

ing, Lee was indicted for sedition, but he managed to escape prison dressed in women's clothing that had been smuggled in.

This collection of essays is uniformly lucid, engaging, and densely documented historical discourse from the English to the French Revolutions. It provides an especially cogent account of how one historical moment re-imagines another for its own ideological purposes. Finally, it offers a rich tapestry representing strains of radical thought, and it forces a reconsideration of the interim between the revolutions as a quiescent, politically dormant period. The subject itself is enormous and awaits further treatment, but this book serves as an exciting stimulus to an ongoing investigation of the kind of historical intertextuality Morton and Smith illustrate in this book.

Michael P. Winship. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. xv + 322 pp. \$29.95. Review by KONSTANTIN DIERKS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON.

It is not uncommon for reviews of new books on Puritanism in seventeenth-century New England to begin by registering astonishment that yet another book has been written on the subject. In fields such as Native American history, creativity comes from the paucity of archival sources, but in the case of Puritan New England it is sparked by the very richness of existing historiography, which imposes a tremendous burden to make an original contribution. *Making Heretics* certainly offers an original and important new study. Michael Winship reinterprets the interval between 1636 and 1641, years of intense controversy in colonial Massachusetts and years of escalating crisis in an England on the verge of what would be prolonged civil war. This chronological focus is central to the very mission of *Making Heretics* and underpins the analytical high ground claimed by Winship to justify adding a new book to the groaning library shelves on Puritan New England.

Winship insists that attention to chronology is vital to the writing of history. That should not be a provocative statement, but, in Winship's view, and to his dissatisfaction, recent scholarship on Puritan New England has tended to foreground a structural framework, preoccupied with neat binary oppositions and consequently inattentive to historical contingencies. As correctives, Winship engages in a fresh look at the archives and a return to the fundamental historicity of history, all meant to point away from predictable historical accounts pitting orthodoxy against heterodoxy.

In Winship's hands, six short years of the early history of Puritan New England become riddled with dynamism, indeed already so before the outbreak of any controversy. Chapters One and Two introduce us to the Puritans' ongoing debates about salvation and grace stretching forward from the sixteenth century and set the stage for the emigration of John Cotton and Anne Hutchinson from England to Massachusetts in the early 1630s. These are typically the two central figures in what other scholars have been calling the "Antinomian Controversy," but which Winship renames the "free grace controversy" to honor the longer cultural debate underlying the dispute that would flare up suddenly in 1637. Chapters Three and Four provide additional background enabling us to appreciate the sheer abruptness of the outbreak of controversy. Before 1637, there was amplifying social change brought by a rising tide of immigration, as well as a burgeoning cultural vibrancy of Puritan experimentation in conditions of religious freedom in the New World. Debate, change, experimentation—these were key characteristics of early Puritan New England, so that the outbreak of full-fledged controversy would manage to agitate colonists accustomed to unsettlement in their lives.

Chapters Five through Ten dwell on the heart of the story, the pivotal year of 1637, when the tenor of cultural experimentation suddenly crossed a threshold from the routine to the controversial. It is here that Winship's tight chronological focus pays its greatest dividends, because his narrative immerses us in the muddy processes whereby attitudes suddenly hardened and factions suddenly

solidified—the very processes he believes are obscured by a structural approach to history. In a structural approach, factionalism is predictable, even *a priori*, unnecessary to explain. But Winship insists that the factionalism characterizing 1637 was something new and momentous, and thus constitutes the historical problem requiring explanation.

And it is here that Winship is at his most original. Other scholars have concentrated upon John Cotton and Anne Hutchinson as representative of structural oppositions in colonial Massachusetts. Winship, however, stresses the roles of John Wheelwright and Henry Vane. It was Wheelwright's trial in early 1637 which shifted the terms of the debate from free grace to political authority. The resulting clashes in court and in print concerned the very definition of Puritanism and the control of Massachusetts. Hence, Winship reverses the usual treatment of Wheelwright's trial, typically cast as a brisk prelude to Anne Hutchinson's trials later in 1637. For Winship, Wheelwright's trial was impetus, while Hutchinson's trials were epilogue. Winship also trumpets the central role of Henry Vane in catapulting the controversy into the political arena, thereby raising the stakes.

By 1641, the controversy faded as abruptly as it had once flared, and gave way to the consolidation of Puritan orthodoxy. In the view of scholars such as Mark Peterson and James Cooper writing in the late 1990s, this orthodoxy reflected a pragmatism that would enable Puritanism to continue to grow in New England even amid the propulsive social transformations of the latter seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century.

Winship adds a bit of darkness to the story, however, perhaps reflective of the spiking darkness of the early twenty-first century. 1641 may have marked the transition toward an era of consolidation—of the achievement of workable and abiding coalitions of power and boundaries of community in New England. Yet for Winship there was troubling postponement of necessary cultural work, a postponement facilitated by the decimation of Native American communities throughout New England, affording open space for the exile of dissidents from Massachusetts. Exile was a

false solution, seemingly effective in the short run, but ultimately untenable in a Massachusetts and a New England whose social and cultural diversity was only increasing, and whose demands for justice were multiplying. (Winship does not make the connection himself, but his ominous conclusion reminded me of false solutions being pursued since September 2001.)

Following the cue of David Hall, many scholars of Puritan New England like Peterson, Cooper, Erik Seeman, and Laura Henigman have been focusing their attention on the laity more than the clergy. One could wish Winship had turned his archival mastery toward greater attention to the perspective of the laity, since his narrative history approach strays toward a top-down account. One also might have wanted Winship to widen not only the social but also the cultural context, since, except for nods to the presence of Native Americans and of England, his account keeps Puritan leaders eerily segregated from other dimensions of colonial life. Here I am thinking of exciting new scholarship on the economy and on masculinity. But these are quibbles about what is otherwise a tightly conceived and compelling contribution to the field.

Matthew Glozier. *The Huguenot Soldiers of William of Orange and the Glorious Revolution of 1688: The Lions of Judah*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2002. xi + 228 pp. + 4 illus. \$69.95. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, NAVY MUSEUM, WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, D.C.

As an early modern military historian the title of the book excited me, and I approached it with enthusiasm. I anticipated comparisons with other itinerant groups (Irish Roman Catholics and Scottish Presbyterians, for instance), as well as a work that would answer questions regarding numbers—whether of officers' origins or casualties—usually asked by military historians. However, the book failed to meet those expectations.

The author divides the 148 pages of text into seven chapters plus an introduction and epilogue. The first two chapters, dealing with French Huguenots in France and the Revocation of the Edict