

Vol. 9, will be difficult to better. No Renaissance musical repertory has been so often recorded as England's.

The format both puzzled and irritated me. The cover, with its detail from *Nieven iencht spiegel* of 1620 on both the front and back, was eye-catching. However, I was astounded to find the almost 3 ¼ inches of white space at the tops of the covers and of every subsequent page occupied only by titles and phrases lifted from the essays, a significant waste of paper in a book that is eleven inches tall. That aside, the combination of authoritative essays and informative catalogue descriptions makes this volume well worth adding to one's library.

Teresa A. Toulouse. *The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. v + 225 pp. \$49.95. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Teresa Toulouse begins her book with a straightforward question: "Why do narratives of Indian captivity appear in New England between 1682 and 1707?" (1). A second question quickly looms on the horizon of the first: "What was at stake—personally as well as socially, politically as well as religiously—in prominent New English ministers' appropriation of the position of the female captive at this particular moment?" (2).

The works under consideration include accounts of the abduction of Mary Rowlandson, Hannah Dustan, Hannah Swarton and John Williams. These narratives were authorized by second and third generation Puritan ministers who, in Toulouse's argument, struggled with a crisis in their authority. These ministers insisted that their identity as religious leaders derived from their strict adherence to the orthodox ways of the first-generation divines. But, in fact, that prior ministerial model was only imaginary and, even more vexing, subsequent ministerial generations found themselves living in a time of post-Restoration political, social and economic change that they could not reverse and in some ways actually preferred.

The captivity narratives of the 1680s and 1690s, Toulouse finds, register apprehensions aroused by so much disconcerting socio-political change. The most obvious fear concerned perceived threats to New England from such

external forces as French colonization, English imperial policies and Indian territorial resistance. A second ministerial concern derived from perceived threats from within New England settlements—the sort of disturbance evident, for instance, in the conflict between Increase Mather and William Hubbard concerning whether or not magisterial and ministerial authority could be divided into separate spheres of influence. Least obvious, but highly influential, was an end-of-the-century ministerial fear embedded in an unwitting, deep-seated ambivalence toward their personal political and social differences from the revered first generation.

This last anxiety, Toulouse contends, profoundly informs the identification of these later ministers with female captives.

Fearful of their own desires to separate from these ‘fathers’ and consciously to embrace the cultural changes they have experienced since the Restoration, in the years after the conflict with Metacom, such men not only renew and transform the jeremiadic rhetoric of generational declension by turning to a rhetoric of passivity, they also actively support the publication and republication of a new postwar type of providence tale—the narrative of an orthodox woman’s captivity by Indians. (71-72)

Cotton Mather, for instance, tried to negotiate his personal unease relating to ministerial identity, particularly his unacknowledged “competing desires” (114) concerning the paradoxical preservation and destruction of power based on weakness. He attempted this negotiation by featuring versions of Hannah Dustan’s “unconverted violence” (99), which he failed to contain and transform when he turned his attention to Hannah Swarton’s more paradigmatically conformist account.

The female captive, in short, served as a type for ministerial ambivalence about all manner of end-of-the-century developments. The captive’s textual performance is informed by a ministerial psycho-dynamic of attraction-repulsion. So she is obedient and loyal, and only against her will transgresses in the course of her compulsory, boundary-crossing experience of an altered social condition. The female captive is restored to her proper community, but of course she is not the same person.

This impossible double valence—restored to a prior condition, yet also necessarily different—made the figure of the female captive an attractive stand in for ministers who were unwittingly ambivalent about their own present colonial circumstances. The female captive provided them with a representa-

tional, if unstable, fantasy of reaffirmed loyalty to and (at the same time) escape from the traditions and authority attributed, out of filial-piety, to a venerated first generation of Puritan leaders.

The Captive's Position has been years in the making, with remarkable results. It meaningfully engages a wide range of pertinent prior scholarly work by others, and its uncommonly lucid sentences are crafted with care and skill. It is a book that takes the reader deeply into the investigative ruminations and convictions of its author but also, as in all good teaching, proceeds in a manner designed with an audience in mind.

Toulouse's opening question, implying a Newtonian world of simple cause and effect, gives way to a more subtle and complex encounter with hard-to-pin-down motives which necessarily remain as elusive as sub-atomic eventuation. The result, however, is a provocative psycho-cultural interpretation comprised of diverse particles—historical details, circumstantial associations and hypothetical propositions—strategically and imaginatively combined to convey a plausible cause-and-effect finale.

Grant Tapsell. *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85*. Woodbridge and Rochester: Boydell, 2007. \$90.00. Review by MOLLY MCCLAIN, UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO.

A more accurate title for this book would be “Whigs and Tories after the Exclusion Crisis.” Grant Tapsell does not deal with King Charles II as a historical figure nor does he pay much attention to “personal monarchy” as a concept. Instead, he provides a survey of political opinion in the early 1680s, relying heavily on the work of Tim Harris, Mark Knights, and Jonathan Scott. His most useful contribution is his wide-ranging archival research.

The Exclusion Crisis (1678-81) gets a good deal of attention from historians as it represents the first major political challenge to James, Duke of York, later James II. The second, in 1688, would lead to his abdication and the accession of William and Mary. The Exclusion Crisis also divided the British into the first recognizable political parties—Whig and Tory. For the past fifteen years, historians of the late Stuart period have been preoccupied with questions about partisanship and public opinion. Jonathan Scott fired the first salvo in what became a lengthy battle about the nature of political alliances