

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

late-life apostasy, the Divine judgment on this apostasy that resulted in a division of Solomon's kingdom during his son Rehoboam's reign, the traditional elaborations on Scriptural accounts that associated Solomon with magic and the occult. In Chapter Two ("Building Solomon's Temple: King James as *Defensor Fidei*"), Tate shows that both Puritan and Episcopal Anglican spokesmen used Solomonic compliment to imply James's duties and role as a supporter of religion. He also shows that neither faction used this typology exclusively to flatter the King; and he fields a series of examples to show how Solomon's story functioned in current theological, ecclesiastical, and political debates. Henri IV scoffed at the English King's implicit claims to wisdom by saying that James's likeness to Solomon lay mainly in his being son of David—i.e., the natural son of David Riccio, Mary Stuart's paramour. Puritan Lucy Hutchinson characterized James's Solomonic pose as an evasion of his need to pursue theological and moral improvement. Bishop Lancelot Andrewes used Solomon's obtaining of the throne against the will of High Priest Abiathar to show that the Pope had no Scriptural right to determine the English succession. Bishop George Carleton praised James as a "peaceable Salomon" and recounted James's wisdom in uncovering and frustrating the Gunpowder Plot, presumably implying that Solomonic peaceability depended on being wary of Roman Catholic alliances. Court Chaplain Thomas Scott urged both King and Puritan to moderation and mercy, quoting the Solomonic warning, "Bee not too just," and citing as an example of excessive justice Calvinist refusal to make the sign of the cross without explicit Scriptural mandate. And William Laud, in a birthday sermon for "our Solomon," capitalized on the *shalom* etymology for the ancient king's name to advise prayer for peace in Church and State, despite some Puritans' claims that God's sovereign providence made such prayers improper. James's choice to publicly emulate Solomon clearly provided a point of departure for remarkably various destinations: a locus for communicating both dissent and assent to current Anglican doctrine and discipline, a handle on the King enabling both confirmation and critique of his political claims.

Tate's third chapter focuses on Jacobean use of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon, and shows that James's political and colonial postures were often presented in terms of the ideals of this Scriptural event. But here again, Tate demonstrates that James took a risk when he chose to associate his court and his foreign policies with the Arabian queen's gift-giving and admiring of Solomon. When John Harington recounted the King of Denmark's dissolute 1606 visit to the Jacobean Court at Theobalds Estate, he emphasized a botched masque performance of the Queen of Sheba's gift-giving: the dramatic accolades, including an exotic queen bringing dainties to the visiting monarch, were fatally compromised by the drunkenness of actors and audience alike; and the bathetic performances prompted Harington to find the Court of James inferior to that of Elizabeth, who would not have involved herself in such behavior so quickly after the discovered Gunpowder Plot. Tate also points out that the uxorious polygamy of Solomon's later years made the story of the Queen's visit rather vulnerable to libertine speculation. Midrashic legend inferred an event of sexual commerce from the Biblical account of Solomon's generosity ("he gave her everything she wanted"), and characterized the Queen of Sheba as a demon-lover on whom Solomon begat Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king who would later destroy Jerusalem and the Temple. Such resonances were evidently available in Jacobean times: Tate cites Marlowe's Mephistophilis, who tempted Faust with a demonic prostitute "as wise as *Saba*." He also mentions Jonson's *The Alchemist*, where Sir Epicure Mammon's avaricious megalomania includes ridiculous Solomonic pretensions toward worldwide power and fame. It was in spite of such potential for bathos that James (in *Basilikon Doron*) enjoined Prince Henry to courtly order and humility, coolly adding that such behavior would impress visitors as Solomon impressed the Queen of Sheba. The King's choice to allude to a story that could so easily be turned on him indicates the strength of his belief in his court's potential for virtuous behavior—and also, perhaps, his overly strong endorsement of the inviolability of the kingly station.

Tate's chapter on Francis Bacon's Solomon shows how Bacon used James's Solomonic emulation to help market his *Great Instauration*. Bacon noted that Solomon had commissioned a natural history, and that the ancient king's pursuit of knowledge could be espoused in the Christian era as charitable public service. The *New Atlantis* played out this sales strategy by way of fictional exemplum: practical, exploitable knowledge is accumulated in the state-subsidized "Salomon's House"; and the Bensalemites owe their technological advancement to the greathearted endowments of King Solamona, an earlier monarch whose lesson for James is prevented from becoming too explicit by the Bensalemites' claim that, despite appearances, the name "Solamona" had no connection with the ancient Hebrew king. Tate concludes his chapter on Bacon with a "coda" describing the most obvious and enduring manifestation of James's Solomonic emulation, the Rubens frescoes on the Whitehall Banqueting House ceiling. (Tate admits to using the word "iconography" broadly in his study, and only this ceiling and some title-page engravings from his primary sources seem to me strictly to match the term. Might the book have been more appropriately titled *The Figure of Solomon in Stuart England, or James, Charles, and the Solomonic Type?*)

Tate's final chapter is the only one not directly relevant to James. It builds on Erica Veevers's observation that Charles I refitted his father's Solomonic pose to his own situation, particularly to his marriage with the Roman Catholic Henrietta Maria. In the Carolean court, the learned Solomon of *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* was left aside in favor of the chaste romantic lover of the *Song of Songs*. Again, Tate shows that the royal couple's ideal Scriptural pretext was vulnerable to hostile readings. *Canticles* had a long history of being associated with Solomon's marriage to the pagan princess of Egypt, and this played easily into the Puritans' opposition to Henrietta Maria's Catholicism, tolerated by Charles's court but condemned as pagan and idolatrous by iconoclastic lower-church theologies. Having described these uses of Solomon in Carolean politics, Tate cites important Protestant commentators who classified *Canticles* as an apocalyptic pastoral. He then em-

ploy such commentary to warrant a hypothetical reading of Milton's pastoral masque: *Comus* quites Charles and Henrietta Maria's high-church Solomonic romance with a Protestant Lady on pilgrimage who chastely rejects the advances of a corrupt Solomonic wizard. I find Tate's suggested anti-Carolean resonance in *Comus* sufficiently probable, but sense nevertheless a certain disproportion when such extensive and interesting reviews of patristic mythology, Scriptural interpretation, and the impassioned praise of chastity in Milton's poem become mere means toward detecting the politics of yet another anti-Solomonic innuendo. The implied reading of *Comus* seems unfortunately close to Tolstoy's Prince Stepan enjoying his newspaper article:

With his natural quickness of perception, he understood the point of each taunt: whence it came, for whom it was intended, and what had provoked it; and this as usual gave him a certain satisfaction. (*Anna Karenin*)

Despite this and several other gestures toward fashionably politicized reading, despite a trace of American animus against James and some overfuss in the footnotes, Tate's examination of the King's Solomonic emulation successfully corrects the slight notice given to this aspect of James's character elsewhere. In Jonathan Goldberg's *James I*, for instance, the "biblical matrix" of John Williams's funeral sermon is largely ignored in favor of repeating Williams's forensic description of James as a "Lively Statue"; and though James Doelman's recent *King James I* cites Tate's work and helpfully elaborates on it, I think that Tate may have a better feel than Doelman for the gradient between the Solomon of Scripture and the positive and negative elaborations traditionally added to the figure—a gradient that would have been quite important to seventeenth-century Anglican readers.

In conclusion, I'd like to propose one implication of James's Solomonic sobriquet that Tate doesn't pursue. There may have been significant benefit for James in a parallel between Solomon's mother Bathsheba and his own mother, Mary Stuart. The figure of Bathsheba could implicitly address a problem that James failed to solve or even openly acknowledge in his political prose. Despite

being the object of David's adulterous affections, Bathsheba does not play the part of an evil woman in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures; and she appears in the opening New Testament lineage of Jesus Christ, apparently as part of St. Matthew's demonstration that the central genealogies of sacred history included a number of women who, like the Virgin Mary, gave birth to sons amidst circumstances that would be considered irregular. Charles Williams, in his early twentieth-century biography of James, notes that when the King maintained that royal authority passed immediately and unproblematically to the nearest heir, he provided himself with no defense against the succession of Mary Stuart. It seems unlikely that James alone among the authorities of Europe took Mary Stuart's revoked abdication seriously, and all too likely that James, amidst his ambitious hopes for succeeding Elizabeth, "merely and naturally forgot" about his mother. But in the figure of Bathsheba, Mary Stuart could receive a displaced but reverent recognition, even while her suppressed claims continued to be tacitly evaded. Something other than the ideal or norm had occurred in the case of Bathsheba, but without her Israel would not have had Solomon.

Richard C. McCoy. *Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. 218 pp. \$29.50. Review by DAVID A. SALOMON, BLACK HILLS STATE UNIVERSITY.

Richard McCoy's *Alterations of State* is a welcome addition to any scholar of the seventeenth century. The book is a study of, as its subtitle puts it, "sacred kingship in the English Reformation," and it approaches its subject through the work of John Skelton, Shakespeare, John Milton, and Andrew Marvell.

Illustrated with pages from contemporary literature, the book aims to be a study of kingship and what Ernest Kantorowicz referred to as "the king's two bodies." The authors surveyed were