

she charts the gradual emergence of an alternative paradigm that originated in Pennsylvania's political struggles and also in the broader imperial crisis. That new paradigm emphasized the universality of emotions; it blended masculine power with a civilized sensibility and presented passion as the natural ally of classical virtue. Eustace insists that the emotional language which pervades anti-British writings from the 1760s and 1770s should be understood not merely as rhetorical flourish but as a substantive and crucial component of the radical message that took form during those years. How that played out in the final decades of the eighteenth century, as citizens became increasingly divided over how radical their revolution should become, is not addressed here. This may frustrate some readers, but of course one can only do so much in one book. Given the ambitious scope of this study as it stands, Eustace was doubtless wise not to extend its reach into the early republic.

Eustace marshals an impressive body of evidence that incorporates personal journals, commonplace books, correspondence, political and religious tracts, public records, and newspapers. The author is clearly well versed in recent theoretical contributions to the history of emotion, but she deploys that knowledge with a light touch. Her prose is accessible and engaging, even when she examines complex ideas or issues that, in the hands of a less accomplished writer, could easily become recondite.

This is a very long book, which might perhaps have benefited from some judicious pruning, but the writing is of such quality and the details so engrossing that few readers are likely to find themselves skimming. Particularly impressive is the author's constant attention to the connotations that specific words would have carried in the eighteenth century and the often subtle distinctions between words that prove telling if paid the attention that they deserve. Most important of all, the author never loses sight of the human beings whose feelings and ideas are being discussed. This is an eminently humane piece of scholarship.

University of Miami

RICHARD GODBEER

Ireland, Philadelphia and the Re-invention of America, 1760–1800. By MAURICE J. BRIC. (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 2008. xix, 363 pp. Notes, appendices, tables, biographical notes, select bibliography, index. \$65.)

Prior to the American Revolution, Irish immigrants came to America primarily from the northern province of Ulster. The eighteenth-century passenger trade, closely linked to the flaxseed trade that supported the linen industry in Ulster, facilitated emigration from Londonderry and Belfast to Newcastle, Delaware, and Philadelphia. Between 1771 and 1774, when linen weaving fell victim to the British credit crisis, at least 18,600 sailed into the ports of the

Delaware Valley. These Scotch-Irish, as they were known in America, typically did not settle in the port towns but pushed on to find homes in the backcountry. They became politicized in 1764 in the aftermath of the Paxton killings and the formation of the Presbyterian committee, whose leaders were Philadelphia merchants in the flaxseed trade; they continued to be active in Pennsylvania politics by supporting the Constitution of 1776.

Maurice Bric summarizes this familiar story, and his focus is on “the new Irish,” or those who arrived between 1783 and 1800. His chapter on “Perceptions, Management, and Flow” is a thorough and perceptive look into every aspect of Irish immigration in those years. Bric acknowledges considerable continuity with prewar patterns. Many of the same merchants in the same ports controlled the passenger trade, and it was still largely a migration of Ulster Protestants, though he fails to note contemporary comments on the greater number of Catholics who were sailing to America from Ulster ports in the 1780s. The significant difference in these “new Irish” was the change in attitudes in both Ireland and America that influenced them; they had a stronger sense of national identity and of individual rights.

Bric has made a case, too, for a heightened sense of ethnic identity among Irish immigrants. Earlier Philadelphia associations, such as the Hibernia Fire Company (1752) and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick (1771), were elite social clubs. The Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland was formed in 1790 to support all who “fly to the Asylum established here for the oppressed of all nations” (157). While many of the newcomers were seeking a better life in Pennsylvania, others were exiles who were conscious of political trends in their old homeland and concerned with movements there. As the United Irish looked to France as a model and source of aid, so did they.

They became involved in Pennsylvania politics, sympathizing with Jeffersonian Republicans. One Federalist saw these “new Irish” as “United Irishmen, Free Masons, and the most God-provoking Democrats on this side of Hell” (229). Federalists responded with a more restricted Naturalization Act (1795) and the Alien Acts (1798). But, the election of Governor Thomas McKean in 1799 benefitted these new Irish immigrants.

Bric’s research is nearly flawless, which is befitting of one of Jack Greene’s doctoral students, and a bare summary cannot do justice to the breadth of his study. His stress on the “new Irish” is not always helpful. Since their political leaders in the 1790s—men like George Bryan, Blair McClenachan, Thomas McKean, and others—were active from the 1760s onward, there clearly was more continuity than Bric seems to allow. He understandably focuses on high-profile figures, but the reader is left wondering about the ordinary Irish men and women in Philadelphia who joined their societies and voted for them.

University of Florida

RICHARD K. MACMASTER