

ways, the Reformation was overwhelmingly rejected after seventy years of tacit civil resistance interspersed with rebellions of increasingly massive proportions culminating in a Nine Years War in which Ireland became a theatre in the international struggle between the forces of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation.

The criticism is that William's rather bland narrative fails to engage with either of these questions. This is not the place to do so either. Suffice it to say, as I have argued at length elsewhere (Bradshaw and Peter Roberts (eds) *British consciousness and identity*, CUP, 1998) that the key to the solution is found in two considerations. One is that the Tudors, lacking a local bureaucracy, were utterly dependent, at such a remote distance from the centre, on the local élites in Wales and Ireland to implement their religious policy. The second is that the revolution in the Church throughout the Tudor dominions was introduced in association with a revolution in the state, the so-called 'Tudor Revolution' in government, which hugely benefited the Welsh socio-political élite while seriously disadvantaging the socio-political élite in Ireland. Accordingly the Welsh élite were predisposed to act as instruments of the Crown's religious reform programme as well as its political one, while their counterparts in Ireland became increasingly averse as the uncongenial aspects of the reform package came to the fore.

'Study problems not periods' Lord Acton advised the historian. It is advice that Glanmore Williams would have done well to follow in this instance. As it is, nevertheless, he leaves us greatly in his debt once more for what is undoubtedly the best survey of the Reformation in Wales to date.

Brendan Bradshaw, Queens' College, Cambridge.

*RENDER UNTO CAESAR: CHURCH PROPERTY IN ROMAN CATHOLIC AND ANGLICAN CANON LAW* by JOSEPH FOX (ed), Pontifical University of St Thomas Aquinas, Rome, 2000, xi + 152 pp (£15 including postage, obtainable from the Centre for Law and Religion, Cardiff University, Law Building, Museum Avenue, PO Box 427, Cardiff CFI 1XD).

Whilst we may debate whether Jesus owned any property other than the clothes that he wore, the Church in carrying out her message requires recourse to property. As a device by which Christian communities can organise themselves, and as a device by which unity amongst Christians can be fostered, it is surprising that the canon law systems dealing with the property régimes of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches have been so scantily treated.

These may have been the thoughts in the minds of a number of Roman Catholic and Anglican canonists who met in Rome at a *colloquium* organised by the Pontifical University of St Thomas Aquinas and Cardiff University's Centre for Law and Religion in April 1999 to discuss issues relating to Church property. The fruits of their labour form this book, which aims to provide a critical examination into Church property in canon law and, perhaps more crucially, an ecumenical dialogue on the same. To that end, the essays in this book elucidate the different systems of property holding, trusteeship, responsibility, liability, and authority in Anglican and Roman Catholic traditions. The essays provide contemporary and historical perspectives, and look at theoretical as well as more practical issues, such as the property régimes which pertain to the contents of churches, sources of funding, and parish quotas. The collection concludes, fittingly, with an examination of the ecumenical use of Church buildings.

Robert Ombres launches the book with an instruction in approach, providing a suggested methodology which may assist the reader in assimilating the book's different canon law perspectives. His threefold structure for placing Anglican and Roman Catholic canon law in context is of particular interest, not just as a comparative tool, but also for the way it aligns the practical starting blocks of the debate alongside larger jurisprudential and theological questions. As Christians, what is our shared heritage? What do we find when we compare our canonical systems? Where can we co-operate and at what points can we converge and move forward together?

It is not surprising that there is much to be shared, particularly jurisprudentially, between Roman Catholic and Anglican canon law in relation to their respective property régimes. What is remarkable is the very breadth of property which falls within Church responsibility. Beyond the obvious examples of freehold and leasehold property such as places of worship, churchyards, burial grounds, church halls and presbyteries, there are also chattels, which include, for example, Church registers and records, fixtures and fittings, donations, collections, stipends and pensions. Just how do the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches manage all these myriad forms of property, let alone act as a good disciple in their respect? One does not have to look too far between the lines of these essays to come to the conclusion that the answer to the former question lies in over determined legalist regulation, whilst the answer to the latter is still being resolved. Reading this collection of stimulating essays, one is left with an abiding image of the intricacy of terminology, conventions and legal rules; of the social organisation of the Church and how complex that organisation is; of how deeply embedded the different traditions are; and how the different canonical systems must have to juggle their conventions and philosophies with secular rules. Moreover, lest one think that a book on Church property in comparative canon law is little more than a lesson in legal history, the essays show that Church ownership of property, the choices it makes in how it runs itself, and how it distributes its resources, has the potential for a major impact on contemporary society. This is not just as a reflection of its practical theology, but also more economically, for example as an employer, educator, provider of some government services, and economic contributor.

One of the dominant themes of all the essays in this book is that of stewardship. The principle of stewardship is common to theologians, canonists and property lawyers alike. Jesus's counsel in Luke 16: 9–12 is one that can easily be read into trustee obligations, particularly their fiduciary duties. The other themes in the essays, for example accountability, responsibility and liability, can all be viewed as subsets of this one overarching proposition. Little is said, however, of stewardship in any of the essays beyond the assertion that it is a predominant theme. This reader would have liked to have seen a more explicit analysis of stewardship in the context of Anglican and Roman Catholic canon law in a manner beyond description of codes, principles or common practice. For example, how does the principle of stewardship in the Anglican and Roman Catholic systems affect the requirement of Church trustees to invest Church funds in a manner which satisfies secular law, but which is in accordance with Church teaching? How does stewardship play out in canon law in regard to those Church properties whose principal fund-raising is a result of the use of the property as a tourist site? Similarly, chancel liability is a much debated issue in English property law, but little mention is made of it in this book, even though it is a good example of a Church stewardship tradition intersecting with secular property law principles.

There is much food for thought in these essays. The exploration and juxtaposition of the different canon law systems provide insights into Church regulation hitherto

unconsidered. The plea for clarity in terminology evident in some of the essays shows the canonists grappling with the complexity of the arena and attempting to forge forward in their understanding of how the systems may converge. The major shortcoming of this book is that it does not appear to have a strong sense of its purpose or its audience. This reader was left questioning whether the comparative element was meant to be anything other than implicit. Parallels and antitheses are not explicitly drawn between the canonical systems, nor is their shared heritage, comparison or points of co-operation and convergence clearly identified. Whilst some essays are highly analytical, others are no more than descriptive of a particular area. Not all areas under consideration had parallel treatment in the different Anglican and Roman Catholic systems. In terms of the book's audience, those with a working knowledge of one system or another, or with an understanding of secular property law, may feel a sense of frustration at the repetition of basic property law points, secular or canon law based, across the essays. Of course, the first criticism may be symptomatic of the infancy of this area of comparative canon law as it pertains to Church property. One may also argue that the latter criticism could be levelled at any comparative law project. Nevertheless, the collection of essays does not hang systematically together at a level beyond *colloquium* proceedings.

One gets a sense that the participants and the authors of this collection of essays not only learnt a great deal at the *colloquium*, but also took part in a highly original and innovative discussion and sharing of ideas. Some of their enthusiasm is conveyed in this book, but the fullness of the debate itself is not. Overall, this reader could not help but feel that this book is a but a hint of what the *colloquium* must have been: a very exciting movement towards unity. That said, this is a fascinating collection of essays which will hopefully prove to be the genesis of an emerging comparative canon law tradition, a movement which has enormous potential. This book is compulsive reading not just for canon lawyers, but also for anyone with a broad interest in ecumenism, the contemporary Church, comparative law, property law, or legal history.

Alison Dunn, Newcastle Law School

*THE DIOCESAN REVIVAL IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND c 1800–1870* by ARTHUR BURNS, *Oxford Historical Monographs*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1999, xiv + 344 pp (Hardback £48) ISBN 0-19-820784-0.

This book, which originated in a doctoral thesis, is an ample tribute to the author's lengthy and detailed research undertaken during 1987–88, but it is also an attempt to bring a new perspective on the impact of the Oxford Movement and the Ecclesiastical Commission upon the nineteenth-century Church of England. The book divides essentially into two parts. The opening and closing chapters form the first, in which is introduced, set out and then summarised and concluded the primary argument—that during the first seventy years of the nineteenth century the Established Church underwent a process of extensive reform sufficient to be described as a 'Diocesan Revival'. The central chapters form the second, in which eight different areas of diocesan life of the period that demonstrate the argument are examined in turn. This reviewer would strongly recommend returning to the first and last chapters since the arguments therein are densely packed and are difficult to follow upon first reading. But the story is fleshed out by what follows and there is much of interest and enjoyment to be had.

The first evidence of early diocesan reform is to be had in the revival and development of the episcopal visitation, particularly in the 1830s. New emphasis was placed