

Hasmonéens que ces derniers présentent comme le renouvellement ou la continuation de certains cultes ancestraux, et la pratique ou la signification effective de ces cultes dans les sources bibliques. Il s'intéresse aux éléments venus du monde grec qui sont intégrés au système hasmonéen et à ceux qui en sont rejetés ainsi qu'aux raisons qui ont mené à leur sort respectif – tout en notant les variations d'un dirigeant hasmonéen à l'autre.

Ainsi, après avoir discuté la teneur des textes mentionnant les Hasmonéens et leurs actions, et précisé que bien que leur représentation soit idéalisée, leurs messages semblent largement acceptés et adoptés par les Juifs de Judée et de Diaspora, l'auteur passe en revue les éléments archéologiques qui contribuent à se faire une idée de ces messages qu'ils voulaient faire passer : les pièces de monnaie des différents dirigeants de la dynastie dépourvues de représentations figurées et mettant en avant leur titre de grands-prêtres plutôt que leur titre royal, la vaisselle trouvée dans les ruines des palais, qui est simple, sans fioritures et de confection locale — ce qui assure qu'elle n'a jamais servi des idolâtres —, la simplicité générale des demeures des régents — illustrée par la méthode d'« analyse de l'accès » qui « déchiffre la complexité spatiale grâce à des outils analytiques », méthode très convaincante –, les bains rituels nombreux qui témoignent de l'attention portée par cette lignée de grands-prêtres aux lois religieuses et rendue manifeste aux yeux de tous afin de mettre en avant l'aspect juif et pratiquant de leur royauté, la magnificence des jardins et piscines ouverts au public qui vise à faire participer la nation au succès rencontré par ses souverains, etc. Une fois étayées les thèses des visées hasmonéennes aspirant à unifier l'ensemble des Juifs du monde (désignés selon l'étude par le terme « heber ha-yehudim » qui inclut les régents eux-mêmes) par une mémoire (historique), une conscience (religieuse), des pratiques et une reconnaissance politique communes, R. en vient à établir les conséquences de ces faits. Parmi les plus intéressantes : d'une part, la restauration du Temple, l'indépendance des Juifs sur leur terre, le pouvoir des Hasmonéens laissent les contemporains imaginer qu'une nouvelle ère d'implication active de Dieu dans son monde s'ouvre, ce qui donne libre cours aux espoirs messianiques ; d'autre part, le façonnement d'une identité collective, commune à tous les Juifs de par le monde, fondée sur les mêmes principes, les mêmes pratiques, la même histoire, les mêmes repères culturels et l'allégeance aux mêmes dirigeants fait basculer le judaïsme de son état de groupe désigné comme tel de l'extérieur à un état de communauté qui s'auto-définit et choisit ses références. R. reconnaît là les éléments qui permettront au judaïsme de devenir une religion prosélyte.

En conclusion, il s'agit d'une étude passionnante et extrêmement bien menée dans son ensemble malgré quelques rares passages un peu difficiles à lire. Le développement des arguments qui gagnent en validité à mesure que le cercle des indices contribuant à les soutenir s'élargit, rend cet ouvrage pertinent et convaincant. Les perspectives nouvelles qu'avance l'auteur en s'appuyant sur ses conclusions sont particulièrement stimulantes. Comme il a déjà été observé plus haut, experts, amateurs et néophytes trouveront leur intérêt dans ce livre.

Stéphanie Binder

Université Bar-Ilan

P. Janiszewski, K. Stebnicka, and E. Szabat, *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2015. 450pp. ISBN:978-0-19-871340-1.

*Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire* by Janiszewski, Stebnicka, and Szabat (henceforth J., S., and S.) is a much-needed addition to the ever-increasing scholarship of the so-called Second Sophistics. As the authors make clear in the very first sentence of their two-page long preface, this volume aims to collect all known individuals who could be included under the title of Greek sophists and rhetors either by the title of σοφιστής or ῥήτωρ or by implication and context (p. vii). The authors also include teachers of rhetoric; individuals known

to have given public performances in the form of lectures; and those who composed treatises on rhetoric. The timespan covered begins with Augustus and concludes with the seventh century CE. Furthermore, the volume includes only those who were engaged in Greek rhetoric, of all origins, whereas orators who wrote or lectured in Latin are excluded. As the authors declare: ‘The collection should not be expected to be a profound and a complete analysis of the intellectual activity of ancient Greek sophists and rhetors in the Roman Empire. It was created to provide a convenient apparatus for source reference that can be used in many different studies on ancient culture and history. Consequently, the entries focus on biographical data, with a clear record of all ancient testimonies on each individual’ (p. vii).

All entries in this volume have been assigned consecutive numbers for cross-reference purposes. In addition, the authors have included a most welcome addition in the form of a collection of “sophists in medicine”, which are numbered independently. This section is preceded by its own concise introduction (pp. 404-6). Entries which the authors believe to have been erroneously treated in existing scholarship are noted. Each entry opens with the name, time and place of the person’s activity. However, the entries are alphabetically ordered, without any other divisions, such as time and place. Each entry is followed by a list of editions, and a concise bibliography. In addition, references to *PIR*, *PLRE*, and *RE* are included, but there is no general concordance of entries available in this volume with those available in other reference works. Furthermore, it is not mentioned which of the entries hereby included do not appear in other works.

It is impossible to review such a volume with reference to each entry. I will therefore examine one prominent figure — that of Aelius Aristides — and a few more minor figures before addressing the book as a whole. The figure of Aelius Aristides is well known from his own corpus, as well as from his mention in works of others, as well as in inscriptions. The relevant entry elegantly describes Aristides’ life, career, and connections with other Greek sophists, such as Polemon, Aristokles, and Herodes Atticus, using a wide range of sources. A comment on Aristides’ health made by his near contemporary Galen, is however omitted (preserved in the Arabic translation of Galen’s Commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus*. See Schröder *CMG*, Suppl. 1. 1934, p. 33). In addition, all epigraphical evidence is only referred to via Puech, B. (2002) *Orateurs et sophistes Grecs dans les inscriptions d’époque impériale* (Paris). I believe that a direct reference would have made this volume a more efficient tool. As J., S., and S. mention, literature on Aelius Aristides is vast, and there is no pretence to cover all of it in a three-column long entry. In fact, the authors announce that ‘this entry is based on the detailed conclusions of C. Behr’ (p. 54). However, with simple cross-references to associated sophists, it is an entry, and a volume, which is beneficial for comparative study.

It is, however, the more minor figures, which make this volume a valuable tool for future research. Thus we find Achilleus, a second century CE rhetor who is only known through a single papyrus (*P. Oxy* LXXV 5055, l. 15). Likewise, M. Antonios Popillios Agelaos, a second-century sophist from Aphrodisias, is mentioned in a single inscription (*I. Aph* 2007 12.807). The second-century Egyptian Longos is only known from excerpts from a court record held in the Arsinoite nome at 184 CE, where Longos and another rhetor by the name of Apollonianos (conveniently cross-referenced) were advocates for the defence (*BGU* 361, col. 3, l. 6).

These entries are concise, useful, with reference to the relevant source and include a short translation of the papyrus/inscription itself. Though an Aelius Aristides scholar is unlikely to solely rely on the entry J., S., and S. offer, those who pursue a comparative study of sophists and rhetors of the Roman Empire will greatly benefit from this full collection of all minor figures.

The only thing missing from this beautifully composed volume is a large section of indices. Other than a list of names of the protagonists included, this book offers no index at all in a work whose value lies in its ability to facilitate future research. Irrespective of the particular interest of future readers of J’s., S’s., and S’s. work, they are bound to require a collation of all accessible

evidence. An elaborate appendix of indices would have assisted. The entries are ordered alphabetically. Although date and provenance are given, it is necessary to go through the whole book in order to collect data relevant to a region, period, epithets, type of evidence, or any other category. Of course, an *index locorum*, which is absent, is essential in this kind of work. Notwithstanding these comments, this volume is a very welcome contribution to the ever-increasing scholarship on Second Sophistic.

Ido Israelowich

Tel Aviv University

William Horbury, *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. X + 501 pp. ISBN 9780521622967.

It is not every day that a book on the second and third Jewish revolts against Rome is published. Usually, the revolt of Bar Kokhba is studied alongside the first Jewish revolt, which led to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish temple, and the revolt in the Jewish diaspora in the reign of Trajan is treated as a somewhat isolated event. Nonetheless, William Horbury (H.) has committed himself to treating these two revolts together. The result is a learned and lengthy book taking into consideration recent scholarship as well as texts and artefacts found in the twentieth century that have enhanced our knowledge particularly of the revolt of Bar Kokhba.

From the outset, this book, which is divided into five long chapters and contains five maps, approaches the disturbances under Trajan and Hadrian not as revolts, but as wars, hence the title of the book. The reason for this is to be found in the Introduction where H. cites precedents in older scholarship not only for treating these two events together, but also for designating them as wars. Furthermore, they are referred to and understood as such (*polemos*) in Cassius Dio and Eusebius. These two historians remain the primary sources for these revolts, but their accounts may be supplemented by rabbinic literature and in particular now the finds from both Egypt and Judaea.

In Chapter 2, 'Sources and historians', H. deals first with Dio, whose description particularly of the revolt in the diaspora is famous, or infamous, for its not very flattering description of the behaviour of the Jews towards non-Jews. Dio's account should, however, so H., be read within the historian's general account of the Jews in his work. In the light of these passages, Dio appears as a nuanced and almost neutral observer of the Jews, stating that the Jews have generally been met with tolerance and have attracted gentile adherents. Eusebius, independent of Dio, views all three revolts as connected, reaching a climax under Bar Kokhba, whose downfall is seen as a divine punishment of the entire Jewish people. The sources for these two revolts are, then, sparse, and it may come as a surprise to the reader that this chapter takes up no less than 100 pages. H. does, however, draw much attention to Jewish sources, rabbinic texts as well as Josephus, the last of which may provide us with the context in which the second and third revolts broke out.

The rest of Chapter 2 deals with what H. designates as "historians", i.e. later sources familiar with and interpreting Cassius Dio and Eusebius. This broadly encompassing group thus comprises authors and scholars spanning from Orosius through Mommsen and Renan to modern scholars. H. elegantly shows how scholarship, like a pendulum, has swung between the verdicts of Dio and Eusebius. Exhaustive in its history of scholarship this chapter will no doubt be very useful for future studies.

With Chapter 3, 'Antecedents', H. provides a context for the outbreak of violence under Trajan and Hadrian. H. argues that from the time of Cicero on, the Romans regarded the Jewish people as particularly rebellious. (It should, however, be emphasised that this is not a view shared by Cassius Dio, one of H.'s two main sources.) This Roman view must not, so H., be conceived of as antipathy towards the Jewish people, not even in the case of the Flavian emperors. The Flavian