

federates who had supported his claims, it is likely, according to the author, that the sentences included several hours in the pillory and confinement in Newgate Prison for a year or two.

Beyond the absorbing accounts of these trials, a particularly useful and enlightening part of the book is the Introduction, in which Wharam describes not only the history of the *1730 State Trials*, published by Sollom Emlyn, a member of Lincoln's Inn born in 1697, but also deciphers many intricacies of the English court system of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The reader learns with interest that in English courts, unlike contemporary courts in Scotland, the accused had no rights to brief his own counsel, to find out in advance the charges against him, or to look at the prosecution's depositions before his trial. *Murder in the Tower* is an excellent work and is one that will be particularly useful to graduate students and specialists in English jurisprudence.

Alan Wharam, born in 1928, was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. He is a retired former barrister and college lecturer, having taught at Leeds College of Commerce and the Leeds Polytechnic Law School before retiring in 1988. Wharam has also written *The Treason Trials, 1794* (1992) and *Treason: Famous English Treason Trials* (1995).

Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds. *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbors*. Dublin: Four Courts Press. 2002. 256 pp. \$45.00. Review by BRETT PARKER, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA.

Almost thirty years ago J.G.A. Pocock pleaded for the development of a new subject called "British history," suggesting that historians give sufficient emphasis to Scotland, Ireland, and Wales in order to better understand the process of English state formation. Initially, his call fell on deaf ears but more recently historians of early modern England have responded by analyzing the political and cultural relationships between the multiple kingdoms of the British

Isles. The aim of this new approach has been to build an integrated portrait of British politics and culture in part to show that Anglo insularity was a Whig invention. Nevertheless, widening the context has not produced the fulsome and cohesive treatment of Britain Pocock and his followers had envisioned. The reason for this failure is that the multiple kingdoms have never had a comfortable or fully cooperative relationship. This stark reality is the common theme of the most recent work on British history, *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbors*. Here is a collection of essays that not only extends the domestic and international dimensions of British history but also accentuates the clumsiness of state relations. In fine detail it demonstrates the whirling circumstances that both pushed the four kingdoms together and pulled them apart. Yet not only is the historical context thickened in these essays but so is the methodological approach, as several essays ask what were the cultural perceptions of these kingdoms and to what degree were they a product of their shared history.

Editors Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer have cleverly organized *Stuart Kingdoms* into five sections that relate the awkwardness of state building by examining Britain in an international, ethnical, diplomatic, Anglo-centric, and religious context. As for the first, two essays explore state formation models that undoubtedly influenced Anglo-Scottish relations in the seventeenth century. Especially compelling is Steven G. Ellis's argument that much of the English view of Britain and particularly Scotland's role in it post 1603 can be traced to the late medieval period when English state building was focused on annexing and consolidating continental territories. According to Ellis, a significant shift in state formation occurred in 1453 when the fall of Lancastrian England also spelled the end of the short lived dual monarchy. Ellis laments this as "one of the great might-have-beens of English history," since it would have promoted greater administrative and juridical efficiency (42). As it was, the Tudors were left to integrate English peripheries and not develop the complex and diverse struc-

tures needed to administer multiple crowns, a development that seriously hampered James VI & I's efforts in 1603.

A larger question is what constitutes a state and how might the history of several peoples who certainly make up a distinct nation, but are ruled by one monarch, be written. Conrad Russell, who for more than a decade has implored scholars to treat Britain from a multiple kingdoms perspective, gives a nonsense answer. In his essay "Is British History International History?" Russell declares that British history is not a subject but rather a method, and one that benefits from a variety of perspectives and viewpoints. It is properly international, moreover, because when rightly considered, British history is about "calling in the history of one country to elucidate what happened in another" (63).

After these initial inquiries, *Stuart Kingdoms* turns attention to cultural and ethnic perceptions of the English and Scots. It is in this section that methodological strategies are most creative, especially in the case of Claire McEachern's reading of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. She argues that the play reflects an acute sense on the part of Jacobean England of cultural difference and sameness with their northern neighbor. The play's protean gender quality serves to prioritize England over Scotland, especially in the case of lady Macbeth's desire to free herself of "of the bondages of female bodily destiny," which is taken to typify Elizabeth's self-fashioning of the "chaste protector" of an exclusive England (112, 100). The play works on a much different level, however, when read in the context of the proposed union of kingdoms in 1603. Macbeth's fierce nationalism is taken as the defensive posture of parliamentarians and common lawyers who championed English law over royal prerogative. England now identified with a Scottish savior. This sort of reconfigured identity could work in opposition to others as well, as Paul McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson demonstrate in their essay on the construction of Britishness in the face of an Iberian world empire. Having a shared enemy in Spain, the English and Scots could imagine a British state that was both free and Protestant. In this sense, national distinctions did not wither but common interests did help to sooth them.

The next two sections both extend the scope of influences on Britain and intensify the Anglo-centrism of the three kingdoms. Two chapters examine the Scottish and Irish efforts in the war of three kingdoms. Steve Murdoch persuasively argues that one of the most difficult challenges the Scottish Covenanters faced in their war against Charles I was securing men and munitions from Swedish armies. Scottish soldiers and diplomats on the continent managed to procure naval supplies and influence the sympathies of Charles's uncle, Christian IV of Denmark-Norway, just enough to sustain the campaign against Charles. By contrast the Irish campaign of the 1640s was unsuccessful in large measure because of the destabilizing effect continental influences had on the Confederate Catholic Association. Essayist Tadhg Ó Hannracháin contends that France and the Papacy had conflicting views about the extent to which a religious settlement in Ireland would shape settlement in England and Scotland, with the Papacy committed to a secular settlement with Charles.

The complexity of these circumstances reminds readers that the British Isles were developing under continental as much as inter-kingdom pressure. Nevertheless, Englishness continued to assert itself despite (or because of) external circumstances. James Scott Wheeler examines English ethnocentrism as manifested in the New Model Army's petitions, proclamations, and letters. From these sources he concludes that members "saw themselves as 'English,' men who shared a heritage of common English rights and freedoms," and because it included rank-and-file members, such thinking "was a major step in the development of English national identity" (152-153). Victories, especially over the "uncivilized" Irish, only reinforced a sense of national superiority. Sarah Barber's analysis of cultural views in the 1650s enhances this understanding, showing that the construction of "otherness" and the language of "antithesis" enabled the English to subsume the Irish and Scots into an "English" not "British" Commonwealth.

National identity was only part of the stew being stirred in the creation of British *imperium* under the Stuarts. Of course the extent and aim of the reformations in the British Isles largely shaped

the nature of union between the kingdoms. In Ireland, John McCafferty argues, the Church of Ireland did not collapse in the face of colliding reformations as the New British History suggests. Rather the Church was accommodating because it allowed minimal conformity, and bishops understood it was a dependent of the English Church.

Different national experiences and religious perspectives do, nevertheless, help explain the “incompatible revolutions” of 1688-89. In a brilliant analysis of the various understandings of revolution and political obedience among conforming Protestants in England, Scotland, and Ireland, Tim Harris shows the difficulty they faced in justifying political change without appropriating Whig contract theory. The Irish and Scots stood at opposite ends in some ways; Scotland being much less scrupled about resistance than Protestant Ireland, where there was no Presbyterian revolution and James II was actively fighting William of Orange. In all three kingdoms, resistance to James II was couched as passive not active since the implications of revolution were more dangerous than abdication. Nevertheless, Protestants in each kingdom tweaked passive resistance to their own interest and historical reality. In the case of Scotland, the revolution of 1689-1690 was especially radical because of the reform program of “The Club,” a parliamentary group that drew on the 1640-41 Covenanting Movement. As a result of The Club’s activity, as John R. Young explains, there was a “reassertion of the powers of the Scottish Estates against the royal prerogative and external court interference in Scottish affairs” (250). Most importantly, “The Club” insisted upon retaining the Scottish parliament against an incorporating union. That Great Britain was an incorporating union echoes the “awkwardness” of state formation.

Stuart Kingdoms is a commendable work because it recognizes that “British” history in the seventeenth century was never really British. Rather, it was a history of diverse peoples and institutions shaped by circumstances both internally and externally. It also realizes that while England may have been the locus of any feigned Britishness, such an identity was always constructed with the great-

est anxiety and trepidation. Nevertheless, if British history is going to remain a viable method in the study of the three kingdoms and their relation to European and transatlantic worlds, it must be remembered that the methodological mirror is two-way. Multi-kingdom approaches should tell us as much about national idiosyncrasies and personalities as they do about British ones. *Stuart Kingdoms* is a modest start in this direction.

William Tate. *Solomonic Iconography in Early Stuart England: Solomon's Wisdom, Solomon's Folly*. Lampeter, Wales: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001. £59.95. 315 pp. Review by JONATHAN NAUMAN, USK VALLEY VAUGHAN ASSOCIATION.

The past two decades have seen increased interest in the person and policies of the Stuart monarch James I, and though William Tate's study of the Stuarts's political use of the Biblical King Solomon is not limited in scope to James, it definitely contributes and responds to recent characterizations of Jacobean political policy. Tate's work focuses on how James, his son Charles, and their contemporaries handled the "extradogmatic surplus of undetermined meaning" in the Scriptural story of Solomon, a line of inquiry suggested in Debora Shuger's *Renaissance Bible*. The project successfully clarifies how the figure of Solomon could be used either to undermine or to reinforce the prestige of the Stuart monarchy; and it argues that, in the Biblically literate culture of seventeenth-century England, James's Solomonic pose would not have been perceived as a safe and unidimensional religious self-compliment, but rather as a daring or opportunistic attempt to emulate and surpass a complex historical figure.

Tate begins his work by contrasting James's funeral sermon by Bishop John Williams, completely endorsing the King's emulation of Solomon, with John Donne's more principled tribute, which alluded to the Solomon-James connection without propagating it. Thence follows an account of the darker aspects of Solomon's story, which opponents to Stuart monarchism found useful when countering James's pose: the Biblical king's uxorious