

Campbell, William S. *Paul's Gospel in an Intercultural Context: Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans*. Studies in the Intercultural History of Christianity 69. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991. vii + 213 pp. \$40.00.

This volume represents a reaffirmation of Campbell's argument in the on-going Romans debate. Of the eleven chapters published here, five had already appeared elsewhere, and two had been accepted for publication. The earliest, containing already *in nocce* Campbell's position, came out in 1974. Unfortunately, the republication of the earlier articles has been done without any updating of the notes. Lamentably, the volume lacks both a bibliography and a scriptural index and is marred by many typographical errors.

Campbell's major argument is that Romans was written in reference to a real situation in Rome, and in order to explain a delay in travel plans due to the need of taking the collection to Jerusalem or to prepare the ground for a future trip to Spain with Roman support. More specifically the problem in Rome is that the Gentile Christians are looking down on their Jewish brethren. Paul writes Romans to affirm the significance of the Jewish roots of Christianity. For Paul the continuities between Judaism and Christianity are more significant than the discontinuities. According to Campbell, Paul argues for a Gospel that envisions a Christianity with dual memberships, one Jewish and one Gentile (150). Apparently this element in the argument allowed for the book's publication in this series.

Thirty years ago the question of Christian identity was debated in terms of the continuity and discontinuity between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith. In that context Jesus was presented as one who belonged within Judaism, whereas the *kerygma* proclaimed a universal New Being. Today the debate has been moved to the sociologically constructed worlds of the Jesus movement and the Pauline churches: both are thoroughly Jewish. Campbell's major concern is to prove that in Romans Paul did not conceive of the church as having displaced Israel. Throughout Romans the hypothetical diatribal interlocutor is a Christian Gentile, who, however, thinks this displacement has occurred. This argument is particularly difficult to defend. Why would Gentiles be particularly worried that God's promises to Israel might have failed (Rom 9:6)? Why would they be in need of recognizing that their security in the law might be false (Rom 2:20)?

For Campbell the core text is Rom 11:29, "For the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable." He interprets this to mean that God's covenantal relationship with Israel insures a series of privileges (75, 143). For him God's impartiality means that the Gentiles shall share in the blessings of Israel (142). But for Paul (as for Philo of Alexandria), the covenant is not a central theological metaphor. God's impartiality means that God's

judgments are not limited to the Gentiles. For Paul election is to responsibility and the God who elects remains totally free. God's gifts and call may be irrevocable, but they may be spurned, and the ways of the Lord are "past finding out."

Campbell posits that the law provides the basic continuity between Judaism and Christianity (86). He refers repeatedly to Rom 10:4 and argues correctly that *telos* here means "goal." The text, however, does not say that the law is the goal of Christ. In my reading I did not find any references to Rom 3:21, 4:14, or 5:20, which certainly cannot be overlooked if the law is to fulfill such a significant role. Campbell argues that Paul was a "believing Jew" (144). I am not sure what that would entail. The question is: Was he a practicing Jew who argued for dual membership?

Even if one agrees that "Paul's strategy in writing Romans is the social reorientation of both the Jewish and Gentile Christians" (140), it does not follow that Paul wishes these two groups to retain their distinct lifestyles and learn to be tolerant of each other. Paul does not reaffirm their identities and argue for pluralism. Rather he relativizes their identities within a new aeon. Campbell repeatedly pays lip service to the apocalyptic in Paul, but his fear of sectarianism (150) and his failure to recognize that Paul argues for a dynamic election prevent him from taking seriously this element in Paul's cosmic vision.

Saint Mary's College,  
Notre Dame, IN 46556-5001

HEROLD WEISS

Daley, Brian E. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. xiv + 300 pp. \$54.95.

In 1952, Jaroslav Pelikan complained that Martin Werner was the only writer who had ever discussed in any detail the problem of the development of early Christian eschatology. Brian Daley's relatively brief survey of the topic in volume 4 of the *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg: Herder, 1986) was a welcome and much-needed addition to the literature on the subject. Even more welcome is Professor Daley's new book, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*.

Like the Herder *Handbuch*, *The Hope of the Early Church* includes concise and accurate appraisals of the eschatological views of most of the Christian writers from the time of the Apostolic Fathers through the end of the sixth century. Daley has also added to his already excellent bibliographies and notes. Further, Daley includes in this volume far more comment on the differences in eschatological emphasis among the patristic authors, as well as the reasons for these differences.