men to one Madame de Verchères). Women in the American Revolution uses Emmanuel Gottlieb Leutze’s (1816–68) Mrs. Schuyler Burning Her Wheat Fields on the Approach of the British (1852) in advance of the Battle of Saratoga from the L.A. County Museum of Art. The detail of this second painting selected by the designer crops out an adolescent African American male figure crouching beneath Mrs. Schuyler and an adolescent and a school-aged white girl. If the African American youth had been included on the cover, he would have illustrated a point that several of the essays make inside the book: that white, elite women were both enforcers and beneficiaries of slavery, and that even ardent Whigs sought to retain or recover their enslaved human property after the war for the sake of their own children’s futures.

This painting also misleads in other respects: the “Schuyler Sisters” made famous by Lin-Manuel Miranda in Hamilton: An American Musical (2014) were born in 1756, 1757, and 1758, which put them in their late teens and early twenties by the time of Saratoga in 1777. Catherine Van Renssaelar Schuyler would not give birth to any more daughters who survived to adulthood until 1776 and 1781, so the girls in Leutze’s painting are both too young and too old to depict as her daughters in 1777. But the compositional qualities of the torso and right arm in motion of the bigger girl mirroring the adult woman’s posture, and the adorably fat-cheeked little girl beseeching her mother’s protection below them both, were just too good to pass up. This painting illustrates at least one truth that Leutze grasped early on in his career painting American myths on monumental canvases: facts are inconvenient when they get in the way of telling a good story.

Ann M. Little is professor of history at Colorado State University and specializes in the history of women, gender, and sexuality. She is the author of The Many Captivities of Esther Wheelwright which won the 2018 Albert B. Corey Prize/Prix from the American Historical and Canadian Historical Associations.


This thoughtful and clearly written book about the problems raised by housing British soldiers in colonial communities in the years
leading up to the American Revolution tells a familiar story from a different perspective. Professor McCurdy puts the issue of quartering troops in an historical perspective beginning long before the arrival of large numbers of British troops in the colonies during the French and Indian War. In the disputes arising from quartering British troops in the colonies, General Gage played a major role during his long service in America, especially after his appointment in 1763 as commander-in-chief. Gage proposed and, for a decade after its enactment, was the principal enforcer of the Quartering Act of 1765. He had long experience dealing with balky colonial legislatures, on whom he was forced to rely for at least a portion of the resources needed to house and feed his troops. He recognized that, notwithstanding the British government’s increasingly strongly asserted claims regarding Parliament’s ultimate authority over the colonies, these popularly elected colonial legislatures had in practice long controlled the taxation of British subjects within their jurisdictions, other than customs duties, as well as the use of tax revenues for public purposes. Like Franklin and others involved in imperial affairs, he experienced the operation of the empire as one of ongoing negotiation, accommodation, and compromise among the colonial governments and the many components of the British state involved in one aspect or another of colonial affairs. Quartering troops was just another source of problems for this capable military bureaucrat, problems for which he was generally able to find acceptable solutions until the hardening positions of both the British and the colonial leadership left him with insufficient room to maneuver. His burdens were increased by the British government’s decision in 1774 to appoint him as what would turn out to be the last royal governor of Massachusetts, while keeping him in place as commander-in-chief and providing him with four regiments to enforce the Coercive Acts. As George III sings in the musical Hamilton: “And when push comes to shove/I will send a fully armed battalion to remind you of my love!” In 1775, when Franklin returned to America after belatedly but deftly switching to the revolutionaries’ side, Gage, temperamentally cautious and a mediocre field commander, was unceremoniously dismissed from both positions by a monarch and his ministers increasingly committed to a military solution to their problems with the recalcitrant colonists on a wide range of issues including quartering troops. Quartering, an irritating necessity when British troops first arrived in the colonies in large numbers to protect the colonists from the French and their Indian allies, became a cause for war, strongly expressed in the Declaration of Independence, as
British troops became first an occupying and then an invading force rather than a protector, at least for the mainland colonies other than the newly acquired territories in Canada and Florida.

McCurdy shows us that, notwithstanding the imperial goal of implementing consistent administrative practices across Britain's greatly expanded post-war American empire that can be seen in the Quartering Act and in other imperial legislation, the problem of quartering was very different in the cities and towns, on the frontier, in the territories recently taken from France, and on Britain's valuable West Indies islands where the sugar plantation owners lived in fear of their numerically superior enslaved populations and of Britain's nearby imperial competitors. McCurdy attributes the Quartering Act's restrictions on quartering in private homes to a developing conception of the home as a protected haven, a zone of privacy in our terms, and notes that the urban solution of barracks, favored but grudgingly funded by colonial legislatures during the French and Indian War to protect private homes and even public civilian spaces like taverns, had the unintended and unwelcome consequence of providing the British army with an expanded, seemingly permanent, and ultimately threatening physical presence in four colonial cities and some towns on the eve of the Revolution. He closes by discussing the complaints about quartering in the Declaration of Independence and the prohibition against quartering in the Third Amendment to the Constitution. He makes a longer-term point about the American government's inclination to keep its growing military might out of the sight of the civilian population. This is probably more true than not, but he notes only in passing the massive military presence in civilian spaces during the Civil War, and does not discuss the imposing armories built after the war in the centers of many American cities, at a time marked by an acute fear of social unrest, especially from the flood of immigrants to American ports, much needed by America's growing industrial economy but much feared by some "old stock" Americans. The oldest stock Americans, whose ancestors had migrated to this continent from Asia in prehistoric times, had similar and, as it turned out, well-justified fears about the earlier waves of European immigrants who eventually took their land and pushed them to the geographic and social margins of the rising American empire.

McCurdy's discussion illuminates the constitutional, legal, political, military, and social aspects of quartering British troops in the colonies. His work is informed by the sophisticated and now voluminous work on Atlantic and global studies, as well as geographers'
studies of place. While he discusses conflicts that arose from the physical proximity of British soldiers and colonial civilians, he might have devoted more attention to the barriers to communication caused by the often difficult-to-bridge gap between the life experiences, and the world views arising therefrom, of British soldiers and their officers, and the colonists, from the political and business elite to men and women in their homes, farms, and shops, as Fred Anderson has done for the French and Indian War and John Shy for the years leading up to the Revolution. In summary, this book is a useful addition to the massive and still-growing literature on the Revolution, which is no small feat.


Friends in life and fellow “liberals” in public memory, Jonathan Mayhew (1720–1766) and Charles Chauncy (1705–1787) have long divided scholars of eighteenth-century New England Congregationalism and its transformation from Puritanism to Brahminism. While many twentieth-century historians such as Bernard Bailyn and Charles Akers viewed Mayhew and Chauncy as clerical promoters of radical Whig politics on the road to the American Revolution, Alan Heimert’s *Religion and the American Revolution* (1966) depicted both pastors as elitist reactionaries. In *The Hidden Balance* (1991), John Corrigan treated both men as theological and political moderates in the tradition of Henry F. May’s “moderate Enlightenment.”

John S. Oakes’s *Conservative Revolutionaries,* in contrast, sets out to take Chauncy and Mayhew on their own terms, as men of their time and place. He does not interpret Chauncy and Mayhew as progenitors or adversaries of a more democratic, egalitarian, heterodox, and pluralistic American Republic. The narrative of *Conservative Revolutionaries* is instead framed by the “intellectual journeys of two individuals” and marked by “areas of continuity, as well as