

tried to create an absolute monarchy in England for the benefit of his Dutch son-in-law whom he disliked' (p. 197). Well, let us not be absolute for defining the absolute, but kings with an exalted sense of their office do not always stoop to consider that they 'dislike' their probable successors. This argument carries force only if we assume that the 'grand design' of catholicity was the *sole* aim of James' policy to which all else was ordered—and that is precisely the thesis it is meant to prove. The book's tendency is to blur slightly the distinction between the predominant and the exclusive.

What is wrong with that Whig tradition which Macaulay represents? It is a philosophy of success rather than justice or just success (witness Trevelyan's revealing remark that had not Parliament triumphed decisively in 1688 'England could neither have been strongly governed at home, nor have maintained her sea-power, world-wide trade and Empire in the

face of the growing power of France'); and it fails in the imaginative effort to see why men might have supported the king (they were not all fools or rogues)—the monarchy, by the very distance from the 'political nation' which its tradition and prerogative rights conferred, could counterbalance the more narrowly sectional interests of Parliament. Lastly, it has no sense of the ambiguity of that word 'freedom' whereby it must include both the bare scope for the action of individual agents and the power that enables men to perform what they ought. The last popish king of England perhaps knew that. At least he was not, like the doctrinally generous 'church papists' of his day (and ours?), one who 'would make a bad martyr and a good traveller, for his conscience is so large he could never wander from it, and in Constantinople would be circumcised with a mental reservation'.

AIDAN NICHOLS, O.P.

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE: THE WORK OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION, edited by Alan C. Clark and Colin Davey. *O.U.P.*, London, 1974. 129 pp. £1 (paper).

PARTNERS IN MISSION: ANGLICAN CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL SECOND MEETING, Dublin, Ireland, 17–27 July 1973. *S.P.C.K.*, London, 1973. 94 pp. 60p.

Two unexciting but no doubt necessary additions to the documentation sections of ecclesiastical libraries. The scope of the former is disappointingly limited, containing neither an account of the extent to which the Preparatory Commission's recommendations, especially the Malta Report of 1968, have found acceptance and implementation within the two communions, nor any evaluation of its influence on its successors, the A.R.C. International Commission. It is wholly documentary, with Colin Davey's description of the meetings and publication for the first time of some of the key papers; inevitably at that stage, these lack the rigour and detail of the work done later for A.R.C.I.C., from which came the two Agreed Statements, and seem somewhat tame, a preliminary kick-about before the game proper got under way.

*Partners in Mission* documents the second meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council (Dublin 1973) established as a result of Lambeth 1968. Unlike some international Church gatherings, the A.C.C. does not restrict its agenda to any one theme, and so here can be found accounts of present Anglican law, practice and/or attitudes on such questions as polygamy and monogamy, the ordination of women, liturgical revision, and the W.C.C.

programme to combat racism, as well as an admirably concise memorandum on Confirmation by Professor Fairweather (pp. 44–46). For Catholic readers, it may be instructive to see how a world-wide communion of autonomous provinces functions collegially, and for the English provides a corrective to the tendency to identify the Anglican Communion and the Church of England.

Both books illustrate the regular over-emphasis on bilateral dialogue in official statements on ecumenism, and the corresponding neglect of significant development at the local level. Whilst Dr McAdoo's Malta paper on three possible stages to full organic unity notes that 'the theological and practical steps must . . . be regarded as part of one operation', the latter are seen as consequent to the former, and the possibility is not seriously envisaged that pioneering groups may precede the rest of the Church on the road to organic union, and that the experience of such groups must be an important source for the reflection of theologians. *Partners in Mission* does recognise at various points that the practical may precede the theological, but illustrates the advantage held in such relatively brief conferences by what was on the agenda last time.

PETER HOCKEN