

corpus (especially *An. et res.*, *Hex.*, *Apol.*), related writings of other early Christian authors (especially Origen, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen), or potential philosophical and technical sources that may be informing Gregory's thought (especially Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus and Galen). Notes also provide readers with scriptural citations, descriptions of manuscript discrepancies above and beyond the critical apparatus, engagement with secondary scholarship, comparison to alternative translations and accounts of the treatise's reception history.

Behr's continuing commitment to the updating of editions and translations of important works from among the Greek Fathers is commendable. He locates Gregory's treatise within its historical, philosophical and theological context, offers an edition more representative of the extant witnesses to this treatise and provides a readable translation for contemporary English readers. One of the areas in Behr's project about which I have a larger question is whether relating Gregory to so many voices from across the landscape of antiquity and late antiquity illuminates Gregory's perspective or perhaps may render it less accessible for many readers. For instance, Behr begins his philosophical typology with Anaxagoras, following the work of Tzamilikos (2016) and Marmodoro (2017), which seems somewhat speculative when it assigns to this distant figure such a high magnitude of importance for the theology of Origen and Gregory. While I agree that it is crucial for readers to appreciate the philosophical tradition with which Gregory's treatise converses, for it is substantial and significant, it would seem to be at least equally as important to lay out at greater length the more immediate context of Gregory's relationship to Basil and Nazianzen, the Eunomian controversy and other late fourth-century matters shaping Gregory's philosophical sensibilities, theological pressures and exegetical decisions. While pursuing understanding of the Church Fathers as a chorus of voices still singing in the Church to this day is a worthwhile task to which I too am committed, I am a little more reticent about what may be glossed over when attempting to generate a grander narrative across philosophical and theological sources from the sixth century BCE to the seventh century CE.

While there will be minor areas of disagreement regarding translation renderings and issues of interpretation present in the introduction and the notes, this work of scholarship is no doubt a gift that should be received by students of Gregory with gratitude and excitement. I am grateful to have it in my library and have already seen the fruit of using it with advanced graduate students.

NORTH AMERICAN LUTHERAN SEMINARY,  
TRINITY SCHOOL FOR MINISTRY

ALEXANDER H. PIERCE

*Épiphane de Salamine. Panarion, I: Livre I (Hérésies 1 à 25).* By Aline Pourkier. (Sources Chrétiennes, 631.) Pp. 673. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2023. €59 (paper). 978 2 204 14958 7; 0750 1978

*JEH* (75) 2024; doi:10.1017/S0022046924001246

Vituperative himself and the cause of vituperation in others, Epiphanius has fewer admirers today, fewer even than his admirer Jerome, who had at least the gift of style. We accuse them both of calumniating Origen, but only Epiphanius incurs

our ridicule for manufacturing heresies (including a second brand of Origen's) to make up his predetermined count of eighty; and even if we subscribed to his sacred arithmetic, what credence can be given to a witness who confuses the Epicureans with the Orphics? His story of an unwary encounter with the Borborites in his youth (*Panarion* 26) is treated as fiction by the doctrinaire scepticism of our time, which assumes, without historical warrant, that propaganda is never true. Yet his efforts to construct precise genealogies for his heresies give every show of diligence, and if the texts that he cites are inconsistent with his lacerating commentaries, that is reason at least to believe that they have been accurately transcribed. We are bound to make use of him even when we doubt him, and this *Sources Chrétiennes* edition, providing not only an up-dated text but commentary, translation and an extensive introduction, will be read with pleasure and profit by students of doctrinal history or the arts of ecclesiastical coercion. This volume, encompassing the first twenty-five heresies, is all the more to be welcomed because its editor, Aline Pourkier, is the author of our most important study of the itinerant theocrat in her monograph *L'Héresiologie chez Epiphane de Salamine* (Paris 1992).

The introduction to this volume necessarily recapitulates much that has already been said in the earlier book. It begins with a skeletal history of the career and peregrinations of Epiphanius, whose appointment in 367, in circumstances now obscure, to the see of Salamis in Cyprus is surmised to have been acceptable to the bishops of the island because of his fame as an ascetic (p. 17). It was in this prelatial character that he composed his most celebrated works, the *Ancoratus* of 374 and the *Panarion* of 375–8 (p. 18). Supporting the claim of Paulinus to the see of Antioch, he seems not to have been present at the Council of Constantinople in 381 which endorsed the rival candidacy of Meletius; in 382 he joined other partisans of the defeated bishop at a Roman synod under Damasus, where he made the acquaintance of Jerome (p. 20). In 392 he displayed more than the customary indifference of the Cypriots to external claims of authority when he publicly denounced the Origenism of John of Jerusalem in John's own diocese (pp. 21–2); unable to refute either his opponent's sermon against the Anthropomorphites or his confession of faith, he ordained Jerome's brother Paulinian without the assent of John, who forbade recognition of the new priest (p. 22). In 400 he joined forces with Theophilus of Antioch to issue a new denunciation of Origenism (p. 23). Pourkier's decision to record the known facts without speculation leaves us with a narrative whose *lacunae* are of more academic interest than its contents. When did the Epiphanius first conceive an animosity to John, the chief bishop of his native Palestine? Why does he show such enmity to Origen in the *Panarion* when he speaks of him far more temperately in the *Ancoratus* and with almost unbroken praise in the treatise *On weights and measures*, which is dated on p. 21 to 392? Was he or Jerome the principal mover of their campaign against the great Alexandrian, whom both commended even as they denounced him? How does his notorious iconoclasm (which Pourkier does not call into question on p. 21) sit with his readiness to excuse the Anthropomorphites, and how do his fanciful readings of the six days of creation or the stones on the High Priest's breastplate escape the strictures that he passes on Origen's figurative interpretation of Scripture?

These questions are not addressed in Pourkier's copious summary of the eighty sections of the *Panarion*, though some of them may be taken up in her annotations

to the discussions of Origen and the Audiani (or Anthropomorphites) in subsequent volumes. In her appraisal of the method and content of the *Panarion*, she finds it for the most part reliable in its use of sources (p. 34); at the same time she remarks on the author's propensity to infer heresy in opinion from deviation in liturgy (as in the case of the Quartodecimans; p. 36) and to assimilate different phases of the same heresy, thus allowing himself to hold certain authors guilty by association of tenets that they never made their own (p. 38). Some Anglophone scholars might feel that this notion of evolving schools is as much a heresiological fiction as the construction of *diadochai* or successions of heresiarchs, which Pourkier herself treats with suspicion, tracing the trope to Justin Martyr (p. 37). She has less to say than might have been expected on the usage of the term *hairesis* itself, which, as her own comments in the first twenty sections demonstrate, is treated as though it always connoted doctrinal error even when applied, in the classical manner, to the schools of Greek philosophy, or with Josephus to lawful sects within Judaism, or even, in the author's own innovation on the taxonomy of Colossians iii.11, to the collective *Weltanschauungen* of barbarians, Scythians, Greeks and Jews. There is some originality here, whatever Epiphanius may have owed to the *Apology* of Aristides of Athens, both surviving versions of which construct an inventory of false religions by setting the Jew against the Greek and the Greek against one or more species of barbarian.

I do not suggest that either the Greek or the Syriac text of Aristides represents a prototype of the *Panarion*; in their present form, indeed, they are late enough to have made some use of its contents. On the other hand, we would surely expect the *Elenchus* or *Refutation of all heresies*, which is commonly attributed to Hippolytus of Rome or his school, to have been as rich a quarry for Epiphanius as the *Refutation of knowledge falsely so called* by Irenaeus. The absence of any allusion to it becomes, if anything, harder to explain if, as Pourkier states in her monograph, and seems still to hold, he did avail himself of a lost *Syntagma* by Hippolytus, of which Photius has preserved a short synopsis (p. 34; cf. *L'Herésiologie*, 72–6). For my part, however, I cannot see how the patriarch's exiguous summary justifies her conjecture that this *Syntagma* was the lost prototype of two Latin texts, the pseudo-Tertullianic *Against all heresies* and a whimsical compilation by Philastrius which is alleged to concur with this in both content and order. In fact there is no more than a partial concurrence, and neither of these treatises ends with Noetus, as the *Syntagma* did according to Photius at *Bibliotheca* 121. Noetus is, however, the final antagonist of the *Elenchus*, not only in book ix, which appears to be the peroration of the main text, but in the tenth, which is widely believed to be an appendix by the author or his redactor. This is evidence that the *Syntagma* and the *Elenchus* (or its appendix) were the same work, but not for any knowledge of it on the part of Epiphanius, whose *Panarion* betrays no clear dependence on the *Elenchus* even when they attack the same heresies. Pourkier seems to think otherwise, for she writes that he borrowed from Hippolytus the 'plan bipartite' of quoting the heretic first and then refuting him (p. 34); she must be assuming either that he was acquainted with the *Elenchus* or else that the structure of this work affords a clue to that of the lost *Syntagma*. Both theses imply that Hippolytus is the author of the *Elenchus*, which is no longer the favoured position in Anglophone scholarship; if Pourkier (who says nothing of recent

debates) believes that he wrote both the extant *Elenchus* and a lost *Syntagma*, we might also expect her to advance some theory to explain this duplication of labour.

Whatever we make of these riddles, we must be grateful to Pourkier for a clear and accurate edition of the Greek text of the *Panarion*, prefaced by a list of readings that differ from those of the standard edition of Holl, sedulously annotated with parallels from Justin, Irenaeus and Clement, and faced on the right-hand side by a French translation which is perhaps less ‘maladroit’ (p. 29) than the original at its worst but equally capable of the colour and spontaneity which Pourkier reckons among its occasional charms.

CHRIST CHURCH,  
OXFORD

M. J. EDWARDS

*Narrating martyrdom. Rewriting late-antique virgin martyrs in Byzantium.* By Anne P. Alwis (trans. and intro.). (Translated Texts for Byzantinists, 9.) Pp. xiv + 210. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2022 (first publ. 2020). £29.99 (paper). 978 1 80207 748 3

*JEH* (75) 2024; doi:10.1017/S0022046924001039

In a world in which originality is prized, simulacra are rarely given the spotlight. But as Alwis’s engaging book demonstrates, rewritings encode historical, social and psychological information that has hitherto been largely overlooked. Three martyrdom accounts, all involving female virgin martyrs, are selected for examination, each a revision (either as a *passio* or as metaphrasis) of an earlier version. This synoptic vantage point allows Alwis to infer a good deal about the psychology and agency of three Byzantine authors, whose texts may be shown to reflect the concerns of their day. The monk Makarios (late thirteenth/fourteenth century) rewrote the martyrdom of St Ia of Persia; Constantine Akropolites (d.c. 1324) the martyrdom of St Horaiozele of Constantinople; and an anonymous wordsmith (ninth century) that of St Tatiana of Rome. Alwis follows up her analysis with the first translation into English of the three texts, shedding light on this long-forgotten material.

The author joins a relatively new but wholly salutary wave of scholarship, examining Byzantine texts for their rhetorical, cultural and social interest. Byzantine hagiography in particular, whose hyperbolic and formulaic construction is traditionally borne impatiently and only in order to access a historical or philological kernel it obscures, can in fact be read as a sophisticated and nuanced communicative act. While on one level this is obvious, Alwis makes the case for the examination of the narratology of hagiographies, specifically focusing on the implied *persona* of the narrator. Probing the distinction between author and narrator, commonplace in other disciplines, Alwis reckons to be relatively unusual in Byzantine studies. Her approach poses the question: how does each author convince the audience of the narrator’s trustworthiness, sincerity and knowledgeability, while also holding their attention?

An extended introduction begins by establishing the main currents in Byzantine scholarship in relation to which the author situates her project. The philosopher Gilles Deleuze is employed to justify that the simulacrum (or rewritten text)