

linguistic shift from ‘created’ to ‘begat’ – ‘this Offspring was begotten by the Father before all created things’ (pp. 102–3). A key distinction was enabling some kind of plurality in the one God to be recognised.

There are a few oversights, missing observations which could perhaps have offered more clarity to the non-specialist reader. At the point under discussion, for example, the reader is not alerted to the fact that the Proverbs text shifts from ‘created’ to ‘begat’, presumably regarding them as synonyms. Meeting ‘Euhemeran’ on p. 36, one would have been helped by the definition which appears later on p. 88. On p. 15 we read about the difficulty of Christian converts continuing to pursue certain trades, some because they were linked with idolatry, others because Christians were committed to not killing – but we are not alerted to the fact that idolatry was also implicated in serving in the military: not to join in offering incense and sacrifice to the gods would be a mark of disloyalty to the emperor. On p. 19 Christians are distinguished from Jews who were willing to sacrifice for the emperor, but we are not reminded that sacrifice could only be offered in the Jerusalem temple and in the second century Jews would not be doing this as the temple had been destroyed in AD 70. Demons appear in places, but it is never explained that *daemon* was a word for any supernatural being, good or bad; in Christian circles *daemons* became dangerous precisely because, as false gods, they exploited those lifeless statues to get sacrifices out of their worshippers. Then, there is nothing about the powerful force of the argument from fulfilled prophecy in a culture where even the emperor consulted the Sibylline oracles before going to war. There are also a few typos and the odd error: Hadrian’s rescript was not sent to Pliny (p. 12) but to another provincial governor, Gaius Minucius Fundanus.

However, for all that, rarely has the world of early Christianity been so well described for the uninitiated, or indeed the consequent emphases of the apologists whether addressing it directly or providing converts with weapons to do so, or again the missional incentives to persuade everyone to recognise the one true God, Creator of all, to whom everyone is ultimately accountable and who sees and judges even the thoughts of the heart.

BIRMINGHAM

FRANCES YOUNG

Origen’s references to Heracleon. By Carl Johan Berglund. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 450.) Pp. xii + 403 incl. 2 figs. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020. €149. 978 3 16 159221 8
JEH (72) 2021; doi:10.1017/S0022046921000786

This impressive monograph is the revised version of a PhD dissertation defended by the author at the Faculty of Theology of Uppsala University in June 2019. It analyses all those passages in the nine extant books of Origen’s unfinished commentary of John that refer in one form or another to an earlier – according to Berglund (pp. 318f) continuous – commentary on the same Gospel, written by a certain Heracleon. Berglund’s aims are twofold: first, by the consistent application of well-defined and strict criteria, he wants to put the identification of authentic material from Heracleon’s work on a much surer footing. And, secondly, having winnowed the original material from Origen’s laudatory or critical comments,

Berglund wants to profile Heracleon's theology in a way that avoids uncritically adopting the heresiological perspective of Origen and places Heracleon in the larger landscape of second-century theological discourses.

Chapters i–iii (pp. 1–106) define the aims, methods and the theoretical framework of Berglund's enquiry and present a short survey of previous scholarship. Berglund distinguishes four ways in which Origen refers to Heracleon's work (pp. 6, 92–106): (1.) Verbatim quotations of Heracleon with little or no alteration of the original wording are introduced by certain formulas such as the definite article 'to', a term such as 'autais lexesin' or a simple *verbum dicendi* such as 'phêsin'; (2.) 'Summaries or non-interpretative rephrasings' may reliably present the meaning of Heracleon's remarks, but their wording may be altered; (3.) 'Explanatory paraphrases' are provided by Origen in order to clarify the 'underlying argument' of Heracleon's remarks: here considerable caution is required because Origen may have substantially altered the passage he refers to, either in light of other parts of Heracleon's commentary or, indeed, in application of Origen's own heresiology; (4.) 'Mere assertions' are those remarks of Origen which are clearly devoid of any basis in Heracleon's commentary, but may draw on the heresiological literature and/or exchanges with Origen's theological opponents.

By defining these four categories Berglund establishes a solid basis for his subsequent analysis of Origen's references to Heracleon in his Commentary on John (chapters iv–x; pp. 107–308). As far as I can see, categories 1, 3 and 4 are convincing in a fairly simple and straightforward way, and their application to Origen's text presents no serious problems. However, on closer examination, category 2, the so-called 'summaries', turns out to be a bit more tricky: Berglund argues that, although these 'summaries' seem to be very close to verbatim quotations, they have yet to be distinguished from them. Whereas some of these summaries use indirect speech formed with accusative and infinitive, others introduce indirect speech with complementisers, as, for example, 'hoti'. In addition there is also the 'hoti'-recitativum which is usually taken to introduce a verbatim quotation. It therefore seems to follow that after a *verbum dicendi* complemented by 'hoti', one has to determine whether this is a case of indirect speech or a case of 'hoti'-recitativum. However, the linguist Emar Maier has recently tried to simplify matters by claiming that a *verbum dicendi* combined with 'hoti' is invariably a marker of indirect speech and that in the case of the so called 'hoti'-recitativum there simply occurs an immediate switch from indirect to direct speech. Having pointed out that 'Greek authors sometimes switch rather abruptly from indirect to direct speech' (p. 98), Berglund uses Maier's theory in order to argue – if I understand him correctly – that there is no difference between 'statements attributed using "hoti"' and statements attributed using infinitive' (p. 99): both are to be considered summaries, and in both cases one may suspect a certain amount of adaptation. Berglund cites Origen, Commentary on John 13,2,11 and Comm.Jo. 2,20,135–6 in support. In both cases biblical 'quotations' (Ex 17,3; Ephesians 5,8) are introduced by, respectively, 'gegraptai hoti' and 'elegeto hoti'. Since in Origen's version the wordings of these biblical verses slightly differs from that of the standard text, Berglund argues that in both cases the direct speech should not be taken as an actual quotation but rather as a summary made by Origen.

I must leave it to the expertise of classicists and linguists to decide whether they accept Maier's theory and particularly the use to which it is put by Berglund. The immediate consequence for the reconstruction of Heracleon's commentary of John is the elimination of a number of 'quotations'. For example, the important passage in Commentary on John 6,20,108: 'Dealing with John [the Baptist] and the prophets, Heracleon says in a rather abusive way that "The Saviour is the word, the voice indicated by John is the voice in the desert, the whole series of prophets is an echo"'; this is taken to be a summary, not a verbatim quotation, because it is introduced by 'phêsin hoti' (pp. 132–6). Here, however, Berglund seems to express some misgivings: 'Nothing in the statement itself precludes it from being quoted verbatim, but our criterion that "hoti" indicates that a speech report is presented in indirect speech leads us to conclude that this is a summary, where the thought is Heracleon's, but the vocabulary may be Origen's.' And he readily concedes that 'the three key terms on which the statements hinges – logos, phônê and êchos – are chosen by Heracleon' (pp. 134f). With regard to this and some other cases I find the term 'summary' slightly odd because no actual 'summing up' of a larger textual unit can be observed. As Berglund himself acknowledges, his categorisation of Origen's intertextuality should and must be tested with regard to other works of Origen, particularly his *Contra Celsum* (p. 342). But even if further scholarly discussion may lead to a modification of Berglund's proposals, his work will remain important as a touchstone for methodical rigour and circumspection.

As regards Berglund's second aim, the reconstruction of Heracleon's theology, as a result of applying his rigorous method he goes beyond his predecessors in distancing the authentic Heracleon even further from the heresiological portrait offered by Origen. Berglund contests the labelling of Heracleon as 'Valentinian' (pp. 340–2) and discovers – drawing on Lewis Ayres's proposals – a certain closeness to a 'proto-orthodoxy' that emerges in the second century. In any case, Berglund argues, Heracleon's distinctions between a transcendent God, his Word, and a maker creating the world (p. 330) should not be deemed sufficient to closet him with a minority of radical 'Gnostic' theologians (p. 341). This removal of Heracleon from the Valentinian school goes possibly too far: Berglund's plausible claim that Heracleon did not accept a theory of three human natures (pneumatic, psychic and hylic) is no strong argument for denying a 'Valentinian' affiliation if it is unclear whether such a theory is a sure marker of a Valentinian doctrinal identity. Furthermore, Heracleon's view of a cooperation between the transcendent God and the creator of this world (p. 332) largely agrees with Valentinian conceptions, although other Valentinians may have laid more stress on the ignorance of the creator god. Ultimately, it all depends on how broadly or narrowly we define 'Valentinianism'. By way of conclusion, Berglund discusses various scholarly attempts at conceptualising early Christian diversity (pp. 344–7). He critiques the proposal of this reviewer according to which Christian doctrinal diversity in the second century should be viewed as a 'laboratory' of Christian theology. It turns out that for Berglund the simile of the 'laboratory' does not evoke a place of unfettered experimentation, but rather an institution characterised by 'authority and control' (p. 347). Clearly, similes suggest different things to different minds: my proposal was inspired by the title of a book published at the time –

Karl Schlögel's *Jenseits des großen Oktober: das Laboratorium der moderne Petersburg, 1909–1921* (Berlin 1988) – and was meant to highlight that the ‘laboratory’ of the Christian second century had been preparing a revolution of concepts, spiritual ideals and mentalities.

This excellent monograph should be required reading for all those interested in the history of early Christianity and the literary culture of the first centuries CE.

HEIDELBERG

WINRICH LÖHR

Tertullians Schrift ‘Adversus Valentinianos’. Die argumentative Widersetzung Tertullians gegen die Valentinianer als sein in rhetorischer Perspektive geschlossenes Werk. By Sarah-Magdalena Kingreen. (Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity, 120.) Pp. xiv + 497. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020. €104 (paper). 978 3 16 159602 5; 1436 3003

JEH (72) 2021; doi:10.1017/S0022046921001032

This monograph, originally a thesis supervised by Christoph Markschies and submitted at the Theological Faculty of the Humboldt University in Berlin, offers a thorough study of Tertullian's short treatise *Against the Valentinians*. In part A (pp. 1–116), a careful introduction to *Against the Valentinians*, Kingreen kicks off by announcing the analysis of the rhetorics of *Against the Valentinians* as the main focus of her study (pp. 2–6). A short chapter first surveys the work of scholars such as J.-C. Fredouille, and R. D. Sider with a similar focus on rhetorical analysis, before identifying a second line of inquiry: recent scholarship has tried to explore *Against the Valentinians* for clues about the origins and development of Valentinian Gnosticism and its various versions (pp. 7–10); Kingreen intends her study as contributing to that inquiry. Chapter iii of part A rehearses our knowledge of Tertullian and his educational background (pp. 11–27), while chapters iv–vi present the main results of Kingreen's rhetorical analysis of *Against the Valentinians* (pp. 28–77): the treatise combines an overlong *exordium* with a *narratio* which also serves as a refutation (p. 52: ‘widerlegende[r] Darstellung’). Or, as Tertullian himself succinctly puts it in *Against the Valentinians* 3.5: ‘merely to show is to destroy’ (‘etiam solummodo demonstrare destruere est’). Accordingly, Kingreen rejects the suggestion of, *inter alios*, Fredouille that *Against the Valentinians* is somewhat unfinished and that – following the example of Irenaeus of Lyon in *Against the heresies* – it was to be complemented by a proper refutation. For a polemical presentation revealing in one form or the other the absurdity of its subject matter one could cite – apart from Irenaeus *Against the heresies* 1 as the immediate model – other ancient examples, such as Plutarch, *On Stoic contradictions*. Building on the excellent work of Fredouille and others, Kingreen convincingly demonstrates that Tertullian's rhetorical strategy amounts to a creative adaptation of classical models, particularly Cicero. According to Kingreen (p. 275), the irony of Tertullian's *narratio* – building again on Irenaeus (*Against the heresies* 1.9.5; 1.11.4) – exposes for the benefit of his educated Christian readership (pp. 78–80) the Valentinian myth as a hybrid piece of stagecraft, combining tragedy and comedy in sordid and decidedly lowbrow fashion (pp. 74–7). Informed by Cicero, Tertullian is well aware of the pitfalls of rhetorical ridicule (pp. 60–73), which, as Kingreen correctly stresses, he