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

war were largely bluff and that there was much enthusiasm in England for the campaign. Louis A. Knafla, on the other hand, looks at Elizabeth's reign in a stimulating and valuable article on the admissions to the Inns of Court, which clarifies, indeed modifies, Lawrence Stone's educational "revolution." It is a pity that a work of such quality should be marred by the use, if not the invention, of such a clumsy term as "antihumanism."

In his concluding article on the rule of law, G. R. Elton surveys the whole Tudor period, and is concerned once again to dispell the tenacious concept of Tudor despotism. In true Eltonian style he slays the paradox that has been found in sixteenth-century England of a deference to sovereign law accompanied by an augmentation of regal power. There is no paradox once it is recognized that regal power only grows by means of statute. The prerogative, though perhaps growing in effectiveness, remained subordinate to parliament. Less successful is Professor Elton's encounter with Professor Hurstfield, who has pointed out that the existence of the rule of law does not preclude despotism. As the earlier essay in this book on the Duke of Buckingham illustrated well, the law could be wielded in a despotic manner. Even Cromwell may have been guilty of despotic behaviour, and it is a weak defense of his handling of the 1536 Canterbury election to say that evidence we do not possess might well vindicate him. The question of whether the Tudors were or were not despotic cannot, of course, be resolved until there is an agreed definition of despotism. It may be accepted that under the Tudors England enjoyed a more representative government than virtually any other European country; Tudor monarchs, moreover, generally operated within the law; yet, as Professor Elton observes, "Tudor law, like Tudor life, was often savage." Ought we then to substitute the term "Tudor savagery" for "Tudor despotism"? Surely not!

M. PERCEVAL-MAXWELL, *McGill University*

Elizabeth W. Pomeroy. *The Elizabethan Miscellanies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973. Pp. x, 145. 5. Richard F. Hardin, *Michael Drayton and the Passing of Elizabethan England*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1973. Pp. xii, 181.

For those who accept the validity of periodization in literary studies, the character of an age or even a decade is often better recognized in minor writers who reflect or conserve fashions than in those whose innovations or audacities create them. Two demonstrations of this assertion are provided by Elizabeth Pomeroy's study of the verse anthologies which, at least chronologically, define the Elizabethan period, since "the first and last of them . . . nearly coincide with the dates of Elizabeth's reign"; and Richard Harding's renovative account of Michael Drayton, whose poetical longevity and retrospective idealism established him as the last of the Elizabethans in a Jacobean age. As Hardin suggests, Drayton's burial in Westminster Abbey was probably earned not by his poetic reputation but by his personal legend "among young poets and writers who had never seen Sidney or Spenser or Marlowe."

The miscellany compilers were conservative by occupation and *de facto*; Drayton, it seems, by nature and upbringing. *Tottel's Miscellany* thrived on the poetry of Wyatt, some