistency with, Smith's otherwise strong presumption against government intervention in markets'.[120] Smith's discussion of scholarships and the wages of teachers suggests that Smith did in fact support such a departure on education policy.

In addition, Otteson overlooks Smith's important qualification on the funding for public works:

> When the institutions or publick works which are beneficial to the whole society, either cannot be maintained altogether, or are not maintained altogether by the contribution of such particular members of the society as are most immediately benefited by them, the deficiency must in most cases be made up by the general contribution of the whole society.[121]

Smith's point here is that, where the benefits are to the whole of society, society should pay or contribute what is not covered by individuals. If one applies this qualification to education, it suggests that where certain children may not have the access to funds to support their education, the public should pay their fees. As noted above, Smith aimed to keep costs for education low enough so 'even a common labourer may afford it'.[122] Only very poor children, whose families earned less than common labourers, would benefit from this qualification. This qualification may not undermine the industry of the teacher, as Otteson suggests it would, because most students would still pay their own fees. Teachers would therefore still be dependent on their custom and thereby be incentivised to teach well.

Smith's proposal on the organisation and funding of primary education therefore mirrored Knox's, who had also argued that the poorest children should receive their education for free.[123] Their visions for education were nevertheless distinct: Knox was principally concerned with teaching Latin and Grammar to support 'the virtuous education and godly upbringing of the youth of this realm', whereas Smith encouraged teaching subjects that he considered useful to the labouring poor in adulthood.[124] Knox chiefly aimed to promote religiosity, whereas Smith thought education was necessary to avert a significant political crisis. And yet, for both education served as an instrument to achieve these ends.

V. Smith on the reliance on charitable donations to fund schools

In light of the widespread benevolence that underpinned the English charity-school model, this section reflects on whether charitable donations could replace government spending on education for Smith. Put differently, did Smith think it was prudent to rely on the benevolence of the wealthy for the education – and therefore also the happiness – of the poor?

Famously, Smith notes at the beginning of WN that '[i]t is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest.' Benevolence may be too uncertain to sustain the constant interest of individuals: 'He will be more likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and shew them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them.'[125] In TMS, Smith explains that nature protects justice, without which society could not exist, through implanting 'in the human breast that consciousness of ill-desert'. However, 'she has not thought it necessary to guard and enforce the practice of it [beneficence] by the terrors of merited punishment in case it should be neglected'. Smith further adds that that although men undoubtedly feel sympathy with others, the extent of their feeling is relative to the closeness of the relationship.[126]

The restricted role of benevolence as a motivator of interactions between strangers could also inform Smith's comments on the limited reach of schools in England:

> [i]n Scotland the establishment of such parish schools has taught almost the whole common people to read, and a very great proportion of them to write and account. In England the establishment of charity schools has had an effect of the same kind, though not so universally, because the establishment is not so universal.[127]

Otteson may be right that Smith generally preferred private schools, as '[t]hose parts of education, it is to be observed, for the teaching of which there are no publick institutions, are generally the best taught.'[128] The limited reach of private schools poses a significant problem as the reach of the drawbacks of the division of labour may not be restricted to locations with private schools. Moreover, private charity schools depended on the fluctuating benevolence of donors, which undermined the security of schools' continued funding.[129] Considering the vital importance of educating poor children for society, the individual concerned, and the government, education may have been too important to depend on fluctuating donations for Smith.

In addition, Smith's comments in TMS suggest that he may have thought that such extensive charity for the poor may be unlikely or difficult to sustain. According to Smith, '[t]he mere want of fortune, mere poverty, excites little compassion.' Someone's mere economic situation does not therefore inspire charity for Smith. Quite the contrary, '[i]ts complaints are too apt to be the objects rather of contempt than of fellow-feeling.' As a result, '[w]e despise a beggar; and, though his importunities may extort an alms from us, he is scarce ever the object of any serious commiseration.'[130]

If one reads his comments on the neglect of education in England in the context of his moral philosophy, it seems unlikely that Smith favoured the English charity model over the Scottish legislative model for education:

> In rich and commercial nations the division of labour, having reduced all trades to very simple operations, affords an opportunity of employing children very young. In this country indeed, where the division of labour is not far advanced, even the meanest porter can read and write, because the price of education is cheap, and a

> parent can employ his child no other way at 6 or 7 years of age. This however is not the case in the commercial parts of England. A boy of 6 or 7 years of age at Brimingham [*sic*] can gain his 3 pence or sixpence a day, and parents find it to be their interest to set them soon to work. Thus their education is neglected.[131]

The possibility of employment of children in England leads to a neglect of their education. On the contrary, in Scotland, children were not sought-after workers, and they could, given the Scottish educational system, attend school cheaply. Smith adds that the overwhelming benefits of the education of the poor illustrate 'the benefit of country schools, and, however much neglected, must acknowledge them to be an excellent institution'.[132] Perhaps due to this association of the development of commerce and the neglect of the education of poor children, Smith went beyond merely offering education through parish schools and advocated for a form of compulsory education. This, however, requires easy and universal access to education, which the charity school system in England failed to deliver for Smith.

VI. Conclusion

This paper has argued that Smith had a more flexible view of education funding than has hitherto been recognised. By extending the Scottish educational model, Smith proposed a direct contribution of government to the costs of educating poor children. In addition, his discussion of scholarships indicate that he favoured further indirect subsidies to education. These significant subsidies were designed to ensure that education was accessible and affordable to most people in society, who would only have to pay a limited sum. I have suggested that for pupils whose families were unable to support their education, Smith may have favoured a full payment of their fees. Situating Smith's intervention on education funding within the context of the English and Scottish educational systems reveals a discussion of the role of government in society. The Smithian state that emerges from such a reading actively intervenes where necessary to prevent 'a publick evil'.[133]

In a recent article, Sylvana Tomaselli showed that fortune played a significant role in Smith's political economy and further demonstrated just how irrational Smith thought men were.[134] Analysing Smith's discussion of public services and specifically education as a necessary safety net within this worldview, helps distil their importance. In a completely rational world, wealthy individuals might recognise the importance of providing the poor with a basic education through charitable donations. At the same time, families might prioritise the education of their children to shield them from corruption. However, this was not necessarily the case. Reading the public provision of education as a safety net that protected men from becoming, as Wollstonecraft would call them, 'machines', also suggests why it had to be *public*.[135] For a safety net to be effective, it must have as few loopholes as possible; this includes the loopholes of the provision of education and its consumption.

Notes

1. A. Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, eds. A.L. Macfie and D.D. Raphael (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976); henceforth TMS. A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 2 vols, eds. R.H. Campbell, A.S. Skinner and W.B. Todd (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976); henceforth WN.
2. A. Skinner, 'Adam Smith and the Role of the State: Education as a Public Service', *Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: New Interdisciplinary Essays*, eds. S. Copley and K. Sutherland (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 83. C. Smith, 'Adam Smith on Progress and Knowledge', in *New Voices on Adam Smith*, eds. L. Montes and E. Schliesser (New York: Routledge, 2006), 308. C. Smith, *Adam Smith's Political Philosophy: The Invisible Hand and Spontaneous Order* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 93.
3. S. Fleischacker, *On Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations": A Philosophical Companion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 10, 235. D. Rasmussen, *The Problems and Promise of Commercial Society: Adam Smith's Response to Rousseau* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2008), 107, 110.
4. E. Rothschild, *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet, and the Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 98.
5. L. Hill, 'Adam Smith and Political Theory', in *Adam Smith: His Life, Thought, and Legacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), 329.

6. J.R. Weinstein, *Adam Smith's Pluralism: Rationality, Education, and the Moral Sentiments* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 216–17.
7. J.R. Otteson, 'Adam Smith on Public Provision of Education', *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* (2023), 4.
8. Otteson, 'Provision', 1.
9. Otteson, 'Provision'.
10. Maria Pia Paganelli argued Smith's uncritical discussion of the Scottish educational system suggests he was biased toward it to demonstrate the civility of Scots in the face of accusations of backwardness by English writers like Samuel Johnson. This potential bias highlights the importance of this contextual section to understanding Smith's educational proposals. M.P. Paganelli, 'Adam Smith and the Scottish Model of Education: a Scottish bias', *The Adam Smith Review* 10 (2018): 154–71. The perceived backwardness is captured by Johnson's definition of oats: 'A grain which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people.' (S. Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (London: John Childs and Son, 1850), 804.)
11. A. Smith, *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, eds. R.L. Meek, D.D. Raphael, and P.G. Stein (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), LJB 329–30; henceforth LJ.
12. M.G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement: A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 3.
13. Jones, *Charity*, 4.
14. B. Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, vol. 1, ed. F.B. Kaye (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924), 268.
15. Mandeville, *Fable*, 270.
16. Mandeville, *Fable*, 253–322.
17. Mandeville was not alone in criticising charity-schools. John Locke, for example, advocated working schools, where children as young as three years old would be taught to spin or knit: J. Locke, 'An Essay on the Poor Law', in *Political Essays*, ed. M. Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 190–92.
18. R.A. Houston, *Scottish Literacy and the Scottish Identity: Illiteracy and Society in Scotland and Northern England 1600–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 112.
19. Houston, *Literacy*, 5; J. Knox, *The History of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland with which are included Knox's Confession and The Book of Discipline*, ed. C. Lennox (London: Andrew Melrose, 1905), 382–90. Smith mentioned Knox in LJ, suggesting he would have been aware of his ideas: Smith, LJA 98.
20. Houston, *Literacy*, 112.
21. Ibid., 5, 112.
22. Ibid., 112, 113.
23. T.C. Smout, *A History of the Scottish People, 1560–1830* (London: Fontana Press, 1972), 423.
24. Knox, *History*, 382.
25. Smout, *History*, 423. Houston, *Literacy*, 6.
26. J. Sinclair, *The Statistical Account of Scotland: Drawn up from the Communications of the Ministers of the Different Parishes*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: William Creech, 1791), 156.
27. Sinclair, *Account*, 156, 176.
28. Ibid., 84.
29. Ibid., 374.
30. D.J. Withrington, 'Education and Society in the Eighteenth Century', in *Scotland in the Age of Improvement: Essays in Scottish History in the Eighteenth Century*, eds. N.T. Phillipson and R. Mitchison (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970), 176–7. See p. 12 below for Smith's intervention in this debate.
31. Smout, *History*, 432, 435.
32. Houston, *Literacy*, 6–7.
33. T. Smollett, *The Adventures of Roderick Random*, eds. J.G. Basker, N. Seary, P. Boucé, O.M. Brack (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2012), 4. By 'North-Briton' Smollett meant Scot: J.G. Basker, N. Seary, P. Boucé, O.M. Brack, 'Notes to the Text', *The Adventures of Roderick Random*, eds. J.G. Basker, N. Seary, P. Boucé, O.M. Brack (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2012), 390, n. 11.
34. D. Defoe, *Review of the state of the British nation*, 5, 80 (30 September 1708), 318.
35. Smith, LJA i.27.
36. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
37. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
38. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
39. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
40. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
41. Smith, WN V.i.f.51. The italicisation is my own.
42. Smith, WN V.i.f.51, fn. 53.
43. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
44. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.

45. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
46. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
47. Smith, WN V.i.f.51.
48. Smith, WN V.i.f.50.
49. R. Lamb, ‘Adam Smith’s Concept of Alienation’, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 25, no. 2 (1973): 283–4.
50. Smith, LJB 328.
51. Smith, TMS I.ii.3.6, III.3.30.
52. Smith, WN V.i.f.50.
53. M. Wollstonecraft, ‘Letters Written in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark’, *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 6, eds. J. Todd and M. Butler (London: William Pickering, 1989), 340–1. For a commentary on Smith and Wollstonecraft on this point, see: S. Tomaselli, *Wollstonecraft: Philosophy, Passion, and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021), 187.
54. Tomaselli, *Wollstonecraft*, 190.
55. Smith, WN V.i.f.49.
56. Smith, WN V.i.f.52.
57. Smith, WN V.i.f.52.
58. Smith, WN V.i.f.52.
59. Smith, WN V.i.f.52.
60. Smith, WN V.i.f.53.
61. Smith, WN V.i.f.54.
62. Smith, WN V.i.f.55; see section 1 above and: Withrington, ‘Education’.
63. Smith, WN V.i.f.55.
64. Smith, WN V.i.f.56.
65. In TMS, Smith notes: ‘To deserve, to acquire, and to enjoy the respect and admiration of mankind, are the great objects of ambition and emulation.’ (Smith, TMS I.iii.3.2).
66. Smith, WN V.i.f.57. The italicisation is my own.
67. Smith, WN V.i.f.57.
68. Smith, WN V.i.f.59.
69. Smith, WN V.i.f.58.
70. Importantly, the degree of compulsion was different: ancient citizens were obliged merely because they would otherwise not have the necessary skills to serve as soldiers, whereas people that did not undergo the compulsory education in commercial society would be prohibited from participating freely in the labour market. (Smith, WN V.i.f.57–58).
71. Smith, WN V.i.f.58.
72. Smith, WN V.i.f.60.
73. Smith, WN V.i.f.60.
74. Smith, TMS IV.i.11.
75. Smith, WN V.i.f.60.
76. Smith, WN V.i.f.61.
77. Smith, WN V.i.f.61.
78. Smith, WN V.i.f.61.
79. Smith, WN V.i.f.61.
80. Smith, WN V.i.f.24.
81. A. Smith, ‘The Principles which Lead and Direct Philosophical Enquiries; Illustrated by the History of Astronomy’, in *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, eds. W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), III.2.
82. Smith, WN V.i.g.14.
83. D. Hume, ‘Of superstition and enthusiasm’, in *Political Essays*, ed. K. Haakonssen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 46–50.
84. Smith, WN V.i.f.61.
85. E.g.: Otteson, ‘Provision’.
86. Smith, WN V.i.i.1.
87. Smith, WN V.i.i.2.
88. Smith, WN V.i.i.3.
89. Smith, WN V.i.i.4.
90. Smith, WN V.i.i.5.
91. Smith, WN V.i.f.1.
92. Smith, WN V.i.g.
93. Griswold describes the congregation as ‘the consumers of religion’: C. Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 280.
94. Smith, WN V.i.g.16.

95. Smith explicitly uses this phrase at the beginning of his discussion of religious sects: Smith, WN V.i.g.1.
96. Smith, WN V.i.f.55.
97. Smith, WN V.i.f.4.
98. Smith, WN V.i.f.4.
99. 'It is the interest of every man to live as much at his ease as he can' (Smith, WN V.i.f.7). Smith echoes Mandeville on this point: Mandeville, *Fable*, 194.
100. Smith, WN V.i.f.6.
101. Smith, WN V.i.f.7.
102. Smith, WN V.i.f.8.
103. Smith, WN V.i.f.17.
104. Smout, *History*, 423.
105. Sinclair, *Account*, 84. See above, p. 6.
106. Smith, WN I.x.c.33–40.
107. Smith, WN I.x.b.1.
108. Smith, WN I.x.b.6.
109. Smith, WN I.x.b.9.
110. Smith, WN I.x.c.1–2.
111. Smith, WN IV.ii.9.
112. Smith, WN IV.vii.c.88.
113. Smith, WN IV.vii.c.89.
114. Smith, TMS VI.ii.2.17.
115. Smith, WN I.x.c.34.
116. Smith, WN I.x.c.38.
117. Smith, WN I.x.c.38.
118. Smith, WN I.x.c.40.
119. Otteson, 'Provision', 15.
120. Ibid., 1.
121. Smith, WN V.i.i.6.
122. Smith, WN V.i.f.55.
123. Knox, *History*, 382.
124. Ibid., 382.
125. Smith, WN I.ii.2.
126. Smith, TMS II.ii.3.4.
127. Smith, WN V.i.f.55.
128. Smith, WN V.i.f.16.
129. Smout, *History*, 423.
130. Smith, TMS III.3.18.
131. Smith, LJB 329–30.
132. Smith, LJB 330.
133. Smith, WN V.i.f.60.
134. S. Tomaselli, 'The Art of Being in the Eighteenth Century: Adam Smith on Fortune, Luck, and Trust', *History of European Ideas* 48, no. 1 (2022): 33–44.
135. See above, p. 10.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Sylvana Tomaselli for her invaluable comments on previous drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank the organisers and participants of the YIS workshop for Adam Smith's tercentenary and the Cambridge Political Thought workshop, where I presented previous versions of this paper. Finally, I thank the two anonymous referees for their helpful suggestions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Bibliography

Basker, J.G., Seary, N., Boucé, P., Brack, O.M., 'Notes to the Text', *The Adventures of Roderick Random*, eds. J.G. Basker, N. Seary, P. Boucé, O.M. Brack (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2012), 389–506.

Defoe, D., *A Review of the State of the British Nation*, 5, 80 (30 September 1708), 317–320.

Fleischacker, S. *On Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations": A Philosophical Companion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
Griswold, C., *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
Hill, L., 'Adam Smith and Political Theory', *Adam Smith: His Life, Thought, and Legacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), 321–339.
Houston, R.A., *Scottish Literacy and the Scottish Identity: Illiteracy and Society in Scotland and Northern England 1600–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
Hume, D. 'Of superstition and enthusiasm', *Political Essays*, ed. K. Haakonssen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 46–50.
Johnson, S., *A Dictionary of the English Language* (London: John Childs and Son, 1850).
Jones, M.G., *The Charity School Movement: A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).
Knox, J., *The History of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland with which are included Knox's Confession and The Book of Discipline*, ed. C. Lennox (London: Andrew Melrose, 1905).
Lamb, R., 'Adam Smith's Concept of Alienation', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 25, 2 (1973), 275–285.
Locke, J., 'An Essay on the Poor Law', *Political Essays*, ed. M. Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 182–198.
Mandeville, B., *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, vol. 1, ed. F.B. Kaye (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924).
Otteson, J. 'Adam Smith on Public Provision of Education', *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* (2023), 1–20.
Paganelli, M.P., 'Adam Smith and the Scottish Model of Education: a Scottish bias', *The Adam Smith Review*, 10 (2018), 154–171.
Rasmussen, D., *The Problems and Promise of Commercial Society: Adam Smith's Response to Rousseau* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2008).
Rothschild, E., *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet, and the Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).
Sinclair, J., *The Statistical Account of Scotland: Drawn up from the Communications of the Ministers of the Different Parishes*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: William Creech, 1791).
Skinner, A. 'Adam Smith and the Role of the State: Education as a Public Service', *Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: New Interdisciplinary Essays*, eds. S. Copley and K. Sutherland (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 70–96.
Smith, A., 'The Principles which Lead and Direct Philosophical Enquiries; Illustrated by the History of Astronomy', *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, eds. W.P.D. Wightman and J.C. Bryce (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 31–105.
Smith, A., *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 2 vols, eds. R.H. Campbell, A.S. Skinner and W.B. Todd (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).
Smith, A., *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, eds. R.L. Meek, D.D. Raphael, and P.G. Stein (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
Smith, A., *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, eds. D.D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).
Smith, C. *Adam Smith's Political Philosophy: The Invisible Hand and Spontaneous Order* (New York: Routledge, 2006).
Smith, C. 'Adam Smith on Progress and Knowledge', *New Voices on Adam Smith*, eds. L. Montes and E. Schliesser (New York: Routledge, 2006), 293–312.
Smollett, T., *The Adventures of Roderick Random*, eds. J.G. Basker, N. Seary, P. Boucé, O.M. Brack (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2012).
Smout, T.C., *A History of the Scottish People, 1560–1830* (London: Fontana Press, 1972).
Tomaselli, S., 'The art of being in the eighteenth century: Adam Smith on fortune, luck, and trust', *History of European Ideas*, 48, 1 (2022), 33–44.
Tomaselli, S., *Wollstonecraft: Philosophy, Passion, and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021).
Weinstein, J.R., *Adam Smith's Pluralism: Rationality, Education, and the Moral Sentiments* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).
Withrington, D.J., 'Education and Society in the Eighteenth Century', *Scotland in the Age of Improvement: Essays in Scottish History in the Eighteenth Century*, eds. N.T. Phillipson and R. Mitchison (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970), 169–199.
Wollstonecraft, M., 'Letters Written in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark', *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 6, eds. J. Todd and M. Butler (London: William Pickering, 1989).