peace, it was hardly a surprise that many Puritans, in Lancashire and beyond, saw the *Book of Sports* as James's willful turning of a blind eye to the potential decline of religion.

Stepping into the historiographical and historical debate as to who was more explicit (and who more complicit) in getting the *Book of Sports* to be republished, Dougall successfully disentangles the web surrounding the agencies between Charles and Laud, leading up to the 1633 publication. Dougall also persuasively shows a real Jacobean self-fashioning on the part of Charles I and how the republication reflects both the looming influence of James's policy on his son and the recalcitrant presence of this debate well into Charles's reign. Charles's sentiment in seeking to enforce the *Book of Sports* is nicely captured by Dougall: "Charles decided that he would not only reissue his father's Declaration but that, unlike his father, he would have it enforced and ensure that it was published in parish churches across the land. Charles was well aware of the power of the pulpit, and told his son many years later that 'people are governed by the pulpit more than the sword in times of peace'" (123).

As parliamentary records indicate, even after an eleven-year hiatus, MPs were eager to engage the controversial topic of the *Book of Sports* when the Short Parliament first sat in April 1640. Both Francis Rous and John Pym, along with Sir Walter Earle, excoriated the unjust and inordinate nature of punishment meted out to the nonconforming ministers, and even after the Long Parliament began, the rancor around this *Book* had not subsided, quite conversely so, in fact. Thus on 8 September 1641, the Commons resolved to quash the *Book of Sports*, averring that "the Lord's day should be duly observed and sanctified; that all dancing, or other sports either before or after divine service, be foreborne and restrained" (149). The most spectacular act of defiance against royal prerogative was the burning of the *Book of Sports* on 10 May 1643, by the order of Parliament. Therefore, Dougall has portrayed the cultural, religious, and political significance of the *Book of Sports* as simultaneously a precipitating cause of the Civil War in England and a symbolic effect of the Parliament's untrammeled opposition to the religious and social policies of Charles I and his Archbishop William Laud.

Paul C. H. Lim, Vanderbilt University

Alan Gilbert. *Black Patriots: Fighting for Emancipation in the War for Independence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012. Pp. 392. $30.00 (cloth).
doi:10.1017/jbr.2013.71

In *Black Patriots and Loyalists: Fighting for Emancipation in the War for Independence,* Alan Gilbert continues the recent trend among historians of the American Revolution to examine the roles of loyalists, Native Americans, and African Americans in that conflict. Gilbert's focus is on African Americans, and he brings an important new perspective to the topic. He is also bold in denouncing the institution of slavery and its supporters on both the American and the British sides, unlike most authors who have previously dealt with this subject and who have been cautious in passing judgment, especially with regard to the contradiction of Americans who fought simultaneously for their own freedom and for the preservation of slavery.

Gilbert asserts that there were actually two revolutions that occurred within the British Empire in the late eighteenth century: one fought for the independence of the American colonies and the other for the emancipation of slaves. The latter, Gilbert argues, began before the American Revolution and was motivated by Enlightenment ideas that emphasized human equality, the increase of antislavery sentiment among Quakers, and the growth of the abolitionist movement in Great Britain. The shift in British views regarding human bondage was clearly demonstrated in 1772, when Chief Justice Lord Mansfield issued his decision in the *Somersett*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2013.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case that declared slavery illegal in Britain. The importance of Mansfield's ruling was evident to Americans, both black and white, leading many slaves to look upon the British as potential liberators while colonial slave owners began to worry that the British government posed a threat to the institution upon which their wealth and prosperity depended.

With the outbreak of war three years later, the actions of another royal official appeared to confirm the hopes of American slaves and the worst fears of their masters. When Virginia's royal governor, Lord Dunmore, emancipated rebel-owned slaves who volunteered to fight for the British, the American rebels thought it necessary to respond to his actions or risk defeat if Dunmore and others mobilized their slaves against them. The revolutionaries' reactions varied, however, largely along regional lines. Gilbert notes that many people in the northern colonies recognized that slavery was incompatible with their political principles and eventually permitted blacks to perform military service and in some cases even supported the abolition of slavery. Southerners reacted in the opposite manner, as Gilbert demonstrates using the colonies of Virginia and South Carolina as case studies. Fearful that Dunmore's actions foreshadowed a British policy of general emancipation in the rebellious colonies, southern leaders adopted a policy of harsh repression of their slaves while embracing the cause of American independence as the best means to protect their African chattel from possible British attempts at abolition.

Ultimately, neither side proved willing to risk the consequences of emancipating slaves on a large scale, and both American and British leaders opted for more pragmatic approaches to the issue of slavery. Gilbert observes that while both sides primarily viewed slaves as a means to achieve their military objectives, some leaders were guided by humanitarian principles. John Laurens, the son of prominent South Carolina planter Henry Laurens and a member of General George Washington's staff, was the leading advocate of offering freedom to slaves who would enlist in the American army. When Laurens, with the support of his father and Washington, finally convinced the Continental Congress to adopt his plan in 1779, Gilbert notes that the War for Independence and the battle against slavery briefly became congruent. However, southern governors and legislators rejected Congress's proposal, and the effort to unite the two revolutions into a single struggle for the liberty of all ended almost immediately.

Gilbert asserts that during the course of the war the British did more to promote emancipation than did the Americans, although British leaders often hesitated to take full advantage of the thousands of slaves who sought freedom with the Royal Army in the southern states. These slaves chose to seek liberation from bondage by fleeing to the British army or navy when opportunity offered, and thus forced military commanders to deal with their presence. British officers, however, were often reluctant to employ fugitive slaves as combat soldiers, preferring the less controversial option of assigning them supporting roles as pioneers and teamsters. In some cases, slaves who had sought freedom with the British were sold into slavery in the West Indies by their erstwhile liberators.

The peace treaty that ended the war allowed Americans to recover slaves who had fled to the British, but General Sir Guy Carleton and other principled British officers insisted that royal officials' previous promises of freedom were inviolable and thereby prevented the return of most slaves. Nonetheless, Gilbert describes how emancipated slaves who left the United States with the British continued to struggle for equality, as racism and misguided British paternalism plagued black refugees in Britain, Canada, and Sierra Leone.

Gilbert argues his case convincingly, and his conclusions are supported by thorough research. However, in some cases it appears that his research was too narrowly focused, resulting in a lack of context that occasionally leads to inaccurate conclusions. For example, Gilbert states that the large numbers of women and children attached to British regiments in America were probably the wives and children of slaves serving as soldiers in those units. Actually, British regiments included female camp followers who performed essential support tasks, and most had accompanied the troops from Britain, many bringing their children with them. Similarly, Gilbert confuses the identity of British lieutenant colonels Archibald Campbell

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2013.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Alexander Campbell, leading to inaccurate observations regarding the former's views on slavery. Despite these minor errors, this is an excellent volume that achieves the author's goal of demonstrating the major role African Americans played during the Revolution, and Gilbert makes a valuable contribution to the study of slavery and the War for American Independence.

Jim Piecuch, Kennesaw State University

Ann Hughes. *Gender and the English Revolution*. London: Routledge, 2011. Pp. 184. $37.95 (paper).
doi:10.1017/jbr.2013.72

In this brisk, engaging, and accessible study, Ann Hughes argues that an exploration of early modern gender is necessary for an understanding of England's upheavals during the 1640s and 1650s. She organizes her book around three central points of investigation: the implications of gendered cultural frameworks in political crisis, the application of gendered terms to define and sharpen political divisions, and the power of political instability to reinforce, challenge, and transform the theory and practice of gender. Two additional, related themes emerge during the course of the book: the place of gender in competing seventeenth-century notions of public and private, and the justification of the label "revolution" to describe the civil war and interregnum. Hughes's analysis moves deftly among diverse sources, from early modern pamphlets, poetry, and political treatises to recent studies by Mary Fissell, Diane Purkiss, Susan Wiseman, and other noted scholars, and her treatment of each of the book's main topics is both thoughtful and thought provoking. These strengths make *Gender and the English Revolution* an important contribution to scholarship on early modern England, women's history, and gender.

The book opens with a consideration of how regicide unsettled England's association of state and household, and provides a useful introduction to the early modern contexts that shaped performances of masculinity and femininity prior to the 1640s. Hughes then moves to "Women and War," a chapter comprising one-third of the book's length. Her approach blends synthesis and anecdote to illuminate the diversity of women's experiences, and many of those whose words and actions Hughes features—Lady Brilliana Harley, Anne Trapnel, Lucy Hutchinson, and Henrietta Maria, among them—will be familiar to students and scholars of the period. Hughes draws on the experiences of both the famous and the unfamiliar in describing women's economic dislocation, opportunities for activism as spies and intermediaries, attempts to secure pensions, property rights, the lives of their husbands, and petitions to Parliament on public matters. Of particular value is Hughes's convincing demonstration that royalists and parliamentarians employed similar gendered strategies in valorizing women, supporting their own cause and vilifying those who favored the opposition; parliamentarians criticized royalist women as wanton whores, for example, while royalists caricatured radicals such as Lady Anne Waller as domineering, subversive shrews. The chapter then considers women and religion, highlighting prophets and Quakers. In closing, Hughes stresses that while "it is not easy to discern a clear line from women's activism in the rival religious groupings of the seventeenth century to modern claims for emancipation or liberation," women's faith imperatives nonetheless served as "a crucial foundation for female agency and creativity" (89).

The next two chapters, "Manhood and Civil War" and "Bodies, Families, Sex: Using Gender, Imagining Politics," employ distinct methodologies that help account for their relative brevity. Presenting "case-studies or snapshots that highlight problems, anxieties and contested stereotypes and identities" (90), Hughes emphasizes the ways in which civil war initiated

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2013.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press