Little of this is easy reading. The chapters of this book are derived from lectures that Mr. Baxandall prepared for students of history at London University, and there is a certain casualness about the language that makes some of the reasoning a little elusive. And we may not entirely agree with the point of his thesis. But what Mr. Baxandall is talking about in this book is new and important material, and there are few readers who will not find their comprehension of Renaissance painting sharpened and enriched by the material included here and the analysis that Mr. Baxandall provides for it.

DAVID CAST, *Yale University*

Andrew Martindale, *The Rise of the Artist in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972. Pp. 144, Ill. \$6.75 (softcover edition \$4.75).

This is a brief, concise book. The material in it appeared first as part of a large, lavish volume entitled *The Flowering of the Middle Ages* that was published by Thames and Hudson in 1966. Since then the text, in the words of the editor, has been "roused, stretched and shaken into a new and somewhat enlarged shape," the plates have been re-arranged and the whole is now presented as an independent contribution to the study of the complex problem of the social position of art and of artists at the end of the Middle Ages onwards, that is to say from about 1250 to 1400.

In one immediate way such an enterprise is obviously worthwhile, for it places material in the hands of readers who could hardly have expected to buy the larger and more expensive book. And the plates in this new version are not, on the whole, inferior to those of the original. But judged as an independent book, it is only partly successful. It is not possible to fault the general account Mr. Martindale provides of the gradual and patchy accumulation of authority that artists enjoyed from the end of the thirteenth century onwards. Nor the divisions—Town, Court, Cloister—under which he presents his evidence. Nor the careful and precise interpretation with which he brings his facts before us. But he is caught by the terms of his own brief. The material he uses is haphazard and generally unfamiliar—names like Jacques Cavael or Girart d'Orléans appear as frequently as do more familiar ones like Giotto, Gislebertus and Melchior Broederlam. And his interpretations are often drawn from appropriate, but difficult sources such as inventories, or the terminology of court offices, or the statutes of the guilds of painters. This leads, I think, to a disturbing imbalance. For the general reader—someone like the "mediocriter literatus" envisaged by Erasmus in his *Adagia*—there is too much taken for granted in our knowledge of social history and social structures. And for the scholar, to whom such matters would be known, there are suggestions and connections made here by Mr. Martindale that without documentation are a little frustrating. Obviously this is not to say that Mr. Martindale's text is without interest. Given to readers sufficiently acquainted with the social history of the late Middle Ages—let us say, advanced undergraduates—this book could well be used to open up a range of possible questions for study. But despite Mr. Martindale's modest claims, this is not merely a survey of the available material; it is more than that. And it is to be hoped that at some time Mr. Martindale will produce a larger, more expansive book on this interesting subject. What we have here is merely a

brief sketch that may have sufficed as part of the original volume for which it was intended. But standing as an independent book, it only makes us wish for more.

DAVID CAST, *Yale University*

Arthur J. Slavin, ed., *Tudor Men and Institutions*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972. Pp. viii, 294. \$11.95.

Tudor Men and Institutions is dedicated to Walter C. Richardson, and appropriately enough most of the ten contributors throw "some light on the nature of Tudor rituals of rule." The first three contributors apply themselves to Tudor men. Mortimer Levine has studied the Duke of Buckingham, or more particularly his trial in 1521, which provides an excellent example of Henry VIII's ruthless ability to manipulate the law to his own advantage. The duke was denied trial by his peers in Parliament, and instead was tried by the Duke of Norfolk and nineteen other peers in the Court of the Lord High Steward. The court found him guilty of treason for words uttered even though no treasonable act had been committed. Buckingham had to die because Henry was already worried about the lack of an heir and the duke possessed too strong a claim to the throne for comfort. Henry used the law, therefore, to implement his policies of the moment. Yet he also needed tools to operate the machinery of the law to kill his victims. One such tool was Sir Thomas Audley, who succeeded Sir Thomas More as Lord Chancellor and presided over his trial as well as that of Anne Boleyn. Stanford E. Lehmberg makes a valiant but unsuccessful attempt to polish Audley's tarnished image. This is a formidable task for if, as is suspected, Audley wrote his own epitaph, in which the black marble of the tomb is described as "not blacker than the soul, nor harder than the heart" of the occupant, Audley seems to have shared the judgment most historians have passed on his character. Professor Lehmberg argues that we should avoid moral judgments, but then tries to shift the blame for Audley's behaviour to Henry. Whatever Henry's failings, the picture of Audley that remains is of a self-seeking, greedy opportunist who would do virtually anything he was told if it helped his advancement. Arthur J. Slavin has no compunction about describing Audley's successor, Thomas Wriothesley, as an ambitious clerk "who rose to high office through cleverness and lack of scruple." Yet for Wriothesley a strong case is made for an element of principle being mixed with the self-interest. Wriothesley, in resisting the 1547 scheme to enhance the power of the Court of Augmentations, wished to preserve not only his own position, but the authority of the crown and the common law as well.

Four contributors are primarily concerned with courts. DeLloyd J. Guth concludes that the Exchequer of Pleas played a "very minor and narrow role in royal justice." Similarly, Jay P. Anglin shows that puritans in Essex had little to fear from the local church courts. W. J. Jones tries to balance our view of Tudor government by looking at a court on the fringe rather than in the centre, in this case the Exchequer of Chester. Finally, R. W. Heinze examines the failure of the special court set up by the Statute of Proclamations of 1539.

The three remaining articles are less easy to classify. J. R. Lander steps out of the Tudor period entirely and looks back to "The Hundred Years War and Edward IV's 1475 campaign in France." He challenges the opinions that Edward's preparations for