

and premodern, or rather was the *sui generis* religious affair it has usually been portrayed as. Moving forward will require, however, one consideration that Winn did not provide for her readers and for those who take up the challenge of a comprehensive history based upon first-hand testimonies of women and men. Egodocuments — memoirs, letters, autobiographies — are among the trickiest of historical sources. Readers of Winn's book might have been helped by some discussion of the particular challenges these sources present for a reconstruction of past experience.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/fs/knae136>

CAROLYN CHAPPELL LOUGEE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
STANFORD, CA, UNITED STATES

The Huguenots in Later Stuart Britain, III: *The Huguenots and the Defeat of Louis XIV's France*. By ROBIN GWYNN. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2023. xxvi + 449 pp.

This final volume of a trilogy, itself in three parts, is the fruit of fifty years of research and focuses on the political aspects of the English refuge: the shifting relationship of the Huguenot refugees to the later Stuarts (Part One); their participation in the reduction of Ireland during the war of the two kings, James II and William III (Part Two); and their contribution to the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694 (Part Three). Although it is traditionally believed that French Protestants fled to England, as they did to other European countries, immediately after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), Robin Gwynn argues in Part One that the greater number of refugees arrived later, peaking in 1687 and continuing into the 1690s, in response to the two Declarations of Indulgence promulgated by James II, which granted toleration to Dissenters (and thereby to French Reformed Protestants) and Roman Catholics. Gwynn proposes an estimate of the number of refugees arriving in England which is higher than heretofore, namely a total in excess of 50,000 over the entire period. More crucial, however, was the timing of their arrival. By 1687 James II's policies had created a crisis in government and society and had reactivated anti-popery sentiments. In Gwynn's view, the very presence of the refugees tipped the balance in favour of William III when he invaded England in 1688; without them, 'the Revolution would have failed or stalled' (p. 171). In Part Two, Gwynn provides a lively narrative of William III's Irish campaigns (1689–92), concentrating on the contribution of the Huguenot regiments of horse and foot and their leaders — Frederick Herman, 1st Duke of Schomberg, and Henri de Massue, 2nd Marquis de Ruigny. The Huguenot regiments in Ireland and their participation in the Battles of the Boyne (1690) and Aughrim (1691) have not lacked historians. However, few would agree that the hard-fought and bloody success of William's forces at Aughrim was '*their* [i.e. the Huguenots'] victory' (p. 106; italics Gwynn's). In Part Three, Gwynn proves beyond any doubt that men and some women associated with the Threadneedle Street (French Reformed) Church in London contributed nearly 15.7 per cent, and not 9.54 per cent as previously believed, to the first funds invested in the Bank of England. The Bank was founded with the expressed intention of financing William III's participation alongside the Grand Alliance in the war against France from 1689 to 1713, which was 'essentially a political purpose, a purpose that derived from fears of Catholic absolutism and the perception of a real Catholic threat' (p. 145) — hence, in his view, the unwavering

support it received from the wealthier Huguenot refugees. In his stated aim of proving the critical importance of the Huguenots to the future of Ireland, England, and France (p. 170), Gwynn is frequently on the defensive. However, the three appendices to this volume: lists of Huguenot army officers (1), some rank-and-file soldiers (2), and detailed information about elders and deacons in the Threadneedle Street Church (3) will ensure that this volume remains for many years a reference work of exceptional merit.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/fs/knae154>

RUTH WHELAN
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND,
MAYNOOTH, IRELAND

Frameworks of Time in Rousseau. Edited by JASON NEIDLEMAN and MASANO YAMASHITA.
(Routledge Studies in Cultural History.) London: Routledge, 2024. 214 pp., ill.

‘Car comment’, asked Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the Preface to his *Discours sur l’inégalité* of 1754, ‘connaître la source de l’inégalité parmi les hommes si l’on ne commence par les connaître eux-mêmes? Et comment l’homme viendra-t-il à bout de se voir tel que l’a formé la nature, à travers tous les changements que la succession des temps et des choses a dû produire dans sa constitution originelle?’ The human soul, Rousseau continued, had come to resemble the statue of Glaucus, ‘que le temps, la mer et les orages avaient tellement défigurée qu’elle ressemblait moins à un dieu qu’à une bête féroce [...] altérée au sein de la société par mille causes sans cesse renaissantes, par l’acquisition d’une multitude de connaissances et d’erreurs, par les changements arrivés à la constitution des corps, et par le choc continuel des passions’ (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discours sur l’origine et les fondements de l’inégalité parmi les hommes*, ed. by Jean Starobinski (Paris, Gallimard, 1985), p. 52). Time, at least in this passage, appears foundational to Rousseau’s moral and political thought. Oddly, the passage does not seem to have been used by any of the contributors to this thought-provoking collection. Nor, equally oddly, does the collection make reference to the framework of time produced by Immanuel Kant’s amalgamation of Rousseau with the Book of Genesis in Kant’s partly serious, partly facetious essay entitled ‘Conjectures on the Beginning of Human History’ of 1786. In one sense the omissions are not important, because all nine contributors highlight Rousseau’s own endorsement of the significance of time and history in human life. As the editors put it in their Introduction, it is now possible ‘to see beyond the image of a utopian Rousseau who aspired to escape or transcend the influence of time’ (p. 10). In doing so, they quote one of the chapters in the collection, that of Flora Champy, which opens with a characterization of Rousseau as ‘the last great political theorist to be utterly uninterested in history, past or future’, made some two generations ago by Judith Shklar (cited, p. 10). In different ways, all the chapters in this collection could be described as refutations of Shklar’s claim. But in another sense the omissions really do matter. This, in the first place, is because they make it harder to identify the concern with normativity and its putative timelessness that was the real historical and analytical point of Shklar’s claim. Shklar, among other things, was a Hegel scholar and, on her terms, Rousseau’s thought belonged to the intellectual world that preceded historicity and historicism. In addition, and in the second place, the omissions also make it harder to identify the unusual combination of memory, imagination, and autonomy that, as Kant was one of the first to recognize, set Rousseau’s framework of time apart from many of those presupposed by