centuries. But at the same time, he is curiously blind to the long-run evolution of colonial rule and the attendant rise and fall of slavery in the Americas. Colonial rule was possible largely because what was not permissible at home was permissible beyond the line. Violent, brutal, and licentious behavior in newly occupied or conquered colonies was as much a constant as was resistance—beginning with seventeenth century Ireland. What was new was the metropolitan reaction to it. The key point is that the Picton case could not have happened at an earlier time in British colonial history. However, it was not just the Picton case. Epstein mentions Governor Joseph Wall, hanged in 1802 for flogging a soldier to death in Gorée without due process, but there were similar cases in this era. Beginning in 1764, several slave ship captains were charged with killing slaves under their control. The Zong case (only the latest instance of mass murder on a slave ship) became notorious in 1781, and a planter was hanged in Tortola in 1811 for murdering a slave. New constructions of social class, race, and morality since the late seventeenth century combined to make such events possible. But whatever colonial insecurities were generated as a consequence in early British Trinidad, they must have begun well before the "Age of Revolution" of the title, and surely well after the beginning of slave resistance (which we can take as a constant). Postcolonial research and cultural studies do not easily engage with long-run shifts in values, especially ones that appear to manifest themselves simultaneously across class lines.

A second elephant in the room is the fact that with full access to the transatlantic—or even the intra-Caribbean—slave trade, Trinidad under the British would certainly have had its time as the leading Caribbean source of plantation produce, especially sugar. The British decision to delay the sale of Crown lands in 1802 and restrict the inflows of slaves from other British Caribbean islands meant that instead of the several hundred thousand arrivals that abolitionists were forecasting in 1800, inflows amounted to only 2,500 a year between 1797 and 1808, and then ended altogether. The various imperial schemes to "develop" the island in the absence of this option were indeed utter failures prior to 1840, but amid all his close discussions of imperial mayhem and competing options for the island, the author appears uninterested in the question of why Trinidad was not opened up to the slave trade like every other Caribbean island that the British acquired after 1650.

The decade after the conquest of Trinidad was indeed critical, but is there nothing in the colonial and imperial records that allows the author to say something new about the above issues for his decade of choice? After many millennia during which all societies accepted slavery as normal, Trinidad was the first British plantation colony that abolitionist policies began to affect. In the Americas as a whole after 1800, ten million slaves—freed over nine decades—began a long tortuous journey to full citizenship. Neither the process itself nor why Trinidad had such a central role at its beginning is anywhere suggested.

David Eltis, Emory University

AMY HARRIS. *Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012. Pp. 224. $100.00 (cloth).
doi:10.1017/jbr.2013.132

The use of the term "siblinghood" in Amy Harris's title shows a conviction that it is a category ripe for historical analysis. Indeed, siblings have become a hot interdisciplinary topic. Lenore Davidoff and others have made recent contributions, but Harris looks to Georgian England to discover why they were so important. The eighteenth century, she claims, witnessed tensions between a tradition of sibling equality and a patriarchy that privileged male, married, and elder siblings. This struggle was linked to a parallel clash between egalitarian and hierarchical ideas of

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2013.132 Published online by Cambridge University Press

authority in the wider world. Harris adds a vibrant horizontal layer to the usual vertical family history that stresses parenthood, marriage, and primogeniture. She also offers a correction to the stress on individualism and the development of the "self" by describing how "siblings formed the bridge into adulthood for one another" (28).

Harris's strength lies in her creative integration of different kinds of sources, which allows her to expand coverage to nonelite social groups. Quotations introducing chapters (unified by Samuel Johnson's nuggets) show a carefully constructed book. Seven families with copious correspondences, wills, diaries, account books, memorabilia, and portraits over several generations form the study's core. As their members introduce each chapter's theme, we get to know people like the orphaned spinster Anne Travell, whose appearance in vertical studies would be unlikely. Core family patterns are validated by twenty-five families with smaller archives, whose experience cumulatively builds up each chapter's arguments. Institutional sources—Consistory Court and probate records, Poor Law accounts, Old Bailey transcripts, and Ordinary accounts—broaden the sample and expose conflict. Gloucestershire, Cheshire, and London records predominate, but not exclusively. Lived experience is also contrasted with prescriptive literature. Surprisingly, the cursory 2.5-page index and lack of references to family trees limit the ability of readers to trace and link interests.

Chapter 1 argues that impacts of children on each other have been underestimated. Siblings grew up in homes where birth order was in constant flux and parental treatment often clashed with norms. Together they tested, taught, reinforced, and resisted social conventions. Family rituals and power patterns learned in childhood were then carried forward in later life. Chapters 2 and 3 compare the ties that both "bound" and "cut" sibling relationships. Love, affection, and friendship are revealed in letters that enshrined the ideal, easy, natural relationship between lifelong peers. But court and probate records expose conflict arising from ill treatment of each other and differences in social and legal positions. In fact, "acrimony among siblings ran the gamut from short-lived frustrations to vicious and lasting resentments, and to murderous rages" (83).

In chapters 4 and 5, Harris most satisfyingly uses personal and legal sources to delve deeply into aspects of economic and political power. Material support from siblings—both wealthy and very poor—extended over generations and households, even when kin did not live together. Analysis of over three thousand West Country will extracts shows men and women testators used siblings as beneficiaries or executors. Commonplace and account books reveal the embeddedness of everyday economic actions—not only small thoughtful expenditures, constant child care, daily errands, marital, occupational, legal, and financial aid but also the "small, even fleeting, tensions and resentments that . . . affected how services and support flowed between households" (121). In each of these areas, Harris highlights the effects of age, birth order, and marital status.

These three factors are even more strongly emphasized and nuanced in the chapter on political power. Families often apportioned resources where need was greatest, depending upon their own shifting internal dynamics, not merely on the basis of age and gender. Harris uses sibling probate disputes of farmers, yeomen, and artisans in the Gloucestershire Consistory Court (1700–1842) to make this point (175–76). These cases dealt with personal, not landed, property, and 59.2 percent of conflicts were between (not within) the genders. Sisters understood inheritance laws and were ready to use the courts to obtain a more equal share of personal property. Brothers also pushed against parents' efforts to equalize or privilege their sisters. Remarkably, there was a slight prevalence of cases in which older siblings argued against younger ones. Married sisters also instigated more disputes than did widowed or single sisters.

Though the number of cases is small, they clearly reveal the tensions between normative expectations of gender, birth order, and marital status, and real-life experience. Personal letters and diaries flesh out these court records and confirm their findings. Contemporary novels and sermons notwithstanding, primogeniture only explained property relations for landed families. Beyond that, maintains Harris, "siblings expected fair and equal treatment

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2013.132 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in matters of inheritance." When this did not occur, they could go to court "to enforce a system that, while not strictly equal, encouraged brothers and sisters to share and share alike" (160).

Harris achieves her goal of uncovering the dynamic, complex, interactive world of sibling relationships. The equally complex historical and legal contexts are downplayed in the interest of a clear, accessible text. Though the uniqueness of sibling experience—disappointments, rivalries, and inequalities—is in some places overstated, the applicability of Harris's accounts of daily life to friends and other kin makes her thesis even more credible. She has achieved her goal of offering new ways to understand the early modern family, the development of gender, and the role of social relationships in domestic power.

Susan Whyman, independent scholar

IAN HAYWOOD and JOHN SEED, eds. *The Gordon Riots: Politics, Culture and Insurrection in Late Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. 288. $95.00 (cloth).
doi:10.1017/jbr.2013.133

On 2 June 1780, some 40,000–50,000 people assembled at St. George's Fields south of Westminster Bridge, determined to present a petition to Parliament protesting against the lifting of restrictions on the civil rights of Roman Catholics in Britain. Presentation of that petition was famously succeeded by six days of violent social unrest that, taking their name from Lord George Gordon, leader of the Protestant Association, collectively have been described as the Gordon riots. The "several and disparate actions" (162) of those days have been construed as a single event, but two stages are generally acknowledged: in the first, the attacks of the crowd were directed toward sites with Catholic associations, such as chapels or the houses of known Roman Catholics; in the second, the crowd's attention turned to symbols of state authority, including Newgate Prison and the Bank of England. By 8 June, hundreds of rioters were dead or fatally wounded, and others would be tried and executed for their participation.

Interpretation of these events has varied over the centuries. The revolutionary aspect of the second phase of the riots gained prominence after the French Revolution, which the editors of this volume argue has overshadowed the riots' significance. Nineteenth-century accounts, including Charles Dickens's description of events in his novel *Barnaby Rudge*, tended to characterize them as the actions of an irrational mob. In the twentieth century, Marxist historians such as George Rudé and E. P. Thompson argued instead for an underlying political logic rooted in class discontents. As editors Ian Haywood and John Seed comment, however, "no single narrative" or "conceptual framework" can account for or contain the events that comprise the Gordon riots (15). This twenty-first-century collection of essays on the subject usefully returns to a complex event, offering a variety of interpretations that set the riots in a global context and provide a sustained, thoughtful, and considered analysis of the historical record as well as siting them within criminal justice history. The collection also benefits from the disparate disciplinary bases of its contributors, divided roughly equally between historians and literary scholars.

The essays are grouped into three main parts: "The Political Moment of 1780," "Representing the Unrepresentable," and "The Aftermath: Politics, Social Order and Cultural Memory," with an afterword devoted to a biographical reassessment of George Gordon, in which the man who triggered the riots is characterized as a "malevolent eccentric" and "political prisoner by nature" (261). Generally speaking, the essays eschew a parochial, narrowly English, interpretation of the events in question, instead setting them within the perspective of the British Empire. The riots occurred during the war with the American colonies, and Nicholas Rogers argues that this unpopular war helped to shape contemporary understandings of the riots,

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2013.132 Published online by Cambridge University Press