beginning of each scene a literary analysis of the scene, with a summary of the action, a discussion of dramatic function and content, and an examination of any new character who appears. There is stylistic analysis as well. The notes explain cultural, literary and historical allusions in the play and elucidate imagery. Text and translation of a lengthy fragment of Menander’s Dis Exapaton, on which Bacchides is based, are given in an Appendix. The students for whom it is primarily intended will find that the commentary admirably fulfils their requirements.

Despite being “slanted towards the needs of those working in translation”, this edition “is intended to be equally useful to the Latinist” (p.iv). So the full Latin text is there, and the Latinist will not only be as much edified by the commentary as will the student working in translation but will also be better able to appreciate the stylistic introduction to each scene (which has reference to the Latin text rather than to the English translation) and many of the notes on matters of style and language. But the commentary will not solve all the problems which a Latinist may encounter. The presence of a translation admittedly renders unnecessary a proportion of the notes which appeared in traditional editions but does not entirely supersede them; in the present instance a classical Latinist might well appreciate a note on, for instance, sis in line 137 or qui in line 191. So, although it is strictly true that this edition is equally useful to the Latinist, it is also true that the Latinist needs something more and will on occasions find it necessary to look elsewhere.

W. F. Richardson

* I am not clear whether these stress marks indicate the basic metrical pattern to which the actual line may or may not exactly conform (as they do, for instance, in line 799 — Bind up his hands there Artamó, and quick —, where a realistic scansion of the line would have to put the first stress on ‘Bind’, not ‘up’) or whether they indicate the actual scansion of that particular line (as they seem to do, for instance, at line 35, where only seven stresses are marked at the start of a section containing lines which clearly have a basic eight-stress pattern, and the second stress is on a syllable which is unstressed in the basic pattern). This reveals a measure of uncertainty about English scansion which is manifest also in that the use of italics to emphasise a word in a line not infrequently conflicts with the scansion of the line.

Alain le Boulluec, La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque Hé—IIIe siècles, 2 volumes, (Paris, 1985), pp.662.

This useful and comprehensive work owes its origin to the questions raised by two quite different puzzles. In the first place the discoveries at Nag Hammadi seemed to show a surprising difference from the accounts of Gnosticism given by the early Christian fathers. Secondly, the questions raised by Michel
Foucault concerning the definitions of norms and their enforcement in human history seemed relevant to the origins of Christian history. In each case the writer was confronted by a separation of the normal from the abnormal, the repression and suppression of the word of the other, and the constitution of rationality by excluding the views of the opponent. Where did the decisive separation take place? At what point did orthodoxy and heresy divide? The distinction was not simply that of reason and unreason. How did it happen?

H.D. Altendorf has shown the importance of right conduct as prior to right belief, while W. Bauer has demolished the view that heresy is a departure from a primitive uniformity.

While there are references to heresies or divisions in Clement of Rome, Ignatius and the Didache, the opponents are never named. Justin names sects which claim the Christian name but depart both in faith and morals from the teaching of Christ. Like the successions of the philosophers, they may be traced back to their founder; but they are not philosophers, for their inspiration is demonic. With Greek historiography and the figure of the false prophet, Christian heresiology is on its way.

Irenaeus abandons the distinction between philosophies and heresies, insists on their many dissensions and their one origin. Heresies are not just different: they are wrong. Only the doctrine of the church gives a coherent account of scripture, neither adding nor taking away from it, presenting a system with some help from true gnosis and allegory.

In Clement, the account is more complex. Philosophy is useful in the fight against heresy, for the cause of all error is the inability to distinguish between what is common and what is particular. Dialectic is the touchstone of truth; in the hands of heretics it degenerates into sophistry. From Clement’s use of philosophy and philology emerges a new approach to scripture and a new concept of tradition. All of which comes out most clearly in an extended and excellent analysis of *Stromateis VII*. In the end, the only way into Clement, as Wyrwa and others have shown, is through the careful examination of his rich and compact text. Clement’s exegesis of scripture is governed by logical rules. It is a matter of separating what is contradictory, improper, contrary to nature and false, from what is true, consistent, proper and in accordance with nature.

Every argument needs a starting point and the first principle of demonstration is faith in the Christ who governs all truth from beginning to end. Heresy can therefore be wrong in two ways; it can start from wrong premisses and it can make plain logical errors. The teaching of the church derives authenticity from an origin in Christ and coherence with its starting point. All of which was worth saying and it is doubtful how much can be added to it, apart from a never-ending series of explanatory footnotes.

It appears that the diffusion of common standards of belief took place earlier than W. Bauer believed; but the borders between heresy and right belief
were readily crossed until the claims of doctrine became so strong that rigorous principles of ecclesiology, theology and exegesis were adopted.

This is one of the most important books to appear for many years. It has substance, originality and integrity and will stimulate the discussion of heresy and orthodoxy.

Eric Osborn