Anthony Hammond (1758-1838)

James E Crimmins
George Hamzo

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/james_e_crimmins/66/
HAMMOND

See also ASSOCIATIONISM; BENTHAM; JEREMY; GODWIN; WILLIAM; HUME; DAVID MILL; JAMES; PALEY; WILLIAM; PHILOSOPHIC RADICALISM; PRIESTLEY; JOSEPH; SMITH; ADAM; STEPHEN; LESLIE.

HAMMOND, ANTHONY (1758–1838)

Anthony Farbane was born on 30 September 1758 in Richmond, Yorkshire. He changed his name from Farbane to Hammond to inherit the estate of his uncle Peter Ham- mond. He attended Trinity College, Cam- bridge in 1776 but did not graduate. In 1777, he was admitted to Lincoln’s Inn and prac- ticed as a special pleader in the Inner Temple, but was only called to the Bar in 1827. For many years, Hammond enjoyed a secondary career as a legal writer, publishing several highly technical legal texts. His interest in the broad form and scope of the law was demon- strated in Scheme of a Digest of the Laws of England, with Introductory Essays on the Science of Jurisprudence (1829). In 1823, he published The Criminal Code, Including a Digest, Consolidation and Collection of the Statutes, in which he explained how the law could be consolidated and made more accessible. Like Bentham, Hammond believed that progress towards the codification of the law could be made with the support of Rob- ert Peel. As Home Secretary, Peel had shown an inclination towards law reform but, as the Bentham, Peel’s incremental approach to reform was a frustration to Hammond. Several of Hammond’s legal publications have at their heart utilitarian arguments. His Scheme of a Digest of the Laws of England outlines utilitarian reform on the principles of criminal responsibility and punishment, while his goals of consolidation and codifi- cation outlined in The Criminal Code follow Bentham’s arguments in favour of the codifi- cation of common law.
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HAPPINESS

The concept of happiness has long been of philosophical interest and continues to play an important role in contemporary discussions of morality and well-being. Ancient moralists identified happiness as the highest good, which could only be achieved through a life of virtue or excellence. During the modern era, the importance of hap- piness was reestablished with utilitarianism, the doctrine that views happiness as the foundation of morality. Although hap- piness figures centrally in the theories of both ancient and utilitarian moralists, their views on the nature of happiness represent opposite extremes. The latter identifies happiness with pleasure (thereby reducing happiness to a mental state), while the former identifies it with virtue (an objective stan- dard that must be met if one is to qualify as happy).

One could classify all theories of happiness in terms of these two opposing views.