IV. CONCLUSIONS

This survey of patron-client relations in Josephus' *Vita* confirms an observation made by Eisenstadt and Roniger regarding the internal characteristics of societies where patron-client relations predominate. In their attempt to control Upper and Lower Galilee, both Josephus and John were dependent on local support. This reflects Eisenstadt and Roniger's observation that elites were not able to autonomously penetrate the periphery administratively:

> Social actors show, in these societies in which the clientelistic model is predominant, a relatively low degree of autonomous access to the major resources needed to implement their goals, and to the control, in the broader settings, of their own resources.[1]

V indicates that Josephus and John exerted a considerable amount of energy to gain and maintain the support of a client base in their efforts to seize hold of the stores of peasant surplus. They were clearly unable to simply do as they pleased as elite members of society. To the contrary, and in confirmation of Eisenstadt and Roniger, they required a degree of local consent to gain access to resources and they appear to have been held accountable in their use of the peasant surplus (at least in the context of a revolt).

In his analysis of Gallic patronage, as recorded by Julius Caesar (*De Bello Gallico*), John Drinkwater noted that the institution of patronage was seen most clearly in time of war.[2] Again, Josephus' record of the events in Galilee at the outbreak of the revolt demonstrate, as we have shown, that this also appears to hold true. War led to the realignment of patron-client networks, brought them into relief against the background of struggles over newly available resources, and

---

[1]Eisenstadt and Roniger, "Patron-Client Relations," 62.

[2]John Drinkwater, "Patronage in Roman Gaul and the Problem of the Bagaudae," *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London and New York: Routledge, 1989, 190.

made the dynamics of loyalty, client choice, competition among elite patrons and competing factions all the more visible to our alien eyes.

In the introduction I indicated that the issue of Josephus' personality could be approached through a model of one of the primary social scripts of the ancient Mediterranean - patron-client relations (above, p. 2). It was noted that Josephus is often accused of being vain (above, p. 5) and it was suggested that such judgements are a result of cultural transference. Using the analysis of Shaye J.D. Cohen, it was then subsequently shown that the concept of vanity was being used ethnocentrically to explain what was readily apparent in the presence of a patron-client model (above, III.B.3). This is a indication of how historical research rooted in intuitive assumptions, creates ethnocentric "common sense" explanations of behaviour in the absence of social models for antiquity. This study is a small example of the potential that adequate social models have to "make strange" our familiar objects of study and our familiar ways of being. Josephus must be to us a stranger in what to us is a strange land. As it is, our assumption of familiarity has lead to no small amount of contempt in the case of Josephus.

Through the four test cases I have demonstrated to a reasonable degree that patron-client dynamics are a significant factor within V. While in V all the necessary facts are not always equally present, nonetheless, the degree of 'fit' between model and text has proven to be significant in all four relational encounters.

Leaving aside within this study the question of historical actuality, the embassy to Rome need no longer be seen as a vain fantasy, but instead, as a realistic portrayal of a relatively common social script within Josephus' time and class. The things that Josephus reported as having occurred are the things that his readers would have reasonably expected to have seen happen. Knowledge of the relevant cultural scripts unlocks the meanings embedded within the

text. In Josephus' world we find brokers at the gateway to patrons and resources, bandits in the employ of elites, colonial aristocrats courting the favour of their conquers, elite Jews fighting over the loyalty of peasant Jews, and peasants playing a skilful hand at manipulating patron against patron to place themselves in the most desirable position. We should expect to see nothing less.

But what has the study produced? Has the model proved to be useful and appropriate to the subject matter? The following is a summary of the primary insights into V and Josephus that have been made possible by the model. It is followed by a summary of the intuitive conclusions which are corrected through use of this model of patron-client relations.

I. Culturally Sensitive Insights

(1) The importance of the role of Aliturus as a "friend" (broker) in Josephus' attempt to access the goodwill of the Imperial household has been brought to light by the model (II.A.2). The discussion of Aliturus is normally focused upon his supposed status as an "apostate" but this has little bearing within Josephus' account.

(2) The "why" of Poppea Sabina's favour and gifts has been shown to be less mysterious in light of the roles cast by society for imperial patrons and colonial clients. Likewise, Josephus' motives for publicizing the gifts can now be understood as a function of the cultural script rather than being reduced to a function of supposed vanity. Imperial patrons where an asset, even for Jews. Josephus knew this well and so did his readers (III.B.3).

(3) The significance of controlling peasant surplus can now be seen in relationship to the role of patrons in a redistributive economy. Josephus and John struggled over the supplies of corn

and oil because they had a large client base to support in the maintenance of their positions as patrons (III.B.2).

(4) Similarly, the inability of Josephus and John to work together is now comprehensible in light of their positions within competing factions of an uneasy alliance. A full understanding of their actions can only be arrived at with reference to the competing factions of the Jerusalem coalition and the lines of the networks that lead from Jerusalem to Upper and Lower Galilee (III.B.3).

(5) The model adds another dimension to the nature of the Galileans of V. Above all else, they were quite certainly loyal clients of Josephus (II.C.2). Their actions toward other cities and individuals are only fully comprehensible when contrasted to these cities and individuals' actions toward their patron Josephus. It would be a mistake to interpret the nature and motives of the Galileans apart from this intimate social relationship.

(6) The general importance of the role of the Galileans' support as a client base in the context of the rebellion's factional struggle has been demonstrated (III). It is probable that the various factions within the Jerusalem coalition were constantly engaged in attempting to expand their client base throughout Roman Palestine while meanwhile undermining the client base of their rivals. The power of the Jerusalem coalition did not exist in the vacuum of Jerusalem society.

(7) The model demonstrates that Josephus' action towards the bandits are typical of the relationship that is known to exist between elite rulers and bandits (III.C.1). Again, we find that Josephus is describing an altogether believable series of relationships in Galilee.

(8) The basis of Josephus' authority in Galilee now no longer need be seen as a function of the "religious" affiliation that Galilee may have had with Jerusalem. The model allows us to see the elite patron, Josephus, as a desirable "resource" to the Galileans (III.C.3). It was on the basis

of his status as an elite patron and a member of the Jerusalem coalition that Josephus was able to take command in Galilee. Here, *material*, and not *religious*, concerns may have been foremost in the minds of the local Galilean leaders.

(9) Josephus' claim to the continued *beneficia* of the emperors Vespasian, Titus and Domitian reflect the best favours from the most desirable patrons. His claims are not unreasonable and they replicate the values dearest to the elite classes throughout the Roman empire (III.D).

II. Corrected Intuitive Conclusions

(1) Why did Josephus receive gifts from the Imperial household? Contrary to Feldman, an attempt to defuse the revolution by Nero can no longer be seen as "the only answer that makes any sense" to this question (III.A.4). This type of gift giving must be interpreted as a function of a patron-client script being enacted through the social personalities of patrons and clients.

(2) There is no reason to interpret Josephus' status as a client of Poppea Sabina as a source of embarrassment for him (III.A.4).

(3) There is no basis for labelling Josephus as vain because he would not accept John of Gischala as an associate (III.B.3).

(4) There is also no basis for claiming that the bandits of V were "experienced, fulltime fighters" (III.C.1). Neither the text nor the social dynamics of social banditry make this a necessary conclusion.

(5) There is no warrant for claiming that the local Galilean elite would have "resented the intrusion" of Josephus into their "domain" (III.C.1). The domain of Galilee was intimately tied to the domain of the centre of Roman Palestine, Jerusalem.

(6) Josephus was not the only patron in Galilee with Jerusalem connections and John was not merely a "local big man". Both were patrons within a competing Galilee-Jerusalem network (III.C.3).

(7) It can no longer be maintained that Josephus based his power simply "on the old tension between city and country".[3] He based his power on his elite status, his network connections and his potential as a benevolent benefactor within the peripheral society of Galilee.

(8) As it is quite possible to have more than one patron at once, there is thus no warrant for ascribing a switch from Flavian patronage to the patronage of Epaphroditus because of the references to Epaphroditus in V 430 and AJ 1.8-9 (III.D).

The primary result of these conclusions and observations, when seen as a whole, is that we are now in a position to better interpret the personality of Josephus. The above four test cases reveal that the central aspect of Josephus' social personality, *from the perspective of his culture*, is that of an elite patron. Josephus saw himself as an honourable patron of honourable clients and an honourable client of honourable patrons. I suggest that a fuller study of V would demonstrate that this theme dominates and unites the apparently disparate elements of Josephus' autobiography.

In the article, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History" (*Journal of Religious History* 11, 1980), E.A. Judge argues that it is illegitimate to import social models "that have been defined in term of other cultures" until the

---

[3]Cohen, *Josephus* 207. The model of cultural antagonism between city and village in Galilee does not adequately take into account the symbiotic economic, social and political relationships that existed between villages and urban areas throughout the Roman empire (see, Edwards, "First Century Urban/Rural Relations").

"social facts of life characteristic of the world to which the New Testament belongs" have been established through historical "field work".[4] He here argues that the social facts (cultural scripts) of antiquity must first be established by the traditional textual "field work" of the historian before cross-cultural social models can be applied to an ancient text. Yet I have shown that historical "field work" (intuitive historical criticism) is largely unable to penetrate the "social facts of life" in antiquity because our own experience of reality comes between us and the subjects of our field work. Judge appears to suggest that the texts themselves will lead to the social facts. In this article he unwittingly provides us with yet one more example of the pervasive "principle of similarity" when he states that "we deny our forebears the individuality we take as a basic feature of our own humanity. The New Testament is conspicuously modern".[5] But if the individuality of our "own humanity" is altogether unique to the modern world, then it is entirely anachronistic to call the New Testament "conspicuously modern". Consider Malina's largely overlooked point that when we speak of the dyadic personality of the first-century Mediterranean person:

> It would make no cultural sense at all to ascribe anything to personal and uniquely individual psychological motives or introspectively generated reasons and motivations.[6]

A model of "individuality", modern and ancient, is needed before we can claim that the New Testament a document of our own time and culture.

Finally, this study corrects the widespread assumption that patronage was only a "Roman" phenomenon and had no place in the Jewish cultures of Roman Palestine (and, by extension,

---

[4]Judge, "Social" 210.

[5]Judge, "Social" 216.

[6]Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981, 52.

Rabbinic Judaism).[7] The dynamics of patron-client interaction are a vital missing perspective in most past and current attempts to unravel the beginnings of Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism.

[7]Martin Goodman's excellent analysis of the origins of the Jewish revolt misses much as a result of wrongly maintaining that the "relationship between patron and client which was fundamental in, for instance, Roman culture was not found among Jews" (*Ruling* 67). His argument is based upon a brief analysis of economic production and overlooks the bulk of the literature on patron-client relations.

Appendix I

The Mediterranean Personality.

The following is a point form summation of Malina's overview of the first century Mediterranean personality.[8] It is included here simply to give the reader who is unfamiliar with cultural anthropology an idea of just how far removed Josephus' social context is from our own (at least according to Malina). Malina arrives at the following definition of the ancient Mediterranean personality:

> First century Mediterranean persons were strongly group-embedded persons. Since they were group-oriented, they were socially minded, attuned to the values, attitudes, and beliefs of their ingroup. Due to their ingroup enculteration, they were used to assessing themselves and others in terms of stereotypes often explained as deriving from the geographical location of their group. Furthermore, since these persons were strongly embedded in a group, their behaviour was controlled by strong social inhibitions along with a general lack of personal inhibition. Their prevailing social institution was kinship; familism was foremost in people's minds. And the primary way in which they made sense of the world was in terms of gender, by viewing persons as well as things, time and space in terms of male and female.[9]

A discussion of the limitations of Malina's model remains beyond the scope of this work.[10] For an introduction to the main issue underlying Malina's personality model - the Mediterranean as a category of regional comparison - see, Jane Schneider, "Of Vigilance and Virgins: Honour,

---

[8]Bruce J Malina, "Dealing with Biblical (Mediterranean) Characters: A Guide for U.S. Consumers," *BTB* 19 (1989) 127-141.

[9]Malina, "Dealing" 139.

[10]For critiques of Malina's modelling theory, see Susan R. Garrett, (Review) *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation*, by Bruce J. Malina, Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1986, in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988) 532-534; Jerome H. Neyrey, "Social Science Modelling and the New Testament," *BTB* 16 (1986) 107-110; and Leland J. White, "The Bible, Theology and Cultural Pluralism," *BTB* 16 (1986) 111-115.

Shame and Access to Resources in Mediterranean Societies," *Ethnology* 10 (1971) 1-24; J. Davis, *People of the Mediterranean: An Essay in Comparative Social Anthropology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977; and Joao de Pina-Cabral, "The Mediterranean as a Category of Regional Comparison: A Critical View," *Current Anthropology* 30 (1989) 399-406 (with a good bibliography).

The Ancient Mediterranean Personality:

(1) Sees no conflict between individual and group needs.
(2) All members of a group share the same perspective (worldview).
(3) Ego is embedded in the group.
(4) Anti-introspective, not-psychologically minded.
(5) Basic personality derives from ethnic characteristics.
(6) Assesses other individuals through ethnic stereotypes.
(7) Divides world according to ethnic group versus world (e.g., Greek vs. Barbarian; Jew vs. Gentile).
(8) Perceives himself and others as sharing an undifferentiated ego mass, i.e., each person represents their ethnic group completely
(9) Psychological ego reference is primarily to some group.
(10) Suppresses consciousness of individual needs and sees group needs as most important.
(11) Immediate group needs are the focus of group interests, not the total ethnic group needs.
(12) "I" always connotes some "we".
(13) Roles and space are divided according to gender.
(14) Behavioral controls are embedded in (social) custom, not in the individual conscience.
(15) Norms are not internalized.
(16) Norms reside in custom which controls situations which controls individuals.
(17) Individuals carry strong social inhibitions and weak or non-existent personal inhibitions.
(18) Virtue is that which strengthens group cohesion, while evil weakens group solidarity.
(19) Community controls behaviour, not individual responsibility.

(20) Concern to demonstrate gender specific characteristics and virtues.

(21) Sexual drive is uncontrollable in the absence of social controls.

(22) Males carry an inferiority complex which breeds sadistic and aggressive tendencies, thus men are willing to inflict pain on everyone except ingroup adult males in order to realize their goals.

(23) Males are ever vigilant and defensive of their male image and have a great fear of being perceived as feminine.

(24) Males are expected to show emotions.

(25) Three zones of action:

Heart is for thinking and eyes fill the heart with data (emotion filled),

Mouth speaks, ears hear (self-expressive),

Hands and feet act (purposeful action).

(26) Kinship is the central institution.

(27) Kinship group is the primary focus of personal loyalty.

(28) Interpersonal behaviour is conducted on the basis of kinship.

(29) All foreigners are a threat.

(30) Everyone knows everyone else's business.

(31) Problems are personalized as "who's" not "what's".

(32) Mother - son bond is the strongest of Mediterranean affective relations.

Appendix II

Characteristics of Mediterranean Biography

Based upon Malina ("Dealing with Biblical [Mediterranean] Characters"), the following diagram is a comparison of cultural themes found in modern and ancient biography. As has been demonstrated, the application of modern criteria to ancient biography leads to false conclusions about past events and personalities. Many of the ancient biographical themes listed below are seen to operate in V. (Keep in mind that these themes reflect broad tendencies and therefore must not be expected to operate in each and every instance). The list is tentative and not meant to be exhaustive yet it renders comprehensible much of what Josephus describes and justifies the peculiar style of ancient Mediterranean texts (see below, Diagram 8).

Diagram 8

Cross-Cultural Comparison of Story Telling (Biography)

F U N C T I O N :	M O D E R N :	A N C I E N T :
What is important...	Events that are factually related	Emotions that arise out of the events described
Description is...	Limited by what is rationally and empirically probable	Unlimited by physical restrictions and impossibilities
Difficulties are perceived as...	Unfortunate circumstances	Personal humiliations
Conversations communicate...	Facts, views, motives	Feelings, measure claims to honour, let off steam provoked by opposing group pressure
Success is...	Great achievements usually measured by material gain	The overcoming of personal antagonists

Diagram 8 - Continued

Cross-Cultural Comparison of Story Telling (Biography)

F U N C T I O N :	M O D E R N :	A N C I E N T :
Describes...	Psychological developmental stages	Fulfilment of stereotypical roles according prominence or deviance status
Individual distinction demonstrated through...	Skills and achievements	Unusual events a person had to confront
Tells reader...	What really happened	How a person felt about what happened and how one ought to feel about the events
Basic personality assumed to be a result of..	Environment of early childhood, education and innate abilities	Geographically rooted ethnic characteristics (stereotypes)
Problems in life are attributed to...	Flawed personality and poor circumstances	Faulty relationships (bad contracts) & personalized forces
Story demonstrates...	The idiosyncratic, the psychologically unique	Conformity to groups' worldview
Details how...	Each person stands alone	Every individual is embedded in some other individual
Very concerned with...	Specific unique achievements	Honour maintenance, favour of patrons, noble family lines
Tends towards...	Realism	Exaggerated descriptions of self and others
Important events are caused by...	Impersonal circumstances and resources - "what's"	Person's - "who's"
Evil is seen as...	The destruction of the self, violation of personal integrity	The destruction of group solidarity
Virtue is seen as...	Perfection of individual quality	The promotion of group cohesion

Appendix III

Other Clients of Poppaea Sabina

There are two other explicit indications that Poppea had clients other than Josephus in Roman Palestine. The earliest indication occurs during the procuratorship of Judaea by Porcius Festus (60-62 C.E.) when a dispute arose between Jerusalem priests and Agrippa II.[11] Agrippa had built a dining-room on to the Hasmonaean royal palace which thus allowed him a view over the inner court of the Temple. This, of course, enraged the priests who responded by building a wall along the west side of the inner court. The new wall effectively blocked not only Agrippa's view but also the view of Roman soldiers who kept watch from the western colonnade during festivals. This in turn angered both Agrippa and Festus who then ordered the priests to tear the wall down. The priests demanded a ruling on the matter from Nero himself as they could not bear to see any part of the Temple demolished. Festus agreed and an embassy of twelve Jews left for Rome which included the High Priest Helcias and the Temple treasurer Ismael. In Rome Nero granted the Jews the right to maintain the new wall. Josephus gives the following explanation for this favour:

> This was granted them in order to gratify Poppea, Nero's wife, who was a religious woman and had requested these favours of Nero, and who gave order to the ten ambassadors to go their way home; but retained Helcias and Ismael as hostages with herself (AJ 20.8.11).

While we can only guess if Poppea's reason for interceding on behalf of the Jewish deputation was truly religiously motivated, we may be sure that the result was that she gained more clients among the Jewish aristocracy who were now indebted to her for this act of intercession. It must be kept in mind that nothing was done by the elite without the expectation of future reciprocity

[11] AJ 20. 189-96.

and there could be no baser action than ingratitude and failure to reciprocate. The High Priest and Temple Treasurer were probably held in Rome by Poppea for a short time to ensure that the priests would not take advantage of their new privacy from the eyes of Roman guards.

The third instance of patronage by Poppea is explicit though lacking in details. Josephus makes a passing reference to Cleopatra who was the wife of Gessius Florus, the last procurator of Judaea (AJ 20.11.1). We are told that Florus obtained his appointment because his wife was a friend of Poppea. There is an abundance of evidence which attests to the granting of offices, honours and verdicts by the wives of Emperors.[12] The granting of such posts is a clear manifestation of patronage. Through such favours Poppaea created a group of clients who were in her debt and from whom she could require service at any point in the future.[13] This was the essential function of patronage in Josephus' world.

---

[12]See, Saller, *Personal* 65-66.

[13]Note that Poppaea had clients among both ruling groups within Palestine, the Romans and the Jewish aristocracy.

THESIS BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Richard N. "Brokers and Career Mobility Systems in the Structure of Complex Societies." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 26 (1970) 315-327.

Andreski, Stanislav. *Social Sciences as Sorcery*. Markham, Ontario: Penguin. 1972.

Ardener, Edwin. "Social Anthropology, Language and Reality." *Semantic Anthropology*. Ed., David Parkin. London: Academic Press. 1982. 1-14.

Attridge, Harold W. "Josephus and His Works." *Compendia* Vol. II (1984) 185-232.

Badian, E. *Foriegn Clientelae: 264-70 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1958.

Barbour, Ian G. *Myths, Models and Paradigms: A Comparative Study in Science and Religion.* New York: Harper and Row. 1974.

Boissevain, Jeremy. *Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1974.

Boon, James A. *Other Tribes, Other Scribes: Symbolic Anthropology in the Comparative Study of Cultures, Histories, Religions and Texts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1982.

Braund, David. "Function and Dysfunction: Personal Patronage in Roman Imperialism." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London-New York: Routledge. 1989. 137-52.

Bruce, F.F. *The Spreading Flame*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1958.

Brunt, P.A. "The Romanization of the Local Ruling Classes in the Roman Empire." *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres". 1976. 161-74.

---------"Josephus on Social Conflict in Roman Judaea," *Klio* 59 (1977) 149-53.

Carney, T.F. *The Economy of Antiquity: Controls, Gifts and Trade*, Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado. 1973.

---------*The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity*. Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado. 1975.

Cohen, Shaye J.D. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: Brill. 1979.

Crick, Malcom. "Anthropological Field Research, Meaning Creation and Knowledge Construction." *Semantic Anthropology*. Ed., David Parkin. London: Academic Press. 1982. 15-37.

Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. Missouri: Clayton. 1982.

Davis, J. *People of the Mediterranean: An Essay in Comparative Social Anthropology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1977.

Driessen, Henk. "The 'Noble Bandit' and the Bandits of the Nobles: Brigandage and Local Community in Nineteenth-Century Andalusia." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 24 (1983) 96-114.

Drinkwater, John. "Patronage in Roman Gaul and the Problem of the Bagaudae." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York: Routledge. 1989. 189-203.

Douglas, Mary. "Do Dogs Laugh? A Cross-Cultural Approach to Body Symbolism." *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 15 (1971) 387-390.

---------"Cultural Bias." (Occasional Paper No. 35 of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland). London: Royal Anthropological Institute. 1978.

Dunn, James, D.G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1980.

Edwards, Douglas R. "First Century Urban/Rural Relations in Lower Galilee: Exploring the Archaeological and Literary Evidence." *SBL 1988 Seminar Papers*. 169-182.

Eisenstadt, S.N. and Luis Roniger. "Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (1980) 42-78.

---------*Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1984.

---------"The Study of Patron-Client Relations and Recent Developments in Sociological Theory." *Political Clientelism, Patronage and Development*. Eds., S.N. Eisenstadt and Rene Lemarchand. Beverly Hills-London: Sage. 1981. 271-96.

Elliot, John H. "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and its Social World: More on Method and Models." *Semeia* 35 (1986) 1-34.

Farmer, William R. "Source Criticism: Some Comments on the Present Situation." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 42 (1988) 49-57.

Feldman, Louis H. "Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, His Writings, and His Significance." *ANRW* Vol. II. New York. 1984. 763-862.

Flynn, P. "Class, Clientelism and Coercion: Some Mechanisms of Internal Dependency and Control." *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 12 (2) 138-56.

Freyne, Sean "The Galileans in the Light of Josephus' *Vita*." *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980) 397-413.

---------"Galilee-Jerusalem Relations According to Josephus' *Life*." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987) 600-609.

---------*Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1988.

Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. 1975.

Garnsey, Peter and Greg Woolf. "Patronage of the Rural Poor in the Roman World." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London-New York: Routledge. 1989. 153-70.

Garrett, Susan R. (Review) *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation*. By Bruce J. Malina. Atlanta, GA: John Knox. 1986, in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988) 532-534.

Gellner, Ernst. "Patrons and Clients." *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. Eds., Ernst Gellner and John Waterbury. London: Duckworth. 1977. 1-6.

Gilmore, David G. "Anthropology of the Mediterranean Area." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11 (1982) 175-205.

Goodman, Martin. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome A.D. 66-70*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987.

Gottwald, Norman K. *The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1985.

Gowler, David B. "Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach." *BTB* 19 (1989) 54-62.

Griffin, Miriam T. *Nero: The End of a Dynasty*. London: Batsford. 1984.

Hall, A. "Patron-Client Relations: Concepts and Terms." *Friends, Followers and Factions*. Eds., Steffen W. Schmidt et al. Los Angeles: University of California Press. 510-12.

Hobart, Mark. "Meaning or Moaning? An Ethnographic Note on a Little-Understood Tribe." *Semantic Anthropology*. Ed., David Parkin. London: Academic Press. 1982. 39-63.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Bandits*. Middlesex: Penguin. 1969.

Holmberg, Bengt. *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal*. Minneapolis: Fortress. 1990.

Hopwood, Keith. "Bandits, Elites and Rural Order." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London and New York: Routledge. 1989. 171-187.

Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1987.

---------John S. Hanson. *Bandits, prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Winston. 1985.

Isenberg, Sheldon R. "Some Uses and Limitations of Social Scientific Methodology in the Study of Early Christianity." *Society of Biblical Literature 1980 Seminar Papers* (19) Ed., Paul J. Actemeier. Chico, California: Scholars Press. 29-49.

Johnson, Paul. *A History of Christianity.* New York: Atheneum. 1979.

Johnson, Terry and Christopher Dandeker. "Patronage: Relation and System." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London and New York: Routledge. 1989. 218-42.

Judge, E.A. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History" *Journal of Religious History* 11 (1980) 201-217.

Lande, Carl H. "The Dyadic Basis of Clientelism." *Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Eds, Steffen W. Schmidt et al. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1977. xiii-xxxvii.

Lemarchand, Rene. "Comparative Political Clientelism: Structure, Process and Optic." *Political Clientelism, Patronage and Development*. Eds, S. N. Eisenstadt and Rene Lemarchand. Beverly Hills-London: Sage. 1981. 7-34.

Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Atlanta: John Knox Press. 1981.

---------"The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation." *Interpretation*. 36 (1982) 229-242.

---------*Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox. 1986.

---------"The Received View and What It Cannot Do: III John and Hospitality." *Semeia* 35 (1986) 171-94.

---------"Patron and Client: The Analogy Behind Synoptic Theology," *Forum* 4 (1988) 2-32.

---------"Dealing with Biblical (Mediterranean) Characters: A Guide for U.S. Consumers." *BTB* 19 (1989) 127-141.

---------Jerome H. Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*. Sonoma: Polebridge. 1988.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: Dutton. 1922.

Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM Press. 1979.

Millar, Fergus. *The Emperor in the Roman World*. London: Duckworth. 1977.

Millet, Paul. "Patronage and its Avoidance in Classical Athens." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London-New York: Routledge. 1989. 15-48.

Moehring, H. "Joseph b. Matthia and Flavius Josephus." *ANRW* 2.21.2. Ed., W. Hasse. Berlin-New York. 1984. 864-944.

Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1988

Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll: Orbis. 1988.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "Social Science Modelling and the New Testament." *BTB* 16 (1986) 107-110.

Paine, Robert. "A Theory of Patronage and Brokerage." *Patrons and Brokers in the East Arctic*. Ed., Robert Paine. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1971. 8-21.

Pina-Cabral, Joao de. "The Mediterranean as a Category of Regional Comparison: A Critical View," *Current Anthropology* 30 (1989) 399-406.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian. *The Fate of Shechem (or The Politics of Sex): Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*. London: Cambridge University Press. 1977.

Powell, John Duncan. "Peasant Society and Clientelist Politics." *The American Political Science Review* LXIV (1970) 411-25.

Rajak, Tessa. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. London: Duckworth. 1983.

Rappaport, Uriel. "Jewish-Pagan Relations and the Revolt against Rome in 66-70 C.E." *The Jerusalem Cathedra* I. Ed., Lee I. Levine. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute. 1981. 81-95.

---------"John of Gischala in Galilee," *The Jerusalem Catherdra* 3. Ed., Lee I. Levine. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute. 1981. 46-57.

Resseguie, James L. "Defamiliarization and the Gospels." *BTB* 20 (1990) 147-153.

Rhoads, David M. *Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E., A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1979.

Rich, John. "Patronage and Interstate Relations in the Roman Republic." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London and New York: Routledge. 1989. 117-135.

Rohrbaugh, Richard. "Models and Muddles: Discussions of the Social Facets Seminar." *Forum* (3) 1987. 23-33.

Roniger, Luis. "Modern Patron-Client Relations and Historical Clientelism: Some Clue from Ancient Republican Rome." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 24 (1983) 63-95.

Sahlins, Marshall D. "On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange." *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. Ed., Michael Banton. London: Tavistock. 1965. 139-227.

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier. 1988.

Saller, Richard. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1982.

---------"Patronage and Friendship in Early Imperial Rome: Drawing the Distinction." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London-New York: Routledge. 1989. 63-88.

Schneider, Jane. "Of Vigilance and Virgins: Honour, Shame and Access to Resources in Mediterranean Societies," *Ethnology* 10 (1971) 1-24

Schurer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. G. Vermes, et. al. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1973-87. I. 336-513.

Schwartz, Daniel R. *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1990.

Schwartz, Seth. *Josephus and Judaean Politics*. Leiden: Brill. 1990.

Scott, James. "Patronage or Exploitation?" *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. Eds., Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury. London: Duckworth. 1977. 21-39.

Scroggs, Robin. "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research." *New Testament Studies*. 26 (1980) 164-179.

Shklovsky, Victor. "Art as Technique." *Russian Formalist Criticism*. Trans., L.T. Lemon and M.J. Reis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 3-24.

Silverman, Sydel. "Patronage as Myth." *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. Eds., Ernst Gellner and John Waterbury. London: Duckworth. 1977. 7-19.

Slatta, Richard W., Ed. *Bandidos: The Varieties of Latin American Banditry*. New York: Greenwood. 1987.

Smallwood, E. Mary. "The Alleged Jewish Tendencies of Poppaea Sabina." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1959) 329-335.

Stock, Augustine. "The Limits of Historical-Critical Exegesis." *BTB* XIII (1983) 28-31.

Strickon, Arnold and Sidney M. Greenfield. "The Analysis of Patron-Client Relationships: An Introduction." *Structure and Process in Latin America: Patronage, Clientage and Power Systems*. Eds., Arnold Strickon and Sidney M. Greenfield. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico. 1972. 1-17.

Stuart, William T. "The Explanation of Patron-Client Systems: Some Structural and Ecological Perspectives." *Structure and Process in Latin America: Patronage, Clientage and Power Systems*. Eds., Arnold Strickon and Sidney M. Greenfield. Albuquerque: University of Mexico Press. 1972. 19-42.

Taylor, Lily Ross. "Nobles, Clients, and Personal Armies." *Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism.* Eds., Steffen W. Schmidt et al. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1977. 179-192

Thackeray, H.S.T., R. Marcus, A Wikgren, and L.H. Feldman, Eds. and Trans., *Josephus* 9 vols. *Loeb Classical Library*. Cambridge. 1926-1965.

Tonkin, Elizabeth. "Language Versus the World: Notes on Meaning for Anthropologists." *Semantic Anthropology*. Ed., David Parkin. London: Academic Press. 1982. 107-122.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Introduction." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London and New York: Routledge. 1989. 1-17.

---------Ed., *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

---------"Patronage in Roman Society: From Republic to Empire." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed., Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. London and New York: Routledge. 1989. 63-87.

Weingrod, Alex. "Patronage and Power." *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth. 1977. 41-51.

White, Leland J. "The Bible, Theology and Cultural Pluralism." *BTB* 16 (1986) 111-115.

White, Peter. "Positions for Poets in Early Imperial Rome." *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Ed., Barbara K. Gold. Austin: University of Texas Press. 1982. 50-66.

Williams, Gordon. "Phases in Political Patronage of Literature in Rome." *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Ed., Barbara K. Gold. Austin: University of Texas Press. 1982. 3-27.

Williamson, G.A. *The World of Josephus*. London: Secker and Warburg. 1964.

Wolf, Eric R. "Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relations in Complex Societies." *Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Eds., Steffen W. Schmidt et al. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1977. 167-77.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "A Survey of Jewish Historiography: Josephus Flavius and John of Gischala." *Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism*. New York: Ktav. 1973. 375-406.