ated as the reason for a piece's wide distribution. The composition could be just as well a testimony to the education and career of the owner or social status of the patron.

Four book reviews form an appendix to this attractive hard bound volume. Care has been taken both with the typography and the presentation of the musical examples, and the numerous facsimiles and photographs are clear and distinctly labelled. One can also imagine that the arrangement of the various tables accompanying the systematic studies presented the publishers with no little difficulty. Almost fifty U.S. dollars might seem to be an exorbitant price for a new annual, but not if the level of the scholarship displayed in this first volume is maintained.

NEIL K. MORAN, *University of Toronto*

Winthrop S. Hudson. *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559*. Durham, N. Carolina: Duke University Press, 1980. Pp. x, 158. \$14.75.

Winthrop Hudson's *The Cambridge Connection* deals with the creation of the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion in 1559, a Settlement that Hudson, in contrast to others, finds to have been formed in a spirit much closer to consensus than to conflict. He attributes this harmony – and the harmonious organization of the Elizabethan government itself – to the operation of the 'Cambridge connection': an informal group which could eventually be described as 'a network of informal relationships of trust among persons at or near the centres of power' (p. 34).

Hudson traces this political and intellectual coterie to the progressive side in Cambridge debates of the 1530s regarding the correct pronunciation of classical Greek. Led at first by the scholars John Cheke and Thomas Smith, the group soon included a score or so of Cambridge men united in interest (classical scholarship, reformed Protestantism, English common law) and training (Cambridge and Gray's Inn) as well as by personal friendships, intermarriage and patronage.

The group evolved in several stages. Its members were among those who came to dominate Cambridge in the '30s, matriculate at Grey's Inn in the early '40s, serve in the 'nursery school' established by Queen Catherine Parr for Prince Edward from 1544, and exercise intellectual and political power under Somerset and Northumberland. Though Cheke and Smith remained among the most respected intellectuals, William Cecil emerged as the most skilled in politics. After lying low or emigrating in the hostile climate of the Marian years, the network – now more extensive than ever through intermarriage and patronage – proved ready, capable and resourceful in helping Elizabeth establish her regime. Of paramount importance, it proved congenial political company for the young Queen, whose own intellectual and even emotional affinity with members of the group, especially William Cecil, ran deep.

Turning from this study in the dynamics of Tudor political affinity to events themselves, Hudson accepts two corollaries regarding the Elizabethan settlement. First, it was founded on the twin supports of royal supremacy and the 1552 Prayer Book; second, the government and the church were dominated by protestants who, for the most part, had long shared ties and views. Yet here Hudson departs from the familiar. *Pace* Neale, the Settlement did not result from the initiative of a radical faction of an unruly House of Commons against the better judgment of the Queen. It

came instead when Elizabeth, personally sympathetic with a predominantly protestant Commons, managed to overcome opposition from conservative Marian holdovers in the upper House to achieve the Settlement she wanted. She did this largely through Cecil's help and with the essential support of the 'Cambridge connection' both in the Commons and on the Council.

The same controlling element receives credit for the remarkably smooth transition from Marian to Elizabethan government in the opening months of the reign. Only when Elizabeth fell out with some of her clergymen over implements and vestments, and when Robert Dudley entered her affections, did this mood of amity and consensus yield to the political friction which, as Hudson – following Wallace MacCaffrey – tells us, then endured on into the early 1570s.

Hudson's accomplishment in *The Cambridge Connection* lies not in any discovery of new sources or even any mastery of unpublished material. It lies in his fresh interpretation of familiar sources, and may ironically have been facilitated by the distance that this accomplished American historian of ideas has maintained from the mainstream of Tudor political history emanating from the Universities of London and, more recently, Cambridge.

This is also the reflective essay of a mature scholar rather than the meticulous monograph prepared for the doctorate or in the hope of academic tenure. Some may find fault with this. The book has no bibliography. Citations of published works or relevant theses are sparse, imprecise and sometimes lacking altogether. Occasionally, though not as often as one might fear, greater precision might have been obtained by more diligent use of secondary sources such as M.K. McIntosh's work on Anthony Cooke, David Starkey's work on Anthony Denny or Joel Berlatsky's work on Bishop Bentham. Yet if Hudson seems to have left blanks to be filled in by graduate students, it can hardly be said that the plausibility of his thesis suffers in consequence.

At the same time, two issues still appear unresolved. First, one wonders what difference it might make if the offices of the Royal Household had been examined along with the more official and visible institutions. Though Hudson looks at the Household in tracing careers through the 1540s, we learn little about the significance of Household appointment under Elizabeth even to such important figures as Nicholas Throckmorton. We know nothing of how Robert Dudley may have used the Household as a path to influence prior to his Council membership. Dudley himself represents the second loose end. So complete does the hold of the 'Cambridge connection' seem on the court by early 1559 that it remains difficult to imagine how an outsider like Dudley could 'suddenly become a dominant figure in government' (p. 32) or why Cecil, in whose brief absence this star burst forth, appears to have had but four firm allies in the Council at this time (p. 33). Surely, if the network of old school ties with Cecil at its head did hold the commanding position here described, this remains a most curious event, and one which Hudson does not successfully explain.

Despite and perhaps partly because of these lingering questions, Hudson's work will long serve to stimulate. It helps bridge a widening gap between Neale's emphasis on political conflict and the more recent view which has emphasized instead the elements of harmony in Tudor government.