

The priory, and St Leonard's in particular, was influenced by the Augustinian reform movement at Windesheim and St Victor in Paris. The end result was an outstanding contribution to the Reformation. Does this indicate some link between Catholic reform and the more radical Protestant reformation? And much more remains to be discovered about the priory community. The list of canons given in an appendix without source references, though adequate for the purposes of the book, is very imperfect. One thing perplexes me. If Winram was born *c.*1492, the accepted date, he was 69 when made superintendent and yet put in twenty more years of constructive hard work. Extraordinary if true, especially for those times. I would like to see a critical examination of his date of birth.

*Edinburgh*

MARK DILWORTH

*The Trial in History. Vol. I: Judicial Tribunals in England and Europe, 1200–1700*, ed. Maureen Mulholland and Brian Pullan (Manchester: Manchester U.P., 2003; pp. 186. £40); *Vol. II: Domestic and International Trials, 1700–2000*, ed. R.A. Melikan (Manchester: Manchester U.P., 2003; pp. 196. £40).

This two-volume collection presents twenty essays discussing trial procedures and particular proceedings from medieval to modern times. Although centred on developments in England, many of the papers are devoted to trials elsewhere: heresy proceedings against Boniface VIII in the early fourteenth century (Jeffrey Denton) and against a Christian who consorted with Jews in Venice in 1589 (Brian Pullan); sodomy trials in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Geneva (William G. Naphy); the prosecution in 1614 of a pair of Venetian nuns for sexual liaisons (Mary Laven); and, leaping four centuries, essays on post-World War II and contemporary war-crimes trials in Europe and Japan (Dominic McGoldrick; Peter Lowe; Robert Boyce). Among the essays on English trials are a concise survey of civil and criminal procedure in late medieval manorial courts (Maureen Mulholland); an account of the roles of lay and professional judges in the royal courts in the later middle ages, which strains to contend that 'the distinction between "professional" or "amateur" is not particularly meaningful during this period' (Anthony Musson); an overview of trial procedures in the English church courts in the two centuries from the mid-1400s (R.H. Helmholz); a summary version of an important paper, published more fully elsewhere, which documents a surge in the making of evidentiary objections in civil litigation at the end of the eighteenth century and links that development to the growing influence of defence counsel in felony trials of the day (T.P. Gallanis). For Victorian times there are essays on the use of character evidence in sodomy trials (H.G. Cocks) and innovations in the use of medical evidence as defence counsel strove to extend the insanity defence (Joel P. Eigen). Particularly noteworthy is A.W.B. Simpson's disturbing investigation of *in camera* trials in twentieth-century Britain, finding that the burden of proof was effectively reversed in secret trials held under the Official Secrets Act, in which the accused was told to prove his innocence against undisclosed accusers; and R.A. Melikan's revealing study of the juridical imbroglio that underlay the celebrated 'trial' of Queen Caroline in the House of Lords in 1820, in which

Melikan shows how the procedural ramifications of the decision to proceed against the Queen by a parliamentary bill pervaded the proceedings and undermined the prosecution. Perhaps the standout contribution to the collection is Daniel Klerman's confident answer to the question, 'Was the [English trial] jury ever self-informing?' Since the definitive work of Thayer and Maitland, written at the end of the nineteenth century, students of the history of the English jury system have understood that both the presentment jury (for crime) and the trial jury (for civil and criminal cases) originated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as self-informing bodies. Jurors were drawn from the vicinity of the events in the expectation that they would know or could investigate the truth of the matter in dispute. Trial was not understood as it is today as an instructional proceeding in which witness testimony would educate the jurors' verdict, but rather as an occasion for the jurors to deliver a verdict based on what they already knew. In recent years several scholars, drawing on sources that illumine the composition of juries in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, have questioned just how self-informing medieval criminal juries really were. These sources show that sheriffs often summoned jurors who lived at some distance from the events in question, and who were therefore less likely to be knowledgeable about what had happened. In Klerman's analysis, what this later evidence shows is not that the jury had never been self-informing, but that the jury was ceasing to be self-informing in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Klerman supplies considerable evidence from record sources and legal treatises for the self-informing character of twelfth- and thirteenth-century juries. Further, he emphasises two developments of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that weakened the self-informing jury. The separation of the personnel of the presenting and trial juries (an important safeguard that spared the accused from being tried by persons who had already accused him) had the consequence of eliminating from the trial jury some of the most informed potential jurors. Moreover, the transition away from eyre courts cost the jury system its large supply of potential jurors possessing detailed local knowledge. The eyre court met infrequently, but when convened it inquired about a broad range of topics, for which many jurors assembled, including some from every village. The more specialised trial commissions, especially gaol delivery, that replaced the eyre convened more frequently but had less business per session and thus weak ground for continuing the voracious manpower demands of the eyres. For these courts the sheriffs summoned fewer jurors, and used as jurors increasing numbers of local office-holders such as constables and bailiffs who had to be present anyhow and who might on occasion have had pre-trial contact with the case by virtue of office. These panels were less likely to contain jurors from the neighbourhood of the events. How, then, did these jurors learn enough to formulate their verdicts? Klerman underscores that even in the heyday of the self-informing jury in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, jurors occasionally heard statements at trial – from the accused, the judge, the victim-prosecutor, and local officers – that might supplement the jurors' own knowledge. Furthermore, self-informing jurors were seldom actual witnesses to the events, rather they were community representatives who were expected to ask around in advance of trial; necessarily some learned more than others. Self-informing was, therefore, a matter of degree. What appears to have happened across the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is that the degree became

attenuated, with fewer jurors having much direct acquaintance with the events in question. In consequence, Klerman concludes, 'when juries c[a]me to contain so few members with independent information, it is easy to see how pressure would build for more in-court presentation of evidence'. Klerman's account gives us confidence that the received understanding of the self-informing character of the medieval jury is sound, while helping us to see more of how that institution ultimately unravelled.

*Yale University*

JOHN H. LANGBEIN

*The Mapmakers' Quest: Depicting New Worlds in Renaissance Europe*, by D. Buisseret (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2003; pp. xxi + 227. £20).

Why were there so few maps in Europe in 1400 and yet so many by 1650? This is the central problem addressed by David Buisseret in this attractive book. In fact Buisseret does not attempt to account for the initial paucity of maps, taking this as a given, but concentrates virtually wholly on the growth of map construction and use. He describes the growing capacity among western Europeans to think visually and the growth in visual representations of all kinds (paintings, maps, plans). This integration of maps into other aspects of visual culture is refreshing and much to be welcomed. He traces the origins of these tendencies in ancient Greece and Rome and follows this with an engaging chapter on the painterly origins of some European mapping. He then surveys the production and use of charts, military plans, estate maps, topographical maps, and town plans, in Europe and in its expansion into new worlds, and shows that they gradually ceased to be novelties. By the modern era whether maps were desirable or necessary was no longer a question commonly posed: they had become an accepted part of life. The most successful chapter is that on military cartography where the author is most evidently at ease with the chronological and geographical spread of his material, and where much of his own research has lain, and this assured treatment extends to much of the discussion on French and Spanish maps, plans, and charting. The geographical range of the book is so wide that there are many areas where the author relies on the original scholarship of others but this is always graciously acknowledged and the extensive bibliography allows the reader to track the ideas to their source. The chapters on cartography among the European elite and on mapping the countryside and town show clearly the contribution of the Nebenzahl lectures delivered at the Newberry Library, Chicago (to which the book is dedicated) to cartographic studies: The scholarship is wide-ranging, the text is easy to read, the bibliography is very useful, and the well chosen and abundant illustrations show that the author's delight in the maps is undimmed by his evident familiarity with them. The book is elegantly produced, in an unusual format which is very pleasant to handle and which well suits the images, and the plates and illustrations are abundant and well produced despite the very modest price. The scholarly reader may find Buisseret's 'renaissance' a little old fashioned. It is unified and progressive: the mapmakers strive onwards on the same quest. It is located in western Europe and the areas it claimed as its colonies. The Islamic world is commended as the custodian of the work of Ptolemy, but the implication is that it was only when western Europeans got hold of it and