

Royal Dublin Society was, she argues, the most successful of the voluntary societies and also uniquely Irish. It aimed to use Enlightenment values for practical ends, such as reclaiming bog lands and teaching modern agricultural methods to children, as well as supporting the first Dublin Workhouse.

In chapter 5, Sonnelitter turns to the issue of women in philanthropic work that was also defined as improving. Her focus is on the work of Lady Arbella Denny, who spent years improving conditions at the Dublin Foundling Hospital and establishing the Dublin Magdalene Society for Penitent Women (not to be confused with the nineteenth-century Catholic Magdalene laundries). Although there were limited roles in improving philanthropy for eighteenth-century women, largely because the voluntary societies were based on a business model, a wealthy and famous woman like Lady Arbella could succeed in philanthropic institutions aimed at aiding women and children. She also became the first woman to be an honorary member of the Royal Dublin Society. She was a role model for women philanthropists, especially later ones, and made women's participation in voluntary societies more socially acceptable.

In the final chapter of the book Sonnelitter discusses national and local government involvement in improving philanthropic endeavors and institutions. More than elsewhere, in Ireland the government provided economic support for voluntary societies devoted to reform and improvement. Both the local government of Dublin and the Irish Parliament, before it was abolished with the Act of Union in 1801, regularly contributed grants and other types of support, especially for infrastructure such as harbors, bridges, and buildings. The Dublin Workhouse, at first a charitable institution, introduced the idea that taxation could be used to address poverty. The government was especially a key source of funding for the projects of the Royal Dublin Society.

Charity Movements in Eighteenth-Century Ireland: Philanthropy and Improvement is well worth reading for scholars of eighteenth-century Ireland or of philanthropy in general. Well researched and informative but also written in a lively style with interesting anecdotes and examples, it serves as an important corrective to the notion that philanthropy is a hallmark mostly of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Dorice Williams Elliott, University of Kansas

Laura A. M. Stewart. *Rethinking the Scottish Revolution. Covenanted Scotland, 1637–1651*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 391. \$110.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.26

A welcome contribution to Covenanter historiography, Laura A. M. Stewart's *Rethinking the Scottish Revolution. Covenanted Scotland, 1637–1651* is presented in two parts. The first, "The Making of Covenanted Scotland," addresses the formation of the Covenanted movement by applying new methodologies to explore the forging of popular politics and a politicized public (chapter 1); the process of subscribing or swearing the National Covenant in shaping individual and corporate identities (chapter 2); and, the development of competing historical and intellectual narratives by Covenanters and their opponents (chapter 3). Innovative as it is, part one presents some challenges that will be addressed later in this review. Part two, "Covenant Scotland," is the more effective portion. In it Stewart builds on her earlier work on the innovations of governance necessary to allow the Covenanter state to function (chapter 4). These mechanisms were rooted in preexisting local networks, both ecclesiastical (presbytery) and secular (shire and burgh) and allowed the transformation from a "protesting movement"

to a functional government (189). In chapter 5 Stewart examines the relationship between the centralized Covenanter state and local agents, usually lesser gentry or of middling rank, empowered to keep their social superiors accountable. Allan Kennedy's recent *Governing Gaeldom* (2014) identified this as indicative of Restoration governance as well. The chapter also explores the means by which the state legitimated itself and the ways the population could demonstrate resistance, particularly to excessive taxation.

The most important aspect of Stewart's study is the analysis of the way Covenanters cast the National Covenant as a guarantor of rights while at the same time delimiting acceptable interpretation. In this respect, Stewart provides a thought-provoking analysis of the 1646 Act of Classes, which defined malignancy and transgressions of the Covenanting cause, as well as the oft-neglected Cross Petition (1648) which challenged the imperial ambitions of the Solemn League and Covenant. Here Stewart begins to address the inherent problem of fragmentation within the Covenanting movement, although the competing tensions between the two covenants are under developed, as is the complexity of individuals like James Graham, first marquess of Montrose, who prioritized the crown's cause. On several occasions Stewart lumps Montrose and the Irish confederate Alasdair MacColla together without considering their ideological differences. Ultimately Stewart argues that the National Covenant served as a tool for forging a "Confessional state," wherein the kirk played a prominent role through press and pulpit, provided networks onto which mechanisms of governance could be mapped, and served as the foundation for a Scottish tradition of collective agency.

Stewart focuses part one and chapter 6 on the forming of a political population. While there is good reason to pursue such a line of inquiry, Stewart's assertion that the employment of popular politics is something new to Covenanting Scotland is problematic. Two strands of popular action were well rooted in Scotland, the first being the iconoclasm evidenced in the Reformation, which was at least threatened in the famous Edinburgh protests of 1596, and the second being the long tradition of regional magnates martialing their inferiors to assert authority in the face of a weak monarchy. In both cases, mustering popular action occurred through the mechanism of noble, elite, and ecclesiastical influence, something that is equally clear in this book. Thus, Stewart's claims that popular mobilization was something distinctive to Covenanting needs qualification.

Perhaps more importantly, so too do claims that Scotland experienced widespread popular debate and the creation of a public sphere. Nothing like the open market of ideas that dominated Revolutionary England appeared in Scotland. As Stewart's own account explains, royal proclamations and counter protestations in 1638 represented polarized, bilateral exchanges that did not invite open discourse or alternative views. So, claims for popular discourse are overstretched. Despite Stewart's claims, there was little use of printing presses for domestic Scottish markets. Presses were strictly regulated and employed primarily for an English audience. Satirical critiques surviving in manuscript originated from a highly-educated social elite with circulation limited to small audiences. The idea that people possessed copies of the National Covenant as cherished personal items is unlikely and unsubstantiated by the nature and number of surviving copies. Copies were distributed through carefully controlled channels to individual parishes where they were read publicly and then sworn or subscribed. These were public events binding the body of the people together, rather than primarily privatized actions.

The assertion of local corporate rights is evidenced by Stewart in the parish of Glassford's complaint over perceived impropriety by the presbytery in planting a minister. Yet this rested less on the National Covenant, though it was referenced, than on ambiguities over congregational rights in the *Books of Discipline* that led to numerous contested inductions and instances of congregations defending deposed ministers. However, these events are not discussed within the framework of contested Presbyterian polity that included the vexed question of patronage before the radical post-Engagement parliament abolished it in 1649. Discussion of this dynamic could have enhanced the analysis of internal discourse in defining post-Covenant Presbyterianism. Another missing component is a much-needed exploration of

the limits of autonomy. No mention is made of the remarkable, but solitary, Covenanter propheticess Margaret Michelson, nor Aberdeen's Otto Ferrendale, whose house-conventicling the Presbytery of Aberdeen believed forced subscription of the National Covenant would remedy.

Overall Stewart's book provides a welcome contribution to early modern historiography, which may prompt further new work on the Covenanters. Albeit this will likely counter some of her claims in relation to existing historiography. Stewart's claims about popular politics rest on English historiography and underappreciate the work of David Stevenson, but also Peter Donald, Ted Cowan, and Allan Macinnes, who argue that the National Covenant represented a reassertion of traditional rights of Scotland's Estates (minus the clerical), or, as Walter Makey put it, "a feudal body feeling its way back into an idealised version of the past" (*The Church of the Covenant, 1637–1651: Revolution and Social Change in Scotland* [1979]), 23). The Commonwealth perceived this as well, which is why it abolished Scotland's heritable jurisdictions, feudal superiorities and the General Assembly in efforts to create their own vision of a public sphere.

R. Scott Spurlock, University of Glasgow

ANTOINETTE SUTTO. *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists: Maryland and the Politics of Religion in the English Atlantic, 1630–1690*. Early American Histories. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015. Pp. 259. \$39.50 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.27

For those studying the early modern period, the colonies have often raised issues about the link with the home country and how differences in the way that such colonial settlements were governed reflected back on or might act as a mirror for those in the country from which the colonists and/or their forbears came. Of course, one might think that other questions were more pressing ones for the colonists themselves—slaughtering or being slaughtered by indigenous peoples, not dying of disease and what not—but in most studies of the topic at some point the question arises of how colonial administration might set new precedents for the exercise of power back home. Antoinette Sutto's *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists: Maryland and the Politics of Religion in the English Atlantic, 1630–1690* covers both this question and a range of other topics, and it deals in particular with questions of religious difference, conformity, and tolerance.

In the book's first section, Sutto makes a valiant effort to address the question of how the colony was constructed and run. But the core of her book lies in the rehearsal of the arguments over the place of the royal prerogative and over which modes of religious expression (at various points on the very wide spectra that, for convenience, are referred to by shorthand names—Puritanism, popery, Catholicism, and so on) might be regarded as politically seditious. Here, in fact, we have a rehearsal of the same kinds of argument that come up in, for example, study after study of Tudor and Stuart Ireland—how was it that regions of the world that were not directly connected with the English/British mainland could be ruled in such a way as to complement and not oppose English/British royal authority?

It has been known for some time that Catholic clergy could live and work in the colonies in ways that were theoretically impossible back home. And, in some sense, Maryland, in its name and through the Calvert family, which held the charter, was a standing example of how certain assumptions about the world after the Reformation did not operate on the other side of the Atlantic. The point was that Lord Baltimore's right to rule came directly from the crown—cutting out the potentially irritating layers of middle management that could, in England,