and pleasing to the believer” (p. 179) — was a key to both Staupitz’s and Luther’s spiritual development. Not unusually for one steeped in Augustine, Staupitz also leaned heavily toward predestination, which left Christ in absolute control of salvation. As for the sacraments, indulgences, and other outward signs of grace, Staupitz tended to sidestep them in favor of “personal satisfaction.” Luther’s decision to challenge their validity openly was but a step further. Luther quarried his cornerstones of *sola fides* and *sola scriptura* right out of Staupitz’s consistent teachings, as in this posthumous formulation: “God wants nothing more from us for our salvation than faith alone” (p. 307). Staupitz also convinced Luther to pursue his doctorate, the key to a preacher’s skill and respect. Posset concludes that, in terms of matters both subtle and deep, “there probably would not have been the Reformation in Germany as we know it” without Staupitz (p. 379).

In the end, Staupitz, like Frederick the Wise, remained an admirer of Luther’s efforts but not a follower of his early movement. Following Oberman, Posset characterizes this position as that of an “evangelical Catholic Reformer.” He forces us to rethink the originality of many of Luther’s positions and to review them in light of the long tradition of reform that lay just beneath the surface of Church consciousness in the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

JOSEPH P. BYRNE, *Belmont University (Nashville, Tennessee)*


Jane Dawson’s subject, the fifth earl of Argyll, was, as she ably shows, a crucial figure in the contexts of both Scottish and British politics in the mid-sixteenth century. As MacCailein Mor (the son of Great Colin), head of Clan Campbell and a Gaelic clan chief, he belonged to a trans-national Gaelic polity that, as Dawson repeatedly demonstrates, paid little attention to the official borders of England, Scotland, and Ireland; but as a peer of the realm of Scotland, he was also a personal friend and key ally of Mary, Queen of Scots. Indeed, so important was Argyll to Mary that when his marriage to her illegitimate half-sister neared collapse, the queen made common cause with so unlikely an ally as John Knox, with each working to bring round one of the two warring parties. (Although this strategy was successful in the short term, Argyll ultimately divorced his wife in pursuit of his doomed quest for a legitimate heir.) Argyll’s association with Knox also alerts us to the third crucial aspect of his career: charged by his father on his deathbed with overthrowing the Mass in Scotland, Argyll was a tirelessly committed Protestant. Dawson is particularly
interesting on how Argyll used his power within his clan to initiate bloodless and indeed quasi-voluntary reform in a monastery with whose abbot he had family connections. Indeed, she is invariably at her best when elucidating Argyll’s place in the clan-dominated Gaelic world, bringing alive the complex culture and alliances of the sixteenth-century Gàidhealtachd, or Gaelic-speaking community, and revealing the complex interconnections between the fall of Mary, Queen of Scots, in Scotland and the murder of Shane O’Neill in Ireland.

As in this instance, Dawson generally handles her complex narrative well. One or two awkwardnesses do arise as a result of the rationale she adopted for structuring the book, which she explains at the opening of the third chapter:

On the one hand, the British dimension of events should be highlighted and, on the other, the integrity of the political worlds in which they occur must be respected. In an attempt to achieve such a balance, the chronological narrative that follows (chapters 3–6) has been divided into three parallel sections. Each section has been divided into three parallel sections. Each section focuses upon events in one of Argyll’s political worlds, with the British dimension and the 5th earl himself binding the separate sections together. For the sake of narrative clarity, the order of the sections varies between chapters. (p. 86)

This generally works well, but it does mean that we find ourselves positioned sometimes before, sometimes during, and sometimes after key events such as the Darnley marriage or the murder of Shane O’Neill, and that people who were dead on one page are sometimes alive again on the next.

Dawson’s primary aim is of course to situate the career of Argyll in its British context, since this book is a volume in the Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History series, and in this she does indeed succeed. She is especially strong in bringing out the tensions between Argyll’s twin roles as Gaelic magnate and Scots earl. I found her less convincing when she was arguing that the problem of Mary, Queen of Scots’ imprisonment in England could have been solved by treating her as a British problem rather than simply an English one; on Dawson’s own showing, the only member of the Elizabethan government who might have been capable of such a perspective was William Cecil, and his own interests were primarily in Wales (an area which receives virtually no attention here; this is an understandable omission in view of the subject-matter of the book, but I did find Dawson’s repeated insistence on the necessity of a “triangular” perspective a little short-sighted at times).

The only real disappointment about the book is that it has not been well copy-edited; it certainly falls far short of the standards one would hope to find from Cambridge University Press. There are hanging participles, as in “Having been sunk in a lethargic gloom at the end of 1570, these developments frightened Argyll into a frenzied round of triangular negotiations” (p. 185); “hung” for “hanged” (p. 185); and “dependants,” a word used frequently...
throughout the course of the narrative in the context of the social structure of
the Gaelic-speaking world, is spelled wrongly (as “dependents”) as often as
correctly. Nevertheless, this is a valuable and accessible study which sheds
useful further light on the dimensions of the British problem in early modern
Scotland, England, and Ireland.

LISA HOPKINS, Sheffield Hallam University


This very useful book succeeds in making some interesting reinterpetations
of a recently well-examined reign (Alford’s is the fourth or fifth new study of
the reign since 1999), mostly by applying a more firm logic to it; a few
unanswered questions are raised along the way.

Alford first challenges the view that the reign was one of political insta-
bility, initially with an examination of the historiography (c. 1550–2000) that
highlights the political and religious agendas of the individual writers and their
influence on subsequent commentators. For instance, it would have been the
height of political naïveté to write despairingly of the politics of John Dudley
while Robert was a court favourite, but less personally and professionally
damaging when Robert was out of the picture. Thus, we see various editions
of John Foxe reflecting the political environment but confusing the actual
circumstances and events. John Hayward, writing in the turbulent, faction-rid-
den 1630s, projected his own political environment backward. David Hume,
writing in the more “enlightened” eighteenth century, sees Edward’s reign as
the “dawning” of religious liberty. Most significantly, Alford challenges Pro-
fessor Elton himself, who, having uncovered the Tudor revolution in govern-
ment, dismissed Edward as a problem to be shoe-horned into an existing polity,
unable or unwilling to accept that the focus of kingship had changed from the
“institutional/structural view” of a Thomas Cromwell to the “politics” focus
of the leading intellectuals of the day.

Alford thus changes our perceptions of the reign and the king. No longer
the “problem to be solved” (*pace* Elton), Edward emerges as the central figure
of a complex web of politics, religion, and social engineering, finally emerging
to take the reins only to be tragically lost. In this way, Alford emphasises the
role of political counsel (and council) around the young king and shows the
reader where and how new concepts of polity developed in answer to the needs
of the country at a time when the “supreme head” was essentially absent. He
thereby sheds some light on the significance of the brief interlude of Jane Grey,
a Protestant who would slot nicely into the political system of council/counsel,