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and spiritually in the world of Richard Baxter, the seventeenth-century divine who figures so prominently in the argument of Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, but he was also a frequently disapproving hearer, in his Leeds chapel, of Joseph Priestley, that most rational of all proponents of Rational Dissent. (Priestley greatly approved of Smith.) Not the least of the many achievements of Kadane’s study is to make one think hard about the chronology of the move from Puritanism to Enlightenment and about the essentially Protestant dynamic of such a transition in Atlantic history. Ryder was born as Dissent was being absorbed into the Revolution settlement of the 1690s, complete with the experience of a financial revolution, and he reached maturity in a country in which the “dissidence of Dissent” was becoming ever more confidently voiced by the likes of Priestley. His unpretentious, perhaps surprisingly eloquent journal—complete with trying exercises in rhyme—is a manifestation of a difficult life, made difficult both by his wariness of prosperity and his concern that his own religious tradition had begun to abandon its rigid, self-examining, and “watchful” theology in favor of a worldly, compromising, and compromised religion of the prosperous self. The Unitarianism of Priestley that shook Dissent at the close of Ryder’s life not only humanized Christ, removing Jesus from an admonitory Godhead, but also, for men of Ryder’s disposition, seemed to elevate humanity into something very much akin to the object of a blasphemous cult of self-worship.

In many ways, Kadane’s study is a development of, and commentary on, Weber’s contested but ever suggestive account of the relationship between predominantly Calvinist theology and capitalist enterprise. It is a token of Kadane’s achievement that his book can readily be described as being worthy of such historically exalted company. *The Watchful Clothier* is a piece of microhistory that is fully, richly, and confidently integrated into a very full and intellectually resourceful account of the origins of modern capitalism. Sympathetically critical of Ryder’s anxieties though Kadane is—going so far in one chapter as to wonder if he was, in clinical terms, permanently “depressed”—he is no less anxious about the celebratory ethos of modern, secular capitalism; and here his work is once again a worthy contemporary reflection of the heroic enterprise of Weber.

Kadane has labored long and hard in evaluating Ryder’s journal, and the result is a model of humane learning. He writes with enviable lucidity, avoiding the jargon that so paradoxically often gets between ego-writing and its interpreters. He entertains enormous historical questions with eloquent humility; the answers he offers are, nonetheless, deeply considered, suggestive, and interpretatively fruitful. Kadane frequently muses as to who Ryder was writing his journal for; his analysis of text and context makes clear that the journal has much to teach modern readers. In Kadane, Ryder has finally found his ideal reader.

**Brian Young**

*Christ Church, University of Oxford*


It would be difficult to find a map that places the Scottish Highlands at the center of the world. And over the past few centuries their core demographic experience has tended to be centrifugal rather than centripetal, as erstwhile Highlanders swelled the populations of far-flung outposts of empire (or former empire). But their landscape and their legends have disproportionately attracted diverse and numerous imaginations; as Hugh Trevor Roper concluded in “The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland,”
tartans are now purchased and “worn, with tribal enthusiasm, by Scots and supposed Scots from Texas to Tokyo” (in The Invention of Tradition, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger [Cambridge, 1983], 41). In Fredrik Albritton Jonsson’s deeply researched study, however, the author argues that the impact of the Highlands was not confined to the romantic realms conjured by Ossian and Walter Scott. From the geographical periphery he moves the Highlands to the theoretical heart as both the inspiration and the laboratory for Enlightenment efforts to understand and exploit the natural world and (especially) its resources.

He begins in some familiar places (and returns to them throughout the book). In the introduction, Albritton Jonsson traces his own transition from intellectual history to environmental history, and it is clear that his subdisciplinary journey has been one of accretion rather than replacement. He offers detailed explications of the ideas of celebrated Scottish Enlightenment figures such as Lord Kames (Henry Home) and, most extensively, Adam Smith (although Albritton Jonsson notes that since Smith was a universalist, his comments on the Highlands were “remarkable for their relative brevity and their many omissions” [146]), along with those of numerous lesser luminaries, drawn not only from voluminous published work but also from the records of presentations and debates in such forums as the Select Society of Edinburgh and the Highland Society, as well as from private correspondence. The positions of participants were complicated and, in some cases, mutable, but in general the author traces a persistent opposition between expansive liberal exploitation and a conservative position stressing limits. Based on their sense of the interconnectedness of the elements that constitute the natural world—climate, soil, plants, and animals—he characterizes the conflicting understandings as “rival ecologies.”

Although these position had (and have, of course, usually been seen to have) very general implications, Albritton Jonsson focuses on their particular relation to the Highlands, where even the answers to basic questions of fact—for example, Was the area naturally rich or poor? Could it support many people or relatively few?—required previous answers to larger theoretical questions. What is freshest and most illuminating about this study is Albritton Jonsson’s search for the answers where many of his subjects looked for them. The abstractions of political economy were concretized in their voluminous discussions of both natural history and agriculture, pursuits that, nevertheless, have only occasionally been fruitfully juxtaposed by historians. And not just discussions—the eighteenth-century combatants attempted to apply their theories (or to get other people to apply them), so Enlightenment’s Frontier includes engaging accounts of Scottish interactions with peat moss, seaweed, larches, cattle, and sheep.

In a chapter appropriately titled “Alternate Highlands,” John Walker and James Anderson represent the opposing viewpoints that gave the debate its overarching structure. The conservative Walker was a clergyman whose interest in natural history led to his appointment as Regius Professor at the University of Edinburgh; he argued that if their resources were properly managed, the Highlands could become self-sufficient. Not coincidentally, he was also anxious to preserve the cultural integrity of the region. The radical Anderson, who was a farmer as well as an economist, urged engagement with the wider world, whether through the acclimatization of introduced species or through trade. A concern with limits underlay both positions, which Albritton Jonsson (who is also very aware, as his subjects could not be, of the economic catastrophe that awaited the Highlands in the nineteenth century) connects to the pessimism that has become a prominent strain in current environmental thought.

And even geographically the Highlands seem less peripheral than usual here. As Albritton Jonsson weakens their ties to the rest of Britain (he frequently characterizes the
development of the Gaelic-speaking Highlands by Anglophone landlords as “internal colonization” [see, e.g., 46]), he strengthens their membership in a generalized North, recalling connections between Scotland, Ireland, and Scandinavia that were most potent when Vikings sailed the seas. He highlights the impact of the eighteenth-century Swedish naturalist Carolus Linnaeus, stressing the economic theory that supplemented the work on botanical and zoological taxonomy and nomenclature for which he is best known and arguing that Linnaeus’s civic cameralism held a stronger appeal for his Scottish contemporaries than it did for Britons who lived further south.

Albritton Jonsson’s largest claim—that the true roots of environmentalism are in the Scottish Enlightenment—is interesting, but its persuasiveness depends on a very expansive understanding of the term. The kind of holistic viewpoint that he attributes to his subjects has emerged from time to time, starting centuries before his book begins. To suggest that the current environmental movement is a direct descendant of any of these iterations is as misleading as to suggest that Saint Francis originated the modern humane movement. Calling the understandings of eighteenth-century Scots “ecologies” is provocatively anachronistic, but it does not make them ecologists in the twentieth-century sense. Such claims aside, however, Albritton Jonsson has produced an imaginatively conceived and persuasively argued study. Whatever the relation of modern activists to his subjects, their concern with growth and with limits remains of acute relevance today.

Harriet Ritvo

Massachusetts Institute of Technology


In The Empire of the Nairs; or, the Rights of Women (1811), James Henry Lawrence—a fringe member of William Godwin’s radical circle—imagines a community where there is no such thing as marriage. Instead, his male and female characters couple at whim, staying together as long as genuine affection exists between them. The goals are purportedly protofeminist. As Lawrence explains, only a permissive society can “restore the liberty and equality of the two sexes” (James Henry Lawrence, The Children of God [London, 1833], 6). It’s a fine sentiment, but one that immediately raises suspicions. It doesn’t take a particularly close read of Empire to see that Lawrence’s interests clearly lay more with the men than with the women. His utopia is one in which man is no longer “enjoined to select a woman, with whom he must live during the whole course of his life” (Lawrence, Empire, 4 vols. [London, 1811], 1:17). It goes without saying that Lawrence believed that parenting in utopia should fall exclusively to the female sex.

Lawrence’s flawed fantasy would be right at home in Andrew Cayton’s Love in the Time of Revolution: Transatlantic Literary Radicalism and Historical Change, a sympathetic and lucid—if a bit tired—rendering of experiments in “friendship and love” during the era of the French Revolution, circa 1793–1818. At face value, Cayton’s book is about the romantic entanglements of Gilbert Imlay, Mary Wollstonecraft, and William Godwin and the ways in which these three willful individuals tried to make “individual happiness . . . the foundation of social progress” (11). Its larger and more ambitious goal, though, is to