Other oddities include the duplication, in Greek text as well as translation, of Douris fragment 18 = Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.84 within a single chapter (p. 127 and 142) and the separation of the two papers dealing with the tenth book of Livy (BRIQUEL and GUITTARD) by an intervening chapter on Livy’s book 30 and ‘tragic history’ (DE FRANCHIS) which logically, as well as chronologically, belongs together with the last paper by KEBRIC.
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This impressive volume offers different scholarly approaches to the library of Alexandria. Aply, the first contribution (HÉLÈNE FRAGAKI, 3–42) addresses the location of the library, while the last two are devoted to its destruction. CHRISTOPHE RICO (293–328) reviews the various sources and theories on the destruction of the library in Alexandria and concludes that Caesar was, indeed, responsible for the initial destruction. ERAN ALMAGOR (257–91) focusses on Plutarch’s depiction of Caesar within the Alexander-Caesar biography specifically and the *Parallel Lives* in general, in which Caesar’s deed, historical or not, serves particular literary purposes typical of the Second Sophistic. Three chapters are devoted to the scholarly outputs facilitated by the generosity of the Ptolemies. JANE L. LIGHTFOOT (125–38) addresses the groundbreaking philological achievements while focusing on *onomastica*, and CHRISTOPHE CUSSET (141–62) investigates the role of Apollonios and Eratosthenes as chief librarians whereas ANCA DAN (165–222) provides a lengthy, learned and pedagogical introduction to the difficult geography of Eratosthenes.

DANIELA DUECK (228–43) surveys Strabo’s intensive use of sources. Although these do not allow us to conclude to which extent the Pontic historian gathered his information in the Library during his stay in Alexandria, they provide us with a feeling of the atmosphere of a research institution such as the one in the old Ptolemaic capital.

Four chapters deal with Jews in relation to the Library. Thus, the *Letter of Aristeas* is the linchpin of the contributions of SYLVIE HONIGMANN (45–77), JAN JOOSTEN (79–87) and ÉTIENNE NODET (89–120), who more or less come to the same conclusion: the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, which was carried out in Egypt, could in theory have been stored in the Library, but in practice it almost certainly was not. EMMANUEL FRIEDHEIM (245–55) focuses on the missing references to the Library in Philo of Alexandria. The paper argues that the anti-Jewish movements in Alexandria in AD 38–40 disappointed Philo to such an extent that he decided never to mention the Library, a not very convincing argument from silence.
For a number of reasons, Jewish texts from the Greco-Roman world are preserved in large numbers – but the amount of space taken up by articles on Jewish matters in this conference volume is not proportional to the demographic reality or cultural or political role of the Jews in Egypt, as is demonstrated from the thousands of papyri. Rather than devoting three papers to the Septuagint whose origins are uncertain, contributions could have focused on, e.g. the fragments of Ezekiel the tragedian or Philo the epic poet. Jewish writers actively engaging in a dialogue with the scholarly outputs of the Library of Alexandria, thereby highlighting an obvious connection with the papers of LIGHTFOOT and CUSSET.

None of this criticism should, however, detract from the overall quality of this volume, which is particularly enhanced by an appendix including the discussions of each paper given at the conference.
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Le présent ouvrage est issu de l’habilitation soutenue en 2010 par MICHAEL RATHMANN (désormais MR), ancien élève de GERHARD WIRTH à Bonn et déjà auteur du commentaire des livres 18 à 20 de la Bibliothèque historique dans la traduction de OTTO VEH et GERHARD WIRTH1 et de deux articles spécifiquement diodoréens, l’un consacré à la figure de Prépélaos et l’autre à la méthode de compilation de Diodore.2

Paru en 2016, ce volume s’inscrit dans un renouveau des études sur Diodore de Sicile. Très apprécié jusqu’au XVIIIe siècle, Diodore a ensuite été cruellement éreinté par les chercheurs du XIXe et du début du XXe siècle qui, adeptes de Quellenforschung, n’ont vu en lui qu’un compilateur maladroit et mal avisé3 et en ont – abusivement, on s’accorde aujourd’hui à le reconnaître – extrait de quoi remplir des chapitres entiers des FGrHist. Quelques études montrant l’unité de la langue de Diodore et l’inscription de ses idées dans les courants de pensée du Ier s. av. J.-C.4