

Taparelli's reasoning is based on his philosophical anthropology. Human beings are intelligent animals (reason). They can also make decisions (liberty) whether or not those decisions are based on right reason. They are also social animals, dependent on one another in many ways. All men and women have their rights, which must be respected (morality). Humans have needs too, which must be pursued (action): here are the roots of Taparelli's "natural law" theory and of rights, properly understood (145).

The modern rationalist understanding of natural law would seem to be very similar to this Thomistic one. What then made the two approaches philosophically so incompatible, apart from the obvious rivalries and hotly contested claims of the churchly and secular bodies? Taparelli's charge was that the rationalists failed to distinguish between *abstract* reasoning and reasoning in the *concrete*. This was a distinction he could not find specified in Thomistic thinking (147–149). Drawing this distinction, however, and consciously utilizing concrete reasoning opened the possibility for Taparelli to develop his own views of subsidiary groupings in society and state, with their own subsidiary ("hypotactical") rights. Modern proposals for causes such as "popular sovereignty," in Taparelli's estimation, seemed to overlook this critical distinction. He viewed any affinity in Catholic circles for political democracy as highly suspect and published his disdain in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, upsetting the more progressive element in those circles.

One reason why *Rerum novarum* hardly hints at Taparelli's intellectual legacy in particular may have been this inner-Catholic difference of opinion. After all, Vincenzo Pecci (since 1878 Pope Leo XIII), Taparelli's student in Rome back in the 1820s, looked upon these same, more democratically inclined Catholic leaders with growing favor in the years leading up to the encyclical. Nevertheless, Taparelli's *Saggio* left an enduring impression on *Rerum novarum*'s drafters, including without doubt the pope himself.

Paul Misner

Marquette University

doi:10.1017/S0009640720001742

***Crawford Howell Toy: The Man, the Scholar, the Teacher.* By Mikeal C. Parsons. Perspectives on Baptist Identities. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2019. xvi + 356 pp. \$35.00 paper.**

If denominations maintain a registry of their "good guys" and "bad guys," some would swear that Crawford Howell Toy ranks first among Southern Baptist "bad guys." Others claim that Toy has been victimized by bad press and under slightly different circumstances he would be numbered among the "good guys." In *Crawford Howell Toy: The Man, the Scholar, the Teacher*, Mikeal Parsons argues that Toy defies simplistic labels like hero or heretic, and he makes a convincing case for Toy being among the most complicated figures in Southern Baptist history.

So, who *was* Crawford Toy? Past inquiries have tended to be tangential, largely because they linked Toy to Lottie Moon and/or Unitarianism rather than focusing on Toy himself. As such, Toy's tarnished legacy is grounded more in myth than actual history. One variation of the Toy myth goes something like this: Toy was a brilliant young seminary professor. He and missionary heroine Lottie Moon were engaged to be married, but Moon spurned him when she discovered that he denied key tenets of the Christian faith. From

there, Toy was tearfully and reluctantly dismissed from Southern Seminary, whereupon he relocated to Harvard and ultimately became a Unitarian.

There are variations of the Toy myth, but their basic story lines are all similar and misleading. For openers, Parsons shows that the romance between Moon and Toy has been greatly exaggerated, if not fabricated altogether. True, they knew each other, but accounts of the romance come from secondary sources, not the alleged participants. Parsons claims that Toy's dismissal from Southern Seminary has also been exaggerated. According to myth, Southern's president, James Petigru Boyce, embraced him and claimed he would give his right arm if Toy would believe as he once had. But in mining William H. Whitsitt's diary, Parsons discovered that Toy and Boyce had probably never really been on good terms. Whitsitt had been Toy's colleague and roommate in Louisville. If anyone knew Toy, it was Whitsitt, and if his diary is correct, Boyce saw Toy as a liability rather than an asset for Southern Seminary. Curiously, even after he left Southern, Toy maintained a cordial relationship with denominational icon John Broadus, whose views may not have differed dramatically from Toy's. Parsons's account of Toy and his time at Southern is worth the book's \$35.00 price tag.

Once at Harvard, Crawford Toy thrived. That aspect of the Toy myth is relatively accurate. Toy proved that he was a productive scholar, and by all accounts he was a dedicated friend, a fine colleague, and an upright citizen. In 1888 he married Nancy Saunders, a woman who apparently had her own social agenda. If so, that may help explain Toy's alleged Unitarianism. Being a Unitarian in Boston had certain social advantages, and though Toy had been a member of a Baptist church, he may have asked to be removed from its membership role so he and Nancy could attend services at the First Parish Church and rub elbows with Boston's elite. In fairness to Toy, however, Parsons observes that according to existing records, Toy never officially united with any Unitarian congregation.

Writing biography may be one of the most difficult tasks any writer can attempt. That said, *Crawford Howell Toy: The Man, the Scholar, the Teacher* is occasionally uneven. For instance, the differences between biblical inerrancy as a theological tenet and hermeneutics as an understanding and application of scripture occasionally get blurred. This may be because Crawford Toy was such a complicated person and his writings reflect as much. On the other hand, it might also be due in part to the author's method. Parsons admits that he is neither a historian nor a biographer, per se, and he was not attempting to write a critical biography. Rather, he relied on numerous, extended direct quotes from previously untapped sources. He concedes early on that he may have used too many, but Parsons states he wanted to offer an abundant sampling of primary material so readers might assess Toy for themselves. These criticisms are minor and do not detract from this book's overall value for readers. As for his own understanding of Toy, Parsons says that his study helped him better understand Toy as a scholar, but "I cannot claim to have fully understood his complex personality" (xvi). Maybe not, but Parsons has provided a resource that will surely be the starting point for any future inquiry.

Readers will find much to ponder in *Crawford Howell Toy: The Man, the Scholar, the Teacher*. Likely, they will not agree with many of his conclusions, but Mikael Parsons provides interested parties a glimpse of Crawford Toy that goes well beyond mere denominational lore. In Parsons's hands, Toy is more than either a heretic or a hero. Toy is a devoted family man, a scholar, an exemplary colleague, teacher, and friend—a

real person as opposed to a symbol. In the end, this book likely raises as many questions as it answers, but in this reviewer's opinion, good books tend to do that.

Keith Harper
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
doi:10.1017/S0009640720001754

Science, Religion, and the Protestant Tradition: Retracing the Origins of Conflict. By James C. Ungureanu. Science and Culture in the Nineteenth Century. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2019. ix + 358 pp. \$50.00 hardcover.

In a time of alternative facts, rampant conspiracy theories, climate change denial, and an apparent upsurge in flat-earthers, it is a breath of fresh air to read James Ungureanu's erudite analysis of why so many people came to believe, and still do, that religion and science are implacable enemies. In six eminently readable chapters and an excellent summary conclusion, Ungureanu introduces the reader to John William Draper (1832–1882) and Andrew Dickson White (1832–1918), authors of two books singled out as the chief instigators of the “conflict theory” of religion and science—Draper's *History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science* (1874) and White's *A History of the Warfare of Science and Theology in Christendom* (1896). By reading these works as primary rather than secondary sources, Ungureanu demonstrates that neither Draper nor White posited an irrevocable rift between science and religion. They were both deeply religious men who believed that liberal forms of Protestantism would preserve and strengthen Christianity by reconciling science and religion. Readers, however, misunderstood their nuanced positions and accepted the “conflict theory” at face value.

While providing an Ariadne's thread through the complex landscape of nineteenth-century religious controversies, Ungureanu demonstrates that the “conflict theory” did not originate with Draper and White but emerged centuries earlier in the writings of Protestants intent on undermining Catholicism by emphasizing the irrationality of Catholic doctrine and the falsity of the historical narrative supporting the church. Over time the weapons devised by Protestants to attack Catholicism were utilized by liberal Protestants against their conservative coreligionists. The conflict was therefore not between religion and science per se but between two theological traditions: a liberal one emerging in the seventeenth century among English Latitudinarians, and more orthodox forms of Protestantism.

In a separate chapter, Ungureanu describes the “communication revolution” that provided Draper and White access to a growing market for their work as a result of cheaper paper, new forms of publication, the increasing ease of transporting printed matter, and a rise in literacy. Their publisher, Edward Livingston Youmans, was a key figure in popularizing their work, even though he rejected their assumption that liberal Protestantism would bring an end to the conflict. Instead, Youmans rejected Christianity altogether in favor of the “new religion” of scientific naturalism.

Ungureanu's book will appeal to anyone interested in the complex relationship between science and religion in the nineteenth century and the profound effects the