

The  
**Reconstruction**  
Of  
**Judean Ethnicity** in 

**MARKUS CROMHOUT**

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor (PhD)

Department of New Testament Studies

Faculty of Theology

University of Pretoria

November 2005

**SUPERVISOR: PROF DR A G VAN AARDE**

# Index

<b>PREFACE</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Introduction	8
1.2 John P Meier – Jesus a Marginal “Jew”	10
1.2.1 Jesus’ Background – His Family and Upbringing	10
1.2.2 Jesus and John the Baptist	18
1.2.3 Jesus and the Kingdom of God	24
1.2.4 Jesus’ Miracles	29
1.2.5 Jesus and other Judean Groups	31
1.2.6 Summary: John P Meier – Jesus a Marginal “Jew”	36
1.3 John D Crossan – Jesus a Mediterranean “Jewish” Peasant	38
1.3.1 Jesus, Nazareth and Sepphoris	39
1.3.2 Jesus and the Brokerless Kingdom	40
1.3.3 Jesus the Magician	41
1.3.4 Jesus and Open Commensality	43
1.3.5 Magic and Meal Coming Together	46
1.3.6 Jesus and the Patriarchal Family	49
1.3.7 Jesus and Inclusive Judeanism	51
1.3.8 Summary: John D Crossan – Jesus a Mediterranean “Jewish” Peasant	53
1.4 Identifying the Problem	55
<b>2. A SOCIO-CULTURAL MODEL OF JUDEAN ETHNICITY: A PROPOSAL</b>	<b>59</b>
2.1 Introduction	59
2.2 Covenantal Nomism	60
2.3 Covenantal Nomism as a “Symbolic Universe”	62
2.4 The Four Pillars of Second Temple Judeanism	67
2.4.1 Temple	68

2.4.2	God	68
2.4.3	Election	69
2.4.4	Torah	69
2.5	Judean Customs as Covenantal Praxis	71
2.6	Ethnicity Theory	73
2.7	Ethnicity in Antiquity	82
2.8	The Socio-Cultural Model of Judean Ethnicity: A Proposal	84
2.8.1	The Habitus/Israel	85
2.8.2	The Sacred Canopy	89
2.8.3	Summary	90
2.9	So What Kind of Judean Was Jesus?	91
2.9.1	John P Meier – Jesus a Marginal “Jew”	91
2.9.1.1	Jesus and the Habitus/Israel	91
2.9.1.2	Jesus and the Sacred Canopy	94
2.9.1.3	Findings	94
2.9.2	John D Crossan – Jesus a Mediterranean “Jewish” Peasant	95
2.9.2.1	Jesus and the Habitus/Israel	95
2.9.2.2	Jesus and the Sacred Canopy	97
2.9.2.3	Findings	97
2.9.3	Summary	97
<b>3.</b>	<b>JUDEAN ETHNICITY IN FIRST CENTURY CE</b>	<b>99</b>
3.1	Introduction	99
3.2	The “Sacred Canopy”	100
3.3	What’s in a Name?	103
3.4	Judeanism Encounters Hellenism	105
3.4.1	Resistance to and Influence of Hellenistic Culture	106
3.4.2	The Maccabean Revolt	106
3.4.3	Be Careful What You Eat	112
3.4.4	Judeanism versus Hellenism	113
3.4.5	The Judean Sects	114
3.4.6	Palestine Under Herod the Great	120
3.4.7	Language	122
3.4.7.1	Aramaic	122
3.4.7.2	Hebrew	122
3.4.7.3	Greek	123

3.4.8	Religious Influence	126
3.4.9	Summary	128
3.5	Religion and Covenantal Praxis	128
3.5.1	The Temple – A Focal Point of Judean Identity	129
3.5.1.1	The High Priesthood	131
3.5.1.2	Jerusalem, the Holy	132
3.5.1.3	The Temple and Ritual Purity	135
3.5.1.4	The Sacrifices	140
3.5.1.5	The Annual Festivals	142
3.5.1.6	Tithes, Offerings and the Temple Tax	146
3.5.2	The Synagogue	150
3.5.2.1	The Synagogue: A Building or Assembly of People?	150
3.5.2.2	Teaching the Law and the Prophets	153
3.5.3	The Household	156
3.5.3.1	The Shema, Dress and Prayers	156
3.5.3.2	Sabbath Observance	159
3.5.3.3	The Day of Atonement	160
3.5.3.4	The Purity of Food	160
3.5.3.5	Ritual Immersion	162
3.5.3.6	Specific Impurities	166
3.5.4	Summary	169
3.6	In Pursuit of the Millennium	170
3.6.1	The Hasmonean Expansion	172
3.6.2	Millenarian Hopes Under Roman Rule	177
3.6.3	The Peasant Farmer	179
3.6.4	Banditry, Rebellion and Royal Pretenders	181
3.6.5	The Sicarii	182
3.6.6	The Sign Prophets	182
3.6.7	The Great Revolt	183
3.6.8	Israel Without a Temple and Its Land	185
3.6.9	Summary: The Hope for the Restoration of Israel	188
3.7	Kinship	190
3.7.1	The Patriarchal Family	192
3.7.2	Marriage	194
3.7.3	The Father-Son Relationship	196
3.7.4	Summary	199

3.8	What of the Gentiles?	200
3.8.1	A Clash of Cultures	200
3.8.2	God-Fearers and Proselytes	204
<b>4.</b>	<b>WHO WERE THE GALILEANS?</b>	<b>209</b>
4.1	Introduction	209
4.2	The Galileans as Descendants of Northern Israelites	210
4.3	Galilee After the Assyrian Conquest	212
4.4	The Settlement of Galilee in the Late Hellenistic Period	214
4.5	The Cultural Continuity Between Judea and Galilee	217
4.6	Galilee and Judeanism: Other Evidence	219
4.7	Woe to Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum	223
4.8	Sepphoris and Tiberias	226
4.9	Hellenisation and the Use of Greek in Galilee	229
4.10	Galilee During and After the Great Revolt	231
4.11	Findings	234
<b>5.</b>	<b>JUDEAN ETHNICITY IN Q</b>	<b>236</b>
5.1	Introduction	236
5.2	The Approach to Q	237
5.2.1	A Stratified Q?	239
5.2.2	The Formative Stratum	242
5.2.3	The Main Redaction	246
5.2.4	The Final Redaction of Q	250
5.2.5	Refining Our Approach to Q	251
5.2.6	The Date and Provenance of Q	261
5.2.6.1	Date	261
5.2.6.2	Provenance	261
5.2.7	Summary	262
5.3	Judean Ethnicity in Q	263
5.3.1	The Main Redaction (Q <sup>2</sup> )	263
5.3.1.1	The Habitus/Israel	263
5.3.1.1.1	Name	264
5.3.1.1.2	Language	265
5.3.1.1.3	Religion and Covenantal Praxis	267
5.3.1.1.4	Kinship	270

5.3.1.1.4.1	The Q People and Broader Israel	270
5.3.1.1.4.2	The Q People and the Family	279
5.3.1.1.4.3	Summary	280
5.3.1.1.5	Land	281
5.3.1.2	The Sacred Canopy	283
5.3.1.2.1	The Christology of the Main Redaction	283
5.3.1.2.1.1	Jesus, the Eschatological Prophet	284
5.3.1.2.1.2	Jesus the Son of humanity/man	288
5.3.1.2.1.3	Jesus the Lord/Master	291
5.3.1.2.1.4	Jesus the Son of God	291
5.3.1.2.1.5	Summary	294
5.3.1.2.2	The Torah and the Kingdom of God	295
5.3.1.2.3	Shared “Historical” Memories	301
5.3.1.2.4	Myths of Common Ancestry	306
5.3.1.2.5	The Eschatology of the Main Redaction	309
5.3.1.2.5.1	Judgement	309
5.3.1.2.5.2	The End Has Arrived!	311
5.3.1.2.5.3	The Coming of the Son of humanity/man	312
5.3.1.2.5.4	Summary	314
5.3.1.2.6	The Gentiles	314
5.3.2	The Formative Stratum (Q <sup>1</sup> )	318
5.3.2.1	The Habitus/Israel	318
5.3.2.1.1	Religion and Covenantal Praxis	318
5.3.2.1.2	Kinship	319
5.3.2.1.2.1	The Q People and Broader Israel	319
5.3.2.1.2.2	The Q People and the Family	323
5.3.2.1.2.3	Summary	329
5.3.2.2	The Sacred Canopy	330
5.3.2.2.1	The Christology of the Formative Stratum	330
5.3.2.2.2	The Torah and the Kingdom of God	332
5.3.2.2.3	Shared “Historical” Memories	336
5.3.2.2.4	The Eschatology of the Formative Stratum	337
5.4	Thesis: The Reconstruction of Judean Ethnicity in Q	341
5.4.1	The Habitus/Israel	341
5.4.2	The Sacred Canopy	345
5.4.3	The Gentiles	350

5.4.4	Findings: So What Kind of Judeans Were the Q People?	351
5.4.4.1	The Habitus/Israel	351
5.4.4.2	The Sacred Canopy	352
5.4.4.3	A Last Word	353
5.4.4.4	Resumé	354
<b>WORKS CONSULTED</b>		<b>356</b>
<b>SUMMARY</b>		<b>368</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>		<b>370</b>
<b>KEY TERMS</b>		<b>371</b>

## **Preface**

It is with immense gratitude to the following persons by which I offer the research in these pages. First of all, to my soul mate, who lovingly accepted the fact that I had to sit many hours while typing up and refining this work. Her support, patience and understanding is greatly appreciated. To my parents, whose support and encouragement from the beginning of my studies made a world of difference. I thank them for the opportunities that they as loving parents granted to me. To Johann Kitching, whose support made it possible for this dissertation to be completed in a shorter space of time than usual. I hope this effort will also in a way contribute to his vision for the development of the Lord's Work. A deep gratitude is also extended to the various scholars with whom I engage in the work to follow. Without their effort and insights, a work like this would simply not have been possible. Then a special word of heartfelt thanks to Prof Dr Andries van Aarde, who during this time period had to contend with serious illness. His passion and dedication through it all is a real inspiration. This work benefited greatly from hours of discussion and his vast insight made this a journey of wonderful discovery. I pray that our Heavenly Father will grant him wellness, and this work is dedicated to him.

Markus Cromhout  
Johannesburg, October 2005



## Abbreviations

### Tanak/Old Testament

Gn	Genesis	Ec	Ecclesiastes
Ex	Exodus	Can	Canticles
Lv	Leviticus	Is	Isaiah
Nm	Numbers	Jr	Jeremiah
Dt	Deuteronomy	Lm	Lamentations
Jos	Joshua	Ezk	Ezekiel
Jdg	Judges	Dn	Daniel
Rt	Ruth	Hs	Hosea
1 Sm	1 Samuel	Jl	Joel
2 Sm	2 Samuel	Am	Amos
1 Ki	1 Kings	Ob	Obadiah
2 Ki	2 Kings	Jnh	Jonah
1 Chr	1 Chronicles	Mi	Micah
2 Chr	2 Chronicles	Nah	Nahum
Ezr	Ezra	Hab	Habakkuk
Neh	Nehemiah	Zph	Zephaniah
Es	Esther	Hg	Haggai
Job	Job	Zch	Zechariah
Ps	Psalms	Ml	Malachi
Pr	Proverbs		

### New Testament

Mt	Matthew	1 Tm	1 Timothy
Mk	Mark	2 Tm	2 Timothy
Lk	Luke	Tt	Titus
Jn	John	Phlm	Philemon
Ac	Acts	Heb	Hebrews
Rm	Romans	Ja	James
1 Cor	1 Corinthians	1 Pt	1 Peter
2 Cor	2 Corinthians	2 Pt	2 Peter
Gl	Galatians	1 Jn	1 John

Eph	Ephesians	2 Jn	2 John
Phlp	Philippians	3 Jn	3 John
Col	Colossians	Jude	Jude
1 Th	1 Thessalonians	Rv	Revelation
2 Th	2 Thessalonians		

### Apocrypha

2 Ezra	2 Ezra	1 Bar	1 Baruch
4 Ezra	4 Ezra	LetJer	Letter of Jeremiah
Tob	Tobit	PrAzar	Prayer of Azariah
Jdt	Judith	Sus	Susanna
AddEsth	Additions to Esther	Bel	Bel and the Dragon
WisSol	Wisdom of Solomon	1 Mac	1 Maccabees
Sir	Sirach	2 Mac	2 Maccabees

### Pseudepigrapha

ApAb	Apocalypse of Abraham	ApMos	Apocalypse of Moses
TAb	Testament of Abraham	TMos	Testament of Moses
ApAdam	Apocalypse of Adam	Ps-Philo	Pseudo-Philo
TAdam	Testament of Adam	LivPro	Lives of the Prophets
LAE	Life of Adam and Eve	SibOr	Sibylline Oracles
LetAris	Letter of Aristeas	PssSol	Psalms of Solomon
2 Bar	2 (Syriac) Baruch	TSol	Testament of Solomon
3 Bar	3 (Greek) Baruch	T12P	Testaments of the Twelve
4 Bar	4 Baruch		Patriarchs
ApDan	Apocalypse of Daniel	TReu	Testament of Reuben
1 En	1 (Ethiopic) Enoch	TSim	Testament of Simeon
2 En	2 (Slavonic) Enoch	TLevi	Testament of Levi
EzekTrag	Ezekiel the Tragedian	TJud	Testament of Judah
TIsaac	Testament of Isaac	TIss	Testament of Issachar
AscenIs	Ascension of Isaiah	TZeb	Testament of Zebulun
TJac	Testament of Jacob	TDan	Testament of Dan
JanJam	Jannes and Jambres	TNaph	Testament of Naphtali
TJob	Testament of Job	TGad	Testament of Gad

JosAsen	Joseph and Asenath	TAsh	Testament of Asher
Jub	Jubilees	TJos	Testament of Joseph
3 Mac	3 Maccabees	TBenj	Testament of Benjamin
4 Mac	4 Maccabees	Vita	Vita Adae et Evae
PrMan	Prayer of Manasseh		

### Dead Sea Scrolls

CD	The Damascus Document	4QpIsa <sup>d</sup>	Isaiah Peshier 1
1QH	The Thanksgiving Hymns	4QTest	Testimonies
1QS	Rule of the Community	4QpsDan	Pseudo Daniel
1QM	War Scroll (4Q471 <sup>a</sup> )	4Q381	Non-canonical Psalms
1QpHab	Habakkuk Peshier	4Q512	Purification Ritual
1QpMic	Micah Peshier	4Q521	Messianic Apocalypse
3Q15	The Copper Scroll	11QTemple	Temple Scroll
4QMMT	More Works of the Torah	11QMelch	Melchizedek

### Philo

Abraham	On Abraham	PreStudies	On the Preliminary
Creation	On the Creation of the World	Providence	Studies On Providence
Decal	On the Decalogue	Rewards	On Rewards and
Embassy	The Embassy to Gaius		Punishments
Flaccus	Against Flaccus	SpecLaws	On the Special Laws
Hyp	Hypothetica	Virtues	On the Virtues
		QExodus	Questions and Answers on Exodus
MigAbraham	On the Migration of Abraham	QGenesis	Questions and Answers on Genesis
Moses	The Life of Moses		
Omnis Probus	Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit (That Every Good Person Is Free)		

### Josephus

Ant	Jewish Antiquities	Life	Life of Josephus
Apion	Against Apion	War	Jewish Wars

### New Testament Apocrypha and Related Texts

2 Clem	2 Clement	EgerGos	Egerton Gospel
Did	Didache	GThom	Gospel of Thomas
GEbion	Gospel of the Ebionites	POxy	Papyrus Oxyrhynchus

### Early Fathers

HE	Eusebius, <i>Historica ecclesiastica</i>
PrEv	Eusebius, <i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>

### Rabbinics

Ab	Abot	Par	Parah
Arak	Arakhin	Pes	Pesahim
ARN	Abot de-Rabbi Nathan	PRE	Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer
AZ	'Abodah Zarah	Sanh	Sanhedrin
b.	Babylonian Talmud	Shab	Shabbat
BB	Baba Batra	Sheb	Shebiit
Ber	Berakot	Sheq	Sheqalim
Bikk	Bikkurim	SifDt	Sifre Deuteronomy
BM	Batei Midrashot	SifNm	Sifre Numbers
Dem	Demai	Sot	Sotah
'Eduy	'Eduyyot	Sukk	Sukkah
'Erub	'Erubin	t.	Tosephta
ExR	Semot Rabbah	TargCan	Targum Canticles
Gitt	Gittin	TargEzk	Targum Ezekiel
Hor	Horayot	TargIs	Targum Isaiah
Kel	Kelim	TargJon	Targum Jonathan
Ker	Keritot	TargNeof	Targum Neofiti
Ket	Ketubot	TargNm	Targum Numbers

Kid	Kiddushin	TargOnk	Targum Onkelos
LamR	Ekah Rabbah	TargYer	Targum Yerushalmi
m.	Mishnah	TargPsJon	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Maas	Maaserot	Ter	Terumot
Meg	Megillah	y.	Jerusalem Talmud
Mik	Mikwa'ot	Yeb	Yebamot
Ned	Nedarim	Yom	Yoma
Nid	Niddah		

**Gentile Authors**

Hist	Tacitus, <i>Histories</i>	Sat	Juvenal, <i>Satire</i>
------	---------------------------	-----	------------------------

## Introduction

A friend of mine, who performs missionary work among the Zulu's 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 Zulu's 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. So out of a sense of frustration my friend told them: “You must now decide whether you want to be part of the Kingdom of the Zulu, or the Kingdom of God”. Whatever you make of his statements, 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”)? What David Sim states in the following passage 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)

This study is to 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 we prefer 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 Ἰουδαῖοι 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.

Lets first focus on the term Judean. The term Judean (Ἰουδαῖος) begins as a way to identify someone from Judea (Ἰουδαία) (Josephus, Ant 11.173). According to Dunn, for its early usage Ἰουδαῖος 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 Ἰουδαῖος 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 Mac 6:6 and 9:17. Here Ἰουδαῖος for the first time can be properly translated as “Jew”. In Greco-Roman writers Ἰουδαῖος was first used as a religious term at the end of the first century. Dunn (2003:262-263) 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?

We would argue that 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<sup>1</sup> (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 [Ἰουδαῖοι] with the territory called Ἰουδαία 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 (2003:262-263) 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 points out 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.” What particularly convinced Esler to translate Ἰουδαῖοι as “Judeans” is a passage from Josephus (War 2.43ff; cf Ant 17.254), which describes that “the people”, that is Galileans, Idumeans and Pereans, *and people from Judea itself* (ὁ γνήσιος ἐξ αὐτῆς Ἰουδαίας λαός) came to Jerusalem in response to the actions of Sabinus, the Roman procurator of Syria, an event dated to 4 BCE. Esler (2003:67)

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be emphasized that we basically agree with Dunn on matters of content, with disagreement restricted to the matter of terminology, and what he sees as “ambivalence” between ethno-geographical identity and religious identity by the use of the term Ἰουδαῖος (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.



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 Ἰουδαῖοι”. 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 we argued against Dunn with regard to the term Judean is also true for the term Judeanism (Ἰουδαϊσμός). Here we follow the translation of the BDAG, instead of the usual “Judaism”. The Greek term Ἰουδαϊσμός appears first in 2 Maccabees in three passages (2:21; 8:1; 14:38). It also appears in 4 Mac 4:26 and Paul himself boasts how he had excelled in Judeanism beyond many of his peers (Gl 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 (our preferred translation) started as a Judean self-reference, reflecting the perspective of Hellenistic Judeanism. Be that as it may, in 2 Maccabees Ἰουδαϊσμός is coined to counter Ἑλληνισμός (“Hellenism”; 2 Mac 4:13) and ἀλλοφυλισμός (“foreignness”; 2 Mac 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).

So we will use Judean and Judeanism throughout whether they are used as “insider” or “outsider” designations. In the pages that follow we are therefore also deliberately replacing “Jew(s)” and “Judaism” 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”. Our 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 we are arguing 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 (Duling 2003a:8). The religious-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 we believe that his argument has 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 to this Thesis**

In chapter 1, our 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 we will do an overview of the work of two important scholars in this field; John P Meier and John D 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 our approach to Judeanism varies from the norm, in that we understand it 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 & Luckmann’s theories on the sociology of knowledge; Dunn’s “four pillars of Second Temple Judeanism”, 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 we will term 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 our model will be elaborated upon 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 as we shall argue, 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. We will adopt an approach where Q will consist of two stratum, therefore modifying Kloppenborg’s own approach of three stratum. Each stratum will be investigated on its own and the findings of our analyses will be explained. As a preliminary thesis we will state the following: *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 our journey now begins in all earnest, it is part of our hope that a realisation 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 ethnic 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, we hope, even applicable to the Q people, will become clearer as this investigation unfolds.