

Leonie James, ed. *The Household Accounts of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1635–1642*. Church of England Record Society 24. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2019. xliii + 277 pp. \$120.00. Review by NATHAN JAMES MARTIN, CHARLESTON SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY.

Leonie James has edited the household account records for William Laud for the years 1635–1642 and published them in a single volume as part of the Church of England Record Society series. James's accomplishment with this publication lies both in her recognition of the document as a valuable source for researchers on Laud and seventeenth-century church history and her editing of various portions of it which provide historical context for the record. As the author states: "the decision to publish this document was shaped by the belief that it has a lot to tell us about the nature of power and politics in seventeenth-century Britain" (xliii).

James's publication aligns well with the mission of the Church of England Record Society which was established in 1991 and seeks to advance historical awareness of the post-Reformation church in England. Prior to this publication, the society has published numerous source materials, including diaries, correspondences, sermons, letters, and other material relevant to sixteenth and seventeenth ecclesiastical study. More well-known figures (such as Laud), as well as lesser-known clerical figures, are represented in this collection. Interestingly, the society has, in 2017, published hitherto neglected correspondence of Laud, edited by Kenneth Fincham, a noted Laudian scholar and mentor to Leonie James. The present work, when considered in the context of Fincham's previous publication, represents a renewed interest in the archbishop, and one that is represented in the frequency of publication on Laud over the past several years.

Most of the recent scholarship on Laud has diverged in two directions. One focuses on his political life. Mark Perry has published articles reassessing the role of the cleric in the Parliaments of the late 1620s, for example. The other focuses on his personal affairs. Interestingly, a growing body of scholarship on the dream life of Archbishop Laud has emerged. Charles Carlton and others have contributed to this vein of scholarship. The publication of James's edition has relevance

for both recent modes of inquiry into Laudian study.

Newer scholarship on Laud has generally tended to advance and reassess the professional and private life of the man. For that reason, the household account document is of great value. As James herself notes, two traditional biographies on Laud by Hugh Trevor-Roper and Charles Carlton did not attempt to integrate these household account records into their works (xiii). Other studies make glancing mentions of the source, but no major effort to incorporate the data has yet emerged. Will this source fundamentally rewrite the narrative of William Laud? Probably not. There is, however, immense value in these account records, as it may help confirm or identify patterns and trends in Laud's career in the 1630s and add depth of understanding to his narrative.

Additionally, the publication of Laud's personal accounts coincides with a rising interest in the larger world of scholarship on domestic and material culture in the early modern period. As James relates, the trend of subject matter has been directed from more well-recognizable historical figures to a more wide-ranging study of household domesticity, focusing on servants and others appending households (often demanding an interdisciplinary approach), but this account does fit that general trend of the study of early modern household activity (xv).

Beyond the relevance to currents in contemporary scholarship, the work succeeds in its editing as well. James has effectively maintained a sense of uniformity in spelling, format, and grammar within the document. Since no standardized format had been regularized in early modern accounting practice, different account sources provide different formats of data. For example, some include income; other do not. Still, others may include running sums of expenditure. Despite these challenges, James has done well to approach the document from a "semi-diplomatic transcription," in seeking to reproduce the original as closely as possible (xix). In this, she strikes a balance between making the document readable and maintain the textual integrity of the original source.

James demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the document in her extensive introductory material. The editor provides a thorough discussion of the intricacies of Laud's household practice, from apparel preferences to the number of servants in the archbishop's service and

their liveries. Food purchases also relate much about the activity of the archbishop's household. A well-covered analysis on the importance of gift-giving in early modern practice and how that practice emerges within the document is included. Gifts, as James relates, was an expected and formalized system with the early modern context (xxxiii). James's context here provides accessibility and depth of knowledge of the *minutiae* of the personal life of William Laud.

Several of the portions of the accounts connect to larger and more macroscopic historical issues. For example, the violence and threat posed to Laud's household during 1640 and the dissolution of the Short Parliament is evidenced by changes in the accounts (xxx). Similarly, when plague came to London in 1636 to 1637, the archbishop removed his household to Croydon Palace for escape, and the shift is reflected in the accounts, too (xxxi). As James notes, the period 1640–1642 provide a clear correspondence between the failing status of the archbishop and his financial expenditures. One may observe a noticeable decline in the overall value of purchases in that late period before Laud's execution (xxxii).

The footnotes within the text of the main source clearly demonstrates James's extensive editing which provides ease and accessibility in working with the document. In a sense, this is a prosopographical work—the networks of individuals and servants surrounding the archbishop are of paramount concern in understanding the spending patterns and gift-giving during the period in question. Some of the footnotes relate to subjects who are more familiar—such as the footnote on Elizabeth of Bohemia (50) for whom Laud had provided books of study. Others are more obscure and necessarily required more extensive background research. But, James's inclusion of these footnotes increases the accessibility of the document and its contextual basis. The editor also includes a thorough appendix, nearly sixty pages in length, of brief biographical sketches of relevant individuals connected to the source. James also provides a shorter glossary in a second appendix of field-specific jargon, which too, creates broader approachability for this work.

Though the editor makes a strong case that this document has significant value to scholarship, James is also able to explain the limitations of the source. James notes, for example, that the scope

of the source is limited to seven years of Laud's career as archbishop; the first two years of his tenure as archbishop is not included. Also, the provenance of the document is 'unusual' (xiv). Located in the National Archives at Kew Gardens currently, the source only emerged in archival records in the early twentieth century; for many decades, the whereabouts of the document was uncertain. James posits that part of the hesitancy of scholars to utilize the source may be due to this fact (xiv). There are several *lacunae*, too—omissions of expenses in various places where expenditures were not recorded (xxviii).

James's work is primarily intended for the academic expert who has an interest in Laudian studies or the religious history of the seventeenth century. However, because of James's adroit editing and inclusion of contextual materials, any interested academic could approach this work and extract value from its contents. James is an expert on Laud and has written extensively on Laud's life and his religious policy in Scotland, and that knowledge has greatly benefited this publication. At face value, this source may seem somewhat mundane, but a closer look reveals a deeper and wide-ranging significance for the study of the seventeenth century.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'* Vol. 4: *Political Relations in the 14th–16th Centuries*. Translated by Andriy Kudla Wynnyckyj, Robert Frost and Yarosl Fedoruk, Consulting Editors, and Frank E Sysyn, Series Editor, with the assistance of Myroslav Yukevich. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press: 2017. \$119.95 Review by CAROL B. STEVENS, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

The publication by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's monumental *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in English translation (each volume with introductory essays, up-to-date bibliographic apparatus, glossaries, and addenda) is a long-term project nearing completion. The three volumes on the fourteenth-sixteenth century will have seen the light of day by October 2019. With the publication of the final volume—vol. 2, on the Kyivan period—anticipated in 2020, the modern, scholarly translation of Hrushevsky's entire 10 volume work will be complete.