

BOOK REVIEWS

CANTOR, Geoffrey, *Quakers, Jews and Science: Religious Responses to Modernity and the Sciences in Britain, 1650–1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 432. ISBN 0-19-927668-4, Hardback, £56.

The primary question addressed in this well-researched, informative book is how specific religious communities engaged in and with science, the latter being defined broadly as the physical and biological sciences, together with geology, anthropology and mathematics. The specific communities investigated are the Quakers and Jews in Britain, particularly England, from the late seventeenth to the late nineteenth centuries. The author is eager to show that any depth of understanding of this can only come from careful contextual underpinning, a point that he fully exemplifies throughout his text. The reader is made very aware not only of the contrast of the Quaker and Jewish communities with other religious groups in England, especially Anglicans, but also is helped to see the complex and changing differences there were within these communities themselves. How to define a Quaker or a Jew is explored cautiously and a brief history of both communities in England is given. Careful attention is given to issues of time and space and location and how these affected variations in the groups and their reactions to science. Class differences within both communities are also shown to be significant and the almost complete absence of women is noted, but not discussed in any depth.

Although clear divergences become apparent in the way Quakers and Jews viewed and connected with science, it is shown that there were also similarities, not least because both communities were dissenters from the established form of religion. More than that they were outsiders: Quakers because their form of Christianity marked them as separate from others of their religion; Jews because they had long been the 'other' for most Christians. Such issues of identity and distinctiveness are demonstrated to be crucial in understanding the two groups in all their activities, science being an important aspect of this. This was especially so because science was one area where (especially if you were socially affluent and you were male), people of varying religious persuasions could come together on equal terms.

In tackling his basic question, the author explores the educational institutions set up or favoured by Quakers and Jews and what scientific education they were likely to receive in them. Excluded from any institutions which enforced subscription to

Anglicanism, they were drawn by inclination or circumstance to those which were more modern, secular and scientific. Quakers also set up schools with 'useful' and often scientific subjects. Quakers and Jews are shown to have participated in differing ways in scientific societies and activities, but what becomes absorbing is the way their different conceptions of religion affected which sciences they were drawn to and how far they engaged with them. For example, the Quakers' emphasis on the 'Inner Light' is convincingly shown to have led them to emphasise empirical science while the Jews urgent concern for correct timing of rituals led them to expand their astronomical and mathematical knowledge. Quakers were also much drawn towards botany as 'innocent leisure' and leading them to God while Jews long studied science for medicine.

Increasingly in the nineteenth century science was viewed as a central component of modernism and Cantor's arguments are particularly interesting and persuasive as he details how his chosen groups dealt with this. The Quakers response to the challenge of Darwinism, for instance, was much influenced by the particular religious position taken by different individuals at a time when Quakerism itself was undergoing decline and schism. By the 1880s it was the growing number of moderate, liberal Quakers who interpreted the Bible historically and as progressive revelation, who found evolutionary theory the easiest to accept. Jews had seemed to endorse Darwinism more readily, especially as some believed that Judaism was more compatible with evolving science as it was less dogmatic and superstitious than Christianity. In following modern science, Jews could both portray themselves as staying within the traditions of their religion and as being intellectually equal to Christians. Not all Jews agreed with such arguments, however, and Cantor's analysis of the arguments in this, as throughout the book, gives a fascinating picture of the interactions and interrelations of science and religion in a way that has been rarely explored. For the nuances and varying facets of this intriguing history, the reader is advised to read the book.

Ruth Watts
University of Birmingham
England

ASHWORTH, T., *Paul's Necessary Sin: The Experience of Liberation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 270. ISBN 0754654990, Hardback, \$99.95, £55.

This reviewer has a number of things in common with the author of the book. Besides our sharing of the same given name, we have both engaged in the academic study of Paul. Like Tim Ashworth I have discovered that we need to pay attention to Paul's use of words and that traditional interpretations need to be reexamined. My graduate study at Brown University led me also to explore the cultural context of Paul's letters and to try to determine what Paul says about the Jewish law in relation to the Gentile condition. Additionally, I share with the author an interest in interpreting and teaching the Bible from a Quaker perspective.

I differ, however, from the author in some significant ways. First, Ashworth wants to detect the root meanings of words and apply that to every instance where the word is used. I think we can reinterpret Paul in significant ways if we pay attention to the way in which language is used within its cultural context and interpret idiomatic expressions according to those contexts. Secondly, Ashworth seems to move quickly from the literary context of Paul's letters dealing with Jews and Gentiles to talk broadly about the human condition. I think we fail to understand Paul properly if we ignore the ethnic distinctions Paul makes, particularly in Romans and Galatians (specifically, if we fail to understand Paul's message about Gentiles not needing the Jewish law). Thirdly, I'm also aware of our own social locations. Ashworth is in dialogue mainly with scholars who are either from the UK or taught there (J. Dunn, J. Ziesler and E. Sanders) and who represent the mainstream of Anglicanism in Britain. I am more influenced by North American scholars on Paul (S. Stowers, J. Gager, L. Gaston, R. Hays and A. Malherbe), and have no religious concern with what Anglicans teach about Paul. Finally, Tim Ashworth and I come from distinctly different Quaker traditions: Ashworth represents classic, British Quakerism, while I am a pastor of a programmed Friends meeting in Indiana.

Rather than simply summarise the main arguments of the book and briefly respond to its overall thesis, I have chosen to engage the text by closely analyzing the way in which Tim Ashworth presents and argues his research. There's no doubt he has spent a great deal of time studying Paul. Anyone who does that should be commended. No one should be surprised by a British Quaker taking on the scholars of the Church of England. It is a bold move, but anyone who challenges the best of the academy needs to be able to support his or her contentions. This book contains detailed philological and exegetical studies of specific Pauline texts. That's exactly what we need to do in order to help people rethink who Paul was and what he taught. I regret to say, however, Ashworth's methodology and analysis is seriously flawed and, therefore, he is not able to support his argument. I can only take one example and try to illustrate how what he does with the Greek text is fallacious and lacks any real merit.

A case in point is Ashworth's treatment of the noun *stoicheion* and the verb *stoicheō* in Paul. Ashworth wants to get to the 'consistent core of meaning' and claims "'row" or "series" represents the 'root meaning' (p. 37). He refers to the 'consistent hard core or skeleton of meaning' as 'to keep aligned' or 'alignment'. As he does with nearly every Greek word or phrase he discusses, he here commits the error commonly called the etymological fallacy. In spite of his few quotes in the introduction from a few people supporting such a practice, there seems to be more of a consensus today among linguists to favor a synchronic analysis of words rather than treat them like boxes that carry an original root meaning around with them wherever they go. There is a place for talking about etymology and root meanings and what the literal sense might be as a way of understanding the all too often obfuscating English idioms used in modern translations. But Greek, like any other natural language, developed idiomatic expressions which must be understood in contexts of meaning.

Ashworth's proposal is that Paul uses these words mentioned above to emphasise living by the Spirit as opposed to living by regulation. Regarding these terms, Ashworth first discusses Gal. 5:16-18, 22-25. He claims the translation of the verb

stoicheō as ‘walk’ does not bring out the distinction Paul is making between the phrase ‘walk (*peripateite*) by the Spirit’ in v. 16 and ‘let us also walk (*stoichōmen*) by the Spirit’ (p. 39). He wants to translate the latter with the literal expression ‘keep aligned’ (p. 39) in distinction to being merely synonymous with ‘walk’ (*peripateō*). For Ashworth, this implies the person is not the active agent in moral behavior, but it is the Spirit who causes the person to act morally. Ashworth says Paul’s ‘exhortation is not about conduct; it is rather about remaining in a fundamentally changed way of living that inevitably brings a transformation of behaviour’ (p. 40). I don’t think Ashworth makes his case here. The verb in Gal. 5:25 is still an active subjunctive with the force of an exhortation to do something. Ashworth changes it into a passive ‘keep aligned by the Spirit’ (p. 39). The word ‘by’ expresses the dative voice of the noun as the indirect object, not the action of the object on the subject as in the passive voice. The passive does occur in Gal. 5:18, ‘But if you are led by the Spirit’. In order to support his contention about the meaning of the word, he would have to translate the phrase as ‘let us also align by means of the Spirit’. The individual in this text does the aligning, albeit through or by means of the Spirit. But it is not an action the Spirit does for the person. At least not in this text.

Ashworth goes on to discuss Rom. 4:12. Again he points to the ‘core meaning’ (p. 40) or a ‘simple precise meaning’ (p. 41). Rather than ‘walk (*stoichousin*) in the footsteps (*ichnesin*)’, Ashworth prefers ‘keep aligned in the footsteps’ (p. 41). He notes that this literal sense has disappeared in the NRSV: ‘follow the example’. Ashworth discusses this text only to try to maintain his thesis that *stoicheō* has this basic sense of alignment in every context in which it occurs. How could we prove otherwise? It happens that Paul uses the noun *ichnos* in another context. In 2 Cor. 12:8 Paul asks two questions, the second of which is elliptical and requires us to supply the verb from the former phrase: ‘Did we not walk (*periepatēsamen*) by/in the same Spirit? [Did we] not [walk] by/in the same footsteps (*ichnesin*)?’ The idiom of following an example as ‘walk in their steps’ is so common, Paul could leave out the verb in the second phrase. That’s why it’s easy to understand Paul expressing the same idiom in the Galatians context but using a different verb simply for variation—an important rhetorical device often overlooked by those who want to squeeze the literal meaning out of every word.

The next text is Gal. 6:16. The phrase in question is ‘to as many as walk/follow (*stoichēsousin*) by this rule (*kanōn*)’. Ashworth discusses this in the larger context of Gal. 6:14–17 (pp. 41–43). In his brief treatment of this text, Ashworth pushes etymology beyond the limits of credulity when he claims three of the Greek words (*stauros*, ‘pole, cross’; *kanōn*, ‘rule, standard’; *stigma*, ‘mark, brand’) in this context all have the root idea of ‘stick’ and Paul is somehow making a point (no pun intended) based on their literal meanings, which conforms to the literal meaning of *stoicheion* as alignment. Sure, *stauros* and *kanōn* both having something to do with wooden poles, but a *stigma* is not related in any way, since in Greek usage a *stigma* is not even the result of being poked with a sharp stick. The main point here seems to be Ashworth’s repeated attempt to say Paul doesn’t establish a standard code (*kanōn*) of conduct by which people are to live. Instead, Ashworth translates the phrase in Gal. 6:16, ‘as for

those who will keep aligned by this stake' (pp. 42–43). Ashworth thinks 'stake' (*kanōn*) refers back to the cross (*stauros*) as a 'pale', in the sense of a 'boundary marker' in v. 14. Would a first-century reader have gotten this connection? If these terms were so closely related, might we not expect other Greek authors to use such synonymous terms within the same context—ever? A search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* shows no other author uses these two terms within a proximity of 250 words. The metaphorical sense of *kanōn* as a 'rule' was quite common in this sort of context. Compare 4 Macc. 7:21–22, which uses *kanōn* in a very similar sense as Paul: 'What person who lives as a philosopher by the whole rule (*kanōn*) of philosophy, and trusts in God, and knows that it is blessed to endure any suffering for the sake of virtue, would not be able to overcome the emotions through godliness?'

The final example relates to the meaning of the plural noun *stoicheia* in Gal. 4:9 and in a related text Col. 2:8, 20. These are texts in which this noun is often translated as 'elemental spirits'. In order to support his case about words always carrying with them their root meaning, Ashworth feels he must prove *stoicheion* in these contexts also refers to alignment or his argument 'breaks down' (p. 49). He goes so far as to claim that the concept of elemental spirits is a later development for the plural *stoicheia* (p. 51). This is simply not the case. Aristotle, for example, in *GC* 314a.26 and 29 uses this term to refer to the four elements (fire, air, water, earth), which usage he attributes to the pre-Socratic philosopher Anaxagoras. In a fragment attributed to Zeno of Elea by Hesychius, Zeno applies Paul's expression 'elements of the world' to the Titans. Philo, a contemporary of Paul, uses the expression 'elements of the world' in *Aet.* 109.4 and describes them as becoming immortal. This had become a very common expression and an established concept long before Paul.

When Ashworth discusses the Gal. 4:9 text, he claims that the relative pronoun in Gal. 4:10 'whose slaves you were' refers not to the antecedent noun 'elemental spirits' (*stoicheia*) in vs. 10, but to 'beings that by nature are no gods' in v. 8. When you look for the antecedent to a relative pronoun, you look for the preceding noun that agrees in gender and number. You can't skip one and keep going back into what is really a previous sentence to find a noun you like, one that fits your theory.

I've only been able here to engage with one small section of this book. But this is a representative example of the sorts of philological, grammatical and exegetical errors that run throughout the book. That is unfortunate, because I think Ashworth's goal in the book is laudable. Contemporary followers of Pauline Christianity continue to be enslaved to principles of Christian conduct rather than discover the freedom and transformation Paul describes as the life of the Spirit. But that doesn't mean Paul didn't advocate preaching and proclamation or exhort people to follow codes of conduct for moral living. In the end, Ashworth fails to make his case. Nevertheless, I hope he will continue to work on the project of reinterpreting Paul, but that the next time he will be more careful about his Greek exegesis.

Timothy W. Seid
Earlham School of Religion
Richmond, IN, USA

HEALEY, Robynne Rogers, *From Quaker to Upper Canadian: Faith and Community among Yonge Street Friends, 1801–1850* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006), pp. xxvi + 292, including maps, charts, tables and illustrations. ISBN 9-78077-35313-69, Hardback, \$75, £56.

Robynne Rogers Healey has written one of the most useful and important studies of the evolution of a Quaker community ever published. Several historians, myself included, have ventured broad overviews of how and why Quakerism changed in the nineteenth century. But now we have a careful, incisive analysis of those changes at the local level.

Healey's subject is Yonge Street Monthly Meeting in Ontario. Shortly after 1800, Friends from Vermont and Pennsylvania took advantage of generous land grants to settle north of what would become Toronto. By 1812, in spite of an epidemic that carried off numerous founders, they had become a flourishing new community under New York Yearly Meeting.

Yonge Street Friends, however, would prove to be as fractious as other American Quakers in the next two decades, perhaps more so. First came a unique movement, coinciding with the War of 1812, in which a charismatic convinced Friend, David Willson, led away a significant number of Friends to form a sect that called itself the Children of Peace. Some returned to the larger body later, as Willson showed increasingly erratic behavior and disavowed some Quaker testimonies, particularly pacifism. Then in the 1820s, Yonge Street Friends faced the Hicksite Separation. Healey's analysis finds that Hicksites were a minority here, in contrast to the rest of New York Yearly Meeting, perhaps reflecting the origins of settlers. Friends with Pennsylvania roots were far more likely to become Hicksites than those who had come from New England, where no Hicksite Separation took place.

Women and the family are central to Healey's study. Healey finds that kinship ties were vital to Yonge Street's community life: the decision to migrate, adherence to the exactions of the Discipline, whether to identify with the Orthodox or the Hicksites or the Children of Peace. One of Healey's most interesting findings is that most Friends who married in meeting married outside of their preparative meetings. She makes a convincing case that this reflects communication among preparative meetings and made for the construction of new communities. Healey rightly emphasizes the central role of women in sustaining the identity of Friends as a community separated from 'the world'. The continuation of Friends as a distinctive sect would largely depend on the success of mothers in inculcating a commitment to the peculiarities of Friends. Healey concludes, moreover, that at Yonge Street Quaker women had a sense of themselves as part of a larger community of Quaker women, reinforced through publications, epistles and visiting ministers.

One of Healey's most important findings involves acculturation, the breakdown of a sense of separateness and peculiarity—what she labels 'The Movement away from Sectarianism'. Population growth was one factor. As Yonge Street Friends acquired more and more non-Quaker neighbours, contacts through business and politics grew. The most impressive evidence of this adjustment to 'the world' came in 1837,

when William Lyon Mackenzie, one of the area's representatives to the provincial assembly, led an armed rebellion against a reactionary Upper Canadian oligarchy. David Willson was one of Mackenzie's staunchest supporters, and Samuel Lount, a Quaker blacksmith and another member of the assembly, led the armed rebellion against the provincial government in the Yonge Street community. Quaker participation was striking—in an area where they made up only 4 percent of the population, they were 40 percent of the rebels, and Lount was hanged for his pains. Healey's conclusion is justified: 'It is here that one begins to see most clearly the evolution of the Yonge Street Quakers' identity. Their identity as a people separated and withdrawn from the world had changed enough that they were able to identify with their non-Quaker neighbours who shared similar concerns. Friends had become part of the mainstream community' (p. 148).

From Quaker to Upper Canadian is arguably the best work on Canadian Quaker history ever published. It is an admirable counterpart to the growing body of work on Quakerism in the nineteenth century in the United States and the British Isles.

Thomas D. Hamm
Earlham College
Richmond, IN, USA

LAMONT, William, *Last Witnesses: The Muggletonian History, 1652–1979* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. xv + 267. ISBN 0-7546-5532-6, Hardback, \$99.95, £55.

The Muggletonians were one of the many sects and religious groups who became established in the 1650s, at approximately the same time as Quakers. Unlike Quakers, they were not interested in converting others to their faith. As William Lamont argues, 'it is not surprising therefore that, while the Quakers flourished, the Muggletonians grew ever smaller in number' (p. xi). What may be more surprising is the fact that they survived, albeit as an increasingly small group, until Philip Noakes, generally believed to have been the last surviving Muggletonian, died in 1979.

While most scholars of the English Revolution have heard of the Muggletonians, few have detailed knowledge of their theology and history. Those that do are likely to be familiar only with their manifestation in the seventeenth century. Christopher Hill, Barry Reay and William Lamont's *The World of the Muggletonians* (1983) provided information on that early period and T.L. Underwood's 1999 anthology of early Muggletonian writings¹ allowed readers a glimpse into their unique mind-set, but until now, little if any work has been done on their story post-1700. Lamont has done scholars of religious history a considerable service by telling the entire Muggletonian story from their origins in February 1652 to their final end in 1979.

Scholars with a particular interest in Quakerism will find the richest material in the earlier chapters of this book. Direct interactions between Quakers and

1. Hill, C., Reay, B., and Lamont, W., *The World of the Muggletonians* (London: Temple Smith, 1983); Underwood, T.L. (ed.), *The Acts of the Witnesses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Muggletonians seem to have ended by the 1680s (before then there was open hostility between the two groups and a host of fiercely fought pamphlet wars). More broadly, however, there is much to interest them in Lamont's later chapters as well, particularly in relation to his discussion of church organisation and the relationship between the sect and its changing context.

The book is based on sound and detailed archival research and one of its virtues is the way in which Lamont makes the research process transparent. It is clearly and entertainingly written, and shows real passion about the topic. I must, however, sound a note of caution. At times, Lamont identifies so closely with his subjects that he presents Muggletonian opinions as though they were his own. This is certainly true of some of his discussion of seventeenth-century Quakers; at intervals his objectivity seems to slip and Muggletonian accounts of Quakers and Quaker theology are presented as fact, without clear acknowledgement that at those points in the narrative we are seeing through Muggletonian eyes.

As a reader and a historian of Quakerism, I found this disorienting and somewhat disturbing—although it also forced me to look at some of my own material and assumptions anew. It is a weakness in an otherwise informative and engaging book and one that suggests that readers should be particularly careful to distinguish Lamont's own views from those of his subjects, particularly where other religious groups are concerned.

Betty Hagglund
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham, England

FROST, J. William, *A History of Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist, and Muslim Perspectives on War and Peace*. Volume 1, *The Bible to 1914* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), pp. xii + 520, ISBN 0-7734-6561-8, Hardback, \$139.95, £84.95.

This book deals with the influence of religions on peace and war in the world. A peace historian, Professor Frost explores the five major religions' ideas of peace and war, the influence of Greek and Roman ideas of war on Western thought and the development of beliefs about war and peace in Euro-American traditions from the middle ages to the early twentieth century. He analyses various reasons why religion is involved in war and in doing so suggests a way in which religions can contribute to peace.

During the nuclear crises of the 1960s, Professor Roland H. Bainton wrote *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* in which he dealt with Western Christian history from the perspectives of peace and war. His book provided historical sources for a critical reflection on just war theory as an ethical imperative in the nuclear age. Professor Frost expands Bainton's historical survey much further in today's context. While Bainton's work reflected upon the nuclear crisis, Frost recognises the spiritual and moral problem of religions instigating war and violence. The terrorism of September 11 and the retaliation wars of America were both religiously supported

and maintained. Other wars and conflicts in the post-cold war era, such as ethnic cleansing in Eastern Europe, massacres in African countries, the Israel-Palestine conflict, the Sri Lankan civil war and many others have been entangled with religions. Frost's book provides a historical reflection on the interaction between religion and war.

Does religion have a pro-war inclination *per se*, or does it become involved in war as a political means? Frost analyses the Scriptures as original sources of religious faith and practice, and finds that there is an affinity between religion and war. The Hebrew Scriptures, which are shared by Judaism, Christianity and Islam, teach that Yahweh is God of war, and in doing so foster religion's positiveness towards war. These three religions each have a belief in 'holy war'. This is why the three religions become frequently involved in war, and why their countries fight each other ceaselessly. However, religions are not war-makers. Rather war must be seen within the interrelationship between politics and religion, which is a main factor in explaining religion's involvement in war. Frost's historical research shows how concepts of politics and religion are entwined with each other when it comes to wars. Political powers use religion to justify wars; conversely, religious powers use political power in order to maintain material and religious interests such as properties, self-defense and religious expansion. Christianity maintains a separation from politics while Islam supports a merger of politics and religion. Although the two religions take different stances in relation to politics, their historical appearance in wars is not seen much differently. Nevertheless, Christianity seems to be more flexible than Islam in attitudes to politics. Frost's book demonstrates that it is through their close connection to politics that religions become involved in war.

On the other hand religions can contribute to peace-making through peaceful influence on politics. This is one of the main points which Frost underlines in this book. Frost provides an example from Buddhism, telling of a time that a Buddhist king abandoned a policy of war because he was influenced by Buddhist ideals of nonviolence. A peacemaking role for religion is feasible and imperative in today's world in which war and violence claiming to be based on religious belief are exploding. According to Frost, religions have the possibility both of justifying war and of working for peace. He discusses the just war theory in which religions provide moral rules to restrain and prevent war. Although Christian just war theorists have emphasized the moral principles of the just war theory, Frost discovers in Euro-American history that just war theory has actually been mainly used to justify war.

Peace is a complex notion. Its achievement often needs war and violence which are contrary to a concept of peace in general. Peace on earth is inevitably incomplete and relative. True and lasting peace can be only achieved in heaven. The religious contribution to peace is in seeking for peace on earth constantly in the light of the true and lasting peace. Frost's book shows that political and religious ideas of peace have diversely flourished in this vision of peace. In his discussion of the development of just war theory and pacifism in the Euro-American traditions, he argues that proponents of the just war theory would claim that they are seeking peace from a realistic perspective that recognises the necessity of war in the world. What Frost is concerned about is how religions can contribute to peace in the world. While

Christian just war theory claims to restrain or prevent war, or to reduce the brutality of war, Frost argues that just war theory has, in fact, mainly functioned to justify wars and it has therefore lost its validity as a Christian ideal of peace. Nonetheless, contemporary Christian ethicists try to strengthen Christian peace-making work through stressing the moral principles of just war theory and it was by using the just war theory that American Bishops, Protestant leaders of America and the Archbishop of Canterbury were able to oppose their governments' military campaign against Iraq. Frost's critical reflection on just war theory seems to be aimed at recovering the peace-making role of religions.

Religion and war are both fundamental factors in determining human behaviour and consciousness. Frost's book, by dealing with the interaction between religion, war, peace and politics, provides a fluent and valuable resource for religious persons, peace scholars and researchers and historians.

Jiseok Jung
Director, Korea Christian Peace Institute
Hanshin University, Korea