Introduction

This book centres on a study of the practices, representations, and justifications of religious intolerance in France, Piedmont, England, Ireland, and the Netherlands in the late seventeenth century, and the arguments for 'universal religious toleration' which were articulated by a small but crucial 'early Enlightenment' group of writers in the 1680s and 1690s in order to combat these practices and justifications of intolerance. It simultaneously studies late seventeenth-century defences of religious intolerance as reiterating many long-standing patristic, late medieval, and early modern justifications of intolerance, and analyses the arguments for religious toleration of the 1680s and 1690s as restatements and expansions of preceding arguments for religious toleration. This book will show that many advocates of 'universal religious toleration' in the 1680s and 1690s, including John Locke, Jean Le Clerc, and Pierre Bayle, were crucial contributors to the development of the 'republic of letters' in the late seventeenth century, and will stress the importance of this 'republic of letters'. It will demonstrate that these thinkers not merely articulated many elements of 'High Enlightenment' thought, such as support for 'civility', 'humanity', and 'tolerance' against 'superstition', 'barbarism', and 'ignorance', but also described their period as one of 'reason' and 'light' against traditional authority and against 'implicit faith'. Religious toleration was the central value of this 'early Enlightenment', and the 'republic of letters' was the central cultural form of the 'early Enlightenment'. Their intellectual and cultural symbiosis will be analysed.

Since Paul Hazard's *La Crise de la Conscience Européenne* identified the late seventeenth century as the crucial revolutionary period in the construction of 'the Enlightenment' nearly seventy years ago, relatively little work has been done on the final two decades of the seventeenth century. Scholarship on 'the Enlightenment' has continued to be dominated by work on the 'High Enlightenment' of the late eighteenth century. Such scholarship has, more-over, tended to focus on the atheistic and materialistic strands of 'the Enlightenment' rather than on arguments of 'the Enlightenment' developed

1

within Christianity.[1] While scholars of the history of political thought associated with the 'Cambridge school' have over recent years paid considerable attention to discourses of resistance and popular sovereignty, natural rights, liberty, and 'reason of state' as foundations of modern political thought, they have paid relatively little attention to religious toleration as another key issue of modern political thought. While Locke has often been discussed as an apologist of religious toleration, Locke's arguments for toleration have not been placed sufficiently in their multiple and international practical and intellectual contexts. Locke has too often been studied in isolation from most or all of his predecessors and contemporaries who advocated religious toleration.[2] The recent outpouring of scholarship on the 'republic of letters' in the eighteenth century has identified this 'republic' as crucial to eighteenth-century sociability and criticism, egalitarianism and participation, and, as such, central to the development of both the 'public sphere' and 'the Enlightenment', but there has been relatively little scholarly attention paid to the 'republic of letters' in the late seventeenth century, to the emergence of its ethos as a 'republic' of virtuous citizens serving the 'public good', and to the central commitment of many in the 'republic of letters' during these years in their advocacy of universal religious toleration at a moment of very considerable religious intolerance.[3]

Travelling widely through European space and time, the chronological focus of this book is on the decade of the 1680s, and the geographical focus of this book is on France, England, and the Netherlands. During the 1680s religious intolerance reached extremely high levels in France preceding and

---

[1] Two particularly important recent works which have studied respectively the radical or 'Spinozist' strains of the 'early Enlightenment' and some of their Christian components as important to the later Enlightenment of Gibbon, are J. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment* (Oxford 2001) and J. G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion* (Cambridge 1999–).

[2] For the methodology and works of the 'Cambridge school' with which this author is associated, see especially the works of J. G. A. Pocock, Quentin Skinner, John Dunn, Richard Tuck, James Tully, Mark Goldie, Justin Champion, Peter Miller, and David Armitage. Aspects of tolerationist and anti-tolerationist arguments have often been briefly but brilliantly discussed by some of these authors. Other useful recent studies of toleration with greater or lesser historical density and acumen have included: J. C. Laursen (ed.), *Beyond the Persecuting Society* (Pennsylvania 1998); O. Grell and R. Porter, *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge 1999); O. Grell and R. Scribner, *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge 1996); J. Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England 1558–1689* (Harlow 2000); C. Berkvens-Stevelinck (ed.), *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic* (Leiden 1997).

[3] P. Hazard, *The European Mind 1680–1715* (1935; tr. 1953–64); D. Goodman, *The Republic of Letters* (Ithaca 1994); D. Gordon, *Citizens Without Sovereignty* (Princeton 1994); R. Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham 1991); M. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment* (Oxford 1991); J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge 1996); A. Goldgar, *Impolite Learning* (Yale 1995). On the late seventeenth century 'republic of letters', also see the valuable works cited in Chapter 16 of this book.

following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685; 200,000 Huguenots fled from France in these years, and 700,000 Huguenots were prevented from leaving France and coerced to attend Catholic worship. Huguenots who resisted were incarcerated, tortured, forced into slavery on galleys, or executed. Catholic intolerance towards Protestants was also significant in Piedmont, where in 1686 Protestant Waldensians who refused to convert to Catholicism were either killed or imprisoned and then forced into exile by a joint French and Piedmontese army. In England from the 1660s to the mid-1680s an extremely high level of Protestant intolerance involved fines, imprisonments, and the deaths of many Protestant dissenters and some Catholic recusants. Such Protestant religious intolerance in England continued at the beginning of the reign of the Catholic James II in 1685–6, and when in 1687–8 James II attempted to provide a large degree of religious toleration this was undermined by reports and representations of Catholic intolerance in France and Piedmont. Protestant intolerance was also significant in Ireland before the reign of James II, and a brief period of religious toleration under James II was followed first by war between an Irish and French Catholic force in support of James II and an international Protestant army led by William III, and then by the reimposition of Protestant intolerance in the 1690s.

As we will see, the Netherlands provided shelter during the 1680s for many religious and political refugees and was the most religiously tolerant society in Western Europe in the seventeenth century. This book will describe in detail the practical toleration in the seventeenth-century Netherlands for Catholics, many unorthodox Protestants, and Jews, alongside the orthodox Calvinist 'public church'. But we will see that in the seventeenth century religious toleration in the Netherlands had significant limits, was practised by failure to enforce intolerant legislation rather than by legislative enactment of toleration, and faced considerable opposition. In the later 1680s, toleration was under increasing challenge as representations of Catholic violence against Huguenots and Waldensians led to the growth of anti-Catholicism in the Netherlands, and as a chorus of 'orthodox' Huguenot refugees added their voices to long-standing Dutch Reformed hostility to toleration of 'unorthodox' or 'heretical' Protestants such as Socinians. The few refugees to the Netherlands who supported a universal religious toleration in the 1680s recognised that such 'universal' toleration was not established in the Netherlands, and realistically feared that intolerance was gaining support. Bayle spoke in the early 1690s of his fear of a developing Protestant Inquisition in the Netherlands which would become worse than the Catholic Inquisition, while Locke and Limborch also compared contemporary Protestant persecution to the Inquisition.

This book will not merely trace the impact of practices of religious violence but also discuss the impact of representations of religious intolerance in the

1680s in France, Piedmont, England, Ireland, the Netherlands, and among
the Huguenot community in exile. It will emphasise the significance in
England, Ireland, and the Netherlands of exaggerated representations of
Catholic violence in anti-Catholic propaganda during the 'Exclusion Crisis'
of 1678–81 in England, in propaganda undermining the tolerationist regime
of James II, and in propaganda generating Dutch and English support for
William's military and political campaigns in England and Ireland in
1688–91. It will be shown that such representations of Catholic violence
against Huguenots and Waldensians drew significance from the commu-
nities against whom they were directed: the massacre of Huguenots on
St Bartholomew's Day in 1572 had long provided a staple of English and
Dutch anti-Catholic propaganda, and Huguenots remained a crucial sister
church in many English Protestant eyes, while the Waldensians were viewed
as the only visible church which had managed to preserve the 'true religion'
in medieval Europe, and previous persecutions of the Waldensians had been
central to British and Dutch anti-Catholic propaganda long before the
1680s, most notably in 1655.

This book will briefly describe the provision of religious toleration and its
limits in England and Ireland in and after 1689–91, after they came to be
ruled by the Dutch stadtholder, William of Orange, and his Protestant
English wife Mary. It will stress the importance of statutory provision of
toleration to orthodox Protestant dissenters in 1689 as ending the incarcera-
tions, financial ruin, and deaths of orthodox Protestant dissenters, and the
significance of the statutory denial after 1689 of toleration to Catholics,
to unorthodox Protestants such as anti-Trinitarians or Socinians, and to
'atheists' and 'libertines'. It will indicate that the degree of religious toleration
and intolerance actually practised depended not merely on statutory provi-
sion but also on royal intervention, and that by these means a limited toler-
ation of Jews was allowed in England before and after 1689, and practised for
Catholics in England after 1689. A careful examination of the practices of
toleration is also provided for the Netherlands, where toleration was often
practised while legally proscribed, and where private religious practice was
usually free but public worship and public expression of one's religious
commitments were disallowed or subject to significant restrictions. In Part 3
of this book the arguments for toleration composed in the Netherlands in the
1680s will be shown to have been influenced by these restrictions.

At many points the story of intolerance told in this book will intersect with
arguments for and against resistance to political tyranny, including most
notably the arguments for resistance of John Locke. As these many inter-
sections are encountered they will be studied. We will analyse the ways
in which practices and representations of Catholic intolerance towards
Protestants in France and Piedmont provided Locke with significant reasons

to fear the growth of absolutism in England, and thus provided a part of the background to his justification of resistance in the Second Treatise. And we will study the ways in which the practices of High Anglican intolerance towards Protestant dissenters also provided a part of the background to Locke's justification of resistance in the Second Treatise as the Crown tried to remove Protestant dissenters from the Church of England from sitting on grand juries, where they had been crucial to providing security of life for political opponents of the drive towards absolutism of Charles II. Nonetheless, this book will stress that Locke's argument for resistance in the Second Treatise does not make a case for resistance on religious grounds, and probes some of the reasons for that absence. That Locke was arguing for rights of resistance *in extremis* will be emphasised. Examination of the defence of individual rights of resistance to tyranny by others who supported religious toleration, including Locke's close friend Jean Le Clerc, will indicate that Le Clerc similarly constructed arguments for resistance *in extremis* and repudiated the actions of the regicides who had executed Charles I as a tyrant in 1649. Other defences of toleration and resistance will be examined, including Gilbert Burnet's arguments, which received wide circulation both in the Netherlands and in England.

But while in these instances defence of rights of resistance was generally aligned with support for rights of religious toleration, we will see in the course of this book that this was a highly contingent alignment. We will see that the leading Huguenot theologian Pierre Jurieu's early works supported a limited religious toleration and opposed rights of resistance to tyranny, and that when he became an avid defender of rights of resistance to tyranny, Jurieu simultaneously wrote works against universal religious toleration. Pierre Bayle was one of the most important advocates of universal religious toleration in the Netherlands in the 1680s and 1690s, but he was an opponent of rights of resistance to political tyranny. As we will see, Bayle defended toleration and non-resistance against Jurieu. I indicated in my book *John Locke: Resistance, Religion, and Responsibility* the contingent relationships between Locke's commitments to rights of religious toleration and rights of individual resistance to political tyranny, as in 1660 he opposed both, in 1667 he supported the former but opposed the latter (like the early Jurieu and the consistent Bayle), and by about 1682–3 he came to support both toleration and resistance. In examining the thought of Locke, Le Clerc, Jurieu, Bayle, Burnet, and others, this book will again indicate some of the complexity of associations between commitments to toleration and resistance in the 1680s. In its examination of the ways in which some Protestant defences of rights of resistance and condemnations of Catholic intolerance were combined with defences of denial of toleration to Catholics, most notably in Ireland, this book will delineate further complexities in the

associations between commitments to resistance and to toleration in the 1680s and 1690s.

The advocates of religious toleration in the 1680s and 1690s were writing to combat not merely contemporary practices of religious intolerance but also to oppose contemporary justifications of religious intolerance. This book will study the justifications of religious intolerance by Anglicans, Huguenots, the Dutch Reformed Church, and Catholics in the late seventeenth century, as Catholics defended the use of force against Protestants, and many Protestants justified the use of force not merely against Catholics but also against unorthodox or dissenting Protestants as 'heretics' and 'schismatics'. It will show that the voices raised in justification of universal religious toleration in this context were few, and that the voices in defence of religious intolerance were legion. In order to understand these multiple Catholic and Protestant justifications of intolerance in the late seventeenth century, which explicitly rehearsed and expanded upon many long-standing themes of anti-tolerationist literature, and in order to understand the character of the response to these arguments by the advocates of toleration, this book will place the arguments against religious toleration of the 1680s and 1690s into the context of arguments against religious toleration developed over the preceding history of Christianity. It will emphasise the sources for later arguments against religious toleration in the fourth century of 'late patristic' Christianity, most notably in the thought of Augustine, and the repetition of many of these arguments in late medieval Christianity, in the time of development of the inquisition against the Waldensians – significantly, the ancestors of the Waldensians against whom Catholics used armed force in 1686. But it will concentrate most heavily on documenting support for religious intolerance in sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century Europe as 'magisterial Reformation' Protestants (that is, mainstream Reformation Protestants such as Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Bullinger, and their followers, who supported the role of the magistrate in enforcing religion) joined hands with Catholics in defending religious intolerance.

The intolerance of Calvinism will be stressed as influential in sixteenth-century justifications of intolerance against Catholics, anti-Trinitarians and Anabaptists, influential again in early and mid-seventeenth-century defences of intolerance against Catholics, Arminians, Baptists, Quakers, and anti-Trinitarians, and central to 'orthodox' Dutch Reformed ministers and to 'orthodox' Huguenot ministers of the 1680s. The Huguenot Church, Dutch Reformed Church, and Waldensians had adopted the same confession of faith in the sixteenth century as parts of the movement of international Calvinism, which also gained considerable support in England, and defined 'orthodoxy' in terms of the strict Calvinism supported against Arminianism at the Synod of Dort in 1618. Defences of religious intolerance in the 1680s

by Huguenot and Dutch Reformed ministers were thus late moments of intolerant international Calvinism.

As this book will show, many early modern assaults on religious toleration were structured around very similar sets of accusations against 'heretics' and 'schismatics'. 'Heretics' and 'schismatics' were associated repeatedly with treason and sedition, communism and anarchy, poison and pestilence, 'libertinism' and 'sodomy'. It will be shown that an understanding of 'heresies' and 'schisms' as repeated through the centuries was central to early modern European anti-heretical and anti-schismatic literature which identified 'new heresies' and 'schisms' as 'old heresies and schisms revived'. Many 'new heresies', such as Protestantism to Catholics, or Anabaptism or anti-Trinitarianism to 'magisterial Reformation' Protestants, were therefore understood in terms that had formerly been deployed against the medieval Waldensians and Albigensians (or Cathars), and before that against fourth-century and medieval anti-Trinitarians. In the Western Europe whose Christianity had fissured after the Reformation into the division between Catholic and Protestant and into a host of Protestant denominations and sects, preceding accusations against 'heretics' and 'schismatics' intensified as the number of such 'heretics' and 'schismatics' was understood to have multiplied. This book will show the ways in which these increased accusations were combined in early modern Europe with accusations that 'heretics' and 'schismatics' were 'witches' or 'monsters' in a period increasingly understood as that of the 'Last Days' before the millennium, a period when biblical prophecies were interpreted as having forecast that 'heresies' and 'schisms' would multiply alongside witches and monsters, comets and eclipses. Most thinkers, both Catholic and Protestant, treated monsters, comets, and eclipses as signs and portents from God, and concluded that magistrates needed to act ever more forcefully against 'heretics' and 'schismatics' in order to ward off God's punishments of their communities by famines, plagues, and wars. To most sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thinkers in England, France, and the Netherlands, both 'magisterial Reformation' Protestants and Catholics, religious toleration was itself a 'poisonous' and a 'diabolical' doctrine. This book will indicate further reasons why the accusations against 'heretics' and 'schismatics' seemed to anti-heretical and anti-schismatic writers to be evidenced by the actual events of early modern Europe, as some individuals pilloried as 'heretical' and 'schismatic' did indeed support communism, seemed to cause civil war, and challenged 'orthodox sexual and familial morality'. But this book will show that anti-heretical and anti-schismatic writers very often mischaracterised the commitments of 'heretics' and 'schismatics', and will stress that the challenges that were posed only by the minority of such 'heretics' and 'schismatics' to political, familial, or social hierarchy were ascribed by anti-heretical and anti-schismatic writers to all 'heretics' and 'schismatics'.

In the course of thus examining in detail the anti-heretical and anti-schismatic literature of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe, this book will describe the arguments for religious toleration advanced in this period. It will note the infrequency of such arguments, and trace some limitations or tensions within such accounts, such as support by largely tolerationist Polish Socinians for the imprisonment of the Socinian Francis David for challenging the invocation of Christ, and the defence of intolerance towards Catholics of the largely tolerationist Arian Arminian John Milton. And it will indicate that most of the arguments for religious toleration were generated by those accused by most of their contemporaries of being 'heretics' and 'schismatics', and thus by those who were accused of being seditious communists, murderers, 'libertines' and 'sodomites'. This book will consider very briefly also *politique* advocacy of toleration on grounds of 'reason of state'. While such *politique* arguments were important in supporting the practice of religious toleration for orthodox Huguenots and Catholics in late sixteenth-century France, the double-edged nature of much *politique* argument for toleration will be indicated: religious minorities who lost the capacity to defend themselves by force of arms became in such *politique* accounts legitimately subject to intolerance, since it was their very capacity to disrupt the state which underpinned the case for their toleration. In the sixteenth century, Lipsius' *politique* argument favoured the toleration of Huguenots; by the late seventeenth, it favoured intolerance, and it was as an argument against toleration that Bayle anathematised Lipsius' thought.

In analysing the development of arguments for religious toleration in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, this book will also trace the importance of arguments from patristic and late medieval writers that Jews, Muslims, and pagans should be tolerated, whereas 'heretics' and 'schismatics' should be punished. Anti-heretical and anti-schismatic writers argued that toleration should be extended to those who had never known Christianity and needed to be persuaded to adopt it, but not to those who had 'fallen' from the 'truth'. It will be shown that much argument for religious toleration in early modern Europe generally, and in the 1680s and 1690s specifically, revolved around suggesting that the accepted toleration for Jews and Muslims should be extended to 'heretics' and 'schismatics'. It will, moreover, be indicated that many supporters of religious toleration in the seventeenth century pointed to Islamic societies as providing a degree of religious toleration which ought to be imitated by contemporary Christian societies. This example of Islamic tolerance was combined in tolerationist argument with the example of the Netherlands as a society tolerating both Jews and Christians in the seventeenth century.

Many limitations on support for toleration for Jews and Muslims even in the Netherlands will nonetheless be stressed, with discussion, for instance, of

the limitations which Grotius sought to place on Jews, and of his unwillingness
to repudiate allegations of ritual murder by Jews. Debates over toleration of
Jewish worship and readmission to England in the mid-seventeenth century
similarly saw accusations of child murder and cannibalism by Jews rehearsed
as reasons to maintain the medieval exclusion of Jews from England. Only a
very limited number of Jews were allowed to resettle in England at the end of
this debate, and then by prerogative action by Oliver Cromwell, not by
statutory permission; it was this prerogative action that was to be repeated
by Charles II, James II, and then expanded by William III in the wake of the
Revolutions of 1688–91. It will be indicated that in Christian arguments,
Jews and Muslims were represented on many occasions as being 'evildoers',
'sodomites', and 'obstinate' opponents of Christianity. While these represen-
tations of Jews and Muslims had often been combined since patristic and
medieval writing with support for their toleration on the ground that Jews and
Muslims needed to be persuaded to adopt Christianity, at other times in late
medieval Europe these accusations had been involved in justifications of pun-
ishments, pogroms, and banishments. Early modern Europeans inherited and
redeployed these accusations, and anti-heretical and anti-schismatic writers
often responded to the example of the toleration of Jews in the Netherlands by
arguing that it gave further grounds to indict religious toleration.

Having thus described in Part 1 of this book the practices and representa-
tions of religious intolerance in France, Piedmont, England, Ireland, the
Netherlands, and among the Huguenot community in exile, and having
described in Part 2 of this book the weight of anti-tolerationist argument in
early modern Europe and in the 1680s while sketching important arguments
for religious toleration in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe,
the final third of this book will be devoted to an extensive and intensive
account of the arguments for religious toleration issued by a small group
of writers in the 1680s and 1690s in order to combat the contemporary
practices and justifications of religious intolerance. Most of the writers
defending universal religious toleration in the 1680s were based in the
Netherlands in the 1680s. Some were Dutch, but most were refugees. All
were composing their defences of religious toleration with an international
perspective, intending to combat Protestant and Catholic arguments for
intolerance, and writing with a strong awareness that contemporary
arguments for intolerance reiterated arguments expressed throughout the
past millennium of Christian intolerance.

The third part of this book will also situate these defenders of universal
religious toleration by showing that these authors, including Locke, were
attempting to develop and to define in the 1680s and 1690s an 'early
Enlightenment culture' which centred on advocacy of religious toleration
and on development of the culture of the 'republic of letters'. This 'early

Enlightenment culture' and the emergent 'republic of letters' of the 1680s
and 1690s will be discussed at length. It will be shown that these advocates of
universal religious toleration offered to each other many important forms of
mutual support, including assistance in improving, publishing, and publicis-
ing their tolerationist arguments themselves. It will be shown that they
viewed such services to each other as contributions to the 'republic of letters',
and that they celebrated an ethos of 'virtuous' service to that 'republic' which
was itself 'republican': based on the duties of citizens to serve the common or
public good, realising their own liberty through performance of that service,
and defending liberty against 'slavery' in the international intellectual society
that was the 'republic of letters' by those actions. In 1685, Bayle depicted the
'republic of letters' as the antithesis of 'the Inquisition', the institutional
epitome of religious persecution and restriction of intellectual enquiry. Locke
drew a similar contrast in the 1680s between the conversational circles of the
'republic of letters' and 'the Inquisition', which he viewed as a central part of
the 'Empire of Darkness'. Many linkages between the cultural practices and
ethos of the 'republic of letters' and the defence of religious toleration will be
analysed.

These thinkers advanced a series of political, economic, epistemological,
religious, historical, and scientific arguments for universal religious toler-
ation. Each of these arguments will be examined in turn. These advocates of
religious toleration particularly stressed that (almost all forms of) religious
worship and all 'speculative opinions' were intrinsically 'harmless'. This
argument was applied against notions of the magisterial duty to establish
the 'true religion' drawn from the Mosaic theocracy and from the
Constantinian Christianisation of the Roman Empire. Magisterial attempts
to institute a religion for all of their subjects and to back that with punish-
ments were defined as 'tyrannical'. These advocates of religious toleration
replied explicitly to the accusations that 'heretics' and 'schismatics' were evil
and intolerable, treasonous and communist, 'poisonous' and 'pestilential',
'libertine' and 'sodomitical'. They argued for toleration of the worship of
Jews and Muslims, and while they did so in the attempt to extend the general
acceptance of toleration of Jews and Muslims and 'pagans' to the toleration
of 'heretics' and 'schismatics' by arguing that it was incongruous for
Christians to tolerate Jews and Muslims but not their fellow Christians,
their arguments were also practical arguments for the religious toleration
of Jews and 'pagans' and perhaps of Muslims. Locke argued for citizenship as
well as toleration for Jews and Muslims, in full recognition of the toleration
of Jews in the Netherlands and in argument for its desirability in England,
and argued for the toleration of 'pagans' as a colonial administrator.

These advocates of religious toleration in the 1680s and 1690s argued that
religious toleration had been practised and supported in the 'primitive