in early England could have signified "Negro," "Ethiopian," "moor," "blackamoor," "barbaree," "barbaryen," or "Indian" (1). Habib also suggests the plural meaning of the term "black" in the first chapter of his book where he discusses thirty records of Indians, Americans, and other people of color that he found in different parts of England, suggesting new ground for research on the history of East Indians and Americans in early modern England (239).

Black Lives in the English Archives is a major book that any serious scholar of early Atlantic history and cultures must have, since it suggests the complex roles that blacks had in England from 1500 to 1677. The book covers almost two centuries during which blacks were hidden in a British society that used them as commodities and vestiges of monarchy and imperial grandeur without shielding them from the abuses of xenophobia, imperialism, and slavery. In addition, the book reveals the presence of blacks in English archives ranging from 1500 to 1677, giving modern scholars an invaluable means for studying the social, political, and economic significance of black migrations to England in new and pluralistic terms that broaden the meaning of color and caste in early Atlantic studies.

Kevin Sharpe. *Images Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealth in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. xvii + 665 pp. $55.00. Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN, SKIDMORE COLLEGE.

Kevin Sharpe's *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealth in England, 1603-1660* is the second in a three-volume series in which the author plans "to turn attention to the changes in the modes and media representing rule and of the relationship of such representatives to perceptions of rule" (xvi). As in his earlier volume, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, Sharpe insists that early-modern governments—like those we know today—"had to project images which subjects found appealing in order to secure support for their authority and policies" (xiv). In some ways, then, Sharpe's trilogy is an early history of political messaging, a pre-history of what those of us accustomed to the twenty-four hour news cycle have come to call "spin."

The notion that politics is about messaging hardly seems new, but Sharpe's argument here is more nuanced. Indeed, one of the great successes of Sharpe's work is his appreciation of the challenges facing any new political leader, and particularly those facing the early Stuarts. Imagine having to sit on the same throne recently vacated by such historical luminaries as Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. As Sharpe notes, Henry VIII branded monarchy as specifically Tudor, and Elizabeth branded it specifically Elizabethan. No wonder that so many have for so long felt that James I somehow did not fit the bill. But, Sharpe argues, James I did not merely accept that he could not be the monarchical "brand" that his predecessors created.

Rather, he worked to re-make the face of monarchy in his own image, using the representational tools that best fitted his particular accomplishments. And he did have some. He was, for instance, the first male to occupy the English throne in half a century and the first to come to the throne with an heir in more than a century. In many ways, then, James represented a return to a pattern of early-modern political power that was properly masculine and dynastically stable. And, unlike his immediate predecessor, who had used her figure and the theatricality of her presence to establish her claims to power, James I had a sense that the Sovereign's power could not be assumed to be sacred *per se*. Having come from a contentious political climate and accustomed to making political arguments both in person and in written form, James I felt he had to (and indeed was equipped to) argue for the sacredness of his throne. "James was his own spokesman in print—both in prose and poetry" (46). As Sharpe notes, those who looked for James I to intervene in politics-as-pageantry found him remote—even missing. Only when we accept that James' interventions were discursive can we truly get at the representational core of his reign.

Like his father, Charles I is often analyzed in historical comparison. His father talked too much; Charles talked too little. Here again, Sharpe is attuned to the way different reigns represented themselves differently, arguing that Charles I's reign was very much a matter of image. Rather than "*arguments for* royal policies," Charles I seems to have favored "(*silent*) *representation of* majesty" (143). Here, we might conjure famous images of the king by Van Dyck, but Sharpe notes

that Charles I's vision of majesty was not like that of Elizabeth I. Rather, the new king "made his family itself a dominant representation of his rule" (205). In Sharpe's view, Charles I was hardly a silent monarch. He was, though, a monarch who seems not to have noticed that, while he was deeply concerned with the image-as-message, others had come to control the discursive political sphere his father had dominated for so long. As such, Sharpe reads the king's speeches to the Long Parliament in 1640-41 not as the story of a king finally being convinced to communicate to his people but rather as "the story of a king in a crisis" who "learned a different vocabulary of self-representation" (173).

Perhaps the most interesting material in this book is that which investigates the period after 1649. Here, Sharpe argues that the republican project failed because, ultimately, it was never able "to secure its own cultural authority or even significantly to undermine the culture of kingship" (388). As Sharpe suggests, the end of monarchy should have brought about an end to the forms through which monarchy had asserted itself. It did not. Rather, those who stood in opposition to the king used the representational tools of monarchy to make and advance their cause. Such was the case when Parliament attempted to forge a seal of state to replace the one that Charles I had carried off with him. Such was also the case as Cromwell tried to forge a functioning political alternative to monarchy. As Sharpe notes, Cromwell's face—and not the notion of "the parliament or of a people made stronger by a union of equals"—is "the most prominent image of the republic" (435). The great irony here is that 1649 marked the moment when one king-as-man lost his life but when the institution of kingship was re-sacralized. Charles I became the great symbol of kingship, and his death an inauspicious founding moment for the republican project. Because the Commonwealth retained the representational structures of royal power—the seals, the portraits, the palaces—it never established itself as a viable alternative to the sacred space left empty by the martyred king.

Image Wars is a big book—both in scope and in size—that revisits the period from 1603-1660 with a new appreciation for the "representations of monarchy" behind state power in this period. Given Sharpe's early claim that "representations of monarchy" are inseparable from "perceptions of monarchy," there is a lot more here

about representation than perception (xiv). One wonders exactly how we might go about understanding what the broader public read in various representations of political power—whether a portrait, a royal procession, or a face on a coin. Sharpe offers us some insights here, but primarily into the minds of an elite political few. That said, *Image Wars* (with its two companion volumes) is likely to be a significant part of the conversation about early-modern English politics for some time to come.

Thomas N. Corns, Ann Hughes, and David Loewenstein, eds. *The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Vol. I. xi+600pp. Vol. II. 465pp. $335. Review by TOM HAYES, BARUCH COLLEGE AND THE GRADUATE CENTER, C.U.N.Y.

This new Oxford English Texts edition of Gerrard Winstanley's complete works, fittingly dedicated to the memory his most ardent admirer Christopher Hill, places him in the company of such canonical seventeenth-century writers as Milton, Bunyan, Hobbes, and Traherne. Indeed, today Winstanley is celebrated more for his vivid and accessible prose style than for his radical political ideas.

As the leader of the Digger colony founded on St. George's Hill near Cobham on April, 1, 1649. Winstanley wrote eighteen works varying in length from five to a hundred and five pages. In these works he tirelessly maintains that aristocracy, i.e. kingship, and clergy, i.e. university-trained exegetes, should be abolished and the earth should again become a common treasury.

The *Gerrard Winstanley* produced by this new scholarly edition differs from the utopian mystic that emerges from George Sabine's edition of *The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley* published by Cornell University Press in 1941, as well as the Marxist avant la lettre of Christopher Hill's Penguin Classics edition published in 1973. The new edition of Winstanly's works puts much more attention on his early works such as *The New Law of Righteousness* where Winstanley tells readers that one day while he was in a trance he heard a voice that said, "Worke together. Eat bread together, declare this all abroad." Winstanley was "raised up and filled with abundance of quiet peace and secret