police reports and gossip (which bestowed ordination on George Talbot, 9th Earl of Shrewsbury)—preclude the production of a definitive work. Slips are inevitable such as, in volume 1, the confusion of the Hampshire with the Oxfordshire Mapledurham (see the very useful index of places: each volume has an excellent introduction and a generous supply of appendices and indices), or the misreading of 'Curryer' as 'courier' for the trade of John Filby's father. Fr Anstruther should be congratulated, however, not only for his painstaking research and his generally high standards accuracy and judgement but also for

his vigorous attempts to enlist the aid of other scholars. The notes for volume 1 were issued in facsimile and worklists for the second were available. The response, however, seems to have been disappointing and it is to be hoped that of the reading public will be better. The four volumes (and the publication of the remaining two depends on the success of the present one) will form in themselves a sufficient library of post-Reformation Catholic history, one that should be with a sense of the past, be he Cathon the shelves of every Englishman olic or Protestant.

ALAN DAVIDSON

ROME AND CANTERBURY THROUGH FOUR CENTURIES, by Bernard and Margaret Pawley. *Mowbrays*, London, 1974. 395 pp. £7.50.

The ecumenical revolution of recent years doubtless demands a fresh look at the less cordial and more tentative contacts between churches in previous centuries, as well as some re-writing of our church histories. This book by Bernard and Margaret Pawley meets the former need and maintains an admirable balance as the authors wend their way through the troubles of the Restoration, the Anglican-Gallican contacts of the 18th century, the reunion societies of the Victorians and the Malines Conversations (on this last, their account is as useful as other ecumenical histories in book form and has more details). The concern to be fair is evident, though Catholic readers may feel that change is seen in too one-sided a manner, as Rome coming over to Canterbury; e.g., "What the Second Vatican Council set out to do in the twentieth century some of the provinces of the Church took it into their heads to do locally in the sixteenth' (p. 3); contemporary Catholic pluriformity is presented as 'the emergence in the Roman Church itself of the same polarities' as those of High and Low Church parties within the Church of England (p. 137).

I must confess to being puzzled as to why this urbane and readable history finishes with such an inadequate (and on small details sometimes inaccurate) account of Vatican II. Is it simply, my first suspicion, that the authors are not at ease with some post-conciliar developments (and so

there is an element of selectivity: 'The achievements of the Council, from an Anglican point of view, can be summarised as follows...', p. 343)? Or is it, a later thought, that this book represents an Anglican concern to stress the special relationship between our two communions, an attitude that does not easily escape an air of ecumenical aristocracy (apart from a brief reference to John Wesley, it is nowhere suggested that other British churches exercise an influence on Anglican-Catholic relations)?

The Pawleys are at their surest in the world of ecclesiastical diplomacy (in the best sense of this phrase) and are at home with the theological points in dispute since the Reformation. But as soon as ecumenical relationships become more than occasional meetings of an élite, the authors somehow lose their grip. This failure exposes the neglect of the so-called "nontheological factors" (e.g. of the class structures of church membership in Britain) and the white, educated and predominantly European presuppositions of our theological encounter with its tendency to envisage ecu-menical progress almost solely in terms of the diffusion from academic centres of a renewed theology.

This is not a bad book. Within the commonly-accepted view of the ecumenical task, it is a good and helpful book. But I suspect it does reveal, malgré lui, the limitations of these assumptions.

PETER HOCKEN