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ABSTRACT

Distinguishing between insider and outsider groups and their differing nomenclatures is essential for accurate interpretation and translation. Jesus and his earliest followers, evidence demonstrates, were called ‘Israelites’, ‘Galileans’ or ‘Nazarenes’ by their fellow Israelites. ‘Israel’, ‘Israelites’ were the preferred terms of self-designation among members of the house of Israel when addressing other members—not ‘Jews’ or ‘Judaism’. Modern interpreters and translators of the Bible, it is argued, should respect and follow this insider preference. ‘Jews’, an outsider coinage, is best rendered ‘Judeans’, not ‘Jew’, to reflect the explicit or implied connection with Judaea. It was employed by Israelites when addressing outsiders as an accommodation to outsider usage. The concepts ‘Jew’, ‘Jewish’ and ‘Christian’ as understood today are shaped more by fourth century rather than first-century CE realities and hence should be avoided as anachronistic designations for first-century persons or groups. Use of ‘Christian’ is best restricted to its three NT appearances. The use of appropriate nomenclature is crucial for minimizing historical and social inaccuracies and misunderstandings.

Key words: Christian, ingroup-outgroup nomenclature, Israelite, Jesus’ identity, Jew, Judean, Judaism, Paul’s identity, social identity, terms of self-designation

Introduction

Jesus was neither a ‘Jew’ nor a ‘Christian’. This is true at diverse levels and stages of discourse. For one thing, Jesus was neither a ‘Jew’ nor a ‘Christian’ in the sense that these terms are used today in ordinary discourse. As Jacob

1. The first version of this study was presented on 22 May 1997 at an international meeting of the Context Group in Prague, Czech Republic, with the title, ‘Jesus was neither a ‘Jew’ nor a ‘Christian’: Dangers of Inappropriate Nomenclature’. A modified version with approximately the same title was presented on 9 August 2004 at the annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America in Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Neusner and a growing number of scholars have been emphasizing for some time now, the concept 'Jew' as understood today derives not from the first century but from the fourth and following centuries CE. It denotes persons shaped by and oriented to not only Torah and Tanakh but Mishnah, Midrashim and Talmudim. In similar fashion the name 'Christian' as used and understood today designates persons marked more by doctrines and events of the fourth and later centuries (trinity of the godhead, double natures of Christ, consolidating and hierarchically structured catholic church) than by those of the first. Thirty years ago Rosemary Radford Ruether had already pointed out that it was in the fourth century that Judaism and Christianity assumed the features by which they are known today. To call Jesus a 'Jew' or a 'Christian', as these words are understood in the vernacular today, not only confuses the matter historically, but has led to disastrous social and inter-religious consequences. In the lexicon entry on λογαρίζω in BDAG (2000, p. 478), Frederick Danker laments that

incalculable harm has been caused by simply glossing λογαρίζω with 'Jew', for many readers or auditors of the 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.

Despite the growing number of scholars in agreement with these positions, use of 'Jew' and 'Judaism' in reference to Israel and Israelis in the Second

4. Jewish scholar Daniel Boyarin (Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999], p. 6) cites Ruether with approval and aptly describes both collectivities as 'twins in the womb' until the fourth century.
Temple period and use of 'Christian' and 'Christianity' in reference to Jesus and his earliest followers continue unabated in both professional and lay circles. In the hope that an extensive review of the evidence might help to persuade those still straddling the linguistic fence, I offer the following study of terminological usage in the first century followed by recommendations regarding preferred usage today.

The Principles and Practice of (Self-)Identification

It will be useful at the outset to clarify key characteristics of how people identify themselves and others, as noted by sociolinguists and social identity theorists, and how this information might guide our research.

1. The process of identification and self-identification is an issue of classification and categorization. As with all classification, it is essential to be clear on who is doing the classifying, according to what criteria, and for what purposes. This principle is necessary to follow in order to avoid imposing on the ancient sources alien and unfitting modern categories or calling camels 'tanks' because a present general is familiar with tanks but not camels. This principle is an example of the anthropological and ethnographic practice of distinguishing 'emic' from 'etic' categories for the sake of analytical clarity. 'Emic' is the designation for information as it is supplied by the language, thought categories, perspectives and worldviews of the ancient native informers and their culture. 'Etic' categories and terminology, on the other hand, are those of the modern investigating social scientist. 'Jesus groups', for example, is a useful etic designation, despite its


7. Esler, Romans, presents a comprehensive overview of social identity theory (pp. 19-39) and research on ethnicity (pp. 40-76). These chapters provide a theoretical framework for the examination of nomenclature in particular and the points that I shall be listing here. Where Esler cites (Galatians) and provides further substantiation (Romans) of my work, he is referring to the material contained in my 1997 paper.
non-appearance in the ancient sources, for it provides a neutral term that focuses our attention on the social character and dynamic aspect of Jesus’s community-forming activity. Eventually the scientist or exegete may reorganize the emic data into fresh interpretive patterns and provide new names such as ‘Jesus movement’ or ‘negative reference group’ and the like. But first she must know the language and terms of the native informants as this discourse reflects their conceptual categories, categories shaped in turn by their economic, social, political and cultural experience. In accord with this methodological principle, we will ask, ‘what are the terms that the ancient biblical communities and their contemporaries used to identify themselves and others?’ 'According to which characteristics were identifications made in antiquity and how are they evident in the discourse of these groups?'

In the ancient world, groups and persons identified themselves and others primarily in terms of family, lineage, tribe or ethnos, and with respect to place of birth, origin and upbringing. Each category of bloodline and locality will have specific features that express or highlight certain characteristics of the group. Jesus is identified as ‘son of Joseph’, for instance, or as ‘Jesus of Nazareth of Galilee’. Paul claims to be ‘an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin’.

2. The study of nomenclature must attend to, and ascertain where possible, who is speaking to whom and under what circumstances. This is necessary because terms of identification and self-identification will vary, dependent upon speaker, audience and context.

3. As a corollary of number two, it is also necessary to distinguish insider from outsider language, speakers and audiences, since, as sociolinguists and social psychologists have established, insiders often employ different vocabulary when speaking to fellow insiders than when addressing outsiders. This includes different nomenclature of identification and self-identification. In my racially-mixed neighborhood of Oakland, California, I, a Caucasian, would never think

of calling any of my African American neighbors ‘nigger’. But these very neighbors, and especially the teenagers, have no hesitation in calling each other ‘nigger’ as in the expression, ‘we’re dumb ass niggas in this shit together. But don’t let on to the Crackers’. African Americans born in the 1920s, ’30s and ’40s of course don’t say ‘nigga’ but ‘Negro’. Most African Americans in my neighborhood also talk about persons like Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice as ‘Oreos’ who also ‘have stopped operating on CPT’. And if you, reader, don’t understand, you realize that you’re an outsider who is not supposed to. This insider-outside distinction is important when considering the use and implications of the names ίουδαῖος and ιερενηλιτης, the former being an outsider term, as we shall see, and the latter being an insider self-designation.

4. Linguists and anthropologists have noted that nomenclature used by outsiders for groups other than themselves is often resisted or rejected by the thus-labeled groups, or accepted only after the passage of much time, sometimes a generation or more. This is particularly the case when the outgroup, from a position of power, superiority and control, imposes its will, language and terminology on its subjects. These principles are relevant to the situation in Judaea, and indeed the entire Mediterranean, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods of domination. Along with its language, the nomenclature of the victor became that of the vanquished.

5. The names and terms used by social groups to identify themselves and other groups are part of a process of self-definition, a process involving a group’s asserting its own character and being, and distinguishing and demarcating it from the character and being of other groups.12 This involves an underlying perception of an ‘us’ distinguished from a ‘them’ (or other ‘thems’), of ingroups and outgroups. Who ‘we’ are is defined not only in terms of our family roots, the group or groups of which we are a part, our personal qualities and what we do, but also in terms of what we are not, ‘not-them’, not sharing ‘their’ view of the world, ‘their’ interests and loyalties, ‘their’ food’, ‘their’ customs. Terms of self-identification are group-specific, speaker- and audience-specific, and will vary in use and nuance as discoursing partners vary and as circumstances of discourse change.

6. In collectivist, group-oriented cultures like those of antiquity, groups speaking of other groups regularly generalize and homogenize ‘the others’, using one collective term to embrace all—ignorant of, or unconcerned with, any distinctions or labels made by group members among themselves. One social entity’s ‘us-versus-them’ distinction was we ‘Hellenes’ as the civilized who speak Greek and lived cultured lives versus them, the uncultured babbling ‘barbarians’

12. See also Esler, Romans, pp. 40-57 on the processes of self-identification as guided by the work of social identity theorists such as Henri Tajfel, Serge Moscovici, Michael Hogg, Dominic Abrams and John Turner.
The Israelites likewise conceived of themselves as the people of YHWH, contrasted to them, the goim or ethné or nationes. The ‘them’ was equivalent to Everyone Else.

7. Such generalizations allow for stereotyping other groups on the basis of the conventional principle, ‘you know one of them, you know them all’. You know one Cretan, you know them all: they’re all liers. You know one Pharisee, you know them all. They’re a brood of hypocritical vipers. You know one Judaean, you know them all. They observe one day in seven without working, eat no swine flesh, mutilate the tips of their male infants and journey regularly to their Temple in Jerusalem of Judaea where they expect to meet their God and pay for its upkeep with their temple taxes. Sadducees are all dastard Epicurians (apikorom in the Mishnah). You know one Galilean, you know them all—amne ha-aretz in the eyes of the rigorists, and rabble reusers one and all.

8. Ingroup members, when referring to themselves, are savvy to ingroup distinctions and discrete classifiers. In the mind of Pontius Pilate and his soldiers, the troublesome inhabitants of Syria-Palestine were all loudaioi somehow connected with loudais 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. In regard to those outside the pale of Israel, however, Israelites stereotyped with the best of them, regarding all goim13 or Hellènes as lascivious and immoral idolaters.

9. As audiences change, a speaker’s choice of self-identifiers will change. When identifying themselves to outgroups, persons often use nomenclature that they believe their audience will understand or they employ terms by which the outsider audience names or labels them, even if these identifiers are not used within the group. This concession could be deference to those who ‘call the shots and set the terms’, both linguistic and socio-political. It is also a matter of expediency for the sake of clear and concise communication when no disputes over identity are at stake. When speaking among themselves, the native American Sioux or Chippawa or Mohegans or Hopi would never refer to themselves as ‘Indians’, let alone as ‘redskin’ or ‘savages’ (the demeaning labels of ‘paleface’ outsiders). When interacting with ‘the white man’, however, they would answer to the label ‘Indian’ simply because it was the term dictated by the one holding the gun and calling the shots.

10. Stereotyping, hegemonic mis-identification, disrespect and conflict are minimized by identifying individuals and groups by those names which they

13. On the ethnocentric character of this designation see Christopher D. Stanley, “‘Neither Jew nor Greek’: Ethnic Conflict in Greco-Roman Society”, JST 64 (1996), pp. 101-124: ‘Those whom the Jews [sic] lumped together as “Gentiles” would have defined themselves as “Greeks”, “Romans”, “Phrygians”, “Galatians”, “Cappadocians”, and members of various other ethnic populations’ (p. 105).
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prefer for identifying themselves. This is the procedure followed, for example, in the USA or South Africa when persons of European origin refer to the indigenous inhabitants by their tribal names. These preferred ingroup identifiers will generally be the names most redolent of the history, sacred traditions and practices of the ingroups.

11. Terms of identification and self-identification also change over time and not infrequently can vary from one geo-cultural region to another. The study of such terms, therefore, must keep an eye out for such change and variation and consider the reasons, conditions and consequences of such change. Today’s ‘African American’ was yesterday’s ‘Black woman’ who was previously a ‘Negro’ after being slurred by Georgians as a ‘Niggra’ or ‘darkie’. Yesterday’s color-coded ‘white man’ is today’s regionally classified ‘Caucasian’. ‘Honkeys’ in the US North are ‘Crackers’ in the South. The ‘nigger’ in Mississippi was the ‘kafir’ in Pretoria. The ‘Bosch’ of World War I became the ‘Krauts’ of World War II.

With these analytical guidelines clarified, we can now turn to the situation of antiquity and consider how Jesus, his compatriots and his followers were identified in the first-century sources, how they identified themselves, and then how we today should best identify them. In the remarks that follow, I will review evidence concerning key names or expressions used in the New Testament and related sources to identify Jesus, his disciples and their contemporaries. I will then show that specific terms of our current nomenclature are inaccurate, and deny advances in our understanding of ancient social relations within and beyond Israel of the first several centuries of the Common Era. When enshrined in inaccurate Bible translations these erroneous terms mislead ordinary Bible readers and promote not only historical misunderstanding but, worse, fan the fires of anti-Semitism. These remarks will add support, social perspective, and perhaps a few new reasons for eliminating our inaccurate terminology and replacing it with better language.

Jesus was Not a ‘Jew’

Jesus, of course, was not a ‘Christian’. The term had not yet been invented and once invented would never have made sense if applied to Jesus. Consequently he is never called ‘Christian’ in the sources and we should not do so either. When and how often in the first century his followers were named ‘Christians’ is another matter which we shall consider anon.

Let us begin with the fact that Jesus was not a ‘louðaioc. This is a more complicated and controverted issue, involving, as it does, the heated debate over the lexical meaning and use of the term louðaios and its preferred translation—‘Jew’ or ‘Judaean’.
There is no direct evidence indicating how Jesus identified himself—to fellow Israelites or to outsiders, though some indirect evidence is at hand, which we shall mention below. In terms of how he was identified by others, the New Testament evidence can be summarized as follows:

Aside from the so-called ‘messianic titles’ or ideological labels, Jesus customarily was identified, as were his contemporaries, according to family, lineage, tribe or ethnos, on the one hand, or according to place of birth, origin, upbringing and activity, on the other. This was in accord with conventional practice of identification in the collectivist, group-oriented world of antiquity. This practice, along with thinking and classifying in terms of stereotypes, has been discussed by Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey in various studies. Thus, in the New Testament Jesus is identified in terms of (a) his parents,15 siblings16 and lineage.17 In terms of his family and lineage, Jesus was Yeshua bar Yosef, of the house of David (Mt. 1.1), of the tribe of Judah (Mt. 1.2-3), of the house of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Mt. 1.1, 2).

Or he is identified in terms of (b) his birthplace, geographical origin and place of activity. Thus he is depicted as ‘Jesus of/from Galilee’ (apo tès Galilaias, Mt. 3.13) or ‘from Nazareth of Galilee’ (apo Nazaret tès Galilaias) (Mt. 21.11; 27.55; Mk 1.9) or as ‘Jesus the Galilean’ (ho Galilaios, Mt. 26.69).18 Galilee was the chief locale of Jesus’ activity,19 the locale of Jesus’ parents.

15. See ‘son of Joseph’ (Jn 6.52), ‘Jesus of/from Nazareth, son of Joseph’ (Jn 1.45; cf. Mt. 1.16, 18-21); or ‘son of Mary’ (Mk 6.3); cf. Mt. 1.18-25; 2.11; 13.55; Lk. 1.26-56; 2.1-7, 34; John 2.12; Acts 1.14.
16. See Mk 6.3; cf. Mt. 13.55. See also Jn 2.12; 7.5, 10; 20.17; Acts 1.14; 1 Cor. 9.5.
17. See ‘son of David’ (Mt. 1.1; 9.27; 20.30, 31; 21.9, 15; cf. Rom. 1.3); ‘son of Abraham’ (Mt. 1.1); for lineage see also the genealogies of Mt. 1.2-17 and Lk. 3.23-38; cf. also Gal. 3.16.
18. This is on the lips of a Judean slave girl. His identity as Galilean is also implied in Lk. 23.6 and Jn 4.45; 7.52.
19. See Mk 1.14, 16, 28, 39; 14.28; 16.7; Mt. 4.12-24; 15.29; 17.22; 19.1; 26.32; 28.7, 10; Lk. 4.14, 31, 44; 23.5, 6, 55; Jn 1.43; 2.1, 11; 4.3, 43, 45-47, 54, 61; 7.1, 9; Acts 10.37; 13.31; implicitly, see Mk 14.70; Lk. 5.17; 8.26; 17.11; 23.49, 55; Jn 7.41, 52bis. On Galilee see, inter alios, Sean Freyne, Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE: A Study of Second Temple Judaism (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980); Sean Freyne, Galilean and Gospel: Collected Essays (Tübingen: Mohr—Siebeck, 2000); Willibald Bösen, Galilaea als Lebensraum und Wirkungsfeld Jesu (Freiburg: Herder, 1985). For a recent overview of research on Galilee and Galilean as context of Jesus’ activity, see Jens Schröter, ‘Jesus aus Galiläa. Die Herkunft Jesu und ihre Bedeutung für das Verständnis seiner Wirksamkeit’, in Santiago Guajardo Oporto (ed.), Los comienzos del cristianismo: IV Simposio del Grupo Europeo de Investigación sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo (Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 2006), pp. 23-42; see also Douglas E. Oakman, ‘Models and Archaeology in the Social Interpretation of Jesus’, in John P. Pilch (ed.), Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the
and family, and the locale of Jesus’ first followers. Simon Peter is twice identified as a ‘Galilean’. Thus, of the sixty-one New Testament occurrences of Galilaea in the New Testament, the vast majority of instances identify Jesus, his family and followers as from, or active in, Galilee. Of the eleven New Testament occurrences of the related adjective or substantive Galilaios, most also are of Jesus and his followers.

A related geographical identification is his being off/from Nazareth:

(a) ‘Jesus off/from Nazareth’
(b) ‘Jesus off/from Nazareth of Galilee’
(c) ‘Jesus the Nazarene (Nazarens, Nazóraios)’: All six of the NT occurrences of Nazarēnos modify Jesus. Of the thirteen NT occurrences of Nazóraios, twelve modify Jesus and one identifies his followers as ‘the party of the Nazarenes’ (Acts 24.5).

The creedal expressions of Acts identifying Jesus as Nazóraios (2:22; 3:6; 4:10) are ancient and consistent in their formulation. This reveals an ancient and consistent identification of Jesus, his family, and his initial followers with the localities of Galilee and Nazareth but not Judea. Jesus and his followers were said to have visited Judea, but they were never called ‘Judeans’ by fellow insiders.

Naturally all these identifications would have certain notions and stereotypes associated with them, as was customary in a world where collective identity and


22. See Mk. 14.70 (and by implication, Mt. 26.69) and Lk. 22.59; cf. also Jn 21.1-23.
23. See Mt. 26.69; Mk. 14.70; Lk. 22.59; 23.6; Jn 4.45; Acts 1.11; 2.7. Four other occurrences of Galilean designates pilgrims from Galilee (Lk. 13.1, 26), or ‘Judah the Galilean’ (Acts 5.37), rebel leader and illustration of the association of Galilee and the Galileans with resistance and rebellion; cf. Josephus, Ant. 18.23.24. See John 1:45; Acts 10.38. For Jesus at Nazareth see also Mt. 4:13; Lk. 4:16; Jn 1.46.
25. For Jesus’ family and Jesus’ at Nazareth see Mt. 2:23; Lk. 1.26; 2:4, 39, 51; 4:16; Jn 1.46.
26. See Mt. 21.11; Mk. 1.11; Acts 10.38.
27. See Mt. 1.23; 26.71; Lk. 18.37; Jn 18.5, 7; 19.19; Acts 2.22; 3.6; 4.10; 6.14; 22.8; 26.9.
28. So also Bösen, Galilaea, pp. 110-45 on Jesus and Nazareth.
group orientation was the norm and where people were known by the parents who bore them, the place they grew up and the company they kept. In a series of brilliant studies, Halvor Moxnes has analyzed Galilee not only as the historical site of Jesus’ upbringing and activity, but also as a frequently varying construct of modern exegesis from the Enlightenment to the present. He has shown how Galilee was an ideologically loaded concept not only for Jesus and his contemporaries but for all generations since. The same, of course, could and should be shown about Judaea and Judeans.

The only exceptions to Jesus’ never being called ‘λούδαιος in the New Testament are three occasions where he is said to be called ‘λούδαιος by outsiders, namely by the Persian Magi who refer to the infant Jesus as ‘king of the ‘λούδαίου’ according to Matthew (2.2), by the Samaritan woman of John 4.1-42, who mistakenly identifies Jesus (coming from the territory of Judea) as a Judean (‘λούδαιος, 4.9), and by the Romans who executed him (Mt. 27.37/Mk 15.26/Lk. 23.38/Jn 19.19). The formulation of the Magi, while conceivable if the episode itself is historical, also can be seen as consistent with the scenario narrated by Matthew. Since Jesus, according to Matthew, was born in Bethlehem of Judaea (2.1), supposedly in accord with prophetic expectation (2.5-6, where Matthew modified the quoted text of Mic. 5.2 to fit the situation of Jesus’ birth), the Magi sought him out in Judaea, the place of his birth, and assumed that he was then ‘born king of the Judeans’. The narrative context also best explains why the Samaritan woman in Jn 4.9 would say to Jesus who requests of her a drink, ‘How is it that you, a ‘λούδαιος, ask a drink of me, a Samaritan woman?’ Jesus, according to the narrator, is leaving Judea and heading north to Galilee (4.3; cf. 4.43-45). In passing through Samaria, he meets a Samaritan woman at Jacob’s well near Sychar (4.4-7). Because of his movement from Judea northward, she naturally mistakes him to be a Judean and addresses him as such. Given John’s awareness of, and repeated identification of, Jesus and his followers as ‘Galileans’ or ‘Nazarenes’; Graham Harvey’s claim that the identification of Jesus as a ‘λούδαιος in Jn 4.9 is part of John’s overall strategy of depicting Jesus as a Judean (and indeed also as a ‘Jew’) fails to convince.

31. Jesus: Jn.1.43, 45; 2.1, 11; 4.3, 43, 45-47, 54, 61; 7.1, 9, 52; 18.5, 7; 19.19; implicitly, 7.41, 52; Jesus’ followers: Jn.1.43-51; 12.21; 21.1-23; implicitly, see also 7.52.
32. Harvey, The True Israel, pp. 84-94 (89).
It is quite noteworthy that the Passion accounts of all four Gospels differentiate the terminologies of insiders and outsiders and the expressions ‘king of the Ἰουδαίων’ and ‘king of Israel’. Pilate is described as having inquired of Jesus whether he was ‘the king of the Ἰουδαίων’ (Mk 15.2/Mt. 27.11/In 18.33), as having referred to Jesus indirectly as ‘king of the Ἰουδαίων’ (Mk 15.12), and as having written as the charge against Jesus, ‘the king of the Ἰουδαίων’ (Mk 15.26); cf. Lk. 23.38 (‘this is the king of the Ἰουδαίων’); Mt. 27.37 (‘this is Jesus, the king of the Ἰουδαίων’); Jn 19.19 (‘Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Ἰουδαίων’). The Roman military detail carrying out the execution is said to have mocked him with the same expression, ‘Hail, king of the Ἰουδαίων’ (Mk 15.18/Mt. 27.29/Jn 19.3). This expression, ‘king of the Ἰουδαίων’, found in all four Gospels, has a firm claim on historical authenticity and is fully consistent with the Roman use of Ἰουδαίες to designate the inhabitants of the territory they knew as Judaea. Nomenclature of the Gospels indicating how the evangelists reported the language of Roman outsiders is consistent with how the Romans themselves classified Jesus; namely as a Ἰουδαίος among a people they named Ἰουδαίοι/Ἰουδαίαι. This identifier fit exactly with the name by which these Romans called the land of residence of the Ἰουδαίοι/Ἰουδαίαι, namely Judaea (as in the series of Ἰουδαίας capta coins minted in celebration of the Roman conquest of Judaea in 70 CE).

Whereas Pilate and the Roman soldiers are reported to have identified Jesus as ‘king of the Ἰουδαίων’, his fellow Israelites spoke of him as (would-be) ‘king of Israel’. The chief priests and the scribes mocked Jesus with the words, ‘Let the Christ, the king of Israel, come down now from the cross, that we may see and believe’ (Mk 15.32/Mt. 27.42). The noteworthy and consistent contrast in the languages recorded of, or ascribed to, Romans and Israelites demonstrates the difference between insider and outsider language for Jesus as reported by the evangelists. Even though reports of the evangelists are second-hand, the language is consistent with the patterns of usage documented elsewhere for both Romans and Israelites. These instances from the Passion narratives belong to an

33. In regard to the sense of Ἰουδαίος in John, Frederick Danker (BDAG [2000], pp. 478-79) also aptly observes that “there is no indication that John uses the term in the general ethnic sense suggested in modern use of the word ‘Jew’, which covers diversities of belief and practice that were not envisaged by biblical writers, who concern themselves with intra-Judaean (intra-Israelite) differences and conflicts”.

34. The substantive Ἰουδαίοι was based on the adjective Ἰουδαῖος, meaning ‘of, belonging to Judaea’. For Ἰουδαῖος, see e.g. Pliny, Nat. Hist. 5.14.15; Suetonius, Tit. 4; Tacitus, Hist. 2.79; 5.9 and the series of Ἰουδαῖοι capta coins minted by Vespasian in announcement of the Roman conquest of Judaea in 70 CE. For Ἰουδαῖος as substantive, Horace, Serm. 1.5.100; Juvenal, Sat. 6.547; 3.18; Tacitus, Hist. 5.2 and passim.

35. This distinction of usage mirrors that found, e.g., in the book of Judith where Ἰουδαίοι is used by outsiders and Israel, by insiders.
array of evidence illustrating the preference for the names 'Israel' and 'Israelite' as self-identifiers when ingroup Israelites are addressing one another. This nomenclature is also found in Jn 12.13 where Jesus, arriving in Jerusalem, is hailed by the crowd of Judeans with the words, "'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, the king of Israel'" and Jn 1.50 where Nathanael, a Galilean, acclaims Jesus to be 'the king of Israel'. This practice, so amply illustrated in the Old Testament, numerous parabiblical writings, and the rabbinic writings, was familiar to, and followed by, the New Testament authors as well. 'Sons of Israel' and 'house of Israel' are the chief collective terms for the people joined by covenant, Torah, and cult to the God YHWH. Even in the post-exilic period when only the tribe of Judah remained, 'Israel', not 'Judah' or 'people of Judah' was the preferred collective term of self-designation. This preference continued through and beyond the New Testament period.

It was in the post-exilic era that another term, 'Ioudaiaos', was coined by Greek-speaking outsiders to identify residents of Judah, 'Yhwh', returnees from the Babylonian exile who had settled the administrative area around Jerusalem (Neh. 5.14). The first attestation of 'Ioudaiaos' appears in the speech of an outsider Greek, Clearchus (fourth to third century BCE),36 a pupil of Aristotle, who observed concerning a certain 'Ioudaiaos':

The man was a 'Ioudaiaos of Coele-Syria. These people are descended from the Indian philosophers. The philosophers, they say, are called Calani by the residents of India, and 'Ioudaiaos'37 by the residents of Syria (παρὰ δὲ Σύροις) for the district that they inhabit is known as 'Ioudaia.'

This awareness of the connection of the name 'Ioudaiaos' to tribe and territory remained alive for centuries, as Josephus, among others, attests. Recounting the return of the Judahites from Babylonian exile, Josephus explains that 'Ioudaiaos', 'the name by which they have been called from the time when they went up from Babylon, is derived from the tribe of Judah ('Iouda') 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). 'Ioudaia', in turn, he describes as the area where Jerusalem and the Temple of the God of the Israelites are located.

36. Clearchus, frg. 6, in Josephus, Apion 1.179. For other Greek references see Walter Gutbrod, 'Ioudaiaos, Ἰαοράηλ, Ἐβραῖος in Greek Hellenistic Literature', TDNT 3 (1965), pp. 369-91 (369-71). Josephus also mentions histories of the Ioudaioi written and quoted by Gentiles, such as Alexander Polyhistor's citation from the 'History of the Ioudaioi' by Cleodomus the prophet (Josephus, Ant. 1.1240).

37. Its gentilic ending (-ais) suggests that underlying Ioudaioi was an Aramaic original denoting the inhabitants of Judah, ylhudi (ending in -ai), a possibility that Clearchus's comment also supports. For the equivalent Hebrew yhudi see 2 Kgs 16.16; Jer 32.12. The Aramaic ylhudi was the standard self-designation of the Judahites residing on the Nile island of Elephantine (K. G. Kuhn, 'Ioudaia, Ioudaioi, Ἐβραῖοι in Jewish Literature after the OT', TDNT 3 (1965), pp. 359-69, esp. 364-65).
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(Ant. 11.4), encompassing some three million areae of fertile soil (Apion 1.195). Noteworthy here is both the identification of Judea through reference to Jerusalem and the Temple and the identification of the deity as ‘the God of the Israelites’ rather than ‘God of the Judeans’ as might be expected in this context. 38 In actuality, the latter expression appears nowhere in Josephus. In this expression, ‘Israelites’ is the traditional term of self-reference, not ‘Judeans’.

When ‘יוֹדְאִים’ is used in reference to inhabitants of Judea, how one envisioned the scope and extent of Judea determined whom one considered to be Judeans/ ‘יוֹדְאֵי’. Concerning Judea, the geographer Strabo notes that ‘the interior above Phoenicia as far as the Arabs, between Gaza and Antilebanon, is called Judea’ (Geography 16.2.21). Pliny (Nat. Hist. 5.12.13 §66) lists Judea as one of the several divisions of Syria, along with Palestina, Coele, and Phoenica, Damascus, Babylonia, etc. ‘Beyond Idumaea and Samaria’, he notes, ‘stretches the wide expanse of Judea. The part of Judea adjoining Syria is called Galilee, Perea joins Arabia and Egypt, and the rest of Judea is divided into ten parishes’ (Nat. Hist. 5.15 §70). These outsider descriptions have a ‘greater Judea’ in view, with Judea virtually equivalent to all of Palestine. On the other hand, a Judea of narrower scope is evident in the Septuagint and most of the New Testament references where ‘יוֹדְאִים’ designates only ‘the southern part of Palestine in contrast to Samaria, Galilee, Perea, and Idumea’ (BDAG 477-478). Josephus also distinguished Judea (War 1.371) from Galilee (War 1.134) as well as from Samaria, Idumaea and Perea (e.g., War 2.43, 96; Ant. 20.118; Life 269), and describes the territory as a district of Coele-Syria (Apion 1.179).

Whatever the extent of Judea, ‘Judean’, not ‘Jew’ or ‘Jewish’, is the appropriate translation of ‘יוֹדְאִים’ as an inhabitant of ‘יוֹדְאִים’. 40 Its Latin equivalent is Judeus as (adjective and substantive). 41 The translation of Tacitus’s *Historiae* by Clifford H. Moore in the Loeb Classical Library series is illustrative of the misimpression created when ‘Jewish’ rather than ‘Judean’ is used to translate the adjective *Judeus*. Tacitus’s description of Judea (Histories 5.6-8) mentions

---

38. Josephus, Ant. 11.123-30, reporting a letter of the Persian Xerxes to Ezra, involves a similar juxtaposition of *Ioudaioi* and ‘God of the Israelites’. Xerxes commands *Ioudaioi* intent on going up to Jerusalem to ‘look after matters in Judea in accordance with the law of God, and bring to the God of the Israelites the gifts that I and my friends have vowed to send’. The expression ‘the God of the Israelites’, while most untypical of outsider parlance, is traditional Israelite phraseology and undoubtedly derives from Josephus, not Xerxes.

39. Accordingly he also distinguished Judeans from Galileans and Samaritans (Josephus, Ant. 9.61; 20.119-36; Life 221; 382-83).

40. Context is one indication of when *Ioudaioi* identified an inhabitant of Judea, as when *Ioudaioi* is juxtaposed to *Ioudaia*, see Josephus, Ant. 11.60-61; 13.24; 15.406; 18.2; 19.366; War 2.184-85; 187.

41. Tacitus illustrates Roman customary nomenclature, where the name *Judei* designated not only the contemporary residents of Judea but also their earliest ancestors (Hist. 5.1-13).
a river of Judaea emptying into a sea: at Belus annis Iudaico mari inabitur (Hist. 5.7). This is oddly rendered as 'The river Belus empties into the Jewish Sea'. This sea, alias the Salt Sea or Dead Sea, is no more a 'Jewish' sea than Judaea is 'Jewish land'.

Although the term 'Iouðaios' was first used of the residents of Judaea in the Persian period by outsiders and not by the residents themselves, eventually it was also adopted as a self-designation by the Judean natives. Thereafter, the range of 'Iouðaios' was extended to apply to all persons and groups who were bound ethnically, politically, economically, socially and culturally to Judaea, Jerusalem and its Temple (and Temple tax), and observance of Torah. Not only outsiders but also insiders gradually began using the term in this extended sense. This broadening of usage is noticeable in the Septuagint, in which there are approximately 220 occurrences of 'Iouðaios'. In sixty-one instances it translates Hebrew terms of the y'hud- root, which identify members of the tribe of Judah or residents in the land of Judah. It occurs far more frequently in the later Apocryphal writings (154+) where it is employed mainly in the regional sense for residents of Judah/Judaea but occasionally in the wider sense as well.

While the size and borders of Judah/Judaea varied over the post-exilic centuries, this territory was always the location of the holy city Jerusalem and of the Temple, the chief markers and orientation points, along with Torah observance, of Judeans wherever located. The numerous juxtapositions of 'Iouðaios' with 'Iouðaiia' illustrate the conventional association in antiquity of the name of the people and their place of residence (Galilaios with Galilaia, Hellën with Hella, Rômaios with Rômê, Nazôraiios with Nazareth, Kyprios with Kyprios, Kyrvênhê with Thessalonikeus with Thessalinkê, Philippêvios with Philippoi etc.). This suggests that even when 'Iouðaios' was used without an accompanying reference to 'Iouðaiia, the connection of persons to place was potentially implied. 'Diaspora Jews [sic]', J.D.G. Dunn notes, 'continued to identify themselves by reference to Judaea, their country of origin, and this state of affairs presumably continued at least so long as the Jerusalem Temple still stood and diaspora Jews continued to attest their identification with it by paying the Temple Tax'.

Philo and Josephus display similar bi-fold usage. Josephus identifies himself as a 'Hebrew' (War. 1.3) and as a 'Iouðaios (Ant. 1.4), in the latter instance when

43. The narrative contexts make this clear; see also the juxtapositions of Iouðaios and Iouðaiia as in 1 Macc. 11.33-34.
45. See Guthbr., 'Iouðaios', p. 371.
referring to the ‘war that we Ἰουδαίοι waged against the Romans’. Both names are juxtaposed in Ant. 1.146 and elsewhere. References to Ἰουδαίοι and Ἰουδαίοι appear far more often in the books of the Antiquities recounting post-exilic history (Books 11–20) than in those covering the previous centuries (Books 1–10) where ‘Israel’, ‘Israelites’ and ‘Hebrews’ are Josephus’s preferred names for the people. In Book 11, as already noted, he explains the origin of the name Ἰουδαίος as linked with the tribal name ‘Judah’. Elsewhere he identifies as Ἰουδαίοι persons referred to by the Greek outsider Herodotus as circumcised ‘Palestinian Syrians’ (Συρίους τοὺς ἐν τῇ Πολιορκητῇ). While he also identifies as Ἰουδαίοι persons living beyond Judaea, the name still may connote a connection of those so named with the land of Ἰουδαία, implicitly, if not explicitly. On the one hand, he can speak of Galilee as ‘the territory of the Ἰουδαίοι’ and of the residents of Galilee as Ἰουδαίοι (War 1.21; 2.232). On the other, he can also designate persons as ‘Galilean’, meaning inhabitants of Galilee; he can distinguish Galileans from Judeans, and he can refer to himself as distinct from the Judeans. In the case of both Philo and Josephus, the fact that they both were reckoning with outsiders as a portion or predominant part of their audiences would explain their use of Ἰουδαῖοι in its more encompassing sense. Josephus wrote for his Roman patrons and identified the land of the rebels and the rebels themselves as the Romans named them, Ἰούδαιοι/Ἰουδαίοι and Ἰουδαία/Ἰουδαία. Whether Ἰουδαίοι is used in the narrower regional or the broader ethnic sense, it is best translated as ‘Judaean’, not ‘Jew’.52

Most of the occurrences in Philo are in Flacc. and Legae. Beside regular reference to the Ἰουδαῖοι of Judaea and Palestine, Josephus also mentions Ἰουδαίοι at Rome (War 2.80–81 = Ant. 17.301); at Babylon (Ant. 15.14–15; Life 54); Caesarea (Life 53); Dicaearchia (War 2.103); or towns of Syria (War 2.463). See also his distinction of Judaea the home country from colonies of the dispersion as at Egypt and Babylon (Apion 32–33).

47. When, for instance, Herod is called ‘the king of the Ἰουδαίοι’ (Ant. 15.409; 16.311), he clearly is not being identified as king of all Ἰουδαίοι, the world over but only as ruler of the inhabitants of Judaea. Cf. also ‘ethnarch of the Judeans’ (Josephus, Ant. 14.8.36, 194–196; 200; cf. ‘Simon... ethnarch of the Judeans’, 1 Macc. 14.47). When he speaks of a Ἰουδαῖος distant from his πατρίς, Judaea is most likely the πατρίς implied (Apion 2.277). The Ἰουδαῖοι seeking help from their fellow countrymen abroad are likewise Judeans (War 1.5).
48. As in the collocations of Ἰουδαίοι and Ἰουδαίοι; cf. e.g. Ant. 13.24; 15.406; 18.2; 19.366.
49. E.g. Judas ‘the Galilean’ (War 2.118, 433; 7.2.253; Ant. 18.4.9, 23; 20.102), leader of fourth philosophy (Ant. 18.23–25).
50. Josephus, Ant. 17.254; cf. War 2.43.
51. War 3.130, 136, 142; Life 113, 416.
52. As Danker explains in BDAG and as now is the practice of a growing number of scholars; see above, n. 6. Ester (Galations, p. 4), acknowledging the problems with ‘Jew’ and ‘Judaism’, agrees with Elliott (Jesus was neither a “Jew” nor a “Christian”) in preferring as
Israelite-Palestinian writings reveal a different practice. Several of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of Palestinian provenance show no use of Ἰουδαίος whatsoever. In these writings the preference for 'Israel' as self-designation is clearly evident. The Qumran literature shows no use of ὑπερθύρων or ὑπερθύρων whatsoever. Here too 'Israel' is one of the most preferred self-designations (IQS 8.5, 9.11; IQSa 1.1.6, CD 3.19 etc.). This preference for the name 'Israel' as self-designation continues in the Mishnah and other rabbinic writings where the word Ἰουδαῖος makes virtually no appearance. The terms ὑπερθύρων or ὑπερθύρων occur most rarely, and then in renderings of Gentile statements (e.g., Seh. 35b; Gen. Rab. 11 on 2.3). The few times this equivalent of Ἰουδαίος does occur as a self-designation among Israelites (m. Ned. 11.2 [3x]; b. Meg. 13a), it appears to intentionally mimic 'the usage of non-Israelites or of the diaspora' for ὑπερθύρων [ὁ Ἰουδαῖός] see only Esther Rab. 7.11. 'Israel' and 'House of Israel' are in this literature the standard and near exclusive terms of self-reference.

Thus use of Ἰουδαίος as self-designation at the turn of the era was by no means universal and this is true of the Israelite diaspora as well. A second-century BCE inscription from the island of Delos indicates that certain persons there identified themselves as 'Israelites of Delos, who offer first fruits at sacred Argarizein [Har Gerizim]'. Their interest in Mount Gerizim shows them to be

designations 'Israel', 'Israelite', and suggests the adjective 'Judaic' in place of 'Jewish'. Subsequently he revised his position, presenting a comprehensive and cogent argument for 'Judaean' as the appropriate rendition of Ἰουδαῖος (Romans, pp. 63-74). Shaye J. D. Cohen (The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties [Hellenistic Culture and Society, 31; Berkeley: University of California, 1999]) wishes to distinguish a 'religious' from a territorial sense of Ἰουδαῖος and to translate the latter as 'Judaean' but the former as 'Jew'. Esler (Romans, pp. 68-74) reveals the flawed assumptions underlying this proposal and rightfully rejects it. Christopher Stanley ("Neither Jew nor Greek": Ethnic Conflict in Greco-Roman Society, JSNT 64 [1996], pp. 101-124), stresses the ethnic, in contrast to religious, dimension of the names Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλληνός, and demonstrates how the numerous conflicts between Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἑλληνες around the Mediterranean world were fought on ethnic, not religious, terms. Alan F. Segal (Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986]) favors using 'Judaean' in reference to Ἰουδαῖοι prior to the fall of the Judaean state and 'Jew' thereafter. While the former is appropriate, the latter still remains anachronistic.

53. This is underlined by both Kuhn, Ἰουδαῖός, and Kahl, Ἰουδαῖος.


Samaritans, who nevertheless considered themselves members of the people of Israel.\(^{56}\)

This overview of usage squares with what Karl Georg Kuhn and Walter Gutbrod concluded over half a century ago.\(^{57}\) Distinguishing already between insider and outsider usage, and between the usage of ‘Palestinian Israel’ and ‘Hellenistic Judaism’, they found that ‘Israel’ was the most common self-designation of the former\(^{58}\) and ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ of the latter.\(^{59}\) ‘Ἰουδαῖος’, the Greek name first used by Greek outsiders,\(^{60}\) was applied to residents of Judaea, the chief territory of this people containing its chief city and Temple, and then eventually to all persons these outsiders thought were related ethnically, politically, economically, socially and culturally to the Judeans, their holy city and their Temple. Israeliite residents of the Diaspora eventually also adopted the appellation when speaking of themselves to outsiders and then eventually when speaking of, or addressing, ingroup members as well. Kuhn saw 1 Maccabees as typical of Palestinian Israeliite practice.\(^{61}\) Here ‘Israel’ is the regular insider term of self-reference. ‘Ἰουδαῖος’\(^{39}\), on the other hand, appears only in the speech of non-Israelites, in diplomatic correspondence between Judaea and outsiders, by Judean envoys to Romans, or in official domestic documents and official titles, including those on Hasmonean coins. 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, and Greek inscriptions, Kuhn notes,\(^{62}\) display a different usage, one influenced by Greek outsider practice.\(^{63}\) In this literature, ‘Israel’ is used only infrequently (mostly in prayer, liturgical and biblical formulas) and ‘Ἰουδαῖος’ is the main identifier.\(^{64}\)

58. See, e.g., Sir. 17:17; 2 K. 33:20; Pr. 15:14; Job. 4:1; 5:1; 7:1; also Bar.; 4 Ezra; *Test. XII Pair.* 3 En. See similarly Kuhli, ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’, representing the present consensus.
60. Clearchus, Theophrastus and Megasthenes; see Gutbrod, ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’, pp. 369-70.
63. While the difference in usage is important to note, the Hellenization of Palestine in this period mitigates the plausibility of Kuhn’s ‘Hellenistic vs. Palestinian’ antithesis.
64. 2 Macc. 65; 3 Macc. 29; 4 Macc. 5.6. In the majority of instances, ‘Ἰουδαῖος’ and ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ designate residents of Judaea; for the wider sense see 2 Macc. 12:40; 3 Macc. 1:3; 3:3; 27:4; 1:1 et al. regarding the Judeans in Alexandria; 4 Macc. 5:6. For ‘Ἰουδαῖος’ on the lips of outsiders speaking of, or addressing, Israelites, see the letters of Antiochus IV to ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ of Judæa (2 Macc. 9:19; 11:27, 31); a letter of the Romans to ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ of Judæa (2 Macc. 11:34); and Lysias’ letters to ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ of Judæa (2 Macc. 11:16-18); see also Antiochus IV’s letter to his brother Lysias (outider to outsider) about ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ (2 Macc. 11:22-24); Philo’s Philopater’s letter to Egyptian military commanders ordering a pogrom against the ‘Ἰουδαῖοι’ of
The rare term ἱουδαϊσμός makes its first appearance here as well (2 Macc. 2.21; 8.1; 14.38 bis; 4 Macc. 4.26). Kuhn opines that it was 'an expression of Hellenistic Judaism' with no Palestinian equivalent. We might add that it apparently was coined as a deliberate contrast to Ἐλληνισμός (2 Macc. 4.13; cf. also το Ἐλληνισμός, 2 Macc. 6.9; 11.24). Designating the deliberate pursuit of a Jewish way of life in strict observance of Torah and loyalty to the Temple, ἱουδαϊσμός implied a concerted resistance to Hellenistic assimilation. ἱουδαϊσμός designates not a collectivity of Judeans, however, but a Jewish way of life. ἱουδαῖος, on the other hand, denotes not only the territory but occasionally its residents. These neologisms notwithstanding, the deity is known as the 'God of Israel' (2 Macc. 9.5; cf. IQS 3.24), 'Redeemer of Israel' (3 Macc. 7.23), not the 'God of Judah/Judea/Judeans'. The people are identified as ἱουδαῖοι but also as 'Israel' (2 Macc. 1.25, 26; 10.38, 11.6; 3 Macc. 3.16, 6.9), 'House of Israel' (3 Macc. 3.10), 'Israelite children' (4 Macc. 18.1), 'Hebrews', 68 or 'children of Abraham' (4 Macc. 6.16, 22). The land promised to Abraham and progeny is referred to only as ερετ σύρις or γέ Ισραήλ, never ερετ Ῥημᾶ. The God of the people of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob likewise is designated only as 'the God of Israel', never 'the God of Judah/Judea' or 'God of the Judeans'. Numismatic evidence is consistent with this nomenclature. A shekel probably minted during the revolt of 66–72 CE bears the inscription `σκελεῖ του Ισραήλ'. The coins minted by the residents of Judea during the Bar Kochba revolt (132–35 CE) likewise bore a legend referring not to 'Judea' but to 'Israel': 'Year 1 of the liberation of Israel', 'Year 2 of the Freedom of Israel'. 70 The contrast to Roman nomenclature could not be clearer. Vespasian announced his conquest of Judea with coins referring not to Israel but Judea and bearing the legend 'Judea capta'.

The New Testament

The New Testament writings present a less uniform picture in regard to use of the terms ᾿Ισραήλ, ᾿Ισραήλιτις and ἱουδαιοί as identifiers. On the whole,

---

66. Josephus does not employ ἱουδαϊσμός at all; for the verb ἱουδαῖζω see War 2.463; cf 2.454; 2.463; Ant. 11.284.
67. See 2 Macc. 5:11; 10.24.
68. See 2 Macc. 7:31; 11:13, 15.37; 4 Macc. 4:11; 5.2; 4:8.2; 9.6; 18; 17.9.
70. The contrasting legend ἡυ τοῖς Ἰδωνίων on earlier Hasmonaean coins Kuhn sees as exemplifying the use of the term or its equivalent, ἱουδαιοί, in official titles.
however, they manifest a continued preference for ‘Israel’ as chief self-designation, especially in Israelite insider-to-insider discourse.

*The Gospels and Acts*

‘Ἰουδαίος’/’Ιουδαίοι

‘Ἰουδαίος’ appears in the New Testament a total of 194/195 times,71 with the Gospel of John (71×) and Acts (79×) containing the largest number of occurrences. In the Synoptic tradition, ‘Ἰουδαίος’ appears far less often than Ἰσραήλ as a term for Jesus’ compatriots, with most involving statements of outsiders. Of the five occurrences of ‘Ἰουδαίοι’ in Matthew,72 all but one73 are in statements of outsiders. Of the six in Mark,74 all but one75 are in the Passion narrative and all these likewise occur in statements of outsiders. Of the five instances in Luke’s Gospel,76 three are outsider statements in the Passion account (Lk. 23:3, 37, 38) and two are statements of the Lukean narrator. One mentions ‘elders of the Ἰουδαίων’ (Lk. 7:3) and the other (Lk. 23:50) identifies a certain Joseph who sought the body of Jesus from Pilate as ‘from Arimathaea, a city of the Ἰουδαίων’, best translated not as ‘Jewish city’ (RSV), but ‘Judean city’, meaning a city in Judaea. On the whole, insider and outsider terminology is distinguished in direct and indirect discourse, and ‘Ἰουδαίος’ appears only on the lips of outsiders. In the few instances where ‘Ἰουδαίος’ occurs in comments of the narrators/authors themselves, it has the more inclusive sense consistent with outsider nomenclature. ‘Ἰουδαίος’ is never used in the Synoptists [sic] as a proper name for the people to whom Jesus comes’.77

The Gospel of John and Acts present a more varied picture. In both, ‘Ἰουδαίοι’ is used of residents of Ἰουδαία as well as of residents of the Diaspora with connections and loyalties to Judaea, Jerusalem and the Temple.78 On the one hand,

71. Mt. 5×; Mk 6×; Lk 5×; Jn 71×; Acts 79×; Rom. 11×; 1 Cor. 8×; 2 Cor. 1×; Gal. 4×; Col. 1×; 1 Thess. 1×; Rev. 2×. For studies on Ἰουδαίοι in the New Testament see Kuhli, ‘Ἰουδαίοι’, pp. 193-94.

72. Mt. 2.2; 27.11, 29, 37; 28.15.

73. In Mt. 28.15 the narrator mentions the rumor of Jesus’ disciples stealing his corpse (28.11-14) that had been spread among Ἰουδαίους (παρα Ἰουδαίους) down through his own time. The contrast between the localities of Galilee (28.7-10, 16-20) and Judaea (28.11-15) may favor taking Ἰουδαίοι here in the regional rather than the global sense. Otherwise Matthew, with a view to the non-Judaic in his audience, is using Ἰουδαίοι in the global sense.

74. Mk 7:3; 15.2, 9, 12, 18, 26.

75. Mk 7.3 is a comment of the Markan narrator explaining purity observances of Pharisees and Ἰουδαίοι from Judaea.

76. Lk. 7:3; 23.3, 37, 38, 50.
