

remarks, such as the footnote on page 4 that ‘“true” indicating “in line” seems to be used only predicatively’.

Professor White proposes a refined correspondence theory of truth. The three terms of his theory are ‘what is said’, the relation of ‘corresponding to’ and ‘the facts’. Let us take each in turn. ‘What is said’ is distinguished from the saying of it, from what is used to say it, and from what it is the content of. The status of these distinctions is left unclear. How does one individuate ‘what is said’? This, and related epistemological difficulties, are not discussed. What is said is ‘embodied in, though not identical with’ what is used to say it. Professor White is over-fond of metaphor. Let us turn to facts. Facts, we are told, have causal effects: ‘It was the fact . . . that the train was diverted which made me late for my lecture’ (p. 83). I have seldom seen a cruder appeal to ordinary language. We might

suppose then that facts are ‘in the world’, but this is not clearly asserted. Facts are said to be ‘what the world is like’, but this is merely to hypostatize an idiom. Nor is the correspondence of what is said to the facts any happier. Professor White is careful to point out the inadequacies of ‘corresponding with’, of ‘picturing’ and of ‘fitting’. He uses the term ‘corresponding to’ and offers in explanation: ‘an entry in a ledger may correspond to a sale and one rank in the army to another in the navy’. I suppose that we are to imagine a list of facts and a parallel list of truths—both expressed in the same words, as is admitted on page 84! Such a theory lacks that ‘feeling for reality’ which Russell thought so important. It certainly does not explain anything. Professor White has, I fear, added to an already long tale of confusion.

DAVID PHILLIPS

**AUGUSTUS TO CONSTANTINE: THE THRUST OF THE CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT INTO THE ROMAN WORLD**, by Robert M. Grant. *Collins*, London, 1971. 415 pp. £3.15.

Professor Grant announces a major theme: ‘to set the Christian movement in its Graeco-Roman context and try to assess how much the direction of its development owed to its environment or environments’; he seeks to complement the classic studies of Nock (*Conversion*), Dodds (*Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*) and Chadwick (*Early Christianity and the Classical Tradition*) with an approach less specialist and more comprehensive than theirs, ranging over the history of the first three centuries of Christianity not only where it interacts directly with the Roman state, but also with reference to the changes in its own internal life and organization brought about by its developing position in the world. The book is inevitably a summary of a mass of material, yet it remains a well-organized and clear presentation of a complex process—the product, as the author demonstrates in his notes, of extensive and up-to-date acquaintance with recent contributions to this prolific area of study.

It is a welcome feature of the book that Professor Grant is concerned not to over-emphasize the significance of the persecutions. Such periodic confrontations with the Roman authorities were no more than isolated outbursts against the background of the more patient and lasting process of accommodation with the empire which occupied the main

body of Christianity from the second century onwards. Grant is also rightly sceptical of the ‘persecution decrees’ which some recent writers have pinned on to sundry emperors with little appreciation of the genuinely popular origin of most anti-Christian disturbances; in this book these so-called ‘persecutions’ of Septimius Severus and Maximinus Thrax, to take two instances, emerge in their proper perspective—the former a series of local incidents, the latter not a ‘persecution’ at all. Moreover, Professor Grant sees correctly that it was essentially the religious issue which divided the Christians and the Roman authorities: this is as clear from the consistent concern for the maintenance of the traditional worship expressed by Roman officials like Pliny in Bithynia or Aemilianus in Egypt, as from the uncompromising refusal of Christians to worship at the altars of the state. The concern for the *pax deorum* was heightened in the critical situation facing the empire in the middle of the third century, and some assessment of this (it is a pity that Professor Grant does not find space for it) is essential to the understanding of the measures of Decius and Valerian. It needs to be emphasized that the edict of Decius was not a ‘persecution’ aimed directly against the Christians—as Grant’s narrative tends to present it—but, in Norman Baynes’ phrase, an ‘Act of Uniformity’.

The author is most at home in the intellectual world of the Apologists, and in the Alexandria of Clement and Origen. None will quarrel with his presentation of these as the 'pace-setters' in the assimilation of Christianity into the Graeco-Roman world; the reader is properly reminded that the works of Justin and Melito were *libelli* submitted to the Roman emperor as respectful pleas for justice and recognition—with them Christianity took its place alongside those interests in the Roman world waiting on the attention of the emperor. But the emperor, for his part, rarely took notice of the Christians, and even if he did he would, like Marcus Aurelius, view them in an unfavourable light. The Apologists and the Alexandrian school were important, as Professor Grant well shows, not for any conversion of the Roman authorities to a sympathetic view of Christianity, but rather for their conversion of Christianity itself to an attitude of convergence with the state and an acceptance of the Graeco-Roman heritage.

This conversion also made possible the transformation which, by the reign of Diocletian, had brought Christians into the imperial court (even to the fringes of the emperor's family), and into the army and the offices of state, and which saw the Church in Nicomedia stand facing the imperial palace. Professor Grant regrettably devotes little space to this social aspect of the Christian 'thrust' into the Roman world—regrettably, because this proved a potent factor in the ultimate triumph of the faith in the next generation or two, as was demonstrated by the late Professor A. H. M. Jones in Momigliano's *The Conflict*

*between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*. Much of the evidence which Grant himself adduces might have been turned to advantage here. It is not without its significance that a contemporary bishop could invoke the prayers of Christian soldiers to explain an event so memorable in the life of the empire that it was recorded on the column of Marcus Aurelius at Rome; a similar point emerges from the incident in the reign of Caracalla when the actions of one (and only one, it seems) 'conscientious objector' aroused the anger of many fellow-Christians in the ranks, who criticized his provocative behaviour. On another social question, Professor Grant notes Celsus' criticism of the Christians' disruption of family life—why not a reference specifically on this point to the telling evidence of the *Acta* of Ptolemaeus and Lucius, or to the *Passio Perpetuae*?

Professor Grant's brief, however, is a large one, and we must beware of demanding too much. In the short chapter which is all that can be allowed for the complexities of Constantine's reign the author manages to combine a succinct narrative with an assessment of the emperor which captures the essential ambiguity of his position, at once *pontifex maximus* and 'bishop of all mankind'. Such are the characteristics of the whole book: the evidence of much learning is presented in a manner which is concise and unburdensome, while the theme of the progress of Christianity into the Roman world emerges always clear and secure.

E. D. HUNT

**THE WORKS OF ST CYRIL OF JERUSALEM: Volume 2: The The Fathers of the Church: Volume 64.** Translated by Leo P. McAuley, S. J., and Anthony A. Stephenson. *Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C.*, 1970. 273 pp. \$8.65.

This second volume rounds off the first complete version, I think, of the surviving works attributed to St Cyril to appear in English (and the first entirely fresh translation of his catechetical lectures in their entirety since that made in 1839 for the Tractarian *Library of the Fathers* by the future Dean Church). Of the two collaborators, Fr McAuley appears only to complete his version of the (pre-baptismal) Lent lectures. The remainder is introduced, translated and commented on by Fr Stephenson (now a lecturer in the department of theology at Exeter), and it is his treatment of the Easter week series of lectures on the sacraments of initiation that constitutes the main interest of this volume.

These lectures stand rather apart from the rest, and for the past thirty years or so it has been known that there is at least a serious critical case against Cyrilline authorship; but Stephenson is, so far as I know, the first to set this out at length in English, a task which he discharges modestly, objectively, and, to my mind, convincingly. If it is accepted, and the lectures accordingly belong to the end instead of the middle of the fourth century, the usual version of the liturgical history of that century needs to be modified in certain respects; Jerusalem can no longer be regarded as the solitary pioneer of developments in eucharistic doctrine and of the dramatic build-up and emphasis on mystery which went along with it,