

legacy of the book in a succinct and unambiguous way: “In the strict sense there is no legacy,” a conclusion that reflects the absence of any “school” committed to furthering B.’s ideas. Does that mean, then, that the book is merely a nineteenth-century curiosity, one likely to appeal only to those interested in exploring the impact of Hegelian thought on one of the significant thinkers in the German Protestant tradition?

Hodgson’s introductory essay brings B. into relief as “a theologian of history,” rather than “a historian of theology.” In so doing, Hodgson makes a case for the enduring relevance of B. as someone willing to grapple with the reality of God’s movement in history, a movement that did not terminate in the nineteenth century. That explicitly theological grappling distinguished B. from both Schleiermacher and Hegel, who were nonetheless formative influences on him, but whom he judged to have been insufficiently attentive to history, particularly to the history of Jesus.

In relation to “dogma,” B. affirmed its value as a way to articulate the Christian “idea” or “principle,” but also understood the history of dogma to be ongoing, not subject to control by either what he regarded as Catholic authoritarianism or Protestant intellectualism. B.’s approach to dogma, then, differed from later scholars such as David Frierich Strauss and Adolph von Harnack, who are more representative of the later triumph of what Hodgson groups together as “Neo-Kantianism, pragmatism, and empiricism.” Indeed, Hodgson argues that B. can be read as anticipating what Paul Tillich would make famous in the twentieth century as “the Protestant principle,” the refusal to limit the movement of God’s Spirit on the basis of what suited the church or the prevailing intellectual fashion. Although the Spirit was not to be contrasted with dogma, dogma could not contain the Spirit.

Ironically, B.’s efforts to construct a theology of history might speak to the contemporary Catholic experience more so than they did to Catholics in the nineteenth century. This is because the movement of God’s Spirit in the vicissitudes of history and context is today more central to the considerations of Catholic theologians, and the struggles of the Catholic community as a whole, than could have been imaginable in B.’s own time. While Catholics are most unlikely to appropriate all aspects of B.’s analysis of dogma, what remains appealing in his work is his commitment to a faith that takes history seriously as the venue for God’s action.

Richard Lennan

Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

Mexican Exodus: Emigrants, Exiles, and Refugees of the Cristero War. By Julia G. Young. New York: Oxford University, 2015. Pp. xii +271. \$74.

Young presents the first transnational study of Mexico’s Cristero War, which erupted in 1926 when President Plutarco Elías Calles enforced anticlerical statutes of the 1917 Mexican Constitution. The war raged for three years until Catholic officials of Mexico, the Vatican, and the United States reached an agreement with the Mexican government to end hostilities. However, since during the Cristero conflict military leaders and

activists—and of course the foot soldiers who were largely peasants—were excluded from these negotiations, sporadic guerilla warfare continued in various locales over the following decade. Previous studies have examined the influence of this church–state conflict in Mexico. Y. contributes significantly to this literature through her exploration of how those who fled to the United States remained linked to their homeland, continued to advocate for their cause, and shaped the formation of ethnic Mexican communities in places like El Paso, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

There is much to commend in this excellent study. While generally sympathetic to the Cristeros, Y. avoids presenting a one-sided history. She points out that Cristeros were at times perpetrators of atrocities, even as many were valiant martyrs for their faith. She also notes the factions among Cristero supporters in the United States, particularly between those who respectively advocated for conciliatory and militaristic strategies. With regard to the latter, she delves into the structural obstacles facing those who sought to supply arms or instigate rebellion on the Mexican side of the border. Mitigating factors included the overwhelming superiority of Mexican regular forces in comparison to small bands of émigré volunteers, the surveillance of Mexican and US agents, and, after the 1929 accords, the call for a truce from Mexican and Vatican bishops.

One minor flaw is that Y. might have been clearer about the biases of some sources. For example, she cites at some length a confidential letter from a Mexican informant in Los Angeles to the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations, informing him that the Knights of Columbus, priests, and “an innumerable amount of dissidents” were stockpiling arms and “preparing a military uprising that will be aimed primarily at Nogales, maybe at Ojinaga, and at Baja California” (121). But there is no corroborating evidence for this claim, nor does Y. assess whether this threat corresponded to any actual military actions of this sort. Similarly, citations about the “fanaticism” (37, 81) of Mexican Catholics from anthropologist Manuel Gamio’s landmark 1920s interviews and study of Mexican immigrants need to be assessed in light of his racial and class assumptions about the project of the modern Mexican nation state.

This is but a small quibble relative to the major achievement of Y.’s superb scholarship: her demonstration of how formative the Cristero War was for Mexican exiles and their descendants in the United States, even down to the present day. She enhanced her extensive archival research with six thorough interviews of Cristero descendants whose testimonies reveal the memory and influence of the armed struggle of Mexican Catholics to defend their faith. The book’s epilogue underscores the ongoing public engagement and debate about the Cristeros in recent canonizations of Cristero martyrs, the 2012 film *For Greater Glory*, and attempts to link current religious liberty debates in the United States with the Cristero legacy.

Readers of this journal might find most useful Y.’s attention to the public ritual and devotion of Cristero exiles, particularly the links between faith and patriotism in their veneration of Christ the King and Our Lady of Guadalupe. While understandably liturgical history was not Y.’s primary purview, the short time-lapse between Pope Pius XI’s promulgation of the feast of Christ the King in 1925 and the outbreak of the Cristero War the following year provides an important arena for further study of the development of this feast. Theologians will also find useful Y.’s treatment of the

popular devotion to Toribio Romo, a priest martyred during the Cristero War whom Pope John Paul II canonized in 2000. Y. notes the shrines to Santo Toribio in his native Santa Ana de Guadalupe, in Jalisco, as well as in Chicago, Los Angeles, and other US locales. She also examines his emergence in recent decades as “the unofficial patron saint of Mexican emigrants” (157). More broadly, she convincingly argues that “the Cristero War comprises an integral, deeply felt part of Mexican American popular religiosity” (180). By this she means that memories of the sacrifice their families and friends made for their Catholic faith have shaped the lives of ethnic Mexicans in the United States for nearly a century. Theologians who examine Latino/a popular Catholicism as a *locus theologicus* and desire to further investigate Y.’s insightful claim will find in this volume a crucial point of departure for their endeavors.

Timothy Matovina
University of Notre Dame

Mannix. By Brenda Niall. Melbourne: Text, 2015. Pp 439. \$25.85.

Daniel Mannix was the third Archbishop of Melbourne in Australia. He was appointed from Ireland as Coadjutor Archbishop in 1912, succeeded to the see in 1917, and died in office in 1963 in his hundredth year. He was born in the year in which the Syllabus of Errors was published, six years prior to the First Vatican Council. He died after the beginning of the Second Vatican Council, commanding the stage until the end.

The first half of Mannix’s life was spent in Ireland, the second half in Melbourne. From his parents’ substantial tenant farm in County Cork, Mannix was educated by the Sisters of Mercy, the Irish Christian Brothers, and in secondary schools in which Latin was taught. To study for the priesthood he entered Royal Saint Patrick’s College, Maynooth, an institution originally supported by the British Government in an attempt to keep Irish clerics away from French Revolutionary influences. After ordination he taught philosophy and was professor of moral theology at Maynooth where he was appointed vice president. In 1903 he became president of the large seminary, which was influential in Ireland and beyond. Mannix worked to give Catholics access to the newly created National University of Ireland, which accepted Maynooth as a constituent college, so raising the academic standards of future priests. He resisted the Gaelic League’s attempts to make the Irish language a compulsory subject for university examinations, creating tension with some members of the faculty. Unlike some members of his family, he had little involvement with the disaffected rural tenants supported by the Land League. He was a figure of the establishment, cool and reserved, respected rather than loved at Maynooth.

In Melbourne Mannix became a radical and progressive social critic and a champion of the poor. In 1917 he was heavily involved in the campaign to oppose conscription for overseas military service in a second referendum during the Great War. His protagonist was the prime minister, William Morris Hughes. This gave Mannix national standing, although there was divided opinion, even within the Catholic