Martin Goodman

Jewish History and Roman History: Changing Methods and Preoccupations

The study of Roman history underwent great changes during the hundred years between the original Schürer and his reincarnation, but those changes had surprisingly little impact on the study of Jewish history in the Roman period until recent years. The aim of this paper is to investigate the reasons for this neglect. If in the process of describing trends in scholarship over two huge fields I generalise unacceptably, I hope this will be forgiven.

Roman historiography emerged from the antiquarianism of the Renaissance above all in the monumental works of Theodore Mommsen and German scholarship of the middle of the nineteenth century¹. Mommsen shifted the focus of scholars from the celebration of classical art, literature and myth to the analysis of institutions. The prolific output of these pioneers set the framework for the understanding of Roman political history and law down to the present day, both in the sense that many of their analyses have been accepted and in the extent to which much Roman history of the twentieth century has been written in more or less conscious opposition to their methods, particularly their over-orderly view of the functioning of constitutions.

Among these reactions since the nineteenth century, some have become wholly integrated into Roman history writing. Thus Syme built on the research into aristocratic prosopography, itself initiated by Mommsen and carried on by Klebs, Dessau and others in their work on the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*², to demonstrate the shifts of power within the Roman ruling elite which underlay apparent constitutional continuity, and this preoccupation with the real workings of power in the Roman world remains important in contemporary Anglo-Saxon scholarship³. Other scholars branched out into areas little considered in the nineteenth century, such as the analysis of ancient economic history pioneered by Max

¹ *Theodor Mommsen*, *Römische Geschichte*, 5 vols. (Berlin 1886–99); *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1876–87).

² *Elmar Klebs* et al, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (Berlin 1897–98).

³ Syme's classic study was *Ronald Syme*, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939), but he retained the same interest in his later career (cf. *Ronald Syme*, *Roman Papers*, 7 vols. [Oxford 1979–91]).

Weber and others and further developed in the revisionist history of Rostovtzev⁴. Of these, most relevant to the study of Jewish history has been the efflorescence since the 1920s of scholarship on the Roman provinces, in which historians have used the findings of archaeologists, whose techniques have themselves become dramatically more sophisticated in the course of the century, to try to understand provincial cultures in their own terms rather than simply as conquered peoples ruled by an imperialist state⁵; in Egypt, the study of the province mushroomed from the late 1890s into a field of its own because of the discovery and gradual publication of masses of papyri⁶.

Equally relevant to Jewish history was the development of serious research into the religions of the Roman empire. This latter field, in the earlier part of the century bedevilled by the Christianising assumptions of Cumont that Roman paganism was ripe for its demise by the second and third centuries CE and that so called "oriental" cults appealed to Romans because of their irrational and emotional nature, was placed on a firmer footing by the epigraphic researches and sound common sense of A. D. Nock⁷; in the work of E. R. Dodds, and to even better effect by others in more recent years, it has been further enlightened by cautious use of insights derived by social anthropologists from the observation of the function of religions in contemporary societies⁸.

Of this great wealth of scholarship on the Roman world since Mommsen very little had penetrated before 1973 into studies of Jewish history in the period. Roman historians themselves used Jewish evidence only for marginal illustrations: the political and religious history of the Jews was taken to be so exceptional in the ancient world that it could not readily be applied to the experience of other subjects of the Roman state⁹. As for historians of the Jews, their reasons for ignoring the advances of their colleagues were varied, and mostly unstated.

The first attempts to produce a systematic account of Jewish history in the Graeco-Roman period were undertaken by the pioneers of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* under the influence of varied, sometimes conflicting, impulses, as Yaa-

⁴ Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Tübingen, 1921–); Mikhail Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1926).

⁵ For the study of Roman Britain compare the concerns and methods of Francis J. Haverfield, *The Romanisation of Roman Britain* (London 1906) to Peter Salway, *Roman Britain* (Oxford 1981).

⁶ See Alan K. Bowman, *Egypt after the Pharaohs: 332 BC – AD 642: from Alexander to the Arab Conquest* (London 1986).

⁷ Franz Cumont, *Les Religions Orientales dans le paganisme romain* (Paris 1909); Arthur Darby Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Zeph Stewart, 2 vols. (Oxford 1972).

⁸ For example Eric R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley, London 1951).

⁹ Note for instance the minimal notice, segregated into special sections, given to Jewish evidence in the volumes of the first edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History* devoted to the Roman empire (ed. Stanley A. Cook et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vols 10–12 [Cambridge 1934–1939]).

kov Shavit has recently analysed in somewhat idiosyncratic depth¹⁰. They were trained and expert in the rabbinic traditions, but it was important to them that their Jewish past should be shown to be as susceptible to historical analysis as that of other peoples of Europe. The result was a distinctive history in which, as in the writings of Graetz, rabbis and scholars took the place as political manipulators of the magistrates and factions familiar from the history of the non-Jewish world¹¹. On the other hand this distinctive history was itself to be integrated into that wider world: just as Jews in nineteenth-century Europe sought a role in wider society, so too their history in the Roman period was envisaged in relation to the power of Rome. The concentration of these early pioneers on constitutional and political history thus mirrored that of their contemporaries in Roman history, but with much less satisfactory results. The reasons for this unsatisfactoriness are not complicated: Mommsen's subjects came to him direct from the pages of the historiographic tradition of Greece and Rome and the legal corpora which he so meticulously edited. By contrast Graetz was attempting to force into a strait jacket of political and constitutional analysis a hotchpotch of religious texts, most especially the Talmuds, intended for wholly different purposes. Paradoxically Jewish scholars may have worked to greater effect when content with the antiquarian concerns of an earlier age, as in the compendious researches of Samuel Krauss¹².

This was the inheritance of Schürer when he began his monumental work in the second half of the nineteenth century; it was of course very much still in creative mode while he was writing, so that new findings were regularly incorporated into the new editions of Schürer's work, but Schürer himself had wholly different aims and preoccupations. For him, as for Wellhausen¹³, Schlatter¹⁴, Holtzmann¹⁵, Bousset¹⁶, Travers Herford¹⁷, Jeremias¹⁸, and many others up to the present, the reason for scholars to know about Jewish history was more or less explicitly as background to the New Testament: the notion was explicit in the title of the first edition of Schürer's *Geschichte*, which came out under the title *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*¹⁹. Schürer and the others made extensive use of the research pioneered by the scholars of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, but without

¹⁰ *Yaakov Shavit*, *Athens in Jerusalem: Classical Antiquity and Hellenism in the Making of the Modern Secular Jew* (London 1997).

¹¹ *Heinrich Graetz*, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, 9 vols. (Leipzig 1853–75).

¹² See, e.g. *Samuel Krauss*, *Talmudische Archäologie*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1910–12).

¹³ *Julius Wellhausen*, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin 1894).

¹⁴ *Adolf Schlatter*, *Geschichte Israels von Alexander dem Grossen bis zu Hadrian* (Stuttgart 1900).

¹⁵ *Oskar Holtzmann*, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1895).

¹⁶ *Wilhelm Bousset*, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen 1926).

¹⁷ *R. Travers Herford*, *Judaism in the New Testament Period* (London 1928).

¹⁸ *Joachim Jeremias*, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu; eine Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig 1923).

¹⁹ *Emil Schürer*, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig 1874).

themselves adding much to the analysis of rabbinic texts that had been undertaken by Graetz and his colleagues. If their work differed substantially from the *Wissenschaft* school, it was because the main categories of their scholarship were set neither by the rabbinic texts nor by the preoccupation of Roman historians, but by the New Testament and early Christianity. Such pre-occupations still dominate, despite all efforts, at least parts of volume 2 of the new Schürer with, for instance, the whole of section 29 dedicated to Messianism and only pages 339–46 providing a slim outline of the development of halakhah.

The impact of such Christian concerns on scholarship on Jewish history of this period has in this century crept backwards, so to speak, into the *Wissenschaft's* stream of scholarship in the work of historians such as Urbach, whose great study *Hazal* has been criticised for importing concepts from Christian theology into the study of rabbinic Judaism²⁰. Other Jewish historians, like Büchler²¹, Salo Baron²², Louis Finkelstein²³ and Solomon Zeitlin²⁴ soldiered on in the *Wissenschaft* tradition, effectively ignoring the historiographical currents which surrounded them, but an even greater influence on many Jewish historians in this century has been Zionism, the explicit driving force behind the classic studies in the middle of the century by such as Alon²⁵, Klausner²⁶ and Avi-Yonah²⁷, with their emphasis on issues such as Jewish settlement patterns and the institution of political control over the land of Israel.

In all this development the changes in general Roman history went little noticed, or at least had little effect. Studies of the economic history of Judaea were rare, and when found, as by F.C. Grant in 1926²⁸ or later by Jeremias²⁹, lacked any of the methodological sophistication and extensive use of archaeological evidence developed for study of the wider empire. The sporadic archaeological work carried out in Palestine before 1948 was mostly sucked into issues of biblical archaeology rather than confronting the problems of evidence for cultural and economic change beginning to be tackled by archaeologists in the northern provinces of the Roman world³⁰. Prosopography had been used since the time of Graetz and

²⁰ Ephraim E. Urbach, *Hazal*. Pirke 'Emunot ve De'ot (Jerusalem 1969).

²¹ See the collected studies in Adolf Büchler, *Studies in Jewish History* (London 1956).

²² Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 3 vols. (New York 1937).

²³ Louis Finkelstein, *The Pharisees: the Sociological Background to their Faith* (Philadelphia 1940).

²⁴ Solomon Zeitlin, *The Rise and Fall of the Judean State*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia 1962–78).

²⁵ Gedalyahu Alon, *Toledot ha-Yehudim be Erets-Yisrael bi-tekufat ha-Mishnah veka-Talmud*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem 1954).

²⁶ Joseph Klausner, *Historyah shel ha-bayit ha-sheni*, 5 vols. (Jerusalem 1958).

²⁷ Michael Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmuds: In den Tagen von Rom und Byzanz* (Berlin 1962).

²⁸ Frederick C. Grant, *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (London 1920).

²⁹ Jeremias, Jerusalem.

³⁰ It is worth comparing for instance the studies published in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* in the first half of the twentieth century with the excavations carried out by Mortimer Wheeler at Verulamium in Britain in the 1930s. (See R. Mortimer Wheeler and Tessa

Bacher³¹ to establish relations between rabbis and rabbinical schools, a process which culminated in *Dor Dor ve Doreshav* by I.H. Weiss³², but this was prosopography used as raw material for chronology and biography (or, given the nature of the evidence, more often hagiography) rather than analysis of the oligarchy which, according to Syme, underlies all systems of power.

More successful was the use of papyrological evidence by Tcherikover, Fuks and Stern to build up a picture of Jewish life in Egypt to set alongside information about Greeks and native Egyptians³³, although, as Aryeh Kasher pointed out, Tcherikover, despite writing in Jerusalem, never quite lost the preoccupations with integration, assimilation and citizenship rights which had permeated Jewish historiography in the nineteenth century³⁴. Less was done in the field of epigraphy, despite the collection of material by J.B. Frey in the 1930³⁵: epigraphic evidence for Jewish life in Judaea is in any case thin for the period covered by Schürer (a fact in itself of some interest), and with a few exceptions, such as the study of the Jews of Rome by Leon³⁶, little effort was made between the original Schürer and the revision by Fergus Millar in the 1980s to use the diaspora material to describe the social and administrative life of Jews outside the land.

In contrast the study of Judaism as a religion within the Roman empire did not escape some of the impact of Cumont's investigation of change in religious life in general. The result, however, was rather curious: since the extant texts hardly supported a view of Judaism as an oriental mystery religion like Mithraism or the worship of Isis, E.R. Goodenough adopted the same techniques as Cumont of imaginative interpretation of huge amounts of epigraphic and archaeological material in the production of his massive study of Jewish symbols³⁷. The result should in many ways be seen as a salutary illustration of the limitations of Cumont's techniques rather than a triumphant breakthrough in the understanding of Judaism. Nor did the rather heavy handed application by Avi-Yonah to Palestine of the administrative theories of A.H.M. Jones, particularly as it affected the role of the Greek city in the East, prove very successful in illuminating the relation between different levels of authority and power in this exceptionally complex society³⁸.

Wheeler, Verulamium: a Belgic and two Roman cities [Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London 11, Oxford 1936].

³¹ *Wilhelm Bacher*, *Die Aggada der Tannaiten*, 2 vols. (Strassburg 1884–90).

³² *Isaac Hirsch Weiss*, *Dor Dor ve-Doreshav*, 5 vols. (Vienna 1871–91).

³³ *Victor Tcherikover*, *Alexander Fuks*, *Menahem Stern*, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1957–64).

³⁴ See *Aryeh Kasher*, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: the Struggle for Equal Rights* (Tübingen 1985).

³⁵ *Jean-Baptiste Frey*, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum*, 2 vols. (Rome 1936).

³⁶ *Harry J. Leon*, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia 1960).

³⁷ *Erwin R. Goodenough*, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*, 13 vols. (New York 1953–68).

³⁸ *Avi-Yonah*, *Geschichte*; *Arnold H. M. Jones*, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford 1940); *idem*, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford 1937).

The insularity of the historiography of the Jews might have mattered less if mainstream Roman historians had paid more attention to the Jewish evidence and incorporated it into their wider histories, but this did not happen. This is rather surprising in some ways, despite the ideological tendency, already noted, to view the Jews as too odd a people and religion to be fitted easily into general theories. It is hardly odd of course that classicists trained in the close reading of Greek and Latin shied away from rebarbative texts in Hebrew and Aramaic which in most cases still lacked critical editions with comprehensible divisions and line numbers, just as they tended to ignore writings from late antiquity in Syriac or Coptic, but more explanation is needed for the attitude of those Jewish ancient historians who lacked not competence but desire to incorporate Jewish evidence into their histories. In comparatively recent times the question might be asked about Moses Finley, a great social and economic historian of the ancient world, himself of Jewish origins and with a vast range of knowledge, but with nothing to say about Jewish history. Their reasons for ignoring Jewish material can only be guessed and doubtless differed in individual cases, but it is plausible that Jewish academics who had made their mark in the wider field of Greek and Roman studies may have wished to avoid the danger of relegation to a ghetto because of their use of Jewish evidence, unknown and often almost unknowable to many of their gentile readers, while the comparative weakness of many of the historical conclusions of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* school from rabbinic texts might be profoundly embarrassing for a rigorous historian who yet shared the desire of the *Wissenschaft* pioneers to uphold the importance of Jewish history. It might seem better not to enter the field at all. Two honourable exceptions, Arnaldo Momigliano and Elias Bickerman, notably steered clear of use of rabbinic material in most of their writings on Jews³⁹.

Something of the psychological and social pressures which inhibited the proper integration of Jewish history into Roman history may be glimpsed in the scholarly career and achievements of Jean Juster, author in 1914 of the classic *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*⁴⁰. Juster was a Romanian Jew, but his origins could not be deduced from his self description in his book: he advertised his credentials as an accredited lawyer in the French courts, but the reader is given no explicit clue about the author's Jewish origins, let alone the underlying polemic about the status of the Jews in Romania. Juster undoubtedly knew rabbinic sources, but he quite deliberately declined to make full use of rabbinic material alongside his astonishing compendium of evidence from Greek and Latin sources. I have been unable to trace any evidence of any connection between Juster and the *Société des Études Juives* during the eight years Juster worked in Paris. I suspect that he saw himself as a legal historian primarily of the Roman world rather than as an expert in Jew-

³⁹ See Arnaldo Momigliano, *On Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Middletown, Conn. 1987); Elias J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, Mass., London 1988).

⁴⁰ Jean Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*, 2 vols. (Paris 1914). My fuller study of the life and writings of Juster is to be published in Hebrew in a volume edited by I. Gafni and A. Oppenheimer.

ish studies. Certainly the academic posts that he was expected to win, according to the brief biography composed by a friend in the late 1930s, were directed to him as a scholar of classical law; his biographer even suggested that his failure to gain such a post was the result of antisemitism⁴¹. Juster's self-presentation in this work is all the more remarkable because in other contexts he was eager to emphasise his own commitment to the special peculiarities of Jewish culture: he was a champion of Yiddish literature and attended at least one, probably two, of the early congresses of the Zionist movement. Perhaps behind his reticence about rabbinic evidence lay embarrassment. The main apologetic thrust of *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* is the integration of the Jews within Roman society, to the extent that Juster claimed, against the overwhelming thrust of the evidence he himself cited, that Jews served in the Roman army⁴². Some Jewish sources, such as Josephus and Philo, could easily enough be read in support of Juster's main thesis, and indeed Juster cited them extensively, but the genre, tone and subject matter of most rabbinic texts from late antiquity were less easy to incorporate.

The impact of this history of the separate development of Jewish and Roman historiography is nicely illustrated by the necessity to have a specialist Roman historian to co-edit the new Schürer⁴³. The discoveries of Romanists had simply not got through to historians of the Jews. But the position has of course changed considerably in the quarter of a century since the publication of the first volume of the revised Schürer. Studies of the Jewish diaspora based on epigraphic research proliferate⁴⁴, as does work on papyri and leather documents, notably the Dead Sea Scrolls⁴⁵. It is rarely necessary any more to urge historians of the Jews in this period to look beyond the Jewish texts to consider the wider Roman context in which the Jews lived, although the willingness and ability of Roman historians to take on board Jewish, and especially rabbinic, evidence is still generally limited to occasional illustrative quotations⁴⁶. More needs to be done to persuade Romanists to incorporate into their studies the extensive Jewish evidence about the politics, economics and society of Roman Palestine, in some ways the best known province of the early Roman empire after Egypt⁴⁷; even more, the wealth of evidence

⁴¹ *Lazar Mayersohn*, *Viata si opera lui Jean Juster* (Bucharest 1939) 3.

⁴² *Juster*, *Les Juifs*, vol. 2: 270–1.

⁴³ See the preface to *Emil Schürer*, ed. *Geza Vermes* et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol 1. (Edinburgh 1973) v, on the adlection of Fergus Millar onto the editorial team.

⁴⁴ *William Horbury* and *David Noy*, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge 1992); *David Noy*, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1993–5).

⁴⁵ See especially the now rapidly expanding series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford 1955–).

⁴⁶ See for comparatively extensive use of Jewish materials, *Ramsay MacMullen*, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., London 1967).

⁴⁷ This is one of the aims of my book, *Martin Goodman*, *The Roman World 44 BC – AD 180* (London 1997).

about Judaism as a religion – the relation between public and private religion, the operation of the Temple cult, the extent of variety within unity, the misleading nature of the inscriptions and iconography of religious sites interpreted without texts – should provide the best check on imaginative reconstructions of the nature of pagan cults known only from material remains.

In more general terms historians of the Jews have something to teach practitioners of wider Roman history about the validity of their methods⁴⁸. The preponderance of evidence about Jews in the Roman world is a straightforward consequence of the transmission of evidence about them for religious reasons by two religious traditions continuous to modern times – that is, rabbinic Judaism and Christianity. It is worth asking what would be known about Jews and Judaism if we did not have this evidence through Jews and Christians and if the evidence about Jews which survived through comments in classical authors, epigraphy and archaeology were of the same type as the evidence for other distinctive ethnic groups such as Celts, Iberians, or Numidians, or for other religions such as Mithraism. We would only have the literary sources collated by Stern in his *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*⁴⁹, the minimal legislation collected by Linder⁵⁰, inscriptions (with all the problems of identifying who and what is Jewish), and archaeology. Here the Dead Sea Scrolls might loom even larger than they do now since they are at least *unequivocally* by and about Jews and Judaism, unlike “synagogues”, “mikvaot” and so on⁵¹. Missing from such a picture of Jews and Judaism would be, for instance, any clear idea of the deity worshipped by Jews, anything about Jewish Greek literature, anything about messianic eschatology except for a few of the Dead Sea scrolls, which would be fiendishly hard to interpret. There would be nothing about the Bible as a sacred text – again, unless this was deduced from the Dead Sea Scrolls; the importance of reading and interpreting a text as a central feature of synagogue rite would be unknown. Any notion of varieties of Judaism such as Pharisees or Sadducees would not come to light. Christians were never seen by pagans as Jews, and Pliny saw the Essenes as a wholly separate *gens*⁵². Above all, the essence of Judaism as a complex mythology based on a covenant revealed to the Jews on Mount Sinai would entirely pass us by. To put it crudely, it should give Roman historians cause to pause when they realise that almost all the most important things known about Jews and Judaism are known from types of evidence not available for understanding the other inhabitants of the empire.

⁴⁸ The arguments which follow are given in much expanded form in *Martin Goodman* (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford 1998) 3–14.

⁴⁹ *Menahem Stern*, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem 1974–84).

⁵⁰ *Amnon Linder*, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Michigan, Jerusalem 1987).

⁵¹ See my discussion of the Sardis Synagogue, *Martin Goodman*, *Jews and Judaism in the Mediterranean Diaspora in the late-Roman period: the Limitations of Evidence*, in: *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 4.2 (1994) 208–24.

⁵² Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 5.73.

For the historian of the Jews the message is also valid that all reconstructions of ancient history must take into account the obvious fact that most evidence is lost. But there is also plenty positive left to do. The story of the Jews is still too rarely fitted in to the history of the Roman Near East⁵³. The complex picture of the survival of other national languages in this period (Nabataean, Phoenician, Palmyrene) makes the significance of the use and disuse of Hebrew as a marker of national identity an important issue still requiring clarification⁵⁴. More needs to be done to fit into the Jewish evidence the central question of Roman history, what it was to be a Roman as Roman citizenship spread throughout the empire until the universal franchise of 212 CE: what does it mean to say or to deny that the Mishnah was a work of Roman literature⁵⁵? If the methods and preoccupation of Roman historians are properly taken into account, it is a fair guess that the next edition of Schürer in 2073 will have to look very different from the twentieth century version.

⁵³ See now *Fergus Millar*, *The Roman Near East 31 BC – AD 337* (Cambridge, Mass., London 1993).

⁵⁴ See *Seth Schwartz*, *Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine*, in: *Past and Present* 148 (1995) 3–47.

⁵⁵ *Martin Goodman*, *The Roman Identity of Roman Jews*, in: *Isaiah M. Gafni, Aharon Openheimer and Daniel R. Schwartz* (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem 1996) 85*–99*.