S. J. Gunn and P. G. Lindley. *Cardinal Wolsey, Church, State and Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Pp. xvi, 315.

The book under review grew out of a conference on Wolsian research held at Cambridge University in 1988. Of the eleven essays presented here, five deal with what might be described as the traditional facets of Wolsey's career: politics, religion, and foreign affairs. John Guy, Greg Walker and Eric Ives give the reader revisionist views along lines established in earlier works. Guy tells us something of the activities of the King's Council during Wolsey's ascendancy. Clearly it did not disappear as has been alleged on occasion. In addition, he also demonstrates the way in which Wolsey tried to exert and keep control over the Commissions of the Peace in the early years of the reign, and to the extent that he was successful, often by imposing outsiders, i.e. his own men. Ostensibly this contributed to the stability and order that the Chancellor claimed to have brought to the realm, although at the same time his success here was by no means universal. Greg Walker extends his study of the satirists of the period to suggest that a work such as *Godly Queen Hester*, which on the surface seems to amount to a brutal attack on the purported excesses of the great Cardinal, on closer examination, along with other evidence, proves to be using the Cardinal as a kind of scapegoat for what were serious jurisdictional disputes and struggles that characterize the late medieval Church in England as elsewhere.

Eric Ives, in his essay on the fall of Wolsey, elaborates lines set out earlier in his *Anne Boleyn* and sees Wolsey's fall as the result of an aristocratic plot dominated by the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, Lord Darcey and the Boleyns which first manifested itself in July 1529 in the wake of the Blackfriar's fiasco, but was thwarted at that point by the King. The argument is that this lot worked hard on Henry during August and September, with the result that Wolsey was indicted and convicted of breaching the Statute of Praemunire in the Court of King's Bench in October, and was thus forced to surrender to the King. On Ives' reading, the King really did not want to give up his great minister and hence this group's hopes of getting Wolsey attainted in the opening session of the Reformation Parliament in November 1529 came to nothing, and indeed he was partially restored. However, that aristocratic gang made sure that he was forced northward to his Archdiocese of York where in desperation he entered into correspondence with the French, the Emperor, and Rome, looking for their help in restoring him to his former eminence. Unfortunately for Wolsey, it proved possible to construe that correspondence as treasonous and that put him beyond any further help from his King.

S. J. Gunn in an essay on the crisis of 1527-28, which was to weaken the position of Wolsey, argues that it had at its heart a disastrous decision by the minister to get at the Emperor Charles V, under the terms of the alliance between England and France, by attacking the Netherlands. In the first place, their ruler, Margaret of Austria, proved to be a far more determined lady than had been anticipated, rallied her peoples and put up a determined defence which resulted in the English and French backing off from the proposed invasion. But what proved far more consequential for Wolsey was the

severe disruption of trade between England and Antwerp which resulted from this scheme, and, combined with a disastrous harvest in 1527, led to serious domestic unrest. Keith Brown relates a story of Wolsey's rather ham-fisted interference (as Cardinal and Legate *a latere* and in the name of ecclesiastical reform) in the affairs of the Observant friars, an interference which seems to have done nothing except weaken the order and made them more vulnerable when their great crisis came in the Cromwellian years of the 1530s.

All of these essays on traditional topics contain much of real interest, but in many ways it is the six essays concerned with Wolsey's patronage of the arts that prove to be more intriguing. At the same time this aspect of his career also presents real problems for the historian. While there is voluminous documentary evidence for his work as Chancellor, Cardinal and politician, as is often the case in the early sixteenth century, when it comes to matters outside those official spheres the surviving evidence is much more fragmentary. What is clear is that Wolsey's patronage of the arts was closely connected to the high position which he held within the realm, and in general its purpose was very much to enhance that position.

Simon Thurley and John Newman are able to document Wolsey as a remarkable builder. Thurley, amongst other things, demonstrates that Wolsey did not hand Hampton Court over to the King in 1525 as has sometimes been thought, but rather provided the space to accommodate the King and his household by building on to the original house. In other words Wolsey simply made clear to Henry that he could make use of the place whenever he liked. Newman argues cogently that Wolsey, in establishing his college at Oxford, was determined to outdo King's College at Cambridge, and most particularly the Chapel at King's: Wolsey's was to be even bigger and more magnificent. One of the central considerations would be the stained glass windows, if King's College Chapel at Cambridge is anything to go by. Hilary Wayment gives the reader a very interesting essay (if rather speculative, in light of the fact that so little of the glass commissioned by Wolsey has survived) on Wolsey's patronage of the glaziers. Interestingly, in the course of her research she has come upon what is perhaps the best likeness of Wolsey in his early years as a servant to Henry VIII in the stained glass at St. Mary's Church in Fairford, Gloucestershire. Evidential problems faced Philippa Glanville in assessing Wolsey's purchases from the London goldsmiths — again, because so little of those have survived. However, she has been able to piece together much about the career of Robert Amadas, a London goldsmith whom Wolsey looked to more than any other to fulfill his considerable needs in this commodity.

No great household in the early Tudor period could do without a musical establishment; and here Wolsey maintained one of magnificence and of the highest performing standards, his chapel choir exceeding in quality that of even the Royal Chapel at times, leading the King to demand singers from Wolsey's choir for his own. Roger Bowers has ferreted out much about Wolsey's musical establishment, such as who some of the singers were, some of the choir masters and composers, including the great John Taverner (c. 1490-1545). But what he cannot tell us is what Wolsey's

attitudes towards or feelings about music were, other than the fact that the music performed in his household tended to look to the past rather than to the new styles emerging at the time, in Burgundy and other parts of Northern Europe, of which Wolsey had ample opportunities to hear. On the other hand, when it came to sculpture, here, as P. G. Lindley demonstrates, Wolsey's tendency was to seek out the newest, most up-to-date of the Italian styles.

This volume is well put together, with first rate figures and plates. There are a few minor annoyances such as the lack of the definite article in the giving of dates in one essay which may represent an eccentricity on the part of the author, or perhaps misprints. In general, however, I think this book will prove pleasurable to anyone with an interest in the early years of the reign of Henry VIII and the great man who in so many ways dominated those years.

CARL ERICSON, *University of New Brunswick*

Kathleen A. Parrow. *From Defence to Resistance: Justification of Violence during the French Wars of Religion*. Philadelphia, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 83, part 6, 1993. Pp. 79.

Dans ce petit ouvrage, Kathleen Parrow se propose de combler une lacune qui, selon elle, caractérise les travaux consacrés jusqu'ici aux justifications de la résistance contre la tyrannie en France pendant les guerres de Religion: l'absence d'analyse approfondie des fondements juridiques et légaux de ces doctrines. Après une introduction qui fait brièvement le point sur l'historiographie de la question, où elle montre que les historiens se sont surtout préoccupés des aspects politiques, religieux et sociaux de la violence, elle examine deux sources négligées de l'affirmation du droit des sujets à résister au tyran: d'une part, le concept romain de légitime défense, et de l'autre, le concept médiéval de guerre juste.

Le premier est exprimé par la maxime du droit romain *vim vi repellere licet* (il est licite de repousser la force par la force), assortie de précisions telles que *incontinenti* (la riposte d'un individu à une agression qui menace sa vie doit être immédiate, et non différée, ce qui l'assimilerait à une vengeance privée) et *moderamen tutelae* (cette riposte doit être contrôlée et proportionnée à l'attaque). Au Moyen Âge, le domaine d'application de cette maxime est clairement étendu de la défense de la vie à celle de la propriété. À travers l'examen des "cas ducaux" normands puis des "cas royaux" français (réservés à la justice ducal ou royale), Kathleen Parrow montre comment peu à peu s'impose l'idée que le roi a le devoir de protéger la vie et les biens de ses sujets,