

Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



Butler, Todd. Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England

Jason A. Kerr

Volume 44, numéro 4, automne 2021

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1089367ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i4.38660>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)

2293-7374 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Kerr, J. (2021). Compte rendu de [Butler, Todd. Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 44(4), 262–264. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i4.38660>

Butler, Todd.

Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xiv, 240. ISBN 978-1-19-884406-8 (hardcover) US\$77.

Todd Butler's book argues that seventeenth-century Britain, in addition to producing an influential body of political thought, was also rich in its attention to what he calls "political intellection," by which he means reflective thinking about both individual political cognition and collective deliberative processes. The result is an incisive reconsideration of British political history, from the accession of James I in 1603 to the death of Charles I in 1649, that offers new insights about familiar events while contributing to scholarship on the early modern development of the "public sphere." (The conclusion briefly extends the argument into the Restoration.)

Butler's first two chapters attend to questions of individual intellection, with the Gunpowder Plot, the ensuing Oath of Allegiance, and swirling concerns about Catholic equivocation as their centre of gravity and John Donne as the major author under consideration. Chapter 1 focuses on equivocation, detailing the debates between the Jesuit Robert Persons and future bishop of Durham Thomas Morton. At heart, equivocation hinges on denying that an authority has the proper jurisdiction to make a particular inquiry. For Persons, internal thought determines meaning, with God as the judge. For Morton, language itself depends on answerability to other people. In Donne's view, the Jesuit position makes statecraft impossible, because subjects must answer to the king. But, for Donne, kings also uniquely enjoy deliberative privacy, which the confessional threatens to breach. These royal considerations frame Donne's approach to the Oath of Allegiance (in chapter 2), as he defends the free exercise of reason in political matters while also holding up divinely constituted monarchy itself as paradigmatically rational. The result, argues Butler, is an intellectual absolutism undergirded by an insistence on deliberative freedom.

The next two chapters turn to collective intellection, focused on debates about what free deliberation entails. Chapter 3 addresses a debate on this point between the jurists Francis Bacon and Edward Coke, in which Coke emphasized the importance of individual deliberation free from external pressure, while Bacon emphasized the role of judges as royal counselors—ultimately, as subjects. This debate extended, Butler argues, to the role of Parliament: was it

a distinct deliberative body, with its own privileges and prerogatives, or was it entirely subject to the king? Chapter 3 reads the 1614 Addled Parliament in these terms, and chapter 4 turns to 1626, with the Declaration of Right, the Forced Loan, and Philip Massinger's reflection on these in *The Roman Actor*.

The final two chapters work at the intersection of the individual and the collective by considering how intellection works in the public revelation of private correspondence, the most famous evidence being the letters between Charles I and Henrietta Maria, captured at Naseby in 1645 and subsequently published by Parliament. Letters offer a window onto private processes of intellection, and the rash of political questions they raise is compounded when the gender dynamics of marriage enter the picture. The Naseby letters revealed an egalitarian trust in the royal marriage, signaling a possible threat to royal deliberative supremacy alongside the threat of Catholic influence. Two major intellectual impulses followed the discovery of the letters. The first is that, by printing the letters, Parliament invited others into the process of political deliberation—contributing, moreover, the publication of its own rationales for publishing the letters. The second involves the royalist claim to Charles's cognitive inviolability and the attendant charge that Parliament had exceeded its deliberative capacities and done violence to the king and queen. The catch is that the royalists were now obliged to make these arguments in public and print, effectively conceding that the tent of political deliberation had widened.

Finally, Butler brings Milton into the picture, reading *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* and *Paradise Lost* in terms of the Naseby-centred controversy about marriage and political intellection. Butler argues that Milton's account of marriage takes a distinctly Parliamentary view that runs counter to a royalist view of marriage as private and egalitarian. For Butler, Milton understands the wife as counselor to the husband, in the manner of a Parliamentary petitioner. Marital conversation then becomes public as the husband confers and argues with other men (as Adam does with Raphael, in contrast to Satan's secret tryst with Sin). Liberty, then, rests on a specifically masculine intellection that bridges the public and private spheres.

Butler's short book ventures into many a well-trodden field, which means that points of disagreement are inevitable. It does not, for instance, consider the relationship between race and political intellection. Even so, its core insight—that the seventeenth century involved a protracted debate about how to think about politics—seems immensely useful to this reviewer. I have already

found it reshaping how I think about (and teach) both Donne and Milton, and it proved immediately relevant to my current scholarship. Given that the book touches on religion, politics, and gender in early Stuart England, it should have something of interest for almost any scholar working in the field.

JASON A. KERR

Brigham Young University

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i4.38660>

Da Costa, Alexandra.

Marketing English Books, 1476–1550: How Printers Changed Reading.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. 270 + 12 ill. ISBN 978-0-19-884758-8 (hardcover) \$100.

A welcome volume in the monograph series Oxford Studies in Medieval Literature and Culture, Alexandra da Costa's account of the marketing of early English printed books certainly lives up to the scholarly standards demonstrated in previous Oxford Studies works and responds admirably to the general editors' criterion of interdisciplinary and innovative research. It is divided into three main sections: "Devotional Reading" (works of catechism and contemplation, forbidden books); "Worldly Reading" (romances, scurrilous tales, gests); "Practical Reading" (pilgrimage guides, advertisements, souvenirs, household books).

Although by now there have been many studies of individual early printers' marketing strategies employed in the competitive world of early modern bookselling in England, this is the first book-length study of the subject. As such, it is also, perhaps, the first to discuss the marketing of a wide range of English books by English printers by placing it within a wider European context, reaching out to connect the publication of works in England to their earlier printed versions in France, Germany, and the Low Countries. In so doing, it reminds readers of the transnational and multilingual nature of early printing but also of the extent to which early printers in England were influenced by their counterparts on the Continent.

Given its emphasis on this close interweaving of English and foreign print practices and concerns, the book demonstrates a rather surprising neglect of