

confessional angst which characterised the post-revolutionary decades informed clerical opposition to the various Societies for the Reformation of Manners, opposition ‘triggered by the involvement of Dissenters in their work’. Moreover, the Toleration Act, in the minds of many, left it unclear whether or not unlicensed Dissenting academies were legally tolerable: the legislative efforts culminating in the Schism Act of 1714 were, on Stevens’s reading, an attempt to ‘restore clerical control’, but, crucially, to restore it ‘without explicitly overturning any provision of the Toleration Act, precisely because Dissenting education had established itself upon silences and ambiguities in the 1689 education’. From the perspective of the established Church of England’s most robust supporters, the Dissenters also took advantage of the Toleration Act’s silences and ambiguities to administer baptism and to establish chapels within existing parishes. With baptism, as with so much else, the Toleration Act seems to have caused as many problems as it solved. As Stevens himself concludes, ‘[t]he key point to be drawn from this study is that the Toleration Act settled very little about the future relationship between the Church of England and Protestant Dissenters. The legislation was so vague on many significant points that it all but guaranteed a troubled transition to religious plurality’.

In the process of making this argument, Stevens demonstrates a command of the primary source evidence and historiography that is admirable. But there is none the less the sense that he might have thought a bit more concertedly about what precisely toleration entails. The sense one gets from *Protestant pluralism* is that the Toleration Act was bad legislation because it was unclear and insufficiently generous: the political troubles that caused that lack of clarity and ungenerosity were, then, unnecessary and avoidable. And yet, as John Dunn and others have shown, toleration necessarily entails restraint and coercion and, furthermore, toleration is not tolerance. The only question for anyone who wants to expand or to constrict legal toleration is who should be restrained and on what grounds. Modern liberalism reckons that pluralism is not just inevitable, but good. But that was not how most living in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution saw it. And, as Ralph Stevens shows us, that they ended up with a pluralistic world was the product not of design but of confusion, uncertainty and chance. That pluralistic world, like ours, was characterised not by *concordia*, but by its opposite, a fate, one suspects, that would have surprised few of the Toleration Act’s opponents.

OHIO UNIVERSITY

ROBERT G. INGRAM

*The Christian Quaker. George Keith and the Keithian controversy.* By Madeleine Ward. (Quaker Studies.) Pp. vi + 101. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019. €70. 978 90 04 39357 8

*JEH* (71) 2020; doi:10.1017/S0022046920000573

In 1692 George Keith was expelled from the Quakers in Philadelphia, and by 1702 he had converted to Anglican Christianity. Historians have attributed Keith’s expulsion to the politics of Pennsylvania. Madeleine Ward demonstrates that the dispute was theological: Keith wished to show the importance of belief in the incarnate Christ to Quakers, whereas his detractors stressed the sufficiency of the light within. Quaker scholars have been reluctant to see Keith as a full Quaker because of these beliefs

but, Ward argues, Keith was in the Quaker mainstream, and the division between Quakerism and Christianity was a consequence of the 1692 schism. There was, Ward demonstrates, no inevitability to the breach: Keith was not alone among Quakers who saw themselves as recovering the true meaning of primitive Christianity. Ward cites a recent survey which demonstrated that 37 per cent of Quakers do not identify as Christian, and this book might be read as an argument for the recovery of a Christian Quakerism in a Keithian mould. *The Christian Quaker* advances this case by tracing the development of Keith's ideas through his career in Scotland, England and America. Keith's return to England as an Anglican clergyman nicely frames the volume. Ward situates her work within the theological turn in Quaker studies over the last few years, and she is at her best when discussing the intricacies of theological argument. She traces Keith's interest in Christology from the 1670s, when he began defending Quakerism as the best reflection of primitive Christian practice. Keith's desire to reconcile Quaker principles with the Incarnation led him to appropriate the Kabbalistic notion of Adam Kadmon. He developed these ideas through his correspondence with the Cambridge Platonist, Henry More. On Ward's account, Keith's attempts to reconcile Quakerism and Christianity only became problematic for his fellow Quakers in the 1690s when his emphasis on the body of Christ led him to downplay the role of the light within. Ward's book could have been improved by examining his engagement with Christian mysticism. As she notes, Keith first became interested in these ideas in Aberdeen. She points out that Keith taught mathematics to Gilbert Burnet and points to several similarities between Keith and the circle of Burnet and his mentor, Robert Leighton, and examines the Aberdeen debates over immediate inspiration in 1675. But Ward's discussion of Keith's Scottish context is limited. She appears unaware of Gordon DesBrisay's work on Quakerism in Aberdeen. Reference could also have been made to Keith's other Aberdeen contemporaries, Henry Scougal and George and James Garden, all of whom defended similar ideas about divine inspiration: why did he turn Quaker, while they remained Episcopalians? Nevertheless, *The Christian Quaker* is an important and timely addition to the literature on both early Quakerism and early modern historical theology, which adds much to an emerging literature on Quaker theology. Ward ably fulfills her objective of showing that, in the seventeenth century, there was no contradiction between being a Christian and being a Quaker.

EDINBURGH

MICHAEL B. RIORDAN

Kilian Stumpf sj, *The Acta Pekinensia or historical records of the Maillard de Tournon Legation, II: September 1706–December 1707*. Edited by Paul Rule and Claudia von Collani. (Studies in the History of Christianity in East Asia, 1.) Pp. x + 811. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019. €199. 978 90 04 39631 9; 2542 3681

*JEH* (71) 2020; doi:10.1017/S0022046920000536

The papal legation sent in 1705 to settle the Chinese Rites Controversy was a disaster. The legate, Tournon, elevated as cardinal shortly before dying of illness in Macao in 1710, was diplomatically maladroit. His mission was doomed from the start. The controversy concerned whether traditional rituals honouring Confucius and dead ancestors could be practised by Chinese converts, and whether the word *Tian* (heaven) could be designated to represent the Christian