Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), is not a household name today, but he was one of the most influential English philosophers of the eighteenth century. His career of published writings began in 1698 with an edited volume of Benjamin Whichcote’s sermons, followed over subsequent years by a variety of other writings, most of which were extensively revised and collected together in the first two volumes of the 3-volume *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711), the work for which he is best known. The third volume consisted of “Miscellaneous Reflections” on the preceding “treatises” by Shaftesbury, writing in the voice of an anonymous and ironic commentator. Taken together, the treatises comprising *Characteristics* address an astonishing range of topics, including moral philosophy, poetics and literary theory, aesthetics, history, politics, and theology, all written in a prose style that was considered a model of elegance. It was extraordinarily successful for a work of its nature, going through at least 13 editions in English over the course of the 18th century. For the second edition (published posthumously in 1714), Shaftesbury commissioned Simon Gribelin (1661-1733) to provide emblematic engravings according to his detailed instructions to accompany key parts of the text. These emblems proved very popular and were included in many subsequent editions of *Characteristics*, including Baskerville’s in 1773.

The present publication is the latest instalment in the *Standard Edition* (hereinafter referred to as *SE*) of Shaftesbury’s writings, edited by the Shaftesbury Project, based out of Friedrich-Alexander Universität (Erlangen-Nürnberg). Volumes of the *SE* began appearing in 1981. Though the editors made some unfortunate editorial choices in the earlier volumes of the 1980s, for which they were duly criticized, the editors’ volumes have since become an invaluable source of scholarship and commentary on Shaftesbury’s work, especially his unpublished writings. The editorial principles are sound, and the scholarship is thorough and exemplary. This is the first of a projected five volumes of Shaftesbury’s correspondence.

Some of the letters included in the *SE* — though a relatively small proportion of the whole — will necessarily have already been printed elsewhere, especially since collections of Shaftesbury’s correspondence began appearing within a few years after his death. For example, in 1716 was published *Several Letters Written by a Noble Lord to a Young Man at the University*. This was followed in 1721 by John Toland’s unauthorized collection, *Letters from the Right Honourable the Late Earl of Shaftesbury, to Robert Molesworth, Esq*. Another collection appeared in 1830 (2nd ed., 1847) in the form of Thomas Forster’s *Original Letters of John Locke, Algernon Sidney, and Lord Shaftesbury*. A much later collection worth mentioning, though more narrowly focused, is Rex A. Barrell’s *Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713) and ‘Le Refuge Français’* (1989), which brings together letters to and from Shaftesbury and various French members of the republic of letters, including Pierre Bayle, Jacques Basnage, and Jean le Clerc. Many of these are in French, for which Barrell did not provide translations (nor does the *SE*).

Perhaps the best-known and most referenced collection of Shaftesbury’s correspondence was contained in *The Life, Unpublished Letters, and Philosophical Regimen of Antony, Earl of Shaftesbury* (1900), edited by Benjamin Rand. It printed 147 letters, all by Shaftesbury; letters received from correspondents were not included, a choice which at times robbed the reader of context. This has been remedied in the *SE*, which includes letters addressed to Shaftesbury. Furthermore, although Rand’s was extremely valuable as being the most comprehensive collection of Shaftesbury’s correspondence prior to the *SE*, his editing was not always to be trusted. To take one example, the surname of Henry Trench, the young Irish draughtsman Shaftesbury employed during his time in Naples appears in Rand as “French”. Also, it was not his intent to make a complete edition of the correspondence, and his selection did not include letters which could be deemed embarrassing or indiscreet.

To give some idea of the expanded scope of the *SE* compared with Rand’s edition, this first *SE* volume of correspondence contains 100 letters, 64 of which are Shaftesbury’s. They cover the period December 29, 1683 to February 16, 1700. For the same period, Rand’s collection contains only 19 letters. Rand provided a modernized text and supplied very few notes. By contrast, *SE* preserves Shaftesbury’s spelling and other incipents, as well as — to the extent possible — the layout of the letters. The footnotes are extensive, even daunting. As the foregoing comparison with the Rand edition implies, a great quantity of Shaftesbury’s correspondence has never before been printed prior to its inclusion in the *SE*. Even for those letters which have been previously published, the *SE* should supersede all previous editions.

The introduction by the *SE* editors contains a helpful overview of all the earlier collections of the letters. In addition, a headnote at the beginning of each letter notes which of these earlier collections a letter previously appeared in, where applicable. If previously unpublished, the headnote supplies the manuscript source.

The letters from the period covered in this first *SE* volume of Shaftesbury’s correspondence give scholars a deep insight into the several events and episodes in the life of the young Lord Ashley (as the third Earl then was) during his precocious rise to adulthood. Perhaps foremost among these is his deep involvement in the management of his family’s vast estates, as he tried to fill the void left by his peevish and invalid father, a cipher who was cuttingly described by Dryden as “born a shapeless Lump, like Anarchy.” To compare, one might imagine the plight of an 18-year-old thrown into the role of *de facto* President and CEO of a mid-sized corporation. His efforts were not always appreciated by his parents, especially it seems, when his advice extended to personal affairs, the education of his brothers, for example. Youngest brother Maurice turned out alright in the end, but the middle brother, John, died in Barbados after being sent to sea on Lord Ashley’s recommendation. It seems that his parents held him in some degree responsible for this.
Lord Ashley's situation was not helped by the fact that his parents' marriage was on the rocks. The Countess had not resided in the family domicile at St. Giles, Dorset, for over five years and seems to have been on speaking terms neither with her husband nor eldest son. Nevertheless, Lord Ashley was given (or took upon himself?) the burden of patching things up between his mother and father. Partly through much filial bending of the knee with the Countess and her relations, partly through the dismissal of the Earl's dishonest steward, mother and father were eventually reunited, though St. Giles did not thereafter become a centre of connubial peace. All this is rather painfully portrayed in this volume. Although young Ashley can come across as cold and perhaps a bit precious, one cannot help sympathizing with him when allowances are made for the difficult position in which he was placed.

Among the family's business interests was a concern in the Carolina colony, for which Lord Ashley's father was nominally one of its Lords Proprietor. The colonists were refractory, even rebellious, and the Lords had great difficulty in enforcing their will. Ashley's correspondence on Carolina affairs show this, and makes evident his frustration with some of the leading colonists. The editors note that in 1694 there had even been a suggestion of sending Ashley there as governor. This did not happen, and it was not long before his interest in it was signed over to his brother Maurice.

Of Ashley the politician, we see his drift towards committed Whiggism (of the country rather than the court variety). During his brief stint as an MP, we see that he approached his role with typical workaholism, and that it took very little time for him to become disillusioned with politics, with his fellow Whigs, and with human nature more generally. His reflections on his political experience are in marked contrast to his reputation as the philosopher of optimism.

Of course, Shaftesbury scholars will read his correspondence desiring to see something of his development as a writer and thinker. They will not be disappointed, even in this early correspondence. Through letters from Pierre Bayle, we see his growing involvement in the republic of letters, his avid book collecting, and his intense devotion to classical studies.

A substantial quantity of Shaftesbury's correspondence before 1704 was with John Locke, his grandfather's famous friend and family advisor. For the most part, these letters will have appeared previously, in E. S. de Beer's massive collection of Locke's correspondence. In these letters, we see that, intellectually, the young Ashley was no mere disciple of Locke. When pressed by the latter to share what would eventually see unauthorized publication as the Inquiry concerning Virtue (1699), Ashley is reticent, anticipating that the ideas expressed therein were unlikely to find favour with Locke. A lengthy letter of September 29, 1694, is particularly instructive for the light it sheds on Ashley's attitude towards philosophical speculation, and by implication, on what he may have thought of Locke's studies. Is he not interested in abstruse metaphysics or intricate questions of natural philosophy, except insofar as these can make us better persons: "It is not with mee as with an Empirick, one y' is studying of Curiosities, raising of new Inventions y' are to gain credit to ye author.... What Signifies it to know (if wee could know) what Elements y' Earth was made from.... What I count True Learning, & all y' wee can profit by, is to know our selves" (201 ff.). Many of the remarks in this letter prefigure themes found in his later published works, especially The Moralists. One can also easily read it as casting mild aspersions on the occupations of the elder philosopher.

Regarding the volume itself, as mentioned, prefixed to each letter is a headnote explaining its provenance and previous publication (if applicable). Where the sender or addressee is new, the headnote also contains brief biographical details. The letters are divided into periods, and each period begins with an outline by the editors of events in Shaftesbury's life and affairs. This additional context is particularly helpful for those early years during which the correspondence is relatively sparse. After each letter, details are supplied regarding any other physical peculiarities in the source manuscripts, including address, postmarks, endorsements, and annotations. Where possible, the copy-texts of the letters are the originals. The text is unmodernized and faithful to the originals (including, for example, "ye" and "y" for "the" and "that"). Also included are an excellent bibliography, critical apparatus, alphabetical list of correspondents, chronological list of letters, and index. Perhaps most importantly, there are six very substantial appendices devoted to various facets of Shaftesbury's life as they relate to the correspondence. Each cites extensively from relevant documents beyond the correspondence. These appendices, amounting to over a hundred pages, alone almost make the book worthwhile, and they form a valuable supplement to Robert Voitle's indispensable 1984 biography of the third Earl.
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Invoking Slavery is an ambitious collection of eight short but lively and dense essays and one summary review. In the introduction, Swaminathan and Beach assert that their project seeks to revisit Orlando Patterson's Slavery and Social Death to "take a more holistic approach to slavery in the period, one that works outward to encompass other discourses about slavery." As such, the collection brings together pieces that "examine the ways in which racialized systems of slavery in the New World interlocked with and depended on the subjugation of a class of poor English, Scottish, and Irish indentured servants and transported criminals who were essentially slaves themselves." This results in the highlighting of continuities rather than differences between those victimized directly by the transatlantic slave trade and those by other forms of involuntary servitude. For the most part, the effort is successful. The question remains, however, whether the approach disregards vital distinctions between