

John Locke in the Glorious Revolution

© 1995 by Ronald Terry Constant

John Locke was the greatest man in the world according to Lady Mary Calverly in correspondence with him after the publication of his major treatises in 1689. People have used many superlatives, including "the most influential philosopher of his age" and "the founder of liberalism," to describe him. Locke did not begin life in circumstances harbingering greatness nor did his early life presage his lasting influence and reputation in philosophy and politics. Though he lived through important events in the Puritan Revolution and the Cromwellian Protectorate, his early life was ordinary. How did such an ordinary life lead to preeminence among English philosophers that has lasted 300 years? An overview of Locke's life indicates that educational opportunities, choices of occupations, friends, philosophical nature, religious beliefs, and events during his career all interacted and prepared him to be the apologist for the Glorious Revolution in 1688-9.¹

Early Life

John Locke was born at Wrington, a pleasant village in the north of Somersetshire, August 29, 1632. Locke's family had some advantages because his grandfather was a successful businessman who built a sizable estate. Locke's father served in the Parliamentary army during the Civil War where he met Colonel Alexander Popham. After the Restoration Popham became a Member of Parliament and helped young Locke gain admission to Westminster School. From there Locke entered Christ Church, Oxford, in 1652. In 1658, the year Cromwell died, Locke received his Master of Arts degree and remained at Oxford as a don, tutoring and lecturing. John Owen, the Dean of Christ Church, advocated religious toleration and affected Locke's intellectual development. Locke's early life was Puritan and Parliamentary. His education was High Church and royalist with a dose of toleration.²

When the monarchy was restored in 1660, Locke was as happy as any royalist and seemed to have abandoned any ideas of toleration in favor of order and peace. In September 1659 he wrote to Henry Stubbe praising excellent reasoning in a book and wishing that Stubbe had written more about toleration. He changed his opinion after Charles II was crowned. In two tracts about government written 1660-2, he argued that rulers were not obligated to allow diversity in opinion and religion. This change was one of several vacillations as Locke developed into the prototypical liberal emphasizing individual rights.³

Two Tracts on Government

The *First Tract on Government* was directed specifically against a colleague, Edward Bagshaw, who defended toleration. In the preface to the *First Tract*, Locke wrote that no one could "have a greater respect and veneration for authority" than he. He was joyous that the storm of the Interregnum had passed and could not understand how anyone would "hazard again the substantial blessings of peace and settlement in an over-zealous contention about things which they themselves confess." For Locke, the peace, joy, and unity pervading England under a monarch overwhelmed any argument for toleration that would result in division. In the tract he argued that "a man cannot part with his liberty and have it too, convey it by compact to the magistrate and retain it himself." His concern was not with toleration per se but with the opportunity that toleration provided for "the cunning and malice of men . . . [to build] a perpetual foundation of war and contention." He observed that if religious men were "to use no other sword but that of the word and spirit," then "toleration might promote a quiet in the world and at last bring those glorious days that men have a great while sought after the wrong way." At the end of the *Second Tract on Government* he wrote, "I conclude that all laws of the magistrate, whether secular or ecclesiastical, whether dealing with life in society or with divine worship, are just and legitimate." He allowed no disobedience. Locke later changed his mind under two monarchs with absolutist and Catholic leanings and committed himself irrevocably to toleration and individual rights when he published *A Letter Concerning Toleration* in 1689. One aspect of his thought surfaced in the tracts and never varied—the Christian religion was inextricably tied to legitimate politics, government, ethics, and knowledge.⁴

An Essay Concerning Toleration

Two years after writing the *Two Tracts on Government*, Locke changed significantly in his views about magisterial authority and toleration in *An Essay Concerning Toleration* (1667). He asserted that magistrates were entrusted with authority "for the good, preservation, and peace" of society. He said that some issues of conscience could conflict with orders by magistrates. In such cases people "ought to do what their consciences require of them, as far as without violence they can, but withal are bound at the same time quietly to submit to the penalty the law inflicts." Locke espoused non-violent civil disobedience—an important step from the absolute obedience in the *Two Tracts*. His views on toleration changed at least as much. He advocated that "all speculative opinions and religious worship . . . have a clear title to universal toleration which the magistrate ought not to entrench on." He argued that people had a right to indifferent actions that did not harm society. Locke defined government as an agent for people and used the benefit of the people as a parameter to limit the power of magistrates. By the time he wrote the *Two Treatises of Government*, government had become the servant of the people with its powers circumscribed by the their rights.⁵

Locke may have preferred to think of himself as a detached philosopher, as some of his adherents claimed, but *An Essay on Toleration* was evidence of his participation in life. His first

trip to the continent, to Germany in November 1665, exposed him to toleration. He went as Secretary to Sir Walter Vane, the head of the English embassy. He found almost complete religious liberty as he visited and conversed freely among Catholics, Calvinists, Lutherans, Mennonites, and Jews. In a letter to Robert Boyle he described, with appreciation and a tone of surprise, religious toleration functioning well. The residents of Cleve "quietly permit one another to choose their way to heaven; for I cannot observe any quarrels or animosities amongst them upon the account of religion." Locke incorporated that experience in the *Essay* and tried to persuade his countrymen to embrace toleration. He asked his readers "to consider, therefore, the state of England at present and . . . whether toleration or imposition be the readiest way to secure the safety and peace" of the kingdom. Locke's change toward toleration was the beginning of his liberalization that continued after 1666 when he met Anthony Ashley Cooper, later the first Earl of Shaftesbury.⁶

Shaftesbury

In 1667 Shaftesbury invited Locke to live with him at Exeter and, over a sixteen year period, influenced Locke's political philosophy more than any other person. We should remember that the influence was two-way. Shaftesbury and Locke became very close and Locke served as Shaftesbury's personal counselor. Shaftesbury, a master politician in the highest levels of government, used Locke in many capacities giving the scholar pragmatic experience. Shaftesbury had been an architect of the Restoration but ended as an enemy of Charles II which broadened Locke's political experience. Locke acquired a profound understanding of national administration and became a philosopher as an eminent politician, not as a don. When Locke wrote his *Two Treatises on Government*, he wrote as a philosopher, but he wrote with the conviction of experience in the urgency of circumstances. The third Earl of Shaftesbury, writing from memory years later, confirmed that his grandfather saw promise in Locke and encouraged him to study religion, politics, and all matters related to administering a state. Locke more than lived up to the first Earl's expectations.⁷

Charles II before the Glorious Revolution

A review of events leading to the Glorious Revolution is in order before further considering Locke's friends and activities. Charles began his reign propitiously with grants of amnesty to most opponents of the Restoration. England was happy to have peace again under a monarch. Charles was scandalous and free in his sexual behavior, yet he was the most popular king with his court since Henry VIII. He lived his life as an atheist and was inclined to toleration for religious beliefs—more tolerant than his "Cavalier" Parliament which was largely comprised of the old aristocracy. In his later years, he seemed to lean toward Catholicism, especially in grants of toleration to them. He died as a Catholic confessing to a Catholic priest. Since he had no Protestant heir, his Catholic leanings caused troubles that continued into the reign of James II. Parliament intended to keep England Protestant under a king who was the head of the Anglican

church and to consolidate its position after the Civil War as the supreme power in government. James II clashed with both intentions.⁸

James II

Charles II died February 6, 1685 and the Duke of York, Charles' brother, became King James II. James enjoyed unexpected popularity in his first months as ruler. He displayed many virtues, and if he had not been so inflexible as a Catholic, he likely would have had a prosperous reign. Religion was not his only source of conflict. He was rigid in his belief that monarchs should have absolute authority and openly continued the conflict with Parliament begun by his father. He issued declarations of religious toleration, appointed Catholics to office, and sought to enlist Dissenters to his side. His actions eventually led to the trials and acquittals of seven Anglican bishops. The general populace of England saw the judgments as victory over Papal designs. Knowledgeable leaders saw them as vindications of Parliament as the supreme law maker. James succeeded in alienating the people of England over religion and their leaders over politics. Englishmen were hesitant to abolish the traditional hereditary monarchy but were pushed too far when Louis XIV, a Catholic and an absolute monarch, announced an alliance with James II. Englishmen responded by accepting William of Orange as their new king in 1689. But now, back to Locke during the turmoil leading to this drastic event.⁹

Locke's friends and activities Recent scholarship has placed Locke firmly in the camp of Restoration radicals. Not only did he formulate the classic vindication for the overthrow of tyranny, but he participated in revolutionary politics against Charles II and James II. By the mid 1670's Whigs feared an end to the peace and quiet of the Restoration Settlement and began producing pamphlets to influence King Charles II to cease from activities that undermined the traditional balance of the constitution. One of the first pamphlets was *A Letter from a Person of Quality to His Friend in the Country* which was anonymous but accurately summarized Shaftesbury's views. The *Letter* appeared in 1675 after Shaftesbury had been relieved as Lord High Chancellor. Many of Locke's friends believed that Locke wrote or was involved in writing the *Letter*. Whether involved or not, Locke hurriedly left for a four year stay in France a few days after the House of Lords named a committee to determine the author of the *Letter* and punish him. Within a few years, the pamphlet literature evolved into heated debates in the Exclusion controversy.¹⁰

On August 28, 1678, Titus Oakes testified about a papal plot to assassinate King Charles II and to provoke rebellion in Scotland. Meager evidence agitated Englishmen who feared Catholic control. In the wake of the Popish Plot, Lord Danby, Charles' leading minister, fell from power, and Charles dissolved Parliament. People were dismayed and discussed the plot and James II, the popish successor to the throne, who had begun openly worshiping as a Catholic in 1673. Shaftesbury requested Locke to return to England in 1679 to a political scene that was more heated than the one he left. Shortly after his return, Locke wrote the bulk of the *Two Treatises* which later became, with emendations, a justification for the Glorious Revolution.

Though some people prefer to view the *Two Treatises* as lofty political philosophy, they were originally written as Exclusion literature in 1679-81, during the crisis itself.¹¹

The Whig pamphlets in general tended to follow a recognizable strategy. First, they tried to reach the king himself. Second, they hinted at a popular rebellion in reaction to royal designs for absolute monarchy. Third, the writers reminded the king that English politics rested on a sharing of power between people and king. Finally, they pointed out the benefits to Charles II if he reconciled with Parliament. The king needed to separate himself from "self-serving and evil counsellors" and realign himself with his people from whence his real power issued. The final thrust of the Whig rhetoric was to restore the old constitution. Locke, who was actively associated with Whig activists, wrote the *Two Treatises* in this milieu.¹²

Petitioning Campaigns

In 1679-80 many petitions requested the king to assemble Parliament. The petitioners, of whom many were Dissenters and Puritan revolutionaries, placed parliament at the center of government. In the *Second Treatise*, Locke mirrored the theme of centrality where he argued that "the Supreme Power, which is the Legislative" was established by a commonwealth "with Authority to determine all the Controversies, and redress the Injuries, that may happen to any Member." Charles II resisted the petitions and regarded his right to summon and dissolve Parliament to be part of his prerogative power that should not be usurped. Locke argued that prerogative power only existed in the absence of positive law by the legislative and as a latitude to ensure continuous government between legislative sessions. The legislative could and should make positive laws to close gaps. Anyone who argued that "the People incroach'd upon the Prerogative" simply had "a very wrong Notion of Government." Locke went so far as to say that "the People . . . have a right to reinstate their Legislative in the Exercise of their Power," and "if the Executive Power being possessed of the Force of the Commonwealth, shall make use of that force to hinder the meeting and acting of the Legislative," then he placed himself into a "state of War with the People." These were the words of a man deeply involved with the revolutionary politics of his day.¹³

Direct evidence of Locke's participation in the petitioning campaigns gives further grounds for seeing parallels between the *Second Treatise* and issues in the petitions. Locke signed a petition in London that included signatures by twenty-nine known radical dissenters of which five appeared on the same page as Locke's signature. His signature was near that of Awnsham Churchill who later published the *Two Treatises* and of Algernon Sydney who wrote *Discourses Concerning Government* in the aftermath of the Exclusion crisis. There were obvious parallels with the *Two Treatises*. It is possible, even probable, that Locke met Sydney. Sydney was tried in 1683 for his political activities. Shaftesbury died on January 23, 1683, after fleeing to Holland. Locke clearly associated with radicals and ignored a royal proclamation prohibiting such activities. In fall 1683 Locke decided to visit Holland. Since he did not return till after the Glorious Revolution was accomplished, it might be more accurate to say he slipped away into self-imposed exile because he did not want to suffer a fate similar to his friends. Before Locke

left he wrote the bulk of the *Two Treatise on Government* and refuted the major arguments of Robert Filmer for an absolute monarchy.¹⁴

Filmer resurrected

Amidst the flurry of petitions and Whig pamphlets, royalists needed justification for absolutism under Charles II and resurrected the writings of Robert Filmer. Filmer wrote around 1642 in support of Charles I defending the divine right of kings. He argued that the king's authority was from God, thus the king was not accountable to the people. Filmer died in 1653 before his major works were published. In 1679 the royalists published a collection of Filmer's works under the title, *The Free-holders Grand Inquest*. They followed these works with *Patriarcha, or The Natural Power of Kings Asserted* in 1680. Locke wrote the *Two Treatises of Government* in response to the publication of Filmer's works. The *First Treatise* was a refutation of *Patriarcha*. The *Second Treatise* dealt directly with the writings in the *Free-holder*.¹⁵

First treatise religious/overlooked

The *Second Treatise* overshadowed the *First* in the historiography of Locke and political thought. Recent textual criticism strongly supports the idea that most of second treatise was written before the first—evidence that Locke began the treatise in 1679 in reaction to *Free-holders*. The *Second Treatise* laid out Locke's political thought that became the foundation for political liberalism. Modern readers often skip the first essay altogether. Was it worth writing? Given the purpose and setting of the *First Treatise*, it was an important work that seems to have lost relevance in a modern secular world. England in the seventeenth century was not secular, and religion was an inextricable part of politics. Filmer wrote an imposing book, *Patriarcha*, in accord with prevalent beliefs about patriarchal authority and used the *Bible* to build an impressive case—impressive to many Englishmen of the time—for the divine right of kings. Divine right was a cornerstone for Charles' edifice of absolute monarchy, and Locke wrote to dislodge it. Locke's response was part of the activist literature of the day but reflected his deeper beliefs about religion and his approach to Scripture. Locke simply accepted that the *Bible* was inspired by God and was true.¹⁶

The *First Treatise* reads more like a theological work than a political discourse. In writing his treatise, Locke followed Filmer's argument and adopted many of his definitions of the issues. Adam, the first man in the *Bible*, was the key to Filmer's argument. According to Filmer, God divinely granted paternal authority to Adam that was perpetuated as divine authority to kings. After summarizing Filmer's argument, Locke wrote, "First, It is false that God made that Grant to Adam." He proceeded to destroy Filmer's argument with proof texts from the *Bible* including quotes in the original Hebrew and Greek languages and authoritative Latin translations. A theological tone permeated the *First Treatise*. Locke succeeded in removing Scriptural foundations for the divine right of kings. In our present world, neither divine rights for rulers nor

Scriptural bases for political authority are issues, but the lack of current relevance does not detract from the importance of the essay to a people struggling with God's place in government. To a degree, the *First Treatise* was irrelevant in 1689 when it was published since the Glorious Revolution was history. However, it ensured that James II's supporters could not resurrect Filmer a second time in an effort to topple William III. Locke likely had an additional motive in publishing the *First Treatise*. It approached the *Bible* with reason—a method he followed in all his writings and completed in *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. Locke was a founder of Enlightenment thought and the *First Treatise* was an example of an enlightened approach to Scripture. Possibly the essay was more important to the Enlightenment concerning religion than politics.¹⁷

Second treatise

The *Two Treatises* have been "often characterized as the first secular expression of political theory in the modern era"—an irony of history. Locke firmly grounded his arguments in God and Scripture as he perceived them, including the *Second Treatise*. The first sentences in the treatise linked Adam to political authority and the law of nature. He used Scripture quotations liberally from the Old and New Testaments as proof to support his positions. Locke argued that God "made man such a creature, that in his own judgment, it was not good for him to be alone, . . . to drive him into society." To keep from belaboring a point, let me summarize. Locke argued that men belonged to God. God provided them with reason which was the substance of the law of nature. He created them as gregarious beings. They came together by consent to form particular societies and governments. Any laws they made "must be conformable to the law of nature, i.e. to the will of God." Men determined the will of God by reason and revelation. People were not bound by any human law that contradicted the will of God such as arbitrary decrees tending to tyranny. Enough from Locke. Recently, Professor John Dunn wrote about the *Two Treatises* to explore "the theoretical centrality of Locke's religious preoccupations throughout the work." One of Dunn's central reasons for writing was "the intimate dependence of an extremely high proportion of Locke's arguments for their very intelligibility, let alone plausibility, on a series of theological commitments." Dunn considered all of Locke's works and concluded that Locke's theory of obligations among people "was at all times set out in theological terms, political duty was always discussed as a duty to God." How is it that "the classic expression of liberal political ideas," so obviously grounded in Christian beliefs, came to be viewed by many as part of the beginning of secular thought?¹⁸

Convoluting reasoning and specious arguments, such as found in a recent article by Bluhm, Wintfeld, and Teger, exemplify how Locke has been misread. These authors correctly state that the fundamental issue is whether the God behind Locke's state of nature can be taken seriously. They answer "no" and argue that Locke did not mean what he said. As an example they point to a particular argument by Locke in the *Second Treatise* and say that since he only said it one time and did not repeat it, he did not mean it and did not intend for a sophisticated reader to believe him. Throughout the article the authors contend that Locke said many things for the "average reader" to believe but intended for the "elite to read between the lines" and understand a

message that he did not say. They say the Locke had a "surface" message, what he said, and a "subterranean" message, what he did not say. The surface message was that God existed and expected lawful behavior. The subterranean message, the real message, was that God did not exist, but people needed to believe in him for political reasons. Their entire argument is that Locke did not mean what he said. He meant what he did not say, and elite people would accurately understand what he did not say. They offer assumptions and reasoning—no positive evidence—for their position. In all of Locke's personal journals, letters, and publications, he was consistent in insisting on the reality of God and truth of the *Bible*. Overwhelming evidence indicates that Locke meant what he said and most Lockean scholars accept the sincerity and centrality of Locke's Christianity. Though religion was foundational to Locke, he wrote the *Second Treatise* as political philosophy.¹⁹

Locke provided a complete political theory in the *Second Treatise* where he expounded "the true original, extent, and end of government." Much has been written about Locke's ideas on the state of nature, law of nature, reason, and property, but his concept of consent should not be forgotten. The word, "consent", or a cognate appears 109 times in the *Second Treatise*. Consent must be voluntary for authority to be legitimate. He reminded politicians that people, who voluntarily formed government "by consent, were all equal, till, by the same consent, they set rulers over themselves. So that their politic societies all began from a voluntary union." No governmental officials could have the power to do anything that tended to enslave the people. Officials would be "exercising a power the people never put into their hands (who can never be supposed to consent, that any body should rule over them for their harm)." Locke argued that when officials overstepped their bounds, no judge remained on Earth and the people had a "liberty to appeal to Heaven"—code for revolution. He warned kings, "'tis the thing of all others, they have most need to avoid, as of all others the most perilous." Locke further used consent to argue that the king could not use prerogative power to keep the legislative from assembling. Consent was crucial to Locke's theories and had many facets that paralleled pamphlets during the Exclusion crisis. The *Second Treatise* reflected Locke as a philosopher which history confirmed, but he also wrote from the perspective of a radical Whig.²⁰

Letter/Essay to Clarke about Glorious Revolution

Without doubt Locke supported the Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement that established William III as the king of England. He allowed his *Two Treatises* to be published as a philosophical justification for the revolution, but he was largely silent in his published writings concerning his opinions about the actual events and aftermath. Two documents written by John Locke to Edward Clarke became available this century that shed light on Locke's attitudes about the revolution.

The first document was a letter to Clarke written one to two weeks before Locke returned to London on February 12, 1689, for the coronation of William III. He told Clarke about men in Holland who misunderstood what Members of Parliament were doing in England, thinking they were merely acting as a formal Parliament. Locke said that parliamentary meetings concerning

William were "something of another nature" and had "business to do of greater moment and consequence." Locke was not ambiguous. He said that the parliamentarians were "restoring our ancient government, the best possibly that ever was," and their goal was "to set up a constitution that may be lasting." He referred to them as a "convention" which was not formulating "anything less than the great frame of the government." The events transpiring in England fit well with Locke's political theories espoused in the *Two Treatises* which he had already written, and Locke saw them in that light. English society, formed by social compact, had not dissolved, but the government that ruled that society needed to be reinstated. Locke never clearly laid out how a government should be formed, but the course that parliamentarians and William pursued met with his approval. He probably had an advisory role in how that "convention" Parliament and William reestablished England's constitutional government.²¹

The second document to Clarke was a reasoned essay with a practical tone in which Locke assessed the mood of the country since William III accepted the crown. From Clarke's notations on the document and a reference to it by Locke in another letter, Locke apparently intended for Clarke to use his ideas in parliamentary and political forums. In the document, Locke clearly supported William III, called for unity among the English people, and supported his opinions with pragmatic reasons of survival. His call for unity involved more than mere submission which would not make the reign of William III legitimate according to his concept of consent in the *Two Treatises*. The people needed to voluntarily consent to the new government. Locke said that William III provided England's "delivery from popery and slavery" and was "the fence set up against popery and France." He argued that William was crucial to the alliance with various continental powers that protected Protestants and England from being conquered by France. In his call for unity behind William III, Locke concluded that if Englishmen refused the call, then England could not stand. Locke credited Clarke with the suggestion that prompted this essay. Again Locke was influenced by friends and tried to influence the course of politics.²²

A Letter Concerning Toleration

In early 1689 Locke published the *Letter Concerning Toleration* which was the first of his three major works put out for publication that year. Locke had written the *Letter* in 1685 after being in Holland for two years where he was again influenced in a land of toleration. He solidified his thoughts but did not publish them till a tolerant king sat on the throne supported by a tolerant Parliament. Locke was always careful. The reasoning was more clear and mature than in the *Essay Concerning Toleration*. Civil society and religious society should not be joined "because the Church itself is a thing absolutely separate and distinct from the commonwealth." He was adamant that the business of government and church was separate and different. "The whole jurisdiction of the magistrate reaches only to . . . civil concerns," and the church had no jurisdiction in them. He applied his concept of "voluntary consent" to the church as a "voluntary society of men" and reached parallel conclusions to those he reached for voluntary civil societies in the *Second Treatise*. He argued that toleration should be a primary doctrine and goal of all Churches, indeed, of all religions. All toleration should "be permitted to the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Arminians, Quakers, and others." He allowed

toleration to people of other religions such as Jews and Mohammedans. Roman Catholics received full toleration in religious matters. Magistrates should interfere with them only when their allegiance to the Pope threatened the commonwealth. Locke never saw grounds for tolerating atheists. They "are not to be tolerated who deny the being of God. Promises, covenants, and oaths, which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold upon an atheist." Locke saw atheists as a danger to society since they had no ethical foundation and could not be trusted. Locke never abandoned the view of toleration expressed in this *Letter*. He was consistent in seeing the grounds for ethical behavior in Christian beliefs and using reason to reach conclusions for civil and religious conduct.²³

Liberalism

All evidence, including Locke's own writings, indicates that Locke was a conservative Englishman till he met Shaftesbury. Apparently he learned to be liberal as "a trusted political adviser to one of the shrewdest and most powerful politicians of seventeenth century England." Shaftesbury did not determine Locke's thought but seemed to act as a catalyst for his philosophical interests.

Reasonableness of Christianity

Locke did not publish his major works till after the Glorious Revolution in 1689, but he wrote often throughout his life and influenced many people. He based all of his important ethical and political arguments on his Christian beliefs and the *Bible* as he understood them through reason. He "laid the foundation" for modern empiricism in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and became "England's most influential philosopher." He provided a theoretical basis for the American Revolution, not just the Glorious Revolution and not to mention France. But "Locke's impact on theology, particularly in America, should be more widely realized." "Not only did Locke greatly influence the political thought of America's founders, but . . . he also helped to shape the religious thought of . . . Americans through his rationalistic interpretation of the *Bible* . . . which stands to this day." Considering the fall of Communism, Locke "may well be the most influential philosopher of the Western world." To understand Locke, one must keep in mind the importance of the Christian beliefs that he espoused. He did not provide a well reasoned explanation of his beliefs till 1695 when he published *The Reasonableness of Christianity* in which we have mature thoughts on the religion that undergirded his previous works.²⁴

Locke believed that the *Bible* was "to be understood in the plain direct meaning of the words and phrases . . . according to the language of that time"—an approach to scripture espoused by Martin Luther in his commentary on Romans that helped shape the Protestant Reformation. Locke argued that the *Bible* taught two laws: a law of nature or works and a law of faith. "The law of works then, in short, is that law which requires perfect obedience" and is "knowable by reason." In terms of eternal salvation, "the law of faith . . . is allowed to supply the

defect of full obedience" since "the law of works makes no allowance for failing on any occasion." The law of faith had only one requirement, faith that Jesus was the Messiah. The law of nature, reason, remained operative in defining how men should relate to each other. The law of nature was the legal basis for societies and governments and was distinct from the law of faith in the religious realm. Governments should concern themselves only with how men should live together reasonably. Locke said that "justification" was "the subject of this present treatise" and spent little time on the law of nature which he expounded in the *Second Treatise*. Locke's bifurcation of the world into the religious and secular with a single law underlying each is crucial in understanding his theories.²⁵

We cannot define John Locke by a single facet of his personality, a single person in his life, or a single event. He published his most important treatises late in life after many enriching experiences in which he developed mature thoughts for a new age, the Enlightenment. He was reared as a Puritan during a Puritan dominated Interregnum. He went to a university where the prime function was to prepare men for the Anglican ministry in a classical and scholastic atmosphere. Locke followed the advice of his friend, John Strachey, not to become a clergyman though he lived in a time when religion was paramount. Yet, he did not abandon his beliefs, and they pervaded his writing. Shaftesbury influenced him toward political liberalism and provided invaluable political experience. He associated with activists among Puritan dissenters and Whig radicals. He was trusted in William III's court. Many people sought his intelligent and reasonable advice. His method was to approach everything with reason. He infused reason into his religion as he did his politics and philosophy. Reason was the unifying factor in his life, and his pursuit of it may have been his most important legacy.²⁶

Copyright Notice: The information in this file may be used and copied freely for any educational or personal use. The name of the author, the copyright notice, and any references or links to the original site (<http://constantsite.com>) must remain intact and visible with the article. All rights to material in this file are retained by copyright holder. The information in this file may not be copied or reproduced in any way except as specified in this copyright notice. The information in this file may not be used at all for commercial use or for the purpose of receiving profit or remuneration of any kind without the express written consent of the copyright holder.

[Goto Top](#) [Goto Main Site](#)

Works Cited

- Ashcraft, Richard. *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.
- Bluhm, William T., Neil Wintfeld, and Stuart H. Teger. "Locke's Idea of God: Rational Truth or Political Myth?" *The Journal of Politics* 42 (April 1980), 414-38.
- Cranston, Maurice. *John Locke: A Biography*. New York: MacMillan, 1957.
- De Beer, Esmond S. "Locke and English Liberalism: The *Second Treatise of Government* in Its Contemporary Setting." In *John Locke Problems and Perspectives: A Collection of New Essays*, ed. John W. Yolton, 1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Dunn, John. "Consent in the Political Theory of John Locke." *The Historical Journal* 10 (June 1967), 153-82.
- _____. *Locke*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- _____. *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of the Argument of the 'Two Treatises of Government'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Durant, Will and Ariel Durant. *The Story of Civilization*. Vol. VII, *The Age of Reason Begins*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- _____. *The Story of Civilization*. Vol. VIII, *The Age of Louis XIV*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.
- Ewing, George W., ed. *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. Washington: Regnery Gateway, 1965.
- Farr, James and Clayton Roberts. "John Locke on the Glorious Revolution: A Rediscovered Document." *The Historical Journal* 28 (June 1985): 385-98.
- Fowler, Thomas. *Locke*. New York: AMS Press, 1888.
- Jeffreys, M. V. C. *John Locke: Prophet of Common Sense*. London: Methuen, 1967.
- Knights, Mark. "Petitioning and the Political Theorists: John Locke, Algernon Sidney and London's 'Monster' Petition of 1680." *Past & Present* 138 (February 1993): 94-111.
- Laslett, Peter, ed. *Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Locke, John. *Essay Concerning Toleration*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *Essay to Clarke*. In "John Locke on the Glorious Revolution: A Rediscovered Document," James Farr and Clayton Roberts. *The Historical Journal* 28 (June 1985): 395-8.

- _____. *First Tract on Government*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *First Treatise of Government*. In *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- _____. *Letter Concerning Toleration*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *Letter to Edward Clarke (29 January/8 February 1689)*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *Letter to S. H.[Henry Stubbe]*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *Letter to the Hon. Robert Boyle*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *Second Tract on Government*. In *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton. New York: Mentor, 1993.
- _____. *Second Treatise of Government*. In *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- _____. *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. ed. George W. Ewing. Washington: Regnery Gateway, 1965.
- Pocock, J. G. A. and Richard Ashcraft. *John Locke: Papers Read at a Clark Library Seminar 10 December 1977*. Los Angeles: University of California, 1980.
- Rabieh, Michael S. "The Reasonableness of Locke, or the Questionableness of Christianity" *The Journal of Politics* 53 (November 1991): 933-57.
- Tarlton, Charles D. "The Exclusion Controversy, Pamphleteering, and Locke's *Two Treatises*." *The Historical Journal* 24 (March 1981): 49-68.
- Wootton, David, ed. *Political Writings of John Locke*. New York: Mentor, 1993.

Endnotes

1. Dunn, John, *Locke* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 1-5; Durant, Will and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, vol. VIII, *The Age of Louis XIV* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963), 575-8.

2. Fowler, Thomas, *Locke* (New York: AMS Press, 1888), 1-3; Wootton, David, ed., *Political Writings of John Locke* (New York: Mentor, 1993), 16-7.

3. Locke, John, *Letter to S. H.[Henry Stubbe]*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 137-39.

4. Locke, John, *First Tract on Government*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 141-51; Locke, John, *Second Tract on Government*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 175-76.

5. Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Toleration*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 186-96.

6. Locke, John, *Letter to the Hon. Robert Boyle*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 184-5; Fowler, 12-20; De Beer, Esmond S., "Locke and English Liberalism: The *Second Treatise of Government* in Its Contemporary Setting," in *John Locke Problems and Perspectives: A Collection of New Essays*, ed. John W. Yolton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969) 36-7; Locke, *Essay Concerning Toleration*, 201-210.

7. Fowler, 21-7; Laslett, Peter, ed., *Two Treatises of Government*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 27-9; Durant, *Louis*, 577-79; Dunn, *Locke*, 4-7.

8. Laslett, 25; Durant, 244-57; Dunn, *Locke*, 9-13.

9. Durant, 288-94.

10. Ashcraft, 25-7.

11. Knights, Mark, "Petitioning and the Political Theorists: John Locke, Algernon Sidney and London's 'Monster' Petition of 1680," *Past & Present* 138 (February 1993): 95; Cranston, Maurice, *John Locke: A Biography* (New York: MacMillan, 1957), 184-204.

12. Tarlton, Charles D., "The Exclusion Controversy, Pamphleteering, and Locke's *Two Treatises*," *The Historical Journal* 24 (March 1981): 50-6.

13. Laslett, 61; Knights, 95-103; Locke, John, *Second Treatise of Government*, in *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 89, 132, 155-163 (references to paragraph numbers).
14. Knights 104-11; Pocock, J. G. A. and Richard Ashcraft, *John Locke: Papers Read at a Clark Library Seminar 10 December 1977* (Los Angeles: University of California, 1980), 5-10; Jeffreys, M. V. C., *John Locke: Prophet of Common Sense* (London: Methuen, 1967), 25-9.
15. De Beer, 34-40; Durant, Will and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization*. Vol. VII, *The Age of Reason Begins* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961), 246-7; Locke, *Second Treatise*, 61.
16. Laslett, 123-6; Dunn, John, *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of the Argument of the 'Two Treatises of Government'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 46-50; Ashcraft, 3-5.
17. Locke, John, *First Treatise of Government*, in *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1-21 (references to paragraph numbers); Wootton, 71.
18. Locke, *Second Treatise*, 11, 21, 77, 109, 135; Ashcraft, Richard, *Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987), 1-7; Dunn, *Political Thought*, ix-xiii; Dunn, John, "Consent in the Political Theory of John Locke," *The Historical Journal* 10 (June 1967), 153-5.
19. Bluhm, William T., Neil Wintfeld, and Stuart H. Teger, "Locke's Idea of God: Rational Truth or Political Myth?" *The Journal of Politics* 42 (April 1980), 415-6, 419-20, 429, 431-2, 436.
20. Ashcraft 4-6, 31-3; Dunn, *Consent*, 156; Locke, *Second*, 102, 168.
21. Locke, John, *Letter to Edward Clarke (29 January/8 February 1689)*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 436-8.
22. Farr, James and Clayton Roberts, "John Locke on the Glorious Revolution: A Rediscovered Document," *The Historical Journal* 28 (June 1985): 385-94; Dunn, *Political Thought*, 42-7; Locke, John, *Essay to Clarke*, in "John Locke on the Glorious Revolution: A Rediscovered Document," James Farr and Clayton Roberts, *The Historical Journal* 28 (June 1985): 395-8.
23. Locke, John, *Letter Concerning Toleration*, in *Political Writings of John Locke*, ed. David Wootton (New York: Mentor, 1993), 390-436.
24. Ewing, George W., ed., *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (Washington: Regnery Gateway, 1965), vii-xix; Rabieh, Michael S., "The Reasonableness of Locke, or the

Questionableness of Christianity," *The Journal of Politics* 53 (November 1991): 933-4.

25. Locke, John, *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. ed. George W. Ewing. (Washington: Regnery Gateway, 1965) 1, 19, 22, 252; Rabiéh, 939-41.

26. Cranston, 76-9.