
Ethnicity and Inclusion: Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities. David G. Horrell. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2020. Pp. 432.
Reviewed by Louis-Joseph Gagnon, *Concordia University*

David G. Horrell's recent book *Ethnicity and Inclusion* explores how the categories of "ethnic" and "religious" function in Jewish and Christian texts as ways of defining each identity. Horrell is a professor of New Testament studies and director of the Centre for Biblical Studies at Exeter University whose research focuses on Christian identity, ethnicity, and race. *Ethnicity and Inclusion* challenges the important distinctions drawn between Jewish and Christian identities in modern New Testament scholarship. More precisely, Horrell criticizes what he calls the "structural dichotomy" mode, which conceives Jewish identity as exclusive and particularist and in opposition to an all-inclusive and universalist Christianity. Horrell undertakes a vast analysis of Biblical and extra-Biblical texts, questioning how they construct Jewish and Christian identities. He approaches these texts by using Anthony Smith and John Hutchinson's definition of ethnic group as a key hermeneutical feature to outline the essential characteristics of both identities in order to compare them appropriately. Horrell concludes that the "structural dichotomy" that has been employed in New Testament studies is unsound. As a result, this leads Horrell to ask why modern scholars have structured the Jewish and Christian identities as being in stark opposition to one another. He argues that the answer lies in the context of scholarly production – one of White Western European countries exploiting the narrative of superiority at a time of colonization.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first part, the first two chapters offer a selective but elucidating literature survey

from the nineteenth century to the present era. The author aims to account for the existence of the “structural dichotomy” in New Testament studies. Horrell highlights the studies of several prominent scholars within the field: Ferdinand C. Baur, E. P. Sanders, as well as several studies from the social-scientific perspective. He observes that although the consistency and terminology change in regard to the way scholars conceptualize Jewish and Christian identities, a “structural dichotomy” persists and continues to shape the discussion on the matter. Chapter 3 offers two reasons to undertake a criticism of such a framework. First, religion and ethnicity are modern categories, and one has to pay close attention when using them in reconstructing antiquity. Second, the separation of religion and ethnicity in the modern age is not a constitutive element of social life in antiquity. Horrell suggests reconsidering the differences between both identities through an examination of “how various facets of what social scientists have identified as typical characteristics of ethnic groups appear in early Jewish and Christian texts” (301). He draws on Smith and Hutchinson’s six components of the definition of ethnicity: a common proper name, a myth of common ancestry, shared historical memories, elements of common culture, a link with a homeland, and a sense of solidarity.

In the second part, chapters four to seven explore the components of Smith and Hutchinson’s definition of ethnicity. The method of examination asks both Jewish and Christian texts – Biblical and extra-Biblical, such as Philo or Josephus – how they echo with the components of ethnicity. Horrell then describes their construction of identities. Chapter 4 examines the second facet of the definition, the myth of common ancestry. He explains how the comparison takes place in terms of ancestry, kinship, marriage, and family. Both religions, in their own ways, appeal to ancestry and brotherhood to create narratives of group identity. The identity

is passed on through family in Judaism by means of endogamous marriage. The New Testament says little about rules on marriage, although Horrell points out Paul's preference of inter-Christian couples and Jewish influence in that matter. Chapter 5 deals with the fourth component, elements of common culture, which Horrell renames as the "way of life." Similarities include the adhesion to a way of life as a necessary characteristic of membership, significant emphasis on socializing children into the culture, and paralleled distinctive practices, like circumcision/baptism, food laws/Lord's Supper, and Sabbath/Sunday meeting. Here, "salience" is the determinative concept to understand what differentiates one group from another. Salience is the significant emphasis which signals the important aspect of one group in comparison to other ethnicities in the same area (Egyptians, Greeks, Idumeans, etc.). Chapter 6 explores the fifth component, a link with the homeland. Horrell advocates for a more nuanced line between a Jewish land rootedness and a deterritorialized Christianity. The existence of the Jewish diaspora acknowledges a distinction between "motherland" (Jerusalem) and "homeland" (πατρίς). This symbolic orientation toward Jerusalem is a theme exploited by New Testament authors. Chapter 7 investigates the sixth component, a sense of solidarity. Horrell explores self-consciousness of belonging to a people by focusing on the ancient vocabulary of "peoplehood": ἔθνος γένος λαός. Although the newness of Christianity limits the signification, the early Christian discourse attests to the emergence of self-consciously being a people (notably in Paul's letters and 1 Pet 2:9–10).

Chapter 8 broadens the discussion on solidarity. Horrell sees mission and conversion as features that intersect with the components of common culture and sense of solidarity. The author shares the view of most contemporary scholars that Judaism was not characterized overall by an effort of proselytization, despite

the claim of exclusiveness. One had the possibility to join the Jewish community as a sympathizer, God-fearer, or proselyte. In the same line of thought, Horrell does not perceive strong differences in the way Christians integrate newcomers in their ranks. Rather, he thinks the two cases of mission and conversion assume similarities. Judaism and Christianity welcomed new members by the “model of mission” he calls “passive attraction,” that is, the communities drag people in by examples of life rather than by proactive proselytizing actions. With the comparative analysis of Jewish and Christian identities, Horrell criticizes the very existence of the “structural dichotomy” and concludes that both religions show more similarities than sharp differences in the way they construct group identity.

In the third part of the book, Horrell accounts for the existence of the “structural dichotomy” as an explanatory paradigm between Jewish and Christian identities in New Testament studies. The answer lies in the context of production. As he puts it: “New Testament studies, as a Western European production precisely concurrent with the period of European imperialism (and its associated racist ideologies) is shaped by and implicated in that wider socio-historical context and specifically in its ideologies of religion and race” (342). To support his claim, he turns to the insights given by whiteness studies aiming to shape a critical reflection on New Testament scholarship. The attempt to universalize claims in that specific field while taking into account the context of production of Biblical texts does not factor in the context of New Testament scholarship. Thus, it leaves out the question of whether scholars can engage with reconstruction without being tainted or flawed by the era of redaction they find themselves in.

Horrell’s book is insightful for understanding a particular state of mind deployed in New Testament studies. Through the

surveys, Horrell introduces important authors and scholars within the field. He grounds his reflections on meaningful citations, providing the reader with a direct access to outside sources. Even the neophyte could easily navigate through the clarity of the explanation. Horrell summarizes and gives a comprehensive view of the analysis. The author takes into account the multidisciplinary aspect of the research. He articulates the results and theorization of social sciences in a useful exegesis of the text.

We could, however, ask why Horrell passes over the first and third components of Smith and Hutchinson's definition, rendering the analysis incomplete. One could also debate whether the context of the works Horrell surveys of modern New Testament studies is actually one of White Western Europeans engaged in a narrative of superiority and imperialism toward a colonized world. The survey extends from the time of F. C. Baur in the first half of the nineteenth century to the present day. Therefore, it can be asked: was the European context rather one of decline in political power, both in Europe and around the globe, with the rise of nationalism and the independence of the colonies? How can the "structural dichotomy" resist the second half of the twentieth century after the horror of anti-Semitic Nazism, the racial revolution in the United States, and the internationalization of knowledge? Furthermore, the attempt to account for the existence of the "structural dichotomy" by referring to the context using whiteness studies alone seems problematic. Is the context surrounding the cultural and racial identity in which an author operates self-explanatory? It seems one has to take into account the micro-context of the author himself as well as his freedom in regard to the macro- and micro-cultural contexts. Otherwise, how can one criticize current positions if the cultural context shapes the very paradigm? It would become the task of further generations,

too biased by their own context. Thus, it reveals a contextual loophole in which knowledge is never genuine and original.