

A Historical narration concerning heresie: Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Barlow and the Restoration debate over ‘heresy’¹

J.A.I. Champion, Department of History,
Royal Holloway, University of London

Addressing the Church at large in 1673, Richard Neville, Fellow of King’s College Cambridge and Rector of Ansty, insisted that ‘the keys of ecclesiastical censures must always be in your hands, and not only hang at your girdles, they must not lye rusting by you, but be kept bright by constant use’.² Defending the power of the Restored Church, clergymen like Neville were certain they exercised a spiritual discipline over the Christian community. What Mark Goldie has described as an ‘anglican theory of intolerance’ remained a staple element of the jurisdictional identity of the established church until at least 1689 (if not afterwards).³ This conviction that Godly churchmen might turn the sharp sword of punishment against dissenters and schismatics was increasingly contested after the 1660s. The ever vocal dissenting attack upon the ‘popery’ of the ecclesiastical settlement of the early 1660s, combined with growing doubts about the confessional commitments of the sovereign in the 1670s, meant that many Protestants became anxious about the legitimacy of the legal instruments for the prosecution of heresy.⁴ It became a commonplace worry that a Roman Catholic sovereign might well turn the sword of state against Protestant heretics. This ambiguous and shifting political context illustrates the tensions evident within Protestant discourses and practices: was it possible to accommodate both a national church and liberty of conscience? Might not Anglican bishops find the arguments they used to compel dissenters into communion, turned against themselves?

In correspondence with his friend Mayor Foxley in Hull, Andrew Marvell expressed just such a anxiety about the growth of popery and arbitrary power within English society.⁵ Amongst the account of bills against popish education of the royal children and anti-transubstantiation acts, Marvell reported on the progress of a Bill ‘to take away the writ de Haeretico comburendo’. Public agitation against the writ, which allowed heretics to be burnt, had been mooted in an anonymous pamphlet *A letter to a member of Parliament* (1675) which argued that the writ, described as a ‘snare among our Law’, should be abolished. Addressed specifically to Members of Parliament the intention was ‘to give

them an occasion to think of the subjects they treat of'. Outlining the foundation of the writ under Henry IV, the anonymous author condemned it as a device, 'whereby the Clergy gain'd a dominion over the lives of the subjects independent upon the Crown'. Premised upon a fundamental epistemological relativism ('Omnis animus veritate invitus privatur'), the author noted that while we all pursue the truth 'we see darkly, and but through a Glass. God hath unfolded himself in as great Variety in the minds of men, as he hath done in the material world'. In a phrase reminiscent of Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651) (chapter 12 on religion) the text noted 'The seed of religion springs up variously in Human Souls, as we see the seminal forms do out of the earth, and would it not be madness or folly to destroy & cut up all Trees and Plants but the Oak?' Fundamental to the argument was a pragmatic fear of the danger of the return of popery: removing such sanguinary laws would be a bulwark against the 'Self-opinion every sect hath, that it hath a monopoly of God to itself'. There were no rational or scriptural grounds for such laws.⁶ The arguments ranged against the writ were fourfold. First, Christianity was meant to be a religion of love and peace: 'in the Gospel of Christ all the punishment of Heresie and of infidelity it self, are adjourned over, and left to the other world'. Second, as an act of indulgence the abolition would reassure 'all persons of a different Judgement from the present establishd Church, that they are secure as to their Lives under the Government'. Tactically these arguments were joined by an insistence that abolition would protect Protestantism from the threat of Popery. Finally, the proposal would 'leave the power of the present Church to convict, excommunicate and imprison Untouched'.

'A bill to take away the writ de haeretico comburendo' progressed through Parliament between March and April 1677. Marvell was one of the notable figures on the committee of whole house, which considered the matter in detail.⁷ The act was passed on the 13th April with amendments and a number of provisos.⁸ The details of the revisions allow an overview of the complexity of the issue of heresy and its treatment in a Protestant culture under threat from Popish subversion. Under the provisions of the statute of 1677 it was established that 'all punishment by Death, in pursuance of any ecclesiastical censures, be from henceforth utterly taken away and abolished; any law, statute, canon, constitution, custom or usage, to the contrary heretofore or now in force, in any wise notwithstanding'.⁹ As the evidence of the Journals of the House of Lords indicates, some of the Bishops had reservations about the jurisdictional implications of the bill. As the Bishop of Salisbury reported from the committee considering the matter, there was an

important proviso attached to this taking away of punishment. The reform was emphatically not to be construed as one 'to take away or abridge the jurisdiction of protestant Archbishops or Bishops, or any other judges if any ecclesiastical courts, in cases of Atheism, Blasphemy, heresy or Schism, and other damnable Doctrines and opinions'. In fact the act reinforced the persisting ecclesiastical power: 'they may proceed to punish the same according to His Majesty's Ecclesiastical Laws, by excommunication, Deprivation, degradation and other ecclesiastical censures, not extending to death'. Although historians have often regarded the taking away of the writ for burning heretics as a milestone on the road to modernity, it was importantly regarded by contemporaries, as a device for the 'saving of ecclesiastical jurisdiction'. The elderly Thomas Hobbes must have breathed an audible sigh of relief since he had direct experience of clerical intolerance being threatened with statutory punishment for heresy and blasphemy in the 1660s.

I

Hobbes' reputation as a heretic was a commonplace in the Restoration. 'How capital a Deliquant is Mr Hobbs', noted John Dowell vicar of the parish of Melton Mowbray in Leicestershire, writing in 1683 against the posthumous publication of 'The Historical Narration of Heresie'. Dowell charged the work with heresy, despite Hobbes' 'art and industry' at masking its character. More significantly the text was not only derived (as he put it) from published work (especially the appendix to the Latin edition of *Leviathan*, 1668) but also reflected 'the language of Mr Hobs in private discourse'. The work was a disgrace and had 'thrown dust and ugly expressions upon the Christian religion, the best of councils, the whole Christian clergie, and hath abused the English Laws'. Despite Hobbes' evasions, Dowell was confident he had established that these 'doctrines are criminal, and the persons that maintain'd them are liable to be punished by the Civil Magistrate'. As many modern commentators have noted, identifying the nature of Hobbes' heterodoxy was difficult. Dowell was confident that having removed the varnish 'with which Mr Hobs useth to hide the deformity of his sentiments', he had 'prove[d] him heretical'.¹⁰ It was Dowell's case that Hobbes' life and work was one of disguised but corrosive irreligion: despite the evasive tactics of his post 1651 writings, it was clear that Hobbes' project was undeniably heterodox.¹¹ Turning to defend himself against episcopal charges of heterodoxy in the 1660s, Hobbes engaged with the issue of defining the nature of heresy.¹² By paying attention to the context, arguments and contemporary

response to the *Historical Narration concerning Heresie* this essay will explore the controversial and unresolved question of the nature of his 'New Divinity'.¹³ Men like Dowell resisted Hobbes' attempt to reduce heresy to a matter of mere opinion and private belief: 'Heresy in the Church of Christ was always a crime, and never the name of an opinion'.¹⁴

From the 1660s Hobbes was working on a number of new projects as well as revising already existing texts: much of this revision was defensive. Although protected in some measure by powerful men, Hobbes also suffered disquiet about the danger of prosecution on at least two occasions in the mid to late 1660s. The stern Anglican royalism of the 1660s turned against many regarded as seditious and sectarian: Quakers, socinians and Hobbists suffered persecution alike.¹⁵ This personal anxiety prompted Hobbes to pay closer attention to the issue of the nature of heresy and its punishment, but there is also no doubt that the core issues about the relationship between private opinion, clerical authority and civil jurisdiction had been a perennial concern of his. As Alan Cromartie has established, Hobbes was reworking his ideas about heresy from the revised material contained in the Latin *Leviathan* before and after June 1668. Here is not the place to give an account of the complex inter-relationship between these different works: it is enough to say that Hobbes was recycling and revising his views on the nature, historical origins, and legal status of heresy over this period.¹⁶ Hobbes' historical understanding of the legal position relating to the prosecution of heretics was still in flux.¹⁷ The developing precision of this legal knowledge may well have been driven by his personal circumstances. Hobbes had insisted in one of his self-defences that 'religion is not *Philosophy*, but *Law*'. In *Historical narration* he put forward his case for treating heresy in the same way.¹⁸

Printed posthumously, first in 1680, and then subsequently in 1682, the *Brief historical narration concerning heresie* was also 'published' in scribal form during the later years of Hobbes life in the mid-1670s.¹⁹ The first form of the work was almost certainly completed by June 1668 when Hobbes sent it to Joseph Williamson to seek permission to publish. Despite being willing to amend the passage which had objections raised against it, permission was refused.²⁰ In this work, derived and reworked from his other contemporary writings on cognate themes, Hobbes engaged head on with the nature, function and origins of heresy in the distant Christian past, and with the implications of

this for the nature and status of dissident belief in his contemporary society.²¹ Exploring the arguments and reception of this work will allow a reassessment of Hobbes' personal religious identity and his commitment to what for shorthand will be termed 'tolerationist' arguments.²² Examination of these writings shows that Hobbes entertained unusual and probably heterodox views about the significance of private belief which are difficult to integrate with the more mainstream defences of the liberty of conscience associated either with the non-conformist traditions or later with the arguments of John Locke. There was a clear intellectual gap between Hobbes' arguments about heresy and the more commonplace dissenting defences of conscience (both before and) after 1660.²³ As we will see at the core of Hobbes' account was a fundamental scepticism about the nature of religious truth quite distinct from the vindications of sincerity and conscience that underpinned many Protestant arguments about liberty of belief and worship.²⁴ One of Hobbes' broader points was that epistemic status of religion had become confused with that of philosophy. Many contemporaries claimed that in considering matters of theology they were engaging with the truth. Although Hobbes may have been indifferent to the veridical status of Christian theology in general, he very certainly (as the evidence of books three and four of *Leviathan* establish) had profound anxieties and active hostilities towards many specific doctrinal positions. Hobbes' post-Restoration works displayed a persisting commitment to the continuing war against the dangers of clericalism.

II

In order to contextualise Hobbes' writings on heresy it is important to outline some of the key contemporary understandings with which he would have been familiar. The language of heresy in the Restoration was freighted with many different meanings: as might be expected Independents differed fundamentally from Presbyterians, Anglicans from Dissenters. There were a number of common approaches to the issue.

Fundamentally the problem was conceived of as an ecclesiological issue best approached in an historical manner. Each position claimed to excavate the primitive Christian practice, and from that derive authoritative principle for the conduct of contemporary institutions. Many within the broad Protestant confession were able to draw a boundary around tolerable 'heresy' because they needed to legitimate the right of conscience against persecuting 'Popery': the dispute focused upon the narrowness of this circumference. When Hobbes set about drafting and collating his views on heresy (in the mid to late 1660s) he had many theological positions to draw upon.

Hobbes's immediate contemporaries defined heresy (and its suitable treatment by the Church or State) in a number of conflicting ways. One consequence of the 1640s was that public discourse was saturated with a range of writings that, in defining heresy, raised points of principle about sociability, epistemology and political right. One position, associated with the heresiographical writings of Presbyterians like Thomas Edwards, anxiously delineated and catalogued the variety of corrupting heresy and schism that threatened to inundate the true religion.²⁵ Others defended 'tender conscience' from prelatical imposition.²⁶ Some legitimated Protestant coercion of dissidents in the name of good discipline; others defended such dissent from orthodoxy. Protestant discourses were far from uniform (or perhaps even coherent): there were different tactical and strategic responses to the complicated relationship between the imperatives of order and conscience, and unity and truth. Even those who insisted that brutal violence against dissenters was not only inappropriate, but ungodly too (classically it was what Catholics did to Protestants) drew that line at tolerating any opinion. When blasphemy and idolatry were mixed with heresy, there was a case for applying a sterner punishment (the judicial law of the Old Testament established death as a proper punishment, a recommendation that did not fit well with 'Evangelical precept'). A more severe course of discipline might be imposed where doctrinal deviance was mixed with political sedition: in these examples the case was 'altered from matter of conscience to matter of offence and crime'.²⁷ The question of the need for, and nature of, public discipline to intervene in the regulation of religious diversity became ever pressing in the 1640s as the legal and institutional jurisdiction of the established church was destroyed. Most clergymen had little doubt that the edge of the sword could be turned against persistent and obstinate heretics. As Ann Hughes has shown, much of this polemic was provoked by the political battle with the Independents, fought out in parishes and in the national forum of Parliament.²⁸ Hobbes was deeply aware of these arguments and debates.

That heresy was something that all Godly men and proper civil institutions had a duty to root out and punish was uneasily balanced by the suggestion that a measure of toleration or tenderness towards errant believers was appropriate in matters of simple opinion. For many heresy was a human inevitability: 'The scripture tells us, there must be heresies'. Restraint of belief did more harm than good: imposing and forcing heresies created the grounding for public disturbances. Drawing on the fundamental distinction between the

power of God and man, this tradition insisted that the claim to the right of confining religious truth to 'a circle and order' was illegitimate: magistrates were not 'state exorcists'. Many condemned the post-Constantinian development of ecclesiastical power which intermingled religion and state policy to define any sort of dissidence as heresy. In the first three hundred years the primitive church suffered persecution as 'state-incendaries': even Christ suffered as a 'disturber of the state' and a 'Blasphemous heretic'. But the Church had endured more by 'peace' than persecution: pomp and policy corrupted the 'purity and plainness of religion' making it 'nothing else but a property for ambitious Churchmen (who in all ages have been the greatest criers up of, because the only gainers by, a specious Uniformity, of which they are the sole managers)'. Hobbes was to appropriate these ideas, both in style and content to his own ends. Such ecclesiological language dismissed 'popery' as a political device contrived to advance corrupt human interest. It was possible to invert the charge of heresy by pointing out that 'under the colour of suppressing heresies, the world consented to enslave themselves unto the most damnable, destructive and fatal heresie, that the Sun ever saw'.²⁹

III

There was then a broad range of arguments about heresy available as context to Hobbes after the Restoration. There was a considerable variation in the understanding of the nature, function and meaning of heresy by independents, Anglicans and Presbyterians. Much of the writing was driven and defined by anxieties about the status of Protestant order and orthodoxy. Certainly the broader confessional conflict between Catholic and Protestant produced a complex and contested definition of 'heresy'. The point to establish is that discourses of heresy were mainstream: Protestant ideology needed both to legitimate an element of liberty, while also reinforcing arguments in defence of order and uniformity. The sectarianism of the Interregnum complicated this ideological process, by edging the Protestant establishment more in favour of defending order than liberty. To write of heresy then was to invoke a series of engagements with fundamental issues about the relationship between Christian liberty and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Any audience in the 1660s would have been readily aware of the subtle variations of the different positions. Hobbes, sensitive to both the question of his own theological reputation and the challenges of restored ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was undoubtedly familiar with the central arguments when he settled down to compose his own contribution. As Noel Malcolm has established Hobbes spent much time on the 1660s

redrafting the theological components of his earlier writings, *Leviathan* in particular.³⁰ Faced with the charge of being rendered criminal by changing circumstances of the Restoration, which brought back the legal basis for enforcing public religious doctrine Hobbes may have flinched but he did not desist but instead carried his war against clericalism forward. The contextual thrust of *Behemoth* provided a means for reading his earlier work as a rebuttal of resurgent Anglicanism. Both the institutions of clerical discipline and the political theology of restoration Anglicanism (embodied in the injunctions of texts like Richard Allestree's *Whole duty of man*) were exposed to corrosive analysis. Far from avoiding or retrenching from his earlier positions Hobbes devoted considerable attention to ensuring the contemporary resonance of his arguments. As Paul Seaward has commented, the scribal copies of many of the works like *Behemoth* (prepared for presentation to Lord Arlington) were intended to get into the bloodstream of political discourse.³¹

A Historical narration concerning hereie set out a simple argument, announced in its opening sentence: 'the Word *heresie* is Greek, and signifies a taking of anything, and particularly the taking of an Opinion'.³² Writing in an historical mode, a standard trope for other commentators on heresy, Hobbes provided an exploration of the development of theological doctrine in the first three centuries of the Christian era. His point was to make a link between a sociological and linguistic analysis: as philosophers embraced Christianity and became priests they imported the (corrupting) foundations of ancient philosophy. More precisely, like the sophists they had been many priests distorted ideas and prostituted philosophy for their own material advantage. In this early period then heresy implied no pejorative quality in either the idea or the believer: as Hobbes clarified, 'each several opinion was called a *Heresie*; which signified no more than a private opinion, without reference to truth or falshood'. Translating this Greek concept into the Roman world of early Christianity, he pointed out that the Latin word for heresy was 'Sects, a sequenda'. Developing what might be called a stadial theory of the historical development of heresy, Hobbes argued that one particular philosophical heresy – the Aristotelian - became dominant amongst a pool of rival Stoic, Epicurean and Platonic schools. Controversy and contention between these 'sects' produced spiteful and fierce name-calling. In this lay the origins of contemporary derogatory meanings of 'heresy'. In this introductory survey, Hobbes laid down some key points: ideas were determined by interest, words were things individuals used to gain advantage and power.³³

The apostles converted people throughout the Roman empire, many of these were philosophers who 'were converted to the Christian faith, some really and some feignedly, for factious ends, or for need'. Due to their skills in disputing and oratory many of these philosophical converts became pastors in the early church. Philosophical heresy laid the groundwork for theological difference since these men 'retaining still many Doctrines which they had taken up on the authority of their former masters, whom then had in reverence, endeavoured many of them to draw the Scriptures everyone to his own heresie'. Although all these men called themselves Christians they interpreted doctrine according to the 'bias' of their philosophical presuppositions. Such dissention also caused scandal amongst the broader community, as a consequence 'the chief pastors of Churches' did assemble to examine and assess 'the rising of any new opinion'. If the opinion was defined as error and the maintainer 'still persisted in it, they laid him aside, and considered him but as an heathen man'. Such 'ignominy' and exclusion usually forced the person to 'consider better of his own doctrine; and sometimes brought him to the acknowledgment of the Truth'. Hobbes was absolutely clear. Diversity of opinion was fundamental to belief in the first church and was driven by philosophical foundations rather than spiritual error. This contrasted with the commonplace assumption that the primitive church presented a pure orthodoxy only later corrupted by heterodoxy and error. Engaging with how the early church dealt with such diversity, again Hobbes was clear: the church had no other form of punishment but 'ignominy'. It is entirely possible that Hobbes chose this word for precise reasons: some one so excluded was given a bad name, in this process 'heresy' also became a word (or in Hobbes linguistic nominalism a 'name') associated with a 'bad' opinion. Applying the approach outlined in *Leviathan* 'of speech', Hobbes summarised, 'So that *Catholick* and *Heretick* were terms relative; and here it was that Heretick became to be a Name, and a name of Disgrace, both together'.³⁴

Having outlined the socio-cultural process by which the word heresy was transformed into an ecclesiastical label, Hobbes then proceeded to analyse the conceptual content of the central doctrinal differences. These focussed on the 'first principles of Christianity' and the nature of the Trinity. The 'usual curiosity' of (converted) natural philosophers meant there was a range of interpretations: Hobbes structured his account to underscore this variety: 'Some there were ... Others would make ... Others there were ... Others ...

Others denied ... Others confest'. He concluded this list of miscellany accounts with a simple comment, 'And a great many other Heresies arose from too much adherence to the Philosophy of those times'.³⁵ In this very condensed survey of a variety of anti- and non-Trinitarian positions, Hobbes implicitly asserted that there was no clear uniform orthodox position. Although philosophy had been entangled with theology neither had persuasive truth status. The advent of Constantine who 'authorised Christian religion only to be publick' saw, according to Hobbes, a step-change in this process of confessional diversity. The dispute between Alexander and Arius over the nature of Christ, became a case study of how religious controversy led to civil disturbance, following the model proposed in Chapter 29 of *Leviathan*. Because the dispute 'was the cause of much bloodshed in and about the City and was likely to spread further, as afterwards it did', Constantine summoned the Council at Nicea for civil rather than theological reasons. As Hobbes noted Constantine was indifferent to orthodoxy, his purpose in calling the synod 'was not so much the Truth, as the Uniformity of the Doctrine and peace of his People that depended on it'. The intellectual components of the dispute between the different readings of the Apostle's creed were marginal to the jurisdictional authority of the civil sovereign defining doctrine for the purpose of public peace.³⁶

Hobbes derived a number of arguments from this historical description. Orthodoxy was defined by the intervention of the civil authority not by the determination of ecclesiastical tradition or Scriptural injunction. Its function was disciplinary and civil rather than theological. As he commented, 'By this it is manifest, that no man was an Heretick, but he that in plain and direct words contradicted that form by the Church prescribed, and that no man could be made *an Heretick by Consequence*'. As an act of state such definition and enforcement of orthodoxy was also only applicable to Churchmen, and so declared Hobbes 'there was no reason to punish any Lay-person that should speak to the contrary'.³⁷ This intervention by Constantine was the second stage in the historical development of attitudes to heresy. Constantine's intervention established that Churchmen were subject to discipline but did not impose any punishment but deprivation and banishment (for a second offence). As he recapitulated, 'And thus did Heresie, which at first was the name of private opinion, and no crime, by virtue of a Law of the Emperor, made only for the peace of the Church, become a crime in a Pastor, and punishable with deprivation first, and next with banishment'.³⁸ Creeds were tools of

ecclesiastical discipline not soteriological hurdles imposed on the laity: in fact Hobbes described creeds as devices for the ostentatious display of clerical prestige ‘to dazzle men, with design to lead them towards some ends of their own’.³⁹ Hobbes ironic narrative of the disputes between Athanasius and Arius, and the consequent revisions of the public creeds reinforced his objective of regarding such statements of public doctrine as heuristic devices to cultivate civil peace, rather than statements of universal religious truth.

The final stage in the historical development of heresy saw the decay of imperial jurisdiction and the rise of the Papacy. The ‘Power Ecclesiastical’ wrested the definition of heresy out of the hands of the civil power, and applied it first to the laity, and then to sovereign itself. The Church of Rome transformed the creed from a device ‘made only for Peace sake’ to a set of beliefs which ‘a man cannot be saved, unless he believe then all stedfastly’. In a few short paragraphs Hobbes delivered a compressed version of the historical claims he had advanced in Chapter 42 of *Leviathan*: the first four general councils managed to lay the foundations for a popish ecclesiastical power that dominated the world. ‘There was’, wrote Hobbes, ‘no doctrine that tended to the power ecclesiastical, or to the reverence of the clergy, the contradiction whereof was not by one council or another made heresies, and punish arbitrarily by the emperor with banishment of death’. This was a ‘story so well known’ that Hobbes excused himself from giving the full details. Ultimately the Church gained supremacy over the civil power ‘and at last Kings themselves, and Commonwealths, unless they purged their dominions of Hereticks, were excommunicated, interdicted and their subjects let loose upon them by the Pope’.⁴⁰ The later sections of the *Brief historical narration* were concerned to show exactly how laws against heretics in England had followed this pattern. The consequence of these arguments were manifest to Hobbes: the imposition of punishment and discipline on heretics was a civil device to defend public peace, not a tool of ecclesiastical authority. Citing St Paul – that even in the case of an obstinate maintenance of error, that ‘the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose’ - Hobbes insisted that the fierceness of divines ‘down from before the Council of Nice to this present time’ was a violation of evangelical precepts.⁴¹

As well as providing a stadial account of the development of heresy, which contradicted much of the mainstream understanding of the prescriptive status of pre-Constantinian primitive practices, Hobbes also engaged with the causes of Christian diversity. The fundamental roots of different theological opinion lay in a combination of self interest and grammatical error. Surveying the arguments of Athanasius, Arius and other Church fathers like Tertullian and Damascene, Hobbes laboured to show that the dominance of Aristotelian metaphysics had corrupted the language of theology. Disagreements in theology were driven by improper linguistic usage: the debate about the nature of Christ was influenced by obscurity about the meaning of the word ‘substance’ which ‘proceeded chiefly from the difference between the *Greek* and *Roman* Dialect in the Philosophy of the *Peripateticks*.⁴² Churchmen had mistaken words for things – in Hobbes’ words they had confounded ‘real and corporeal things with incorporeal’. Misunderstandings and mistranslations from Greek to Latin had, historically, caused conceptual mistakes. As Hobbes lamented, ‘and this mistake is received, and continues still in these parts, in all disputes both of Philosophy, and Divinity’. The vocabulary of substance, essence, persons and of ‘hypostasis’, were all misused by churchmen who confounded the concrete and the abstract. While Scripture commonly employed metonymical language to persuade, Hobbes insisted that ‘such abstracted words ought not to be used in Arguing, and especially in the deducing the Articles of our Faith’.⁴³ Interwoven with his historical account of the growth of ecclesiastical power, Hobbes delivered a commentary on the various patristic controversies dealing with the Apostle’s Creed. As well as exposing the contradictions and mistakes of the Church fathers in their interpretations, he also implied that the text of the creed was less than robust.⁴⁴

Heresy for Hobbes was an historical construct rather than an identifiable theological error. More pertinently, heresy was a device originally employed to denote diversity that had been turned into a powerful weapon of priestcraft. None of these arguments fitted well with mainstream Christian understandings of heresy as an act of wilful human error deserving of reproof and correction. Why did Hobbes maintain these views? At one obvious level the work was intended to lambaste the persisting ambition of Churchmen: showing that heresy, properly determined, was a civil issue rather than theological proposition. Here Hobbes’ anticlericalism was intentionally thorough: his narrative of the development of heresy implicated the early church, Roman Catholicism, and Protestants of all hues (Anglican, Presbyterian and Independent). But Hobbes was doing more than

simply beating the priests with yet another convenient stick. The *Historical narration* was also a very careful consideration of the nature of heresy itself. Where other authors defined heresy in terms of errors of understanding, of the will, or the influence of Satan, Hobbes addressed the question from a very oblique angle. What Hobbes had done was combine a genealogy of structures of power that had defined heresy, with an account of the skewed processes that defined orthodoxy. He had not (unlike many other contemporaries) traced the origins and lineage of specific doctrinal heterodoxy to individuals or sects. What Hobbes showed (and implied) was that both orthodoxy and heresy were the result of conventional human definition (through a combination of institutional decision and individual intellectual insight). Hobbes' point was more than a simple sceptical relativism. It was not that one man's true faith, was another's heresy, but that all public claims to 'true' belief were ambitious of cultivating power before understanding. There was no independent source for religious truth beyond the definition of the civil sovereign.

Hobbes' views on the nature of public religious behaviour are neatly illustrated in his discussion of the actions of Naaman the Syrian in *Leviathan* (Chapters 42 and 43). The first discussion of Naaman was introduced to illustrate Hobbes' response to the question of the extent of Christian duties to the commands of an infidel sovereign: 'what ... if a King, or a Senate, or other Sovereign Person forbid us to beleeve in Christ?' For Hobbes the case was clear: such forbidding had no effect 'because Beleef, and Unbeleef never follow mens Commands. Faith is a gift of God, which man can neither give, nor take away by promise of rewards or menaces of torture'. Public proscriptions of true doctrine could not affect private faith. The 'licence' of Naaman was crucial for Hobbes. The question of his bowing to the idol of Rimmon, was for Hobbes not an issue of theological correctness but sovereignty: 'that action is not his, but his Sovereigns'.⁴⁵ Indeed Hobbes went on to expand the point to encompass the duties of obligations of all believers to their sovereigns insisting on complete obedience: 'and when the Civill Sovereign is an Infidel, everyone of his own Subjects that resisteth him, sinneth against the laws of God'.⁴⁶ Rebutting at length the classic statement of the duties of the Christian conscience towards heretic rulers as articulated by his *bete noire* Cardinal Bellarmine, Hobbes insisted that 'Christians are to tolerate their Heathen Princes'.⁴⁷ Hobbes argued that all public expression of religion was empty of spiritual significance: it was soteriologically neutral or indifferent. The wider purpose of these arguments was to

disenfranchise both the private conscience and the clerical body from attempting to 'judge' the religious legitimacy of the sovereign.

At one level then it is apparent that Hobbes proposed a profoundly conformist model of public religion. Citing the licence of Naaman, all believers, whether Christian, Jewish, Mahometan or otherwise, were bound to obey publicly authorised religion. Importantly however Hobbes did not consider this unbending obligation as the application of intolerance. Crucial to his understanding was the distinction between public and private religion. Hobbes had no objection in theory to the principle of a diversity of religions within any particular state. Indeed in Chapter 12 of *Leviathan* he had applauded the model of the Romans who 'made no scruple of tolerating any Religion whatsoever in the City of Rome itself; unless it had something in it, that could not subsist with their civil government'.⁴⁸ Toleration limited by the imperatives of civic order was acceptable: indeed it might be possible to suggest that by personal inclination Hobbes approved of an ecclesiological structure that allowed a liberty of public worship proximate to the 'independency of the Primitive Christians'. The citation of the precedent of the alternatives Churches of 'Paul, or Cephas, or Apollos' suggested that Hobbes ultimately approved of a system of public religion where worship was practised 'every man as he liketh best'.⁴⁹ The unorthodoxy of this position was apparent to Hobbes: and he ensured that such passages, which were in clear contradiction to the established Church settlement, were excluded from later editions of the work.⁵⁰ While priests were powerful such liberty was dangerous.

Hobbes' understanding of liberty of thought rested upon a rigorous distinction between the public and the private. Faith was 'internal and invisible' not subject to any public restraint: 'interior cogitations' were not subject to the commands even of God.⁵¹ Hobbes made the distinction between internal and external worship transparent in Chapter 31 'The Kingdom of God by Nature': 'Publique, is the worship that a commonwealth performeth, as one person. Private, is that which a Private Person exhibiteth. Publique, in respect of the whole common wealth is free; but in respect of Particular men it is not so'.⁵² To reinforce the point Hobbes continued 'Private is in secret Free; but in the sight of the multitude, it is never without some restraint, either from the lawes, or from the opinion of men; which is contrary to the nature of Liberty'. In private then Hobbes suggested that belief was unrestrained and more importantly unmonitored: as long as this

internal understanding remained unpublished in the broadest sense it was acceptable. Once again the dynamic of restraint was not directed against any theoretical opposition to diversity but against the social effects of challenges to constituted doctrinal authority. Although very concerned to affirm that no individual should deliberately flout an authoritative command upon grounds of religious dissidence Hobbes was equally concerned both to rebut Anglican arguments that insisted the civil authority had a duty to proscribe heretics and also that common law defined heresy as an offence harmful in its nature and thus subject to law. Heresy was 'nothing else but a private opinion, obstinately maintained, contrary to the opinion which the publique person ... hath commanded to be taught'. Determining whether heretics should be punished was to be left to the sovereign: there was no theological ground for persecution only the calculations of civil protection and security. For Hobbes, heresy (and perhaps atheism also) was simply a matter of error not a direct affront to God which required a forced edification: as he wrote 'unbelief is not a breach of any of his lawes; but a rejection of them'.⁵³ In Hobbes' reading of the divine purpose, temporal institutions were irrelevant to eschatology: salvation was to be achieved by God's election and 'faith' not by any association with an earthly Church or by a public profession of belief. Civil religion was a social act disconnected from conscience. Needless to say, such an account was regarded as deeply suspect by Hobbes' contemporaries.⁵⁴

IV

One of the most learned, but unstudied, rebuttals of Hobbes' views on heresy can be found in the scribal response of Thomas Barlow (1607-1691), Provost of the Queen's College, Oxford and Bishop of Lincoln. Here Hobbes encountered one of the most erudite scholars of the primitive church.⁵⁵ Barlow, a powerful figure in restoration Oxford, engaged in serial polemics against theological and political heterodoxy, defending Calvinist positions against threats from what he perceived as the rise of Pelagianism associated with the work of George Bull. Hostile to 'Socinianism' and all doctrinal deviance, Barlow reserved his venom for the threat of idolatrous and antichristian 'popery'. Despite antagonism towards religious dissidence Barlow did entertain arguments in favour of a more tolerant disposition. One piece of evidence for this survives in the brief written (probably in 1660) for Robert Boyle 'on the toleration of Protestant Dissenters'. Barlow's relationship with Boyle, as Michael Hunter has explored, was casuistical with the churchman acting as Boyle's 'confessor'.⁵⁶ There has been some

considerable historiographical misunderstanding over Barlow's views: far from endorsing comprehensionist schemes in the late 1660s, Barlow was actively hostile. As an old man he vented his spleen against the (so-called) 1689 Toleration act.⁵⁷ Barlow's views were complex, and shaped by his visceral anxieties about the threat of Roman Catholicism. Like many Protestant theologians, Barlow's understanding of heresy (and consequently the development of arguments about toleration of such deviance) was driven by the uncomfortable recognition that 'protestantism' had been successfully represented as historically 'heretical' by the Papacy. Barlow's point was, 'It were to be wished that men would not be so fierce to punish heresie, till they be more certainly informed, and assured what it is'.⁵⁸

The evidence of Barlow's scribal response to Hobbes' history of heresy, allows an intellectually intimate insight into the limits of clerical tolerance. It also throws into sharper relief the contemporary perception of the heterodoxy of Hobbes' position. Sent a copy of the *Brief historical narration concerning heresie* by Arthur Annesley, First Earl of Anglesey in late 1676 for comment, Barlow worked his annotations up into a lengthy rebuttal of Hobbes' text ultimately recommending that the author be executed for blasphemy.⁵⁹ Although the draft and fair copy of the work are extant, Barlow's complete work remains unpublished to this day. The response, 'Animadversions on a MS. Tract concerning Heresy, and the Punishment of Heretiques', neatly written over 94 pages in August 1676, was a model of erudition. The visual organisation of the work was calculated to display the author's learning: each page was divided into text and a dense thicket of supporting marginal references. Barlow, having 'diligently read ... and impartially consider'd' Hobbes' work, offered (at Anglesey's encouragement) censure of the dangerous and pernicious errors advanced in it. 'The 'love of truth' transcended any bonds of personal friendship, as Barlow clarified (citing Aristotle) 'soe say I of Mr Hobs and Truth; I love both; but truth better'.⁶⁰ Focusing on positions rather than persons, Barlow identified two distinct types of errors the 'verball or reall'. As he clarified there were mistakes 'in the words and expressions, misquotes or some things of less consideration, yet fitt to be noted'. Such slips pointed to the 'imperfection of our rational soul'. More serious were mistakes in 'the things themselves, and the positions affirmed by him, or denyed'. Perhaps many of the mistakes (detailed by Barlow with precision) were the fault of transcribers or the amanuensis, but he detected a deeper error. The main example was Hobbes' assertions about the usage of Aristotelian language of

phantasmata, substance and accident. Hobbes was also convicted of making basic errors in historical fact confusing the creed of the Council of Nicea with that of Constantinople. So much was 'evident to any who compares ye originall copies of those Creeds': conveniently Barlow's marginal references identified the best editions for such an examination (Valesius' editions of Socrates and Theodoret, and Labbe's *Councils*).⁶¹ . As the evidence of the manuscripts indicate, Barlow worked and reworked his material polishing and adding new historical references. The evidence of his annotation on a scribal copy of the work indicates a careful attention to the historical context and sources used by Hobbes.

Barlow devoted much of the first half of his response to detailing, line by line, the faults of Hobbes' Christian erudition. Hobbes' account of Constantine's pursuit of uniformity at the expense of truth was impious and inaccurate: 'peace without truth, is a war with God'. Similarly his version of the nature of pre-Arian heresies was faulty: the testimony of Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Philastrius and Augustine (amongst others) showed that many before Arius had denied the divinity of Christ. It was key for Barlow to traduce Hobbes' claim that the institutions for determining and punishing heresy had been a post-apostolic development in early Christianity. Contra the claim that the early fathers did not use the Greek and Latin vocabulary of 'persons', Barlow deployed the evidence of a range of modern scholarly grammatical commentaries.⁶² To cap this the Greek, Arabic and Ethiopic versions of scripture established that Paul used the words *personae* and *hypostasis*. Just as heresy had bedevilled Christian communities from apostolic times, so too had the orthodox language underpinning central doctrine such as the Trinity. If Hobbes had displayed a less than accomplished erudition in constructing an account of the early church, Barlow was appalled by his understanding of the corporeal nature of God, which explicitly contradicted the first of the *39 Articles* (that 'God is infinite without body, parts or passions'). Hobbes had already advanced dubious remarks about a substantial God in *Leviathan*, which, Barlow noted, he had reiterated in the appendix to the Latin edition, and again in the *Brief narration*.⁶³ This was an evidently 'atheisticall opinion'. Citing Aristotle, Barlow insisted that the maintenance of such opinion deserved punishment rather than confutation; as he clarified, 'that Mr Hobs in maintaining these wild and wicked opinions ... has done that which neither the ancient heretiques, or Stoicks did, or dared'.⁶⁴ Even the Manichees were more acceptable than Hobbes because at least they proposed that evil was the action of a false divinity. It was

clear that for Barlow, Hobbes' work was advancing heretical opinion as much as defending heresy from punishment.

Barlow was concerned to rebut the erroneous historical accounts of Constantine and the early Councils that Hobbes had perpetrated in the *Brief narration*; he was also anxious to challenge the claim that 'heresie ... at first signified only a private opinion amongst philosophers'.⁶⁵ Hobbes had argued for an historical development from Greek notions of *hairesis* to Christian ideas of heresy, suggesting that the motor of this transformation was ecclesiastical ambition.⁶⁶ Hobbes' account not only indicted the involvement of clerical institutions, but also pointed out that early Christian heresy was a crime 'only in ecclesiastical not in any lay persons'. Barlow engaged with the arguments by interrogating Hobbes' (mainly unacknowledged) sources. Diogenes Laertius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Josephus indeed wrote about heresy without reference to 'truth or falsehood', but Christian writers always applied a pejorative language of error to such opinion. A long list of patristic sources as well as apostolic and scriptural statements condemned heresy as the 'works of the flesh'. Paul damned heretics as both a sin and a crime three hundred years before Constantine imposed laws. Even Arius had been regarded as impious by the Nicene fathers before the Emperor's intervention. The application of civil sanction added punishment to an already existing crime.⁶⁷ Again explicitly traducing Hobbes' scholarly competence Barlow insisted that hostility to heresy extended to the laity as much as the clergy: far from simply being an ecclesiastical crime, he argued that all Christians had an obligation 'to know the truth'.⁶⁸ As Barlow pointedly insisted, this applied especially to men like Hobbes who had been endowed with 'great abilities and opportunities' so could not appeal to the excuse of ignorance.

Consistent with his earlier writings on the legitimate treatment of heretics, Barlow maintained the view that, although heterodoxy had always been in the Christian community, the Church only had spiritual instruments to combat it. The Church was not a 'regnum mundanum' and by consequence could not use 'swordes, spears & pistols'.⁶⁹ Christ had condemned Peter for cutting off the ear of Malcus (and indeed restored the ear by a miracle).⁷⁰ This spiritual conduct was the true legacy to Peter and the Church: ecclesiastical authority was 'ministeriall not imperiall'. The Church had the power to open and shut the kingdom of heaven by ecclesiastical actions: baptism, catechism and excommunications. The importance of this for Barlow was to establish that in the 'times

before Constantine' the Church had spiritual means and power to define and engage with heresy. Hobbes putative case that Constantine had seen a radical erastian invention of discipline and definition of heresy was wrong.⁷¹ Interestingly however, Barlow tended to agree with Hobbes' understanding that after the age of Constantine, both Church and Empire tended to employ orthodoxy as a device to establish their own corrupt interests. He included a list of canon and imperial laws against heretics to establish this point. While preserving the integrity of the Church of the first three centuries, Barlow wanted to show that Roman Catholic grounds for persecuting heretics were wrong.⁷² Once again it is possible to expose the tightrope along which Protestant Churchmen like Barlow had to tread carefully: it was necessary to invest the Church with a just measure of authority to define and protect 'truth'. Establishing too little authority might open the way for a Hobbist relativism; too much authority would allow the popish pyres to be kindled against protestants.

Barlow next turned to deal with the second half of Hobbes' *Brief historical narration*, which had concentrated on illustrating the evidence of the civil laws against heresy in England from the time of Richard II. By close forensic examination of the legal evidence it was Barlow's claim that all of the laws allowing capital punishment for heresy had been abrogated: as he clarified, 'soe yt now there is noe statute, by wch a heretique can be punished with burninge'. Indeed his hope was that there never should be such a law 'yt I may freely confesse, wt I really believe, I doe not thinke ye execution of such a law; and inflictinge such capitall punishment, on such persons, to be consistent with prudence or justice, nor to have any firm ground in Nature or Scripture, Reason or Religion'.⁷³ A further examination of both common and canon law similarly showed no evidence of legal capital punishment.⁷⁴ Rehearsing many of the arguments from the work written for Boyle, Barlow was insistent that there was no ground in Scripture for using the 'materiall sword' for propagating the Gospel. Adopting a very different tack from the mainstream Augustinian defences of orthodoxy, Barlow pursued a very distinct line of argument against Hobbes. He agreed that the issue of defining heresy was problematic: as the several catalogues of ancient and modern heresy showed 'it is not agreed, or certainly resolved what heresie is'. Erroneous opinion could not be then, the only criterion: 'obstinacy, or pertinancy' were further qualities, but as aspects of the soul could only be truly known by 'our infinitely wise God'.⁷⁵

At this point in Barlow's text, it might appear that a step was taken towards Hobbes' position. This was not the case. While heretics might fall beyond the jurisdiction of the material sword, blasphemers did not. Hobbes' writings were so 'wild & monstrous' that Barlow pointed out that 'if it be blasphemy I am sure it deserves death'. Hobbes was invited either to retract his views or explain them. Furthermore, others should be brought to account to explain why they did not prevent the publication of such ideas; or why, as he continued, 'when published, they did not publicly condemne & set a brand upon ye books & punish the Author, printer, & publisher of such apocriphall and Hereticall opinions'.⁷⁶ Barlow was convinced, then, that in the case of Hobbes' writings there was evidence enough (of their blasphemy rather than heresy) to invoke the authorities (the phrase he used was the rather indistinct 'some others') to impose possibly capital punishment. We should not be led to assume that this attitude towards blasphemy contradicted the thrust of his arguments about the treatment of heresy. Blasphemy was beyond the pale and prompted a Christian duty of punishment. Heresy was a different matter: those who advised coercive or even capital punishment for such opinion were in error and without Christian compassion. Barlow developed this point in the last section of the work which gave a chronological account of legal evidences of treatment of heretics from the times of the Codices *Theodosians* and *Justinians*, up until the seventeenth century. Here, with relentless citation of legal textbooks, Barlow showed that 'the popish authors are for extirpation, death, and burning Hereticks, or utter destruction of them'.⁷⁷ What was significant in this account was that not only subjects but also 'supreme powers' were liable to excommunication if they fell into error or indeed if they failed to enact punishment of heretics. Such excommunication exempted all subjects from oaths of obligation and fidelity. Indeed, as Barlow explained, pious subjects were positively encouraged, by papalists like Bellarmine, to resist any heretical sovereign: 'It is not only lawfull to take arms & depose an hereticall King, but they are bound to doe it'. All Protestants, kings and subjects, ought to 'consult their safety'.⁷⁸ The message was clear Roman Catholicism was a threat not only to devout protestant subjects, but to Protestant Kings too. Attitudes towards the treatment of heresy were then not simply driven by theological correctness, but by political demands too.

The difficulties Barlow had balancing a fear of popish persecution with disciplining dissent were evident to one contemporary. Henry Brougham commented, 'that how reasonable soever in the *Theory* a Toleration might seem to the Bp. Yet when he came to

reduce it to *Practice*, and have to deal with the troublesome *Spirit* of our *Dissenters*, he found it not feasible, nor consistent with the Weal of the Church'.⁷⁹ In the text prepared for Boyle, Barlow addressed the question of the 'toleration of several religions, or opinions, in a well governed Church and State'. Excluding the case (for obvious reasons) of atheists, Barlow defined arguments in favour of liberty of belief in a framework of law and authority: toleration was taking away obligations of conformity, as he explained 'it must be remembered, that it is a toleration we speak of, not an approbation of those religions'. Barlow noted the tricky problem of the state authorisation of religions (that is, that sometimes the established religion as in France was false), and defined 'toleration' as the taking off of the 'obligation to obedience' and the consequent exemption of the application of punishment for disobedience.⁸⁰ Rewards and punishments were the devices the supreme authority employed to ensure peace and order. The application of exemptions was a political calculation best determined by *politique* assessment of the circumstances, numbers and nature of those who might attract toleration. Prudence and conscience might prompt the magistrate to a measure of 'moderate' toleration in order to preserve the public peace: some times when the dissident community was substantial or powerful it was more prudent to pardon than to punish.

In the case of a minority group, where there was no immediate threat to peace, Barlow raised the matter of toleration: 'is the magistrate then bound in prudence and piety to punish, or may he (without violation of either) tolerate?'. Here by default there was engagement with mainstream Anglican discourses focused on the magisterial duty of compulsion. By deploying the Augustinian reading of Luke ('*compelle entrare*'), many argued that intolerance was a religious duty. Forcing the dissident or heretic to embrace the truth by punishment and coercion was a pious and Godly act. Importantly, Barlow insisted that such issues were matters of political jurisdiction, but most emphatically not issues of ecclesiastical authority or duty. Although there was a distinction between civil and ecclesiastical punishment, presented in the difference between *in foro interno* and *in foro externo*, this did not imply the Church had any apostolic or Christian power to punish any man with loss of livelihood, liberty or life. '*Dominium non fundatur in gratia*' was an old but true saying and pagans and infidels have 'a good title to their patrimonies, and a just propriety in their Estates real or personal'. Just as conversion to Christianity neither brought a new title, so turning heretic did not mean a forfeiture of life or liberty. Matters of toleration should be determined by an assessment of 'public safety': any religion which

compromised this criterion was intolerable. Typically, Barlow listed those groups like Anabaptists, Roman Catholics and other radical sectarians who either denied all magistracy or offered political loyalty to other authorities, who would prudentially be disabled from toleration. Similarly any religions that were destructive of the laws of nature 'or evidently dangerous to the well-being of humane society' were beyond the pale.

Public safety might be threatened by irreligious conduct or political sedition. It was not clear to Barlow though, that matters of 'faith and false Opinions' also attracted punishment and discipline. The evidence of the Catholic Church making 'men coals and cinders, but not Christians' was damning. Individuals who were 'otherwise peaceable and good subjects, neither rebelliously or seditiously disturbing the publick peace, nor injuriously wronging their neighbour', contrary to common practice, did not warrant punishment. Barlow was explicit, if cautious, in his views: while it was not 'absolutely unlawful for the civil magistrate (in this case) to use temporal, and compulsory, punishments, yet thus much ... I think I may safely and truly say, that it will be very difficult and dangerous for him to do it'.⁸¹ 'Verbo et exemplo agebant, non gladio' was the primitive Christian model: preaching, a 'rational pressing', 'reasoning men out of their errors', pious lives and patient suffering were the models of conduct and conversion. The blood of martyrs rather than murdered heretics made the 'field of the church so fruitful' in the early years of Christianity. Although some Christians advocated Scriptural examples of 'coactive punishments', Barlow dismissed the cases of Paul, Ananias and Sapphira, and Elymas the Sorcerer as 'impertinent'.⁸² An appreciation of the specific circumstances of these chastisements indicated that they were 'extraordinary and miraculous from the hand of heaven' rather than part of the *jure ordinario* of civil or ecclesiastical government.

The most significant defence of 'compulsory means' derived from the parable of the marriage feast (*Luke 14.23*) as interpreted by Augustine, which inferred that it was 'lawful to use coactive means in case of different religions, to compel men to the best'. Here Barlow denied the force of the parable, and cited Grotius and Theophylact to support the claim that compulsion meant not violence but an 'earnest and prevailing importunity'. Far from imploring coercion, the precepts of Christ and the apostles counselled against violence, citing the parable of the tares 'where he tells the servants, that they must suffer

the *tares* to grow with the *wheat* (hereticks with Catholicks) till the harvest'.⁸³ Interestingly, Barlow cited as support for his case two scriptural passages – *John 18. 36* ('my kingdom is not of this world') and *Romans 10. 17* ('Faith comes by hearing') which Hobbes made much use of in *Leviathan*.⁸⁴ Belief was voluntary: 'that men are or can be beaten into a belief of Truth we read not'. In strikingly modern language Barlow defended toleration: 'Bonds and imprisonment may captivate the body, but not the understanding; Fire and Faggot may consume, but not convert an Heretick'. Religion was determined by the understanding and the will 'things incapable of force, or coercion'. The civil or ecclesiastical authorities might apply the full force of 'plunderings, sequestrations and imprisonments' to establish (probably hypocritical) compliance, but not 'true and unfeigned Piety'. In practical terms, violence usually confirmed, rather than confuted, commitments to error. The example of the early Church and the growth of Protestantism despite the fury of persecution, established that force in matters of faith was counter-productive.

Barlow was clear, then, that punishing a heretic with death was unchristian, impractical and epistemologically and jurisprudentially dubious. Despite this tolerant disposition, the churchman had no doubts that heresy itself was a bad thing. As he clarified, defining the nature of heresy was a difficult business. Augustine had asserted that the formal understanding of heresy was to be found in 'pertinacy, or contumacy'; the Greek *scholia* required that an heretic was 'self condemned, incurable, incorrigible'. Others had defined heresy as anything which was 'contra articulos fidei'. To all of these arguments Barlow replied with a form of epistemological uncertainty and relativism: only God could know the inner thoughts of any one (therefore only he had certain grounds for punishment), and on the issue of doctrinal articles he pointed out that confessional diversity meant that 'what is heresie to one is Catholick verity to another'. On the issue of ecclesiastical discipline, such as excommunication, penance and censure, Barlow was cautious too. There was enough clarity of judgement to allow Christians to avoid social intercourse with heretics: but those sects who added to their error by causing rents in the community of the Church by schism could be punished. Such action was 'visible and confessedly punishable'.⁸⁵ The practice of the primitive church showed that excommunication was commonplace, but Barlow noted 'it will not hence follow, they did well and justly in doing so'. Displaying his full range of historical and patristic erudition, Barlow insisted that the model of the primitive church was not one that embraced persecution: 'He that

reads *Justine Martyr, Athenagoras; Tertullian, Arnobius, Minutius Felix, Lactantius, &c.* or indeed any Ecclesiastical Author for 300 years after Christ, will find Grotius his observation to be true, *Quod perpetuo asserunt Neminem ob fidei professionem esse cogendum*.⁸⁶ As one of the leading figures in the world of patristic learning, and as author of the profoundly influential *de studio theologia* (a bibliography of best reading on the early church and the history of doctrine), Barlow's interpretations of primitive practice were weighty.⁸⁷

Barlow displayed his learning in detail – Eusebius, Augustine, Athenagoras, Ambrose, Lactantius, all supported (he claimed) the view that 'Fides voluntatis est, non necessitatis'. The case of Augustine was controversial. In claiming that he was 'at first against all persecution for religion', Barlow argued against the tenor of Restoration Anglicanism. Acknowledging that Augustine had revised his opinions on the legitimacy of coercion, Barlow persevered in pointing out that 'even then he was against punishing any (even the worst) Hereticks with death'.⁸⁸ The point for Barlow was that true Christianity was a voluntary faith: individuals chose their beliefs rather than being pressed to service. Writing in 1660, Barlow may have had real anxieties about the nature of the Church settlement being developed by the Restored regime. A constant apprehension of Anglican thinkers like Barlow was that in defending the imposition of penalties and punishments against dissenters they were also laying the conceptual foundations for the application of similar policies against themselves by potential Roman Catholic governors. The grounds of this tension were made manifest in Barlow's later work *A discourse concerning the laws ecclesiastical and civil made against hereticks* (1682). The point of the work was twofold: first, to show 'what protestant subjects may expect to suffer under a popish prince' and second, 'that no oath or promise of such a prince can give them any just security'. Written explicitly in the context of the crisis over popery and arbitrary power the work was defensive. The preface 'against persecuting and destroying hereticks' was in effect a work condemning the persecution of 'Protestants'. In this case, then, (using many of the same sources and authorities), Barlow was addressing not the relationship between an established Protestant church and Protestant dissent, but the more confessionally combative hostility between Roman Catholic and Protestant. The imminent danger of a popish successor to the throne made the threat of persecution more present. Persecution was the mark of an antichristian church. The practice of the purest and primitive church was tolerant and 'calm'. The example and deportment of the apostles underscored this commitment to (in Tillotson's words) the 'gentle and peaceable

methods of Reason and Persuasion'. As Barlow acknowledged, despite the challenges of dangerous and pernicious heresies, the early church had no recourse to violence and the sword.⁸⁹

Christian authority was given for edification rather than destruction: Christ resisted the call for fire from heaven to punish the village of Samaria (*Luke* 9. 54). When the Roman Catholic church deployed 'fire and faggot, swords and inquisitions' they acted in an ungodly manner. The thrust of patristic and contemporary commentary (from Augustine to Jeremy Taylor, and Tertullian to John Tillotson) supported the prohibition of capital punishment. It was even possible to cite Cardinal Baronius, papalist supreme, arguing that 'not one of the holy fathers did allow that ecclesiastical persons should procure the punishment of hereticks with death, or move the civil magistrate to doe it'.⁹⁰ The main part of the work showed (in meticulous detail from primary sources) how the contemporary Roman Church had deviated from this 'good catholic' practice after the seventh century. There were three categories of law concerned to preserve the orthodoxy of the Christian community, to identify heretical opinion and to punish such heresy. Barlow's point was to establish that the Roman faith had ample precedent to support and indeed encourage the persecution of heresy, and that in fact, a Catholic prince had an active duty to pursue such ends. The detail of the provisions provided a Protestant audience with more than ample evidence of the traditions and prospects of persecution. It would seem then that Barlow's commitment to toleration was both tactical and principled: there was a core argument that diversity of religious belief was a consequence of epistemological factors. Although dedicated to a conception of public communion and unity of faith, Barlow also understood the relationship between church and believer and Christian and citizen to be a voluntary one. Preservation of public peace should be the only criterion determining the application of legal punishment by the civil authority; the nature of the Church excluded it from the administration of anything more severe than rational edification. Complementary to these arguments about the nature of religious conviction, the duties of civil magistrates and the jurisdictional competence of ecclesiastical authority, was a fundamentally historical argument. Barlow was confident that all of the components in favour of a tolerant attitude could be derived from a close and forensic examination of the writings and practices of the primitive Church. This foundation of Christian erudition was a critical element of his engagement with Hobbes' argument about the historical treatment of heresy.

We should be aware that the materials so far examined to determine Barlow's attitude to heresy and toleration, were in part shaped by context and audience. In the work composed for Boyle, the churchman operated in casuistical mode, carefully assessing the jurisprudential, moral and doctrinal components of the matter. In the second work he was constructing a defensive account premised on historical evidence, calculated to preserve Protestant liberties from the threat of Popish princes. The contrast between this profound anxiety about the threat of a persecuting Popery, and the need to punish a blasphemous Hobbes is stark. There was both a tactical and strategic element in Barlow's account of the nature of heresy and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Clearly as a member of an established Church that claimed close affinity with the models of primitive practice, Barlow insisted that he was able (with confidence) to recognise the boundary between orthodox belief and blasphemy, while the relationship between orthodoxy and heresy was more indistinct. The strategy of Barlow's response to Hobbes was intended to reinforce the claims of the established Church to orthodox integrity by insisting on the illegitimacy of his views. At the same time, Barlow devoted considerable erudition and energy to defending a broader tolerance of Christian heresy, against the persecuting ambitions of popery. At points some of these arguments shadowed the sort of case Hobbes' advanced in the *Brief historical narration*. In matters of inter-Christian confessional diversity, Barlow proposed a reasonably radical defence of liberty of conscience. He still however preserved a sense of religious authority, as is evidenced by his encouragement of the prosecution of the laws against dissenters in Lincolnshire on the grounds of preserving unity and order; as he explained it was probable that 'their sufferings by the execution of our just Laws, and the blessing of God upon them, might bring them to a sense of their duty'.⁹¹ Hobbes' arguments, however, had crossed a very carefully defined boundary between the tolerable and the intolerable. The convergence between some of the arguments advanced by both men indicates the permeability of orthodox and heterodox discourses. By focusing on the exact discrepancies between the two texts it has been possible to contextualise (with some precision) the idiosyncrasy of Hobbes' positions.

Protestant culture still was fundamentally clerical. In Hobbes' view there was still plenty of political work to do before the corrupting influence of ecclesiastical power could be neutralised. In the 1660s Hobbes maintained the war against the Church and clerical understandings of orthodoxy by restating and revising his earlier works. Hobbes was not alone in taking a different tack. At least two other contemporaries – John Milton and Andrew Marvell, the latter at least intimately associated with the Anglesey circle, also responded to the problem of heresy.⁹² Published in the same year as Hobbes work on heresy, Marvell's *A short historical essay* (1680) was drafted in the earlier 1670s and is a useful text for drawing some comparison with Hobbes' ideas.⁹³ Deploying the 'naked truth of history', Marvell delivered a compressed history of the rise and progress of Christianity from primitive times to the seventeenth century. Up until the time of Constantine, the Christian faith had suffered at the hands of ungodly magistrates: some persecuted only on a civil account recognising that punishment for doctrine and ceremony was 'a thing out of the magistrates province and altogether unreasonable'. Unlike commonplace Anglican historiography the conversion of Constantine was not embraced as a moment of providential triumph. The conversion provided the foundations for the 'new disease' of Episcopal ambition, contention and imposition which eventually broke out as 'a plague sore of open persecution'. Just as Hobbes did, Marvell paid close attention to the history of Constantine's intervention in the doctrinal concerns of the Church at the Council of Nicea, basing his account on a reading of the key historical sources (Eusebius). The Council was called to keep the peace, by implication a more significant (if less Godly) ambition than defining truth. Constantine saw the council as a means for remedying disorder in an 'ecclesiastical cockpit' riven by disputes about the very marrow of divinity. Marvell noted that, 'Hypostasis, Persona, Substantia, subsistentia, essential, consensualis, consubstantialia, ante saecula coaeternus', were the words at the centre of contention. It was of course to be precisely this vocabulary that provide Hobbes with the backbone of the major part of the *Historical Narration*. The imposition of orthodox creeds compromised the integrity of sincere Christian understanding of scripture: it made 'martyrs for reason'. The rest of Marvell's text condemned the 'ecclesiastical machine' that used the institutions of councils to impose human convention as religious truth. In a compressed but effective narrative, Marvell established the essentially historical pattern of orthodoxy: councils changed and revoked central doctrinal positions according to their own interest, at times he

commented they ‘inverted the poles of heaven’. The implication of such an historical account was that the ecclesiastical imposition of doctrinal orthodoxy, even in the 1660s, was illegitimate.⁹⁴

As the cases of Hobbes and Marvell indicate many who advanced a defence of ‘heresy’ did so from the starting point of a visceral hostility towards clerical persecution rather than from a commitment to toleration. Richard Tuck has suggested that Hobbes *au fond* was a tolerationist. While there is considerable merit in approaching Hobbes’ religious thought from this perspective, it is still fundamentally misconstrued, since languages of toleration in the period were primarily driven by theological objectives. Hobbes’ ambition was not to tolerate a diversity of religious beliefs, but to neutralise them. To adapt a distinction commonly used to describe the different conceptions of liberty at play in the period, Hobbes did not defend a positive account of religious freedom (that is he did not want to enfranchise individuals’ freedom to express their religious views) but instead defended a negative form. He wanted to free both the individual and the civil society *from* religious orthodoxy (or at least the clerical version of religion). Theories of toleration in the period were part of a theological idiom: the liberties they defended rested upon concepts of the sincere Christian conscience. Hobbes wrote from outside this discourse (although he inconveniently used many of the vocabularies and authorities of the religious culture). Hobbes’ project was to render the independent authority of ecclesiastical institutions and individual Christian conscience inoperative. His thoughts on the complicated historical relationship between orthodoxy and heresy led him to suggest that no set of religious beliefs or doctrines had truth status. In one sense for Hobbes the only distinction between orthodoxy and heresy was determined by who held the reins of sovereignty. The arguments were distinctive from those contemporaries who in advancing defences of toleration inevitably also drew boundaries around the tolerable. Hobbes defined heresy in structural rather than doctrinal terms: heresy was any opinion not authorised by the state. As he implied, the implication of this was that much of what the established Church of the 1660s held to be theological truth, might at a stroke become heresy. If the determinant of heresy was dissent from the singular authority of civil sovereignty then the greatest heretics of his day were also probably the most orthodox.

¹ I am grateful to the editors for their suggestions in revising this contribution. I am also very grateful for advice, insights and comments from Sean Greenberg, Colin

Davis and Mark Goldie. References to Hobbes' works are as follows: T. Hobbes *Leviathan* (ed) R. Tuck (Cambridge, 1991) [cited as Hobbes *Leviathan*]; T. Hobbes *An answer to a book published by Dr. Bramhall, late bishop of Derry; called the Catching of the leviathan. Together with an historical narration concerning heresie, and the punishment thereof.* (1682) [cited as Hobbes *Historical Narration*]. Unless otherwise stated place of publication is London.

² R. Neville *An English inquisition for a heretick* (1673) p. 4, 6, 7, 8-9, 10-13, 15, 23-24.

³ M.A. Goldie 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England'. In O. Grell, J. Israel, N. Tyacke (ed.), *From Persecution to Toleration* (Oxford, 1991) p. 331-68.

⁴ See J. Miller *After the civil wars* (Longman, London, 2000) for an overview.

⁵ See H.M. Margoliouth (ed) *The poems and letter of Andrew Marvell* 2 volumes (Oxford, 1927) II, p. 181, 186, 187, 193.

⁶ Anon *A letter to a member of Parliament* (1675) p. 3-4. The text was dated April 17th 1675.

⁷ For details of membership of the committee see *Journals of the House of Commons* (1803) volume 9, p. 406.

⁸ *Journals of the House of Commons* 9, p. 402, 406, 409; *Journals of the House of Lords* (1829) volume 13, p. 92, 99, 103, 104, 109, 110.

⁹ 29 *Car II c. IX*, 'An act for taking away the writ de Haeretico comburendo' in *Statutes at large 1660-1696* volume 5 (1811) p. 441.

¹⁰ J. Dowell *The Leviathan Hereticall* (1683) Preface.

¹¹ See J. Overhoff 'The Lutheranism of Thomas Hobbes'. *History of Political Thought*, 18 (1997) p. 604-23, and idem 'The theology of Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan'. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 51 (2000) p. 527-55; See also R. Tuck 'The "Christian Atheism" of Thomas Hobbes' in M. Hunter, D. Wootton (eds) *Atheism from the reformation to the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1992) p. 111-130.

¹² For an account of the attempted prosecutions see P. Milton, 'Hobbes, heresy and Lord Arlington'. *History of Political Thought*, 14 (1993) p. 501-46; J. Parkin 'Hobbism in the later 1660s: Daniel Scargill and Samuel Parker'. *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999) p. 85-108.

¹³ See T. Hobbes *Considerations upon the reputation, loyalty, manners, & religion of Thomas Hobbes of Malmsbury written by himself, by way of letter to a learned person* (1680) p. 29.

¹⁴ Hobbes *Considerations* p. 83.

¹⁵ See P. Milton, 'Hobbes, heresy and Lord Arlington'. *History of Political Thought*, 14 (1993) p. 501-46; J.B. Parkin, 'Hobbism in the later 1660s : Daniel Scargill and Samuel Parker'. *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999) p. 85-108.

¹⁶ I am very grateful to Alan Cromartie for a view of his introduction to the forthcoming Clarendon Press edition of the *Dialogue Concerning Common Laws*.

¹⁷ See the later case advanced in the Chatsworth manuscript, discussed in S.I. Mintz 'Hobbes on the law of heresy: a new manuscript' *Journal of the history of ideas* 29 (1968) p. 409-414.

¹⁸ T. Hobbes *Seven philosophical problems and two propositions of geometry by Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury with an apology for himself and his writings* (1682) p. A3v.

¹⁹ For a description of the manuscripts see P. Beal (ed.). *Index of English literary manuscripts, volume 2: 1625-1700* (1987) p. 579. There are three key original mss: 'Of Heresy: written ('tis said) by Thomas Hobbes' [Bod. Ashmole 1818 item 30]; Queen's College, Oxford Ms 449 folios 118-26, a copy in three hands with Thomas Barlow's annotations; University of Toronto, MS 5161.

²⁰ N. Malcolm (ed) *The correspondence of Thomas Hobbes* Volume II, p. 699-700.

²¹ For further discussion see J.A.I. Champion, M.A. Goldie (eds) *Hobbes on Religion* (Clarendon, Oxford, forthcoming) which comprises editions of *An answer to Bramhall*, the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the *Historical narration concerning heresy*, and other fragments on heresy.

²² The most recent account of the work on heresy is M. P. Thompson 'Hobbes on heresy' in J.C. Laursen (ed) *Histories of heresy in early modern Europe* (Palgrave, London, 2002) p. 77-99; for a broader discussion see, R. Tuck, 'The civil religion of Thomas Hobbes'. in N.T. Phillipson, Q. Skinner (eds) *Political discourse in early modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 120-38; A. Ryan, 'A more tolerant Hobbes?'. in S. Mendus, (ed.), *Justifying Toleration : conceptual and historical perspectives* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 37-59; R. Tuck, 'Hobbes and Locke on toleration' in M. G. Dietz, (ed.), *Thomas Hobbes and political theory* (Lawrence, KA,

1990), p. 153-71; G. Burgess, 'Thomas Hobbes : religious toleration or religious indifference'. in C.J. Nederman, J.C. Laursen, (eds) *Difference and dissent : theories of toleration in medieval and early modern Europe* (Lanham (MD), 1996), p. 139-61.

²³ G. de Krey 'Rethinking the Restoration : dissenting cases for conscience, 1667-1672'. *Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), p. 53-83; idem 'The first Restoration crisis: conscience and coercion in London, 1667-73.' *Albion*, 25 (1993), p. 565-80.

²⁴ See G. Burgess 'Thomas Hobbes: religious toleration or religious indifference' in C.J. Nederman, J.C. Laursen (eds) *Difference and Dissent* (1997) p. 139-161.

²⁵ See for example James Crawford, *Hereseo-machia; or the mischiefe which heresies does, and the means to prevent it* (1645) p. 2, 4-5, 6, 33, 47-48. For two powerful sermons preached before the House of Commons see T. Hodges *The growth and spread of heresie* (1647) p. 3-5., 26-27, 32, 41-42, 57, 59, and R. Vines *The authors, nature and Danger of Haeresie* (1647) p. 35-36, 45-47, 62-63, 66.

²⁶ See for example, S. D'Ewes *The primitive practice for preserving truth* (1645) p. 6, 9-11, 19, 20-31, 49-53.

²⁷ S. D'Ewes *The primitive practice for preserving truth* p. 54-56.

²⁸ A. Hughes 'The pulpit guarded: confrontations between orthodox and radicals in revolutionary England' in A. Laurence, W.R. Owens, S. Smith (eds) *John Bunyan and his England* (1990) p. 31-50.

²⁹ E. Bagshaw *The necessity and use of heresies* (1662) p. iv [up] p.i, ii, iii.

³⁰ See N. Malcolm *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford, 2003); see also Q. Skinner *Reason and rhetoric in the philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996); T. Sorrell, L. Foisneau (ed) *Leviathan after 350 years* (Oxford, 2004).

³¹ I am grateful to Paul Seaward for sharing the insights of his forthcoming Clarendon Press edition of *Behemoth*.

³² Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 135.

³³ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 135-138.

³⁴ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 139.

³⁵ Hobbes *Historical narration* p.139-140.

³⁶ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 143.

³⁷ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 148.

³⁸ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 151.

³⁹ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 153.

-
- ⁴⁰ Hobbes *Historical narration* p.154.
- ⁴¹ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 160.
- ⁴² Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 143.
- ⁴³ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 146-147.
- ⁴⁴ Hobbes *Historical narration* p. 139-140, 142-144.
- ⁴⁵ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 343-44; for a discussion of this passage see J. Marshall ‘The ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson and “Hobbism”’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985) p. 407-427, at p. 422; for further discussion see, J.A.I. Champion “‘Le culte prive est libre quand il est rendu dans le secret’: Hobbes, Locke et les limites de la tolerance, l’atheisme et l’heterodoxie’ in Y.C. Zarka, F. Lessay, J. Rogers (eds) *Les fondements philosophiques de la tolerance* PUF, Paris, 2002) p. 221-253, esp. p. 226-228.
- ⁴⁶ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 314.
- ⁴⁷ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 399-400.
- ⁴⁸ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 83.
- ⁴⁹ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 479-80. The same scriptural passage was the basis of E. Bagshaw *The necessity and use of heresies* (1662) p. iv [up] p.i, ii, iii.
- ⁵⁰ See G. Wright ‘1668 Appendix to Leviathan’ *Interpretation* 18 (1991) p. 323-413.
- ⁵¹ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 414, 198.
- ⁵² Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 249.
- ⁵³ Hobbes *Leviathan* p. 351, 399, 198.
- ⁵⁴ See M. A Goldie ‘The reception of Hobbes’ in J.H. Burns (ed) *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1994) p. 589-615.
- ⁵⁵ See John Spurr’s entry in the *New Dictionary of National Biography*. I am very grateful for seeing a pre-publication version.
- ⁵⁶ M.Hunter ‘The disquieted mind in casuistry and natural philosophy: Robert Boyle and Thomas Barlow’. (forthcoming).
- ⁵⁷ N. Tyacke (ed) *The history of the university of Oxford. IV Seventeenth century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997) ‘Religious Controversy’ p. 606, footnote 91.
- ⁵⁸ T. Barlow *Several miscellaneous and weighty cases of conscience learnedly and judiciously resolved* (1692) [cited below as *Cases of Conscience*] p. 65.
- ⁵⁹ See Queen’s MS 449 f. 118-126; further evidence of this exchange can be seen in Queen’s College MS 195 and 204. I am very grateful to the Librarian at Queen’s, Dr

Jonathan Bengston, for facilitating access to these papers. For the Anglesey circle see, M.A. Goldie 'Sir Peter Pett, sceptical Toryism and the Science of Toleration in the 1680s' *Studies in Church History: Persecution and Toleration* (Oxford, 1984) p. 247-273.

⁶⁰ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 1.

⁶¹ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 2-3.

⁶² Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 9-11.

⁶³ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 19-20.

⁶⁴ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 22, 24.

⁶⁵ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 31.

⁶⁶ See M. Simon 'From Greek haireisis to Christian heresy' in W.R. Schoedel, R. Wilken (eds) *Early Christian Literature and the Classical intellectual tradition* (Paris, 1979) p. 101-116.

⁶⁷ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 31-34.

⁶⁸ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 36-38.

⁶⁹ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 41-42.

⁷⁰ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 42 See *Luke 22. 50-51*.

⁷¹ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 44-50.

⁷² Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 52-55.

⁷³ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 65.

⁷⁴ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 68-77.

⁷⁵ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 65.

⁷⁶ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 79.

⁷⁷ Barlow 'Animadversions' f.80-93 see esp. f. 84.

⁷⁸ Barlow 'Animadversions' f. 88-92.

⁷⁹ H. Brougham *Reflections to a Late Book* (1694) p. 21.

⁸⁰ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p.4-6, 10.

⁸¹ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 38-39

⁸² Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 39-41.

⁸³ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 49-51. Citing *Matthew. 13. 38, 39*.

⁸⁴ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 44, 53.

⁸⁵ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 65-71.

⁸⁶ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 81

⁸⁷ See J.A.I. Champion “‘To know the edition’: erudition and polemic in eighteenth century clerical culture’ (forthcoming).

⁸⁸ Barlow *Case of Conscience* p. 86-89.

⁸⁹ T. Barlow *A discourse concerning the laws ecclesiastical and civil made against hereticks by popes, emperors and kings, provincial and general councils, approved by the church of Rome with a preface against persecuting and destroying hereticks by a cordial friend to the Protestant religion now by law established in these realms.* (1682) p. 6-13.

⁹⁰ Barlow *Discourse* p. 30-34, 38-39.

⁹¹ T. Barlow *The genuine remains of that learned prelate Dr. Thomas Barlow, late Lord Bishop of Lincoln containing divers discourses theological, philosophical, historical, &c., in letters to several persons of honour and quality : to which is added the resolution of many abstruse points published from Dr. Barlow's original papers* (1693) p. 642-643.

⁹² See J. Milton *Of true religion, Haeresie, Schism, Toleration* (1673) 3, 4-5, 6, 7-8, 10-12. For discussion see the contribution of XXXXXXXXXXXXX

⁹³ For some context see A. Patterson, M. Dzelzainis ‘Marvell and the Earl of Anglesey: a chapter in the history of reading’ *Historical Journal* 44 (2001) p. 703-726.

⁹⁴ A. Marvell *A short historical account* (1680) p. 5, 7, 8-9, 10, 12-16, 17, 19-21, 22, 23, 37.