

book gifts and dedications as a means of securing favor from her father, stepmother, and brother.

Indeed, throughout, Schutte tends to favor the conclusion that Mary's translations and dedications were a sign of the strength of her position, while Elizabeth's were a sign of her weakness and lack of prestige. This is one way in which Schutte presents her work as part of the scholarly trend of reassessing Mary's reputation vis-à-vis that of her younger sister. Schutte acknowledges in this instance and others that alternative explanations are possible; scholars who would not see such a large gap between the two princesses' positions will likely favor other interpretations.

As Elizabeth's dedications were all linked to the giving of texts as New Year's gifts, Schutte's fourth chapter examines the annual ritual at the royal court, looking at ground covered in more general terms by Maria Hayward and Felicity Heal, but with a narrower lens: that of the New Year's gifts that members of the Tudor royal family made to other members. One pattern that emerges clearly from the discussion is Mary's preference for lavish gifts whereas Elizabeth preferred personalized ones, a habit she continued when queen and which may equally explain her use of book dedications and gifts more broadly. Part of Schutte's argument explaining why Elizabeth's enduring scholarly reputation has been stronger than that of her sister lies partly in the fact that Elizabeth's translations were subsequently published and eulogized by their later editors. Consequently, the final chapter analyzes editions of Elizabeth's translation of Marguerite de Navarre's *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*, published in 1548, 1568, 1580 and 1582.

The format of short-form monograph works well for this sort of project. The heavy contextualization Schutte provides would have been impossible in an extended article (or even two). Equally, the work will have greater appeal in its current form, as sections are of interest to scholars working on book dedications and book gifts, translations, and relations among the Tudor royal family. It is, however, a book that assumes significant background knowledge in places.

Tracey A. Sowerby, *University of Oxford*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.148

Public Opinion in Early Modern Scotland, c. 1560–1707. Karin Bowie.

Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. viii + 294 pp. \$99.99.

What is meant when we refer to public opinion in the early modern period? How did writers, protesters, and governments think of and use public opinion then, and what was its impact on extrainstitutional debate, and ultimately on historical events? How representative were claims of public opinion by political or religious groups, and what were the actual opinions that lay behind those publicly expressed? How might

thinking of the generation of public opinion in Scotland as a cultural dynamic suggest an alternative to the model of the public sphere developed in Jürgen Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1989)?

These are the key questions Karin Bowie asks of a huge body of protestations, petitions, communal oaths, and public communications that express opinion outside government in Scotland from the Protestant Reformation of 1560, through the cataclysmic Covenanting Rebellion and Wars of the Three Kingdoms, to the Revolution of 1688–90 and the negotiations leading to the Anglo-Scottish Union of 1707. In the first four chapters, Bowie demonstrates how traditional devices of complaint and protest were “re-engineered” from 1560 to 1688 to “increase reach and impact,” as “powerful tools for public resistance” that circumvented and stimulated government’s attempts to suppress what it saw as dangerous opinion (15). She is not interested so much in what that opinion was, but in how it was generated and expressed, and what effect it had. The last two chapters cover the period from the Claim of Right of 1689, in its expression of the “inclinations of the generality of the people” (18), to the Act of Union of 1707, and the legitimacy opposition to it claimed from a sense of nation. As the Duke of Atholl protested, “the inclinations of [Queen Anne’s] people” and “the immediate sentiments of the nation” against union meant that the government should “satisfie the minds of the people” (239).

Bowie’s argument is a tour de force, succinctly, authoritatively, and accessibly expressed, and richly evidenced. It makes a compelling case for what was claimed of public opinion in its own time, and a distinctive “grassroots opinion formation” (17) in Scotland, unlike the political debate generated in a male-dominated, print-facilitated Habermasian public sphere. The crowd (and women) make it into that space, threatening institutional attempts to suppress sedition and control disorder. The presence of the crowd in the presentation of petitions, for instance, suggests something of the orality and performance of dissent and the expression of public opinion. This is an understanding of protest beyond the confines of print-based sources.

This work draws and builds on Bowie’s previous groundbreaking research on the public voicing of opposition to the Anglo-Scottish union, for instance in pamphlets, in the years of its negotiation. Now, over this longer period, she shows how traditional resistance, in oral, written, and printed form, facilitated different processes of dissent (protestation), complaint (petition), commitments to resist (oaths), and communication with larger audiences (public tracts), looking beyond the consumption of print into the repurposing of these older devices to mobilize much larger-scale opposition. Their strength came from the implicit “threat of collective disorder and violence” (4) when everyone was allowed their own opinion. As Sir John Skene warned in 1597, “I am affrayed of all Readers, for ilk man hes his awin Judgement and opinion” which would lead to “als mony contrarities” (12).

Bowie kicks off with a striking example of contemporary awareness of the existence and power of public opinion in a pamphlet of 1706 against union by Robert Wylie. He

was convinced of the effect it might have: “the very Fears of [union] are like to cause a most dreadful Convulsion!” Such illuminating quotations appear throughout. But it is in this expression of a collective opinion that dangers lie of an overly homogenous picture. Although Bowie nuances this, there is an unease in defining something as public opinion when it derives from multiple individual opinions, mediated by those who use them to legitimize their objectives and to mobilize that public opinion. Bowie is careful to explore the differences between opinion claimed on behalf of a group and their actual opinions. But given the difficulties in capturing the granularity of such thoughts from their ephemeral oral origins, it is a tension that remains somewhat unresolved.

Bowie’s great strengths lie in unpacking theoretical models that elsewhere are obfuscated by overly complex language. With great clarity she shows that “Scotland does not present an obvious fit with this [Habermasian] scenario” of the public sphere (240), sidestepping it with the identification instead of a “cultural dynamic” (243) in the articulation of public opinion itself. This has significance, not just for understanding the impact of public opinion on events in Scotland, but in suggesting an alternative method of analysis for extra-governmental political debate in other countries: away from a prescriptive model to a more amorphous understanding of the generation of thought, words, and actions.

Anna Groundwater, *National Museums Scotland*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.149

Reformation Reputations: The Power of the Individual in English Reformation History. David J. Crankshaw and George W. C. Gross, eds.
London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021. xxvii + 474 pp. €114.39.

Reformation Reputations is an edited collection of essays that investigates not only how individuals self-fashioned contemporary identities, but how our interpretation of that self-fashioning has been itself fashioned, packaged, and disseminated over time. In an age where our own heroes are scrutinized for inclusion in modern history books, and indeed, “at a time when even texts and manuscripts are deemed to have after-lives” (4), this book seeks to understand the genesis and afterlife of a person’s reputation. It asks why certain individuals are chosen to be remembered, how their reputation is approached, and why. In doing so, it seeks to recover individuals lost to history and to nuance those reputations that have been flattened into a character trait or polemical caricature. In the Reformation period, this is an interdisciplinary act relevant to, and in need of, work from many fields.

In a lengthy introduction, Crankshaw and Gross explore the idea of reputation in the sixteenth century. They acknowledge that while individuals of this period may have been self-fashioned, many reputations are created over time “externally to the subject”