

Kenneth Fincham, ed. *The Further Correspondence of William Laud*. Church of England Record Society 23. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2018. lii + 304 pp. \$120.00. Review by NATHAN MARTIN, CHARLESTON SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY.

*The Further Correspondence of William Laud*, edited by Kenneth Fincham, provides new depth and significance to the collection of printed sources on the life and career of William Laud, the archbishop of Canterbury from 1633–1645. Fincham is a well-renowned scholar on Laud and has presented in this volume an array of source material that will certainly raise the prominence of Laudian study and provide better access to primary sources on the influential churchman. The collection itself includes two hundred twenty-three letters that have not until this point seen publication, spanning from the early phase of Laud's career in 1614 to 1645, right before his execution. As Fincham himself writes: "what *The Further Correspondence* does contain is new information, fresh insights, and a fuller appreciation of the character, career and impact of William Laud" (xxii).

Fincham's effort in editing this work is indeed impressive. As is the case with so many topics of historical inquiry during the early modern era, relevant sources are scattered throughout archival depositories and libraries in various locations. According to the bibliography, Fincham accessed at least thirty-eight different archival sources in creating this volume. Without that painstaking effort, this collection would not hold as much significance as it does.

Perhaps the biggest contribution this collection makes is that it greatly expands source material in certain eras of Laud's career. Between 1847 and 1860, William Scott and James Bliss published several volumes of Laud's letters in *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud*. Those volumes contained five hundred forty-eight of his letters (xxi). Relatively few, however, date to the 1620s. Fincham's collection adds thirty-nine to the thirty-eight in *Works* covering that period (xxii). Most of the letters of that period include correspondence with Sir John Scudamore and William Smyth and involve collegial politics at Oxford University. This portion provides new insight into Laud's activities during that phase of his career.

Several letters in this collection are noteworthy. In a letter dated 4 December 1631, Laud wrote to Elizabeth of Bohemia, Charles I's sister, who had married Frederick V, Elector Palatinate (63–64). In the letter, Laud discusses the role of Griffin Higgs, Elizabeth's chaplain whom Laud had promoted earlier in his career. Laud also informs Elizabeth that he is sending a book of collected sermons from Lancelot Andrewes, the former Bishop of Winchester. In another letter, from 12 September 1621, Laud complains to Lord Cranfield, who had recently been promoted to high advisory position with Charles I, that a majority of fellows at St. John's College, Oxford, had chosen a successor to the presidency of that college without his recommendation (4–5, xxiii). Lastly, Fincham points out that a 29 August 1627 letter addressed to the Vice-Chancellor at Cambridge University is the first documented occurrence of the Crown interfering with the religious direction of the university during Laud's career. In this letter, Laud announces that the king is "resolved to take some course to revive that ancient discipline which made the member...honoured both at home and abroad..." (27). Laud demands that the Vice-Chancellor "cause a search to be made in all your records for all directions, orders, iniunctions, admonitions, or the like concerneinge learneinge or manners which have beene sent in the happy and blessed raigne of Queene Elizabeth and Kinge James" (27). Of course, the implication here is that Laud's staunch anti-Calvinism and his promotion of Arianism through more elaborate ceremonial and ritualistic expression is developing at this early point.

Beyond the inclusion of these consequential letters, Fincham's volume holds importance for controversy and debate within the field. One of the long-standing issues in this regard is the question of whether Laud was carrying out Charles I's agenda or whether Laud was using the Crown as a vehicle for his own. It is clear from Fincham's work that Laud had "easy access to Charles and this enabled him to move very rapidly, if necessary, to protect his interests or advance his own agenda" (xxvii). At the same time, as Fincham points out in his Introduction, "the easiest way for Laud to cut through disputes and ensure compliance was to cite the king's wishes" (xxviii). These letters indicate that most often there was significant overlap between the king's aims and the archbishop's.

These letters also show some of the normative church administration employed by Laud. In the Introduction, Fincham does well to describe some of the methods of operation used by the archbishop. For example, in a chastisement of the practices of the bishop of Hereford, Laud threatens that he should reform his ways or “be more wary for Hereafter and I shall forebeare to acquaint the King with it; Unless farther Complaint, or Other Necessity urge me to it” (xxviii, 196). Such a threat motivated reform; Laud used this tactic in other scenarios as well (xxviii).

Many of the letters are addressed to bishops and other high-ranking clergy as most of Laud’s day-to-day correspondence centered around church governance and administration. Figures such as John Bramhall, bishop of Derry, John Bridgeman, bishop of Chester, and others like James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, and Thomas Morton, bishop of Durham, fill out a majority of the two hundred twenty-three letters. University administrators play an important role in this collection, too. The first forty pages of the collection, most dating from the 1620s, are dominated by correspondence with Sir John Scudamore and William Smyth, warden of Wadham College, Oxford. Other significant political figures have a place in this collection as well: Thomas Wentworth, earl of Stafford, and John Stewart, earl of Traquair, for example, have important presence in the collection.

On the balance, this edited collection of letters from William Laud is a significant work in that it expands the general understanding of the archbishop, advances the study of religious policy during the reign of Charles I, and provides important source material for the furtherance of discussion of debate surrounding this controversial churchman. Because of Fincham’s efforts, scholars will be able to access with ease important material on Laud. Fincham’s “Introduction” is impressive too; it contains thirty-one pages worth of deep historical context on Laudian study while providing a general roadmap and guide for understanding the source material contained within. Fincham also provides a bibliography for those interested in obtaining the original sources (most of the letters were not written in Laud’s own hand).

In conclusion, *The Further Correspondence of William Laud* is a significant contribution to the study of this era of English religious history. I would recommend this work for anyone interested in early

modern history, both for the professional and the student, as well as specialists with theological or intellectual history interests. This work is sure to have a lasting impact on scholarship in this field.

Moria Coleman. *Household Inventories of Helmingham Hall, 1597–1741*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2018. xxxvii + 342 pp. + 30 illus. \$60.00. Review by BRETT F. PARKER, ISOTHERMAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

Historians have long recognized the importance of household inventories in understanding consumption habits, cultural tastes, and social status and change in a particular period. This is especially true of early-modern England, when the political and economic fortunes of the aristocracy rebounded in the seventeenth century after years of falling rents and entry fines. As a result, the Stuart era, as well as the Hanoverian, are marked by conspicuous consumption by the peers, whose extravagant houses and furnishings testified to their material well-being. Moria Coleman's work on the four inventories of Helmingham Hall, compiled over five generations of the Tollemache family, offers a riveting glimpse into these cultural and social changes. Moreover, her meticulous research explains the events that likely led the family to inventory their possessions and make periodic changes to the home.

The inventories of Helmingham Hall in Suffolk are unique in part because there are four sequential records extant (1597, 1626, 1708, and 1741). In addition, the Suffolk house dates back more than five centuries and the inventories were produced by descendants of the founding family (xv). This alone would make the Helmingham Hall inventories a historian's treasure. But as Coleman rightly emphasizes, household inventories, while not as plentiful, differ significantly from probate inventories. The latter were required by law in order to assess value on a property and simply captured a fixed moment in time, while the former served to record the location of items and "could continue in use as a working document, recording the outcome of periodic stock-checks and amendments until superseded by a new version" (xix). Coleman notes that the motives for each of the four