

Shaftesbury · Standard Edition

ANTHONY ASHLEY COOPER,  
THIRD EARL OF  
SHAFTESBURY

STANDARD EDITION

Complete Works, Selected Letters and  
Posthumous Writings

Edited with a German Translation  
and a Commentary by

Wolfram Benda, Christine Jackson-Holzberg,  
Friedrich A. Uehlein & Erwin Wolff

Advising Coeditors:

Rudolf Freiburg & Karl-Josef Höltgen

frommann-holzboog

ANTHONY ASHLEY COOPER,  
THIRD EARL OF  
SHAFTESBURY

STANDARD EDITION

Sämtliche Werke, ausgewählte Briefe und  
nachgelassene Schriften

Herausgegeben, übersetzt und  
kommentiert von

Wolfram Benda, Christine Jackson-Holzberg,

Friedrich A. Uehlein & Erwin Wolff

Beratende Mitherausgeber:

Rudolf Freiburg & Karl-Josef Höltgen

frommann-holzboog

II,5

*CHARTAE SOCRATICAE*

DESIGN OF A  
SOCRATICK HISTORY

## CONTENTS

Introduction	9
<i>CHARTAE SOCRATICAE</i>	39
Appendix I: Xenophon, <i>Epistles</i>	289
Appendix II: <i>Little Brown Notebook</i>	293
Appendix III: <i>Books Bought in Holland</i>	314
Critical Apparatus	321
Illustrations	325
Index	331

## INTRODUCTION

Discussing Socratic dialogue as the “*Preliminary Science to Poetry and just Writing*”, its “*Mirroure-Faculty*” designed to reflect “*real Characters and Manners*” and thus ultimately teach us to know ourselves, Shaftesbury observes in his *Soliloquy* (1710) that modern authors “can neither well imitate, nor translate” this ancient form, “whatever Pleasure or Profit we may find in reading those Originals”. He illustrates his point with a “borrow’d Sketch” – a rendering of the opening scene from Pseudo-Plato, *Alcibiades II* – in which “a poor Philosopher, of a mean Figure, accosts one of the powerfullest, wittiest, handsomest, and richest Noblemen of the time”. A literal translation of this kind will be greeted, the Earl foresees, with “a thousand Ridicules arising from the Manner, the Circumstances and Action it-self, compar’d with modern Breeding and Civility.” Were he to transpose the text into a modern setting, adding for example the requisite “Preludes, Excuses, Compliments”, the effect would, however, be equally disastrous: “If we avoid Ceremony, we are unnatural: if we use it, and appear as we naturally are, as we salute, and meet, and treat one another; we hate the Sight.”<sup>1</sup>

This perception was quite possibly the result of Shaftesbury’s own experience as would-be translator, and the dilemma described could be one of the reasons why his planned English version of selected Socratic dialogues – those which, in his view, constituted the “*CHARTÆ* of our Roman Master-Poet [...] the *Mirroures*, the *Exemplars* he bids us place before our Eyes”<sup>2</sup> – seems never to have progressed beyond a series of notes on how best to translate specific words and expressions. These jottings and queries survive, however, as just one small part of the thoughts and memoranda recorded by Shaftesbury within a systematic and elaborate skeleton plan: the “*Design of a Socratick History*”. Although the entire draft remained

1 Shaftesbury’s index to the *Characteristicks* s.v. “*Dialogue*” (SE I 4, 354); *Soliloquy* 199; 194; 204; 202–4 (SE I 1, 98; 92; 106; 102–6). Cf. also the verdict on the “*Dialogue-Manner* (whether direct or recitative)” in *Plasticks* (SE I 5) 164: “too ponderouse & vaste” for the *Second Characters*. Our references here and in the following to the individual treatises of the *Characteristicks* show the page numbers of the relevant 1711 volume and, in brackets, those of the Standard Edition (SE).

2 *Soliloquy* 205–6 (SE I 1, 108); cf. 41, 16–19 below.

just that, its characteristic detail offers us not only a unique insight into the Earl's own handling of those "*Exemplars*", but also a clear picture of what he envisaged as a companion to "Vertue & Philosophy & y<sup>e</sup> Antients" (229, 15): the *Chartae Socraticae*.

### *Hearty Application to the Ancients*

As he had hoped when writing to John Locke in April 1698, Shaftesbury (then still Lord Ashley) was able to "Chang the unprofitable and ungrateful study of these Moderns of ours [sc. his fellow politicians in London], for a hearty Application to the Antients"<sup>3</sup> in July of the same year. He spent the following nine months in Rotterdam, living what his political enemies at home derided as "a Platonick & Romantick life, Confining Virtue only within the Shades of the Chestnut Groves" where, in his despair, he could "like Poetical Lovers delight in nothing but Shades & woods".<sup>4</sup> His return to Rotterdam in August 1703 for an extended stay of twelve months<sup>5</sup> was similarly attributed by some of his contemporaries to severe depression. In response to this Shaftesbury commented to Henry Davenant: "as for Melancholly (w<sup>ch</sup> you say is said of me) I am contented it should pass so. Every one must be thought Melancholly that may enjoy Pleasure & won't. [...] One that lives not in what is call'd *the World*, but quite out of it, is thought not to live. so I may pass for not living, & claim the Priviledge of the Dead, not to be disturbd where I lye buried."<sup>6</sup>

His reasons for withdrawing from public life clearly did on both occasions have much to do with his physical health "& another of more importance": "*Retirement* with me is soverain in both Cases. I know not in

<sup>3</sup> *The Correspondence of John Locke*, ed. E. S. De Beer, Vol. 6 (Oxford, 1981), no. 2415 (9 April [1698]).

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Stringer to Lord Ashley, 5 May 1699: The National Archives (TNA), PRO 30/24/44/77.

<sup>5</sup> He left for Holland on 13 August 1703 and returned to England on 22 August 1704. On both retreats see Robert Voitle, *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury 1671–1713* (Baton Rouge, LA, 1984) 84–98 and 214–25.

<sup>6</sup> Rotterdam, 19 April 1704 (TNA:PRO 30/24/22/4).

w<sup>ch</sup> sense I recover fastest: but y<sup>t</sup> I recover I well know.”<sup>7</sup> One constituent of this self-imposed convalescence – described to Davenant (in the letter just cited) as the “Quiet retir’d way of Life, y<sup>t</sup> best suits me” – was a two-fold course of study as intense and productive as it was undisturbed and restorative. On the one hand self-examination and self-exhortation in the form of written philosophical exercises, drawing again and again on his principal Stoic ‘mirrors and exemplars’, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. On the other, the aforesaid direction of his energies towards classical antiquity, concentrating in the main on Socratic literature. The result in the first case was Shaftesbury’s Ἀσκήματα, most of which was put to paper in two ‘instalments’ (1698–1699 and 1703–1704); later entries show that he kept the two notebooks with him over the years, even taking them to Naples, but their contents were private and never intended for publication. The second, parallel ‘therapeutic’ studies, by contrast, led to the creation of a blueprint for the *Chartae Socraticae*, a work designed entirely for the “publick good of Learning” (238, 26), but one which, although the Earl would also return sporadically to this notebook in later years, was eventually abandoned.

A 1698/1699 thought on “Self” – one of the thematic headings within the Ἀσκήματα – reads: “Whilst I find it to be my Part in the world, to live, as now, a more retir’d sort of life; to learn withall what I can from the Antients; I will continue in this, chearfully & contentedly. If Greek be a help; I studdy Greek: and this, tho’ I were now but beginning, & at y<sup>c</sup> age of y<sup>c</sup> first Cato. If any better part be given me, I accept it. If all Books are taken from me, I accept that too, & am contented. If He who placd me here, remove me elsewhere (let y<sup>c</sup> Scene chang to Asia, Africa, Constantinople or Algiers) I am contented.”<sup>8</sup> Given the number of books bought by Shaftesbury at the time (then again in 1703 and 1704) and the fervour with which he would apply himself to his study of them, the words must certainly be taken as an incantation or enjoinder to himself, not as the description of an appropriately detached state of mind. The back of the *Chartae* notebook shows a register of Shaftesbury’s purchases – very many of them

7 To Teresias, Rotterdam, 5 February 1704 (TNA:PRO 30/24/22/4).

8 *Askemata* (see 36 below), “Self”, 81/Rand 118–19. On Cato (said to have learnt Greek in his old age) cf. 50, 23 below.



Greek and Latin texts – in Holland (Appendix III below), and not only the draft *Chartae*, but also a commonplace book, the “Little Brown Notebook” (here Appendix II) reveal the extent to which he absorbed their contents. One simple example is the 1698/1699 purchase Theodoor Jansson van Almelooven, *De vitis Stephanorum* (Amsterdam, 1683), a biography which lists at the end publications prepared by all the various Estiennes (*Index librorum, qui ex omnium Stephanorum officinis unquam prodierunt*). Shaftesbury appears to have combed through this for editions of interest – “Harry Stephens” features prominently among the items bought in Holland – and he recorded for his own use snippets of information found in van Almelooven.<sup>9</sup>

The “hearty Application” occasionally involved, at least during Shaftesbury’s first retreat, rather more than searching for books and being closeted with them in a Rotterdam chamber. We know that he became personally acquainted at this time with, for example, Pierre Bayle and Jean Le Clerc, and the latter of these two remembered how “being in Holland some Years ago in my House, we discours’d about the antient Greeks and the Reading of their Books”.<sup>10</sup> The volumes bought from Bayle (we have marked the titles in Appendix III) point to similar shared interests and include, perhaps significantly, two editions of Socratic writings which would play an important part in Shaftesbury’s studies: H. Stephanus’ 1581 edition of Xenophon and the 1602 text of Ficino’s Plato. Although the second period of retirement in Holland was one in which Shaftesbury sequestered himself more consistently from the world, Bayle remained an exception to this rule.

Needless to say, Lord Ashley’s study of the ancients prior to August 1698 differed only in the amount of time it could claim, not in its ‘heartiness’. It is not always easy to date the relevant entries in his commonplace books, but it seems at least likely that, for example, his critical discussion in the “Little Brown Notebook” of Dio Cassius and the notes there on obscure

9 Appendix II, 312, 19 and 313, 8–9. Shaftesbury’s private name for Henri Estienne II is used e.g. 263, 23.

10 Cf. *Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae*, ed. J. Le Clerc (Amsterdam, 1709), in the (Latin) letter of dedication to Shaftesbury; English translation quoted here: TNA:PRO 30/24/22/7. See Voitle 84 ff. on the first retreat.

philosophers (see Appendix II, 295–6) were written before July 1698. And, such speculation aside, both the effortless with which he draws on classical models in Ἀσκήματα and *Chartae*, and the store of ready-to-quote parallels from ancient literature suggest not only that a solid foundation had long been laid, but also that Socrates was already firmly established in Shaftesbury's mind as the exemplar he would always be: a unique phenomenon comparable to the mighty "Aloes-plant" seen in Holland,<sup>11</sup> the "divinest Man that had appear'd ever in the Heathen World" (*A Letter concerning Enthusiasm*), the "greatest of *Philosophers*, the very Founder of Philosophy it-self" (*Miscellaneous Reflections*).<sup>12</sup>

### *Socratic History*

In the second half of the seventeenth century the familiar and virtually ubiquitous figure of Socrates was exploited at one end of the *Nachleben* spectrum for his entertainment potential – the great but old man who must accept that the young and fair Timandra loves not him, but Alcibiades (the ensuing "displeasure" allows him to "meet death with such constancy"),<sup>13</sup> or the wise, patient (and musical) bigamist who tries to keep the peace between his battling wives.<sup>14</sup> At the other, we find, for example, Thomas Stanley's portrayal in *The History of Philosophy*: an exhaustive compilation of the ancient evidence and anecdotes, ordered to form a biography and combined with *dicta* which emphasize Socrates' monotheistic thinking

11 *Askemata*, "Human Affaires" 166–7/Rand 89: "not one in a hundred makes a Shoot; nor *that one* perhaps in a hunderd, or at least in many years. But *then*, how vast, how mighty a Plant! Remember this when thou thinkst of Socrates or any such. and say not of the Age *why dos it not produce of tener?* for this is being angry at the Aloes. Fool!"

12 *Letter* 31 (SE I 1, 344) and *Misc. Refl.* 244 (I 2, 292).

13 In *The Loves of Sundry Philosophers, and Other Great Men* (1673), a translation of Marie C. Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu), *Les Amours des grands hommes* (1671); Socrates: 26–62.

14 In Antonio Draghi's comic opera *La Patienza di Socrate con due moglie* (first performed in 1680). Nicolò Minato's libretto was used again by Georg Philipp Telemann for *Der geduldige Sokrates*, 1721; see Klaus Döring, "Sokrates auf der Opernbühne", in: *Antike und Abendland* 47 (2001), 198–213.

and the moral code by which he lived.<sup>15</sup> More overt attempts to christianize Socrates, or to rule out the possibility of his salvation, still looked, as they had done for centuries, at his belief in the one god or the many and his place in the genealogy of Christian beliefs.<sup>16</sup> Le Clerc saw in Socrates one of those men (Confucius was another) chosen by divine providence to guide us towards truth and virtue, furnished to this end with a genius and perhaps helped, unbeknownst to himself, in other mysterious ways.<sup>17</sup> Bayle, on the other hand, said very little at all about him in the *Dictionnaire*, although there are two notes in which strong objections are raised to Socrates' criticism of Anaxagoras, and one in which Bayle suggests that the path to virtue advocated by Socrates laid a little too much stress on being seen to be virtuous and praised for that.<sup>18</sup>

If Shaftesbury did discuss the *Chartae* plans with his Rotterdam friends, it seems unlikely that they would have found much in the way of common ground. The manuscript draft shows its author in any case engrossed in the original Socratic texts and the ancient *testimonia*. The book was to present an image of Socrates not obfuscated by, for example, any attempt to claim

- 15 Stanley (see 37 below) 74–113. Cf. esp. 77–8 (“God is one [...] perfect in himself, giving the being, and well-being of every Creature”), 81 (moral *dicta*), and 83–5 on Socrates' daimon (esp. 85: Stanley, who rejects the notions that this “Spiritual attendant” was simply “Prescience within the Soul” or “an evil Spirit”, sees it as “sent from God” and favours the description ‘guardian’, “which *Maximus Tyrius*, and *Apuleius* describe in such manner, that they want only the name of a good Angel”).
- 16 e. g. Theophilus Gale, *The Court of the Gentiles*, Part II (Oxford, 1670), 217: “Socrates had very Metaphysic contemplations of Divine Mysteries, and that originally from the Jewish Church.” Cf. also 62, 18 and 227, 18 below (Ralph Cudworth; Henry More).
- 17 *Aischinis Socratici dialogi tres*, ed. J. Le Clerc (Amsterdam, 1711), 213–17 in the third of Le Clerc's own appended *Silvae* (177–225 *De Socrate*).
- 18 All three introduced in the 1702 edition. See the article on Anaxagoras, notes *R* and *S* (Socrates had sought knowledge of the universe from A., “mais cette science n'est pas faite pour le genre humain [...] A moins que d'avoir toute l'idée que Dieu a suivie en faisant le monde, on ne pourroit point donner les explications que Socrate souhaitoit”, and his poor opinion in Xenophon, *Mem.* 4,7,6 of the gods as jealous guardians of their causal secrets does not deserve mention), and on Amphiaraus, note *H* (on *Mem.* 2,6,39). Note *H* in the Agesilaus article (1697) does defend Socrates against a suggestion that he boasted about his ‘fooling around’ with children, but Bayle seems to be primarily interested not in clearing Socrates' name, but in reprimanding the impugner (La Mothe le Vayer).

him for the tradition of Christian morality: “no Mention more of any thing but Philosophy. The Misteries of our Holy Religion not being to be mixd.” (49, 18–20). Visible interest in recent readings seems for the greater part limited to what modern editors and translators had written. One of these stands out, however: François Charpentier (1620–1702), whose translation of Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* and accompanying biography of Socrates – *Les Choses mémorables de Socrate [...] avec La Vie de Socrate* (Paris, 1650) – marks the beginning of a gradual shift in approaches to Socrates or, more specifically, to the texts traditionally treated as authentic biographical accounts and faithful transcripts of his words.<sup>19</sup> The *Vie*, placed before *Les Choses mémorables*, offers readers “*tout d’un coup*” the material “*qui nous a esté donnée avec tant de confusion par les anciens Autheurs, qu’on a peine à reconnoistre ce qui est le premier ou le dernier entre ses actions*”.<sup>20</sup> This was the first modern life of Socrates to appear in print, and its combination with what Charpentier considered “*une des plus excellentes pieces de toute l’Antiquité*” was an attempt to create “*un corps [...] afin qu’on eust ensemble toute l’histoire de Socrate*.” Although he stresses at the outset how fortunate it is that the writings of both Plato and Xenophon have survived, these two being the “*fideles dépositaires de l’ame de ce grand homme*”, it is Xenophon alone who “*a raporté de véritables discours de Socrate, sans meslange d’aucune fiction, comme avoit fait Platon auparavant*”.<sup>21</sup>

Charpentier supported his argument that Plato is less reliable as ‘repository’ with oft-quoted remarks made by Diogenes Laertius, and, although the notion was neither new nor even taken in the *Vie* noticeably more consistently as a criterion,<sup>22</sup> it seems to have appealed to readers between

19 On Socrates in the seventeenth century see P.J. FitzPatrick, “The Legacy of Socrates”, in: *Socratic Questions*, ed. B. S. Gower and M.C. Stokes (London, 1992), 153–208, esp. 168–74; also F. Bottin, L. Malusa, G. Micheli, G. Santinello, I. Tolomio, *Models of the History of Philosophy: From Its Origin in the Renaissance to the ‘Historia Philosophica’* (Dordrecht, 1993), *passim*.

20 Preface, A7<sup>r</sup>. Originally placed before both *Vie* and translation, this preface stands, in the edition which we quote (1699), between the two; its place is taken at the front by a letter of dedication to Cardinal Mazarin (see n. 23 below).

21 *ibid.* A2<sup>v</sup>; 7<sup>v</sup>; 2<sup>r</sup>; 3<sup>v</sup>.

22 Stanley 77 refers to the same remarks (Xenophon recorded Socrates’ discourses “with most punctualness, as *Plato* with most Liberty, intermixing so much of his own, as it is

1650 and 1700 and especially in the eighteenth century. Second, revised editions each of the *Vie* and the translation appeared in 1657; the life was issued separately in 1668, and a third edition of the “corps” was published in 1699.<sup>23</sup> It was translated into German by Christian Thomas as *Das Ebenbild eines wahren und ohnpedantischen Philosophi, Oder: Das Leben Socratis* and *Der Kern wahrer und nützlicher Welt-Weißheit ehedessen von Xenophon in Beschreibung der merckwürdigen Dinge des Socrates* (1693).<sup>24</sup> The first English version was prepared by Edward Bysshe: *The Memorable Things of Socrates* (London, 1712); it included a translation of the *Vie* and offered in addition Bysshe’s own biography of Xenophon. A second edition of Bysshe’s text appeared in 1722, but the “New Edition, Corrected and Improved” of 1757 (Glasgow; also Dublin, 1758) is vastly altered and barely recognizable as his work,<sup>25</sup> let alone as that of Charpentier.

The *Vie de Socrate* of 1650 had in the meantime formed the basis for John Gilbert Cooper’s *The Life of Socrates* (London, 1749), a work designed to show that the philosopher “fell a glorious and undaunted Martyr” to his belief (this the result of God’s ‘mediate’ revelations to the pagan world) in the “ONE, eternal, uncreated, immutable, immaterial, incomprehensible” God (vi). The often lengthy footnotes function as a vehicle for Cooper’s

not easy to distinguish the Master from the Scholar”) but, on the same page, is quite happy to draw on Plato for Socrates’ “*Metaphysics*”. FitzPatrick (n. 19 above) suggests that the need to distinguish clearly between the Platonic and the real Socrates developed in the eighteenth century with Mosheim and Brucker (175–6), but their “critical discernment” was – as we can see in Shaftesbury – not entirely new.

- 23 1657 and 1668 in Paris (in each case with Charpentier now named on the title-page and the *Vie* dedicated to Cardinal Mazarin), 1699 in Amsterdam; the eighteenth century saw two further editions: Amsterdam, 1745 and 1758. Charpentier’s translation of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* (Paris, 1659) enjoyed similar popularity, with further editions in 1660, 1661, 1717, 1732, and 1749.
- 24 Published in Halle, with a reissue there probably in the same year; second edition *ibid.*, 1720. The full title shows that Thomas translated the *Memabilia* from the French and not from the original Greek.
- 25 Bysshe’s five books of *Memorable Things* are back to four (cf. 42, 25–6 below) and the translation much revised; the *Life of Socrates* and the *Life of Xenophon* appear reduced and completely rewritten as “Observations on the Life, Character, and Doctrine of Socrates” (15–64); editor(s) unknown. Bysshe’s translation of Xenophon was published again as *The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates* in 1904 (London; introduction by H. Morley).

wrangling with various ancient sources and more modern authors,<sup>26</sup> and in his view Plato, Xenophon, and Cebes “ought only to be called *Chartæ Socraticæ* [...] and no others can be rely’d upon for an Account of the Life and Tenets of this incomparable Man; the Compositions of that Crowd who have incidentally treated of either in After-ages, being either made up of dull oral Traditions, or the improbable and inconsistent *Chimeras* of their own Imaginations” (178–9).

Despite the popularity of Cooper’s book,<sup>27</sup> the established view on what could be called authentically Socratic was somewhat different. The later resurgence of interest in the *Memorabilia* – only a few years after the 1757 *Memorable Things*, Sarah Fielding published her own translation, *Xenophon’s Memoirs of Socrates* (Bath, 1762)<sup>28</sup> – is perhaps due in part to Johann Jacob Brucker’s damning assessment of Plato’s Socratic *chartæ*. These, wrote Brucker in 1742, were promoted by their author as the genuine article, because Plato wished to be thought of as Socrates’ faithful disciple: he had in reality adulterated the dialogues not only with his own thoughts, but also with Pythagorean, Eleatic, and Heraclitean ideas. Only Xenophon, therefore, is wholly reliable.<sup>29</sup> However, Brucker’s preference is a far cry from the admiration for the *Memorabilia* voiced by Charpentier. The French translator enthuses: “soit que l’on jette les yeux sur cette grande diversité de discours soit que l’on s’attache à cette naïveté inimitable, avec laquelle les choses y sont racontées; soit qu’on pese l’excellence de la doctrine, & que l’on considère cette grande ame de Socrate qui paroist icy tout nuë; on est contraint d’avouër qu’il ne s’est rien fait de plus accomply dans les plus heureux siècles de la Philosophie.”<sup>30</sup> Brucker concentrates on disparaging Plato, with no words of praise for Xenophon – and no intention of numbering him (as Stanley had done) among the philosophers in his *Historia*.

26 Cf. the title-page: “Herein the different Sentiments LA MOTHE LE VAYER, CUDWORTH, STANLEY, DACIER, CHARPENTIER, VOLTAIRE, ROLLIN, WARBURTON, and others on these subjects, are occasionally consider’d.”

27 See FitzPatrick (n. 19 above) 175.

28 Second edition London, 1767; third London, 1788 (also published in Dublin). Shaftesbury’s nephew James Harris provided some of the footnotes.

29 *Historia Critica Philosophiæ* (Leipzig, 1742), Vol. I, 554–6 (esp. 556).

30 Preface to the translation A2<sup>v</sup>–3<sup>r</sup>. Charpentier continues: “Ce qui donne le dernier ornement à toutes ces autres perfections c’est que ce ne sont point icy des Dialogues faits a plaisir, où

Shaftesbury's position within the *Nachleben* tradition is closer to that of Charpentier, although he is generally more circumspect and critical when it comes to the validity of the ancient sources. The two men admire the same qualities in Xenophon, their assessments, for example, of Socrates' daimon as his own inner voice rather than a supernatural one – and the desire to avoid upsetting readers by being too insistent about this – are quite similar. Charpentier also makes no conspicuous efforts to christianize Socrates (unlike, e.g., the editor of the 1757 *Memorable Things*). The parallels illustrate again the importance of Charpentier for this period (even if Shaftesbury prefers not to mention the French translator by name). And more interesting, perhaps, is the position taken by both on *the* Socratic problem, the one that would trigger nineteenth-century debates and that ultimately remains unsolved: how we are to read the ancient texts in order to determine exactly what Socrates did and thought and said.<sup>31</sup>

The Earl's own work on Socrates remained, of course, without influence. We know that he discussed it with his secretary and librarian Paul Crell (185, 18), who would return to East Prussia and comparative oblivion after his patron's death. It is even possible that John Toland knew something of the plan, as he refers in 1700 to his own work on a Socratic history. After a disclaimer for his biography of James Harrington, Toland declares: "if I write any thing hereafter [...] I have determin'd it shall not concern personal disputes, or the narrow interests of jarring Factions, but something of universal benefit, and which all sides may indifferently read. [...] Besides other reasons of mentioning my suppos'd designs, one is to disabuse several people who (as I am told) are made to believe that in the History of SOCRATES I draw a Parallel between that Philosopher and JESUS CHRIST. This is a most scandalous and unchristian calumny, as will more fully appear to the world, whenever the Book it self is publish'd: for that I have bin som time about it, I freely avow; yet not in the manner those

*L'on assemble des personnes qui ne se sont pû voir, & qui n'estoient pas d'un mesme siècle, & dont Socrate pust dire, qu'on luy fait bien tenir là des discours à quoy il n'a jamais pensé; tout ce que Xenophon escrit, a esté véritablement dit par Socrate dans les occasions mesmes qui en sont icy rapportées" (A3).*

31 See A. Patzer (ed.), *Der historische Sokrates*, Wege der Forschung 585 (Darmstadt, 1987), a collection of articles devoted to the problem; among them is Friedrich Schleiermacher's famous essay of 1818 ("Ueber den Werth des Sokrates als Philosophen": 41–58).

officious Informers report, but as becoms a disinterested Historian, and a friend to all mankind.”<sup>32</sup> Cryptic banter with Shaftesbury in mind, or just a curious coincidence? Toland did eventually publish something – his *Pantheisticon, sive Formula Celebrandæ Sodalitatis Socraticæ* (1720) – but this was a “deistic liturgy”<sup>33</sup> which not many sides are likely to have read “indifferently”.

### *First and the Second Memoirs*

By the time Shaftesbury started work on his draft, he had already given much thought to his own definition of Socratic *chartae*. Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* were “for y<sup>e</sup> World, & to shew Socrates as he appeard to y<sup>e</sup> world & as he treated these matters [...] with y<sup>e</sup> generality of Mankind [...] to whome he explaind things after the best manner but not so as to form a System w<sup>ch</sup> by those that came after him was done [...] But Plato is all the contrary. for as he enterd into Metaphisicks so he made Socrates enter, & not only privately but before all y<sup>e</sup> world & in great Companyes every where & eternally” (130, 30 ff.). The distinction between what he elsewhere calls the first and the second memoirs<sup>34</sup> had been made, and the *Chartae* manuscript shows him ordering his thoughts, sometimes reconsidering, also looking beyond Xenophon and Plato. His “Socratick History” was to be divided into two books, “The Reason of the Seperation of this Book from y<sup>e</sup> former: *that* History. *this* Apochryph” (161, 4–5). The designated contents:

32 James Harrington, *Oceana* [and other works], ed. J. Toland (London, 1700), xl–xli of the “Life”.

33 FitzPatrick (n. 19 above) 175.

34 “What had Socrates been (as to memory) but for These Two? And even by these had He ever been celebrated or mention’d but for the Accident of his Death w<sup>ch</sup> gave such Lustre? [...] Thence y<sup>e</sup> real History, Memoirs, Defence: y<sup>e</sup> Πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα Wonder, Appeal *Apology*. all from this Death so much lamented: for w<sup>ch</sup> Providence has been so oft questiond: for w<sup>ch</sup> thou thy self so often hast been disturbd. Had it not been for this, where had been either the first or second Memoirs? Where had been the Subject, or where y<sup>e</sup> Spirit of his Historean, or Poet? the Heroe–Author, or Poet–Philosopher? the Chastity Simplicity Politeness Justness of y<sup>e</sup> One, or y<sup>e</sup> Divine Enthousiasms of the other?” 1703/1704 in *Askemata*, “Human Affaires” 243/Rand 98–9.



*CHARTAE SOCRATICAE*

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES  
PRO 30/24/27/14

## Design of a Socratic History.

Title of the Work

[*Chartæ Socraticæ.*

(Motto)

— sapere est principium & fons

Rem tibi Socratica poterunt &c: —

Hor: Art. Poet.<sup>a</sup>

OR SERMONES SOCRATICÆ as Ode 21 of Hor: Book 3

*Non ille quanquam Socraticis madet (Sermonibus)*

*Sermonibus* —<sup>b</sup>]

<sup>a</sup> Horace, *De arte poetica* 309–10: “moral sense is the base and source for good writing, *subject-matter the Socratic writings can show you*”. Cf. *Soliloquy* 193 (SE I 1, 90–2): “The Skill and Grace of Writing is founded, as our wise Poet tells us, in *Knowledge and Good Sense*: And not barely in that Knowledge, which is to be learnt from common Authors, or the general Conversation of the World; but from those particular Rules of Art, which Philosophy alone exhibits;” *ibid.* 205–6 (SE I 1, 106–8): “those *Philosophical Sea-Cards*, by which the adventuring Genius’s of the times were wont to steer their Courses, and govern their impetuous Muse. These were the *CHARTÆ* of our *Roman Master-Poet*, and these the Pieces of Art, the *Mirours*, the *Exemplars* he bids us place before our Eyes”.

<sup>b</sup> Horace, *Odes* 3,21,9–10: “though he be steeped in Socratic dialogues”, Messala will not be so abstemious as to pass over the wine, after all (vv. 11–12) even the dyed-in-the-wool Stoic Cato is said to have indulged on occasion. → 240,1–3: verses like these will ‘sweeten’ the text for readers.

## Order of it as follows

### *Book the 1<sup>st</sup>*

(I.) \*a PREFACE shewing the (r)Reason of the undertaking, Order of the Work. Apology as to Modern Religion. the Nature of History: to what incident: & that of Philosophers especially. Diogenes Laertius. and from hence fall naturally into what follows (P. I.)<sup>†</sup>

\* See Instructions n<sup>o</sup> (2.) 237,7 & Suppliment. inf. p. 52. & 53 238,18–20.

† (2) See Instruction n<sup>o</sup> (7.) below page 53.)



(2.) The Life of Socrates from Dio. Laertius<sup>a</sup> & others:<sup>\*</sup> and concluding with his Death & the censure of it fall naturally into Xenophon's expostulation & the first words of y<sup>e</sup> Memorables πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα<sup>b</sup> — See page 2. 52

\* the examination of y<sup>e</sup> τὸ δαίμονιον to be in this place, partly.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> D. L. 2,18–47.

<sup>b</sup> *Mem.* 1,1: “I have often wondered with what arguments the men who prosecuted Socrates managed to persuade the Athenians that, in the interests of the city, he deserved the sentence of death.” An opening imitated by Shaftesbury in *Plasticks* (SE I 5) 204: “πολλάκις ἐθαύμασα [...] I have always thought strange”; perhaps also (hyperbolized) → 47,9–10.

<sup>c</sup> Socrates' *daimon*; → 247.

\* (3.) The 4 Books translated<sup>a</sup> See P. 4. 65 (& Notes on them. See Page. 6. 73)

\* The Life of Xenoph in this place between 2 & 3. See p. 68. 255 & Instruct. p. 53. 237,20

<sup>a</sup> i. e. Xenophon's *Memorabilia*.

(4.) Discours ⟨y<sup>e</sup> first⟩ on y<sup>e</sup> ⟨o⟩Order Composition & Symmetry of y<sup>e</sup> 4 Books of Xenophon (of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Economicks, far from being a Part)<sup>a</sup> in the conclusion introductory to the following Apology ⟨& explaining⟩. (Pag. 8. 146)

<sup>a</sup> Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* was read by some as a work in its own right, but taken by others to be no more than the closing section of the *Memorabilia* (a theory probably first advanced by the second-century physician and philosopher Galen). D. L. 2,57 lists the titles separately, STANLEY avoided controversy by referring to the *Mem.* as “the memorials of Socrates” and to *Oec.* as “the last Book of the memorable discourses” (120). CHARPENTIER was convinced that Xenophon “quitte la plume” after four books (preface A4<sup>i</sup> ff.), but BYSSHE would dismiss the arguments (iv–xi) and tack “The Economick” on to the *Memorable Things* as fifth book. WELLS distinguished between *Mem.* and *Oec.*, whereas LEUNCLAVIUS had suggested that they belong together; Shaftesbury owned two editions of Xenophon – Frankfurt, 1595 and 1596 – which show *Oec.* as Book 5 of the *Mem.* The texts are now usually regarded as separate compositions. → 43,26.

(5.) The Apology of Xenophon translated (P. 10 153) with Notes ⟨all along⟩ (P. 12 154)

6. Discours ⟨the second on the Whole History⟩ ⟨on this History of Xen: & on Xen: himself⟩ ⟨&⟩ on y<sup>e</sup> ⟨...⟩ 2 Historically Pieces of Xenoph: (or) on y<sup>e</sup> *Writings of Xenophon*. (P 14 156)

Here end of the First Book.

5 *Memor*<sup>d</sup>: the General Title of y<sup>e</sup> Pages of this First Book to be *History*. as thus. for (1) Preface to the History. for (2.) History of Socrates — Diog: Laertius &c: for (3.) Hist: of Soc: — ⟨Memoirs of Xenophon or⟩ *Xenophon's Commentaries*. Hist. of Socrat: — Account of Xen: his Historean. for (4.) Hist. of Soc: — Discours on y<sup>e</sup> ⟨Memoirs of⟩ *Commentaries of*  
10 Xen. for (5.) H: of Soc: — the Apology of Xenoph. for (6.) H: of Soc: — Discours on ⟨the foregoing Tracts⟩ the 2 Pieces of Xenophon [fol. 4<sup>r</sup> a]

### Book the 2<sup>d</sup>

2.) (1) Preface. Idea of y<sup>e</sup> Collection. Reason why these Tracts separated from y<sup>e</sup> former. why some cut short & some Fragments. Dialogues Dramatic peices, orations from friends & Enemyes. ⟨(Aristophanes Lucian Atheneus on one hand Xenophon Plato on the other) from Enemyes first & therefore necessary to insert Aristophanes.⟩<sup>a</sup> and to begin. (P. 16 161) ⟨with Friends. viz.⟩

<sup>a</sup> → 19–20.

20 1.) (2.)<sup>a</sup> *Economicks of Xenop.* ⟨not whole⟩ (P 18 164) Notes. (P 20. 165) [see Query (15). 235,29]

25 <sup>a</sup> The manuscript shows alternative numbering for this and the preceding note (with no deletions). The numbers appear to have been inserted later together with the reference to Query (15), perhaps in connection with Shaftesbury's decision there to change the order of the texts at the beginning of Book 2.

(3) Discours on y<sup>e</sup> *Economicks*. no part of y<sup>e</sup> *Memorables* (as above) ⟨& less⟩ & more loose than the *Convivium* ⟨w<sup>ch</sup> follo⟩ w<sup>ch</sup> follows. on w<sup>ch</sup> something by way of preparation. (P. 22 166) to y<sup>e</sup> following

(4.) the *Convivium* ⟨[not whole]⟩ (P. 24 169) & Notes (P. 26 171)

(5.) Discours on y<sup>c</sup> 2 Peices of Xenophon whose ⟨feigned peices more⟩ looser Peices more true then any of Plato's unatested by himself & not speaking at all as an Historian. only Pictures & sometimes not ⟨that be⟩ so much as that. from hence fall into y<sup>c</sup> account of y<sup>c</sup> Friendly & unfriendly Pictures & Fictions. first Unfriendly. (P. 28. 179)

5

(6.) Aristophanes Comedy.<sup>a</sup> not whole (P. 30 182) Notes (P. 32. 182)

<sup>a</sup> i. e. *Clouds*.

(7.) Discourse on it, & Introductory to Plato (P. 34 183)

(8.) Plato's Convivium & other Fragment (P. 36 193) Notes (P. 38 197)

⟨Discours on⟩ (9.) Discours on them, concluding so as to prepare for y<sup>c</sup> Apology representing y<sup>c</sup> Town of Athens & opening y<sup>c</sup> Scene (page 40. 200) ⟨Notes p. 42.⟩

10

(10.) Apology ⟨⟨p. 44⟩ Notes ⟨p. 46⟩ then⟩ Crito & ⟨then⟩ Phædo P. 44. 202 Notes 46. 207

(11) concluding Discours (P. 48 215)

15

☞. ⟨[Mem<sup>d</sup>. Last of all Cebes & Discours. Q:<sup>r</sup> ?]⟩ ⟨reserv'd for hereafter⟩  
⟨2<sup>d</sup> Chartæ⟩<sup>a</sup>

see 162. 275,5 [fol. 4<sup>r</sup> b]

<sup>a</sup> → 21 on the planned "2<sup>d</sup> Chartæ".

Common place for Generall ⟨Citations⟩ Remarks Notes Citations & Passages of Authors not ⟨fixd ⟨...⟩⟩ ⟨allready⟩ determin'd where to have their place See Page 50. 219 ⟨Gen. Notes.⟩

20

Common place for Queryes, Generall Ideas Generall Cautions Instructions as to y<sup>c</sup> Composition Style Genius of Writing, things in Controversy &c: See Page 52.\* 226

25

\* See Second Thoughts 162. 275

Letters of Socrat: (to be plac'd at y<sup>e</sup> latter End, but in y<sup>e</sup> Life) & Xenoph: (y<sup>e</sup> same) Translation. Page 54: 245

Notes on the Letters. Judgment of them w<sup>ch</sup> true w<sup>ch</sup> not. P. 56. 246

5 Matters referring to the τὸ δαμμόνιον p. 66. 247 (w<sup>ch</sup> is to be plac'd in y<sup>e</sup> Life of Socr.< >) partly. but chiefly as directed p. 80. n<sup>o</sup> 10. 55,4)

Matters referring to the Life of Xenophon (to be plac'd <but> just before the Mem<sup>s</sup> as is shewn <below> below, in Instructions. n<sup>o</sup> (7.) 237, 20) See below Page <68> 68. 255

10 <Table of Cebes (the Socratick) to be added last of all, after <y<sup>e</sup> 1> the 3 last pieces of Plato & the Death of Socrat: in Phædo. the same Discours w<sup>ch</sup> concludes w<sup>th</sup> Plato & the Platonick History, introducing to this of Cebes the only Socratick remaining besides our <t>Two. <& w<sup>th</sup> this, end (a small Conclusion)> [See Pag ... <1> & 162.]

<...> Notes on y<sup>e</sup> Table of Cebes. P. ...

15 <Discours, & Conclusion. P. ...<sup>a</sup>  
[Mem<sup>s</sup>: the Similitude between this Picture & that of Hercules <M> in the Mem<sup>s</sup> B. 2.]<sup>b</sup> [fol. 4<sup>v</sup>a]

<sup>a</sup> The deletions here suggest that Shaftesbury eventually decided not to use the *Tabula Cebetis*.

20 <sup>b</sup> → 103,1–2.

Common Place for certain Thoughts & Reflections fitt to be produc'd in this Work but not <fix'd> determin'd to what Discours <they sh> or what Note <& <...>> they shall be added. See P. 82. 272

25 Place for y<sup>e</sup> *Marginall* Notes & *Index* (to be made Alphabetically & full at y<sup>e</sup> end of y<sup>e</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> Book, for finding out of Places) See Page 126. 279

Place for y<sup>e</sup> Same *Marginall* Notes *Index* of y<sup>e</sup> 2<sup>d</sup> Book. See ...

Advertisements as from y<sup>e</sup> Printer [58 48,30] ...<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> → 238,24–9.

New place for Second Thoughts on y<sup>e</sup> Composition & Additional ⟨Pei⟩  
Peices. 162. 275 [fol. 4<sup>v</sup> b]

in all (including Cebes, & Discours) ⟨22⟩ 24 Pieces. of w<sup>ch</sup> 2, Lives (viz: 5  
Soc: & Xen) ⟨&⟩ 12 Discourses. & 10 Tracts. if (if Cebes be omitted (9 Dis-  
courses 9 Tracts. & 2 Lives. in all 22 Pieces.) y<sup>e</sup> 3 Dialogues of Plato (viz:  
Apol: Crito & Phædo) are to be sepearate ⟨&⟩ with discourses between. for  
then y<sup>e</sup> first Book will be of 7. & the 2<sup>d</sup> Book of 18 unless y<sup>e</sup> last Discours 10  
after Cebes be (as 'tis probable it must) y<sup>e</sup> Concluding Discours. then in  
all 23.

Mem<sup>d</sup>: the Supposd Quarrell of Xenoph: & Plato  
See p. 15 159,1–19

Memorand: The Generall ⟨Pag⟩ Title of y<sup>e</sup> Pages of y<sup>e</sup> 2<sup>d</sup> Book ... of 15  
*Socrates*.<sup>a</sup> [fol. 3<sup>v</sup>]

<sup>a</sup> Lines 5–15 were entered on the originally blank verso opposite fol. 4<sup>r</sup>, apparently some  
time after completion of this section.

N<sup>o</sup> (1.) Preface or { Prefatory  
Preliminary  
Introductory  
by way of Introduction  
or (meerly) Introduction } Discours (1<sup>st</sup>)

5

as thus. in one page *History of Socrates* [or Socratick History] & then over ag<sup>t</sup> it in y<sup>e</sup> other page, *Introduction* & so on forwards: as in the Frontispiece y<sup>e</sup> leaf before: See y<sup>e</sup> Memorandum. 43,5

(1) That when I have consider'd, I have often thought it a thing very  
10 absurd & unaccountable to hear Antient Names quoted with great Author-  
ity when at the same time there was no manner of right Understanding or  
Notion of those talkd of. and whereas a Man would be rediculouse who  
should <quote Hercules or Theseus or Cadmus> in any grave <disc> concern  
bring instances from Cadmus or Orpheus; yet it is not in itself <more> less  
15 absurd when Socrates or any such, being quoted; neither the person y<sup>t</sup>  
quotes nor any <of those that are about him> of y<sup>e</sup> standers by y<sup>t</sup> hear, have  
any Notion who Socrates was <or> & understand & conceive his Story as  
rediculously & fabulously as <if> that of Cadmus or Orpheus <tho the>.  
However this I have observ'd <that tho> that in very many occasions <by> the  
20 Citation of some Wise Antient by a person of prudence [*pietate gravem & me-  
ritis &c.*]<sup>a</sup> has great Weight to do good. therefore I thought it not altogather  
absurd to attempt to set this in a right light: especially since I think <so> (it is  
my opinion & will be seen afterwards whether so or not by one who will  
read this) that there is nothing nor <...> no Person <of> in Antient History  
25 of whome <we> we may have a \*clearer plainer view & more intirely know:  
even so that (it is my opinion) no person whome we do not now actually  
convers with but have knowledg of from history ever so fresh can be better  
known to us and (in my opinion<)) of w<sup>ch</sup> the reasons shall be given after-  
wards<sup>†</sup>) hardly <so well> any or at least but very few so well.<sup>‡</sup>

30 \* See Cautions. n<sup>o</sup> (3). 226,16

† See ...

‡ See w<sup>t</sup> in appearance contradicts this. inf p. 71. Column. 2. latter end. 186,33 ff.

<sup>a</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid* 1,151: an angry crowd will fall silent at the sight of a man who “commands respect on account of his virtue and services rendered”. Also cited, e.g., by Benjamin  
35 Whichcote in one of the sermons edited by Shaftesbury in 1698 (SE II 4: *Select Sermons* 185),