

that Clement frequently adopts the usual method of interpreting the obscure through the more perspicuous and invoking the *akolouthia*, or continuity, of the Scriptures as a constraint on our liberty of exegesis (pp. 96–8). While all this is true, it is possible that Ward makes too little on p. 99 of Clement’s frequent citation of the parables of Jesus as evidence of the enigmatic character of the Gospel and the consequent necessity of an imaginative leap beyond the text.

Proceeding in chapter vi to ‘Scripture and the art of memory’, Ward observes that the cultivation of the memory was a recognised perquisite in antiquity for literary invention (the very word ‘inventio’ denoting in Latin not so much creation as discovery). Clement’s praise of his tutor Pantaenus as a Sicilian bee is itself such an act of inventio, alluding to the use of this image by Seneca Quintilian (I would add, perhaps Theocritus) to represent the gathering of knowledge from many repositories (pp. 109–10, 114–15), while his understanding of ‘chewing the cud’ in Leviticus as a symbol for meditation has its origins in Philo (pp. 110–12, 115–17). In chapter vii we read that the metaphor of building on Christ at 1 Corinthians iii.11–17 is, in the words of Mary Carruthers, a ‘trope for invention’ (p. 125), which Clement combines not only with the image of rumination but with Paul’s desire at 1 Corinthians iii.1–3 to wean his neophytes from milk to meat. After assembling a ‘constellation’ of passages in chapter viii which show that Clement held Christ to be the one Logos who expresses the mind of the Father and gives unity to the biblical revelation, Ward argues in chapter ix that the exhortation at Ephesians iv.13 to grow into the stature of a perfect man is the primary text in the light of which Clement’s handling of 1 Corinthians iii.1–3 should be construed (pp. 160–9). Apparent inconsistencies in his exposition can be explained by distinguishing the senselessness of the ignorant from the simplicity of faith (pp. 165–6). In chapter x a similar distinction, in conjunction with another ‘constellation’ of texts, allows us to grasp the role of pious fear in the attainment of the unshakeable tranquillity of wisdom. In these later chapters the technicalities of ancient grammar appear to lose significance; Ward has none the less completed a satisfying account of Clement’s pedagogical method as an exegete, which is grounded in a voluminous knowledge of Scripture and a profoundly Christian theory of the nature and purpose of God.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD

M. J. EDWARDS

Hippolytus of Rome’s commentary on Daniel. By T. C. Schmidt. (Studies in Early Christianity and Patristics, 79.) Pp. x + 207. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2022. \$37. 978 1 4632 4436 1; 1935 6870
JEH (74) 2023; doi:10.1017/S0022046923001161

N. Bonwetsch’s Greek text of Hippolytus’ *Commentary on Daniel* (*Hippolytus Werke: Kommentar zu Daniel*, i, GCS 7, Leipzig 1897) was considerably improved by G. Bardy and M. Lefèvre in *Hippolyte: commentaire sur Daniel* (Sources Chrétiennes xiv, Paris 1947) following the discovery of the *Codex Meteora* 573. A. Dihle and M. Richard, *Hippolytus Werke* (GCS Neue Folge 7, Berlin 2000) were able to make further improvements following the discovery of new leaves in the *Codex Vatopedi* 290 that is our sole surviving complete Greek manuscript. The recovered texts

were translated by their respective editors into German and into French. The Greek fragments found in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* x. 637–70, Paris 1857, I–XLIV under the heading *Hippolyti episcopi Romae Danielis et Nabuchodonosori visionum solutiones ambarum simul* had been translated into English in Philip Scaff's *Library of the Ante Nicene Fathers* v. Schmidt has now provided us with a much to be welcomed, accurate, literal translation in English of the entire restored text.

General interest in this text has been directed at the chronological issues raised. The divergent chronologies that appear in the works in the surviving Hippolytan *corpus* have inevitably raised the question as to whether those divergences represent different authors with different chronological interests and perspectives, or whether they result from confusions in the mind of a single author. Furthermore, if we are to regard (as Schmidt actually regards) those surviving works as from more than one writer representing a second-century, Roman ecclesial community, each influenced by a quite different perspective, then we can explain, for example, what the *Commentary on Daniel* presents as the chronology of Christ's life. In a manuscript reading that is disputed, 4.23.3 informs us that Christ was born on Wednesday 25 December but his Passion took place on Friday 25 March. The author's reasoning is on the one hand strictly chronographic, based upon data drawn from Luke's Gospel that affirms that Jesus, less than thirty years old, died in Tiberius' eighteenth year. The consuls for that year were duly named. However, on the other hand, parts of his chronology were based upon a highly allegorical hermeneutic that is quite the opposite to a strictly chronographic approach. The six days of creation were 6,000 years; the measurement of the Ark of the Covenant, five- and one-half cubits, indicated mystically that Christ's conception took place 5,500 years after creation and was therefore 500 years short of the 6,000 in which his second coming and sabbath of rest would take place (4.23.4–24.6). We have here seemingly together the criteria used to distinguish two distinct literary profiles of two distinct authors whose different works are found in the Hippolytan *corpus*. One profile is of a writer impressed by chronographic concerns raised by dates established against astronomical observations and consular lists and Passover calendars, the other is concerned with biblical exegesis based upon a complex method of allegorisation (pp. 19–20).

Schmidt is quite correct to see the *Commentary on Daniel* as the product of a distinct school of writers and exegetes and, moreover, to emphasise that such a community was geographically located in Rome despite its Eastern cultural and religious heritage. In multicultural Severan Rome in particular, cultural space between communities is only fallaciously equated with geographical distance. As a consequence, different methods (astronomical and chronographic as opposed to biblical and exegetical) could be employed by members within the same community, however much in conflict their original proponents may have been (pp. 5–7). But, none the less, the distinction between those different approaches is sufficient to point to two distinct profiles that in turn points to two distinct individuals from which they emanated in an originally separate form and whose difference as teachers led to some contradictory approaches in biblical commentaries composed by members of the community of which they were the teachers. I am not sure that Schmidt has recognised this point in his acknowledgement of different, conflicting perspectives owned within a common cultural backcloth (pp. 6–7).

The engraving in stone of the list of works on the statue of ‘Hippolytus’ in the *Bibliotheca Vaticana* (pp. 2–3) in my opinion proves empirically and beyond any hypothetical deduction from constructed literary profiles the existence of two different authors in the Hippolytan *corpus*. At certain points, dates from the author of the original *Chronicon* have been corrected by the engraver or by a second hand *κατὰ Δαυιέλα*. Thus the witness of the existence of the second author, beyond mere literary hypothesis, has been set in the stone forever. What Schmidt has shown is that work that survives as the *Commentary on Daniel* is not the work of the engraver/corrector: that title is found neither on the plinth of the statue nor in Eusebius’ catalogue but only in that of Jerome. The author of the *Commentary on Daniel* is clearly the heir to two conflicting chronological approaches, the one astronomical and scientific (or trying hard to be so) and the other hermeneutic and allegorical that he has combined, not without some mutual contradictions.

Schmidt is to be congratulated for both a welcome and a much needed translation of the fully restored text, with a commentary that points out implications for the construction of this work.

KING’S COLLEGE, LONDON/ST EDMUND’S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE

ALLEN BRENT

Manichaeism and early Christianity. Selected papers from the 2019 Pretoria congress and consultation. Edited by Johannes Van Oort. (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 99.) Pp. xii + 446. Boston–Leiden: Brill, 2021. €132. 978 90 04 44545 1; 0929-2470
JEH (74) 2023; doi:10.1017/S0022046923001203

Few areas in religious studies have benefited as much from continuing textual discoveries as that of Manichaeism. As a result, meetings bringing together Manichaean scholars working on the newly discovered genuine Manichaean texts from Egypt and Central Asia with patristic scholars researching on anti-Manichaean texts authored by Fathers such as Augustine, Evodius and Epiphanius take place regularly. The International Association of Manichaean Studies, for instance, sponsors a major international symposium once every four years. However, because of the high level of linguistic demands for research on newly discovered Manichaean texts, in recent years there have tended to be regular regional meetings focusing on Eastern Manichaeism attended by scholars researching on Manichaean texts in Middle Iranian, Old Turkish and Chinese from Turfan, Dunhuang and Xiabu and separate meetings for scholars researching on texts in Coptic, Greek and Latin from Egypt and North Africa. Given the importance of Manichaeism to the intellectual evolution of Augustine, the continuing interest of patristic scholars in Manichaeism is unabated. However, it must be pointed out that because Manichaeism is a ‘source-rich’ area of research and as such qualifies for international research funding, scholars active in Manichaean research, including the present reviewer, have pushed for Manichaean Studies to become a discipline in its own right independent of patristic studies. The success of such a move has also seen a steadily growing separation