

than Easter. Decline then ensued, particularly after the Second Vatican Council, whose local impact is portrayed as ‘a source of contention and disarray’. Although Middlesbrough is initially offered as a microcosm of English Catholicism, the story is told with the aid of few metrics, so its representativeness of other dioceses is never really demonstrated. The author’s principal interest lies in the transformation of Catholic devotional and liturgical practice by manifestations of revivalism and renewal which she deems normally associated with Protestantism. Much is made at the outset of the ‘radical new insights’ which arise from ‘placing ... Roman Catholicism within the Evangelical spectrum’, but they eluded this reviewer. Part of the problem is that the analytical framework inevitably becomes submerged within the book’s chronological structure. The five chapters are divided according to significant Catholic dates, starting with the first Relief Act and ending with the retirement of Bishop Augustine Harris in 1992. The chief merit of this approach is that it brings out changes in policy and resourcing priorities following the appointment of each new bishop (or Vicar Apostolic before the restoration of the hierarchy in 1850). Lack of systematic treatment of the diocese during the First and Second World Wars is a disappointment. Befitting its origin as a 2012 Nottingham PhD thesis, a wide range of archival and printed sources has been utilised, albeit there is far less recourse to oral history than in Alana Harris’s *Faith in the family* (2013), a comparable study of grassroots Catholic life in the diocese of Salford for 1945–82. Turnham has made a valuable contribution to Catholic historiography but perhaps does not sufficiently connect with wider scholarly debates about the place of religion in modern Britain, thereby restricting her readership.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

CLIVE D. FIELD

*Archbishop Howley, 1828–1848*. By James Garrard. (The Archbishops of Canterbury Series.) Pp. xv + 172. Farnham–Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2015. £60. 978 1 4724 5133 0

*JEH* (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046916000191

This is the fifth title in Ashgate’s new *Archbishops of Canterbury* series and the first study of a nineteenth-century archbishop. Compared to Tait, Benson or even the first Evangelical archbishop, John Bird Sumner, Howley is little known yet his working life spanned a crucial period in Church and State encompassing both the major period of church reform and the formative years of the Oxford Movement. Bishop of London from 1813 to 1828 and then archbishop until 1848, Howley lacked a nineteenth-century biographer perhaps because his reputation suffered at the hands of Whig politicians and the coolness of the Tractarians. He was also a shy man with a poor speaking voice and presence. James Garrard rescued him from relative obscurity in his Oxford DPhil thesis in 1992 and the subsequent article in the new *ODNB*. Seen by many politicians and others as a reactionary cleric out of tune with the ‘Age of Improvement’, Howley was in time converted to the need for significant church reform and chaired the Ecclesiastical Commission throughout the 1830s and ’40s as well as pushing through the reform of cathedrals which sounded the death knell of ‘Basset’. Garrard’s reassessment outlines these activities in a scholarly and clear way utilising all the available

primary and secondary sources. It is further demonstration of the influence that the old High Church party exercised in the early nineteenth century through its links with government, influential laity, its patronage networks and its concern to defend the role of the Church in education. Although reticent in spirituality and firmly wedded to Establishment and the Church's role within it, once galvanised the 'high and dries' were capable both of spearheading reform and carrying it through. The chapter on the Oxford Movement is also enlightening as it gives us, unusually, the 'view from Lambeth' where Howley's chaplain Benjamin Harrison was a Tractarian sympathiser in contact with the leaders and so bridging both worlds. Despite its relative brevity this is a concise and scholarly study which, despite its specific focus, does not lose sight of the wider context. About a third of the book consists of primary sources: Howley's Charges, his provincial Letter on ritualism and some of his speeches in the House of Lords relating to parliamentary reform and education. This is a fine addition to what will be a helpful series. Garrard has shown that the usual tepid assessment of Howley's primacy is misplaced.

UNIVERSITY OF KENT

PERRY BUTLER

*Religious life in mid-19th century Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire. The returns for the 1851 census of religious worship.* Edited by David M. Thompson. (Cambridgeshire Records Society, 21.) Pp. viii + 275 incl. 5 maps and 23 tables. Cambridge: Cambridgeshire Records Society, 2014. £27 (paper). 978 0 904323 23 8

*JEH* (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046916000476

This volume provides transcripts of returns of the 1851 Census of Religious Worship for the geographical counties of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, and notes patrons of Anglican livings, dedications of parish churches, references to Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* or Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses* for Anglican clergy, and any other livings that they held, dissenting ministers' occupations from the relevant county directories, and parishes' populations in 1851. Tables for each registration district list numbers of churches and returns, and total numbers of sittings, and morning, afternoon and evening average attendance of congregations and scholars for each denomination, and for each county by denomination and registration district. This is the eighteenth volume of returns for (so far almost entirely rural) counties to be published since 1975. David Thompson first wrote about the Census in 1978, so his introduction represents mature reflection on the debates since Kenneth Inglis's article 'Patterns of religious worship in 1851' (this *JOURNAL* xi [1960], 74–86) about how the returns may be read to assess the numerical strength of denominations in terms of church attendance. Thompson's judicious introductory review and evaluation of this literature should be essential reading for all future researchers on the Census. His excellent detailed discussion of the Church and nonconformity and the relative strengths of denominations in the counties, informed by knowledge of their social and economic context, should also provide a model for future editors of such volumes in providing a broader assessment of the significance