

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.

The key section of the book involves the “decentering of Athanasius” in the evaluation of fourth-century theology and beyond. Though certainly not the first to subject Athanasius to a severe critique, B. portrays him as the inventor of the Arian heresy and a confused purveyor of a dualist Christology. This harsh assessment forces the Alexandrian bishop to step aside and allows neglected figures to take the stage. In this way a new theological narrative emerges that follows the thread of Origen’s legacy in the understanding of the unity of Christ.

For B., the true constructive influence during this period was Eusebius of Caesarea, a figure long undervalued as a theologian. At the heart of all of Eusebius’s works is the confession of Christ’s divinity and the incarnate Christ as the basis of true theology. In particular, in his refutation of Marcellus, Eusebius highlighted the unity of Christ, in which the human existence of the Word is one with the life of the divine Word. In championing this reading of Eusebius, B. is even ready to justify problematic passages regarding the Word’s absence from Christ’s human body on the cross as “part of Eusebius’s concern to explain Christianity to a pagan audience” (94).

B.’s reading of Athanasius deserves close scrutiny. Athanasius, he asserts, held a *Logos* theology that led to a dualizing conception of Christ that effectively separated the divine Word from his humanity: there was no room for a functioning human being in Athanasius’s Christology. Some of B.’s related critiques are not new—for instance, that Athanasius failed to take into account the soul and mind of Christ—but these supposed weaknesses have found compelling responses in the works of Kahled Anatolios and others. Furthermore, B. describes Athanasius’s understanding of “deification” as a “dehumanization” in which Christ’s humanity—and therefore also ours—is delivered from anything recognizably human. Is this really what Athanasius meant by man “being made Word”?

This shift of key players and positions on the stage—from Athanasian dualism to the more unitive position of Eusebius—allows for a refocused reading of later developments. In particular, B. highlights the major positive contributions of Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria. Gregory stressed the single divine existence of the Son even after the incarnation, the acceptance of Christ’s human suffering into the divine life, and the importance of Christ’s human will. These teachings would become major influences on the thought of Cyril, whose preference for single-nature language finds its roots in Gregory. Cyril’s dualistic deviations from Gregory, such as his acceptance of the impassability of the Word in Christ’s suffering, result from an appropriation of Athanasius in a self-defense against accusations of theopaschitism.

Other figures and councils find themselves subjected to B.’s detailed reassessment, including some fine treatments of Leo the Great, Leontius

of Byzantium and Maximus the Confessor. This fascinating attempt to shake up conventional narratives of these centuries through a focused reading and a new selection of authorities will give new life to many areas of contemporary scholarship beyond B.'s main theme. For instance, the concept of deification recurs throughout the book, from Athanasius's supposed "dehumanization" to Gregory of Nazianzus's gradual participation in the divine nature. How, one may ask, does the understanding of the unity of Christ affect the understanding of *theosis* during these centuries?

B. has written an important work that scholars and graduate students will be discussing for years to come. I highly recommend it.

College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA

JOHN GAVIN, S.J.

TRENT: WHAT HAPPENED AT THE COUNCIL. By John W. O'Malley. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2013. Pp. 335. \$27.95.

Readers of O'Malley's *What Happened at Vatican II* will find in his latest volume a work that is equally masterful. Until now there has been no accessible and critical history in English of the Council of Trent apart from the monumental four-volume history by Hubert Jedin, only two of which have been translated into English. O'M. acknowledges his debt to Jedin, but draws also on recent research that goes beyond the limitations of Jedin's work. While these secondary sources are cited throughout, it is above all O'M.'s close reading of the primary sources that makes his book a work of outstanding scholarship in its own right. Despite the complexity of the issues he is summarizing—"I gambol blithely through minefields" (11)—O'M. presents a compelling account of a council that came to shape Catholicism uniformly for 400 years, albeit through misunderstandings and myths that O'M. is intent on exposing.

The conciliar meetings took place over 18 years from 1545 to 1563 in three distinct periods, during the pontificates of three different popes. Participation by bishops was a shifting affair—out of a possible 700 bishops worldwide, attendance numbers ranged from 15 to 200. The council's decrees were promulgated in pairs, one on a doctrinal issue, another a reform decree on some disciplinary issue. The popes never attended, but controlled things from Rome via their legates, who alone could present agenda items. The Protestant Reformation of course set the immediate context, but O'M. places his narrative within a longer context, devoting the first two (of six) chapters to a discussion of the previous century, examining its set of "reform councils," with their desire for "reform of the head," the papacy, and raising the specter of conciliarism and ongoing papal suspicion of councils. Yet, mainly for political reasons, Paul III finally succeeds in getting the council started. Throughout his narrative of the