

the basic footwear as a challenge to the perceived worldliness of their colleagues. Urban's main contribution to resolving the problem was to impose an ineffective *silentium* on the two groups, leaving his successors to deal with the hostilities. He was more active, as chapter eight shows, in responding to those that tried to use black magic against him. Rietbergen provides a fascinating review of the case of Count Giacinto Centini, executed for conspiring to murder the pope through necromancy. As sole heir of one of the *papabili*, Centini hoped to become Cardinal-*padrone* himself after his uncle filled the ensuing vacancy. While the relevance of all this to Barberini cultural policy seems a bit stretched, the plot emphasizes the manner in which Urban's lengthy pontificate frustrated the ambitions of families that were waiting for their turn to take over the papacy.

There is a good book here trying to get out. Although the lengthy Epilogue attempts to demonstrate the implications that such diverse material has for our understanding of Barberini cultural policy, repeating much of the contents of the individual chapters in the process, some ruthless editing would have greatly improved the continuity of the overall text. A particular distraction for the reader looking at the study as a whole, apart from a surprising number of typographical errors, is the extent to which relevant historical figures like Galileo Galilei and the Calabrian heretic-monk Tommaso Campanella are introduced and reintroduced over a series of chapters. However, given the breadth of Rietbergen's primary research and the new perspectives opened up by his approach to cultural history, there is no question that *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome* will be of interest to a wide variety of scholars working in seventeenth-century studies.

John Marshall. *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. viii + 767 pp. + 6 illus. \$110.00. Review by CHRISTOPHER N. FRITSCH, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

With professional roots in the examination of early Pennsylvania, John Locke and toleration has often been a strong interest. William Penn's connection to both Locke and the topic of toleration are intriguing to say the least. For the author, John Marshall, both of these men and numerous others debated and wrote about the application, limits, and merits of toleration in a

period designated as the early Enlightenment. In the years between the Restoration and the Wars of Succession, the authors on all sides of the question of toleration found themselves influenced, in part, by the religious, intellectual, and political ideas and events of the ancient, medieval, and Reformation worlds. They were not, as Marshall shows, men with only a contemporary mindset, but rather men who engaged in the critical examination of the past and an ever-developing interest in the variety of academic study and discourse within the present.

For example, Locke and his tolerationist associates were as adept at formulating anti-intolerance arguments based upon the writings of Augustine, the actions of the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, and the most recent activities of the French monarchy in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. For these men, toleration—the question of it—or the lack of it, involved an understanding of the foundations of Christianity, the early debates by Church synods on creeds, and the actions of contemporary governments, both Roman Catholic and “magisterial” Protestant in their efforts to undo or limit Reformation thought. Their diverse backgrounds of experiences and perceptions of the past and present, combined with an intellectual breadth of curiosity and thought that went beyond politics and religion to the developing sciences of physics and chemistry, forged the early Enlightenment which was international in its development, perception, and influence. They came from England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, and for a number of years lived together in, what was for many, the most tolerant environment in Europe, the United Provinces.

In order to provide a cohesive and thoughtful examination of this broad range of early Enlightenment authors and their ideas, Marshall has taken the challenge to explore all facets of toleration and its antithesis. The book, therefore, is broken into three parts. Part one focuses upon the contemporary issue of intolerance as practiced by both Roman Catholics and Protestants in late seventeenth-century Europe. Part two is a thorough examination of the intellectual foundations of intolerance from both the Roman Catholic and Protestant perspectives. The final section of the book, perhaps the most interesting, concentrates upon the early Enlightenment defense of toleration and the creation of an intellectual world collectively perceived by its participants as the “Republic of Letters.”

Part one specifically examines intolerance by both Catholics and Protes-

tants. Marshall explores these attitudes and actions in England, Ireland, and the Netherlands, and within this geographical structure, he shows the types and levels of intolerance by Catholics against Protestants, such as the increasing intolerance from French Catholics toward their Protestant countrymen. However, he also provides insight into the intolerance of Protestant communities in England, the Netherlands and the exiled French Huguenot toward, not only Roman Catholics, but also toward perceived Socinian and Arminian Protestant believers. What is perhaps most interesting about his examination of Catholic/Protestant intolerance is the trans-Channel impact which certain events had. The forced re-Catholicization and expulsion of French Huguenots from their homes presented a seemingly clear picture of a Catholic monarch's perspective on upholding former laws which protected Protestant worship. For English Protestants, the Revocation and the subsequent treatment of the Huguenots showed all too clearly what might happen in the near future under an openly Catholic Stuart monarchy. With an understanding of the events in France, one can begin to see the impact that the Revocation had on events, such as, the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis and how they, in turn, impacted events across the Channel and the broad political and intellectual world in which Locke's essays on toleration were developed.

With a broad understanding of the political, religious, and social events and how they impacted each other across a broad stretch of geography, part two of the book takes us on a journey backwards in order to understand how intolerance was justified by Catholics and "magisterial" Protestants. As we might come to expect, Catholics and Protestants saw each other as heretics and schismatics. For political and religious leaders of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though, the designation of people as heretics and schismatics encompassed much more than theological perspective. Heretics and schismatics were also associated with sedition and treason within a political framework and pestilence, poison, sodomy, and libertinism within a cultural one. Ultimately, there were those groups, such as Anabaptists and Quakers, who incurred the wrath of both sides—Roman Catholic and "magisterial" Protestant. By the Restoration, Catholics and Protestant hoped to gain or maintain political power in order to curb what they considered to be Christian heresy and societal malevolence, as they called for the destruction of residents outside the religious norm. There were those, such as Pieter de la Court, who questioned the use of political power in this way, if only for the

sack of the national economy and decreasing the threat from nations interested in protecting coreligionists.

Part three returns us to John Locke and his circle of friends and associates. In many ways they were fellow critics of intolerance but they seemingly became friends and colleagues, who debated with each other, critiqued each other's writings, reviewed each other's works and helped each other to find employment by recommending them to other friends and associates. They became a group of scholars beyond the issue of toleration as they began publishing their own journals, which became forums for the critique of Catholic and Protestant thought and the presentation of recent scholarly inquiry of the latest writings on history, philosophy, and science in the hopes of finding "truth" and presenting truthfulness. Locke and his associates looked to move the rhetoric beyond its contemporary level of heresy and schism to focus the debate upon a new set of criteria that looked to end superstition, ignorance, and barbarism. In this shift from the question of toleration for Christian heretics and schismatics, Jews, and Moslems to an intolerance of superstition, ignorance, and barbarism, one finds Marshall's *Enlightenment* has all of the trademarks of the traditional view of the Enlightenment. Marshall's story, however, shows that not all of Locke's friends and associates were always tolerant and enlightened. Criticisms, arguments and fears about the tendencies of certain members within the group ended some relationships, while others experienced some of the strongest friendship ties these men would encounter.

Here lies one of the strengths of Marshall's work. His early Enlightenment is much more than scientific discovery and philosophic inquiry. Marshall brings Locke and his colleagues to us in recognizable form—the lunchtime colloquium or the office discussion over books and interpretation—a collegial environment. This does not question the value of the main thrust of this work—his discussion of tolerance and intolerance. Marshall brings to us an in-depth reading and comprehension of the issues as they date back to Augustine and he masterfully provides us with the contemporary use of this knowledge by Locke and his co-tolerationists. If there is anything that might be thought of as a criticism, it would perhaps be the call for a bit of editing to reduce certain phrases and explanations, but even here, within a work this large and vast, they are more often a helpful aid in keeping the reader on course throughout his exploration of the political and religious debates of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, than they are an encumbrance.