

Ultimately, Quakers' own concessions led to the dissolution of their holy nation. Internal divisions, sparked by the changing world around them, led several Friends to call for greater standardization in discipline and practice. The Hicksite-Orthodox schism of 1827-28 fractured the Society of Friends from within as members' competing visions of withdrawal or participation in the larger society created a deep ideological rift, one that would last well into the twentieth-century. Crabtree, diverging from past historians, contends that this split resulted from the demands of nationalism rather than from an inevitable confrontation between religious tradition and modernity.

Sarah Crabtree's *Holy Nation* makes an important contribution to the study of the Atlantic World and transnational history by convincingly demonstrating how the growth of nationalism dramatically impacted the Society of Friends in their disparate communities. The book's transatlantic approach is mirrored in the meticulous research conducted in the United States, England and Ireland. Much more than a book about Quaker history, this monograph compellingly connects the fields of religious history, political history and transnational history in the age of revolution.

doi:10.1017/S0165115315000844

Amy Weiss, *The City College of New York*

WORLD

Sophus A. Reinert and Pernille Røge, eds. *The Political Economy of Empire in the Early Modern World*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2013. 256 pp. ISBN: 9780230230644. \$85.00.

The aim of this edited volume is to show how economic policy was rooted in a trans-European science and how the political economy responded to problems associated with empire. The book has nine chapters that are predominantly written by younger scholars. The first section of five chapters deals with the theoretical framework of political economy and covers different parts of Europe: Jan Hartman and Arthur Weststeijn discuss De la Court's Dutch ideas; Pernille Røge's chapter investigates the French physiocratic vision of empire; Thomas Hopkins focuses on Adam Smith; and Gabriel Paquette writes about the influence of British ideas on Iberian political economy. The fifth chapter in the first part, by Sophus Reinert, is a quantitative study based on translations of economic writings in several European languages. This chapter functions like bridge to the second section that deals with the practical aspects of economic policy for empire: Giles Parkinson studies the role of the stock market in financing imperial warfare; Claire Levenson describes the process of gift exchange between the British and the Yamacraw Indians; James Lees discusses the fiscal-military politics of the English East India Company; and Bertie Mandelblatt focusses on the French and the practice of inter-colonial food provisioning. The main reason for the publication of the book is that, in the words of Richard Drayton in the foreword, "no other study before this has so explicitly and comparatively explored the interactions of the new political economy and Europe's new overseas interests" (viii-ix).

This edited volume is definitely comparative or, at least, the first part is. It could have drawn more conclusions about the circulation of ideas and their reciprocal influence on the reality of economic policy addressed in different chapters. The introduction is short (only six pages) and

ties together empire and political economy on a conceptual level well but does not actively engage with the chapters that follow. The book would have overall benefited from a more elaborate introduction or a concluding chapter that tied its chapters together. The chapter by Levenson, for example, was interesting in its own right but the precise connection between the spot gift exchange on the one hand and larger theoretical issues on the other are not easily identified.

The book does a very good job integrating the dynamic relation of the practical aspects of the political economy of empire with the theory of the first part of the book. This ensures that the book avoids the “so-what?” pitfall that is sometimes associated with the history of ideas by actually showing how ideas were historically employed. That being said, Reinert’s quantitative chapter on printed translations advocates for a stronger scholarly research emphasis on historiographically “neglected” but regularly translated “mercantilists”, such as John Gray, who had strong connections to actual policy making. In other words, he states: “we should study the canon historically, not history canonically” (123-124). Nevertheless, the other chapters emphasise the “usual suspects” and indicate that there is still a lot of work to be done for future researchers. Again, the inclusion of a final chapter that draws everything together would have made this collection of essays stronger.

A main take-away point from this edited volume is the significance of imperial “peripheries” for the development of economic thought. Paquette writes: “Colonies were not merely laboratories where ideas generated in the metropole were clumsily applied” (78-79). Colonists had a considerable amount of agency in originating and applying ideas regarding the political economy of empire. The chapters other than Paquette’s also show clear links of correspondence and the exchange of ideas between the metropole and its periphery. As Lees writes: “colonial powers were beginning to attach increasing importance to the internal development of conquered territory” (186). Similarly, Mandelblatt argues “that the centralised control and promotion of colonial trade of Colbert and his successors in all its forms was welcomed and even petitioned for by private traders” (199).

As a whole, the essays in this book seem to advocate for an approach that does not dismiss the centrality of canonical thinkers for the circulation of ideas about political economy. However, it equally has an eye for the other less well-known actors and how they influenced decisions that involved the political economy of empire. Such an approach has the potential to shine a light on the origin or “*generation* of political and economic ideas” and has not received the attention that it deserves (97).