

Note: This Work has been made available by the authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research and may not be copied or reproduced except as permitted by the copyright laws of Canada without the written authority from the copyright owner.

Reynolds, Benjamin E. Review of *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur*, by F. Stanley Jones. (History of Biblical Studies; no. 5). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. *Journal of American Oriental Society* 135, no. 4 (2015): 889-890.

The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur. Edited by F. STANLEY JONES. History of Biblical Studies, vol. 5. Atlanta: SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, 2012. Pp. xii + 248. \$33.95 (paper).

This volume is a collection of essays deriving from the meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature Consultation (now Section) on Jewish Christianity. The volume seeks to refute the general understanding within biblical studies that F. C. Baur began the study of Jewish Christianity. Specific essays and the volume as a whole argue that Baur is dependent in some way on the British Deists John Toland and Thomas Morgan, both of whom wrote over a century before Baur. The *Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity* thus seeks to revise the common understanding about the roots of "Jewish Christianity."

In the first essay, "'Christian Jews' and 'Jewish Christians': The Jewish Origins of Christianity in English Literature from Elizabeth I to Toland's *Nazarensus*," Matti Myllykoski traces the earliest use of the terms "Jewish Christian" and "Christian Jews" prior to their use by John Toland and Thomas Morgan. Myllykoski contends that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the term "Christian Jews" was not used negatively and described Jews who became followers of Jesus within early Christianity. The term "Jewish Christians," however, was negatively used in religious polemic against Catholics and Unitarians. With regard to early Christianity, the term indicated a group "too 'Jewish' to be identified as true Christians" (p. 18). Myllykoski discusses the work of John Selden, who influenced Toland, and concludes that Toland appears to have coined the English phrase "Jewish Christianity."

Pierre Lurbe's essay, "John Toland's *Nazarensus* and the Original Plan of Christianity," presents Toland as a provocative figure continually stirring up controversy, as seen in Toland's early works, in which he calls into question the New Testament canon. Lurbe draws attention to Toland's use of the Gospel of Barnabas to reconstruct early Christianity and also notes Toland's claim that there were two sorts of Christians, Jews and Gentiles. Lurbe argues that *Nazarensus* can be understood as an argument for non-conformists.

In "The Invention of Jewish Christianity in John Toland's *Nazarensus*," Matt Jackson-McCabe highlights the way in which original Christianity is for Toland about faith or an "internal spiritual disposition" (p. 89). Jackson-McCabe contends that in attempting to classify Islam as Christianity (Mahometan Christianity) Toland was actually responding to criticism that accused Unitarianism of being "Mahometan Christianity." In response, Toland argues that Mahometan Christianity was indeed part of Christianity. Toland did not classify Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as Judaism because Christianity was the legitimate religion of Toland's day. Jackson-McCabe concludes that Toland's concept of "Jewish Christianity" "represents little more than a humanistic retelling of Trinitarian Christianity's myth of origins" and that it was "invented as a humanistic reclamation of Christian myth" (p. 89).

In his essay "The Genesis, Purpose, and Significance of John Toland's *Nazarensus*," F. Stanley Jones draws attention to Toland as politician and theologian. Jones notes how Toland's political writings are in the service of toleration, namely the naturalization of ethnic Jews in Britain, consideration of Muslims as part of Christianity, and allowing non-conformists to hold office. *Nazarensus* was Toland's theological argument for this political toleration. In naming Jewish Christianity the earliest Christianity and calling Jewish Christians "Ebionites," he made "Jewish Christianity" a distinct form of Christianity and was "the catalyst behind modern critical study of the New Testament and Christian origins" (p. 99), and the recognition of the importance of using documents from outside the New Testament.

In Jackson-McCabe's second essay, "'Jewish Christianity' and 'Christian Deism' in Thomas Morgan's *The Moral Philosopher*," he concentrates on the work of Thomas Morgan, a British Deist roughly a decade younger than Toland. Like Toland, Morgan used critical historiography to give credence to his humanistic views by claiming their connection to original Christianity. Morgan also attacked dominant Christianity, but unlike Toland, he associated his opponents with Jewish Christianity, viewing Jewish Christianity not as original Christianity, but as a perversion of it. Jackson-McCabe states that "Morgan is more precursor to Baur than successor of Toland" (p. 107).

F. Stanley Jones traces the scholarly links between Toland and Baur in "From Toland to Baur: Tracks of the History of Research into Jewish Christianity." He characterizes the links as "circuitous," but he is nonetheless successful in demonstrating their plausibility, as he shows links from Johann

Mosheim's 1720 review of Toland to Siegmund Baumgarten's own review (1749) in which he cites Mosheim. Johann Semler, Baumgarten's student, took a position similar to that of Toland (1762, 1775) and referred to Jewish Christians as "*Partey*" (p. 128). J. K. Giesler (1820), who had a profound influence on Baur, credited Semler with being "*the first* to express the opinion that the Nazoraenes and Ebionites made up the same party ('*Einer Partey*')" (p. 131). As Jones argues, these views about "Jewish Christianity" can be traced back to Toland.

The final essay, "F.C. Baur's Place in the Study of Jewish Christianity" by David Lincicum, retraces much of Jones' second essay in linking Baur to Toland and Morgan, although in a more hesitant way. Lincicum also highlights Baur's contribution to the study of early Christianity and particularly of Jewish Christianity. Lincicum indicates that Baur had a dialectic understanding of history and philosophy, which is noticeable in his emphasis on conflict in the early church. Baur understood Christianity as a universal whole for which it was necessary that Judaism die. Paul was the champion of true Christianity, and Jewish Christianity opposed Paul's version. According to Lincicum, Baur's dialecticalism caused him to see only two parties in conflict and Jewish Christianity as the opponent.

The inclusion of John Toland's work *Nazarensus* (second ed., 1718) at the end of the volume is extremely helpful, considering that almost every essay addresses this work. As a collection of SBL papers, the essays are actually quite coherent and form a general trajectory: pre-Toland, Toland, Morgan, plausible links to Baur, and finally Baur himself. Because the essays are self-contained, there is some redundancy, but at the same time, the argument of the volume is shown to be more than plausible: Baur's contribution to the study of Jewish Christianity, while being distinct, relied directly or indirectly on the contributions of John Toland and Thomas Morgan.

BENJAMIN E. REYNOLDS
TYNDALE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE