

Kevin Sharpe. *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013. xxii + 849 pp. Review by CATHERINE PATTERSON, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON.

This hefty volume is the final work in Kevin Sharpe's three-part study of the images of monarchy in early modern England. Sadly, Sharpe succumbed to cancer before its completion. His colleague Mark Knights brought the manuscript to publication, and scholars will be grateful for his efforts. This is a significant and wide-ranging work.

As with the previous two volumes in this trilogy (*Selling the Tudor Monarchy* [2009] and *Image Wars* [2010]) *Rebranding Rule* takes an interdisciplinary approach to the problem of the representation of rule in early modern Britain. It rigorously interrogates a broad range of sources—portraits and poems, political pamphlets and panegyric prose—to analyze how the royal image of the later Stuart kings and queens was shaped and displayed. Organized generally chronologically, the book moves through the successive reigns of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Anne, examining the multiple modes of representation for each monarch.

Continuing his theme from his two earlier books in this series, Sharpe argues that the successful fashioning of the royal image was vital to an early modern monarch's grasp on power and authority. For Charles II, this representation of rule was trickier than for his forebears. The events of 1649 and those that followed had profound revolutionary consequences, throwing the very meaning of kingship into question. The genie of republicanism, once released from the bottle, could never be completely put back inside. Powerful images of royal authority flourished after 1660, but they were not uncontested.

Upon his restoration, Charles had to construct his image to be accepted as king and to maintain royal authority despite many challenges. In his own speeches, the king was conciliatory, yet strong. Willingness to exercise mercy formed an important early element of the king's image; except for a modest number of regicides, few of those who opposed the royalist cause during the "troubles" were executed, even outspoken ones like John Milton. Royalist essayists, poets, and preachers emphasized themes of the king's sacredness, naturalness, and

power, perhaps even more than the king himself did. Yet the image of the king was not uncomplicated. Sharpe, carefully reading the words of Restoration poets, sees in them both images of sacred power and the ambiguities of a monarchy that was once laid low but now restored. Poetry, pamphlets, histories and sermons became “more topical and more partisan” as the reign progressed (83).

Visual images of the king were likewise powerful, yet restrained. Compared to his forebears, there are far fewer portraits of Charles II in state. And unlike his father, Charles II (for obvious reasons) was not portrayed surrounded by his wife and children. In a seemingly purposeful break from the past, portraits of the king rarely contained the neo-Platonic themes so common in generations past. As with literary images, the visual images of kingship, Sharpe argues, became more politicized as the reign continued. By the end of Charles II’s reign, the portraits of the king had become specifically Tory representations.

James II, on the other hand, had the bad fortune to have his lasting image largely created by the Whigs, his detractors, after his departure from the throne. But Sharpe argues that James fashioned a much more positive image of his monarchy during his short reign, one emphasizing his legitimacy and the divinity of his rule. The Whigs, suggests Sharpe, were concerned enough about the power of James’s image of legitimate kingship that they went to great lengths, across many written and visual genres, to “vilify” James and to “inscribe a new regime” through texts and images(226).

With the advent of William and Mary, Whig propagandists strove to create an image of legitimacy based on the support of the people to counter the Jacobite image that still lingered. They were in the ambiguous position of having to persuade people of the legitimacy of a monarchy that was in fact brought to power through a violent coup. Sharpe argues that although the Whig narrative ultimately won, it was not a march of triumph from 1689 to 1702. Rather he emphasizes the insecurities and anxieties that dogged representations of William and Mary’s royal authority throughout their reign.

By the time Anne, the last ruling Stuart, came to the throne, the ability of the monarch to “stage” her own majesty was much reduced. Whereas her Tudor predecessor Elizabeth I had placed herself at the center of the attention of all her subjects and had ruled, almost

goddess-like, by divine right, Queen Anne presented herself largely as a frail human being who, though she ruled by God's will, understood her position within a constitutional monarchy. Sharpe suggests that after the Glorious Revolution, English monarchs did not, or could not, make themselves the focal point for culture, politics, and society in the realm that they once had been. Even so, the success of later monarchs like Queen Victoria at crafting a meaningful public image suggests the power that representations of authority maintained (and perhaps still maintain) over people.

A short review can only scratch the surface of the arguments and details of this large and important book. The work speaks to historians, literary scholars, and art historians alike. One of its chief advantages is its sophisticated interdisciplinary approach to the subject. At the same time, the work is not without flaws. It does assume an "image is everything" point of view that not all readers may fully accept. Also, Sharpe's perspective tends more heavily toward the monarchs he investigates; the book focuses on the creation and projection of the royal image far more than on the reception of it. Nevertheless, *Rebranding Rule* is an excellent piece of scholarship, exhaustively researched and engagingly written. The book will be essential reading for scholars of the later seventeenth century, who will find much of value in Kevin Sharpe's final opus.

Donna Merwick, *Stuyvesant Bound: An Essay on Loss Across Time*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. xx+ 219 pp.
Review by LAURA CRUZ, WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

Peter Stuyvesant, the long-serving and often beleaguered Director General of the New Netherlands colony, is a complex historical figure and many historians have wrestled with his character, his actions, and his legacy. Donna Merwick joins these ranks with her slender volume, *Stuyvesant Bound: An Essay on Loss across Time*, in which she focuses her analytical eye on the final days of the Dutch colony in the Americas, and Stuyvesant's decision to give it up without a fight. On the surface, this would appear to be a rather conventional historical exercise, i.e. a biography of a major historical figure, concentrated on a particularly