

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

propaganda, most famously in the *Iudaea capta* coins, served only the purpose of legitimising the new dynasty.

On the Jewish side, however, H. identifies a continuous preoccupation with the themes of redemption and liberty in Jewish literature as well as on coins from the first rebellion. According to H., these themes are to be connected with a widespread messianism and a hope for the downfall of Rome. Furthermore, one should not expect that Jewish hatred of the Romans will have decreased after 70. H. is particularly successful in pointing out the relations between Judaea and the diaspora in the events of the aftermath of the first Jewish revolt in the case of the Sicarii who took refuge in the diaspora as well as Catullus' operations in Cyrenaica.

With Chapter 4, 'Trajan and Hadrian', H. finally comes to the revolt under Trajan. According to Eusebius, what started as unrest (*kinēsis*) led to strife (*stasis*) in its first year before bursting into outright war (*polemos*) in the second year. A discussion of the date of the revolt follows, with H. settling for 115 as the year of outbreak on the basis of Eusebius as well as a dated papyrus. The revolt outlasted Trajan and probably only ended in the latter part of 117. In this respect, H. differs from the dating of the events proposed by Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev (116-117).<sup>1</sup>

H. is particularly successful in describing the so-called theatres of war: Cyprus, Alexandria, Egypt and Mesopotamia. As for Alexandria, many of the references to turmoil in Alexandria in the papyri do not mention Jews and might be unrelated to the revolt, but H. takes this as an indication of unrest being a rather common element in Alexandria. In *The Acts of Hermiscus*, part of the so-called *Acts of the Alexandrians*, H. points to precursors for violence between Jews and Greeks in Alexandria shortly before 115. The sources are less obvious when it comes to the revolt in Mesopotamia. According to H., Dio and Eusebius were perhaps using the same source, Arrian's *Parthica*, which has not been preserved for posterity. Dio does not, however, mention Jews in this context but speaks of a general uprising. Judaea may, so H., have been affected, but the revolts were concentrated in the Diaspora.

By analogy with the faction and strife in Syria and Palestine leading up to 66, H. posits divisions, inner-civic and inner-communal, in Alexandria, Egypt and Cyrene among the origins of the revolt. What will furthermore have fuelled the revolts was the aforementioned antipathy towards Rome on the grounds of the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. Although no sources attest to this, H. argues that the themes of redemption and freedom were equally dominant in the revolts in Cyrenaica, Egypt, Alexandria and Cyprus, which will have been coordinated with the purpose of reconquering Judaea and Jerusalem.

Chapter 5, 'Hadrian and Pius', deals with the Bar Kokhba revolt that, according to H., broke out in 132 over the plans to found a colony, Aelia Capitolina, on the ruins of Jerusalem, where Roman soldiers were already stationed. Most likely the colony did not come into being until after the quelling of the revolt, and the much discussed reference to a ban on circumcision in the biography on Hadrian in the *Historia Augusta* is, so H., to be placed during the revolt. The revolt itself was crushed in 135, but pockets of resistance as well as Roman mopping up in Judaea will have continued into the reign of Antoninus Pius, as suggested by a comment in the biography of this emperor in the *Historia Augusta*.

The plans to found a Roman colony and the prospect of foreign cults being introduced into Jerusalem could, however, not have kindled the revolt on their own, and H. convincingly argues that the abolition of the Jewish Tax by Nerva had given rise to widespread hope for an immediate rebuilding of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. This hope persevered, so H., under Trajan until 106, the year of the creation of the province Arabia. H.'s argument is, however, only valid if it is accepted that the Nabatean kingdom was annexed by force. Nonetheless, the fact that the Jewish

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Pucci Ben Zeev, *Diaspora Judaism in Turmoil 116/117 CE. Ancient sources and modern insights*. Peeters: Leuven 2005.

temple in Jerusalem was not rebuilt will have led to a general disappointment among rebellious Jews in the diaspora in 115-117 as well as among the Jews, who joined Bar Kokhba's revolt. Messianic overtones, no doubt, also attached to Bar Kokhba, and his revolt will have gained widespread following, though it was mainly concentrated in Judaea and Idumaea.

The chapter on Bar Kokhba is no doubt the most successful in the book, and with his impressive knowledge of the landscape, H. manages to describe the territory under Simon's control in detail and furthermore brings to life the last days of the siege of Beththera by resorting to archaeology and rabbinic texts. Alongside this long tradition for revolt H. posits a more loyal Judaism, centred around Jewish teachers and synagogues, continuously responsible for the perseverance of Judaeen Jewish life.

Apart from discussions of date, H.'s reconstruction of the events concerning the second and third revolts differs little from other descriptions. H.'s firm command of the sources, Graeco-Roman authors, rabbinic texts, inscriptions, papyri and archaeological artefacts, as well as the entire tradition of interpretation of these two revolts from Orosius on is what has impressed the reviewer most. To this should be added H.'s insistence on seeing not only the revolts under Trajan and Hadrian, but also the first revolt, as firmly connected by the themes of the redemption and freedom of Jerusalem. Awe-inspiring in size and detail this book is a must-have for anyone working on the Jews in the Roman Empire.

Søren Lund Sørensen

Freie Universität Berlin

Greta Hawes, *Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity*, Oxford University Press, 2014. 279 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-967277-6.

This book is a revised version of a dissertation submitted at the University of Bristol. Hawes (hereafter H) presents a vigorous apology for the rationalizing approach to Greek myth taken by Palaephatus, whom H identifies as a peripatetic who lived in the second half of the fourth century BCE (p. 228), in his *Peri Apistōn* (pp. 37-92), traced down in subsequent authors — Heraclitus (pp. 92-118), the anonymous *Peri Apistōn* (pp. 119-132), Conon, *Diēgēsis* (pp. 133-148), Plutarch, *Life of Theseus* (pp. 149-174) — and culminating in the *Periēgēsis* of Pausanias, who lived in the second half of the second century CE (pp. 175-222). The book thus offers snapshots of the rationalizing approach over a span of more than four hundred years. Two brief Appendices conclude the book, the first a discussion of the date and authenticity of Palaephatus, *Peri Apistōn* and the second a translation of the anonymous *Peri Apistōn*.

H's objective is to rehabilitate rationalizing interpretation of myth, to redeem it (1) from its use (abuse?) in Christian polemic as a means for proving that the Greeks and Romans did not believe in the truth of their own tales, as narrated primarily by Homer and Hesiod and then (2) from the low regard in which it was held by some of the giants of Classical Studies, such as U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who dismissed Palaephatus' work as an intellectually inferior approach to the glories of Greek life and literature, a "wretched, failed effort", written in a banal everyday style, which wasted great effort for little reward (pp. 3-4). This judgment cast a shadow over all the ancient authors who attempted rationalizing interpretations, a shadow which H aims to lift so that ancient rationalizing interpretation will shine forth in its full contextual glory.

To accomplish these goals, H opens the discussion with an extended Introduction (pp. 1-36) in which H places rationalizing interpretation in comparison and contrast with Euhemerism and Allegory, as three of the ways in which educated and sophisticated readers coped with the difficulties of Greek mythology. Euhemerism, H elucidates, was a theory of institutionalized religion, explaining the origins of the worship of the gods as a consequence of the actions of extraordinary mortals, who were then raised to divine status. From that perspective, Euhemerism was