Introduction

On the afternoon of 22 July 1722, seven young ladies were sitting in the drawing room of a house somewhere near Rochdale, Lancashire. Two of them were engaged in needlework; the rest were playing cards. This was a pleasant but unremarkable scene, at least to the casual observer. From the perspective of one of the women, however, the occasion was a cause of considerable consternation. Anne Dawson, the 26-year-old daughter of a Presbyterian minister from Rochdale, recorded later that day in her diary that she had found the five hours spent at the house deeply uncomfortable. She had arrived there with her sister, hoping for 'agreeable conversation', and had been appalled when instead 'there came out a Pack of Cards'. She and her sister had both refused to play, and while she admitted that 'my thoughts was not well imployed', she believed she was 'imploying my hands much better with my nedle than they were, And when I came home and Vewed my work I was well pleased at it … whereas had I spent my time as they did I durst not reflect on it for if I did it must be with trouble & regret'. She concluded her diary entry by imploring God that she 'be spur'd on by other people's negligence'.[1]

Dawson's social discomfort is intriguing. She looked for 'agreeable conversation', but it is unclear what she expected this to be. Given her objection to card-playing – a common contemporary social activity – did she equally reject conversational norms? We hear Dawson's side of the story, but how was her behaviour received? And how might it have affected her long-term social relationship with the other ladies? Dawson was hoping to 'be spur'd on' in her piety by viewing the idleness of others; this sense of spiritual and moral difference can hardly have oiled the wheels of friendship. So what was her relationship with the other people in that room, and how did she square this with her particular understanding of pious social

[1] Diary of Anne (Dawson) Evans 1721–22, Add MS 71626, fol. 38r-v, British Library (BL), London.

practice? Presented with a social scene in which she evidently wished to take part, but felt unable, she was left to seek a balance between religious integrity and her desire for social participation. From her own admission that her 'thoughts was not well imployed', it seems that this balance was not easy to strike.

The layer of social tension hovering over that Rochdale drawing room bore some resemblance to that present in English society more broadly in the half century that followed the passage of the so-called 'Toleration' Act of 1689. This legislation marked a significant change in the legal status of religious minorities in England. While providing no toleration for Catholics, it allowed Protestants who dissented from the Established Church to worship separately in their own registered meeting houses for the first time in the nation's history. However, a single piece of limited and contested legislation was insufficient to erase completely over a hundred years of religious strife.[2] Many contemporaries remained hostile to perceived competitors to the Established Church, a hostility that crept into multiple aspects of social and cultural life. The toleration of 1689 was not so much an end point as the start of a process by which English society worked out how to manage – rather than attempt to remove – religious differences previously denied legitimacy by the legal exclusion of Dissent.

This process was not linear; neither was it frictionless. Protestant Dissenters, many of whom had, under the persecutions of the Restoration, maintained group identities that placed a strong emphasis on solidarity in suffering, now had to work out what it meant to Dissent under a legal framework that was considerably more favourable. Grateful for their increased liberty, and hopeful that it might be extended, Dissenters in this context had good reason to demonstrate their ability to integrate within contemporary society. At the same time, however, the very fact of their Dissent from the Established Church was a claim to difference. In order to justify this Dissent, and to meet the expectations of their religious professions, Dissenters were obliged to distinguish themselves. Like Anne Dawson, who entered a room in expectation of social interaction but quickly found herself unable to share fully in the sociability of those therein, Dissenters in general were left teetering between integration and separation. The Toleration Act theoretically placed them within a shared Protestant interest united against the perceived threat of popery, but it by

[2] Ralph Stevens, *Protestant Pluralism. The Reception of the Toleration Act, 1689–1720* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2018), p. 6.

no means guaranteed that their conception of Protestant society would chime wholly with that of staunch supporters of the Established Church.

The scene from Rochdale is also telling in another respect. Polite culture – including activities such as sitting and playing cards – has generally been regarded by scholars as a discourse that rejected and smoothed over the religious divisions of the past. In fact, the eighteenth century as a whole has been seen by some historians as an 'Age of Tolerance', meaning that work emphasising the widespread impact of religion, and particularly religious difference, on everyday life in this period has been slow to gain traction.[3] Approaches to the eighteenth century which do emphasise the role of religion in shaping cultural developments tend to characterise new conversational norms and sociable venues as reactions to religious division, rather than products of it.[4] By such accounts, eighteenth-century society was decisively and somewhat deliberately moving away from the troubles of a previous age. Yet Dawson's experience shows how senses of religious difference could be deeply embedded within even the most innocent of social activities. As many other incidents in this book demonstrate, brazen persecution decreased across English society after the Toleration Act, but this was accompanied by a move towards more insidious forms of social exclusion.

With this in view, this book throws into relief the extensive cultural impact of England's new and unstable religious settlement. The Toleration Act of 1689, despite its apparently innovative nature, failed to resolve in full the country's religious problems, and instead forced religious and social issues into closer conversation. Recent scholarship has demonstrated decisively the sense of uncertainty created by this ambiguous legislation.[5] This book shows how in a period when prejudices remained ingrained but were no longer fully facilitated by the law, contemporaries sought social means to manage living with religious difference. The result was that as new social modes and cultural venues developed, assumptions about religious differences were embedded into the norms of social interaction in a way that sustained distinctions without necessarily spilling into immediate conflict.

[3] The challenges of this descriptor are discussed in Ourida Mostefai, 'Dissensus and Toleration: Reconsidering Tolerance in the Age of Enlightenment', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 47 (2018), pp. 269–73.

[4] Lawrence E. Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century', *Historical Journal*, 45, 4 (2002), p. 890; Alison E. Hurley, 'Peculiar Christians, Circumstantial Courtiers, and the Making of Conversation in Seventeenth-Century England', *Representations*, III, 1 (2010), p. 41; Brian Cowan, '"Restoration" England and the History of Sociability', in Valérie Capdeville and Alain Kerhervé (eds.), *British Sociability in the Long Eighteenth Century: Challenging the Anglo-French Connection* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2019), pp. 22, 24.

[5] Stevens, *Protestant Pluralism.*

In 1689 both High Church opponents to toleration and some Protestant Dissenters were attempting to manage religious difference by eliminating it outright. However, an increasing recognition of the impossibility of this over the period resulted in a shift in emphasis towards the management of religious difference through social and cultural means. By 1750 religious difference was no longer so frequently a cause of violent conflict, but it had been deeply woven into English culture. This process – and its effect on daily life – lies at the heart of this book; by these means religious difference was a formative principle of English culture and society after 1689.

By examining the social terms in which religious differences were framed, the contestation of ideas about 'public religion', and the places and spaces in which religious differences were subtly reinforced and managed through social behaviour, this book demonstrates the mutually constitutive relationship between religious difference and English society in the first half of the eighteenth century. In doing so, it makes two principal contributions to our understanding of this period. First, through examining the social subtleties of interactions between people of differing beliefs, and how they were mediated through language and behaviour common to the period, it moves beyond binaries of assimilation and separation to examine the graduated layers of religious exclusivity that shaped everyday existence. Secondly, it points towards a new approach to the social and cultural history of the eighteenth century, one that acknowledges the integral role of the dynamics of religious difference in shaping key aspects of eighteenth-century life. This book therefore proposes not just to add to current understandings of religious co-existence in this period, but also to shift our ways of thinking about the construction of social discourses, parish politics, and cultural spaces in eighteenth-century England.

Eighteenth-Century Cultural Change

Historians have given substantial attention to the impact of England's religious settlement on the Established Church clergy, and on contemporary religious and political developments.[6] The work of Ralph Stevens

[6] Nicholas Tyacke, 'The "Rise of Puritanism" and the Legalizing of Dissent, 1571–1719', in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 17–51; Brent Sirota, 'The Occasional Conformity Controversy, Moderation, and the Anglican Critique of Modernity, 1700–1714', *Historical Journal*, 57, 1 (2014), pp. 81–105; Stevens, *Protestant Pluralism*; Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Toleration and Religion after 1688', in Grell, Israel, and Tyacke (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration*, pp. 389–408.

in particular has drawn attention to the practical challenges of religious plurality for Established Church clergy as they adapted to a 'new religious reality' after 1689.[7] More generally, over the past two decades the importance of religious developments in the eighteenth century has been given considerable scholarly attention in accounts of what has been termed the 'long Reformation'.[8] It is now widely understood that England 'did not go into the eighteenth century complacent about its post-confessional stability', and that senses of instability had widespread religious, political, and intellectual consequences.[9] However, the implications of the religious settlement of 1689 for England's social and cultural development have been little considered.

This is symptomatic of a lack of conversation between religious, social, and cultural histories of this period.[10] With the advent of a social history that predominantly took a materialist view of religion in the 1960s and 1970s, social historians were reluctant to emphasise the role of religion in shaping English society.[11] The influence of this approach is to some degree still evident today. Histories of politeness, sociability, commerce, and many other key themes of the period have been written with religion either on the margins or discussed in isolation.[12] This is in spite of earlier work that recognised the necessity of a more integrated approach to the

[7] Stevens, *Protestant Pluralism*, p. 1.

[8] See for example Jeremy Gregory, 'The Making of a Protestant Nation: "Success" and "Failure" in England's Long Reformation', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800* (London: UCL Press, 1998), pp. 314, 324; Lucy Bates, 'The Limits of Possibility in England's Long Reformation', *Historical Journal*, 53, 4 (2010), p. 1051; Robert G. Ingram, *Reformation Without End. Religion, Politics, and the Past in Post-Reformation England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp. xi–xii.

[9] Sarah Apetrei, *Women, Feminism, and Religion in Early Enlightenment England* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 24–5.

[10] Jeremy Gregory, 'Introduction: Transforming the "Age of Reason" into an "Age of Faiths:" or, Putting Religions and Beliefs (Back) into the Eighteenth Century', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 32, 3 (2009), *passim*.

[11] See for example Eric Hobsbawm, 'Methodism and the Threat of Revolution in Britain', *History Today*, 7 (1957), pp. 115–24; Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost* (London: Methuen, 1965); Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580–1680* (London: Routledge, 1993); E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (London: Penguin, 1993). The problems of separating social, religious, and political history were described in Dan Beaver, 'Religion, Politics, and Society in Early Modern England: A Problem of Classification', *Journal of British Studies*, 33, 3 (July 1994), pp. 314–22.

[12] This problem is outlined in B. W. Young, 'Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian', *Historical Journal*, 43, 3 (2000), pp. 857, 859. See for example Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance. Culture and Society in the Provincial Town 1660–1770* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People. England 1727–1783* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); H. T. Dickinson (ed.), *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002); Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

eighteenth century.[13] J. C. D. Clark's *English Society*, while controversial in its emphasis on the hegemony of the Church of England in tandem with the state, undoubtedly demonstrated the need for attention to religion in histories of this period.[14] However, perhaps partly because Clark's work focused primarily on political and ecclesiastical matters, paying little attention to the central interests of social and economic historians, this work had a frosty reception in these fields.[15] In addition to this, there has been a considerable strand of scholarship that while rejecting the notion that the eighteenth century was the beginning of an inexorable march towards 'secular' modernity, suggests that religious pluralism diluted the influence of religion over public life.[16] The result is that historians have not considered religious differences to be of primary importance for understanding eighteenth-century society and culture.

It is fair to say that many of the social and cultural developments of this period did, at least superficially, turn away from a century of religious and political division. Although controversial in the Restoration period, urban venues such as coffeehouses were by the eighteenth century an accepted part of social life, allowing contemporaries (principally men) to exchange news and conversation, drink coffee, and debate ideas in a genial fashion.[17] Other venues – such as pleasure gardens, assembly rooms, and spas – were new in the eighteenth century, and themselves facilitated the display of fashionable consumption.[18] Alongside this emerged new modes of behaviour, such as politeness – a form of moderate, decorous, agreeable social interaction that has become a 'key word' for historians of the eighteenth century.[19] Politeness was by no means the only social mode of the period,

[13] See for example Jonathan Barry, 'The Cultural Life of Bristol, 1640–1775' (Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1985), p. 3.

[14] J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985; 2nd edn 2000).

[15] Frank O'Gorman, 'Review of English Society 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime', (review no. 41b) https://reviews.history.ac.uk/review/41b, accessed 15 October, 2019.

[16] Blair Worden, 'The Question of Secularization', in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed. England After the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 24; Penelope Corfield, '"An Age of Infidelity": Secularization in Eighteenth-century England', *Social History*, 39, 2 (2014), pp. 229, 231; Brad S. Gregory, *The Unintended Reformation. How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), pp, 368–9, 373–4, 376.

[17] Brian Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee. The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2005), p. 100.

[18] Hannah Greig, '"All Together and All Distinct": Public Sociability and Social Exclusivity in London's Pleasure Gardens, c. 1740–1800', *Journal of British Studies*, 51, 1 (2012), pp. 70–1.

[19] Paul Langford, 'The Uses of Eighteenth-Century Politeness', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), p. 311; Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century', p. 875.

and it could take many different forms, but is particularly important here because it has been understood to be significant in its apparent rejection of divisive religious politics.[20] This stemmed from the fact that the Civil Wars and Interregnum of the 1640s and 1650s had witnessed a violent mix of religious conflict and social prescription, denounced by contemporaries as fanatical 'enthusiasm'. This experience, along with the fresh memory of the religious and political dilemmas of the Restoration, resulted in the emergence of new social practices in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries which, by discouraging fanaticism, sought to limit the potential for religious divisions to cause damage.[21]

Supporting these cultural changes was an economy that appeared to be (and in some places literally was) steaming ahead. This was a period of expanding national wealth, commercialisation, and increased material possession, in which many households, urban and rural, had greater access to luxury goods and new consumables.[22] Better communication and an expanding print trade allowed greater national economic and cultural integration than ever before.[23] Improvements in agriculture had by the beginning of the eighteenth century enabled structural adjustments in the workforce that underpinned the country's ability to produce goods for export.[24] This engagement in global commerce facilitated the increased domestic purchase and consumption of goods such as tea, coffee, sugar, and hot chocolate – staples of eighteenth-century social life.[25] Against the backdrop of much that seemed innovative about the eighteenth century, it

[20] Nicholas T. Phillipson, 'Politics and Politeness in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hanoverians', in John Pocock (ed.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press in association with the Folger Institute, Washington, DC, 1993), p. 215; Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century', p. 890; Markku Peltonen, 'Politeness and Whiggism, 1688–1732', *Historical Journal*, 48, 2 (2005), p. 396.

[21] Cowan, '"Restoration" England and the History of Sociability', pp. 22, 24.

[22] Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century', p. 898; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 2–3; Lorna Scammell, 'Town Versus Country: The Property of Everyday Consumption in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries', in Jon Stobart and Alastair Owens (eds.), *Urban Fortunes: Prosperity and Inheritance in the Town, 1700–1900* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 27, 35; John Brewer, '"The Most Polite Age and the Most Vicious": Attitudes Towards Culture as a Commodity, 1600–1800', in Ann Bermingham and John Brewer (eds.), *The Consumption of Culture, 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 345.

[23] Dror Wahrman, 'National Society, Communal Culture: An Argument About the Recent Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Social History*, 17, 1 (1992), p. 44.

[24] Patrick Wallis, Justin Colson, and David Chilosi, 'Structural Change and Economic Growth in the British Economy before the Industrial Revolution, 1500–1800', *The Journal of Economic History*, 78, 3 (2018), p. 864.

[25] Patrick K. O'Brien, 'Inseparable Connections: Trade, Economy, Fiscal State, and the Expansion of Empire, 1688–1815', in P. J. Marshall and Alaine Low (eds.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire. Volume II: The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 56–7.

is in some ways unsurprising that social and cultural historians have paid little attention to the effect of religious divisions in this period.

As much as early eighteenth-century England may look like the prelude to an 'Age of Improvement', the universality of the effects of economic expansion, commerce, and fashionable consumption has been questioned in recent scholarship. The acquisition of new 'luxury' goods, for instance, was not necessarily always motivated by a desire for fashionable display as an end in itself, but rather by the role of display in establishing a creditworthiness increasingly based not so much on an individual or household's accrual of possessions, but on their purchasing power.[26] Those of middling social status – a group often associated with the increased purchase of consumer luxuries in this period – were also prey to considerable financial insecurity that made their status difficult to maintain.[27] Participation in eighteenth-century consumer culture was precarious, and for a range of reasons some individuals abstained from embracing the cultural trends of the day. As Helen Berry's study of 'the pleasures of austerity' has highlighted, there were multiple different ways of engaging with contemporary culture, including abstinence from it. In focusing on those who did not participate fully in the cultures of luxury and pleasure, either through choice or necessity, we can 'develop a new and more expansive understanding of Georgian England'.[28]

This book proposes that exploring the impact of religious difference on the first half of the eighteenth century is important for creating this wider view of eighteenth-century society and culture. An understanding of the dynamics of religious difference is not, it suggests, merely an addition to our knowledge of the eighteenth century, but rather is fundamental to our interpretation of the social and cultural developments of the period. By exploring the religious ideals inherent in ideas such as politeness, and in the social interactions that took place in a wide range of locations, such as the alehouse, the assembly room, and the street, it shows the lingering and evolving impact of religious difference in social discourses and venues that were idealised by contemporary writers as rejecting a divisive religious past. Religious difference, it shows, is an essential lens for understanding eighteenth-century life.

[26] Alexandra Shepard, 'Crediting Women in the Early Modern English Economy', *Historical Workshop Journal*, 79, 1 (2015), pp. 17–19.
[27] Tawny Paul, *The Poverty of Disaster: Debt and Insecurity in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 4–5.
[28] Helen Berry, 'The Pleasures of Austerity', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37, 2 (2014), p. 263

The 'Toleration' of 1689

The nature of the religious settlement of 1689 was crucial in creating the conditions in which religious difference shaped English society. It is not simply the case that the eighteenth century had more of a hangover from the poisonous disputes of the Reformation than we first thought. The reconfiguration of England's religious landscape created new headaches – and cures – that are especially illuminated when we examine religious changes in tandem with social and cultural developments.

There is no doubt that the Toleration Act was a highly significant departure from state insistence on religious conformity. In addition to its unprecedented resignation to the existence of worship outside of the Established Church, it acknowledged all nonconformists who subscribed to the doctrine of the Trinity, including Quakers, to be part of a wider Protestant cause. This was clear from the preamble to the Act, which stated that 'some ease to scrupulous Consciences in the Exercise of Religion may be an effectuall meanes to unite their Majesties Protestant Subjects in Interest and Affection'.[29] This represented a substantial change in mindset from the 1662 Act of Uniformity, which had made it clear that any deviation from the Established Church was contrary to the interests of the nation.[30] Thus, the 1689 Act was vastly different in its sentiment from the legislation that had been brought in just twenty-seven years previously. However, born of political expediency, this measure was also highly limited.[31] The Act was open to differing interpretations, and the result was that Protestant Dissenters and stalwarts of the Established Church alike battled to define the religious settlement in ways that promoted their interests.

These definitional battles took place amidst ideological shifts in attitudes towards the management of religious difference in the later seventeenth century. Although the view that persecution was a just means of

[29] 'William and Mary, 1688: An Act for Exempting their Majestyes Protestant Subjects Dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of Certaine Lawes' [Chapter XVIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 15.]', in John Raithby (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm* (s.l, 1819), vol. VI, pp. 74–6. *British History Online*, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol6/pp74-76.

[30] 'Charles II, 1662: An Act for the Uniformity of Publique Prayers and Administrac[i]on of Sacraments & Other Rites & Ceremonies and for Establishing the Form of Making Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops Priests and Deacons in the Church of England.', in Raithby (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm* (s.l., 1819), vol. V, pp. 364–70. *British History Online*, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp364-370.

[31] Trevor-Roper, 'Toleration and Religion after 1688', p. 391; David L. Wykes, 'Quaker Schoolmasters, Toleration and the Law, 1689–1714', *Journal of Religious History*, 21 (1997), p. 186; Martin Hugh Fitzpatrick, 'From Natural Law to Natural Rights? Protestant Dissent and Toleration in the Late Eighteenth Century', *History of European Ideas*, 42, 2 (2016), p. 199; Stevens, *Protestant Pluralism*, pp. 8–9.

saving erroneous consciences persisted, during the Restoration an increasing number of contemporary thinkers promoted the idea that persecution of conscience might itself produce immorality, encouraging only outward conformity while facilitating inward error.[32] Most famously, John Locke's *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) argued that it was possible to win over consciences only through persuasion, rather than coercion, and that the jurisdiction of the magistrate extended only over civil matters. Dissenters were therefore to be tolerated.[33] Locke was not alone in promoting such ideas. In his 1687 Declaration of Indulgence, James II had argued that constraint of conscience 'has ever been directly contrary to our inclination, as we think it is to the interest of government'.[34] While James had plenty of self-interested reasons to promote toleration, such as a desire for his fellow Catholics to be able to serve in political office, he may also have genuinely supported the principle of liberty of conscience.[35] The Toleration Act was passed at a time when the idea of indulgence to tender consciences was becoming more current.

However, the Act itself did not represent acceptance of the idea of liberty of conscience. In fact, the measure was something of a last resort. Initially, attempts to achieve a religious settlement following the landing of William III in 1688 had been focused on the comprehension of moderate Dissenters within the Established Church. Proposals for the indulgence eventually enacted in 1689 were brought to the fore of negotiations of England's settlement only when the recalcitrance of many in the Church, combined with Dissenting concern about the Church's sincerity, resulted in the rejection of comprehension.[36] This was, then, a 'politique religious settlement', and not one that could erase the memory of the past century.[37]

The difficult circumstances in which the Act was passed were reflected in its detail – or lack thereof. As recent histories of this period have

[32] Mark Goldie, 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England', in Grell, Israel, and Tyacke (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration*, pp. 334; Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 302.

[33] John Locke 'A Letter Concerning Toleration [2nd edn, 1960]', in Mark Goldie (ed.), *John Locke: A Letter Concerning Toleration and Other Writings* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2010), pp. 8, 11–12.

[34] 'Declaration of Indulgence of James II, 4 April 1687', in Andrew Browning (ed.), *English Historical Documents, 1660–1714* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1953), p. 399.

[35] Scott Sowerby, *Making Toleration. The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), p. 3.

[36] John Spurr, 'The Church of England, Comprehension, and the Toleration Act of 1689', *English Historical Review*, 104, 413 (1989), pp. 943–4.

[37] Stephen A. Timmons, 'From Persecution to Toleration in the West Country, 1672–1692', *The Historian*, 68, 3 (2006), p. 461.