Lancelot Addison and the Intolerant Religious Liberalism of Late Stuart England

William J. Bulman, Lehigh University

(Not for Citation or Circulation Without Permission)

This is part of a draft chapter for my current book project, which is tentatively entitled "Anglican Enlightenment: Culture and Religious Politics in England and its Empire, 1648-1714." The book attempts to challenge the currently-dominant liberal master narrative of late seventeenth-century English politics as a struggle between intellectually-progressive proponents of increased religious freedoms and intellectually-ossified opponents of those freedoms. It then goes on to develop an alternative account of late seventeenth-century political engagement built upon a conception of this period as in essence a post-revolutionary one, in which elite political engagement centered on a struggle among competing schemes for taking England out of an age of civil chaos made possible by the role of religious zeal in politics (in other words, competing schemes of Enlightenment, if we adopt a formulation similar to that of John Pocock). The book makes its revisionist and positive arguments by examining the pastoral and political outlook and activities of the most supposedly backward force in English politics during this period: the persecutors who led the Church of England. It shows that these divines were leading participants in early Enlightenment culture, and that religious persecution was far from central to their pastoral and political agenda.

This chapter, like the rest of the book, has a biographical spine. It considers the historical writing of a decidely second (or third) rate thinker and political actor, Lancelot Addison (father of the famous Joseph), who served as chaplain to England's first African colony, Tangier, and as dean of Lichfield. It highlights what is in many ways an ordinary example of the relativistic understanding of religious truth, order, and history that appears to have underpinned the authoritarian agenda of most the leadership of the Church of England between the English Revolution and the Glorious Revolution. It shows how the foundations of Anglican apologetics in this period were not patristic and scholastic commonplaces and theological systems, as other scholars (most notably Mark Goldie and John Marshall) have argued, but ideas drawn from the cutting edge of late humanist scholarship, and in particular, historical scholarship. From here the book goes on to show how these scholarly practices and conceptual tools underpinned Anglican ideology and pastoral work in the period, and it then illustrates how many of the major religio-political controversies of the period up to 1714 look fundamentally different once we properly understand the nature of Anglican political engagement in the period.

Lancelot Addison and the Intolerant Religious Liberalism of Late Stuart England

William J. Bulman, Lehigh University

(Not for Citation or Circulation Without Permission)

"The Deist view of the origin of religion was propagated by a wide variety of writers, many of them bitterly inimical to one another, ranging from the rambunctious pantheist John Toland through respectable Anglican cathedral deans with a penchant for rationality in religion."
—Frank Manuel, *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods* (1959)

One of the main characteristics of the early Enlightenment was the development of a relativistic, anthropological understanding of religion, and laudatory articulations of civil and natural religion.[1] This essential idea was developed not primarily in philosophical treatises, as is so often supposed by historians of both England and continental Europe, but within historical scholarship, and the religious polemics and missionary zeal that so often motivated and guided it. This body of writing ranged from biblical criticism to contemporary histories of politics and religion. Work on this front often took the form of shrouded historical parallels like Montesquieu's famous *Persian Letters*, which suggested that universalized ideas about the nature of religion ought to be applied to Christianity itself.[2]

Lancelot Addison's historical writing was part of this development. His earliest readers recognized not only his distance from the essentially medieval intellectual world with which

[1] The classic Enlightenment example is Hume 2007 (1757). New reflection on the pagan gods also dealt with the psychological origins of belief in them, and the idea of primitive mentalities. A psychological theory of the origins of religion is the basic idea of the *philosophes* for Frank Manuel, although he also notes how orthodox figures maintained very similar notions. Manuel 1959.

[2] Champion 1992; Champion 1996; Sheehan 2006a and 2006b (Sheehan was apparently unaware of Champion's much earlier articulation of a very similar thesis, something which makes clear the distance between these two historiographies). See also Harrison 1990 and Rubiés 2006b and 2007. Cf. Mulsow 2001 and Stroumsa 2001b. For broader versions of the thesis offered by Champion and Sheehan, see Buc 2001 and Asad 1993 (these works, however, use this history to critique modern social science).

scholars today would tend to associate him, but also his break from the Renaissance traditions in which he was actually reared. In July 1671, once his history of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Morocco, *West Barbary*, had been printed at the Sheldonian in Oxford, Addison was anxious to get the work into the hands of his main hope for preferment, the secretary of state, Joseph Williamson. At the Oxford Act, his printer, Leonard Lichfield, had seen the orientalist, astronomer, and mathematician, Edward Bernard, who agreed to present the work to Williamson. Bernard was himself supported by the secretary of state in his work, and in February 1669 he had accepted an offer to go to Tangier with Sir Hugh Cholmley, presumably to advise him on the construction of the fortifications there, and to conduct research.[3] Addison and Bernard also evidently knew one another, probably from Oxford in the 1650s. While he never made it to Tangier, Bernard would for numerous reasons have had a keen interest in Addison's work in the summer of 1671.[4]

Nevertheless, after having a loook at *West Barbary* before passing it on to Williamson, Bernard was unimpressed, even angry. He made this clear when he sent the work by post to Williamson in London. "I crave you to suppose Mr. Addison's remote abode hindered a more welcome service, or moderate presenting of his book," he complained. "The treatise makes amends for the deplorable illiterateness of peoples which never better deserved this name then now, yet the modest and reverend author had not given it this common light, if not more provoked by his gratitude to your self, than the bare truth, of his relations."[5] Bernard, on the lookout for preferment outside the university, might have taken particular offense at Addison's account of his discussion with the Moroccan secretary ʿAbd Allāh, in which Addison agreed

[3] Public Record Office 1856-1924: 1668-9, 16 February 1669, Bernard to Williamson, from Leiden.

[4] Throughout his entire career Bernard corresponded with English scholars serving as chaplains in the Ottoman Empire: see Bodleian MS Smith 45, *passim*.

[5] NA SP 29/291/124, Edward Bernard to Joseph Williamson, 4 July 1671.

with his Maghribi friend that scholarly zeal was often inimical to the interests of the state. "The city," Addison had concurred, "may be taken, while the mathematician is delineating the fortification."[6] This remark almost seemed meant for Bernard himself, since it would obviously apply to the mathematician's intentions to go to Tangier and assist Cholmley with the fortification of the port. Yet there was something more at work here: Bernard seemed genuinely offended by Addison's relativizing suggestion that literary achievement was not a reliable marker of virtue, civility, or wisdom. Indeed, at the beginning of *West Barbary*, Addison had actually counseled Williamson to recognize that the supposed distinction between barbarism and civility was useless and misleading for someone concerned with the prudent management of religion and politics.

Williamson seems to have felt differently about the work than Bernard did, and later congratulated Addison for his achievement.[7] As we have seen, the secretaries in Whitehall were enthusiastic about gathering political counsel from traveling historians like Addison. They seem to have been willing to accept the notion that political wisdom could be gleaned from the history of any polity or people, whatever their literary accomplishments. In fact, just three years before Williamson was presented with *West Barbary*, his superior, Lord Arlington, had been the dedicatee of Paul Rycaut's very similar work, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*. There Rycaut had made the same point about civility and barbarism.[8] When traveling historians like Addison and Rycaut used cutting-edge historical methods to counsel their contemporaries, their methods encouraged them to make some striking pronouncements about the relationship between religion and politics. These pronouncements were aimed at creating a society in which political order was secured, and political conflict—brought on by claims to religious truth—was rendered

[6] Addison 1671, "To the Reader."
[7] NA SP 29/292/156, Addison to Joseph Williamson, 29 August 1671.
[8] Rycaut 1668, Epistle Dedicatory. For an example from Madras, see Stern 2004, p. 309, n. 56.

impossible. They were classic, relativistic statements of an Enlightenment project. Yet these pronouncements were often authoritarian in their implications, and were widely shared by Addison's like-minded contemporaries within the Church of England, both clerical and lay.

Much like Michel de Montaigne, reading travel literature on the New World as France descended into an apparently barbaric civil chaos in the latter half of the sixteenth century, Addison was convinced after the English Revolution and his travels in the Maghrib that one of the basic *loci* of the Renaissance humanists' worldview, especially with regard to Muslims—the dichotomy between barbarism and civilization—did not exist.[9] Addison's views on barbarism and civility were predictable consequences of the culture of travel, historical writing, and counsel in which he was immersed. If universal history was to be used for counsel, it would imply, on some level, the relativization of all the qualities of prudent and virtuous political actors, including their religious beliefs. The myopic, derisive outlook of the ancients towards those who did share their customs had been occasionally criticized since the later sixteenth century.[10] Similarly, the religiosity and civility of a people were part of the standard inquiries urged in the *ars apodemica* of the same period. Any civilized nation, these works assumed, could learn from the most barbarous, in order to improve its public and private life.[11] Originally, such comments would have been interpreted in terms of European travel, but once these lessons were extended to Europe's new worlds in the East and West, notions like civility and religion were immediately relativized in profound ways. Addison's critique of the notion of civility was still firmly rooted in late humanism, and seemed to retain an Aristotelian definition of civility that had been popularized by Erasmus.[12] Yet, as Bernard realized, Addison was also self-consciously allying

---

[9] See Montaigne 1685 (1580), IV ("Of Cannibals").
[10] See the comments of François Baudouin in 1561, quoted in Grafton 2007, p. 117.
[11] Palmer 1606, pp. 60-62.
[12] See Johnson 2006, p. 598.

himself with the "Moderns" of his own time, and taking sides in one of the great ongoing scholarly and literary battles of the late seventeenth century. Traveling historians were eminently well-suited to contribute on this front, just like the adventurous chronologists and philosophers of the period.

To belittle the distinction between barbarism and civility in a study of an Islamic polity was to explode the basic means by which Islamic history had been understood in the Renaissance.[13] Addison was quite clear about his assault on humanists who were slaves to antiquity. "It was one of the pedantic vanities of the Grecians," he wrote in 1671, "to repute all barbarous but themselves." Addison offered instead a universal basis for historical analysis and counsel that left no room for a stark dichotomy between barbarous and civilized nations, but rather a sort of continuum. "There are some who have the same opinion of every thing that is diverse from the manners and customs of their own country," he acknowledged, referring his more traditional humanist contemporaries. "Yet those who acknowledge humanity in all its habits, may in perusing the remarks made upon these Barbarians meet with something that may civilize the title, and induce them to think, that what is commonly called barbarous, is but a different mode of civility."[14] Here, by using the term "Barbarians" for the men and women of the Maghrib, Addison was playing on the rhetorical value of making such a claim in a study of the population of Barbary. If the "Barbarians" were not barbarous, who was? Here he appealed to a universal science of man.

Addison made quite clear that this move meant that no ingredient for the peace of early modern states—even justice, virtue, and, most important here, *religion*—was peculiar to Christian monarchies. He explicitly framed this in terms of counsel, when he addressed his

---

[13] Meserve 2008; Bisaha 2004; and Hankins 1995.
[14] Addison 1671, Preface to the Reader. Cf. Descartes 1649 (1637), p. 26.

patron Williamson. "I know," he wrote to Williamson in *West Barbary*, "that little worthy a polite judgment can be gathered from a discourse of people famous only for being barbarous; yet if public affairs can spare you minutes enough to read over these remarks, you may perhaps in them meet with so much order, civility, and (according to their way) religion, as may somewhat refine the name."[15] Addison's basic rhetorical point was that the Muslim polity he had observed had, in many ways, more justice, virtue, and religion than England did. As he told his readers, "If I had any [design] in publishing this besides your divertisement, it was chiefly to make the justice and religiousness of a people esteemed barbarous, rude and savage, to reflect upon their enormities, who would be reckoned for the only *Illuminati* of both, and to shew that this unlicked, uncultivated people agree with the wisest nations, in making the care of religion and justice to suppress vice and encourage virtue, as the only method to make a state happy."[16] The "Barbarians," Addison insisted, were a source of enlightenment, and their history presented a challenge to the arrogant supposition of the English that they themselves were enlightened.[17]

There was also a striking, immediate consequence to Addison's search for enlightenment about virtue and religion in Moroccan history. In this scheme of political counsel, Christian revelation and providence simply had no significance. Of course, this did not mean that Addison came close to denying the reality or wider significance of Christian revelation. He simply sought to show that the wise management of churches and states did not require knowledge that was particular to the Christian tradition. He went out of his way to publicize this position. All peoples, he thought, were capable of instilling justice (i.e., all virtues) and religion in their

---

[15] Addison 1671, Dedication.

[16] Addison 1671, Preface to the Reader. For the basis of this sort of counsel in the *ars apodemica* see Lipsius 1592, sig. b5r.; Essex 1633, pp. 90-91; Descartes 1649 (1637), pp. 16, 45; and Turler 1575, p. 37.

[17] On the broader literary tradition of the "savage critic," see Pagden 1983.

populations, whether or not they accepted Christianity.[18] Addison believed that this was the case because at one point in time, these principles of justice had been revealed by God to all of mankind, and were to some extent still present in the nations of the modern world. The civility of a given country depended in large part on whether this revelation had been successfully preserved, communicated, and implemented, by means of education and zealous political management. Here Addison's early Enlightenment scheme, like so many others, re-negotiated the relationship between European and world cultures and their supposed Judaic origins, and de-stabilized the centrality of the Bible as a source for ancient history.[19]

Addison revealed the deep-historical background to his position on the relationship between Christianity and civilization in his 1674 treatise on the importance of catechizing, *The Primitive Institution*. Here, in setting out the earliest historical evidence for catechizing, Addison combined scraps of knowledge gleaned from a rabbi in Morocco with his reading of John Selden's scholarship on natural law, which had itself been taken from wide reading in patristic and (for the most part) Jewish sources. Selden's historicized discussion of the first human awareness of natural law was drawn from Tertullian and Maimonides (he also thought traces of this event were found in the Bible).[20] Much Like Selden, Addison realized that in this age of historical scholarship, "all other nations must have recourse to the Jewish records, to clear their genealogies, and attest their lineage." His view of the testimony of the Bible and the rabbinic literature used by Selden was extremely sanguine on this front. "To the Jews likewise," he affirmed, "we stand obliged for the original history of the creation, and that with indubitable

[18] Cf. Taylor 1660, p. 221; and Frantz 1968 (1934), Ch. 4.
[19] Cf. Sutcliffe 2003, p. 60.
[20] See Selden 1640, Bk. 1, Chs. 8-10, esp. pp. 99, 109-10, and 119. On Selden and natural law see Tuck 1979, Chs. 4-5, which should be read with the important correctives in Sommerville 1984; and Toomer 2009, Ch. 14. See also Rosenblatt 2006, Chs. 6-7, and the rather different analysis of Parkin 1999, pp. 60-66.

integrity they have delivered to us the infallible memoirs of all those passages which happened before and after the Deluge, of which the faint glimpses, retained by other nations, were wrapped up in stories so notoriously fabulous, that they were fitter to evidence the vanity of the pagan rhapsodies, than to confirm a truth of so great an importance."[21] Here Addison, much like his contemporary in the church, Edward Stillingfleet, worked to reinforce the centrality of the Bible as a credible historical text, while going beyond it to incorporate Jewish scholarly traditions.[22]

Addison followed Selden's discussion of natural law closely, but tweaked his argument in a radical direction in order to emphasize how indispensable catechizing was to any religion. "Religion began," Addison declared, "when God was Adam's catechist, and gave and instructed him in that law, in whose observation consisted the main articles of his continuing in a state of excellent felicity." God's oral command not to eat of the forbidden fruit logically subsumed the ten commands that were later given to Moses and then reduced to two heads by Jesus. More importantly, though, once Adam ate of the fruit, God instructed him in six moral precepts, which explicated this initial "primordial law." These precepts outlawed idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, and theft; and they commanded civil justice and obedience. Addison referred to these six commands as "precepts of natural right, common to the whole human race," "the common law of all nations under heaven," "a complete scheme of duties toward God and neighbor," and "the common religion of mankind." Like Selden and a larger rabbinic tradition he claimed that they made up a "natural law."[23] Thus for Addison there was no distinction, chronological or otherwise, between the original religious law, the law of nations, and the state of nature. God's

[21] Here he Addison clearly rejected the basic thrust of Isaac La Peyrère's notorious theory that there had been men before Adam, and its unambiguous notion of a society without religion, as nearly all scholars did. See Popkin 1987; Grafton 1991; Sheehan 2006a, pp. 54-5. Addison 1675, pp. 1-2, 4-5.

[22] See Stillingfleet 1662b.

[23] Addison 1674, pp. 14-24. This natural law was discussed (though usually only in terms of the seven precepts given to Noah) by a number of other authors before 1700. See [Stubbe?] 1911, pp. 13, 24, 25, 180; Rosenblatt 2005, pp. 9-10, and Chs. 6-7; Ziskind 1991, Introduction; Toomer 2009, Ch. 14.

response to the tendency of humans to moral error was a more detailed moral code, but this moral code also constituted a natural religion.

Addison insisted that Adam's descendants could not have preserved this law unless Adam had catechized his children, these children catechized their children, and so on.[24] Human rational faculties were not capable of deriving such laws, or recovering them from oblivion. Some traces of Adam's tradition of catechizing had in fact survived, and could be seen in his sons' "deportment, when they brought their offerings to God's altar as testimonies of gratitude and devotion." These basic sacrifices, Addison insisted, "could not be the effect of mere natural instinct, but of Adam's pious diligence to bring them up religiously. And though mere natural reason may teach man a belief and worship of God, yet to do it with the circumstances of the first two brethren, exceeds its power."[25] Religious worship could not take a specific form without continuous institutions of education.

What was true for worship, Addison argued, must be true for all six moral precepts. This resulted in a thoroughly materialistic conception of religious history. "That which most imports the present subject," he continued, "is the manner how the first six precepts were instructed: which without doubt was *viva voce*, or by an oral institution: for certainly of things unwritten, there can be no other means to instill and propagate their knowledge." Addison went out of his way to rebut an alternative explanation, preferred by Selden himself, who had appropriated a medieval notion that each rational soul was endowed with a faculty, the *intellectus agens*, through which the law could be continually revealed. Addison preferred the purely materialistic explanation that Selden had also adumbrated (and admitted was implied by the rabbinic texts he cited), and stated his preference in strong terms. "Notwithstanding that these precepts contained

[24] As usual, here Addison supplemented the work of learned antiquarians with his findings from travel. See Addison 1674, pp. 14-24.

[25] Addison 1674, pp. 15-16.

such an apparent equity and right, as could be by none denied, who therein had once been duly informed: yet there was a necessity of competent means to procure this information." He continued: "If the soul of man be at first as a book wherein nothing is, and yet every thing may be written; then either education or instruction, use or discipline must of necessity full up this blank. And the *rasa tabula* of man's soul, as it is most susceptive, so is it most concerned to be first engraven with those things which indispensably respect his duties toward God and his neighbor."[26] At bottom, human reason was passive. Men were only capable of evaluating the rationality of information provided to them from the outside world.

Here Addison offered an argument that was being developed at the very same time by John Locke. Locke would later make such an argument famous in his 1689 *Essay concerning human understanding*, where he too made his case with frequent recourse to travel writing.[27] For Addison, like Locke, it was meaningless to speak of natural religion, or even natural law, as something independent of, or antecedent to human history. He evidently considered this completely historical argument to be superior to the argument of Thomas Hobbes that there was a point in time where natural law was not binding. This, though, was not because he substituted another scholastic philosophical argument for Hobbes's, but because he offered an historical argument in its place. This argument was in a sense more radical than even the Maimonidean notion, which most scholars avoided, that idolatry was so easily acquired as a religious corruption that it dated to only 235 years after Adam's expulsion from paradise.[28] In Addison's scheme not only false worship but a total abandonment of the natural law was possible from the beginning of human history, and only averted by sound education. Yet Addison crucially

---

[26] Addison 1674, pp 26-8. Compare this and Addison's catechizing project as outline in Part 5, Ch. 2 with Hobbes 1994, pp. 219-233 (XXX), esp. p. 221 (XXX.6).

[27] Locke 1975 (1689), Bk. I, Chs. II-IV (pp. 48-103); and for the 1671 drafts of the *Essay*, Locke 1990. See also Russell 1994.

[28] Sheehan 2006a, p. 54.

retained the notion that true religion did manage to persist for some time. Addison's work was a very early example of the development of comparative religion within a fundamentally pious framework that scholars have tended to associate exclusively with the period after 1680.[29]

In this scheme, the history of true religion, and the history of happy states became above all not histories of revelation and divine right, but histories of good education. Before Abraham, Addison argued, mankind had a common religion, based purely on the six precepts given by God to Adam, which contained all that was necessary for salvation. This could be seen, he said, in the religion of Job, who was an Idumaean (neither a native Israelite nor a proselyte) but followed the six precepts, and used his observance of them to demonstrate his integrity.[30] Addison's perspective therefore fit with the work of chronologists contemporaneous with him, like John Marsham's *Canon Chronicus* of 1672, which retained the biblical regime of time while making possible the cultural superiority and distinctiveness of pre-Mosaic peoples.[31]

From the time of Noah, however, indifferent precepts and ceremonies were added to this base. Some nations failed in their duty to educate, and fell into idolatry, violating the first precept. Noah himself was given (according to Genesis 9.4) a precept "against eating the limb of a living creature." Its purpose was merely functional: it was meant to teach his people to avoid acting cruelly and sharing in the customs of idolatrous peoples. Addison therefore followed Selden and argued that this command was not a natural precept, but merely part of "Noah's ritual of ceremonies," despite its divine origin. This placed immense pressure on the idea, so central to much of post-Reformation Protestantism, that the divine origin of a command implied that it was

---

[29] See Sheehan 2006a; Stroumsa 2001; Assmann 1997, Ch. 3.

[30] Addison 1674, p. 22. Again Addison is working from Selden 1640, pp. 834-7. On this chapter in Selden see Rosenblatt 2006, pp. 155-7.

[31] Sutcliffe 2003, p. 63. Rossi 1984 shows that many classic Enlightenment problems on this front were broached before the 1680s and 1690s, and makes clear the diversity of the formulations, the many ideological uses to which they might be put.

an essential part of the economy of salvation. Job had recognized the indifferent and nationally-specific nature of the seventh precept too, and therefore paid no heed to it. Similarly, later, the moment when God gave Abraham the sacrament of circumcision was for Addison merely the moment when Abraham's people first took on "an exterior badge of distinction." This eighth oral precept was the true beginning of "the great distinction of nations in respect of worship," but was far less important than the universal characteristics of true religion. Later, to further distinguish his people, Moses simply added three more precepts. "God at Mara gave them a statute and an ordinance; and by spaces filled up their ritual."[32] As we will see, these arguments could form the basis for a post-revolutionary, enlightened form of Laudianism. As in Laudian discussions of the importance of the sacraments, here the purpose of rituals was distinction; the truth of their specific contents was much less important than their function. In a sense, what Addison and his contemporaries did in this period was to radically extend the Reformation notion of *adiaphora*, or things indifferent, applying it to nearly all of the Christian tradition, but also a number of pre-Christian traditions.[33]

While Addison made no mention of arguments about the Egyptian origins of Jewish civilization that had been recently broached by his contemporaries, which he evidently believed were based on uncertain pagan traditions, he certainly emphasized the insignificance of the Mosaic law. The Hebrews continued to receive revelation, but from Noah's time onward, that which was revealed was not essential to leading a moral life. Addison was so concerned with this basic core of moral religion that he joined Selden, and many later so-called "freethinkers," in claiming that Christianity was little more than a reformed Judaism. "A large share of both Christian rites and doctrines were derived from Judaism, which was not to be laid desolate by

[32] Addison 1674, pp. 25-6.
[33] See also Sheehan 2006a.

Christianity, but completed and reformed. The primitive Christianity being (according to Mr. Selden) the lawful and prophetic offspring of the old Judaism."[34]

Addison also insisted that after religious diversity appeared in the world, all religions continued to display common characteristics. This was Addison's "natural religion"—those elements of particular religious traditions that were the result of men prudentially applying their reason to further refine and expand religious practice. This process, he suggested, paralleled that of the development of civil institutions. Here again the basis of his discussions of religion in history and counsel was clear. "All religions in their first model and constitution," he wrote in 1671, using the same language employed in his discussion of the Moroccan polity, "have had some less intelligible articles and things of a remoter signification, mingled with their easier doctrines, and more obvious institutions." The basic elements of all religions had the same features. "There has ever been found a catholic agreement," he argued, "not only in the main article of the Deity, but also in some solemn manner of his worship." These propositional features of all religions matched two of the five "common notions" espoused by Deist versions of natural religion, beginning with the work of Lord Herbert of Cherbury before the Civil Wars. But from here on Addison's account of natural religion set out the practical consequences of these two notions. "Upon which consideration," he continued, "there were ritual circumstances established, for the more decent celebration of religious ministers." The impulse here was simply decency, but the consequences were profoundly important. "In the number of which ritual circumstances, I esteem a dedicate place, separate time, solemn actions, prescript forms, and above all a distinct order of persons, by whom the exterior religion is to be officiated, and to whom for the power and sacredness of their function there have even been decreed convenient

[34] Addison 1674, p. 38. See also pp. 197-8, and (for the slightly later and more extensive analysis of Richard Simon) Stroumsa 2001b.

observances and revenues."[35] Religious ritual and the priesthood, Addison showed, were direct consequences of the first natural law given by God to Adam, which concerned the solemn worship of God.

Addison here used the historical record to substantiate strict uniformity in religious worship within Christian churches. But most importantly, he distinguished himself from similar, but radically anti-clerical versions of natural religion, by insisting that priests had always "officiated" over the ritual circumstances of religion. In his 1677 treatise, *A Modest Plea for the Clergy*, he substantiated this with a history of the clergy in antiquity. The institution of a clergy, he concluded from the historical record—both ancient and contemporary—was "so universally observed by all nations moderately civilized, that it may seem to be founded in the law of nature, and to have had none other but God for its author."[36] Addison did all this, then, without directly approaching the issue of whether Christian rituals, or the Christian clergy, were divinely appointed, though he obviously believed that history suggested this was the case. His historically-grounded arguments about barbarism and civility came full circle here, in rhetorical and substantive terms. "Not to render due regard unto those who are known to be true ministers of Christian religion," he wrote, "is either to think them less worthy then the pagans thought the ministers of their idolatrous ceremonies; or to show our selves less civil, than the greatest barbarians."[37] This was nothing less than Enlightenment ritualism and clericalism.

Addison made very clear how his argument was meant to confute sophisticated impugners of the Anglican clergy, by arguing on their own terms. In 1677, Addison directly

---

[35] Addison 1671, pp. 132-133; see also the formulations in Addison 1677, pp. 6 and 18.

[36] Addison 1677, p. 18.

[37] Addison 1674, pp. 33-34. Cf. Taylor 1651, pp. 3-4. For Addison's other borrowings from Taylor see Addison 1677, p. 23, and Taylor 1651, p. 5. For the royal commissioning of *Clerus domini*, see Taylor 1653. For other discussions of the use of travel literature in discussions of natural religion, see Frantz 1968 (1934), Ch. 3.

addressed the classic Enlightenment thesis that the history of religion was a history of imposture. The antiquity of the clerical order was unquestionable, Addison declared, and anyone who doubted this was "a mere skeptic wrangler, unworthy of confutation." Yet the history of the very first institution of a clerical order was murky at best, and the conditions of this institution were virtually unknown. This made the thesis of imposture, the basic aspect of "the unhappy genius of the age wherein we live," a difficult position to dismiss. "It is our hard lot," Addison wrote, "to fall into those perilous times wherein not only some inferiour points, but the whole frame of religion is ready to be brought in question, and to be thought not more than a mere engine of government." Addison directly referred to what at this time was a murky, underground movement of scholars who espoused this thesis. "I hope it will not be deemed mere melancholy to imagine," he continued, "that there is a race of men who will not be coy and squeamish to make the calling of the clergy, as well as the belief of a God, to be wholly grounded upon some blind tradition, set on foot by some crafty politick, who by the doctrine of obedience and submission, daily inculcated by this order of men, might be the better able to awe a fully sheepish world, and to render it more tractable to his purposes." Addison pointed out, though, that the theorists of imposture—at this time—had no more historical evidence to support their position than he had to support his.[38]

As we have seen, Addison had already grounded his account of the erection of a priesthood in an historical account of natural law. He repeated this defense in some more detail in *A modest plea for the clergy*. The universals of religion were founded on natural law, since they were rational deductions from the first of the six Adamic precepts. This precept was also evident in the shared customs of all nations (*consensus gentium*). Nearly everyone in history,

[38] Addison 1677, pp. 12-14.

Addison noted, believed that there existed a God whom men were to please and honor.[39] Atheists were not brought to their position via reason. The nations of the world also concurred in thinking that religion was to be expressed in solemn worship. This entailed for them that worship be publicly celebrated "in appointed places, at set times, in prescript forms, and by select persons."[40] Addison was more explicit later on about how this too was an historical view of natural law: "ever since the creation a deity, religion, and priesthood, do as mutually infer each other, as the most natural relations." These practices continued in history, he argued, by three means: rational deduction; blind tradition; and rational emulation of other nations. Addison therefore accepted that religion might continue, in part, as a "blind tradition." But this was not imposture if that tradition had been originally grounded in a rational account of religion and the necessity of the clerical order. "If the politician," Addison wrote, "did move men to receive the blind tradition of the clergy merely upon the account of the reasonableness of the thing it self, then is this ground enough both to acknowledge and respect the function." Here Addison was taking head-on what would become the thesis of that famous Enlightenment tract, the *Traité des trois imposteurs*. He abandoned the insistence of many pious authors in the Machiavellian tradition that sincerity in religion or in the erection of a priesthood was more effective than feigning.[41]

Yet to directly confront a proponent of the imposture thesis who based his argument on Hobbesian premises, Addison could not rely on his historical, Maimonidean account of natural law, which flatly contradicted Hobbes's account by showing that the six Adamic precepts were

[39] The fact that some early Enlightenment writers like Pierre Bayle made much of travel writing that described modern communities of atheists would have been rather unimpressive to authors like Addison, since Addison did not assume that it was inevitable that all men had such basic knowledge of God.

[40] Note that because direct historical evidence of the existence of clergy in primordial religion was lacking, Addison was reserved in his claim that the need to erect a clergy was a divine command or an aspect of natural law.

[41] Addison 1677, pp. 15-18, 24. See Kahn 1994, pp. 74-5.

in place from the time of the Fall. Addison therefore offered another sort of historical account of the necessity of a priesthood that was rooted in a Hobbesian account of natural right and natural law.[42] This was a conjectural history, a type of writing which historians usually assume was first practiced in the eighteenth century. Addison called it a "rational account" of "the antiquity of the clergy."[43] Addison seemed to think, like Hobbes, that "a custom or law, though it cannot be elder, yet it may safely be supposed to be as old as its chief motive and reason."[44] This allowed him to specify a limited social role for the clergy that was not supported by any claim whatsoever about its divine institution. "Not to meddle at present with the divine appointment of certain men for the administration and defense of religion," he wrote, "we will conceive upon what ground men herein, left unto their own reason, might be induced to erect a clergy, or to constitute an order of men to appoint and perform the public solemnities of religion, and to direct and determine in emergent cases."[45] Addison set out to show how a clerical order would have been erected in the state of nature.

For Hobbes, in a state of nature men were bound only by the law of self-preservation, and not the so-called "natural laws of good and evil"[46] that most contemporaries argued would also operate in such a state. Addison set his scenario for the erection of a priesthood in just such a world, in which men remained free to enjoy their natural right to perfect liberty. "If the politician moved men by reason to believe him, we must needs grant the reasons to have been wonderfully clear and weighty that could persuade the whole world to come off from their old opinion, and so far to part with their liberty, as to set over them an order of men, whom they

---

[42] On Hobbes's reception in this period more generally, see Mintz 1962, Goldie 1991c, Malcolm 2002, and Parkin 2007.

[43] Addison 1677, p. 12. On the eighteenth-century "conjectural histories," see Phillips 2000, Ch. 7.

[44] Addison 1674, p. 200.

[45] Addison 1677, pp. 18-19.

[46] See Tenison 1670, p. 135.

knew from the design and tenour of their function, would fill their minds with fear and awe, and put a curb upon their carnal wills, restrain their darling lusts, bound their worldly interests, obstruct the stream of their natural inclinations, and at once abridge them of all their wonted licenses." In this world, men followed no moral laws, and they erected a priesthood in order to be bound to good behavior. Yet there was a crucial difference here from Hobbes's account. For Hobbes, the erection of a sovereign and a priesthood were one in the same thing. Addison was therefore using Hobbes's account of the erection of a commonwealth, but implicitly referring to a moment in which both a priesthood and a sovereign were erected. By doing so, though, Addison was forced to depart from a purely Hobbesian account of natural law, and to revert somewhat to a more traditional position. Men would have been persuaded to erect a priesthood, he argued, because of their awareness of the need to worship God. "We may imagine," he wrote, "that the first motive thereunto was a mature deliberation of the natural importance and design of religion itself; which was clearly seen to bind men to a solemn and regular worship of the Deity." In this account, men parted with their natural liberty not because they were naturally sociable, but because they were naturally inclined to value religion.

After apparently re-inserting the first two Adamic precepts back into his account in this way, Addison merely drew out their immediate rational consequences. "Now this worship (they saw) could neither be regular nor solemn, if there were not select persons to make it so; for things cease to be both, when they become common; and they must needs become common, when vulgarly mixt and transacted with profane, that is, common utensils. And what is not the least considerable, those things are in great likelihood to be done at all or with no just decorum, which are left arbitrary for any one to do."[47] Here Addison was explicitly making a modern

[47] Addison 1677, pp. 19-20.

separation between sacred and profane, and presenting it as a basic condition in the erection of human societies. Again, though, the account returned to men's irregular nature. Addison even combined this with the Hobbesian elements of the natural state that other natural law theorists had also recognized. Yet expressed this state as the fallen state, as many French Augustinians did at the time:

> But that which we may presume to have been most moving in this concern, was the consideration of the common nature of mankind; which being far gone in corruptions, is utterly unfit for, and unprovided of that sanctity which is required in religious addresses: upon which consideration it was deem'd not only safe and agreeable, but also necessary for this fallen condition of men, that out of themselves some persons should be chosen, and by holy ceremonies set apart, and as it were placed in middle station between God and the people, on purpose to present God with the people's petitions, and to bring down his blessings upon them.[48]

Predictably, the argument then flowed into secular analogies to the state, and to the arts and professions:

> If it be for the credit and advancement of all profitable arts and professions to be provided of such professors, officers and masters as may propagate, instruct, and execute the same, then the like must be granted to religion, or else we must think it to be of less worth and moment than secular professions, and that less is required to make a man religious, than a pinmaker, and to give him a competent knowledge of the things of God, than of making of a horse-shoe … Nor doth it amount to any valuable objection, that the common right and interest, which every one hath in religion, is sufficient to entitle them to the publick officiating the solemn rites thereof; for by the same reason every one might gird on the sword of justice, and become a public minister of the laws, on pretence of the common interest which he hath therein: the consequences of which hypothesis are so absurd and monstrous, that they carry with them their own confutation.[49]

Addison was defending the established church as a civil religion. While he clearly retained a

---

[48] Ibid., pp. 21-23.
[49] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

more explicitly sacerdotal position on the priesthood, he made clear that the defense of the clerical order need not rest on such a foundation, and that its existence and current operation could be defended on radically Erastian premises.

Another means of developing this anthropological understanding of religion in the period was to construct a universal history of religious imposture, priestly intrigue, and religious error, which made no reference to divine or diabolical agency. Of all the universal methods of revolutionary politics, Addison was most concerned with what many of his contemporaries called "priestcraft": the universal tendency of religious leaders to use the power they wielded over ordinary people in pursuit of their own gain, to the detriment of both good governance and true religion. Priestcraft was a central historical theme in the early English Enlightenment.[50] Addison's understanding of religious imposture, corruption, and manipulation, like that of his contemporaries, was a product of both his humanist education and the wider world of post-Reformation religious politics. In England, post-Reformation religious polemic was dominated by two historically-oriented discourses of religious corruption: anti-popery and anti-puritanism.[51] Attacks on popery and puritanism, and related discussions of "popularity" and universal monarchy, were some of the primary sites for the proliferation of Machiavellian rhetoric in seventeenth-century England.[52] The process by which the languages of popery and puritanism were universalized to become the rhetoric of priestcraft was also part of a much wider European

[50] Previous discussions of the discourse of priestcraft have considered it mostly as a universalized version of anti-popery, and a discourse wielded only by Whigs. See Goldie 1993a and Champion 1992 and 2003. See also Klein 1994, Ch. 8, and Goldie 1987. For criticisms of mistaking this partisan picture for the whole see Spurr 1991; Spurr 2000, pp. 234-5 and p. 329, note 79; Spurr 1988a; and Spurr 1988b.

[51] For anti-popery see *inter alios* Clifton 1973; Lake 1980 and 1989; Milton 1995; Miller 1973; Pincus 1992 and 1995; and on anti-puritanism, Tyacke 1987; Lake 1988; Cust 1992; Collinson 1995; Lake 2006; and Milton 2007.

[52] See Kahn 1994, Part 2.

phenomenon. All over the continent, developments in the historiography of religion were driven by religious conflict, missionary activism, and imperial expansion. Early modern historians, Catholic and Protestant alike, identified idolatry, superstition, and many other forms of religious corruption not only among other Christians, but also in the pagan religions of both the ancient world and the new worlds of Asia, Africa, and America. Eventually, at the end of the seventeenth century, a number of European scholars eschewed a primarily theological or demonological interpretation of idolatry and religious corruption, and re-fashioned the classical notion of superstition into a sociological account of religion.[53] Constant remarks upon the conformities among pagan, Jewish, Muslim, and Christian religious corruption, both implicit and explicit, led to the universal, materialistic theories of religious imposture characteristic of the Enlightenment.[54] The radical's choice to explicitly level such a critique on all of Christianity was at this point in the story just that—a mere preference, mostly devoid of intellectual innovation, if not devoid of courage.

Anti-popery, in particular, had a wide sphere of application from almost the beginning of the post-Reformation period. Use of this language was hardly confined to puritan attacks on Catholicism and its remnants in England. Conformist divines under Elizabeth I and James I consistently described the tactics of puritans and presbyterians as popish, melding anti-popery with anti-puritanism. By the beginning of James's reign, practitioners of anti-popery were also offering extensive comparisons between popery and paganism.[55] The eagerness of English Protestants to identify pagano-papism demonstrates well how anti-popery and similar Reformation polemical weapons were ultimately rooted in the wider humanistic education upon

---

[53] See the long-term trajectory traced in Rubiés 2006b (and also Sheehan 2006b). See also Harrison 1990.

[54] Manuel 1959, pp. 15-23; Hazard 1953 (1935), Ch. 1. See also Frantz 1968 (1934), pp. 81-99.

[55] See, e.g., Ormerod 1605 and 1606. For the early intersection of these polemical resources see, e.g., Milton 1995; Lake 1988; and Lake 1989.

which all educated controversialists drew. By the time of the Restoration, both puritans and papists had been frequently compared to both Muslims and Jews.[56] This was evident even in some more scholarly publications. In the 1657 English version of Johann Buxtorf's *Jewish synagogue*, for instance, an editor added this note to Buxtorf's explanation of Talmudic discussions of the afterlife: "Surely the Papists had their purgatory from hence." The editor went on to intervene at a number of other points, alleging that other Catholic traditions were derived from the Talmud, and that certain Jewish practices were in turn best understood as "papistical."[57] Not until after the Restoration, though, were these comparisons were worked out in detail, and stripped of the theological and demonological principles that were usually used to explain religious corruption.

Protestant scholars' accounts of ancient and modern Judaism tended to be structured less by anti-puritanism than by anti-popery.[58] This was part of what made Protestant Hebraism distinctive. This scholarship included traditional Catholic concerns about Judaism as a non-biblical, anti-Christian religion, concerns which dated at least to the emergence of medieval Hebraism in the thirteenth century. Yet work by Protestants eventually abandoned the usual obsession with ritual murder, took less interest in doctrine, and became focused on the details of Jewish religious customs and textual traditions. By the mid-seventeenth century, the English, as well as other Protestants, were keen to frame their analyses in the language of anti-popery.[59]

Addison's 1675 study of the Jews of the northwest Maghrib was saturated with the language and concerns of anti-popery. He used anti-popery to help him explain why Jews remained immune to Christian evangelical efforts, and to offer a new scheme for converting

---

[56] Sanders 2003; McDowell 2005.

[57] Buxtorf 1657, pp. 15, 218, 234, *passim*.

[58] For a similar story in studies of ancient Judaism, see Stroumsa 2001 and Sheehan 2006a.

[59] For another early Enlightenment example from the continent (the work of Jacques Basnage), see Elukin 1992.

them to Christianity. The Jews, Addison claimed, had received directly from God the first religion of the world, but had perversely transformed it into a mass of human traditions and superstitious rites. "For many years," Addison sneered, "the Jews have been the most vile adulterers of that religion which was delivered them in greatest purity." Addison had hoped to find in Morocco practitioners of the "pure" Jewish religion. The Jews of the modern world, it seemed, had abandoned the religion God gave them for a concoction of rabbinic traditions. "However they may pretend the present Judaism, or that sort of religion and worship they now profess, to be contained in the law and prophets; yet to those who duly consider the ingredients thereof, it will appear to be patched up of the traditions of the masters, and the opinions of old philosophers; which are indeed so artificially interwoven with Scripture, that this last to an unwary surveyor may still seem to be predominant." What Addison meant to expose was nothing less than a vast system of Jewish scholasticism, which needed to be reformed just as medieval Christianity had been. The main obstacle to this, of course, was the tyranny and trickery of the rabbis. "There is small hope, as things now stand," he wrote, "to have it reformed: for the Bible, the rule of all reformation, though it be not denied the people's reading, yet the giving the sense thereof belongs only to the masters, in whose interpretation the text, the vulgar upon pain of excommunication are bound to acquiesce." Addison was well-versed in the tactics of rabbinic mind-control, he claimed, because he had befriended the rabbis themselves, who let him in on the secrets of their Machiavellian priestcraft. "This was told me," he revealed, "as an *arcanum Judaismi* by rabbi Aaron Ben Netas, a person not unlearned in their law."[60]

The rabbis relied upon the Talmud in disputation like Catholics clung to the judgments of late fathers and medieval councils. "The Talmud," he wrote, "is oftener brought in vindication

---

[60] Addison 1675, pp. 4, 11-12, 14. On similar interest in Samaritans and Karaites among other students of Judaism in the period see Stroumsa 2001b and Sheffield RO, Hartlib MS 1/33/33B.

of their religion, than Moses, the prophets, and holy writings: insomuch that they make it, and not the Old Bible, the touchstone of their doctrine." Addison was sure that the claim that the Mishna was in fact given by God to Moses but only preserved orally until the end of the second century after the birth of Jesus was merely a priestly, anti-Christian scheme. "As to the reason why God would not suffer it to be written," Addison wrote, "it was the profound mysteriousness of its nature (say the masters), which to have communicated it by writing to the vulgar people, would have been no better than to give holy things unto dogs, and to cast pearls before swine." This was merely a variant on the medieval church's distaste for vernacular bibles. Addison found it curious that none of the church fathers before Augustine had even mentioned the Mishna, despite their knowledge of Judaism. The Talmud was in essence nothing more than a means by which the rabbis defended themselves against Christians and controlled the minds of their followers. It contained hundreds of passages "which if taken literally, the Jews confess, would look like the most idle and romantic tales that ever filled a legend. And therefore they assign them a secret and reserved interpretation, which, say they, fall not under the comprehension of vulgar and ordinary capacities."[61] Addison included within the work a short history of rabbinic learning from antiquity to the present, in order to document how the Jews had found themselves trapped in a complex web of priestcraft.

The basics of rabbinic religion, Addison reported, were transmitted to young Jews by a rigorous system of catechizing only rivaled among the world's religions by the zeal of Jesuits and other Catholic orders. "The care of the Jews is very laudable in this particular," he observed, "there being not many people in the world more watchful to have their children early tinctured with religion than the present Hebrews … The main design of their early instruction is especially

[61] Addison 1675, pp. 240, 241, and 245.

spent in imprinting religion upon the tender minds of their children." The rigor of their childhood education was such that "there is no youth under heaven [who] can at thirteen years old give so exact an account of the rites of their religion as the Jewish." This educational system, like the learned texts from which it was gleaned, was forged in part as an antidote to Christianity. It was, Addison wrote, "part of their first institution, to imbibe a malicious prejudice against Christianity. And the better to manage this ill seasoning, there is not a passage of the Old Bible any way relating to the proof of the Messiah's being already come, but it is so perverted by the glosses of the rabbis, that the common people are not able to arrive at its genuine intent and meaning." These glosses were supplemented by a number of well-crafted summaries of Jewish doctrine that Addison referred to as catechisms. "And the better to facilitate the people's understanding of their religion," he wrote, "and to prevent the dangers that may accrue by leaving them to the hazardous toil of collecting their principles out of Moses and the masters, they are provided with two systems or abridgements thereof." One was the 613 precepts, and the other was Maimonides's list of thirteen principles, the *Ikkarim*. Addison was particularly impressed by Maimonides's work. "That they might imbibe a more implacable hatred against the Christian faith, the crafty rabbi so composed (for he is thought to be the author thereof) the Jews' creed, that it might one way or other wholly confront the Christians." These priestly inventions, Addison related, were taught to be an "immemorial tradition." They were "the sum of the present Judaism" yet at the same time "not so much a system of Judaism, as a cunning a malicious contradiction of Christianity." The system worked. If all else failed, ordinary Jews, in the face of sound arguments against their religion, merely ran to their rabbi. "The common sort of Jews are bound to acquiesce in the judgment of their rabbis, to whom they make their last appeal, when pressed with arguments too difficult for their own solution." The creation and

dissemination of such priestly traditions, Addison believed, was a universal characteristic of popular religions. To make this point clear, he turned to a classical reference point favored by conformists and freethinkers alike: Cicero's *De natura deorum*. "For not only Cotta in Cicero," he wrote, "but most men of any parts or education, have thought themselves under no small obligation to keep close to the traditions of their fathers; although no rational evidence could be produced for the matter of the tradition. *Unum mihi satis est majores nostros ita tradidisse* (which was Cotta's) is the ultimate resolution of the Jews' religion."[62]

For Addison, this system of religious education was primarily significant not for its theological content, but as a source of power. "The Jewish masters take an especial care, to see the youth be so profoundly instructed in the elements of their religion, that it may be no easy task to efface the characters of their first catechism, or to pull down the fortress of education." Priestly manipulation rendered Judaism secure. "However their private judgments may dispose them," he concluded, "they are careful to preserve an outward unanimity in their religion; and are signally vigilant to avoid divisions, as looking upon those among Christian professors, to be an argument against the truth of the things they profess." Addison often expressed frustration about how the Jews refused to defend their religion according to the dictates of humanist dialectic. "Though the Jews are sufficiently taught to evade all those Scriptures which relate to the truth and establishment of Christianity, yet they are not forward to enter into disputes concerning them. And if it so happen that they are forced thereunto, they will not be confined to the laws of disputation, but usually confront text with text, and never directly answer the objection, but set up another against it."[63] It was a mistake, Addison thought, to seek to convert the Jews with the idea that they defended their religion as a reasonable one, and could therefore

[62] Ibid., pp. 80-82, 86, 225-228; Cicero 1998, III.9. Cf. Champion 1992, Ch. 6.
[63] Addison 1675, pp. 12, 14-15, 227-8.

be converted through logical discourse.

Addison had encountered a strong instance of this enforcement of priestly tradition among Jews in Morocco, and described Moroccan Judaism in part as a system of popery. Like other early Enlightenment students of priestly manipulation, the Tangier chaplain was less interested in comparing theological extravagancies than in locating religious corruption in practice and social relationships. Similarities among the theological errors in different religions were important for Addison only because they revealed how certain doctrines had appealed to priests in many religions as a useful means of dominating and misleading ordinary people. This explains why Addison generally avoided discussions of Jewish doctrines, but considered their beliefs on salvation worth special attention. The Jews, he claimed, were essentially Pelagians. To demonstrate this, he reported another discussion with a Moroccan rabbi. "He would," Addison recalled, "have none to pay his debts, nor any but himself to satisfy divine justice for his sins: that he did not expect the felicity of the next world upon the account of any merits but his own: that he was certain whosoever lived and piously kept the law, could not miss of being happy." Addison's concern was not with doctrinal error itself, but the conditions and utility of its creation and dissemination, as he made clear in a comment on the Jews' "purgatory." "Neither would it avail our present purpose," he explained, "to compare the Jewish with the papal purgatory; which how much soever they may differ in other circumstances, do sufficiently harmonize in vain and groundless extravagancies."[64] Addison's attention was keenly focused on how Jews had been led away from the primitive truths of the Old Testament by priestly guile and invention.

From cradle to grave, Addison claimed, the Jews practiced a host of superstitious,

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 15-25, 33-36.

enthusiastic rites that had been invented by the rabbis. While the Sephardim were rightly horrified at the idolatry of Catholics, their own religion was in large part magical and carnal, and therefore equally irrational. "The rabbis," Addison explained with the derision of a late seventeenth-century post-skeptical historian, "who too much play the poets with all their rites, have not forborn even those of childbirth: but have devised several fabulous stories and impertinent rites concerning it." This particular "conjuration" was meant "to fortify the chamber appointed for the teeming woman against all hags and goblins." The Jews' "sacrament" of circumcision was no less inundated with "mystical" practices. Addison sensed sartorial popery in the t*zitzit*, or fringes on the corners of the *tallit* or prayer shawl. "To this religious utensil," he claimed, "no fewer miracles are ascribed than to the cowl of St. Francis: for the Jews say it can deliver from sin, and make proselytes to their faith: and that it is an amulet against sorceries, and preserves those from receiving any hurt from evil angels who constantly put it on." The *tefillin* or phylacteries were of course biblically sanctioned, but had long ago become the victims of priestly perversion. The modern Jews maintained the *tefillin* as a central part of their religion by erroneously interpreting a series of passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy. "The superstition of this ornament," in its current usage, was obvious. "The first, plain and wholesome intent thereof," he wrote, "has in course of time been much corrupted, chiefly by the schismatical pharisees, who instead of binding them for a sign upon their hands, and as frontlets between their eyes, hung them as charms about their necks, supposing in them a secret power to defend them from dangers." This, Addison alleged, had inspired a parallel Catholic practice. "And at this day," he added, "the papists permit the wearing about their necks the beginning of St. John's gospel, as a defensative from evil."[65]

---

[65] Ibid., pp. 55-64, 100-104. On Addison's sense of the Jews' attitudes towards Catholic religiosity,

Practices like the current use of the *tefillin*, in Judaism as in Catholicism, resulted in a spiritually hollow, mechanical religion, just as other early Enlightenment figures described ancient and modern paganism. "This carnal people," he wrote, "which have ever been apt to turn all inward piety into outward form, and to make that matter of ambition and ostentation, which was designed for humility and holiness, understand the precept concerning the philacteries merely according to the letter." Addison tried to be precise about his critique. "What is principally blameable therein," he explained, "is their affixing on God their own carnal observation and frivolous ceremonies of these *tefillin*, as if they were his own institution and appointment." The rites of preparation for the sabbath were similarly "all bodily and external, and not worth our recital, if it were not to let us see into what follies a people may fall in religion, when they have once renounced the truth." The Jewish celebration of the sabbath, he claimed, was similarly flawed:

> Notwithstanding that their offices for the Sabbath contain excellent things, according to their way of worship, yet they have therein many things apparently trivial and ridiculous. Of which we may give an example in their praying over the lamps, wine, and spices which are brought into the synagogue. Where the wine being consecrated, it is carried home, that therewith they may sprinkle their houses, to preserve them from witchcraft and sorcerous incantations … It cannot be denied that albeit the sabbath offices of the Jews are taken for the greater part out of Scripture, but that they entertain a very carnal sense thereof, and that the whole rest tends more to gratify the body than serve God.

Addison's distaste for the carnal and magical nature of Jewish religious customs was implicit throughout the work. "If upon every occasion," he wrote, "I should have set down the miracles wherewith their most ridiculous and improbable rites are attested, I might have made this

---

see pp. 235-8.

discourse voluminous to no purpose."[66]

Addison even went so far as to claim that the Jews' popish familiarity with the nature of superstition made it easy for them to pass unnoticed among Catholics in continental Europe. "Coming within the cognizance and power of the papal inquisition," he explained, many Jews "can join themselves to a crucifix and rosary, as well as to the *tzitzit* and *tefillin*." He ended this discussion by offering an even wilder claim. "Some," he wrote, "have ventured to affirm that there want not Jews among the very judges of the inquisition; which may be one reason why of late so few are convicted of Judaism by that dreadful tribunal."[67] Jews were so popish, and superstition so universal in its nature, that the cleverest among them could perfectly impersonate and infiltrate the religious and authoritative world of the Roman church.

Despite their popish religiosity, the Jews could never mirror for Addison the political face of popery, and most importantly for Addison, the performative machinations of puritanism. These phenomena were most evident in the history of Islam, both ancient and modern. Addison described the Jews' "present condition under the Moresco government" as "no other than a better sort of slavery," implicitly judging their Muslim masters' style of rule. The popish Jews in the Maghrib were tyrannized by yet another form of popery.[68]

Addison expounded upon this view of the Muslims of contemporary Morocco, as well as those of late antiquity, in *West Barbary* and *The first state of Mahumedism*.[69] Similar arguments

---

[66] Ibid., pp. 103-4, 119, 126-7, 192.
[67] Ibid., pp. 30-32. Addison cited a number of specific examples on pp. 31-2.
[68] Ibid., p. 7, and more generally, Ch. 1.
[69] Pre-modern European "views" or "images" of Islam and the Ottoman Empire are like their modern equivalents the subject of a large but often unfocused and de-contextualized literature. See e.g. Daniel

can be found in a variety of works from this period that described the Ottoman Empire.[70] Addison believed that like Jews, Muslims practiced a religion that despite all its aversion to idolatry, was in many ways popish. Like the Roman church, Islam was a subtle mixture of truth and falsehood. In describing this Addison made a rare use of theological language, which he mostly eliminated from his historical work. "There are many such pious doctrines in the Qurʾān," he wrote in a discussion of Islamic almsgiving, "but they are but as so many good ears of corn in a good field of tares, or as so many single grains lost in a heap of chaff: it having been the subtilty of the old serpent in all ages, to guild over his poisonous pills, and to blend truth with falsehood, that the latter might be embraced for the sake of the former."[71] Any truth in Islam was due to its plagiaristic origins.[72] Like Jews and Catholics, Muḥammad had grafted his own inventions and those of priestly impostors from the past onto a pure monotheism and claimed that the entire concoction was divine revelation.

While Addison was aware of the importance of *ḥadīth* in Islam, he did not criticize it in the same way he did the Mishna, because he assumed that unlike Judaism, Islam, even in its founding text, was a religion of human invention.[73] Instead, he focused on Muslim religiosity. In general, in fact, he stood in awe of the Moroccans' piety, while also criticizing it at length. He described both piety and its opposite, superstition, in relativistic terms, and saw much of Muslim superstition through the lens of popery. Maghribi Muslims, for instance, indulged in mindless magical beliefs. The "superstitiosi" among them, for instance, attributed absurd significance to washing rituals, a belief partly rooted in scripture, since "all the *musalmim* of the Qurʾān use

1993, Beck 1987, Chew 1937, Schwoebel 1967, Hourani 1991, Southern 1962, Tolan 2002, Thomson 1987, Çirakman 2002, and works by Matar cited before.

[70] See [orientalism article].

[71] Addison 1671, pp. 143-44.

[72] Addison 1678, p. 84.

[73] Ibid., pp. 53-8 and 84. Addison refers to it as the "Suné" (i.e., *sunnah*).

washing in a mystic signification of internal purity." Addison reserved much of his criticism for the sufi leaders who figured so prominently in his political history. His description of their religious and political activities featured a complex mixture of anti-popery and anti-puritanism. The private prayers of the Moroccans were priestly concoctions. "There are few who are able to read, that want manuals of private devotions, which are composed by the *morabitos*, or marabūts, and are indeed rather to be termed charms, than prayers." The marabūts, he explained, combined popish superstition with the performative antics of puritans. They were

> a sort of Arabs which are skilled, or pretend to be, in the law of Muḥammad, severe in their conversation, bearing a great ostentation of sanctity, pretending to prophesy, or predictions. They compose all sorts of charms, to which the Moor is so addicted, that he has one for every occasion: I have seen a book thereof, containing some for the child-bearing women, to facilitate their travel; some for the passenger, to guide him in the way; some for the soldier; and one for the horse, which is much in the service of the saddle: this they hang under the beast's neck, and believe that it keeps him from being blind, or dimsighted.

These sufi-inspired superstitions covered every aspect of daily life. "They have likewise spells to keep their cattle healthy, and make them fruitful, all composed by the marabūts or priests; the latter, of late, being given much to this sort of composures." Addison also saw Islam as a carnal religion, and made this clear, for instance, in part of his description of Ramadan. Like Jews, Muslims had gotten fasting all wrong. "They place a great sanctity in this fast, which yet to a scrupulist, scarce would seem to deserve that name, for the day is usually passed away in a loitering sleepiness, and the night in a junketing: the one is at best a drowsy Lent, and the other a luxurious Carnival." This was true to the spirit of the Qurʾān. "Such was the carnal temper of their Prophet, that he thought it an impossibility to live a whole day continent."[74]

---

[74] Addison 1671, pp. 93, 148, 161-3, and 211-12.

Addison also described the work of puritanism and popery in Islamic politics. Here he continued his own contribution to the Machiavellian tradition. Like Machiavelli, Saavedra Fajardo had stressed the centrality of religion to both rebellion and the legitimate acquisition and maintenance of political power and civil order. There was no more common cause of rebellion, he noted, than the failure of religious unity. As a result, Saavedra Fajardo was a devoted student of the role of religious imposture in the erection and destruction of states. He only differed from Machiavelli by insisting, as many authors in this tradition did, that true religion was even more politically effective than false or disingenuous piety.[75] Addison's overwhelming preoccupation with this theme was most potently seen in the first pages of *West Barbary*, in his adaptation of the account of the rise of the Saʿdī dynasty in Giovanni Botero's *Relationi universali*. "Near the time the Marīn family[76] approaching its designed period and determination," Addison wrote, "it fortuned that a certain *al-faqīh*, or Moorish priest, in the province of Dara, began to grow into great reputation with the people, by reason of his high pretensions to piety and fervent zeal for their law, illustrated by a stubborn rigidity of conversation and outward sanctity of life." Addison twisted Botero's account in order to weave Malikite legal expertise and sufi religiosity into a Moroccan version of puritanism.[77] "His first name was Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad; but pretending to be descended from their Prophet, he caused himself to be called *sharīf*: a title which the kindred of that impostor have appropriated to themselves, and made the character of that whole family. The credit of his pretended pedigree, was another engine wherewith he insinuated himself into the people's likening, which together with his seeming severity, made him of no vulgar esteem with a generation, who from time to time have been fooled with such

---

[75] Saavedra Fajardo 1700 (1640), Vol. I, Emblems 24-5 (pp. 178-186) and 27 (pp. 195-201); Vol II, p. 86.

[76] i.e., the Marinids.

[77] For Addison's awareness of the Malikī school, see Addison 1678, pp. 55-56.

mountebanks in religion."[78]

Knowing that religion was best "fit to advance him on the estimation of the many," Aḥmad decided to send his three sons on pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, to secure the basis for the long-term stability of his fledgling empire. "Much was the reverence and reputation of holiness, which they thereby acquired among the superstitious people, who could hardly be kept from kissing their garments, and adoring them as saints." Aḥmad's sons were masters of puritan and Jesuit priestly performance. "His admired sons failed not in their parts, but acted as much devotion, as high contemplative looks, deep sighes, tragical gestures, and other passionate interjections of holiness could express; 'Allāh, Allāh' was their doleful note, their sustenance the people's alms." According to Addison, Aḥmad then deployed his sons to hatch revolution in all the major principalities of Morocco, in a clear allusion to the British dynamic of the Civil War. Two sons were sent to the court of Fez, where "the too credulous king" made "the elder [son] president of the famous College Amadorac, and the younger, tutor of his own sons." Priestcraft, Addison suggested, was above all rooted in pretensions to a learned sort of holiness. Aḥmad himself, Addison remarked, was reported to have been a learned astrologer.[79]

Aḥmad's son then took their puritan politics to another level, and offered to lead an army from Fez against the Catholic Christians who occupied numerous outposts on the northern coast of Morocco. To make his point even clearer, at this point Addison included a dissenting voice, the brother of the king of Fez, Nasr, who advised against the proposed military campaign. The king's brother, he wrote, "resisted the petition, warning the King not to arm this name of sanctity, which being once victorious, might grow insolent, and forgetful of duty in minding a kingdome. He told him likewise that war makes men aweless, and that through popularity, many

[78] Addison 1671, pp. 1-3.
[79] Addison 1671, pp. 3-4.

became ambitious and studious of innovation." The sons of Aḥmad, Addison warned through Nasr, "took up arms, not out of love to their country and zeal for their religion, but out of a desire to rule." Despite the advice, these young men's "armed hypocrisy" proceeded apace. "Puffed up with their successes they forgot their obedience." Before long, they had poisoned the king of northern Morocco while on campaign, and returned to secure the kingdom of Fez from the king who had given them the military power they now wielded against him. Soon the sharīfs controlled the kingdoms of Fez and Morocco.[80]

The political ambitions of such "saints" were also the basic content of Addison's original meditations on the revolutions of the seventeenth century, after the collapse of the Saʿdī dynasty, which, as we have seen, occurred as a result of the revolution of Laella and Kirūm in 1655. The new contenders for power in northern Morocco at this point—the *mujāhid* al-ʿAyāshī, Abū Bakr, and the *sharīf* Aḥmad "Bocálla"[81]—were, Addison related, "all great saints." Addison was again picking up on phenomena—in particular, Moroccan sufism, legal expertise, and sharīfian ideology—that played a hugely important role in the region's political history, and making it intelligible to western students of priestly politics. Speaking of al-ʿAyāshī and Abū Bakr, Addison explained that "their outward sanctimony equaled them in the people's affection and esteem." Al-ʿAyāshī, in particular, "had the learning of a *ṭālib*, and the sanctity of a *marabūt*, by which he was esteemed as an oracle among his countrymen, who upon all emergent occasions repaired unto him for advice and instruction; which they received as infallible, and obeyed as a law." Abū Bakr headed a *zāwīya* or sufi house. He ended their rivalry by arranging the

[80] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[81] Fuller names of these two were Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Mālikī al-ʿAyāshī, and Muḥammad al-Ḥajj ibn Abū Bakr al-Dilaʾī. The third contender mentioned may have been Bū Hassūn (see Cour 1904, p. 173).

assassination of al-ʿAyāshī, again by pretending to meet with him in order to arrange a truce.[82] As Abū Bakr assumed control of the region, he took care to bring the young sons of the local leaders he murdered or oppressed to live at his *zāwīya*, "not," Addison wrote, "as hostages of peace, but a pledges of his care, whom being as yet in their nonage, he loved to print with the characters of a peaceful acquiescence in his authority." Like Addison and his model historian Saavedra Fajardo, Abū Bakr knew that one's early education was crucial to the formation of future political behavior, and the substitution of passion for acquired virtue. He did this, Addison explained, because he knew "that the vindictive spirit of a Moor would take the first occasion of avenging."[83] This was particularly true, Fajardo had noted, in climates like Morocco's, which were apt to produce great and noble spirits.[84]

Eventually, though, Abū Bakr faced the wrath of one of his most able pupils, Ghaylān, who remembered the wrongs done to his father and his father's friend, al-ʿAyāshī. Ghaylān's time at the *zāwīya* was cut short when he married a woman from his home town. As a result, he was re-educated in revenge. As a leader, Ghaylān was gifted with "his plausible fortune and personage, zeal for their law, and reservation of carriage." In this he followed a family tradition: his father too took political advantage of his learning. "His greatest renown," Addison wrote, "sprang from his zeal for the Mahumetan law, an artifice which seldom fails, and a knack with which whosoever is gifted, cannot want reverence among the Moors." Ghaylān bolstered his authority, though, by marrying the daughter of a sufi saint from Tiṭwān, and positioning himself as the leader of a *jihād* against the Spanish and Portuguese. "He first showed the Moors how their Prophet, both by his example and doctrine, had taught them to exercise their revenge

[82] Addison 1671, pp. 22-7.
[83] Addison 1671, pp. 30-31.
[84] Addison 1674, p. 162, quoting Saavedra 1700 (1640), Vol. I, p. 5. See also Vol. II, p. 121.

against all oppressors of his law; and that whoever should die in its defense or propagation, were assured of paradise." This call to religious revenge was strikingly attractive. "This proposal was strangely moving with people of all capacities, and the report of Ghaylān's intentions against the Christians, induced many to be his followers, who otherwise would have eschewed his company."[85] The continued success of his enterprises only increased his religious presence. "It being the genius of this people," Addison explained, "to make the prosperity of the action, and undoubted argument of its justice, and the voice of Heaven to approve it."[86] Ghaylān, like many before him, had fabricated the combination of religious zeal and selective providential interpretation that aided military conquest.[87] This provided the sort of unity that Saavedra had argued was superior to the sowing of discord among the people.[88]

Addison also claimed that the rise of Muḥammad exemplified the link between the superstitious nature of Islam and its other more obviously political characteristics. Muḥammad, he claimed, was "the only great impostor that every continued so long prosperous in the world." Muslims foolishly believed, Addison wrote, that seven miracles occurred at his birth. Yet, he reckoned, no Protestant reader would be surprised to see such a tradition, such "palpable trash." "It need not create our wonder," he wrote, "that the Mahumedan doctors be thus large in the encomiums of their apostle, when as strange things are attested of St. Francis, by the friars of his order; and also the Dominicans, in praise of their founder." Muḥammad also claimed to have performed numerous miracles during his ministry, in order to prove himself to Jews and Christians who attributed miracles to the founders of their religions.[89] Rycaut noted, in turn, that a number of religious orders in the Ottoman Empire attributed miracles to the founders of their

[85] Addison 1671, pp. 30-37.
[86] Ibid., p. 43.
[87] Cf. Saavedra Fajardo 1700 (1640), Vol. I, Emblem 26.
[88] Saavedra Fajardo 1700 (1640), Vol. II, Emblem 89. See also Vol II, Emblems 73 and 90.
[89] Addison 1678, Epistle Dedicatory, and pp. 12-15, 122-5. See also Osborne 1656, p. 4.

specific traditions as well.[90] Muḥammad, Addison wrote, had invented a religion that was also well-equipped to indulge the carnal appetites of himself and his proselytes. "He denied himself in no instance of lewdness, but that he entitled God to a special approbation thereof, and made it a divine testimony of the truth of his apostleship." For instance, "whenever Muḥammad had a mind to a new bedfellow," Addison wrote, "the angel Gabriel brought him a revelation for so doing." Muḥammad's care for carnal indulgence earned him a powerful following among the people, "to whom nothing was more acceptable, than to have the indulgence of their vile affections to be made an article of their religion, and a piece of their worship." He marshaled their cleverly-solicited support to pursue his imperial designs. Such a superstitious religion was especially popular with the pagans of Arabia. "The more to endear these his new proselytes, (measuring theirs by his own libidinous humor) he indulged them all manner of carnal and filthy enjoyments; which, I doubt not, was a winning concession to that rude and blockish people, and a fit engine to insinuate his religion into their imbrutished minds."[91] Muḥammad drew pagans to his religion because he practiced priestcraft better than the pagan priests did. Here Addison showed yet again how there were both formal and causal links between the different types of priestcraft that had emerged in world history. In Addison's view, Muḥammad saw religion primarily as an agent of universal dominion. Here the universalization of post-Civil War notions of popery became complete: priestly imposture, Addison claimed, was the engine of universal monarchy, and both were best exemplified in the Islamic empires of the Mediterranean, and in the life of Muḥammad. "Under the pretense of religion," Addison wrote, "he designed an empire; and he was a prophet in show, but a tyrant in project."[92]

The depiction of rabbis, imams, sufis, and lay religious leaders as agents of religious

---

[90] Rycaut 1668, pp. 142-145.
[91] Addison 1678, pp. 27-30, 119-121. See also Rycaut 1668, p. 104; and Osborne 1656, p. 4.
[92] Addison 1678, p. 63.

corruption and universal dominion had a particular utility for writers confronting Whiggish critiques of priestcraft. None of these men, after all, were actually priests, strictly speaking, and Addison was aware of this. He defined a priest simply as a member of a distinct order of men who administered the exterior aspects of a religion.[93] This definition, coupled with his critique of laymen's ability to assume and manipulate sanctity, enabled him to employ a notion of popery, priestcraft, and religious authority that was even more universal and relativized than that used by radical, Erastian critics of sacerdotal power. For figures like Addison, a dogmatically Erastian solution to the problems of Restoration religious politics was obviously insufficient. Priests and laymen, dervishes and sultans, bishops and kings, were *all* capable, alone or in concert, of employing popery, superstition, and enthusiasm to further their political ends and make a mockery of religion.

After the English Revolution, discourses like popery and universal monarchy, not to mention idolatry, were employed in such a general manner that they needed not apply to either Catholics or monarchies.[94] By going beyond the European context of English discussions of anti-popery, anti-puritanism, and priestcraft, one sees clear evidence that in this period, these post-Reformation strands of historical narrative and argument became truly universalized. To many contemporaries there was nothing inherently Christian—or even sacerdotal—about popery, puritanism, and priestcraft, and there was nothing inherently European about universal monarchy. Contemporaries of all political persuasions shared a deep concern about the various forms of priestcraft that surrounded them, but they vehemently disagreed about who the most dangerous practitioners of it were. In this sense, religion, and even, to some degree, religious zeal, remained central elements of English politics. The emergence of "civil" (if not secular)

[93] Addison 1671, pp. 132-165; Addison 1677.
[94] Pincus 1995, esp. Ch. 16; and Pincus 1992.

notions of popery, puritanism, and universal monarchy in this period was encouraged by the way in which the legacy of the English Revolution, the religious struggles of the Restoration, and continuous denunciations of "enthusiasm" and priestly imposture on all sides, brought many English closer and closer to open advocations of civil religion.