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Leibniz is not commonly numbered amongst canonical writers on toleration. One obvious reason is that, unlike Locke, he wrote no treatise specifically devoted to that doctrine. Another is the enormous amount of energy which he famously devoted to ecclesiastical reunification. Promoting the reunification of Christian churches is an objective quite different from promoting the toleration of different religious faiths – so different, in fact, that they are sometimes even construed as mutually exclusive. Ecclesiastical reunification aims to find agreement at least on the most important doctrines. Religious toleration involves accepting and respecting disagreement even on the most important doctrines. If one regards these two projects as alternative rather than complementary strategies for dealing with religious diversity, Leibniz might more readily be characterised as an ecumenist rather than a tolerationist.[[2]](#endnote-2) Such appears to be the conclusion, at any rate, implicit in the balance of critical literature on these topics: whereas a steady stream of studies has discussed Leibniz’s project of ecclesiastical reunification, only a meager trickle has been devoted to his views on toleration;[[3]](#endnote-3) and some of these studies go so far as to conclude that Leibniz had no doctrine of toleration at all.[[4]](#endnote-4)

This chapter will attempt to show, on the contrary, that a robust, many-layered, and unusually inclusive doctrine of toleration can be gleaned from Leibniz’s writings. The fragmentary, occasional nature, and relative paucity of passages expressing his views on toleration – although far less immediately impressive than the mass of texts specifically devoted to the project of ecclesiastical reunification – is by no means an indication of the lack of importance of religious toleration in Leibniz’s general outlook. It is not in fact unusual for significant Leibnizian doctrines to be buried in his general correspondence or in occasional writings tackling a vast array of disparate issues; and as Leibniz scholars have become aware of this fact, they have needed to become increasingly adept at teasing out statements on particular issues from a multiplicity of diverse texts and then carefully comparing and contrasting them to work out the consistent though often complex doctrines underlying them. Applying such an approach to Leibniz’s scattered statements on the topic of this chapter allows us to reach at least four fresh and significant conclusions.

First and most generally, it can be documented that Leibniz had, in fact, a doctrine of toleration and frequently employed and developed it in writings on a wide range of subjects throughout his long intellectual life. A second conclusion is the discovery that this doctrine operated at least at three different levels: philosophical, theological, and pragmatic. As this implies, thirdly, the doctrine of religious toleration, rather than being in collision with Leibniz’s core project of ecclesiastical reunification, was an essential element of that very project: it should be seen, in other words, not as a competing goal, but as a necessary first step toward ecclesiastical reunification. Yet at the same time it will also emerge, fourthly, that Leibniz’s doctrine of toleration was no mere function of this intra-Christian project of reunification: rather it was a still more fundamental principle which extended beyond the ecumenical project as well. It had the resources, in other words, for accepting and respecting irreducible religious diversity and disagreement on points of importance not only between Christian communities, but also between Christians and non-Christians, including, in principle, even the atheists. These points should emerge from a discussion of statements on the philosophical, theological, and pragmatic justifications of religious toleration scattered throughout Leibniz’s sprawling corpus of writings.

I

Leibniz’s doctrine of toleration rests on a range of philosophical premises. From an epistemological point of view, Leibniz shares with Locke the thesis that to change beliefs or opinions is not within the power of the will, but only within the power of the intellect. This is apparent, for instance, in his epistolary exchange of 1690-1691 with Paul Pellisson-Fontanier, a French Huguenot who had converted to Catholicism. In a *memoire* addressed to Pellisson in response to the French thinker’s *Reflexions sur les différends de la religion* (Paris 1686) Leibniz writes: ‘Opinions are not voluntary, and are not dismissed at will; this is why (absolutely speaking) they are not subject to orders’.[[5]](#endnote-5) The same position was already presented in a letter of 11 January 1684 to another convert from Calvinism to Catholicism, Leibniz’s trusted friend Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels, who repeatedly tried to convince him to embrace the Catholic faith. Writing to Landgraf Ernst, Leibniz maintains that ‘opinion is not something which depends on the Empire of the will and which can be changed as one pleases.’[[6]](#endnote-6) In turn, in a letter to Marie de Brinon of 23 October 1693 he repeats: ‘opinions [les sentimens] are not arbitrary, it is not up to us to adopt them.’[[7]](#endnote-7) Likewise, in his *Remarques sur un petit livre traduit de l’Anglois, intitulé Lettre sur l’enthousiasme* written around 1711 in response to Shaftesbury’s *Letter concerning enthusiasm* (London 1708), we read: ‘one does not have a belief at will, but acts as one wills; it is not the lack of belief which deserves properly to be punished, but malice and obstinacy’.[[8]](#endnote-8)

If belief is intellectual in origin rather than voluntary, it follows that nobody should be condemned or punished for believing (or not believing) any particular doctrine, since to do otherwise is not within the power of their will. It is true that belief can be obliquely influenced by the will, as Leibniz admits in the *Nouveaux Essais*: ‘what we believe is never just what we want to believe but rather what we see as most likely … nevertheless we can bring it about indirectly that we believe what we want to believe. We can do this by turning our attention away from a disagreeable object so as to apply ourselves to something else which we find pleasing; so that by thinking further about the reasons for the side which we favour, we end up by believing it to be most likely.’[[9]](#endnote-9) But this is, precisely, an *indirect* intervention of the will by which we focus our attention on the *reasons* in favour of a belief so that we are, eventually, convinced by them. The only way to bring a person to change opinion therefore ultimately remains persuasion based on reasons regarding the falsity (or truth) of the doctrine in question.[[10]](#endnote-10) As an example Leibniz uses the most consequential clash between religion and science of his time: the condemnation by the Roman church of the Copernican system:

to believe or not to believe is not a voluntary thing. If I believe I see a manifest error, all the authority of the world could not change my view if this [authority] is not accompanied by some reasons capable of satisfying my difficulties or of overcoming them. And if the whole Church were to condemn the doctrine of the movement of the Earth, the able astronomers of this opinion [ce sentiment] could certainly dissimulate, but it would not be in their power to give up [their view].[[11]](#endnote-11)

The only rule of faith is therefore to believe that for which reasons have been given: ‘In order to believe, faith must be presented in a credible way: otherwise there is no obligation to believe’.[[12]](#endnote-12) Belief – any belief – must be based on reasons, as Leibniz writes in 1690 commenting on Pellisson’s *Reflexions sur les différends de la religion*: ‘it is obvious that nothing can be believed if one does not think that one has some proof or ground for it. Therefore it must be acknowledged that we all have need of some examination, otherwise religion would be arbitrary’.[[13]](#endnote-13)

However, as this response to Pellisson continues, the reasons required for (any) belief can be of two different kinds. They can be either ‘explicable’ or ‘inexplicable’:

the *reasons* of our persuasion are of two kinds, those of one kind are explicable; those of the other kind are inexplicable. Those which I call *explicable* can be proposed to other people by distinct reasoning; but *inexplicable reasons* consist only in our conscience or perception, and in an experience of an interior feeling into which others cannot enter, if one does not find a way to make them feel the same things in the same manner. For instance, it is not always possible to tell others what one finds pleasing or disgusting in a person, in a painting, in a sonnet, in a ragout; for this reason it is said that tastes should not be disputed. It is for the same reason that one could not make a person born blind comprehend what colour is. Now, those who say that they find in themselves a *divine internal light*, or a ray [of light] which makes them feel some truth, base themselves on some inexplicable reasons. And I see that not only the Protestants but also the Roman Catholic use this *ray* [*of light*]: since -- in addition to the *motives of belief* *or of credibility* (as they call them), that is to say, in addition to the explicable reasons of our Faith, which are nothing else than a collection of arguments of different degrees of force, and which even taken all together can only ground a *human faith* -- they demand a light of grace from heaven capable of producing a full conviction, and which forms what is called *divine Faith*[.][[14]](#endnote-14)

Explicable reasons can provide the basis merely of human faith. This kind of reasons is nevertheless extremely important precisely because they can be ‘explained’, that is, they can be communicated to other people, providing a sort of objective common ground on which rational beings can meet and discuss. Examples of explicable reasons might therefore be the defence against the charge of contradiction; the historical and philological verification of the authenticity of Scripture and of the authenticity of testimony; and the ‘explanation’ of the mysteries ‘so much as is necessary to believe them,’ that is, by providing at least an ‘analogical understanding’ of the meaning of the mysteries since (according to Leibniz) one cannot consider as true ‘words entirely devoid of meaning’ or ‘sounds without meaning (*sine m[[15]](#endnote-15)ente soni*).’[[16]](#endnote-16) In other words, explicable reasons are those normally called by Leibniz the ‘motives of credibility’ which can and should be provided in support of the Christian faith. These motives do not amount, however, to a rational demonstration of Christian doctrines. According to the metaphor used by Leibniz in the ‘Discours preliminaire’ of the *Theodicy*, they are like the ‘Letters Patent’ which must be presented before the tribunal of reason, before reason can yield to revela[[17]](#endnote-17)tion as a new light superior to it.[[18]](#endnote-18)

Inexplicable reasons, on the other hand, are those which ground faith in the full sense of the term, that is, as a divine faith which is the fruit of God’s grace and of his illumination. Due precisely to their ‘inexplicability’, however, this second kind of reasons must be subject to caution in order to avoid to the danger of illusion.[[19]](#endnote-19) The bottom line is that religious belief can only be grounded in reasons – either reasons which can be provided by human beings or reasons coming directly from God as a product of divine illumination. In neither case can belief be the result of a mere act of human will.

II

From the epistemological view that beliefs are not voluntary, there quite naturally follows Leibniz’s distinction between the errant and error. In essence, this distinction implies that, whereas one has the duty to fight error through the mean of rational persuasion, one must not persecute those who are in error, since coercion is in itself an enemy of truth.[[20]](#endnote-20) The penalty for the errant, Leibniz therefore insists, is simply ‘to be taught’.[[21]](#endnote-21) Leibniz’s attitude toward antitrinitarianism offers a particularly good insight into the way in which he weds the unyielding defence of what he regards as objective religious truth with the rejection of violent means of propagating or defending it. Throughout his life, from his earliest writings to the *Theodicy*, Leibniz consistently opposes antitrinitarianism, leaving behind a wealth of texts in which he engages in a sophisticated intellectual duel especially against the chief antitrinitarians of his days, the Socinians.[[22]](#endnote-22) At the same time, however, he consistently opposes the persecution and universal ban of these same Socinians.[[23]](#endnote-23) In particular, he describes as ‘inexcusable’ the violent repression of antitrinitarians emblematically represented by the condemnation and execution of Michael Servetus (c. 1511-1553) in Calvin’s Geneva: ‘the severity exerted against them [the antitrinitarians], and particularly against Servetus, is inexcusable, since it is only the bad will, and not the error, in him that can be punished. *The penalty for one who is mistaken is to be taught.*’[[24]](#endnote-24) Writing in 1698 to Hiob Ludolf, Leibniz claims that ‘refutation can exist together with ecclesiastical toleration.’[[25]](#endnote-25) Leibniz recognizes that it is often difficult in practice to combat error without harrying those who propagate it; but instead of using this difficulty as a justification of religious persecution, he derives precisely the opposite conclusion from it: namely, that a tolerant attitude be adopted toward an error if it cannot be eradicated without causing great harm to those who hold it or to the society in which they live.[[26]](#endnote-26)

The inexcusability of the use of violence against people who profess opinions regarded as erroneous but believed by them in good conscience to be true is ultimately justified by appeal to natural law and natural rights, that is to say by appeal to the primary, inalienable moral qualities of human beings the violation of which define what is an unjust action. Since it is ‘a natural right [droit naturelle] to express what one believes to be the truth,’ Leibniz doubts that one could have the ‘right to proceed … to the ultimate punishment’ even in the case of recognised atheists.[[27]](#endnote-27) On the contrary, ‘it is against natural right [droit naturelle] to punish someone because he is of some opinion, no matter which, as opposed to punishing someone for some actions; *for the penalty for one who is mistaken is to be taught* [*nam errantis poena est doceri*]. And again, I do not believe that we have the right to punish someone with corporal pains for actions which he undertakes in accordance with his opinion, and which he believes his conscience obligates him to perform’.[[28]](#endnote-28) Indeed, it is nothing less than ‘a crime’ to abjure what one believes to be true.[[29]](#endnote-29) Therefore ‘it is necessary to be very careful in matters of retractation to avoid forcing people to act against their conscience.’[[30]](#endnote-30)

III

In addition to Leibniz’s general epistemological doctrine of the involuntariness of beliefs, his epistemology of toleration can also be seen as specifically grounded in his views regarding the epistemic status of faith. As he writes in the early *Commentatiuncula de judice controversiarum* (c. 1669-1670) ‘[f]ides est credere. Credere est verum putare’,[[31]](#endnote-31) that is, faith is to believe and to believe is to hold something as true as opposed to *knowing* that something is true. Faith, in other words, belongs in the domain of opinion (broadly conceived) based on reasons for credibility,[[32]](#endnote-32) and not in the domain of demonstration. As such belief (any belief) is exposed to the possibility of error. From an epistemological point of view, faith admits the possibility that a doctrine believed to be true might on the contrary be demonstrated to be false. ‘I challenge’ Leibniz continues in the *Commentatiuncula* ‘those who deny that faith [fidem] exists together with the fear of its opposite or that it is an opinion [opinionem esse], if they are telling the truth, to try to explain why such faith has room for the notion of “more or less.” However, that it does admit of it, the witness of Christ shows.’[[33]](#endnote-33) Since, ‘due to the obscurity of the human mind’,[[34]](#endnote-34) the truth of revealed propositions cannot be demonstrated, one must hypothetically admit that the contrary of these propositions could be demonstrated. The task of the defender of the mysteries is therefore to dispel ‘the fear of the opposite’, repelling time and again attempts to prove the contrary.

To be sure, in the case of a genuine divine revelation, the believer is certain that no such proof exists. Moreover, for Leibniz faith does not simply reduce to believing a proposition to be true. To be truly faithful, the will as well as the intellect must be involved. Leibniz does distinguish between a theoretical opinion which one can embrace on purely rational grounds, and the wholehearted practical assent and unshakable conviction which is the fruit of the supernatural grace of God and marks faith in the full sense of the term, that is divine faith.[[35]](#endnote-35) Nevertheless, as long as there is no demonstration or adequate knowledge, the possibility of error cannot be excluded, that is to say, the possibility cannot be excluded of having mistakenly believed as divine revelation some doctrine which is later demonstrated to be false and therefore not of divine origin at all. Although believers will hold firm to their beliefs and are rationally justified in doing so as long as there is no proof that they are mistaken, the epistemology of faith described above naturally opens the faithful to a more humble attitude toward what they believe to be true – and ‘*humility*’, as Leibniz remarks, ‘does not imagine that reason is always on its side.’[[36]](#endnote-36)

Indeed, according to Leibniz, fragments of truths are present everywhere and the same, universal truth is expressed by different people and traditions from different perspectives. As he tells Nicolas Rémond on 10 January 1714, ‘I have tried to unearth and reunite the truth buried and dispersed under the opinions of the different sects of philosophers, and I believe I have added to that something of my own in order to advance a few steps further. … I have found that most sects are right in a good part of what they affirm, but not so much in what they deny.’[[37]](#endnote-37) Likewise, at the beginning of 1708, pouring water on the fire of a sterile controversy in which he had become involved against his will, Leibniz confides:

I am more inclined to excuse than to accuse, and to praise rather than to blame; and I prefer to note the good in people to benefit from it and to encourage them, than to point out their defects and do them wrong.... There are many true and certain things, but sometimes this truth is only known in a confused way until one begins to doubt it. And it is then that it is developed and demonstrated as it should be.... [I]nsightful objections are always useful, and serve to clarify truth the better[.][[38]](#endnote-38)

This typically conciliatory outlook – substantiated by his doctrine of universal harmony, according to which diversity and multiplicity should not be feared but celebrated since it can be ultimately traced back to unity – could not but foster a tolerant attitude.

IV

These epistemological views grounding toleration, and his appeal to natural law are complemented at the metaphysical level by Leibniz’s conviction of the conformity between divine and human justice and love. In the *Méditation sur la notion commune de la justice* of 1703, rephrasing Plato’s celebrated ‘Euthyphro dilemma’, Leibniz asks the vexed question of whether there is an objective standard of goodness and justice:

It is agreed that whatever God wills is good and just. But there remains the question whether it is good and just because God wills it or whether God wills it because it is good and just: in other words, whether justice and goodness are arbitrary or whether they belong to the necessary and eternal truths about the nature of things, as do numbers and proportions.[[39]](#endnote-39)

Following in the footsteps of Plato, Leibniz thinks that justice and goodness belong to ‘eternal truths about the nature of things’, which as such have the same kind of absolute necessity as the truths of logic and mathematics. Divine justice and human justice must therefore be of the same kind, differing from one another only in degree of perfection. Against Pellisson, who advocates the incommensurability of human and divine justice,[[40]](#endnote-40) Leibniz therefore argues for the opposite thesis in a way reminiscent of his defense in the *Theodicy* of the conformity of human and divine reason, despite the finitude of the former and the infinitude of the latter:[[41]](#endnote-41)

There are certain universal principles of justice which suit both God and man; otherwise God’s justice would be actually denied or we would not have any idea of it. To distinguish the principles of divine justice from those of human justice, would amount to saying that the principles of our geometry are not good for God or the angels.[[42]](#endnote-42)

What would seem to be deeply unjust in the human domain could not be just for God. Therefore ‘one should not imagine that God is capable of doing what would be tyranny if done by human beings’[[43]](#endnote-43) and

one should not say either that what we call justice is nothing in relation to God, who is the master of all things to the point that he could condemn innocent people without violating his justice; or finally that justice is something arbitrary in respect to him; [these are] bold and dangerous expressions to which some people have let themselves be dragged to the prejudice of God’s attributes: since in this case there would be no point in praising his goodness and justice; and everything would be as if the most wicked spirit, the Prince of evil spirits, the evil principle of the Manicheans, were the only Master of the Universe.[[44]](#endnote-44)

This position leads, in turn, to a cluster of theological reasons for religious toleration grounded in key aspects of Leibniz’s soteriology and ecclesiology.

V

According to Leibniz, it would be against God’s justice and love to condemn those who search for the truth in a sincere way even if they are objectively in error. Writing to his friend Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels on 4/14 September 1690, he remarks:

I am not entirely of the opinion of Mr Arnauld who … finds it strange that so many millions of pagans have not been condemned; I would find it much stranger if they had been: I don’t know why we are so inclined to believe that people are damned or sunk in eternal miseries, even if they could not help it; but this leads to thoughts hardly compatible with the goodness and justice of God … I don’t believe that the opinion of the eternal damnation of so many virtually innocent people is so edifying and so useful in preventing sin as is imagined. It leads to thoughts hardly compatible with the love of God.[[45]](#endnote-45)

In the *Nouveaux essais*, recalling his exchange of 1690-1691 with Pellisson, he notes, ‘I once showed M. Pellisson that many eminent doctors of the Roman Church, far from damning lax Protestants, have been willing to save even pagans … I adduced the view of a Portuguese teacher, Diego Payva de Andrada, who was very famous in his day and had been one of the theologians at the Council of Trent. He went so far as to say that those who took the opposite view of the matter were making God supremely cruel – “For”, he said, “there can be no worse cruelty”.’[[46]](#endnote-46) After disapproving of Augustine’s view according to which unbaptized children are damned, Leibniz concludes: ‘we are fortunate that God is more charitable than men.’[[47]](#endnote-47)

Leibniz, in fact, finds reasons internal to the Christian revelation for proposing toleration as the most consistent way of following the teaching of Jesus Christ. Persecution and condemnation is against the very spirit of Christianity since ‘it is clear that the spirit of Christianity should lead to mildness’[[48]](#endnote-48) and toleration is ‘necessary on account of the principle of Christian charity’[[49]](#endnote-49). As a young man, countering the accusation by his half-brother that he had abandoned Lutheranism to embrace the hated heresy of Calvinism (vehemently condemned by the hard-line Lutherans who dominated his immediate family), Leibniz replies: ‘I hold and with God’s help will continue to hold fast to the Evangelical [i.e. Lutheran] truth as long as I live, but I am deterred from condemning others both by my own personal inclination and by the stern command of Christ: “Judge not, that ye be not judged”.’ [[50]](#endnote-50) Later on he launches a heartfelt appeal to Christian charity and the evangelical love of peace as the basis for ending the division amongst Christians:

Charity (which is the highest of virtues), the love of peace, so recommended by Jesus-Christ, and the proofs of Christian moderation given for such a long time by this side [i.e. the Lutherans], demand that we omit nothing now which is in our power and which could serve to remove or diminish the unfortunate schism which is so harmful to souls and which has rent the West for over a century and a half[.][[51]](#endnote-51)

As shown by this passage, the well-being of Christian souls themselves is endangered by the conflict amongst the Christian churches. Indeed, in Leibniz’s view, a central feature of Christian soteriology points to toleration as something required by the very nature of salvation. Although he firmly maintains the objective truth of the Christian religion, he also identifies the subjective sincerity or insincerity of conscience as the ultimate ground of salvation or condemnation; and in this, he is eager to stress, he is in agreement with prominent theologians in the Roman Catholic church. One of the key reasons presented by Leibniz in support of religious toleration both of other Christians and of non-Christians is precisely this distinction between the objectivity of truth and the subjectivity of salvation.[[52]](#endnote-52) This distinction, in turn, goes hand in glove with the traditional distinction between material and formal heretics proposed by Roman Catholic theologians. Material heretics are those who embrace a doctrine which is objectively erroneous and against the teaching of the truly universal or catholic church. Formal heretics are those who not only embrace an objectively erroneous doctrine, but are also conscious of their opposition to the teaching of the universal church and nevertheless continue to hold what they know to be condemned by it. Material heretics are excused by their invincible ignorance of their error and, in particular, by their invincible ignorance of being opposed to the teaching of the catholic church. As a consequence they are not excluded from salvation, as are formal heretics.[[53]](#endnote-53) Those who have not been reached by the Christian revelation are not excluded from salvation provided that they search for the truth in good faith and strive toward a morally good life.[[54]](#endnote-54)

The difficult case, however, is represented by those who *are* reached by the teaching of the catholic church but do not embrace it.[[55]](#endnote-55) This category of people can include both non-Christians such as Muslims and Jews, and Christians from other confessions such as – from the point of view of the Roman church – Protestants or Christian heresies such as Socinianism. It is at this point that the full inclusiveness of Leibniz’s doctrine of toleration appears. According to Leibniz, the category of material heretic can be extended also to these people.[[56]](#endnote-56) Muslims and Jews, even when presented with the definitive revelation from God, do not realize its true status. As long as there is not conscious disobedience to God’s revelation, they can only be considered material heretics.[[57]](#endnote-57) Moreover, following the principles of Roman Catholic theologians themselves, Leibniz insists, the same applies to Protestants and even to Socinians and other radical movements since, from their point of view, what they refuse to follow is not in fact the doctrine of the truly universal or catholic church but only the teaching of a particular church.[[58]](#endnote-58) Referring in particular to the case of the Protestants, Leibniz argues:

Mr Pellisson … admits amongst material heretics only those who do not know, or do not believe, that the dogmas in matter of faith which they reject are the doctrine of the Catholic Church. If we apply this restriction to the Protestants we will find that they are of this number. … So it is not easy to prove to the Protestants that they deny what they know to be decided by the Catholic Church.[[59]](#endnote-59)

The consequences for toleration are clear. None of these people can be rightfully condemned and it should be assumed that they are saved as long as there is no conscious rebellion against what they know to be the true church or the true divine revelation.[[60]](#endnote-60) From very early on Leibniz maintains, in fact, that to be in error (that is, to believe something false) cannot be confused with acting against conscience and should not, therefore, be taken as a ground of condemnation. In a letter responding to the attack against Calvinism and Syncretism[[61]](#endnote-61) by his strictly Lutheran half-brother, the twenty-three year old Leibniz writes:

To err against conscience [Errare contra conscientiam] implies contradiction. In fact, from the beginning of the world, nobody has erred against conscience. Someone errs who believes as true that which is false [Errat qui putat verum esse quod falsum est]. Whoever believes, this person is not otherwise convinced; whoever is not otherwise convinced, does not know better; who does not know better, does not feel against conscience. Or, in short, the contradiction could be shown as follows: to err against conscience is to err knowing the very thing in which one is in error. To err knowing the very thing in which one is in error is to err in the very thing in which one is not in error. In fact, who knows, to the extent in which he knows, does not err. Therefore, if someone errs against conscience, two contradictory things – to err and not to err – belong to him in the same respect, which is absurd. We can act against conscience but we cannot believe [sentire non possumus] against conscience. So you see that, if only those who err against conscience are to be damned, nobody is to be damned for his error.[[62]](#endnote-62)

Pellisson is clearly troubled by Leibniz’s position and does not hesitate to define toleration as ‘the greatest of all errors because it agrees with all errors’.[[63]](#endnote-63) Indeed, the point Leibniz is trying to advance seems to be precisely the one which Pellisson finds so scandalous. For all that we know or can judge, there are no heretics in the sense of people certainly excluded from salvation on the ground of their objectively erroneous beliefs.[[64]](#endnote-64) The reason for this is that we cannot see the secrets of their hearts and the ways in which the grace of God can work within them.[[65]](#endnote-65) ‘Nor,’ Leibniz clarifies in the *Nouveaux essais* (firmly rejecting as a good Protestant any Pelagian interpretation of the claim that people could also be saved outside Christianity), ‘are those who accord salvation to pagans, or to others who lack the ordinary aids, thereby obliged to rely for this on natural processes alone … One can, after all, maintain that, when God gives them grace sufficient to call forth an act of contrition, he also gives them before their death, even if only in the final moments, all the light of faith and all the fervour of love which they need for salvation; this being given to them either explicitly or dispositionally, but in any case supernaturally. … Let me add that none of this gives this doctrine anything in common with the special views of the Pelagians and Semipelagians … Contrary to the Pelagians, all three of the accepted religions[[66]](#endnote-66) … agree in teaching that there is a supernatural grace in all who possess faith.’[[67]](#endnote-67)

As we have seen, for faith in the full sense of the term – that is, divine faith as opposed to a merely human faith based on explicable ‘rational grounds for beliefs’[[68]](#endnote-68) – a supernatural light and ‘fervor of love’ is necessary which can only be given by God’s grace. Precisely because these are ‘inexplicable reasons’ which ‘consist only in our conscience or perception’, ‘those who base themselves on this light, cannot demand another examination from others who base themselves on a contrary light than the examination of one’s own individual conscience; namely whether one says the truth and really feels the light of which he boasts.’[[69]](#endnote-69) As the Jesuits themselves maintain, Leibniz concludes, the last instance of judgement regarding the salvation of any individual can therefore only be the sincerity of his or her conscience, no matter how objectively erroneous his or her beliefs may be.[[70]](#endnote-70) ‘People are not excommunicated for their error,’ Leibniz writes, ‘but for their obstinacy or bad disposition of heart. One can be of bad faith and obstinate even if he asserts the truth, that is to say when this is maintained without foundation on the basis of a bad principle.’[[71]](#endnote-71) So it is this subjective sincerity or insincerity of conscience (together with God’s grace) which is, ultimately, the ground of salvation or condemnation.[[72]](#endnote-72) Yet since we cannot enter into the conscience of other people, it is God’s business alone to decide who is saved or condemned. Leibniz stresses forcefully that it would be extremely arrogant to assume otherwise: ‘I do not know how one can be humble when he sets himself up as a judge of souls to the point of condemning them to eternal fire. There is nothing more presumptuous than that.’[[73]](#endnote-73)

The question nevertheless arises what this sincerity of conscience (on which salvation ultimately rests) consists of, given that it cannot be identified with believing a corpus of true doctrines. Asserting his agreement with the ‘views of several very celebrated Doctors of the Roman Church’, Leibniz claims that for the salvation of an individual ‘no revealed article is absolutely necessary, and therefore *it is possible to be saved* in every Religion, *provided that one truly loves God above all things*’.[[74]](#endnote-74) It should be noted that this is not, for Leibniz, a super-fundamental article of faith which on its own could be sufficient for salvation.[[75]](#endnote-75) On the contrary, Leibniz explicitly distances himself from the well-known and controversial Protestant doctrine of fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith, that famously came to be used as a basis for toleration.[[76]](#endnote-76) The point which is controversial in this doctrine is not, strictly speaking, the *distinction* between fundamental and non-fundamental articles as such. Rather, the crux of the controversy is whether these necessary or fundamental articles of faith can be determined by Scripture alone without appeal to a principle of authority. Leibniz does not deny that an infallible authority is needed in order to decide at least some controversies regarding fundamental matters. More specifically, in the passage quoted above, he is not proposing some sort of ‘single necessary article of faith’, on the belief in which alone salvation depends. Instead he is reiterating that salvation, ultimately, does not rest on the correctness of one’s beliefs but on a practical attitude: that is, a sincere love of God.

If salvation depends on the sincere love of God above all things bestowed by the supernatural and mysterious operation of God’s grace, the further conclusion follows that compulsion in religious affairs undermines rather than advances the aim of salvation. To force someone to embrace a religion which he or she cannot sincerely believe could put in danger the soul of that person, even if the religion in question is the true one. As Leibniz writes in March 1685 to the Catholic convert from Calvinism, Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels, ‘One should not create hypocrites, since a true Huguenot is incomparably more worthy than a false Catholic and will sooner be saved without any doubt.’[[77]](#endnote-77) It is clear that Leibniz rejects the tradition of the *compelle intrare*.[[78]](#endnote-78) This position has obvious consequences for toleration, since he deems it unacceptable to try to convert people with tools other than persuasion on the ground that to do otherwise, far from propelling them through the gates of heaven, could instead close those gates to them for ever.

VI

Leibniz’s ecclesiology also naturally leads to toleration amongst the main Christian churches. In his view, each particular Christian church has some fragment of truth, and none can claim to possess the truth in its totality. Against Pellisson’s denial that the truth might be distributed amongst the Christian churches, Leibniz replies in no uncertain terms: ‘this is possible.’[[79]](#endnote-79) The truly universal (or catholic) church is not one of the particular churches and its true doctrine can be discovered only by respectful listening to the entire ecclesiastical tradition from apostolic times onward.[[80]](#endnote-80) In a letter of 30 January 1692 to Landgraf Ernst, Leibniz summarized the positions of the main parties – the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox churches, the Protestants, and the more radical Christian movements emblematically represented by the theological rationalism of the Socinians – giving in a nutshell his own view on the matter:

One might say that the parties have three principles: 1.) the authority of traditions, 2.) Scripture [and] 3.) philosophy. Authority leads principally the Greeks and the Romans, Scripture the Protestants, and philosophy the Socinians. All three principles are good, but one can abuse each of them, and this [abuse] causes the errors.[[81]](#endnote-81)

In a typically conciliatory way, Leibniz acknowledges the merits of all three approaches while taking his own stand. Despite his own allegiance to Protestantism, he admits the legitimacy of a recourse to ‘the authority of the Traditions’ against a rigid application of the Protestant rule of ‘scripture alone.’ Moreover, he rejects, on the one hand, irrationalistic positions barring all ‘philosophy’ or rational motives from the realm of faith, while criticizing, on the other hand, the Socinian abuse of reason as the sole, ultimate criterion of religious truth. The view that no particular Christian church has a monopoly of a truth which needs to be retraced in the entire ecclesiastical tradition has immediate consequences for toleration amongst the Christian confessions. No particular church can claim to be the true Church to the exclusion of the others, and none has the right of excommunicating those who do not follow all of its doctrines.

The ecclesiology just described might leave the impression that Leibniz was impossibly naive when it came to assessing the extent and depth of the disagreement between the Christian churches, as well as the willingness of their armies of theologians and prelates to restore harmony by sitting around a table serenely reviewing the entire ecclesiastical tradition in search of the doctrine of the truly catholic church. Far from dissolving into such Panglossian optimism, however, Leibniz’s approach to church reunification is in fact markedly pragmatic.[[82]](#endnote-82) Regarding reunification between Protestants (notably Lutherans) and Roman Catholics, he embraces the plan proposed by the Roman Catholic negotiator, the Franciscan Cristobal de Rojas y Spinola (c. 1626-1695), who toured the courts of Protestant German princes on behalf of the (Catholic) Holy Roman Emperor seeking an understanding with Rome. Basically Rojas’s reunion strategy was twofold: first it envisaged a preliminary reunion of the Protestants with the Roman Church before full agreement had been reached on controversial issues, at which point, secondly, a truly ecumenical Council would be summoned. Having been recognised at the outset as truly ecumenical, the Council would therefore be endowed with the authority to settle controversial issues. Both Catholics and Protestants would agree in advance to abide by its decisions. By consistently supporting this strategy over the years until finally confronted with its failure, Leibniz shows himself fully aware that theological agreement could not, in all probability, be reached through learned discussion alone. It was for this reason that a pragmatic, preliminary reunification would need to be achieved before controversial issues could be settled by a principle of authority recognised at the outset as such by all parties.

After these plans for a comprehensive reunion of Protestants and Catholics became unworkable, Leibniz from the late 1690s onward concentrates primarily on the more limited project of reunifying the Lutheran and Reformed confessions; and here too he is equally aware of the difficulty (if not impossibility) of reaching full theological agreement. For instance, when in the autumn of 1699 a small group of Lutheran and Reformed theologians proposes to convene a broad Protestant theological conference involving England, Scotland, Brandenburg, Braunschweig-Lüneburg and, possibly, Denmark and Sweden, Leibniz opposes the idea. According to him, such an initiative was more likely to exacerbate divisions than to mend them: inter-protestant reunification needed to be prepared in advance through the careful negotiation of agreement on controversial points by a small, select, but representative group of theologians working in private. In his view, to plunge straight into a large, international conference without a fairly firm platform in which theological differences had already been mediated was only likely to provoke intransigent confrontation. As a matter of fact, when toward the end of 1702 the Prussian king decides to take matters in his own hands and to pursue the union between Lutheran and Reformed churches within his own dominions by convening a *Collegium Irenicum*, Leibniz’s warnings prove more than justified, since a barrage of polemical pamphlets began from both sides even before the work of *Collegium Irenicum* could begin.[[83]](#endnote-83)

Without entering into the details of Leibniz’s life-long ecumenical efforts, for present purposes it is enough to note that in both projects – the pursuit of comprehensive reunification of Catholics and Protestants and the narrower pursuit of inter-protestant reconciliation – toleration is seen by Leibniz as an essential ingredient of the whole process. It is true that in his earlier years he sounds almost dismissive of toleration in observing that it addresses only ‘the most pressing symptoms’ rather than being a proper cure for the malaise gripping the Christian churches. On the other hand, he also grants that ‘the way of dispute or discussion,’ in which controversial points are examined in detail by the opposing parties, has proven of ‘little effect’ in these matters.[[84]](#endnote-84) For all his indefatigable efforts toward the development of a *characteristica universalis* which would have settled all controversies including religious ones,[[85]](#endnote-85) Leibniz is realistic enough to see that the solution of the religious conflicts raging across Europe could not wait for the creation and universal acceptance of his wonderful formal language. Instead a bold pragmatic move of the sort indicated by Rojas was needed, the first step toward which could only be establishing religious toleration amongst the churches which agreed to the preliminary reunification while awaiting the final verdict of a truly ecumenical Council on controversial points. Later, with the insight gained from years of difficult negotiations, Leibniz comes to estimate more highly the value of toleration amongst the Christian churches, despite its falling short of being a definitive solution of their conflicts. In 1697, addressing the task of re-establishing Protestant unity, he identifies three different degrees of increasing difficulty: political unity or ‘a good civic understanding’, ecclesiastical toleration, and finally theological agreement or ‘concord of views’. ‘The first and the second degree,’ Leibniz concludes,

seem to me necessary and achievable, and sufficient. The first degree is necessary on political grounds for the conservation of both parties. The second degree is necessary on account of the principle of Christian charity, and in consequence is more than feasible. The third degree does not seem attainable, but it is also not necessary. It would nevertheless be good if some able theologians were to work at it at least as regards certain points where, I believe, the disputes consist in fact more in formulations than in realities.[[86]](#endnote-86)

Notwithstanding his unquenchable optimism that many problems could be ironed out if people would agree to sit down and discuss, he recognizes that full theological agreement ‘does not seem attainable’. But, he adds pragmatically, it is also not necessary provided that there is ‘a good civic understanding’ and ecclesiastical toleration.

VII

Here we encounter in another context his belief that the alternative to toleration –that is, persecution – is futile and counterproductive. In 1687 Leibniz brushes aside the ‘way of rigour’ as of dubious legitimacy and uncertain results.[[87]](#endnote-87) When in 1693-1694 news reaches him that the English Parliament has ordered the public burning of an antitrinitarian pamphlet by William Freke, he dryly comments that the antitrinitarians could reasonably reply that ‘it is easier to burn such things than to refute them: the truth, indeed, cannot be burned.’[[88]](#endnote-88) Around 1711 he also observes that persecution has proven to strengthen rather than weaken the convictions of its victims: ‘I acknowledge that in general persecution is not at all desirable, and that it has wronged the faith of many people but gives relief to that of some others: more zeal is never noted than in these occasions of trial, and greater examples of a great conviction are never found’.[[89]](#endnote-89)

His own pragmatic advice is that it is often better to leave heterodox doctrines alone, especially when they have no bad practical consequences. In many cases they will die down on their own, while attempting to exterminate them more often ends up enflaming them. As he explains to Duchess Sophie in a letter of 26 October 1691,

under the pretext of preventing heresies, they have been engendered. Normally these things fade away on their own when they lose the attraction of novelty; but when one wants to suppress them with noisy denunciations, persecutions, and refutations, it is like wanting to extinguish a fire with a pair of bellows. … For fear of being short of heretics, Messieurs the theologians sometimes do everything they can to find some[.][[90]](#endnote-90)

Not everything which is true is also necessary to believe, and there are things which are not true and are nevertheless tolerable.[[91]](#endnote-91) In some cases, he argues, a heterodox theology can positively enhance the moral stand of a person, and abstaining from intervention is definitely advisable when incorrect beliefs have a good practical effect. A noteworthy example is Leibniz’s reaction to Baron Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont. While taking issue with the strange and (in Leibniz’s view) dubious elements which peppered van Helmont’s thought,[[92]](#endnote-92) Leibniz deeply appreciates the baron’s commitment to the common good which inspired a number of practical schemes for the improvement of the human condition. As Leibniz writes on 20 December 1696 to Andreas Morell, ‘the touchstone of true illumination is a great eagerness for contributing to the general good.’ This is, in his view, what really distinguishes van Helmont from other millenarians and promoters of controversial religious movements. ‘Among those who had extraordinary ideas,’ Leibniz concludes, ‘I have hardly found anyone beside van Helmont who shared this great principle of charity with me and who had a true eagerness for the general good, although in other respects we often had very different opinions about different matters.’[[93]](#endnote-93) In short, van Helmont’s belief in universal salvation, combined with a radically optimistic eschatology expecting a future millennium and a final restoration of all things, although supported by shaky arguments and contrary to ecclesiastical tradition, plays an important role in inspiring his love of God and his commitment to the common good.[[94]](#endnote-94) Leibniz acknowledges and admires this aspect of van Helmont’s thought despite his own distance from many of the baron’s ‘extraordinary ideas.’

Leibniz’s criterion for not tolerating certain religious doctrines is also practical: doctrines should not be tolerated if they are dangerous in practice and are clearly against precepts of natural law. This is evident from the passage already mentioned above, in which Leibniz writes: ‘it is against natural right to punish someone because he is of some opinion, no matter which, as opposed to punishing someone for some actions; *for the penalty for one who is mistaken is to be taught*. And again, I do not believe that we have the right to punish someone with corporal pains for actions which he undertakes in accordance with his opinion, and which he believes his conscience obligates him to perform’. This passage continues with the following caveat: ‘apart from the case in which these actions are evil in themselves, manifestly contrary to natural right. As if someone wanted to trouble the State and use violence and poison for a religious principle.’[[95]](#endnote-95) If (to give a resonant example from a later period) someone in Germany were suddenly to promote the opinion that the Jewish nation must be exterminated, Leibniz would deny that this view should be tolerated because it clearly violates natural law. Likewise, the use of violence against the state to pursue religious aims should not, according Leibnizian principles, be tolerated.

On the other hand, doctrines which do not teach criminal behavior should not be persecuted. As Leibniz writes to his Jesuit friend, Bartholomew Des Bosses, on 21 July 1707:

what I find worst of all is persecution on account of opinions that do not encourage criminal acts, a practice from which honorable men should not only refrain, but which we should also abhor and work against so that others, over whom we have some authority, are discouraged from it. … And indeed, if it were within my powers of persuasion, Gerberon[[96]](#endnote-96) and others like him would enjoy complete freedom: … let them write, let them defend their opinions. Their errors should be overturned with equal arms, not by force and fear … It is extremely harmful that freedom of thinking [sentiendi libertatem] be restrained from day to day within unnecessary limits.[[97]](#endnote-97)

Mentioning explicitly the Socinians, he remarks in 1698: ‘I am delighted that authors whose views are dangerous are refuted but I am not sure it is appropriate to establish against them a kind of inquisition when their false opinions have no influence on morals; and although I am very far from the views of the Socinians, I don’t believe it is right to treat them as criminals.’[[98]](#endnote-98)

To sum up, in Leibniz we find no blanket exclusion from toleration of broad categories of people: certainly not the Catholics, but also not the Socinians or other heretical movements. It is not beliefs as such which are not to be tolerated but actions deriving from these beliefs which harm other people. The measures to be taken for dealing with such potentially or actually harmful beliefs should, however, be as restrained as possible. As he writes in 1706, ‘One has some right to take measures to prevent the propagation of a pernicious error, but that is also all one has a right to do, and these measures must be the mildest possible.’[[99]](#endnote-99) In concrete terms, what Leibniz normally proposes, beside active refutation, is moderate censorship or, in some cases, the ban; but even the latter should not be universal, since a universal ban would be equivalent to a sentence of death.[[100]](#endnote-100)

VIII

Leibniz does not ground toleration in the separation between church and state (as Pufendorf and Locke do).[[101]](#endnote-101) His doctrine of toleration is also not grounded in indifference toward the content of revealed religion, in favour of natural religion. Nor is it even grounded in the distinction between the fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith. He is convinced of the objective truth of the Christian religion and of the duty to uphold and propagate it; but he denies that it should be upheld or propagated by means other than persuasion, and this for philosophical, theological, and pragmatic reasons, not least by appealing to natural law and to the very nature of that salvation one has in sight when setting of to spread the good news. In short, in his thought, belief in what is regarded as objective truth does not and must not yield intolerance. On the contrary, when the expressions of Leibniz’s view have been collected from a broad sample of his correspondence and other writings, it yields one of the most inclusive doctrines of toleration of his time.

It cannot be denied that Leibniz devoted far more energy to the pursuit of ecclesiastical reconciliation than to the formulation of a doctrine of religious toleration. But this does not imply that he regarded the one as far less important or fundamental than the other. Rather, this concentration of effort reflects the balance of opportunities and necessities in seventeenth-century Germany, a balance which can perhaps best be revealed in contrast to the more familiar situation in contemporary England. In England – a large, politically unified but religiously rather diverse polity – the dominant issue was how to get Protestants of different shades of opinion to tolerate one another. This was the problem addressed by Locke. In the Holy Roman Empire, on the other hand – a vast entity divided into a large number of internally more religiously homogeneous territorial states which in turn formed three main confessional blocks – the crucial political issue was how to regain sufficient unity to allow the Empire to defend itself against confessionally unified neighbours who sought to exploit these confessional differences and thereby to divide the Empire against itself. In this respect, as in so many others, Leibniz’s intellectual priorities can only be properly assessed by putting them back in the unfamiliar context of the Holy Roman Empire; and his dogged pursuit of ecclesiastical reconciliation should not be interpreted as a lack of commitment to the still more basic need for religious toleration. Since Leibniz never published a major synthetic statement of his views on this latter subject, it would be unjustified to regard him as a major contemporary advocate of religious toleration, alongside his celebrated English contemporary. Yet this conclusion is also not without irony, since Locke – unlike Leibniz – won his reputation as an apostle of religious toleration despite excluding from toleration by far the largest single confessional community in Europe: the Roman Catholic church. Locke’s famous formulations, addressed as they were to insular conditions, were utterly inadequate for dealing with the religious divisions of continental Europe as a whole, half the population of which they excluded from toleration. Leibniz’s softly-spoken and hitherto overlooked reflections on the subject, on the other hand, originating as they did from the juxtaposition of all the main branches of Latin Christianity within the microcosm of the Holy Roman Empire, expanded to embrace the entire population of Europe.
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