

among the ranks and anxieties over Walpolean despotism or, later, Cumberland's brutality. Smith, however, indicates that the second quarter of the eighteenth century also witnessed "the development of a loyalist culture" within the army and a concomitant decline in anti-army sentiment by the 1750s (238). By that time, Monck's ghost was all but exorcised, with the British army now the staunch defender of God, King, and Country.

Hannah Smith is to be commended for filling a significant lacuna in our understanding of the British army's role in politics during this turbulent period. The book is an important and welcome contribution that will fit snugly alongside the works of John Childs, R. E. Scouller, and J. A. Houlding, among others.

David R. Lawrence, *York University*

doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.462

*Artistic and Political Patronage in Early Stuart England: The Career of William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke, 1580–1630.* Brian O'Farrell.

Routledge Research in Early Modern History. Abingdon: Routledge, 2021. xii + 261 pp. \$160.

---

What this book does well, it does very well indeed. O'Farrell presents an excellent analysis of the "Pembroke Connection" in the House of Commons, "composed of the relatives, friends, and dependents of Pembroke . . . who sat for constituencies which he controlled, or who owed their election, from whatever constituency, to his patronage" (60). Appendix 3 lists the names and seats of these MPs, increasing from twelve in the Parliament of 1604 to twenty-six in the Parliament of 1628. Pembroke also held an increasing number of proxies in the House of Lords. Pembroke understood, long before his peers, the potential power of Parliament; and the Pembroke Connection represented a significant source of his political power. O'Farrell efficiently navigates the complex issues confronting the Parliaments of James and Charles, adroitly indicating the positions taken by Pembroke and his connection.

Other strong points appear in the appendixes. In appendix 1, O'Farrell's research in the Close Rolls yields specific information about Pembroke's landholdings. A general assessment of the family's wealth, which remained massive, shows a decline between 1599 and 1641. Detailing Pembroke's activities as an entrepreneur, appendix 2 praises Pembroke for his canny investments in timber, mining, and overseas colonization. A less positive narrative is suggested by the riots by the inhabitants of the Forest of Dean in response to Pembroke's extensive cutting of timber to provide charcoal for his iron mills. O'Farrell also presents useful information concerning Pembroke's active investment in the East India Company and the Virginia Company.

O'Farrell's book has two unfortunate flaws. The first, proceeding from his urge to gain for Pembroke additional recognition, is his exaggeration of Pembroke's role as "the

patron of almost every important literary artist of his day” (1). Pembroke was, in fact, an important patron to a number of writers such as Ben Jonson, William Browne, and George Herbert. O’Farrell claims him as a patron of John Donne (ix, 100, 106) as well as Donne’s “intimate friend” (94) but then observes that “we do not have much evidence for their relationship” (99). He claims Pembroke’s patronage for Thomas Nashe (111) but then notes that “we have no evidence of any patronage from Pembroke to Nashe” (128). O’Farrell quotes liberally from the dedications of a number of the 110 works dedicated to Pembroke listed in appendix 5 as if they were straightforward testimonies to his character. Pembroke naturally attracted dedications in several roles as Lord Chancellor, as Chancellor of Oxford, as a wealthy landowner in control of many advowsons, and as a member of a literary family. These do not in themselves necessarily indicate patronage or even protection (106). It is a stretch to title Pembroke as the “greatest Maecenas” of his day (110).

The second flaw proceeds from O’Farrell’s desire to defend Pembroke’s moral character. O’Farrell discounts Clarendon’s often quoted observation that Pembroke was “immoderately given up to women” on the grounds of its inconsistency with Clarendon’s otherwise glowing praise. This praise is difficult to reconcile with O’Farrell’s claim that Clarendon, as a Royalist, was biased against a Pembroke because his “brother and heir was a leading Parliamentarian” (21). O’Farrell completely discounts the information that Mary Wroth bore Pembroke two illegitimate children as “totally out of character for the Third Earl” as “the leading Calvinist nobleman at Court . . . not the kind of person who would leave a cousin he had known all his life bankrupt and burdened with his two illegitimate children” (24). He discounts Thomas Herbert’s mention of the children—William, who died unmarried, and Catherine, who married Mr. Lovel [Lovet] near Oxford—in his *Herbertorum Prosapia* as an attempt only to “curry favour with the Fourth Earl” (23). O’Farrell ignores Margaret Hannay’s corroboration of Herbert’s information in her *Mary Sidney, Lady Wroth* (279–297) listed in his bibliography. Hannay observes that William was given a “brave living in Ireland” by the King on Philip Herbert’s mediation (285); Catherine’s marriage to Thomas Lovet is recorded in the *Visitation of Buckinghamshire 1634* (293).

Finally, Routledge is surely aware that much of O’Farrell’s book appeared in his earlier book *Shakespeare’s Patron: William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke 1580–1630: Politics, Patronage, and Power* (2011). There is some light rewriting in places, and the chapters “Improving Landlord” and “Aristocratic Entrepreneur” are moved to appendixes, but a significant portion of it is, word for word, the same. His earlier book should perhaps have received more attention than it did.

Despite these flaws, O’Farrell’s recent book presents a much-needed focus on the life and works of William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke.

Mary Ellen Lamb, *Southern Illinois University-Carbondale*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.461