

proceed to The Composition (Chapter 5). A closely reasoned analysis of the text of the *Didache* serves to distinguish two redactions of the work by the same author: these are termed D 1 and D 2. Further, we are treated to a very able discernment of an intervening gospel composition *between* D 1 and D 2; the *Didache* would then depend on a tradition *related* to Matthew, but does not know our Matthew. More on this fascinating aspect appears in Chapter 6 (The Sources). We can only stop to draw attention to a pre-history of the 'Duae Viae' (p. 158), and a rearrangement of the now threadbare arguments of Connolly and others. Our author's solution *par une chance inattendue* finds confirmation from the Qumrân Manual of Discipline.

The last chapters cover the date and place of origin, and the history of the document in antiquity. The conclusion is that the *Didache* probably saw the light in Antioch somewhere between 50 and 70 A.D.

Among many points of interest and value, let us just note: the doxology of the Our Father is in D 1 (Did. 8.2), i.e. before any gospel; and the Trinitarian formula for baptism is also in D 1 (Did. 7.1). These and like points should make us think anew about New Testament times and teaching. A valuable book, and *opus facile princeps* on the *Didache*.

ROLAND POTTER, O.P.

THE EMERGENCE OF LIBERAL CATHOLICISM IN AMERICA. By R. D. Cross. (Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press; 45s.)

This readable yet weighty book describes the rise of 'Americanism'—with or without heretical overtones—with special emphasis on the life and times of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland. It is, very rightly and properly, fattest in the middle and tapers off at the edges. The chapters that sketch in the European background of liberal Catholicism, the European (including the Roman) response to developments in America, and the epilogue in America itself, are little more than outlines. But the central part of the story is told in full, on the solid foundation of eighty-eight pages of bibliography and notes. I retain from it four main impressions.

First, how right both the conservatives and liberals were, and how necessary to the development of the Church. From one point of view, a conservative—if extreme, an integralist—Catholic is one who takes the Protestant side in the debate on the consequences of original sin. Human nature is fundamentally corrupt, and all social developments not directly inspired and guided by the Church are to be regarded with the deepest suspicion. The liberal takes the Catholic side. Human nature is imperfect, but not fundamentally unsound. It is therefore reasonable to welcome, and use for the Church's account, attempts like those of modern democratic society to advance the growth of

human personality on the common ground of natural morality. *Extra ecclesiam*, the conservative is liable to emphasize, *nulla salus*, whereas the liberal more easily admits that the Spirit works through non-Catholic as well as Catholic channels. On this point of *extra ecclesiam* Dr Cross quotes some interesting comments from both the liberal and the conservative side. But on the other hand it is above all the conservative who is conscious that the Church is founded on that stable and nobbly thing, a Rock. The liberal who wishes to build high, wide, and swiftly has sometimes to be told to watch his foundations. Or, in what has as a matter of fact, in one phrasing or another, been a favourite metaphor of American liberal Catholics—Dr Cross quotes various samples—the Church needs brakemen as well as (locomotive) engineers. The liberal Catholic's initiative can range far and fast, just because it is safeguarded by the teaching authority of the Church, which conservatives take it as their task to ensure is not forgotten.

But, secondly, at the time Dr Cross describes neither liberals nor conservatives in America had worked their philosophy out. If liberal and conservative Catholicism both contain part of the truth, it follows that the best sort of liberalism will be rather conservative and the best sort of conservatism rather liberal. In the Church today I suppose the Dutch best represent conservatism with the right sort of liberal tinge. Like liberals, they embrace the modern world with both hands. And they insist, as good conservatives, that the Church shall advance into this world not in open order, scattered and intermingled with the enemy, but in a solid phalanx of Catholic parties, unions, radio stations, technical colleges and co-ops, presenting a bristling array to outsiders and holding each individual Catholic firmly in the ranks. Liberalism with a conservative stamp, on the other hand, would be the view of those in the Anglo-Saxon countries or, often, in France who prefer to see Catholics operating on their own, in open order, as participants in neutral movements, but recognize that they can do this fruitfully only with the help of intensive individual training in Catholic Action; plus that much greater frequency of directives from Pope and Bishops to which we have grown accustomed since Leo XIII. In Dr Cross's narrative we can see these ways of thinking taking shape, but as yet, by the end of the nineteenth century, only in embryo form. His conservatives are still very often plain reactionaries, aware of the need to fortify the Rock but not yet convinced that it should be used as a base to advance into new territory. His liberals see not only the need to advance into new territory but also the value, precisely for their liberal enterprises, of the increasingly firm guidance given them from Rome. But while appreciating and learning to use modern trends in secular culture, they have not yet learnt how to train their own

followers to give their contribution to that culture a characteristically Catholic stamp. It has been almost as true of American as of British Catholics that their contribution to social movements is negative, a question of preventing error rather than of promoting truth. To prevent error—to avoid, for instance, revolutionary or class-war policies in the labour movement—is of course essential. But it falls far short of the ideal of positively promoting Christian ideals in public life.

Thirdly, there is a word for missionary churches on the advantages of obscurity. The Church in America was able, thanks to its insignificance in the general Catholic scheme of things, to work out a novel and experimental approach to modern society without the alarms and excursions experienced by liberal Catholics in, notably, France. This approach was already well-developed when American Catholics began to attract world-wide attention and, in some quarters, suspicion: and by that time they were well able to defend what they were doing. They were warned in *Longinqua Oceani* against possible excesses, but subject to this were left to pursue their way in peace. Is the lesson that, if we in our time wish to see what new things will characterize the Church tomorrow, we should look for them in the missions rather than in France, Holland, or even, today, the United States?

Fourthly, Dr Cross is a Protestant. Occasionally this is apparent in a phrase or interpretation that surprises a Catholic reader. A Catholic author would have seen more clearly that what might be called 'Lourdes and all that'—the devotional movement of the nineteenth century, preceding the liturgical movement of the twentieth—is as much a part of the freshening-up of the Church in the last century as is the work of the liberal Catholics. But slips like this are only occasional. One of the best contributions in recent years towards mutual understanding between Protestants and Catholics is the study by scholars on either side of the institutions of the other. Those who want an account in English of the social action of the Protestant churches find themselves referred to the work of Catholics such as Shanahan or Duff. It is all to the good that Catholics who are concerned with a vital phase of the growth of the Church in America should in turn be referred to this solid and impartial study by the Protestant Dr Cross.

MICHAEL P. FOGARTY

THE ILLUMINATED BOOK; ITS HISTORY AND PRODUCTION. By David Diringer. (Faber; £6 6s.)

For most of the centuries covered by this book the most common representation of God is one in which he holds a book in his hand; a book, not a sceptre, is the normal attribute of the medieval vision of Christ in majesty. In a largely illiterate society the written word of God