

difficulty also affects the way Elijah and other ancient biblical figures might be pressed into service as parallels for the traditions that arose about what happened to Jesus.

S. does not refer to Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (2006), a work that might have qualified his willingness to credit the NT authors and their sources with a "creativity" that could have allowed Mark and/or his sources to fashion an empty-tomb tradition on the basis of a Q saying: "You will not see me." Dealing with this and other texts from the common sayings-source used by Matthew and Luke, S. (like many others) writes of those (in the plural) who compiled Q and speculates about their theology and community life. But surely it is possible that only one individual put Q together, allowing for a single, central viewpoint as with Luke and the other Gospels.

S. offers various helpful insights when treating details in the Easter chapters of Luke and Matthew. But the arguments in favor of his central theme (that, as we move from Mark to John, we see a progressive accommodation of a disappearance/assumption tradition, first found in Mark, to an appearance/resurrection tradition) do not convince. The Greco-Roman material used to support S.'s interpretation of Mark 16:1–8 as a disappearance/assumption story seems largely irrelevant to a Gospel that most scholars interpret against a Jewish background. As we move from Mark to John, we do find a progressive linking, but it is one that links the tradition of discovery of the empty tomb (entailing Jesus's resurrection from the dead) with the tradition of his appearances and the individuals and groups to whom he appeared.

In any case, the central statement in the Easter chapter of Mark is "he has been raised" from the dead (along with "he is going before you into Galilee and there you will see him"), not "he has been taken up into heaven" (and "you will see him again at the parousia"). S. tries hard to explain (or explain away?) Mark's text in favor of his own disappearance/assumption thesis, but the arguments seem contrived.

Some of the page references in the endnotes should be corrected: e.g., n. 26 on p. 215 refers to p. 194 (not to p. 182), and n. 78 on p. 233 refers to p. 211 (not to p. 197).

Australian Catholic University, Melbourne

GERALD O'COLLINS, S.J.

THE EARLY CHURCH: HISTORY AND MEMORY. By Josef Lössl. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2010. Pp. viii + 247. \$130; \$29.95.

If you are expecting a straightforward survey of church history, Lössl's book will strike you as strange. Yes, there is a section that might be called a thematic history, but there is more. The book has three parts: an introduction to the history of writing church history and to historiographical problems; a treatment of the matrix of Christianity in Judaism and Greco-Roman religion; and final chapters on early Christian practice, doctrine, and leadership up to the year 500.

Chapter 1, “What Is the Early Church and Why Would We Want to Study It?,” justifies L.’s focus on church as institution rather than on Christianity as a movement, and shows why scholars of the past have studied it, but he does not make a good case for what he himself purports to be doing. L. understands church history as “a critical self-reflection process” (9) and includes a discussion of the methods of influential popular writers such as Robin Lane Fox, Elaine Pagels, and Dan Brown. This is where the “History and Memory” of the subtitle come into play as each age writes history for its own reasons. This chapter might easily be paired with Elizabeth Castelli’s *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (2004) as a case study of L.’s broader sketch. Chapter 2, “A Brief History of the Study of the Early Church,” situates early Christian historiography in the matrix of Hellenistic Judaism with parallels between Josephus and Luke-Acts and examples of Augustine and Orosius. L. follows Christian historiography through the centuries up to the “new vagueness of the post-modern age” (40). Missing is any discussion of the eclipse of the grand narrative, but this is still a catalogue of historians valuable for graduate students making their first forays into historiography.

In the middle part of the book, L. turns from method to content, and chapter 3 describes the origins of the early church with historical background for the emergence of Christianity, from Alexander the Great to the Bar Kosiba revolt, focusing on Roman attitudes toward Jews for their impact on Christians. Chapter 4 then takes up the question of identity formation in Jewish and Gentile Christianities between 100 and 300. L. wisely admits that the variety of Judaisms make Jewish-Christian differentiation a complex subject, and that “the two categories, ‘Jewish’ and ‘Christian,’ remained for a long time far from mutually exclusive” (75). In light of this, he analyzes documents such as the *Ascension of Isaiah* and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* for what they say about identity formation. A transitional chapter of 24 pages, “A Brief Survey of Earliest Christian Literature,” sketches major authors, their works and genres, again from 100 to 300. Two pages treat the West while the rest concentrates on Eastern developments, including gnostic writings.

The remaining chapters are thematic, requiring numerous cross-references to the other chapters. The first, “Living the Early Church,” concerns early Christian religious practices. It fulfills the author’s promise to treat topics not usually treated in introductions (119). The sections are ordered: sacraments as *mysteria*, conversion, asceticism, books, images, relics, prayer (including posture and kissing), Eucharist, Sabbath versus Sunday, church buildings, and finally baptism. To his credit, L. wants readers to note a variety of practices across the Roman Empire and beyond, but a treatment of rituals surrounding death and a different ordering of the material would have contributed to a more cohesive picture of the early church.

The second thematic chapter, “Teaching the Early Church,” deals with the development of Christian doctrine, specifically monotheism, the Trinity, and Christology. As in the chapter on practice, he recognizes a plurality

of orthodoxies (159). All the usual characters are accounted for, from Platonists, Tertullian, and Arius, to Eunomius, the Cappadocians, and Augustine. This chapter is clearly and economically written. The final chapter, "Leading the Early Church," deals with roles of hierarchs, councils, and emperors. The section on Constantine skillfully recapitulates the theme of the first part of the book on the creation of memory.

Despite some problems (e.g., Tertullian as a "defector" to a Montanist church [8, 169] rather than as a sympathizer of the "New Prophecy" movement), the material in the three sections makes the book useful for beginning master's students, as do the bibliographical references to primary texts in translation. The same aspects, however, make the book problematic for use with doctoral students. There are too many references to secondary sources where there should be references to primary sources. This is a useful book for beginning graduate students and seminarians.

Fordham University, New York

MAUREEN A. TILLEY

THE DELIVERANCE OF GOD: AN APOCALYPTIC REREADING OF JUSTIFICATION IN PAUL. By Douglas A. Campbell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009. Pp. xxx + 1218. \$60.

Campbell's lengthy study is the product of more than a decade of analysis of the Pauline understanding of God's act of justification through Jesus Christ. Focusing mainly on Romans 1–4 and Galatians, C. tries to deal with conundrums raised by the "conventional 'Lutheran' and essentially forensic" construal of justification by faith and not by works of Law. Regarding the first conundrum, he tries to reconcile two contrasting discourses, already noticed in the 19th century, in Romans 1–4 (forensic justification) and Romans 5–8 (sanctification, mystical participation), the first anthropocentric, and the latter Christocentric, mystical. As to the second conundrum, C. confronts the caricature of Judaism in Paul's day as legalistic in the justification theory, a particularly sensitive issue in the post-Holocaust period. In the third, the composition and purpose of Romans is at issue, and the nature of the problem and Paul's opponents are identified. The "individualist, conditional, and contractual account of the whole notion of salvation" in the conventional "Lutheran" construal of Paul leads to these intractable issues that have long engaged Pauline scholarship.

C. hopes with good reason that his work will break through an "essentially modern European construal" of the Pauline gospel with its projection of values and presuppositions into the Pauline texts. As such, the study is a comprehensive attempt to rethink the interpretation of fundamental Pauline texts and to formulate an explanation that takes into account the deficiencies already observed in the literature, to allow the texts to speak for themselves, and to be sensitive to the rhetorical strategy employed by Paul in Romans.

As an interpretation of Romans 1–4, C. observes that the theory of justification as a model of salvation presupposes a rational, self-centered