Currents in Biblical Research

The Meaning of *Ioudaios* and its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient 'Judaism'

David M. Miller

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

$SAGE

Additional services and information for *Currents in Biblical Research* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://cbi.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts
Subscriptions: http://cbi.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://cbi.sagepub.com/content/9/1/98.refs.html

The Meaning of *Ioudaios* and its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient 'Judaism'*

David M. Miller
Briercrest College and Seminary, Caronport, Saskatchewan, Canada

Abstract

This article, the first in a two-part series, describes and critically evaluates major contributions in the last seventy years of scholarship on the relationship between *Ioudaios* ('Jew' or 'Judaean') and other group labels. The first section examines the common suggestion that *Ioudaios* was an outsider label, and 'Israel' an insider label. The second section surveys explanations of the relationship between *Ioudaios* and other terms such as 'Galilaean', 'Idumaean' and 'Ituraean', evaluating them in light of the evidence from Josephus. The conclusion sketches the decline of religion and rise of ethnicity as interpretive categories in scholarship on *Ioudaios*, and raises questions about the meaning of the term that require further discussion. The second article in this series will analyse the use of religion and ethnicity in scholarship on the meaning of *Ioudaios*, and evaluate the debate over the term's English translation.

Keywords
ethnicity, Galilaean, *Ioudaios*, Israel, Jew, Judaean.

Introduction

In the latest edition of Bauer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Danker 2000), Danker recommends translating the Greek word Ἰουδαῖος (*Ioudaios*) as 'Judaean' instead of the more common English word 'Jew'. Danker's preferred translation is gaining ground in academic circles thanks to Mason's editorial decision to render *Ioudaios* as 'Judaean' in the Brill Josephus series (Mason 2000–), and to recent essays by Mason himself (2007), Elliott (2007) and Esler (2003; 2007; 2009). According to Danker, more is at stake than the outcome of a philological debate:

Corresponding author:
David M. Miller, Briercrest College and Seminary, Caronport, Saskatchewan, Canada
Email: dmiller@briercrest.ca

Incalculable harm has been caused by simply glossing [*Ioudaios*] with 'Jew', for many readers or auditors of Bible translations do not practice the historical judgment necessary to distinguish between circumstances and events of an ancient time and contemporary ethnic-religious-social realities, with the result that anti-Judaism in the modern sense of the term is needlessly fostered through biblical texts (Danker 2000: 478).

Esler is also concerned about anachronism since, he argues, 'the words "Jews," "Jewish," and even "Judaism" now carry meanings indelibly fashioned by events after the first century' (2003: 66-67). Indeed,

It is arguable that translating Ἰουδαῖοι [*Ioudaioi*] as 'Jews' is not only intellectually indefensible…but also morally questionable. To honor the memory of these first-century people it is necessary to call them by a name that accords with their own sense of identity. 'Jews' does not suit this purpose… 'Judeans' is the only apt rendering in English of Ἰουδαῖοι [*Ioudaioi*] (Esler 2003: 68).

By contrast, Levine claims that such proposals will do more harm than good:

The Jew is replaced with the Judean, and thus we have a *Judenrein* ('Jew free') text, a text purified of Jews. Complementing this erasure, scholars then proclaim that Jesus is neither Jew nor even Judean, but Galilean… Once Jesus is not a Jew or a Judean, but a Galilean, it is also an easy step to make him an Aryan. So much for the elimination of anti-Semitism by means of changing vocabulary (Levine 2006: 160, 165).

Determining the best translation of *Ioudaios* is clearly important for scholars concerned to guard against contemporary anti-Semitic readings of the New Testament or for those who wish to demonstrate that the New Testament writings are not in themselves anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish. A given translation may also hinder efforts to understand the lives of ancient *Ioudaioi*, as Esler argues.

It is a mistake, however, to combine the translation question with the more important and logically prior question of the meaning of *Ioudaios* in the Greco-Roman world. If we assume, for the sake of argument, that ancient readers were aware of distinct meanings of *Ioudaios* which correspond exactly to our English terms 'Jew' and 'Judaean', we must remember that there was no simple way of conveying this distinction in Greek. The same word would have had to do duty for both, and the result would sometimes have been ambiguity—an ambiguity that is eliminated by choosing one English term instead of another (cf. Ashton 1985: 43). Of course, there is no reason why the semantic range of *Ioudaios* must correspond precisely to the English 'Jew' and 'Judaean', which is another reason why the translation of *Ioudaios* should be distinguished from its meaning: ancient readers need not have drawn conceptual boundaries where modern readers do. Studying *Ioudaios* without entering into the question of its translation thus permits a more careful analysis of its meaning. Distinguishing translation from meaning also avoids the misunderstanding that can ensue when scholars disagree about the modern meanings of 'Jew' and 'Judaean': While Esler (2007: 132) takes for granted that the English word 'Jew' designates an adherent of a religion, and that 'Judaean', by contrast, is an ethnic label,

D. Schwartz assumes that 'Judaean' is exclusively a geographical term, whereas 'being a Jew may have to do with one's descent, or with one's religion, or with both' (Schwartz 2007: 8). In order to avoid similar confusion, in this article I will employ *Ioudaios* in the singular and *Ioudaioi* in the plural instead of 'Jew(s)' or 'Judaean(s)' for the Greek Ἰουδαῖος (*Ioudaios*) and the corresponding Latin, Hebrew and Aramaic terms *Iudaeus*, יהודי (*Yehudi*) and יהודאי (*Yehudai*). For the sake of convenience, and in accordance with the conventions of this journal, I will continue to employ 'Jew' and 'Jewish' when referring to the people designated by *Ioudaios*.

Although scholarship on *Ioudaios* proliferates, it is still the case that 'we lack a detailed and sophisticated study of the term' (Cohen 1999: 71). According to Cohen, the following issues require further investigation:

> In particular, the use of the plural *hoi Ioudaioi* must be distinguished from the use of the singular *Ioudaios*; self-designation must be distinguished from designations imposed by others; official public designations must be distinguished from unofficial private ones; the relationship between the term *Ioudaios/oi* and the terms *Hebraios* and *Israel* must be determined; and the occurrences of the terms must be catalogued by chronology, geography, and language (1999: 71).

While several of these issues will be discussed below, my primary concern in this article is the relationship between *Ioudaios* and other group labels. In section one I evaluate scholarship on the relationship between *Ioudaios* and 'Israel'. Both terms were current in ancient 'Judaism'. Were they interchangeable? Or was *Ioudaios* a subset within the larger category of 'Israel'? Was *Ioudaios* an outsider label and 'Israelite' an insider designation? Did one term predominate in the land of Israel, another in the Diaspora? Or did one simply carry greater theological freight? In section two I review scholarship on the relationship between *Ioudaios* and associated terms such as Galilaean, Idumaean and Ituraean, asking whether Idumaeans such as Herod and Galilaeans such as Jesus were considered *Ioudaioi* or contrasted with them—or both.

Conclusions about the paradigmatic relationship between *Ioudaios* and Israel, on the one hand, and between *Ioudaios* and Galilaean or Idumaean, on the other, influence the discussion about contemporary English terminology in at least two ways: (1) Elliott (2007: 153) has recently argued that since ancient Jews normally referred to themselves as 'Israelites' not *Ioudaioi*, modern scholarship should follow suit, adopting 'Israelite' as the normal scholarly designation for Jesus and his Second Temple 'Israelite' contemporaries. (2) Horsley (1995: 13) argues that since *Ioudaios* was closely associated with the region of Judaea and typically opposed to 'Galilaean', it should be translated as 'Judaean' rather than 'Jew'. I will argue against Elliott that *Ioudaios*, like 'Israelite', was in use as an insider self-designation, and against Horsley that Josephus, at least, regarded Galilaeans as *Ioudaioi*.

I will also begin to chronicle changing perspectives on the denotation of *Ioudaios*, in preparation for a detailed evaluation of this central semantic question in a subsequent article. As we will see, earlier views that *Ioudaios* was a racial, religious or geographical label have been supplemented and at times replaced by the more recent view that the term was an ethnic label. Since conclusions about the translation of *Ioudaios* often depend on conclusions about the meaning of ethnicity and the utility of religion as an

interpretive category, a full discussion of the translation question will conclude the second article in this two-part series, which will assess these questions in more detail.

1. 'Israel' and *Ioudaios* as Insider and Outsider Labels

a. Kuhn (1965)

Elliott's argument about insider use of 'Israelite' in ancient 'Judaism' depends on Kuhn's seminal article in Kittel's *Theological Dictionary*, which was first published in 1938. Kuhn maintained that both *Ioudaios* and 'Israel(ite)' designate members of a people defined by physical descent, and, at the same time, adherents of a religion (1965: 359). While the two terms denote the same people, Kuhn argued for a fundamental distinction in usage. Within Palestinian Judaism, *Ioudaios* is a label used primarily in non-Jewish contexts, while 'Israel' 'is the name which the people uses for itself' (1965: 360). In support, he observed that 'Israel' is the standard self-designation in Rabbinic texts; on the rare occasions that *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]; Aramaic יהודאי [*Yehudai*]) appears, it is normally in speech attributed to non-Jews (1965: 362). The narrator in 1 Maccabees also prefers 'Israel' to *Ioudaios*; with a few exceptions, occurrences of *Ioudaios* are attributed to non-Jews, appear in Jewish correspondence with non-Jews, or occur in official political contexts. In a companion essay, which worked with Kuhn's model as a starting point, Gutbrod (1965) argued that the Synoptic Gospels correspond to this Palestinian pattern. While Jewish speakers within the Synoptics employ 'Israel' rather than *Ioudaios*, *Ioudaios* is attributed almost exclusively to non-Jews who use the phrase 'king of the *Ioudaioi*'. The exceptions are all in narrative descriptions, and are, according to Gutbrod, easily explained as a copyist's gloss, in the case of Mt. 28.15, or as addressed to the non-Jewish audience of the Gospels in the case of Mk 7.3; Lk. 7.3; 23.51 (1965: 370-72).

In the Diaspora, which he equated with Hellenistic Judaism, Kuhn argued that *Ioudaios* rather than 'Israel' became the normal self-designation, although 'Israel' was still used in 'prayers and biblical or liturgical expressions' because its connections to Scripture and the covenant gave it stronger religious associations (Kuhn 1965: 360). Kuhn pointed to 2 and 3 Maccabees and Jewish inscriptions as evidence. Gutbrod added that Philo's preference for *Ioudaios* is typical of Diaspora Jews and that Josephus's usage is 'suitable for the readers whom he has in view' (Gutbrod 1965: 372). Gutbrod also proposed that many of the occurrences of *Ioudaios* in John and Acts can be explained on the analogy of Josephus—a Jewish author adopting 'a usage which is fitting when addressing non-Jews' (1965: 377). Other occurrences in John and Acts as well as Paul take on a new Christian meaning, denoting those whose opposition to Christ is rooted in their 'essential Jewishness'—that is to say, in their religious commitment to the one God, the temple and the Law (1965: 378-79, 382).

For Kuhn, religion is the defining characteristic of the people denoted by *Ioudaios* and 'Israel', and it is religion that normally determines the choice of 'Israel' instead of *Ioudaios*. Because of its religious connotations, 'Israel' was adopted by Palestinian Jews as a self-designation even in contexts that were not overtly religious (Kuhn 1965: 362). In the Diaspora, where *Ioudaios* became a self-designation, the religious contexts in which the word 'Israel' appears explain exceptions to the normal use of *Ioudaios* (1965: 363-65).

Even variations from the standard use of *Ioudaios* in official secular contexts within Palestine result from religious influence: The change from *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]) on Hasmonaean coins to 'Israel' on coins minted during the revolts of 66–70 and 132–35 CE is attributed to the 'religio-political' aims of the latter movements, which contrast with the merely political ambitions of the former (1965: 361). In sum, religion typically accounts for any occurrence of 'Israel' or *Ioudaios* that is not explained by the differences between Jewish and non-Jewish terminology, on the one hand, or between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism, on the other.

After Hengel's pioneering work (1974), it is now clear that 'Palestinian Judaism' was thoroughly Hellenized (cf. Barclay 1996: 6). While Jews in the Diaspora *may* have chosen a different self-designation than Jews in the homeland, we can no longer assume a rigid separation between two forms of Judaism. Appealing to religion to explain exceptions adds an additional level of complexity to the model. The result is unwieldy and, it must be admitted, not completely successful. For example, not every occurrence of *Ioudaios* in 1 Maccabees can be attributed to a non-Jewish or political context. Kuhn states that the man who 'came forward…to offer sacrifice on the altar in Modein' (1 Macc. 2.23) is labelled a *Ioudaios* 'as in the usage of the *diaspora*' where the term 'denotes purely formal membership of the Jewish people', but he does not explain why Diaspora usage is adopted here. Nor does Kuhn explain how evidence from the Diaspora demonstrates that 'the camp of the *Ioudaioi*' (1 Macc. 4.2) became 'a stereotyped expression' in a Palestinian Jewish text composed in Hebrew (1965: 361 n. 35). Moreover, some Diaspora texts employ 'Israel' when *Ioudaios* would be expected. In the case of Tobit—wrongly assigned by Kuhn (1965: 362) to Palestinian Judaism (cf. Nickelsburg 2005: 34)—there is no obvious religious explanation for the use of 'Israel' instead of *Ioudaios*. And if, as Kuhn argues, the use of 'Israel' in the Diaspora is limited to religious contexts, it is surprising that Josephus does not draw attention to the religious connotations of 'Israelite'.

Even more problematic for Kuhn's model are Josephus's switch from 'Israelite' to *Ioudaios* at the return from exile, and his suggestion that the term *Ioudaios* became standard for members of the people at that time:

> This name [*Ioudaios*], by which they have been called from the time when they went up from Babylon, is derived from the tribe of Judah; as this tribe was the first to come to those parts, both the people themselves and the country have taken their name from it (*Ant.* 11.173; Marcus 1937).

Josephus's own usage is telling. The term 'Israelite' occurs 186 times in the first eleven books of the *Antiquities*, but nowhere else in his writings. The term *Ioudaios*, by contrast, occurs 582 times after *Ant.* 11.173, but only 65 times in the first half of the *Antiquities*. Josephus could be wrong, of course, but his explanation and his pattern of usage deserves consideration. His insistence that the name for the people changed—even if only during the Persian era—raises a final red flag about Kuhn's model. Kuhn assumed the meaning and function of the standard labels stayed the same for the entire period under review: 1 Maccabees is cited together with much later rabbinic literature as the main evidence for Palestinian usage. Hasmonaean coins are contrasted with coins from the Bar Kokhba revolt to demonstrate the religious motivations of the latter, disregarding other historical

factors that may have influenced the change of terminology. While it may be the case that the meanings of 'Israel' and *Ioudaios* remained constant for several centuries, only to change again when Christianity arrived on the scene, it is also possible that linguistic patterns shifted during the Greco-Roman period itself.

b. Tomson (1986; 2001)

In a lengthy two-part essay (1986), and a sequel fifteen years later (2001), Tomson refined and simplified the basic pattern proposed by Kuhn, while avoiding several of its weaknesses. Tomson agrees with Kuhn that both *Ioudaios* and 'Israel' refer to members of the same people and religion (1986: 124-26). But instead of trying to establish that one term was preferred by Jews and the other by non-Jews, Tomson concentrates on the role both terms play in signaling social identity. According to Tomson, 'Israel' always reflects an insider perspective that 'continues the concept of biblical Covenant history', and *Ioudaios* always reflects an outsider perspective that views the Jews in relation to other ancient groups (1986: 278, cf. 126). Usage and perspective overlap, of course, for non-Jews naturally adopted an outsider perspective. However, the new terminology and its focus on attitudes towards social identity is able to explain a wider variety of speech situations without appealing to exceptions. And because Tomson insists that *Ioudaios* and 'Israel' *always* reflect opposing outsider and insider perspectives, he does not have to distinguish between Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism. Regardless of location, Jews who employed *Ioudaios* adopted an outsider or non-Jewish point of view with respect to their own people. This is to be expected in communication with non-Jews as well as in writings 'situated in non-Jewish surroundings' such as political and legal writing, inscriptions, and 'apologetic works and historiography in the Hellenistic tradition' (1986: 126).

Tomson's survey of the data is much more thorough than Kuhn's. It is not, however, primarily a defence of his interpretation of *Ioudaios* and 'Israel' as outsider and insider terms. That would be to repeat Kuhn's basic argument, which Tomson takes for granted as a presupposition of his own. Tomson's main goal is rather to exploit the insider–outsider distinction to help determine patterns of social identity in ancient Judaism, and to show that the same inner-Jewish and non-Jewish duality occurs throughout the New Testament, not just in the Gospels and Acts as Gutbrod had argued. In his discussion of the New Testament, and of John in particular, Tomson sharpens the insider–outsider distinction into a source-critical scalpel, which he uses to separate inner-Jewish tradition from non- or anti-Jewish redaction.

Not surprisingly, the texts that support Kuhn's model and those that fit the insider–outsider pattern as Tomson reconfigures it are similar. Tomson also incorporates evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls—insider texts *par excellence* that consistently employ 'Israel' (1986: 136). His detailed discussion of rabbinic literature demonstrates that 'Israel' was much more common than *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]; Aramaic יהודאי [*Yehudai*]) in these inner-Jewish texts (cf. Stern 1994: 10-11). The *Tosefta* and Tannaitic Midrashim as well as Palestinian Amoraic literature fit the pattern perfectly. The two occurrences of *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]) in the Mishnah (*Ketub.* 7.6; *Ned.* 11.12), Tomson suggests, adopt an outsider perspective because they deal with the possibility of divorce among proselytes who might choose to abandon the Jewish way of life (1986:

271-72). 'Israel' is also the standard self-designation in the Talmudim. Tomson identifies just five passages in the Babylonian Talmud where *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]; Aramaic יהודאי [*Yehudai*]) is used exceptionally in an insider-context: *Shabbat* 139a; *Pesahim* 8b; *Bava Batra* 21a; *Avodah Zarah* 13a, 26a (1986: 276-77). The two instances of *Ioudaios* (Aramaic יהודאי [*Yehudai*]) in internal contexts in the Palestinian Talmud— Tomson cites *y. Demai* 1.3, 22a = *y. Ta'anit* 3.1, 66c and *y. Bikkurim* 3.3, 65c = *y. Sheqalim* 5.2, 49a—function as a rhetorical device to suggest 'distance' or 'estrangement' from those so labelled (2001: 188-90).

While the basic pattern works in a number of texts, Tomson's explanations sometimes seem forced. For example, Tomson concludes from the use of *Ioudaios* in official internal contexts in 1 Maccabees (13.42; 14.47) and in Hebrew (יהודי [*Yehudi*]) inscriptions on Hasmonaean coins 'that the Hasmonean leadership saw itself from a non-Jewish perspective even in official internal communications' (1986: 130), to which he adds 'It may be connected with the external hellenization of the Hasmonean court' (1986: 130 n. 36a). But if 1 Maccabees is effectively 'a Hasmonean court chronicle' (1986: 133), why does its narrator prefer the 'insider' term 'Israel' over *Ioudaios*? In his second article, Tomson replies:

> When presenting themselves as respectable subjects of the larger empire, the Hellenized Hasmonaean leaders seem to have opted for the appellation 'Jews,' but in defense of their religio-ethnic specificity, they would call themselves 'Israel' (2001: 182).

The answer does not satisfy. While 1 Maccabees's preference for 'Israel' may be explained by its 'biblical style' (1986: 133), the larger empire is not in view in 1 Macc. 13.42 and 14.47, which describe how the people acclaimed Simon as 'leader' and 'ethnarch' of the *Ioudaioi*. Similar questions arise when 1 and 2 Maccabees are compared. Because of its use of 'Israel' Tomson classifies 1 Maccabees as an inner-Jewish text along with other 'Biblical and related works'. Because 2 Maccabees normally employs *Ioudaios* it 'implies an "outside" view of "Judaism" as a separate entity in the Hellenistic world'. Its 'overall frame of reference is non-Jewish' (1986: 134). This is puzzling. To be sure, 1 Maccabees sounds more biblical, and 2 Maccabees has a more pronounced 'Hellenistic literary character' (Nickelsburg 2005: 109), but is a 'non-Jewish' perspective a helpful way of describing these literary differences when both texts are addressed to Jews and both authors are deeply concerned about the temple and preserving their ancestral way of life?

Tomson suggests that Paul uses 'Israel' in order to encourage his non-Jewish readers to adopt his own inner-Jewish perspective about the people of Israel. This means, on the one hand, that non-Jews 'are invited to call the Jews by the cherished, inner-Jewish name of the Covenant People: Israel', and on the other hand, that non-Jewish believers in Jesus are encouraged to view themselves as 'spiritual proselytes' who adopt the name 'Israel' as their own (1986: 284-88). Elliott (2007), whose insider–outsider model is very similar to Tomson's, proposes a simpler explanation that focuses on Paul's audience rather than his perspective: In 2 Cor. 11.22-23 and Phil. 3.5-6, where Paul identifies himself as an 'Israelite', he is 'addressing fellow Israelite insiders' within the mixed audiences who received his letters. In Romans 9 Paul 'aims at persuading Israelite Christ followers to

share his perspective and follow his lead' (2007: 144-45). Both explanations presuppose the insider–outsider distinction rather than providing independent support for it; neither explanation has much to commend it on other grounds. Against Tomson, Paul's claim to be 'of the people of Israel' (Phil. 3.5) and an 'Israelite' (2 Cor. 11.22) is a reason for boasting about his own status, not an observation about the covenant status of, or correct nomenclature for, Paul's fellow Jews. Against Elliott, there is nothing in the context of Romans 9 that suggests Paul is now addressing fellow 'Israelites' instead of a mixed audience of Jews and non-Jews. And there are alternatives that do not require complex decisions about shifting perspectives and audiences. Perhaps, for example, 'Israel' is used in some contexts simply because of its covenantal connotations.

Tomson's discussion of the evidence from inscriptions has been challenged by subsequent research. He observes that ethnic labels were normally unnecessary in inner-Jewish contexts. Thus *Ioudaios* typically appears in synagogue inscriptions in non-Jewish settings; the rare use of the term in Greek and Latin inscriptions in Jewish cemeteries is normally associated with proselytes where 'a non-Jewish perspective would be implied' (1986: 130-31). But Williams (1997) points to a Latin example from Rome (*Iudea*) and a Greek example from Beth She'arim in Galilee (Ἰουδέα [*Ioudea*]) where this is clearly not the case. Instead, in these two instances, '*Jewishness*, in the sense of living an upright life in accordance with Jewish values, is a quality singled out for celebration' (1997: 254).

Tomson's explanation of the evidence from Philo is also problematic. He explains that Philo regarded 'Israel' as an insider term because it was a word in Hebrew, the language of Scripture and Jewish tradition, that denoted ancient Israelites and contemporary 'Jews who read the Scriptures in Hebrew' (1986: 137). The supposed Greek translation of 'Israel' as 'The nation of vision' is also an insider term because it 'represents Philo's innermost Jewish consciousness' (1986: 139), and because it is used by Philo in inner-Jewish settings connected to the interpretation of Scripture (1986: 137). *Ioudaios*, by contrast, is an outsider label because it occurs in Philo's 'political' writings or in reference to his Alexandrian Jewish contemporaries. (Tomson knows that *Ioudaios* in Philo sometimes denotes ancient Israelites, but thinks that in these instances Philo's contemporaries would have seen a direct connection between ancient Israelites and themselves [1986: 136-37].) The main points of difference between *Ioudaios* and Israel are the political as opposed to biblical subject-matter and the modern as opposed to ancient referents, but Tomson applies the insider–outsider distinction in such a variety of ways that it lacks precision. It is also misleading. *Ioudaios* is not restricted to political contexts, and its occurrences in Philo's exegetical works do not refer only to contemporary Alexandrian Jews. In *Virt.* 212, for instance, Philo refers to Abraham as 'the most ancient member of the Jewish nation' (Colson 1939); elsewhere Abraham (*Mos.* 1.7) and the patriarchs (*Mos.* 1.34) are presented as the founders of the nation (*ethnos*) of *Ioudaioi*. And in *Prob.* 75, the term *Ioudaios* is applied to residents of Palestinian Syria (cf. Harvey 1996: 43-46, for additional examples). Philo's interpretation of the biblical term 'Israel' assumes a central role in his allegorical scheme, but most of the references to 'Israel' appear in biblical quotations (Harvey 1996: 221) that are often interpreted allegorically. Unlike *Ioudaios*, which typically refers to Philo's contemporaries, Philo normally applies 'Israel', in the non-allegorical sense, to ancient Israelites. This suggests that—whatever his 'innermost Jewish consciousness'— *Ioudaios* was the unmarked term for his contemporaries (cf. Harvey 1996: 46). Indeed,

Philo's allegorical interpretation of 'Israel' may be due not only to its being a biblical term but also to its no longer being in common use. If *Ioudaios* was the more common term, one must inquire how long a group must use an outsider term before it is accepted as an insider label. Since Philo seems comfortable using both terms in writings addressed primarily to a Jewish audience (cf. Sterling 2003: 256-60, on Philo's audiences), the insider–outsider distinction is unhelpful in this case.

The evidence from Josephus supports some aspects of Tomson's model, but undermines others. On the one hand, Josephus's preference for *Ioudaios* after the exile is, for Tomson, an example of 'fine historical sense'. Josephus recognized the term's novelty and correctly located its origins in the post-exilic period (Tomson 1986: 123-24). On the other hand, restricting 'Israelite' to the biblical era is dismissed as an artificial accommodation to Josephus's non-Jewish audience who expected the external term, *Ioudaios*, in narration of contemporary events (1986: 138-39). The problem here is that Josephus uses *Ioudaios* consistently for a five-hundred-year period; the Persian era *Ioudaioi* were hardly his contemporaries. Moreover, if the *Antiquities* was written for a non-Jewish audience, would this not require an outsider perspective all the way through? Why, then, does he prefer 'Israelite' during the first ten books of the *Antiquities*? Tomson explains that Josephus used 'Israelite' in his retelling of the biblical narrative because 'an inner-Jewish perspective is brought in when the Bible is being commented on' (1986: 127). But this explanation appears to conflict with his argument elsewhere: In this context, Tomson assumes that Josephus can write to an outsider non-Jewish audience from an 'inner-Jewish perspective', while at other times he appeals to the non-Jewish audience to explain Josephus's use of the outsider term, *Ioudaios.* Again, 'outsider' and 'insider' seem ill-suited to describe Josephus's use of both 'Israelite' and *Ioudaios* in a work whose intended readership included non-Jews. As Wilson notes,

> Tomson tries to press all occurrences into the same mould, but there are too many exceptions to sustain it consistently. The argument is somewhat circular—sometimes the linguistic usage is allowed to determine the perspective of the text, at other times the reverse (Wilson 2004: 169 n. 9).

c. Goodblatt (1998; 2006; 2009)

Goodblatt seeks to preserve the essential features of Kuhn's model by substituting a linguistic distinction in place of Kuhn's problematic division between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism. According to Goodblatt, 'Israel' normally appears in works composed in Hebrew, while Jews who wrote in Greek and Aramaic, such as the authors of 2 and 3 Maccabees, Philo, Josephus, the *Letter of Aristeas*, and the Aramaic Elephantine papyri, adopted *Ioudaios* in imitation of the term universally employed by non-Jewish authors (2009: 114-17). Following Kuhn, but avoiding direct reference to religious terminology, Goodblatt adds that Greek-speaking Jewish authors sometimes used 'Israel' 'in primarily ceremonial contexts such as prayers' (2009: 118).

Most Hebrew texts fit this language model well. Goodblatt notes that 'Israel' occurs eight times more often than 'Judah' in the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls (2009: 118); to this one may add Bergsma's generally persuasive argument that the Qumran sectarians consistently

avoid using 'Judah' or *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]) as a self-designation (Bergsma 2008: 179). 'Israel' is standard in Tannaitic literature. The same pattern holds for other texts that were most likely originally composed in Hebrew: Ben Sira, Baruch, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and *4 Ezra* consistently use 'Israel', not *Ioudaios*. Judith uses 'Israel' 50 times, 'Hebrew' three times, but never *Ioudaios*, although 'people of Judaea' does occur (cf. 1.12; 4.3, 13). *Jubilees*, *2 Baruch* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* belong with 1 Maccabees in a related category of texts that use 'Israel' more frequently than *Ioudaios*. Goodblatt has also argued persuasively from the numismatic and manuscript evidence that 'Israel' was the official name adopted by the Bar Kokhba revolt, and, most likely, by the first revolt as well (2006: 136-39).

The use of *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]) rather than 'Israel' in Hebrew inscriptions on Hasmonaean coins is more difficult to explain. Goodblatt concludes that the Hasmonaeans employed *Ioudaios* in both Greek and Hebrew texts as an official designation. Although they may have simply assumed the Persian and early Hellenistic name for the territory, Goodblatt wonders why, 'in light of all the instances of Hasmonean activism that sought to…restore the ancient glories of Israel', they did not adopt the more common biblical name 'Israel' when they expanded north of Judah's borders (2009: 125). Goodblatt leaves Hasmonaean usage unexplained in the end (1998: 35; 2006: 159; 2009: 127), but the puzzle itself suggests answers to another. Goodblatt proposes that the adoption of 'Israel' as an official title during the first and second Jewish revolts might have been 'an attempt to differentiate the rebel regime(s) from the Hasmonean-Herodian state "of the Judeans [i.e., *Ioudaioi*]", or from the Roman province of Iudaea'—or both (1998: 36; cf. 2006: 136-37).

If the official use of *Ioudaios* in the Hasmonaean era, and subsequently in the Herodian period, is exceptional, Goodblatt maintains that the rule is generally valid and that it confirms the central conclusions of Kuhn's model: 'Hebrew writers preferred the ethnonym "Israel," non-Jews used "Judeans" [i.e., *Ioudaios*] exclusively, and Jews writing in Greek tended to use this term as well (to which I would add that the same was true of Jews writing in Aramaic)' (2009: 123). Goodblatt (2009: 129) also claims that the linguistic pattern corresponds to the insider–outsider distinction proposed by Tomson. This is to be expected since most Hebrew texts are products of Palestinian Judaism, and all Hebrew texts present an insider perspective. There is, however, one crucial difference between them. While Kuhn and Tomson assume that their conclusions apply to speech as well as written texts, Goodblatt's argument for a connection between the Hebrew language and the label 'Israel' appears to apply only to written evidence. If Aramaic was adopted as the language of everyday discourse among Jews in Second Temple period Judaea (2006: 67), Goodblatt's model actually suggests that Palestinian Jews would have used *Ioudaios* rather than 'Israel' in their daily Aramaic conversation.

Moreover, the overlap between 'Israel', Hebrew, and insiders, on the one hand, and *Ioudaios*, Greek (or Aramaic), and outsiders, on the other, only succeeds by side-lining Jewish literature written in Greek and Aramaic. Goodblatt does not address the status of Greek-speaking Jews who, according to his model, tended to employ *Ioudaios*: Were they insiders or outsiders? Instead of associating Greek-speaking Jews with non-Jewish outsiders, we must rather imagine interaction and mutual influence between Jews who composed in Hebrew and Jews who composed in Greek. Hebrew-speaking Jews, wherever

they were located, would of necessity engage in correspondence with Jews whose native language was Greek (cf. 2 Macc. 1.1). All Jews, one may presume, would have been influenced by the verbal patterns of Scripture, whether in Hebrew or in Greek translation. Bilingual Jews may have used 'Israel' in one language and *Ioudaios* in the other, but since both terms were viable options in both languages, it is also possible that some Jews employed both terms more-or-less interchangeably. In any case, the linguistic distinction between insiders and outsiders breaks down when the evidence of Jewish literature composed in Greek is considered alongside Jewish literature composed in Hebrew.

While Goodblatt has shown that Hebrew texts tend to use 'Israel' rather than *Ioudaios*, his linguistic model does not adequately explain texts that employ both *Ioudaios* and 'Israel'. He repeats Kuhn's claim that the Hebrew-speaking author of 1 Maccabees 'consistently uses "Israel" when narrating in his own voice' (2009: 115), but he does not examine the—admittedly rare—occurrences of *Ioudaios* in passages where the author appears simply to be narrating his story (see discussion above). Even in the Dead Sea Scrolls, where 'Israel' is used almost exclusively as a self-designation, Harvey observes that *Pesher Micah* (1Q14 8-10) interprets 'high places of Judah' (Mic. 1.5) as a reference to the community (Harvey 1996: 30-31). There are other examples: Susanna, whose place of origin and language of composition are uncertain, uses 'Israel' more frequently than *Ioudaios* or Judah, but Susanna, a 'daughter of Judah', is presented more positively than the 'daughters of Israel' (Sus. 56-57). Goodblatt's model does not explain the contrast between the two terms. In 1998 (p. 10 n. 16) and 2006 (p. 118 n. 24), Goodblatt cited favourably Gutbrod's and Tomson's conclusions that the Gospels' use of 'Israel' and *Ioudaios* fit nicely within a Palestinian Jewish or insider perspective, but in his most recent essay (2009) he excludes Christian usage, and does not comment on the New Testament, a body of evidence that is particularly difficult to accommodate to a linguistic model. One could argue that characters within the Gospels who mention 'Israel' are understood to be speaking Hebrew rather than Aramaic or Greek, but Luke uses both *Ioudaios* (Lk. 7.3; 23.51) and 'Israel' (Lk. 1.80; 2.25) in narrative asides, while Matthew, who also composed in Greek, clearly prefers 'Israel'. Goodblatt's linguistic model is not applied in a thorough-going way to all the evidence he does discuss, for he suggests that the use of *Ioudaios* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]) in the Hebrew texts of Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah results from imitating the non-Jewish Aramaic pattern of the Persian rulers (2009: 117). Here the insider–outsider pattern Goodblatt seeks to defend is brought in through the back door to explain evidence that does not fit his own reconfiguration of the model.

Finally, the statistical correlation between the Hebrew language and 'Israel' sometimes masks alternative explanations. The recension of Tobit preserved in codex Sinaiticus uses 'Israel' 17 times, all in speeches; *Ioudaios* occurs just once, in narrative description. If the original language of Tobit was Hebrew rather than Aramaic (see Nickelsburg 2005: 351 n. 90, for the options), Tobit's consistent use of 'Israel' would support Goodblatt's model. There are other possibilities, however. The use of 'Israel' may be related to Tobit's position as an exile from the tribe of Naphtali in the northern kingdom of Israel. Since one of the book's main emphases is the unity of the twelve tribes of Israel and the necessity of their restoration, it is also possible that 'Israel' was used, at least in part, for its covenantal or eschatological significance. The reason for the adoption of 'Israel' as the standard label in Judith is not as clear as it seems at first, especially if, as

Goodblatt argues, Judith's use of Judaea indicates that Judaea was the official Hasmonaean name for the state (2009: 120-22). Rather than indicating common Hebrew usage, 'Israel' may have been chosen in Judith (as well as in 1 Maccabees) because of its association with Scripture or to score a theological point. It is significant that Ben Sira never uses *Ioudaios*, but it is possible that 'Israel' was chosen not because it was the standard label in Ben Sira's time, but because it suited the elevated nature of his discourse. Of the seventeen occurrences of 'Israel' in the Greek text of Ben Sira (excluding the prologue), eleven refer to the period between Moses and Jeroboam; three more refer to the prophet's own time, but in a liturgical context (50.13, 20, 23); 36.11 is a prayer, as is the Hebrew poem included between 51.12 and 13 in the NRSV. The preference for 'Israel' in *Jubilees* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* may be due to the fact that the storyline in these two books retells ancient Israelite history. In sum, it is not straightforward to move from a literary text to conclusions about standard speech or writing patterns.

Goodblatt's study is marked by detailed and cautious analysis. By taking historical developments within ancient Judaism into account, his analysis marks a decisive advance over Kuhn's more static approach. Goodblatt has demonstrated that *Ioudaios* was the official Hasmonaean term, and that 'Israel' was preferred by the first and second revolts. His proposal rightly draws attention to the role of language as an influence on patterns of speech. He has also identified a general preference in our surviving Hebrew literature for 'Israel' rather than *Ioudaios*, but the significance of this pattern is unclear.

d. Summary

There can be no doubt that, when it was used, 'Israel' was an insider term employed only by Jews. Conversely, non-Jews used *Ioudaios* exclusively. Why and to what extent *Ioudaios* was employed by Jews remains debated, but some Jews did, in insider contexts. The models considered above, which elevate the insider–outsider distinction into a pattern that explains all the evidence, are flawed. It is better to allow for diversity, at least as a methodological starting point. A variety of factors may have shaped usage during the Second Temple period and beyond; usage may have changed at different rates for different reasons in different locations. Some texts may have been affected more by one factor than another. Each text should be considered on its own terms with attention to date, location, language, genre, purpose, content, and audience, among other variables. Two further methodological suggestions may be made at this point: (1) We must be wary of moving too quickly from written evidence to conclusions about oral speech patterns. (2) Palestinian (or Hebrew language) usage should not be examined on its own without reference to Jewish texts composed in the Diaspora (or in Greek and Aramaic). As a result of the insider–outsider distinction proposed by Kuhn and developed by Tomson, it is common to do this very thing.

2. *Ioudaioi* versus Galilaeans, Idumaeans and Ituraeans

Kuhn's legacy lives on in those who argue that *Ioudaios* was adopted as a self-designation by insiders in the Diaspora, but that within the land of Israel insiders would have regarded *Ioudaios* as a term that stood in contrast with other group labels such as 'Galilaean', 'Idumaean' and 'Ituraean'.

a. Ioudaios *as a Geographical Label*

The possibility—proposed, for example, by Bernard (1928: 34-35) and Bornhäuser (1928: 140)—that *Ioudaios* was a geographical label, Kuhn dismissed in a footnote. He admitted that the name originally 'derives from the territory', but denied it ever referred to a geographical region after the exile (Kuhn 1965: 359 and n. 27; cf. 1938: 360 and n. 27). In his companion article Gutbrod acknowledged that, for non-Jewish writers, 'the term Ἰουδαῖος [*Ioudaios*] may also refer to nationality or to a connection with the Palestinian homeland' (Gutbrod 1965: 370), but he generally agreed with Kuhn's assessment that *Ioudaios* is fundamentally a racial and religious rather than a geographical or political term (1965: 369).

This conclusion was soon challenged by Grundmann (1940), who argued for a non-Jewish Jesus based on differences between Galilaeans and Judaeans. While he did not propose a specifically geographical meaning of *Ioudaios*, Grundmann observed that after the exile Judaism ('Judentum') was confined to the region around Jerusalem (1940: 169), and he generally avoided calling Galilaeans Jews. 1 Maccabees 5.23 is taken as evidence that after Simon's evacuation of *Ioudaioi* living in Galilee around 150 BCE, Galilee was free of Jews (1940: 169). As a result of Jewish territorial expansion outside of Judaea fifty years later, the Galilaeans were forced by the Jews to adopt the Jewish religion, but they did not become Jews by race (1940: 169-70). Regional differences between Judaeans and Galilaeans extended beyond race to religion itself: Whereas the Judaeans followed the official Judaism of the Torah-centred Pharisees, Grundmann argued that the religion of the Galilaean 'people of the land' was characterized by the apocalyptic mindset of Enochic literature, and influenced by Iranian and Hellenistic elements (1940: 82-90). Although Jesus' closest religious affinities were with the distinctive Galilaean form of Judaism to which his family adhered, he eventually repudiated it too (1940: 205). Jesus was not a Jew by race or religion (1940: 175, 199-200). The author of the Fourth Gospel—to say nothing of Jesus—would never have said that 'salvation is from the *Ioudaioi*' (Jn 4.22); the verse is a later gloss (1940: 230-31). It is no coincidence that Grundmann advanced these arguments as a member of the Nazi party and leader of 'The Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence from German Church Life' (Head 2004: 76, 70-86; cf. Johnson 1986: 5-12; Heschel 2008).

The first major post-Holocaust defence of a geographical meaning of *Ioudaios* is Lowe—this time, in contrast to Grundmann, with the goal of countering anti-Semitism (Lowe 1976; 1981; cf. Cuming 1948/1949: 290-92). Lowe acknowledges that *Ioudaios* was a 'nationality-word' (1976: 107), but maintains that its basic meaning between 200 BCE and 200 CE was geographical, referring to inhabitants of, or emigrants from, Judaea. This was true across the board, although Lowe agrees with Kuhn that Diaspora usage differed from Palestinian. The use of 'Israel' within Palestinian Judaism as an alternative to *Ioudaios* and as the standard designation for the whole land meant that *Ioudaios* tended to be reserved for the inhabitants of Judaea 'in the strict sense' (1976: 103)—that is, 'for the Jerusalem region alone' (1981: 56). In the Diaspora, where both Jews and non-Jews used *Ioudaios* instead of 'Israel', the term generally denoted people from Judaea, understood broadly as the whole land—'the kingdom of Herod the Great and the last Hasmoneans'—or more narrowly as 'the procurate of Pontius Pilate' (1976: 103). *Ioudaios* also took on a

secondary religious meaning in the Diaspora, designating '"Jews" *as opposed* to members of other religions' (1976: 103). The shift from a solely geographical to a solely religious meaning was gradual. The forced conversion of people living outside Judaea during the Hasmonaean era made a secondary religious meaning possible, but it was only after the Bar Kokhba revolt, when the Jews were expelled from Judaea, that the religious meaning triumphed and the geographical connotations of the term were lost (1976: 108-109).

Lowe finds evidence for both primary and secondary meanings in Josephus. *Ioudaios* is used with the secondary religious meaning 'whenever there is a need to distinguish Jews and Gentiles', but both narrow and broader geographical meanings are also common: Josephus 'even uses the word in *different* senses in the *same* passage, supposing that the reader can easily guess the correct sense from the context' (1976: 104-105; original emphasis). The combination of both meanings is explained by Josephus's position as a Palestinian Jew writing for a non-Jewish audience (1976: 105 n. 16). In other Palestinian literature, including 1 Maccabees, the Mishnah and the New Testament Gospels, the geographical meaning is standard (1981: 58). According to Lowe, there are only 'four or five' possible exceptions out of 88 occurrences in the Gospels, and the majority of these are easily explained. In Jn 4.9, 22 Jesus adopts outsider language for the sake of his Samaritan interlocutor (1976: 124-26). John 6.4 was most likely not original to John's Gospel (1976: 116-17). In Lk. 7.3 a religious meaning is most likely present because *Ioudaios* refers to elders who lived in Galilee, not in Judaea, but 'this is one of the rare occasions in the Gospels…where there is a need to distinguish between Jews and Gentiles'. Finally, the description of Arimathea as a 'city of the *Ioudaioi*' (Lk. 23.51) could refer to a city located in Judaea or a city that was Jewish in the religious sense (1976: 127). According to Lowe, then, most occurrences of *Ioudaios* in the Gospels appear with the geographical meaning common to Palestinian Judaism. Unfortunately, subsequent confusion between Palestinian and Diaspora meanings of *Ioudaios* 'has provided…a constant excuse for antisemitism' because negative statements about Jewish residents of Judaea in John's Gospel have been wrongly applied to all Jews (1976: 130). 'John's Gospel is…at most anti-*Judean*' (1976: 130, n. 88; original emphasis).

Lowe is correct that *Ioudaios* continued to be closely associated with the geographical region of Judaea. In John references to the feasts of the *Ioudaioi* are typically followed by a journey to Jerusalem, Judaea's central city (Jn 2.13; 5.1; 7.2-3; 11.55). In Jn 11.7-8 a proposed journey to Judaea prompts the amazed response, 'the *Ioudaioi* were just now seeking to stone you, and are you going there again?' In Mt. 2.2 the *Ioudaioi* in the phrase 'king of the *Ioudaioi*' most naturally refer to the subjects of Herod's kingdom of Judaea (1976: 119 n. 60). *Ioudaios* also occurs in close association with Judaea in *Ant.* 18.2, 89. However, Lowe has *not* established 'that the primary meaning of Ἰουδαῖοι [*Ioudaioi*] was geographical' in the 'New Testament period' (1976: 106). In the first place, his two articles only treat exhaustively the New Testament Gospels (1976) and four Apocryphal Gospels (1981). Corroborating examples are cited from Josephus, 1 Maccabees and the Mishnah, but these texts are not examined in detail. Within the Gospels, Lowe tends to appeal to later redactional changes to explain exceptions—a somewhat circular approach (1976: 112, 114, 117, 120). Lowe's initial taxonomy of possible meanings for *Ioudaios*, which is derived from the word's etymology and its modern religious meaning (1976: 102-103), is a more serious weakness: Is a choice between geography and religion the

best way of capturing the nuances of what Lowe admits is a 'nationality word' (1976: 107)? And does the term's ongoing association with the geographical area of Judaea necessarily constitute a distinct geographical meaning that can be contrasted with a religious meaning? Ashton's criticism bears repeating:

> [I]t is a grave mistake to attempt to adjudicate, as it were, between two conflicting claims, because the claims do not in fact conflict. The whole point of continuing to identify the customs of a particular group of immigrants or their descendants by the name of their nation of origin (whether one uses the adjective 'Polish' or the noun 'Poland') is that their practices have not changed (Ashton 1985: 45-46).

In short, as Ashton would no doubt put it today—and as Meeks put it in an article published before Lowe—*Ioudaios* is an ethnic label that, like other ethnic labels, was associated with a geographical region as well as with 'religious' customs (Meeks 1975: 182). Lowe almost admits as much when he explains that the secondary religious meaning of *Ioudaios* 'was no more a religious term than "Greek", "Egyptian", "Persian", etc., each of which denoted primarily a nation living in a certain geographical area and only secondarily the unique religion proper to that nation and area' (Lowe 1981: 56; cf. 1976: 108 n. 22). Ashton simply closes the circle: If *Ioudaios* is an ethnic label like 'Egyptian' and 'Persian', religious customs and place of origin will not be distinguished as separate meanings.

b. Regional Ethnicity

The articles by Ashton (1985) and Meeks (1975) on *Ioudaios* in the Gospel of John provide an early glimpse into the use of ethnicity language by biblical scholars. They also illustrate two different ways the concept can be applied. Ashton uses a contemporary ethnic example to show that *Ioudaios* was not a narrow geographical term divorced from religious practice, but because he thinks the term designated residents of both Galilee and Judaea, he ends up agreeing with Lowe's fairly traditional conclusions about religious practice. That is, both Ashton (1985) and Lowe (1976) affirm that residents of Galilee and Judaea were Jews by religion in the first century, and shared basically the same practices and beliefs. Meeks, on the other hand, substitutes ethnic terminology for the geographical distinctions proposed by Lowe, which sets Galilaeans, with their distinct customs, over against Judaeans (Meeks 1975: 182). The result is a much more diverse picture of what was once known as 'Palestinian Judaism'. The scholars considered in this sub-section follow the same trajectory as Meeks. In each case ethnicity is identified at the local level, with the inhabitants of Judaea in the narrow sense defined as an ethnic group that is contrasted with the Idumaean, Galilaean and Ituraean ethnicities.

M. Smith (1999). Unfortunate publication delays mean that M. Smith's characteristically brilliant and speculative essay has not received the attention it deserves. S. Schwartz (1989: 384 n. 17) and Cohen (1990: 208) mention reading an early version, but the essay was not published until 1996, five years after Smith's death. It was reprinted in 1999 when the *Cambridge History of Judaism* volume for which it was intended finally appeared. The essay addresses how the *Ioudaioi*, who were mostly restricted to the

province of Judaea before 125 BCE, expanded throughout Idumaea, Samaria and Galilee by the end of Alexander Jannaeus's reign in 76 BCE fifty years later. Smith concludes that Josephus's description of forced conversion as a result of military conquest is impossible. The extension of territory was too rapid, the Hasmonaean army too small (1999: 198). Instead, Smith posits a political coalition of regional ethnic groups, with the Judaeans at their head. Coalition members 'would all have been classed as *Ioudaioi*' (1999: 202, cf. 210), but the alliance 'also maintained each as a distinct people' (1999: 204). As evidence, Smith observes (1999: 218, 248) that Josephus refers to both Idumaeans and Galilaeans as an *ethnos* ('nation') distinct from Judaeans (cf. *JW* 1.123; 4.231; 2.510; 4.105), that 'Apart from his dubious conversion story (*Ant.* XIII.255-8) Josephus never directly refers to the Idumaeans as "Jews"' (1999: 206), and that according to *JW* 4.236-82 Idumaean fighters were not allowed into Jerusalem by the other *Ioudaioi* after the revolt began (1999: 204-205). The Ituraeans are another example. Since they 'and probably many' of their Galilaean subjects already practised circumcision, references to the rite in Josephus and Strabo indicate that it formed the basis of an alliance, not a precondition for conversion (1999: 206-208).

Subsequent conflict under Hasmonaean rule is also to be attributed to inter-ethnic struggles within the league of *Ioudaioi*. Smith proposes that Alexander Jannaeus was rejected by Judaean *Ioudaioi*, but maintained power with the support of other members of the political league (1999: 213-16). Conflict between primarily non-Judaean members of the alliance explains the manoeuvring of rival claimants for the throne at the tail end of the Hasmonaean era, with Aristobulus II backed by Galilaeans and Ituraeans, and Hyrcanus II by the Idumaeans (1999: 216-22). As an Idumaean *Ioudaios*, Herod was never accepted by the Judaean *Ioudaioi* as one of their own. He was 'at best an ally… circumcised, indeed, but not otherwise an observer of the law' (1999: 233).

Four meanings of *Ioudaios* can therefore be distinguished: (1) 'a member of the tribe of Judah'; (2) a geographical and ethnic meaning: 'a native of Judaea, a "Judaean"'; (3) a religious meaning that developed during the exile: 'a "Jew", i.e. a member of Yahweh's chosen people, entitled to participate in those religious ceremonies to which only such members were admitted'; (4) a political meaning: 'a member of the Judaeo-Samaritan-Idumaean-Ituraean-Galilean alliance'.

> The three older meanings lived on vigorously in their proper contexts, but in discussions of Palestinian politics the fourth meaning now becomes common, and most of those who use it pay no attention to the fact that by religious criteria most Ituraeans, many Idumaeans, and some Galileans were pagans, i.e. Gentiles (Smith 1999: 210).

Smith supposes that the geographical and ethnic, religious, and political meanings were current in the Diaspora as well, but thinks that those who for whatever reason were labelled *Ioudaioi* 'often stuck together, overcoming their differences by compromise or neglect' (1999: 235; cf. 210 n. 76; 246).

The political meaning does not, for Smith, exclude religious elements. Smith claims the political alliance was originally 'based on common religious practices' such as circumcision, opposition to Hellenism, and the common worship of Yahweh (1999: 241; cf. 202, 204). He also allows that participation in the Jerusalem temple cult would have been

part of joining the Judaean-led coalition (1999: 202). But religious conversion or assimilation was not primary or immediate. Joining the alliance did not require exclusive worship of Israel's God or adoption by the common people of the Judaean way of life (1999: 207-208). On the other hand, the political alliance facilitated conversion. Over time many members of the political coalition became Jews by religion too (cf. 1999: 203, 206) so that by the first century 'the political-military meaning has been replaced by a social-religious one' (1999: 245-46). But the process of assimilation was uneven, and was not complete by 70 CE. The Ituraeans never converted and eventually broke away from the league (1999: 209, 240), the Samaritans stopped referring to themselves as *Ioudaioi*, and the Galilaeans were a mixture of observant and non-observant *Ioudaioi* (1999: 244-46). Those who did assimilate retained many of their own distinctives, which helps explain the diversity we find in ancient Judaism (1999: 223).

Cohen (1990; 1999). M. Smith (1999) proposed a political meaning of *Ioudaios* to account for the sudden expansion of *Ioudaioi* during the Hasmonaean era, but he did not explain *how* an ethnic-geographical term could be transformed, in some contexts, into a political term that designated members of several different ethnic groups. According to Cohen (1999 revised from 1990), *Ioudaios* always had an ethnic-geographical meaning before the Hasmonaean conquests of the late second century BCE, designating members of the *Ioudaios* ethnic group who lived in Judaea, or, in the Diaspora, members of the *Ioudaios* ethnic group whose ancestors came from Judaea in the narrow sense (1999: 71-78, 82). Cohen notes that the ethnic characteristics of the *Ioudaioi* included a connection to 'a specific territory', 'a sense of common origins', 'a common and distinctive history and destiny', 'distinctive characteristics', and 'a sense of collective uniqueness and solidarity' (1999: 7; drawing on A. Smith 1981; 1986), but the irreducible characteristic of ethnicity is 'a sense of common origins' (1999: 7, cf. 24). Ethnicity is immutable; politics and religion are not (1999: 109-10). Cohen agrees with M. Smith that the incorporation of Idumaeans, Ituraeans and Galilaeans as *Ioudaioi* is best understood as a mostly voluntary political alliance (1999: 116-18, 73, 114), but previous political alliances had not required the incorporation of entire people groups into Israel, and there is no biblical model for such a process (1999: 118, 125).

How, then, did a term for an immutable quality, 'a function of birth' (Cohen 1999: 109), come to designate membership in a political alliance? Cohen replies that it was by reconceiving the *Ioudaios* way of life along Greek lines as a *politeia*, and the *Ioudaioi* as its citizens. In a Hellenistic context and at a time when Greek 'city-states were more open to the incorporation of outsiders as citizens than they had ever been before' the Hasmonaean policy 'fits perfectly'. 'Indeed, the formation of the Greek leagues provide a striking parallel—and perhaps a source—for the policy of the Hasmoneans toward the Idumaeans and Ituraeans' (1999: 127; cf. M. Smith 1999: 210 n. 75). More than M. Smith, Cohen suggests that as new citizens, members of the political alliance also had to adopt the *politeia*, or way of life, of the *Ioudaioi* that was enshrined in the Torah (1999: 128), though they may not have had to follow all of it, and the Idumaeans, for example, 'were able to retain a measure of their old Idumaean culture and religion' (1999: 137).

Accepting the Law did not entail religious conversion because political incorporation emphasized joining a group, not one's orientation towards God (1999: 136-37).

Nevertheless, the two are closely related, and the religious meaning was also made possible by developments in Greek thought. Cohen argues that the religious meaning of *Ioudaios* emerged in opposition to a new understanding of Greekness, which 'became a function of culture rather than genealogy' in the Hellenistic period (1999: 132). As with the political meaning, this new religious meaning of *Ioudaios* is first attested at the end of the second century BCE (1999: 129-30; cf. 2 Macc. 9.13-16; Jud. 14.10).

In Judaea, the religious meaning was eventually added to the traditional ethnic-geographical meaning (1999: 137). In the Diaspora, similarly, associations of *Ioudaioi* 'that once had been defined ethnically came to be defined religiously' (1999: 80). And, after the end of Hasmonaean rule, the political meaning of *Ioudaios* was absorbed by the religious one (1999: 137-38). But this did not mean all *Ioudaioi* were regarded alike. Cohen argues that ethnic distinctions from the time of the political alliance lived on through the first century, well after the alliance itself had disappeared: 'For some Judaeans, especially "genuine" Judaeans from the "real" Judaea (the district around Jerusalem), Idumaeans…would always be outsiders, a combination of parvenus and country bumpkins' (1999: 18). Thus, Herod was accused of being a 'half-*Ioudaios*' (*Ant.* 14.403) because of his Idumaean, non-Judaean ethnicity (1999: 18). And in *JW* 2.43, Josephus distinguishes 'the genuine nation from Judaea' (*Ant.* 17.254) from the inhabitants of Galilee and Idumaea who came to Jerusalem (1999: 73). Not everyone adopted the same perspective, of course. Outsiders continued to regard *Ioudaios* as an ethnic-geographical term until the end of the first century CE (1999: 96), and even insider perspectives changed over time: Herod, derided as a half-*Ioudaios* during his lifetime, was lauded as a *Ioudaios* by birth (*to genos Ioudaion*; *Ant.* 20.173) a few generations later by the *Ioudaioi* of Caesarea (1999: 16). But while ideas about the term and who it designated could change over time and from context to context, and while regional ethnic distinctions allowed for regional differences among the *Ioudaioi*, Cohen suggests that the new religious meaning of *Ioudaios* ultimately transcended ethnic differences.

Horsley (1995). In contrast to M. Smith and Cohen, who argue that Galilaeans joined the Judaean alliance and came to be known as *Ioudaioi* in a political and religious if not an ethnic sense, Horsley consistently opposes Galilaean to *Ioudaios* as a competing ethnic label. As evidence for an insider distinction between the two labels, Horsley mentions the Mishnah, which refers to the Galilaeans as 'Israelites' not *Ioudaioi* (Hebrew יהודי [*Yehudi*]), the Gospel of Mark, which Horsley claims never uses *Ioudaios* 'with reference to people in Galilee', and Josephus, who 'rarely' uses *Ioudaios* 'inclusive of Galileans' (1995: 13).

Horsley also differs from earlier scholars in his insistence that it is impossible to isolate a distinct religious meaning of *Ioudaios*. Where Lowe assumed that *Ioudaios* could designate a resident of a geographical region without reference to religion, and Cohen and M. Smith argued that a distinct religious meaning of *Ioudaios* was eventually adopted by Galilaeans as well as Judaeans, Horsley argues that it is anachronistic to speak of religion in the ancient world: 'in a traditional agrarian society there was no such thing as a religion, separate from the basic political-economic institutions, to which people could "convert"' (1995: 34).

A final difference concerns the rate of Galilaean assimilation to the customs of *Ioudaioi*. While M. Smith admits that substantial assimilation occurred before 70 CE, Horsley argues that the Galilaeans retained their ethnic distinctives through the end of the Second Temple period. According to Horsley, the Galilaeans of Second Temple times were Israelites, descendants of the northern tribes who had responded negatively to the original Judaean temple and Davidic monarchy, and who remained in the land after the Assyrian conquest, undisturbed by events to the south (1995: 19-33). Only with the Hasmonaean military conquest did Galilee return under Judaean influence (1995: 43). Like M. Smith, Horsley argues that Josephus's statement about the forced conversion of Idumaeans is unrealistic and contradicted by Josephus's subsequent description of the Idumaeans as a distinct *ethnos* with their own customs. For the Galilaean *ethnos* too, conversion is an inadequate paradigm (1995: 44-45). What the Hasmonaeans actually did was set up 'a Judean-Hasmonean aristocracy' and impose Judaean law on Galilaean society, which 'meant political-economic-religious subordination to the Hasmonean high priesthood in Jerusalem' (1995: 47-48), but not abandonment of the distinctly Galilaean way of life: 'Local family and communal affairs would have been conducted according to the Galileans' own customs and traditions' (1995: 51; cf. the similar argument in Adam 1996). Actual integration into the Judaean *ethnos* would have required concentrated effort by '[a]gents of "secondary socialization"', but this is not likely to have occurred or to have had much effect under Hasmonaean or Herodian rule (Horsley 1995: 51, 56, 60). Josephus's failure as a Judaean-sponsored general in Galilee shows that opposition to Judaean control remained constant through 70 CE (1995: 87-88).

c. Ioudaios *as a Geographical Label Revisited (Elliott 2007)*

In contrast to M. Smith, Cohen and Horsley, Elliott uses ethnicity language in connection with Israel as a whole rather than in connection with regional groups. Drawing on Malina and Neyrey (1996), Elliott states that people in the ancient world identified themselves, on the one hand, by physical descent—their 'family, lineage, tribe or *ethnos*'—and, on the other hand, by their 'place of birth, origin and upbringing' (2007: 122, cf. 126). In this taxonomy, the Greek word, *ethnos*, designates a group analogous to but larger than family and tribe, and defined by 'bloodline' as opposed to place of origin (2007: 122). Elliott uses related English words such as 'ethnicity', 'ethnic' and 'ethnically' in the same way as *ethnos*, though they can also be used more broadly of the 'political, economic and social-cultural matrix' (2007: 139) within which ethnicity in the narrow sense plays a leading role.

According to Elliott, 'Israel' was the primary insider designation for the *ethnos* throughout the Second Temple period. He argues from Paul's use of 'Israel' in letters to mixed audiences of Israelites and Gentiles that 'Israel' retained its priority in the Diaspora too (2007: 149). A 'broader ethnic sense' (2007: 133) of *Ioudaios* was employed by 'Israelite' insiders in conversation with outsiders and, occasionally, in the Diaspora, as an insider self-designation (2007: 135, 142). In Palestine, however, Israelites speaking to Israelites only used *Ioudaios* in the geographical sense, and only in connection with the narrow region around Jerusalem:

> In the mind of Pontius Pilate and his soldiers, the troublesome inhabitants of Syria-Palestine were all *Ioudaioi* somehow connected with *Ioudaia* and its Temple. Insider Israelites, on the other hand, members of the House of Israel, would never confuse Judaea with Galilee or let a Galilean brogue go undetected (2007: 124).

Although it does not function as an ethnic label, this insider use of *Ioudaios* conveys more than mere geography. The ancients believed 'that geographical origin and location determined peoples' characteristics and character' (2007: 149). Recognizing geographical differences thus contributes to the study of other 'economic, political and socio-cultural differences' within a larger *ethnos* such as 'Israel' (2007: 149). Elliott does not explore these differences in detail, but his insistence that Jesus was a Galilaean Israelite, not a *Ioudaios*, makes room for the opposition between *Ioudaioi* and Galilaeans advocated by Horsley.

Like Elliott, Boyarin (2002) argues that the *Ioudaioi* formed a sub-group within Israel and that they had geographical ties to Jerusalem, but he maintains they were distinguished by religion as well as by geography: '"Judeans" was the name for citizens of the Temple-State founded by the returnees from Exile, and…these "Judeans" were always differentiated religiously from the other Israelites, "the People of the Land"' (2002: 221 n. 19). Boyarin suggests that, as Israelite members of 'the people of the land', the community responsible for the Fourth Gospel was opposed only to 'a particular hegemonic sect of Jews' not Jews in general (2002: 238).

d. Nested Ethnicity (Esler 2003; 2007)

Instead of assuming that ethnicity functions at a regional level, with the *Ioudaioi* contrasted with other ethnic groups, or that it is rightly reserved only for the people as a whole, Esler maintains that ethnicity can function at more than one level at once. Just as it is possible for someone to be both Scottish and British, so one could be a member of both the *Ioudaios* and Galilaean ethnic groups. Which ethnicity is salient at any given time is determined by context:

> Sicilians watching a football game between Italy and Germany usually support Italy in demonstration of their Italian ethnicity, but activate Sicilian ethnicity when a team from Palermo takes on another from Milan (Esler 2003: 49).

In these examples one 'more local or limited' ethnicity is 'nested' inside the other 'larger and more general one' (2003: 49). Though the distinctive features of Galilaeans differ from those of *Ioudaioi*, ethnicity is flexible enough to apply to both groups. Esler argues that the *Ioudaioi*, as described by Josephus (2009) and the Gospel of John (2007: 119-24), share all six characteristic features of ethnic groups presented in Hutchinson and A. Smith, including (1) 'a common *proper* name', (2) 'a myth of *common ancestry*', (3) 'shared *historical memories*', (4) 'one or more *elements of common culture*', (5) 'a *link* with a *homeland*', and (6) 'a *sense of solidarity*' (Hutchinson and A. Smith 1996: 6-7). But these are merely diagnostic tools rather than defining characteristics of ethnic identity (Esler 2003: 43). It is enough that the Galilaeans were (1) a named group with

(4) 'specific cultural features, including a local accent', and (5) a common homeland geographically distinct from Judaea in the strict sense for them to be identified as a separate ethnic group (2007: 123; cf. 2003: 72). That many Galilaeans were also *Ioudaioi* is demonstrated by regular Galilaean 'participation in the festivals in Jerusalem' (2007: 117), by references to *Ioudaioi* who live in Galilee (Jn 2.6; 6.41-42), and by archaeological evidence that indicates that, like the *Ioudaioi* in Judaea, many Galilaeans used stone vessels, immersed themselves in ritual baths, and avoided pork (2007: 123). Esler does not speculate about how many Galilaeans were also *Ioudaioi*, but Jesus clearly was.

Esler is able to explain John's use of *Ioudaios* primarily by means of nested ethnicity. According to Esler, the Johannine Jesus was a *Ioudaios* and a Galilaean who affirmed that salvation came from the larger *Ioudaios* ethnicity (Jn 4.22) (2007: 129, 133). Thus he was not opposed to *Ioudaioi* or their religion—it is 'an anachronistic illusion' to think the concept existed in the ancient world (2003: 73); he was only attacking his compatriots' 'ethnic pride', and advancing a new 'trans-ethnic identity' (2007: 131, 133).

From a broader perspective, Esler regards the *Ioudaioi* as a unified ethnic group, regardless of location, whose members were more committed to their Judaean homeland and their concomitant *Ioudaios* ethnic distinctions than to the characteristics of any nested ethnicity (2003: 73). For Esler, nested ethnicity was only possible in the Diaspora, not in Judaea itself. *Ioudaioi* who actually lived in Judaea—which, for Esler, always refers to the region around Jerusalem exclusive of Galilee—were distinguished from Diaspora *Ioudaioi* only by the absence of an additional nested ethnicity. Diaspora Galilaeans, Idumaeans and Alexandrians were no less *Ioudaioi* than those who lived in the homeland. In *JW* 2.43, when Josephus needs to distinguish the residents of Judaea from the Diaspora *Ioudaioi* who came to Jerusalem from Galilee, Idumaea and Peraea, he avoids nested ethnic labels such as Galilaean and Idumaean, and he 'invents a periphrasis to describe those who do live in Judea' to avoid suggesting that Galilaeans and Idumaeans are somehow other than *Ioudaioi* (2003: 67). (Esler insists that the phrase translated by Thackeray [1927] as 'the native [*gnêsios*] population of Judaea itself' and by Cohen [1999: 73] as 'the genuine [*gnêsios*] nation from Judaea' should be translated as 'the people by physical descent [*gnêsios*] from Judea itself' or more idiomatically, 'the membership [*gnêsios*] of the people from Judea itself'; the parallel in *Ant.* 17.254, which omits *gnêsios* and has simply 'a multitude of Judeans themselves', means the same thing [Esler 2003: 72].) There was thus no term for, and no concept of, a nested Judaean ethnicity within the larger *Ioudaios ethnos* that could be contrasted with the nested Galilaean and Idumaean ethnicities. And there is therefore no reason to expect opposition or conflict—certainly not along ethnic lines—between Galilaean and Judaean *Ioudaioi*.

e. *Evaluation*

Whether *Ioudaios* is a geographical, ethnic, religious or political term, or some combination, all the scholars considered in this section, with the exception of Esler (2003; 2007) and Ashton (1985), agree that the *Ioudaioi* included Idumaeans and Galilaeans in some contexts, and were contrasted with them in others. The broad sense of *Ioudaios* is frequently attributed to outsiders and Diaspora Jews, while the narrow sense is attributed to Jewish insider residents of Palestine. There are contemporary parallels to this proposed

dual use of *Ioudaios*. Outsiders often refer to the Netherlands as Holland even though the latter term correctly denotes only two western provinces of the 'Low countries'. Similarly, within their native isle, the Scots and the English form two separate entities with distinct dialects, histories, cultures and laws. Yet when Scots travel abroad they are sometimes regarded as English by outsiders. Lowe describes this as 'a universal semantic process characteristic of nationality-words: when there exists a certain dominant region in a country, the local name of that region tends to usurp the name of the whole country' (Lowe 1981: 57). However, the parallels only extend so far. In both examples it is outsiders who mistakenly use a label insiders reject. As 'Vietnam' demonstrates, groups sometimes do accept an outsider label as their own (Goodblatt 2006: 108), but I know of no modern instance where the same insiders accept an outsider label in some insider contexts and reject it in others. This is what we must envisage when Diaspora usage is considered alongside Palestinian speech patterns if the distinction between the narrow and broad uses of *Ioudaios* is valid: If Diaspora Jews employed *Ioudaios* as an insider label, Jews from Galilee would find themselves referring to each other as *Ioudaioi* in the Diaspora and contrasting themselves with *Ioudaioi* back in Galilee. An analogous modern scenario—two Scots introducing themselves to each other in America as English—is scarcely imaginable. Arguments from analogy are never decisive in the interpretation of ancient evidence, but the existence of cross-cultural parallels may increase the likelihood that a given interpretation is correct. In this case, the absence of relevant parallels invites a reconsideration of the evidence.

The variety of meanings ascribed to *Ioudaios* is also cause for concern. To be sure, it is possible that *Ioudaios* bore different meanings in different contexts, and that ancient readers would readily discern these distinct meanings from the context. This is the way language works. Modern scholars frequently map these meanings onto separate English words, with the religious meaning assigned to 'Jew' and the ethnic or geographical meaning assigned to 'Judaean'; M. Smith even conscripts *Ioudaios* for a political meaning. But it is important to avoid reifying these categories, imagining that ancient readers asked whether a particular occurrence of *Ioudaios* meant 'Jew' or 'Judaean'. With *Ioudaios* as the only label, ancient readers had no verbal way of distinguishing these meanings, and there is no necessary reason why they would define their categories the way modern readers do. Occam's razor would suggest that, all other things being equal, explanations of *Ioudaios* that posit fewer meanings are more likely to be correct.

In the end, of course, all proposals must be evaluated in light of the primary sources. What follows is an initial sounding limited to the evidence in Josephus about the relationship between Galilaeans (*Galilaioi*) and *Ioudaioi*. If the two groups are distinguished along geographical (Lowe 1976; Elliott 2007) or ethnic (Horsley 1995; Cohen 1999; M. Smith 1999) lines, we should expect to find evidence in Josephus of opposition between them. If, on the other hand, Esler (2003; 2007) is correct that the Galilaeans constituted a nested ethnic group within the larger *Ioudaios ethnos*, then there should be few, if any, signs that the term *Ioudaios* is opposed to 'Galilaean'.

Because the term 'Galilaean' is relatively infrequent, the argument for a distinction between *Ioudaioi* and Galilaeans sometimes relies on distinctions between Judaea and Galilee. Since Judaea and Galilee are contrasted, and *Ioudaios* and Galilaean are associated with Judaea and Galilee, it is suggested that *Ioudaios* and Galilaean must have been

contrasted too. Unfortunately for this argument, while Josephus sometimes treats Galilee as distinct from Judaea (*JW* 1.22; 2.95-96, 247; 3.48; *Ant.* 13.50, 125; 17.318-19), he can also include Galilee as part of Judaea (*Ant.* 12.421; 13.336-37; 14.120; *JW* 1.309). Elliott's response that the inclusive use of Judaea is a concession to Josephus's outsider audience (2007: 133) overlooks Josephus's own attitude towards Galilee. According to Josephus, the *Ioudaioi* began to dominate Galilee during the rule of Jonathan, not during Aristobulus's Ituraean conquest in 104–103 BCE, 50 years later, as modern scholarship assumes (e.g., Chancey 2002: 42). Jonathan's interaction with the Seleucid ruler Demetrius indicates that the 'three toparchies adjoining Judaea of Samaria and Galilee and Peraea' were under Jonathan's control (*Ant.* 13.50, cf. 13.125). *Ant.* 13.154 states not only that Galilee was allied to Jonathan, but that the Galilaeans 'were of his own people' (*ontas autou*) (Marcus 1943). According to *Ant.* 13.322, John Hyrcanus (134–104 BCE) had his son, Alexander Jannaeus, raised in Galilee. It follows that Josephus makes no reference to Galilee during Aristobulus's conquest (*Ant.* 13.318-19) because he believed it was already under Hasmonaean control (cf. S. Schwartz 1989: 385). Ptolemy Lathyrus's subsequent attempt to subdue Judaea began with a Sabbath day attack on Asochis 'a city of Galilee', and was followed by an attack on Sepphoris, another Galilaean city (*Ant.* 13.336-38). Sepphoris was also included along with Jerusalem in Gabinius's division of the 'nation' (*ethnos*) into five districts (*Ant.* 14.91). After Herod's death, Josephus's summary statements about unrest in Judaea (*Ant.* 17.269, 285) are followed by examples of fighting in Galilee (*Ant.* 17.271, 288-89). The procurator Felix received 'the rest of Judaea' after four cities, including 'Tarichaeae and Tiberius in Galilee', were awarded to Agrippa II (*JW* 2.252). If Galilee was in the Diaspora before the Hasmonaean conquests (Schürer, Vermes and Millar 1979: II, 8), it was so no longer by the first century BCE. Josephus believed Galilee belonged, in some sense, within Judaea's borders.

Josephus also regarded the Galilaeans as *Ioudaioi*. *Ant.* 20.43 identifies Eleazar as a '*Ioudaios* who came from Galilee', *JW* 3.229 mentions another Eleazar who is identified as a *Ioudaios* and a native of Galilee, *JW* 2.232 relates the murder of a Galilaean who was one of many *Ioudaioi* on their way from Galilee to a feast in Jerusalem, and Judas 'the Galilaean' was leader of one of the philosophical schools of the *Ioudaioi* (*Ant.* 18.23, 25; cf. 20.102). *JW* 2.184-98 describes an assembly of *Ioudaioi* in the plain of the Galilaean city of Ptolemais who met to protest Gaius's plan to erect a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple. Josephus switches between *Ioudaios* and 'Galilaean' often enough in his account of the war in Galilee to remove any doubt that the Galilaeans are also *Ioudaioi* (*JW* 3.110, 113-14; 3.191, 199, 207; *Life* 113, 349). Finally, although Josephus can use the word *ethnos* ('nation') to refer to the Galilaeans as a distinct group (*JW* 2.510, 4.105), he also uses the word to refer to Jewish residents of Judaea and Galilee (*JW* 1.155; *Ant.* 14.74; 15.315).

Ioudaios and 'Galilaean' seldom occur in the same context, but in a few places Josephus distinguishes them. *Ant.* 17.254 sets the '*Ioudaioi* themselves' (*autôn Ioudaiôn*) apart from 'Galilaeans, Idumaeans, a multitude from Jericho, and those who lived beyond the Jordan'. The context indicates that all were *Ioudaioi* (*Ant.* 17.257; cf. Ashton 1985: 56), but the residents of Judaea in the strict sense were 'much more eager' to punish Sabinus than those who had come to Jerusalem from other regions (*Ant.* 17.254). While Josephus identifies the man who was murdered in Samaria as a Galilaean *Ioudaios* (*JW* 2.232), the

Jerusalem leadership disperses a mob of *Ioudaioi* set on revenge by appealing to the man's Galilaean identity: Why risk Roman reprisal over 'one Galilaean' (*JW* 2.237)? This may suggest that, from a Jerusalem perspective or perhaps from the perspective of the 'Jerusalem aristocracy' (Freyne 1987: 608), Galilaeans were of lower status than other *Ioudaioi*. (But compare the parallel in *Ant.* 20.118-124, where this part of the speech is omitted.) In *Life* 221 the situation may be reversed. Josephus's servant introduces as a *Ioudaios* a messenger who interrupts Josephus's dinner with Galilaean leaders. Since the message was from Josephus's opponents from Jerusalem, an intentional contrast between *Ioudaioi* and Galilaeans may be in view (so Cohen 1999: 73 n. 12). Alternatively, Josephus may have simply wanted to confirm the man's identity for his readers after mentioning that he had previously served in Agrippa's army (*Life* 220; cf. 382-83).

A full analysis of the meaning of *Ioudaios* and, in particular, of the relationship between *Ioudaios* and 'Galilaean' would need to consider the relationship between *Ioudaios* and other labels. Is it true that the Galilaeans formed a distinct group in the same way that the Idumaeans did, so that information about Idumaeans can inform our understanding of Galilaeans (Schürer, Vermes and Millar 1979: II, 9-10)? What is the relationship between rural Galilaeans and the citizens of the major cities in the region (cf. Freyne 1980)? One would also need to consider all the available evidence. Even then answers to some questions would remain tentative. Nevertheless, a few initial conclusions may be drawn from this survey: Josephus seldom contrasts *Ioudaioi* and Galilaeans. The general impression one receives is of a unified group with regional distinctives, whose members shared a commitment to the Jerusalem temple and to a common way of life. This is the perspective of Josephus at the end of the first century CE. If Smith and Cohen are correct, the meaning of *Ioudaios* shifted over time, and even within the same period meant different things to different people. Josephus may be guilty of imposing a unified perspective on the past, as Smith (1999: 226) argues. But to the extent that his perspective is taken for granted rather than argued, it may well reflect common assumptions in the first century.

If, as I suggested in the first half of this article, Diaspora evidence should not be excluded from the discussion of insider speech patterns in Palestine, Josephus must be taken seriously. His use of *Ioudaios* in the broad sense, inclusive of Galilaeans, weighs heavily against the arguments of Lowe (1976), Horsley (1995) and Elliott (2007) that the *Ioudaioi* and Galilaeans were mutually exclusive parties. It is worth noting that if Josephus is omitted, evidence for the relationship between *Ioudaioi* and 'Galilaeans' within Palestine is limited indeed. The New Testament Gospels and Acts are the only 'insider' texts that use 'Galilaean', and these sources do not draw clear contrasts between the terms 'Galilaean' and *Ioudaios*; 'Galilee' also occurs in the Mishnah and a few times in the Apocrypha, but is rare elsewhere. Although 'Israel' was in use as an insider term, the evidence from Josephus suggests that *Ioudaios* was also an acceptable insider label for Galilaeans in the first century.

Conclusion

This article's primary purpose has been to evaluate scholarship on the relationship between *Ioudaios* and 'Israel', on the one hand, and between *Ioudaios* and other labels such as 'Galilaean' and 'Idumaean', on the other. As we have seen, studies of *Ioudaios* have tended to look for a simple explanation, such as a distinction between insider use of

'Israel' and outsider use of *Ioudaios*, that can be universalized to account for all occurrences of the term. Though there are general patterns, we should be alert to variations between writers and to the possibility of change over time. It is true that 'Israel' was only used by insiders, and that outsiders only used *Ioudaios* as a designation for the Jewish people, but Jewish use of *Ioudaios* is more difficult to explain. Claims that only residents of the Diaspora or only Greek-speaking Jews adopted *Ioudaios* as a self-designation are unconvincing. Nor is it the case that Palestinian Jewish insiders who employed *Ioudaios* were always adopting an outsider perspective on their own people or that they only used *Ioudaios* in connection with Jews from Judaea in the narrow sense. Josephus, at least, believed Galilaeans were also *Ioudaioi*. If insiders accepted *Ioudaios* as a self-designation, there is no need for modern scholars to switch from 'Jew' or 'Judaean' to 'Israelite', as Elliott recommends. Before reaching a decision on the translation of *Ioudaios*, however, it will be necessary to explore the term's meaning in more detail.

The conclusion that *Ioudaios* could function as an overarching label that included Galilaeans within its scope still leaves open several possibilities about the meaning of the term and its relationship to 'Galilaean': (1) *Ioudaios* may have been an ethnic label, and 'Galilaean' a label for a non-ethnic sub-group defined by geographical region (a modification of Elliott 2007; cf. Freyne 2001: 183). (2) *Ioudaios* may have designated members of a larger ethnic group who sometimes also belonged to nested ethnic sub-groups such as the Galilaeans. Esler's model of nested ethnicity (2003; 2007) will need to be modified, however, because Josephus appears to regard Galilee as part of Judaea instead of in the Diaspora. (3) It is also possible, as Cohen (1999) argues, that *Ioudaios* came to function as a religious term before the destruction of the Second Temple.

That two of the three options presented here mention ethnicity, and only one advances a religious meaning of *Ioudaios*, highlights a major shift in scholarship over the last seventy years. While Kuhn and Gutbrod could take for granted that *Ioudaios* was a religious term, and Cohen (1999: 78-79) argues that a distinctive religious meaning of *Ioudaios* appeared in the aftermath of the Maccabean revolt, Boyarin (2003: 66-71) and Mason (2007: 489) deny the existence of religion as a discrete category before the Christian apologists of the third or fourth century. The movement away from religion corresponds to an increase in 'ethnicity', a term that was apparently first used with a modern sense in 1941, almost seventy years ago (Sollors 1981: 257-58). 'Ethnicity' and related words became popular in the social sciences during the 1970s, and gradually made their way into literature on ancient Judaism in general, and the meaning of *Ioudaios* in particular. The result has not been total clarity—partly because 'ethnicity' was adopted as a welcome alternative to 'race' before it was carefully defined, partly because such a complex subject resists simple definition. The cognate relationship between 'ethnicity' and the Greek word *ethnos* can also be confusing because it is not always clear whether scholars are discussing ancient ethnicity as defined by a modern etic framework, or an ancient emic understanding of *ethnos* and related terms and concepts (cf. Goodblatt 2006: 4-5). Even in theoretically informed discussions the concept is understood in a variety of different ways, with results that sometimes affirm a common element within ancient 'Judaism' and sometimes assert its radical diversity. In part two of this two-part series, I will assess in more detail the corresponding rise of ethnicity and decline of religion as interpretive categories as they relate to the possible meanings of *Ioudaios* discussed in this article. I will then return to the question of the term's English translation.

Bibliography

Adam, A.K.M.
1996   'According to Whose Law? Aristobulus, Galilee and the NOMOI ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ', *JSP* 14: 15-21.

Ashton, J.
1985   'The Identity and Function of the ʾΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ in the Fourth Gospel', *NovT* 27: 40-75.

Barclay, J.M.G.
1996   *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Bergsma, J.S.
2008   'Qumran Self-Identity: "Israel" or "Judah"?', *DSD* 15: 172-89.

Bernard, J.H.
1928   *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Bornhäuser, D.K.
1928   *Das Johannesevangelium: eine Missionsschrift für Israel* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann).

Boyarin, D.
2002   'The IOUDAIOI in John and the Prehistory of "Judaism"', in J.C. Anderson, P. Sellew and C. Setzer (eds.), *Pauline Conversations in Context: Essays in Honour of Calvin J. Roetzel* (JSNTSup; London: Sheffield Academic Press): 216-39.

2003   'Semantic Differences; or, "Judaism"/"Christianity"', in A.H. Becker and A.Y. Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (TSAJ; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]): 65-85.

Chancey, M.A.
2002   *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee* (SNTSMS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Cohen, S.J.D.
1990   'Religion, Ethnicity and "Hellenism" in the Emergence of Jewish Identity in Maccabean Palestine', in P. Bilde, et al. (eds.), *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press): 204-23.

1999   *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Hellenistic Culture and Society; Berkeley: University of California Press).

Colson, F.H.
1939   *Philo VIII* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Cuming, G.J.
1948/1949   'The Jews in the Fourth Gospel', *ExpTim* 60: 290-92.

Danker, F.W.
2000   *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 3rd edn).

Elliott, J.H.
2007   'Jesus the Israelite Was Neither a "Jew" Nor a "Christian": On Correcting Misleading Nomenclature', *JSHJ* 5: 119-54.

Esler, P.F.
  2003   *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Fortress: Minneapolis).

  2007   'From *Ioudaioi* to Children of God: The Development of a Non-Ethnic Group Identity in the Gospel of John', in A.C. Hagedorn, Z.A. Crook and E. Stewart (eds.), *In Other Words: Essays on Social Science Methods and the New Testament in Honor of Jerome H. Neyrey* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix): 106-37.

  2009   'Judean Ethnic Identity in Josephus' *Against Apion*', in Z. Rodgers, M. Daly-Denton and A. Fitzpatrick McKinley (eds.), *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism; Leiden: Brill): 73-91.

Freyne, S.
  1980   'The Galileans in the Light of Josephus' *Vita*', *NTS* 26: 397-413.

  1987   'Galilee-Jerusalem Relations according to Josephus' *Life*', *NTS* 33: 600-609.

  2001   'Galileans, Phoenicians, and Itureans: A Study of Regional Contrasts in the Hellenistic Age', in J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press): 182-215.

Goodblatt, D.
  1998   'From Judeans to Israel: Names of Jewish States in Antiquity', *JSJ* 29: 1-36.

  2006   *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

  2009   '"The Israelites who reside in Judah" (Judith 4:1): On the Conflicted Identities of the Hasmonean State', in L.I. Levine and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (TSAJ; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 114-38.

Grundmann, W.
  1940   *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum* (Leipzig: Georg Wigand).

Gutbrod, W.
  1938   ''Ιουδαῖος, Ἰσραήλ, Ἑβραῖος', *TWNT* III: 370-94.

  1965   ''Ιουδαῖος, Ἰσραήλ, Ἑβραῖος', *TDNT* III: 369-91.

Harvey, G.
  1996   *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGJU; Leiden: Brill).

Head, P.M.
  2004   'The Nazi Quest for an Aryan Jesus', *JSHJ* 2: 55-89.

Hengel, M.
  1974   *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; London: SCM).

Heschel, S.
  2008   *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Hjelm, I.
  2004   'What Do Samaritans and Jews Have in Common? Recent Trends in Samaritan Studies', *CBR* 3: 9-59.

Horsley, R.A.
1995   *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International).

Hutchinson, J., and A.D. Smith (eds.)
1996   *Ethnicity* (Oxford Readers; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Johnson, M.D.
1986   'Power Politics and New Testament Scholarship in the National Socialist Period',
            JES 23: 1-24.

Kuhn, K.G.
1938   ''Ισραήλ, 'Ιουδαῖος, Ἑβραῖος', *TWNT* III: 360-70.

1965   ''Ισραήλ, 'Ιουδαῖος, Ἑβραῖος', *TDNT* III: 359-69.

Levine, A.-J.
2006   *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (San
            Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco).

Lowe, M.F.
1976   'Who were the IOYΔAIOI?', *NovT* 18: 101-30.

1981   'IOYΔAIOI of the Apocrypha: A Fresh Approach to the Gospels of James, Pseudo-
            Thomas, Peter and Nicodemus', *NovT* 23: 56-90.

Malina, B.J., and J.H. Neyrey
1996   *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality* (Louisville: Westminster
            John Knox).

Marcus, R.
1937   *Josephus VI: Jewish Antiquities Books IX-XI* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University
            Press).

1943   *Josephus VII: Jewish Antiquities Books XII-XIV* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard
            University Press).

Mason, S.
2007   'Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient
            History', *JSJ* 38: 457-512.

Mason, S. (ed.)
2000–   *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (11 vols.; Leiden: Brill).

Meeks, W.A.
1975   '"Am I a Jew?" Johannine Christianity and Judaism', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christi-
            anity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty.
            Part One: New Testament* (SJLA; Leiden: Brill): 163-86.

Nickelsburg, G.W.E.
2005   *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary
            Introduction* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2nd edn).

Schürer, E., G. Vermes and F. Millar
1979   *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (3 vols.; Edinburgh:
            T & T Clark, rev. edn).

Schwartz, D.R.
  2007   '"Judaean" Or "Jew"? How Should We Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?', in J. Frey, D.R. Schwartz and S. Gripentrog (eds.), *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World* (AGJU; Leiden: Brill): 3-27.

Schwartz, S.
  1989   'The "Judaism" of Samaria and Galilee in Josephus's Version of the Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (*Antiquities* 13.48-57)', *JJS* 82: 377-91.

Smith, A.D.
  1981   *The Ethnic Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
  1986   *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Smith, M.
  1996   'The Gentiles', in M. Smith, *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh Volume 1: Studies in Historical Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill): 263-319.
  1999   'The Gentiles in Judaism 125 BCE-CE 66', in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies and J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume 3: The Early Roman Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 192-249.

Sollors, W.
  1981   'Theory of American Ethnicity, or: "? S Ethnic?/Ti and American/Ti, De or United (W) States S S1 and Theor?"', *AmQ* 33: 257-83.

Sterling, G.E.
  2003   '"Philo Has Not Been Used Half Enough": The Significance of Philo of Alexandria for the Study of the New Testament', *PRSt* 30: 251-69.

Stern, S.
  1994   *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings* (AGJU; Leiden: Brill).

Thackeray, H. St. J.
  1927   *Josephus II: The Jewish War Books I-III* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Tomson, P.J.
  1986   'The Names Israel and Jew in Ancient Judaism and in the New Testament', *Bijdragen, tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 47: 120-40, 266-89.
  2001   '"Jews" in the Gospel of John as Compared with the Palestinian Talmud, the Synoptics, and Some New Testament Apocrypha', in R. Bieringer, Didier Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox): 176-212.

Williams, M.H.
  1997   'The Meaning and Function of *Ioudaios* in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions', *ZPE* 116: 249-62.

Wilson, S.G.
  2004   '"Jew" and Related Terms in the Ancient World', *SR* 33: 157-71.