

EVAN HAEFELI, ed. *Against Popery: Britain, Empire, and Anti-Catholicism*. Early American Histories. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2020. Pp 358. \$39.50 (cloth). doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.145

Against Popery: Britain, Empire, and Anti-Catholicism, edited by Evan Haefeli, includes both essays originally presented in 2008 at a conference on transatlantic anti-Catholicism and essays specially written for this volume. The chronological coverage of the contributions (which might usefully have been made explicit in the title), extends from the later sixteenth century to the early nineteenth.

In his stimulating introduction, Haefeli immediately articulates a key argument that runs through some of the chapters: the value of making a distinction between anti-Catholicism “animus to Roman Catholics and their religion”, and anti-popery “deriving from hostility to the religious *and* political example of the Roman Catholic papacy” (1–2). Anti-popery indeed could be directed against both Protestants and Catholics, either because they were perceived as deliberately or unwittingly assisting the papacy or because they were deemed to be behaving in a popish manner. The distinction is then argued even more robustly in Tim Harris’s chapter on seventeenth-century England, which opens with the bold assertion that “Anti-Catholicism and anti-popery were not the same thing” (25). As Haefeli acknowledges, the boundaries between them “are fuzzy” (1), but, as the contributions in *Against Popery* illustrate well, the potentialities of pursuing the analytical separation.

The chapters are organized into three sections: those in “Foundations” focus on the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the chapters in “Hegemony” are concerned with the implied dominance of anti-Catholicism in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and the chapters in “Transformations” examine the place of anti-Catholicism in the revolutionary era from the 1770s to 1829. There are, however, some chronological overlaps between the sections. “Foundations” includes, alongside Harris’s chapter on England, studies of Virginia by Cynthia van Zandt, of Scotland by Craig Gallagher, and of Ireland by Haefeli. “Hegemony” is thematic rather than geographical in its coverage, including a multiauthored analysis of representations of the 1678 Popish Plot on playing cards; Laura Stevens’ account of the complex and shifting attitudes of British Protestants to the Virgin Mary; and Clare Haynes’s investigation of the comparable ambiguities in attitudes toward Roman Catholic art, centered on the career of Benjamin West.

Haefeli opens “Transformations” with his own *longue durée* survey of the enduring prominence of anti-popery in America throughout the colonial period. Hence, he argues the Quebec Act of 1774 “destroyed [colonists’] faith in the empire” (222) and that anti-popery quite as much as secular liberalism inspired American independence. In the next chapter, Brendan McConville argues that the subsequent American alliance with Catholic France was a consequence of pragmatic necessity that was at odds with the enduring anti-Catholicism and Francophobia of the population as whole. Peter Walker then traces the advance of religious toleration in Britain during the half century after 1780, arguing that the Gordon Riots discredited anti-popery in ways that proved to the long-term advantage of Catholics. *Against Popery* is rounded off by a conclusion from Haefeli and an epilogue from Anthony Milton, who helpfully highlights the fluidity and complexity of anti-Catholicism.

Like any multiauthored book, *Against Popery* suffers a little from repetition and apparent inconsistencies but achieves significant coherence through Haefeli’s substantive and editorial contributions. As a whole, the book therefore provides an excellent overview of current scholarship on anti-Catholicism and anti-popery in Britain and America in the early modern era, convincingly demonstrating the wider significance of its theme for understanding the overall development of the Protestant empire. There is also much insight here that can usefully be applied to the study of later periods and other geographical and national contexts.

As Haefeli acknowledges, there is nevertheless “certainly more work to be done” (297). In particular, his claim (5) that he is bringing together “disparate and widely scattered” work on anti-Catholicism and anti-papery needs to be qualified by the recognition that, with only two exceptions, the contributors are all based at institutions in the United States. This assemblage of work primarily by American scholars should therefore be read alongside another collection of essays edited by Claire Gheeraert-Graffeuille and Géraldine Vaughan, *Anti-Catholicism in Britain and Ireland 1600–2000: Practices, Representations and Ideas* (2020), which includes studies by British and French researchers. As Haefeli and his collaborators so effectively demonstrate, anti-Catholicism has been a transatlantic movement, and further advances in understanding it are likely to be facilitated by transatlantic collaboration among historians.

John Wolffe 
 Open University
john.wolffe@open.ac.uk

HENRIETTA HARRISON. *The Perils of Interpreting: The Extraordinary Lives of Two Translators between Qing China and the British Empire*. Princeton University Press, 2021, Pp. 312. \$32.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.144

It is well documented in the discipline of translation studies that translation and interpretation are perilous occupations that translators and interpreters across time and place must navigate, especially when working on rendering one language into another in the midst of an international conflict. The dangers arose from the fact that word choices and modes of rendering could make drastic differences to actual events and the fact that, as go-betweens, interpreters risked being scapegoated for difficulties inherent in such fraught encounters. Henrietta Harrison’s *The Perils of Interpreting: The Extraordinary Lives of Two Translators between Qing China and the British Empire* documents how two translators one Chinese, Li Zibiao, and the other British, George Thomas Staunton, risked their lives in dealing with the government of Qing China. Their paths became intertwined during the Macartney Embassy, a British diplomatic mission to China in 1793. Although informed by Harrison’s formidable scholarship, the narrative style aims at the nonspecialist. The work provides an extensive exploration of late-eighteenth and early nineteenth-century encounters between China and Britain (in effect, between China and the West). These early encounters set a pattern of interactions that entailed enormous consequences for the events in the following one and half centuries.

Staunton’s life and work are well known to researchers of Chinese history, not just for his childhood fame, but also for his works of translation. The son of an Irish colonial administrator who found his career in the British empire working in the British West Indies and British India, Staunton was groomed by his father to be a diplomat. He was expected to be useful to the empire and to exceed his father’s achievements. Educated at home by a small group of knowledgeable private tutors, he learned Latin, Greek, and other classical subjects. His training also involved visits to northern Britain, where the industrial revolution was transforming both nation and empire. He viewed newly dug transportation canals and visited a factory that made pins. The father and son dined with illustrious figures of the industrial revolution, including Matthew Boulton and James Watt. This aristocratic and idiosyncratic education prepared him for his first moment in the sun. At age twelve, he accompanied the Macartney Embassy of 1793 to the Qing court. Officially he acted as page, while his father acted as the mission’s secretary. Staunton learned Chinese onboard the ship heading to China, and thus he was able to speak a few words of Chinese to the Qianlong emperor after receiving a yellow silk purse from