disciplines compatible with the divine; on this theoretical level, Philo was successful. But he also seems to have offered the encyclia as a common ground between the Greek and the Jewish worlds" (p. 83). This was a failure, both because of the abstract character of his writings and historical circumstances, Greek anti-Judaism, the war of 66-70, and Philo's adoption by the Church.

Coming to a judgment, the present reviewer can only find words of praise. The main thesis of the book has been worked out convincingly: Philo, so far from being the eclectic he has been often taken for, deliberately incorporated parts of the Greek heritage, in this case the encyclia, into his essentially Jewish system. One of the difficulties of presenting a systematic treatment of a subject in Philo is that he discusses various topics in several places and often from different angles. It is to the credit of Mendelson that he has gathered his material from Philo's entire corpus and organized it into a straightforward whole without overinterpreting it. The result is a well composed, well written, and sensitive study on an already fascinating subject. Indexing and proofreading have been done with care.

A. Hilhorst

Stuart S. Miller, *Studies in the History and Traditions of Sepphoris* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity ed. Jacob Neusner vol. 37), E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1984, x and 160 pp., cloth fl. 60,—.

This slender volume deals with two main topics both relating to the city of Sepphoris in the Talmudic period. The first part discusses the problematic nature of the "Old" *Castra* (military camp) just outside Sepphoris and the "Old" *Archei* (archives) of Sepphoris. A very careful and detailed examination of all the sources touching upon these two institutions leads the author to the conclusion that they were both originally Jewish and go back to the period before the destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.). An attempt is made to sketch their history, but the results are both fragmentary and conjectural. (The present excavations around Sepphoris may lead to further clarification of some of these issues.) The second part attacks the question of whether there was a large settlement of priests in Sepphoris during the later Second Temple period and the Roman era. It comprises a painstaking analysis of the sources concerning certain problematic Second Temple personalities—Joseph ben Elim and ben Hamsan—and evidence of priests in Sepphoris during the post-destruction period. Again the conclusions are by no means definite and leave as many questions open as are solved.

The author is meticulous in his documentation, primary and secondary, careful and thorough in his analysis of sources, and honest in his
scholarship. A good deal of effort has been expended with very few tangible results, and the temptation to read more conclusions in his evidence must have been great. Hence, his straightforward cataloguing of the results of his researches is truly commendable.

I shall not comment on the general thrust of his arguments, which are balanced and well-reasoned. I shall merely remark on a few incidental details, remarks of a primarily methodological nature.

First a philological note. On p. 81, note 106 the author comments on Brandt’s assumption that the word segan is related to Mandaic §̣g̣nda. Even if the two were related, Rabbinic segan would be related to Biblical segan (probably from As. §g̣ndnu), and the meanings would be related. The Rabbinic word would bear no direct relationship to the Mandaic, which would at the most have a joint root with the Biblical word. In fact, however, Mandaic ašganda has nothing to do with segan, and is derived from Sum. aš-gan-da, Akk. ašgandu. (See Drower & Macuch, A Mandaic Dictionary (Oxford 1963), p. 40a s.v.) As to pol and the Greek pyle (p. 102) this may be rejected for the reason given in note 222 ibid.

In chapter 2 the author discusses the tale of “Joseph ben Simai of Shihin” (p. 31 et seq.), and how a fire that broke out in his courtyard became known to the men of the castra of Sepphoris. Most of the sources he brings read Joseph ben Simai “be-Shihin”, in Shihin, and not “mi-’Shihin”, from Shihin (see his note 106 on p. 31). One wonders how the news of the fire spread from Shihin to Sepphoris so rapidly on the Sabbath.

On p. 49, he discusses the various forms and meanings of archei, archa’ot etc. For a detailed analysis of this issue I now refer the reader to my Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature (Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat-Gan 1984), pp. 62-66.

On p. 76 note 80 the author rightly rejects Wikgren’s suggestion that the fast referred to in Jos. Ant. 17.166 was the Fast of Esther on the thirteenth of Adar. He writes: “There are several problems with Wikgren’s suggestions. First of all, the Fast of Esther was not observed until the post-talmudic period ...” This is, indeed, the generally accepted view, based upon the fact that the earliest attestation to this fast seems to be in the early Sheiltot of R. Ahaî (c. 760) (Pekudei, ed. Mirsky vol. 2, p. 222) and the later Gaonic addition in Tahuma Genesis, Bereishit sect. 3. However, a careful reading of the Sheiltot text will show that it quotes a statement by the Amoraic R. Samuel b. Isaac: “The thirteenth of Adar, a time of fighting (kehilla, in a special sense) for all, as it is said, ‘But the other Jews that were in the King’s provinces gathered themselves together, and stood for their lives, and had rest from their enemies ... On the thirteenth of the month of Adar ...’” (Est. 9:16-17), which is not a quotation from Bavli Megillah 2a, as was previously thought. Then the biblical verse is not cited. Furthermore, the text in the Bavli ibid. reads as follows: “As