It is of the nature of a review that space must limit the praise and that criticisms must have their place, but if space permitted, much more commendation might be given. The only serious criticism is that occasionally Mrs Griffin seems to make the evidence bear slightly more weight than it can. While it is true that Cicero names Panaetius as his major source for the *De Officiis*, one might wonder whether it is fair to assume that he is used as the source for all topics not specifically mentioned as not being in his *peri tov kathikon* (p.180). In general the ancients were far more lax about matters of attribution than moderns. Likewise it is far from certain that Bibulus' behaviour in 59 BC is portrayed by Seneca as an act of impotent envy (p.185). While Bibulus is said to have shut himself in his house *ob invidiam collegae* (*ad Marciam* 14,2) I suspect that *invidiam* means little more than political enmity. One must remember that in this passage both Caesar and Bibulus have to be portrayed as examples worthy for Marcia to emulate, and it is likely that Seneca is far more concerned with Marcia's situation than with making any comment on the political controversies of the late republic.

In a work of this length and detail, it is to be expected that slips will occur, but they are few. A slip of the pen probably accounts for the statement, 'In 54 he [sc. Seneca] was not an ex-praetor'. (p.75). That was exactly Seneca's position, for Agrippina secured for him the praetorship from Claudius on his re-call from Corsica in AD 49 (Tac. *Ann* XII, 8,3), as Mrs Griffin rightly states (pp.62-63). Moreover, despite Plutarch's statement to that effect, Galba could not have been made consul in AD 33 at the instance of Livia; she had already been dead four years (p.243). If Mrs Griffin means that Galba's relationship to Livia had an influence on Tiberius, that is a different matter.

These criticisms, however, are minor and should not do anything to detract from the impression that this is a very good book and has succeeded in making major advances in our understanding of Seneca and his relationship to the times in which he lived.

_C.E. Manning_


When this reviewer, after a few summer weeks at Cambridge, and a few days at Oxford, ventured to remark that he preferred the former to the latter in the presence of an old Oxonian, the Third World War nearly started. Despite this, numerous scholars have made the transition from Oxford to Cambridge—notably C.S. Lewis and Dean Inge, and even that in the reverse direction as with our author Maurice Wiles, who after many years at Cambridge is now Regius
Professor of Divinity in Oxford. Dr Wiles has attracted attention by his views on Christology (in company with John Robinson), which are highly speculative, and his investigations of doctrine in the Early Church, which are solidly documented. In 1966 he contributed ‘The Christian Fathers’ volume to the ‘Knowing Christianity’ series (H. & S.) and in 1967 his study of the interpretation of St Paul’s Epistles in the Fathers (The Divine Apostle, CUP), a twin of his earlier volume on the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Fathers (The Spiritual Gospel, 1960, CUP). Now in conjunction with Mark Santer of Westcott House, Cambridge, and also from CUP we have Wiles and Santer Documents in Early Christian Thought (1975).

The new anthology invites comparison with Stevenson’s collection, A New Eusebius (SPCK 1965), and with the older works of Henry Bettenson, Documents of the Christian Church (Nelson Classics 1943), and The Early Christian Fathers (OUP 1956), but the real comparison is only with the last-named as the Wiles-Santer and the Bettenson Fathers are alike in limiting themselves to doctrinal selections, where Stevenson and the first Bettenson include documents of all kinds, in Stevenson’s case down only to AD 337, but in Bettenson in all Christian history.

Stevenson’s volume is compendious with three hundred and nineteen items in chronological order, but difficult to use through lack of any analysis of the types of material. To study the Christian ministry, for example, one has to leap frog from item thirteen (Clement) to thirty-three (Hermas) to forty-two (Justin) to one hundred and three (Didache), etc. There is an index but the daunting list of contents is purely seriatim. In contrast the Wiles-Santer has a neat arrangement under the major headings of God, Trinity, Christ, Holy Spirit, Sin and Grace, Tradition and Scripture, Church, Sacraments, Christian Living, Church and Society and Final Goal. The writers represented under each vary from four to seven (on the Sacraments Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem twice, Irenaeus, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom and Augustine) and the extracts are longer (fifty-eight in two hundred and sixty-eight pages — Stevenson has four hundred and twenty-two pages). Each of the eleven topics has an excellent short introduction of one page putting the quoted writers in context. There are also necessary footnotes. No biographies are included as they are readily available elsewhere. It is no doubt for this reason also that community products like Creeds and Confessions are not represented. All are personal extracts but they are not limited to dogmatic writings but are made also from sermons, letters and commentaries.

The main weakness of the volume for class use is that it does not begin until approximately AD 200 as Irenaeus is the first writer represented and Augustine the last. It thus complements but does not replace Bettenson’s Fathers, which includes also the Apostolic Fathers and runs from Clement of Rome to Athanasius. Bettenson has a similar range of topics, but under each writer, and
thus is in some ways more useful, although his extracts are shorter and lack the contextual build-up, which is perhaps the strongest feature of the Wiles-Santer. Incidentally the first one hundred pages of Bettenson’s volume in the Nelson Classics is a true *multum in parvo* and as good a source for doctrinal selections as is available and for the average student has the advantage of brevity, accessibility and the widest coverage.

*R.J. Thompson*