Introduction

A friend of mine, who performs missionary work among the Zulus of KwaZulu-Natal, recently told me of the realities he encounters. Even congregations that have long been established, he said, tenaciously cling onto traditions that are incompatible with Christian theology. The Zulus are a very proud people, and especially those in the rural areas foster ancestral traditions as part of their culture. This in itself poses no problem, but they—like many peoples in Southern Africa—have a strong tradition about making contact and seeking guidance from their ancestors. On special days they make sacrifices to them, all based on the view that the ancestors, believed to be close to God, are sort of "demi-gods" themselves possessing powers that can have a major impact on the quality of one's life here. You must make the ancestors happy and seek their blessing in all areas of your life. They do all this, despite the fact that they would regard themselves as Christians. His experiences illustrate that even today ethnic identity is many times inseparable from religious identity. How much more must it have been the case for the Israelites or Judeans ("Jews") of Palestine who lived in the time of Jesus, including the Messianists ("Christians")? David Sim's point is certainly no exaggeration; speaking of the first century,

> the various traditions which comprised [Judeanism] took very seriously the notion of ethnicity, and the messianic movement associated with Jesus of Nazareth was no exception to this rule. So important was this issue that it threatened to tear apart the early church [*sic*] in the first few decades of its existence. (Sim 1996:171)

In this study I investigate the question of Judean ethnicity in further detail. Our focus will eventually shift to the people presupposed by the hypothetical source known as Q. As this study progresses, hopefully it will become clear that without a better understanding of first-century

Judean ethnicity and all the dynamics that it entails, a more comprehensive understanding of Jesus and the movements that he spawned is not possible.

Judean and Judeanism versus Jew and Judaism

As this investigation is focussed on the question of ethnic identity, it would be appropriate to discuss why it is preferred to use the terms *Judean* and *Judeanism*, instead of *Jew* and *Judaism*. Is it proper to refer to "Jews" and "Judaism" when speaking of the people and religion of first-century Palestine? Pilch argued that it is anachronistic to speak of "Jews" in the biblical period, and the Greek word 'Ioudaiοi should be translated as *Judean*, a designation which the Israelites accepted during the Second Temple period (520 BCE–70 CE). The religion of that period (in all its diversity) is also properly called Judean or Judaic, and "Judaism" is not a proper term for it did not yet exist. Only from the sixth century can we speak of rabbinic "Judaism" and from when it is proper to use the term "Jews" (Pilch 1997). In similar vein, BDAG (2000) argued consistently that "Judean" and "Judeanism" is the best translation.

Let us first address the term *Judean*. The term *Judean* ('Ioudaiοj) begins as a way to identify someone from Judea ('Ioudaia) (Josephus, *Ant.* 11.173). According to Dunn, for its early usage 'Ioudaiοj should be translated as "Judean," rather than "Jew." He basically follows the argument of Cohen (1999:70–136; cf. 1990:204–23) who stated that prior to the Hasmonean period 'Ioudaiοj should always be translated "Judean," never as "Jew." But there was a shift from purely an ethno-geographical term to one of a more "religious" significance, first evident in 2 Macc 6:6 and 9:17. Here 'Ioudaiοj for the first time can be properly translated as "Jew." In Greco-Roman writers 'Ioudaiοj was first used as a religious term at the end of the first century. Dunn (2003:262–63) basically rejects the BDAG terminology—by implication, that of Pilch as well—as he argues that it does not take into consideration the shift in reference as outlined by Cohen. But is the argument justified?

To switch from "Judean" to "Jew" based on a so-called shift to a more "religious" significance is arbitrary at best. Dunn's objection (and Cohen's argument) cannot be accepted since for first-century Judean ethnicity—here particularly ethno-geographical identity—was inseparable from religious identity, something which Dunn himself suggests[1]

1. As will be shown throughout this book, there is a lot of agreement with Dunn's

(since Judea was a temple state). Esler points out that in antiquity it was common practice to name ethnic groups in relation to the territory from which they came. Speaking of the Greeks and Romans he writes that one "would expect them to connect ['Ioudaiōi] with the territory called 'Ioudaia that this people inhabited, and that is what we usually find" (Esler 2003:63). The attachment between the people and the land is even closer in Judean sources (cf. Esler 2003:64–65). Dunn (2003:262–63) himself admits that "even in later usage, referring, for example, to Jews long settled in the diaspora, the basic sense of 'the Jews' as the nation or people identified with the territory of Judea is still present." Esler (2003:70) also states that Cohen "seems to assume that from the first century BCE onward it is possible to speak of 'religion' existing as a realm of human experience distinct from other realms such as kinship, politics, and economics in a manner similar to modern understandings of religion," but "in the Mediterranean world of the first century CE the features that we refer to as 'religious' ideas and institutions were primarily embodied in structures of the political and domestic realms." Perhaps this critique misses the thrust of Cohen's approach,[2] but what particularly convinced Esler to translate 'Ioudaiōi as "Judeans"

work in terms of content, but here one must disagree with him on the matter of terminology, and what he sees as "ambivalence" between ethno-geographical identity and religious identity by the use of the term 'Ioudaioj (Dunn 2003:263). He argues this ambivalence and shift to a more religious significance allowed for non-Judeans to become (religious) "Jews," such as in the case of Izates, king of Adiabene, without the need for circumcision (Josephus, *Ant.* 20.38–46). But this was a unique and exceptional case, and Izates was eventually required to undergo circumcision anyway. In a technical sense, his circumcision was an affirmation of what his religious status really implied—ethnically he became a Judean, irrespective of the attempts to "mask" it by him not having to undergo circumcision. As Sim (1996:176) mentions the "importance of this narrative lies in the fact that circumcision as the normal rite of entrance into [Judeanism] is taken for granted." The point is this: at that time there was basically no (complete) religious conversion to Judeanism apart from a complete ethnic conversion, involving the performance of all Judean customs and allegiance to the temple in Jerusalem.

2. Apart from the preference for "Jew," Cohen argues that 'Ioudaismoj analogous to Hellenism developed to become a function of religion and culture; the religious definition supplemented the traditional ethnic definition. "Jewishness" (which he proposes as a translation for 'Ioudaismoj) became an "ethno-religious identity." This is despite the fact that he knows that 'Ioudaismoj as a term refers to more than just religion, as religion is but one of many aspects that make a group or culture distinctive (Cohen 1999:7–8, 137). The approach taken here is in line with the latter, in that it is better to regard 'Ioudaismoj (Judeanism) as a summary term for an entire cultural system, where "religion" must not be preferred above other cultural aspects. As such, Judeanism was a term for a cultural system *that already existed*, being territorially rooted in Judea. Its practitioners are therefore properly called Judeans.

is a passage from Josephus (*War* 2.43ff; cf. *Ant.* 17.254), which describes that "the people," that is Galileans, Idumeans, Pereans, *and people from Judea itself* (oJgnhsioj eJauJthj Ioudaiaj laoj) came to Jerusalem in response to the actions of Sabinus, the Roman procurator of Syria, an event dated to 4 BCE. Esler (2003:67) argues that the "critical point in this passage is that the existence of a segment of this people who lived in Judea itself was irrelevant to the fact that all those of its members who came to Jerusalem were Ioudaioi." Josephus, Esler (2003:72) suggests, distinguishes this group of Judeans from others with the use of a periphrastic explanation, literally "the people by physical descent from Judea itself" although Esler prefers to translate it as "the membership of the people from Judea itself."

What is argued against Dunn with regard to the term *Judean* is also true for the term *Judeanism* (Ioudaismoj). Here the translation of the BDAG will be followed, instead of the usual "Judaism." The Greek term Ioudaismoj appears first in 2 Maccabees in three passages (2:21; 8:1; 14:38). It also appears in 4 Macc 4:26 and Paul himself boasts how he had excelled in Judeanism beyond many of his peers (Gal 1:13–14). Dunn noted, in the earliest phase of its usage, there is no evidence for its use by Gentiles (Dunn refers to "Judaism" as such). Judeanism started as a Judean self-reference, reflecting the perspective of Hellenistic Judeanism. Be that as it may, in 2 Maccabees Ioudaismoj is coined to counter Ellhnismoj ("Hellenism"; 2 Macc 4:13) and aJlofulismoj ("foreignness"; 2 Macc 4:13; 6:24). So the term *Judeanism* was used as a self-definition to mark out the character of belief and practice that distinguished its participants from the surrounding culture and ethos (cf. Dunn 2003:261). To put it differently, it was a summary term for an entire cultural system that reacted to Hellenism.

So here the terms *Judean* and *Judeanism* will be used throughout whether they are used as "insider" or "outsider" designations. This means that "Jew(s)" and "Judaism" will also deliberately be replaced with "Judean(s)" and "Judeanism" when referring to or quoting from the work of scholars (when quoted, the replacement will appear in square brackets). This is by no means intended to be an anachronistic distortion of their positions. It should be remembered that they speak of "Jews" and "Judaism." The replacement serves as a necessary economy and to illustrate that what these scholars wrote in reference to "Jews" and "Judaism" also holds true for what is argued here in reference to "Judeans" and "Judeanism." For our purposes therefore a Judean refers to an "Israelite" inhabitant of Judea (and Palestine generally), a person who was a Judean

by religion and culture and therefore had ethnic connections to Judea and allegiance to its state religion (cf. Duling 2005). The entire cultural system of Judeans is also properly called "Judeanism."

Messianist and Messianism versus Christian and Christianity

As Pilch (1997) argued that it is anachronistic to speak of "Jews" in the biblical period, so he argued that it is anachronistic to speak of "Christians" in the biblical period. He argues that first-century "Yahwism" consisted of various groups: Pharisaic, Messianic (called Christian), Sadducaic, Essene, among others. Again his argument is accepted as having merit, and for our purposes we will call the early followers of Jesus 'Messianists.' The form of Judeanism they belonged to was therefore Messianism. As we shall see, the Judeanism of Q was a radically redefined "covenantal nomism."

The Approach

In chapter 1, the approach at first glance will appear to be somewhat unorthodox. To end up investigating Judean ethnicity in Q, we will begin by utilising scholarship on the historical Jesus. The reason is simple. It is often claimed that Jesus was this or that kind of "Jew," or rather, Judean, but Jesus scholarship lacks an overall interpretive framework within which to understand what kind of Judean Jesus was. Chapter 1 is dedicated to expose this shortcoming, as an overview will be done of the work of two important scholars in this field: John P. Meier and John Dominic Crossan.

Chapter 2 will be dedicated to the task of developing a Socio-Cultural Model of Judean Ethnicity. It will be important to understand that the approach taken here to Judeanism varies from the norm, in that it is understood primarily as an *ethnic identity*, not as a "religious system" as such. The proposed model will be a synthesis of the following: Sanders' notion of covenantal nomism; Berger and Luckmann's theories on the sociology of knowledge; Dunn's "four pillars of Second Temple Judeanism ('Judaism')," combined with the insights gained from his "new perspective" on Paul; the insights of cultural anthropology, with the focus on modern ethnicity theory; and lastly, Duling's own proposal for a Socio-Cultural Model of Ethnicity, taking note that the latter is a more generic model. The proposed model will be termed "covenantal nomism." It will be a pictorial and abstract representation of the Judean

social construction of reality, or the Judean "symbolic universe." It will also be argued that first-century Judeanism as an ethnic identity was *essentially* primordialist.

In chapter 3 I will elaborate upon the model by giving it the relevant and appropriate content. We will look at the importance of historical links to the past via a shared historical tradition and a common ancestry. The battle with Hellenism will be discussed and related to this, the adoption of the Greek language by Judeans and the infiltration of Hellenistic religious thought. We will then investigate aspects of Judean religion and customs applicable to the temple, the synagogue, and the home. Millennial hopes too are very important, as they were a driving force of Judeanism in the first century, and it will be argued that it primarily had to do with the independent control and ownership of the land. Judean kinship patterns will be investigated as well, and finally, an overview of Judean-Gentile relations will end the chapter.

Chapter 4 will investigate the ethnic identity of Galileans, as Q has plausibly been located in Galilee. Based on archaeological excavations and literary evidence it will be demonstrated that there existed a fundamental continuity between the people of Judea and Galilee. They had a common culture and both lived on the ancestral land of Israel. Judeanism was not some foreign import into Galilee that contested with local traditions. Galileans shared the same "symbolic universe" as the people of Judea. In effect, the Galileans were ethnic Judeans.

The hypothetical source Q will be the focus of chapter 5. An approach will be adopted where Q will consist of two stratums, therefore modifying Kloppenborg's own approach of three stratums. Each stratum will be investigated on its own and the findings of the analyses will be explained. As a preliminary thesis the following will be stated: *Q presupposes a community whose Judean ethnicity was in (re)construction. Most of the cultural features demonstrate a strong element of discontinuity with traditional Judean identity (= covenantal nomism)*. The Q people were given an *eschatological Judean identity*, based on their commitment to Jesus and the requirements of the kingdom/reign of God. This proved to be an identity that necessitated the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction.

As the journey now begins in earnest, it is hoped that a realization will take shape how *critically important* the matter of *ethnic identity* was to Judeans in the first century. Surrounded by a Gentile world filled with idolatry, the emperor cult and economic exploitation of the land, the Judeans were a unique people that for greater part, held their eth-

nic identity intact, even though their "symbolic universe" was not. The foreigner was in the house. Nevertheless, they were people of the covenant, the one Creator of the world's special and chosen people, living on the land given to them by Yahweh. They were committed to their ethnic identity by doing God's will. This Judean self-understanding, it is hoped, even applicable to the Q people, will become clearer as this investigation unfolds.