

For example, and just to name three that M. highlights: *Lumen gentium*'s communion ecclesiology seems displaced by a return to a more juridical ecclesiology in *Apostolos suos* (1998) that denies episcopal conferences the fullness of their theological and juridical identity supported by an expansive understanding of episcopal collegiality. The 1983 Code of Canon Law (cc. 337.3, 338.1, 338.2) continues to understand an ecumenical council in such a way that the role of the bishops is overshadowed by the juridical rights of the papacy, and by the way c. 129 frames the sacred power of the ordained overstates the division between clerics and laity and does not incorporate the conciliar teaching on the *sensus fidelium*.

Fordham University, New York

CLAUDIO M. BURGALETA, S.J.

CUSHING, SPELLMAN, O'CONNOR: THE SURPRISING STORY OF HOW THREE AMERICAN CARDINALS TRANSFORMED CATHOLIC-JEWISH RELATIONS. By James Rudin. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans: 2012. Pp. x + 147. \$18.

Part memoir, part historical examination, part biography, Rabbi James Rudin's discussion of Jewish-Catholic relations during the 20th century offers a window into the world of three American cardinals who involved themselves in what R. argues was a "transformation" in theological perception. The three cardinals "gained a unique place in history because they were able to acknowledge . . . the truth of other religions, especially Judaism" (49). For R., Cardinals Francis Spellman and Richard Cushing were prime motivators for the adoption of the doctrine of Jewish brotherhood that emerged at Vatican II. Due to their authority and position, the public statements of Cushing and Spellman catalyzed the enfolding of a new doctrine into the psyche of ordinary Catholics. Cardinal John O'Connor, who was in a sense a theological son of these two early 20th-century prelates, implemented and carried out pastorally what both Spellman and Cushing argued for at Vatican II.

Unfortunately, with the arrival of John Connelly's source-based *From Enemy to Brother* (2012), R.'s tripartite hierarchical methodology comes off as lacking both in depth and impact. While R. argues about transformation, Connelly highlights revolution—a revolution that was not only prepared for, but reluctantly forced upon, Roman Catholic bishops by lay Catholic convert-theologians. The three cardinals under consideration were the pastoral products of a movement led by lay theologians in Europe during the late 1920s. Although R. places the ameliorative force of 20th-century Catholic-Jewish relations at the feet of a triumvirate of American cardinals, we might be better to think of their outward utterances and activities as being the fruit of the labor of earlier lay theologians who suffered the bumps and bruises of Catholic anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism during the 1930s.

In his writing about Cushing, Spellman, and O'Connor as beacons for Catholic transformation of attitudes toward Jews, R. has tied his narrative to the concept of Americanism. By this he does not mean the early-20th-century *soi-disant* heresy of Americanism, but the value-driven program of democracy and religious pluralism that was put forward to an immigrant church by its hierarchy. R. views this type of Americanism as the concept of "the right to spiritual self-definition" (48). By placing American assimilation at the core of how these three cardinals identified with and became sensitive to the importance of moving Catholic theology away from its anti-Judaic roots, R. has made a singular and important contribution.

R. also does well to show that Catholic-Jewish relations were dark and despicable up until Vatican II. One difficulty, however, is that R.'s account pays no attention to how this context of suspicion affected our prelates. While R. offers the reader much material about the post-Holocaust trajectory of the three prelates with respect to Catholic Jewish relations, there is little to nothing about their pre-World War II sentiments, context, and theological vision.

Spellman, of all three, holds the distinction of having lived and been educated within a fascist state; R., however, does not mention this. From 1925 to 1932, Spellman received his education and first working assignments while living in fascist Rome. The interplay between Spellman's Americanism and Mussolini's fascism would be an obvious and tantalizing investigation. One also wonders how Spellman processed the political situation within Italy amid the backdrop of an increasingly anti-Semitic state.

In the case of Cushing, pre-Vatican II Catholic views on Communism bear investigation. While all three prelates were staunchly anti-Communist, Cushing wrote more on the subject than the others did. While the bogeyman of Judeo-Bolshevism haunted prelates from Father Charles Coughlin in America to Pope Pius XII in Rome, we are left to wonder whether Cushing's early formation in anti-Communist theological doctrine had any bearing on his later turn toward the concept of Jewish brotherhood. R. aptly makes the case that prior to Vatican II many American Catholics subscribed to the Judeo-Bolshevist theory, but sadly we are lacking any description of the role that this force played in the careers of our three protagonists. Was Cushing's Vatican II attention to Jewish matters a renunciation of previously held theories, or simply an embrace of new doctrines?

Also unfortunate is the lack of any attention to Spellman's position as president of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association. Here, Vatican anti-Zionism played a key role. After 1948, this body argued vigorously on behalf of the Holy See for the United Nations to declare Jerusalem internationalized as a "holy city," thus allowing clear-cut and perpetual Catholic access to Roman Catholic holy sites. While the Holy See formally indicated indifference to the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, as Daniel Mandel has put it, for those occupying the offices

astride St. Peter's dome, even "Muslim control . . . was preferable to Jewish control of Jerusalem" (Daniel Mandel, *H.V. Evatt and the Establishment of Israel: The Undercover Zionist* [2004] 236).

Spellman played a crucial role. The Welfare Association's director during this period, Harry M. O'Connor, was a South Boston priest who had been freed-up by Cushing specifically to assist Spellman in thwarting Jewish control of the holy sites. "The fact is," O'Connor implored a Boston audience in May 1949, "Israel has no intention of giving up this territory, which she gained by force of arms, and to which she has no just claims" ("Israel Defies United Nations on Holy City," *Boston Daily Globe*, May 23, 1949). While anti-Zionism is distinct from anti-Judaism, Cushing and Spellman's tack from 1948 to 1950 was clearly to push against Jewish control of Jerusalem, albeit through surrogates.

This book can be counted as a useful companion piece to Connelly's larger treatment of the Jewish-Catholic revolution. It provides a decidedly clerical view, admirably showing how important churchmen adapted to and publicized the Catholic-Jewish turn toward brotherhood. Academics will find the lack of footnotes nettlesome.

*Boston College*

CHARLES GALLAGHER, S.J.

THE UNITY OF CHRIST: CONTINUITY AND CONFLICT IN PATRISTIC TRADITION. Christopher A. Beeley. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2012. Pp. xii + 408. \$50.

Beeley's latest book offers an important new reading of the trinitarian and christological debates from the third through the eighth centuries. B. chooses as his lens the theme of the unity of Christ: the understanding of Christ as a single, divine-human figure. This unity of Christ is opposed to dualizing tendencies that divorce the incarnate divine Son from the fullness of his humanity. This leads B. to some significant and even controversial reassessments of both personalities and theological positions during these formative centuries.

The pervading influence of Origen of Alexandria becomes a recurring theme throughout the work. Despite a dualizing cosmology and anthropology, Origen's positions would shape the understanding of the Son's single identity for centuries to come. In particular, Origen's teachings regarding the distinct hypostasis of the Son, the Son's divine nature in relation to the Father, the Son's mediatory role, and the importance of the incarnate Son's freedom would all become reference points for future theologians. Here B.'s attempt to downplay the subordinationist tendencies in Origen's trinitarian theology, though compelling, may require further reflection on the mediatory roles of the Son and the Spirit.