introductions and commentaries. The difference consists rather in the types of texts which are discussed. In Appendix I, we have '(1) texts ... where some of the references to Jews or Judaism are less obvious or certain than those given in the first two volumes ... (2) problematical passages ... and (3) geographical texts, which according to the strict criteria established in the Preface to Volume I were not brought in the first two volumes.' (GLA II, p. vii.) Appendix II contains four short passages from the legal writers Ulpian, Modestinus and Paulus. This appendix has been added 'for the sake of completeness', and these passages are given without introductions, translations, or commentaries (excepting one reference).

The authors quoted in Appendix I, on the other hand, receive the standard treatment. The first of these is Alcaeus, who is the first classical author to refer to Palestine. The passage quoted, however, has been preserved on a badly mutilated papyrus, but the words Βαβύλων and Ἀσκόλων are readable, so it may be that we have a reference to the Babylonian campaigns in Palestine around the year 600 B.C. Stern denies that Choeirilus of Samos or Naevius refer to Jews, though some scholars have thought that they do. The geographical texts included in the volume are from Pseudo-Scylax, Dionysius Perigetes and Julius Honorius. More complex problems are treated in the addenda to Alexander Polyhistor and in sections concerning references to Moses in the Cohortatio ad Gentiles and to the Jewish revolt under Trajan in anonymous Greek authors cited by Eusebius. Stern also includes a passage which was written by Synesius when he was still a pagan (hence its inclusion in the collection). It describes a voyage on a ship, the captain of which was a Jew as were at least half of the crew. Of particular interest are two passages from a Pythagorean treatise entitled On Kingship which is attributed to Ecphantus of Syracuse. These passages contain possible reminiscences of Genesis, and raise the question of pagan familiarity with the Greek Bible. In this context I note that Stern has omitted an important passage from the collection. Themistius expresses his admiration for the Ἀσσύρια γράμματα, and continues: λέγει γάρ ποι ἐκείνα τά γράμματα τῆν τοῦ βασιλέως καρδίαν ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ παλάμῃ δορυφορέοιται (Or. 11.147b–c). This is a quotation of Proverbs 21:1. Themistius quotes this same verse on two other occasions (Or. 7.89d; Or. 19.229a). These passages should be taken into account when considering possible biblical reminiscences in Julian and Libanius (GLA II, pp. 562, 580 n. 1). It should also be noted that this is the only instance in which the book of Proverbs is quoted by a pagan author, or so it would seem from Stern's index of biblical references. The fact that the writings are called 'Assyrian' also has importance for questions raised by Stern (GLA II, p. 485).

The second part of the volume (pp. 69–159) contains the indexes. There is an index of sources divided into sections, the most important of which is that of Greek and Latin authors. The other sections include the references to the Bible, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the New Testament, Rabbinic literature, Papyri and Inscriptions. The second index is a subject index, and runs to 54 pages. This will perhaps be the most important index for users of the collection. The third and final index contains select Greek words.
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This revised dissertation does not attempt a history of the city—'historical data'
and 'archaeological findings' are rapidly covered on pp. 1–6—but is devoted to two moderately interesting problems in the references to Sepphoris found in rabbinic texts. Considerable effort and expertise are devoted to determining the nature and date of the 'old' castra and 'archeï' said to have existed in the city and to establishing whether priests were settled there before or after A.D. 70 and in what numbers.

The various rabbinic traditions are subjected to careful and judicious examination. The discussion uses modern scholarship on a variety of subjects to good effect and is not confined to talmudics. The ways in which traditions were developed and elaborated are convincingly demonstrated and the often decisive role of the redactors of the stories is emphasised in the footsteps of Neusner. In the process a whole series of sloppy and implausible theories proposed by earlier scholars who amalgamated traditions without regard to date, purpose and context are usefully dismissed. This negative task is carried out thoroughly and painstakingly.

In proposing alternative solutions, Miller's own arguments are not always so watertight. To argue that, because the castra of Sepphoris was mentioned in an invented list of cities walled since the time of Joshua, the castra must, like Jerusalem, have existed as a Jewish settlement before A.D. 70 (p. 24), is pushing the evidence. Nor is it true that the gentile soldiers referred to at Shabb 13:9 could not have been employed by a Herodian king (p. 35). But these are rare lapses, for Miller is usually and wisely prepared to remain agnostic when the evidence is lacking.

Which it usually is, for these problems are very obscure, and it is inevitable that negative arguments predominate in the book. This sometimes goes to absurd lengths: it is hardly necessary to take up space dismissing the highly implausible notion of an etymological connection between the name Phiabi and faba, the Latin for 'bean' (pp. 100–102). But on the whole this approach is preferable to the search for substantive suggestions which may be no better than those rejected. That Miller makes such suggestions at all is due to an assumption which, at the least, should be made explicit. It is taken for granted that the earliest appearance of a tradition in a written source is likely to be a truthful historical account. So it may be, but if rabbis could elaborate existing traditions for their own purposes, they could also invent; that they did not do so, as perhaps in the attribution to Sepphoris of Joseph b. Elim, who was once High Priest for a day (cf. pp. 64–88), needs to be argued.

The truth is that Miller has used much scholarship and ingenuity in searching for what cannot be found rather than looking at the more straightforward subjects for which the rabbinic texts provide first-hand testimony. When he does briefly (pp. 116–27) describe the attitude to priests in Sepphoris in the third and fourth centuries, he uncovers some fascinating problems. It would be nice to know, for instance, not only that traditions about the courses of the priests were becoming in this period increasingly popular, and that, even so long after the destruction of the Temple, priests were interested in emphasising their status, but why.
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This is the author's dissertation written under the direction of Roger Le Déaut at