Pasha to withdraw his forces at the beginning of January, compelling him to wait to be swallowed up. The Turkish tactics were equally unsound. Suleiman divided his forces and used up his troops in costly frontal attacks on Mt. St Nicholas, the southern and strongest point of the position, whereas a well-supported flank attack would probably have met with success. The manner in which he sacrificed his men earned for him the name of the “ Shipka butcher.” (J. H. V. C.)

**SHIPLEY, JONATHAN** (1714-1788), bishop of St Asaph, was educated at Reading and Oxford. He was ordained about 1738, and acted as tutor in the household of the 3rd earl of Peter- borough. In 1743 he became rector of Silchester and Sherborne St John, Hampshire, and prebendary of Winchester. He was appointed to a canonry of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1748, and in 1760 to the deanery of Winchester and the living of Chilbolton, Hampshire, which he held in addition to his earlier preferments. In 1769 he was consecrated successively bishop of Llandaff and of St Asaph. He was much concerned with politics, and joined the Whig party in strong opposition to the policy of George III. towards the American colonies. In 1779 he was the only bishop to advocate the abolition of all laws against Protestant dissenters. He died on the 6th of December 1788. His brother, William Shipley (1714-1803), originated the Society of Arts; and his son, William Davies Shipley (1745-1826), became dean of St Asaph.

**SHIPLEY,** an urban district in the Shipley parliamentary division of the West Riding of Yorkshire, England, on the south bank of the Aire, 3 m. N. by W. of Bradford, on branches of the Great Northern, Midland, and North Eastern railways. Pop. (1901) 25,573. The manufacture of worsted is the principal industry, and there are large stone quarries in the neighbour- hood. The parish includes Saltaire, so named after Sir Titus Salt, who established large alpaca manufactories, opened in 1853.

**SHIP-MONEY,** a tax, the levy of which by Charles I. of England without the consent of parliament was one of the causes of the Great Rebellion. The Plantagenet kings of England had exercised the right of requiring the maritime towns and counties to furnish ships in time of war; and the liability was sometimes commuted for a money payment. Notwith­standing that several statutes of Edward I. and Edward III. had made it illegal for the crown to exact any taxes without the consent of parliament, the prerogative of levying ship-money in time of war had never fallen wholly into abeyance, and in 1619 James I. aroused no popular opposition by levying £40,000 of ship-money on London and £8550 on other seaport towns. The fleet of Charles I. during the first three years of his reign was, says S. R. Gardiner, “ largely composed of vessels demanded from the port towns and maritime counties. The idea of universal ship-money to be levied in every county in England seemed to him to be merely a further extension of the old principle.” Accordingly, on the 11th of February 1628, Charles issued writs requiring *£173,000* to be returned to the exchequer by the 1st of March for the provision of a fleet to secure the country against French invasion and for the protection of commerce, and every county in England was assessed for payment. This was the first occasion when the demand for ship-money aroused serious opposition. Lord Northampton, lord-lieutenant of Warwick­shire, and the carl of Banbury in Berkshire, refused to assist in collecting the money; and Charles withdrew the writs.

It will be seen, then, that the statement of Hallam—that in 1634 William Noy, the attorney-general, unearthed in the Tower of London musty records of ship-money as a tax disused and forgotten for centuries—has no real foundation. It was, it is true, the suggestion of Noy that a further resort should be had to this expedient for raising money when, in 1634, Charles made a secret treaty with Philip IV. of Spain to assist him against the Dutch; and Noy set himself to investigate such ancient legal learning as was in existence in support of the demand. The king having obtained an opinion in favour of the legality of the writ from Lord Keeper Coventry and the earl of Manchester, the writ was issued in October 1634 and directed to the justices of London and other sea ports, requiring them to provide a certain number of ships of war of a prescribed tonnage and equipment, or their equivalent in money, and empowering them to assess the inhabitants for payment of the tax according to their substance. The distinctive feature of the writ of 1634 was that it was issued, contrary to all precedent, in time of peace. Charles desired to conceal the true aim of his policy, which he knew would be detested by the country, and he accordingly alleged as a pretext for the impost the danger to commerce from pirates, and the general condition of unrest in Europe. The citizens of London immediately claimed exemption under their charter, while other towns demurred to the amount of their assessment; but no resistance on constitutional grounds appears to have been offered to the validity of the writ, and a sum of £104,000 was collected. On the 4th of August 1635 a second writ of ship-money was issued, directed on this occasion, as in the revoked writ of 1628, to the sheriffs and justices of inland as well as of maritime counties and towns, demanding the sum of *£208,000,* which was to be obtained by assessment on personal as well as real property, payment to be enforced by distress. This demand excited growing popular discontent, which now began to see in it a determination on the part of the king to dispense altogether with parliamentary government. Charles, therefore, obtained a written opinion, signed by ten out of twelve judges consulted, to the effect that in time of national danger, of which the crown was the sole judge, ship-money might legally be levied on all parts of the country by writ under the great seal. The issue of a third writ of ship-money on the 9th of October 1636 made it evident that the ancient restrictions, which limited the levying of the impost to the maritime parts of the kingdom and to times of war or imminent national danger, had been finally swept away, and that the king intended to convert it into a permanent and general form of taxation without parliamentary sanction. The judges again, at Charles’s request, gave an opinion favourable to the prerogative, which was read by Coventry in the Star Chamber and by the judges on assize. Payment was, however, refused by Lord Saye and by John Hampden *(q.v.),* a wealthy Buckinghamshire landowner. The case against the latter *(Rex* v. *Hampden, 3 State Trials,* 825) was heard before all the judges in the Exchequer Chamber, Hampden being defended by Oliver St John *(q.v.)* and Robert Holborne, and lasted for six months. Seven of the twelve judges, headed by Finch, chief justice of the common pleas, gave judgment for the crown, and five for Hampden; though two of the latter—namely, Bramston, chief justice of the king’s bench, and Davenport, chief baron of the exchequer—based their judgment on technical grounds which did not touch the constitutional question at issue. The judgment of the court practically abrogated the right of parliament to control supply; and the necessity for curbing the royal pre- rogative in regard to taxation, thus rendered arbitrary by legal decision, became one of the chief motives in the popular resistance to Charles I., which after the Hampden trial grew increasingly formidable. In 1639 Charles ventured again to issue a writ of ship-money, but for the comparatively small sum of £70,000. In 1641, by an Act of the Long Parliament (17 Car. I. **c.** 2), introduced by Selden, the illegality of ship-money was expressly declared, and the Hampden judgment annulled.

See John Rushworth, *Historical Collections,* vols. i., ii., iii. (7 vols., 1659-1701); Strafford’s *Letters and Despatches,* edited by W. Knowler (2 vols., London, 1739); S. R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War,* vols. iii., vi., vii., viii. (10 vols., London, 1883-1884); Henry Hallam, *Con­stitutional History of England* (3 vols., London, 1832, &c.); Oliver St John, *Speech to the Lords, Jan. 7, 1640, concerning Ship-money* (London, 1640). (R. J. Μ.)

**SHIPPARD, SIR SIDNEY GODOLPHIN ALEXANDER** (1838- 1902), British colonial administrator, was the eldest son of Captain William Shippard, 29th Regiment. He was educated at King’s College school and Oxford. Taking his degree in 1863, he was called to the bar as a member of the Inner Temple in 1867. He then entered upon a long career in South Africa. He was attorney-general of Griqualand West from 1873 until 1877, when he was made acting recorder of the High Court of Griqua­land. From 1880 to 1885 he sat as a judge of the Supreme Court of Cape Colony; and he was British commissioner on the Anglo-