

FICTIONAL LETTERS OR REAL ACCUSATIONS? ANONYMOUS CORRESPONDENCE IN THE BAYLE- JURIEU CONTROVERSY

Anton MATYTSIN*

Abstract. This article describes the polemical debate that took place between Huguenot refugees Pierre Jurieu and Pierre Bayle following the publication of Bayle's notorious *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1697). It focuses specifically on the volume of letters from anonymous readers published by Jurieu in order to condemn Bayle. The article describes the philosophical, theological, and personal dimensions of their quarrel, and it considers the moral and intellectual implications posed by Jurieu's publication of anonymous letters that condemned Bayle's controversial text. Anonymity was a powerful epistolary device in the Republic of Letters that, while divided along confessional lines, was becoming increasingly integrated through learned journals and expanding epistolary networks. This article reflects on the multiple uses of anonymity in the context of the philosophical and theological debates of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Keywords: Pierre Bayle, Pierre Jurieu, Eusèbe Renaudot, skepticism, Pyrrhonism, anonymity, correspondence

Introduction

As the confessional conflicts of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries created and sharpened geographical divisions within the French-speaking world, correspondence proved an enduring link between Huguenot intellectuals and their Catholic counterparts. The vast epistolary networks enabled scholars to exchange reports about the most recent intellectual developments in France, Switzerland, England, the Dutch Republic, and other places where the Huguenots emigrated after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. In order to disseminate information more effectively, Huguenot thinkers such as Pierre Bayle, Henri Basnage de Beauval, and Henri du Sauzet, among others, began to publish journals that contained versions of private letters, reviews of the latest scholarly works, and reports of the most recent scientific discoveries. These periodicals offered an opportunity for readers all over the continent to keep up with the latest debates in theology, philosophy, sciences, and literature. They also facilitated rapid expansion of epistolary networks.

Private correspondence provided a way to extend scholarly debates beyond published treatises, allowing intellectuals across Europe to probe the philosophical

* Andrew W. Mellon Fellow in the Humanities, Stanford University, Department of French and Italian, Pigott Hall, 450 Serra Mall, Stanford, CA, 94305-2010, email: matytsin@stanford.edu

principles of their allies and adversaries. Thinkers would often write to their close friends, asking them to pass their questions and objections onto those authors with whom they were not directly acquainted, thereby expanding the epistolary networks even further. Frequently, these exchanges were published in journals or in edited volumes, allowing the reading public to witness the protracted versions of philosophical debates. Given this public nature of private letters among intellectuals in early-modern Europe, correspondents followed a set of unwritten rules regarding the content and form of their letters. Although these rules were not formally articulated, correspondents were expected to observe a certain tone, refrain from excessively aggressive accusations, and adhere to various formal conventions.¹

One notable episode that provides insight into the nature of these informal epistolary rules can be seen in the protracted and acerbic exchange between Pierre Bayle and his fellow Huguenot refugee Pierre Jurieu. As the founder and editor of the prominent learned journal, entitled the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, the self-exiled Bayle became one of the most prominent links for French-speaking intellectuals across Europe. Pierre Jurieu, who had moved from Academy of Sedan to the *École illustre* of Rotterdam along with Bayle and later became the minister of the Walloon church in Rotterdam, was one of the more outspoken voices of the Huguenot community in the Dutch Republic. The two men had been engaged in a series of intra-confessional debates about the sources of religious certainty, the role of miracles and prophecies in the Bible, and even about the legitimacy of Louis XIV's rule. They represented opposite poles of the theological and philosophical spectrum of the Huguenot community: on the one side, stood the fideist and irenic Bayle, who called for a submission of reason to faith, for religious toleration, and for a peaceful coexistence with Catholic France; on the other, was the *dévo*t Jurieu, who fervently defended his rational interpretations of Scripture from Catholics and fellow Protestants alike and called for holy war against Louis XIV.² Their enmity ran so deep that Jurieu played a decisive role in getting Bayle dismissed from his teaching position at the *École illustre* in 1693 by harshly condemning his rival for penning the *Avis aux réfugiés* (1690), a work in which Bayle had directly attacked Jurieu's prophetic claims about the deposition of Louis XIV and called for moderation among Huguenot exiles.³ While their intellectual clash lasted for a better part of three decades, the publication of Bayle's controversial *Dictionnaire historique et critique* in 1697 paved the way for a climax in the exchange between the two Protestant adversaries.

Following the appearance of the *Dictionnaire*, Jurieu anonymously edited and published a volume of letters that contained bitterly negative reactions to Bayle's grandiose work.⁴ These letters allegedly arrived in Rotterdam from Paris, London, Geneva, and other cities, and each of them condemned Bayle's text in the harshest terms. While only one set of letters was signed (by the French Royal censor, the abbé Eusèbe Renaudot), others appeared in anonymous form because their authors allegedly wished to remain outside the public view. Bayle replied that he refused to consider anonymous accusations and insinuated that Jurieu had fabricated the letters in order to make his criticism of Bayle seem more legitimate. Nevertheless, without attempting to discover whether the letters were real or fabricated, Bayle decided to answer these accusations and provided a detailed set of replies.

This article describes the nature of the polemical debate that took place between Jurieu and Bayle. It considers the moral and intellectual implications posed by Jurieu's publication of the anonymous letters in the context of the epistolary culture of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Such an analysis sheds light both on the substantive philosophical and theological disagreements between the two prominent Huguenots and on the intellectual context that shaped their debates. It also reflects on the issues of authorship, anonymity, and the public nature of private correspondence.

Renaudot's and Jurieu's Criticisms

Although Jurieu did not sign his name to the *Jugement du public et particulièrement de M. l'abbé Renaudot sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, any contemporaneous reader familiar with the intellectual life of the Dutch Huguenot community could easily identify the editor of the volume.⁵ To headline the critiques, Jurieu chose a report written by Eusèbe Renaudot to the chancelier Louis Boucherat. This report was the main reason why Bayle's *Dictionnaire* would be banned in France until the death of the Sun King in 1715.⁶ Jurieu's animosity for his fellow exile seemed, in this instance, to outweigh any of the larger confessional disagreements he might have had with the Catholic censor. Although the report was intended for the French crown, Jurieu saw no problem with reprinting it for the Huguenot reading public. Despite belonging to different confessions and having rather divergent theological agendas, both authors saw Bayle as the enemy of the faith, because they believed that he purposely sought to undermine all sources of religious certainty.

In his introductory remarks, Renaudot noted that Bayle's text should be regarded less as a dictionary or a scholarly compendium and more as an agglomeration of disorganized digressions on all sorts of subjects. He also claimed that while the book had little utility, it was quite dangerous due to its remarks on matters of religious doctrine, especially regarding the Catholic Church, its jabs against the French monarchs, and its implications for morality. Renaudot was also unimpressed by the quality of Bayle's scholarship, accusing the author of relying on very few sources and of using ancient works in translation and not in the original.⁷

The censor's major point of contention was that Bayle's treatment of religious questions could do nothing other than scandalize the readers and promote libertinism. Among the offenses of the *Dictionnaire* he cited the irreverent way in which the Huguenot skeptic had treated the sacred authors of the Old Testament, the improper comments in the article "Adam," and the licentious remarks about temptations faced by various saints and other revered Biblical figures. Renaudot noted that Bayle often cited out of context passages written by the early Fathers of the Church, by St. Augustine in particular, in order to ridicule them. He also accused Bayle of promoting various doctrinal errors and heresies, such as those of the pre-Adamites, the Manicheans, and the Pelagians by discussing them in a way that lent them credence. In sum, the censor concluded, Bayle's radical Pyrrhonism was injurious to revealed religion:

And since the nature of his mind is a kind of Pyrrhonism in religion, it reigns in all of this work in a way that must harm not only the Catholics but also the Protestants of good faith.⁸

While Renaudot acknowledged that Bayle's apparent Pyrrhonism was pernicious to both major confessions, he did claim that Bayle specifically focused on attacking the Catholic Church.

Jurieu, who anonymously commented on Renaudot's critique, appeared surprised at the latter's distaste for Bayle's alleged anti-Catholicism. Jurieu maintained that Bayle was against all organized religion and revealed himself to be a libertine, a Pyrrhonian, and a deist. Bayle's chief goal, Jurieu argued, was to ruin all religion:

The abbé should regard this as being part of the outrages that the author makes against religion in general, and not take it as a particular offense against Papism. He quickly forgot the character of this author, though he had described him a few lines before as a libertine, a Pyrrhonian, and a common enemy of all religions. The abbé seems to have misread or forgotten the other works of this author. Thus, to console him, we must remind him that this man [Bayle] does not begrudge other religions any less than to that which calls itself Catholic. This is a complete Pyrrhonian or a deist, whose main goal is to destroy all faith and all religion.⁹

Jurieu was referring mainly to Bayle's *Avis aux refugiez*, where, he argued, Bayle was significantly more irreverent against Calvinist authors than against Catholic ones. Bayle did, in fact, criticize other prominent Huguenots who called for an allied Protestant front against France, claiming that such calls for war were just as unchristian as the Catholic persecutions of Protestants. Jurieu claimed that Bayle was equally disrespectful of Catholic and Protestant authors, describing the former as overly superstitious in the *Pensées diverses sur la comète* (1682), while attacking the Huguenots in the *Avis au refugiez*.

Jurieu was further incensed at the fact that Bayle's *Dictionnaire* had undermined both sources of religious certainty: authority and reason. While he conceded Renaudot's point that the text cast doubt over the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church, Jurieu maintained that his Huguenot rival posed an even more aggressive challenge to the possibility of a rational analysis of the Bible. He noted that Bayle attempted to implicitly demonstrate that various heresies could be just as true as the most solidly established religious doctrines, since all religious knowledge was equally uncertain and unknowable to the human mind:

There he wants to prove that the [supposed] truth, which he calls putative in the matter of religion, that is to say error or heresy, is just as good as the real truth, because all is uncertain, all is obscure and impenetrable; [and] that the truth is plunged in the well of Democritus. On the one hand, the foundation of the Roman Catholic religion, which is blind submission, is reversed; on the

other hand, the foundation of the faith of the Reformed, which is [rational] examination, is ruined. Where then does that leave religion?¹⁰

Jurieu thus sought to demonstrate that his skeptical opponent had a consistent record of employing his Pyrrhonism to defend heresy and to promote atheism.

While he acknowledged that Bayle explicitly called for the submission of reason to faith, Jurieu also argued that his opponent did all he could to subvert the authority of the Scriptures:

After having said all that he could say against religion and against its mysteries, he comes back to say that one must believe the Revelation, and submit reason to faith. But he says all this after having claimed all that can be imagined to weaken the authority of revelation and of the sacred authors.¹¹

Jurieu took particular issue with the article “David” claiming that Bayle presented the author of the Psalms as a villain. He was equally displeased with the article “Pauliciens,” where Bayle had allegedly ridiculed the notion of Original Sin, comparing God’s treatment of Eve to that of a “mother who turned herself into a madam of her daughter, by putting her in the circumstance, where the daughter could not do otherwise but yield [to advances] and be debauched.”¹² By highlighting Bayle’s seemingly irreverent treatment of Christianity, Renaudot and Jurieu sought to cast him as a radical philosopher and to discredit him among the majority of the reading public.

Anonymous Attacks

In the introduction, Jurieu noted that, although Renaudot wrote the most detailed censure of Bayle’s text, the volume also contained extracts of letters from a number of other figures. Speaking as the anonymous editor, Jurieu claimed that he had received these letters without any solicitation both from those who had been attacked in Bayle’s notorious work and from those who had no personal stake in the debates. At the same time, he refused to reveal the names of those who had composed the critical letters, claiming that he “did not wish to expose honest people to the ill temper of such a violent and angry author.”¹³ According to Jurieu, his goal in presenting the various reactions to the *Dictionnaire* was to show what the reading public thought about Bayle’s latest book:

But trust that in all that I will tell you, as well as in what I have told you, there is none of my voice. It is always the public that speaks. I assure you that I did not read the book [the *Dictionnaire*], not even the title. And so that one does not say that I judge things without having seen them, I do not give my opinion, but that of others.... I was sufficiently scandalized by this simple report that I made.¹⁴

By presenting the opinions of so many diverse readers, Jurieu attempted to offer a more objective evaluation of the controversial work. A variety of negative

judgments about the *Dictionnaire* served as an effective way to sway the undecided Huguenot reading public to side with the apparent consensus opinion about the text. Furthermore, Jurieu remained anonymous as editor of the volume and author of the remarks, to make his critique against Bayle seem less vindictive. It is consequently impossible to know whether the letters in question really existed or whether Jurieu fabricated them. It was this ambiguity that would cause Bayle to voice his indignation.

Having presented the extracts from fifteen different letters, Jurieu then summarized the major anonymous criticisms brought up by his correspondents. First, many of the readers claimed that Bayle's *Dictionnaire* was replete with irrelevant digressions on all sorts of topics. Jurieu speculated that Bayle did this in order to extend the length of his text and to make himself seem more erudite than he actually was.¹⁵ One correspondent from Paris claimed that the work was overfilled with minutia, while a reader from London complained that Bayle mentioned too many minor historical figures and left out important ones.¹⁶ The correspondent from London pointed out that this defect of the work rendered it a lot less popular than was anticipated.¹⁷

Second, Jurieu noted that many letters accused Bayle of feigning erudition, citing ancient authors in translation, and plagiarizing from relatively unknown scholars.¹⁸ Renaudot had attacked Bayle along similar lines, claiming that the author of the *Dictionnaire* cited only recent authors, and demonstrated both insufficient erudition and plain ignorance of history, chronology, geography, and other subjects. This criticism was rather significant in the learned world of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. By claiming that Bayle had no direct knowledge of antiquity and attacking his use of sources, Jurieu, Renaudot, and the anonymous authors attempted to undermine his scholarly credibility—the basis of any author's reputation in the Republic of Letters.

The third set of criticisms concerned Bayle's allegedly malicious intentions and improper attacks against both historical figures and contemporaries. The universal indignation toward the text, Jurieu maintained, came from the fact that Bayle "attacked the whole world with unfair critiques."¹⁹ Jurieu noted that Bayle libeled not only contemporaneous intellectuals, but also kings. This irreverent attitude toward the French monarchs, a letter from Paris argued, was "what particularly forced the Chancellor to burn and to ban" the work.²⁰ Coming from Jurieu, or at least selected by him, such an accusation was particularly ironic, since the Huguenot minister himself had denounced Louis XIV and called for his deposition on numerous occasions. However, by presenting his opponent as an indiscriminant accuser, Jurieu hoped to further discredit Bayle.

The fourth and most extensive type of censures of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, Jurieu's commentary suggested, concerned the mistreatment of religion in general and of Christianity in particular. One letter, attributed to the members of the Berg-op-zoom synod, claimed that Bayle's work was far more dangerous for the propagation of atheism than Spinoza could ever be:

This book and the way that it is written, with fire, with wit, with a lively imagination, and with all possible charms, is capable of producing more

atheists and libertines than Spinoza, whose principle Bayle tries to refute, ever could.²¹

Indeed, while some of Bayle's opponents had praised him for his refutation of Spinoza, Jurieu noted that Bayle's arguments against the controversial thinker contained no trace of claims based on the Christian Revelation.²² Instead, he maintained, Bayle spoke in deistic terms that could have been used by a Platonist or an Aristotelian.²³ By comparing his Huguenot opponent with Spinoza, Jurieu hoped to cast Bayle as an extreme atheist and turn even the most moderate readers against him. He attempted to demonstrate that his rival's ideas were dangerous to Catholics and Protestants alike, seeking to discredit him in the Dutch Huguenot community above all.

The fifth category of critiques involved the great number of scandalous and impure accounts contained in Bayle's work. Several readers complained about the inappropriate examples and stories recounted in the *Dictionnaire*. A letter from London informed that the Archbishop of Canterbury returned the controversial text to the bookseller because he found "so many things that not only offended piety, but ones that simple decency could not put up with."²⁴ Similarly, another correspondent argued that Bayle's dictionary was so conducive to promoting sexual libertinism that its title should have been: "Of Ancient and Modern Brothels."²⁵ It was almost as if Bayle wanted to be censured for "the magnitude of his excesses," argued Jurieu.²⁶

Bayle's arch-nemesis concluded the critiques by citing the instances in which Bayle's *Dictionnaire* attacked him specifically. Since the *Jugement* was an anonymous work, Jurieu wrote of himself in the third person. At the same time, he made sure to cast himself as an innocent victim who had been attacked by an aggressive and vindictive Bayle. Having summarized the "unjust criticisms and malicious accusations" of his rival, Jurieu argued that through the negative reception of the *Dictionnaire* both by Bayle's friends and enemies, God himself passed judgment against the impious thinker:

One must admit, along with the author of this letter, that there is an evident judgment of God on this man: He hoped to make his reputation immortal with this enormous work, and that is what adds the last straw to his infamy.²⁷

The combination of the anonymous letters and Jurieu's reflections was nothing less than an act of academic aggression in the early-modern Republic of Letters. The entire volume was a direct attack against Bayle's scholarly reputation, his religious beliefs, and his moral proclivities. Bayle could not leave the attacks unanswered.

Bayle's Response

The Huguenot skeptic gave a number of substantive replies to the accusations leveled by Renaudot, Jurieu, and the autonomous authors. First, Bayle defended himself against the charge that his *Dictionnaire* was full of moral impurities and filthy stories, arguing that, as a historian, he had the right to recount true events even if they contained improprieties. He compared himself to Michel de Montaigne, claiming that

his *Dictionnaire* “draws on the poetic license Montaigne’s essays, both with respect to Pyrrhonism and with respect to the filth!”²⁸ He similarly refused to censor his work of the immoral actions of various kings, arguing that by giving these examples and citing passages from licentious books he had hoped to demonstrate humanity’s extreme depravity.

Bayle defended himself vigorously against the charges of atheism and libertinism, suggesting that he saw faith and not philosophy as the source of certainty in religious questions. He sided with the controversial Paduan philosopher Pietro Pomponazzi, claiming that the immortality of the soul could only be known through revelation, not through philosophical inquiry.²⁹ He argued that the source of human happiness and the best use of man’s rational faculties was reason’s total submission to faith. Bayle further denied Jurieu’s claim that he had attempted to weaken the Scriptures with his article on King David. He maintained “adultery and murder did not prevent David from being a great prophet.”³⁰ He also claimed that accusing opponents of libertinism and atheism was merely a rhetorical strategy to undermine any legitimate dissent in theological discussions:

It suffices to observe here, in general, that this supposed libertinism is a solid justification of our most orthodox theologians. They never stop reproaching sectarians by claiming that the principles of the Socinians lead to Pyrrhonism, to deism, and to atheism. To this I ask them: ‘either you are slanderers, or it is very true that, rather than submitting the understanding to obey faith, one is driven by the principles of philosophy to doubt everything. Since you are not slanderers, it is, therefore, true.’³¹

Bayle tried to deflect the substance of Jurieu’s and Renaudot’s charges, suggesting that their accusations were made purely for shock value. He claimed that if they argued in good faith, they would have to agree that Pyrrhonism was the only possible outcome of all philosophical investigations of religious questions.

Bayle also took particular exception to the goals of his anonymous critic, claiming that Jurieu’s chief aim was not to defend religion, but to claim credit for getting Bayle dismissed from the *École illustre*. He argued that Jurieu had similarly libeled Elie Saurin, another Huguenot theologian, by writing two volumes of unjust defamations against him.³² Bayle also questioned Jurieu’s decision to publish the Catholic Renaudot’s text in a Protestant country, claiming that his was an “odious and despised name in all the countries that wage war with France.”³³ He thus hoped to appeal to the public’s sympathy, by presenting Jurieu as a vengeful and libelous thinker who turned intellectual debates into personal vendettas.

Bayle’s major contention with the *Jugement du public*, however, concerned its anonymity. He noted that the volume’s title was not reflective of the nature of the work. Since Renaudot’s name was the only one that appeared in the publication, Bayle argued that the text had to be renamed:

It should not have for its title anything other than *Jugement de l’Abbé Renaudot commenté par celui qui le publie*, since all the other critics are but phantoms; they

are invisible beings; one does not know if they are white or black. This is why their testimonies are worth nothing.³⁴

Even the pagan authors, Bayle maintained, who had frequently engaged in fierce debates, detested such anonymous attacks. The implication of Bayle's critique was that Jurieu had either acted cowardly or was an outright liar. If he chose to publish private letters along with his own commentary without putting any names to the page and hiding behind Renaudot's report, then he lacked the courage to make his accusations openly. An even worse implication of Bayle's dismissal was that Jurieu had simply fabricated the letters. By composing fictional extracts and claiming they had been taken from letters written by actual readers of the *Dictionnaire*, Jurieu could make the critique of Bayle's work seem more pervasive than it was. Bayle also argued that Jurieu failed to provide any witnesses to corroborate the authenticity of these testimonies, and that he expected the public to take him at his word without producing a shred of evidence.³⁵

Bayle was further incensed at the fact that his critic published letters that were written to him in confidence. He believed that by putting these private opinions into print without permission, his rival had violated the basic rules of the Republic of Letters:

What people do we see here? One writes what he claims to have heard being said to a priest, the other prints it. Neither one nor the other asks for permission. They name him without asking. Can one imagine greater brazenness? Does this not tyrannize conversation more than Phalaris tyrannized the people?³⁶

The tyranny in this case, lay in the fact that Jurieu publicized opinions that were meant to remain private. If the letters had indeed been real, then, Bayle argued, his rival had no right to publish anything that was written to him in confidence. By putting these letters into print, Jurieu violated the trust of his correspondents. In a learned world where private correspondence often became public it was essential to observe the unspoken epistolary rules. Bayle insinuated that, if people could not trust that the views they expressed in private would remain secret, they would be less likely to express any opinions.

Consequently, Bayle agreed to answer only those accusations that were specifically signed by Renaudot. In a follow-up to the *Jugement du public*, Jurieu chastised Bayle for his vocal dismissal of the other criticisms, claiming that Bayle "regards as zeroes, the authors of the letters whose extracts were published without names. He disregards all who are not known."³⁷ By taking their quarrel into print and by involving the reading public, both Bayle and Jurieu hoped to appeal to the readers and present each other as dishonest, irreverent, and vindictive. The discussion became as much about the substantive issues as about the form in which the arguments were presented and the intentions that underlay the authors' substantive claims.

Conclusion

This episode in the acerbic series of debates between Bayle and Jurieu offers several insights into the epistolary culture of the early-modern period. First, it demonstrates that intra-confessional tensions could surpass Catholic-Protestant antipathies in levels of animosity. In this case, Jurieu was willing to use a Catholic condemnation of his opponent in order to make his case against Bayle stronger. Indeed, while the inter-confessional contests involved general theological questions with clearly marked differences, debates within the Dutch Huguenot community touched on more quotidian, but, partly for that very reason, more sensitive issues, such as an author's credibility, standing in the community, and, in this case, even employment.

Second, it shows how widely disseminated private correspondence could really become. In some ways, letters provided another medium through which scholars could continue their debates. However, they could be published, either in their entirety or as extracts, not only by journals to which they were formally addressed, but also by individuals. The stakes of the philosophical and theological debates were so high, that participants were not willing to let public or private challenges go unanswered. The reading public, in turn, was eager to witness protracted arguments between notable intellectuals. Consequently, appealing to the sentiments and sympathies of potential readers was just as important as making a consistent and strong argument. This paved the way for more contentious expressions of intellectual and personal animosity among correspondents, since the stakes concerned the public perception of their intellectual abilities.

Finally, the episode sheds light on the interplay between anonymity, authorship, and the perception of truth. By failing to reveal the names of his correspondents, Jurieu rendered both the content and the sources of his extracts subject to doubt. Whether the letters were real or fictional, Jurieu gave Bayle the opportunity to dismiss the alleged critiques. In this case, specifying the authors of the disparaging statements was more significant for establishing the validity of the critiques than were the actual arguments contained in the anonymous letters. Identifying oneself as the critic authenticated one's assessment, because it allowed one's opponent to reply to the attacks and gave the reading public a clear indication of where the censure was coming from. Thus, establishing the author of a given text was often as important as the content of what was printed or written in the learned culture of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

References

¹ For more on the cultural and intellectual context of the early-modern Republic of Letters, see Goldar, A., *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) and Bots, H. and Waquet, F., *La République des Lettres* (Paris: Belin, 1997).

² For the best accounts of the contest between Bayle and Jurieu see: Labrousse, E., *Pierre Bayle: Hétérodoxie et rigorisme*, 2^e édition (Paris: Albin Michel, 1996); Lennon, T.M., *Reading Bayle* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); Bost, H., *L'Affaire Bayle: la bataille entre Pierre Bayle et Pierre Jurieu devant le consistoire de l'Église wallonne de Rotterdam* (Saint Étienne: Institut Claude Longeon, 2006). For more recent work on the intellectual and culture context of

Bayle's thought, see the essays in van Bunge, W. and Bots, H., eds., *Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), le Philosophe de Rotterdam: Philosophy, Religion and Reception. Selected Papers of the Tercentenary Conference Held at Rotterdam, 7–8 December 2006* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

³ Bayle, P., *Avis aux réfugiés*, in *Œuvres diverses de Pierre Bayle* (The Hague: La Compagnie des Librairies, 1737), t.II, 564.

⁴ [Jurieu, P.] *Jugement du public et particulièrement de M. l'abbé Renaudot sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle* (Rotterdam: Abraham Acher, 1697). For a modern edition of the work, see *Correspondance de Pierre Bayle*. Tôme dixième. Lettres 1100-1280. Publiées et annotées par É. Labrousse, A. McKenna et al. (Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 2013), 613–637.

⁵ Bayle identifies Jurieu in his response to the printed work in Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public, & particulièrement de l'Abbé Renaudot, sur le Dictionnaire Critique du Sieur Bayle* printed in *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 5^e éd. (Amsterdam: Brunel et al., 1740), t.IV. 616–626 and in Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public, & particulièrement de l'Abbé Renaudot, sur le Dictionnaire Critique du Sieur Bayle* in *Œuvres diverses de Pierre Bayle*, t.IV, 746. See also Kappler, E., *Bibliographie critique de l'œuvre imprimée de Pierre Jurieu, 1637–1713* (Paris: Champion, 2002).

⁶ Burger, P.-F., “La prohibition du *Dictionnaire historique et critique* de Pierre Bayle par l'abbé Renaudot (1648–1720)”, in Bots, H., ed., *Critical Spirit, Wisdom and Erudition on the Eve of the Enlightenment* (Amsterdam: Holland University Press, 1998), 81–107.

⁷ Renaudot, E., “Jugement de l'abbé Renaudot sur le Dictionnaire critique à monsieur le chancelier”, in *Jugement du public et particulièrement de M. l'abbé Renaudot sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle* (Rotterdam: Abraham Acher, 1697), 5–10.

⁸ Renaudot, E., “Jugement”, 6. “Et comme le caractere de son esprit est une maniere de Pyrrhonisme dans la Religion, il regne dans tout cet Ouvrage d'une maniere qui doit blesser non seulement les Catholiques, mais encore les Protestans de bonne foy.”

⁹ [Jurieu, P.] “Réflexion”, in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 11. “L'Abbé devoit regarder cela, comme faisant partie des outrages que l'Auteur fait à la Religion en general, & ne s'en faire pas une offense particuliere contre le Papisme. Il a bien-tôt oublié le caractere de cet Auteur, qu'il avoit si bien fait peu de lignes auparavant ; comme d'un libertin, d'un pyrrhonien, & comme d'un ennemi commun de toutes les Religions. L'Abbé semble avoir mal lû, ou avoir oublié les autres Ouvrages de cet Auteur. Ainsi pour le consoler il faut le faire souvenir, que cet homme n'en veut pas moins aux autres Religions, qu'à celle qui s'appelle Catholique. C'est un Pyrrhonien achevé, ou un Deiste, dont le but general est de ruiner toute foy & toute Religion.”

¹⁰ [Jurieu, P.], “Réflexion”, 13. Là il veut prouver que la verité, qu'il appelle putative en fait de Religion, c'est à dire l'erreur & l'heresie, est toute aussi bonne que la verité réele; parce que tout est incertain, tout est obscure & impenetrable; que la verité est plongée dans les puits de Democratie. D'un côté voila le fondement de la Religion Romaine renversé, qui est la soumission aveugle; de l'autre côté voicy le fondement de la foy des Reformez ruiné, c'est l'examen: Ou est donc la Religion?”

¹¹ [Jurieu, P.] “Réflexions”, in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 32. “Après avoir dit tout ce qui se peut dire contre la Religion & contre ses Mysteres, il en revient quelquefois à dire, qu'il s'en faut tenir à la revelation, & soumettre la raison à la foy. Mais c'est en disant, & après avoir dit tout ce qui se peut imaginer pour affoiblir l'autorité de la revelation, & des Ecrivains Sacrez.”

¹² [Jurieu, P.] “Réflexions”, 32. “On n'a pas manqué aussi de vous parler de l'article des Pauliciens: Dans lequel pour rendre ridicule la Theologie de l'Eglise sur la providence de Dieu dans le peché, il compare Dieu, à une mere qui se rendroit la maquerelle de sa fille, en la

mettant dans un lieu & dans une situation, où elle ne pourroit manquer de succomber & d'être corrompue."

¹³ [Jurieu, P.], Préface, in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 4. "On ne veut pas exposer d'honnêtes gens à la mauvaise humeur d'un Auteur si violent & si emporté."

¹⁴ [Jurieu, P.], "Réflexions", 28–29. "Mais comptez que dans tout ce que je vous vais dire, aussi bien que dans ce que j'ay dit il n'y a rien du tout de moy. C'est toujours le public qui parle. Je vous avoue que je n'ay pas lû le Livre, ni même le titre. Qu'on ne dise pas que je juge des choses sans les avoir vûës, je ne donne pas mon jugement, c'est celui des autres...j'ay été suffisamment scandalisé par le simple rapport que j'en ay ouy faire"

¹⁵ [Jurieu, P.], "Réflexions", 30.

¹⁶ "Autre extrait d'une autre Lettre du même lieu à M... du 1 Mars [1697]", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 19 and "Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Londres le 28 May 1697", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 25–26.

¹⁷ "Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Londres le 28 May 1697", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 25–26.

¹⁸ [Jurieu, P.], "Réflexions", 30.

¹⁹ [Jurieu, P.], "Réflexions", 31. "Ne demandez donc pas d'où vient ce déchaînement universel contre le Dictionnaire: C'est qu'il attaque tout le monde par d'injustes critiques..."

²⁰ "Extrait d'une lettre de Paris, du 10 Juin 1697", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 26. "...c'est ce qui a obligé particulièrement M. le Chancelier de le brûler, & de le défendre."

²¹ "Extrait d'une lettre écrite à un des membres du Synode qui c'est tenu à Berg-op-zoom", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 24–25. "Et je pose en fait que ce Livre de la maniere dont il est écrit avec feu, avec esprit, avec une vive imagination & tous les agréments possibles, est capable de nous faire plus d'Athées & de libertins que n'a jamais fait Spinoza, dont il entreprend de refuter les principes."

²² Compare Jurieu's reaction to that of Jean-Pierre de Crousaz in Crousaz, J.P. de, *Examen du pyrrhonisme ancien et moderne* (The Hague: Hondt, 1733), 356.

²³ [Jurieu P.], "Réflexions", 33.

²⁴ "Extrait d'une lettre imprimée d'un Agen de Messieurs les Etats à Londres du 29 Avril 1697", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 23. "L'Archevêque de Cantorbery a eu cet empressement comme les autres; mais parmi tout cela il y a trouvé tant d'autres choses que non seulement la pieté ne peut goûter, mais que la simple pudeur ne peut souffrir, qu'il l'a renvoyé chez le Libraire..."

²⁵ "Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Londres le 28 May 1697", in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 25. "...l'ouvrage de M. Bayle pouvant avoir pour titre: De prostibulis veterum & modernorum."

²⁶ [Jurieu P.], "Réflexions", 34. "Il y a apparence que M. Bayle a eu intention de se mettre à l'abri de la censure, par la grandeur de ses excès."

²⁷ [Jurieu, P.] "Réflexion", 46. "Il faut avouer avec l'Auteur de cette Lettre, qu'il y a un jugement de Dieu évident sur cet homme: Il croyoit rendre sa reputation immortelle par ce gros Ouvrage, & c'est ce qui met le comble à son infâmie."

²⁸ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 747a. "Après tout oseroit-on dire que mon Dictionnaire approche de la licence des Essais de Montagne, soit à l'égard du Pyrrhonisme, soit à l'égard des saletez."

²⁹ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 752b.

³⁰ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 754b. "Nous convenons tous que l'adulterre & l'homicide n'ont point empêché que David n'ait été un grand Prophète."

³¹ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 752b. “Il me suffit en général d’observer ici, que ce prétendu libertinage est une justification très-solide de nos Docteurs les plus orthodoxes. Ils ne cessent de reprocher aux Sectaires que le principe des Sociniens conduit au Pyrrhonisme, au Déisme, à l’Athéisme. Sur cela je leur demande, ou vous êtes des calomnieux, ou il est très-vrai qu’à moins que de captiver son entendement à l’obéissance de la foi, on est conduit par les principes de la Philosophie à douter de tout. Or vous n’êtes point calomnieux, donc il est très-vrai &c.”

³² Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 749a.

³³ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 746a–b. “Il a supprimé le nom de tous ses témoins, excepté celui qu’il devoit cacher principalement, nom odieux & emprise dans tous les Païs qui font la guerre à la France.”

³⁴ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 746a. “Il ne doit avoir pour titre que, *Jugement de l’Abbé Renaudot commenté par celui qui le publie*; car tous les autres Juges sont moins que fantômes: ce sont des êtres invisibles; on ne sait s’ils sont blancs ou noirs. C’est pourquoi leur témoignage & un zéro sont la même chose.”

³⁵ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 750a.

³⁶ Bayle, P., *Réflexions sur un imprimé qui a pour titre, Jugement du Public*, 746a. “Quelles gens voyons nous ici? L’un écrit ce qu’il prétend avoir ouï dire à un Evêque, l’autre le fait imprimer. Ni l’un ni l’autre n’en demande la permission. Ils le nomment sans aveux. Peut-on voir plus de hardiesse? N’est-ce pas tyranniser la conversation plus que Phalaris ne tyrannisoit le peuple?”

³⁷ [Jurieu, P.], “Lettre Sur les Réflexions publiées contre le Jugement du public sur le Dictionnaire du Sieur Bayle”, in *Jugement du public... sur le Dictionnaire critique de Sr. Bayle*, 6. “N’avez-vous pas eu envie de rire, Monsieur, en lisant tout au commencement des Réflexions, que cet homme regarde comme des zeros, les Auteurs des Lettres dont on publie les extraits sans les nommer? Il compte pour rien tous ces inconnus.”