

few instances involving notable changes with particular importance for how readers will interpret and translate the text. In the opening of the *VS*, following the dedicatory letter, Philostratus discusses the differences, as he sees them, between the ‘Ancient’ and the ‘Second’ Sophistic. In addition to some small changes (καὶ κατὰ σμικρὰ, following Reiske’s conjecture, for καὶ τὰ σμικρὰ; προσβιβάζοντες for προβιβάζοντες), S.’s text gives μοῖσις ἀστέρων στοχαζόμενοι τοῦ ὄντος rather than Kayser’s μυρίσις ἀστέρων στοχαζόμενοι τοῦ ὄντος. The latter reading, as the apparatus criticus reports, is found in Laur. Plut. 59.15, and is the consensus of Mosq. Synod. gr. 239, Ambros. T. 122, Esc. Ψ IV.1, Guelferbytt. Gud. gr. 25 and Par. gr. 3059. S.’s choice, a technical astrological term, is certainly the *lectio difficilior* and apt for the analogy that Philostratus is developing here between the practice of rhetoric and various forms of divination.

At the end of the life of Polemon (*VS* 544), readers of Philostratus will remember the dramatic scene in which the sophist has himself buried alive, commanding ‘Hurry, hurry, do not let the sun see me silent’. In these penultimate words of the great sophist, S. adopts Cobet’s conjecture ἔπειγε, ἔπειγε for ἔπαγε, ἔπαγε (the reading of the archetype). There is a more striking choice to be made in Polemon’s final sentence. S., like Kayser before him, has ultimately opted for δότε μοι σῶμα καὶ μελετήσομαι (‘give me a body, and I shall declaim’), apparently changing his mind from his 2010 article, in which he argued for μετεμβήσομαι (‘give me a body, and I shall embark upon [it]’). This latter option would indeed, as S. has previously argued, be better suited to comforting the members of his household (*WS* 123 [2010], 91), to whom Polemon is speaking. The former reading is that of Vat. gr. 140, the latter of Vat. gr. 99, Laur. plut. 59, Marc. gr. 391, and of β (as S.’s apparatus criticus records). Despite the appeal of a reincarnating Polemon, given Philostratus’ interest in Pythagoreanism elsewhere (in the *Life of Apollonius* and in a different way in the *Heroicus*), one must concur with S.’s change of mind. Speech, and the importance of declamation to Polemon even at the point of death, are the key themes of this passage, and a Polemon who wishes for a new body in order to declaim is entirely in character. For the sophists of the *VS* literally nothing is more important than μελεταί.

S.’s edition of these key ‘Second-Sophistic’ texts will be standard for the foreseeable future. All serious readers of Philostratus and of what remains of Polemon will want to acquire them.

University of Tasmania

GRAEME MILES
graeme.miles@utas.edu.au

A NEW EDITION OF THE *REFUTATION*

LITWA (M. D.) (ed., trans.) *Refutation of All Heresies*. (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 40.) Pp. ix + 824. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016. Paper, US\$99.95 (Cased, US\$119.95). ISBN: 978-0-88414-085-6 (978-0-88414-087-0 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000215

The *Refutation of All Heresies* is a third-century CE Christian anti-heretical text that was likely authored in Rome. Originally published in ten books, the *Refutation* argues that the author’s opponents are guilty of plagiarism because they stole their teachings from

Greek philosophy, mystery religions and astrology. In contrast, the author proposes that true doctrine comes from scripture and the apostles. The *Refutation* contains a wealth of information about Greek philosophy and mathematics as well as how these were understood in the third century CE. L.'s edition comes from his own need for a 'usable, scholarly edition and translation' of the work (p. ix). In terms of both the work's utility and scholarly credibility, this edition and translation can be judged to have successfully achieved L.'s aims.

Before the text, L. includes a concise and up-to-date introduction. Although originally written in ten books, Books 2–3 are no longer extant, while Books 4–10 are found in a single fourteenth-century manuscript. Along with Book 1, which is attested in five manuscripts, these books were first published in 1851. Various manuscripts and early editors attributed the work to Origen. However, L.'s section on authorship illustrates that the primary debate centres on whether the work should be ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome, to a Hippolytus from the eastern Empire or to another anonymous author. After surveying the scholarship on the issue, L. argues that scholars must admit *aporia* on the topic, and he refers to the writer simply as 'our author' (p. xl). While the biographical details in the text are insufficient to identify the author conclusively, the author lived during the time of Zephyrinus and Callistus. L. proposes that Callistus' death in 222 CE serves as a *terminus post quem* for the *Refutation*, while the absence of a discussion of how matters developed after Callistus suggests a date not long after 222 (p. xli). The *Refutation* divides into three parts: sources (Books 1, 4), opponents (Books 5–9) and summary with true doctrine (Book 10). L.'s useful organisation of the work is accompanied by a fuller outline (pp. lv–lix), to which readers of this labyrinthine work may refer in order to orient themselves. The introduction concludes by addressing precursors to this work, its audience and its value for studies of Christian gnosticism.

The text and translation are formatted in a way that is clear and easy to read. The Greek text appears on the left page, while L.'s translation appears on the right. The sigla utilised to establish the text are a series of parentheses, brackets and ellipses that are inserted unobtrusively into the text. While they do not adversely affect the readability of the Greek, they helpfully show ambiguities in the manuscripts and the activity of the editor. No apparatus is found next to the text, but significant text-critical decisions are discussed in footnotes. The English translation renders the Greek text faithfully without being so slavish as to confuse or bore readers who utilise the translation in order to move more quickly through the *Refutation*. L.'s use of em-dashes and parentheses in the translation allow the author's sometimes cumbersome Greek clauses to be more easily understood while also allowing for some imitation of the word order and sentence structure in Greek.

Several elements of this book commend it to readers. First and foremost, L.'s text and translation comes after the text of M. Marcovich (*Hippolytus: Refutatio omnium haeresium* [1986]), which has been criticised for its invasive practice of emendations. While the manuscript tradition of Books 4–10 is corrupt at points, and L. follows some of the emendations by Marcovich and others, he avoids the temptation to insert himself into the text unnecessarily with too many emendations. While scholars may quibble with this or that textual decision, neither emendations nor a corrupt manuscript adversely affect the text. L.'s more sober editorial stance is to be appreciated. The introduction to the text is likewise useful, and L.'s note on the value of this text for Christian gnostic studies is particularly helpful. Although various debates have occurred regarding the author's use of sources, L. argues that the author's interpolations are governed by the author's aims to link heresies to Greek philosophy and to one another as well as the author's desire to appear cultured. Although the comments on Gnosticism cannot be accepted uncritically, the author of the *Refutation* generally maintains the integrity of the sources. L. rightly notes that, whatever

the author's faults, readers can be grateful for the preservation of this material on Christian gnosis (pp. lii–liii). Finally, L.'s voluminous notes to the text contain numerous helpful references to other ancient texts, recent academic studies and interpretative debates. For scholars who already know the text of the *Refutation* well, these notes alone provide enough incentive to consider buying the book.

For those wanting to move L.'s project forward, it is worth noting that this volume does not contain a full textual apparatus. Such an apparatus remains desirable. Readers who would like a fuller list of variants in the manuscripts, particularly in book 1, will still need to access earlier editions, such as those by Marcovich or P. Wendland (*Refutatio omnium haeresium* [1916]). Others may see ways to improve upon L.'s text or translation, perhaps by using the text as a basis for translation into languages other than English. However, most readers will find in this volume a useful base from which to conduct further studies. One such study may consider the *Refutation* as an attempt to make Christianity more palatable to ancient audiences alongside other attempts to do the same, such as the second-century Apologists or Origen's *Contra Celsum*.

This edition of the *Refutation of All Heresies* offers a thorough introduction, a useful text and translation, and enlightening notes that enable readers to understand better the author's thesis that his opponents plagiarised their arguments from Greek philosophy, mystery religions and astrology. The book will be of interest to students, scholars and libraries who study, or facilitate the study of, early Christianity, Greek philosophy and interactions between religion and philosophy in Classical antiquity.

Anyang, Republic of Korea

JONATHON LOOKADOO
jonathonlookadoo@gmail.com

NARRATIVE FEATURES IN NONNUS

GEISZ (C.) *A Study of the Narrator in Nonnus of Panopolis' Dionysiaca. Storytelling in Late Antique Epic.* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 25.) Pp. x + 282, fig. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018. Cased, €110, US\$127. ISBN: 978-90-04-35533-0.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001208

Once understudied, Nonnus of Panopolis (particularly his *Dionysiaca*) now has the allure of a true classic, at least if one were to judge based on the recent and vast scholarly interest in this author. The publication of *Brill's Companion to Nonnus of Panopolis* (2016, ed. D. Accorinti) is an important landmark. Whether Nonnus will one day also conquer a place among the classics for the general readership and in university curricula remains to be seen. G.'s book is not just another sign of this increased interest in Nonnus. Often indirectly, it also points its readers to reasons why the *Dionysiaca*, full of contrasts, is such a fascinating poem, embedded in the Classical tradition, yet surprisingly modern.

G.'s use of the theoretical concept of the 'spatial form' (G. defines it as 'a literary technique by which a narrative is structured according to the interplay of analogies and correspondences . . . rather than by a definite timeline' [p. 265]) of literature illustrates my point (pp. 74–8 and 254–8, a more extensive treatment would have been welcome). This term, developed in literary theory to describe an innovative feature of certain modernist novels,