Polasky makes clear the trends of revolutionary exchange are personal as well as structural. As Polasky recreates their experiences, she helps readers appreciate them as well.

Scholars of Britain will find that Polasky has touched on several significant British concerns from the period, beyond merely setting the late-eighteenth-century stage on which the British Empire acted. Polasky identifies British reformers who sympathized with the Atlantic revolutionary ferment and attempted to convince and rally their countrymen. She also pays attention to the abolitionists in Britain, their support of freed slaves and writers such as Olaudah Equiano, their founding of the Sierra Leone colony, and the way that colony developed in ways unforeseen by its backers. Finally, she ties in the Irish revolt of 1798. Noticeably missing in significant ways, though, are leaders of the British government at the time, especially William Pitt the Younger and Edmund Burke, men who were not always so enamored with the desire for liberty and revolution that Polasky narrates.

These absences raise three important issues for thinking about the revolutionary Atlantic of the late eighteenth century. First, for all of the talk of "revolution," this reviewer was not convinced that the term formed an adequate umbrella for all the events that occurred. In fact, the content of what reformers and revolutionaries desired varied greatly across the Atlantic, as did their methods. Some pamphleteers blanched at the thought of French revolutionary armies forcing other nations toward freedom. Clearly many reformers at the time could advocate some reforms without being in favor of "revolution" in general. The French Revolution, after all, rejected many of its earlier supporters. Similarly, in the American context, many supporters of that Revolution could still be horrified at the French Revolution's Terror, at the French invasion of other European states, or at the bloodshed in Saint-Domingue. Further, the treatment of the domestic revolutions Polasky believes were aborning did not necessarily integrate into the other upheavals of the period. Second, in her sympathetic interest in revolution and revolutionaries, Polasky cannot easily account for their failures. The book ends as a tragedy, as these revolutionaries do not achieve all or even much of what they set out to accomplish. Instead, they (and the reader) are forced to witness the triumph of nationalism over cosmopolitanism. However, the causes of these failures are not accounted for. If the Atlantic World was so caught up in revolutionary fervor, what stopped it? Polasky might have wrestled at greater length with the failures of revolution in this period. Finally, the book does not take on the Latin American revolutions of the early nineteenth century. Although subsequent to the period Polasky recounts, they might have been fruitfully integrated into the story.

In her acknowledgments, Polasky notes that this volume caps forty years of her thinking about the era of eighteenth-century revolutions. That research shows both in the text of the volume and in its supporting scholarly apparatus. The book demonstrates important scholarship that should be attended to by scholars of both Atlantic history and British history. It certainly should be assigned in graduate seminars, thereby to challenge the next generation of scholars with both impressive research and the way it opens up additional, transatlantic paths to follow.

Jonathan Den Hartog, University of Northwestern–St. Paul

James Dingley. *Durkheim and National Identity in Ireland: Applying the Sociology of Knowledge and Religion*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. Pp. 220. $95.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2015.183

Although James Dingley does not refer to it, his new book, *Durkheim and National Identity in Ireland*, is timely. Over the next year, with the hundredth anniversary of the 1916 rising, there will much public debate and discussion about Ireland and how it came to be the way it is. It would be helpful if these discussions were less banal and ideological and more critically

reflective. We need to think about not just how the island of Ireland became divided by two types of nationalism, but also about the nature of nationalism in general. Dingley's book promotes just this sort of analysis.

Dingley argues that if we are to understand nationalism, we should begin with Émile Durkheim, a thinker who recognized that the success of the nation-state depends on its ability to transcend the competing religious and ethnic identities that bind people together. For Durkheim, nationalism has to be based on scientific thought, rationality, legal principles, and reasoned debate, which seek to enshrine individual as opposed to group rights. Respect for the reasoning individual is what makes nationalism good. The opposing tendency to base nationalism on nonnegotiable group beliefs, values, and identifications is what makes it bad. In a detailed review of Durkheim's writings on France and his sociology of religion and knowledge, including the related secondary literature, Dingley makes a good case for developing and applying a Durkheimian perspective on nationalism to Ireland.

What makes his book controversial is that Dingley argues that the nationalism that developed in the South and, later, the Republic of Ireland was Catholic (ultramontane and scholastic), mythical, magical, institutional, romantic, closed, and unscientific; whereas in the North it was Protestant, scientific, individual, and open to reason, debate, and change. These radically different cultures made the North a scientific, technological, and industrial powerhouse while the South wallowed in traditional romantic aspirations, imagining the nation as a spiritual haven full of saints and scholars who rejected the North's materialism. The explanation for this bifurcation is that the social structure of the South was based on a mechanical form of solidarity in which freedom and individuality were stifled and constrained, whereas in the North the social structure was more organic: religion had always been less influential in the North, and individuals had greater freedom to develop themselves.

My problem with Dingley's book is that, having set up a challenging argument, he then digresses into a lengthy review of the literature on nations and nationalism. While much of this secondary analysis is very competent, it tends to stand too much on its own and is not integrated sufficiently into addressing the Irish question. The same could be said even for the more substantive chapters on the revisionist historical debate in Ireland and on contrasting approaches to science and the arts in the two parts of the island: they stand too much alone. These chapters could do more to press Dingley's suggestive and controversial thesis.

The revisionist debate has been central to the way history has been done in Ireland and, consequently, to the way the Irish story has been told. For many decades after independence, there were many people who felt the need to rewrite Irish history and to capture the important role of colonization and the role the Catholic Church played in the liberation and modernization of Irish society. Given the difficulty of ever developing an objective, detached, scientific story of Ireland, there was, particularly from the 1970s, an attempt to include an Anglo-Irish, Protestant, Unionist dimension to the Irish story. Dingley synthesizes the revisionist debate very well. He does a similarly good job describing how, as part of the creation of a new, romanticized version of Irish nationalism and the promotion of the church's role in Ireland's story, the sciences became secondary to the arts in Irish education.

The debates about these discourses and how they shaped institutions and, therefore identities, are relevant, but they often relate to high rather than popular culture and, for me, the connection between the two could have been made more explicit, particularly if there had been more empirical detail. Beyond the important role of education, how did irredentist Catholic nationalism become so embedded in Southern collective consciousness? What was the role of collective memory in relation to colonial exploitation and the Famine, for instance?

Dingley is right to emphasize not just the independent role of culture in the development of the North and South in Ireland but the ways in which it was intertwined with economics and politics. Although he avoids going into the postcolonial debate, the Irish story relates to the ways in which the majority of the people in the South could never become like the Protestant English, while those in the North could never have become otherwise. And this is where

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2015.183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

popular culture becomes important. As much as the Protestant working class in the North began to develop an identity and collective consciousness through the Orange Order and all the symbolism that went with it, small farmers and the working class began to embrace all the folklore, beliefs, and practices of the Catholic Church, many of which were fundamentalist and magical.

The Catholic Irish nationalism that developed in Ireland during the nineteenth century, some traits and legacies of which can still be found today, portrayed the Protestant English as materialistic, corrupt, and "unspiritual," while it characterized the Irish as spiritual, virtuous ascetics. Protestant English nationalism, on the other hand, portrayed the Catholic Irish as uncouth, uncivilized, magically oriented, and religiously dominated, and the English as rational, scientific, progressive modernizers. This, Dingley argues, is the origin of Ireland's two main strands of nationalism.

We all know the legacies of the symbolic cultural wars in Ireland. The peace process makes important strides each year in overcoming the divide between North and South and between Catholic and Protestant. But as evident in the persistence of denominational schooling, flags, parades, murals, and so forth, there is still a deep cultural divide between the communities. Dingley has done a good job in revealing how the cultural wars are reflected in discourses relating to nationalism, particularly in relation to education, arts, the sciences, and intellectual debates. Maybe it is the task of a Durkheimian oriented anthropologist or ethnographer to describe and analyze how these divisions are embodied and acted out by people in their everyday lives.

Tom Inglis, University College Dublin

Steven S. Maughan. *Mighty England Do Good: Culture, Faith, Empire, and World in the Foreign Missions of the Church of England, 1850–1915*. Studies in the History of Christian Missions. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014. Pp. 527. $45.00 (paper).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2015.184

Do not be misled by the hagiographic sound of the short title—a quotation attributed to Jacob Wainwright, the African servant who brought David Livingstone's body back to England in 1872. Steven Maughan's *Mighty England Do Good* is an important and most scholarly contribution to the imperial history of Victorian religion as well as to the intellectual history of foreign missions. The intrinsic importance of its surprisingly neglected subject, the Church of England's multiple missionary organizations, is far from this study's only claim to attention. Maughan is a gifted intellectual historian whose exquisitely crafted narrative provides a welcome advance beyond the crude juxtaposition of sacred and profane that fueled past polemics. It is precisely by attending to ties that bind Anglican missions to the British Empire that Maughan succeeds in demonstrating "the power of religion and religious organization, as well as languages of faith, to convey meaning and spur action … in the 'high imperial' era" (xii).

The introductory chapter provides an invaluable map of a field whose considerable growth over the last couple of decades shows no sign of abating. Maughan is an informed and reliable guide through discussions of interest to imperial historians, historians of former colonies, women's historians, the cultural historians interested in gender and race, as well as historians of religion. Though interested primarily in missionaries' religious inspiration, he readily acknowledges the missionary movement's contribution to the exercise of colonial power and its reinforcement of the colonial rule of racial difference, however inadvertent or complicated by indigenous missionary agency. There were occasional exceptions and differences of degree. None were more implicated, however, than those connected to the Church of England. Its establishment virtually required Anglicans to articulate their faith in relation to the nation as well as to global Christianity. Maughan foregrounds rather than minimizing these entanglements,