

which, however, he was afterwards relieved by Cromwell. On October 25 he was made commander-in-chief in Dorsetshire, and in November he took by storm Abbotsbury, the house of Sir John Strangways,—an affair in which he appears to have shown considerable personal gallantry. In December he relieved Taunton. His military service terminated at the time of the Self-denying Ordinance in 1645; he had associated himself with the Presbyterian faction, and naturally enough was not included in the New Model. For the next seven or eight years he lived in comparative privacy. He was high sheriff of Wiltshire during 1647, and displayed much vigour in this office. Upon the execution of Charles, Cooper took the Engagement, and was a commissioner to administer it in Dorsetshire. On April 25, 1650, he married Lady Frances Cecil, sister of the earl of Essex, his first wife having died in the previous year leaving no family. In 1651 a son was born to him, who died in childhood, and on January 16, 1652, another son, named after himself, who was his heir. On January 17 he was named on the commission for law reform, of which Hale was the chief; and on March 17, 1653, he was pardoned of all delinquency, and thus at last made capable of sitting in parliament. He sat for Wiltshire in the Barebones parliament, of which he was a leading member, and where he zealously and prudently supported Cromwell's views against the extreme section. He was at once appointed on the council of thirty. On the resignation of this parliament he became a member of the council of state named in the "Instrument." In the first parliament elected under this "Instrument" he sat for Wiltshire, having been elected also for Poole and Tewkesbury, and was one of the commissioners for the ejection of unworthy ministers. After December 28, 1654, for reasons which it is impossible to ascertain with clearness, he left the privy council, and henceforward is found with the Presbyterians and Republicans, in opposition to Cromwell. His second wife had died during this year; in 1656 he married a third, who survived him, Margaret, daughter of Lord Spencer, niece of the earl of Southampton, and sister of the earl of Sunderland, who died at Newbury. By his three marriages he was thus connected with many of the leading politicians of Charles II.'s reign.

Cooper was again elected for Wiltshire for the parliament of 1656, but Cromwell refused to allow him, with many others of his opponents, to sit. He signed a letter of complaint, with sixty-five excluded members, to the speaker, as also a "Remonstrance" addressed to the people. In the parliament which met on January 20, 1658, he took his seat, and was active in opposition to the new constitution of the two Houses. He was also a leader of the opposition in Richard Cromwell's parliament, especially on the matter of the limitation of the power of the Protector, and against the House of Lords. He was throughout these debates celebrated for the "nervous and subtle oratory" which made him so formidable in after days; he had "his tongue well hung, and words at will."

Upon the replacing of the Rump by the army, after the breaking up of Richard's parliament, Cooper endeavoured unsuccessfully to take his seat on the ground of his former disputed election for Downton. He was, however, elected on the council of state, and was the only Presbyterian in it; he was at once accused by Scot, along with Whitelocke, of corresponding with Hyde. This he solemnly denied. After the rising in Cheshire Cooper was arrested in Dorsetshire on a charge of correspondence with its leader Booth, but on the matter being investigated by the council he was unanimously acquitted. In the disputes between Lambert at the head of the military party and the Rump in union with the council of state, he supported the latter, and upon the temporary supremacy of Lambert's

party worked indefatigably to restore the Rump. With Monk's commissioners he, with Haselrig, had a fruitless conference, but he assured Monk of his co-operation, and joined with eight others of the overthrown council of state in naming him commander-in-chief of the forces of England and Scotland. He was instrumental in securing the Tower for the Parliament, and in obtaining the adhesion of Admiral Lawson and the fleet. Upon the restoration of the Parliament on December 26 Cooper was one of the commissioners to command the army, and on January 2 was made one of the new council of state. On January 7 he took his seat on his election for Downton in 1640, and was made colonel of Fleetwood's regiment of horse. He speedily secured the admission of the secluded members, having meanwhile been in continual communication with Monk, was again one of the fresh council of state, consisting entirely of friends of the Restoration, and accepted from Monk a commission to be governor of the Isle of Wight and captain of a company of foot. He now steadily pursued the design of the Restoration, but without holding any private correspondence with the king, and only on terms similar to those proposed in 1648 to Charles I. at the Isle of Wight. In the Convention Parliament he sat for Wiltshire. Monk cut short these deliberations and forced on the Restoration without condition. Cooper was one of the twelve commissioners who went to Charles at Breda to invite him to return. On his journey he was upset from his carriage, and the accident caused an internal abscess which was never cured.

Cooper was at once placed on the privy council, receiving also a formal pardon for former delinquencies. His first duty was to examine the Anabaptist prisoners in the Tower. In the prolonged discussions regarding the Bill of Indemnity he was instrumental in saving the life of Haselrig, and opposed the clause compelling all officers who had served under Cromwell to refund their salaries, he himself never having had any. He showed indeed none of the grasping and avaricious temper so common among the politicians of the time. He was one of the commissioners for conducting the trials of the regicides, but was himself vehemently "fallen upon" by Prynne for having acted with Cromwell. He was named on the council of plantations and on that of trade. In the debate abolishing the court of wards he spoke, like most landed proprietors, in favour of laying the burden on the excise instead of on the land, and on the question of the restoration of the bishops carried in the interests of the court an adjournment of the debate for three months. At the coronation in April 1661 Cooper had been made a peer, as Baron Ashley of Wimborne St Giles, in express recognition of his services at the Restoration; and on the meeting of the new parliament in May he was appointed chancellor of the exchequer and under-treasurer, aided no doubt by his connexion with Southampton. He vehemently opposed the persecuting Acts now passed,—the Corporation Act, the Uniformity Bill, against which he is said to have spoken three hundred times, and the Militia Act. He is stated also to have influenced the king in issuing his dispensing declaration of December 26, 1662, and he zealously supported a bill introduced for the purpose of confirming the declaration, rising thereby in favour and influence with Charles. He was himself the author of a treatise on tolerance. He was now recognized as one of the chief opponents of Clarendon and the High Anglican policy. On the breaking out of the Dutch War in 1664 he was made treasurer of the prizes, being accountable to the king alone for all sums received or spent. He was also one of the grantees of the province of Carolina and took a leading part in its management; it was at his request that Locke in 1669 drew up a constitution for the new colony. In September

1665 the king unexpectedly paid him a visit at Wimborne. He opposed unsuccessfully the appropriation proviso introduced into the supply bill as hindering the due administration of finance, and this opposition seems to have brought about a reconciliation with Clarendon. In 1668, however, he supported a bill to appoint commissioners to examine the accounts of the Dutch War, though in the previous year he had opposed it. In accordance with his former action on all questions of religious toleration he strongly opposed the shameful Five Mile Act of 1665. In 1667 he eagerly supported the bill for prohibiting the importation of Irish cattle on the ground that it would lead to a great fall of rents in England. Ashley was himself a large landowner, and moreover was opposed to Ormonde who would have greatly benefited by the importation. In all other questions of this kind he shows himself far in advance of the economic fallacies of the day. His action led to an altercation with Ossory, the son of Ormonde, in which Ossory used language for which he was compelled to apologize. On the death of Southampton, Ashley was placed on the commission of the treasury, Clifford and William Coventry being his principal colleagues. He appears to have taken no part in the attempt to impeach Clarendon on a general charge of treason.

The new administration was headed by Buckingham, in whose toleration and comprehension principles Ashley shared to the full. A most able paper written by him to the king in support of these principles, on the ground especially of their advantage to trade, has been preserved. He excepts, however, from toleration Roman Catholics and Fifth Monarchy men. His attention to all trade questions was close and constant; he was a member of the council of trade and plantations appointed in 1670, and was its president from 1672 to 1676. The difficulty of the succession also occupied him, and he co-operated thus early in the design of legitimizing Monmouth as a rival to James. In the intrigues which led to the infamous treaty of Dover he had no part. That treaty contained a clause by which Charles was bound to declare himself a Catholic, and with the knowledge of this Ashley, as a staunch Protestant, could not be trusted. In order to blind him and the other Protestant members of the Cabal a sham treaty was arranged in which this clause did not appear, and it was not until a considerable while afterwards that he found out that he had been duped. Under this misunderstanding he signed the sham Dover treaty on December 31, 1670. This treaty, however, was carefully kept from public knowledge, and Ashley did not hesitate to help Charles to hoodwink parliament by signing a similar treaty on February 2, 1673, which was then laid before them as the only one in existence. This is one of the proved dishonourable actions of his life. His approval of the attempt of the Lords to alter a money bill led to the loss of the supply to Charles and to the consequent displeasure of the king. His support of the Lord Roos Act, ascribed generally to his desire to ingratiate himself with Charles, was no doubt due in part to the fact that his son had married Lord Roos's sister. It is, too, necessary to notice that, so far from advising the "Stop of the Exchequer," he actively opposed this bad measure; the reasons which he left with the king for his opposition are extant. The responsibility rests with Clifford alone. In the other great measure of the Cabal ministry, Charles's Declaration of Indulgence, he cordially concurred. He was now rewarded by being made Earl of Shaftesbury and Baron Cooper of Pawlett by a patent dated April 23, 1672. It is stated too that he was offered, but refused, the lord treasurership. On November 17, 1672, however, he became lord chancellor, Bridgman having been compelled to resign the seat. As chancellor he issued writs for the

election of thirty-six new members to fill vacancies caused during the long recess; this, though grounded upon precedent, was certainly open to the gravest suspicion as an attempt to fortify Charles, and was vehemently attacked by an angry House of Commons which met on February 4, 1673. The writs were cancelled, and the principle was established that the issuing of writs rested with the House itself. It was at the opening of parliament that Shaftesbury made his celebrated "delenda est Carthago" speech against Holland, in which he urged the Second Dutch War, on the ground of the necessity of destroying so formidable a commercial rival to England, excused the Stop of the Exchequer which he had opposed, and vindicated the Declaration of Indulgence. On March 8 he announced to parliament that the declaration had been cancelled, though he did his best to induce Charles to remain firm. For affixing the great seal to this declaration he was threatened with impeachment by the Commons. The Test Act was now brought forward, and Shaftesbury, who appears to have heard how he had been duped in 1670, warmly supported it, with the object probably of thereby getting rid of Clifford. He now began to be regarded as the chief upholder of Protestantism in the ministry; he rapidly lost favour with Charles, and on Sunday, September 9, 1673, was dismissed from the chancellorship. Among the reasons for this dismissal is probably the undoubted fact that he opposed reckless grants to the king's mistresses. He has been accused of much vanity and ostentation in his office, but his reputation for ability and integrity as a judge was high even with his enemies.

Charles soon regretted the loss of Shaftesbury, and endeavoured, as did also Louis, to induce him to return, but in vain. He preferred now to become the great popular leader against all the measures of the court, and may be regarded as the intellectual chief of the opposition. At the meeting of parliament on January 8, 1674, he carried a motion for a proclamation banishing Catholics to a distance of ten miles from London. During the whole session he organized and directed the opposition in their attacks on the king's ministers. On May 19 he was dismissed the privy council and ordered to leave London. He hereupon retired to Wimborne, from whence he urged upon his parliamentary followers the necessity of securing a new parliament. He was in the House of Lords, however, in 1675, when Danby brought forward his famous Non-resisting Test Bill, and headed the opposition which was carried on for seventeen days, distinguishing himself, says Burnet, more in this session than ever he had done before. The bill was finally shelved, a prorogation having taken place in consequence of a quarrel between the two Houses, supposed to have been purposely got up by Shaftesbury, in which he vigorously supported the right of the Lords to hear appeal cases, even where the defendant was a member of the Lower House. Parliament was prorogued for fifteen months until February 15, 1677, and it was determined by the opposition to attack its existence on the ground that a prorogation for more than a year was illegal. In this matter the opposition were clearly in the wrong, and by attacking the parliament discredited themselves. The immediate result was that Shaftesbury, Buckingham, Wharton, and Salisbury were sent to the Tower. In June Shaftesbury applied for a writ of *habeas corpus*, but could get no release until February 26, 1678, after his letter and three petitions to the king. Being brought before the bar of the House of Lords he at length made a complete submission as to his conduct in declaring parliament dissolved by the prorogation, and in violating the Lords' privileges by bringing a *habeas corpus* in the King's Bench.

The breaking out of the Popish Terror in 1678 marks

the worst part of Shaftesbury's career. That so clear-headed a man could have really credited the extravagant lies of Oates and the other perjurers is beyond belief; and the manner in which by incessant agitation he excited the most baseless alarms, and encouraged the wildest excesses of fanatic cruelty, for nothing but party advantage, is utterly without excuse. On November 2 he opened the great attack by proposing an address declaring the necessity for the king's dismissing James from his council. Under his advice the opposition now made an alliance with Louis whereby the French king promised to help them to ruin Danby on condition that they would compel Charles, by stopping the supplies, to make peace with France, doing thus a grave injury to Protestantism abroad for the sake of a temporary party advantage at home. Upon the refusal in November of the Lords to concur in the address of the Commons requesting the removal of the queen from court, he joined in a protest against the refusal, and was foremost in all the violent acts of the session. He urged on the bill by which Catholics were prohibited from sitting in either House of Parliament, and was bitter in his expressions of disappointment when the Commons passed a proviso excepting James, against whom the bill was especially aimed, from its operation. A new parliament met on March 6, 1679. Shaftesbury had meanwhile ineffectually warned the king that unless he followed his advice there would be no peace with the people. On March 25 he made a striking speech upon the state of the nation, especially upon the dangers to Protestantism and the misgovernment of Scotland and Ireland. He was, too, suspected of doing all in his power to bring about a revolt in Scotland. By the advice of Temple, Charles now tried the experiment of forming a new privy council in which the chief members of the opposition were included, and Shaftesbury was made president, with a salary of £4000, being also a member of the committee for foreign affairs. He did not, however, in any way change either his opinions or his action. He vigorously opposed the compelling of Protestant Nonconformists to take the oath required of Roman Catholics. That indeed, as Ranke says, which makes him memorable in English history is that he opposed the establishment of an Anglican and Royalist organization with decisive success. The question of the succession was now again prominent, and Shaftesbury, in opposition to Halifax, committed the error, which really brought about his fall, of putting forward Monmouth as his nominee, thus alienating a large number of his supporters; he encouraged, too, the belief that this was agreeable to the king. He pressed on the Exclusion Bill with all his power, and, when that and the inquiry into the payments for secret service and the trial of the five peers, for which too he had been eager, were brought to an end by a sudden prorogation, he is reported to have declared aloud that he would have the heads of those who were the king's advisers to this course. Before the prorogation, however, he saw the invaluable Act of Habeas Corpus, which he had carried through parliament, receive the royal assent. In pursuance of his patronage of Monmouth, Shaftesbury now secured for him the command of the army sent to suppress the insurrection in Scotland, which he is supposed to have fomented. In October 1679, the circumstances which led Charles to desire to conciliate the opposition having ceased, Shaftesbury was dismissed from his presidency and from the privy council; when applied to by Sunderland to return to office he made as conditions the divorce of the queen and the exclusion of James. With nine other peers he presented a petition to the king in November, praying for the meeting of parliament, of which Charles took no notice. In April, upon the king's declaration that he was resolved to send

for James from Scotland, Shaftesbury strongly advised the popular leaders at once to leave the council, and they followed his advice. In March we find him unscrupulously eager in the prosecution of the alleged Irish Catholic plot. Upon the king's illness in May he held frequent meetings of Monmouth's friends at his house to consider how best to act for the security of the Protestant religion. On June 26, accompanied by fourteen others, he presented to the grand jury of Westminster an indictment of the duke of York as a Popish recusant. In the middle of September he was seriously ill. On November 15 the Exclusion Bill, having passed the Commons, was brought up to the Lords, and an historic debate took place, in which Halifax and Shaftesbury were the leaders on opposite sides. The bill was thrown out, and Shaftesbury signed the protest against its rejection. The next day he urged upon the House the divorce of the queen. On December 7, to his lasting dishonour, he voted for the condemnation of Lord Stafford. On the 23d he again spoke vehemently for exclusion, and his speech was immediately printed. All opposition was, however, checked by the dissolution on January 18. A new parliament was called to meet at Oxford, to avoid the influences of the city of London, where Shaftesbury had taken the greatest pains to make himself popular. Shaftesbury, with fifteen other peers, at once petitioned the king that it might as usual be held in the capital. He prepared, too, instructions to be handed by constituencies to their members upon election, in which exclusion, disbanding, the limitation of the prerogative in proroguing and dissolving parliament, and security against Popery and arbitrary power were insisted on. At this parliament, which lasted but a few days, he again made a personal appeal to Charles, which was curtly rejected, to permit the legitimizing of Monmouth. The king's advisers now urged him to arrest Shaftesbury; he was seized on July 2, 1681, and committed to the Tower, the judges refusing his petition to be tried or admitted to bail. This refusal was twice repeated in September and October, the court hoping to obtain evidence sufficient to ensure his ruin. In October he wrote offering to retire to Carolina if he were released. On November 24 he was indicted for high treason at the Old Bailey, the chief ground being a paper of association for the defence of the Protestant religion, which, though among his papers, was not in his handwriting; but the grand jury ignored the bill. He was released on bail on December 1. In 1682, however, Charles secured the appointment of Tory sheriffs for London; and, as the juries were chosen by the sheriffs, Shaftesbury felt that he was no longer safe from the vengeance of the court. Failing health and the disappointment of his political plans led him now into violent courses. He appears to have entered into consultation of a treasonable kind with Monmouth and others; he himself had, he declared, ten thousand brisk boys in London ready to rise at his bidding. For some weeks he was concealed in the city and in Wapping; but, finding the schemes for a rising hang fire, he determined to flee. He went to Harwich, disguised as a Presbyterian minister, and after a week's delay, during which he was in imminent risk of discovery, if indeed, as is very probable, his escape was not winked at by the Government, he sailed to Holland on November 28, 1682, and reached Amsterdam in the beginning of December. Here he was welcomed with the jest, referring to his famous speech against the Dutch, "non-dum deleta Carthago." He was made a citizen of Amsterdam, but died there of gout in the stomach on January 21, 1683. His body was sent in February to Poole, in Dorset, and was buried at Wimborne St Giles.

Few politicians have been the mark of such unsparing abuse as Shaftesbury. Dryden, while compelled to honour him as an

upright judge, overwhelmed his memory with scathing, if venal, satire; and Dryden's satire has been accepted as truth by later historians. Macaulay in especial has exerted all his art, though in flagrant contradiction of probability and fact, to deepen still further the shade which rests upon his reputation. Mr Christie, on the other hand, in possession of later sources of information, and with more honest purpose, has done much to rehabilitate him. Occasionally, however, he appears to hold a brief for the defence, and, though his picture is comparatively a true one, should be read with caution. Finally, in his monograph in the series of "English Worthies," Mr H. D. Traill professes to hold the scales equally. He makes an interesting addition to our conception of Shaftesbury's place in English politics, by insisting on his position as the first great party leader in the modern sense, and as the founder of modern parliamentary oratory. In other respects his book is derived almost entirely from Christie. Much of Shaftesbury's career, increasingly so as it came near its close, is incapable of defence; but it has escaped his critics that his life up to the Restoration, apparently full of inconsistencies, was evidently guided by one leading principle, the determination to uphold the supremacy of parliament, a principle which, however obscured by self-interest, appears also to have underlain his whole political career. He was, too, ever the friend of religious freedom and of an enlightened policy in all trade questions. And, above all, it should not be forgotten, in justice to Shaftesbury's memory, that "during his long political career, in an age of general corruption, he was ever incorrupt, and never grasped either money or land. In the days of the Commonwealth he never obtained or sought grants of forfeited estates. In the days of the restored monarchy he never profited by the king's favour for aught beyond the legal emoluments of office, and in office or out of office spurned all and many offers of bribes from the French king." (O. A.)

SHAFTESBURY, ANTHONY ASHLEY COOPER, THIRD EARL OF (1671-1713), was born at Exeter House in London, February 26, 1670-71. He was grandson of the first and son of the second earl. His mother was Lady Dorothy Manners, daughter of John, earl of Rutland. According to a curious story, told by the third earl himself, the marriage between his father and mother was negotiated by John Locke, who was a trusted friend of the first earl. The second Lord Shaftesbury appears to have been a poor creature, both physically and mentally,—"born a shapeless lump, like anarchy," according to what is doubtless the exaggerated metaphor of Dryden. At the early age of three his son was made over to the formal guardianship of his grandfather. Locke, who in his capacity of medical attendant to the Ashley household had already assisted in bringing the boy into the world, though not his instructor, was entrusted with the superintendence of his education. This was conducted according to the principles enunciated in Locke's *Thoughts concerning Education*, and the method of teaching Latin and Greek conversationally was pursued with such success by his instructress, Mrs Elizabeth Birch, that at the age of eleven, it is said, young Ashley could read both languages with ease. In November 1683, some months after the death of the first earl, his father entered him at Winchester as a warden's boarder. Being a shy, retiring boy, and being moreover constantly taunted with the opinions and fate of his grandfather, he appears to have been rendered miserable by the rough manners of his schoolfellows, and to have left Winchester in 1686 for a course of foreign travel. By this change he was brought into direct contact with those artistic and classical associations which afterwards exercised so marked an influence on his character and opinions. On his travels he did not, we are told by the fourth earl, "greatly seek the conversation of other English young gentlemen on their travels," but rather that of their tutors, with whom he could converse on congenial topics.

In 1689, the year after the Revolution, Lord Ashley returned to England, and for nearly five years from this time he appears to have led a quiet, uneventful, and studious life. There can be no doubt that the greater part of his attention was directed to the perusal of those classical authors, and to the attempt to realize the true spirit of that classical antiquity, for which he had

conceived so ardent a passion. He had no intention, however, of becoming a recluse, or of permanently holding himself aloof from public life. Accordingly, he became a candidate for the borough of Poole, and was returned May 21, 1695. He soon distinguished himself by a speech, which excited great attention at the time, in support of the Bill for Regulating Trials in Cases of Treason, one provision of which was what seems to us the obviously reasonable one that a person indicted for treason or misprision of treason should be allowed the assistance of counsel. In connexion with this speech a story is told of Shaftesbury which is also told, though with less verisimilitude, of Halifax, that, being overcome by shyness, and unable to continue his speech, he simply said, before sitting down: "If I, sir, who rise only to speak my opinion on the bill now depending, am so confounded that I am unable to express the least of what I proposed to say, what must the condition of that man be who is pleading for his life without any assistance and under apprehensions of being deprived of it?" "The sudden turn of thought," says his son, the fourth earl, "pleased the House extremely, and, it is generally believed, carried a greater weight than any of the arguments which were offered in favour of the bill." But, though a Whig, alike by descent, by education, and by conviction, Ashley could by no means be depended on to give a party vote; he was always ready to support any propositions, from whatever quarter they came, that appeared to him to promote the liberty of the subject and the independence of parliament. Unfortunately, his health was so treacherous that, on the dissolution of July 1698, he was obliged to retire from parliamentary life. He suffered much from asthma, a complaint which was aggravated by the London smoke.

Lord Ashley now retired into Holland, where he became acquainted with Le Clerc, Bayle, Benjamin Furly, the English Quaker merchant, at whose house Locke had resided during his stay at Rotterdam, and probably Limborch and the rest of the literary circle of which Locke had been a cherished and honoured member nine or ten years before. To Lord Ashley this society was probably far more congenial than his surroundings in England. Unrestrained conversation on the topics which most interested him—philosophy, politics, morals, religion—was at this time to be had in Holland with less danger and in greater abundance than in any other country in the world. To the period of this sojourn in Holland must probably be referred the surreptitious impression or publication of an imperfect edition of the *Inquiry concerning Virtue*, from a rough draught, sketched when he was only twenty years of age. This liberty was taken, during his absence, by Toland.

After an absence of over a twelvemonth, Ashley returned to England, and soon succeeded his father as earl of Shaftesbury. He took an active part, on the Whig side, in the general election of 1700-1, and again, with more success, in that of the autumn of 1701. It is said that William III. showed his appreciation of Shaftesbury's services on this latter occasion by offering him a secretaryship of state, which, however, his declining health compelled him to decline. Had the king's life continued, Shaftesbury's influence at court would probably have been considerable. After the first few weeks of Anne's reign, Shaftesbury, who had been deprived of the vicoadmiralty of Dorset, returned to his retired mode of life, but his letters to Furly show that he still retained a keen interest in politics. In August 1703 he again settled in Holland, in the air of which he seems, like Locke, to have had great faith. At Rotterdam he lived, he says in a letter to his steward Wheelock, at the rate of less than £200 a

year, and yet had much "to dispose of and spend beyond convenient living." He returned to England, much improved in health, in August 1704. But, though he had received immediate benefit from his stay abroad, symptoms of consumption were constantly alarming him, and he gradually became a confirmed invalid. His occupations were now almost exclusively literary, and from this time forward he was probably engaged in writing, completing, or revising the treatises which were afterwards included in the *Characteristics*. He still continued, however, to take a warm interest in politics, both home and foreign, and especially in the war against France, of which he was an enthusiastic supporter.

Shaftesbury was nearly forty before he married, and even then he appears to have taken this step at the urgent instigation of his friends, mainly to supply a successor to the title. The object of his choice (or rather of his second choice, for an earlier project of marriage had shortly before fallen through) was a Miss Jane Ewer, the daughter of a gentleman in Hertfordshire. The marriage took place in the autumn of 1709, and on February 9, 1710, was born at his house at Reigate, in Surrey, his only child and heir, the fourth earl, to whose manuscript accounts we are in great part indebted for the details of his father's life. The match appears to have been a happy one, though Shaftesbury neither had nor pretended to have much sentiment on the subject of married life.

With the exception of a *Preface to the Sermons of Dr Whichcote*, one of the Cambridge Platonists or latitudinarians, published in 1698, Shaftesbury appears to have printed nothing himself till the year 1708. About this time the French prophets, as they were called, attracted much attention by the extravagances and follies of which they were guilty. Various remedies of the repressive kind were proposed, but Shaftesbury maintained that their fanaticism was best encountered by "raillery" and "good-humour." In support of this view he wrote a letter to Lord Somers, dated September 1707 which was published anonymously in the following year, and provoked several replies. In May 1709 he returned to the subject, and printed another letter, entitled *Sensus Communis, an Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour*. In the same year he also published *The Moralists, a Philosophical Rhapsody*, and in the following year *Soliloquy, or Advice to an Author*. None of these pieces seem to have been printed either with his name or his initials. In 1711 appeared the *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, in three volumes, also without any name or initials on the title-page, and without even the name of a printer. These three handsome volumes contain in addition to the four treatises already mentioned, *Miscellaneous Reflections*, now first printed, and the *Inquiry concerning Virtue or Merit*, described as "formerly printed from an imperfect copy, now corrected and published intire," and as "printed first in the year 1699."

The declining state of Shaftesbury's health rendered it necessary for him to seek a warmer climate, and in July 1711 he set out for Italy. He settled at Naples in November, and lived there considerably over a year. His principal occupation at this time must have consisted in preparing for the press a second edition of the *Characteristics*, which appeared in 1713, soon after his death. The copy, most carefully corrected in his own handwriting, is still preserved in the British Museum. He was also engaged, during his stay at Naples, in writing the little treatise (afterwards included in the *Characteristics*) entitled *A Notion of the Historical Draught or Tablature of the Judgment of Hercules*, and the letter concerning *Design*. A little before his death he had also formed a scheme of writing a Discourse on the Arts of Painting,

Sculpture, Etching, &c., but when he died he had made but little progress with it. "Medals, and pictures, and antiquities," he writes to Furlly, "are our chief entertainments here." His conversation was with men of art and science, "the virtuosi of this place."

The events preceding the peace of Utrecht, which he regarded as preparing the way for a base desertion of our allies, greatly troubled the last months of Shaftesbury's life. He did not, however, live to see the actual conclusion of the treaty (March 31, 1713), as he died the month before, February 4, 1712, O.S. At the time of his death he had not yet completed his forty-second year. His body was brought back by sea to England and buried at St Giles's, the family seat in Dorsetshire. Though he died so long ago, and was one of the earliest of the English moralists, his descendant, the celebrated philanthropist, who died so recently as 1885, was only his great-grandson.

Shaftesbury's amiability of character seems to have been one of his principal characteristics. All accounts concur in representing him as full of sweetness and kindness towards others, though he may sometimes himself have been the victim of melancholy and despondency. Like Locke he had a peculiar pleasure in bringing forward young men. Amongst these may be especially mentioned Michael Ainsworth, a native of Wimborne St Giles, the young man who was the recipient of the *Letters* addressed to a student at the university, and who was maintained by him at University College, Oxford. The keen interest which Shaftesbury took in his studies, and the desire that he should be specially fitted for the profession which he had selected, that of a clergyman of the Church of England, are marked features of the letters. Other protégés were Crell, a young Pole, the two young Furllys, and Harry Wilkinson, a boy who was sent into Furlly's office at Rotterdam, and to whom several of the letters still extant in the Record Office are addressed.

In the popular mind, Shaftesbury is generally regarded as a writer hostile to religion. But, however short his orthodoxy might fall if tried by the standards of any particular church, his temperament was pre-eminently a religious one. This fact is shown conspicuously in his letters, where he had no reason for making any secret of his opinions. The belief in a God, all-wise, all-just, and all-merciful, governing the world providentially for the best, pervades all his works, his correspondence, and his life. Nor had he any wish to undermine established beliefs, except where he conceived that they conflicted with a truer religion and a purer morality.

To the public ordinances of the church he scrupulously conformed. But, unfortunately, there were many things both in the teaching and the practice of the ecclesiastics of that day which were calculated to repel men of sober judgment and high principle. These evil tendencies in the popular presentation of Christianity undoubtedly begot in Shaftesbury's mind a certain amount of repugnance and contempt to some of the doctrines of Christianity itself; and, cultivating, almost of set purpose, his sense of the ridiculous, he was too apt to assume towards such doctrines and their teachers a tone of raillery and banter, which sometimes even approaches grimace.

But, whatever might be Shaftesbury's speculative opinions or his mode of expressing them, all witnesses concur in bearing testimony to the elevation and purity of his life and aims. Molesworth, who had no special reason for flattering him, speaks of him as "possessing right reason in a more eminent degree than the rest of mankind," and of his character as "the highest that the perfection of human nature is capable of." Even Warburton, in his dedication of the *Divine Legation* to the free-thinkers, is compelled to "own that this lord had many

excellent qualities, both as a man and a writer. He was temperate, chaste, honest, and a lover of his country."

As an earnest student, an ardent lover of liberty, an enthusiast in the cause of virtue, and a man of unblemished life and untiring beneficence, Shaftesbury probably had no superior in his generation. His character and pursuits are the more remarkable, considering the rank of life in which he was born and the circumstances under which he was brought up. In many respects he reminds us of the imperial philosopher Marcus Aurelius, whose works we know him to have studied with avidity, and whose influence is unmistakably stamped upon his own productions.

Most of Shaftesbury's writings have been already mentioned. In addition to these there have been published fourteen letters from Shaftesbury to Molesworth, edited by Toland in 1721; some letters to Benjamin Furlly, his sons, and his clerk Harry Wilkinson, included in a volume entitled *Original Letters of Locke, Sidney, and Shaftesbury*, which was published by Mr T. Forster in 1830, and again in an enlarged form in 1847; three letters, written respectively to Stringer, Lord Oxford, and Lord Godolphin, which appeared, for the first time, in the *General Dictionary*; and lastly a letter to Le Clerc, in his recollections of Locke, first published in *Notes and Queries*, Feb. 8, 1851. The *Letters to a Young Man at the University* [Michael Ainsworth], already mentioned, were first published in 1716, it being uncertain by whom. The *Letter on Design* was first published in the edition of the *Characteristics* issued in 1732. Besides the published writings, there are still to be found several memoranda, letters, rough drafts, &c., in the Shaftesbury papers in the Record Office.

Shaftesbury, it is plain, took great pains in the elaboration of his style, and he succeeded so far as to make his meaning transparent. The thought is always clear. But, on the other hand, he did not equally succeed in attaining elegance, an object at which he seems equally to have aimed. There is a curious affectation about his style,—a falsetto note,—which, notwithstanding all his efforts to please, is often irritating to the reader. Its main characteristic is perhaps best hit off by Charles Lamb when he calls it "genteel." He poses too much as a fine gentleman, and is so anxious not to be taken for a pedant of the vulgar scholastic kind that he falls into the hardly more attractive pedantry of the esthete and virtuoso. But, notwithstanding these defects, he possesses the great merits of being easily read and easily understood. Hence, probably, the wide popularity which his works enjoyed in the last century; and hence, undoubtedly, the agreeable feeling with which, notwithstanding all their false taste and their tiresome digressions, they still impress the modern reader.

It is mainly as a moralist that Shaftesbury has a claim to a place in the history of literature and philosophy. Like most of the ethical writers of his time his first impulse to speculation, or at least to publication, seems to have been derived from a desire to combat the still fashionable paradoxes of Hobbes, and to arrest the progress of doctrines at which society still continued to be seriously alarmed. Hence it became his main concern to assert the reality and independence of our benevolent affections, and to show that these and the acts which result from them are what mainly elicit the feeling of moral approbation. This work he appears to have conceived it his special mission to undertake, not as a "pedant" or a "Schoolman," but as a "man of taste." It was probably in accordance with this conception that he refrained from using the language about the "laws of nature" which had hitherto been current in ethical treatises, and that he preferred to represent morality as a matter of "taste," "sentiment," or "affection," rather than as dictated simply by reason.

The leading ideas in Shaftesbury's ethical theory are those of a system, or the relation of parts to a whole, benevolence, moral beauty, and a moral sense.

The individual man himself is a system consisting of various appetites, passions, and affections, all united under the supreme control of reason. Of this system the parts are so nicely adjusted to each other that any disarrangement or disproportion, however slight, may mar and disfigure the whole. "Whoever is in the least versed in this moral kind of architecture will find the inward fabric so adjusted, and the whole so nicely built, that the barely extending of a single passion a little too far, or the continuance of it too long, is able to bring irrecoverable ruin and misery."

But morality and human nature cannot be adequately studied in the system of the individual man. There are parts in that system, both mental and bodily, which have an evident respect to something outside it. Neither man nor any other animal, though ever so complete a system of parts as to all within, can be allowed in the same manner complete as to all without; he must be considered as having a further relation abroad to the system of his kind. So even this system of his kind to the animal system; this to the world (our earth); and this again to the bigger world

and to the universe. No being can properly be called good or ill except in reference to the systems of which he is a part. "When, in general, all the affections or passions are suited to the public good or end of the species, then is the natural temper entirely good. If, on the contrary, any requisite passion be wanting, or if there be any one supernumerary or weak, or anywise disserviceable or contrary to that main end, then is the natural temper, and consequently the creature himself, in some measure corrupt and ill." Hence it follows that benevolence, if not the sole, is at least the principal moral virtue.

The idea of a moral and social system, the parts of which are in a constant proportion to each other, and so nicely adjusted that the slightest disarrangement would mar the unity of design, almost necessarily suggests an analogy between morality and art. As the beauty of an external object consists in a certain proportion between its parts, or in a certain harmony of colouring, so the beauty of a virtuous character consists in a certain proportion between the various affections, or in a certain harmonious blending of the various springs of action as they contribute to promote the great ends of our being. And similarly, we may suppose, the beauty of a virtuous action would be explained as consisting in its relation to the virtuous character in which it has its source, or to the other acts of a virtuous life, or to the general condition of a virtuous state of society. This analogy between art and morality, or, as it may otherwise be expressed, between the beauty of external objects and the beauty of actions or characters, is never long absent from Shaftesbury's mind. Closely connected with it is the idea that morals, no less than art, is a matter of taste or relish.

This idea leads us to the last of the distinctive features in Shaftesbury's ethical philosophy. The faculty which approves of right and disapproves of wrong actions is with him a sense, and more than once he anticipates Hutcheson by calling it a "moral sense," an expression, indeed, which he may be said to have contributed to the English language. This "sense of right and wrong" is "as natural to us as natural affection itself," and "a first principle in our constitution and make." At the same time it includes a certain amount of judgment or reflexion, that is to say, a rational element. Shaftesbury's doctrine on this head may, perhaps, briefly be summed up as follows. Each man has from the first a natural sense of right and wrong, a "moral sense" or "conscience" (all which expressions he employs as synonymous). This sense is, in its natural condition, wholly or mainly emotional, but, as it admits of constant education and improvement, the rational or reflective element in it gradually becomes more prominent. Its decisions are generally described as if they were immediate, and, beyond the occasional recognition of a rational as well as an emotional element, little or no attempt is made to analyse it. It was reserved for Hume properly to discriminate between these two elements, and to point out that, while the feeling of moral approbation or disapprobation is instantaneous, the moral judgment which precedes it is often the result of an intellectual process of considerable length and perplexity.

It may be sufficient to supplement this brief survey of Shaftesbury's system by a still briefer summary of the answers, so far as they can be collected from his works, which he would have given to the principal questions of ethics as they are now usually propounded. His answers to these questions are, as it appears to the present writer, that our moral ideas—the distinctions of virtue and vice, right and wrong—are to be found in the very make and constitution of our nature; that morality is independent of theology, actions being denominated good or just, not by the arbitrary will of God (as had recently been maintained by Locke), but in virtue of some quality existing in themselves; that the ultimate test of a right action is its tendency to promote the general welfare; that we have a peculiar organ, the moral sense, analogous to taste in art, by which we discriminate between characters and actions as good or bad; that the higher natures among mankind are impelled to right action, and deterred from wrong action, partly by the moral sense, partly by the love and reverence of a just and good God, while the lower natures are mainly influenced by the opinions of others, or by the hope of reward and the fear of punishment; that appetite and reason both concur in the determination of action; lastly, that the question whether the will does or does not possess any freedom of choice, irrespectively of character and motives, is one (at least as we may gather from Shaftesbury's reticence) which it does not concern the moralist to solve.

The close resemblance of Hutcheson's speculations to those of Shaftesbury, amounting sometimes to identity, will be apparent on reference to the account of that philosopher (vol. xii. pp. 409-11). Next to Hobbes, the moralist with whose views Shaftesbury's stand in most direct antagonism is Locke, who not only maintained that moral distinctions depend solely on the arbitrary will of God, but that the sanctions by which they are mainly enforced are the hope of future reward and the fear of future punishment. "By the fruit is the rod, and with the transgression a fire ready to