

The author is also fond of flying off at momentary tangents to make comparisons or construct analogies with diverse other parts of human history. Sometimes this enlivens things. Often, though, it just makes the main thrust of the argument harder to follow, particularly as it can disrupt clear chronological narration.

As for the accuracy of the overall argument—it is hard for anyone without specialism across the vast range of the case to judge. It may even be difficult for the author to fully know, since this account rests largely on summarized research by others, albeit enlivened by quotes from primary sources. In the area this reviewer specializes in, there is a degree of over-simplification (the balance between the 1650s and 1690s in the creation of the British state is probably skewed toward the former in order to construct a dramatic turning point at one moment in history): but such boiling down is probably inevitable in a work of already epic scale. At points, too, this work sails close to some old tales, which might make the reader pause: Protestantism as an engine of industry, secure property rights as preconditions for economic expansion, an enlightenment freeing minds to find new solutions, and so on. All that said, however, industrialization was a dramatic transformation that needs urgent, nuanced, and full explanation. In this brave and ambitious work, Scott provides a plausible and thought-provoking one.

TONY CLAYDON

Bangor University

The Warrior, the Voyager, and the Artist: Three Lives in an Age of Empire. By *Kate Fullagar*. The Lewis Walpole Series in Eighteenth-Century Culture and History. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2020. Pp. xii+306. \$40.00.

In 1769, the painter Joshua Reynolds, first president of the Royal Academy of Arts, in London, opened the Academy with a public address. The Academy, he began, belonged to the nation. Reynolds hoped that British artists would develop a vernacular suitable for a growing empire. “Elegance and refinement,” he predicted, would be “the last effect of opulence and power.”¹

And yet, as Kate Fullagar argues in *The Warrior, the Voyager, and the Artist: Three Lives in the Age of Empire*, Reynolds’s ambivalence to imperial “opulence and power” is obvious, even in his most “imperial” portraits. “Reynolds’s life,” she writes, “shows that [the British] empire neither followed an even path toward global supremacy nor enjoyed uniform support from within” (46). In this cleverly constructed triple biography, of Reynolds and of two men whose portraits he painted (the Cherokee warrior-diplomat Ostenaco and the Ra’iātean traveler Mai), Fullagar limns the limits of British imperial power in the era of the Seven Years’ War and the American Revolution.

Fullagar argues that the Atlantic and the Pacific were not two “worlds” for British imperialism, but rather two intricately connected spheres of conquest, exploration, and commercial exploitation. She cautions readers against the temptation to treat Indigenous histories as subordinate to imperial or settler-colonial history, particularly in the eighteenth century. Indigenous politics were not defined by their relationship to European power. “The intrusion of empire,” she comments, “into Indigenous societies was momentous but never total” (6).

¹ Sir Joshua Reynolds, *The Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, Knight: Containing His Discourses, Idlers, a Journey to Flanders and Holland, and His Commentary on Du Fresnoy’s Art of Painting*, ed. Edmond Malone, 3 vols. (London, 1798), 1:1–10.

Fullagar places herself in the tradition of “new biography,” “with at least one eye out for the constructed nature of selves” (5). In compelling sketches of Ostenaco and Mai, Fullagar struggles with the intellectual problem of writing the lives of people who would consider the idea of a life story that begins with individual birth and ends in individual death to be incoherent, even repugnant. She interpolates political histories of white settlers and Cherokee towns in South Carolina, and of British merchants and explorers and Ra’iateans in the Pacific, with reflections on how men like Ostenaco and Mai might have conceived of their own lives. Cherokee selfhood, for example, would not begin “among kin, community members, and shared resources” (17).

The book pivots on two imperial wars with quite different outcomes for Britain: triumph in the Seven Years’ War, and humiliation in the American Revolutionary War. In 1762, just before the end of the Seven Years’ War, Ostenaco and two other Cherokee diplomats spent a few months in London, formalizing a treaty to end the Anglo-Cherokee War. Fullagar follows Ostenaco to London, back to North America, and on past 1776, when the aging warrior and his allies dissented from treaties that the Cherokee were compelled to sign, choosing to fight the settlers from new bases beyond Appalachia. Mai, in contrast, spent years in London after joining Captain Cook’s 1773 voyage when it called at Ra’iatea—about a decade after the island was conquered by invaders from nearby Bora Bora. Fullagar shows both what British officials hoped to make of the visitors and contrasts British politics with Ostenaco and Mai’s own motivations and ambitions. For example, Joseph Banks and other leading Britons with interests in the Pacific hoped Mai would become their envoy. Mai, in contrast, seems to have thought only of revenge for the defeat of his people.

Reynolds painted both men and was unhappy with the portraits. He never sold either painting, and seems to have never displayed his portrait of Ostenaco at all. Reynolds, Fullagar argues, saw his paintings as a form of biography, a balance between the individual quirks of a sitter and “the values of an entire society” (56). Empire confounded him; he did not know what Britain’s empire was, or even if it ought to exist. In an impressive passage, Fullagar shows how Reynolds’s desire to convey both human universality and exotic particularity in his portrait of Mai produced an image of “an everyman from everywhere . . . from *everywhen* as well as everywhere” (206). Reynolds combined elements drawn from his impressions of Indigenous people from across the empire as well as signifiers of both the imperial past and present. Fullagar speculates that Reynolds was unhappy with his portraits of Ostenaco and Mai because they reminded him of his own unsettled conscience.

As an experiment in biography intended to dislodge Britain from the center of British imperial history, the book succeeds brilliantly. Fullagar draws widely from scholarship in Indigenous history, the history of art, and historical geography to weave together three divergent lives. She shows both the shifting scales of the British empire in the eighteenth century and the limits of imperial power. However, the chapters on Reynolds, focused on British politics and culture, may frustrate specialists in eighteenth-century British history. Fullagar uses Edmund Burke as a proxy for jingoistic imperialism in North America and the Pacific, a “Whig” policy. She uses Samuel Johnson to stand in for a “Tory” policy, skeptical of empire. Reynolds was able to maintain friendships with both men, Fullagar argues, as he wavered back and forth between these two poles. It is a convenient device, but it flattens, to an extent, the politics of two complex, often self-contradictory thinkers. Reynolds, she argues, “didn’t want to be aligned to a Whiggish jingoistic sect but neither was he keen to be seen as a kowtowing Tory sycophant” (168). Whig and Tory politics were also not as cut-and-dried or as focused on overseas empire as Fullagar implies. War and empire, as Linda Colley and others have argued, helped to forge the British state in the eighteenth century. In chapters on North America and the Pacific,

Fullagar adeptly shows the dynamic, uneven, and generally destructive energy of British imperial expansion in the eighteenth century. But she occasionally elides the effects of that energy on Britain itself.

PADRAIC X. SCANLAN

University of Toronto

The Right to Rule and the Rights of Women: Queen Victoria and the Women's Movement. By *Arianne Chernock*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Pp. xii+250. \$99.99 (cloth); \$80.00 (Adobe eBook Reader).

The past decade has yielded a number of important reassessments of Queen Victoria, about whom hundreds if not thousands of scholarly and popular accounts had already been written. Our fixation on the woman may be a consequence of her slipperiness: despite the availability of volumes of her letters and journal entries—and the outright distortion or excision of many of them—she remained a cypher, an empty figure upon whom we could project our own interests and preconceptions. Some of the new work appears as general biography, recontextualizing familiar moments of the princess's and then monarch's life. The most fruitful new scholarship, I would argue, focuses on specific aspects of the queen's reign, such as Miles Taylor's 2018 *Empress: Queen Victoria and India*, and now Arianne Chernock's treatment of Queen Victoria and the women's movement. As Chernock points out, digital tools that have come online over the past ten years have enabled scholars to plumb the depths of the monarch's relationship to and with a variety of people, places, policies, and themes, yielding a richness of investigation not previously possible.

Scholars who have written about British feminism, this reviewer included, have overlooked one crucial element, a neglect that has necessarily colored our analyses of Victoria's articulation to the subject. While many of us noted that the queen's very existence lent a kind of logical support to the argument about women's public presence, we've highlighted the queen's oft-quoted remarks about "this mad, wicked folly of 'Woman's rights,'" her "strongest aversion for the *so-called & most erroneous 'Rights of Woman'*," her insistence on the "dangerous & unchristian & unnatural *cry & movement of 'woman's rights'*" to demonstrate the antipathy she displayed toward the women's movement, and on that basis, let her drop from sight. Except she didn't display hostility to feminism, at least not publicly. Chernock points out that all of these pronouncements were made by Victoria in private and did not come to light until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This left open to supporters of women's rights and women's suffrage the opportunity to co-opt her to the side of the cause. "The queen in fact played a significant and surprisingly sustained role in the Victorian feminist imagination," Chernock asserts (5).

Chernock shows how a tendency for commentators in the eighteenth century to associate queens with liberty and equality paved the way for early nineteenth-century radicals to relate the "right to rule" to the "rights of women" in such movements as the Queen Caroline affair and Chartism. Once Victoria came to the throne in 1837, early women's rights advocates regularly used the "paradox" of her position to draw attention to the absurdity of women's disabilities. Harriet Taylor, only one of the best-known early feminist writers to question the idea of separate spheres for men and women by referring to the standing of sovereign queens, wryly reminded the readers of the *Westminster Review* in 1851 that women, "by a curious anomaly, though ineligible to even the lowest office of state, they are in some countries admitted to the highest of all, the regal. . . . Concerning