Bradshaw thus seeks to oppose the revisionist turn by replacing "the old nationalist history, myths and all" (40) with a "healthy" ideological nationalism, and one defined by ethnic inclusiveness; a shared Counter-Reformation Catholicism; the contributions of learned advocates for a common if at times invented history (the most notable being Geoffrey Keating, "Ireland's first national historian and ideologue" [89]); assertions of Ireland as a sovereign kingdom, "governed by its own lords and commons under the English Crown" (90); and, from the Tudor period on, a hostility to the new and more aggressively colonizing English presence in Ireland. The latter hostility was expressed most potently in Gaelic poetry of exile and dispossession—a point which elicited fierce rebuttals by Tom Dunne and Michelle O'Riordan. Bradshaw follows his lengthy argument with a series of essays or "case studies" that elucidate his position, from a survey of nationalism and the Irish parliamentary tradition (one of Bradshaw's primary contributions to early modern Irish history) to a comparative analysis of the impact and reception of the reformation on and in Wales and Ireland.

The historiographical storms have grown less fierce in the years since Bradshaw wrote these essays and engaged in intense exchanges with scholars such as Steven Ellis or Bernadette Cunningham, and many of his calls have been taken up by other historians, including Bradshaw's own student, Hiram Morgan. The volume's essays, however, would have benefited from an introduction that acknowledged or engaged with these more recent works. For example, studies of violence by Vincent Carey, David Edwards, and others indeed focus their attention on the "catastrophic dimension" of early modern Ireland, to powerful effect. Historians are also beginning to tentatively reach into alternative sources and to respect rather than dismiss "popular" memory, with Guy Beiner the most prominent practitioner of such an approach, in his exploration of the folklore of 1798. It should be noted, however, that Bradshaw first recognized the usefulness of folklore and oral history for understanding early modern Ireland, as his excellent and perhaps most personal essay on Patrick Sarsfield, the dashing if doomed Jacobite hero of 1690 and 1691, demonstrates. In general, however, "nationalism" itself, while defined by Bradshaw according to its component parts, could have been problematized as a term; or at least Benedict Anderson, among others, might have been consulted. Bradshaw's nationalism also tends at times to reduce the complexities of early modern Irish history and supersedes other ideological movements at play. While Bradshaw carefully places the ideology in its early modern context, it also seeps out at times to join a larger whiggish stream, however unwittingly. Even so, the essays in *"And So Began the Irish Nation"* stand as a monument to a pioneering historian of a kind rarely seen today: a well-battered historian, to be sure, but one who changed and challenged all of our thinking on the traumatic story that was early modern Ireland, and whose legacy will remain with us, deservedly so, for decades to come.

Sarah Covington, The Graduate Center and Queens College, CUNY

A. T. Brown. *Rural Society and Economic Change in County Durham: Recession and Recovery, c.1400–1640*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015. Pp. xvi + 288. $99.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.105

A. T. Brown's *Rural Society and Economic Change in County Durham: Recession and Recovery, c.1400–1640*, based on a Durham University PhD dissertation, is a well-written, thoroughly researched, and compellingly argued analysis of landholding in county Durham in the late Middle Ages and the Tudor and early Stuart periods. It is an important contribution not only to the history of the county, but more generally to the economic and social history of England as a whole.

Brown's account begins around 1400, when England was experiencing a deep recession, and continues into the sixteenth century, when the population rose steeply, and prices did likewise. Brown discusses the strategies that landowners developed to deal with the problems they faced and argues that the policies they adopted (or the paths they selected) in the years of recession constricted their choices in the age of inflation, with effects that sometimes caused substantial difficulties for them. This idea of "path dependency" plays a major explanatory role in Brown's argument. Durham is unusual in that so much land was owned by the church, and in particular by the bishop and the cathedral priory (later the dean and chapter). The church could not sell or alienate these lands, unlike lay landlords, who could do both. In the first two chapters Brown discusses the ecclesiastical lands. The next chapter is about a few great lay landlords, and the fourth chapter concerns the gentry. The coal industry of the northeast of England expanded greatly from the second half of the sixteenth century, and in the fifth chapter Brown discusses the impact of this new industrial wealth upon landownership. The final two chapters concern leaseholders on ecclesiastical estates and the diverging experiences of yeomen and smallholders.

Brown's major theme is that many of the wealthier landlords abandoned demesne farming in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, when the demand for agricultural products was low, and instead lived on rents. Once the population and prices rose again, it sometimes proved difficult for them to readjust, and greater economic opportunities awaited those who could profit more directly from high food prices, or who exploited mineral deposits on their lands. In the sixteenth century, the owners of the greatest estates often faced difficulties because they were too dependent upon rental income, whereas those a little further down the social scale were better placed to profit from inflation. Brown argues that in Durham the sixteenth century witnessed both a crisis of the aristocracy and the rise of the gentry (or, more strictly, a crisis for rentiers, and an age of opportunity for those who put their land to productive use).

Brown contends that the strategies adopted on the bishop of Durham's lands differed markedly from those which prevailed on the estates of the cathedral priory (and later the dean and chapter), and that notably divergent outcomes ensued. The bishop was less successful in increasing his income than the dean and chapter, though this resulted in part from royal intervention in his affairs rather than from his own policies. By the end of the period, a few yeomen on the bishop's lands had amassed substantial estates that approached those of the gentry in size, while many of the other inhabitants were impoverished smallholders. On the lands of the dean and chapter, by contrast, there was much less diversity in the size of holdings, or in types of tenure (21-year leases became the rule), and much greater economic equality. Brown argues that the divergent outcomes on the two great ecclesiastical estates were the consequence of "path dependency" and resulted from policies introduced early by the bishop and the priory. But Brown also shows that the crown's actions had a serious impact on the bishop's room to maneuver. Queen Elizabeth confiscated many of the bishopric's estates and forced the bishop to grant tenants long leases on manors and mines. It is difficult to quantify how much effect royal policy (and other factors) had, and therefore it is also difficult to clinch the thesis about "path dependency." Moreover, Brown presents relatively little evidence about what might have motivated the bishops and other landowners to adopt the policies they did, and more generally on the ideas that underlay economic decisions, perhaps because such evidence is scarce or lacking.

By the early seventeenth century, few of the lay families who had formed the social elite in 1400 retained importance. They had been replaced in significance by rising lesser gentry and by coal merchants. Brown convincingly rejects the conventional notion that merchants standardly aimed to join the landed elite and to trade urban for rural wealth. Many of them had no such ambitions, and social theory often already ranked merchants as the equals of gentlemen. Brown argues that the decay and fragmentation of many of the great estates was the result not simply of individual misfortune but of long-term economic factors. Arguably, crown policy was also of central importance. Brown notes that the reduction in the size of

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2016.105 Published online by Cambridge University Press

northern estates was a deliberate aim of Elizabethan governments. For example, the great estate of the Neville Earls of Westmorland was forfeited to the crown after the earl joined the Northern Rising in 1569.

Brown convincingly contends that 1500 is not a useful dividing line between periods, at least as far Durham is concerned. It contributes valuably to the historiography of feudalism and capitalism, the rise of the gentry, and much else. Durham was in some ways exceptional. It was a border region, with unusually large and compact ecclesiastical and lay estates, and a precocious coal industry. But much of what this Brown has to say is relevant to the social and economic history of late medieval and early modern England as a whole, and this fine first monograph deserves a wide readership.

Johann Sommerville, University of Wisconsin–Madison

Sarah Crabtree. *Holy Nation: The Transatlantic Quaker Ministry in an Age of Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015. Pp. 276. $45.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.110

Holy Nation is fascinating in its scope and in its delivery. Sarah Crabtree looks at how Quakers navigated their interplay with the "world" and, in particular, potentially hostile nation states emerging in "an age of revolution" between 1754 and 1826. It is a period that started at the beginning of what Jack Marietta has called the "reformation of American Quakerism" and ended just before the "Great Separation," a schism that was to split Quakerism in two. It is a period that saw Quakers accused of British sympathies during the American Revolutionary war and of revolutionary sympathies in a 1790s Britain afraid of what was happening in neighboring France. It was a period in which Quaker spirituality was bifurcating between an emphasis on the inward and a more confident and relaxed Quaker sensibility (labeled "gay") that was starting to be less fearful of the outward. It is a period of Quaker history largely not researched, and for that reason alone, Crabtree's book is most welcome.

Crabtree also offers a compelling theorization of how Quakers responded to the transatlantic experience of suspicion and, in parts of the United States, the new experience of marginalization and hostility. The "reformation" was about spiritual renewal and a reclamation of authentic Quaker faith in a corrupt and corrupting world. The adage goes that Quakers emigrated from Britain to America to "do good" and they did very well. In major towns like Philadelphia, founded by Quaker William Penn in 1681, Quakers celebrated a religious freedom they had not experienced in seventeenth-century England and enjoyed mercantile dominance. Some Quakers became very rich and in spite of a numerical minority in the colony, ran Pennsylvania. However, antiwar Quaker integrity was compromised by the continuing demands of the crown for war taxes until, in 1756, most of the Quaker members left the Pennsylvania Assembly. Penn's "Holy Experiment" had come to an end due to the desire for spiritual renewal. A commitment to antislavery would quickly follow as part of a wider anti-worldliness. Quaker members whose behavior threatened the presentation and preservation of the purity of the true church, a gathered remnant in a corrupt and corrupting world, were disowned.

The reformation was transatlantic. Quakers in Britain did not enjoy the same privileges and freedoms that their coreligionists in North America did, but they had made steady progress in their campaigns for rights. Quaker worship was legal after 1689; they could affirm in court rather than swear an oath from 1694; and, along with Jews, were given special dispensation to marry in their own priest-less manner in 1753. They represented a separated people, dressing and speaking differently from the general population while practicing their form of