

that the liberation of the press did not result from a sudden discovery of Enlightened tolerance among the ruling elites, but rather from the sheer practical difficulty of containing an “exuberant, diverse, endlessly innovative print culture” (21). This rather consoling conclusion may have political relevance today.

Brent S. Sirota and Allan I. Macinnes, eds. *The Hanoverian Succession in Great Britain and its Empire*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, United Kingdom: The Boydell Press, 2019. x + 222 pp. \$115. Review by CHRISTOPHER N. FRITSCH.

Understanding past events is often difficult. The aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, specifically the Protestant Succession, is a good example of a complex problem. Studies of the Revolution of 1688 and its aftermath are often very diverse and just as complex. The editors, Brent Sirota and Allan Macinnes, argue that the arrival of William and Mary was far less important than the changes that ensued. They see an “evolving politics” of individuals, groups, organizations, and nations. For the authors of this volume, Great Britain was anything but stable and on a sure footing in the wake of the Revolution of 1688.

The essays, then, reflect the multitude of changes within “four nations,” the overseas ventures of Great Britain and Scotland, and their intellectual, commercial, and diplomatic relations with the Continent. These include controversies arising from the last Stuart monarchs and political moves to consolidate both the Protestant Succession and the power of Parliament. At a certain level, each of the essays provides insight into the plethora of arguments and debates as responses to the events of 1688 and those since the revolution. These include controversies arising from the reign of the last Stuart monarchs. This leads to a discussion of the continuing existence of a Catholic Stuart line and their Jacobite and French Catholic support. Larger questions of continental and imperial conflict follow, leading to more theoretical issues involving the impact of industrialism and the Enlightenment.

Contradicting J. H. Plumb’s standard work, *The Growth of Political Stability in England* (1967), Daniel Szechi begins by positing a Britain that was highly Tory and hence unstable due to the Hanoverian Succession.

sion. Celebrating George I's succession in Buckinghamshire, wealthy, land owning Whigs built a bonfire to commemorate this accession and their own ascendancy, while middling and lower sorts poked fun at the king by depicting him as a turnip. Szechi argues that the succession produced a Whig ascendancy, though whether a stable one or not is in question. Scottish opposition to English designs accompanied strong Tory criticism of the monarch. George I continued to be assisted by the Whigs in the advancement of his Hanoverian goals. Thus, as supporters of the Crown, Whigs became more like traditional Tories.

Next we find Christopher Dudley's argument based upon solid qualitative and quantitative evidence. Through his analysis of specific shires and voting patterns from the elections of 1710, 1713, and 1715, Dudley concludes that there was no great shift in pro-Whig voting. He argues that, although Whigs increasingly lost the clergy and gentry as voters, English voters in the 1715 elected Whigs for one good reason—voters agreed with the Whig version of the 1688 Revolution. The Glorious Revolution became a familiar topic, compared to elections during the reign of Queen Anne. The Whigs successfully connected the potential goals of the Glorious Revolution to the frailty of the succession in a more meaningful way than their Tory counterparts. The fulfilment of the 1688 Revolution depended upon the Hanoverian succession, and this resonated with voters in the English shires under examination in Dudley's essay. Therefore, the election of 1715 was not an altogether new or more stable politics, regarding the Hanoverian succession, but reflected "a shift in the balance of power within the existing politics" (38).

Instability in Britain was partly due to the clergy. The Church of England and its clerics, as well as the non-conforming clergy, represented issues at the heart of political, social, and religious debate throughout the seventeenth century. The crucial moments in the early eighteenth century, including the Act of Settlement, the Act of Union, and the subsequent Hanoverian succession and conflict with Scotland, all held political, as well as religious components.

In "The Backlash Against Anglican Catholicity, 1709–18," Brent Sirota argues that at the advent of George I, the Church of England moved to end its Roman Catholic ties. The Church's whiggish members moved from the opposition in 1688–1689 to the inner circle

of power and assumed “the mantle of Anglican royalism” (61), by supporting George I and the succession. However, this threatened to further divide the Church between extremes of high Anglican orthodoxy and an ever growing development of theological pluralism. Whig churchmen positioned themselves as opponents of Anglican orthodoxy and its predisposition toward Catholicity, which often meant strained relations within the Church of England, as some clerics remained orthodox and conservative, while their bishops moved the church to a more whiggish position. All of this was fueled by George I, as he supported Whig supremacy and represented a non-Anglican theological position. English religious and political problems increased due to the recent War of Spanish Succession, which did much to dislocate Germans from their homes and bring them to England and, eventually for many, to the colonies in America.

What impact did the polarization have upon the subsequent life of the Church of England? Like Dudley, Sirota sees a world that is perhaps more shifting, than new. He addresses a church filled with historical identity problems that always entwined with the politics of monarchy. By 1715, the church faced a greater threat to their establishment. The seventeenth century saw the growth of non-conformity and sectarianism and the increasing scientific and philosophical moment, which threatened the foundations religious beliefs and church establishment.

These shifts forced the church to practice greater toleration for religious practices and thought. Conservative Anglican clergy opposed societal change and the bishops, who moved the Church away from establishment toward an allowance for private conscience, and, in the long run, disestablishment. The established Church of England, less dogmatic than the Laudian church a century before, prompted Whiggish churchmen to disconnect from the political and religious conservative Catholicity at one end and the more eroding demands of non-conformity, sectarianism, and personal conscience. This became more difficult with the advent of evangelicalism on the one side and an increasing movement that displaced God in favor of deism. Thus, for Sirota, the Hanoverian church was hardly a place to find stability.

If Whig churchmen found themselves caught in the middle and at odds with the political and religious extremes of their day, the essay by James Caudle continues this conversation. Like previous authors, the

past continued to be a point of contention. Caudle sees a potential end to the questions and demands surrounding the Glorious Revolution, but in many ways, the sermons depict an incomplete and unfulfilled revolution. The political sermons of 1714 “frequently connected the perceived core policies of the Glorious Revolution in civil rights and civil liberties to the policies expected to be brought in by the House of Hanover and the new branch of the Protestant Succession” (83). Clergy were, as Caudle presents, much more historical in their approach. They linked the Gunpowder Plot, the Glorious Revolution, the national deliverance from Jacobitism, and the Scottish rebellion of 1715 to the Hanoverian Succession. Connecting these events to the Hanoverian Succession was critical in securing 1688 goals. Caudle shows that Whigs and many Tory members within the church and the government were relieved by the Revolution and the succession. Not unlike Elizabeth’s England, Providence again saved Britain from all things Catholic, and this victory allowed the advance of civil rights and freedom of conscience.

However, the victory was more than just the Protestant providentialism that removed a Catholic political and religious threat. The decades before the Hanoverian Succession saw a financial revolution. Abigail Swingen recounts the works of John Toland and Joseph Addison as they connected the 1689 constitutional settlement with Britain’s economy. For Joseph Addison, the Jacobite restoration was detrimental to a Protestant nation, religiously and politically, but also economically (101)

Swingen, like Szechi, targets Plumb’s stability thesis and the perception that a large consensus existed on the efficacy of the financial revolution. Swingen argues that many did not endorse the policies of national debt and public credit, and the emerging world of financial wealth, as opposed to the more traditional form of landed wealth. Jacobite repudiation of debts, though, not only attacked Britain economic ideas and interests, but also attacked the nation’s religious and political settlements after 1689.

The first five chapters show an unstable England. How did the tumultuous events of Revolution or Succession impact regions beyond England? In Megan Cherry’s essay on colonial policy toward North America between 1688 and 1715, she argues that Britain became

more staunchly anti-Catholic. Beyond this, Whigs and Tories held opposing views of the role of colonies. Whigs believed that colonies would provide raw materials and finished goods, and consume goods from around the Atlantic and the world. Whigs saw the creation of a world-wide trading network that united colonies to the United Kingdom. Thus, they pursued the settlement and development of colonies, the production of naval stores, and the consumption of goods. Tories maintained a more conservative plan that relied less on colonial development and more on “monopolistic trading companies” and the re-export trade. In the end, Cherry argues, neither the Glorious Revolution nor the Hanoverian Succession made much impact upon colonial policy. What changed regarding the colonies in North America was the Whig ascendancy.

The impact of Succession is more difficult to see in Scotland. Allan Macinnes argues that “There was no straight correlation between English and Scottish politicians” after the Revolution (137). Externally, England saw Scotland as a backdoor to the rest of the island. Internally, Scotland was fractured in a number of political and religious ways. Macinnes argues that Scotland became “comfortable with the Hanoverian Succession” (137), only with the accession of George II. This occurred after the creation of what Macinnes calls “an alternative patriotism to that of the Whig Supremacy or of Scottish Jacobitism” (137). This patriotism was an adherence to the Empire. As spokesman for imperial patriotism, Macinnes argues that Sir William Keith “contended that British subjects at home and abroad were bound together by rights and liberties applied equitably and without privileging one part of the state over another” (153). For Keith, patriotism had less to do with the politics of the nation and more to do with the rights and liberties espoused by the nation. If Keith was correct, so is Macinnes. Patriotism or loyalty changed in Scotland. The rebellion of 1715 may have come at a time when the outcome was questionable, but by 1745, Scots embraced the empire as the “Jacobites were unable to change the British government or restore the Stuarts” (154).

Patriotism, or loyalty, changed beyond Scotland. As the monarch and the Whigs violated British laws regarding the separation of British and Hanoverian foreign and military policy, for many, patriotism meant adherence to Whig Party policy. Steve Pincus and Amy Watson

do not address the kind of patriotism presented by Sir William Keith. Rather, Pincus and Watson explore the Patriots, a political group, who had broad impact in England, Scotland, and the colonies of North America. Originally Whigs before 1720, within a decade they aligned themselves with Tories. Within another decade, they created their own structure and ideology to become a distinct party (157). Patriots held the national interest above party, and broadened their membership by including disaffected Scots and extending their reach to the colonies. Pincus and Watson see the greatest impact by the Patriots upon the empire, as they believed that the empire was “a vital national interest” (174). Thus, they laid the foundation for British policy in the 1740s and 1750s, and perhaps how London saw North America in 1776.

Ideas did not always move from the British Isles to the rest of the world. Esther Mijers sees the movement of ideas from the continent via the United Provinces. The United Provinces continued as an intellectual conduit across the English Channel. For example, French Huguenots arrived in the Provinces, and with their movement to England brought French ideas and contacts. Mijers argues that these movements created the Republic of Letters, and encouraged men in Britain, such as Samuel Johnson, to develop an international climate for the transmission of ideas across the British Isles, the continent, and North America.

Finally, Robert Frost compares the monarchs of Hanover and Saxony and their respective reigns in the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth of Poland-Lithuania. Regarding the former, Frost argues that the Scottish rebellion of 1715 helped George I and the Whigs consolidate power and ended the anxiety of a Stuart return. Situating Frost’s comments with previous essays, one can see the validity of his conclusion. Consolidating power and ending the Stuart threat did not prevent some Britons from believing that the Hanoverians placed the interests of the United Kingdom behind those of Hanover. These suspicions explain why Patriots, as written about by Pincus and Watson, placed the national interest above party. Hanoverian policies looked to unify British and Hanoverian interests, at the cost of British independence. Perceptions of policy increased conflict within the United Kingdom. As the Patriots wanted, the national interest grew in value in the United Kingdom and the continent became a secondary issue.

The real issue is, as developed by Daniel Szechi—was Britain really stable? These essays reject Plumb's thesis of stability. However, there is more. Perhaps, the authors of these essays should address the broader question of revolution and stability: the dynamics of revolution. For example, conservative elements within the Church of England regarded Charles and James Stuart as Roman Catholic, and thus a threat to the Church of England and Protestant England. They looked more conservative and anti-revolutionary in the light of 1715, as they appeared as pro-Stuart and pro-Catholic spokesmen. A more moderate and conciliating position captured the Church of England. The revolution—to paraphrase Crane Britton—moved a little more left, and trying to stop it made you more conservative. High Anglican clergy became more conservative in the aftermath of the Revolution. In the construction of a Protestant Britain, they saw a Church of England run by bishops and archbishops, who made concessions to non-conformists and sectarians, and endorsed personal conscience and choice to the point of recognizing deist ideas. Whiggish Anglicans searched for a middle course to consolidate power and maintain control, as they looked to define the Church of England within the existing extremes of Catholicity and deism and confront a growing threat from evangelicals. In countering those extremes, the Church continued this dynamic of revolution.

In the aftermath of the War of Spanish Succession, the War of Austrian Succession, and the Seven Years' War, Tories came to power. This change in party was no less connected to the past and no less confronted with problems, especially financial ones. These problems and responses led to another revolution—this time a transatlantic one involving Britain's North American colonies. Spokesmen in the colonies often connected historical moments, beginning with 1649 and moving toward 1776.

The stability under investigation within these essays connects to the nature and workings of revolution. Revolutions are, in themselves, destabilizing moments. This volume adequately recognizes the weaknesses of Plumb's stability. Each author discusses not the end of the revolution or revolutionary considerations, but the continuation of revolution. For the authors, the Glorious Revolution continued to be a part of the political conversation, and these conversations furthered

other revolutions and reactions. The Revolution of 1688, the rise of Parliament, the construction of Union, and defining succession were destabilizing events, creating new sets of winners and losers. Both groups found links to the past. This dynamic rejects stability, but demands greater research into revolution. Therefore, we are left questioning when the United Kingdom became stable, why it happened, and what forces constructed this more stable environment.

Todd Butler. *Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. xiii + 240 pp. \$77.00. Review by BRETT A. HUDSON, MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY.

In *Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England*, Todd Butler re-examines the political tensions and the struggle for power between the monarchies of James I and Charles I and their judiciaries and Parliaments through the context of the seventeenth century's shifting understanding of private and public deliberation. Butler's journey through what he describes as intellectual prerogatives and liberties charts an intriguing path through confessionals, court rooms, chambers of Parliament, royal cabinets, and Edenic domiciles in order to illustrate the gradual democratization of decision making and interpretation during the seventeenth century. Butler's use of the term intellection is situated near the developing field of cognitive studies; however, he eschews a firm use of anatomical or scientific terms and instead chooses to focus on political intellection as "the various ways that early modern individuals sought to think through the often uncertain political and religious environment they occupied, and how attention to such thinking in oneself or others could itself constitute a political position" (6). In using this methodology, Butler reveals how intellection was not only a process by which political opinions and their subsequent actions were formed but also a process over which political battles were fought throughout the seventeenth century's Early Stuart period and beyond.

We are introduced to Early Stuart intellection in the context of the Gunpowder Plot. The fears and anxieties over treasonous thoughts and actions which followed the Gunpowder Plot animated debates over