

Diodorus' publication strategy and the difficulties in bringing this about is broadly convincing.

This is a persuasive work that places Diodorus firmly into his historical context; the corollary to this is that Diodorus is argued to be a writer and historian in his own right, and one worth studying for his own sake. There is a strong emphasis on Rome throughout the work, and it could be argued that inspiration for Diodorus' choices could be found in the wider contemporary situation – he was, after all, a universal historian, and his lessons may well have been intended for a universal audience. Nonetheless, M.'s work is an important contribution to the study of Diodorus and Hellenistic historiography, and is sure to be a starting point for much work to come.

*University of Manchester*

PETER MORTON

[peter.morton@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:peter.morton@manchester.ac.uk)

## THE MARTYRDOM OF PETER AND PAUL

ZWIERLEIN (O.) *Petrus in Rom. Die literarischen Zeugnisse. Mit einer kritischen Edition der Martyrien des Petrus und Paulus auf neuer handschriftlicher Grundlage*. Second edition. (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 96.) Pp. xiv + 486, pls. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2016. Paper, £14.99, €19.95, US\$19.95. ISBN: 978-3-11-048849-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X17001470

The second edition of Z.'s critical editions of the *Martyrdom of Peter* and *Martyrdom of Paul* has now been released in a paperback version. Z. had compiled critical editions of classical texts before this one and has continued to contribute to studies of early Christianity since the publication of the first edition. In the volume currently under review, Z. also analyses the evidence for Peter's travel to the city of Rome and purported execution there. Although he has examined most of the relevant sources in detail, Z.'s minimalist conclusions have not been without response, notably a volume of essays edited by S. Heid (*Petrus und Paulus in Rom. Eine interdisziplinäre Debatte* [2012]). While aware of the reaction that Z.'s volume has elicited, this review hopes to offer a fresh account of the book's scope and a judicious assessment of its overall quality.

The study unfolds in two primary sections. The first section explores the origins of the belief that Peter went to Rome and was executed there, while the second contains the critical editions of the narratives about the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul. The volume concludes with a bibliography, indexes, a list of corrections to the first edition and four plates containing nine images of artefacts and manuscripts that are referred to at various points in the study.

The opening enquiry into whether Peter was executed in Rome uses traditional historical-philological tools to argue that Peter was not executed in Rome. Moreover, Z. argues that Peter did not even visit Rome. Rather, this story arose among early Christians in the mid-second century. In order to reach this conclusion, Z. argues that the reference to Christians as the chosen woman in Babylon in 1 Peter 5.13 (ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή) refers not to Rome, but instead serves as a general reference to the Christian community in exile. Likewise, he sees the references to Peter's many

hardships in 1 Clement 5.4, a letter sent from the Roman church to Christians in Corinth, in general terms and thus not as evidence for a particular link between Peter and Rome. The sufferings of Peter and Paul that are mentioned in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch are permitted as a reference to the death of the men in Rome, but only because Z. views them as pseudepigraphic letters dating from 160–180. The source for the tradition that Peter went to Rome thus does not come from the earliest Christian literature. Z. attributes this tradition instead to Justin Martyr's misreading of a Roman inscription. On the basis of this inscription, Justin concluded that Simon Magus had come to Rome (*I Apology* 26.1) and that Simon's arrival in Rome led to the story found in the *Acts of Peter* in which Peter follows Simon to oppose him. Dionysius of Corinth and Irenaeus of Lyons then developed the legend with reference to Peter's death and place as the first bishop of Rome, the latter of which was utilised as an anti-heretical tool.

This reading of the sources is not without issues. First, although Z. cites Tacitus' reference to Nero's treatment of Christians after the fire in Rome at various points, no study is made of *Annales* 15.44. While the execution of Christians in Rome during the early 60s does not necessitate the conclusion that Peter was executed in Rome at this time, it does mark a plausible historical situation if Tacitus' text is allowed to stand. Second, Z. occasionally opts for surprising interpretations of texts. This is the case both when he rejects the use of Babylon as a cipher for Rome in 1 Peter 5.13, a reference that seems to be made more pointedly in Revelation 17–18, and when he refuses to see John's reference to Peter with bound hands being led where he does not want to go (John 21.18) as a reference to Peter's execution. Third, Z. must date several texts late. He expends much energy to do this with 1 Clement and Ignatius' letters, but the dating of 1 Peter to the early second century (p. 7) and John 21 to a later redactor (p. 120) as well as attributing only six letters to Paul (p. 217) are passed over without significant comment. Although Z.'s positions are not without support, he does not take into account the different conclusions of other scholars. Collectively, the consistent choice of late dates and hyper-critical positions will not convince all. Fourth, Z. points out that Peter's visit to Rome has been employed to support doctrinal positions such as papal authority (pp. 334–5). On the other hand, Z. seems to assume that his perspective as a Classicist is somehow neutral. This assertion is undercut, however, by the recognition that the legitimacy of Peter's stay in Rome has also been challenged by the Waldensians and some Protestant interpreters. There is no neutral perspective from which to assess these claims.

These criticisms of the first part of the study do not take away anything from the critical editions of the martyrdom texts. Z.'s is the most complete critical text of the *Martyrdom of Peter* since R.A. Lipsius compiled his *Acta Apostolorum apocrypha* (1891). The Greek text of the Petrine and Pauline martyrdom narratives appear on the left page with a thorough text-critical apparatus below. On the facing page, the text is accompanied by a highly readable German translation along with footnotes that offer cross-references and select thoughts on interpretative matters. Z. employs a new Greek manuscript, cod. Ochrid. bibl. mun. 44. The manuscript contains the martyrdom narratives of both Peter and Paul. Z. has made an important contribution by taking this manuscript into account and in his attempt to put forward the earliest texts of these narratives. These texts provide the guild with updates that are much needed.

In his introduction to the critical edition, Z. divides the textual tradition into two broad streams:  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The newly utilised Greek manuscript offers an earlier and more reliable witness to the former, while Lipsius' text relied primarily on witnesses for the latter. Z.'s text thus presents readers with a more complete picture of the current state of the textual tradition. In addition, the textual introduction comments on a lengthy description of Paul found in his own words at the beginning of the *Martyrdom of Paul* in cod. Ochrid. bibl.

mun. 44. If the point at which this description entered the textual tradition could be reliably dated, the comments in the introduction could be leveraged to aid in studies of Pauline reception. Finally, if one agrees with Z.'s two-fold division of the textual tradition, the introduction contains a detailed list of variants within the two traditions in addition to cataloguing the variants at the appropriate places in the textual apparatus.

*Petrus in Rom* is thus warmly recommended to scholars and students of Christian origins as well as to libraries who support them. Z.'s expertise as a Classicist and textual scholar comes to the fore in his much-needed update to the *Martyrdom of Peter* and *Martyrdom of Paul*. His study of Peter in Rome also challenges traditional interpretations at nearly every turn. Although such challenges are useful for recalling the slender evidence upon which ancient historians must reconstruct arguments, Z.'s particular lines of argumentation may not convince all readers. Nevertheless, readers owe a debt of gratitude to Z. for his work as author and editor and to the publisher for releasing this reasonably priced paperback edition.

*University of Otago*

JONATHON LOOKADOO  
[jonathon.lookadoo@otago.ac.nz](mailto:jonathon.lookadoo@otago.ac.nz)

## PLUTARCH'S VERSATILITY

OPSOMER (J.), ROSKAM (G.), TITCHENER (F.B.) (edd.)  
*A Versatile Gentleman. Consistency in Plutarch's Writing*. Pp. vi + 304.  
 Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2016. Cased, €69.50. ISBN: 978-94-6270-076-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000100

Plutarch is one of the most versatile Greek authors. He not only wrote works of completely different styles and generic registers – ranging from philosophical, ethical, rhetorical and educational essays to biographical works –, but also varied extensively the structure of the works in the same group (e.g. his biographical books, see T. Duff, *ClAnt* 30 [2011], 213–78) as well as his moral attitude from one work to another. Different arguments about the same things or people, for example, can be exploited in different contexts to make different points. The volume under review is made up of sixteen papers and is divided into four main parts, which examine several aspects of Plutarch's versatility: 'Plutarch's Versatile Philosophy'; 'Literary Versatility'; 'The Versatile World of the *Lives*'; and 'A Versatile *Paideia*'. The volume is addressed to Luc Van der Stockt on the occasion of his retirement, a distinguished scholar whose work on Plutarch contributed enormously to the establishment and advancement of Plutarchan studies.

After a brief introduction, in which T. summarises beautifully the breadth and depth of the honorand's scholarship as well as the main themes of the chapters, J. Dillon efficiently shows the variety of Plutarch's approaches to the concept of *apatheia*. Dillon argues that Plutarch varies his usage of the term according to the context and mode of composition of his work: as a school philosopher Plutarch uses the concept philosophically and polemically as a technical term of Stoic ethics, while as an essayist and historian he uses it in its normal, non-technical and positive meaning. Philosophy is the subject of the next chapter too, in which R. Hirsch-Luipold examines Plutarch's religious philosophy, which (as he argues) explains much of Plutarch's harsh attacks on Stoics. The discussion enlightens Plutarch's complex attitude towards the Stoics, which, as is shown, varies from Plutarch's acceptance of Stoic ideas, or acceptance of Stoic terminology and revision of the concepts