PERSECUTION AND TOLERATION
By the end of the seventeenth century, persecution was on the wane in Europe. There are several explanations for this. If persecution was a means for states to exert their authority, then the decline in persecution would suggest that states had found other means of keeping their subjects in line. Independent prosecutions by local authorities were increasingly constrained by growing state authority. Religious leaders also found new means of ensuring conformity, or in some cases stopped challenging rival beliefs and practices. In addition, there was decreased interest in pursuing religious minorities and witchcraft accusations, almost an exhaustion of zeal that some have attributed to a rejection of intense interest in religious matters after the violence of religiously motivated conflicts like the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648) and the English Civil Wars (1642–1649).

Moreover, the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century generated a new “toleration debate” among the educated, in which earlier ideas about the individual nature of religious belief reemerged, this time reasoned to the conclusion that religious belief could not be coerced. John Locke (1632–1704), for example, argued that religious belief was voluntary, and outside the control of civil authorities, with the exception of Catholics and atheists. Skepticism—about the efficacy of witchcraft and about the nature of religious belief itself—grew, as thinkers like Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677) published their ideas from the relative safety of Amsterdam. Finally, thinkers argued that political states could no longer afford to wage war over religion. Suppression of religious populations within a state, and religiously motivated wars with other states, had become so destructive that it was politically and economically unfeasible. Charles-Louis de Secondat, marquis de Montesquieu (1689–1755), and Voltaire (1694–1778) argued against the Inquisition as the epitome of an irrational, and economically counterproductive, denial of political liberty. Others pointed out that, by other names, Lutherans and Calvinists had instituted their own inquisitions that were equally dangerous. By the end of the eighteenth century, Europe had moved away from the religious persecution that had marked the beginning of the early modern period.
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PETER I (RUSSIA) (1672–1725; ruled 1682–1725), tsar of Russia. Peter I, who was formally known as Peter the Great after defeating Sweden in the Great Northern War in 1721, has long defined the transition from old to modern Russia in Russian historical consciousness. Although recent scholarship has modified this view somewhat, pointing out the antecedents of his reforms and the unchanged reality of Russia as a state built on the pillars of agriculture, elite service, and servile labor, few would challenge the defining character of the Petrine era for Russia’s subsequent sense of its own modernity.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS
By the time of Peter’s accession in 1682, Muscovy had become a vast and sprawling realm, subsuming most of the east Slavic world, as well as the vast and barely explored Siberian expanse. It lacked access to the Baltic Sea to the north and the Black Sea to the
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south and suffered on the southern steppe border from debilitating raids by nomadic and pastoral peoples. In pursuit of a Baltic presence, Peter clashed with the equally ambitious Charles XII of Sweden and became enmeshed in the Great Northern War, a conflagration lasting over two decades, ending victoriously for Russia only in 1721 with the Treaty of Nystadt. Simultaneously, Peter faced a southern war against the Ottoman Empire, allied with Sweden for most of the Northern War.

Unsuccessful battles at Azov against the Ottomans in 1695–1696 set Peter’s drastic reform of state and military structures in motion, convincing him of the urgency of building a navy. After opening a shipyard on the lower Volga River, in Voronezh, he departed on his vaunted Great Embassy, an extended journey through Europe, traveling nominally incognito as a captain (“Peter Mikhailov”) largely to avoid ceremonial obligations at foreign courts. He spent most of 1697–1698 abroad, in Holland, England, the Germanies, and France, observing trades and hiring hundreds of craftsmen and naval officers to work in Russia building and training a fleet. Upon his return he inaugurated a flurry of changes, mostly designed to build a formidable navy and maximize the number of men in arms. These included establishing a Navigational (later Naval) Academy and initiating a military draft to replace the outmoded mobilization of peasant militias. Beginning in 1705 one adult male in seventy was to be drafted, and, during the course of the Northern War, the ratio fell as low as one in twenty. Those drafted served for life, and their legal status became that of soldier. While the number of those in arms was not dramatically greater than before, perhaps a quarter million at its peak, these soldiers, organized into permanent regiments and detachments, were far better trained and equipped than their forebears.

CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS REFORM
Peter’s cultural revolution often took on a decidedly coercive cast. Symbolic of his statist and modernizing vision was the establishment of a new capital, St. Petersburg, situated in the swampy territory of Ingermanland, on the site of a small fortress on the southeastern rim of the Gulf of Finland. First proclaimed in 1704, the capital’s initial permanent structures were completed in 1707, when the government began to shift from Moscow. Situated far from the center of Russian population, with a German name, a decidedly un-Russian rectilinear street pattern, and distinctly European architecture, the new capital stood as a powerful statement of the massive Europeanization to which Peter meant to subject his realm.
Taxes on beards and sleeves, first imposed in 1699–1700, obliged serving men to break with Muscovite appearances and adopt European dress. The balls at court, culminating in the 1718 decree on “assemblies,” imposed a new Europeanized public sociability at court, one that commanded the visible presence of women as well as men at balls, formal dinners, and celebrations. The switch in 1700 to the Julian calendar (previously the new year had occurred on September 1), and counting the years from the birth of Christ rather than from creation, commanded nothing less than a *renovatio* of time. The imposition of a new “civil” alphabet in 1707, which over time became the orthography of officialdom and secularity, reinforced in highly visible ways the symbolic separation of the church’s spiritual realm (Church Slavonic and the religious calendar) from the state’s civic realm.

Peter’s determination to separate the church from and subordinate it to the state defined his entire approach to ecclesiastical authority, culminating in the elimination of the patriarchate in 1721 and its replacement by a governmental body, the Holy Synod. Peter’s relationships to church and religion were more complex than mere caesaropapism, however. Sincerely if eccentrically religious, he held redemption and salvation paramount, and he relied on clergy to help him rule and reign. Leading ecclesiastic officials, such as Feofan Prokopovich and Gavriil Buzhinskii (the first rector of the Alexander Nevski monastery), articulated the ideological legitimation for Peter’s reforms and produced the defining panegyrics of his reign and legacy. Parish clergy were required (at least by the terms of the Spiritual Regulation of 1721) to act as agencies of the law as well as of the soul, by reading aloud new decrees and keeping parish registries and confession lists. The large monastic clergy, whom Peter viewed as little more than parasites, experienced reform personally as Peter closed approximately two-thirds of Russia’s monasteries and submitted the rest to a test of their social utility.

**SOCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES**

It would be a mistake to imagine that Peter’s reforms followed an orderly or systematic path. Nevertheless, a functionalist schema suggested by the early-twentieth-century historian Paul Miliukov effectively captures the dynamics of policy reform.

Military necessity drove technological and military reform, whose immense costs (commanding up to 90 percent of the budget) necessitated changes in taxation and in mass mobilization. Thus, Peter imposed numerous tariffs and luxury taxes before transforming direct taxation in 1724 from a household basis to a per capita “soul tax” of 74 kopecks, which counted adult males (with certain exemptions). He eliminated slavery, making all former slaves into serfs, who were thus subject to the soul tax and military recruitment. Changes such as these demanded comparable reforms in central and provincial administration, the conducting of regular censuses, and the overhaul of state service.

Peter’s interventions in the landed nobility were particularly momentous. Having done away with the last of the landed militias, and freed from the old system of precedence (*Mestnichestvo*), Peter pursued ad hoc strategies to make service more professional. As before, service remained compulsory, but it was
deemed a full-time, lifelong obligation, slowly transforming noble serving men into absentee landlords. Seeking to loosen the stranglehold of elite noble clans, Peter collapsed all forms of land tenure into hereditary land, and he elevated several foreigners and lowborn Russians to positions of authority, nominally on the basis of ability. This latter practice was institutionalized in 1722 with the Table of Ranks and Orders, which pegged specific work to specific ranks, salaries, and privileges. In addition to eliminating virtually all of the Muscovite terms of status, such as “boyar” and “boyar’s son,” the Table of Ranks created a mechanism of advancement, at least on paper, whereby untitled servitors could advance first to personal nobility and then to hereditary nobility. Peter also intervened directly in familial inheritance by abolishing partible inheritance in 1714 in favor of unigeniture, wherein one son would inherit the entire estate. Deeply resented by noble families, unigeniture was dropped in 1731 and partible inheritance returned.

To maintain administration during his frequent absences, he created the Ruling Senate in 1711, which had the power of decree in the tsar’s name. Originally composed of his closest advisers, the Senate took on a more bureaucratic cast toward the end of his reign, when Peter replaced the Muscovite system of ad hoc civil chancelleries with twelve functionally defined colleges, each of which was to be run by a council rather than by a single individual as in a ministerial system. Each college was represented in the revised Senate. Provincial government underwent a somewhat more modest reorganization in 1708 with the creation of eight vast territorial governments. These territorial governments had almost no direct contact with the populations over which they nominally ruled. As before, the exercise of governmental authority in the provinces relied mostly on a mixture of military presence and unpaid office holding. Exceptions to this rule were tax collecting and military recruitment, placed in the hands of a cadre of armed horsemen called fiscals, a group whose name became synonymous with violence and brute confiscation.

The disruptions generated by these widely unpopular policies engendered extensive popular resentment and periodic waves of armed resistance and defections from his ranks. These included rebellions by Moscow’s musketeers (strel’tsy) in 1697, Cossack-led rebellions (Bulavin’s revolt in 1707 and Mazepa’s defection to the Swedes in 1708), and Old Believer riots (1703–1704 and later). Numerous elements of Russia’s population looked upon the era as one of oppression and betrayal and upon the tsar as a tyrant, usurper, and Antichrist. All such opposition met fierce repression; none elicited moderation or concessions.

SUCCESSION

A combination of familial rivalry (the disinheritance of his eldest son, Alexis, and his death in prison before his planned execution in 1718) and misfortune (the death of his youngest son, Peter, in 1716) deprived Peter of direct male heirs. In response, Peter decreed a new form of succession in 1722 in which the reigning monarch named the successor. This shortsighted decision virtually guaranteed periodic instability at court, especially when a ruler died without naming a successor, as was the case with Peter himself. Unintentionally, however, it opened the way for nearly a century of female rule by displacing the principle of father-son lineage. Peter’s widow, Catherine, thus became Russia’s first crowned female ruler in 1725.

See also Alexis I (Russia); Catherine II (Russia); Church and State Relations; Moscow; Northern Wars; Russia; St. Petersburg; Taxation.
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PETTY, WILLIAM (1623–1687), English political economist. Born in Romsey, Hampshire, William Petty was the son of a tailor. At age thirteen, Petty became a cabin boy on a merchant ship. He broke his leg at sea and left the ship in Caen, France, where he enrolled in a Jesuit school and mastered Latin, Greek, and French. On returning to England, he joined the Navy, but in 1643, with the outbreak of the Civil War, he went to the Netherlands to study medicine at Utrecht, Leiden, and Amsterdam, and then to Paris, where he became acquainted with Thomas Hobbes and Marin Mersenne. In 1646, Petty returned to England and later studied medicine at Oxford, receiving his M.D. in 1649. He was appointed professor of anatomy at Brasenose College, Oxford, and then professor of music at Gresham College, London. In 1652, Petty became the physician-general to Oliver Cromwell’s army in Ireland. Petty directed the famous Down Survey, using the army to map all Irish lands in just one year. In the process, he acquired an immense amount of property, especially in County Kerry. In 1661, Petty was knighted by Charles II. In 1667, he married Elizabeth Fenton and they had two sons and one daughter who survived to adulthood.

Petty was a virtuoso. In 1662, he became a charter member of the Royal Society in London. (He was also one of the founders and the first president of the Dublin Philosophical Society.) He is most famous for his contributions to economics and his promotion of a new science he called political arithmetic. The aim of political arithmetic was to treat political problems (broadly defined) mathematically. One of the most pressing problems for Petty was population. Petty viewed labor as essential to the production of wealth and advocated means to increase population and to measure it. To this end, he urged the English and Irish governments to collect regular statistics on births, deaths, and total population. In his Treatise of Taxes (1662), he argued that the use of political arithmetic could rationalize tax collection and thus put the nation on more stable financial ground.

Petty was a close friend of John Graunt, who had pioneered the numerical study of society. Like Graunt, Petty investigated bills of mortality for a variety of purposes, ranging from determining the optimum number of physicians for England to demonstrating the superiority of England to France. In a series of pamphlets, Petty developed methods to estimate population from the number of houses and from the number of burials and christenings. He stated that the number of deaths due to contagious, acute, and chronic diseases would provide a measure of the salubrity, or healthfulness, of a specific parish. He compared the mortality rates at London hospitals with those of Paris hospitals and concluded that London’s were lower.

Petty was a prolific writer and published numerous books, pamphlets, and articles. Many other writings were published posthumously. He has been regarded by later writers, including Karl Marx, as the founder of English political economy. More recently, historians have emphasized his contributions to the quantifying spirit of the eighteenth century and his advocacy of creating new methods of governance (especially statistics) that are characteristic of modern societies.

See also Census; Cromwell, Oliver; Graunt, John; Hobbes, Thomas; Public Health; Statistics; Taxation.
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