

THE BOOK

The system used for referring to sources and authorities is described on pp. 132-3.

'Property I have nowhere found more clearly explained, than in a book entitled, Two Treatises of Government.' This remark was made by John Locke in 1703, not much more than a year before he died. It must be a rare thing for an author to recommend one of his own works as a guide to a young gentleman anxious to acquire 'an insight into the constitution of the government, and real interest of his country'. It must be even rarer for a man who was prepared to do this, to range his own book alongside Aristotle's *Politics* and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, to write as if the work were written by somebody else, somebody whom he did not know. Perhaps it is unique in a private letter to a relative.* What could possibly be the point of concealing this thing, from a man who probably knew it already?

Odd as it is, this statement of Locke anticipates the judgement of posterity. It was not long before it was universally recognized that Locke on *Government* did belong in the same class as Aristotle's *Politics*, and we still think of it as a book about property, in recent years especially. It has been printed over a hundred times since the 1st edition appeared with the date 1690 on the title-page. It has been translated into French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, Swedish, Norwegian, Hebrew, Arabic, Japanese and Hindi: probably into other languages too. It is an established classic of political and social theory, perhaps not in the first flight of them all, but familiar to eight generations of students of politics all over the world, and the subject of a great body of critical literature.

The prime reason for the importance attached to this book of Locke's is its enormous historical influence. We shall not be concerned here with the part which it played in the growth to maturity of English liberalism, or in the development of those movements which had their issue in the American Revolution, the French Revolution and their parallels in southern America, in Ireland, in

* The Rev. Richard King. Locke's letter to him of 25 August 1703 is printed in *Works*, 1801, x, 305-9. They had a mutual cousin in Sir Peter, later Lord King.

India—everywhere where government by consent of the governed has made its impact felt. We shall certainly have to decide whether or not the book was worthy of the effect it has had, or perhaps to work out a criterion to make such a decision possible. But our first object must be a modest historian's exercise—to establish Locke's text as he wanted it read, to fix it in its historical context, Locke's own context, and to demonstrate the connection of what he thought and wrote with the Locke of historical influence.

We may begin with Locke's own attitude to his own work on government. Our direct evidence is meagre, for we have only two further references to the book by name from Locke himself. One is an exactly similar recommendation made in the same year in *Some Thoughts Concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman*.^{*} This makes no mention of property, but the tendency is clear enough, and it marks his recognition of the uses which the work would have, the same for *Two Treatises of Government* as for everything else he published. They were to be part of the assimilated atmosphere of the English gentleman, the Member of Parliament, the administrator and politician, at home and overseas, but above all the landowner, the local notable.

In the third and most important reference of all he finally did acknowledge his authorship. He was addressing himself to posterity rather than to his contemporaries, to us who can only read him and not to those who could have known him: it was made in a codicil to his will, signed only a week or two before he died. He was listing his anonymous works for the benefit of the Bodleian Library, and he wrote:

'I do hereby give to the public library of the University of Oxford . . . *Two Treatises of Government* (whereof Mr Churchill has published several editions, but all very incorrect).[†]

Without this final, almost accidental afterthought we should have no direct proof that he wrote the book at all.[‡] His anxiety to keep the secret is the more remarkable in that his responsibility was widely suspected from the time of publication. It was talked of in Oxford in 1689, and in 1690 Molyneux was told in London

^{*} *Worke*, 1801, III, 272.

[†] Will, dated 7 April 1704; codicil, 15 September 1704. This clause is printed in *Worke*, 1st edition, 1714, as part of the preface. Locke died 28 October 1704.

[‡] Though there is conclusive circumstantial evidence. In the former Whitehouse Collection (now MS. Locke b. 8) there are papers of corrections in his hand for the 1694 printing.

that he wrote the work. In 1693 Bayle referred to Locke's authorship as if it were generally known, even on the continent.^{*} Early in 1695 an Englishman wrote casually enough about the second printing, in a private letter. 'Here is a book written by Mr Locke which makes a great noise, called *Two Treatises of Government*, price 3s. 6d. This Locke was expelled from Christ Church College for his Presbyterian principles and was chaplain to the Earl of Shaftesbury.' Inaccurate in detail, but apt in general, this judgement may have been based on special information. Although it would seem that his most hostile critic, John Edwards, was not in the secret in 1697, it was being referred to openly in print in the following year.[†] Walter Moyle, in his *Essay on the Lacedaemonian Government*, declared: 'I would advise you to read first the answer that has been made to *Filmer* by Mr Locke, and his *Essay of the Original, Extent and End of Civil Government*; that piece contains the first Rudiments upon this subject. I know a Gentleman, who calls it the A.B.C. of *Politicks*.'

Molyneux in 1698 was not so frank, but even more complimentary: he called it 'An Incomparable *Treatise*, . . . said to be written by my Excellent Friend, JOHN LOCKE, Esq; Whether it be so or not, I know not; This I am sure, whoever is the Author, the greatest Genius in *Christendom* need not disown it.' Leibniz was told in far less enthusiastic terms in the same year of Locke's 'heroic' refutation of Filmer, as if its anonymity was of no account and as a postscript to a notice of Sidney's much more conspicuous volume which had just appeared. In 1701 the most powerful and important of all Locke's friends, John, Lord Somers, cited the book with marked deference to its author: his clear implication was that he knew who wrote it and so did his readers.[‡]

By then, no doubt, Locke had told the great man by word of mouth that the book indeed was his, as he had told Tyrrell and

^{*} Tyrrell to Locke, 20 December 1689, 30 August 1690 (see below, 52 and 80); Molyneux to Locke, 27 August 1692 (*de Beer*, 4, 508), and his *Care of Ireland*, 1698, 1720 ed., 23 and 130 where he refers to *Locke's Treat. Government* (in his reply Clement, 1698, complains of the abuse of 'Mr Locke, or whoever was the Author of that Excellent Treatise of Government'); Bayle to Minutoli, 14 September 1693, 1725, IV, 731.
[†] Historical Manuscript Commission, 12th Report, 1890, Fleming MSS, p. 335; George Fleming to Sir D.F., 29 January 1694-5.

[‡] Moyle's *Essay* was printed in his *Worke* in 1727 (see p. 58), and the date on the title-page was given as 1698 by the editor, to whom it was dedicated. See Robbins, 1968 pp. 28 ff. For Somers's reference, see note to II, § 138 and for Leibniz, see Jolley 1972, p. 21. Other instances could be found, e.g. Cary, 1698; Leslie (?), 1698.

Molyneux, imploring all of them, everyone who challenged him with the secret, to keep his knowledge to himself and out of print.* And he persisted in all his other exasperating attempts to conceal it, in a way which can only be called abnormal, obsessive. He destroyed all his workings for the book and erased from his papers every recognizable reference to its existence, its composition, its publication, printing and reprinting. All the negotiations with both printer and publisher went on through a third party, who was instructed to refer to the author as 'my friend'. This in spite of the fact that the publisher was a personal acquaintance both of Locke and his agent, and handled nearly all of his other books. In Locke's own library, this book in all its editions was catalogued and placed on the shelves as anonymous, so that even a casual browser should find nothing to compromise the secret.

He showed a similar cautiousness over some of his other works. He was willing to risk a breach with his Dutch friend Limborch for letting it be known that he had written on toleration, since this fact, as well as his responsibility for the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, was also reserved for final revelation in the codicil to his will.† But nothing exceeded his cold fury towards Tyrrell, a lifelong associate, when he had reason to believe that he had betrayed him over *Two Treatises* in 1690. There is no parallel in the papers of this devious man for the labyrinthine methods he used when the book was reprinted in 1694, perhaps no parallel in literature.‡

All this argues a peculiarity in Locke's personality as a man and in his personality as an author, particularly as a controversialist and especially as a commentator on political issues. This we will consider in its due place. The present importance of his anxiety to keep the secret about *Two Treatises* as long as he lived lies in the effect which it has had on the transmission of the text. His state-

* Locke obviously told Tyrrell between August 1691 and August 1692 (see below, 79), and Molyneux when he visited him in England in 1698 (see Molyneux to Locke, 15 March 1698, and Locke to Molyneux, 6 April 1698, *Works*, 1801, ix, 430-4 and compare Bastide, 1907, 286).

† Locke, Limborch letters, April 1690, in King's *Locke*, 1830, II, 305-11. He never put his name on English printings of the *Education*, though it appeared on the French translation.

‡ De Beer, I, 29-36, and the originals, with some unpublished items, in the Whitehouse Collection (MS. Locke b.8). Rand assumes that the only book referred to in these letters between Locke and Clarke is the *Essay*. But *Two Treatises* is obviously intended in Locke's of 7, 12, 19 (as well as the *Essay*) and 30 March 1694.

ment in his will betrays his vexation that this book had been mangled by the printer, and implies that he was anxious to leave behind him an authoritative text. There is evidence to prove that he went to great pains to ensure that we should read him on politics in the exact words which he used, and we must turn to the history of its printing to see why it is that we do not do so. Our modern reprints of Locke on *Government* represent a debasement of a form of his book which he himself excoriated, and tried his best to obliterate.*

This author lived most of his life amongst books. He was well informed about printing and publishing, and the firm of Awnsham and John Churchill, one of the great houses of his day, came to be a part of his life. Yet he could write in June 1704:

Books seem to me to be pestilent things, and infect all that trade in them . . . with something very perverse and brutal. Printers, binders, sellers, and others that make a trade and gain out of them have universally so odd a turn and corruption of mind, that they have a way of dealing peculiar to themselves, and not conformed to the good of society, and that general fairness that cements mankind.†

This profound suspicion of book tradesmen, rather than any argued belief in liberty of expression, made John Locke the champion of the freedom of the press. His bitter experience with the publication of his own works was an important reason. It was certainly *Two Treatises of Government* which irritated him most.

We have said that Locke carefully expunged from all his records every overt mention of this book. It is not surprising, then, that no manuscript version of it or any part of it has ever been recovered. This is another indication that his anxiety to conceal it went far beyond what he felt about his writings on toleration, for example, since he preserved draft after draft of his views on that subject. But although it has never been seen we know that the manuscript on *Government* which Locke sent to the press, or perhaps had copied for the printer, in the late summer of 1689, had some interesting peculiarities. It was a remnant: more than half of it had been lost. It was probably written all over with corrections, amendments and extensions: some recent, others going back six years and more. We shall discuss these features of the original

* See Laslett, 1912 (iv), 342, note 2, and 1954 (ii), note 1.

† *Works*, 1801, x, 291. Locke to Anthony Collins.

manuscript when we come to the date of composition. The printed text of the first, 1690, edition has the status which comes from being taken from a manuscript original, even though the cunning author may have made sure by using a copyist that his publisher did not recognize the hand.

This is only the beginning of the story which ends with the versions read today. The work of editing is complicated when only printed sources are available, especially when there were several editions in the author's lifetime, and printing difficulties as well. The 1st edition was botched, and no wonder, with such copy and such tortuous communications. We may never know in detail what happened, and the bibliographical problem is for specialists only. Locke certainly interrupted the press, and one of his objects was to change the title of the book and of each treatise, so as to alter the apparent relationship between them. The difficulty is to account for the fact that two sorts, or 'states',* of the finished book were produced. In the earlier state it had no paragraph 21 in the *Second Treatise*, and a few pages before the point where it should have appeared the ordinary print gave way to three pages in the larger type of the Preface. The second state was made to look normal: nothing is obviously missing, there is no large type. Modern editors in a hurry, just well enough informed to seek out the 1st edition to reproduce, have sometimes lighted on one state, sometimes on the other; hence a great deal of confusion and some mixed-up references.†

This 1st printing, our first authority, was completely unsatisfactory to Locke. We have been able to use his personal copy for this edition. Apart from corrections of misprints, it has a few amendments in his hand.

The plot of the story begins to unfold, a story of repeated

* Called for reference 1X and 1R, see Laslett, 1952 (iv); Bowers, Gerritsen and Laslett, 1954; Johnston, 1956. Dr Gerritsen has now put forward an explanation which seems to me to make the earlier, more complicated conjectures unnecessary. Though its effects on the text are not important, it implies the following. The passage which is present in 1R and not in 1X was lost at the press and had to be rewritten by Locke. He may have been able to use an earlier copy of his text, or he may have been composing anew. It is therefore very interesting that this passage (see 11, 20-1, and especially paragraph 20, 11-23 and note) should contain statements which refer so definitely to the revolutionary events of 1688. It is hoped that Dr Gerritsen's explanation will finally appear in print.

† See notes on 11, § 16, 1; § 17, 15. And for the extraordinary liberties taken with the text in the *Fireyman* edition, see 11, § 20, 2; § 21.

frustration of Locke's attempts to get out a clear text. The book sold, and in 1694 a new printing was wanted. By this time, we may expect, both his manuscript original and all handwritten copies had been destroyed. So Locke sent a corrected copy of the 1st printing on its roundabout way through Edward Clarke, his third party, and Churchill the publisher to the printer. It had over 150 alterations of sense or extensions, but the final text was worse than ever, so bad that Locke felt like abandoning the whole book. On 12 March 1694, he wrote to Clarke:

There is no contesting with everlasting unalterable neglect. If I receive that other paper I sent for I shall go on with it. If not I shall trouble myself no more about it. Its fate is it seems to be the worst printed that ever book was, and it is in vain for anyone to labour against it.*

The chastened Churchill offered to scrap the whole edition. But not before Clarke had been told to 'rub up his carelessness a little' for this second was 'ten times worse than the first edition'. They finally agreed to sell it very cheap, so that it should be 'scattered amongst common readers'. Meantime Locke would correct it more exactly, especially as to punctuation, and then Churchill would print it again with better type and on good paper. This is what seems to have happened, though we have no further correspondence which we can attach to the affair.‡ The 2nd edition of 1694, and it is in fact a cheap and nasty little book, price sixpence, held the field for four years, when it was sold out in its turn. Then the better quality reprint was issued as Locke had demanded, the 3rd edition, 1698. The modifications in the 2nd edition, and the very minor alterations in the 3rd, have been taken account of in our text.‡

But even this did not satisfy Locke, who seems to have had a standard of perfection above the resources of the printers of his time. This 3rd printing of 1698 had its faults, but it is difficult not

* De Beer, 5, 30. The 'other paper' was a missing page of corrections. The effect of Locke's vain attempts to clear up the worst of the muddle is to be found in the numbers of cancel leaves in this printing, see Johnston, 1956.

‡ The references to a book printed in 1698 quoted by Bowers, Gerritsen and Laslett, 1954, where the printer left out whole paragraphs 'in the former sheets of this very book' now seems to concern a different work.

§ It had two cancel leaves. See Editorial Note (127) for the effect of these successive corrections. Where Locke retained them in his 'text for posterity' (see below) they appear in the present text as a matter of course, and occasionally where he omitted to reinsert them there.

to feel the exasperation which he showed in his will over all the printings of this work had an independent source in an inner anxiety about what he had written. As it became obvious to him that no version correct enough to satisfy such meticulousness would ever appear in his lifetime,* he made plans to ensure that it should do so after his death. He corrected a copy of the printed version in minute detail, scrutinizing the word-over, the italics, the punctuation, even the spelling, as well as the general sense. It seems that he intended to carry out this process in duplicate, which is what we might expect in him. It seems also that one of the copies he corrected may have been of the 2nd printing of 1694, rather than the 3rd of 1698, which, though slightly revised, was a page for page reprint of its predecessor. The other copy, the text of the 3rd printing corrected between the lines, in the margins and on the fly leaves, is the one reproduced here. Locke himself did not get further than the first few pages in the laborious correcting process, and the rest is in the hand of his amanuensis, Pierre Coste, though Locke's hand does appear occasionally throughout the book. The indications are that Coste was copying from the other master-copy.

Locke must have left directions behind him for the publication of this text for posterity, just as he did in the case of the *Essay on the Understanding*.† Presumably these directions were left with Churchill, the publisher, though it is a little difficult to understand why nine years were allowed to elapse before the book appeared, for the posthumous *Essay* took only two. It may be that Locke's heir and literary executor, Peter King, later 1st Lord King was given the responsibility, or even Pierre Coste.‡ But whoever it was who made the decision, in 1713 this definitive text appeared over Churchill's imprint as the 4th edition, and in the following year it was included in the 1st edition of Locke's *Collected Works*, published by the same firm. And whatever exactly took place between Locke's death in 1704 and 1713, it is clear that the effect

* Though a new edition was entered in the *Term Catalogues* in 1699.

† The 5th edition, 1706, was obviously a posthumous fulfilment of Locke's own directions, presumably to Churchill: see Yolton's *Everyman* edition, 1961. Introduction.

‡ But see a letter from La Motte to Desmaizeaux of November 1709 (British Museum, Sloane MSS. 4286, f. 91), inquiring for a copy of that edition of *Two Treatises* 'qui a été faite après la mort de l'auteur, où l'on a inséré les corrections dans l'exemplaire laissé à Mr. Coste'. The assumption here is that the text for posterity had already appeared, and it seems to imply rather that someone other than Coste had been charged with it. The context shows that a number of people, including Barbeyrac, knew of the existence of the master-text, and that Coste had a copy of it.

he desired was brought about. A fairly reliable text of the book became established, and the earlier, imperfect printings were left behind.

As the eighteenth century wore on the work was sent to press again and again, about once every five years. Each new printing was usually set up from its immediate predecessor, and so the text inevitably declined in accuracy: it lost its original flavour. But in the 6th edition, 1764, this process was arrested. That fine republican eccentric, Thomas Hollis, had acquired in 'his private walks' the Coste master-copy and he published it. He then presented the volume itself to Christ's College, Cambridge, 'where Milton, the matchless John Milton' was bred.* The present text is a reproduction of this document, made possible by the generosity of the present Master and Fellows of Christ's. But it is not 'the copy from which Mr L hopes that his book will be printed after his death' † to which Coste himself refers. That other volume, the hypothetical second master-copy, has so far escaped a search for recovery begun in 1949. Even now, therefore, editorial work on this book could be overtaken by the discovery of a yet more authentic version.‡ So end attempts at perfection.

As his gentleman-scholarly habit was, Hollis did some editorial work on the book before he sent the Coste copy to Christ's.¶ Subsequent reprints followed this fresh and better version. It was left to modern scholarship, and in particular to the editors of successive reprints after 1884, to go behind all this to the unsatisfactory printings of Locke's lifetime, and to create the prevalent confusion over the text. Hence the imperative need for doing Hollis's work over again, in accordance with our own standards of textual accuracy, presenting the book as the author intended us to read it, but registering his successive corrections. These have their own significance, for they show us how Locke's views in 1694, 1698 and in the period from about 1700 to 1704 differed in microscopic detail from those he originally published

* On Hollis, see Robbins, 1950. Professor Robbins has been kind enough to communicate relevant extracts from the full, unpublished diary of Hollis.

† 'L'exemplaire sur lequel il [i.e. Mr L.] souhaite que son livre soit imprimé après sa mort', note in Coste's hand on the final fly of the Christ's copy: see note on II, § 172.

‡ See Editorial Note (below, p. 127) for a discussion of the second master-copy. ¶ Blackburne's *Memoirs* of Hollis, 1780, I, 224, Hollis collating this copy with the third, the collected and the fifth editions, 'with no little labour'.

in 1689.* Moreover the knowledge that he worked so hard and so often at his text is also important in itself. We must surely suppose that he meant to stand by what he finally approved for us to read. He certainly gave himself every opportunity to see and to revise those points of inconsistency and obscurity which have been seen in his text by so many of his commentators.

So John Locke has not escaped the consequences of the extraordinary attitude which he took up to his book on *Government*. There is an appropriate irony in the fact that the scholars of our own day have been confused by it, not the men of the eighteenth century. Though a study of this work must begin with this complicated story of determined anonymity and failure at the press, there is still more to be said. It was a different, a much modified version which entered into the main stream of European political thinking and affected French, even American revolutionism. Ever since it was translated into French, less than eighteen months after publication, the first of his English works to be put into the polite and universal language of that time, *Two Treatises* has led two quite independent lives. They have touched only at one point: in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1773.

In 1691 David Mazel, one of the Huguenot pastors living in Holland, translated the book.† He made an excellent version, which is now highly valued, but the book was transformed as well as translated. Locke's *Preface*, the entire *First Treatise*, the opening chapter of the *Second* connecting it with the *First*, were all left out. An *Advertisement* was prefixed, a fair enough statement of the drift and purpose of the text. The paragraphs were re-numbered under chapters and not consecutively through the book; they were divided slightly differently.‡ A briefer work in an alien language and an altered shape, this essay 'Du Gouvernement Civil' was subtly changed in the direction of the Enlightenment and eighteenth-century Revolutionism. In this form it was re-printed a dozen times in the next century, more often as an independent book in France than in England. In this form it was

* Though it bore the date 1690, it was actually printed in 1689 (see below, section III) and was on sale by November of that year. This was normal publishing practice then as it still is for our motor-car makers.

† There seems to be nothing to confirm, but nothing to upset, this traditional attribution.

‡ These divisions are recorded in the footnotes to the text.

read by Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau. From this version and not, until our day, from the English original, the translations into other languages were made. Did Locke know that his book was being altered in this way? Was he himself in any way responsible?

He may have been. He was presumably acquainted with the publisher, Abram Wolfgang, for he also published the periodical *La Bibliothèque Universelle*. During his recent exile in Holland, Locke had contributed to this journal.* Jean Leclerc, the editor, was one of Locke's closest friends in Holland, and he was no doubt acquainted with most of the protestant refugees, perhaps with Mazel himself though we have no evidence of such a connection. *Du Gouvernement Civil* was anonymous both as to author and to translator, but its preface gets very close to Locke's doctrine and object in writing.†

Leclerc published a summary of the whole of *Two Treatises* in his periodical in 1691, from the English original. Nevertheless, the form of the French version may suggest that Locke himself would have approved of the fact that the *Second Treatise*, independent of the *First*, is the form in which it had been read, even by those who have had the *First Treatise* in the volume in hand. We have already seen Locke emphasizing the disconnection between the two treatises when he changed the titles at such a late stage, and we shall present the case for supposing that the *Second Treatise* was the earlier work. I am prepared to believe from these indications that the French, the European and generally appreciated form of this book, was authenticated by Locke. Any overt recognition of the French form would of course have offended his passionate desire for anonymity.

This view has its difficulties, for it makes it necessary to ask why he did not adopt this form for subsequent English editions and in his text for posterity. It leaves open a decision on the extent to which he oversaw the French edition. Nevertheless we may believe that Locke would have been pleased to think that the

* See Laslett 1932 (ii). The closer study of Locke's books which has since become possible shows that in this article Locke's contributions were confused with Leclerc's.

† The title page to this volume, with Locke's manuscript addition *Pax ar Libertas*, is reproduced from Locke's own copy in H. and L., 1971 (1965), along with Locke's paraph (authenticating sign) on the final page.

French form, the independent *Second Treatise*, was to be received into the canon of classics on political theory.*

Whatever the status of the French version for Locke, it did not affect his corrections to the English versions, and he showed no sign that he realized the growing influence of the work on a readership far wider than his English public. That public, as the eighteenth century wore on, was no longer confined to readers of English in the British Isles, for it included those men, a few of them eminent men, who imported Locke's works into the British colonies in North America in the seventy years after his death. But the book of *Government* was not the most sought after by the colonists, and it is now known that other 'classics of liberal revolutionism' were in greater demand. Sidney, it appears, did more to legitimate the American revolution than ever Locke did, and *Two Treatises* were used in favour of the Royal regime as established in North America as well as against it.† Not until 1773 did the controversy over the rights of Americans call for a reprint from Boston.

The text of this solitary early American edition was a standard one, following that printed by Hollis in 1764. But it is a singular fact that the form of the book followed the French set of conventions established by Mazel, and not the English: no *First Treatise*, and chapter 1 of the *Second* omitted.‡ What more intriguing example could be found of the well-known pathway of radical thinking from its origin in England, by way of French Protestants in Holland and French political criticism in France, to the new Englishmen of the New World?

So much for Locke's book as a book and the plot of its development to a giant of historical importance. The whole story could be told at much greater length. There is a striking illustration of

* Locke's own copy of *Du Gouvernement Civil* has written in in his hand on the title: *Pax ac Libertas*. See Harrison and Laslett, 1965, p. 33 and plate 6. This is the only known example of his adding to the title of one of his own books. On the final page he has also added the personal sign which he used to authenticate his signature on financial documents. This sign is found on a dozen or so of Locke's books, and may have had a meaning to him which has not been recovered.

† See Dunn, 1969 (ii). Further work towards dispelling the myth of Locke's commanding influence on the American revolution is in progress. Thomas Jefferson may have been a Lockean, in somewhat the sense that political scientists have used that expression, as is evident from the coincidence of phrases between the *Declaration of Independence* and *Two Treatises* (see the relevant footnotes to the text). But it would seem that not many of his contemporaries went with him.

Locke's attitude to the work, his unwillingness to own it and to take responsibility for its effects, in his failure to take any notice of Molyneux's *Case of Ireland*. Here a close friend was using the book as it was always going to be used, to justify a people in their demand for a voice in their own government. Locke's name appeared in the ensuing controversy. There are signs that Locke felt concern, perhaps even contemplated changing his text, yet he said nothing: his final corrections ignored the whole thing.*

Or we could watch the interplay between editions of Locke and the crises of government and opinion. There was no American edition after 1773 until the twentieth century; a proposal for publication by subscription in 1806 apparently got no response. But during 'L'an III de la République Française' (1795) it appeared in revolutionary Paris in four different sizes, a neat tapering pile. Traditionalists in contemporary Britain were disturbed by the uses being made of the great philosopher of common sense and moderation by revolutionaries at home. In 1798 Bishop Thomas Eltrington produced his edition of the book, introduced and annotated with remarks directed against citizen Thomas Paine so as to establish the distinction 'between the system of Locke and the theories of modern democrats'.‡ The first Spanish edition appeared in 1821, at the outset of the critical decade for the independence of the Spanish-American communities: in 1827 a further reprint was smothered in the press at Madrid.

Meanwhile the political theory of *Two Treatises of Government* had established its place in the mind of Montesquieu and Rousseau, Burke and Jefferson. We must now turn our attention to the personal qualities and the personal experience of the man who brought this system into being, and whose attitude to his own creation was such a singular one.

* Information from Prof. John Dunn, of King's College, Cambridge. See references in note †, p. 5 above, and compare Laslett, 1957 (i). Molyneux's reproduction of passages from Locke is recorded in the notes to II, §§ 4, 134, 177, 178, etc.

† Eltrington was the only editor to notice the peculiarities of the 1st edition: his notes have been incorporated here.

the *Letters of Toleration* and *Two Treatises of Government*. He could not have anticipated then, nor at any time before his sixtieth birthday, that what he had noted in private would become famous in public as his *Thoughts on Education* and *Considerations on Money* and economics. John Locke wrote and published as an old man, though he was quite confident that he would never live to be old. But like every other man, he thought his important thoughts when he was young. The fascination and difficulty of his career is to recognize the seeds and saplings burgeoning in his early and middle life and to watch them grow and spread into the mature forest trees which he left to posterity.

It could be said of the select group of great Englishmen in the century of our intellectual greatness that only one, John Locke, was a don by choice. Bacon was a lawyer and a politician, Hobbes was a teacher of noblemen, Newton was an academic by necessity until, after a hard struggle, he got into the great world as an administrator. Locke went up to Oxford in 1652 at the age of twenty and he remained a full member of his college, if only nominally resident in later years, paying his fees and receiving his dues until he was ejected, illegally and against his will, in 1684 when he was fifty-two. He did his best to get back his place, and if we are to believe what he tells us himself he would have liked to have lived his whole life at the university. It was his career: for most of his earlier life it was the only thing which he thought he could excel in.

He reached Oxford by the most conventional of paths. He was a scholar, and no very distinguished scholar, of Westminster School under the formidable Doctor Busby. He was there on that awful morning of 30 January 1649 when Charles I was executed, kept in school by his Royalist headmaster but within earshot of the awe-stricken crowd. There was a closed avenue for King's scholars of Westminster either to Trinity College, Cambridge, or to Christ Church, Oxford. John Dryden, of Northamptonshire, went to Trinity but his schoolmate, John Locke of Somerset, a westerner, a member of the Puritan network of families which were intertwined with the Royalist and predominating strands in that loyalist area, went to Christ Church. At the head of his college he found John Owen, the Independent and champion of toleration, all that was best in the Cromwellian attitude to learning and the Church. In his second year of residence Locke made his first appearance in print as an author: it was a salute to the Lord

II

LOCKE THE MAN AND LOCKE

THE WRITER

1. LOCKE AND OXFORD

John Locke lived from 1632 to 1704, from the seventh year of the reign of Charles I to the third year of the reign of Queen Anne: 1632 was the year of the birth of Sir Christopher Wren in England, of Pufendorf and Spinoza on the continent. In the course of his seventy-two years Locke saw the worlds in which he spent his life, the intellectual and scientific world, the political and economic world, change farther and faster than any of his forefathers had done, and in England more markedly than anywhere else. He was as much of a mere Englishman as a universal genius could be, though he spent two critical periods of his life abroad, in France from 1675 to 1679 and in Holland from 1683 to 1689. He was as private and ordinary a man as could be expected of an individual who was to help to change the philosophical and political assumptions of Europe, but for two other periods he was a directive political influence in his own right and something of a public personality. This was between about 1667 and 1675 and again in 1679-82 when he was associated with that overpowering political leader, the first earl of Shaftesbury, and between 1694 and 1700 as the confidant of Lord Somers, the chief figure of the government. He died a famous man and he has remained one of the great English names ever since.

That fame was intellectual and literary; it still is. But he was a reluctant author, a professed 'enemy to the scribbling of this age'. He was fifty-seven years old before a word of the works which have given him renown was published in print. When he went to France in 1675 he expected to die of what we should call tuberculosis of the lung. He could not have supposed he would live to see his disordered sketches on philosophy become the *Essay on Humane Understanding*, or his notes on religious and political society become

Protector on his victory over the Dutch in 1653, in a volume of academic poems edited by the admiring Owen.*

There was a great deal to attach this modestly rising academic to the Cromwellian regime and the good old cause of Puritan and Roundhead against King and Cavalier. Down in Somerset his father, John Locke senior, was a late Captain in the parliamentary armies, the second in line of a family recently risen to gentle rank by the exertions and good fortune of its members. Nicholas Locke, the grandfather, had made the money which set the family up as proprietors of some small consequence in the little villages of Chew Magna, and Pensford and Belluton, Belluton which became Locke's family home. Nicholas had succeeded in the familiar way as a clothier, a capitalist middleman, setting on work the cottagers of the countryside round the great port of Bristol and selling the cloth in that flourishing market. But his son, John Locke senior, we are told, was a loser rather than a gainer in the race for wealth and social consequence so typical of his class and time. A Calvinist attorney, Locke's father was, and Clerk to the Justices of Somerset, dependent for patronage on a much more powerful parliamentary family, the Pophams.

It was the influence of the Pophams which had made it possible for Locke's father to mark out the scholarly calling for him at Westminster and at Christ Church. It was a recognized way up in the world; for the clever boy the most reliable. There were two children only, John and his younger brother who died a youth, and they were authoritatively handled. Although he paid his tribute to parental sternness, much later he was to say that he 'wish'd his Father had design'd rather him for anything else than what he was destined to'. † In 1661 the squire of Belluton died, and left his son a gentleman of Somerset in his own right, the owner of farms and farmhouses and even a small Mendip mine. Academic, unmarried, independent he was to remain, but it is very important that John Locke was always the titular representative of an English landed family.

At Oxford Locke was urbane, idle, unhappy and unremarkable, all these things at the same time and only just successful enough. He passed with fair credit up the steps: scholar; then Student or Fellow as it would be in other colleges; then the holder of the

* Cranston, 1977, 36. Many other men contributed, including clandestine Royalists.

† Lady Masham, 1705, in Collic, 1955, 17.

usual teaching offices. Next in order was ordination in the Church, if he were to stay at the University; but here he hesitated, wavered and refused. He found a way out in medicine, one of the Studentships reserved for doctors. He had played some little part in that remarkable upsurge of interest in 'natural philosophy' at Oxford which was so soon to give rise to the Royal Society, and was associated with Boyle in his laboratory in the High Street. He took up botany, the herbal side of medicine, in a systematic way, and duly proceeded to the bachelor's degree in medicine. Although he finally wriggled his way, as an unsympathetic contemporary put it, into a faculty place or medical Studentship at Christ Church, he never became a full Doctor of Medicine. His academic career was checked by the mid-1660's, and, as it proved, it was checked for ever.

Locke did not begin as a philosopher and at Oxford he was never a philosopher at all. We can now piece together from the mass of papers he has left us what his earliest interests were. Politics was certainly amongst them. His correspondence, reading, notes and sketches show that he was first concerned with the authority of the state in religion, then with the Natural Law which sanctioned that authority, and with the basis of Natural Law in experience. It was only after this, after he had ceased to spend his whole time at Oxford, that he proceeded to philosophy as such, to the problem of knowledge. Apart from his congratulatory poems, his first work written for publication was a polemical tract on the *Civil Magistrate*; it was never printed, but we have his manuscript. His addresses as a college official, and especially as Censor of Moral Philosophy in 1664, have similarly survived, and they are concerned with Natural Law.* The surprising thing is that his attitude to politics then was traditionalist and authoritarian.

Here we would seem to be faced with a clean break with his heritage and a vivid contrast with his final reputation. He firmly proclaims his submission to authority, and his whole position is that in indifferent things, the power of the magistrate is necessarily absolute because the nature of civil society requires it. He insists

* Dr Von Leyden has published these writings as Locke's *Essays on the Law of Nature* (1914), with an admirable introduction. The two pieces on the *Magistrate* (MS. c. 7, in English, MS. c. 28, f. 3ff. in Latin with a draft in c. 6) are now published as *John Locke, Two Tracts on Government*, edited by Philip Abrams, Cambridge, 1967. References here are to the version in Dr Abrams's Dissertation of 1961. The English tract was directed against Edward Bagshaw, also of Christ Church.

that each and every individual grants his whole liberty to the supreme legislative power, which is a necessary mark of all civil society, and is the representative of all. Its decisions bind the conscience of everyone, though they may not reach what he defines as his judgement and in case of conflict there is no remedy but passive obedience. Liberty is what is left untouched by regulation. As for the people, this is typical of what he says:

Nor will the largeness of the governor's power appear dangerous or more than necessary if we consider that as occasion requires it is employed upon the multitude that are as impatient of restraint as the sea, and whose tempests and overflows cannot be too well provided against. . . . To whom are we most likely to be a prey, to those whom the Scripture calls Gods, or those whom knowing men have always found and therefore call beasts?

Kings are called Gods in Scripture, and the people are beasts for the knowledgeable men, of Locke's day and before: no sharper conflict could be found with the doctrine of *Two Treatises of Government*. The uneasy, anarchical months between the death of Oliver Cromwell and the Stuart Restoration had made this slightly sceptical, unselfconfident Oxford don into the determined defender of authority, a man prepared to go to great lengths to secure quiet. But it was legal, not arbitrary authority which he championed, 'a body of laws so well composed' that their preservation 'was the only security of this nation's settlement'. Even in this, to us his earliest, his most authoritarian mood, Locke is revealed as a constitutionalist, and a man convinced of the fundamental distinction between secular and spiritual power, political and religious authority. He was not tempted into that safest and most effective of illiberal positions, the Divine Right of Kings based on patriarchalism, though he does mention it.* Throughout these papers, in fact, he professed indifference as to the origin of political power, 'whether the magistrate's crown drops down on his head immediately from heaven or be placed there by the hands of his subjects', which was to be a main concern of his mature political writings. But searching examination of his manuscript shows that he did assume the popular origin of political power: his references to the possibility of Divine Right were evidently

* See Abrams, 1961, 236-56, and his statement on 255 about 'constitutional' in relation to 'arbitrary' positions. Locke took note of patriarchal theories. There is evidence that he already knew, even respected, Filmer's writings—see below, 33, and Schochet, 1966.

concessions to the outburst of such sentiment which greeted the Restoration.*

These recent recoveries, then, reveal something quite unexpected in the intellectual development which led up to the writing of *Two Treatises*. We do not know why the polemical tract was not printed, but we may assume that its theories were made public to a certain extent, by being developed into a Latin address to members of Christ Church delivered between 1661 and 1664.† It is interesting in itself that Oxford students should have listened to an oration on such a subject, more interesting still to wonder whether they recognized certain elements in it which have a flavour of Hobbes, the arch-authoritarian. No one who set out, as Locke did, to argue from consent to absolute authority, could have avoided arguing to some extent in parallel with the already infamous *Leviathan*. Hobbist notions were in the air: Locke must have absorbed them, more perhaps from the attacks on them than from direct acquaintance. The two men were closer then than at any other time, but beyond this point we should not go: the evidence will not bear it. It is to submit uncritically to the strong tradition which dictates that Locke should always be considered alongside of Hobbes and to go on to claim that he was a conscious Hobbesist at this time, too cautious to reveal himself.‡

But Hobbes is not the only contemporary of Locke's earlier years whose writings are of importance to his development as a political thinker. The resemblance between Locke's final political doctrines and those of the English radicals writing and acting between 1640 and 1660 is most marked. It is so close in some

* See e.g. his corrections and overwriting on the first page of his English treatise, on page 4, and the passage deleted on p. 33.

† Von Leyden, 1954. He does not recognize the Latin treatise, undoubtedly the most important writing by Locke on political theory before *Two Treatises*, as one of the *Essays* which he publishes. Dr Abrams (1961, 50-1) also suggests that it was one of the Latin *Essays* or *Lectures*, and stresses (cf. note on English treatise, p. 21) the Oxford context of the politics discussed in both tracts.

‡ This has been the tendency of those who have commented on these writings, so far, see Gough, 1950, and Cranston, 1956, and 1957, 61-3. Von Leyden rightly sees certain of Hobbes's arguments absorbed into the discussions of natural law, but it is he who suggests that the influence came from contemporary discussion of them as much as from direct acquaintance. Abrams thinks that the resemblances of the sentence quoted by Cranston (1957, 62, see English treatise, p. 21) with Hobbes's famous description of life in a state is no greater than with many such descriptions of life without government, and quotes one from a book known to have been in Locke's mind (Sanderson, *De Obligatione Conscientiae*, 1660, 1686 ed., 43). On Locke and Hobbes generally, see section 1 v below.

respects that direct influence would seem obvious, through his personal experience amongst those of the 'honest party' and through his reading. He knew Henry Stubbe, for example, and wrote to him in praise of his *Essay on the Good Old Cause*; through him he could have been in contact with Harrington and the Rota men, and there are many other such possibilities. But we have no indication that he read radical literature at Oxford, or indeed much political literature at all apart from such highly respectable, academic authors as Grotius and Pufendorf, his coeval, whose first work appeared in 1660. Classical and polite learning occupied him, even the French romances. The fact is that as far as we know Locke never read Lilburne or the other Levellers, then or afterwards. He was brought back into the tradition which they began by an unexpected turn in his personal life. Thereafter politics came to mean something very different from scholastic exercises on things indifferent, and on the scope and authority of Natural Law.

He was never to get much further as a Natural Law theorist, and we shall point to this fact as critical to his whole development. Nevertheless these early writings can fairly be called the typical product of a mind capable of enormous expansion, as yet unable to expand at all. Something of the platform for his political theory had been set up, and he could have proceeded either in the authoritarian or in the liberal direction, but to no very important effect. It was not to be a simple question of unfolding the implications of a particular starting point: it never really is for any thinker. As yet he had little sense of political reality, of policy itself. Indeed, a great deal was lacking in this meticulous Oxford bachelor, with his fine conversation, his keen mind and conventional views, lacking that is to *le Sage Locke*, Voltaire's idol, the universal philosopher with an attitude on all things. Something was to happen when his life was nearly half over, something which was to give him that firmness of intellectual tread which accounts for his giant reputation and to transform these early sentiments on authority, political and religious, into the Lockean liberalism which presses on us still.

Oxford frustrated him, but he was not yet master of himself enough to make his way in the world there or outside. Locke had a name for disputation in the Schools, the established method of instruction and examination: 'Hogshearing' he called it, the

laborious clipping of tiny hairs from the skins of vociferating animals, not swine apparently, but yearling lambs. Locke hated it, and he did it badly; his whole life work in one sense was a protest against it. This, he said later, was another reason why he 'pitched upon the study of physic', where he was at one remove from the Schools, and 'as far as might be from any public concerns'.* This second object, to keep away from public affairs, prevented him from pursuing the diplomatic career which opened up in 1665 and 1666.

This was a whiff of Machiavelli's world, and might have convinced him that he had talents and a personality for other things than teaching, the pressing of flowers from the University Botanic Garden and the systematic filling out of a great series of notebooks. He went to Cleves, the capital of Brandenburg, as secretary to a special mission in 1665, and was so successful that he was offered a similar post in Madrid when he returned, and another post after that.† But he preferred to return to his students and his everlasting medical mixtures. His association with Shaftesbury was to change him profoundly, but never quite to convince him that his academic ambition was misplaced.

When that change had taken place, Oxford rejected him. As a traditionalist institution she mistrusted his politics, and the developed originality of his thought menaced her curriculum. All this was to happen twenty years later and more, and his removal from his place was brought about neither by his college nor the university, but by the Crown as a piece of political vindictiveness. But though the inbred little society of clergymen at Christ Church in the 1680's were not actually responsible for expelling the ablest man amongst them, they were not guiltless in the matter. The good and scholarly Dr Fell, head of the house since 1660 and trusted by Locke, wrote thus to the Secretary of State:

Mr Locke being 'a student of this house' . . . and 'suspected to be ill-affected to the Government, I have for divers years had an eye upon him. . . . Very frequently, both in public and in private, discourses have been purposely introduced, to the disparagement of his master, the Earl of Shaftesbury, his party, and designs, he could never be provoked

* Locke to the eighth earl of Pembroke, 3 December 1684, de Beer, 2, 663, see p. 41 below.

† See Cranston, 1957, ch. 7.

to take any notice, or discover in word or look the least concern; so that I believe there is not in the world so great a master of taciturnity and passion.*

The Royal order to remove Locke from his Studentship in 1684 was the first move made against the universities in the final Stuart bid for personal government, which was to stumble over the obstinacy of the Fellows of Magdalen in 1688. It is ugly to see those who sat with him at table acting as *agents provocateurs*, but typical of the man that not a flicker of an eyelid could be used against him. Half a generation later the teachers of Oxford did greater harm to their university by refusing to acknowledge his books in their teaching.† So little can Oxford and the House justly claim him as their own that he was a power over the whole learned world before they would recognize him. The last days he spent amongst them illustrate his manner of going in a dramatic fashion.

On 21 July 1683 the University of Oxford in Convocation ordered to take place in the Court of the Schools, now the Bodleian Quadrangle, the last burning of books in the history of England. The decree was displayed in the halls and libraries of the colleges, and it anathematized doctrine after doctrine already written into *Two Treatises*. Amongst the authors they condemned to the fire were some of those on the books which then stood on the shelves of Locke's chamber at Christ Church. It seems that he was there himself, to watch the acrid smoke drifting up between the spires, tight lipped as ever and busy packing off his library into the country. Within a few weeks he had certainly left Oxford for the countryside where he was born, and by the autumn he was an exile in Holland. Locke never went to Oxford again in his life.‡

* Fell to Sunderland, 8 November 1684, see King, 1830, I, 279. Pridesaux, one of the Students, was passing information to government circles on Locke at this time, see *Letters*, 1875. It is fair to add that the full exchange with Sunderland shows that Fell was doing something to protect Locke, and that he was disturbed by what was forced upon him. See Lady Masham (Colie, 1956, 83).

† See Cranston, 1957, 466-9 and references, for the meeting of heads of houses in 1703 to consider the suppression of the new, Lockean philosophy.

‡ The *Derrez* can best be consulted in *Somers' Tracts*, 1812, viii. Locke's movements can be traced in his diary and from the addresses of his letters, though he becomes very elusive in the weeks before he left for Holland, and it is impossible to be certain that he did not pass through Oxford in later life.

2. LOCKE AND THE FIRST EARL OF SHAFTESBURY

Anthony Ashley Cooper, of Wimborne St Giles in Dorset, later first Lord Ashley and still later first earl of Shaftesbury, was one of the ablest and most extraordinary men alive in the England of Locke's lifetime. He was rich, rich in land and from political office, rich from investment at home and overseas. He was powerful, politically powerful both in the regional politics of the south-west and at Whitehall. It had been done by a series of swerves of allegiance: first for King, and then for Parliament; first a minister of Cromwell, then his great opponent, then an architect of the Restoration. He was one of the small, assertive men; a phenomenon of shrewdness and penetration, highly intelligent and critical, yet affected with delusions of grandeur and unscrupulous in his inconsistencies; superb as a leader and administrator, yet chronically ill, physically not psychologically, for he had the extraversion of Prime Minister Walpole.

His disease was a hydatid, an affection of the liver, fatal if it should give rise to an abscess and the abscess not be removed. In July 1666, Lord Ashley, Chancellor of the Exchequer, convalescent after one of his attacks, rumbled down in his great coach to Oxford to try the waters of Astrop. They were to be brought to him in bottles, and the man who came into his presence with the twelve flasks was not the physician he expected, but the physician's friend, John Locke. This was how the two men first met, and at that moment a famous friendship began.

It was Locke's conversation which attracted the keen-sighted politician as well as his skill as a doctor. Courteous and modest, for Locke always knew his place with the great, he was penetrating and ironical, immensely well informed. Within a year he had taken up residence in the Ashley family, with his own apartment at Exeter House in the Strand, invited there to talk to the great man, to advise him and to doctor him and those about him. On the body of his noble patron he brought about one of the medical miracles of that age. He advised and directed an operation, an operation at a time when surgery was butchery, to remove the abscess on the liver and to insert a little pipe through the stomach wall as a drain to prevent another abscess from forming. Ashley wore the pipe

for the rest of his life: to the satirists of the 1680's it became a great wooden tap to be mocked at, like the tap on a barrel of beer. In fact this pathetic little object was made at first of silver then of gold.*

This operation made Locke famous and it changed the whole course of his life. Ashley was convinced, and he had good reason to be, that he owed his life to Locke. An association which began casually and was continued on a pattern conventional at the time, since it was not unusual for the great to introduce men of Locke's stamp into their families, became a working association for all purposes for both of them. All that political influence could do was directed towards Locke's promotion in his profession of academic medicine, and he was provided for financially, though his obstinate independence evidently made it difficult for Ashley to go as far as he wanted. He was given offices, the secretaryship of the associated proprietors of the colony of Carolina, the secretaryship of Ashley's Board of Trade, the secretaryship for ecclesiastical patronage when Ashley, now earl of Shaftesbury, became Lord Chancellor in November 1672. These were not great offices, and none of them led to the high political career which might well have developed out of this association.

We do not know why this was, though we may believe that it was Locke who held back rather than that Shaftesbury judged him unfit for the highest promotion. For we do know that he was paid the highest compliment in the gift of a great politician.

My Lord imparted to him from time to time all the secretest affairs then in agitation and by my Lord's frequent discourse of state affairs, religion, toleration and trade, Mr Locke came to have a wonderful knowledge of these things. . . . He writ his book concerning Human Understanding whilst he lived with my Lord.

And again, from a source of the very highest authority, Shaftesbury's grandson and Locke's pupil, the third earl:

Mr Locke grew so much in esteem with my grandfather that, as great a man as he had experienced him in physic, he looked upon this but as his least part. He encouraged him to turn his thoughts another way. . . . He put him upon the study of the religious and civil affairs of the nation with whatsoever related to the business of a minister of state, in which

* On the operation, see Osler, 1914: a more recent medical opinion is that the drainage pipe was useless, but that the operation did save Shaftesbury's life and its success was almost miraculous.

he was so successful that my grandfather began soon to use him as a friend and consult with him on all occasions of that kind. . . . When my grandfather quitted the Court and began to be in danger from it, Mr Locke now shared with him in dangers as before in honours and advantages. He entrusted him with his secretest negotiations, and made use of his assistant pen in matters that nearly concerned the state, and were fit to be made public, to raise that spirit in the nation which was necessary against the prevailing Popish party.*

We owe *Two Treatises* to the wonderful knowledge of state affairs which Locke acquired from frequent discourse with the first earl of Shaftesbury; indeed the evidence suggests, as we shall see, that he actually wrote the book for Shaftesbury's purposes. The original meeting may not have been entirely a consulting-room accident. Shaftesbury's grandson tells us that he was recommended by the earl's steward, an important figure in the machinery of local influence.† Local politics, then, the association of families over wide areas and long periods of time, made this meeting no unlikely thing, although no other connection has yet been found between the Lockes of Somerset and the great political family of the neighbouring county of Dorset. But its results were not simply political, nor were they confined to political and social theory. They are to be seen over the whole area of Locke's intellectual activity: without Shaftesbury, Locke would not have been Locke at all.

We have seen that Locke was never a pure philosopher at Oxford, and we have quoted the claim of a witness that his major work on philosophy was written in Shaftesbury's household. It is now known that this was indeed the case, though the actual work of composition took so long, nearly twenty years, that the finished work was never seen by Shaftesbury. Locke began his career as a philosopher in his chamber at Exeter House in the early months of 1671, and by July he had produced a draft of the

* The first extract comes from a document in the Shaftesbury Papers (P.R.O. 30/24, XLVII, 28, 3) endorsed 'F.C.' and copied in what looks like the third earl's hand into a fuller account. The second comes from the third earl's letter written for Jean Leclerc and based on documents like these—dated February 1705, printed by B. Rand in his life and letters of the third earl, 1900, p. 332.

† 'Mr Bennet of the town of Shaftesbury': he and his son were M.P.s for the borough. Even the physician, David Thomas, who commissioned Locke with the water bottles, had a political identity. He was a strong Whig, and when the *Essay on Human Understanding* appeared, would have preferred a life of Shaftesbury. For even stronger emphasis on Locke's association with the Earl, see Viano, 1960; Ashcraft, 1986, 1987.

He had shown no sign of an interest in the upbringing of children at Oxford, nor any trace of the economist's attitude. And yet within two years of his going to London he produced a paper on the rate of interest written for Shaftesbury formulating the position which he consistently maintained for the rest of his life, with results of considerable consequence to the future of the British economy.* In economics he might be called a traditionalist, almost an Aristotelian, but on the subject of toleration his association with the acknowledged champion of religious freedom swiftly transformed the traditionalist and authoritarian views written into the Oxford treatise. In 1667, during the first months of his residence at Exeter House, he composed an *Essay on Toleration*† which turned his earlier arguments into a vigorous defence of the right of dissent, proceeding from analysis of the intellectual problem to positive recommendations about national policy. Advice of this sort was now expected of him, and he seems to have written similar policy documents on many or all of the objects of Shaftesbury's public career. Not the least of these new-born interests was colonial administration.‡

Locke the man and Locke the writer make up a complicated personality, very difficult to separate from that of Shaftesbury himself in these truly formative years. Apart from the *Toleration* drafts, there are two published political works which have claims to be the result of literary co-operation between them. *The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina*, privately and anonymously issued in 1669, and the *Letter from a Person of Quality*, anonymous, 1675, alike appear in an authoritative collection of Locke's works.§ The manuscript of the *Constitutions* is in Locke's hand in the Shaftesbury papers, and a note of his written during or before composition

* See Laslett, 1957 (i), especially footnote 21. The draft, the first of a series, is MS. c.8, dated 1688, compare Viano, 1960, 183 on, and refs.

† Manuscript version in Shaftesbury papers printed by Fox Bourne, 1876, 1, 174-94. There are three other versions, and their relationship is not finally established (see the discussions in Cranston, 1957, 11; Gough, 1950, corrected by Von Leyden, 1954; Johnson, 1956; Brown, 1933). But the evidence implies a close relationship in composition between Locke and Shaftesbury. Further information on Locke, Ashley, economics and toleration is to be found in Abrams, 1967, Haley, 1968, and Kelly, 1969.

‡ See Laslett, 1969 revised by Kelly 1969, who finds Locke to have derived much from his companions and predecessors in Shaftesbury's entourage, especially Benjamin Worsley and Henry Slingsby.

§ *A Collection of Several Pieces of Mr John Locke* 1720. Desmaizeaux and Collins, who were responsible, were well placed to know what Locke had a hand in. Both pieces are reprinted in collected Lockes from the 4th, 1740.

embryonic *Essay* in one of his own notebooks. Before the end of the year he had rewritten and extended it, but meanwhile he had got someone to copy parts of the original and some of his workings for the information of the earl himself. We know this, and we know that this incomplete manuscript was looked on by Shaftesbury as a personal possession, because it was seized amongst his most private papers from his study when he was arrested in 1681: it has even been suggested that another such paper represented Shaftesbury's own sketched attempt at a theory of knowledge.* Here we have them, the statesman and his medical, scholarly intimate, stimulating each other on the most abstract subject of all. It was not Locke the Oxford don who became a philosopher, but Locke the confidant of an eminent politician, living the political, social and intellectual life of Restoration London.

So it was with Locke the economist, the educationalist, the theorist of toleration, even Locke the scientist and medical reformer. He became a Fellow of the Royal Society in November 1668, from Exeter House and not from Christ Church, sponsored by Sir Paul Neile, a founder of the Royal Society, but also a friend and political associate of Shaftesbury's. In London he met the great Sydenham, joined in his medical practice and helped in his study of smallpox. He helped him also with his writings, leaving most of the relevant papers to join Shaftesbury's. Locke published nothing on medicine as such, but his views on education and economics both appeared in the 1690's in printed treatises, and it is quite clear that they had their origin in the work he did for, and in co-operation with, Shaftesbury. He was entrusted with the delicate and important task of finding a wife for the lumpish heir to the house of Ashley, and making sure that he produced an heir in his turn. What had begun as a medical undertaking, turned itself into an educational experiment, and the third earl tells us that he and his five brothers and sisters were all educated by Locke 'according to his own principles (since published by him)'.†

* See Laslett, 1952 (i): the suggestion is Dr Von Leyden's and cannot be pursued because we have the first few words of the paper only. The subject of the first workings for the *Essay* is complex, see Cranston, 1957, 141 2, Aaron, *Locke*, 2nd ed. 1955, 50 5. Johnston, 1954, rightly corrects my suggestion that the Shaftesbury draft is the earliest still extant. The two other 1671 versions have been edited by Aaron and Gibb, 1936, and Rand, 1931.

† See Axtell, 1968, which discusses the whole question of Locke's educational experience in relation to the house of Ashley. Kelly, 1969, makes the case that Locke was given some oversight of Shaftesbury's heir at Oxford when the two men first met there, and that this furthered their subsequent intimacy.

has been found in one of his books:* in 1679–80 he wrote to his French friends as if he were responsible for the work. No such evidence has come out about the *Letter*, and in 1684 he seemed anxious to repudiate authorship. We shall perhaps never know exactly to what extent the *Constitutions* represented Locke's or Shaftesbury's views of how a society newly set up in the American wilderness should be ideally constituted, or whether it was a compromise between them and the other proprietors. The contrast between its doctrines and those of *Two Treatises* is intriguing. If Locke approved them in 1669, for English as well as colonial society, his views on the people, who they were and how they were related to government, changed profoundly by 1679.

But it may be unprofitable simply to seek for consistency or inconsistency here, just as it is in comparing Locke at Oxford with Locke in Shaftesbury's entourage. These publications indicate one of the ways in which he acted as 'assistant pen' to his master in the first period of their association, before he left for France in 1675. He would also draft official papers, record conversations and negotiations, even prompt his masters from behind his chair, as he is supposed to have done when Lord Chancellor Shaftesbury delivered the famous speech *Delenda est Carthago* against the Dutch enemy in 1673. But his important literary function was to write out for Shaftesbury's use an account of this or that political or social problem, telling him what had been thought or written about it, what arguments were likely to convince intelligent people of the correctness of a certain attitude to it. The successive drafts on toleration, economics, even perhaps on education and philosophy fit into this context, as well as being records of Locke's own intellectual development. They are supplemented by what he wrote in his diaries, his letters and his commonplace books. From these sources a remarkably complete record can be recovered of the story behind nearly all of his final books: the conspicuous exception is the work on *Government*.

In a sense, of course, all this material is relevant to Locke's development as a political theorist, especially the toleration file. We shall see that he began reading and making notes on political authority and the origin of political power as soon as he came under Shaftesbury's influence. It may be true that no draft on

* This interesting fragment, in the possession of the present writer, is endorsed 'Carolina, a Draft of some Laws'. It contains two sentences only, highly Harringtonian.

this subject was ever drawn up during this earlier period, to be subsequently destroyed.

For the issue of political obligation as such did not arise in an urgent form until 1679, when Shaftesbury found himself in need of a general, theoretical argument to justify a change in the constitution. There can be little doubt that Locke was summoned back from France early in 1679 to help his master. Shaftesbury was temporarily in office once again, trying to use the national scare over the Popish Plot to force on King Charles II the exclusion from the succession of his brother and heir apparent, the Catholic James, duke of York.* It is certain that Locke knew all about what was going on, and that he took no opportunity to disapprove the forced confessions, the judicial murders, mob oratory and agitation. We do not know whether he 'believed in' the Popish Plot any more than we know if Shaftesbury did, but he never criticized Shaftesbury's actions at any time. He was always his loyal and wholehearted admirer.

He went much further towards revolution and treason than his earlier biographers knew, anxious as they were to present him as a man of unspotted personal and political virtue.† When Parliament was summoned to meet at Oxford early in 1681, at a time when armed resistance seems to have been decided on if the Exclusion Bill failed again, Locke took an active part. He went from house to house finding accommodation for Shaftesbury's entourage, even for Rumsey, the chief of his desperadoes. He was in correspondence with Shaftesbury about influencing elections; he may even have written the famous 'Instructions to the Knights of the County of . . . for their Conduct in Parliament', which has claims to be the first modern party document in history.‡ When

* 'In the year 79 the Earl of Shaftesbury being made Lord President of the Council Mr Locke (as it is said) was sent for home', Lady Masham, 1705. Another argument can be based on the fact that, though Locke had been away for four years, he was so busy with Shaftesbury's business directly he arrived in London, that it was seven months before he could get away to Oxford, and a year before he could go down to Somerset to visit his neglected property. There is a list of trials and confessions in MS. b. 2 and Locke sent a collection of literature of this sort to Thomas in Salisbury at his request. On Shaftesbury and the Plot, Haley, 1968; Ashcraft, 1987, 138 ff.

† Prof. Cranston has effectively demolished the belief of Locke's Victorian biographers in his 'political innocence', see especially chs. 14 and 16. Bastide, 1907, still maintained that 'he kept aloof from the struggle' (p. 68), but suspected that he may have helped Monmouth. I am prepared to believe that he was more deeply implicated in Monmouth's rebellion than even Cranston allows: Ashcraft, 1987, makes a strong case for Locke's involvement in radical plots, propaganda and subversion.

‡ P.R.O. 30/24 v18, Item, 399, endorsed 'The original of this wrote in Mr Locke's own hand'. On all this, see Christie, *Shaftesbury*, 1871, Haley, 1968.

the parliamentary attempt had finally failed and Shaftesbury, after a period of imprisonment, had no other resort than to persuade his associates into consultations verging on treason, Locke went along with him and the others.

With his diary open to us we now know that Locke spent the whole of the summer of 1682 with Shaftesbury while these consultations proceeded. On 15 September he even went with him to Cassiobury, the seat of the earl of Essex, where a meeting of the Whig leaders was scheduled at the height of what is sometimes called the Insurrection Plot. Most significant of all, since it was the action of a man with an independent political personality for the first time, is the fact that he went there again on 24 April 1683, at the very time when preparations are supposed to have been under way for the Assassination, or Rye House, Plot.*

We can assume that he went on this second occasion entirely of his own choosing because Shaftesbury was dead, dead in exile in Holland, his last hours spent, so the tradition goes, in discussing the unorthodox religious doctrines implied in the later part of Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*. Another frequent visitor to the earl of Essex in those dangerous days was Algernon Sidney, regicidal and republican, a man who was to lose his head for his part in the Rye House Plot. Sidney had written at length in support of his views and in refutation of Sir Robert Filmer, the author whose works had become the official exposition of the Royal and Tory view of the basis of governmental power. Sidney's manuscript, later published as his *Discourses Concerning Government*, was an essential part of the case of the Crown at Sidney's trial later in the year.† As we have seen from what happened at Oxford, Locke was already a suspected man, and from the time of the discovery of the Rye House Plot he became a fugitive, quite soon in exile. Nothing specific was ever proved against him, but it was persistently believed that his treasonable activity had been writing against the government, just as Sidney had done.

* There is no reliable evidence of what was discussed on either occasion. Ashcraft (1987, 386) maintains that on the second occasion Locke went 'as a representative of the [revolutionary] Council of Six to summon Essex . . . for an emergency meeting'. Essex was apparently quite unwilling to contemplate tyrannicide, though he died in the Tower when a prisoner for his part in these preparations. Locke preserved a manuscript maintaining the Whig view that Essex did not commit suicide but was murdered, and he was conceivably quite close to Essex.

† See Laslett, 1949, 36-7.

We shall attempt to show that Locke had by this time written a work against the government, and that what was finally published under the title *Two Treatises of Government* was the book in question. The case will have to be presented in full because of the established dogma that it was written in or just after 1688.* We must now turn to such evidence as he has left us of his development as a political theorist whilst he was with Shaftesbury. We may believe if we wish that the train of thought which gave rise to *Two Treatises* departed from the following quotation from one of the works of Sir Robert Filmer, written by Locke into a notebook very early in his days at Exeter House.

Hobs

With noe small content I read Mr Hobs booke De Cive & his Leviathan about the rights of Sovereignty w^{ch} noe man yt I know hath soe amply & Judiciously handled. Filmore. Obser. pface:

The list of books on politics, quotations from them and judgments of their value, from which this quotation comes, seems to have been drawn up in Shaftesbury's presence, for a very similar list has been found in Shaftesbury's own papers, in Locke's hand;‡ there are many items common to both. From this evidence we may conclude that the intellectual relationship between Locke and Shaftesbury in the matter of political theory was, as might be expected, much the same as for economics, toleration and so on. The association directed Locke's attention to the works of Milton, Campanella, Guiccardini, Adam Contzen, as well as to such English champions of non-resistance as Heylyn, Dudley Digges and Filmer. Some of these authors were known to him already, and we may believe that he had read, and praised, a work of Filmer's as early as the year 1659, though this was the first time he

* See section III.

† MS. f. 14, folio 16. The quotation was obviously directly copied from Filmer's *Observations concerning the original of Government*, 1 *pon Nlr Hobbs Leviathan* . . . London, 1652, first words of Preface.

‡ P.R.O. 30/24/47, no. 39, classified book list, section *Politici*. It is a curious fact that in both lists, Sir Robert Filmer, whose tracts had been printed anonymously, is called Sir Thomas Filmore. This is the only occasion known to me when the name 'Filmer' was associated with these tracts before their collected publication in 1679, outside Sir Robert's family and his circle of friends. Locke and Shaftesbury named every one of Filmer's political tracts except his pieces on the *Power of Kings* and his *Freeholder*. Maclean, 1947, recognized that Locke read Filmer as early as 1667, but did not notice the parallel in the Shaftesbury papers.

had been told that Filmer was its author.* It is clear that Shaftesbury's company was bringing him up against the questions he had deliberately left on one side at Oxford. What were the origins of political power, how is it to be analysed, what are its limits and what are the rights of the people?

That these questions were exercising Locke during his first period with Shaftesbury, especially the possibility of a patriarchal origin for political power, is shown by another note made in 1669.† There he made a point which he was to argue at length in *Two Treatises*. In 1672 he schemed something out on *Wisdom*, dividing his observations under the three headings 'Prudence', 'Theology' and 'Politics' (Politia). Politics in its turn is divided into 'Fundamentals', 'The form of the State' and 'Administration', and the two fundamentals are *Jus Paternum* and *Consensus Populi*.‡ This acceptance of patriarchalism alongside of popular consent is also to be found in the final work, here no longer equally fundamental.

But though we know that this was the period of his development as a political theorist, the book itself comes as a revelation. The best illustration of this is the important issue of property, for nothing in his literary remains from the years leading up to his writing on *Government* suggests that property would be a major theme. It is mentioned, in a phrase which fits in with his statement about it in his *Essay on the Understanding*, in his Oxford *Essays on Natural Law*; but what he says in his 1667 *Essays on Toleration* seems to imply a general position which is very different from that presented in *Two Treatises*.§ These are only isolated references. The fact would seem to be, and it can be confirmed for many of the other subjects, that Locke simply had not thought in a systematic way about property before 1679. He had not worked out his justification of ownership in terms of labour.

* There are two references to another set of Filmer's *Observations*, his essay on Philip Hutton which had the title *The Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy* (1648) in Locke's notebook entitled *Lemnia Ethica*. Neither reference is dated, and most of the other entries in the book are later, and marked as such. But their position and context suggest that they were made very early in Locke's use of the book. One quotes the definition of absolute monarchy from p. 15 of Filmer's tract and adds appreciatively: 'hujusmodi monarchia optime defenditur'. No author's is given. It is a curious fact, noted in Kelly, 1969, that Locke's economic writings may well have been affected by Sir Robert Filmer's work on usury, though he never refers to this title.

† MS. c. 29, ff. 7-9, notes on Samuel Parker, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, 1670, printed in full by Cranston, 1957, 131-2.

‡ MS. c. 28, f. 41: 'Sapientia 72.' Compare Abrams, 1961, 311, scheme of? 1661.

§ See below, 103.

The pre-history of *Two Treatises*, then, is a complex study which cannot be taken further here. Enough has been said to suggest the atmosphere in which its doctrines were formulated, an atmosphere of political decisions and policy itself, with Shaftesbury as the policy-maker and Locke as the confidential co-adjutor, one amongst others but the most important. This is not the atmosphere we associate with philosophy, and too often with political thinking, nevertheless this was also the time of Locke's philosophical maturation. *Two Treatises* and the *Essay* were in gestation at the same time, and the political work reached its almost final form earlier, in spite of the fact that systematic work on it began seven or ten years later.

We shall assign the important part of the work of composition to the years 1679-80. It was then, as we believe, that the book took shape, and took shape suddenly for an author with such slow, deliberate habits. Up till then the train of ideas which had been present in his mind from the beginning had developed in a desultory way, as a subordinate theme to that of toleration. It had been deliberately pushed aside when he wrote on Natural Law at Oxford, and can be seen only in such details as his registration of Filmer's agreement with Hobbes. Since he has left us no sketch, no early form of any part of the book, we cannot tell what his earlier opinions had been on many of the subjects it covers, nor how they developed. He was certainly reflecting on them occasionally in his journeys through France between 1676 and 1679.

In February 1676, when he was at Montpellier, he made a note in his journal on the *Obligation of Penal Laws* which dealt rather obscurely with the problem of resistance. He is quite confident that civil laws do not necessarily oblige the individual conscience, but he maintains that there is a law of God 'which forbids disturbance or dissolution of governments'. Conscience is satisfied if a man 'obeys the magistrate to the degree, as not to endanger or disturb the government, under what form of government soever he live'.* Two and a half years later we find an abbreviated sketch of a complete theory, relating man to God, father to son, the individual to society, in familial, patriarchal terms: not Filmer's patriarchalism, but nevertheless closer to the notes of 1669 and 1672 than to *Two Treatises*. The heading he chose was Natural Law, *Lex*

* Printed in King, 1830, I, 114-17; compare Lamprecht, 1916, 142-3, who seems slightly to exaggerate Locke's insistence here on passive obedience.

Naturae. Man, he noted, has 'a knowledge of himself, which the beasts have not' and this knowledge was 'given him for some use and end'. It shows men that a son should obey his father (although begot 'only in pursuance of his pleasure, without thinking of his son') and therefore they must obey God as the final 'author of their being'. It is similarly 'reasonable to punish' a child 'that injures another', and from this we may conclude that children, and all men, are expected by God 'to assist and help one another' as a duty. 'If he find that God has made him and all other men in a state wherein they cannot subsist without society, and has given them judgment to discern what is capable of preserving and maintaining that society, can he but conclude that he is obliged, and that God requires him to follow those rules which conduce to the preserving of society?'

He wrote this when travelling up the Loire in July 1678, a long way from London, Shaftesbury and the dreadful Popish Plot, and he wrote it for himself. We shall claim that his work on *Government* was an exercise on this same theme begun only about a year later, but written for his leader, written also for the public which both men wanted to persuade. Such is the measure of the difference between the Locke who wrote in solitude and the Locke who wrote for Shaftesbury.

But he also wrote for his patron in a way which is much more familiar and typical of his time, to honour and divert him. He presented his little volume on *The Growth of Vines and Olives* to his Lordship on 2 February 1680, and that eminent epicure and cultivator was overjoyed with the exquisite little manuscript volume. To the Countess on the same occasion, it was to celebrate his return from France, he dedicated his translation of the *Essais* of Nicole. In our anxiety to understand the harsh political reality in which these two friends lived their life together, we must not lose sight of its gracefulness, gentility and wit. Locke sat at the Chaplain's table in Lord Chancellor Shaftesbury's meticulously regulated dining hall: he had to trudge through the mud to support that megalomaniac imp when he went out in his coach on state occasions. But he also had a voice in the decoration of his houses, the layout of his gardens: he educated the grandchildren

* Journal for 1678, 201-2, modernized: compare I, § 32 and note. In the note to II, § 38, is quoted a further note of importance to politics, written in his journal in Paris in March 1679.

of his master in English gentility, that just and mellow blending of the practical man, with stoic virtue, understatement and a deep respect for learning. The ideal of the English gentleman is with us today, and in part it is Locke's invention. It grew out of his affection for Shaftesbury.

The last thing Locke wrote as literature was a life, a vindication, or an *Éloge* as the French were saying, of his great master. This was as it should be, for it was the final debt which all literary men owed to those who made the life of literature and thought possible for them. His own end came before he could get further than the first few pages, but the Latin epitaph was finished:

Comitate, acumine, suadela, consilio, animo, constantia, fide,
Vix parum invenias, superiorem certe nullibi.
Libertatis civilis, ecclesiasticae,
Propugnator strenuus, indefessus.

Liberty, then, is the last word we are left with—a tireless, fierce fighter for liberty in religion, liberty in politics, the liberty of Locke's own work on *Government*.

3. LOCKE AND SOMERS

1689 was the year of the great climacteric in the life of Locke. As a result of the Revolution the obscure exile became a man of political influence, with powerful friends in high places. The minor figure in the republic of letters, something of a journalist in the Dutch intellectual community where he had been living, the multiplier of notes and writer of drafts, at last appeared as an author, first of the *Letter on Toleration*, then of *Two Treatises of Government*, both in print by the autumn of that year, but both anonymous. Then in December the John Locke who signed the Preface to *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* became, by that very act, the John Locke of intellectual history. It turned him into a national institution and an international influence. In the fifteen years left to him he twisted his fingers round the haft of English intellectual life and got so firm a grasp that it pointed at last in the direction which he had chosen.

It was a philosophical reputation which he enjoyed, and it was because of the key position of philosophy that his intellectual domination was possible. Everything else which he wrote was important because he, Locke of the *Human Understanding*, had

written it. It was so with his *Thoughts Concerning Education*, 1694, his works on *Money*, 1692 and 1695, and his polemic with Stillingfleet in defence of his *Essay* in 1697 and 1699. The anonymous works, the three letters on *Tolerance* of 1689, 1690 and 1692, the *Reasonableness of Christianity* and its *Vindications* of 1695 and 1697, could not be associated with his philosophy by his contemporaries, or only by very few. It is surely significant that the work on *Government*, the most secret of all, went almost unscathed till its authorship was finally revealed.* But from the time of his death the relation of *Two Treatises* with the *Essay* has been its leading characteristic. Here is an important philosopher, the proposition goes, addressing himself to politics, so what he writes must be important political philosophy.

This way of looking at *Two Treatises of Government* has given rise to a convention of analysis which we shall have to criticize. There is a danger too in the very pattern of Locke's literary career: an apprenticeship of remarkable length leading up to a short final period in which six major works and nine lesser ones were published, most of them in several editions, all by an aging man, busily engaged with other things in his study, and in the world of politics and administration. It makes it look as if he deliberately planned his life in this way, and in the case of political theory this impression is hard to avoid. Here, it would seem, was a mind which trained itself first academically, then at the very seat of political power, and after two important periods of residence abroad, in France and in Holland, finally responded to the Revolution of 1688-9 with a work on *Government*.

The impression of a deliberate plan is of course an illusion, and I believe that he cannot have composed his book after 1683, but there is some value in this commentary on Locke the writer. He felt the need to ripen, particularly as a philosopher, before he appeared in print, and he was also both anxious to publish books and afraid of being criticized. In the final period of his life Locke overcame this fear, and when he found that what he published was a success, he published more. Criticism always disturbed him

* Prof. Dunn finds the earliest reply in Leslie, 1703, and what seems to be the second is *An Essay upon Government, wherein the Republican Schemes renv'd by Mr. Locke are Refuted*, London, 1705, author unknown. But it was noticed abroad: *Du Gouvernement Civil* was coolly reviewed by Basnage in his *Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, Tome VIII, June 1691, 457. 'C'est dommage,' he says on p. 461, 'quell'Auteur n'a pas toujours bien déchargé ses pensées, ni bien développé ses sentimens.'

deeply, which must be one of the reasons for his refusing to acknowledge books which he knew would be controversial. The effect of all this was to make him publish late and enter into history only as an older man, but it was not simply a matter of cumulative experience and above all it was not deliberate.

Calculated strategy is to be seen, however, in the way he went about the task of making sure that his ideas and opinions should affect the policy of governments in these years of his intellectual ascendancy. He had never wanted political office of the ordinary kind and once again he found himself refusing diplomatic posts. Hypochondriac as he was, his first need, as he said, was for a place of 'highest convenience for a retired, single life'. He found obstacles in the way of getting back his Studentship at Christ Church, but a far more comfortable and delicate home for an ageing bachelor presented itself. By the middle of 1691 he was established in the household of Sir Francis Masham at his little moated manor house at Otes, in Essex, under the loving care of his lady, Damaris Masham, Locke's closest friend of all. Here twenty miles from London he spent his final, glorious years, his great and growing library around him, his special chair and desk, his cum-brous scientific apparatus, with his own servant and fodder for his own horse, for one guinea a week.* His time went in writing, not simply the works he published in such numbers, but letters, letters to the learned world, to publishers, to stockjobbers, and letters to politicians and to ministers and professional servants of the crown. The political influence he exercised in this way was truly extraordinary, and for the hundred warmest days in the year he exercised it in person from his London address in Lincoln's Inn Fields.

He did hold office of a sort, for from 1689 he was a Commissioner of Appeals and when the Board of Trade was founded in 1696 he was made a paid member. It has been shown, in fact, that Locke himself played a part in the creation of this second body, the architect of the old Colonial System. Though his responsibility for the Great Recoinage of 1695-6† has been misunderstood,

* For Locke at Otes, see Laslett, 1954 (i), Harrison and Laslett, 1965. From 1697 Locke had the literary assistance of Pierre Coste, who came to live at Otes as tutor to Lady Masham's son; hence the Christ's master-copy of *Two Treatises*.

† Kelly, 1969, shows that the recoinage was carried out in a way which was against Locke's advice, and that his attempts to influence monetary affairs directly (for instance by obtaining the post at the Mint, which went to Newton) were not very successful.

the expiry of the licensing of the press and other measures too were to some extent his doing.* There was a knot of Lockean members of parliament, a group cutting across political 'connection' as it is now beginning to be understood, 'the only known example of an association of politicians for the purpose of a set of rationally conceived policies, a programme based not only on common sentiment, but on superior information and abstract thinking'. It was all done by a typically Lockean foundation called the 'College' whose main function was correspondence, but which met as a club when Locke was in London: its patron was John Somers, later Lord Somers, counsel for the Seven Bishops in 1688, Solicitor-General in 1689, Lord Keeper 1693, Lord Chancellor 1697 and the chief figure in William III's government until 1700.

Somers may well have met Locke in the early 1680's and by 1689 looked to him so much as his mentor that he actually asked his advice on whether he should go on circuit or attend at parliament: in 1690 they exchanged views on the state of the currency. In fact, but with differences, Somers took on Shaftesbury's role for Locke. We need not dwell here on the importance and results of this association for government policy in the 1690's nor list the other noblemen, ministers and members who looked to him for advice and turned that advice into policy. The point of interest for Locke as a writer of political theory lies in the relation between the principles he had published, but not acknowledged, and the practical decisions which he advised so effectively and often helped to carry out. It would almost seem that during these years after the Revolution there was a very distant sense in which liberal or Whig philosophy did in fact inform government and affect politicians in the person of Locke the Whig philosopher.

Such an interpretation cannot be taken too literally. Locke, as we have seen, seemed indifferent to the implications of *Treatises*, certainly for communities under English domination. There was a general change towards 'rationalism' over these years, and it is significant that Locke's part in it was not confined to thinking and writing: success and reputation came to him suddenly after 1688 because at that point a secular drift in the atmosphere became a rapid transformation. But historians are

* See Laslett, 1969. The full story is sketched by Kelly, 1969, and will be published at length by him.

now careful not to call the events of 1688-9 the triumph of the Whigs, or even a revolution as that word is often used. Nevertheless it was the new general situation, as well as his own skill and good fortune, which enabled Locke to observe something of what we shall call his 'principle for policy' in action. The interesting thing is that he did not feel called upon to revise the text of his political theory in the light of this observation, although he did correct and recorrect its details and he can hardly have been unaware of its difficulties as a guide for ministers and administrators.

Outstanding in Locke's attitude and behaviour was his insistence on the citizen's duties in government: he looked upon himself and his friend Isaac Newton, Warden of the Mint, as contributing what an intellectual owed to government activity. If we are to understand Locke the political writer we must dwell for a little while on his peculiar relationship with the politicians.

In December 1684, he wrote from Holland a defensive letter to his patron at the time, the earl of Pembroke: it is a vindication of himself from the charges which had been used to justify his expulsion from Christ Church, and is an instructive commentary on several of the themes we have discussed. Talking of what he did in Shaftesbury's household, and hinting that as a practising physician he might have done better for himself materially, he continues:

I never did anything undutifully against His Majesty or the government. . . . I have never been of any suspected clubs or cabals. I have made little acquaintance, and kept little company, in an house where so much came. . . . My unmeddling temper . . . always sought quiet, and inspired me with no other desires, no other aims, than to pass silently through this world with the company of a few good friends and books. . . . I have often wondered in the way that I lived, and the make that I knew myself of, how it could come to pass, that I was made the author of so many pamphlets, unless it was because I of all my Lord's family happened to have been bred most among books. . . . I here solemnly protest in the presence of god, that I am not the author, not only of any libel, but not of any pamphlet or treatise whatsoever in print, good, bad or indifferent. The apprehension and backwardness I have ever had to be in print even in matters very remote from anything of libellous or seditious, is so well known to my friends.*

We may raise our eyebrows at Locke's definition of being

* Locke to Pembroke, 8 December 1684, de Beer, 2, 663-4; probably not seen by Pembroke, but retained by Edward Clarke, through whom it was to be sent, and who was asked by Locke to destroy it. See his letter to Clarke of 1 January 1685 (de Beer, 2, 671-5), where he also repeats these assertions of his innocence, literary and political.

undutiful to government and feel he was prevaricating over his authorship of political works, but we must welcome this insight into his character as a writer and his attitude to his political patrons. It suggests a delicate and precise portrait of the intellectual in the company of men of action. Obviously fascinated with the consummate effectiveness of all that Shaftesbury thought and wrote, said and did; anxious, perhaps over-anxious, to identify himself with the power he wielded; Locke could not bring himself to share his whole personality with the politicians. There is a hint here of his uneasiness about their lack of scruple and the dusty triviality of political activity day by day. But this was not the inner reason why he held himself back; why he kept up his Oxford career while it lasted, paying token visits there in the summer when the great men were in the country, or insisted on his separate personality as a doctor and a thinker.

He never overcame his inhibitions, although his situation in the 1690's made it possible for him to do what he wanted in spite of them. Locke cannot be described, therefore, simply by the somewhat superficial phrase *intellectual engage*: his reticence over his writings relevant to politics and political life makes that impossible in itself. Wonderfully quick and effective as an expository talker and writer, a genius in the calm clarity with which he could see the shape of complicated things, he was not a man who could lose himself in the act of political doing, or even of intellectual creation. His was an effectiveness at one remove, a power to fascinate the men of action, and in his last years he enjoyed to the full the directive influence it gave him.

Locke died on 29 October 1704, in his study at Otes, a room walled in dark oily brown and dull white, the colours of the books which had been so much of his life. He is buried a long way from Oxford and from his ancestors in Somerset, and buried in some-what strange company, for the Mashams who lie all round him at High Laver were Tories and courtiers of the next generation.* He died a gentleman: 'John Locke, Gent.' is the author's line on the title-pages of the endless reprints of his books which stood on the shelves of eighteenth-century libraries.† This raises the final ques-

* See Laslett, 1954 (i). Abigail Masham is there, the snivelling High Church chambermaid who insinuated Sarah Churchill out of the affections of Queen Anne.

† Locke was so conscious of status, his own in particular, that he actually cancelled the title-page of one of his books because it described him as Esq., and substituted another calling him Gent. See Kelly, 1969, and for these titles in the system of honour, see Laslett, *The World we have lost*, ch. 2.

tion which must be asked about him as the intimate of great politicians and the creator of political principle for the modern world. Can he be called, as so often he is, the spokesman of a rising class, the middle class, the capitalists, the bourgeoisie?

We cannot here pass judgment on the sociological system which regards this question as a critical one. Locke certainly satisfies some of the criteria which it has set up. He was born, as we have said, into the classical atmosphere of early capitalism, into what might well be called a Puritan rising family in the loose way in which the term is used, for he was brought up amongst the lawyers, officials and merchants who had found their way into the Somerset gentry and lived his life as an absentee member. When he joined Shaftesbury, it could be said that he passed from the *petite bourgeoisie* to the *haute bourgeoisie*. He followed his wealthy patron into his investments—the Africa Company, the Lustring Company and finally the Bank of England. He invested in mortgages, lent money all his life to his friends for their convenience and at interest; although he protested that he 'never lov'd stock jobbing' there is in his letters of 1700–1 a clear example of stockmarket profiteering in the shares of the Old and New East India Companies. In his published works he showed himself the determined enemy of beggars and the idle poor, who existed, he thought, because of 'the relaxation of discipline and the corruption of manners'. He even implied that a working family had no right to expect its children to be at leisure after the age of three.*

But at the same time Locke profoundly mistrusted commerce and commercial men. He obviously welcomed the refusal of Somers to permit the control of national economic policy by such men when they attempted to set up a parliamentary Board of Trade in 1695, and though he approved the Bank of England, there is in his hand a curious dialogue expressing deep suspicions of the capitalists who floated it.† Although he was a doctor, it is difficult to make him a representative of the emerging professions which are now taken as symptomatic of the new order, for he despised medical men just to the extent that they were a profession and he shared Shaftesbury's contempt for lawyers. His expulsion

* See his report to the Board of Trade on the poor, 1697, for these details: printed by Fox Bourne, 1676, II, 377–90, compare Cranston, 1957, 424–5. Locke's recommendations make it look as if the conditions discovered in the early nineteenth century were not accidents, but the result of deliberate policy.

† See Laslett, 1969.

from Oxford may have been symbolic of the clash of the new view of the world with the old, but the crisis which actually brought it about was a complex conflict of interests and beliefs leading to violent political actions, and his own philosophical and general views were unpublished at the time.

It can be said nevertheless that Locke the individualist was an individual, and this is to claim for him a more exceptional social position than appears at first sight. The remarkable thing about him was his freedom from engagement: family, church, community, locality. To be free in all these directions at that time posed a dilemma to him. This dilemma can be seen in his relations with Oxford and even with the household at Otes. That such a position was possible, for him and a growing number of others, was a development pregnant of the future. Locke was as free as a man could then be from solidarity with the ruling group, and yet he was not one of the ruled; this is the only intelligible definition of 'middle-class' as applied to him and it leaves out many of the things which that expression seems to imply. Ultimately the possibility of living like this did arise as a function of economic change, but Locke can only be made into the spokesman of that change by the use of a whole apparatus of unconscious motivation and rationalization. An order of free individuals is not a concerted group, not a cohesive assemblage actually bringing about change; no simple conception of 'ideology' will relate Locke's thought with social dynamics.

He is perhaps best described as an independent, free-moving intellectual, aware as others were not of the direction of social change. This is evident in the central issue of *Two Treatises*, which is primarily concerned with the structure of the family and its relevance to social and political authority. If ever men dealt with fundamentals, Filmer and Locke did in this polemic. That Locke should have been an innovator in his justification of property may seem even more significant, but in fact it makes a determinist view of his thinking more difficult. For the attempts to make his doctrine into a straight justification of capitalism have to be complex, too complex to be convincing.

So much for Locke's political writing as determined by social structure and his personal situation. We must now turn to our detailed examination of its chronological determination, the actual events which impelled him to write *Two Treatises of Government*.

III

'TWO TREATISES OF GOVERNMENT' AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1688*

Whilst he was waiting at Rotterdam for a ship to take him home after the Revolution, Locke received the following letter from The Hague:

I have been very ill this fortnight. The beginning was what is called disease of one's country, impatience to be there, but it ended yesterday with violence, as all great things do but kings. Ours went out like a farthing candle, and has given us by this Convention an occasion not only of mending the Government but of melting it down and making all new, which makes me wish you were there to give them a right scheme of government, having been infected by that great man Lord Shaftesbury.†

The writer was Lady Mordaunt, wife of his friend who was to become Earl of Monmouth and Earl of Peterborough and who was already in England with William III. The Convention she mentions was the Convention Parliament, then working out the constitutional future of England after James II had sputtered out. By 11 February Locke was in London: on the 12th the Declaration of Right was completed:‡ on the 13th William and Mary were offered the crown.

This letter, except perhaps for its last phrase, aptly expresses the traditional view of the reasons why Locke sat down to write *Two*

* This section has been published in a slightly different form in the *Cambridge Historical Journal*, vol. xii, no. 1, March 1956, 40-55 (Laslett, 1956).

† Paraphrased: the original seems to read, e.g.: 'ours went out: Lyke a farding candle: & has given us by this convension an occasion of mending the government but of melting it down and make. . . .'; Dated 11 January 1689 (de Beer, 3, 528-9), compare p. 77 below.

‡ This date makes it practically impossible that Locke had anything to do with its composition, or with any of the arguments to the Convention, though some of them look not unlike some portions of *Two Treatises* (compare, e.g., the *Proposals Offered to the Present Convention*, printed in *State Tracts*, 1693, with ii, §§ 217, 219). Locke's papers contain nothing to suggest that he communicated his views from Holland to such writers or to members of the Convention.

Treatises of Government. What was wanted was an argument, along with a scheme of government, an argument deep in its analysis and theoretical, even philosophical, in its premises, but cogent and convincing in its expression. In its second part, at any rate, *Two Treatises* presents precisely these things. The author's objects and the occasion of his writing are set out just as might be expected in the Preface. He hoped that the book would be:

sufficient to establish the Throne of our Great Restorer, Our present King William; to make good his Title, in the Consent of the People, . . . and to justify to the World, the People of England, whose love of their Just and Natural Rights, with their Resolution to preserve them, saved the Nation when it was on the very brink of Slavery and Ruine.

The case for supposing that the composition of this work belongs wholly and indissolubly with 1688, the year of the Glorious Revolution, is superficially convincing, therefore. It contains a statement which dates itself in that year.* It did in actual fact justify the Revolution to posterity, as well as to contemporaries. 'It is allowed on all hands,' wrote Josiah Tucker in 1781, 'and it has been a continual belief of the friends and admirers of Mr Locke, that he wrote his Essay on Government with a view to justify the Revolution.† In the history books and the works on political theory, Locke on the English Revolution is still the supreme example of the way in which political events interplay with political thinking. This belief is far too deeply engrained, far, far too useful, to be easily abandoned. Nevertheless it is quite untrue.

Untrue, that is to say, in its most useful form. What Locke wrote did justify the Glorious Whig Revolution of 1688, if that phrase can be permitted at all. Some of the text undoubtedly was written in 1689 to apply to the situation then and its author must have intended the whole work to be read as a comment on these events. But it cannot be maintained that the original conception of

* 1, § 129, 'Judge Jeffries, pronounced Sentence of Death in the late Times', the last phrase being in common use in 1689 to refer to James II's reign.

† Tucker, Josiah, *A treatise concerning civil government*, p. 72. In a short paper kept by his parliamentary friend Edward Clarke and probably written in April, 1690, Locke pronounced on the necessity of everyone publicly repudiating divine right doctrines because they divided the nation. Close to the Preface of *Two Treatises* in tone, it is markedly Williamite in tenor: MS Locke c. 18 (recovered after being lost for 30 years), printed by Farr and Roberts, 1985.

the book was the justification of a revolution which had been consummated. A detailed examination of the text and the evidence bearing on it goes to show that it cannot have been 1688 which fastened Locke's attention on the nature of society and politics, political impersonality and property, the rights of the individual and the ethical imperatives on government. The conjunction of events which set his mind at work on these things must be sought at an earlier period. *Two Treatises* in fact turns out to be a demand for a revolution to be brought about, not the rationalization of a revolution in need of defence.

It was suspected as long ago as 1876 that the *First Treatise* was composed several years before 1688, and that the *Second* cannot have been wholly subsequent to the Revolution.* But the evidence available at that time was even more fragmentary and difficult to interpret than it is today, and within a decade or two the dogma that Locke wrote to nationalize the events of 1688-9 became firmly established in the nascent study of political science.† Another reason why this came about was that the reprints of the book which have circulated since that time have been so unsatisfactory.‡ Few of the students who have handled Locke on *Government* in recent generations were to know that he explained himself as he did in his

* Fox Bourne, 1, 466, and II, 166: he believed that the *First* was prepared in 1681 or 1682, and that the *Second*, from its tone and method, seemed to have been 'composed before, instead of after, King William's accession . . . It may fairly be assumed that the whole work was substantially completed during the last year or so of Locke's residence in Holland'.

† Sir Leslie and Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, T. H. Green and Sir Frederick Pollock form the very distinguished group who seem to have been responsible, ignoring Fox Bourne and blandly accepting traditional dogma. Writing in 1876 itself, Sir Leslie Stephen merely said (II, 135) that 'Locke expounded the principles of the Revolution of 1688', but in 1879 Green was claiming in his famous *Lectures* that 'Locke wrote with a present political object in view . . . to justify the Revolution' (published 1895, 1931 ed., 76). Fowler was still following Fox Bourne in 1880, but Pollock was much more specific in reading the Revolution into the *Treatises* in his *Introduction to the History of the Science of Politics*, published originally in 1890. Sir James Stephen based his whole critique of the book on the fact that it had this as its occasion: he published this view in his *Horae Sabbaticae*, 2nd series, 1892. In 1904 Pollock developed the case in definitive form in his address to the British Academy, and more recent commentators seem to have followed him uncritically here and in his claim that Locke was really and consciously attacking Hobbes. Bastide, 1907, went farthest in reading the events of 1688-9 into the *Second Treatise*, although he relied heavily on Fox Bourne, and accepted his date for the *First Treatise*—see especially pp. 255-72.

‡ See section I and Laslett, 1952 (IV), 1954 (II).

Preface, or even that the work consists in two treatises, not one, the first breaking off in the middle of a sentence only a quarter of the way through its text. For the *Preface* has not been reprinted in England since 1854, and the *First Treatise* only once since 1884.* When we treat what we are pleased to call our great political classics like this, there can be little wonder that a minor mythology should grow around one of them.

Although Locke makes this statement in his *Preface* of 1689 expressing the hope that what he had written would serve to justify the Revolution, he does not elaborate it. Nothing he says there refers directly to the time at which the work was composed, but he does explain why it would not have been worth his while to rewrite the missing majority of his manuscript. We may take this to imply that the *First Treatise*, described on the title-page as a refutation of Filmer, had been composed some time before, and was not so much a thing of the moment when the *Preface* was being written. It is interesting to recognize that Locke originally wrote such an extensive analysis of the work of a man whom he wanted to regard as an obscure nonentity,† and that the book planned was similar in size and in purpose to Sidney's unmanageable *Discourses*. But it is quite understandable that he should have been unwilling to repeat the performance. Filmer's great vogue had been between 1679 and 1681, and only the lingering attachment to his principles of the passive obedience party in 1689 justified the appearance between the same covers of the *First* and *Second Treatise*.

More recent specialist students of Locke have used this evidence in favour of the view of the date or dates of composition originally proposed in 1876. They have freely granted that the *First Treatise* was written before 1683, before Locke left for Holland, and they explain the fact that it contains the only statement which undoubtedly belongs after 1688 (the reference to 'Judge Jeffries') as an insertion of 1689. But the second book, they seem to agree, must be much later, and can only be dated in the months surrounding

* Until the appearance of the present work in 1960, that is to say, for the previous English edition with both treatises and the *Preface* dates from 1824, but they presumably appeared in the last *Collected Locke* in 1854, whose existence has been doubted. They were included in an American reprint of 1947 (Hafner).

† On Filmer, see Laslett, 1948 (i) and (ii). Daly, 1979, Ezell, 1987. The slightly apologetic tone of Locke's remarks about him in the *Preface* may be due to the fact that he knew his family in Kent.

ing the revolutionary events themselves, though they find it difficult to decide which passages came before and which came after William's triumph over James. It has been noticed that the books to which Locke directly refers in his text, though very few in number, were all in print before 1683. But in the absence of any detailed knowledge of the editions and copies he actually used to write any part of his text, this fact has not been taken to point to an earlier date of composition for the whole work. They concede that the drift of Locke's statements makes it look as if the Revolution was yet to come. Nevertheless they see nothing impossible in supposing that the *Second Treatise* was written in its entirety after the event: that is presumably between Locke's return in February 1689 and August of that year, when it must have been complete to receive the Licenser's stamp.*

In view of all the work on this point over the last eighty years it seems extraordinary that the traditional fallacy, that not one but both *Treatises* were written to justify the Revolution of 1688-9, should still survive. But before it is abandoned, it should be pointed out that there is evidence in its favour which has never been brought forward. In some ways it is a better explanation than the one which has just been summarized. If the wording of Locke's *Preface* is considered carefully, it will be seen that he talks of the book as a whole. He cannot be made to imply that it was written in two parts, on two occasions, separated by some years,† though the admission that so much of the manuscript had been lost would seem to invite some such statement. It is a 'Discourse concerning Government', with a beginning, a middle (now missing) and an end, not the two disparate essays which recent commentators seem to have in mind.

His cross-references tend to confirm that this was his view of it.

* On 3 August 1689, the limiting date for the completion of the text. Among the Locke scholars referred to here are Gough, 1950, following Maclean, 1947 (i) and (ii), and Barker, 1948. Vaughan, 1923, conjectures from an argument about the inconsistency between the *Essay* and *Two Treatises*, an argument which is quite untenable in view of the history of the *Essay* as it has since become known, that '*Civil Government* . . . was written . . . in or shortly after 1680' (163, cf. 130). Driver, 1928, reaches a similar hypothesis on somewhat similar, though no more reliable grounds. Hinton, 1974, wishes to assign the original work of authorship of the *Second Treatise* to a date even earlier in the 1670s.

† Compare the *Fipstle* introducing the *Essay on the Understanding*, explaining that it was 'written by incoherent parcels; and after long intervals . . . resumed again', etc.

They all occur in the first book, which is an interesting point, as we shall see. In § 66 he talks of something he will examine 'in its due place', which turns out to be the second book §§ 52-76: in § 87 he refers to a man's acquiring property, 'which how he . . . could do, shall be shewn in another place', that is in the second book, chapter 5: § 100 contains the words 'for which I refer my Reader to the Second Book'. This second book opens with the phrase 'It having been shewn in the foregoing Discourse', which means the text to be found in the preceding pages, not an earlier and separate discourse, for when unqualified that word refers to the complete work. When Locke wrote these phrases, he must surely have been quite clear about the content of his whole book, and their contexts make it very unlikely that they were later insertions.

We can add to these details Dr Gerritsen's very interesting discovery. Using the exact and subtle methods of analytical bibliography, he has shown that the title-page of the second book was a later insertion, made in the course of printing. The title to the whole, printed even later of course, was presumably brought into line with it.* It follows from this that Locke did not think of his volume originally as in two parts at all, any more than any work presented in two 'books'. The word 'Treatise', the expression 'Two Treatises', the title 'An Essay on Civil Government' applied to the second book were all afterthoughts, appearing finally on the title-pages, but never used in the text at all, not even in the cross-references. What Locke thought he was writing was a whole Discourse, set out in two books for his own literary purposes.

The book, then, was written as a whole. It is permissible to infer from this that it was written within a relatively short time, then an exact chronological argument is possible about the work he put into it, the work of original creation that is to say, as distinct from addition and revision. Given evidence to show that any considerable portion can only belong to the situation of a few particular months, say in 1688-9, then the whole belongs to those months.

But however willing men may have been to read the events of 1688-9 into Locke's text, there are convincing signs that the months of composition cannot have fallen then. The *First Treatise*, as we have seen, was intended as a complete refutation of Filmer,

* See Bowers, Gerritsen and Laslett, 1954.

Patriarcha and all, and in its original form may well have covered all his propositions, except perhaps his specifically historical argument about English institutions. Moreover, the exhaustive contradiction of patriarchalism runs right through the *Second Treatise* too: this is perhaps the most important result of editing it critically. If we believe that the whole book was written at one time, then we are obliged to believe that it was written between 1679 and 1681, or 1683 at the latest, since it is so obviously connected with the controversy of those years over the republication of Filmer. We have already seen that it was this controversy which set Sidney on work at his *Discourses*, which must have been complete by mid-1683 and very probably earlier. It is well known that in republishing Filmer, the Tories, champions of the Monarchy against Shaftesbury and the Whig Exclusionists, scored a notable propaganda victory, and Sidney was only one of a large number who took the risk of writing against it.* If the *First Treatise* belongs to these earlier years and the *Second Treatise* is part and parcel of it, then the whole work was written before 1683, and there is an end of it.

Though a simple proof of this sort carries conviction to its editor, the assumption that the book was composed over a relatively short span of time is open to attack. It could be maintained that it was the result of two separate impulses from historical circumstances, although it was composed as a whole. Granted that it was finished in some form when Filmer's name was on everyone's lips, it could still be supposed that it was rewritten later, and altered so extensively as to be a work of dual or multiple composition. This, as we have seen, was how Locke wrote on the *Understanding*, on *Toleration* and on *Education*. Doubt could even be thrown on the claim that the connection with Filmer must place the work in the early 1680's, for his name was still alive in 1688 and even later. The book, then, was composed as a whole, it might perhaps still be argued, but in the months up to August 1689; an author in a hurry might have started it as late as February of that year.

These possible objections make it necessary to go further into the evidence. Some of it can certainly be used against the position taken up here. There is force in the claim that it was still necessary

* See Laslett, 1948 (ii) and 1949: on the Whig Exclusionists, Furlley, 1957; Pocock, 1957; Ashcraft, 1986, 1987.

for a Whig writer to go to some trouble to refute Filmer as late as 1689. His works were reissued in 1696, and any acquaintance with English political literature up to 1714 will show that Locke was not wasting his publisher's money by including the *First Treatise*. Locke's own correspondence makes this clear. James Tyrrell, who knew him best as a political writer, published *Patriarcha non Monarcha* against Filmer in 1681, but he found it necessary to return to the attack in 1691. * When he first saw *Two Treatises* in December 1689, he thought of it as an attack on patriarchalism, 'a very solid and rational treatise called of Government in which Sr R Filmer's Principles are very well confuted'. In the previous June, Furlly the English Quaker who had been Locke's host in Rotterdam and was then in England, wrote thus to him: 'I met with a scrupulous Cambridge scholar that thought nothing could discharge him of the Oath of Allegiance that he had taken to James II and his successors. I had pleasant sport with him upon Sir R Filmer's maggot. † The letter which Leibniz received in 1698 telling him of Locke's book was also quite unequivocal on the point.

'Le livre de Monsy. Lock sur le gouvernement repond par tout son traité à celui de Chevalier Filmer'. ‡

But all this goes to show why it was that Locke published what he had written against Filmer in 1689, rather than to demonstrate that he actually composed his refutation then. It is just possible that a man could find time to do all that Locke is known to have done between February and August and also to begin and complete a work at such length against the patriarchal extremists. The tracts he acquired make it plain that he interested himself in all that was coming out for and against the new order of things at that critical time. § But it is very difficult indeed to believe that he allowed himself to be rushed into print in this way. If he did, he

* *Bibliotheca Politica*, 1st dialogue and *passim*.

† Tyrrell to Locke, c. 19 December 1689; Benjamin Furlly to Locke, 10 June 1689, compare his letter of 26 October 1690, which confirms that he knew of the authorship of *Two Treatises* (de Beer 3, 638-39, 763-64; 4, 144-45). The book was in circulation a little before Tyrrell saw it. It was advertised in the *London Gazette* for 14-18 November.

‡ Gerhardt, *Leibniz*, vol. 3, 1887, p. 243.

§ Locke bought political pamphlets only sporadically. Quite a number in his library catalogue date from 1679-82, though it is clear that at that time he was using some of Shaftesbury's copies of such works. A superficial survey shows that he bought for himself as much in 1689 as in all other years together. Ashcraft, 1987, 294-5, takes a different view of Locke's interest in and purchase of political pamphlets.

must have lost over half his manuscript immediately after he had finished writing, and this is almost inconceivable.

For we must never lose sight of his personality. 'Reader, Thou hast here the Beginning and End of a Discourse concerning Government; what Fate has otherwise disposed of the Papers that should have filled up the middle, and were more than all the rest, 'tis not worth while to tell thee' are the exact words he uses to explain the fragmentary nature of his text. Whatever this mysterious fate was, it cannot have been that Locke the precisionist had simply mislaid a whole sheaf of his own papers within the previous week or two, and he was not the man to allow an agent, a printer or a publisher to do such a thing. * Nor was he a man to do things in a hurry: we have seen how long and complicated was the process through which all his other books had to go before they appeared in print. To think of him as a man who would write for publication a rationalization of events which had just taken place is to misunderstand his character completely. This makes against the traditional interpretation in all its possible forms.

Did he compose the work, or at least the second book, in the leisurely, Lockean manner during his Dutch exile, bringing it home with him for final revision and publication? This is the tendency of recent Locke scholarship, at least as to the *Second Treatise*, and there is evidence for it. It accounts for the fact that his political comment reads for the most part as if it were made before and not after William's accession. † It allows for a much earlier date of germination. His connection with such architects of the Revolution as Mordaunt naturally gave rise to the expectation that he might write about it. He was pressed as early as 1687 to publish on *Toleration*, ‡ and if he could go into print on this

* This obvious point can be illustrated by his behaviour when a paper of his corrections was said to be mislaid in 1694, see above, 8-9 and note* on page 9.

† It will be seen from the passage in the Preface quoted on p. 46 that Locke writes of William alone, and not his co-sovereign Mary. This may mark him as a supporter of William's sole sovereignty, an attitude typical of the Whigs who had been in exile, but one which ceased to be held by the latest date at which the Preface can have been written—October 1689.

‡ Tyrrell to Locke, 6 May 1687: 'your Discourse about Liberty of Conscience would not do amiss now to dispose people's minds to pass it when the Parliament sits'. This 'Discourse' was not the final *Epistola*, which was composed in Holland in 1684-5 and was unknown to Tyrrell, and to everyone except Limborch, see Fox Bourne, 1876, II, 34. In Laslett, 1976, evidence is cited about a work which Locke was trying to get printed in 1687. Prof. Cranston has since convinced me that it cannot have been *Two Treatises*.

subject, why should he not be writing on politics? Any sign that he was actually engaged on *Two Treatises* in Holland in or just before 1688 would make this view formidable.

There is an entry in his journal in February 1687 which seems at first sight to provide just the detail to sanction such an interpretation. It is an extract from Garcilaso de la Vega which is also to be found in the *Second Treatise*, § 14.* But even this turns out to be quite inconclusive. For it so happens that the passage is present in the second state of the first edition only, and therefore could easily have been added when he made the modifications which turned the first into the second state in October 1689.† Nevertheless the possible implication of this one item and the necessity of finding positive confirmatory evidence of the view put forward here makes it very important that there should be a whole class of sources which has yet to be used. In Locke's notes on his reading, in his lists of books, in the books themselves and their whereabouts at the dates under discussion, we have indications of a much more specific and reliable kind than those so far cited.

But before we turn to this material we may refer to some obvious features of the text of the book. Quite apart from its unmistakable connections with the Filmer controversy of 1679–81, there are political references which make sense for those years and those years alone. In 1689 the phrase 'King James' with no number following could mean King James II and nobody else. Yet in the text printed in that year Locke twice refers to 'King James' when he meant James I, surely a very significant anachronism and one which he corrected in later printings.‡ It seems strange that this should not have been noticed before, but even stranger that the parliamentary issues of the Exclusion Controversy have not been noticed in the constitutional discussion of the *Second Treatise*.

* See II, § 14, 12–17 and note, and Locke's diary for 2 February 1687.

† See Laslett, 1952 (iv) and 1954 (ii), for the two states. The item was either a MS. addition to author's copy, misunderstood by the compositor of the first state, or an alteration between the two states. Even if it were the former, it could have been done in 1689, when he modified his MS. in so many other respects. In fact this detail may confirm the view that Locke did not have his MS. with him in 1687 when he made the diary entry, but copied that entry into it two years later.

‡ *Second Treatise*, §§ 133 and 200, corrected in 1694 and 1698 respectively—see Collation. This perhaps should not be pressed too far. James I was also a literary figure and the omission of the number would not confuse the reader in obviously literary contexts.

Except perhaps in the last chapter, Locke's chief concern there was the summoning and dissolution of Parliament. This was for him the crucial relationship between Legislative and Executive. It was this which could lead to 'a state of War' (that is with the people) when the 'Executive Power shall make use of . . . force to hinder the meeting and acting of the Legislature' (II, § 155). Now this was not the major issue of 1688, nor of James II's reign. But it was typical of the years between 1678 (or even 1675) and 1681, when Shaftesbury with Locke so often at his side had made attempt after attempt to force Charles II either to dissolve a parliament long out of date, or to summon it after an intolerable series of prorogations. The 'long train of Abuses, Prevarications and Artifices' of § 225 became a phrase in the American Declaration of Independence. It included underhand favouring of Catholicism '(though publicly proclaimed against)' (§ 210). These abuses were those of Charles II, not James II. He did not find it necessary either to be underhand in favouring Catholicism, or to proclaim against it.

We can go no further into the results of reducing Locke's theories to their revised historical context. Let us begin our consideration of the evidence now open to us in Locke's books and reading by taking a straightforward example. His diary tells us that he was in London in August 1681, in Shaftesbury's house, though Shaftesbury was away, in the Tower. On the 29th he bought 'Knox, R' Historical Relation of Ceylon, fol. London 81' for eight shillings (that is, Robert Knox on Ceylon, 1681). In § 92 of the *Second Treatise* he refers to 'the late Relation of Ceylon', and the word late here means, presumably, just published. Now we know that Locke kept this book in London, and that he lost sight of it in 1683 when he went to Holland. There is no sign that it was ever amongst the separate collection which he kept at Oxford, and which was transported to Tyrrell's house in 1684 when he was expelled from Christ Church. Knox does not appear in any document from the period of his exile; journal, book bill, book list or notebook. We have no evidence that he ever saw this copy, or any other copy, until the title appears in the catalogue he made of his London books in the summer of 1689.* His Oxford books were not delivered to him by Tyrrell until 1691. It is, therefore, very unlikely that he wrote this phrase in the

* The complicated story of the disposition of his books whilst he was in Holland, and of Tyrrell's actions over them, is told in Harrison and Laslett, 1965, Part I, Chapter II.

Second Treatise between 1683 and 1689, and very likely that he wrote it between 1681 and 1683.

'Very likely' could become 'certainly' only if we could exclude the possibility of access to another copy later, and if we had cumulative evidence. It is in the nature of things that later access cannot be entirely excluded,* though in this and many other cases it is highly improbable. But cumulative evidence is just what we do possess. Although he refers to so few books directly in his text, we can work out a sizeable list of those he may have consulted and compare it with three other lists. One is the census of the books in his rooms at Christ Church which he wrote out in his diary under July 1681, another is the London list of 1689, and the third is Tyrrell's catalogue of the books returned in 1691. It appears that Locke's library of the early 1680's, divided between Shaftesbury's house and Christ Church, contained nearly all the works which he used for the writing of *Two Treatises*.

This can be supplemented from his records of his reading and purchases over the relevant years. They show that between 1679 and 1682 Locke was more interested in publications on political theory and natural law than ever before or after. One or two of the critical titles, as we shall see, are to be found amongst those which Shaftesbury drew to his attention in 1679, and which were lent to him, or made available in London. It was only in the period before 1683 that Locke had convenient access to the particular books which he needed for writing on *Government*. Any other suggested date of composition implies that he went painfully from friend to friend and library to library consulting them one by one.

We may take a further particular example in confirmation, a book of much greater importance to his political thinking than Knox—Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. He had read Hooker before, we know, though perhaps not far into that tall folio.† But it was not until 13 June 1681 that he bought in London 'Hooker

* Maclean, 1947 (ii), ingeniously argues that a book which he believes is vital to *Two Treatises* (Lawson, 1657, see below) could have been used by Locke in Furlly's house in Rotterdam. But though it has this Lawson and some other relevant items, the catalogue of Furlly's library (*Bibliotheca Furliana*, 1714) does not contain enough of the right titles to make it likely that the reading for the book was done there. On these topics, see Ashcraft, 1969 (ii), 1987, and Addendum, pp. 123–6 below.

† In his early essay on the *Civil Magistrate* he states that he had only read the Preface, see Abrams, 1961, p. 32, though within a few months he had read at least the first book, and Hooker appears occasionally in his notebooks up to 1681.

Ecclesiasticall Politie fol Lond. 66'. He read in the book during the rest of the month, making lengthy extracts from it into his journal, some of them important for his philosophizing. Now, there are sixteen passages from Hooker quoted in the *Second Treatise*,* and in § 239 Locke explains why he had used the work. When the quotations in his diary are set alongside those in the *Second Treatise*, they are seen to alternate, never overlapping. The conclusion must be that in June 1681 Locke was working on the *Second Treatise*, incorporating extracts from Hooker into it, and at the same time copying into his diary other passages of philosophical interest.† These details are interesting not only for the implication that the Hooker quotations were added to the text after it had been begun, but also because they reveal Locke at work on *Two Treatises* and the *Essay on the Understanding* at the same time.

We have chosen these examples from books quoted in the *Second Treatise* only, and enough has been said to establish a presumption against assuming that only the *First Treatise* could have been in existence in 1681. For closer indications that the composition of the whole book can plausibly be supposed to belong to a particular series of months we may turn to the copies Locke used of the works of Filmer, which enter into both treatises.

These tracts had originally been published separately in 1648, 1652 and 1653, but Filmer's original writing, the famous *Patriarcha*, from which they finally derive, had never been printed.‡ About the middle of 1679 the printed tracts were hurriedly re-published as a collection under the title *The Freeholders Grand Inquest*, each tract being individually paginated. In January 1680 this collection was printed again, with continuous pagination. At about the same time *Patriarcha* was first published. Locke bought this 1680 collection with *Patriarcha* bound up with it for 4s. 6d. on 22 January 1680,§ and in his Preface to *Two Treatises* he tells us

* Four in the text (§§ 15, 60, 61), eleven in Locke's notes (see §§ 74, 90, 91, 94 (two), 111, 134 (two passages quoted together), 135, 136 (same passage as in 134)).

† A 1666 edition of Hooker appears in the London list and in a slightly puzzling entry in his final catalogue (Harrison and Laslett, 1491), which also contains the 1676 edition (Harrison and Laslett, 1490) still among his books. These volumes therefore may not be distinct. He had yet another Hooker dated 1632 in Oxford (Harrison and Laslett, 1492), though it is interesting that he did not use it to finish this work when he visited his rooms during July. He continued when he got back to London.

‡ See Laslett, 1949, especially 47–8, *Concrete Bibliography of Filmer's Works*.

§ This volume is in front of the present writer. Some of the leaves are folded up to indicate passages, but there are no marginal notes.

that these were the editions he used. He explains his references to Filmer thus: 'O for his Observations on Hobbs, Milton etc. . . . a bare Quotation of Pages always means Pages of his Patriarcha. Edit. 1680.* This was presumably the volume short-titled 'Filmer' which was standing in his rooms in July 1681, for it was certainly the one which Tyrrell took charge of whilst Locke was in exile, and returned in 1691.

As we should expect with the meticulous Locke, these conventions are consistently respected. In the 200 or so references to Filmer in the *First Treatise*, a passage marked 'O 245' is always found on p. 245 of the 1680 Collection, and one marked '13' is always found on p. 13 of *Patriarcha*. But on the single occasion on which he cites this author by page number in the *Second Treatise*, he breaks his convention.

He is discussing liberty as being 'for every one to do what he lists' in § 22, and he refers to 'what Sir R.F. tells us O.A. 55'. Now this will not work for the 1680 Collection. Nothing resembling what he quotes is to be seen on p. 55 of that volume. But it does work for a p. 55 of the 1679 Collection, p. 55 of the *Observations on Aristotle* which becomes p. 143 in the 1680 reprint, where Filmer does make this particular statement about liberty. It looks as if Locke must have been using the 1679 volume when he wrote § 22 of the *Second Treatise*, and so observing a different convention of reference. And it looks as if he had reached that paragraph before even reading *Patriarcha*: indeed the text of the *Second Treatise*, although written against patriarchalism, could have been originally composed without his having seen *Patriarcha* at all.

We have independent evidence that Locke was in fact reading the 1679 Collection in the year of its appearance, and that he was making extracts from the book in almost precisely the form found in the *Second Treatise*. A 'Tablet', or note pad, of his has survived from this period, used for notes and references, some taken into Shaftesbury. On p. 119 he wrote under '79' (for 1679): 'Filmer to resolve the conscience Op. 59.' † On p. 59 of Filmer's *Observations on Aristotle* in the 1679 Collection, resolving the conscience is discussed, discussed along with the consent of the people to

* 'Observations on Hobbs', etc. refers collectively to the tracts in the volume, with the exception of the *Freeholder*, printed first; Locke never refers to the *Freeholder* in *Two Treatises* as we now know it.

† Resolving the conscience was a crucial issue in the Exclusion years. Ashcraft objects that this note was not necessarily made in 1679 because it was the first entry on the page: see below p. 124.

government, a major theme of the *Second Treatise*. Good evidence this, as such circumstantial evidence goes, that Locke may have been engaged on the early part of that essay in 1679.*

I am prepared to venture a general assertion on the basis of this discussion. As early as 1679 Locke had begun a work on government, and a work with the immediate object of refuting Filmer. He had begun it, it would seem, with Shaftesbury's connivance, perhaps at his request and with his assistance in the matter of sources. But the work he had begun was not the *First Treatise*, but the *Second*. He seems to have reached paragraph number 22 of that *Treatise*, possibly number 57 and even number 236, almost at the very end, when he changed his mind sometime in 1680, and decided to write the *First Treatise* too. † We need not look far for the reason why he did this. It was the appearance of *Patriarcha* in January 1680, together with the enormous growth of Filmer's influence which went on during the rest of that year. The reply he had originally planned was insufficient because it left out account the most important work of the man he was criticizing and did not contain the phrase-by-phrase refutation which he recognized was now needed. It is possible moreover that a somewhat similar path was taken by his friend James Tyrrell during the writing of his own independent essay in refutation of Filmer, *Patriarcha non Manarcha*, published in 1681.

Locke and Tyrrell had been friends from their Oxford days, and mutually interested in primitive peoples, Natural Law and toleration as well as politics; they exchanged books, corresponded and from time to time discussed. ‡ It was no even, undisturbed friendship for Tyrrell, as will be seen, was not the most tactful of

* The 'Tablet' is MS. f. 28. On p. 40 he notes, also under 1679, 'Shaftesbury: Lawson's book of the English Government', an entry later crossed through, showing, it is clear, that Shaftesbury made Locke a loan of this book, who crossed out the entry when he returned it (or it may have been Locke who lent, and Shaftesbury who returned). The two men were presumably reading Lawson then, and so Maclean's supposition that Locke read him in 1687 in Holland is otiose. If Shaftesbury was the lender, it may be that he lent Locke the 1679 collection of Filmer too. Locke had Lawson, 1660, in Holland, and finally bought the 1689 reprint. Ashcraft rejects this use of Locke's 'Tablet'.

† See notes on these paragraphs. In § 57 he repeats, without reference, the phrase from Filmer used in § 22, and in § 236 inserts another quotation noted in his 'Tablet', this time under 1680. In the *First Treatise*, § 14, there is a phrase which might possibly imply that he read *Patriarcha* first, and the other tracts later, but, statements in 1 §§ 6, 11 confirm the view taken here.

‡ On Locke and Tyrrell, see J. W. Gough, 1976.

men. 'He never polished himself out of his sincerity', as his epitaph admits.

In the crisis years of 1680-3 Locke spent much of his time at Tyrrell's house at Shotover, some miles away from his suspicious college, and they engaged in collaborative writing: a critical commentary on Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation* (1681).^{*} But each may have been at work at another literary task as well. In January 1680 Tyrrell wrote a letter to an eminent Whig historian which remarked 'There is lately come to this town a new treatise of Sir Robert Filmer's called *Patriarcha*'.[†] This suggests that he was already at work on *Patriarcha non Monarcha* using Filmer's previously republished tracts, in the 1679 edition.[‡] He may have had to take the new publication into account by modifying his text. The published book begins with a page by page refutation of *Patriarcha* in rather the same way as Locke's work in its final form begins with the *First Treatise* also specifically directed against *Patriarcha*.

Locke and Tyrrell, then, were in close communication when, as I am prepared to believe, both were engaged in refuting Filmer, and their writing plans followed a remarkably similar pattern. So close were they, indeed, that some sort of collaboration would seem possible, or even likely. But the remarkable thing is that the evidence we have goes to show that Locke most certainly did not let Tyrrell see his manuscript, or even know of its existence, and that Tyrrell seems to have been almost as guarded about his too.[§] This is of some interest, since so many of Tyrrell's positions against Filmer were also those of Locke, more particularly the account of the right of property. || But whatever the exact relationship of the two men

^{*} MS. c. 34: Locke's, Tyrrell's and another hand (? an amanuensis) interspersed. Tyrrell actually made notes, on subjects of importance to political theory, in Locke's journal for 1680, see note on II, § 108, 6.

[†] Inner Temple MS. 583 (17), f. 302, Tyrrell to Peysr 'Jan. 12th', obviously 1680. See Pocock, 1957, 187-8: Mr Pocock helped with this reference.

[‡] This book was divided between compositors in such a way as to give rise to three inconsistent paginations. In earlier editions my *Introduction* suggested that the discontinuities arose because Tyrrell sent added copy dealing with *Patriarcha*. This does not seem to have been so and the facts are as set out in a letter to me of January, 1972 by Mr J. Attig, and as printed in 1978 by J. W. Gough.

[§] Locke bought a copy of *Patriarcha non Monarcha* 'for Mr Tyrrell' soon after its appearance in June, 1681. No man buys a book to give it to its anonymous author, if he knows who wrote it. Tyrrell later sent Locke a copy amended in manuscript (H. and L. 2999, see note on II, 74, 14-17).

|| See footnotes to text throughout, especially note on II, § 27. *Patriarcha non*

over their two books, it is clear that when Locke decided to deal as he did with Filmer's *Patriarcha* he did as Tyrrell did and what circumstances demanded.

Only in *Patriarcha*, and after January 1680, was the authoritarian, patriarchal, Tory case work on the minds of the politically important as one influential whole. In his tracts Filmer had commented on the constitution and on the origin of government in separate contexts, so much so that it has been widely believed that the *Freeholders Grand Inquest*, his specifically constitutional work, was by a different author.^{*} Locke may have modified, rearranged, perhaps extensively rewritten the *Second Treatise* when he knew that the *First* would be added: we have seen him working at it in this way in 1681 when he added the Hooker passages. As Ashcraft insists, the Oxford parliament where the Exclusion Bill finally failed gave great urgency to the issues and may well have had a considerable effect on Locke's text. Moreover he certainly made further additions and presumably modifications in 1689, and the decision to print the treatises in their final order could have been taken then. But much of it was left as originally written, including the reference in § 22 which survived all his repeated correction. From the point of view of our discussion, the book as a response to political and literary circumstances, its origin belongs to the autumn and winter of 1679-80, exactly a decade earlier than it is traditionally supposed to have been written. *Two Treatises* is an Exclusion Tract, not a Revolution Pamphlet.

As it stands, Locke's book is cumbersome and uninviting: two hundred unreadable pages introducing an essay which is lively and convincing if a little laboured and repetitive. We can see why he arranged it thus, though we may feel aggrieved at his insensitivity. But there is no good reason for supposing that he thought his thoughts in such an unlikely order, or wrote them down like this.

Every one of his positions is assumed in the *First Treatise*, but when he refers to them there he has to send us forward to the

Monarcha is referred to appreciatively, by title if not by author, in I, § 124. It can be argued from the facts presented here that Tyrrell, not Locke, must be regarded as the initiator of the 'labour theory of value', unless these two claims are accepted. One is that Locke had written, or worked out, the substance of his text by 1679, and the other is that he had communicated his conceptions to his friend. It is quite possible to accept the first of these claims, but the second is not so clearly established, and any assessment of the 'originality' of any part of *Two Treatises* must take these facts into account.

^{*} See Allen, 1928, a view forcibly restated by C. C. Weston in 1980.

Second. Who would deliberately choose to begin the exposition of a complicated theme by the refutation of another man's system without laying down his own premises? It would seem undeniable that the *Second Treatise* is logically prior to the *First* because its author never had occasion to cite the *First* in composing the *Second*. I believe that a satisfactory account of the writing of the book must assume that the *Second Treatise*, the positive statement, was already in existence in some form or other when the *First*, the negative commentary, was begun.

This is as much as may be safely inferred from what is certainly known about the date and manner of composing *Two Treatises*. It leaves a great deal open to conjecture, and this interlude will be given up to conjecture. Only one guess will be made, but if it is a lucky guess it explains a great deal.

There is a document referred to in the papers of both Locke and Shaftesbury which had a history corresponding quite exactly with the history of the manuscript or manuscripts of *Two Treatises* as it has been worked out here. It had a cover name, *de Morbo Gallico*, a cant expression for syphilis, the French disease. This may seem vulgar, but Locke's medical identity must not be forgotten, and cover names are common in these papers, especially for secret, dangerous or embarrassing documents. Moreover Locke and Shaftesbury did think of despotism as a French disease, and when he wrote in 1679 Locke had just returned from France, from studying the French disease as a political system.

When Shaftesbury was arrested in July 1681, Locke was presumably in the house. But by the time lists had been drawn up of the papers which had been seized, Locke was in Oxford, making the catalogue of his books there. Amongst his folios, standing close to Hooker and to the big bound notebook containing his first draft on the *Understanding*, he entered *Tractatus de Morbo Gallico*. * Meanwhile in London the government men were searching amongst Shaftesbury's papers, and they had come across several Locke items. There was the Shaftesbury copy of the draft on the *Understanding*, the letter on the Oxford Parliament, 'Mr Locke's book of fruit trees'. 'Notes out of Mors Gallicus in my

* This must be distinct from his old material book with the title *Morbus Gallicus. Omnia quae extant de eo, Venetiae, 1766* (Harrison and Laslett, 2041), which was a folio 100.

lord's hand' was another document registered by them. * Shaftesbury must have had some reason to go to the trouble of making these notes: he may conceivably have been a syphilitic, but this has never been suspected before. Anyway Locke took his document with this title over to Tyrrell's house on 17 July, and when he left for London on the 18th wrote in shorthand in his diary 'Left with him De Morbo Gallico'.

A year later Dr Thomas of Salisbury, his medical and political friend, wrote and told him that 'You may send your Observations de Morbo Gallico' and named a messenger. † If this was the same thing, it must have been something Locke had himself written. It next appears in November 1683, in a letter written to Clarke from Holland soon after he had arrived, full of cryptic allusions to possessions left behind.

Honest Adrian writes me word that the chest that is now in Mrs . . . custody was not opened, though he had the key and directions to do it. Neither do I ask whether anything else was in her custody was opened, only give me leave to tell you that I either think or dreamt you enquired of me concerning the title of a treatise, part whereof is in Mr Smith's hands, and it is *Tractatus de Morbo Gallico*. If there were another copy of it I should be glad to have that at any reasonable rate, for I have heard it commended and shall apply myself close to the study of physic by the fireside this winter. But of this I shall write to your more hereafter, when I hear there are more copies than one, for else it will not be reasonable to desire it. I desire also to know whether Dr Sydenham hath published anything this year. ‡

Locke seems to say that he wants another copy of a treatise which exists in part in the keeping of someone he names, perhaps Mrs Smithsby his London landlady. But he is evidently afraid that the cautious Clarke may have destroyed the full copy. Well he might have, if this was the manuscript we are after, for in that very month Sidney was up at the Old Bailey for writing against

* P.R.O. Shaftesbury Papers, 30/24 Bundle VIA, item 349, paper 3.

† Thomas to Locke, 25 July 1682; on 5 August he acknowledged arrival of the man who was to bring 'your opinion de Morbo Gallico' (de Beer, 2, 535, 537).

‡ Locke to Clarke, 21 November (1683), de Beer, 2, 606. The 'Mrs' whose name has perished may be Mrs Smithsby, and the same with the later 'Mr Smith': Adrian' is Dr Thomas; the medical references look like a blind. Unfortunately this and the next letter are missing from the collection (now in the Locke papers in the Bodleian Library) as Rand knew it, and his unreliable transcription cannot be checked.

Filmer: in his previous letter Locke had asked for 'what news the Old Bailey affords'.

The last context is mutilated but clearer. In a much later letter to Clarke of 18 February 1687, Locke writes: 'I beg also that the half . . . *de Morbo Gallico*, which I left with R. Smith sealed up in a little [box] about the length of a hand and about [half a] hand in breadth, may be sent into. . .'. And a little further on in the letter: 'You may easily [perceive] why I would have that tract *de Morbo Gallico*. . .'.* It would seem that the full copy of the work had not been available, for it had evidently not been sent to him in Holland. It is tempting to suppose that the reason why he wanted the other half-copy was political, and only recently Locke had complained of hearing little about politics.† Nothing with this title, or on a subject which would fit these references, has survived in Locke's voluminous papers, although other writings he found at Mrs Smithsby's when he returned to London in 1689 are still to be seen amongst them.

If this exercise in conjecture could be substantiated it would imply all these things. The first form of *Two Treatises*, under the name *De Morbo Gallico*, was originally written into a folio notebook, in the same way as Locke's first sketch of his *Essay*. Shaftesbury had seen and noted it before his arrest in July 1681, when it had already been placed on Locke's shelves at Christ Church amongst the books he used to write it. Tyrrell had charge of it for a while after this, though he did not know its identity: Thomas, who read it in 1682, and Clarke were let into the secret. It existed in two copies by 1683, but before Locke went to Holland, one of the copies had been halved and then left with Mrs Smithsby: Clarke had orders to destroy the other copy completely if it should seem advisable, with an eye to what was happening at the trial of Sidney.‡

Clarke did dispose of the full copy, and Locke did not regain any

* De Beer, 3, 132. The dots represent passages which had perished when Rand saw the letter, and the square brackets his suggested readings.

† Locke to Limborch, 14 February 1687, de Beer, 3, 128.

‡ Locke was in a high state of anxiety at this time and destroyed a great deal: it was probably then that he effaced the references to the writing of the book from his papers. Campbell (*The Chancellors*, 1845, 111, 374) states that Locke had Shaftesbury's autobiography destroyed because of Sidney's fate. In the 1950's Locke's letters to Clarke contained a sheet numbered 185 containing cyphers to be used, which Clarke seems to have received in Feb. 1684 (de Beer, 2, 685). This document has not subsequently been referred to.

part of this writing, as far as we know, before 1689, certainly not before 1687. We may identify the half of his manuscript which he left with Mrs Smithsby with the whole work as we now have it. His motive for destroying the remainder can easily be inferred. Presumably this area was the dangerous one. It came, it will be remembered, at the end, not in the middle, of the manuscript, since it was a continuation of the *First Treatise*. It contained those passages which he and his friends were afraid might be of use to a counsel for the Crown in persuading a court of justice that in writing this book John Locke had been as much of a traitor as Algernon Sidney. Such, then, in the words of the Preface was the 'Fate' which 'otherwise disposed of the Papers that should have filled up the middle'.

Quite apart from conjecture, the evidence presented here and further analysed in the footnotes to Locke's text* makes possible the following tentative reconstruction of the stages of composition. In the winter of 1679-80 the *Second Treatise* was written, perhaps only partially, perhaps as a completed work. Early in 1680 the *First Treatise* was added to it, and if Shaftesbury did read the book, he probably read it at this stage. Perhaps he or someone else suggested revisions to Locke, for he went at it again in the summer of 1681, adding the Hooker references and excerpts, and probably chapters xvi, xvii, xviii and part of chapter viii in the *Second Treatise*, in all some fifty paragraphs. The process of revision and extensions went on into 1682, it may be, and there are parts of chapter xviii which seem to belong to 1683, with perhaps some or most of the final chapter. From February to August 1689 further revision and extension went on, as we have seen, throughout the volume, and continued until the very last possible printer's moment. In all, however, only the Preface, the titles and some twenty-five new paragraphs seem to have been written then, including the whole of chapters i, ix and xv in the *Second Treatise*. In these passages only, together with the considerable number of much briefer additions and modifications, can the book be said to belong to the year of the Glorious Revolution.

The writing of *Two Treatises of Government* as it has been reconstructed here can only belong to the association of Locke with

* An attempt has been made to assign each chapter of the *Second Treatise* to one of the conjectured periods of composition: see the notes on the first paragraph of each chapter. Where any particular paragraph or passage seems to be of different date from the surrounding text, this has been commented upon.