done enough to compare the influence of philosophers with the influence of other teachers and advisers: there was always the consilium.

Quibbles notwithstanding, Rawson’s paper is the most important in the book. Sedley’s is perhaps a close second. If in the end Philosophia Togata disappoints, the trouble is in the project itself: it is too easy to go long on Philosophia and short on Togata. The Romans never really made philosophy their own. Cicero comes up virtually every other page in the book, as he must: but he did not do for Roman Philosophy what Virgil in the next generation did for Roman Epic. Rome had a more than passable answer to Homer and Hesiod, but it is embarrassing to mention Cicero in the same breath as Plato.

P. McK.


It is evident early on that Griggs intends *Early Egyptian Christianity* to be more than a ‘local study’. On the subject of Apocalyptic he says: ‘Western Christianity (defined here as Christianity in the Asia Minor-Greece-Rome sphere of influence) had not only a narrow geographical outlook, but also a limited literary tradition’ (p. 7). On reasons for the rejection of certain books as heretical: ‘an early tendency towards geographical eclecticism’ (p. 8). On Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria from 189: ‘one might ... account for the silence among his successors concerning the previous “Christianity” in Egypt on the grounds that they did not consider it Christianity at all’ (p. 28). Generally: ‘it is to such early heresiologists as Irenaeus, Hippolytus and Tertullian that one must turn for information concerning the nature of second century Egyptian Christianity’ (p.45).

The theory is an imposition of orthodox Christianity just at the moment when there begin to be any extant sources at all (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius’ account of Origen). Grigg’s hypothesis is essentially that the ethnocentric ‘Western’ Church brought Egypt into line, while inventing an orthodox past for the Egyptian Church. Grigg’s use of the word ‘Western’ is nothing to do with the Greek-speaking/Latin-speaking
division of the Church (and the Roman Empire) — it is essentially the twentieth-century use of the term. He means the modern parallel to be treated as exact, and he thinks the version of Christianity imposed on Egypt in the late second century may have been less like what Jesus began than the indigenous version (p. 29).

Is his case persuasive? It is evident that Birger A. Pearson’s article ‘Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations’ [Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring (eds.) The Roots of Egyptian Christianity (Philadelphia, 1986), at p. 132-159] was not available to Griggs in time: Pearson brings a new clarity to dealing with the Mark legend. But the heart of Grigg’s case is in the Origen period. This is when he claims the takeover happened. A pity, then, that his treatment of Origen himself is so thin (pp. 60-67). Though in a history book theological detail cannot be allowed to take over, this is the key moment. The usual assumption is that Origen, and before him Clement, are working from the background of a well-established Church rather than one which is in the throes of making a basic change in its doctrinal character. Some detailed comment on how Origen’s work would fit in with the situation was needed.

Griggs finds Origen difficult. He says: ‘evaluation of his theology with respect to gnostics, for example, is ... quite difficult because so many of his writings have perished’ (pp. 64-65). To which one can only answer that more of Origen survives than of virtually any ancient author — something must be possible. When Origen’s wealthy patroness’ other favourite, her gnostic chaplain, led the prayers, Origen would not join in. He was aware of a distinction between orthodoxy and heresy, and however much he was influenced by ideas from outside the mainline Christian idiom, he intended to be orthodox himself. Griggs pictures Origen as a semi- (or even crypto-) gnostic (pp. 66-67), but (perhaps oddly) he accepts without discussion the theory that there were two Origens – a pagan and a Christian (p.63). There seems to be some inconsistency. H. Crouzel Origen (tr. A.S. Worrall, Edinburgh, 1989) advances the debate on Origen: again, evidently published too late for Griggs to use it.

Though Griggs points to discoveries of manuscripts over the past century as necessitating his evaluation of Egyptian Christianity (p. vi), it is surprising how little he has to say about the Nag Hammadi codices. They are doubly relevant to his study: the codices themselves and the context where they were found are important, and so is the ‘prehistory’ of the texts in them. As to the first point, Griggs tends to reject the idea of any connection with the Pachomian community at Pbow or Chenoboskion (p. 178), but remains agnostic about who was using the books until they got hidden in the fourth
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century, and what they were used for. Granted that they should be associated with some sort of Christian context, were they for public reading or for esoteric use? Did their users also read the Bible, or only gnostic texts? Given what Griggs is trying to argue for, it is hard to see why he does not try to establish something positive at this point: specially since (as Griggs notes — p. 180) the focus of controversy that interested Athanasius was Arianism. Was Gnosticism of more importance than Athanasius would like us to think? Or was the fact that it was dying out connected with the codices getting buried? Then their prehistory: Griggs has something to say about anti-Catholic propaganda in The Second Treatise of the Great Seth and the Apocalypse of Peter (pp. 84-85), but he does not deal with the date, place or language of their composition. The fact that someone, somewhere, at some date, wrote against the Catholics does not prove that Catholic Christianity was imposed on Egypt from outside.

Perhaps I am asking questions that could not be answered definitively. But it is only by getting some way towards an answer that Griggs could prove his theory of a sort of 'let a thousand flowers bloom' Church before AD 200 in Egypt. Other Churches kept close communication from an early date, passing round letters from authoritative figures and giving (and accepting!) reproaches nineteen to the dozen. It would seem odd if Egypt was completely outside that orbit, and odder still if none of the voluminous writers in the Greek Patrology ever knew it had been a special case. Griggs wants not only 'autonomous groups throughout the country presided over by local presbyters rather than by the bishop of Alexandria' (p. 229) but a completely different Christianity: what he offers in this book is not enough to support this radical hypothesis.

P. McK.
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Halton in his Introduction tells us that Theodoret became Bishop of the town of Cyrus in Syria in 423 AD. He was a man of wide learning and a large body of his written work survives. This reveals an extensive knowledge of Classical and Hellenistic authors whose work he constantly quotes or alludes to. He has been credited with inventing the convention of printing the names of speakers in dialogues outside the actual text in the margin, \( \varepsilon \xi \omega \theta e \nu \)