

THE TRUE ISRAEL
USES OF THE NAMES JEW, HEBREW AND ISRAEL
IN ANCIENT JEWISH LITERATURE

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Religious Studies

Graham A.P. Harvey.

Department of Religious Studies
April 1991

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

089 61481 0

L3765

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

ABSTRACT

1. It is often asserted that the phrase "True Israel" sums up the interests and aims of any group within ancient Judaism. This thesis examines the extant literature of the period to determine whether this reflects the actual situation. Its approach is to examine the associations of "Israel" together with those of the two most closely related terms, "Jew" and "Hebrew". Only these three terms were used to describe the people in all Jewish literature.

2. "Jew" is primarily associated with Judah and Jerusalem whether those so labelled live in Palestine or elsewhere. Additional associations given to the name depend on views of what has happened in the region and especially in Jerusalem.

3. "Hebrew" occurs less frequently than the other two terms and was conventionally associated with conservatism or traditional values. Links with Abraham are central to this association. "Hebrew" was especially used by those who wished to appear conservative rather than innovative.

4. "Israel" is not associated with a perfect community (even in the phrase "the God of Israel"). It is most commonly the name of an audience a writer wishes to convince or convert. It labels every generation of the people's history and refers to both "good" and "bad". The "true Israel" of ancient Judaism is not a "pure Israel".

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	The Problem	1
1.2	Previous Approaches	4
1.3	Present Approach	6
 PART ONE: "JEW" IN ANCIENT JEWISH LITERATURE		
2	JEW IN THE MT	10
2.1	From Ancestor to Territory	11
2.2	From Land to Individual	13
2.3	Land	13
2.4	People	14
2.5	Individuals	15
2.6	Trends	16
2.7	Occurrences in Aramaic	16
2.8	Conclusion	17
3	JEW IN JOSEPHUS	18
3.1	Distribution Pattern	18
3.2	Self-designation	19
3.3	Sources and Subjects	19
3.4	Origins	20
3.5	Territory	21
3.6	People and Neighbours	22
3.7	Character	24
3.8	Religion	24
3.9	Judas	29
3.10	Conclusion	30
4	JEW IN PHILO	31
4.1	Conclusion	33
5	JEW IN QUMRAN LITERATURE	35
5.1	War Rule	35
5.2	Testimonia and Pesher on Zephaniah	36
5.3	Damascus Document	36
5.4	Pesharim	39
5.5	Heavenly Lights and Blessings of Jacob	41
5.6	Fragments	42
5.7	Florilegium and Lamentations	43
5.8	Personal Name In wadi Murraba ^c at	43
5.9	Conclusion	44

6	JEW IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE	45
6.1	Occurrences and Associations	45
6.2	Specific Texts	48
6.3	Luke and Acts	49
6.4	John	53
6.5	Galatians	60
6.6	Romans	67
6.7	Revelation	69
6.8	Ignatius	70
6.9	Conclusion	70

PART TWO: "HEBREW" IN ANCIENT JEWISH LITERATURE

7	HEBREW	75
7.1	MT	75
7.2	Samaritans	80
7.3	Septuagint	81
7.4	Pseudepigrapha	85
7.5	Targumim	87
7.6	Targum Onqelos	88
7.7	Targum Jonathan	89
7.8	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan	90
7.9	Targum Yerusalmi I	91
7.10	Targum Neofiti	91
7.11	Qumran Literature and Murabba'at Texts	92
7.12	Philo of Alexandria	94
7.13	Flavius Josephus	96
7.14	Early Christian Literature	101
7.15	Gentile Greek and Latin Authors	113
7.16	Conclusion	116

PART THREE: "ISRAEL" IN ANCIENT JEWISH LITERATURE

8	ISRAEL IN THE MT	119
8.1	Etymologies	120
8.2	People: <u>bene yiśra'el</u>	122
8.3	People: <u>'am yiśra'el</u>	125
8.4	People: <u>'iš yiśra'el</u>	128
8.5	Congregation	130
8.6	House	131
8.7	Israel and Judah	134
8.8	Northern kingdom	135
8.9	Tribes	136
8.10	God	137
8.11	Holy One	143
8.12	Land and Places	145
8.13	Borders, Sanctuaries and Cities	150
8.14	Possessions	152
8.15	Conclusion	154

9	ISRAEL IN PHILO	156
9.1	Ancestor	156
9.2	People	157
9.3	Biblical Occurrences	158
9.4	Non-Allegorical Usage	158
9.5	Philo's Contemporaries	158
9.6	Exhortations	159
9.7	Philo's Influence	159
9.8	Conclusion	161
10	ISRAEL IN QUMRAN LITERATURE	162
10.1	Community Rule	162
10.2	Damascus Document	164
10.3	Rule of the Congregation	166
10.4	War Scroll	167
10.5	Words of Heavenly Lights	169
10.6	Blessings of Jacob	170
10.7	Words of Moses	170
10.8	Pesharim	171
10.9	Midrash on the Last Days	173
10.10	Messianic Anthology	174
10.11	Daily Prayers	175
10.12	Ordinances	175
10.13	Visions of Amram	176
10.14	Temple Scroll	176
10.15	Conclusion	178
11	ISRAEL IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE	180
11.1	Matthew	180
11.2	Mark	183
11.3	Luke and Acts	184
11.4	John	191
11.5	Romans	195
11.6	1 Corinthians	198
11.7	2 Corinthians and Philippians	199
11.8	Galatians	200
11.9	Ephesians	201
11.10	Revelation	201
11.11	Conclusion	202
12	CONCLUSION	204

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My first thanks are to John F.A. Sawyer for his supervision of my research. I hope that the end product, this thesis, makes it clear how much I have learnt from him. Obviously its methodology is influenced by his own work, but so too are some of its interests (and maybe obsessions). Equally obviously, any failings of the thesis are probably due to having paid insufficient attention to Prof. Sawyer's advice.

I am grateful to Leslie C. Allen, firstly for his evident enthusiasm in teaching Hebrew, and secondly for suggesting Prof. Sawyer as a supervisor.

I owe Stephen Rushton, of the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Science, considerable gratitude for his advice, help and participation in the application of multivariate classification and ordination techniques in this research.

The Computer Department provided advice and assistance at a number of points in the research, word-processing and printing of this thesis. Judith Hunter has been particularly helpful.

Tyndale House, Cambridge, supported my research financially during the years 1984 to 1986. I am grateful to them for this help.

More personally, among the most important people to me over my years in Newcastle are Steve and Sara, Mike and Sally, Caroline, Molly, Bernadette, Jon, Claire, Carol, Mishmish and Ariel. I would also like to thank all those who have shared my love for Eddybroth and her woods.

To my parents and family I owe more than I can begin to say, for their love, support and encouragement, for financial assistance and for many welcome (though not always well-earned) breaks.

Dedwydd un ai gwyl ai câr

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in this thesis are those of CBQ 50 (1988) 769-776.

Abbreviations for the works of Philo are those of Wolfson, Philo, 462.

The following additional abbreviations occur:

<u>CCARJ</u>	<u>Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal.</u>
<u>CCL</u>	"Canonised Christian Literature"; refers to those texts usually labelled "the New Testament".
<u>CD</u>	"The Damascus Document";
<u>CD</u>	Barth, <u>Church Dogmatics.</u>
<u>CHJ</u>	<u>The Cambridge History of Judaism</u> (eds.: Davies, W.D., Finkelstein).
<u>DBI</u>	<u>A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation</u> (eds.: Coggins, Houlden).
<u>ES</u>	Even-Shoshan, A., <u>Konkordansiah Hadašah leTorah Nebi'im uKetubim.</u>
<u>DBI</u>	<u>Illustrated Bible Dictionary.</u>
<u>FJB</u>	<u>Frankfurter Judaistische Beitrage.</u>
<u>JSI</u>	<u>Journal of Social Issues.</u>
<u>QJR</u>	<u>Michigan Quarterly Review.</u>
<u>NIDNTT</u>	<u>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</u> (ed.: Brown, C.).
<u>PIBI</u>	<u>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Institute.</u>
SSRC: RCR	the Social Sciences Research Council: Reviews of Current Research.
QL	Qumran Literature.

Transliteration

The transliterated Hebrew and Aramaic alphabet used in this thesis is as follows:

ʾ b g d h w z h t y k l m n s ʿ p s q r ś š t.

Hebrew and Aramaic are transliterated with vowels in discussions of the MT but not of QL. However, no distinction is made between vowels of different length, i.e. e stands for šewa, segol and sere.

The transliterated Greek alphabet is as follows:

a b g d e z ē th i k l m n x o p r s t u ph ch ps ō; h
signifies a rough breathing.

SOME AVOIDED TERMS

In this thesis several common terms are not used. To me, "patriarch(s)" and "patriarchal" have overwhelmingly masculinist and therefore negative connotations. I use "ancestor(s)" and "ancestral" in their place except where they are used by other authors. This does mean that at times I have used the inclusive "ancestors" in place of a text's masculine "fathers".

I have also consistently capitalised "God(s)". I intend, by using capital letters, to make the point that there is very little difference between God and the Gods. A similar point is made by the opposite method, lower case "g", by Cohen [1].

Except in quotations gender terms are only applied where accurate. Whilst the ancestor "Israel" may be referred to as "he", the people "Israel" are not [2]. The word "man" is only used to refer to individual men. Divinities are not assumed to be male, but "the God of Israel" may be referred to as "he" in biblical or other quotations [3].

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

What's in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other word would smell as sweet [4].

This thesis examines the uses of the names, "Jew", "Hebrew" and "Israel" in surviving ancient Jewish literature. Its purpose is to understand the different appreciations of the nature of "Israel" among the diverse groups which together form ancient Judaism. According to many commentators the phrase "True Israel" sums up the interests and aims of any of the constituent Judaisms of ancient Judaism. However, examination of the uses made of the names shows that the theory of the "True Israel" is an inaccurate imposition on a diverse and somewhat pluralistic situation.

1.1 THE PROBLEM

The earliest surviving occurrence of the collocation of "Israel" with "True" in the phrase "True Israel" is in the writings of the Christian Justin Martyr in the second century CE [5]. This clearly exemplifies Christianity's separation of itself from Judaism whilst claiming the entire inheritance of earlier Israelite tradition [6]. Christianity continued to use names and literature of the period when it had been one of the Judaisms of ancient Judaism. Taking for itself the name "True Israel" it stressed the negative associations given by some of the earliest Christians to the name "Jew". The associations of "Hebrew" with ancestral tradition made it the obvious word to choose for those writers who thought there were some "good Jews". Some of these associations were common to the literature of ancient Judaism, but Christianity's unique developments led to unique uses.

"Ancient Judaism" is itself problematical [7]. Other partly synonymous labels are available and widely used for the period labelled "ancient". In terms of dates applicable to Jewish and Christian historiography, the period of interest is roughly 300 BCE to 150 CE [8]. This excludes Mishnah and Talmud.

Other labels which refer to wider cultural and political influences on the contemporary world

(e.g. "the Persian period", "the Hellenistic Period" and "the Graeco-Roman period") are also available [9].

Judaism in this period has been labelled "late Judaism", or Spätjudentum [10]. This is unacceptable (not merely "rather doubtful" and "odd" [11]) because it implies degeneration from an earlier purer Judaism [12].

Similarly, the labelling of the period "Inter-testamental" implies that its literature is of less value than that of the "Old" and "New" Testaments [13] or that little of significance happened in the period [14]. "Judaism in the Age of Jesus Christ" is inaccurate and also highly inappropriate. Sometimes the period is dealt with explicitly as "New Testament Background" [15].

"Early Judaism" is less objectionable, but is not useful as it implies that a later Judaism developed from something in this period [16]. Certainly what became "Rabbinic Judaism" had roots in an earlier period [17]. However, nothing within the period, its literature or groups determined that this particular development would take place. At whatever date "Orthodox Judaism" was recognisable [18] no such entity existed in this period [19].

The label "Second Temple Period" [20] is useful, but covers too wide a period (515 BCE to 70 CE). Some of the literature discussed dates from after the destruction of the Second Temple (e.g: the letters of Bar Kochba).

The label "ancient" is to be understood as a temporal marker, opposed to "mediaeval" and "modern". It does not imply "merely of antiquarian interest". The period is "ancient" compared with today but is not simply a prelude to more recent periods. What took place among the Jews and other peoples in that period was formative of later history.

The literature discussed includes not only works actually written in that period but also works distributed, heard or read then.

The continuing use of the bible [21] during this period makes it a contemporary text and its usage of names contemporary with usage in sources actually written in the period [22]. There is a "fundamental synchronicity" between these texts and others read or heard in the period [23]. This involves "respect and confidence for the Massoretic tradition, both in the

details of the text and in literary contexts, great and small" [24] as one text alongside other literature of the period as a contemporary text.

In addition to the bible in Hebrew I also comment on the occurrences (and non-occurrences) of the three names in the LXX [25]. The LXX is not a straightforward translation from a Hebrew Vorlage but has its own interests and contains its own polemic [26].

Literature written in the period includes some now labelled "apocryphal" [27] or "pseudepigraphical", the extant works of Josephus and Philo and surviving texts from near the Dead Sea. Documents now collected as the "New Testament" (which I refer to as "Canonised Christian Literature" [CCL] to avoid the implication that there might be an "Old Testament" too [28]) are also part of the Jewish literature of the period. I also note some material from inscriptions (e.g. from Corinth and Rome).

Tannaitic sources are not discussed, though their occurrences were examined. Discussion of this material would add little to the argument, other than further examples, as they are either identical with or developments from uses in literature discussed. Some works of a later date are discussed (for example the Targumim and works by some Christians) [29]. However, these are illustrative of continuing trends in the use of the names, rather than being vital to the argument itself. It was felt that it was useful to do this especially in the case of Christian uses as it is here that certain key innovations took place. The name "Jew" acquired increasingly negative connotations while the associations of the name "Hebrew" gained added value.

I make no claim that any individual or group would have seen or heard much of this literature. Some of it may not even be representative of any group's ideology. For example, I have avoided synthesizing material from QL as it is not clear that the entire collection would have been read by one group, or that those texts which were read (rather than just being stored away) had equal value or were some sort of Canon [30].

An examination of the three names, "Jew", "Hebrew" and "Israel", will show that this construct, "the True Israel", does not represent the views of any of the Judaisms of the period. It will clarify exactly which associations of the names were central and will reveal the real Israel of ancient Jewish literature.

1.2 PREVIOUS APPROACHES

Previous approaches have been problematic for a number of reasons. Studies of "Jew" are more adequate than those of "Hebrew" and "Israel" but are flawed by the apologetic motives of researchers. Two major weaknesses in previous studies of the names "Hebrew" and "Israel" are both aspects of a genetic fallacy. Believing that it is sufficient to explain the origins of something, most previous approaches have studied these names in either an etymological or archaeological manner.

Coote's article "the meaning of the name Israel" says little about the way the name is actually used but explores a theoretical origin of the name [31]. Margalith cites Philo and Josephus as evidence in a quest for the original meaning and pronunciation of "Israel" [32]. Many dictionary articles begin, at least, with an etymological discussion.

Matsuda says that,

traditional approaches to "original meaning", or etymology, are nothing but transference of the problem to the level of the other cognate indeed, but culturally and historically different languages; even if the sense of these cognate words would become manifest, there would be nothing to assure that they should have an exactly identical sense with the word in question [33].

As Barr says, "The point is that the etymology (of a word) is not a statement about its meaning but about its history" [34]. Both Barr and Sawyer emphasise that etymology does have a role in biblical research but not the dominant role given to it in, for example, dictionaries in which Hebrew words are arranged alphabetically according to "roots" [35].

The related "archaeological" approach is particularly applied in studies of "Hebrew", the majority of which are discussions of the origins of the people. "Hebrew" is seen to be cognate with 'apiru or habiru and this initially etymological approach, leads to discussion of the social character of the first ancestors of the people. Gray and Loretz devote an article and a book respectively to this debate [36].

None of the literature discussed is interested in these issues. The MT knows nothing about the habiru and

uses 'ibrim as a gentilic partly synonymous with yiśra'el and yehudim. I will explore the full range of associations of the names in their contexts to discover, not some proposed original meaning, but the way they are actual used.

In discussing "Jew", "Hebrew" and "Israel" etymologies are only relevant when they occur in the literature, i.e. in the context of the words examined (e.g. Philo's claim that "Israel" means "One who sees God").

Another weakness of some studies is their reliance on a theory that some names are those applied by "outsiders" while others are those of "insiders" [37]. It is undeniable that foreigners are often referred to in the context of occurrences of "Hebrew" and that it often occurs in speeches attributed to foreigners. However, foreigners are also able to use both "Jew" and "Israel". More significantly, this theory presupposes that the literature was interested in the accurate historical reporting of, for example, the words spoken by hostile Philistines. This is a dubious assumption which will not be followed here. There are no records by "outsiders" of what the Philistines actually said. All that is available to us is the words of "insiders" to other "insiders". The words attributed to "outsiders" must not be taken to be evidence of actual usage.

Neither the etymological nor the "insiders versus outsiders" approach adequately explains why writers used one name rather than another. Nor do they properly explain the actual range of uses of each name and its different associations and referents.

Much of what has passed for study of ancient Judaism has been motivated and dominated by partisan issues, the denigration or justification of Judaism for example. One effect of this polemic is that discussion of the name "Jew" has been seriously affected by negative overtones given to it by Christians. This might be behind claims that the name is primarily an "outsider's" designation for a people who preferred to use the more exalted "Israel" in spite of the evidence that converts to Judaism sometimes took the name "Jew" and even "Judas" [38]. Christians have also given the term "Judaize" negative associations which it does not have in the literature studied here.

1.3 PRESENT APPROACH

The approach adopted here is based on the theory of associative fields [39]. Every word occurs in context and must be discussed in context, indeed the meaning of words can only be ascertained from their contexts. At the same time, each word is associated with other words in different sorts of fields. These include antonyms, synonyms, words that sound alike or have some kind of conventional association [40]. Within this wider associative field, a narrower lexical group composed of those words which are more closely related, that is more or less synonyms, can be separated [41]. Additionally, a writer's choice of words used is not determined by their conventional associations but each user will bring to a word their own associations [42].

"Jew", "Hebrew" and "Israel" make up the central core of the field, the narrow lexical group and are discussed in their literary contexts to determine what other words are most closely associated with them. Who is the name applied to? What other words occur in the context which act as synonyms or antonyms? Why is this name used here rather than any other? When certain words occur frequently in the context of each name it is probable that they are conventional associations. Every occurrence of these names in the extant literature (including inscriptions and coins) has been considered and all their actual associations and collocations discussed. For clarity it was found to be preferable to provide examples rather than list every occurrence exhaustively.

The discussion is divided into three parts, one devoted to each name, with separate chapters dealing with distinct literatures. The methodology applied requires that each section and chapter refer to other chapters and sections. Each word discussed has some relationship to other the other names. Therefore, for example, the chapter on "Hebrew" contains some discussion relevant to the section on "Israel". The concluding chapter summarizes the conclusions of the individual chapters, with particular interest in the question of what influenced a writer's choice to use one name rather than another.

Part One, concerned with "Jew", is divided into five chapters. "Jew in the MT" explores occurrences which would have been the common inheritance of all ancient Jewish groups and are themselves an integral part of ancient Jewish usage. Biblical usage is synchronous with all other uses read or heard in the period and is

not merely some prelude to the discussion of other literature. Usage of "Jew" in the works of Josephus and Philo is less controversial and exemplifies widespread neutral or general use of the name. Other literatures, including QL and CCL, can use "Jew" as a general name for the people but often give it strongly negative associations.

It is often necessary (if problematical) to decide whether "Judean" or "Jew" is a better English translation-equivalent of the various Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic forms. This is suggestive of its wide range of possible associations. Whilst it can refer to a geo-political region and its inhabitants, it can also refer to the religion of people who may not live in that region. As the religious usage occurs because of links to the region the name's associations depend on views of what has happened in the region and especially in Jerusalem. In QL and the CCL the name's associations reflect negative relationships with other groups in Jerusalem.

The discussion of the name "Hebrew" in Part Two begins by noting its relative infrequency in comparison with the names "Jew" and "Israel". Its most significant association is with conservatism or traditionalism and opposed to innovation. The association of "Hebrew" with Abraham is central to this association. Reference to a language called "Hebrew" is less significant. It will be seen that the name "Hebrew" (as opposed to "Jew" or "Israel") is used when a writer wishes to write about a "good Jew".

Part Three, concerned with "Israel", is divided into four chapters which are also based on an examination of every occurrence in the literature. These are longer chapters because one of my central contentions is that there was no "true Israel" belief in ancient Judaism(s). To make certain of this point the occurrences of "Israel" are examined in considerable depth. Recent discussions of the name "Israel" are more numerous than those of the other names.

"Israel" is rarely associated with a perfect community (even in the phrase "the God of Israel"). It is most commonly the name of an audience a writer wishes to convince or convert. It is usually a mixed community including those commended and those condemned and is applicable to every generation of the people's history.

One of my main contentions is that the Israel described in ancient Jewish texts was not a "pure

Israel" but a mixed community. Each of the three names can be used to stress the claims of a writer to be at the centre of the people's ancestral tradition. The literature discussed is not unbiased but hopes for a response from its readers or hearers, but it does not deny to "outsiders" the use of the names "Jew", "Hebrew" or "Israel". The "true Israel" in ancient Jewish literature is not a "Pure Israel".

Part One: "Jew" in ancient Jewish Literature

CHAPTER TWO

JEW IN THE MT

In this chapter I have no new information about the uses of the name. For the most part existing discussions are adequate for the purposes of this thesis. There are some areas of disagreement but these are generally in such areas as etymology which it is not my purpose to discuss. The purpose of this chapter is, therefore, to note uses made of "Judah" and cite some examples. It is a brief but important chapter.

If approached in order of occurrence in the MT "Judah" progresses from being the name of an individual to being that of a group and / or a territory. The stages in this development are: the name of an ancestor, his children, all the descendants as they become a tribe, then a kingdom. Then it is the name of a province and its inhabitants. At some point within this development it gains the meaning, "the religion of the people and / or province". For those people who left the territory, taking the religion with them, the name has less to do with belonging in the territory than it has to do with belonging to a people from the territory.

It is curious, however, that, even when the word clearly refers to this distinctive religion, it is never collocated with words for "God" [43]. In the range of surviving literature there are places where the phrase "the God of Judah" or "the God of the Jews" could occur, but does not. In Isa 2:3 "the Mountain of YHWH" is "Zion" and "the House of the God of Jacob" is certainly the Jerusalem Temple. "The God of Judah" would not be out of place here. In Borges' "The Garden of Forking Paths" there is a debate about the non-usage of the word "time" in a book that one disputant claims is about time. To explain the "voluntary omission" of the word "time" the question is posed,

"In a riddle whose answer is chess, what is the only prohibited word?" [44].

The answer is, obviously, "chess". If a writer were claiming that a God was particularly "the God of Judah" there are many ways in which this could be done without the actual phrase "the God of Judah" ever occurring.

This description of the developing uses of the name would be obvious to one who deliberately set out to think about the word by reading the texts in canonical order. A different sense of the name is gained by

realising that the approximately 810 occurrences of "Judah" fall into three broad uses. "Some 40 times it refers to an individual, about 290 times it refers to a tribe or people, and 480 times it refers to the land or political entity" [45].

The first approach stresses descent from the ancestor. The second stresses relationship to the land. Whilst the two approaches are complementary they have roles in two different ideologies of nationhood. The first approach sees nationhood as peoplehood; the second sees it as statehood. The people predominate in one, the land in the other.

Initially I follow the development of "Judah" from personal name, through family, tribe and territory to religious designation. Then I give examples of "Judah" as land, people and individual. Within these sections I note some conspicuous collocations, for example with eres, bet, ben and melek. Another brief section will draw together some trends from these examples. Then I discuss the positive, negative and neutral usage of "Judah". The conclusion will be in the form of a summary.

2.1 FROM ANCESTOR TO TERRITORY

The first significant narrative about the ancestor Judah offers an explanation (in the form of a folk etymology). In what Barr calls "associational wordplay" [46] and Speiser attributes to assonance [47], yehudah is associated with the verb hodah at Gen 29:35 and 49:8. Judah is the last of Leah's sons and is so named because Leah praised Yahweh. Judah will be praised by his brothers. The distinction between etymology and associational wordplay is important [48]. The latter is part of the actual usage of the word, the former is theoretical and not part of actual usage. The relationship between yehudah and hodah is similar to that between "cat" and "cattle". One is not derived from the other, nor are they conventional collocations, but can be associated because of the similarities of sound.

Relationships between "Judah" and "praise" exist explicitly in Gen 29:35 and 49:8 [49] but this need have no bearing on other occurrences. There are times when Judah will be praiseworthy but many others when Judah is condemned. This is true of the ancestor, of the group and of other individuals named "Judah". Judah the

Maccabee may be praiseworthy; Judas, Jesus' follower, is not. Judith, in the book named for her, is praiseworthy; Judith, Esau's Hittite wife, is not [50].

"Judah" as the name of the ancestor occurs in Gen 37:26 [51]. The immediate children of the ancestor are named "sons of Judah", bene yehudah at Gen 46:12 and elsewhere. In some passages the name is said to be "transparent, revealing behind it a tribe" [52], for example at Gen 49:8 and Deut 33:7.

Zobel cites Judg 1:4-7 as another example of this transparent usage, citing the plural forms of the verbs as evidence [53]. Given the setting, however, it would be better to cite Judg 1:2-3 as an example of the personification of the tribe as an individual. By this point in the narrative the ancestor is long dead, but the tribe named after him could be seen as his continued existence. The two tribes in dialogue can therefore be portrayed as the two brothers.

At 2 Sam 2:4 "Judah" is clearly the name of the tribe and so of the kingdom in which David is crowned. At 2 Chr 11:17 "kingdom of Judah, malkut yehudah" occurs.

Sometimes "Judah" is the name of the fleeing exiled people [54] and is collocated with "remnant", še'erit. They are also named "all Judah, kol yehudah", in the same contexts (e.g. Jer 40:15; 43:9; 44:1). In Esther "Judah" means, "those who come from the territory of the (now destroyed) kingdom of Judah". Even those of other tribes, such as "Mordechai the Benjaminite" are known as yehudim (Est 10:3). Mordechai, in addition to being ʔiš yemini, is named ʔiš yehudi (2:5) and hayehudi (10:3). His king was the "king of Judah, melek yehudah" (2:6) and other exiles are named yehudim (10:3).

There are also places where "Judah" can be read as the name of a geographical region (e.g. Josh 20:7; Judg 15:9; 1 Sam 23:3). Judg 15:9 says that the "Philistines came up and encamped in Judah". Then the "men of Judah" respond to their threat (vv10,11). "Judah" here means both the territory and its inhabitants.

Another example of the territorial implications of yehudah is the word yehudit used of the language spoken in the region. The contrast between yehudit and ʔašdodit, "Ashdodite" (Neh 13:24) suggests that "the language spoken in the region" is more central to the meaning of the word than "the language spoken by the people" [55].

2.2 FROM LAND TO INDIVIDUAL

In the following sections I discuss the impression given of the usage of the name "Judah" when it is noted that the majority of occurrences refer to the land. References to the people and to individuals occur less frequently.

2.3 LAND

The majority of occurrences of yehudah in the MT refer to the land or to a political entity. The most obvious indicator of such usage is collocations such as "land of", "hills of" or "borders of".

The commonest collocation (here specifically relevant to the political entity) is "kings of Judah" [56]. The next commonest is "cities of Judah" which occurs forty-nine times. There is some overlap here (as frequently in uses of yehudah) with the name as applied to a group of people. The "Judah" of "cities of Judah" can be either "cities in the territory named 'Judah'" or "cities lived in by the people Judah". Similarly, in the ten occurrences of "Bethlehem of Judah" "Judah" could be either the people or the territory. Most commonly, however, "Judah" in such phrases is the name of the territory.

Other obviously territorial collocations include "land of Judah", ʔadmat yehudah (Isa 19:17), "land of Judah", eres yehudah, (Deut 34:2; 1 Sam 22:5 and a further 21 times), "land of Judah", ʔaresot yehudah (2 Chr 11:23), "borders of Judah", gebul yehudah (Ezek 48:8 [57]), "hills of Judah", har yehudah (Jos 11:21; 20:17 21:11; 2 Chr 27:4), and "wilderness of Judah" (Judg 1:16; Ps 63:1).

In the phrase "Negev of Judah" there is also overlap between the senses "people" and "territory". For example, at 1 Sam 27:10 there are also references to the "Negev of the Jerahmeelites" and that "of the Kenites" suggesting that "Judah" here refers as much to the people living in a defined area as to the land. At 2 Sam 24:7 there are references to other tribal areas by names such as "Gad", "Gilead" and "Dan" alongside references to cities such as "Tyre". Two other collocations are noteworthy. The inhabitants of the region can be called "Judah" but they can also be called, "those who live in Judah", yošebe yehudah, (Ezra 4:6). The surrounding nations are called "the kingdoms

of the lands that surrounded Judah" (2 Chr 17:10).

The "land of Judah" in Isa 19:17 occurs in a remarkable passage, 19:16-25, which reverses the more common denunciations of Egypt and particularly of those Israelites who go there [58]. Egypt was frequently seen as a place of refuge for the earliest ancestors in early Christian literature (e.g.: Gen 12:10-20; Matt 2:13-14) but this passage goes so far as to legitimate the worship of YHWH in Egypt. This passage, according to Josephus, inspired Onias to build a temple at Leontopolis (Ant. 13.64) [59].

There are also occurrences of yehudah without specific collocations which refer to the territory. For example, Josh 19:34; Judg 15:9; 18:12 and 1 Sam 23:3. It is these uses which show that "Judah" (when collocated with words for land) is not only the name of a people. That is, "hills of Judah" does not (necessarily) mean "hills belonging to a people". As "Judah" alone can refer to land rather than people, so "Judah" in the above phrases is the name of an area, perhaps even regardless of the name of its inhabitants.

2.4 PEOPLE

According to Zobel there are 280 occurrences of yehudah which refer to a people or tribe [60]. Many of these stand alone rather than in a specific phrase. At Num 1:7; Deut 27:12; 33:7 and Judg 1:2, for example, "Judah" refers to the people. Sometimes "Judah" is referred to as "he" as if the name applied to an individual rather than a group, however, in these cases (e.g. Josh 18:5) the group is being personified as a unity.

There are many different words with which "Judah" as the name of a people is collocated. In the fifty-five occurrences of bene yehudah, yehudah is the name of the people (rather than the ancestor) fifty times. The next commonest collocation is bet yehudah (41 occurrences), followed by thirty occurrences of "man of Judah", ʔiš yehudah. "Tribe of Judah, mateh yehudah", occurs ten times [61], "People of Judah, ʿam yehudah", seven times [62], "men of Judah, ʔanše yehudah", four times [63] and "clans of Judah, ʔalpe yehudah", twice [64]. The martial aspect of the group is suggested by "the hosts of Judah, sebaʔ yehudah" [65] and, perhaps, by "enemies of Judah, sare yehudah" [66] and sorre yehudah [67]. Its sacral nature is suggested by "congregation of

Judah, gehal yehudah" [68] and by "sin(s) of Judah, hata't yehudah" [69]. A group of leaders is called "elders of Judah, zigne yehudah" [70]. The division of the tribe of Judah into families is shown by the two occurrences of "families of Judah, mišpahat yehudah" [71].

2.5 INDIVIDUALS

yehudah is the name of five individuals. Primarily it is the name of the ancestor, the son of Jacob. This usage covers thirty-nine occurrences [72]. It has this sense also in "son of Judah, ben yehudah" [73], "sons of Judah, bene yehudah" [74], and "families of Judah, mišpahot yehudah" [75].

In addition to the ancestor the MT refers to four other people named "Judah": a Levite (Ezra 10:25), a Benjaminite (Neh 11:9) and two priests (Neh 12:8,34,36).

There is also a "Yehudi, yehudi" (Jer 36:14,21,21,23) who is an officer of Jehoiakim. Similarly there is a feminine form of the name, "Judith", referred to in MT at Gen 26:34 when Esau marries Judith, daughter of Beeri the Hittite. The fact that yehudit occurs before yehudah ought, perhaps, to cause more problems than it does. As the first occurrence of a name related to "Judah" it might be expected to belong to someone other than a Hittite. That it also belongs to one who is not at all praiseworthy (in terms of Israel's views on foreigners [76]) ought to affect the idea that the word derives from hodah. Rashi comments on Gen 36:2 that "Olibamah is Judith" and that Esau had changed her name to Judith to suggest that she had abandoned idol-worship. This is done to deceive Isaac and Rebekah who prevents Jacob from marrying a Hittite (Gen 27:46-28:1). This did not stop Solomon (1 Kgs 11:1). Of course, Judith is not unique in having a name related to "Judah" but having nothing to do with praise. Yehudi in Jeremiah acquiesces with the burning of the scroll and Judas in Christian tradition is a notable anti-hero.

2.6 TRENDS

Ahlstrom [77] believes that, just as yiśra'el began as the name of a territory and was then applied to its inhabitants, the original use of yehudah was as the name of an area. yiśra'el, he argues, originally referred to the hill country as distinguished from the populated areas, which were called "Canaan". Within the hill country there were two regions, the northern area being called "Ephraim", the southern one, "Judah". Whether or not such a reconstruction of the origins of the names is accurate is not within the purpose of this thesis to discuss. However, the impression given by a general reading of the MT is that yehudah is predominantly the name of a region.

2.7 OCCURRENCES IN ARAMAIC

yehud and yehudaye' occur in the Aramaic sections of Daniel and Ezra. yehudaye' occurs ten times [78] and yehud seven times [79].

In Daniel yehudaye' and gubrin yehuda'in are in the province of Babylon, accused by "Chaldeans", gubrin kaśda'in, of acting contrary to the king's command (3:8,12). They are also contrasted with "all peoples, nations, and language-groups", 'ammaya' 'umaya' weliśonaya' (3:4,7). One of them, Daniel, is introduced on several occasions, as an "exile from Judah", gebar min-bene galuta' di yehud (2:25; 5:13; 6:14) who were brought from "Judah" (5:13). He is also one of the "wise men of Babylon", hakime babel (2:18,24) and "chief of the magicians, enchanters, Chaldeans and astrologers" (5:11).

Ezra's yehudaye' have returned from exile to Jerusalem (4:12) where there is trouble between them and other peoples (4:23). The yehudaye' are supported by those who prophesy in the name of the "God of Israel" (5:1). They have elders (5:5; 6:7,8,14) and a governor (6:7) who is distinguished from the province "Beyond the River". After the king commands that taxes be spent reinstituting the worship of "the God of Heaven" the "people of Israel, bene yiśra'el, and priests and Levites and the rest of the returned exiles" celebrate" (6:16). This all takes place in "Judah and Jerusalem", biyehud ubiruśelem (5:1), also named as a "province", yehud medinta' (5:8). Ezra is sent to "Jerusalem and Judah" (7:14) because of a royal decree that any of the "people of Israel or their priests or Levites who wish

to return to Jerusalem may do so". This is "according to the law of your God" who is "God of Israel, ʿeloh yiśraʿel".

5:5 says that "the eye of their God was upon the elders of the Jews". God is never explicitly named "the God of Judah" or "the God of the Jews" but this phrase implies such a belief. God is, in Ezra as elsewhere, named "the God of Israel" but is worshipped in Jerusalem.

In Aramaic yehud is a area within a wider province of an Empire. It is centred on Jerusalem (perhaps almost restricted to it). Those who belong to the area, the yehudin, either live in it or in other parts of the Empire, sometimes "in exile". Even the exiles maintain a heirarchy of their own and do not abandon their own God. Their relationship with outsiders is sometimes hostile and sometimes one of dependency [80].

2.8 CONCLUSION

"Judah" in the MT is a name applied to a number of different groups and individuals. It is applied more often to a people than to an individual. It refers to a nation, distinguished from "foreign" nations such as "Egypt" and from the northern kingdom, "Israel" or "Ephraim". The name claims a direct link from an eponymous ancestor to one tribe among the twelve which then becomes a "kingdom". However, "Judah" is more often associated with the region centred, politically and religiously, on Jerusalem. Whilst the name is linked to "praise, hodah" this association is not predominant except where it is explicit. "Judah" is not continuously either "praiseworthy" nor "praising God". The name is more generally applicable than other names and is largely neutral in its associations. Individuals named yehudah and groups named yehudim are neither totally "good" nor totally "bad".

CHAPTER THREE

JEW IN JOSEPHUS

By far the most common appellation applied to the people by Josephus is ioudaios which occurs 1122 times throughout his works. hebraios occurs 302 times and israelitai occurs 188 times. Josephus also refers to "Judaea, ioudaia" 164 times, the "tribe of Judah, iouda phulēs" 63 times, the ancestor "Judas" eight times, Judas Maccabee 77 times and various other individuals named "Judas" less frequently. He also uses ioudaizō twice.

Josephus' use of "Jew" is illustrative of the more widespread neutral or general use of the name. Josephus has no overwhelmingly negative feelings towards Jerusalem or Judaea and his use of the name "Jew" is free of such associations.

3.1 DISTRIBUTION PATTERN

The distribution pattern of these names is worth examining. "Judaea, ioudaia" occurs throughout Josephus' works (though most commonly in J.W. 1-2 and Ant. 12-14 [81]). ioudaios occurs 473 times throughout J.W. [82], 24 times in Life, 72 times in Apion [83]. It is common (525 occurrences) in Ant. 11-20 [84] but is rare (28 occurrences) in Ant. 1-10 [85]. In those books in which ioudaios occurs infrequently, israēlitai and hebraios are more frequent. When ioudaios occurs frequently the other names are infrequent. israēlitai never occurs in J.W., Life or Apion. hebraios occurs 5 times in J.W. [86], once in Apion 1 and never in Apion 2. israēlitai occurs 174 times in Ant. 1-10 (though never in 1) and 14 times in Ant. 11-20 (all of them in 11). hebraios occurs only 5 times in Ant. 11-20 [87] but 281 times in Ant. 1-10 (most frequently in 1-8).

These figures are compatible with the synonymy of ioudaios with israēlitai and hebraios illustrated in the remainder of this chapter. Sometimes two names occur in close association (as at Ant. 1.146 where Josephus says that the ioudaioi are named hebraioi after heber) making the synonymy explicit. The fact that one name occurs more often than the others and that frequent occurrences of ioudaios mitigate the use of the other names, shows that it was in more widespread use and bore more generalised associations than other available names. It can be used without conjuring up associations with

Abraham or with the ancestral traditions of the people (as the use of "Hebrews" would). It can be used without confusion with the northern kingdom of "Israel". Its associations are with an area, a city and a Temple. Those who do not live in Judaea are linked to it through their Temple tax. Although ioudaios does not have the antiquity of the other names, it is linked with the people's struggles for independence in their homeland and freedom of religion wherever they live.

3.2 SELF-DESIGNATION

Josephus identifies himself as a ioudaios at Ant. 1.4 in referring to the "war which we ioudaioi waged against the Romans". The readers of Ant. were familiar with both the name ioudaios and the war they fought against the Romans. This first occurrence of the name in the work reinforces what is already known about the ioudaioi, they are not "Romans, rōmaious" but their (one time) opponents. At a similar point in the introduction to J.W. Josephus says "I am genei hebraios" (J.W. 1.3), and, although he writes about his role in the war, he distances himself from the "rebels" [88]. Josephus is an "apologist for the Jewish people" and a "polemicist against Jewish revolutionaries" and wanted "Eleazar, the leader of the Sicarii, to take full responsibility for the war" [89].

3.3 SOURCES AND SUBJECTS

In Ant. 1.5 Josephus says that he has used material translated from "Hebrew, hebraikōn" so that the "Greek-speaking world would find it worthy of attention". He notes that he had intended to write, in his "War of the ioudaioi against the Romans" (his "Judaica, ioudaikōn" [90]), about

the origin of the ioudaioi, the fortunes that befell them, the great lawgiver under whom they were trained in piety and the exercise of the other virtues and all those wars waged by them through long ages before this last in which they were involuntarily engaged against the Romans (1.6).

These things are the subject of Antiquities and are based on works in "Hebrew", though Josephus cites some "histories of the ioudaioi" by foreigners, e.g. Cleodemus

(1.240) [91]. The two "sources" come together in, for example, 1.95 which says that the "great lawgiver", "Moses the Jewish lawgiver, ho ioudaiōn nomothetēs wrote about Noah, nochos, who "might well be the same man" as various "histories of the barbarians, barbarikas historias" mention. Moses is also "our lawgiver" (1.18) on whose wisdom Josephus says "well-nigh everything herein related is dependent".

In this programmatic introduction ioudaioi are people with ancient ancestral traditions, originally written in their own language, "Hebrew". The people are now part of the "Greek-speaking world". Josephus' work results from his decision that "the ancestors were willing to communicate such information" and "the Greeks, hellenōn, are curious to learn our history". As with the sources of Josephus' work, so the two groups, ancient "Hebrew" speakers and the modern "Greek-speaking" world come together.

3.4 ORIGINS

I have already noted that ioudaios occurs far more frequently in Ant. 11-20 than in 1-8. In Ant. 11 alone there are 91 occurrences whereas in books 1-8 there are only 28 occurrences (and one further possible occurrence).

At 1.146 Josephus notes that "the ioudaioi were originally called hebraioi" after "Heber, heberos" (i.e. MT's ēber). As "Hebrews" is Josephus' preferred name for the people in the Ant. 1-8 (not just in the period of their "origins") perhaps archēthen would be better translated by "archaically" in this context [92]. Josephus does go on to speak about "the Hebrews" (1.148), especially Abraham, but first says, "phalek is what the Hebrews call 'division', merismon" (1.146). Even though he prefers to speak of his contemporaries as ioudaioi he also names them hebraioi, especially when writing about their language or when stressing their ancestral traditions.

Ant. 11.173 gives Josephus' reason for the change of names. ioudaioi is the "name by which [hoi ioudaioi] were called from the time when they went up from Babylon". It

is derived from the tribe of Judah, iouda phulēs; as this tribe was the first to come to those parts, both the people and the country

have taken their name from it.

Whilst there are occurrences of ioudaioi before this they are not as frequent as in the remainder of the book or the following books.

3.5 TERRITORY

References to "Judaea, ioudaia" also become more frequent after Ant. 11 [93]. The "tribe of Judah, iouda phulēs" occurs most frequently in Ant. 5-8 (narratives concerned with the rule of Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon) but is absent after Ant. 11.173. israēlites is less common after Ant. 9 [94]. hebraios also decreases in 8.

Josephus refers to the area "Judaea, ioudaia" 164 times throughout his works. Ant. 1.134 notes that it was originally called Canaan after a son of Ham who "settled in the country now called ioudaia and named it after himself, Chananaea" (1.134). The "land now called ioudaia" was still chananaia when Abram was there (Ant. 1.160) [95].

Most often ioudaia is an area centred on Jerusalem (Apion 1.90), neighbouring "Samaria and Phoenicia" (Ant. 11.26-30) and continually threatened or attacked by whichever superpower was building an Empire at the time. It is the place in which ioudaioi live, from which they leave and to which they return. The temple of their God, "the God of the Israelites", is "in Jerusalem, in the land of Judaea, en tē ioudaia chōra" (Ant. 11.4).

Josephus provides various descriptions of the size and nature of ioudaia. He quotes Hecataeus as saying,

they occupy almost three million arourae of the most excellent and fertile soil, productive of every variety of fruits. Such is the extent of Judaea (Apion 1.195).

The "plains of Judaea abound with sycamores" (Ant. 8.188). Jericho is the "most fertile place in Judaea and produces an abundance of palms and balsam-trees" (J.W. 1.138) and "when snow falls in the rest of Judaea, in Jericho they wear linen" (J.W. 4.473).

Pompey, "having passed Pella and Scythopolis, came to Coraea, at which point a traveller ascending through the interior enters the territory of Judaea" (J.W. 1.134).

Here "Judaea" is separate from "Galilee". Elsewhere Josephus distinguishes between "Judaea" and "Samaria", "Idumaea" and "Peraea" (e.g. J.W. 2.43,96).

At Ant. 14.120 he uses ioudaias in a more inclusive sense. He includes Tarichaeae as "in Judaea" because it was a place where ioudaioi lived. At J.W. 2.252 the "rest of Judaea" is distinguished from four cities and their territories which Nero annexed to the kingdom of Agrippa, Abila and Julius in Peraea, Tarichaeae and Tiberias in Galilee. Again ioudaia is "where the ioudaioi live, or come from". Pompey had previously removed various towns from control by "the ioudaioi" and "restored them to their legitimate inhabitants and annexed them to the province of Syria" (J.W. 1.15-157). Had the "legitimate inhabitants" been ioudaioi these areas would have been linked with "Judaea" in its widest sense and controlled by it in its political sense.

3.6 PEOPLE AND NEIGHBOURS

In J.W. ioudaios is by far the most common name used for the people. The book was written for the Romans who knew the people as ioudaioi and related them to "Judaea" [96], a province of the Empire, which had rebelled and been defeated by the legions. This is clear from the predominance of the name in J.W. and also from the first sentence, "the war of the ioudaion against the Romans".

Ant. begins by noting that the work originated in the earlier narration of Josephus' "experience of the war which we ioudaioi waged against the Romans" (1.4). The Romans were not alone in using the name ioudaioi for the people, Josephus mentions a number of "histories of the ioudaioi" written and quoted by gentiles, e.g. Ant. 1.240 refers to Alexander Polyhistor's quotation from the "History of the ioudaioi" of Cleodemus the prophet.

Josephus uses ioudaioi to mean the "inhabitants of ioudaia". At J.W. 1.371 the "Arabs" attacked "Judaea" after first "massacring the envoys which the ioudaioi had sent to them". At Life 50 it is alleged that Philip was "fighting against the Romans with the ioudaioi in Jerusalem".

ioudaioi are also inhabitants of other places than Judaea. J.W. 2.80-81 talks about the "ioudaioi of Rome" (the later version, Ant. 17.301, names them "local ioudaioi"). Ant. 15.14-15 says that there was a "great number of ioudaioi" living in Babylon when Hyrcanus was

taken to Parthia, and that "the whole ioudaiōn ethnos occupying the region as far as the Euphrates honoured him as High Priest and king". Some "Babylonian ioudaiious" had been settled in Ecbatana in Batanaea (Life 54) and were still known by that name in distinction from others such as the "Caesarean ioudaiōn" (Life 55).

Although Josephus is happy to name some ioudaioi as "inhabitants of" different towns outside Judaea, at times he distinguishes between the place where the ioudaioi are and their origins.

Nehemiah was a "ioudaiōn captive in Susa". Hearing two strangers speaking "in Hebrew, hebraisti" he asked where they had come from, "when they reply that they had come from ioudaias he began to enquire" about the people and about Jerusalem (Ant. 11.159-160). In the reign of the following king the "entire nation of the ioudaiōn" was in danger, but was saved after the king had married a "ioudaian gunaika of royal family" (Ant. 11.185).

At J.W. 101 Josephus introduces a "young man who, though by birth a ioudaios, had been brought up at Sidon". He also notes that in some places where they lived the ioudaioi had their own quarters, J.W. 2.103 has this youth loaded with gifts by the "colony of the ioudaioi" of Dicaearchia.

Although Josephus quotes a source who does not distinguish between ioudaioi and israēlitai, Josephus does note the difference between "Judaea" and the northern kingdom at Ant. 7.101,103. The source, Nicolas, names David as "king of Judaea" and says that the third Ptolemy "marched against the ioudaioi and sacked the country now called Samaria". Josephus says that this is correct and that it happened when "Ahab ruled over the Israelites". He does not take time to note that the inhabitants of "Samaria" are not ioudaioi, but suggests this by using israēlites. Similarly, Ant. 9.99 distinguishes between "Israelites" and their kings and the "tribe of Judah, tēn iouda phulēn, and the citizens of Jerusalem".

Since much of Josephus' writing concerns wars, it is therefore not surprising that "Judaea" is frequently opposed to names for various foreign nations and areas. Nebuchadnezzar "occupied all Syria except Judaea" (Ant. 10.86) then, in the "eighth year of Joakeimos' rule over the hebraioi, marched against the ioudaioi" (10.87). Soon "the Egyptians" become involved, "the Egyptian [king] came to Judaea to lift the siege" (Ant. 10.110).

For most of its existence "Judaea" was a province, or a district of a province, of a larger, foreign power. At Apion 1.179 it is a district of Coele-Syria. It is given, along with Coele-Syria, Samaria and Phoenecia, as present to Ptolemy by Antiochus (Ant. 12.154,175). Annexed to Syria by the Romans, a census of the property of its inhabitants is taken by Quirinius at Ant. 18.2. Pilate becomes its Procurator at J.W. 2.169. In Life it is of interest to various Roman Emperors for its taxes and its potential for war (Life 13,37,422,425,429).

3.7 CHARACTER

According to J.W. 6.17 the party of "rebels" with John in the Antonia fortress did not act like ioudaioi, "for, to begin with, they dashed out in small parties, at intervals, hesitatingly and in alarm, in short not like the ioudaioi". Then Josephus describes the "character of the ioudaioi":

daring, impetuosity, the simultaneous charge,
the refusal to retreat even when worsted.

3.8 RELIGION

Josephus makes a number of comments on the religion of the ioudaioi. There are a number of things which make the ioudaioi different from their neighbours and others with whom they have contact. The Law, keeping of Sabbath, circumcision, their own language, food laws and single Temple are among these distinguishing marks. Josephus, however, wants to make it clear that each of these things is not unique to the ioudaioi. One nation or another will have similar customs, the ioudaioi are a distinct people but they are not aliens to the culture of the Near East or Mediterranean area.

Circumcision is an ancient ancestral tradition, instituted partly so that Abraham's descendants should be "kept from mixing with others" (Ant. 1.192). All the males of Abraham's family were circumcised, including Ishmael, which explains why both ioudaioi and "Arabs, arabes" circumcise, the ioudaioi "near birth" whereas the Arabs "defer the ceremony to the thirteenth year" (Ant. 1.214). The lack of Josephus' projected book on this and other traditions makes it difficult to know exactly what he thought of the role of circumcision

[97].

On a number of occasions Josephus says that circumcision is practiced by surrounding nations, especially the Egyptians (Apion 1.169-171; 2.137-143). Circumcision is something that separates the ioudaioi from the Greeks (Ant. 12.241,254) whilst sacrificing animals divides them from the Egyptians (Apion 2.137). If the first separates ioudaioi from Greeks, it links them with Egyptians and if the second divides them from Egyptians it links them with the Greeks. Circumcision is infrequently mentioned in his extant works [98].

Several groups and individuals had to be circumcised in order to maintain contact with ioudaioi. Hyrcanus permitted the Idumeans to stay in their territory so long as they were circumcised and willing to "observe the laws of the ioudaioi" (Ant. 13.257). Izates wished to convert and thought it necessary to circumcise in order to be a "real ioudaios" (Ant. 20.38). An argument about whether this is necessary or not ensues between different teachers. Izates is circumcised and God protects him through various events which are hinted at but not fully narrated (20.38-48). The king of Emesa can marry Agrippa's sister because he has agreed to be circumcised, but Epiphanes could not because he was "unwilling to convert to the ioudaiōn religion" (20.139). Berenice marries the king of Cilicia after his circumcision but when she left him he was "relieved simultaneously of his marriage and of further adherence to the ioudaiōn lifestyle" (20.147). Nothing more is said in these texts about what "the ioudaiōn religion or lifestyle" might entail. If circumcision is a necessary entrance qualification Josephus says no more about how they "stay in" or how they "get out" (although it is clear from the last example that "getting out" was possible).

Three other occurrences of "circumcision" with reference to foreigners trying to approach ioudaioi are notable. Two of these (Ant. 11.284 and J.W. 2.454) are concerned with circumcision as part of a "conversion", though neither of them are voluntary. The third (Life 113) concerns the rights of gentiles to live among the ioudaioi. Here, Josephus has in mind his Roman audience and argues that "every one should worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience".

Ant. 11.284 is Josephus' version of Est 8:17, which he renders, "from fear of the ioudaioi they had themselves circumcised and thereby managed to avoid danger". The MT reads, "many from the peoples of the

country mityahadim, for the fear of the yehudim had fallen on them". The LXX expands on this, "many of the gentiles were circumcised and ioudaizōn for fear of the ioudaioi". Commentators on the Hebrew text of Esther suggest that the occurrence of the word mityahadim is a reference to proselytism and therefore reveals the late date of the work [99]. The addition by the LXX of a reference to "circumcision" must mean that more is involved than "their support of Jewish interests" [100]. Josephus avoids using the verb ioudaizō, implying that the action of the gentiles was not one of conversion but merely an attempt to save their lives by emulating those they feared. He does not say that they adopted any of the other defining activities of the ioudaioi.

In J.W. 2.454 a Roman officer, Metilius, is spared by the "rebels" in Jerusalem because he said that he would "be circumcised ioudaisein". ioudaizō also occurs at J.W. 2.463. Thackeray translates 2.454 by "to turn a Jew" and 2.463 by "Judaizers" [101]. Other suggestions include, "to embrace the Jewish faith, to live as a Jew" for 2.454 and "to be an adherant (partisan) of the Jews" for 2.463 [102]. The actual narratives tell us little about what Josephus intends by this word.

Josephus clearly does not approve of the actions of the "rebels" who desecrate the sabbath by this massacre of Roman soldiers (2.454). This is not an account of a willing conversion but of a Roman commander trying to save his own life by promising kai mechri peritomēs ioudaisein. Josephus is also writing for Romans and is aware of their horror of circumcision as mutilation. Metilius' words could mean that he is promising to "live as a Jew" presumably adopting a "Jewish" lifestyle but are less likely to mean that he will "convert to Judaism" or "embrace the Jewish faith" as it is not clear that such a separation of religion from the rest of the national identity would have been understandable in that period. "To live as a Jew" or "to be a partisan" seem much more fruitful interpretations.

Life 113 is concerned with an attempt by ioudaioi to compel two nobles from Trachonitis to be circumcised as a condition of residence with them, not as a step in conversion. Josephus claims that he prevented this and protected the "refugees" by an argument that would certainly have appealed to his Roman readers [103], "each one should worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience and not under constraint". This is probably the "betrayal of his country's Law" which Jesus, son of Sapphias, condemns Josephus for (135). In Jerusalem the "rebels" broke the nation's Law by their

actions towards Metilius and his troops, here the tables are turned and Jesus is able to attack Josephus on religious grounds [104].

In writing for a Roman audience Josephus' purposes would have included allaying their fears of the mutilation that they considered circumcision to have been. He does not indicate whether the circumcision of Metilius would have been an acceptable means of "becoming a Jew" in other circumstances, but he strongly suggests his disapproval.

In J.W. 2.463 the towns of Syria had "rid themselves of the ioudaioi" and then became suspicious of their ioudaizontas. These people are "of mixed stock" [105], their "Jewishness" and "Gentileness" being uncertain they were obviously suspect of being partisan to those more clearly Jewish. Josephus writes about their sufferings with as much feeling as he writes about those of the ioudaioi.

Circumcision is an issue for Antiochus Epiphanes. However, it is neither the first nor the only thing that he bans or desecrates. He forbade the daily sacrifices, built altars over the Temple altar and slaughtered pigs on it, forced "reverence" for other Gods, built sacred places elsewhere than Jerusalem and sacrificed pigs daily at them (Ant. 12.248-256). The prohibition of circumcision occurs at the end of this passage. Those who disobeyed Antiochus were crucified, their wives and circumcised sons were strangled and the sons were suspended from their parents' necks. Law books were burnt and those who possessed them were killed. Clearly circumcision was among the most obvious acts of rebellion, but was not the sole act. Similarly when Mattathias begins to act he forces uncircumcised boys to be circumcised. But first he pulled down altars and killed "sinners" (Ant. 12.278).

Josephus also notes decrees by various cities concerning the ioudaioi who live with them. These refer to "sabbaths and sacred rites in accordance with their ioudaikous laws", their "places of prayer near the sea in accordance with their native custom" (Ant. 14.256-258), their "communal life", "legal suits", "offerings" and "suitable food" (Ant. 14.259-261). Of these Sabbath is most frequently mentioned, and circumcision never [106].

Several other passages concerned with the distinction between ioudaioi and gentiles say nothing at all about circumcision. When the Romans confirm the rights of the

ioudaioi of Asia Minor to keep their "ancestral law" what is at issue is their right to send money to the Jerusalem Temple, not to work on their Sabbath, to gather for "sacred rites and common meals" and to have meeting places [107].

The rituals of the ioudaioi are practised in Ephesus and Rome and other cities according to Ant. 14.228 and 18.65-84. Whilst Ant. 14.228-240 is concerned with permission given to various communities to be released from military service because of their "rites" or "traditions", Ant. 18.65-84 parallels the banning of the rites of the Egyptians and ioudaioi and the expulsion of their communities from Rome.

In Apion 2.27 says that "in the language of the ioudaiōn" sabbaton "denotes cessation from all work". He says this because Apion has asserted that it is an Egyptian word for "disease of the groin". Apart from the evidence that the keeping of Sabbath was known to outsiders (though maybe not the reasons for it) this passage is most interesting for being the sole use in Josephus of the phrase, "language of the ioudaiōn". Elsewhere he prefers to talk of "Hebrew" or "the Hebrews say".

Xerxes' letter to Ezra distinguishes between priests and Levites and other members of the nation (Ant. 11.123-130), saying that he has given the command for "those of the ioudaiōn nation and the Levites in our kingdom" who wish to go up to Jerusalem to

look after matters in Judaea in accordance with the law of God, and bring to the God of the Israelites the gifts which I and my friends have vowed to send.

There are a number of references to the "philosophies", which contributed or made up the religious life of the ioudaioi. At J.W. 2.119 Josephus claims there are three forms of philosophy among them,

the followers of the first school are called Pharisees, of the second Sadducees, of the third Essenes".

At Ant. 18.11 he repeats this introduction to the "three philosophies", says something about each of them and then writes about "the fourth philosophy" of which "Judas the Galilean" was the leader (18.23--25).

At J.W. 2.119 Josephus says of the "Essenes, essēnoi" that they are "ioudaioi by birth", which might mean that "the Essenes did not permit a non-Jew to become a member of the sect" [108]. Josephus does not make it clear whether or not the other three of his "philosophical groups" did permit converts to join them or what they thought of gentiles who wished to worship their God.

3.9 JUDAS

The ancestor "Judas" is only referred to in Ant. 1,2 and 7 [109]. Judas Maccabaeus is referred to 4 times in J.W. 1, 66 times in Ant. 12 and 7 times in Ant. 13. Other individuals named "Judas" are referred to a few times in different books [110].

The ancestor named "Judas, ioudas" is referred to on eight occasions [111]. His name means "thanksgiving, eucharistian" according to Ant. 1.304. Josephus does not explain the reason for this name or "meaning" as do the MT and LXX [112]. Nowhere else does this "etymology" affect Josephus' usage of the name. He does, however, turn "Ehud" of Judges 3 into ioudēs who is himself a "man worthy of praise" (Ant. 5.188-197).

Josephus refers to "Judas" ("also known as Maccabaeus, makkabaios") 77 times. Frequently "Judas" occurs in proximity to "Judaea, ioudaias". The first reference to Judas (J.W. 1.37) is as heir to his father Matthais who had driven the generals of Antiochus out of Judaea (1.16). According to Josephus' later version (Ant. 12.285) it was Judas himself who "drove the enemy out of the country". At Ant. 12.289 "Judas" occurs in proximity with both "Judaea" and ioudaioi. The governor of Coele-Syria with troops and "fugitives and irreligious ioudaioi" marched against Judas and they met at "Baithoron in ioudaias". This "Judas" is clearly a positive character for Josephus. Ant. 13 begins by claiming that after Judas' death "all those who remained of the godless and the transgressors against their country's manner of life, rose up among the ioudaiois" (13.2). Whilst rebellions against the Romans are condemned, Josephus praises these actions against the Macedonians.

Another "Judas", a (or "the") "Galilean" [113] is referred to seven times [114]. His rebellion in the time that Quirinius took a Census of Judaea is referred to at Ant. 18.3-10 and 20.102. A descendant of his was crucified under Tiberius Alexander (Ant. 20.102) who,

Josephus omits to note, was Philo's nephew.

As if to balance this rebellious Judas Josephus also notes another Judas, "son of Sepphoraëus", a "sophist", who lectured in Jerusalem and encouraged the young people to destroy an eagle which had been set up above a Temple gate (J.W. 1.648). Herod had this Judas and those who had demolished the eagle burnt to death. According to Ant. 17.149 Judas was an "unrivalled interpreter of the Law among the ioudaioi" and was mourned by the "rebels" who were causing the insurrection (Ant. 17.214). Josephus seems ambivalent about this Judas. His "piety", but not his popularity among the "rebels", obviously appealed to Josephus. Perhaps it was permissible, in Josephus' eyes, to act against Herod but not against the Romans.

3.10 CONCLUSION

In Josephus' extant works ioudaios is the most popular name for the nation. It is a "neutral" name, its associations are less complex than those of hebraios or israēlitai. The associations of the name with the ancestor "Judas" are not as strong as those with the return to "Judaea" and Jerusalem from exile. This event gives the name its primary associations. Josephus claims that before that date the ioudaioi were named hebraioi, though he does use ioudaioi in his narration of events prior to the return. His ioudaioi are those who either live in or originate from ioudaia. Particular customs distinguish them from one foreign group or another, though not in themselves entirely unique.

It is possible for non-ioudaioi to join the community, to worship their God (who is called "the God of the Israelites" and never "the God of the ioudaioi") and to celebrate their traditions. Foreigners were aware of some of the differences between the ioudaioi and themselves. Which of these traditions were most in view depends on the origin and customs of the writer. Josephus does give some importance to circumcision as an entrance qualification and as a marker of the difference between the ioudaioi and some of their neighbours. However, sabbath and allegiance to Jerusalem and the Temple are more significant as "taxic indicators". ioudaios is the most general and the most commonly used of the names for the people.

CHAPTER FOUR

JEW IN PHILO

ioudaios occurs 107 times in Philo's works [115]. ioudaikos occurs 11 times [116] and ioudaia occurs 10 times [117]. As in Josephus' works, "Jew" is used by Philo neutrally, without the derogatory associations it carries in, e.g. QL and CCL.

ioudaios often refers to past generations. Abraham, "the most ancient member of the Jewish race, tou tōn ioudaiōn ethnous ho presbutatos genos, was a Chaldean by birth" (Virt. 212). Moses is named the "Legislator of the Jews", nomothetou tōn ioudaiōn (Mos. 1.1 and elsewhere). His legislation was for his own generation and for all succeeding ones and ioudaioi refers to all of them. The generation of the exodus is named ioudaioi (Mos. 1.34 [118]). The wilderness generation are ioudaioi in Mos. 2.193,

a certain base born man, the child of an unequal marriage, his father an Egyptian, his mother a ioudaias had set at naught the ancestral traditions of his mother and turned aside to the impiety of Egypt.

The Law also applies to Philo's own generation according to Mos. 2.17, "Not only the ioudaioi but almost every people ... value and honour our Laws". At 2.41 Philo claims that "every year there is a feast at Pharos where not only ioudaioi come but multitudes of others" to celebrate the translation of the scriptures into Greek. The keeping of the sabbath is also part of contemporary Jewish life, according to 2.216, "even now this practice is maintained and the ioudaioi every seventh day occupy themselves with the philosophy of their fathers". This distinguishes them from other nations, according to Decal. 96, which, in discussing the fourth Commandment, says that

while some states celebrate this day as a feast once a month ... ioudaiōn ethnōs, never ceases to do so at continuous intervals with six days between each.

According to Philo, king Agrippa wrote to Gaius naming himself, "a ioudaios by birth and my native city is Jerusalem" (278). Philo's contemporaries are particularly in view in Flac. and in Legat.. Both works

deal with attacks on the community of Alexandrian and other Egyptian ioudaioi. According to Flac. 43 and 45 the ioudaioi are spread throughout Egypt and throughout the world.

The governor (Flaccus), knowing that there were two kinds of inhabitants in the country, us and them, and that there were no less than a million ioudaioi between Libya and Ethiopia... permitted the installation of images in meeting places (43).

So populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them (45).

At 47 he states that the ioudaioi are not aliens in Egypt but citizens and at 49 claims that "everywhere in the habitable world the religious veneration of the ioudaioi for the Augustan house has its basis as all may see in the meeting houses". ioudaioi are loyal citizens of the Roman Empire.

Flac. 55 describes the two Alexandrian Quarters where most of the ioudaioi live as ioudaikai. ioudaikōs also occurs at Flac. 73 (of "life") and 74 (of "affairs"); Legat. 157 (of "citizenship"), 159 (of "institutions") and 170 (of "customs").

In various places Philo compares what ioudaioi know to what other "philosophies" have said. According to Virt. 65

Moses said, "what disciples of the most excellent philosophy gain from its teaching, the ioudaioi gain from their customs and laws, that is to know the highest, most ancient Cause of all things and reject the delusion of created Gods.

Probus 29 compares a saying of Moses ("the law-giver of the ioudaion) with various quotations from Greek philosophers. At 57 he claims that "we may well suppose that the fountain from which Zeno drew this thought was the law book of the ioudaion". Aet. 19 claims that "long before Hesiod the law giver of the ioudaion said in the Holy Books that it [the world] was created and imperishable".

Frequently, as seen above, ioudaioi is used in opposition to names for "other nations". The difference between ioudaioi and "other nations" is that, although the "ioudaiōn nation" is counted among the "barbarians" (e.g. Mos 2.18), it acts as Priest for the "whole human

race" (Spec. 2.163). Philo also claims that the Jewish "High Priest, ho tōn ioudaiōn archiereus, prays for the whole human race and also for the elements" (Spec. 1.97).

When Philo is concerned with ioudaioi of one area it tends to be with those of Alexandria. However, he also refers to the region named "Judaea", ioudaia. For example, Ptolemy Philadelphus sent to the "High Priest and King of Judaea, ioudaias" for those who would translate the Law for him (Mos. 2.31).

ioudaia is also the name of the Roman province. For example, Legat. 199 talks of a "tax collector for Judaea", 215 of its "unlimited inhabitants" (even without the gathering of ioudaioi from other areas) and 299 of the appointment of Pilate as governor of Judaea.

Philo also names Jerusalem as "the mother city not only of the one country Judaea but also of the colonies" in which ioudaioi live (281) and Jamnia as "one of the most populous cities of Judaea" (200). Probus 75 names the region "Palestinian Syria", palaistine suria. Having named various groups of philosophers around the world Philo introduces the Essenes as "more than four thousand persons" living among "the very populous nation of the ioudaioi" in that area.

Philo offers an etymology for ioudas and for ioudin which is related to that of earlier Hebrew and Greek texts of the bible, i.e. "praise". At Plant. 134 "Judas" is said to mean "praise to the Lord, kurio exomologēsis" [119]. "This derivation from ydh (hifil) "praise" could easily be deduced from the LXX Gen 29:35, though Philo also sees the divine element Yah in it" [120]. Philo's etymology leads to his using "Judas" symbolically, as "mind that blesses God and is ceaselessly engaged in offering hymns of thanksgiving to him" (Plant. 135). "Judith, ioudin" is also said to mean "woman who praises, laudatrix" but this is a negative "praising", i.e. she symbolises "vain glory" (Qu. in Gen. 4.195, frg.10 OL [121]).

4.1 CONCLUSION

To Philo the name ioudaioi is applicable to the contemporary nation, whether they live in "Judaea" or elsewhere, and also to their ancestors as far back as Abraham. Within the nation Philo names various officials (such as priests and kings) and various

subdivisions (Essenes, those who live in different places, citizens and commoners). The name ioudaioi is contrasted with names for "other nations". The former group are superior to the latter, not socially, politically or economically, but in access to a better ancestral philosophy.

Although the name does not have derogatory overtones, neither does it have the same, philosophical, centrality as "Israel", nor the associations of "conservatism" that "Hebrew" has in Philo's works. ioudaioi is the regular, unexceptional name applied to the people. Whilst it can refer to the ancestors (even exalted ones like Abraham and Moses) it generally refers to the actual social entity of Philo's contemporaries. Less of his philosophy and less religious polemic affects his use of ioudaioi than is the case with the other designations.

CHAPTER FIVE

JEW IN QUMRAN LITERATURE

"Judah" in QL is used as both a self-designation and as a name for opponents. At 1QpHab 8:1 "the House of Judah" is the author's own group, whilst CD 8:3 names opponents, "Princes of Judah". As yhwdh relates to a geo-political area uses of the name will reflect differing reactions to the region. As it is also the name of a tribe distinct from other groups ("Levi", "Benjamin", "Zadok") uses will reflect different reactions to this plurality. I also note that among the Wadi Murraba⁶at texts "Judah" is a not infrequent personal name.

5.1 WAR RULE

The opening lines of the War Rule (1QM [122]) identify the community as "Sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin the exiles in the desert" and as the "Sons of Light" who will fight against "the Sons of Darkness" (1:2). The community identified themselves as exiled Judeans now returning from the "wilderness of the peoples" to camp in the "wilderness of Jerusalem" prior to the final conflict which would liberate Jerusalem. In the scroll's perspective the Exile [123] had not yet ended and would not do so until Jerusalem was purified.

In a hymn (12:13, repeated in 19:15) the "cities of Judah", especially "Zion" and "Jerusalem", are exhorted, in the language of Psalm 24, to open their gates and to "rejoice greatly in their liberation". This refers to the actual cities and their inhabitants.

The collocation, in 1QM, of "Judah" with "Levi" and "Benjamin" places it among other tribal designations and particularly among southern tribes. Davies [124] argues that these southern tribes were expected to initiate the War of Liberation, the success of which would lead to the return of the "lost tribes". It is, therefore, significant that it is also collocated with "Jerusalem" and "cities".

5.2 TESTIMONIA AND PESHER ON ZEPHANIAH

The impurity of the present Jerusalem implied by 1QM is made explicit in 4Q Testimonia 27 (4Q175 [125]) which applies Josh 6:26 to the contemporary situation [126]. In this it is aided by the lack of the MT's explanation that "this city" is "Jericho" [127]. "This city" is now Jerusalem, which has been rebuilt as a "stronghold of wickedness in Israel and a horrible thing in Ephraim and in Judah [...and they] shall cause pollution in the land". Despite the lacuna it is clear that "Judah" is as polluted as "Israel" and "Ephraim" according to the scroll.

The Pesher on Zephaniah (1Q15 [128]) also notes that it is upon the "inhabitants of the Land of Judah" that "the anger of Yahweh will fall" (1:5 commenting on Zeph 1:18, 2:2).

In these texts "Judah" is distinguishable from "Ephraim" but neither are unambiguously geographical regions (as they were in the source texts) but refer to "opponents".

5.3 DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

The Damascus Document also claims that the founders of the community were exiled Judeans. According to 4:2,3 the "priests" of Ezek 44:15 (here a separate group from the "levites" and "sons of Zadok") refers to the original members of the community who are the "captivity of Israel [129] who went out from the land of Judah" and were later joined by the other groups.

This exile from Judah is further clarified by CD 6:5 where the "captivity of Israel" are those "who went out from the land of Judah and settled in the land of Damascus". The "land of Damascus" here qualifies the "going out from Judah" demonstrating that no metaphorical exile is intended but rather a physical move away from the land to "a place of exile, wherever it was".

A number of suggestions have been made concerning the meaning of "Damascus" in the CD, where it occurs seven times (though nowhere else in QL). Murphy-O'Connor argues that "Damascus" is a cipher for Babylon, where the group originated [130]. He also accepts, however, the argument of Vermes that in CD 7:18-19 "Damascus" refers to the community itself [131]. He rejects this

interpretation for the remaining references to "Damascus" on the grounds that they pre-date the arrival of the group at Qumran. This argument is forcefully challenged by Knibb [132]. Pixner, in an attempt to "unravel the topography" of the Copper Scroll (CS or 3Q15) concludes that "the Land of Damascus" in CD is equivalent to an area of Essene settlement around the Yarmuk river in CS [133]. This assertion does not explain why any group of returning exiles (let alone leaving exiles) should stop so near the borders of the Land. The argument of Milikowsky recognises that either "in Damascus" or "beyond Damascus" are possibilities [134]. No evidence is provided for an "exile" "this side of Damascus". Milikowsky's conclusion is that "Damascus" is a label for a place of exile. The community is in exile, wherever it is, therefore the community is in "Damascus".

A further use is made of the theme of exile in the Admonition section of CD. Those who reject the instruction of the community are warned that,

God shall visit the earth to repay the reward of the wicked upon them, when there shall come to pass the word which is written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amoz, the prophet, who said: "There shall come upon you and upon your people and upon your father's house days which have not come since the day when Ephraim departed from Judah". When the two houses of Israel separated, (it was) Ephraim (who) departed Judah, and all who turned back were delivered to the sword (7:9-14 paralleled by 14:1 [135]).

According to this Pesher on the Exile of 721 BCE "Judah" will survive the destruction of "Ephraim". "Judah" is a self-designation opposed to "Ephraim", a label for opponents.

The polemic against "Ephraim" does not ignore the fact that the community's opponents were also Judeans living in Judah and in Jerusalem itself. In 8:3 those who did "turn back" and who "did not hold fast to these Injunctions" were

visited to destruction by the hand of Belial. This is the day when God shall visit. The princes of Judah have become as those whom wrath shall be poured out on them.

The 'B' text of this passage (19:15,16) reads:

The princes of Judah have become like those who remove the boundary, upon whom I will pour out wrath like water

and makes it clear that this is a quotation of Hos 5:10. [136]. The "princes of Judah" condemned here are opponents of the author's group (or deserters from it) [137].

"Judah" is also used a name for the majority of those outside of the community in 20:25-27.

"And all who have transgressed the limits of the law among those who have entered the covenant; when the glory of God appears to Israel, they shall be cut off 'from the mid[st] of the camp', and with them all the evildoers of Judah in the days of its trials".

Although "the House of Peleg" is commended [138] for having left Jerusalem when the majority of the people, named "Israel", sinned, some of them "returned to the ways of the people". The appearance of the "Glory of God" makes clear who is in "the camp" and will condemn the sinful members of "the House of Peleg". They are linked with the "evildoers of Judah" who had left the author's group, who had "defiled the sanctuary" and removed themselves from "the Covenant".

Davies notes that kl mršy'y yhw dh here could also be translated as "all who do evil to Judah" [139]. If this is correct it has very different implications. "Judah" would be a name for the group itself, opposed by the renegades of the "House of Peleg" and the larger group of sinful "Israel".

There is some confusion about the meaning of 4:11,

At the completion of the period, according to the number of these years, there will be no (further) joining the House of Judah.

Despite the detailed arguments of Davies and Schwarz [140] that the "House of Judah" is the community, the context requires that it refers to outsiders. They are linked with the people left behind when the "chosen of Israel" removed themselves from the "people of Israel" who had "gone astray". The temptation to return to the wider community was evidently too strong for some of "the House of Peleg" but this option would not be available "at the completion of this period". Then "the wall will be built, the boundary extended" and there

will be "guards on the watchtowers". Dupont-Sommer says,

celle-ci, en effect, est déçue: elle est remplacée par la Communauté de l'Alliance, qui est seule désormais <<la Maison sûre en Israël>> [141].

5.4 PESHARIM

The Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab [142]) also makes use of "Judah" in a context of judgement. 1QpHab 8:1-3 interprets Hab 2:4b, "The righteous shall live by his faith",

this concerns all those who observe the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will deliver from the House of Judgement because of their suffering and because of their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness.

Those who are to be rescued are also "men of Truth", "Judah" itself and not merely potential Judean converts.

A more explicit identification is possible in the light of 12:1-10 which interprets Hab 2:17,

this saying concerns the Wicked Priest, inasmuch as he shall be paid the reward which he himself tendered to the Poor. For Lebanon is the Council of the Community; and the beasts are the Simple of Judah who keep the Law. As he himself plotted the destruction of the Poor, so will God condemn him to destruction. And as for that which he said, Because of the blood of the city and the violence done to the land: interpreted, the city is Jerusalem where the Wicked Priest committed abominable deeds and defiled the Temple of God. The violence done to the land: these are the cities of Judah where he robbed the Poor of their possessions" [143].

This division of the group into "the Council" and "the Simple of Judah" is not a definitive statement on sectarian organisation. It is a simplified version of the more elaborate order found in 1QS and CD where priests rank above levites who rank above the rest of the people, and where additional hierarchies also operate [144]. All those who became linked to the

"Teacher of Righteousness" were persecuted by the "Wicked Priest", evicted from the "the cities of Judah" and so joined those who already saw themselves as "Exiles". "Judah" is a self-designation indicating the group's origins within a region and a wider community. "Judah" is not a "pure community" but one which has faced, and will face, judgement.

The interpretation of Nah 3:6 in the Pesher on Nahum (4Q169 3:3-5 [145]) also illustrates the possibility of joining the community.

The Interpretation concerns the Seekers of smooth things whose evil deeds will be revealed at the end of time to all Israel and many will discern their iniquity and hate them and consider them repulsive because of their guilty insolence. And when Judah's glory is revealed the Simple ones of Ephraim will flee from the midst of their assembly and forsake those who misled them and join themselves to Israel [146].

The community here is both "Judah" and "Israel" while the "Simple", now living in the corrupt "Ephraim", are potential recruits. The scroll is chiefly concerned with the judgement and tribulations of Jerusalem and "Ephraim" and does not specify what the "glory of Judah" is, nor when it will be revealed. The abasement of "Ephraim" is clearly the fault of the "Seekers of smooth things" whose falsehoods have lead everyone astray, though only temporarily in the case of the "Simple".

The "Simple", the northern kingdom (here called "Samaria" under the influence of the text to be interpreted) and "Judah" (the community) occur again in the Pesher on Micah (1Q14 [147]) which says of Mic 1:5-6,

Interpreted, this concerns the Spouter of Lies [who led the] Simple [astray]. "And what is the high place of Judah? [Is it not Jerusalem?" Interpreted, this conce]rns the Teacher of Righteousness who [expounded the Law to] his [Council] and to all who freely pledged themselves to join the elect of God [to keep the Law] in the Council of the Community; who shall be saved on the Day of [Judgement].

The community's high opinion of itself and its denigration of outsiders has lead to a peculiarly atomistic interpretation. Mic 1:5-6 had previously

condemned Samaria and Judah equally, but here the "the High Place" is a positive "exalted" position, assigned to the community, whilst humiliation is assigned to their enemies.

The community not only experienced opposition from outsiders (whether foreigners like the "Kittim" or Israelites like "Ephraim") but there was also dissent within the community. In the Pesher on Psalm 37 vv.12,13 are said to concern

the ruthless ones of the Covenant in the House of Judah who will plot to obliterate those in the Council of the Community who carry out the Law (4Q171 2:12-14 [148]).

These "ruthless ones" are linked with other opponents, "outsiders", treated in 2:15-18 which interprets vv14,15,

the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh who will seek to put forth a hand against the Priest and the men of his Council in the time of trial that is coming upon them.

"House of Judah" refers to the community which is composed of two groups, the "ruthless ones" and "those who carry out the Law".

5.5 HEAVENLY LIGHTS AND BLESSINGS OF JACOB

"The Words of Heavenly Lights" (4QDibHam [149]) contains several columns concerned with the results of election: the praise of God and the chastisement of the "chosen people". Column 4 develops the theme of the election of the people and that of king David.

For thou hast loved Israel above all peoples. Thou hast chosen the tribe of Judah [150] and hast established Thy Covenant with David that he might be as a princely shepherd over Thy people and sit before Thee on the throne of Israel for ever [151].

This reference to the choice of Judah is not coincidental to the argument, but is "sectarian". Vermes admits that 4QPB, similarly emphasising the royal power of Judah, implies "that all non-Davidic rulers such as the Hasmonean priest-kings, occupy the throne

unlawfully" [152].

"The sceptre shall not depart from the tribe of Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs. And the peoples shall be in obedience to him" (Gen 49:10). Whenever Israel rules there shall not fail to be a descendent of David upon the throne. For the ruler's staff is the Covenant of kingship, and the clans of Israel are the feet, until the Messiah of Righteousness comes, the Branch of David. For to him and to his seed was granted the Covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations [153].

Given the group's self-understanding that it is in "exile" from Jerusalem and alienated from both royal and priestly power the above texts resonate with sectarian biases. The two passages also reflect the interests of Psalm 78, especially vv66-72 [154].

These uses of "Judah" are associated with divine election with its concomitant opposition to other groups, here foreign nations and other tribes. In the context they are "sectarian" in that the opposition comes from "outsiders" who are also Judeans. The previous history of the name "Judah", in which it was opposed to names for the northern kingdom, is less important than the group's contemporary self-definition in providing associations.

5.6 FRAGMENTS

A series of fragmentary texts also suggest themes of election and judgement. They oppose "Judah" to "foreigners" and apply to both "good" and "bad". Such passages include 1Q25 5:5; 4Q177 (Catena) 1-4 9 and 4Q177 9 6.

1Q25 is too fragmentary to provide much information, but 5:5 probably collocates "YHWH" with "Judah" [155].

4Q 177 suggests both election and judgement,

"to the heads of mourning return [...G]od of mercy, and to Israe[l...re]compense of the prophets of Judah [...] who [Be]lliel..." (177 1-4 9-10)

"concerning th]em in the las[t days...] them in

the multitude of the purified one[s...] they are the congregation of the Seekers of [smooth things...] and in their zeal and in [their] hostility [...] from Judah amongst all the peoples [...] a people righteous and wicked, foolish and sing[le...] of foreskins to lead them aright in the L[ast] Generation[...]" (177 9 2-8) [156].

Fragment 9 recognises that although "Judah" is chosen from among "all the peoples" yet it is made up of both the 'righteous' and the 'wicked', "the purified ones" and their opponents "the Seekers of smooth things". "Judah" is, at present, an amalgamation of different groups but, the community hoped, would one day be the righteous people of God without dissent. The present generation was suffering because of God's choice.

5.7 FLORILEGIUM AND LAMENTATIONS

The judgement theme is also present in 4Q174 (Florilegium) and 4Q179 (Lamentations) [157], for example 4Q174 1-3 ii 1 concerns, "the time of trial that is co[m]ing upon the house of J]udah".

5.8 PERSONAL NAME IN WADI MURRABA^cAT

Whilst QL does not provide names of individuals, in surviving texts from Wadi Murraba^cat "Judah" is a personal name. In an Aramaic note about debt one of the signatures is that of "Joseph son of Judah" (Mur 18), a Hebrew farming contract probably bears the signature of "Judah son of Rabba" (Mur 24E) and a letter of the administrators of Bet Mashiko to Joshua ben Galgula bears the names "Jacob ben Judah" (Mur 42) [158]. The number of ancestral or traditional names in this period suggest an avowal of traditionalism and of national identity. It is not unlikely that similar names were chosen during the first rebellion against Rome, and that those responsible for QL also took such names.

5.9 CONCLUSION

The name "Judah" is used in QL in a number of ways as dictated by both earlier uses of the name and by the community's own view of their situation. In common with both earlier and wider contemporary usage, "Judah" is applied to the geo-political area and its inhabitants. It is opposed to names for other "tribes" and "foreign nations". Some occurrences are "neutral" in that they refer to past generations. However, even "historical" usage can be "sectarian" in that the group claimed to be heir to all that was good.

The community's view of their own origins leads to an ambiguity in this use. The community believed itself to have been founded by priests exiled from Judah and joined in exile by other groups. When this combined community eventually attempted to return to Judah and to Jerusalem it saw itself as not merely a group of Judeans but as the Judeans par-excellence. This view combined with the community's desire to root its claims in the bible lead to a distinctive use of the phrase "the House of Judah" as a name for the community, especially when in opposition to "Ephraim".

"Judah" is applied to both "good" and "bad" in QL. Reflecting the contemporary situation of a plurality of Judaisms, it is applied to both the producers of QL and their opponents in other groups.

The summary by Zobel clearly expresses the way "Judah" is used in QL,

the Dead Sea scrolls reflect initially the usage of the OT. "Judah" can refer to the land (CD 4:3; 6:5) and its cities (1QM 12:13; 19:15; 1QpHab 12:9), the people (CD 7:12; also 4:11: "house of Judah") and their leaders (CD 8:3; 19:15), and finally also the tribe of Judah (4QPB 1). But this last passage with its messianic interpretation of Gen.49:10 makes it clear that the notion of Judah is privately shifting so as to refer to the Qumran community. Judah consists of those who - although there may be evil in Judah (4QT 27) and wicked people in Judah (CD 20:27) - fulfill the law and are faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 8:1; 12:4), of those who, together with the Sons of Levi and Benjamin, fight against the Sons of darkness (1QM 1:2) [159].

CHAPTER SIX

JEW IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Few commentators would deny that there is considerable anti-Judaism in early Christian texts. Arguments about which text(s) are most responsible for this prejudice and attempts to save Jesus from involvement with it, continue. Anti-Judaism does not reside only in the use of the name ioudaios. Portrayals of the groups that constitute the Judaisms of the period are also part of the general and increasing anti-Judaism of the texts. This chapter, however, concentrates on the various uses made of the name "Judah" or "Jew". In this chapter I do not discuss every occurrence of the name, but, after making some comments on some of the uses of the name, I note, in more detail, discussion concerning Luke, John, Galatians and Romans. Finally I make some comments on the opposing assessments of Jews and Judaism in Revelation, Ignatius and Origen.

6.1 OCCURRENCES AND ASSOCIATIONS

ioudaias occurs twice (Acts 16:1; 24:24). ioudas forty-four times, with several different referents: seven times it refers to a tribe [160] and three times to an ancestor, son of Jacob and "father of Perez and Zerah by Tamar" [161]. There are twenty-one references to a ioudas further named "Iscaiot", "one of the twelve" and "who betrayed [Jesus]" [162]. Another iouda is mentioned in Jesus' genealogy at Luke 3:30. Jesus also has a brother named ioudas at Matt 13:55; Mark 6:3, and Jude 1. Another disciple is called ioudas, "the son of James" and "not Iscaiot" [163]. A ioudas surnamed "Barsabbas" is referred to in Acts 15:22,27,32 and "ioudas the Galilean" is referred to at Acts 5:37.

McComiskey says, "the meaning [of iouda] is uncertain but probably means 'praised' (Gen.29:35)" [164]. This cannot be what everyone understood themselves to be saying when they named people or territory "Judah" or "Judas". Although hebraios is associated with Abraham and with conservatism, the most important associations of iouda are with David and not with the earlier ancestor. Even the "blessing of Judah" depends upon the importance of Jerusalem as the Davidic capital. The associations of iouda are as various as reactions to Jerusalem.

The appropriateness of "Judas" as the name of "the one who betrayed Jesus", a reversal of the name's conventional associations with praiseworthy ancestors or heroes [165], would not have been lost on the early Christians. Its associations with Jerusalem as centre of David's kingdom may also be inverted in locating Judas' only significant actions in Jerusalem. He betrays Jesus in Jerusalem (alleged by the prophets and Christians to have been the location of the deaths of many prophets), receives and returns coins to the Temple rejected by Christians and then himself dies near the city.

A territory is named ioudaia forty-four times [166]. The word ioudaizō occurs at Gal 2:14; ioudaikois at Titus 1:14; ioudaikōs at Gal 2:14. ioudaios occurs 194 times [167]. ioudaismōs occurs at Gal 1:13,14.

According to BAG the forty-four references to the territory ioudaia can be divided into references to "Judaea", used "properly, of the southern part of Palestine in contrast to Samaria, Galilee, Peraea and Idumaea" [168] and also "in a wider sense, the region occupied by the Jewish nation" [169]. Lowe distinguishes three senses of "Judea, ioudaia",

- (1) Judea in the strict sense;
- (2) the procurate of Pontius Pilate (i.e. Judea as above together with Idumea and Samaria);
- (3) the kingdom of Herod the great and the last Hasmoneans (i.e. approximately the whole of the historic Land of Israel [170]).

These are distinguishable by collocations such as "Samaria", "Peraea", "Jerusalem", "Galilee", "king of" and "Governor of". Lowe argues that the majority of the occurrences of "Judea" are used in the first sense although in three passages, where "the whole of ioudaia" occurs (Luke 6:17; 7:11-17; 23:5) he says that it is possible that the third usage is meant.

ioudaios collocates with other designations, such as "Greeks", "Gentiles", "Samaritans", "Pharisees", "Sanhedrin", "Romans", "Priests", "Levites", "Galileans" and "Israel". Some of these function as opposites, others as synonyms.

iouda is used as the name of a tribe seven times. At Heb 7:14 it is claimed that "it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests". "Judah" is a "tribe" and is not "priests". The writer uses the

traditional distinction between a non-priestly tribe and "priests" in an attempt to prove that Jesus is in fact a priest. The tradition also refers to a "priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek", a "priest" from outside the priest-tribe. Whilst the tribe, "Judah", is ineligible for Levitical priesthood, individual members of the tribe may act as "priests" of another order.

Melchizedek combines priesthood and royalty and is, therefore, a role model for unusual claims. Psalm 110 and 11Q Melchizedek similarly attribute royalty and priesthood to the same figure. A more traditional occupation for members of the tribe "Judah" is referred to at Rev 5:5, "weep not; lo, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered". If being a Judean precludes priesthood it is a necessary qualification for royalty. Where Hebrews has to use this alternative order of priesthood to justify its claim that Jesus is a High-priest, Revelation can use Jesus' Judean ancestry to support the claim that he is the Davidic king [171].

The tribe "Judah" is also listed among the twelve "tribes of the sons of Israel" in Rev 7:5. It is linked with "Israel" in Heb 8:8, quoting Jer 31:31, "I will establish a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah". The occurrence in Rev 7:5 refers to one of the twelve parts of the entity "Israel". At Heb 8:8 "the House of Judah" is the same kind of thing (rather than a subgroup of) "the House of Israel". Both are originally used as the names of separate but related political entities. In quotation this political situation is irrelevant. The writer is disinterested in any distinction, their unity is so central that a single name would have been used were it not for the two names in the source passage.

Sanders claims that "the factor of nationality was the stronger" association of the name "Jew" in CCL, taking priority over its other, religious, association [172]. This argument is based on the contrast between "Jews" and "Gentiles" (John 2:6; Acts 14:1) and "Samaritans" (John 4:9) and also on the application of the name to "Jewish Christians" [173] (Acts 21:39; Gal 2:13). Some ioudaioi live among the "Gentiles" (Acts 21:21). Collocations such as "king of the Jews" (e.g. Matt 2:2), "feast of the Jews" (5:1), "people of the Jews" (Acts 12:11) and "country of the Jews" (Acts 10:39) may also distinguish these things belonging to "Jews" from similar things belonging to "Gentiles" ("Greeks", "Romans" and others).

The distinction between religion and nationality is not entirely concrete [174]. There may be a stress on one rather than the other in some situations, but neither is far from the other. Sanders also notes, for example, that "faith" is not ignored in uses of the words in CCL [175]. The polemic of Rom 2:28,29; Rev 2:9 and 3:9 depend on ioudaios having strong associations with religious belief and practice. Clearly, however, no single religious entity should properly be called "Judaism" (as a singular) in this period. CCL uses certain things as emblematic of "what Jews do" and certain institutions which are "Jewish". It claims that these things are distinctively "Jewish" (or "Judean") rather than "Gentile" [176]. Christianity eventually opposed "Judaism" to "Christianity".

Religion is stressed (more than nationality, regional or tribal origins) in "Jewish, ioudaikois" at Titus 1:14. That which is "Jewish" is belittled as "myths" and linked with the "commands of men who reject the truth" as opposed to those who are "sound in the faith" (Titus 1:14-15). "Judaism" may also be in view when Titus is told to "avoid stupid controversies, genealogies, dissensions and quarrels over the law, for they are unprofitable and futile".

From an outsider's perspective these texts are themselves controversies over exactly those issues. "Judaism" is a label applied to "others", its content is not specific. In reality nothing is said other than that it is not Christianity. It is possible that this "Judaism" is actually a divergent form of "Christianity", i.e. "Jewish Christianity" rather than "Gentile Christianity" or "Judaizing Christianity" rather than "Christianity divorced from Judaism". Certainly "Jewish" here is not truly descriptive of any of the Judaisms of the period.

6.2 SPECIFIC TEXTS

There is considerable debate at the moment about the origins of Anti-Judaism (and anti-Semitism) in CCL. The evident anti-Judaism of (slightly) later Christianity is divorced by some writers from any possibility of its having originated in CCL. When it is recognised in those texts a more honest approach is to say so, noting that this need not bind later readers to similar anti-Judaism. Similar apologetic concerns are evident in this discussion as in other material concerned with the relationship between early Christianity and its

Jewish context, and between the now separate religions.

Since it is impossible to deal with the entirety of these debates I intend to discuss the role of ioudaios in Luke, John, Acts, Galatians, Romans and Revelation. These works alone have provoked a not inconsiderable amount of discussion. My comments cannot be exhaustive but aim to suggest that CCL's portrayals of ioudaioi arise from ambiguity and do not reflect a consensus. Other passages could have been discussed [177] but the ones discussed represent the various options available, from hostility towards ioudaioi to claims that the writers are "Jews".

6.3 LUKE AND ACTS

The ioudaioi of Luke's Gospel and Acts are the subject of much recent debate. I do not intend to survey the entirety of this debate but rely heavily on the work of Sanders [178]. In the same year as Sanders' book another arguing the exact opposite was produced by Brawley [179]. The debate is not a new one but appears to be being pursued with vigour at the moment.

Luke is capable of using ioudaios in a "neutral sense" in opposition to "Gentiles" (eg. Luke 7:3; Acts 14:1) and in a geographical sense (eg. Luke 23:50; Acts 2:5,10,14). However, it is increasingly used as if it were a label for not merely "outsiders" but "the opposition". The period prior to the killing of Stephen is portrayed very differently to that afterwards [180]. Townsend claims that the difference between the first eight chapters (in which ioudaios appears three times) and the rest of the book (in which it occurs 76 times) is the setting, "Palestinian" and "semitic" to begin with and "Greek" after chapter eight [181]. An alternative reason for these figures is that after Stephen's death Acts is mainly concerned with the mission to "Gentiles". ioudaios is increasingly used, with increasingly negative overtones, to mean "opponents of the Christians". Luke's Gospel and the first chapters of Acts set up the ioudaioi as those who have had every opportunity to respond to the gospel but have failed to do so.

Stephen's death not only initiates a persecution but marks the beginning of the wider spread of "the gospel" towards the "end of the Earth". This change is marked by several narratives concerned with the spread of the gospel and the conversion of Gentiles [182]. It

culminates in Paul and Peter's visions, which both point to the Gentile mission, and to the discussion between the Apostles in Jerusalem about what is to be expected of Gentiles. The mission then gets under way in earnest. The ioudaioi are, by and large, opponents of this activity.

Acts still uses ioudaios when it means "a group of people distinct from Gentiles" (14:1) but "such usage cannot obscure the fact that, beginning with Acts 9:22, 'the Jews' are the enemies of Christianity" [183]. This is particularly true in 12:3-11 where hoi ioudaioi clearly act against Peter who is rescued by an angel. "God", "an angel", "the Church" and "Peter" are opposed to ioudaioi, "the Jewish people, tou laou tōn ioudaiōn" and "Herod".

Luke portrays Paul as preaching in synagogues when he arrived in new towns, he is the "Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel" [184]. He preaches in synagogues (most of which are explicitly "of the ioudaioi") at Salamis (13:5), Pisidian Antioch (13:14), Iconium (14:1), Thessalonica (17:1), Beroea (17:10), Athens (17:17), Corinth (18:4), Ephesus (18:19; 19:8) and Rome (28:17).

The Pauline mission in Acts is an attempt (which fails) to persuade hoi ioudaioi (and sometimes "Gentiles") to believe in Jesus. This is not the impression given by Paul's own writings where his claim to be "Apostle to the Gentiles" shows what is central to his message. His phrase "to the Jew first and also to the Greek" (Rom 1:16) is not a statement of Paul's missionary approach on arriving in a new city [185] but says something about the way in which the gospel came into being. However, Luke's Paul is a different character from the Pauline Paul. Luke's Paul is one with Luke, "Paul" speaks for Luke. He is continually disappointed that the ioudaioi either do not respond (or respond negatively) to the preaching of the gospel.

For Luke and his apostles (particularly Paul) the mission to the ioudaioi is a failure which leads to the mission to the Gentiles. Paul's call to take the gospel to Gentiles is in the context of Jewish hostility, which he had previously exemplified in his own actions. His name change came not with his call on the Damascus road but in conflict with a Jewish "false prophet" in competition for the allegiance of the procurator of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus (13:9 [186]).

Three times Paul announces that the Christian mission will "now go to the Gentiles" because the ioudaioi have opposed him. At 13:42-48 although "many ioudaioi and devout proselytes" followed Paul and Barnabas one sabbath, on the following sabbath "when the ioudaioi saw the crowd who had gathered they were filled with jealousy, contradicted Paul and reviled him". Paul and Barnabas declare that God has sent them to the Gentiles, who respond gladly. The missionaries do go to the "synagogue of the ioudaioi" of the next town and "a great company, both of ioudaioi and Greeks, believed" (14:1). "But the unbelieving ioudaioi stirred up the Gentiles" against them.

Several more episodes about attempts to preach are opposed by ioudaioi and, more rarely (and without similar condemnation), Gentiles. The Jerusalem apostles and elders confirm the approach of Paul and Barnabas, sending a letter to the "brothers who are of the Gentiles, adelphois tois ex ethnōn" to say so (15:22-29). In Corinth Paul had been arguing "in the synagogue every sabbath, persuading ioudaioi and Greeks" but was soon "reviled" and declares to the ioudaioi, "your blood be upon your heads! I am innocent. From now on I will go to the Gentiles" (18:6). Again there are some ioudaioi who respond to Paul's message and who work with him, but more attention is paid to those who oppose him. Eventually, the third and final prophetic condemnation of the ioudaioi is announced as the climax of the book, and the successful, unopposed teaching of the gospel to Gentiles is anticipated (28:25-28) [187].

Donaldson says that "Luke has a more positive attitude to the Jewish origins of the Church and to the place of the Jewish Christian remnant in Heilsgeschichte than is to be found in ... any of the other second century Gentile Christian writers" and that "Luke gives an important place in salvation history to the Jewish-Christians" [188]. Brawley claims that "rather than rejecting the Jews, Luke appeals to them" [189]. According to Van Goudoever,

Luke was prudent in his attitude towards Israel - probably because he realised the tragic situation for Israel after 70 CE. On the other hand Luke was quite convinced of the rightness of the messianic movement. The only thing he could hope was that the Jews acknowledged that the Holy Spirit was sent to the nations too [190].

A more remarkable claim is made by Young who accepts as

largely historical the "Jewish hostility [which] is found throughout the book of Acts" and says, "Christians tried to maintain their contact with Judaism". It is Jewish rejection of the gospel and of Christians which puts Christians in their "problematical situation" in which they tried "to prove that they were the true inheritors of the past, and the Jews were misguided" [191]. This very different reading of Luke-Acts must be accounted for.

According to Conzelmann Luke divided history into three epochs: "the Epoch of Israel", "the Epoch of Jesus' Ministry" (the "Middle of Time") and "the Epoch of the Church" [192]. Whether or not this is entirely adequate it is probable that Luke considered the time of Israel to be over. The "middle of history" is concerned with making certain of that. The gospel is proclaimed, by Luke's Jesus, Peter, Paul and others to ioudaioi as well as "Gentiles". A large amount of Luke-Acts is spent in claiming that great efforts were made to persuade hoi ioudiaoi to hear the gospel [193].

According to Tatum Luke "uses the birth stories in order to portray the first period in the story of salvation, the Epoch of Israel" [194]. Israel or the ioudaioi have had every chance to respond adequately but have consistently refused. Now Luke announces the end of God's mercy towards them. He has Paul announce the "Eschatological Judgement" against the ioudaioi, "your blood be upon you" at the same time as he reiterates his announcement that the message is going to the Gentiles (18:6). The time of "Eschatological Repentance" for the people is over, they have refused and persecuted God's messengers. Luke portrays the failure of Paul's missionary activities towards the ioudaioi forcing him, reluctantly, to reject them and to go to Gentiles [195]. Not only Paul, but God also, rejects the Jews.

Luke consistently portrays the ioudaioi as a people who have had many opportunities to respond to God. The birth narrative of his Gospel and Paul's sermons epitomise Luke's attitude. Tannehill believes that the end of Acts "leaves us with the unanswered question of how God's ancient promise to the covenant people can now be fulfilled" [196]. However, Luke claims that the ioudaioi have consistently refused to respond or have responded negatively and that "now" God has finished with them. They have rejected Jesus and his apostles (e.g. Luke 11:47; Acts 2:23; 3:15; 5:30). There should be no surprise at the ending of Acts. The ioudaioi with one accord, homothumadon (e.g. Acts 18:12) have rejected

and now been rejected by God and the church.

hoi ioudaioi in Luke-Acts is, increasingly, a negative term. The positive things said of them only throw into relief the negative things. Luke writes for a Gentile church who are not encouraged to see themselves as belonging to a Jewish group but as being God's new community. The killing of Jesus and the rejection of the ioudaioi is part of the gospel of Luke proclaimed to Gentiles in Luke-Acts [197].

6.4 JOHN

hoi ioudaioi occurs 67 times in John and ioudaios, four times. John's five uses of "Israel(ite)" are very significant, but the 71 occurrences of ioudaios suggest another stress of the Gospel.

Not surprisingly these occurrences have provoked much debate but little agreement. In this section I do not intend to review all the literature surrounding John's Gospel, nor will I discuss every occurrence. I intend to summarise some suggestions on the usage of the word.

It has been suggested that ioudaioi refers to "Judeans" rather than "Jews". Although "Jews" now has connotations of a world-religion divorced from territory or nationality more ancient usage would not have divorced the religious expression from the ethnic group and territory in which it originated or existed. There is no problem in Greek, ioudaioi includes all these connotations, the problem arises when we try to translate ideas about what John is referring to, or when we ask why he chose to name his opponents ioudaioi. Does he mean that one religion is opposed by a wider religious community? Or does he mean that the inhabitants of a place named "Judah" or "Judea" opposed Jesus and his followers? Either of these possibilities (and others) could be expressed by ioudaioi.

Lowe [198] argues that almost all the occurrences of ioudaioi in John's Gospel should be translated by "Judeans". Rather than have Jesus opposed by "Jews" everywhere, John accused "Judeans" in one region of such opposition. This territorial and historical limitation of the conflict counters later anti-Judaism. Christianity is not opposed to "Jews" as a continuing religion and its self-awareness is not based on the denigration of "others", specifically "Jews".

There are occurrences of ioudaioi which could easily be translated by "Judeans". At 7:1 Jesus refuses to go to "Judea, ioudaia" because "the ioudaioi sought to kill him". "Jews" is a possible translation (as most versions show) but "Judeans" is "more immediately appropriate" [199]. At 11:7 Jesus wants to go to "Judea" but his disciples remind him that hoi ioudaioi there had only recently tried to stone him. At 11:54 Jesus again withdraws ("to the country near the wilderness, to a country named Ephraim") rather than "go openly among hoi ioudaioi".

There are also a number of "neutral" passages [200] where ioudaiōn defines various feasts (and sometimes links them with Jerusalem and the Temple). At 2:13; 6:4 and 11:55 the feast is specified as "Passover". Passover is probably intended at 5:1. At 7:2 the feast is Tabernacles and at 19:42 it is Preparation [201]. At 19:40 John refers to the "burial custom of the ioudaioi" which might also be rendered "Judeans" rather than "Jews" [202]. Such a usage is comparable with 10:22 where Hannukah, ta egkainia, is said to be "in Jerusalem" [203]. Meeks is clear that John does not necessarily use ioudaioi in this way because he is an "outsider" distant from Judaism. He cites the letter of "Soumaios" (either "a nickname of Bar Kochba... or someone very close to him") which refers to Tabernacles in exactly the same way that John does [204].

Lowe claims that John uses ioudaioi in these passages to explain why Jesus and his followers went to Jerusalem. At 5:1 "Judah" has just been contrasted with "Galilee" and where Jesus is about to "go up to Jerusalem". In chapter 6 there is, however, no movement out of Galilee but Jesus feeds five thousand men when "Passover was at hand" [205]. At 2:6 the setting is the wedding at Cana and has nothing to do with going to Judah. The translation "Judean feast" might be acceptable and is, at least, no worse than "Jewish feast". "Judean feast" is not equivalent to "feast celebrated in Judah". To Gentiles, and therefore the majority of Christians (especially those for whom these "neutral" uses were written [206]) these feasts, even when celebrated in Galilee or Rome, were intimately related to what happened in Jerusalem. Thus ioudaiōn means both "Jewish" and "Judean" in these cases, our problem of translation is not John's [207].

Lowe [208] believes that John "appears to speak of Judea only in the strict sense" of the area, once named "Judah", immediately surrounding Jerusalem. It is distinguishable from "Galilee" and "Samaria" (4:3-4) and

"Perea" (11:7). If ioudaioi is translated "Judeans" rather than "Jews" it implies that the majority, if not all the inhabitants of Judea, opposed Jesus and his followers. One suggested reason for this is that these first Christians were "Galileans" [209]. Unless the Gospel was written for Galileans it is hard to believe that this would be sufficient grounds for such a usage of "Judeans". It has been suggested that the Gospel was produced by and for Samaritans and reflects their view of "Judeans" [210]. A similar objection can be raised against this proposal, it does not account for enough of the Gospel. Nor does the proposition that the Gospel is (or contains) an anti-Judean polemic. The DSS are undoubtedly anti-Jerusalem and anti-Temple as currently administered but can use the name "Judah" of themselves. John's Gospel undoubtedly sees Jerusalem and Judea as the focus of the culpable rejection of Jesus by "his own" but John means more by ioudaioi than "inhabitants of Judah at that date".

A clarification of the translation "Judeans" is that it refers to "the Judean authorities". Something akin to this possibility is recognised by the Living New Testament. Epp writes,

whether legitimate or not as a translation or justifiable hermeneutically, the LNT (not often noted for consistency) has quite consistently substituted "Jewish leaders" for "the Jews" in contexts where the Fourth Gospel portrays hostility between Jesus and "the Jews" [211].

Epp says, "doubtless this is correct historically" as not "all Jews were Jesus' opponents, accusers or murderers". However, the Living New Testament castigates and denigrates Jews and Judaism in most other contexts more than the manuscripts do and recognises something Epp ignores: the Gospel "is not an unpretentious and impartial record of events" [212]. John's ioudaioi are characters in a book written to argue a case, they are clearly the opposition. "What actually happened" is less important than "what Christians perceive the situation to be". In John's account all the ioudaioi are implicated. It may be true to John's purposes to translate this as "Judean" or "Jewish leaders" sometimes, but historical details (such as not every leader was involved) are not important.

One leader of the ioudaioi in John is Nicodemus. He is also named, ironically, "teacher of Israel" [213]. This is not because "Israel" for John is a community without fault but because Nicodemus is ignorant of

things which a "teacher of Israel" ought to know. He does not respond adequately to Jesus and actually brings spices to anoint Jesus' dead body (19:39) when he ought to have known there would be no dead body. He joins with Joseph of Arimathea in coming to the tomb "secretly for fear of the ioudaioi" and fulfils the "burial customs of the ioudaioi". Nicodemus acts in secret again, he has not changed since his first appearance at 3:1-2 where, as "a man of the Pharisees" and a "ruler of the ioudaioi" he came to Jesus "by night". He exemplifies John's ioudaioi. Although he is sympathetic he is unconvinced and remains among those who do not respond adequately. He is part of "the world" and prefers "the dark".

Schram sees ioudaios here as the "address of the evangelist to his readers" whereas "Israel" is "the reported usage of a Jewish speaker (Jesus) to a Jewish hearer (Nicodemus)" [214]. I have argued that John has clearer reasons for the use of "Israel" and doubt that he was interested in getting such details as the alleged "insiders versus outsiders designations" correct.

John is not very interested in distinguishing between the groups which might constitute ioudaioi. His "Pharisees" are the distillation of his ioudaioi. Not all ioudaioi are "Pharisees" but all "Pharisees" are ioudaioi. John is not attacking Pharisaism, as, perhaps, the Synoptic Gospels may do. It is not even necessary for a reader of the Gospel to know anything about the "historical Pharisees". If ioudaioi is to be translated "Jewish" or "Judean leaders" then "the Pharisees" is a label for one part of that leadership. It is, however, inaccurate to say that "it is not the Jews, it is the Pharisees" who consistently oppose Jesus [215]. John does accuse hoi ioudaioi of consistent opposition and claims that the Pharisees were among the leaders of this opposition.

Jesus is also named a ioudaios (4:9). This has led some to believe that John cannot be as anti-Jewish as others claim. However, the designation ioudaios used by a "Samaritan" is to be understood as having been intended as derogatory and as a misunderstanding. John explains why he has his character, the "Samaritan woman", say this to Jesus, "for ioudaioi have no dealings with Samaritans". Jesus does not need to deny this designation because of this explanation and because readers will know that it is as inaccurate as many other conceptions of Jesus in the Gospel. It is inaccurate to say that "Jesus emphatically welcomes this appellation" [216] as 4:22 is not a reply to the woman's question.

At 7:52 Nicodemus is asked if he too has become a "Galilean" because he has suggested Jesus should be listened to. This appellation is also intended to be derogatory, Jesus and his followers are "Galileans" and "no prophet is to rise from Galilee". When Jesus is called a "Samaritan" and asked if he has a demon this is not taken to mean that John might use "Samaritan" as a positive name. Again Jesus does not respond to the appellation. It is clear that everyone misunderstands and insults Jesus and that this is part of the gospel John taught.

At 4:22 Jesus says that "salvation comes from the ioudaioi" [217]. This uncharacteristically positive use of ioudaioi causes problems in most discussions of the name. If it is not assumed that these are the actual words of Jesus and a Samaritan woman the difficulties are eased. There is no need to search through Samaritan literature to find out what may or may not have been going through the minds of these two actors. They and the events of the chapter are part of John's own thoughts about Jesus and his significance to the contemporary world. Themes of misunderstanding and revelation, rejection and belief are favourites of John's. John has affirmed that "the light" came "to his own home, but his own people received him not" (1:11) and made it clear that these people were ioudaioi. They have been the audience for God's prophets and now even for "the light of the world", yet they have refused to respond.

In chapter 4 Jesus has already provoked a certain amount of misunderstanding by asking for water and then declaring that the woman should have asked him for water. Meeks' sympathy for

poor Nicodemus and the "believing" Jews with whom, it seems, Jesus is playing some kind of language-game whose rules neither they nor we could possibly know [218]

must be extended to the Samaritan woman. When Jesus declares that "you worship what you do not know; we worship what we know for salvation comes from the ioudaioi", he is being provocative, trying to elicit a different understanding from his audience.

John does portray Jesus as a "Judean" [219] but probably means more than that "Judea is conceived as the country of origin of Jesus the Messiah and as such the source of salvation" [220]. John's point includes the fact that Jerusalem (and so Judea) is the place of the

"lifting up" of Jesus, and so doubly the "source of salvation". The primary point of the words, however, is that Jesus is trying to provoke the woman into saying whether she sees him as anything other than someone from Judea who asks for water. Will she, like the majority of the ioudaioi misunderstand and reject him, and thus remain part of "the world", or will she "believe"?

Eventually "many Samaritans from that city believed in him because of the woman's testimony" (4:39) which had been couched in Johannine language, without aid from the disciples who also misunderstood Jesus. The Samaritans declare that "we know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world".

Jesus' declaration to the Samaritan woman does not really mean that John was willing to have him thought of as a ioudaios. That Jesus originated and the saving events (the "lifting up") took place in Jerusalem and Judea only highlights the culpability of the ioudaioi who, despite everything, continued to misunderstand. John in chapter 4 may be validating an expansion of the Gospel, but his primary literary purpose is to explore one more example of misunderstandings of Jesus turning into faith. It is also important that "Samaritans" believed when "the Pharisees" (4:1), the disciples (4:31-37) and the ioudaioi (4:43-45) did not understand or even opposed him. The disciples will eventually understand properly, but in chapter 4 it is "Samaritans", non-ioudaioi, who know that Jesus is "the Saviour of the world".

I note briefly that if any of these comments are valid the argument that ioudaioi is an "outsiders" name for the people who preferred to call themselves israēl is unnecessary. I have already noted the inadequacy of this thesis in discussing the use of ioudaioi and israēl in Jesus' discussion with Nicodemus. Here I note that Smith claims that,

Jews do not ordinarily refer to themselves [as "Jews"] except when assuming an outsider's perspective. John's usage, on the other hand, does not conform to what we would expect from Jewish circles in first century Palestine. The narrator somehow stands outside the orbit of Judaism in that he seems no longer to consider himself, or even Jesus and his disciples, to be Jewish [221].

It is not, however, the case that John uses ioudaioi because it is an "outsiders" word. He links ioudaioi

with Jerusalem and Judea (as "insiders" did as much as "outsiders"). He sees Jerusalem as the focus of Jesus' activities. The ioudaioi are the prime audience for what God has done in the past and what Jesus has done. Jesus himself is a ioudaios if only because "his own people" who rejected him were ioudaioi. It is no mistake that the inscription on the cross reads, "king of the ioudaioi" (19:19), "king of those whose faith and confidence he failed to elicit" [222].

A reader of John's Gospel cannot but be aware that what he wrote about was events which happened among ioudaioi. Whether or not his readers were Gentiles, Samaritans or Galileans, the events and characters of the Gospel (good and bad) were ioudaioi. In that light to speak of ioudaioi as consistently negative is a strange thing to do. This is, however, what John does. He did this neither because he has divorced himself from "Judaism" nor because he was exalting "Galileans" (or "Samaritans") above "Judeans". He had become convinced that certain events among the ioudaioi had taken place which he could only condemn. Jesus, he believed, had come to his own, the ioudaioi and they, he thought, had rejected him. Had they accepted Jesus, John would have used ioudaioi with unreserved praise.

Other groups in the period may have been "reluctant to call themselves Ioudaioi" [223] for regional or historical reasons (such as being "Samaritans" or not having been "returnees from exile"). Their reasons might also include opposition to the Temple, the priesthood and other authorities in Jerusalem and Judea.

John's reasons are sectarian. The one he thought of as "the light of the world" was rejected by those he thought should have been the first to accept him. These people were not just the inhabitants of Judea but all ioudaioi anywhere and at any time. John blamed them for this so much that their very name became, for him and those he influenced [224] synonymous with all they opposed. As Bultmann wrote,

The term hoi Ioudaioi, characteristic of the Evangelist, gives an overall portrayal of the Jews, viewed from the standpoint of Christian faith, as the representatives of unbelief (and thereby, as will appear, of the unbelieving "world" in general) [225].

John, unlike the writers of the Synoptics, is not interested in distinctions between different groups of

ioudaioi (except for a few occasions where he refers to "Pharisees" or "the crowd"). All are blamed, not just "Judeans" ("ioudaioi in Judea") but "all ioudaioi everywhere". Neither is John interested in Jewish-Christian relations. He categorised all ioudaioi as opponents. The ioudaioi are not just symbolic [226]. Fortna attempts to avoid John's anti-Judaism by claiming that it is "not in any sense racial" and that John

is not finally concerned with Judaism itself as a historical phenomenon alongside Christianity, so much as with the human condition, as it can be symbolised by the non-Christian religion he apparently knew best, Judaism [227].

ioudaioi may be symbolic and certainly represent "the world" [228] but John is concerned with real Jews and Judaism too.

It remains to note that the Gospel's opposition to the ioudaioi is not to be attributed to the "Jews" (or "Judeans") themselves. In asking why John opposed the ioudaioi some writers have suggested that it was because Christians had been thrown out of synagogues or were persecuted by some Jews in some way [229]. However, this is sectarian propaganda of a group who defined themselves over against other people, they needed no other "cause" for opposition than what they already believed had happened. It may or may not be the case that some Jews were hostile to some Christians but that would only have reinforced an already accepted and unprovable (and equal unfalsifiable) opposition. The roots of John's polemical use of ioudaioi are in his Christology. The "rhetorical situation of the Gospel" must not be confused with, or collapsed into, "its historical situation" [230]. Victims must not be blamed for the actions or intentions of aggressors.

6.5 GALATIANS

The polemic against a "Judaism" (as defined by Christians rather than as an observable entity) is clear in the use of "circumcised" in Galatians [231]. Paul uses a number of past events to clarify the purpose of this letter to the Galatian (mainly Gentile [232]) Christians. One of these is an incident between himself and Peter in Antioch. It might be important that (Acts claims) Antioch was the first place where the name "Christian" was used. Rowland sees this as evidence that this was the first place and time that Christians

had become distinctive in beliefs and practices from "others of a Jewish persuasion" [233]. The main issue in Galatians is an inner-Christian conflict rather than one between "Christianity" and any other "Judaism". However, Paul begins by narrating his earlier life.

He refers to his "former life in Judaism, ioudaismos", claiming that this involved the persecuting and attempted destruction of the "church of God" (1:13). More positively, Paul claims that he "advanced in Judaism, ioudaismō, beyond many of my own age among my people" (1:14). The phrase, "he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace" (1:15) is descriptive of Paul's former life and faith [234]. The difference between then and the "now" of the letter is that God "was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles" (1:16) [235]. Paul was not "converted" from "Judaism" to "Christianity", he "changed parties within Judaism from Pharisaism to Jewish Christianity" [236].

1:16 states what is most central to Paul's understanding of "the gospel" which it is the purpose of the letter to restate. He is not "defending his apostleship" but explaining his understanding of the gospel, its origin and how it is particularly addressed to Gentiles [237]. Davies notes that these Gentiles would have found some of the argument of Galatians (particularly chaps. 3 and 4) "remote and puzzling" unless they were "deeply influenced by the synagogue" and therefore concludes that Paul's audience were "former proselytes, God-fearers and Jews" [238]. Paul probably expected his words to be further explained by someone in Galatia and it is not inconceivable that his audience were all Gentiles, albeit ones heavily influenced by ("Christian" or non-"Christian") Judaism.

Paul's ioudaismos itself is not totally opposed to his new way of life. Although the change caused by being sent to convert Gentiles [239] affects his view of "Judaism" he does not denigrate it absolutely. He opposes "Gentiles", "Greeks" and even "the church of God" with "circumcision" [240] rather than with "Judaism".

Although Paul declares himself to be a ioudaios [241] rather than a "Gentile sinner" (2:15), within the "church of God" there are still "circumcised" and ioudaioi who are opposed. Cephas, Barnabas and hoi loipoi ioudaioi are accused of insincerely acting differently towards Gentiles depending on whether "certain men from James, the circumcised, tous ek

peritomēs" were present (2:12,13).

The actions that Paul sees as "insincerity" were probably attempts by Law-Observant Christians to persuade Gentiles to observe the God-given Law [242]. Paul is not concerned to explain what the problem was, except that it was focussed on eating or not eating. He does not say whether the others' point of view was that Gentiles ought to keep kosher, merely avoid pork, slaughter properly, tithe adequately or avoid idol offerings, or whether they thought ioudaioi should be more rigorous [243].

Although Paul has decided that it is unnecessary for Gentiles to be circumcised and (possibly) to obey the food regulations [244], the issue here is not opposition to the Law or to any "Judaism" external to "Christianity". This is an inner-Christian debate. What Paul "accuses Peter to his face" about is "hypocrisy" or "insincerity". Having not displayed these "works of the law", Peter then does so. Paul claims that this sort of insincere change of life-style is the kind of thing that "Gentile sinners" might be expected to do. "We ioudaioi" are supposed to be single minded, to carry out whatever has been decided [245]. How are gentiles to know what to do? They have not had the benefit of being "Jewish", but have heard a "gospel" which would make them "children of Abraham" by the act of faith. If someone now gives them a different gospel, one which includes the taxic indicators of circumcision and food regulations, they may come to think of the gospel as something as changeable as their previous status as "gentile sinners".

The issue is summed up in the sentence, "if you, though a ioudaios, live like a Gentile and not like a ioudaios, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like ioudaioi?, ei su ioudaios huparchōn ethnikōs kai ouk ioudaikōs zēs pōs ta ethnē anagkazeis ioudaizein" (2:14). Paul and Peter and the other ioudaioi involved are all "trying to make Gentiles into ioudaioi" or "trying to make Gentiles live like ioudaioi". Paul, however, does not want them to become ioudaioi of the "circumcised" sort. For him "circumcision" is a mark, a taxic indicator, of a sort of Judaism he has moved on from, it "cannot be isolated but entails keeping the whole Law" (5:3 [246]). Paul is not opposing covenantal nomism [247] but wants to incorporate the Gentiles into the covenant with Abraham and see them demonstrate this by "hearing with faith" and "works of the Spirit".

It is not "Judaism" or being a ioudaios that is bad. Paul is not accusing Peter of "Judaizing", of "requiring from the Gentile believers" some sort of non-Christian "Jewish" life-style [248]. It is, however, now out of the question that ioudaioi, that is, those who will later be called "Christians", should use the signs of a sort of Judaism different to the one Paul preaches (as did Peter in Acts). For Paul (among other early Christians) these things were no longer to be a taxic indicator of their form of Judaism [249]. What is wrong with them is not, as Luther thought, that people thought of them as means of gaining merit with God. To Paul they are wrong because they are signs of "national privilege".

As Paul is trying to establish a "new taxon" where there is "neither Greek nor Jew" nor "male nor female", circumcision cannot be acceptable as it establishes the Jewish male as the definition of "Israel" and as the primary recipient of God's message [250]. The issue is "biblicism" not "legalism" [251].

Paul does not assert the "displacement" of the Synagogue by the Church [252]. He is certain that his gospel (that Gentiles would be justified) is contained in scripture (3:8). His debate is not about "how to get in" but how to "stay in" or, more accurately, about "being in" [253]. The taxic indicators of this expression of the covenant [254] are works of the Spirit" (3:2-5; 5:16-26). When Christianity eventually separated itself from other Judaisms it saw circumcision, dietary regulations and the keeping of Sabbath as taxic indicators of error, i.e. "Judaism".

There is nothing wrong with Paul's understanding of other Judaisms, he knows all about covenantal nomism and does not reject it. What he explicitly opposes in Galatians is the "hypocrisy" which will confuse Gentiles as to what is important in "being in" the Covenant with God which was first made with Abraham and reiterated through Jesus.

With the advent of this "seed of Abraham" the covenant does not change or cease. It is still "by faith", "by hearing" and is still expressed in outward actions. Circumcision and food regulations are rejected, not as if they had been attempts to gain merit, but because they had become associated with one nation and with ioudaioi and "the circumcision" who opposed Paul's mission. These opponents, whatever name they were labelled with, may as well have been Gentiles within a "Jewish" group (including some variety of

Christianity) as Jews trying to convert Gentiles.

Galatians is addressed to Gentiles and the people who remain in disagreement with Paul are Gentiles. Nothing suggests that Paul is still in conflict with Peter [255]. They both aim to "Judaize" Gentiles who otherwise remain "sinners". Paul can use ioudaioi to refer to both "ioudaioi who believe in Jesus" and "ioudaioi who do not". There is no opposition between ioudaioi and "Christian" (or any other name for that group). ioudaioi are not non-"believers" or non-"Christians" but non-"Gentiles" or non-"Greeks" [256]. ioudaioi refers not to a religion or a sect opposed to other religions or sects but to a range of options some of which Paul agrees with and others which he rejects.

It is worth comparing ioudaizein in Galatians with similar words elsewhere [257]. There are various contexts and usages of the word. In Esther mityahadim or ioudaizō is something positive. To Ignatius it is a serious error.

At Esth 8:17 the MT reads mityahadim and the LXX reads ioudaizōn. RSV translates this as "declared themselves Jews". Since this action is done "for fear of the Jews" it is perhaps inappropriate to translate it as "became Jews" [258] but "acted as Jews" [259] suggests insincerity which is too negative an implication [260]. "Lived as Jews" (as opposed to "living as Greeks") might be a better translation. The text does not explain what the action entailed, e.g. it does not say whether or not they were circumcised [261] nor what their position in the community (of either ioudaioi or Gentiles) was afterwards. Esther does not suggest that the action was wrong or that the motive of fear invalidated it. Presumably these people and their actions were accepted.

Josephus also uses ioudaizein in J.W. 2.454, in reference to a Roman commander, and ioudaizontas in J.W. 2.463, in reference to the suspicion in Syria of some people of ambiguous allegiance. These passages are fully discussed in my chapter on "Judah in Josephus". I conclude that "to live like a ioudaios" is probably a better translation than "convert to Judaism" which implies a religion distinct from its culture.

"Judaize" is more a transliteration than a translation and is inadequate for most occurrences of ioudaizō, having only the virtue of not forcing one interpretation on an ambiguous word. However, the

strongly negative connotations of "Judaize" in Christian usage are certainly inapplicable in Josephus.

Plutarch says that a freed slave, Caecilius, was "suspected of Judaizing, enochos tō ioudaizein" (Cicero 7:6). Plutarch claims he is quoting Cicero [262]. He says nothing about how Caecilius is supposed to have "Judaized". It may well be that Plutarch had nothing specific in mind but has mistaken the accused Caecilius for one who was actually Jewish. Whatever the truth of the matter, nothing is said as to the nature of "Judaizing".

Ignatius expresses clear opposition to "Jews" and "Judaizing" by condemning those who "try to talk of Jesus Christ and yet to Judaize" (Magn 8:1; 10:3). I devote more space to Ignatius below. In short, his "Judaizers" were a group (or subgroup) of Christians, of Gentile origin, who (perhaps) claimed to be ioudaioi. They did not ascribe divinity to Christ nor would they accept some Ignatian interpretations of Scripture. They did not circumcise (and Ignatius appears to be upset about that) but celebrate Sabbath rather than "the Lord's day" [263]. Ignatius says that "it is better to hear the circumcised teaching Christianity than the uncircumcised teaching Judaism" (Phld 6:1).

According to Filson, Pilate in the Acts of Pilate tells the "Jews" that "you know my wife is God-fearing and more than ever Judaizes with you" (2:1) [264]. Scheidweiler and Higgins render the passage, "you know that my wife fears God and favours rather the customs of the Jews, with you" [265]. Once again there is nothing in the context that says what Pilate's wife does. Cohen concludes that

if we seek to produce a single definition of a "judaizer" or a "god-fearer", and if we limit that definition to the realm of Jewish practices alone, we labor in vain [266].

What is clear is that as Pilate is attempting to ensure a hearing from the ioudaioi, he must be speaking of something that ioudaioi would perceive as positive. The text is, of course, Christian polemic, in which what "Jews" do, say and perceive are negative things. Trying to persuade Gentiles, including women, to have some relationship to Judaism is a Jewish, therefore negative, activity. Pilate's wife's "fearing God" allows her to play the part of a witness to Christ but she is not fully within the Church.

As Filson says, "every use of the Greek word applies to Gentiles who live in the Jewish way" and not to ioudaioi attempting to "inculcate or impose Judaism" [267]. It is also clear that it is only Christian uses in which it means "an attempt to convert others to Judaism". Elsewhere Gentiles might follow "Jewish" customs (what these are are rarely specified) or maybe even go beyond "God-fearing" to "becoming Jewish", but this is not explicitly encouraged in any texts. It is equally clear that for Christians "Judaizing" is a negative activity [268].

In Galatians Paul considers himself and his fellow apostles to be ioudaioi and to be engaged in an attempt to persuade "Gentiles" to "become ioudaioi" or "live as ioudaioi". This involves their incorporation into the covenant with Abraham and in doing certain things and not doing other things. It does not involve circumcision or recognising the food regulations of what Paul saw as a different Judaism. He does not deny that these things are scriptural but does not apply them to those he converts. His own self-perception as the "apostle to the Gentiles" has affected what he teaches and the way he sees what it is to be a ioudaios. "Gentile" is synonymous with "sinner" and with an "insincere" lifestyle. Paul accuses Peter of being "insincere" in his dealings with Gentiles and is concerned that this will confuse them as to what is expected of them. In "becoming ioudaioi", i.e. Christian ones, the Gentiles are expected not to go back to their previous lifestyle. Nor, however, are they to display signs of a different sort of "Judaism" to the "Christian" one.

The majority of commentators have assumed that "Judaize" is something negative and that Paul is anti-Jewish. Although this is certainly not his intention, the seeds of the denigration of Judaism are to be found within Paul's letters. The strength with which Paul states his case against the taxic indicators of other Judaisms became a stepping stone into deeper anti-Judaism. A similar situation arose with later readings of Paul's argument in Romans that the ioudaioi have many benefits and have received much good. His omission of, "however, now believing Gentiles have replaced them" was soon amended. When the ioudaioi continued to refuse to believe, Christians found in the benefits that ioudaioi had received in the past only opportunities to repent, opportunities missed and therefore damnable. Thus Paul became a source for anti-Judaism.

6.6 ROMANS

In Romans Paul refers to "Jews" and "Judah" twelve times [269]. Rom 15:31 refers to the "land of Judea", centred on "Jerusalem", where there are "unbelievers" and "saints". The "saints" are believing Christians, the Church. They are not named "Israel". The "unbelievers" are not named "Jews" as they would be in John or Luke-Acts. Indeed it could even be that the "unbelievers" were the Roman authorities and troops. Certainly Paul does not take the opportunity to talk of "Jewish" "unbelief" as should be expected from Ruether's claim that, "Paul's position was unquestionably that of anti-Judaism" [270].

The word "Jew" is opposed to the word "Gentile" but one is not more positive than the other. Both have been "under the power of sin" (3:9), have heard the Gospel (1:16; 2:9,10) and have been "prepared for glory" and "called" (9:24). God is "the God of the Gentiles" as well as "the God of the Jews" (3:29), and the latter is no less important than the former. In the end "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows riches upon all who call upon him" (10:12). The distinction between "Jew" and "Gentile" (or "Greek") is not one of ranking, the denigration of one in favour of the other, but of nationality.

Paul even asks, "what advantage has the Jew?", expanded by, "what advantage is circumcision?" and answered, "much in every way" (3:1). Against Paul's explicit statements, Ruether writes,

Judaism for Paul is not only not an ongoing covenant of salvation where men [sic] continue to be related in true worship of God; it never was such a community of faith and grace [271].

According to Gaston,

Paul has provided the theological structure for Christian anti-Judaism, from Marcion through Luther and F.C.Baur down to Bultmann, in a manner even more serious than Ruether indicates in her brief discussion of Paul [272].

He also claims that Paul "disagrees with... Judaism itself, saying that Christianity has replaced it" [273]. This is not what Paul says, in Romans or elsewhere. Indeed he writes mainly of God's grace towards Israel and, far from teaching "the divine rejection of Israel"

he "expressely says the opposite (11:1)" [274].

Paul expands his answer ("much in every way") by saying that, "they are entrusted with the oracles of God" (3:2). However, now that these "oracles" have been heard and believed in by Gentiles a question is raised about the continuing benefits accruing to the ioudaioi. Paul responds to this problem in chapters 9-11, in which he prefers to use the name "Israel" but also uses ioudaioi (9:24; 10:12) without derogatory overtones. "Jews" and "Gentiles" are "called", the former are not replaced or displaced by the latter. In 9:1-5 Paul lists the things which belong to his "kinsmen according to race, kata sarka", "the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, the promises, the ancestors" and "of their race is the Christ according to the flesh, kata sarka".

Nothing Paul says about "Jews" (or "Israel") in any of the above suggests that it has "played out its role" [275]. It is only 2:17-29 which questions the effect of naming oneself "a Jew". Paul's argument is that to be "a light to the Gentiles" Jews must themselves obey the Law, within themselves and not (merely) externally. This is, of course, a recognisably Jewish insistence on the role of the Law. The purpose of the argument is to demonstrate that "all have sinned". Having said that Gentiles are condemned for their lifestyle, now Paul stresses that Jews are no less liable to judgement. When Paul writes, "the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you" (2:24 misquoting Isa 52:5) he does not follow on by exhorting "Jews" to abandon "Judaism" or by saying that "Judaism" is replaced by "Christianity". On the contrary, the following part of his argument begins with the question, "what advantage has the Jew?", answered, "much in every way".

I conclude this section on Paul's usage of ioudaioi in Romans by summarising my discussion of the olive tree of Rom 11:16-24 [276]. The Gentiles are "grafted in" to a tree rooted deep in Israel's traditions and ancestors. They have ceased to be what they were and have become part of a fruitful people. As has always been the case, God has removed unfruitful, unbelieving branches. The tree has always been one of faith, of response to God's gracious covenant. What is new is that Gentiles have been brought in. God has previously used Gentiles mostly for judgement against Israel. Now they have been given life. Certainly they benefit the tree by increasing its fruitfulness but they are not to consider themselves to be more important than that which they are grafted into. Nor must they forget that God's choice

may be to cut them out again if they become unfruitful.

Paul, in Romans, does not denigrate "Jews" or "Judaism". His self-perception as "apostle to Gentiles" means that non-ioudaioi are his focus of attention, but he chooses to address them about their relationship with "Israel" and the ioudaioi. They have become part of an already existing community and what is left behind is the "Gentile" lifestyle not the "Jewish" one.

The problem that Paul leaves behind is rooted in the duality he establishes in refusing to reject those who do not believe in favour of those who do. His "kinsmen according to the flesh" have many and great benefits, they have not been abandoned by God. However, when "the Jews" still have not believed, Paul's heirs could see no value in "Israel according to the flesh". They found in Johannine (and other) responses to the same problem, an answer more to their liking: the ioudaioi were rejected and replaced. Then the Church could take the name "Israel" for itself and reserve "the Jews" for application to rejected outsiders, their (perceived) opposition. The positive Pauline associations of "the Jews" with Abraham and with God's grace are forgotten in favour of a negative application of the name.

6.7 REVELATION

Rev 2:9 condemns a group who "call themselves Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan" [277]. Whilst it is possible that these people are gentiles who have "Judaized" in some sense, it is more likely that they are ethnically ioudaioi but are being denied the use of their ancestral name in a polemic which asserts that Christians are "true Jews" [278]. Revelation is full of Judean and specifically Jerusalem imagery. Jesus is the "lion of the tribe of Judah" (5:5) rather than being compared to a Roman Imperial figure. 7:4-8 lists the 12 "tribes of the sons of Israel". The vision of the new Earth focuses on the "holy city, new Jerusalem", the materials for the foundations and gates of which are named, along with the inscriptions to the 12 "tribes of the sons of Israel" and the 12 apostles.

Other details fill out the work's usage of traditional imagery fitted to a claim that the Church has now replaced those who were once named ioudaioi but are no longer eligible for such a name. The assumption of the name ioudaioi by Christians did not become a popular one. Christian tradition preferred to use "Jew"

as a negative term and to use "Israel" or "Hebrew" positively.

6.8 IGNATIUS

Ignatius' Christian self-identity (Magn 8.1-10.2; Phld 5.1-9.2) includes the understanding that he is a member of a movement which is distinct from Judaism [279]. In contrast to the claim of Rev 2:9 and 3:9 that the writer's group are correctly named ioudaioi, Ignatius says,

it is monstrous to talk of Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism, ioudaizein. For Christianity, christianismōs, did not base its faith on Judaism eis ioudaismōn but Judaism on Christianity all ioudaismōs eis christianismōn and every tongue believing on God was brought together in it (Magn 10.3).

The purpose of this remarkable polemic is to claim that "Judaism" and "Christianity" are two distinct faiths [280]. He also writes that, "if we live according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace" (Magn 8:1) and "if anyone expounds Judaism to you, do not listen to him" (Phld 6:1).

Ignatius' "Judaizers" were Christians, of Gentile origin, who (perhaps) claimed to be "Jews". They did not ascribe divinity to Christ nor would they accept some Ignatian interpretations of Scripture. They did not circumcise, which upsets Ignatius, and celebrate Sabbath rather than "the Lord's day".

6.9 CONCLUSION

The name "Jew" in CCL is sometimes related to a geographical region, further defined in relation to its centre, Jerusalem, and neighbouring areas, Samaria and Galilee. It can also be opposed to "the ends of the Earth", or "the rest of the world". Elsewhere the name is that of a tribe distinguishable from "priests" and from other, northern "tribes" and diaspora communities. These uses are standard ones among all early Jewish groups.

CCL begins to be distinctive in associating the name with "authorities". Other groups centred in Galilee

might have seen themselves in distinction from, if not opposition to, "Judeans". The message of the Church was that "Jews" had opposed God, Jesus and themselves.

These "Jews" are not always only the authorities in Jerusalem. ioudaioi could sometimes be translated as "Judeans", sometimes as "the authorities in Judaea" but most often it refers to "all the Jews". "The Jews" are, for several writers (particularly the Evangelists) the prime opponents of Christ and Christianity. If a negative example is required for almost anything disliked by Christian writers "the Jews" can be accused. Primarily, of course, they are charged with the killing of Christ.

When it refers to "Judeans" it is opposed to "Galileans", when referring to "Judaeian authorities" it is linked with "Romans" and opposed to "the disciples" (or another self-designation of the early Christians). "The Jews" are increasingly the opposition to the Christians. This use of "the Jews" is a part of the message of several books of CCL and should not be explained as an accurate reflection of real Jewish opposition. Any such actual opposition could have resulted in a different reaction and it is clear that some writers could say the same thing without scapegoating "the Jews" (i.e. everyone so named). The victims of Christian anti-Judaism should not be blamed for that anti-Judaism.

That Jesus and the first Christians were themselves Jews has recently been rediscovered as part of Christian self-understanding. This has led to a re-reading of CCL, much of it for apologetic purposes, i.e. a new mission to the Jews or the turning of the Church away from its undeniable anti-Judaism and anti-semitism.

One problem with the "Jewish" Jesus is that it was part of the Evangelists' message precisely because it showed just how bad the Jews really were, it deepened their culpability. The sources for this Jesus must be recognised for what they are, polemic, attempts to persuade readers of particular views. Lochman claims that because Jesus' God was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and because Christians are more closely bound to Jews than to any other community of believers, "a good Christian cannot be anti-Semitic" [281]. This must mean the Evangelists were "bad Christians" for they certainly saw "Jews" as "bad". I have implied that Paul's letters are actually a healthier source for Christians who wish to pursue Christian-Jewish dialogue. They too are polemic (there are no purely "historical"

accounts about Jesus or his early followers) but their message has more good to say of "the Jews" than do the Gospels.

The name ioudaios in CCL has a variety of referents and associations. Sometimes it is used positively, at other times it is distinctly negative or hostile.

In the Gospel of John ioudaioi are the opponents of God, Jesus and the Church. The name ought to have been associated with "Jesus" as John clearly believes Jesus came from Judea. Instead the two names are opposed because John believes Judea is the location of severe opposition to Jesus by hoi ioudaioi. The primary association of the name is therefore with opposition. It is synonymous with "the world" which, for John, also means "the opposition". Even "neutral" uses of the name to explain that an event happened during or because of a feast of the ioudaioi provide a backdrop to the negative use of the name. By ioudaioi John meant not only "the inhabitants of Judea" but also "all Jews everywhere, at any time".

In Paul's works "the Jews" is used positively, even as a self-designation. Those who believe in Jesus join a "Jewish" group with "Jewish" traditions. However, even linking the name with traditions focussing on God's grace to ancestors prior to the Davidic establishment of the centrality of Judah and Jerusalem does not provide a lasting counter to the anti-Judaism of other CCL. Paul's own positive use of ioudaioi was misread by those who found in the Gospels a usage of "the Jews" more to their liking.

For Luke, Ignatius and the majority of later Christian writers "the Jews" is used negatively. The opposition is not linked to "Judea" but to a religious struggle fought in synagogues, Christian gatherings, law courts and popular meeting places all over the Roman Empire. Christians (by whatever name they chose to call themselves) increasingly used "the Jews" as a label for all that they opposed. The use of the word "Judaize" is the best example of this and completely overshadows the attempt by Revelation to use the name ioudaioi as a self-designation. The Church preferred to associate the name with their (perceived) opponents than to claim it for themselves.

In CCL ioudaioi can be opposed to "Gentiles", be used positively or neutrally of the inhabitants of "Judea" and distinguished from other ethnic groups. It can also be used negatively, be opposed to self-designations of

the Christians and become a blanket term for opposition. Combinations of these positions are possible. Rarely are the writers interested in history, in actual events. When "the Jews" are blamed for the killing of Jesus CCL is not interested in one generation in one geographical location. In the light of later history it is only to be lamented that Christians refused to hear Paul's self affirmation, "we Jews".

Part Two: "Hebrew" in ancient Jewish Literature

CHAPTER SEVEN

HEBREW

This discussion of the uses of "Hebrews" begins with a synchronic reading of its contexts in the MT. Following this I examine the ways in which the translators of the LXX rendered ḥibrim into Greek, noting that there are significant places where "Hebrews" are mentioned by the LXX but not by the MT. In doing so I aim to understand what motivated the translators in their lexical choices. What associations and/or oppositions are suggested, is there deliberate avoidance of, or choice of, "Hebrews" and if so why? A similar pattern will follow for other literature. Some of this material is not translation of the Hebrew text of the bible, but may either quote or allude to it.

7.1 MT

This initial list of the occurrences of ḥibrim in the MT is in order of occurrence in the text [282].

Genesis 14:13; 39:14,17; 41:12; 43:32.
Exodus 1:15,16,19; 2:6,7,11,13; 3:18; 5:3; 7:16;
9:1,13; 10:3; 21:2.
Deuteronomy 15:12.
1 Samuel 4:6,9; 13:3,7,19; 14:11,21; 29:3.
Jeremiah 34:9,14.
Jonah 1:9.

My interest here is in a brief synchronic reading of these passages and in asking what an ancient Jewish reader might have understood by them.

In Genesis Abram (14:13) and Joseph (39:14,17; 41:12) are both called ḥibrim as are Joseph's brothers (43:32). The land Joseph was taken from is once named as ḥeres haḥibrim (40:15). In the same passages other groups are named: Abram is allied to three "Amorites", Joseph and his brothers live amongst "Egyptians". ḥibrim is likely to be a gentilic among these gentilics. As these people are the ancestors of "Israel" and of the "Jews" the name "Hebrews" is (at least partly) synonymous with these other designations.

The phrase "the land of the Hebrews" is strange in this context as it refers to a land in which the small group of "Hebrews" (seventy according to 46:27) had little power. The land is more often named "the land of

Canaan" (e.g. 37:1; 42:7,13; 47:1). Joseph and his brothers identify the land as "Canaan" and apply the names "Canaan" and "Hebrew" to the same area. In 40:15 Joseph is claiming ownership of the land for his people, as a political statement or in anticipation of gaining control of it, or "in the name of the ancestors".

Redford asks whether "the land of the Hebrews" would have been meaningful to Egyptians as well as to Israelites and cites a Demotic Papyrus which refers to ‘ybr, i.e. "(the land of the) Hebrew(s)" [283]. Other names in the context make it clear that this is a territorial name used in Saite times (c. 664-525 BCE). He also cites Tacitus' hebraeas terras (Hist 5.2) as evidence of its continuing intelligibility.

The majority of passages in Exodus occur in the story of Israel in Egypt [284] and have similar meanings: the ‘ibrim are the "people of Israel" and the "God of the Hebrews" is the "God of Israel". Like their ancestor Joseph they are slaves in Egypt, but are treated more harshly than he had been. Their low social status in Egypt is seen by Exodus as the oppression of a nation, sometimes called "Israel", at other times "Hebrews".

‘ibrim in Exodus is usually spoken by Israelites to Egyptians (1:19; 2:7; 5:3; 7:16; 10:3) or by Egyptians to Israelites (1:16; 2:6). Three times the narrator uses the name when commenting on an Egyptian-Hebrew meeting (3:18; 9:1,13). The name is used only twice in the narration of the following Wilderness period. This adds to the archaic associations of the name.

Tomson argues that "Hebrew" in the bible is

used of the Israelites in a non-Israelite perspective, and thus has a function comparable to the later "Jew". More specifically, a position of social inferiority seems implied, since it is used mainly for slaves and unsettled migrants" [285].

Being "comparable" with "Jew" means, for Tomson, that it is a name given by "outsiders" and eventually accepted by people. He believes the name to be one used by "outsiders" (or "insiders" when "outsiders" are present) rather than a self-designation. By the time it occurs in Jonah it has become "a more neutral 'outside' appellation" and, by the time of 2 and 4 Maccabees, it became not only "acceptable" but "conveys a flavour of antiquity and heroism".

However, any name given to the people in Egypt would be a name referring to slaves. Additionally, the texts are not "historical" nor do they record the words of objective "outsiders", but are written by and for "insiders". Any names used must make sense to the readers or hearers. Whilst "outsiders" designations could be used for the sake of "colour" this is not a necessary explanation for the occurrence of ʿibrim in this context. The name is used in other ancient Jewish texts as a gentilic synonymous with "Israel" and "Judah", adding the association of antiquity.

Exod 3:18's usage of "God of the Hebrews" also contradicts this "insiders' versus outsiders' designations" approach. The narrative concerns the words (which Moses and the elders of Israel are to say to the "king of Egypt") "YHWH, the God the Hebrews, has met with us". "Hebrews" is synonymous with "Israel" and opposed to "Egyptians" and to other ethnic designations (vv.8,17). More specifically, "God" is the "God of your ancestors, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" who has made certain promises and has some relationship with the people. "God of the Hebrews" means, not that Moses is using an outsiders' designation, but that he is linking his desire for leaving Egypt with ancestral traditions.

Exod 21:2 is different from the previous passages. Until this point ʿibrim has occurred in narrative contexts, here for the first time it occurs in a legal context. The first law in the "Book of the Covenant", Exod 21:2, tells liberated Israel how to treat a person called ʿebed ʿibri.

Lev 25:39-40 outlaws the enslavement of fellow Israelites which would suggest that the ʿebed ʿibri cannot be an Israelite slave, but might be the foreign slave of an Israelite. However, in Deut 15:12-15 and Jer 34:9 the ʿebed ʿibri is an Israelite slave. In Deuteronomy 15 the feminine form of ʿibri, ʿibriah, refers, along with the masculine counterpart, to the Israelite slave of a fellow Israelite. The two slaves are said to be ʔahika (15:12). In Jeremiah 34 every "Hebrew slave", female or male, is to be liberated because there should be no "Judean" slaves. Whilst it may be clear that Deuteronomy and Jeremiah are reinterpretations of Exodus 21 [286] an earlier reader with different hermeneutics would find no such simple solution. The rabbis were aware of the problem but their methodology demanded that each passage has equal legitimacy and authority. Thus 'reinterpretation' within the canon was not a possible explanation for them. A common solution was to regard the slavery of

Exodus 21 as a punishment. Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael at Nez. 1:23 [287] sees the boring of a hole in the ear as a punishment of Israel who was supposed to be a servant only of God [288].

A synchronic reading of these passages can only conclude that ‘ebed ‘ibrim and ‘ibriot were Israelites who had been enslaved. The obvious difficulty that this contradicts the legislation of Leviticus 25 is not solved within the text and remains a problem.

Of the eight occurrences of ‘ibrim in 1 Samuel five are in the mouths of Philistines (4:6,9; 13:19; 14:11; 29:3), one in the mouth of King Saul (13:3) [289] and two are comments of the narrator.

When the Ark arrived in the camp "all Israel raised a great shout" and the Philistines asked "what is all this shouting in the Hebrew camp?". Understanding leads to fear that they will meet the same fate as the Egyptians, so they exhort one another, "be men, or you will be subject to the Hebrews as they have been to you" (4:5-9). The ‘ibrim are "Israel" who, having been subject to the Philistines, are now a force to reckon with [290].

In chaps.5 and 6 ‘ibrim is not the only name which Philistines use of Israel: the Ark is frequently described by them as "the Ark of the God of Israel" [291]. Philistine usage of "Israel" collocating with ‘ibrim shows that neither are, in themselves, derogatory. Nor are the names, necessarily, the precise words used by historical Philistines. These are literary uses by Israelites for Israelites.

According to Na^caman there ought to be an occurrence of ‘ibri at 2 Sam 20:14 instead of the MT's kol haberim [292]. However, there is no textual tradition which supports this reading and the theory of the habiru origins of Israel should not be the sole grounds for emmending the text.

Jonah 1:9 also shows that ‘ibri was considered to be a perfectly acceptable self-designation. Jonah identifies himself as a "Hebrew" in response to the questions of foreigners.

The author's careful use of words in this work [293] suggests that ‘ibri was deliberately chosen here. It is not immediately obvious what Jonah's reply means. Allen, claiming that the reply "goes to the heart of the matter", says that

Jonah answers the last question first, explaining that he is a Hebrew, the term generally used by the people of Israel in describing themselves to foreigners [294].

This is inadequate as a reason for the choice of this name in a text written not for foreigners but for "insiders". The use of ʿibri does avoid the inaccuracy of having Jonah reply, "I am a Judean", if he is to be identified as the prophet of Gath Hepher (2 Kgs 14:25) [295]. It could imply that ʿibrim was seen as being a common self-designation among northern Israelites.

Allen makes two comments which are more useful. Firstly, he notes that "a further interesting feature of the book is its 'old world' air" [296]. Secondly he links ʿibri with the phrase "God of the Hebrews" (Exod 3:18), explaining that "this means that Jonah is a worshipper of Yahweh" although Jonah's actual behaviour belies this claim to be one who "fears" his God [297]. The writer has Jonah use this name rather than any other because it is associated with such "archaic" figures as Abraham and with the God of the Exodus. This highlights the irony of Jonah's attempt to flee from God whilst the sailors are actually afraid of God. Jonah's "orthodoxy" is a front, a thin disguise.

A synchronistic reading of the biblical material would suggest that the nation had been called "Israel" after the ancestor and "Judah" after the region, but why ʿibrim? The most simple summary of the use of ʿibrim in the MT is that it functions as a synonym of yiśraʿel or of yehudah. Thiselton notes that "the major test of synonymy is interchangeability" [298]. Since these names are interchangeable in most contexts (in Gen 14:13 "Israel" and "Judean" would be anachronistic) another question is needed: what associations does ʿibrim have which govern its choice over against its synonyms?

ʿibrim is not so strongly associated with the land as is yehudah. The connection with the ancestor ʿeber is very remote and is nowhere made in the MT (in the genealogies of Genesis 10 and 11 ʿeber is less significant than ʾem [299]). The language of the people is not called ʿibrit but yehudit and "the language of Canaan" [300]. Ullendorf [301] considers the absence of ʿibrit to be "no more than a sheer accident." To Gray however, this absence is evidence that ʿibrim was not a gentilic at all [302]. Once the term ʿibrit had been coined it would be natural to suppose that ʿibrim were speakers of that language.

To those who sought answers in "root meanings" or "etymologies" an Ḳibri might have been considered as "one who crossed boundaries". If so the name could be translated as "nomad", "immigrant", "foreigner", "pilgrim", "fugitive" or somesuch depending on context.

The name Ḳibrim is applied to some of the most important people and to some of the earliest generations in the story of Israel. The name is associated with antiquity, origins and people of central importance. All the other possibilities for the use of the name are contained within these areas. The origins of the people are believed to have been among travellers, people leaving one land for another. The earliest ancestors would be expected to have spoken the same (holy) language as the current generation.

The primary associations of Ḳibrim in the MT are with the oldest and most hallowed traditions of the people.

7.2 SAMARITANS

The Samaritans [303] normally rejected the label "Jewish" as they did not accept the importance implied by that phrase of Judea and Jerusalem [304], however they are among those groups which depend on earlier Israelite traditions.

The Samaritan Pentateuch differs from the MT in having an additional occurrence of Ḳibrim at Exod 1:22. The effect of this is a clearer text. Lowy [305] claims that far from being the Samaritans' favourite self-designation Ḳibrim in their literature bears the wider connotation of "all the descendents of Abraham" including both Ishmaelites and Edomites. Exod 21:2 and Deut 15:12 are taken to refer to non-Israelite slaves. This is possible in conjunction with Lev 25:39-46 and the lack of Jeremiah in the Samaritan Canon.

Other evidence, however, suggests that the Samaritans did not always (or normally) use Ḳibrim to refer to outsiders. Macdonald claims that Ḳibrim was one of their favourite self-designations [306]. Josephus says that the Samaritans decided to claim to be "Jews, egnōsan hautous ioudaious homologein" before Alexander until he asks who they are. Then they reply that they are "Hebrews, hebraioi, but were called the Sidonians of Shechem" (Ant. 11.340-44). Josephus also claims that the Samaritans are more properly called "Cuthim", "foreigners transported to Samaria" (Ant. 9.288-291) and

that they were "apostates from the Jewish nation", apostatōn tou ioudaiōn ethnous (Ant. 11.340). He appears to want to have it both ways: they are sometimes Jews and sometimes foreigners. This is, of course, exactly the polemical usage of names that he accuses the Samaritans of [307].

7.3 SEPTUAGINT

Occurrences of "Hebrew" in the LXX [308] include those also represented in the MT and some additional ones.

LXX Gen 14:13 names Abram, tō peratē. When Philo also explains that hebraios means peratēs, specifically using both words [309] he does something different from the LXX which is making sense of the Hebrew consonant sequence ḥbr rather than offering a meaning.

In Exod 21:2 the ḥebed ḥibri has become paida hebraion, in Deut 15:12 the ḥibri and ḥibriah have become ho hebraios and hē ebraia [310], whilst those of Jer 34:9,14 (LXX Jer 41:9,14) are rendered as ton hebraion and tēn hebraian. The translators obviously considered the name understandable even in transliteration. It must, therefore, have been in common usage as a known and acceptable designation.

The remaining occurrences of ḥibrim in Exodus and in the Joseph narrative are also transliterated. The LXX of Exod 1:22 contains an additional use of the name (in the form tois ebraiois) to clarify that it is only "Hebrew" boys who are to be killed not "every child in Egypt" [311].

At Exod 2:11 the text is again clarified by the explanation that the "brother Hebrew" is an "Israelite, huios israēl". De Vaux notes that the contrast "is between the Hebrews... and the Egyptians referred to in the same verse" [312]. Others regard this passage as evidence that there were non-Israelite ḥibrim [313]. That other groups participated in the Exodus is claimed by Exod 12:38 but it does not name these non-Israelites "Hebrews", nor does it support the argument for them.

To the authors of the LXX ḥibrim was evidently quite understandable in transliteration and could simply have been a commonly used gentilic, synonymous with yiśra'el and yehudah. At Exod 2:11 they noted the stress of the Hebrew text on the fact that the ḥibri was a "brother"

to Moses and expressed that stress by adding "of the sons of Israel".

There is rather more diversity in the LXX's version of 1 Samuel, 1 Kingdoms. In 4:6; 13:19 and 14:11 the ῥιβριμ are hoi ebraioi in opposition to hoi allophuloi which renders (ha)pelištīm. At 4:9 only some of the LXX's manuscript traditions have any equivalent of ῥιβριμ [314], the others having an abbreviated text.

In four other passages where ῥιβριμ occurs in the MT the Greek text has different readings. 13:3 and 14:21 read hoi douloi. Gray [315] considers this convincing evidence that the Philistines were not using a synonym of "Israel" but were referring to a social group akin to the habiru. A simpler explanation is that the translators read ῥεβεδ in place of ῥιβριμ. This is supported by the LXX's version of 17:8 where it reads hebraioi tou saoul in place of the MT's ῥαβδιμ λεῶα'ουλ.

The translators of the LXX obviously had difficulties with 13:7 (as do more recent commentators [316]). They interpreted the subject of the sentence in the light of verb which has the same consonant sequence: ῥβρ, kai hoi diabainontes diebēsan tov iordanēn eis gēn gad kai galaad. At 29:3 David and his troops (ῥιβριμ in the MT) are hoi diaporeuomenoi, again based on a Hebrew consonant sequence ῥβρ and probably implies that the translators had "immigrants", "mercenaries" or even "deserters" in mind.

Had the name ῥιβριμ carried these connotations the translators could have left it as a transliteration. Had they wished to stress a particular connotation they could have done it better by saying "these immigrant Hebrews". It is more likely that they did not see that the consonant sequence ῥβρ was to be read "Hebrews" and chose to translate it by a word for "crossing boundaries".

In LXX Jonah 1:9 Jonah no longer offers the confusing reply, "I am a Hebrew", but says, doulos kuriou eimi egō. This is different from the rendering of ῥιβριμ by douloi in 1 Sam 13:3 and 14:21 in that Jonah certainly does not intend to denigrate himself by this title, nor is doulos kuriou a definition of ῥιβριμ. There are two possible explanations for this reading:

1. the translators had a Vorlage which read ῥβδϣϣϣ, or simply ῥβδ;
2. the translators harmonised Jonah's reply with 2 Kgs

14:25 where he is an ēbed of YHWH.

At Num 24:24 in the MT Balaam's oracle ends with the destruction of ʿašur and ēber. The LXX understood the oracle to be concerned with the hebraioi [317]. Noth writes, "Absolutely nothing positive can be said as to what the name 'Eber' (originally an eponym of 'Hebrews') means in this context" [318]. The LXX does not note that the nation was called hebraios because of ēber here or elsewhere. As with the MT so in the LXX Abram's ancestor is not referred to as the originator of the name "Hebrew". The LXX's reading of Num 24:24 is an attempt to make sense of a difficult verse by means of a consonant sequence: ēbr [319].

A mountain named ēbrym caused the translators problems in a number of texts [320] which they solved in several different ways. At 27:12 the mountain is named tōn ebraiōn by some manuscripts, whilst at 33:47,48 it is the orē ta abarim and oros to abarein at Deut 32:49. However at Jer 22:20 instead of the MT's meēabarim the LXX has read meēber yam (as does the Syriac), translating it eis to peras tēs thalassēs. That hebraios is among the possible translation equivalent for ēbr shows that the name remained in current usage. However these passages tell us nothing more about what the name signified to the translators.

The three occurrences in 2 Maccabees (7:31; 11:13 and 15:37) are all in contexts where foreigners are involved: king Antiochus, Lysias and Nicanor. This should not be taken to mean that the name was derogatory and an "outsiders" name as ioudaios is also used by foreigners (9:19; 11:27) and other words in the context of hebraios give it a higher dignity. In 7:31 and 11:13 "God" is declared to be fighting for the hebraioi, whilst 15:37 claims that the possession of the city by the hebraioi is due to God's help. The use of hebraios in 2 Maccabees is comparable to that of Exodus. Gray notes that the term "acts as a synonym designating the Jews who participated in the Maccabean revolt" [321]. The name "Hebrew" was used in this context not because it is an outsider's designation but because it stresses the traditional virtues or "piety" of those so labelled. The actions of foreigners provoke a situation where it is obvious which people are firm in their adherence to ancestral traditions. In so doing a "Jew" or "Israel" is shown to be a "Hebrew".

In 2 Maccabees hebraios is a synonym of ioudaios [322] or israēl and also has associations of

traditionalism, i.e. it portrays those who rebel as standing in a long tradition of refusing to bow to foreigners.

This impression is further strengthened by three references in Judith (10:12; 12:11; 14:18). At 10:12 Judith says, "I am a daughter of the Hebrews, thugatēr eimi tōn hebraiōn". In 12:11 and 14:18 Assyrians call Judith a "Hebrew woman". Foreigners also use the name "Israel" (eg. 5:23; 6:2) but do not use derogatory names for the nation. Lowe says,

this distinction [between "Hebrews" as used by foreigners and other names used by the people of themselves] is maintained in Judith, where it might be thought a deliberate archaism [323].

However, the archaism does not lie in the occurrence of the word but in its use. The name is a claim to be part of a tradition or a history going back to Abraham and the earliest ancestors, to a time before the division into twelve tribes, before the dominance of Judah, and, most significantly, before the people's humiliations under foreign domination.

The book is not given archaic flavour by this word but the main character is to be seen as locating herself in the tradition of her people. Judith is not an innovator in acting for her people but is to be seen alongside other heroes acting against oppressors. It is also possible that the name "Judith", like "Judah" (a favourite name for leaders of the nation, like "Judah the Maccabee"), carried strong associations with heroism and with fighting for traditional virtues and independence. Christianity, of course, reversed these associations by linking "Jew" with "Judas who betrayed Jesus".

The final reference to "Hebrews" in the LXX is that of the Prologue of Ben-Sira where the translator acknowledges the difficulties of translating from "Hebrew" into any other language [324]. The language of Israel is no longer called ioudaisti but is hebraisti. The word does not occur in the body of the work so it is impossible to say what the grandfather would have thought of it. Its occurrence in the Prologue is without an accompanying explanation which suggests that, whenever it arose, it was a common usage in the grandson's time. All other uses of hebraios would have been coloured by this usage, e.g. Jonah may have been a hebraios because he spoke hebraisti.

In the period when the LXX was written "Hebrews" was not merely an outdated name but was still a current and vital name. As well as being the name of a language it continued to be used as one of the self-designations of the people. It is also clear that one way in which the authors of the LXX chose their translation equivalents was by means of consonant sequences. As there are no glosses on any of their uses of hebraios no definition of the name is provided.

"Hebrew" is not archaic in the sense of having fallen out of contemporary usage but bears the connotations of traditionalism or orthodoxy. It is used in contexts where traditionalists are opposed to innovators, or the pious are opposed to assimilators.

7.4 PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

In the Pseudepigrapha [325] "Hebrews" functions as the name of the people and of the language.

In Jubilees hebraios occurs five times [326]. 39:10 is a version of Gen 39:17; 47:7 of Exod 2:8 and both are close to the MT. In 12:26,27 God teaches Abram "Hebrew", the "language of creation", after which Abram spends six months studying books in "Hebrew". In 43:15 Joseph speaks with his brothers in "Hebrew". The Jubilees version of Gen 14:13, at Jub. 13:24, does not name Abram "the Hebrew", but neither does it give Aner, Eschol and Mamre their designation, "Amorite". If the idea that Abram and Joseph spoke "Hebrew" depends on the passages where they are named hebraioi then the identification of name and language was well established before the writing of Jubilees. No trace of the process of interpretation remains in the passages closest to the MT. If Gray is correct in thinking that,

writers in the last two centuries B.C. may have adopted the name "Hebrews" for the Jews and their language because of an archaizing tendency and the desire to be called by the title of the first patriarch [327]

then in Jubilees this is a fait accompli. The writer(s) made no conscious choice to "adopt" the name, it was already an accepted gentilic synonymous with israēl or ioudaios.

Pseudo-Philo 9:1 supports the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch in specifying that the children to be thrown

into the river are "born to the Hebrews" [328]. This is the only occurrence of "Hebrews" in Pseudo-Philo not represented in the MT. Other MT occurrences are represented (e.g. 9:15 echoes Exod 2:9).

In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs [329] hebraios occurs five times. In a Hebrew fragment of the T.Naphtali [330] the angels teach the "seventy languages" to the "seventy families" but the "the holy language, the Hebrew language, lašon haqodesh lašon 'ibri", continues in use by the family of Shem and Eber, and the family of Abraham "who is one of their descendents" (8:6). Whatever the date of this fragment [331] it is part of the tradition that the earliest ancestors were "Hebrew speakers".

The Testament of Joseph [332] contains four uses of the word hebraios (12:2,3; 13:1,3) in an expansion of Genesis 39-41. Joseph is named both tinos neou hebraiou (12:2 cp. LXX Gen 41:12) and ho pais ho hebraios (13:3 cp. LXX Gen 41:17) whose land is gēs hebraiōn (13:1 in Mss b [333] cp. LXX Gen 40:15) and whose God is ho theos tōn hebraiōn (12:3).

That Egyptians use the name does not prove that it is a derogatory appellative. The same Egyptians also speak of ges chanaan (12:2; 15:2), as does Joseph (13:8) [334], and are very complimentary towards Joseph. A number of other names occur without such associations.

The Epistle of Aristeeas [335] contains the story of Ptolemy's determination to have the Law translated from the "Hebrew" language into Greek (hebraikōn to hellēnikois) as an expression of gratitude to the oikoumenon ioudaiois kai tois metepaita, "the Jewish community and to succeeding generations" (30,38) [336]. The Epistle of Aristeeas knew of no Jewish literary convention that Egyptians speaking of israēl or ioudaios used the name "Hebrews". It refers only to the language as "Hebrew" and prefers to name the people "Jews" or "Judeans".

Sibylline Oracles does use hebraios as a gentilic. Book 3.68-76 talks of an antichrist who is "Beliar from the stock of Sebaste" deceiving many, including "Hebrews faithful and elect and lawless too" [337].

The evidence of 4 Maccabees is that "Hebrew" was used both for the people and the language. The word occurs eight times (4:11; 5:2,4; 9:5,18; 12:7; 16:15; 17:9) and is almost the only gentilic used for the people in the book [338].

The narrative of 4 Maccabees, like that of Judith, is concerned with the persecution of the nation by Antiochus Epiphanes and its stated aim is to prove that "Inspired Reason is supreme over the passions" (1:1).

The "Hebrews" are first referred to in 4:11 where Apollonius asks them to intercede on his behalf after his entrance into the Temple. Antiochus' attempt to destroy the "Jewish Religion" (4:26) begins with an order to force every male "Hebrew" to eat pork (5:2). An example is given immediately (5:4). At 9:5,18 another example is given, this time the "Hebrew" dies for "Inspired Reason and the Law". At 12:7 and 16:15 a mother exhorts her final son to persevere, speaking in the "Hebrew" language. Her own epitaph records that she died with her seven sons "through the violence of a tyrant desiring to destroy the Hebrew nation" (17:9).

Throughout the period in which these works were produced "Hebrews" functioned as both the name of the people and of the language. Undoubtedly both these usages had become commonplace at some previous date. This explains why, in comments on the bible, the name "Hebrews" was taken to mean "a speaker of Hebrew". There is no evidence in this literature that "Hebrews" had shameful connotations, unless it be in its non-usage as a title for Abram in Jubilees [339]. However, this non-usage is countered by the naming of Joseph, a model of traditional piety, as a "Hebrew". The choice of hebraios over against israēl(ites) or ioudaios may have been directed by its associations with (perceived) piety, traditional virtues and unbending allegiance to the Torah (here specifically not eating pork). These associations are highlighted by the proximity of foreigners and the persecution they inflict on those who will not compromise. In this way the name became part of the language of a theology of suffering and liberation.

7.5 TARGUMIM

In the following sections I discuss the occurrences of "Hebrew" in various Targumim: Tg.Onqelos, Tg. of the Prophets, Tg.Pseudo-Jonathan, Fragmentary Tg. and Tg.Neofiti. I do not enter into the debate concerned with the date [340] of any part of any Targum, but do not, therefore, assume any date for them. Those occurrences of the names being discussed which occur in passages or Targumim from later than this period show, at least, that the names were understood. If nothing

else the Targumim illustrate the continuing usage of the name "Hebrew" and show that the pattern of usage of the name also continued. My approach to the Targumim will be to look at those passages where ʿibrim occurs in the MT and then examine additional uses of the word.

7.6 TARGUM ONQELoS

In Tg.Onqelos [341] the thirteen uses of ʿibrim in Exodus are rendered by yehudaʿe (2:6; 3:18; 5:3; 7:16; 9:1,13; 10:3), yehuday (2:11) yehudaʿin (2:13) and yehudayataʿ (1:15,16,19; 2:7). "Jews" in a general sense is intended here rather than the more specific "Judeans". The effect of this is to make the bible a contemporary document again.

The first ancestors, however, are named "Hebrews". Abram the ʿibri becomes ʾabram ʿibraʿah (Gen 14:13) whilst ʿibri in the Joseph narrative is rendered ʿibraʿah (39:14,17), ʿibreʿe (40:15; 43:32) and ʿibray (41:12).

Tg.Onqelos recognised the ʿebed ʿibri of Exod 21:2 and Deut 15:12 as an Israelite and therefore names them bar yiśraʿel and bat yiśraʿel. The translators understood ʿibri to be a gentilic synonymous with "Judah" or "Israel" rather than as a derogatory appellation. Where some interpreters have seen derogatory associations, Tg.Onkelos uses a word with far from derogatory associations. As it names the first ancestors "Hebrews", the use of "Israelite" is not an avoidance of the name. Rather, it clarifies an ambiguous text by making it clear that these "slaves" are part of the "family" of "Israel", making their enslavement unthinkable.

The particular choice of translation equivalents for ʿibrim in Tg.Onqelos shows an interesting diversity: all three gentilics yiśraʿel, ʿibriʿah and yehudayataʿ are used. Clearly ʿibri was understood as an archaic name (synonymous with "Israel" or "Judah") which was retained for the ancestors. Whilst this synonymity was also understood in Exodus and Deuteronomy the translators chose to use the more common names. It is possible that the designation was not in widespread use among Aramaic speakers as a self-designation (hence the use of "Jews" and "Israel") but was only used for the founding ancestors. However, the nature of the text precludes certainty on this matter. The Targum does, however, link the first ancestors with the translators'

contemporaries by its varied equivalents [342].

I have noted that the LXX reads hebraios at a number of places where the MT does not read ‘ibrim. At Num 24:24 Tg.Onqelos parallels Asshur with the "Province beyond the Euphrates, ‘eber perat" thereby reading the whole passage as a condemnation of Israel's enemies and clarifying the passage. This is, perhaps, a more obvious solution than the LXX's.

At Num 27:12 the har ha‘abaram of the MT has become the tura’ de‘ibra’e. Unfortunately for the present purpose Tg.Onqelos does not expand these texts to explain why a transjordanian mountain should be named after the ‘ibrim. Possibly it was associated with the "crossing over" into Canaan. Whilst Num 24:24 is clarified in the Targum the remaining texts are more enigmatic than before.

7.7 TARGUM JONATHAN

In Tg.Jonathan [343] the maḥaneh ha‘ibrim of 1 Sam 4:6 becomes the mašrit yehuda’e. The Philistines (pelishta’e) no longer speak of the ‘ibrim but of the yehuda’e, as does Saul at 13:3 saying, yism‘un yehuda’e. At 13:7 it is the yehuda’e who cross the Jordan, whilst at v19 the Philistines say, "otherwise the Judeans, yehuda’e, will make, ya‘bdun, swords or spears" [344]. In 1 Samuel 14:11,21 the Targum also speaks of yehuda’e as it does at 29:3 of David and his troops. At Jonah 1:9 the prophet no longer identifies himself as an ‘ibri but says, yehuda’ah ‘ana’, despite the fact that the Jonah of earlier tradition was certainly not a Judean. These translations make the text contemporary by applying them to Judeans.

Tg.Jonathan agrees with Tg.Onqelos in seeing the ‘ebed ‘ibri as a bar or bat yiśra’el. At Jer 34:9,14 there is no hesitation in the choice of "sons and daughters of Israel" to render ‘ibrim. This choice was probably governed by an established interpretation of the passage. The ‘ebed ‘ibrim are consistently named "Israelites" in the Targumim whilst other individuals or groups are named either "Hebrews" or "Judeans". Since the translators felt free enough to create an anachronism by naming Jonah a "Judean" why did they not use yehuda’ah in the slave passages also? The regional name "Judah" occurs in the context of Jer 34:9,14 (but not in Jonah) and could easily have affected the translators in their choice of translation equivalents,

but did not. This suggests a tradition of interpretation in which the first ancestors were known by an archaic name, slaves were given an honourable name to continue the liberating traditions of the Torah and other texts were made contemporary by the use of yehuda ah.

7.8 TARGUM PSEUDO-JONATHAN

Tg.Pseudo-Jonathan [345] Exod 21:2 and Deut 15:12 again name the slaves as bar and bat yiśraʿel. The problematic contradiction of Lev 25:39 is faced by this Targum. At Exod 21:2 it begins, "If the Courts sell an Israelite into slavery". Since Leviticus had banned slavery as an escape from poverty (expecting charity as a solution to economic hardship) Tg.Ps-J considers that this case cannot be the choice of a free Israelite but must be the punishment of a criminal. The crime is not specified here but is probably theft [346]). A further clarification of the Exodus passage occurs in Tg.Ps.-J. Exod 21:3 where the wife of such a slave is explicitly stated to be a bat yiśraʿel.

The occurrences of "Hebrew" in Exodus 1-10 are consistently rendered by "Judean". Tg.Ps.-J. Exodus begins with a warning to Pharaoh that a "son of destiny" will be born in the "congregation of Israel, keništʰon diyiśraʿel" who will destroy Egypt (1:15). Pharaoh's response is to order the midwives, hyyt yehudyytʿ, to kill the "sons born to yehudayyatʿ". The remainder of the narrative talks of the yehudʿe not of ʿibraʿe. The Targum, like the LXX, clarifies 1:22 by use of "Judeans". It is not unlikely that they had a Vorlage reading ʿibrim at this point.

Tg.Ps-J of the Joseph narratives uses ʿibraʿe at each occurrence of ʿibrim in the MT, except Gen 43:32 where the Egyptians are unable to eat with the yehudaʿe.

Despite a lengthy interpolation concerned with the fugitive Og, in Gen 14:13 Abram is called ʿibraʿah as if no explanation was needed. Such an explanation is not provided by Genesis 10's references to ʿeber. At v24 (MT v23) the name is unchanged in the Targum. Gen 10:21 (where the MT names Šem as the "father of all the sons of ʿeber") the Targum translates as "the father of all the Hebrews, ʿabohon dikol bene ʿibraʿe". This additional use of "Hebrews" does not make ʿeber, but rather Shem, the father of the "Hebrews". At Num 24:24 in place of the MT's wʿino ʿeber, Tg.Pseudo-Jonathan

reads wyis abdin kol bene di eber. Otherwise ‘eber is as obscure a figure as in the MT and is unlikely to have been considered the reason for calling anyone a "Hebrew". šem was clearly a more important figure than ‘eber. "Hebrews" are "Semites", descendents of Shem, not only in antiquity but in the Targum's present.

As with Tg.Onkelos the har ha‘abarim (Num 27:12; 33:47,48 and Deut 32:49) is rendered as tur(?)e di‘ibr?e, "the mountain of the "Hebrews"", with no further explanation.

Once again the evidence is that for Aramaic writers ‘ibrim was synonymous with "Israel" and "Judeans" which can translate "Hebrews". The difference between the names is the reservation of "Hebrews" as an honorific for the ancestors and founders of the nation.

7.9 TARGUM YERUSALMI I

This Targum [347] has little to add to the above. At Exod 1:15,19 it reads ‘bryyt?. Presumably ‘ibrim was in contemporary use and therefore needed no clarification. Tg.Yer.I. Num 24:24 reads bene ‘eber nahar? which is very close to Tg.Onkelos' ‘br prt. It also demonstrates that when the translators were faced with a difficult text they examined the consonant sequences. Here, they connected ‘br with "crossing boundaries". This is not to say that they understood ‘ibrim in this light.

7.10 TARGUM NEOFITI

Tg.Neofiti [348] reinforces the impression given by the Fragmentary Tg. that "Hebrews" was readily understandable by at least some Aramaic speakers. Unlike Tg.Onkelos the majority of the MT's occurrences of ‘ibrim are rendered by a similar Aramaic form: ‘br [349], ‘bry [350], ‘br[yh] [351], ‘bryy [352], ‘bryy [353] ‘bryyh [354], ‘bryyn [355] and ‘bryyt [356]. Only Exod 9:1,13 are exceptions: the Targum reads YYY ?lhhwn dyhwdyy though there is a variant reading YYY ?lhhwn d‘br?y (cp. Tg.Neof. Exod 7:16; 10:3).

None of the passages contains interpolations explaining the name thus it is likely that the translators had no fear of being misunderstood. Presumably the name was in contemporary use in Aramaic.

7.11 QUMRAN LITERATURE AND MURABBA'AT TEXTS

In this section I discuss the almost complete absence of any form of the name "Hebrews" in any of the literature from the various sites by the Dead Sea. Within this category are included the QL, the Nahal Hever texts, those of Masada, Khirbet Mird and Wadi Murabba'at. This non-usage is certainly aggravated by the fragmentary nature of some works and the discovery of others in the past [357]. It is certainly not because the texts which have survived have no occasion to use the name.

The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 [358] mentions Abram twenty-six times but never names him ha'ibri. He is named the "uncle of Lot" (20:22), the "husband of Sara" (20:25) and even "my Lord" (by the king of Sodom in 22:18). The events of Genesis 14 are treated in 1QapGen xxi and xxii; Gen 14:13 is 22:1-3,

but one of the herdsmen of the flock which Abram had given to Lot escaped from the captives and came to Abram. At that time Abram was dwelling in Hebron [359].

The brothers Mamre, Eskol and Arnem are dealt with in 21:21 where 1QapGen does not hesitate to call them ʔhy ʔmwrʔʔ, "Amorite brothers". It may be significant that the writers of the Apocryphon had problems with Genesis 14. Until its version of Genesis 14 at 21:23 it uses the first person (as if it were narrated by Abraham) but from that point onwards it is a report similar to that of the MT.

Another possible area for the use of ʿibrim is in connection with slaves. The Apocryphon mentions slaves only once, in 22:6 (in place of the MT's "retainers") but does not name them "Hebrews".

Genesis 14 supplied part of the impetus for another work found at Qumran: 11Q Melchizedek [360]. Not only is there no reference to "Abram the Hebrew" but neither is there any occurrence of ʿibrim at all. The work opens (in its present fragmentary state) with decrees of release and freedom in the year of Jubilee, even drawing on Lev 25:13. The opportunity to proclaim the liberty of the "Hebrew slave" is not taken.

There are a number of fragments of Jubilees among QL (1Q17; 1Q18; 2Q19 and 2Q20 [361]. None of them are related to the relevant passages in Genesis or Jubilees and therefore do not use ʿibrim. Presumably if more

fragments were found the possibility of a reference to ‘ibrim would be great.

2Q4 [362] is a small fragment of Exod 5:3-5 but it begins immediately after where ‘ibri should have been. This is due to accidental damage and presumably when the text was whole the name would have been used. There is also a fragment of Exodus 20 and 21 (with a brief insertion of Deut 5:30,31) in 4Q158 7-8 [363] which lacks Exod 21:2. This is entirely due to the fragmentary nature of the scroll.

It is probable that "Hebrew" did once occur in the literature now surviving in a fragmentary state as QL, if only in copies of biblical texts. However, the non-occurrence of the name in a number of contexts cannot be dismissed as accidental loss, although there is no other obvious explanation.

At Wadi Murabba[‘]at two fragments of Exodus produce no further uses of the name "Hebrews". Listed by DJD 2 [364] as 4 and 5 they are incomplete copies of Exod 4:28-31 and 5:3.

A copy of Jonah from Muraba[‘]at, listed by DJD 2 as Mur 88 x and xi, does contain the name ‘ibri. The scroll's copy of Jonah 1:9 is contained in line 14 of column 10 and reads precisely as the MT does.

No further occurrences of the name "Hebrews" have survived in the Wadi Muraba[‘]at. It is thus impossible to say whether the people who hid their texts there ever used the name as a self-designation. However, the texts which have survived prefer the designation "Judean". To infer more from this situation would be purely speculative.

The texts from Nahal Hever yield a further use of the word "Hebrew". In a letter from Soumaios [365], possibly Bar Kochba, the recipients are told that the letter is written "in Greek, elēnisti", because "a [des]ire has not be[en] found to w[ri]te in Hebrew, hebraesti" (lines 11-15). No reason is provided for this lack of desire to write in Hebrew, or Aramaic, which is strange especially in light of the writer's evident difficulty with Greek [366] and the fact that a similar request for branches and citrons is written in Aramaic. The letter does not refer to any group of people as "Hebrews" and does not imply that the people who might have written in hebraesti were known as "Hebrews". On the contrary, the letter actually refers to the feast the group intends to celebrate as "Judean"

or "Jewish" (line 9-10), which is presumably their preferred self-designation.

7.12 PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA

In LXX Gen 14:13 Abram is named ho peratēs. I have argued that the translators derived this reading from the consonant sequence ḥbr and that "migrant" is to be understood as an appellative distinct from the gentile hebraios. Philo of Alexandria [367] also derives ho peratēs from hebraios (Migr. 20). He claims that the name of the "Hebrew people, genos hebraiōn" (Gen 40:15) means ho peratēs, which he interprets as "quitting sense perceptions to go after those of Mind". Similarly, to Philo, Lot is not only Abram's nephew but also his opposite: if Abram's title is ho peratēs, "Lot, as he is called among the hebraiois, means to incline towards sense perceptions" (Migr. 13). This claim is determined by Philo's philosophical purposes. It is similar to the idea that Terah was Socrates (Somn. 1.58). Philo's statement is an important aspect of his philosophy of knowledge, in which the goal is to quit sense-perceptions in aiming for the vision of God, expressed by the name, "Israel". In no other place does Philo make use of his idea that a "Hebrew" is ho peratēs.

Apart from this usage of "Hebrews" to mean "crossers over", Philo's uses of hebraios fall into two groups. Firstly, he names a number of people hebraioi; secondly, he explains a number of Hebrew words to his readers by a phrase such as "the hebraioi call it 'x' where we (Greeks) call it 'y' (in Greek)".

The people named hebraioi by Philo are generally, but not exclusively, those so named by the MT and the LXX. The majority of them are in quotations, allusions or paraphrases of the biblical passages. The "Hebrew women" and "Hebrew midwives" of Exodus 1 and 2 are prime examples. Philo refers to the women as hebraiai psuchai, "Hebrew souls", (in contrast to the aiguptiai, "Egyptian women") in Migr. 141; as hebraikon in Mos. 1.16 and in Fug. 168, each time paralleling them to Sara "who gave birth when old" (Gen 21:1-7). Philo allegorises upon the names of the midwives in Heres. 128. Joseph is an hebraios at Jos. 42,50,104. Philo notes that although Moses is called an "Egyptian, aiguption" by Jethro's daughters (Exod 2:19) he "was not only a Hebrew, hebraion, but was also of the purest Hebrew blood which alone is consecrated" (Mut. 117).

Some people are named hebraioi in addition to those of the MT and LXX, for example in Philo's narration of the exodus and wilderness traditions (Virt. 35; Mos. 1.105,143,144,147 and often).

The second category of uses are more widely distributed throughout Philo's works. Some of them are explanations of what the "Hebrews" call something, for example: "the seventh day which the hebraioi call the sabbath, sabbata", (Abr. 28); "the seventh day which in the hebraioi patriō glōttē is called sabbath", (Spec. 2.41); or "the seventh day which is called sabbatov par hebraiois" (Spec. 2.86). The majority are more allegorically motivated. Philo explains the meaning (by means of an "etymological" approach, which does, at least, demonstrate Philo's understanding of his Hebrew sources [368]) of "Israel" (Abr. 57), "Enoch" (Abr. 17), "Jerusalem" (Somn. 2.250) and many other words.

In Abr. 57 where Philo says that

that nation is in the Hebrew language, hebraiōn glōttē called Israel, which, being interpreted is "he who sees God".

In Legat. 4 he writes

now this race is called in the "Hebrew" language, chaldaisti, "Israel", but translated into our language, hellēnistai de hermēneuthentos, the name is "he who sees God".

By chaldaisti Philo means "Hebrew" not "Aramaic" (or at least does not necessarily mean "Aramaic") since he claims that the Law in chaldaisti was translated into hellēnisti by the hebraiōn (Mos. 2.26,31,32,40).

There is a notable difference between Philo's two uses of "Hebrew(s)". When Philo says that the hebraioi have a name for something he is not usually thinking of a specific generation but is speaking inclusively ("this has always been and continues to be the name for 'x'"). However, the people he names hebraioi almost without exception lived prior to the conquest of Canaan. Nowhere does Philo refer to himself as a hebraios.

The only people to be named hebraioi after the Conquest are the translators of the Law into Greek for Ptolemy Philadelphus (Mos. 2.32). The account of this (25-40) begins with the claim that the "sanctity of our legislation has been a source of wonder not only to the Jews, ioudaiois, but also to other nations, tois allois

tethaumastai". It was, he says, considered a shame that the "barbarians, barbarikōi" could read it but "half the human race was denied access to it". Steps were therefore taken to translate it from the Hebrew, glōsse chaldaike", in which it was originally written, into "Greek, hellada glōttan". Ptolemy sent to the "High Priest and King of Judaea, ioudaias archierea kai basilea" (one person), who sought out "hebraiōn of highest reputation who had received an education in Greek as well as native lore" and sent them to Ptolemy. In Alexandria they translated the Law from Hebrew into Greek. His "Hebrews, hebraioi", are people of good reputation and education. Whilst they have a Greek education they are not innovators but follow their ancestral law.

Not only does Philo not name himself a "Hebrew" but he also excludes himself from among those whose primary language is Hebrew. At Conf.Ling. 1.29 he writes, "that name is in the Hebrew language 'Penuei' but in our own, hōs de hēmeis, 'turning from God'". Later (Christian) writers named Philo a "Hebrew", sometimes explicitly in contrast with the "Hellenists" [369]. This usage is not so alien to Philo himself. Although he does not name himself a "Hebrew" he gives the impression that what he says is in accordance with traditional explanations. His usage of "Hebrews" could be paraphrased as "traditionalists" and this is not far removed from Christian usage in which it refers to "good Jews". Both Philo's "Hebrews" and those of the Church were represented primarily by the earliest ancestors of the people.

Philo's "Hebrews" are speakers of the the "Hebrew" (or "Aramaic") language. This is an ancestral language in distinction from the use of "Greek" by other people of similar descent. Philo prefers to use the name for the ancestors of the people, especially those so named in his sources. "Hebrews" in Philo refer to those respected and traditional people. That Philo is himself named a "Hebrew" shows that he was seen by later (Christian) writers as a "conservative" or "good Jew".

7.13 FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

Josephus uses hebraioi 302 times throughout his works, hebraikos 5 times and hebraides once [370]. On three occasions he refers to people speaking "in Hebrew, hebraisti" [371].

Frequently Josephus uses the phrase kata tēn hebraiōn to explain the meaning of words to his readers, for example saying that 'Adam' means 'red' kata glōttan tēn hebraiōn (Ant. 1.34) and 'Eve' means 'woman' in the hebraiōn dialekton (Ant. 1.36). Whilst the majority of the words discussed in this way are Hebrew words, he also says of "sabbath" with an Aramaic ending, sabbata, that it means "rest" kata tēn hebraiōn dialekton (Ant. 1.33,34) [372]. Especially interesting in comparison with Philo's uses of the name is Josephus' explanation that "Israel" kata tēn hebraiōn glōttan means "the opponent of the angel of God", ton antistatēn angelō theou, (Ant. 1.333). These are not intended as merely historical statements but mean that contemporary Jews still spoke "Hebrew".

At Ant. 10.8 Josephus distinguishes between the Hebrew and Aramaic languages in his version of 2 Kgs 18:26-28. The Assyrian general speaks loudly "in Hebrew, hebraisti" and refused to speak "in Aramaic, suristi", saying that he was "speaking in Hebrew so that all may hear the king's commands". Josephus follows neither the MT's yehudit nor the LXX's ioudaisti and also names Aramaic, "Syrian". Both of the names he uses are normal as designations of those languages in his time.

Josephus follows the MT in naming Abraham, Joseph and Jonah as hebraioi, but also includes, among others, Moses, Joshua and Saul [373]. At Ant. 2.302 Pharaoh says that the "Hebrews" can leave Egypt but their wives must stay behind, implying that "Hebrews" refers only to men, or that the people are represented primarily by men. Similarly at Ant. 2.207 Pharaoh tells Moses, "taking the women and children, take the Hebrews away but leave the livestock".

Some occurrences of hebraios in Josephus' works represent yisra'el in the MT [374]. In other passages Josephus is closer to the MT than the LXX. Both Josephus and the MT refer to "Hebrews" at, for example, 1 Sam 29:3 = Ant. 6.352 where the LXX reads diaporeuomenoi. Josephus is also willing to add occurrences of "Hebrews" to the biblical text e.g. "let my people go" of Exod 10:3 becomes, "let the Hebrews go" at Ant. 2.309. At Ant. 6.325 Josephus parallels "Israelite" with "Hebrews". The "Philistines, palaistinon, resolved to take the field against the Israelites and called their allies to meet them to make a combined assault on the Hebrews". These two names are entirely synonymous, there are not two groups. Elsewhere all three names under consideration are used:

at Ant. 5.177 the Canaanites take Ascalon from the "tribe of Judah, iouda phulēs" as part of their attack on "Israelites" and "Hebrews".

Josephus can also use "Hebrews" to mean "the majority of the nation" when one or more tribes or cities act alone or against the majority. In Ant. 5.160-165 "Hebrews" fight against the "Benjaminites". Later "Israelites" is used synonymously with "Hebrews" in this encounter (5.168,174). Then Josephus writes about the attack by the Canaanites on the tribes, saying that when the "Israelites" relaxed the Canaanites attacked "the Hebrews", taking towns from the "tribe of Judah" and forcing "the tribe of Dan" to move from its tribal area. At Ant. 7.356 Josephus refers to "all the Hebrew nation and the tribe of Judah, te hebraiōn ethnous pantos kai tēs iouda phulēs".

The "Hebrew slave" law is referred to at Ant. 4.273 but Josephus avoids naming such slaves hebraioi. Josephus is providing a classified list of the laws or constitution left by Moses (Ant. 4.196-198 introducing 4.199-301). He claims that there must be no temple or altar anywhere but Jerusalem because "God is one and the Hebrew race is one" (4.201) and that the people should gather three times a year "from the ends of the land which the Hebrews shall conquer" (4.203), a land previously called "Canaan" (4.199). He says that thanks should be given "for such favour towards all Hebrews in common" (4.243) and that "it should not be permitted to lend on usury to any Hebrew" (4.266). After narrating the ceremony at "Garizin" Josephus says, "such were the ordinances of Moses, and the Hebrew nation continues to act in conformity therewith" (4.308). Josephus avoids using "Hebrew slave" in this context because the name had strongly positive associations. It was not to be linked to slavery but with the Laws, constitution and virtues of the "Hebrew nation" from the time of Moses and continuing into Josephus' own time. The "nation" in this summary predates the giving of the Law and bears strong associations with the nation's origins.

Josephus also uses hebraios for contemporary Jews and, most significantly, he himself is genei hebraios (J.W. 1.3 [375]). This is in the preface to his account of the "War between the Romans and the ioudaioi" which, he says, he writes because others have vilified "the ioudaioi". He acknowledges that he was a commander in the war. Josephus does not consistently distinguish between ioudaios and hebraios in his works, anyone he calls one name he will call by the other at another point [376]. Yet here he chooses to use a name not so

immediately associated with the war. This use of name "Hebrew" might also support Josephus' claim that, "in comparison with parvenu high priests of the Herodian and procuratorial period, Josephus' family had substance and antiquity" [377].

This is not the only place where Josephus uses hebraios as an alternative to ioudaios. Later in his account of the war he says that the rebels have caused the disparaging of to genos tōn hebraiōn by their atrocities in Jerusalem (J.W. 5.443). By the use of different names Josephus wants to demonstrate that the whole nation is not to be implicated in whatever barbarities are attributable to the revolutionaries. The "Hebrews" are "good" people and the name is a positive one, however, the action of the revolutionaries has besmirched them and their name [378]. Josephus is willing to allow that some ioudaioi are guilty of rebellion. He can call them ioudaioi because it is the name which the Romans use for the people,

this was the work of Josephus the apologist for the Jewish people and the polemicist against Jewish revolutionaries [379].

Josephus' account of the reign of Manasseh (Ant. 10.36-39) begins with the assertion that he

imitated the lawless deeds of the Israelites wherein they sinned against God and so perished. ... For, setting out with a contempt for God, he killed (cruelly) all the righteous men among the Hebrews, hebraioi, nor did he spare the prophets ... therefore God sent prophets and through them threatened them with the same calamities as had befallen their Israelite brothers.

In this passage Josephus contrasts the northern and southern kingdoms and their peoples using different names for them. He refers to Manasseh's domain as "Judaea" and has already referred to the north as "Israel". However, the choice of a name for the third "righteous" group is not mere chance. "Hebrews" has the associations: "traditional", "conservative" and "non-innovative". To Josephus these were positive values for which "pious" might serve as a summary. Those killed by Manasseh are not mere bystanders, they are "righteous men" and especially "prophets". They are contrasted with the far from neutral figure of Manasseh who "broke with his father's practices and left no

impiety undone".

Elsewhere David is named both "king of Judaea" and "king of the Hebrews" in close proximity (Ant. 7.101,105). "King of Judaea" occurs in a quote from Nicolas, and though there is nothing negative in Josephus' use of ioudaia at this point, the use of hebraioi is deliberate. Josephus writes that the "king of the Hebrews, with the encouragement of God who gave him success in war" attacked another city. "Judaea" points to David's political power, the name his Empire was known by, but "Hebrews" carries associations with "God" and divine promises to "Abram the Hebrew".

There is one place where Josephus offers an explanation of the origin of the name. At Ant. 1.146 he says that selēs (MT's šelah) was the "father of heberos from whom the ioudaious were originally called hebraious". This is at the end of a list of ancestors, slightly expanded from that of the MT and LXX. It is followed by a brief rendering of Gen 11:16-32 which is introduced, "I shall now speak of the Hebrews, hebraiōn". This leads to Abraham who, although he is not called a hebraios in this context, is obviously the main point of this narrative. Nevertheless, nowhere else does Josephus make use of the idea that the "Hebrews" are named after an ancestor "Hebreos". Josephus is lead to this interpretation not by the associations or use of the name "Hebrews" but by his desire to explain the name heberos (MT's ēber).

In his discussion of the Samaritans Josephus uses both "Hebrews" and "Jews" in a way which suggests that the two names are not exactly synonymous but are applicable to the same group. Josephus says that the Samaritans decided to claim to be "Jews", egnōsan hautous ioudaious homologein, before Alexander despite the fact that they were "apostates from the Jewish nation, apostatōn tou ioudaion ethnous". He claims that "when the Jews are in difficulties [the Samaritans] deny that they have any kinship with them, thereby admitting the truth". When Alexander asked who they were, they replied that they were "Hebrews, hebraioi, but were called the Sidonians of Shechem" (Ant. 11.340-44). According to Josephus the Samaritans more often saw themselves as "Hebrews". Their claim to be "Jews" was only for the purpose of gaining something. Josephus prefers to see them as "Cuthim", foreigners brought into the land (Ant. 9.288). Mor argues that the Samaritans were persecuted because they had been identified as "Jews" and therefore claimed to be "hellenists",

by calling themselves Sidonians of Shechem they wanted to prove that their origins, customs and way of life, were rooted in Hellenistic culture and not in the Jews and Judaism [380].

If Josephus has recorded an historical discussion, the claim to be "Hebrews" is a claim to have origins more ancient than those of Jerusalem and (persecuted) Judaism.

Josephus uses ioudaioi as a name for good and bad, ancestors, kings and rebels. This is the name he prefers to use even when naming those who rebelled against Rome, people he saw as "bad". "Israelites" he uses for the northern kingdom, for the whole Davidic kingdom and its people, for later generations and as an all embracing name in the same way that he uses ioudaioi. It is also partly synonymous with "Hebrews" (in Ant. 3.192 "Hebrews" are pleased with a speech addressed to them as "Israelites"). Josephus' use of "Hebrews" is as a label for those related to the "good" ancestors and ancestral traditions. At Ant. 2.268 God says to Moses (from the burning bush) that he will be the leader of the "Hebrew hosts, for they shall dwell where Abraham lived, the forefather of your race". "Hebrews" are "good Jews".

7.14 EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

The occurrences of "Hebrews" in CCL fall into two groups: eleven times it refers to a language [381] and four times it is used of a group of people [382].

The language referred to is sometimes Hebrew but it can also mean Aramaic, at other times commentators are divided as to which is intended. The translators of the NEB avoid making their opinions public by using "the language of the Jews" in all but four places [383].

hebraidi dialektō is the language of Paul's speech to the Jerusalem crowd (Acts 21:40; 22:2) which is clearly expected to be understood. At Acts 26:14 hebraidi dialektō occurs again in the narrative of Paul's conversion. As the commissioning words are rendered in Greek it is impossible to tell whether Luke means Hebrew or Aramaic. In John's crucifixion account the words on the cross are said to have been written "in hebraisti, rōmanisti and hellēnisti" (19:20). Some manuscripts of Luke 23:38 contain another usage to harmonise the account to that of John. The remaining uses of "Hebrew"

for a language are references to individual words. Four of these occur in John: bēthzatha (5:2), gabbatha (19:13) and golgotha (19:17) are said to be place names in hebraisti; and Mary, recognising Jesus, exclaims in hebraisti: rabbouni (20:16). In Revelation another place-name, harmagedōn (16:16), and the angel of the bottomless pit, abaddōn (9:11) are named in hebraisti.

Since my purpose is to discuss the name of a group of people it will not further my purpose to decide whether Hebrew or Aramaic is intended. A more significant question for the present purpose is "why should either language have been called "Hebrew" in the first place?" Black writes,

The use of the term 'Hebrew' to refer to Aramaic is readily explicable, since it described the peculiar dialect of Aramaic which had grown up in Palestine since the days of Nehemiah and which was distinctively Jewish (with no doubt distinctive Hebrew script associated with it, and a large proportion of borrowings from classical Hebrew) [384].

This explanation does not solve the problem as the earlier yehudit could more easily have served this purpose leaving the newer "Hebrew" to refer to the Hebrew language. The use of one name to refer to two languages spoken by the same people seems confusing. According to 2 Kgs 18:26 the two languages were distinguished. It is possible, however, that Greek writers did not distinguish between the two languages. Black's suggestion does not explain the process by which the distinction was lost. It is also possible that the name "Hebrew" was coined for the language previously called yehudit precisely because of the growth of the new Aramaic dialect.

"Hebrews" also refers to a group of people. The most debated occurrence of this usage is Acts 6:1 which describes "the first suggestion of some diversity in the Palestinian Church" [385]. The majority of commentators on this passage are more concerned with the meaning of hellēnistai than with that of hebraious. Rowland notes that "there has been much dispute over the identity of the Hellenists" but says very little about the "Hebrews" [386]. Murray retreats from his earlier "advocacy of the 'dissident Hebrews'", saying, "no doubt 'Hebrew' has already caused quite enough trouble in early Christian sources" [387]. However, it is only the collocation with "Hellenists" which has caused trouble.

Martin surveys five different interpretations of hellēnistai but says of hebraious only that it "obviously refers to the original converts to the faith from Judaism, typified by the Twelve" [388]. Bruce writes,

The word here stands in opposition to hellēniston, and apparently means Hebrew or Aramaic-speaking Jews, whether of Palestine or, like Paul (Phil 3:5 ebraios ex ebraion), of the Dispersion. Elsewhere ebraios is not so restricted [389].

Barrett considers that

It has been shown conclusively.... that the word is used in two senses. The primary one (clearly used in Phil 3:5), is that of pure-blooded Jew; and only secondarily, and in contexts where the "Hebrew" is contrasted with other Jews (as at Acts 6:1), do considerations such as language (Hebrew-speaking over against Greek-speaking) arise [390].

Brown claims that the term "Hellenists" is used "in contrast to the corresponding term 'Hebrews' and is clearly a linguistic designation". It is applied both to "Greek-speaking Jews, whether Christian (Acts 6:1) or not (9:29), and Gentiles (9:20), who were obviously Greek-speaking" [391].

The immediate solution to divisions in the early Christian community was the choice of seven men with Greek names. Some commentators argue that these are the representatives of the "Hellenists" [392]. This would be a strange solution to the problem. Moule believes (despite the objections of Cadbury [393]) that the choice of seven "Hellenists" in this situation is "intelligible".

Either the entire Christian community made the generous gesture of trusting these seven, although drawn from the wrong section, to deal fairly with the Hebraic group as well; or it was assumed that the care of the 'Hebrews' needed no special attention [394].

Hengel claims that Luke has played down both the conflict between the two factions (speakers of Aramaic and speakers of Greek) and the course of the persecution [395]. Stephen (and sometimes anyone else portrayed positively in Luke-Acts [396]) represent the

"Hellenists" whose liturgy and soon their entire attitude to the Law and mission differ radically from that of the "Hebrews" who are increasingly left behind. Although Raisanen says, "it is a pity that we know so little about the 'Hellenist' group around Stephen" [397] he does not say how he knows that Stephen was a "Hellenist" when Luke does not say so.

When it is noted that "Greek names were not so uncommon among Palestinian Jews - two of the twelve had Greek names, after all (Andrew and Philip)" [398] the conclusion that perhaps the seven were not all "Hellenists" is not drawn. If the seven were "Hellenists" and the twelve were "Hebrews" the solution must have deepened the division.

It is alleged that Stephen was an "Hellenist" because his name is Greek. In addition: his initial opposition came from "Jews of Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia and Asia" (Acts 6:9) and some of those scattered in the following persecution were from Cyrene and Cyprus (Acts 11:20). Haenchen [399] claims that only the "Hellenists" were persecuted and that the "Hebrews" were untouched. Hengel [400] repeats this claim "contrary to Luke's account". However, Acts 8:1 says that all were scattered except the apostles. Moule "guesses" that the apostles escaped the persecution because, as Galileans, they had not joined local synagogues or other gatherings [401]. This ignores the claim (e.g. 3:1) that they often went to the Temple where Luke would have us believe they must have been conspicuous to all other groups. Luke does not say that the Diaspora Jews were "Hellenists" or that the persecution of the Church was a conflict between "Hellenistic" Jews and "Hellenistic" Jewish-Christians.

Stephen's speech (Acts 7) is seen as a manifesto of the "Hellenists". This speech with its "freedom in relation to the Law" is said to have "provoked the wrath of the Jews against Stephen and his group". Yet, as Haenchen has to admit "Jesus himself both used and taught such freedom". The outcome of this argument is that Haenchen is forced to argue that it is "entirely possible that the 'Hellenists' were more ready than the 'Hebrews' to interpret the Law in Jesus' sense" [402]. Cullman sees "Hellenists" as those whose spirituality is not centred on the Jerusalem Temple and therefore labels the Qumran community "Hellenists" [403]. The "obviousness" of Brown's acknowledgement that "there is obviously no direct connection between the Hellenists' use of the Greek language and their attitude to the law" [404] has little effect on these arguments (including

those of Brown).

This lengthy discussion of the use of "Hellenists" cannot be balanced by one of the use of "Hebrews". Most commentators assume that the "Hebrews" were the opposite of the "Hellenists" so that, having described what the "Hellenists" are alleged to have said and done (and their reasons for doing so), nothing more needs to be said about the "Hebrews". If the "Hellenists" are innovators the "Hebrews" are traditionalists. They are observant of the Law if the "Hellenists" are against it. Brown writes, "it goes without saying that any gentile who sought admission into the "Hebrew" wing of the Jerusalem community would have been obliged to undergo circumcision" [405].

This entire debate has very flimsy foundations. There are even voices raised to suggest that in fact Stephen was a "Hebrew" and not a "Hellenist". Two appendices of the Anchor Bible Commentary on Acts are devoted largely to "proving" that Stephen's speech (if not Stephen himself) came from a Samaritan community [406]. This cannot be deemed to have succeeded any more than the more extensive claims that Stephen was a "Hellenist" are persuasive.

Murray believes that Stephen's speech is "perhaps the most unmistakable expression of 'dissenting Hebrew' criticism of Judaism" [407]. He does see the names as labelling "linguistic groups" and claims the dispute is "not ideological", but also says, "Stephen's ideology is not defined until he makes it clear by his speech, and 'Hellenist' is not the name for it" [408]. Murray's proposals for distinguishing amongst the diverse groups within both Judaism and Christianity, allied to an examination of wider uses of the name "Hebrews", should provoke a rethinking of Acts 6.

Chrysostom says of Acts 6 that, "there arose a mummering against the Hebrews for that description of people seemed to be more honourable" [409]. He interprets the "Hellenists" of Acts 9:29 as "those who used the Greek tongue, hellēnisti phtheggomenous". He says that Paul was wise to speak to them because "those others, those profound Hebrews, hoi batheis hebraioi, had no mind even to see him" [410]. "Hebrews" here does not describe a language but is an honorific meaning something more like "conservative", "traditional" or (given Chrysostom's anti-Judaism) "good Jews".

2 Cor 11:22 and Phil 3:5 also use "Hebrews", in defending his ministry against "false apostles" and

"super apostles" (2 Cor 11:5,13),

Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they Abraham's descendents? So am I. Are they servants of Christ? (I am out of my mind to talk like this). I am more.

These names occur in a debate between Christians, Paul and his opponents, rather than between Jews and Christians.

Philippians is of the same polemical nature. Paul argues against "the circumcision" that "we put no confidence in the flesh" (3:3), yet he challenges his opponents:

If anyone thinks he has reasons to put confidence in the flesh, I have more: circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews.

According to Barrett [411] Paul uses hebraios in its "primary sense": "Paul thus claims to be a full Jew by descent". That hebraios means "Jew" without any linguistic reference is argued on the basis of a Corinthian synagogue inscription (reconstructed from the surviving, agōgēēbp, as synagōgē hebraion) and one from a Roman synagogue of "the original small group of Jews resident in Rome (as early as the time of Pompey)" [412]. Other synagogue inscriptions have the names of geographical regions, family groups and sectarian or political groups (i.e. "Herodians"). However, as the inscriptions provide no information as to what "Synagogue of the Hebrews" implies, this does not clarify the use of the name elsewhere [413]. The inscriptions from the odeum at Aphrodisias (ebreon ton paleiōn and topos ebreōn [414]) add little other than the occurrence of the name.

Richardson believes that "Hebrews" implies an origin in Palestine although he notes that "it is possible that hebraioi could refer to Diaspora Jews speaking Hebrew as well as Greek" [415]. It seems more likely that language and place-of-origin have little to do with divisions between early Christian groups. Wider usage of "Hebrew" suggests that the name bears associations of "traditionalist" and that this is what those who used it as a self-designation claimed to be.

In 2 Corinthians and Philippians "Hebrews" occurs in the context of other names. What is added to "Hebrews" by "Israelite", "Abraham's descendant", or indeed by "circumcised", "Benjaminite" or "Pharisee"? They cannot be reduced to read "Jewish" [416] as though there was no difference between them. Their role within the debate between Paul and his opponents suggests that they are different ways of looking at the same thing. It is only the last phrase, "are they servants of Christ?" which does not receive its kago, "So am I", ironically suggesting that Paul is a "servant of Christ" but his opponents are not.

The argument that hebraioi refers to the language spoken by Paul's opponents is met with again. Bruce says,

The distinction was probably linguistic and cultural: the Hebrews, in that case, attended synagogues where the service was conducted in Hebrew and used Aramaic as their normal mode of speech, while Hellenists spoke Greek and attended synagogues where the scriptures were read and the prayers recited in that language [417].

Usage of the name "Hebrews" elsewhere and its occurrence in inscriptions written in Greek rather than Hebrew show that more is intended than "speakers of a language".

Black argues that

it is possible that the description of synagogues of 'Hebrews' in the Diaspora means more than synagogues of Aramaic-speaking Jews, and that the reference is rather to Jews of the Hasidean tradition, that is, of the Essene type [418].

If this is so, he claims, "we would then have an even closer link between the 'Hebrews' of Acts and the 'non-conformist' tradition of the scrolls". This is closer to the truth than those who argue about language.

"Hebrews" is a designation for those who claim to stand within an ancient tradition, to be conservative and non-innovative. Whether this is true of the "Essenes" (and the improbability of the existence of an organised group named "Hasideans" [419]) is not relevant. Josephus' "Hebrews" tend to be those of an archaic era. The loyalists and martyrs of 2 and 4 Maccabees and the "faithful elect" of the Sibylline

Oracles were "Hebrews". "Hebrews" in CCL also fits this pattern. "Hebrews" claim (whatever the historical truth may be) to be pious, loyal and traditional observers of ancestral ways.

Before looking at the way in which early Christians continued to use the name it remains to note the occurrence of "Hebrews" in the title of the "Letter to the Hebrews". Bruce says that "the title may simply have reflected his [the person who first attached the title] own impression (shared, no doubt, with other readers) that the document was addressed to Jewish-Christians" [420].

In previous discussions of the uses of the name "Hebrews" it has become apparent that it has the connotations of "traditional" or "conservative". I have argued that this is true of occurrences of the name in CCL. When Paul writes that he is a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil 3:5) he is denying that he is innovative or anything but a traditionalist. He is claiming that what he teaches is compatible with what he taught as a Pharisee. What he writes off as "refuse" (Phil 3:9) is all of these positive things as marks of his own special status. He does not deny their goodness in their (past for him) context.

The three designations ("Israel", "Hebrews" and "Jew") are used throughout early Christian texts including those now labelled "Gnostic" [421]. "Hebrews" here could often be paraphrased as "traditional". Sometimes it is also linked to the "etymology" "passing over" or to the language, "Hebrew".

The interpretation of "Hebrews" as peratēs occurs in some early Christian writings. The majority of them depend on the LXX rather than on Philo. Africanus says that the people were called "Hebrews" because they crossed boundaries [422]. Origen says that Abraham is called a "Hebrew" because from the land of the Chaldeans he crossed from Mesopotamia and came to the land of the Canaanites" [423]. However, he also argues that Jesus' followers are "Hebrews" because they "transcended the visible and corporeal and attained the invisible and eternal" [424]. This is closer to Philo's use of the interpretation and may be dependent on his works.

Clements writes about the Jerusalem Church in the time of James as "the Church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem". Black claims that the title of the "Apocryphal 'Gospel to the Hebrews'" and the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews are both late second-century

echoes of this usage" and recognises that it is "an archaic form of speech" which describes "loyal Jews" [425].

In the middle of the Second Century C.E. Melito of Sardis was accusing "Israel" of deicide [426]. He highlights this accusation by stressing the positive location of the act:

An unprecedented murder has occurred in the
middle of Jerusalem,
the city of the law,
in the city of the Hebrews,
in the city of the prophets,
in the city accounted just
(Peri Pascha 693-95 [427]).

Whilst Melito is vehemently against Judaism, he believes that there were once "good Jews" who he refers to as "Hebrews". Kraabel claims that "attempts to understand [Melito's anti-Jewish vehemence] by fitting it into his theology have not been satisfactory" and suggests instead that a "socio-political motivation" should be found. "In the face of such a large and powerful Jewish community Melito felt forced to adopt the stance demonstrated in Peri Pascha" [428]. This is to blame victims for victimization, i.e. Jews are to blame for Christian anti-Judaism. Elsewhere Kraabel notes that "there is no evidence that the Sardis Jews knew of Melito's wrath; Jews and gentiles were generally on better terms than Christian leaders like Melito might wish" [429]. Such a social situation makes it hard to believe that Melito was "forced" to his stance by anything other than a "normal" Christian anti-Judaism, which is unique for its time only in its clarity. It is not alien to but part of wider Christian theology [430].

The Apology of Aristides says that Jesus was "born of a Hebrew maiden" [431] and "of the tribe of the Hebrews". The Greek text is considerably harsher in its views on the Jews than the Syriac or the Armenian versions [432] which explains its non-usage of "Hebrew" here. The Syriac version is concerned to show that the Jews were the forerunners of Christianity and, as such, had a valuable contribution to make.

Origen uses the name "Hebrews" in almost every possible way. "Hebrews" are those who speak the language, "Hebrew", in Cels. III.5,6,8. This is important to Origen as it refutes the claim that the Jews are descendants of expelled or runaway Egyptians. "Hebrews" also means the "ancestors of contemporary

Jews". These people can also be named "Hebrews" because they "crossed over" from Egypt to the "promised land", from darkness to light and from death to life (In Num. hom. XIX.4). Abraham also is one who "crossed over, peratēs", "from the land of the Chaldaeans he crossed Mesopotamia and came to the territory of the Canaanites" (Sel. in Gen. XIV.13).

Origen claims that others before and since Abraham (e.g. Enosh, Enoch and Melchizedek) held to the true faith. They cannot be named "Jews" nor "Greeks", the best name for them is "Hebrews", "either from Eber, or from the interpretation of the name: they are called, 'crossers over', peratikoi" (PE VII.8). Origen also applies the name to the Christian Church, which is the "crossing over and the true Hebrews" (Mart. Exh. 33). The followers of Jesus are "Hebrews" because they "transcended the visible and corporeal and attained the invisible and eternal" [433]. Eusebius also uses this interpretation, saying that the pre-Christ faithful are not "Jews" or "Greeks" but "Hebrews", "crossers over, peratikoi" because they "set out to cross over from this wordly life to the contemplation of the God of all things" [434].

Origen's contemporary "Hebrews" are his friends and teachers. According to de Lange

Ioudaios, in many mouths, was a sneering expression, even perhaps a term of abuse; Hebraios, on the other hand, was a liberal's word, leaning over backwards to give no offence. It was Origen's dilemma that as a theologian he must condemn the Jews while as a scholar and exegete he depended on them. The dilemma is not resolved, but concealed, by using a different word in each case for the same people [435].

This seems a rather sad comment on Christian responses to Judaism. In the light of wider uses of the names, it would seem fairer to suggest that "Hebrews" is used by Origen to mean "good Jews".

I have noted above [436] that Chrysostom implies that "Hebrews" is an honorific. He says of its usage in Acts 6 that "that description of people seemed to be more honourable" (Homily 14) and comments on Paul going to the "Hellenists" in Acts 9:29 that "this he did, very wisely, for those others, those profound Hebrews, hoi batheis hebraioi, had no mind even to see him" (Homily 21). Whilst the latter passage obviously indicates a negative response to Christianity, Chrysostom's use of

"Hebrews" is a positive one.

The early Syriac Christian Homily 8 of the pseudo-Clementines says that "Jesus is hidden from the Jews, who have taken Moses as their teacher, and Moses is hidden from those who have believed Jesus". This is not a condemnation, but "God accepts him who has believed either of these". The "Hebrews" will not be "condemned on account of their ignorance of Jesus... if, doing the things commanded by Moses, they do not hate him who they do not know". Nor will (Christian) Gentiles be condemned for ignorance of Moses if they obey Jesus [437]. "Hebrews" are, in short, "good Jews".

Even before the discoveries at Nag Hammadi various texts were known from the writings of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and others, as addressed to (or by) "Hebrews" [438]. It is possible that this group spoke Hebrew (or Aramaic). Tertullian wrote that "in ancient times the people we call Jews bore the name of Hebrews, and so both their writing and their speech were Hebrew" [439]. His narrative here concerns the translation of the Law into Greek under Ptolemy and is comparable to Philo's narrative and uses of "Hebrews". However, Jerome's use of the name "Hebrews", "according to the Gospel written in the Hebrew speech" [440] more clearly implies that the name is associated with the language.

Wider usage of the name, however, shows that it meant more than "speakers of a particular language". Eusebius, discussing which texts are canonical, says that "among these some have reckoned also the Gospel of the Hebrews, a work which is especially acceptable to such Hebrews as received the Christ" (H.E. III.25,5). Eusebius refers to the Gospel of the Hebrews on other occasions (III.27,4; 29,17). At IV.22,8 he says of Hegesippus's "Memoires",

he quotes both from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac (Gospel) and in particular some words in the Hebrew tongue, showing that he was a convert from the Hebrews".

"Hebrews" here means "Jews who were ready to convert". Even Tertullian's usage associates the name with antiquity. "Hebrews" is a name used for those who might otherwise be called "Jews" were it not for the fact that "Jew" had taken on negative associations. "Hebrews" is a positive name for those "Jews" who Christians considered to be "good".

Siker thinks that the use of "Hebrews" in the Gospel of Philip [441] "might be some indication that [those responsible for the Gospel] were initially Jewish-Christians" [442]. A stronger statement could be made. "Hebrews", when used as a self-designation, is a claim to be traditional and non-innovative. In case of the Gospel of Philip, "Hebrews" is used as a designation for what the community used to be, i.e. it is a claim to have been traditional and non-innovative. The community uses "Christians" as a self-designation and mean by that what are now labelled "Gnostic Christians".

"Hebrews" occurs six times within the Gospel [443]. Once it refers to the language (62:13). Elsewhere it refers to "a religious group" [444]. It is inadequate to write of the Gospel that "apparently we have to do with a continuous discourse... delivered by a group who present themselves as Hebrews converted to Christianity" [445]. The name is not exactly synonymous with "Jews" in many other texts and appears to mean more here.

The Gospel of Philip is interested in three groups who it names "Jews", "Hebrews" and "Christians". The "Christians" [446] are the author's community, Gnostics. The "Jews" [447] are a group racially distinct from "Romans" and "Greeks" and religiously distinct from "Christians". They are non-Christian Jews. The "Hebrews" are racially "Jews" (as, perhaps, may the "Christians" be) but are Christians. Indeed, given Christian anti-Judaism, the name could be paraphrased "good Jews". The apostles were "Hebrews" (55:27-28). Mary is one whose "existence is anathema to the Hebrews, meaning the apostles and apostolic persons" (55:27-28). The Gnostic community began as "Hebrews", "when we were Hebrews we were orphans with only our mother, but when we became Christians we got father and mother" (52:51 [448]). 36:5 says that "anyone who has received something other than the lord is still a Hebrew". Whilst this could be interpreted as a reference to non-Christian Jews, it is likely, in the context of the Gospel's usage, to refer to the apostles. They ceased being "Jews" and became "Hebrews" (good Jews) but did not become "Christians".

Being "Hebrews" is a stage enroute to becoming proper, i.e. Gnostic, Christians. It is inaccurate to say that "everything Hebrew is devalued as an obsolete preliminary to true faith" [449].

The usage made of the name "Hebrews" in the Gospel of Philip is not something that the writer feels the need to justify. It is that of the community for which the

text was produced. From earlier discussions of uses of "Hebrews" it is clear that there is a distinction between "Jews" and "Hebrews". "Hebrews" are Jews by descent, but when writers express anti-Jewish sentiment they use "Jew" and reserve "Hebrews" as an appellation for "good Jews" (but, perhaps, "not-good-enough Christians") like the apostles or prophets. To many Christians the occasions for being positive about Jews became fewer as the Church became increasingly Gentile. Any "good Jews" could be labelled as "Israel" and the distinction between them and the Church could be ignored. "Jews", "Judaism" and "the circumcision" became increasingly negative terms [450]. The Gospel of Philip was produced for a group for whom some contemporary Jews were not all bad. "Hebrews" exist not only in the past of the prophets and apostles but are also the community from whom the "Christian" group arose.

The positive use of the name "Hebrews" continued long beyond this period. In the Old English poem Andreas the "habitual" usage of "certain patristic authors" is echoed,

when God contemplated the sufferings of Matthew,
he was mindful of how He had often shown love
for the 'Hebrews' and the 'Israelites', the
traditional names for the Jews as the people of
God; and He also remembered how He had withstood
the 'galdorcreftum' [blasphemous deceits] of the
Jews [451].

This, I have argued, is not only the usage of "certain patristic authors" but is developed from ancient Jewish usage.

7.15 GENTILE GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

The name "Hebrews" also occurs in the works of "Pagan" Greek and Latin writers. The majority of these wrote later than the first century C.E. and some are only extant in quotations by Christian writers, especially Eusebius. The following examples are not intended to be exhaustive [452] but to illustrate wider usage.

Eusebius quotes some material from the peri ioudaiōn of Alexander Polyhistor (first century B.C.E.). Alexander writes that Ezekiel (the dramatist [453]) "introduces a messenger who describes the condition of

the Hebrews and the destruction of the Egyptians" [454]. This is a fairly straightforward paraphrase of Exodus, however Alexander also had a more novel idea. His De Roma is quoted by Suda as stating that "there lived a Hebrew woman, gunē gegonen hebraia, Moso, who composed the law of the Hebrews, ho par hebraiois nomos [455]. Stern argues that this is either a mockery as Alexander clearly knows enough of the traditions about Moses, or depends on the idea of the Sybils giving out the law.

Alexander uses "Hebrews" both of ancient people and of contemporaries (those to whom the "law of the Hebrews" is still applicable). Stern also notes that Alexander is "the first pagan writer to substitute the term 'Hebrew' for 'Jew'" [456].

The first Latin use of the name Hebraeique occurs at Statius' Silvae V, 1:213 [457] where the funeral gifts for Priscilla include "Palestinian and Hebrew essences, Palestini simul Hebraeique liquores". This refers to the export of balsam from the territories labeled "Palestinian" and "Hebrew" in the second half of the first century C.E. Early in the second century Tacitus, in discussing different views of the origins of the Jews, says that they might have been "Assyrian refugees, a landless people who first got control of a part of Egypt, then later they had their own cities and lived in the Hebrew territory, Hebraeasque terras, and the nearer part of Syria" (Historiae V, 2:3 [458]). These accounts suggest that there was an territory which could be known as "Hebrew" which was between "Syria" and "Palestine". Presumably this refers to the central hill country, an area which had always been "conservative" due to its distance from the main cosmopolitan settlements and trade routes of the Palestinian coastal plain.

Alexander Diogenes (at the end of the first century C.E.) "says that Pythagoras came also to the Egyptians, the Arabs, the Chaldeans and the Hebrews, hebraious, from whom he learnt the exact knowledge of dreams" [459].

At the beginning of the second century C.E. Plutarch discussed the issue of "who the God of the Jews is". His disputant Symmachus asks Lamprias whether he intends to "enrol your national God [Dionysus] in the calendar of the Hebrews, tois hebraiōn aporrētois" (Quaestiones Convivales IV, 6:1 [460]). This reference to the calendar is intriguing as one of the "taxic indicators" of Judaism (as seen by "outsiders" and some "insiders") in the period was their celebration of sabbath and their own calendar.

In Vita Antonii 27:4 Plutarch claims that, "in interviews with barbarians [Cleopatra] very seldom had need of an interpreter, but made her replies herself and unassisted, whether they were Ethiopians, Troglodytes, Hebrews, hebraiois, Arabians, Syrians, Medes or Parthians". Elsewhere Plutarch prefers to use "Jew" or "Jews" [461]. "Hebrew" might have been used here as the name of the people because of its links with language.

Ptolemy Chennus (first half of the second century C.E.) lists various famous people whose nicknames are derived from letters of the alphabet. The only one of these who is not a Greek or Roman is Moses, "legislator of the Hebrews, ho tōn hebraiōn nomothetēs" [462], whose nickname is said to have been alpha because he had "dull-white leprosy, alphous, on his body".

A note is preserved by Stephanus Byzantius that Claudius Charax of Pergamum says, "Hebrews, hebraioi. Thus are called Jews after Abramon, abramōnos" [463]. This is comparable with the quotation by Stephanus Byzantius of Alexander Polyhistor, that the name "Judea, ioudaia" "derives from that of the children of Semiramis: Juda, iouda, and Idumea" [464].

Appian of Alexandria's second century C.E. Bella Civilia says that "almost all the nations of the Levant sent aid to Pompey... [including] the Hebrews, to hebraiōn genos and their neighbours the Arabs" (II.71:294 [465]). This probably refers to the troops sent by Hyrcanus and Antipater to support Pompey.

Pausanias "never uses the names 'Judaea' or 'Jews', but consistently employs the terms 'land of the Hebrews' and 'Hebrews' respectively" [466]. In his Graeciae Descriptio he says that Hadrian "never voluntarily entered upon a war but he reduced the Hebrews, hebrious, beyond Syria, who had rebelled" (I 5:5 [467]). He also says that "red water, in colour like blood, is found in the land of the Hebrews, hebraiōn hē gē, near the city of Joppa" (IV 35:9 [468]). When he refers to the river Jordan (V 7:4 [469]) he says that it is in "the land of the Hebrews, tē gē hebraiōn". At Graeciae Descriptio V 5:2 he compares "the fine flax of Elis" with "that of the Hebrews, tēs hebraiōn" saying that "it is as fine but not so yellow".

At VI 24:8 and VIII 16:4-5 [470] Pausanias refers to graves in the "land of the Hebrews, ev tē hebraiōn chōra". The name is not only that of a territory but also of the people who inhabit it, as he says that "in the land of the Hebrews the Hebrews have a grave".

At Graeciae Descriptio 10.12:9 Pausanias writes that "there grew up among the Hebrews above Palestine, par hebraiois tois huper tēs palaistinēs, a woman who gave oracles and was named Sabbe". In this context Pausanias limits "Palestine" to the ancient "Philistia", the coastal plain. The "Hebrews" are the inhabitants of the hill country. At IX 19:8 he compares the dates of "Palestine" with those of Artemis' sanctuary in Boetia. "Palestine" had recently become the official title for the province which included the old "Judah" as well as the coastal plain which is distinguishable from the "land of the Hebrews".

Lucian of Samosata in his Alexander Pseudopropheta says that the false prophet gets attention and then "utters a few meaningless words like Hebrew, an hebraiōn or Phonecian" (13 [471]). Elsewhere Lucian talks of "Jews" as exorcists among other purveyors of the supernatural, which he hates. Here "Hebrew" refers to the language of the "Jews".

7.16 CONCLUSION

The name "Hebrew" was conventionally associated with traditionalism or conservatism. It is frequently used by those who might be accused of innovating to claim that they stand within the ancient tradition of the people.

The name has an archaic flavour, being associated with an era prior to the ancestors "Israel" and "Judah" and the tribes and kingdoms named after them. "Hebrew" is linked to Abraham in a time before all divisions. It is applicable to everyone within the nation, no matter what division or sub-division they may also belong to (e.g. priests and people, northern or southern kingdom). It tends, despite this broad applicability, to be used for those commended by writers or as a self-designation.

At some point, prior to the production of the literature being discussed, "Hebrew" became the name of a language. Sometimes this is the Hebrew language, at other times it is Aramaic. This ambiguity means that unless an example of the language is given it is not always possible to tell which is intended. However, for those to whom "Hebrew" was the name of a language one of its associations as a name of a people was "speakers of the language".

Some writers were also interested in associating consonant sequences in different ways. It could then be claimed that "Hebrew" derived from ḥbr and included in its meaning something to do with "crossing boundaries". A lesser claim could be made that the name "Hebrews, ḥibrim" and the verb "to cross boundaries, ḥabar" could be associated, e.g. by assonance.

Most often, however, the name "Hebrew" was not associated with movement but with secure and solid adherence to ancestral traditions. "Hebrews" in ancient Jewish literature is a name applied to those who might otherwise be named "good Jews".

Part Three: "Israel" in ancient Jewish Literature

CHAPTER EIGHT

ISRAEL IN THE MT

The opening verses of Amos illustrate the semantic range of "Israel" in the MT,

The words of Amos, one of the shepherds of Tekoa, what he saw concerning Israel two years before the earthquake, when Uzziah was king of Judah and Jeroboam son of Jehoash was king of Israel.

The first occurrence of "Israel" here is the name of an entity formed of two groups called "Judah" and "Israel". The second occurrence of "Israel" refers to the latter of these subdivisions of the larger "Israel". This second usage is clarified by the opposition of "Israel" to the name "Judah". That "Israel" and "Judah" form subdivisions of the larger "Israel" becomes apparent from the subject matter of the text to which this is a title. The two groups, "Israel" and "Judah" are the sphere of interest of YHWH, according to the prophet, and are thus equivalent to the first usage of "Israel" which could be called "the people of God" [472]. Amos is identified (1:1) as a southerner, a citizen of the kingdom of Judah [473].

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the ways in which the name "Israel" is used throughout the MT. As there are over 2500 [474] occurrences in the MT it has been necessary to find a method which does justice to the different uses to which the name is put. Whilst all occurrences have been taken into account not all of them need explicit mention.

In the following discussion I divide the occurrences of "Israel" into groups of phrases, such as "people of Israel", "House of Israel", "God of Israel". However, the word on its own is grouped differently by different commentators. A useful starting point is the subdivisions of ES.

ES divides the uses of "Israel" in MT firstly into two groups: a) references to the ancestor Jacob by the name Israel, b) references to the descendants of the ancestor. The former category has thirty-nine examples. The second category is subdivided, firstly into those occurrences of "Israel" which collocate with other "ancestral" names (Abraham, Isaac, Esau, Judah and Jacob) and secondly a miscellaneous group of phrases which are more significant for my purpose. There are

four phrases (one of which is further subdivided) which refer to "Israel" among other ancestral names: "Abraham, (Isaac) and Israel" (five occurrences), "Judah and Israel" (six occurrences), "Jacob ... Israel" (eleven occurrences) and "Isaac, Esau and Israel" (one occurrence).

A particularly significant use of yiśra'el for the ancestor Jacob is in the genealogy of 1 Chr 1:34 and 2:1. Williamson argues that this is part of the means by which the Chronicler stresses the "special election of Israel within the family of nations" and is also a part of a "possible indication of the Chronicler's view that Israel was expressed through the full twelve tribes" [475].

This is worth comparing with the rendering by 1 Chr 16:13 of Ps 105:6. In this "most pregnant text" [476] "Abraham" of the Psalm is changed into "Israel" [477] in order to stress the importance of that eponymous ancestor and the people descended from him [478].

It is the larger group of 117 phrases by which ES covers 1741 texts out of his total list of 2512 [479] which are of major interest here. I have subdivided this group into four groups: 1) the people; 2) God; 3) the land and places; 4) possessions of the people. Before discussing these sections I note that the MT itself offers an etymology of the name "Israel".

8.1 ETYMOLOGIES

In this section I am interested only in "etymologies" offered by the MT itself and do not present a complete list of etymologies offered [480]. "Etymologies" offered by other ancient Jewish writers [481] are discussed in relevant chapters.

These popular etymologies are part of the actual usage of the name "Israel" in MT and in ancient Judaism. It is arguable that when MT and Philo offer their explanations they are aware that the meaning is one of their own making. The word and the "meaning" are only related in the immediate phrase. As Coote notes, "the meaning of the root śry in Gen. 39:29 is of course not necessarily the same as the original meaning of śry in the name Israel" [482]. "Etymology" is not entirely satisfactory as the word and its "meaning" are principally linked by association rather than a history of development.

Gen 32:23-33 offers an explanation of why the ancestor has two names: Israel and Jacob,

your name shall be no more called Jacob but Israel for you have striven with God and with men, śarit ʿim ʾelohim wʿim ʾanaśim, and have prevailed.

God is called ʾel in the context and the fight is initially said to have been with a man, ʾiś (v25). The synonymous verb used of the fight in v25 is ʾabeq. Since the writer does appear to offer "struggle" as part of the associations of the name "Israel" Danell is inaccurate in saying that there is "little point in grammatically analysing the noun yiśraʾel in order to understand the author's interpretation of the name" [483]. Grammatical analysis suggests that there is more involved in yiśraʾel than "struggle". Danell's point would be better expressed as "grammatical analysis is not what the writer invites us to consider". Gen 32:29 sees Jacob/Israel as one who struggled, survived and was blessed.

The Haftarah to Gen 32:4-36:43 is Hos 11:7-12:12 [484] which can be taken as an interpretation of Genesis 32's etymology [485]. Hos 12:3-5 reads,

YHWH has a controversy with Judah, and will punish Jacob according to his ways, according to his doings will he recompense him. In the womb he took his brother by the heel and by his strength he strove with God. And he strove with an angel and prevailed, he wept and made supplication to him; at Bethel he would find him and there he speaks with him.

"Judah" is parallel to "Jacob". Whether this is the "original text" or not [486] the present text refers, not to both north ("Jacob") and south ("Judah"), but only to the south. Whatever point is being made about the ancestor Jacob and the people, is being made about "Judah". Jacob is the eponymous ancestor of the people, Judah is the current exemplar of that people. It is worth noting these verses in Hebrew:

babeten ʿaqab ʾet-ʾahyw ubeʾono śarah
ʾet-ʾelohim wayaśar ʾel-malʾak wayukal bakah
wayithanen-lo.

There are clearly a number of differences here from the etymology given in Gen 32:29 [487] but, as Good says, "whether or not the etymology is correct, the pun

reflects the same interpretation of the name as the Genesis story to which the lines allude" [488]. Jacob, in Hosea, is one who struggles. At Hos 4:16 yiśra'el is associated with srr, "stubborn".

Wolff notes that Gen 25:26 derives Jacob from "heel", ageb, not "deception", that Jacob is associated with "deception" by Esau (Gen 27:36) and that mirmah, "deception" is associated with Jacob in Gen 27:35 [489]. This is insufficient explanation of Hosea's association of "Jacob" with "deception". Fishbane's comments are more useful here,

because of the eponymous link between the person Israel and the nation, the parallelism drawn between the actions is not a mere rhetorical trope, but drives deep in to the very 'nature' of Israel. The nation is not just 'like' its ancestor, says Hosea, but is its ancestor in fact - in name and in deed [490].

Hosea's point is, then, that the people of Judah could be the subject of the stories of Jacob. Hosea stresses Jacob/Judah's aggression and deceit. Margalit suggests that Hosea sarcastically refers to the links of "Jacob" with "crookedness" or "deviousness" because "Israel" was associated with "straightness" or "honesty" [491]. Although acknowledged by Genesis, Jacob's deceit is less important than his gaining blessing through struggle.

There are some differences between the Genesis and Hosea versions of the Jacob story but "it is possible that such a striking expression with its etymology could have remained constant in oral tradition, while the details of the story around it changed" [492].

Coote implies that in Judges 9 the name yiśra'el bears the connotations of "to judge Gods and men" [493]. This is not represented in any other ancient Jewish texts where yiśra'el is associated with srr, "to go astray" [494], śrh, "to struggle", śrr "to rule, act like a prince" [495] and šrr, "to be strong" [496].

8.2 PEOPLE: bene yiśra'el

Numerically the most significant group in ES's list is the phrase bene yiśra'el, occurring throughout the MT [497] 636 times. It is particularly common in the Torah, in Genesis only 7 times and in Deuteronomy only 21, but around half of its occurrences are in Exodus,

Numbers and Leviticus. "Sons of Judah", however, occurs only 49 times (out of a total of around 870 occurrences of Judah in the MT [498]). bene yiśra'el is applied to almost every group mentioned in the MT.

It has the obvious application to the immediate sons of the ancestor Jacob (e.g. Gen 42:5; 45:21; 46:5) in which case the ancestor is often named "Jacob" rather than "Israel". Jacob's grandchildren, the generation who moved to Egypt, are bene yiśra'el in Gen 46:8 and Exod 1:1. The whole community at Jacob's death is also bene yiśra'el (Gen 50:25). Later descendants, in Egypt when a "Pharaoh arose who did not know Joseph", are named bene yiśra'el by the narrator and by Pharaoh (Exod 1:7,9). The exodus and wilderness generations are bene yiśra'el in Lev 1:2 and 1 Kgs 6:1. Jer 16:14,15 says,

however, the days are coming, declares YHWH, when people will no longer say "As surely as YHWH lives, who brought bene yiśra'el up out of the land of Egypt", but they will say "As surely as YHWH lives, who brought bene yiśra'el up out of the land of the north and out of all countries where they were banished [499].

Weinfeld says of this statement that

while it sounds like a protest against cultic traditions, is compatible with the prophecy regarding the new covenant of which it is explicitly said that it shall not be "according to the covenant which I made with their fathers in the days that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt" [500].

The passage shows that the bible is not primarily interested in linear history. Each generation expresses its unity with all preceding ones ("not with them, but with us").

The commandment to bene yiśra'el to keep the sabbath is said to have been given for all generations. bene yiśra'el includes both the people at Sinai and all subsequent generations (Exod 31:12-17).

The conquest generation is called bene yiśra'el most frequently when contrasting the action of a king (or of the whole people) with that of "bene yiśra'el before whom God drove out the nations" (1 Kgs 14:24; 2 Kgs 16:3; 21:2,9; Isa 17:9).

At 1 Kgs 14:24 Judah is accused of "doing evil in the manner of the nations whom YHWH had driven out before the bene yiśra'el". bene yiśra'el is the conquest generation, but it is comparable with the actions of succeeding generations.

Some references to bene yiśra'el clearly include Judeans. 2 Kgs 18:4 notes that Hezekiah, king of Judah, "broke in pieces the bronze serpent that Moses had made for until those days bene yiśra'el had burned incense to it". Ahaz, king of Judah, had previously "walked in the ways of the kings of bene yiśra'el" (2 Kgs 16:3). In the sole occurrence of bene yiśra'el in Daniel some of the royalty and nobility from among the Judean exiles are referred to as bene yiśra'el (1:3).

More frequently bene yiśra'el refers to the northern kingdom in opposition to bene yehudah,

bene yiśra'el and bene yehudah have done nothing but evil in my sight from their youth; ... bene yiśra'el and bene yehudah have provoked me by all the evil they have done - they, their kings, their officials, their priests and prophets, the men of Judah and the people of Jerusalem (Jer 32:30-32).

Similarly Jer 50:4 looks forward to the time when,

bene yiśra'el and bene yehudah shall come together, weeping as they come, and they shall seek YHWH their God.

There are other indicators that bene yiśra'el refers to the northern kingdom. In 1 Kgs 18:20 Ahab, king of Israel, sends a message to bene yiśra'el to gather at Mount Carmel with the prophets of Baal and Asherah. Judah is only referred to in the following episode which notes that Elijah fled to "Beersheba in Judah" (19:3).

In 2 Kgs 13:5 the reference to the northern kingdom is indicated by its opposition to "Aram" and collocation with "Jeroboam" and "Samaria".

According to 1 Kgs 12:17 (parallel to 2 Chr 10:17), "Rehoboam reigned over bene yiśra'el who dwelt in the cities of Judah" who are distinguished from "Israel" who left the gathering of "all Israel" which had refused to make Rehoboam king. Here bene yiśra'el refers to southerners who are as much bene yiśra'el as the remaining ten tribes according to the writer.

Conversely, Amos 3:12 talks of "the bene yisra el who live in Samaria".

Those who returned from exile to the Land are also named bene yiśraʿel [501]. At Ezra 3:1 and Neh 7:72 bene yiśraʿel is parallel to kol yiśraʿel. In this passage kol yiśraʿel is distinguished from "priests, Levites and some of the people [502] and the singers, the gatekeepers and the temple servants". Batten argues that "some of the people" refers to "temple officers" [503]. Blenkinsopp says that this "would have included leaders and members of the upper class" [504]. It is, however, unlikely that kol yiśraʿel refers to the returning exiles as "the authentic Israel of the early days" or "the true 'Israel of God'" [505] since kol yiśraʿel here excludes the temple officials. bene yiśraʿel can be distinguished from "priests and Levites" (e.g.: Ezra 6:16 [506]) but here is inclusive of the other groups gathering in Jerusalem. At Neh 9:1,2 bene yiśraʿel is opposed to "foreigners, bene nekar".

8.3 PEOPLE: ʿam yiśraʿel

yiśraʿel and ʿam are collocated in a number of phrases throughout the MT. In the majority of these phrases the "people" is specified as being a possession of God's. It is, for example, either ʿami, "my people", ʿamo, "his people" or ʿameka, "your people".

ES lists four occurrences of ʿam yiśraʿel (2 Sam 19:41; 1 Kgs 16:21; Ezra 2:2; Neh 7:7) although others occur (e.g. 2 Sam 18:7). In 2 Sam 19:41 "the people of Israel" and "the people of Judah" act together. In 1 Kgs 16:21 "the people of Israel" is divided as to whether to have Omri or Tibni as king. The context makes it clear that, in these passages, ʿam yiśraʿel is the northern kingdom.

Ezra 2:2 introduces a census of the ʿam yiśraʿel (vv3-35) which are distinguished from "priests" (vv36-39), "Levites" and other officials (vv40-58) [507].

At Ezra 7:13 the "people of Israel" (ʿamaʿ yiśraʿel) is again distinguished, in the decree of Artaxerxes, from "its priests and levites". This Aramaic passage is introduced in vv7-10 which notes that "some of the people of Israel, bene yiśraʿel, and some of the priests and levites" and other officials "went up to Jerusalem".

2 Sam 18:6 notes that

the ʿam went out into the field against Israel and the battle was fought in the forest of Ephraim, and the ʿam yiśraʾel was defeated there by the servants of David, ʿabde dawid, and the slaughter was great on that day ... and the forest devoured more of the ʿam than did the sword.

ʿam is translated by the RSV in v6 by "the army", but in v7 by "men of" and in v8 by "people". According to Good ʿam, originally referred to the "noise made by caprine beasts" and meant "flock", later came to mean "people" and "army" [508]. In this passage "militia" or a word suggestive of a "people's army" would be a good English translation equivalent [509].

More common than ʿam yiśraʾel are phrases including ʿami, ʿameka and ʿamo collocated with "Israel".

In Exod 1:9 Pharaoh tells his own people that the ʿam bene yiśraʾel are a threat to them. At 3:10 and 7:4 God tells Moses about the plans for bringing "my hosts, my people, the people of Israel, zibʾotay ʿami bene yiśraʾel" out of Egypt despite Pharaoh's opposition. Similar to this piling up of names are five occurrences of ʾet ʿami ʾet yiśraʾel (2 Sam 5:2; 7:7,8; 1 Kgs 8:16; 1 Chr 11:2). Each of these examples deals with the leadership (by either a "shepherd" or a "prince") of the people.

A larger list of occurrences of ʿami yiśraʾel [510] provides further detail. For example, within ʿami yiśraʾel in 1 Sam 9:16 is "a man from the land of Benjamin" who is to be made "king" and "save my people, ʿami, from the Philistines".

At 1 Kgs 6:13 and 8:16 ʿami yiśraʾel refers to the empire of David and Solomon. Thus it includes people of the north and of the south. 8:16 links the generation of David with ʿami yiśraʾel who were "brought out of the land of Egypt".

At Jer 7:12 ʿami yiśraʾel is parallel to kol-zeraʿ ʾepraim (v15). The instruction to "go to Shiloh to see what I did to it because of the wickedness of my people Israel" is intended to make Judeans abandon actions similar to those of the northerners. For this to be an effective warning it is necessary that ʿam yiśraʾel is also "my people".

Jer 30:3 anticipates the time when

I will restore the fortunes of my people, Israel and Judah, and I will bring them back to the land which I gave to their ancestors and they will take possession of it.

The following "words of YHWH" are spoken "to Israel and to Judah", ʔel yiśraʔel weʔel yehudah. BHS' suggestion that wʔel yehudah is an addition is said to be "unwarranted" by Carroll [511]. Both names are important to Jeremiah's hope.

Ezekiel's interest is in a united people and not in distinct parts. The only divisions recognised are tribal ones (which will continue even after the return from exile) and the current divisions between exiles and non-exiles and between "sinners" and non-sinners. ʕami yiśraʔel is the community (also named bet yiśraʔel) from which idolaters will be removed (14:9). It is used of the future united nation (25:14); of returnees (36:8,12) who will dwell secure despite "Gog and Magog" (38:14,16); and the current generation who need to learn the holiness of God's name (39:7).

Amos 8:2 says, "my people Israel, I will never again pass them by". Amos' vision of the basket of summer fruit is explained,

the end has come upon my people Israel, I will never again pass by them. The šīrot of the hekal shall become wailings in that day, says the Lord YHWH.

As Sawyer says,

For masoretic tradition, followed by AV and RSV, the original meaning of these words as they were understood in Samaria in the eighth century BC, would have been of purely academic interest, whereas the words as they stand are addressed to Jerusalem and foretell the destruction of the temple in 587 BC [512].

This process of reapplication of the prophecy culminates in 9:11-15 where the hope of "my people Israel" is in the restored "tent of David". Finding the experience of the southern kingdom (either politically or religiously) to be comparable to that of the north Amos ends with a hope of return after exile that incorporates the whole people. This is possible because 9:7 asks, "O people Israel, bene yiśraʔel, did I not bring Israel, yiśraʔel,

up from the land of Egypt?". If the origin of the whole people was as a unity in Egypt and their experience of exile is one, it is not hard to claim that their future experience of return and abundance will also be as a united community. This hope is centred on the Davidic family as an aspect of the Judean context both of the prophet Amos and of the completed book.

At Dan 9:20 'ami yiśra'el the prophet confesses "my own sin and the sin of my people Israel". This is the sole use of the phrase where "my" refers not to God but to an individual. Nevertheless, the same group is involved. The "people, Israel" is a community in whom God and prophets are interested though they disapprove.

The phrase 'am yiśra'el (and its variations) is used in naming both inhabitants of the northern and southern kingdoms, both those approved of and those disapproved of. yiśra'el remains "God's people" whether they are "good" or "bad". The judgement of God and prophets, even though it involve the action of foreign armies against the people, does not remove the designation "my people Israel" from them.

8.4 PEOPLE: ʾiś yiśra'el

ʾiś yiśra'el occurs forty-seven times in the MT [513]. Of these four occurrences refer to individuals (Num 25:8,8,14 and Judg 7:14). Zimri, the ʾiś yiśra'el of Numbers 25, is also named ʾiś mibene yiśra'el (v6). He is also "of the tribe of Simeon" (v14). For the crime of taking a "Midianitess, midyanit" into his family tent "in the eyes of Moses and of all the congregation of the people of Israel, kol 'adat bene yiśra'el", he and the woman are speared to death by Phineas.

In Judg 7:14 the ʾiś yiśra'el is Gideon. A man in the camp of the Midianites and Amalekites explains his companion's dream,

this is no other than the sword of Gideon the son of Joash, a man of Israel; into his hand God has given Midian and all the host.

Gideon and Zimri are representative of the entire people at that time. Although Zimri's crime and punishment are unique, the preceding narrative is of the more widespread links between Moab and Israel which result in many other deaths. Zimri is a specific example of what

others were doing. Gideon is the leader of the remainder of the army of Israel. Whilst the dream interpretation says that the "host is given into his hands" he declares it to mean that "the host of Midian is given into the hand of the camp of Israel".

ʾiś yiśraʾeli also occurs at Lev 24:10-11 in association with an unnamed ben ʾiśah yiśraʾelit, ben hayiśraʾelit. Ross notes that yiśraʾel is the "largest 'community' by which an individual might be identified" and that other tribal names (such as "Benjaminite") occur more frequently as identifiers of individuals [514]. Groups are more likely than individuals to be identified as "Israelite".

The majority of occurrences of ʾiś yiśraʾel refer to groups of people, the "army of Israel" or "the majority of Israel" which the JPS version renders, "the main body of Israel" [515]. In Judg 20:11, for example, "all the men of Israel, kol ʾiś yiśraʾel" does not include Benjaminites because Benjamin is distinguished from the majority of the people.

In addition to the occurrences of ʾiś yiśraʾel there are nine occurrences of ʾanše yiśraʾel [516]. Some of these can best be translated as "the army of Israel" or "the militia of Israel" as in 2 Sam 18:6.

2 Sam 15:6 probably should not be translated "army of Israel". According to McKane,

it is difficult to ascertain the meaning of ISRAEL here and elsewhere in the chapter (vv.2,10,13). Noth holds that ISRAEL means the whole nation since Absalom had his main following in Judah but also won support among the northern tribes. This interpretation agrees well with the fact that the standard of revolt was raised in the south at Hebron, but it raises certain difficulties in connection with vv.2 and 10, where ISRAEL might more naturally be understood as referring to the northern tribes. Hence Hertzberg thinks ISRAEL refers to the northern tribes and that Absalom deliberately chose Hebron in order that the revolt would paralyse Judah and bring about its submission. Cp.2 Sam 19:8bf where 'Israel' can only mean the northern tribes, although it is clear from v11 that Judah was also implicated in the revolt [517].

McKane, Hertzberg [518], and other commentators attempt

to prove that yiśraʿel should have one consistent referent. What is "clear" from v11 is that "Israel" does mean more than "the northern tribes", it certainly includes Judaeans.

In 1 Sam 17:52 yiśraʿel is distinct from yehudah in the phrase ʿanše yiśraʿel wiyhudah. ʿanše yiśraʿel occurs in parallel with ʿam, ʿame and with ʿiš yiśraʿel at 1 Sam 31:1,7. David's men are not included among ʿanše yiśraʿel at 2 Sam 2:17 - but here there are two groups in conflict. ʿanše yiśraʿel means "the majority of the people of Israel", "the main body of Israel", or "the army of Israel" whilst David's group is a minority of the people and are not part of the wider army.

8.5 CONGREGATION

yiśraʿel is collocated with ʿedah in eleven places [519] and with qahal thirteen times [520]. Despite having different translation equivalents in some books in the LXX [521] the two phrases are synonymous and are used in the same ways and "neither word is intrinsically a technical term" [522].

kol ʿadat yiśraʿel and kol qahal yiśraʿel occur in close proximity in 1 Kgs 8:5,14 where they refer to a gathering. Its core is "the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes and the leaders of the ancestral houses of the people of Israel" (8:1). This is a cultic event, situated in the Temple with sacrifices, prayers and sermons, but also serves to demonstrate the unity of a political entity, Solomon's kingdom. Ahlstrom says that the "theological dimension" of the name yiśraʿel expressed in the phrase qahal yiśraʿel,

arose from the common Ancient Near Eastern conception that the God's political nation also constituted his cultic congregation because he ruled over and protected that group, both politically and religiously [523].

8.6 HOUSE

The phrase bet yiśra'el is listed by ES as occurring 143 times (bet ya'akob occurs 21 times). The majority of occurrences are in Ezekiel (82) followed by Jeremiah (20) [524].

Williamson shows that the Chronicler avoids using bet yiśra'el because it is used elsewhere of the northern kingdom [525]. However, in Ezekiel bet yiśra'el is not specific to the northern kingdom. The two works use opposite means to stress the unity of the north and south. Ezekiel applies bet yiśra'el to the whole nation, to Judah alone and to the north alone.

bet yiśra'el in the MT can refer to the northern kingdom in distinction from the southern kingdom. At 1 Kgs 12:21-24 the bet yiśra'el is the north but remains related to the "the House of Judah and the tribe of Benjamin" who are told,

thus says YHWH, you shall not go up or fight against your kinsmen, bene yiśra'el.

The two "houses" together form "Israel" of which "all Israel" (v20) is the majority grouping, here excluding "the House of Judah" because of their acceptance of the Davidic lineage.

The five occurrences of bet yiśra'el in Hosea are straight-forward references to the northern kingdom. At 1:4 "the kingdom of bet yiśra'el" is parallel to both "Israel" and to "the house of Jehu" and linked to the "valley of Jezreel". At 1:6 the bet yiśra'el will be "not pitied" but the House of Judah will be pitied and delivered. The third child of Hosea and Gomer is to be called "Not my people" indicating that the north is to be destroyed. The prophecy is reversed by 2:21-23 where "Not my people" becomes "My people" and "not pitied" becomes "pitied" and should not be taken to mean that there is a "True Israel" and a "False Israel".

bet yiśra'el at Jeremiah 48:13 is collocated with "Bethel" of which it "will be ashamed" (a lesson to Moab who will be ashamed of Chemosh [526]). This collocation shows that bet yiśra'el is the northern kingdom.

bet yiśra'el is also used as a name for the southern kingdom. In Isaiah there are four occurrences of bet yiśra'el (out of a total of 92 occurrences of yiśra'el). 5:7, addressed to "the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the men of Judah" (v3), explains the "song of the vineyard"

the vineyard of YHWH of Hosts
is bet yiśra'el
and the men of Judah
are his pleasant planting.

Although Clements argues that Isaiah uses "Israel" to refer to the north and "Judah" to refer to the south [527], Wade notes that bet yiśra'el is "not a designation of the kingdom of Ephraim, but synonymous with men of Judah" [528].

At Jeremiah 2:4 bet yiśra'el is parallel to bet ya'aqob and invites the hearers to consider their links with past generations. The prophecy begins with Jeremiah being told to "proclaim in Jerusalem". The point of looking back to the Exodus generation is that the hearers' apostasy is taking them back to Egypt. The apostasy, specifically idolatry, will shame bet yiśra'el (2:26). In v28 it is "Judah" which is addressed.

bet yiśra'el also means "all the tribes" or "the whole people". At Ezek 37:16 the bet yiśra'el [529] includes the north, in that part of it ("Joseph") lives in Ephraim, and also the south, as another part ("Judah") live in Judah. Zimmerli notes,

here with the staff inscribed with "Judah and the Israelites connected with it" there is contrasted, for the representation of the northern kingdom, not, for example, a "staff of Israel", but there is chosen the inscription "for Joseph and the whole house of Israel connected with it" [530].

The unity of the two is to be summed up in a Davidic ruler and in the Temple.

Ezekiel's ideal is that bet yiśra'el should be a united, worshipping community of all the tribes [531]. Currently it is disunited and scattered. The underlying unity of bet yiśra'el is obscured by conflict, sectarianism and exile. For the most part the prophet is not interested in the divisions between different groups in the nation. The aim is for a bet yiśra'el equivalent to "YHWH's people".

The above uses are made clear by the collocation of bet yiśra'el with other names, e.g. "Ephraim", "Judah", "Joseph". In Lev 10:6 kol bet yiśra'el is distinguished from "Aaron, Eliezar and Ithamar" who, as priests, must not express their mourning in the same way as "all bet yiśra'el" in case "wrath breaks out on the congregation,

kol ha'edah". Here "all bet yiśra'el" is parallel to kol ha'edah and are "brothers, ʔahim" to the priests who are separated by the "anointing of YHWH".

It is also opposed to "foreigners" and "the nations", some of whom are "enemies" while others are potential converts or "sojourners". At Josh 21:45 bet yiśra'el is opposite to foreign "enemies". The function of these verses is to summarise the preceding statement of the division of the land at the completion of the conquest, when YHWH had "given all their enemies into their hands".

In 1 Samuel bet yiśra'el occurs twice at 7:2,3. The Ark of the Covenant is taken to Kirjath Jearim and whilst it is there "all bet yiśra'el lamented after YHWH" (7:2) until Samuel told "all bet yiśra'el" to "put away their foreign Gods and return to YHWH" (7:3). bet yiśra'el is parallel to "Israel", opposed to foreign enemies, specifically "Philistines" and collocated with "YHWH" and "the Ark".

In Lev 17:3,8,10 various regulations concerning offerings and blood are prefaced by the phrase "if anyone of bet yiśra'el or of the foreigners who sojourn among them". These regulations are centred on the sanctity of the Tent and the camp [532]. A further instruction concerning offerings is prefaced by the same introduction at 22:18. Again, bet yiśra'el is parallel to bene yiśra'el.

bet yiśra'el is also collocated with "God" and "YHWH" in a number of the above examples. The three occurrences of bet yiśra'el in the Psalms sum up several of the above uses and add some further detail. bet yiśra'el is opposed to "the nations" and "all the ends of the earth" (98:3); it is distinct from "the house of Aaron" (115:12) and the "house of Levi" (135:19). It is parallel to "his people" who live in "YHWH's land" which was once "all the kingdoms of the Canaanites" (135:11). "Israel" is the name for the whole people whereas bet yiśra'el is distinguished from the priests.

Finally, bet yiśra'el refers not only to historical groups but also to the current generation. It is, of course, true of the "historical uses" that their purpose is to address contemporary groups. However, in the community lament [533] of Isaiah 63, in which YHWH's actions towards bet yiśra'el (v7) are recounted, bet yiśra'el is the prophet's audience.

I will recount the steadfast love of YHWH the

praises of YHWH according to all that YHWH has granted us and the great goodness to the bet yiśra'el which he has granted them according to his mercy, according to the abundance of his steadfast love.

The prophet does not belong to an exclusivist or closed group but recognises a wider community also named bet yiśra'el.

8.7 ISRAEL AND JUDAH

The names "Israel" and "Judah" collocate in a number of different ways throughout the MT. They can be a unity, two parts of a larger whole or two totally different things. "Israel and Judah" can also be a merism expressive of "the twelve tribes of the whole nation".

The phrase "House of Israel and Judah" occurs only at 2 Sam 12:8 and Ezek 9:9. In 2 Sam 12:8 "House of Israel and Judah" stresses the point that David is king over one united kingdom. The two parts may once have been separate but are now one. "Judah" is also mentioned because Jerusalem and Judah are the centre of David's kingdom. An inexact modern parallel might be with the choice of names "United Kingdom" and "Britain". Both are names for the same geographical area and, though the origins of the two names may be very different, they are actually used as synonyms. However, it is possible to use "United Kingdom" to stress the fact that the area is a unity of several parts. To divide these parts up it is necessary to use words like "England" and "Scotland" which are comparable with the use of "Judah", "Israel" and "Ephraim" to name distinct groups or areas.

"House of Israel and Judah" in Ezek 9:9 is also set in Jerusalem. When Ezekiel cries out "Ah Lord YHWH, will you destroy all that remains of Israel in the outpouring of your wrath on Jerusalem?" the response is "the guilt of the House of Israel and Judah is exceedingly great, the land is full of blood and the city of injustice".

The phrase "House of Israel and House of Judah" (and variations) is more common. Jer 3:18 declares that, "in those days the House of Judah shall join the House of Israel and together they will return from the land of the north to the land I gave their ancestors for a heritage". This follows the declaration that "Israel"

is less guilty than "Judah", and that "Israel" is invited to return to Zion, Jerusalem (v6-17). Chapter 4 announces the coming judgement of Judah. Similar use is made of "House of Israel and House of Judah" in Jer 5:11; 11:10,17; 13:11; 31:27,31; 33:14. The "House of Israel" and the "House of Judah" are two groups whose unity lies in common actions and common fates [534].

Similar to the phrase "house of Israel and Judah" is the phrase "my people Israel and Judah", ʿami yiśraʾel wihudah in Jer 30:3 and "the people of Israel and Judah", bene yiśraʾel wihudah in 2 Sam 21:2. Both phrases stress the unity of the people, a unity centred in the belief that they are "the people of God".

At 2 Sam 3:10, however, Israel and Judah are two groups to be united in the kingship of David. In the narrator's eyes the rebellions leave David as "king of Judah" but not as "king of Israel". The hope of unity is the hope that David will be "king over Israel" and "king over Israel".

Israel and Judah are two contrasted groups in conflict, in 2 Kgs 14. Such a situation is true of the Deuteronomist's alternating tellings of the deeds of the "king of Israel" and of the "king of Judah".

When "Israel" and "Judah" occur in the same context - for example in their collocation in the phrase "Israel and Judah" - there is more than one possible way of reading their relationship. "Israel" can be a separate entity from "Judah". In this case other ways of expressing the same idea would be, "the north" or "Ephraim". "Israel" can be a wider more inclusive term. In this case "Judah" and "Ephraim" may be seen as constituent parts or they may be irrelevant. Thus, when "all Israel" is used it can mean either "Israel and Judah" or "a cultic congregation". When "the God of Israel" is used the two subgroups are irrelevant. In the latter case "Israel" has no national boundaries, it is a theological or religious community.

8.8 NORTHERN KINGDOM

In Ps 78 "Israel" is used both as the name of the northern kingdom and as that of the entire people wherever and whenever they lived. "Israel" is the name of that part of the people who are rebellious (vv21,56) and who God has "utterly rejected" (vv31,59). It is also God's "inheritance" (v71) who David was chosen to

shepherd. The rejected "Israel" is also named "Jacob" (vv5,21), "Ephraim" (vv9,67) and "Joseph" (v67). In this rejection, leaving the "tent of Joseph" (v67) God "forsook his dwelling at Shiloh" (v60). Yet God is the "Holy One of Israel" (v41) who had given "Israel" the Law (v5) and the land (v55). "Israel" which is God's "inheritance" is also "Jacob his people" (v71).

Despite naming the rebellious and now destroyed northern kingdom "Israel", the Psalm prefers to name them "Ephraim". Such preference is clearest when "Ephraim" (v9) and "their ancestors" (v12) are blamed for all the rebellions in the wilderness.

"Israel" is not a pure community who only ever obey God. It is the name of a community who are unreservedly condemned. At the same time it is the name of those who remain intimately associated with "God". Psalm 78 rejects the northern kingdom absolutely, nothing good can be said of it. Yet even in this polemic the name "Israel" is not denied to the "rebellious".

8.9 TRIBES

There are forty seven occurrences of šibte yiśra'el in the MT [535]. Generally speaking, the "tribes of Israel" is equivalent to "all the people". Often the phrase indicates that the people is gathered for some purpose (the allocation of land or the choice of a king). In this situation the "twelve tribes" will mean the "majority of the people" or a sufficient group to act for the complete people. The actual names of the twelve "tribes of Israel" are sometimes given though there is some variation in these names.

In Gen 49:28 Jacob's blessing of his sons is summarized, "these are the twelve tribes of Israel and this is what their father said to them as he blessed them". The "twelve sons" of 49:1 recognisably stand for the "twelve tribes".

The list of "sons/tribes" blessed in Genesis 49 is different from that of Deuteronomy 33. In the gathering described in this "blessing of Moses", "YHWH became king in Jeshurun when the heads of the people were gathered, all the tribes of Israel together". The people is named by tribes and also named "people of Israel, bene yiśra'el" (v1), "peoples, ʿamim" (v3), "his people, ʿamo" (v7), "the assembly of Jacob, gehilat yaʿaqob" (v4), "Jeshurun, yešurun", (vv5,26), and yiśra'el

(vv10,28,29). Within this list of additional titles for the same group "tribes of Israel" is used as reinforcement for the twelve-part structure of the blessing and to parallel the blessing by Jacob.

Elsewhere "the tribes of Israel" means the majority of the people". At Judg 20:2 they provide an army to fight against Benjamin. Benjamin (described by Saul as "the least in the tribes of Israel" in 1 Sam 9:21) is chosen out of "the tribes of Israel" and Saul becomes "head of the tribes of Israel" (15:17).

8.10 GOD

There are about 250 places where a God is named as "of Israel" in the MT [536]. The majority of these texts read "the God of Israel, ʔelohe yiśraʔel" (204 occurrences). Other phrases are discussed in the following two sections. The Aramaic ʔelah yiśraʔel occurs three times.

ʔelohe ʔabraham ishak weyiśraʔel occurs three times (1 Kgs 18:36; 1 Chr 29:18; 2 Chr 30:6). The first of these occurs in prayers attributed to Elijah and David respectively. The petition of the first of them is,
let it be known that you are the God of Israel,
and that I am your servant.

When the people acknowledge that "YHWH is God" the prophets of Baal are slaughtered. The second prayer parallels "YHWH the God of Israel our father" with "YHWH the God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel our fathers". YHWH is also "our God" as David speaks for himself and for "my people" (v14), "your God" as David addresses "all the assembly" (v20), and "YHWH the God of their fathers" according to the narrator (v20). At 2 Chr 30:6 Hezekiah sends messengers through "all Israel and Judah" telling them to celebrate the passover at Jerusalem. Their message begins, "O people of Israel, return to YHWH the God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel". The closest parallel to this phrase is in Exod 3:6 in which God announces to Moses, "I am the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob".

There are also a number of collocations of ʔelohim with individual ancestors. Abraham (14 times, including "people of the God of Abraham" at Ps 47:10), Isaac (20), Jacob (15), "David" (4). David also blesses God, saying, "Blessed are you, YHWH the God of Israel our father", at 1 Chr 29:10.

Among the 2603 references to "God", 251 to "the God of Israel" is not a high percentage. Although there are no references to "the God of Judah" and only two to "the God of Jerusalem" [537] phrases such as "city of God" (Pss 46:5,6 and 87:3) make it clear that such language may not have been impossible. Judeans certainly thought of YHWH as their God. Cultic sites belonging to the north were disparaged in comparison with Zion (cf. Ps 87:3 and Ps 78:68). "Israel", in the phrase "the God of Israel", does not refer to the north. "The God of Israel" is the God worshipped in Jerusalem.

Some further statistics are suggestive. Of the 204 occurrences of "the God of Israel" the majority (118) are listed as YHWH ʔelohe yiśraʔel. There are only three occurrences of this phrase in the Torah (Exod 5:1; 32:27; 34:23). 1 and 2 Chronicles contain the largest concentration of these (28 - 8 in 1 Chronicles and 20 in 2 Chronicles). Of these nine are paralleled in Kings (2 from 1 Chronicles, 7 from 2 Chronicles) [538]. Remaining occurrences are in Joshua (14), Judges (7), 1 Samuel (8), 2 Samuel (1), 1 Kings (18), 2 Kings (8) [539], Isaiah (4), Jeremiah (14), Ezekiel (1), Malachi (1), Psalms (2), Ruth (1) and Ezra (6).

Although these figures are incomplete without the remaining phrases in which ʔelohe yiśraʔel occurs they do suggest a major significance of the phrase for the Deuteronomist, the Chronicler and for Jeremiah. If Christensen [540] is correct, people [541] from Anathoth are responsible for both Deuteronomic works and for Jeremiah. Clearly there are similarities in the language and interest of these works.

In addition to these 118 occurrences of YHWH ʔelohe yiśraʔel ES lists thirty occurrences of ʔelohe yiśraʔel [542]. These occur in Exodus (1), Numbers (1), 2 Samuel (1), 1 Kings (1), 2 Kings (1), Isaiah (6), Jeremiah (3), Ezekiel (7) Psalms (4), Ezra (4) 1 Chronicles (1), 2 Chronicles (1) (with neither occurrence in Chronicles paralleled elsewhere). beʔlohe yiśraʔel at Josh 22:16; we lohe yisra el occurs at 1 Sam 1:17; leʔlohe yiśraʔel at 1 Sam 6:5 and elsewhere [543] and ubeʔlohe yiśraʔel at Isa 48:1

In 1 Samuel 5 and 6 ʔaron ʔelohe yiśraʔel is referred to seven times [544]. Elsewhere in the context the Ark is named as "of YHWH" (4:6; 5:3,4; 6:1,11), "of God" (4:17; 5:1,10,10), "of the covenant of God" (4:4) and "of the covenant of YHWH of Hosts" (4:4). The Philistines also name the Ark, "of YHWH" (6:2), and God, "of Israel". They also distinguish themselves and their

Gods from the Israelites and their God. The different epithets are used for stylistic variation and to impart realism to the story [545].

The phrase YHWH (ʿelohe) sebaʿoth ʿelohe yiśraʿel occurs 40 times, of which 35 are in Jeremiah [546]. Since "God" and "YHWH" occur with sebaʿoth around 300 times [547], (with heavy concentrations in Isaiah, Jeremiah and especially in Zechariah) it is to be expected that there is some significance to the addition "of Israel". "The God of the hosts of Israel" is a warrior God who brings armies to fight on behalf of "Israel" whether "Israel" refers to two, four, six or twelve tribes or to a group (of warriors) within a tribe [548]. The title YHWH sebaʿot is especially associated with "YHWH's kingship in the Jerusalem cultus" and is "a sign of YHWH as the war God of Israel" [549].

Of the two occurrences of "YHWH of Hosts, the God of Israel" in Isaiah (21:10; 37:16) the second is in a Temple prayer. In opposition to "YHWH of Hosts, the God of Israel" are arrayed idols which are "no Gods", and "Israel" is opposed to "the nations", especially "Assyria". The response to the prayer of Hezekiah is a prophecy delivered by Isaiah from "YHWH the God of Israel", which notes that Senacherib has mocked "the Holy One of Israel" (v22).

"YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" in Zephaniah 2:9 occurs in an oracle against Moab and Ammon (2:8-11) [550],

therefore, as I live,
says YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel,
Moab shall become like Sodom
the Ammonites like Gomorrah:
a land possessed by nettles and salt pits,
a waste forever.
The remnant of my people shall plunder them
and the survivors of my nation shall possess
them.

To this is added a prose passage (v10,11),

This shall be their lot in exchange for their
pride, because they scoffed and boasted against
the people of YHWH of Hosts. YHWH will be
terrible against them, yes, he will punish all
the Gods of the earth and to him shall bow down,
each in its place, all the lands of the earth.

"YHWH of Hosts" here is a resonance of "YHWH of Hosts

the God of Israel". Its literary context is Josiah's reform in Jerusalem (1:1), oracles against the nations, the naming of the active God worshipped in Jerusalem and, most importantly, the phrase ne²um YHWH, indicating that the prophet's words are those of this God. "Israel" is used as another name for the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem.

The uses of "YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" in Jeremiah are almost all in the phrase, "Thus says YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel, koh ²amar YHWH seba²oth ²elohe yiśra²el", in prose sections [551]. In many, but not all, of the contexts in which this phrase occurs the Temple, Jerusalem and Judah are central. For example 7:3, which also opposes "YHWH of Hosts, the God of Israel" and foreign Gods and "idols".

The phrase also occurs, as in Isaiah, in contexts where the people ("my people" etc.) are opposed to "nations" (e.g. 9:14). 25:27 forms a climax in a prophecy against "all nations" [552] many of which are listed between vv17 and 26. This section of the prophecy (which is concerned with the captivity of Judah and the destruction, after seventy years, of Babylon) begins at v15 with "Thus says YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel". The judgement on "all nations" is introduced, followed by the listing of those nations (including "Jerusalem and the cities of Judah") in vv17-26. Verse 17 is a variation on the theme of v15. The final verses (vv28,29) clarify the point that if YHWH of Hosts "begins to work evil" in Jerusalem ("the city called by my name") then Babylon and "all the inhabitants of the earth ... shall not go unpunished".

Some of the occurrences of "Thus says YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" in Jeremiah are addressed explicitly to Judah and Jerusalem, e.g. 19:3. "Israel" also refers to the northern kingdom as a separate entity to the south, "Judah", and also to the whole people. Both usages occur in 50:17-20. "YHWH of Hosts God of Israel" is the God of Jerusalem and Judah but is also interested in the northern kingdom. "Israel" in the phrase "YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" must be understood as a reference to the whole people apart from its divisions into two states. Judah is more in view than the northern kingdom because the prophet is more involved in Judah. However, Jeremiah does not deny that the north is also "Israel" and that the "the God of Israel" is the God of the whole people. The return of the northerners (albeit to a Davidic state) leads to reference to the north as "Israel". So, whilst "YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" is primarily the God of Jerusalem, "Israel"

refers to a wider entity: the whole people. "YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" is God in Jerusalem but "Israel" does not mean solely Judah.

In "the God of Israel" yiśra'el refers to the whole people, the "people of God". This is not a pure community, a "true Israel". This God is "God" of both prophets and those who rebel. "The God of yiśra'el" tends to be seen in Jerusalem, to be heard speaking about Jerusalem, and is especially connected with the Davidic lineage and the Jerusalem cultus. In the northern kingdom God is also "the God of Israel". This God is not defined as the God of one part of the people (whether "good" or "bad", or "north" or "south"). The most common opposition to the phrase "the God of Israel" is some word denoting foreigners or outsiders or their Gods.

In addition to the phrase "the God of Israel" there are a number of phrases applied to "the God of Israel": ʔabir yiśra'el (Isa 1:24); ʔeben yiśra'el (Gen 49:24); ʔor yiśra'el (Isa 10:17); bore yiśra'el (Isa 43:15); goʔel yiśra'el (Isa 49:7); melek yiśra'el (Isa 44:6); mezareh yiśra'el (Jer 31:10); neṣaḥ yiśra'el (1 Sam 15:29); sur yiśra'el (2 Sam 23:3 [553]); roʿeh yiśra'el (Ps 80:2 [554]); šomer yiśra'el (Ps 121:4).

"YHWH" occurs in the contexts of the majority of these phrases. It does not occur in the context of Gen 49:24, however within the blessing of Joseph by Jacob (vv22-26) God is called "the Mighty One of Jacob", "the Shepherd", "the Stone of Israel, ʔeben yiśra'el", "the God of your father", and "the Almighty, šadai" [555]). This is illustrative of other phrases each of which is paralleled by at least one other name or title for God and opposed to various words for opponents of either God or the people. Thus God is "the Glory of Israel" (1 Sam 15:29) in opposition to the view of a divinity who might repent. The nations, goyim are told that despite being "the Scatterer of Israel" YHWH "will gather and keep Israel and guard Israel as a shepherd guards flocks" (jer 31:10).

The importance of reading words in context is highlighted by the use of these titles. For example, YHWH as "Creator of Israel" (Isa 43:15) can lead to discussion of creation theology, whereas its proper context is a discussion of redemption. YHWH the "Creator of Israel" is the "Redeemer of Israel". In Sawyer's commentary on Isaiah [556] 45:15 is in a section (beginning at v14) entitled "The New Exodus". Here "Creator of Israel" is part of a new redemptive

activity. In Westermann's commentary [557] v16 begins a new section, "A proclamation of salvation: Behold I am doing a new thing" in which context "Creator of Israel" looks backwards to the origins of God's relationship with Israel.

Whybray stresses creation but his recognition of the redemption theme leads him close to a synthesis.

The reference is to Yahweh's "Creation" of the nation of Israel and probably includes the whole series of events from the call of Abraham to Israel's occupation of Canaan. In using in this way verbs which were normally reserved for statements about the creation of the world, Deutero-Isaiah was asserting that Israel has a unique place in the divine scheme of things. At the same time, by speaking of what was thought of as redemptive acts in terms of creation, he was making it possible for the new redemptive act of which he was about to speak to be regarded as nothing less than a new creation [558].

Isa 1:24 is the turning point of a chiasmus (1:21-26 [559]). The verse is preceded by a description of the way in which "the faithful city has become a harlot". Verse 24 introduces what God is going to do to cause the city to be called "faithful" again. God is named as the "Mighty One of Israel, ʔabir yiśraʔel" and, in parallel, "YHWH of Hosts", to introduce this dramatic change. God is "the Mighty One" [560] when there is a reversal of fortunes or at least a dramatic action.

In Isa 1:21-26 the city benefitting from the action of "the Mighty One of Israel" is Zion. "Israel" is therefore at least Judah and may include the whole people. "Israel" includes the rebels and thieves as well as the judges and counsellors.

In Ps 80:2 the "Shepherd of Israel", roʿeh yiśraʔel, is said to "lead Joseph like a flock", noheg kaʔoʔn yosep. God is called "God" (v4), "YHWH the God of Hosts" (vv5,20), and "the God of Hosts" (v8,15). Those who the "Shepherd of Israel" is asked to hear look back to the exodus and the conquest, but now consider themselves oppressed and leaderless again. Before v4 (the refrain and, with v20, an inclusio for the psalm proper [561]) the "Shepherd of Israel" is also "the One Enthroned between the Cherubim". In addition to the request to listen God is asked to "shine forth" and to

"stir up your might and come and save us" i.e. "Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh". Judah is not mentioned. To invoke the God "enthroned on the cherubim" (which, to a Judean, would have meant in the Jerusalem Temple) asking for the restoration of northern tribes must have sounded strange. The temptation to add "and Judah" would have been great [562].

8.11 HOLY ONE

"Holy One of Israel" occurs thirty-one times, of which twenty-five are in Isaiah [563]. One of the remaining six (2 Kgs 19:22) is identical to Isa 37:23.

Jeremiah uses "Holy One of Israel" twice (50:29; 51:5) [564]. In these "oracles against Babylon" God is also called "YHWH of Hosts the God of Israel" (50:18), "your God" (50:28), "their God" (51:5), "YHWH of Hosts (50:25,31; 51:5,14). Babylon is judged as the oppressor of "the people of Israel and the people of Judah" (50:33). The judgement is announced from "Zion". Despite the "guilt which fills their land" Israel and Judah have not been "widowed" (51:5). "Israel" in "the people of Israel and the people of Judah" and in "Israel and Judah" means something different from "Israel" in "Holy One of Israel". In the latter phrase God is not only the God of the northern people but is a God who speaks from Zion about the whole world on behalf of one people who can be named either "Israel and Judah" or "Israel". In this context "Israel" is the supra-historical entity met elsewhere. It is a theological rather than political term [565].

There are three occurrences of "Holy One of Israel" in the Psalms (71:22; 78:41; 89:19). "Holy One of Israel" is part of the stylistic variation of these Psalms in which "God" is also named, "YHWH", "YHWH of Hosts", "my God", "my father", "Most High God", "the Lord", and "Lord YHWH". yisra'el here is a supra-historical community. It collocates with "God" not because it is "Holy" but because it is God's audience.

In addition to Isaiah's twenty-five uses of "Holy One of Israel" there are thirteen occurrences of "the God of Israel". There are also five places where a God is named as "of Israel", as in the phrase "Light of Israel". Since "Israel" occurs ninety-two times in Isaiah the total of forty-three occurrences in titles for this God are significant and must affect the

understanding of the remaining forty-nine occurrences.

Some of these occurrences are in the phrase "YHWH Holy One of Israel" (e.g. 10:20;47:4) and "Lord YHWH Holy One of Israel" (30:15). All but three occurrences (5:19; 30:11,12 [566]) are collocated with "YHWH". Eighteen occurrences are distinguished from the others in having foreigners in the context. Sometimes these are specific peoples (Assyrians [567], Egyptians [568] and Babylon/Chaldeans [569]) at other times more generalised "nations" or "people" [570]. 54:5 is a special case as the "Holy One of Israel" is also called "the God of the whole earth, ʔelohe kol haʔareṣ". God is also "YHWH of Hosts, your maker, ʔośayik", "your Redeemer, goʔalek" and "your husband, boʕalayik" [571].

60:9,14 occur in a prophecy about the many nations (some named) coming to Zion. 60:14 parallels "the City of YHWH" with "Zion of the Holy One of Israel". Assyrians and Zion also occur in the context of 37:23 where "mocking Zion" is equivalent to "mocking the Holy One of Israel". 12:6 exhorts the "inhabitant of Zion" to "sing praises to YHWH ... for great in your midst is the Holy One of Israel" and to "let this be known in all the earth".

The phrase occurs throughout Isaiah and "reflects a continuing theme in the growth of Isaianic literature" [572]. Procksch [573] implies that the phrase was an innovation of Isaiah's since "the Trisagion of his initial vision (Isa 6:3) remained normative for his picture of God". Vriezen [574] writes of the use of "Holy One of Israel",

the emphasis laid by Isaiah on the holiness of God originates in the vision of his calling (vi) where Yahweh is celebrated as the Holy One by the Seraphs at the throne; God's holiness is contrasted with human sin and uncleanness.

"Holy One of Israel" "may be drawn from the language of the cult" and adds emphasis to the description of the "monstrous" behaviour of Israel [575]. Kaiser also comments that "Holy One of Israel" occurs in 5:19 "not by chance ... for his judgement is no less than the emanation and consummation of his holiness (cf. 6:3ff)" [576]. Sawyer says that the,

Isaianic title, "Holy One of Israel" (gedosh yisra'el), points forwards to chapter 6 (where the concept of holiness will be discussed in full). Wherever it occurs, it highlights the

terrifying, transcendent power of Israel's God and the demands for moral and spiritual purity alongside, or even in preference to, ritual purity [577].

Clements thinks more is involved. "Holy One of Israel" "appears designed to stress, not only the element of holiness, but also the fact that he was God of both kingdoms: Ephraim (Israel) and Judah (cf. 5:7)". Whilst the phrase was

almost certainly an ancient title, used in the Temple cult ... the prophet had certainly invested it with a new significance in view of the sharp division between the two kingdoms ... YHWH still remained the God of the entire people [578].

Similarly, although Sawyer says that,

it seems probable that, like the following prophecy (10:24-26), [10:23-24] is about Israel as a whole. Certainly in the phrase "Holy One of Israel" it cannot have any other meaning, and "your people Israel" points in the same direction [579]

he also suggests that the detail of the prophecy refers to Judah. If so "Israel" here may well be synonymous with "Zion". Isaiah says "Holy One of Israel" when "Holy One of Judah" may have been more accurate (in his own polemic if not "historically" or "politically"). "Israel" in the phrase "Holy One of Israel" can refer to the north alone, to the whole nation or to the south alone. In this case, however, it is used in a "new" way: it does mean "the whole people", transcending the old barriers between north and south, but it does so by uniting the two groups in a Zion and David centred cultus.

8.12 LAND AND PLACES

Twelve phrases which refer to the land, or to places within the land, as "of Israel" account for seventy-two of the occurrences of "Israel" in the MT. ʔadmat yiśraʔel (17 occurrences), ʔeres yiśraʔel (11), ʔarṣot yiśraʔel (1), gebul yiśraʔel (13), har yiśraʔel (2), hare yiśraʔel (16), miqdeše yiśraʔel (1), merom yiśraʔel

(3), mašqeh yiśraʿel (1), nahalat yiśraʿel (1), ʿare yiśraʿel (5) and ʿir weʿem beʿyiśraʿel (1).

The phrase ʿadmat yiśraʿel is unique to Ezekiel [580]. In Ezek 7:2 "An End!" is announced to the "land of Israel" but it is the "inhabitants of the land" whose "doom has come" (v7) because of the "abominations" in the land, such as the "High Places" on the "Mountains of Israel, hare yiśraʿel" of chapter 6. Although the prophet is in exile he addresses those not exiled.

11:17 reads "I will gather you from the peoples and assemble you from the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel". This is said by YHWH to the exiles because the "inhabitants of Jerusalem" have decided that those God calls Ezekiel's "fellow exiles, the whole House of Israel" (v15) have "gone far from YHWH and to us this land is given for a possession". Evidently they are wrong. The returnees will clean away the abominations of those inhabitants who "the God of Israel" does abandon (v22) [581].

12:22 concerns a "proverb about the land of Israel" in parallel with a "proverb in Israel" (v23). Here the land is a metaphor for the people who are named the "House of Israel" in vv24,27 [582].

In 13:9 the "land of Israel" and the "House of Israel" are two separate things, lying prophets will not be registered among the people nor will they enter the land [583].

At 20:42 the "land of Israel" is the land promised to the ancestors of Israel. It is parallel to "the Mountain Heights of Israel" (v40). This is comparable with the use of ʿadmat yiśraʿel and har yiśraʿel in 36:1-12. In 36:1 Ezekiel is told to prophesy to "the mountains of Israel" beginning by saying, "O Mountains of Israel". The prophecy concerns the way enemies have mocked the land and said, "the ancient heights, bamot ʿolam [584], have become our possession". The "Mountains of Israel" are then told to "listen to what "Lord YHWH says" to "the mountains and to the hills, to the ravines and to the valleys and to the desolate wastes and to the deserted cities" (v4). God then talks about "what the rest of the surrounding nations" have thought and done about "my land", the "land of Israel, ʿadmat yiśraʿel". Functionally ʿadmat yiśraʿel is synonymous with hare yiśraʿel [585].

Since the interest of the prophet is not in the land alone, and certainly not in a barren land, the following verses tell "the mountains of Israel" (v8) to prepare for the return of "my people Israel", ‘ame yiśra’el. These people are also named "all the house of Israel, all of it", kol bet yiśra’el kuloh (v10). Thus the land is again to have people, ’adam (v10,11,12) and animals, behemot (v11) in it.

25:3 is a prophecy against the Ammonites,

Because you said, "Aha!", over my sanctuary when it was profaned, over the land of Israel when it was made desolate and over the House of Judah when it went into exile.

In 25:6 "the land of Israel" stands for all three of these objects of Ammon's mockery (the sanctuary, the land and the House of Judah). The "House of Judah" is the inhabitants of the "land of Israel". Zimmerli notes that this verse

clearly shows that Jerusalem, Judah and the land of Israel are understood as concentric circles and that "Israel" is certainly not to be taken to refer to the northern kingdom in contrast to Judah [586].

According to 37:22,

there will be one nation in the land on the mountains of Israel under one king and they will no longer be two nations and no longer be divided into two kingdoms.

This is part of the explanation of the prophecy of the two sticks representing "Ephraim and Judah" and is comparable with the prophecy against Mount Seir (chap.35) which will be destroyed for saying, "these two nations and these two countries shall be mine" (v10). The prophet recognises that Israel was once two nations, but proclaims that on the return from exile they will be one nation in one territory.

The addition of merom to har [587] and hare [588] is significant. har merom yiśra’el is a reference to Zion. hare merom yiśra’el and hare yiśra’el are parallel in 34:13,14 and are in "their own land", ’admatam in v13. The centre of "the mountain heights of Israel" is "my hill", giba’^cti (v26). This being so it is unnecessary to emend hare merom to har merom. hare yiśra’el and hare

merom yiśraʿel refer to the whole land whilst har merom yiśraʿel refers to the Temple Mount [589].

Josh 11:16,21 are the sole occurrences of har yiśraʿel in the MT. Unlike Ezekiel's usage, the "hill country of Israel" in Joshua does not include Judah which has its own "hill country" (v21). The "hill country of Israel and its lowland" in v16 is not paralleled by "hill country of Judah and its lowland" but is defined as being "from Mount Halak that rises towards Seir as far as Baalgad in the valley of Lebanon below Mount Hermon". Joshua is also credited with taking "all that land, the hill country and the all the Negeb and the land of Goshen and the lowland and the Arabah" as well as "the hill country of Israel and its lowland". This area is identical with that in which the preceding battle take place and is therefore the area north of Jerusalem to upper Galilee (which is probably the "northern hill country" of vv2,16). This is somewhat wider than the area which Ahlstrom considers to have been "Israel" in this historical period [590].

According to v.22 at the end of all these battles (and the treaty with Gibeon's Hivites) "there were none of the Anakim left in the land of the people of Israel, ʿeres bene yiśraʿel, only in Gaza and in Ashdod did some remain". This designation includes the area labelled, "all the hill country of Judah and all the hill country of Israel". "Israel" therefore includes both "Israel" and "Judah".

In the following division of the land among the tribes the area is called either "the land" or "this land". More commonly it is described by the rivers and the cities which mark its divisions. However the whole land is seen (in chaps.13-19) as being in two parts: "beyond the Jordan eastwards" (13:8) and the "land of Canaan". "Land of Canaan" covers much the same area as har yiśraʿel.

Elsewhere the phrase har ʿepraim is the area central to "Israel" after the division of the kingdom. This area is similar to the area which Ahlström believes to have been the original referent of the name "Israel" [591]. However, the two are not exactly synonymous anywhere. har ʿepraim (e.g. Jer 31:6 [592]) is the centre of Joshua's har yiśraʿel, which itself would be included in Ezekiel's hare yiśraʿel along with the "hill country of Judah". For Jeremiah har sion is the centre of the whole land; the centre of the north, har ʿepraim, takes second place to it [593].

ʔeres yiśraʔel occurs eleven times in MT [594], ʔeres bene yiśraʔel once [595] and ʔarsot yiśraʔel once. Other than three occurrences in Ezekiel [596] these are either in the Deuteronomic history [597] or in Chronicles [598].

In 1 Sam 13:19 "the land of Israel" is circumscribed by the territory controlled by the Philistines. It is described in terms of smaller areas (often around cities) in which the Israelites live.

In 2 Kings the "land of Israel" is ruled over by the "king of Israel", Jehoram, whose capital city is Samaria (6:20) and is being raided by "Arameans". Elisha is the "prophet of Israel" (5:8) who is in Samaria at 5:3 and in Dothan at 6:13. He lives with "the sons of the prophets" who go logging at the river Jordan. This place is also distinct from "the hill country of Ephraim" (5:22). The Aramean, Naaman, having been cured of his leprosy, declares his knowledge that "there is no God in all the earth but in Israel" and therefore requests two mule loads of the soil of Israel on which to worship YHWH when back at home. The narrative concludes, "Aram came on no more raids into the land of Israel" (6:23).

Three of the occurrences of ʔeres yiśraʔel in Chronicles refer to "sojourners, gerim". In 1 Chr 22:2 David commanded "the aliens who were in the land of Israel" "to gather together" to quarry and prepare stones for the Temple. In 2 Chr 2:16 "Solomon took a census of all the male aliens who were in the land of Israel like the census which David, his father, had taken". These people are then assigned tasks in quarries and in transport and as supervisors over each other.

In 2 Chr 30:25 Hezekiah's passover feast is a cause for joy to

the whole assembly of Judah and the priests and Levites and the assembly that came out of Israel and the sojourners who came out of the land of Israel and the those who lived in Judah.

Although the "land of Israel" in relation to David and Solomon refers to the entire united nation, north and south, in relation to Hezekiah it is distinguished from "Judah".

The occurrence of ʔarsot yiśraʔel in 1 Chr 13:2 should be noted here. This passage narrates the

inception of the Ark's move from Kirjath Jearim David addresses "all the assembly of Israel", kol qeḥal yiśra'el, saying,

if it seems good to you and if it is the will of YHWH our God let us send abroad to our brothers who remain in all the lands of Israel, bekol 'arṣot yiśra'el and with them to the priests and levites in the cities

so that the gathered people might bring the Ark to Jerusalem. David's audience are in Hebron "to crown David king over all Israel" (12:38). The LXX reads a singular rather than a plural [599]. The area from which David assembled "all Israel" is said to be "from the Shihor of Egypt to the entrance to Hamath". This does not refer to a "Greater Israel" but to "all the territories in which Israel lives" or, on the analogy of 2 Chr 11:23 ("all the districts of Judah and Benjamin" [600]) to the listing of the tribal regions and the numbers of those from each tribe who had gathered to enthrone David.

Ezekiel uses 'eres yiśra'el three times (27:17; 40:2; 47:18). The first of these names two separate states, "Judah and the land of Israel" among many others with which Tyre traded.

Having talked about bringing the exiles home from "among the nations" into "their own land" (39:25-29) Ezekiel says that he was brought,

in the visions of God into the land of Israel, and set upon a very high mountain, on which was a structure like a city (40:1-2).

The "land of Israel" is distinct from the places in which the "House of Israel" is currently exiled and is the area in which the group named "Israel" belong. Its centre is the Temple (distinguished in these chapters from the "city which was conquered").

8.13 BORDERS, SANCTUARIES AND CITIES

ES lists eleven occurrences of gebul yiśra'el under yiśra'el but 13 under gebul [601].

As with the "borders" applied to parts of Northumberland and Scotland, gebul is often applied to an area rather than a line. According to 2 Kgs

10:32-33,

YHWH began to cut off parts of Israel, and Hazael defeated them throughout the territory of Israel, bekol gebul yiśra'el, from the Jordan eastwards, all the land of Gilead, the Gadites and the Reubenites and the Manassites, from Aroer which is by the valley of the Arnon, that is Gilead and Bashan.

Ezek 47:18 marks the end result of this divinely approved removal of Gilead and Bashan from "the land of Israel" which is hinted at in the disapproval of the Conquest narrative for those who settled there. In 2 Kgs 10:32-33 these are the "borders" of the territory of Israel.

Similarly at 1 Sam 11:3,7 gebul yiśra'el includes all the area lived in by "Israel and Judah", including Jabesh Gilead and Gibeah. It is similar, therefore, to Judg 20:6 where "the fields of the inheritance of Israel", śedeh nahalat yiśra'el refers to an area inclusive of "Dan to Beersheba".

There are, however, occurrences of gebul yiśra'el which do refer to borders as lines. Ezek 11:10,11 tells the people who "will be brought out of the city" that they will be "judged at the border". According to 2 Kgs 14:25 Jeroboam "restored the border of Israel from the entrance of Hamath as far as the sea of the Arabah" and, in doing so, he "recovered for Israel, Damascus and Hamath which had belonged to Judah". "Israel" in this case is distinguished not only from the Aramean kingdoms but also from "Judah".

There is also some ambiguity in Mal 1:5 which might be translated "Great is YHWH beyond the borders of Israel" or "Great is YHWH outside the territory of Israel", yigdal YHWH me'al ligebul yiśra'el.

The sole collocation of "Sanctuaries, miqdeš" with yiśra'el is at Amos 7:9, which announces the destruction of the "High Places of Isaac" and the "Sanctuaries of Israel". This provokes Bethel's priest, Amaziah, to tell Jeroboam, king of Israel, that Amos has "conspired against you in the midst of bet yiśra'el and that "the land cannot bear his words". Amos is told to go back to "the land of Judah" (v12). The "Holy Places of Israel" are those of the northern kingdom and there is more than one of them. This is an offence to those who had become convinced of the sole legitimacy of Jerusalem's Temple as the place to worship God.

The "cities of Israel, ‘are yiśra’el" include southern cities, such as Jerusalem (1 Sam 18:6) and northern ones (1 Kgs 15:20; 2 Kgs 13:25; 2 Chr 16:4).

At 1 Sam 18:6 women come out "of the cities of Israel" to greet Saul on his return from Philistia to Jerusalem. In 1 and 2 Kings "the cities of Israel" are northern ones which are attacked by Benhadad, king of Aram (at the suggestion of Asa, king of Judah) and later retrieved by Josiah.

Ezekiel uses "the cities of Israel" in a reference to their future inhabitants who will "destroy the weapons of Gog". ‘are yiśra’el is applied then to places within the (re)united kingdom.

At 2 Sam 20:19 Joab is asked why he wants to destroy a city (Abel of Beth Maacah) which is a "city and mother in Israel, ‘ir we’em beyiśra’el". This phrase is unique in MT although cities are generally female. The

expression is probably related to the word ‘mh, "mother city, metropolis". Towns attached to the mother city were called bnot, "daughters" [602].

Adler argues that this symbolism "implies some sort of protective relationship between them. The ties were, in fact, economic, administrative and military". The phrase may mean much the same when applied to the city as it does of Deborah, a "mother in Israel" (Judg 5:5-7) who, as a "quasi-military leader", protects the people [603].

8.14 POSSESSIONS

A list of examples, even without full discussion, of "possessions of Israel" says quite a lot about "Israel". ge’on yiśra’el [604]; hata’t yiśra’el [605]; hemdat yiśra’el [606]; huqot yiśra’el [607]; hoq leyiśra’el [608]; yad yiśra’el [609]; yešū’at yiśra’el [610]; yešū’ot yiśra’el [611]; kebod yiśra’el [612]; kise yiśra’el [613]; laḥaṣ yiśra’el [614] mamleket yiśra’el [615]; mamleket yiśra’el [616]; minḥat yiśra’el [617]; ma’aseh yiśra’el [618]; miqneh yiśra’el [619]; ner yiśra’el [620]; ‘awon yiśra’el [621]; ‘amal yiśra’el [622]; ‘ani yiśra’el [623]; piš’e yiśra’el [624]; qol yiśra’el [625]; qešet yiśra’el [626]; regel yiśra’el [627]; rekeb yiśra’el [628]; šebut yiśra’el [629]; šem yiśra’el [630]; tehillot yiśra’el [631]; tip’eret [632];

tesu^{at} yiśra^{el} [633].

"Israel" in this listing does not cover the full range of possible uses. Phrases which might be referred to as "the possessions of the ancestor Israel" (e.g. yeme yiśra^{el}, Gen 47:29; and yemin yiśra^{el}, Gen 48:13) are not noted.

The people in Egypt prior to the exodus are the "Israel" of migne^h yiśra^{el} at Exod 9:4,7. The Conquest generation is referred to in yad yiśra^{el} at Josh 10:30. The period of Judges and Samuel is referred to in minhat yiśra^{el}. Kingship is moved from Samuel to Saul and then from Saul to Samuel in mamleket yiśra^{el} and mamleket yiśra^{el}. The period of Saul is referred to in hemdat yiśra^{el}, that of David in ner yiśra^{el}, of David and Solomon in kise yiśra^{el}. The divided monarchies are referred to in ge^{on} yiśra^{el}, kise yiśra^{el} and awon yiśra^{el}.

Among these references some refer to the northern kingdom and others to the south. Thus, kise yiśra^{el} at 2 Kgs 10:30 refers to Jehu and the throne of the northern kingdom; the awon yiśra^{el} of Jer 50:20 is that of the north and is distinguished from the "sin of Judah", hata^t yehudah. The ge^{on} yiśra^{el} in Hos 5:5 includes Judean guilt,

The pride of Israel, ge^{on} yiśra^{el}, testifies to his face, Israel and Ephraim shall stumble in their guilt, Judah shall stumble with them.

In Nah 2:3 the ge^{on} yiśra^{el} is that of the south. Verse 1 encourages "Judah" to "keep your feasts". The context thus shows that "Israel" is "Judah". The comparison of the "majesty of Israel, ge^{on} yiśra^{el}" with the "majesty of Jacob, ge^{on} ya^{aqob}" does not distinguish "Judah" from the northern kingdom, but uses both names for the southern kingdom [634].

According to Mic 1:15 "the glory of Israel, kebod yiśra^{el}, shall come down to Adullam" because of a conqueror because of the "transgressions of Israel", piś^e yiśra^{el} (1:13). Those leaving the Judean cities will "roll in dust" (v10), leave in "nakedness and shame", "wailing" (v11), leaving "parting gifts" for the enemy (v14), even the "kings of Israel" find no security (v14) and the exiles, "as bald as eagles", will mourn for the "children of their delight" (v16). kebod is expressed in tangible things which are left behind by exiles, not merely "wealth" but "abundance", "splendour" or "opulence".

The "possessions of Israel" refer to northerners and southerners, to "good" and "bad". "Glory" and "sin" represent two poles among the good and bad possessions of Israel. The ge'on yiśra'el of Nah 2:3 is something positive, that of Hos 5:5 and 7:10 is negative.

Whilst it would be improper to claim any links between these passages, the range of possible uses of "Israel" is well illustrated by them. "Israel" can apply to any period in the people's history. "Israel" is not the name of some pure community. The people named "Israel" can be good or bad, they are both praised and criticised. The "possessions of Israel" are not of a unique type, other nations possess "glory", "sins". "Gods" might also be counted among the possessions of both "Israel" and "the nations".

8.15 CONCLUSION

"Israel" in the MT refers to a mixed community. It can be applied to the northern kingdom alone, in opposition to "Judah", and to the whole people. When it refers to the whole people it does not necessarily ignore the division into north and south, but can explicitly link the two in a single entity.

This entity, however, is not a "pure" community of YHWH worshippers, it comprises "good" and "bad", "worshippers" and "rebels".

"Israel" can sometimes include all the nation, at other times it refers to "the people" as opposed to "priests" and "levites". It is perhaps significant that there is no class division in the use of the name, kings and commoners are named "Israel" [635].

The popular etymologies linked with "Israel" in the MT are not central to its usage, they do not constitute its primary associations.

The "True Israel" is not a "pure Israel". Whilst an ideal is continually proclaimed, "Israel" remains the name of all the people however closely they approximated those ideals. Ahlström is incorrect in saying that kol yiśra'el

expresses the tendency of biblical writers to identify the religious ideal which made Israel the people of Yahweh, with the political situation, real or imaginary [636].

It is the "real Israel", good and bad, with which God is concerned. The attempt to make the people into a "holy nation and royal priesthood" is not made by denying the name "Israel" to "rebels". "Sinners" are condemned but remain "Israel".

The real "Israel" of the MT is a community which God, prophets and writers aim to persuade to live or think differently, for example, Hosea wishes "Israel" to be more just, straightforward, and less devious. Even the cultic congregation gathered in Jerusalem is not a pure community but an "Israel" which ought to turn from its use of "foreign" symbols and ought to divorce its foreign wives. It is an audience called to live differently. "Israel", however, is the name of both good and bad in the people's past, present and future.

CHAPTER NINE

ISRAEL IN PHILO

The occurrences of israēl in the works of Philo of Alexandria can be divided into two groups: references to the ancestor Jacob and references to the nation. In the former category there are 29 occurrences [637]. In the second category are 47 occurrences [638]. There is also a single occurrence of israēlitikos at Heres. 203.

This categorisation of the occurrences is, however, unsatisfactory. It obscures the actual use of the name by Philo. Whether the name is being used to refer to the ancestor or to the people Philo most often says that "Israel" means "the person or group who sees God". Commentators who divide the uses into "references to Jacob" and "allegorical references to Jacob", for example, [639], incorrectly analyse Philo's own approach.

Philo's purpose is to present a coherent philosophy in which the central theme is the philosophy of knowledge. His works could be summarised as an answer to the question, "how is God known?". According to Wolfson,

the distinction between the two methods of knowing God and with God also the Logos reflects the distinction made by Philo himself between the two kinds of knowledge of the mind, one that is indirectly derived from sense-perception and another which is directly derived from God by revelation and prophecy [640].

Within this philosophical system "Israel" is a central metaphor. Some representative passages from Philo will clarify his approach.

9.1 ANCESTOR

At Praem. 44 Philo says that,

In their company is he who in Hebrew, chaldaisti, is called "Israel", but in Greek, hellēnisti, "the one who sees God, horōn theon", who sees not his real nature, for that, as I have said, is impossible, but that he is.

At Conf. 72 Philo claims that "Jacob" is a symbol of

"hearing" whereas "Israel" is a symbol of "seeing". In a comment on Genesis 32 Philo says, "Jacob is the name of one wrestling and tripping up his adversary ... when deemed capable of seeing God he will receive the new name, Israel" (Migr. 201). This "seeing" is a revelatory experience. The fluctuating use of the names Jacob and Israel is seen by Philo as evidence that the visionary spirit is trapped within the material (as soul is imprisoned by body). Seeing is therefore preferable to hearing because "it is possible to be deceived by hearing but sight, which discerns what really is, is devoid of deception" (Fug. 208). Although Philo most frequently renders "Israel" by the verb horaō he also uses bleppō (Somn. 1.114), skeptikon and theōrētikon, "observation and contemplation" (Heres. 279).

9.2 PEOPLE

Precisely the same use is made of the name "Israel" when it refers to the people. Exod 17:11 ("whenever Moses lifted up his hands Israel prevailed") is explained as meaning that "when the mind lifts itself up away from mortal things and is borne aloft that which sees God (to horōn ton theon), which is Israel, gains strength" (Leg.All. 3.186). At Abr. 54-57 Philo, discoursing on the ancestors, says that Adam is "the father of everyone before the flood", Noah of everyone after it, but the "august and precious trinity" Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (who are really "symbols of virtue acquired respectively by teaching, nature and practice") are

parent of one species of that race, which species is called "royal" and "priesthood" and "holy nation". It's high position is shown by the name, for the nation is called in Hebrew, hebraiōn glōtte, "Israel", which interpreted is "one who sees God, horōn theon".

This is an almost unique reference to Exodus 19. In the whole range of surviving early Jewish literature only Philo and 1 Peter make anything of the phrases "royal priesthood" and "holy nation" [641]. This is itself remarkable as Exodus 19 is an ideal quarry from which to carve claims about the "True Israel".

Philo also means that the actual social entity, the community which he names israēl, is itself theologically and philosophically important. He is not dealing only in abstract theories, though he does prefer to exhort

people towards his hypothetical construct a community of people who "see God".

9.3 BIBLICAL OCCURRENCES

The majority of occurrences of "Israel" referring to the people are quotations from the bible. In some of these quotations the name "Israel" is incidental to Philo's purpose. In others it is central and in these cases the name is said to mean "the race which sees God". Generally Philo says "Israel means those who see God", however on one occasion (Leg.All. 3.15) he quotes LXX Lev 15:31 but replaces "Israel" by "the sons of the seeing one". Jacob's flight from Laban (a flight from possessions and "objects of sense" to avoid being ensnared by them) is to be commended because, Philo claims, "Moses says, 'you shall make the sons of the seeing one cautious' not bold and aiming at what is beyond their capacity". Jacob was beginning to aim for Laban's possessions so he fled from them.

9.4 NON-ALLEGORICAL USAGE

The use of israēlitikos at Heres. 203 will serve as an example of a reference to the people without allegory (some of which are quotations from the bible). Philo cites Exod 14:20 where the "hosts of Egypt and Israel", te aiguptiakēs kai tēs israēletikēs statias, are separated from each other by the pillar of cloud.

9.5 PHILO'S CONTEMPORARIES

In his introduction to Legatio ad Gaium Philo says of his generation that

they have come to disbelieve that the Deity takes thought for men, and particularly for the suppliant's race which the father and king of the universe and source of all things has taken for his portion. Now this race is called in the Hebrew language, "Israel", but, expressed in our language, the word is "he who sees God" (3-4).

Not only does Philo distinguish himself from those whose primary language is Hebrew but he later prefers to use ioudaioi of his own generation. This introductory usage

establishes a philosophical point about vision, rather than a political or social one about the people. His next reference to the people is at 117 where he names them "the nation of the Jews" and this is his more usual usage.

9.6 EXHORTATIONS

Philo's use of the name "Israel" is often dictated by passages from scripture which he wishes to discuss. He is not very interested in history but is concerned to preach various virtues to his readers. To the extent that they are "seers of God" they could be considered to be "children of Israel". "Israel" for Philo could be described as the people who ought to embody a certain mythical construct, an enlightened, visionary people. Philo is more interested in this mythical construct which his contemporaries might embody, than in any actual individual or group.

This point is well expressed in an extensive quotation from Neusner,

In the philosophical system of Philo, "Israel" constitutes a philosophical category, not a social entity in the everyday sense. * That is not to suggest that Philo does not see Jews as a living social entity, a community. The opposite is the case. but when he constructs his philosophical statement, the importance of "Israel" derives from its singular capacity to gain knowledge of God, which other categories of the system cannot have. When writing about the Jews in a political context, he does not appeal to their singular knowledge of God, and when writing about the Jews as "Israel" in the philosophical context, he does not appeal to their having formed a this-worldly community. [642].

9.7 PHILO'S INFLUENCE

As Philo influenced early Christian writers (Jerome even lists him among the "Church Fathers" [643]) his interpretation of "Israel" as "he who sees God" may have influenced their interpretations. Winston believes that Philo's interpretation is taken up by Christian authors

"presumably dependent on Philo" [644]. However, Smallwood thinks the interpretation is the "stock-in-trade of the Church Fathers" rather than a borrowing [645].

Certainly the idea that "Israel" refers to "one who sees God" occurs in later texts. Christian users of the interpretation include: Clement of Alexandria [646], Origen [647], Eusebius [648], Jerome [649] and Hippolytus [650]. "Gnostic" texts are often indistinguishable from what was becoming "Orthodoxy" in their use of names. "Israel" as "one who see God" also occurs in two prayers which Winston says are "Jewish (?) prayers" [651].

However, as it is also known from Origen's citation of a lost Jewish work (The Prayer of Joseph [652]) Winston says that Philo "seems to be drawing on an earlier tradition" [653], and Smallwood says, "this etymology was well known" [654]. This single reference is an uncertain foundation to base such a conviction upon. The interpretation is not widespread in any of the other Judaisms of the time. Winston implies that if the Alexandrian Jewish community had not been annihilated following their revolt against Trajan Philo's philosophy may have had a wider impact on Judaism [655]. He says, though, that "Palestinian Jewry contemporary with Philo was not much interested in philosophy, particularly when written in Greek". His citation of evidence "that the Rabbis were not unmindful of the dangers inherent" in an approach such as Philo's, should suggest that they, at least, were not unaware of philosophical methodology.

Though the interpretation is central to Philo's philosophy of knowledge, it is not as central to any other writer's argument. Melito of Sardis employs it (as if it were well known) in Peri Pascha where he accuses "Israel" of the "unprecedented crime" of murdering the one

who made you, who honoured you,
who called you "Israel".
But you did not turn out to be "Israel":
you did not see God,
you did not recognize the Lord (580).

This is not a central metaphor for Melito who has plenty of other means of accusing Israel, under various names, of deicide.

9.8 CONCLUSION

Wherever Philo's "etymology" originated, its function in Philo is more central than in any other (later or earlier) extant texts. "Israel" as "one who sees God" is central to Philo's philosophy of knowledge. It is primarily the name of a philosophical construct rather than a socio-political or religious group. Philo's israel is an "Israel after philosophy" rather than "after the flesh" or "after the spirit". Its relationship to Philo's own generation, who he prefers to name "Jews", is that of a model towards which they are encouraged. Dahl suggests that ioudaioi is used mainly in Philo's political writings whereas israēl is used mostly in his "allegorical" commentaries [656]. "Israel" is an idea about knowledge of God, some of Philo's contemporary "Jews" have this vision, but it is also available to non-Jews.

Philo's "Israel" is a standard of visionary experience with which to compare the current generation. No group can claim to be the only one to which the name is applicable. Everyone, including Gentiles, are exhorted to live up to the name, to live in a "visionary" way.

CHAPTER TEN

ISRAEL IN QUMRAN LITERATURE

"Israel" is used in a number of different ways throughout QL [657]. It can be used as a designation for the community itself or for outsiders. Various phrases occur, such as bt yśr'1, šby yśr'1 and '1 yśr'1. In this chapter I discuss the uses according to the scrolls in which they occur without claiming that all the scrolls were either produced or read by one group. The conclusion to this chapter brings together the different uses made of the name.

10.1 COMMUNITY RULE

The first occurrence of yśr'1 in 1QS is at 1:21-24,

then the priests shall recite the favours of God manifested in his mighty deeds and shall declare all his merciful grace to Israel, and the Levites shall recite the iniquities of the children of Israel, all their guilty rebellions and sins during the dominion of Belial.

yśr'1 includes the three divisions of the nation and the community, priests, Levites and people. It refers both to those to whom God has been merciful, and those which have sinned. It is also contrasted with "priests" and "levites" as a name for the people (of both nation and community) and is parallel to "those entering the Covenant" in 1:24. The community recognise their own guilt although they are also "those of the Lot of God who walk perfectly in all God's ways" (2:2). The passage also has overtones of the Deuteronomic recitation of blessings and curses.

yśr'1 also has a double meaning at 2:22 and 5:22. At 2:22 yśr'1 is the name for the unity of "priests, levites and people" who are ordered so that "every Israelite, kl 'š yśr'1 may know his place in the Community". In 5:20-22 "the multitude of yśr'1" are distinguished from "the sons of Aaron". Both groups have "freely pledged themselves in the Community" [658].

At 9:11 the two parts of the group are again referred to as "Aaron and Israel". This passage looks forward to the "coming of the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" and projects the division of people and priests into the future.

yśr²l refers to the nation outside the Community at 6:14,

everyone born of Israel who freely pledges himself to join the council of the community,

and 8:4,6,10,14

when these [12 men and 3 priests] are in Israel the council of the community shall be established in truth. ... It shall be an everlasting plantation, a house of holiness for Israel, an Assembly of supreme holiness of Aaron.... It shall be a house of perfection and truth in Israel. ... and the interpreter shall not conceal from them, out of a fear of apostasy, any of those things hidden from Israel which have been discovered by him ... and when these become members of the community in Israel according to all these rules they shall separate from the dwellings of ungodly men.

"Israel" is a wider community but ought to "become members of the community in Israel". This passage, with its distinction of "Israel" from "Aaron" here suggests a renewed cultic community which will eventually embrace the whole nation, so that "there is no fear of apostasy". Similarly 9:6 [659] anticipates the establishment of a "house of community for Israel",

at that time the men of the community shall set apart a house of holiness in order that it may be united to the most holy things and a house of community for Israel, for those who walk in perfection.

"The God of Israel, śl yśr²l" occurs at 3:25 where "the God of Israel and his Angel of Truth will succour all the sons of Light". yśr²l and the "Sons of Light" do not have precisely the same connotations. yśr²l is the wider nation. God and the Angel will be particularly concerned with that part of the nation also named "Sons of Light".

In 1QS "Israel" is used both as a self-designation for "the Community" and a name for the wider community, including priests and people. It is also used to distinguish people from priests and Levites. "Good" and "bad", members of the Community and "outsiders" are labelled "Israel", with other words making it clear what the author thought of each.

10.2 DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

yśr'1 occurs 43 times in CD [660]. Its initial occurrences (1:3,5,7) refer to the people, at the time of Nebuchadnezzar, both when they are unfaithful, when God looks after them and when God begins to return them to the land,

for when they were unfaithful and left God he hid his face from Israel and his sanctuary and delivered them up to the sword, but remembering the covenant of the ancestors he left a remnant to Israel, hš'yr š'ryt lyśr'1, and did not deliver it up to be destroyed. Three hundred and ninety years later he caused a plant root to spring from Israel and Aaron to inherit his land and to prosper on the good things of his earth.

CD often uses yśr'1 in this "historical" way [661]. This usage includes both "good" and "bad": at 3:13,14 "Israel" is the name of those with whom "God made his covenant" but also of those who "had gone astray". At 5:19,20 "Israel" refers to the people "delivered" in the exodus but also to those "who went astray".

As in 1:3-7 "Israel" can also be a name for both the whole nation and for the people as distinct from "the priests". At 10:5 the "rule for the Judges and the Congregation" decrees that "ten shall be elected from the Congregation for a definite time, four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron and six from Israel" [662].

In the "Rule for the assembly of all the camps" the "priests and people" separation is further subdivided into four groups: priests, levites, people, and converts (14:4,5). This reference to "converts" is unusual in QL which normally sees "foreigners" as either "aliens" or "enemies". The "joining" of the community is normally expected to be from that "Israel" outside the writer's group.

yśr'1 is also opposed to "foreigners" who are not "converts". At 12:8 the property of "gentiles" must not be carried except by advice from "the Company of Israel, hbwr yśr'1".

At 12:19 the "rule for the Assembly of the towns of Israel, ‘ry yśr'1" applies the Levitical instructions to the scroll's audience in whatever towns they live. The barrier provided by such "purity rules" are particularly important when surrounded by "outsiders" [663].

CD also uses "Israel" as a self-designation. According to 3:19, God "forgave their sin, pardoned their wickedness and built them a sure house in Israel whose like had never existed before". The community is also the "seed of Israel" at 12:22.

6:1 interprets the "digging of the well" of Num 21:18 as a reference to the community. They are

the šby yśr'1 who went out of the land of Judah to sojourn in the land of Damascus [664].

The debate about the meaning of šby yśr'1 is central to the debate about those who produced CD. A community founded by "those who returned from exile" would have a very different self-perception than one founded by "the penitents". 8:16 (=19:29) supports the interpretation "captivity" rather than "converts",

As Moses said (to Israel [665]), "You enter to possess these nations, hgwym, not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your hearts but because God loved your fathers and kept the oath", and this is the judgement of the šby yśr'1 who departed from the way of the people, h'm (8:14-18; 19:26-29).

Whilst this could refer to a conversion away from the practices of the majority, it is preferable to read "returnees". hgwym and h'm refer to the same group which need not refer to foreigners but includes anyone outside of the community.

In 4:1-5 "Israel" is both the community and its opponents. Having quoted Ezek 44:15, an interpretation is offered,

the Priests are the šby yśr'1 who departed from the land of Judah, and (the Levites are) those who joined them. The sons of Zadok are the elect of Israel, bhyry yśr'1, the men called by name who shall stand at the end of days [666].

"Departing" is condemned in Ezekiel but commended in CD. The community ("Priests", "Levites" and "sons of Zadok") only exists because "when the bny yśr'1 went astray" those commended by Ezekiel "kept the Temple". According to CD the next (and parallel) commendable thing done by those who were to form the community was to "depart from the land of Judah". Ezekiel's "departure" is away from God, CD's is away from those who had "deviated". Both groups are parts of yśr'1: the bny yśr'1 of v1 were

sinful, the šby yśr'1 of v2 and the bhyry yśr'1 of v3,4 are the community. Both have as much claim to the name yśr'1 in CD despite the author's condemnation of outsiders.

Another use of "Israel" is as a name for those outside the group. In 1:14 it occurs in a quotation of Hos 4:16, presented as scriptural proof concerning "the congregation of traitors, those who departed from the way ... when the Scoffer arose who spouted waters of deceit to Israel" [667].

To summarise this discussion of CD: yśr'1 is sometimes the name of the entire nation, in the past, present or future; and is sometimes applied solely to the group responsible for CD. "Israel" can be praised or condemned. Opposed to it are various names for "outsiders", whether "the nations" or other Israelites. It is also distinguishable from "priests".

CD does not claim that there is a "true Israel" living within a wider nation (either in one place or scattered throughout its towns). Its "Israel" is a mixed community, "sinners" and "righteous". However much its author(s) may have wished that all "Israel" would acknowledge the authority of the community, CD does not deny the use of the name yśr'1 to "outsiders" also.

10.3 RULE OF THE CONGREGATION

There are three uses of yśr'1 in the "Rule of the Congregation" (1QSa). It is collocated with "congregation, ḥdh" where it refers to the community of "the last days"; with various words for leaders of the community; and with "messiah, mšyh".

The collocation with "congregation" occurs in the title of the scroll at 1:1,

this is the Rule for all the congregation of Israel, lkw1 ḥdt yśr'1, in the last days, when they shall join the [Community to walk according to the Law of the sons of Zadok the Priests and the men of their Covenant who have turned asid[e from the] way of the people, the men of His Council, ḥnšy ḥstw, who keep His covenant in the midst of iniquity, offering expiat[ion for the Land] (1:1-3).

This congregation explicitly includes women and children (1:4) and further glossed as "every man born in Israel" (1:6). The scroll describes a future situation when the "congregation of Israel" will include not only current members of the author's group but also many other current outsiders. It will not be formed until the "messiah of Israel, mšyh yśr'1", (2:14,20) comes. Then the messianic community will be lead by the messiah, the Priest (2:19), the Priests ("sons of Aaron" [2:13] or "sons of Zadok" [1:2]), the "chiefs of the clans of Israel" (2:15) and so on, down through "leaders of thousands, hundreds and fifties" to "heads of tribes and families".

Within this hierarchy each person will have a place. According to 1:13,14, "at the age of thirty he may approach to participate in lawsuits and judgements and may take his place among the chiefs of the Thousands of Israel". "Simpletons, 'yś pwt'y" are not to hold office or bear responsibility in the "Congregation of Israel, 'dt yśr'1", their only function is to be as porters in the "war against the nations" (1:19-21).

yśr'1 is the name of a community centred on those now gathered at Qumran. It is not, however, the name of an exclusivist group separate from the wider nation. It is the name of the community in the "last days", the time of the last war against the nations and the coming of the messiah of Israel. These days will usher in a period of perfect order symbolised by the celebration of a meal where all the people gather in the correct order and the correct leaders offer thanks over the offered food and drink.

yśr'1 does not refer to only the Qumran group in opposition to the rest of the people, except in as much as they represent the core of the nation. There is no "true Israel" as a minority within the nation. In the future yśr'1 will be the name of a pure community but it will embrace the entire nation, the sinners having excluded themselves and somehow (not specified in 1QSa) having disappeared.

10.4 WAR SCROLL

Of the twenty-eight occurrences of yśr'1 in the War Scroll (1QM) thirteen occur in the phrase "God of Israel" [668]. In 1:10 "God of Israel" is witness to the "fall of the Kittim" "on the day appointed for the battle of destruction of the sons of darkness". When

"the enemy", also called "the nations of vanity", are defeated "sovereignty shall be to the God of Israel and he shall accomplish mighty deeds by the saints of his people" (6:6). These two passages are typical of the use of the phrase which collocates with names for groups either opposed to God [669] and the Community or related to God and the Community.

At 2:7 the nation is divided into tribal groups from whom a levy of troops was to be gathered against the gentiles and reflects a belief that a restoration of all twelve tribes would precede this final conflict. With the restoration comes a recognition of the sabbatical years in which "they will not mobilise because it is a sabbath rest for Israel" (2:9). The twelve tribes also feature on the banners and shields of the armies and of the "prince of the congregation" (3:13,14; 5:1).

Another group of occurrences are in hymnic passages, often similar to the biblical Psalms. At 10:8 the question,

O God of Israel who is like you
in heaven or on earth?

leads to the question, "who is like your people Israel?" (10:9).

The whole people is called both yśr'1 and "Jacob" (11:6,7), stressing the belief that the people are related to the ancestor known by both names, and opposed to "the nations" (11:6,7; 15:1).

17:6,7 refers to the future of yśr'1 after all the conflict and judgement,

with everlasting light he will enlighten with
joy [the children] of Israel; peace and blessing
shall be with the company of God. He will raise
up the kingdom of Michael in the midst of the
Gods and the realm of Israel in the midst of all
flesh [670].

Here yśr'1 is not only a people with a history stretching back to the wilderness, nor is it only a nation of several classes (priests, levites and people), or merely another tribal league. yśr'1 participates in the divine realm. It has an regal angelic or even divine reflection in the "midst of the Gods". Israel's status among "all flesh" is like that of Michael among "all the Gods". It is also the earthly part of the

"company of God". The two realms are intimately linked by the people yśr'1 which is at the heart of the cosmology of the QL. If the reading bryt yśr'1 is correct then it refers particularly to the Community and stresses that they are not a new, sectarian, group but descend from the first ancestors, and every succeeding generation, and are the centre of the history of the nation.

10.5 WORDS OF HEAVENLY LIGHTS

In 4Q Dibre HamMeorot (4Q504) yśr'1 occurs six times. Each of these stresses the special relationship between God and the people. yśr'1 is named as "your people" in addresses to God (2:11; 4:7,9; 5:11; 6:12) and is named "my son, my first born" by God (3:6).

The long penitential prayer asks God to "let thy anger and wrath against all their sin turn away from thy people Israel" (2:11) because God, in the past, has been experienced as merciful. yśr'1 is "[God's] first born son" (3:6) in opposition to "the nations" who "are as nothing".

This choice of yśr'1 from among the nations is developed by the further choice of "the tribe of Judah" and then "David" within yśr'1. At 4:4-6 God has "loved Israel above all the peoples" and has

chosen the tribe of Judah and established your covenant with David that he might be as a princely shepherd over your people and sit before you on the throne of Israel for ever.

4:9 claims that "all nations have seen your glory, you who has sanctified yourself in the midst of your people Israel". The scroll sees the exile as God's judgement on yśr'1 but believes that it is neither final nor totally destructive, "You did not reject the seed of Jacob neither did you cast away Israel to destruction" (5:7) and "you were gracious towards your people Israel in all the lands to which you did banish them" (5:11). Finally the scroll asks God to "look on our [affliction] and trouble and distress, and deliver your people Israel" (6:12).

Baillet notes that the scroll is lacking in sectarian bias [671]. yśr'1 is always the name of the entire people. No group within the nation is singled out as

either particularly good or as especially bad, or as primarily responsible for the exile. The writer prays for the whole people including it all in yśr'1. yśr'1 excludes foreigners and occurs in opposition to various names for them.

10.6 BLESSINGS OF JACOB

In an interpretation of Jacob's blessing on Judah (Gen 49:10) 4Q PBless says that,

whenever Israel rules there shall [not fail] to be a descendant of David upon the throne. For the "ruler's staff" is the covenant of kingship [and the thous]ands of Israel are the "feet" until the Messiah of Righteousness comes, the Branch of David (frg. 1:1-4) [672].

The writers of the scroll hoped that one day soon yśr'1 would not only be independant of foreign rule but also dominate other nations. Then the ruler of yśr'1 could only be a member of the Davidic family, "to [David] and to his seed was granted the covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations" (line 4). The actual situation of the nation, ruled by foreigners and without a Davidic claimant to the throne, is criticised. yśr'1 is not only the authors group but is the whole nation. It is properly the name of a group ruled over by a king from one of the tribes which form yśr'1. The hoped for independance results from the activity of a Messiah sent by God, clearly yśr'1 is the name of a group intimately related to God's plans.

10.7 WORDS OF MOSES

Milik calls this scroll a "Petit Deutéronome" as Jubilees is a "Petite Genèse" [673]. In it yśr'1 refers to the wilderness generation waiting at Mount Nebo. Its action takes place in "the fortieth year after the children of Israel had come out of the land of Egypt" (1:1).

More specifically yśr'1 refers to the people as opposed to the priests and Levites. At 1:1-4 God divides the nation into "levites", "priests" and the "children of Israel" (1:1-4). The "heads of family of the Levites" and "all the priests" are to have "the Law which I proclaimed to you on Mount Sinai" interpreted to

them while the "children of Israel" have it "proclaimed" to them.

There is nothing specifically sectarian in the scroll. However, it would have been heard as a warning to the contemporary generation, based on what had happened to the entire nation. yśr'1 has the connotation of "the entire nation from the entry into the land until now". Warnings of exile would be balanced by the hope of a new return to the land of promise.

10.8 PESHARIM

There are a number of fragments of commentaries on Isaiah in which some of the occurrences are in quotations from Isaiah and others in interpretations.

4QpIsa(a) frg. 1, 1-4 reads,

[.. a remnant will return, the remnant of Jacob]
to the [mighty] Go[d.. 2..'remnant of I]srael':
it is [...3...] the leaders of his warrior band
and [...4..assembly] places of the priests, for
it [..

The interpretation of this quotation of Isa 10:21 appears to apply yśr'1 to the leaders of the people. If the text were not so fragmentary it might be possible to work out what relationship the priests have to the name.

4QpIsa(a) frgs. 8-10 line 3 interprets Isa 10:33,24 and 11:1-5 as concerning "the Ki]ttim who will beat down the House of Israel, byt yśr'1 are like poor ones of [...".

4QpIsa(b) 2:6-8 applies Isa 5:24-25 to the "scoffers in Jerusalem". They "have despised the Law of YHWH and scorned the word of the Holy One of Israel" and will be judged for it. God is also named "YHWH Holy One of Israel" in 4QpIsa(c) 2:3 quoting Isa 30:15-18.

The interpretation of Isa 54:11b given in 4QpIsa(d) 1:1 reads, "all Israel sought Thee according to Thy command". The interpretation of Isa 54:12b is said to "concern the chiefs of the tribes of Israel" (1:7). The interpretation of Isa 54:11c "is th]at they have founded the Council of the Community, [the] priests and the peo[ple...] a congregation of his elect" (1:2-3) which implies that yśr'1 has some relationship to the Community. "All Israel" is "all the people" but "the

tribes of Israel" are the non-priests. Whilst the scroll is concerned with the whole nation it focusses on the non-priestly "Israel" within the Community. The whole nation was involved in "seeking for God" but only some, the "council of the Community" or "the elect" (priests and people) actually returned to God's ways.

The final occurrence of yśr'1 among these fragments is in 4QpIsa(e) 6, line 1, where blhyry yśr'1, "the chosen ones of Israel" occurs. There is not enough of the text to decide exactly who is referred to, but it is likely that the name is applied to a group within the nation, probably the author's Community itself.

There are four occurrences of yśr'1 in frgs. 3 and 4 of 4QPesher on Nahum (1:8,12; 3:3,5; 4:3). The first occurrence refers to the entire nation in the past and is an interpretation of Nah 2:13 which is interpreted,

this concerns the furious young lion who executes revenge on those who seek smooth things and hangs men alive, a thing never done formerly in Israel.

This refers to a group wider than the Qumran community or to any single group within the nation, i.e. it refers to the whole nation throughout its history.

There is a possible occurrence at 1:12, though this is at the end of a column and only survives as fragments. Vermes has "Israel shall be delivered" [674]; but Lohse and Allegro read "they will give [...E]phraim, Israel will be given for[...]" [675]. This is in an interpretation of Nah 2:13 but nothing in the text provides enough information to say any more about yśr'1.

At 3:3 yśr'1 occurs in an interpretation of 3:6-7.

Its interpretation concerns those who seek smooth things whose evil deeds shall be uncovered to all Israel, kwl yśr'1, at the end of time.

which could refer either to the entire nation or to the community alone. "All Israel" refers to the majority of the nation, excluding the "Seekers of smooth things" whose interests are opposed to those of the majority. Those who have been "led astray" will be convinced that the Community is correct, then the whole people will be reunited.

In the past, present and future yśr l refers to the entire nation. Within it at present there are smaller groups, like the "Seekers of smooth things" and those responsible for the scrolls themselves.

At 3:5 yśr²l refers to the Community itself. When the "evil deeds" of the "Seekers of smooth things" have been exposed "the Glory of Judah, kbwd yhw dh, will arise and the Simple of Ephraim shall flee their assembly and join Israel". The text does not explain what is meant by "the Glory of Judah" making it impossible to be definite about what is hoped for here. Clearly, however, three groups are involved, "those who seek smooth things" (also called "Ephraim"), "the Simple of Ephraim" [676] (or "those led astray by the Seekers of smooth things") and "Israel" (probably here also called "Judah"). In the future the first group will be "exposed" in some event which will benefit the last group; the second group will be free then to join the third group.

At 1QpHab 8:10 Hab 2:5-6 is said to concern "the Wicked Priest who was called by the name of Truth when he first arose but when he ruled over Israel his heart became proud". yśr²l here refers to the entire nation. It is ruled over by a High Priest who, instead of serving God and the people, is accused of abandoning and robbing them, and of amassing a personal fortune from the wealth of foreigners. yśr²l itself is not condemned but defended by the scroll against this High Priest and his supporters. It refers to the nation beyond the writer's immediate group.

10.9 MIDRASH ON THE LAST DAYS

The first lines of 4QFlorilegium (4Q174 [677]) quote 2 Sam 7:10. As the manuscript is damaged the beginning of the quotation is missing, the existing text reads,

...] enemies. No son of iniquity [shall afflict them again] as formerly, from the day that [I set judges] over my people Israel, 'my yśr²l.

The scroll also talks of a "sanctuary" which "strangers shall not lay waste any more, as they formerly laid waste the sanctu[ary of I]srael, mqd[šy y]śr²l because of its sin" (1:6).

When the scroll interprets Amos 9:11 (at 1:13 in order to explain 2 Sam 7:12-14) the "fallen tent of

David" is said to be "he who shall arise to save Israel". The "tent of David" who needs to be "raised up" is also the "Branch of David" who will "arise with the Interpreter of the Law [to rule] in Zion [at the end] of time" (1:11-12). This yśr'1 which needs "saving" is the entire nation itself. This will involve the group also. "Israel" needs "saving" from foreigners and strangers. Those within the nation who oppose the Qumran group's ideas are condemned in the following verses.

In frg. 5 "Israel" is distinguished from "Aaron",

1..] when[...2...I]srael and Aaron [...3...k]now
that he [...4...] among all the seers.

If more of the scroll had survived there would have been further occurrences of "Israel" [678]. Though it is not clear what point is being made by this text, it is clear that "Israel" is distinguished from the priests.

10.10 MESSIANIC ANTHOLOGY

The first two occurrences of yśr'1 in the Messianic Anthology, 4Q175, are in quotations from Torah: line 12 is in a quotation of Num 24:15-17 [679]; line 18 is in a quotation of Deut 33:8-11. In these verses yśr'1 is the name of the nation. As used in this collection it refers to the nation in the future when the entire nation is to be ruled by God's chosen leader again.

Line 27 is part of a comment on Josh 6:26 ("cursed be the one who rebuilds this city!"). Having said that "they have rebuilt Jerusalem and have set up a wall and towers to make of it a stronghold of ungodliness", the scroll reads, "in Israel and a horror in Ephraim and in Judah... They have committed an abomination in the land". The text is too fragmentary to decide whether yśr'1 is inclusive of "Ephraim" and "Judah" or not. The names do, however, refer in this context to the wider nation. Not all of "Israel", "Ephraim" or "Judah" are condemned, only some "in" the groups referred to.

10.11 DAILY PRAYERS

In the evening and morning prayers set by 4Q Daily Prayers (4Q503 [680]) "Blessed be the God of Israel, brwk ʔl yśrʔl" [681] and "peace be on you, Israel" are refrains in the blessings. There is not enough detail here to tell whether these prayers were intended for the whole nation or for a small gathering. Although there is nothing specifically "sectarian" in the 225 surviving fragments [682], if the prayers were only to be spoken among one group "Israel" would refer to that group alone. Wider usage of the phrase "God of Israel" suggests, however, that "Israel" includes the widest possible community, past and present, "good" and "bad", within the nation.

10.12 ORDINANCES

In the fragments of 4Q159 there are five occurrences of yśrʔl [683]. The pattern of 4Q159 is not precisely that of the Pesharim in that it does not offer a text and interpretation. It offers expansions or applications of laws found in Torah.

The first occurrence (frg. 1, 2:4) is an expansion or application of Deut 23:25-26. Deuteronomy permits the gathering of grain by hand in a neighbour's field without the use of a sickle. 4Q159 says that one who is destitute may eat while in another's field but must not gather for others, but may both eat and take home from the threshing floor.

He who comes to the threshing fl[oor...] who is in I[sr]ael who has nothing shall eat and gather for himself and for his hou[sehold]. But should he walk among corn standing in] the field, he may eat but may not bring it to his house to store it.

In a poorly preserved section (frg. 1, 2:17) there appears to be an allusion to Exod 32:20, "con]cerning the people and concerning [their] gar[ments ... I]srael, Moses burnt...". The occurrences in frgs. 2-4 also related to various biblical passages. Line 2 says that a family which has lost its "guardian" must not be made to serve gentiles. The words "before Isra[el]" suggest that the writer believes the whole nation to be "guardians" for each other. The exodus from Egypt is noted as the reason why people should not be enslaved to

foreigners. Line 4,5 read, "and two priests and they shall be judged before these twelve [...] spoke in Israel against a person". Another legal issue is referred to in line 8, "if they defame a man concerning a virgin of Israel, btwlt yśr'1".

The yśr'1 of this scroll is distinguished from foreigners and from priests. It is not a sectarian group but refers to the whole nation which is expected to abide by a clear legal and ethical code.

10.13 VISIONS OF AMRAM

In 4Q Visions of Amram [684] the sole surviving occurrence of yśr'1 refers to the generation which left Egypt. It is used in a phrase dating the visions of amram (a Levite), in "the one-hundred-and-fifty-second year of Israel's exile in Egypt". In this (fragmentary) Aramaic text amram describes his vision of "the Watchers" and "Melkiresha". yśr'1 is the name of a past generation (exiled in Egypt for 210 years [685]). However, the scroll is part of the contemporary literature of a group to whom the name would have meant not only a past people, but "ancestors" and particularly "our ancestors". yśr'1 would remind the audience they they were linked to the events narrated.

10.14 TEMPLE SCROLL

In the Temple Scroll yśr'1 occurs thirty-eight times [686].

Three of these occurrences collocate with "land". At 58:6, in a discussion of how the king is to conduct himself in times of conflict, it is the king's duty to raise a suitably large army "if a large host comes to the land of Israel". At 60:12 instruction is given concerning the status of rural levites in the sanctuary, they are named, "a Levite who comes from one of your localities in the whole of Israel". At 57:21 the king is told not to covet "anything valuable in Israel".

Six occurrences refer to various parts of the Temple (37:5,12; 39:7,12; 40:3; 42:14). 37:5,12 deals with the purpose of the porticos. The offerings of the "Israelites" are to be put in different places to the sacrifices of the "priests" so that there will be no confusion. 39:7,12 deals with the middle court: those

restricted from it and the names of the gates. These gates are to be named,

according to the names of the sons of Israel: Simeon, Levi and Judah in the east; and Reuben, Joseph and Benjamin in the south; Issachar, Zebulun and Gad in the west; Dan, Naphtali and Asher in the north.

At 42:14 the porticos of the outer court are the location of the booths for the "elders of the community, for the leaders, for the heads of the houses of the fathers of the Israelites and for the commanders" to make them visible during the celebration of Succot. These functions of the parts of the Temple reflect its division into areas for "people" and areas for "priests", which reflects the division of the nation into those groups. It also shows the writer's concern to keep those groups separate and distinct.

22:11 provides instruction in atonement sacrifice which further illustrates this division,

The other shoulder they shall bring out to the Israelites. And the sons of Israel shall give to the priests one ram, one lamb, and to the Levites one ram, one lamb, and (thus) for each and every tribe.

The people is divided into Priests, Levites and Israelites; and also divided into twelve tribes named after the immediate sons of the ancestor Israel.

Three occurrences of yśr²l are in opposition to "foreigners" or "nations", (58:4,5; 64:10). 58:4,5 says that when foreigners seek to steal anything belonging to Israel, the king should send instructions to the military commanders who live in "the towns of Israel" to raise the militia. At 64:10 anyone "committed of a capital offence who flees to the nations and curses his people, the Israelites, should be hanged on the wood so that he dies".

yśr²l is also supposed to keep separate from "uncleanness". Several occurrences of yśr²l are concerned with the cultic purity of the people (49:9; 51:6,8). Conversely, the scroll recognises the sins of the people (26:11; 27:2; 55:6,20). yśr²l refers to people who ought to be, and are taught to be, pure but who are often unclean. The remedies for this are sometimes as drastic as the death penalty.

The majority of occurrences of yśr²l refer either to the whole nation in a general sense or to the whole nation gathered for some cultic purpose. Only at 63:7 is yśr²l "the people of God" when YHWH is asked not to "allow the guilt of innocent[ly shed] blood remain in the midst of your people Israel".

There is a single occurrence of yśr²l in a specific reference to a woman. At 65:15 the phrase "a daughter of Israel" occurs. The passage is about slander. Given that yśr²l normally refers to men, and then often in cultic situations, it is significant that when a woman is slandered it is stressed that she is "a daughter of Israel".

The use of yśr²l by the Temple Scroll describes a community whose history goes back to the exodus and wilderness. It is sometimes the name of the whole people, including its priests. Elsewhere priests and yśr²l are distinguished. In this scroll yśr²l is God's special audience (though only once is it named, "your people Israel"). It is distinguished from foreigners and taught to live by the purity laws as reapplied by this scroll. Whilst the community is primarily represented by its males (and even then some men are more significant than others) the name yśr²l does include women. Even when it is identified as "your people Israel" it is not a pure community.

10.15 CONCLUSION

In QL "Israel" is a name for a number of different, and even opposed, groups. It is used as a self-designation, collocating with words like "elect" and "covenant". It also labels the opponents of the scrolls' authors, collocating with words like "sinners" and "gone astray". It can be a more general name for a people distinguished from "the nations" who can be either "enemies" or "converts". "Israel" is sometimes the whole people regardless of status, but can refer to "the people" when in opposition to "priests" or "Levites". "Israel" is a name for a people with a long history which is continually referred to in QL, to exemplify either "good" or "bad". The scrolls are not, primarily, interested in history for its own sake, but as a source of examples and warnings to the current generation, their intended audience. In both "history" and in the current generation, "Israel" is primarily represented by males. "God" occurs in the context of many of the occurrences of "Israel". This does not mean

that "Israel" is a "pure" community, or that QL knows of any "True Israel". "Israel" in QL is a mixed community. It is this "real Israel" in which "God" and the scrolls are interested.

The "real Israel" is expected to "join the House of Judah", the Qumran community, to live a purified life in preparation for the future activity of God. "Israel" is an audience composed of good and bad. The name is not removed from the "bad", nor is there a threat that the name will one day be taken from them. Whatever happens to the "sinners in the House of Israel" they remain "Israel".

CHAPTER ELEVEN

ISRAEL IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

The name "Israel" (including the form israēlites) occurs 77 times in CCL [687]. The comparative rarity of "Israel" in CCL (ioudaios occurs 70 times in John's Gospel alone [688]) suggests that it had strong resonances for the early Christians. Given its conventional associations with beliefs about election, for example, it is to be expected that these associations were very positive ones. However, a word or a phrase's associations are not limited to its conventional ones, everyone is (more-or-less, even if unconsciously) free to add to the associative field differently.

11.1 MATTHEW

Of the 77 occurrences of "Israel" in CCL 12 are in Matthew [689]. The first of these (2:6) renders Micah 5:2 as "a ruler who will be a shepherd of Israel" will come out of "Bethlehem in the land of Judah" which is "far from the least of the rulers of Judah" [690]. Whilst "Judah" here refers to both the area, gē iouda, and the tribe, the name "Israel" refers to what Gutbrod calls the

people as a whole and in its essential being. Its essential being is that it is God's people. "Israel" is thus almost a supra-temporal entity [691].

Similarly Mayer says that "Israel" "refers to Jews as members of the people of God" [692].

Other occurrences of "Israel" do refer to the land: Joseph is told to "take the mother and child and return to the land of Israel, eis gēn israēl", and he does so (2:20,21). The story is set in "Egypt" which functions as the opposite of the "land of Israel". Hearing that Herod's son Archelaus rules in Judaea, Joseph is afraid to go there. Judaea is "the land of Israel". The family withdraws to Nazareth in "the district of Galilee, ta merē tēs galilaias" which is a district within "the land of Israel".

The family is understood to be a Judaeen (indeed Bethlehemite) one who must leave Judaea for another region of "the land of Israel" which does not include

Samaria because it was not considered, by the narrator, to be part of "the land of Israel" [693].

"Israel" is not commonly used as the name of the land [694]. Elsewhere the land is named according to regions ("Galilee" [695] and "Judaea" [696] for example). Matt 2:20,21 alludes to Jer 31:15 with its interest in the people's return to the land. This interest is, in turn, intimately related to the Joseph and Jacob narratives of Genesis and to the theme of Exodus. However, in these passages it is "Israel" that returns to a land (called "Canaan" in Genesis, "Judah" and "Zion" in Jeremiah) rather than a people returning to a land called "Israel".

"Israel" is used here to dramatise the events narrated. The unusual collocation of "Israel" with "land" is deliberate. The writer wanted to use a name closely related to biblical traditions about the land. The use of a name labelling the area as a Roman province would have implied a move from one foreign land to another land dominated by foreigners.

A number of occurrences of "Israel" in Matthew are in opposition to various names for "Gentiles" (either individuals or groups). In 8:10 "Israel" is opposed to "a centurion". The opposition is not straightforward, however, because "Israel" is also related to the expressions "the kingdom of heaven" and "the subjects of the kingdom". Whilst those named "Israel" ought to be those named "the subjects of the kingdom", and the "Gentiles" (here represented by "a centurion") ought to have been "outsiders" or "enemies", this centurion (and therefore other gentiles) is called "a subject of the kingdom". Meanwhile those called "Israel" are not part of "the kingdom". The grounds for this alignment is "faith", understood here as an appreciation of the power or authority of Jesus and of Jesus' desire to help everyone. "Israel" has not lost any of its conventional associations, but, as seen by the early Christians, the people called "Israel" are expected to have responded to Jesus with "faith". To paraphrase Pauline language, an "Israel by descent" is not necessarily "Israel which believes".

At 10:6 "Israel" is a group opposed to "Gentiles" and "Samaritans" [697]. It is primarily a "chosen audience", including "lost sheep" who need a shepherd or leader. This is an echo of Jer 50:6, Ezek 50:6 and Zech 11:17. "Israel" is not rejected or superseded for some failing. What is called "Israel" is a mixed community whose lack of leadership is no new phenomenon.

In 15:24 Jesus appears to act counter to his own command not to go to Gentiles. Again "Israel" is opposed to several other group names. Whilst in the region of Tyre and Sidon Jesus responds to the cry for help of a "Canaanite woman, gunē chania", that he has been "sent only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel" and that "it would not be right to take the children's bread and toss it to the dogs". Here even the "lost sheep of the House of Israel", are "children" whilst outsiders, particularly this "Canaanite", are "dogs". Much of the discussion of this passage evidences great embarrassment about the rudeness of Jesus.

In the context of the Gospel (as early Christian literature) the events of the visit to "Tyre and Sidon" form a transition between the redefinition of uncleanness (vv.1-20) and further narratives about the feeding of the children (15:29-16:12). The apparent reinforcement of the separation between "Israel" and "Gentiles" in fact opens the mission of the early Christians to include Gentiles. "Gentiles" do not become part of "Israel". They may no longer be necessarily "unclean" but this narrative is not interested in redefining the use of the name "Israel".

Miraculous happenings lead to the crowd praising "the God of Israel" in 15:31 (in fulfillment of Isa 29:18-19 [698]). According to Gundry, "those who saw were Gentiles, for 'they glorified the God of Israel'" [699]. This is unlikely. The audience in Mark's version are Gentiles and they are only "astonished". Matthew's context and scene is an Israelite one. This passage leads to the "children's bread" discussion. Secondly, and more importantly, the phrase "the God of Israel" here is comparable with usage in Psalms and elsewhere. Within CCL also the phrase "the God of Israel" is used in two other places (Luke 1:68; Acts 13:17) and not at by Gentiles.

At 19:28 Jesus promises those who have "left everything to follow" him that they will "sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel". This saying occurs among others about the "kingdom of Heaven". The Twelve disciples are part of both "Israel" and of the "kingdom of Heaven". They do not cease being "Israel" when they enter the "kingdom of Heaven", nor is "Israel" reserved only for the group of followers. "Israel" is a mixture of those who are followers of Jesus and those who are not. Whilst all are expected to ally themselves with the "kingdom of God", those who do not are still named "Israel" [700].

"Israel" is the name Matthew uses for the people also named ioudaioi; included under this name are Judaeans, Galileans, the leaders of the people and the followers of Jesus. "Israel" is applied to both the followers and the rejectors of Jesus. This work does not offer us the charter of a "New Israel" or a "True Israel". "Israel" is not synonymous with the expression "the kingdom of Heaven". That "the covenant community should reasonably be 'Israel'" [701] might be true, as it might be true that "Israel" ought to be within the "covenant community", yet for the writer of this Gospel "Israel" was the name not of a perfect community but of a chosen audience. That the audience often refused to hear is just as important a part of the name's associations as the idea that it would remain an audience nonetheless.

11.2 MARK

In the Gospel of Mark "Israel" occurs two times. The first of these (12:29) is a quotation of the Shema (Deut 6:4,5) which, Jesus tells a "teacher of the Law" [702], is "the most important commandment". "Israel" is the contemporary community who are united to the generation of Moses via the application of the Law. This "cultic" use of "Israel" makes it clear just where the distinction between "Israel" and any other group lies. "Israel" is not only "non-Gentiles" and not only "descendants of Abraham" but is a community centred on a particular religious ideal.

Mark's second use of "Israel" (15:32) is in the account of the crucifixion which says that the "chief priests and teachers of the Law mocked him among themselves" saying, among other things, "Let this Christ, the king of Israel, come down from the cross that we might see and believe". Attention has already been drawn to the sign on the cross reading "The king of Judaea" [703], to which no-one in this Gospel objects, and to the soldiers mockery of Jesus as "king of Judaea". Something in the core meanings of the two names means that they can refer to the same group or individuals. What needs to be decided is: given two such closely related words (perhaps synonyms) how did people decide to use one rather than the other in each instance?

The Romans named the region "Judaea" and its inhabitants "Judaeans", so to be "king of Judaea" is to be a client or puppet of the Romans or a revolutionary. However, the writer is generally disinterested in any

character's place of origin [704]. In Mark the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judaea prefer to name themselves "Israel". The writer and the Roman authorities prefer to name them ioudaioi. Jesus, however, is "king of Israel".

Jesus is named, in the ironic story of the mockery by the priests, as heir to the Davidic kings of Israel, those chosen and anointed as king by God (through prophets or prophecy [705]). christos occurs seven times in Mark [706]. It is used with a number of other titles [707] but it is these titles which further define christos rather than the contrary [708]. The title "king of Israel" explains the title "Christ". The writer intends us to link this verse with others in the Gospel where su ei is used to state things about Jesus [709] and also to ask things about him [710]. Kingship is central to the Gospel, especially in the mockery narrative. "Israel" is not an incidental detail here but is central to the proclamation about the Messiah to whom the readers are expected to respond. "Israel" is the name of a group related to "Messiah", it is a messianic community.

"Israel", the cultic community, centred on the Shema, is formed around God's chosen leaders. "King of Israel" means that Jesus is king of that cultic community. The Gospel of Mark invites its audience to believe that Jesus is God's Messiah.

11.3 LUKE AND ACTS

The first occurrence of "Israel" in Luke is in the angel's description of what John would be like (1:16). The angel expands Mal 4:5,6 with the prefacing remark that "[John] will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God" [711]. "Israel" is parallel to "a people prepared for the Lord" (1:17), i.e. they are already "God's people" but are not yet "prepared". They include a "multitude" praying outside the Temple whilst a priest "of the line of Abiathar, whose wife was a daughter of Aaron" was inside burning incense. Luke portrays "Israel" as a people at least some of whom live in Judaea who pray in large numbers and who are waiting for some sort of theophany.

Mary's "Magnificat" includes the lines,

[God] has helped his servant Israel,
in remembrance of his mercy,

as he spoke to our ancestors,
to Abraham and to his posterity for ever"
(1:54,55).

Some of the closest biblical parallels to these verses are found in Isaiah 40-45 (eg. Isa 41:8f) [712]. Whilst the servant is "Israel" it is also exemplified in individuals. Here Mary symbolises "Israel" the humble servant of God who has been poor and oppressed but is now being exalted and fed. "Israel" is also a group that spans generations back to Abraham and can look forward with Mary to generations who will remember God's activity on behalf of their ancestors. Within both Isaiah and the Magnificat "Israel" applies to both the oppressed servant(s) of God and to Israelite oppressors [713]. There is no "pure" community named "Israel" but rather "Israel" is the name of a mixed group of "good" and "bad" people.

The narrative of the birth and childhood of John the Baptist ends with the note that "the child grew and became strong in spirit and he was in the desert until the day of his manifestation to Israel" (1:80). The preceding prophecy makes it clear that John was in the wilderness to "prepare the way of the Lord" and that he would "give knowledge of salvation to the people [of the Lord]" (1:76,77). "Israel" is once again portrayed as a mixed group who receive God's attention and for whom God provides leaders. John was to be made manifest to the whole nation regardless of their piety because it was his message that would force them to align themselves with or against what (it was claimed) God was doing.

At 2:25 Simeon, "a righteous and devout man" living in Jerusalem, is introduced as "looking for the consolation of Israel". It is Jesus who will "comfort Jerusalem" and "console Israel". In Simeon's prayer (2:29-32) the writer again uses Isaiah (particularly 42:6; 46:13 and 49:6,9):

I have seen with my own eyes your salvation,
which you have prepared in full view of all
peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles
and glory to your people Israel.

The "glory of Israel" is not entirely a thing to be grateful for: the result will be "the fall and rise of many in Israel" through the "revealing of the secret thoughts of many" (2:34,35). For some who are called "Israel" the activity of God among them would be a time

of celebration, for others, also called "Israel", the time would be disastrous. The "secret thoughts" of many would be revealed as they "spoke against" or "reject" God's sign.

"Israel" is a mixed company who will respond differently and benefit differently from what the child would become. The lines are already drawn: whilst some spend their time in the Temple or elsewhere "looking for the redemption of Israel", many others are already dismissive of "the sign" given by "the God of Israel". The latter group will suffer humiliation. Even the group who are "waiting" will not escape unscathed in this meeting with God: Mary is told that "a sword will pierce your heart also".

This introduction is integral to the whole Gospel. It establishes that the audience for the claimed activities of God is a people who have consistently offered a mixed reception to God. That "Israel" is not opposed from the very beginning highlights the opposition and rejection when it does come. "Israel" is set up as particularly privileged. Both here and in the introductory chapters of Acts "Israel" and "the Jews" have had many great benefits from God but have failed to respond adequately by "their own fault" [714]. This highlighting of benefits in order to magnify the denunciation is comparable with Philo's portrayal of Flaccus,

I praise Flaccus not because I thought it right to laud an enemy but to show his villainy in a greater light. For to one who sins through ignorance of a better course pardon may be given but a wrongdoer who has knowledge has no defence but stands already convicted at the bar of his conscience [715].

At 4:25-27 "Israel" is used in opposition to "Sarepta, in the land of Sidon" and to "Syrian". Jesus is in his "home synagogue" in Nazareth responding to a criticism that he ought to do at home what he is reputed to have done at Capernaum. The remarks about "Israel", "Syria" and "Sidon" illustrate the saying "no prophet is welcome in his own country" (as demonstrated by the attempt to throw Jesus over the cliff). In contrast the people of Capernaum in the following pericope are much more welcoming. Nazareth is treated as a microcosm of the whole of "Israel". As the prophets in the past left "Israel" to go to foreign lands and foreign people so the town of Nazareth will be abandoned for its hostile

reaction to Jesus.

The writer uses the name "Israel" instead of the more widely used Palastina. Various geographical locations in which Jesus and John have operated have been noted: firstly in the Jordan valley (3:3), then in the wilderness (4:1,2), in Jerusalem (4:9) and now in Galilee (4:14). It is also noted that the devil showed Jesus "all the kingdoms of the world" (4:5). The conventional opposition of "Israel" to "Gentiles" and its associations with "people of God" made it the obvious name to use here. The name also has associations with the "bewitched" land which ejects its people and then receives some of them back, a land which God has left also [716].

There are further Isaianic allusions in 24:21 where two disciples say that they had hoped Jesus would be the one to redeem "Israel". Although the disciples soon rediscover hope, the writer first uses them to portray the lack of faith of the "Israel" which still existed outside the Church. The narrative provides the opportunity for the writer to explicitly blame the "chief priests and [Jewish] rulers" for killing Jesus. "Israel" is a mixed group formed partly of those who will respond "in faith" to Jesus and partly of those who will not do so. Both of these parts form one group and both parts need "redemption".

The first of the twenty occurrences of "Israel" in Acts [717] is at 1:6. The gathered apostles ask Jesus whether he is about to "restore the kingdom to Israel". The response to this is that they do not need to know about "times and seasons" but that after the "Holy Spirit has come upon you you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judaea and Samaria and to the end of the earth". Jesus is then "lifted up" out of their sight and an angel addresses them as "men of Galilee". The passage is partly concerned with geography. If there is any relation between question and answer then there is a relationship between the "kingdom" of "Israel" and these geographical locations. The passage is also intended as a reminder of Luke 24:21. The "redemption of Israel" and "restoring the kingdom to Israel" as seen by these disciples amount to very much the same thing: the simultaneous geographical expansion of the empire and the defeat of the present oppressors.

Part of the core meaning of "Israel" is "the people who live in this geographical location". Used in this sense it could be synonymous with "Judah" and other locations. The apostles already associate the name with

Solomon's empire, centred on Jerusalem and stretching to the "ends of the earth" [718] and expect the restoration of that empire. Jesus, however, implies that "Israel" is a group of people which needs the witness of the apostles. The writer claims that Jewish people misunderstood the nature of the "kingdom of God".

At 2:22 Peter, in the middle of a speech, addresses a crowd as "men of Israel, andres israēlitai". The same phrase occurs in four other places in Acts (3:12; 5:35; 13:16; 21:28). Here it is synonymous with "men of Judah and all who live in Jerusalem" (2:5) with which the speech begins, "brothers, andres adelphoi", (2:29) and "the house of Israel, oikos israēl" with which it ends.

In all these occurrences of "Men of Israel" the group addressed could also be named ioudaioi. The address is one which expresses respect and a positive response. It is implicit that both the speaker and the audience are "Israel". The unity of the group named "Israel" is its history, which is relevant to each speech in which the address is used. The history looks back to "Abraham and the ancestors" and to "Moses and the prophets". The centre of the history is a God who can be called "the God of Israel". "Gentiles" are outside of the group "Israel", although they can be linked to "Israel" through fear of "the God of Israel".

"Israel" is not tied to one geographical location any more than it is tied to one time (either past or present). It is not an exact synonym of ioudaios although the same people can be referred to by either name. The use of "Israel" in speeches suggests that "Israel" is associated with the relationship of a God with a people over a long period of time.

By way of summary it is perhaps sufficient to say that the phrase "Men of Israel" is an honorific term used in speeches. It is a flattering appellation, especially as a more diminutive "sons" might have been used [719].

The implication of the address, that women do not participate in the decision making processes of the people, must be taken into account by those currently arguing about women's roles in Christianity and Judaism. The fact that Luke's purpose is to show that the Jews did not listen, even when spoken to respectfully, and, despite every opportunity being given to them, must be taken into account by those engaged in Jewish-Christian dialogue.

In 2:22 "Men of Israel" is parallel to "house of Israel, oikos israēl", in 2:36. This honorific also occurs at 7:42 and in Heb 8:8 [720]. At Hebs 8:8 "house of Israel" parallels "house of Judah" in a quotation from Jer 31:31-34.

The phrase expresses the unity of the people in their common history and theology. At Acts 7:42 the "house of Israel" is again part of a quotation from the prophets, this time from Amos 5:25-26 [721]. It is possible (although no longer very important) that in Amos "Israel" originally referred to the northern kingdom. Yet this is not its only meaning. Within the canonical Amos "Israel" refers to the Davidic kingdom (9:14). In Acts 7, certainly, "Israel" means the ancestors of a Judaeans audience. The quotation from Amos is part of Stephen's telling of a history of Israel in which "Israel" occurs twice. In 7:23 Moses is said to have returned to Egypt to "visit his brothers, the sons of Israel"; in 7:37 Moses speaks to Israel, huios israēl. These people are named "our fathers" in vv.39 and 44. "Israel" is used here because it refers to theological history (or salvation-history).

In another address put in the mouth of Peter the people are again addressed as "Israel":

Rulers of the people and elders [722] be it known to you all, and to all the people of Israel, pasin humin kai panti tō laō israēl (4:8-10).

The speech itself is an accusation that this group has killed Jesus (named, somewhat enigmatically, "the Christ of Nazareth"). "Israel" is used here because the whole speech is concerned with God's choice and that of the people. The people's choice has been against that of God and this is something the prophets had foretold. "Israel" thus reminds the leaders that they rule over what is supposed to be a theocracy and one with a history which illuminates recent events. In the Passover Haggadah and elsewhere the solidarity of the people is commonly expressed ("not with them, but with us"). The result of using one name for all groups in the nation is a similar stressing of this solidarity. In the context of Luke's argument this further condemns the people.

The writer refers to the "peoples of Israel, laois israēl", in 4:27. The plural, "peoples", does not refer to different communities within the nation (Judaeans, Samaritans, Galileans, or Pharisees, Sadducees, etc.)

but interprets Psalm 2,

Why did the Gentiles, ethnē, rage and the peoples, laoi, plot vanities? The kings of the earth took their stand, and the rulers were gathered together, against the Lord and his against his Anointed (Acts 4:25-26 quoting Psalm 2:1-2).

Jesus is the "Anointed" and Pilate represents the "kings of the earth", Herod represents the "rulers". ethnē can only refer to the ethnēsin, the Gentiles. If laoi needs to be interpreted as something other than "Gentiles" its commonest referent is "Israel", hence laois israēl. It is the "chosen people of God" who spurn "God's anointed one" as is to be expected in Luke.

At 5:31 "Israel" occurs in a statement of the present activity of God as seen by the early Christians. This brief speech (attributed to Peter) claims that the "God of our ancestors" has made Jesus "leader and saviour, to give repentance to Israel". "Israel" is seen as a group with a history of involvement with a God whose typical activities are to be seen as operating through Jesus and his followers. The Sanhedrin (5:27) is expected to recognise this picture of "Israel". Despite the theocratic associations of "Israel" the theme of the need for repentance, forgiveness and new leadership show that no perfect state is associated with the name. "Israel" is a mixed group, an audience rather than willing participants. By the end of the work Luke aims to prove that the audience has finally turned its back.

The final occurrence of "Israel" in Acts is at 28:20. In a speech attributed to Paul [723] the apostle claims that "it is because of the hope of Israel that I am bound with chains". Having heard nothing about him from Judaea these leaders decided to come and listen to him at a second meeting where Paul concludes, "this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles, who will listen" (28:20).

This is the conclusion to which the whole work has been pointing and does not really need v29 (not found in all manuscripts) which says that "hoi ioudaioi departed arguing among themselves". In a speech to and about "Jews" Paul's message is the "hope of Israel" because "Israel" was associated with the activity of God on behalf of the nation. "Israel" is part of the literary-theological language of covenants and salvation-history. For Luke's message (that this uniquely privileged group have refused the gospel, which

has therefore gone to Gentiles) "Israel" was the most suitable word.

11.4 JOHN

In the Gospel of John the name "Israel" occurs only five times [724] but ioudaios occurs 70 times. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the writer chose to use "Israel" because it bore rich associations. This does not necessarily mean that it "does not carry with it the bad connotation often attached to hoi ioudaioi in this gospel" [725].

"Israel" first occurs in John at 1:31, in a passage similar to Luke 1:80 which ends the narrative of John the Baptist's infancy. John the Baptist's purpose was "that [Jesus] might be revealed to Israel". The interest of the writer is in the enlightenment of everyone by the "light which came into the world, ho kosmos", (1:9) who "came to his own home yet his own people received him not" (1:11).

The words of John the Baptist are those of the writer [726] who is not interested in the exact words spoken by anyone but in persuading people that Jesus is God's chosen and revealed one, the "taker away of the world's sins" and the "baptiser in the Holy Spirit". The revelation to "Israel" is not some temporary first step, the gospel is addressed to the chosen people of God, here and elsewhere named "Israel". The contrast here between "Israel" and "the World" is one of style rather than of theology or christology. "Israel" is the name of a spiritual (or imaginary) entity (equivalent to "the World" in this case).

At 1:47 Jesus says of Nathanael, "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!, ide alethōs israēlitēs en hō dolos ouk estin". Some translations of this verse interpret alēthōs by "true" (NIV) or "worthy of the name" (NEB [727]). Commentators discuss in what way Nathanael is different from other Israelites. Is he more honest, more forthright, or is it that he spends his time studying the Law [728]?

As alēthōs is an adverb not an adjective, it does not necessarily qualify israēlitēs [729]. It ought to be translated [730] by an exclamation such as "indeed", "certainly", "really" or "surely" (as it is in its seven other occurrences in this Gospel [731] and elsewhere in CCL [732]). That it is another way of writing amēn

(amēn) legō humin / soi, "Truly, (truly), I say to you", or "Truly, I assure you" [733] (which occurs frequently elsewhere, eg. Luke 12:44 [734]) is shown by the use of alēthos and ep alētheias in Luke 9:27 and 4:25, for example). There are not two types of Israelite, one true and one false, or one honest and one dishonest [735]. Nathanael is without a doubt an "Israelite".

As the few details given about Nathanael do not constitute what it means to be an "Israelite" it is to be expected that other information is given. Given that this Gospel is full of symbolic language which the writer does not spell out but expects the readers to think about (or have explained to them) it is more than reasonable to expect Nathanael's fig-tree to be more than an incidental detail [736].

It is unlikely that the writer meant us to think of Nathanael as doing anything specific under a fig-tree [737] but did mean us to think about Genesis 28 and 32. The vision promised to Nathanael is only paralleled by that of Jacob at Bethel, especially in the reference to the ascent and descent of angels. Like Jacob/Israel Nathanael will see heaven open, he will see the revelation of God upon earth.

For John, God is revealed in the person of Jesus, who is now the object of the angelic ascent and descent... Just as in his dream Jacob saw God, so now, claims the fourth evangelist, all believers can see God in the Son of Man [738].

Jacob becomes "Israel" in his response to God, Nathanael is an "Israelite" in responding to Jesus.

Nathanael's promised vision echoes John 1:14,18 and 32, begins to be fulfilled in 2:11, is echoed in chapter 3 and is central to the purpose of the Gospel as outlined in 20:31. Nathanael is the last called disciple and fulfils John the Baptist's purpose of "revealing Jesus to Israel".

It is Jesus who has a vision in which he had seen Nathanael sitting in peaceful prosperity under his own fig-tree, straight from Zech 3:10 and Mic 4:4. Nathanael had not been sitting under a tree when Philip called him (or, if he had been, it would not have been important) but he would do so one day as the Messianic Age had now dawned with the arrival of Jesus. Jesus knows that Nathanael is an israēlites because he knows that Nathanael is about to become his follower [739].

Nathanael fulfils this vision by his response, "Rabbi, you are the son of God, the king of Israel!" (1:49). That is, "since the messiah alone knows those who are his, you have named me and must therefore be the messiah".

This second use of "Israel" in the Fourth Gospel occurs in such close association with the description of Nathanael. The passage is carefully constructed to highlight the climax of John's introduction [740]. Roffe [741] and Trowbridge [742] provide detailed analyses of the many links between this passage and others in the Gospel.

In response to Nicodemus' words, "teacher come from God" (3:2) Jesus replies, "you are a teacher of "Israel" and yet you do not understand this?" (3:10). The following narrative centres upon the nature of the "kingdom of God" and the way in which it is known, or seen. As with Nathanael, so Nicodemus is known only in this Gospel and the purpose of their narratives is similar. Nathanael is symbolic of "Israel" which responds to God and to the kingdom of God, whilst Nicodemus is a "teacher of Israel" who ought to respond more adequately than he does. As Meeks writes,

The unbiased reader feels quite sympathetic with poor Nicodemus and the "believing" Jews with whom, it seems, Jesus is playing some kind of language-game whose rules neither they nor we could possibly know. What we are up against is the self-referring quality of the whole gospel [743].

For the writer the two phrases, "teacher come from God" and "teacher of Israel", ought to be synonyms. However, Nicodemus knows nothing worthwhile and should know better. In his final appearance he brings a large amount of spices intending to anoint Jesus' dead body. Sylva argues that this episode shows Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, "manifesting a lack of understanding of Jesus' life beyond death", i.e. they fail to understand "the 'lifting up' of the Son of Man" [744]. Nathanael responds positively to the "ascending and descending" and is therefore "an Israelite", Nicodemus expects an un-risen dead body and is therefore only ironically "a teacher of Israel". He remains a "proximate other" [745].

In his several appearances in the Gospel Nicodemus remains among "the Jews". He would be a "disciple" but

for "fear of the Jews" (19:38-39). He is a "tertium quid", part of "this world", "the Jews" and connected with darkness (3:2; 19:39) but also on the periphery of the "disciples", those "born from above".

Nicodemus moves through the narrative with one foot in each world, and in this Gospel that is just not good enough" [746].

His links with "the Jews" predominate and that is a damning difference. He remains "a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews" (3:1 [747]) and represents what Paul would call the "Israel after the flesh". John sees no value in such an "Israel".

The "Israel" of which Nicodemus is "a teacher" is no different to John's disparaged "Jews". John refers to Nicodemus as "Israel" ironically and as "Jew" in line with his particular use of that name. The two names are synonymous in reference to Nicodemus. "Israel" is a mixed community, some believe and are "born from above" (but do not, in that process, become "true Israelites"). Others, who do not respond adequately, become what John chooses to call "the Jews". Nicodemus' tertium quid of sympathetic but unconvinced people, in the end, remain part of "this world" of those who "did not recognise" Jesus adequately. "Israel" can refer to all three groups although the writer prefers to use "the Jews" to label the two deprecated groups.

"Israel" at 12:13 also collocates with "king": "Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, even the king of Israel!". The exclamation is a traditional one, drawn from Psalm 118 (traditional at Passover). The addition of "king of Israel" emphasises that the exclamation is to be taken as a prophetic welcoming for a Messianic king (although a Messianic Priest might be closer to the ethos of Psalm 118). It also has the effect of linking the contemporary "Israel" with the cultic community who have always celebrated Passover.

John's "Israel" is a mixed community. It is related to the people who have a long history of relationship with God, prophets and scripture. It is not, however, limited to "good" people. It is applied to the antithetical characters Nathanael and Nicodemus. One is like the first ancestor named "Israel" in that he will see the open heavens and respond adequately. The other is one who teaches a community who, for the most part, reject the gospel. John links "Israel" to visions and messianic hopes but also with rejection. The use of

"Israel" in this gospel highlights the overwhelmingly negative use of "Jews".

11.5 ROMANS

The eleven occurrences of "Israel" in Romans are all in chapters 9-11 [748]. In these same chapters ioudaios only occurs twice (at 9:24 and 10:12) whereas in the rest of Romans it occurs nine more times [749]. The number of occurrences of "Israel" is not surprising as these chapters are concerned with the relationship between God and Israel and between Israel and the Gentiles. They are the "climax of the letter", rather than an "appendix to chs. 1-8" and in them,

Paul is not carrying out such a polemic against the Jews [as Bornkmann argues], but is rather giving an apology for his mission in which he reflects on the mystery of God's dealings with Israel [750].

Lindeskog notes the opinion that "the real purpose of the Epistle to the Romans is the theme which Paul develops in Rom. 9-11", namely that "the aim of the Pauline mission to the Gentiles is in fact the salvation of Israel" [751].

Paul first says of his "brothers, those of my own race" that "they are Israelites, hoitines eisin israēlitai" (9:4). At 11:1 he writes about his ancestry, "I myself am an Israelite, egō israēlites eimi, a descendant of Abraham, a member of the tribe of Benjamin". This is not mere biographical information but is an important part of the argument. Paul names himself an "Israelite" because he is addressing the problem of the relationship of "Israel" to the activity of God. It is first established that Israel has a history of intimate relationship with God and that the God at work in Jesus Christ is the same God known to Israel. It is also established that at least some "Israelites" are believers in Jesus Christ. There is continuity from ancestors, covenant and Law to what God is claimed to be doing now. God has "by no means" rejected "Israel" (11:1) and neither a rejection nor Israel's "unbelief" are subject of these chapters [752].

The problem of these chapters for early Christianity is that not all who are called "Israel" are members of this community of believers. Paul's first suggestion as to the cause of the division is that "not all who are

descended from Israel are Israel" (9:6), i.e. the continuity from the ancestors is not simply a matter of birth, the choice of God is involved. Not every descendant of Abraham lives within the covenant and Law given by God. In fact, "as Isaiah cries out concerning Israel" (9:27) in an inversion of the promise to Abraham,

though the number of the sons of Israel, huiōn
israēl, be like the sand by the sea, only a
remnant will be saved, for the Lord will carry
out his sentence on earth with speed and
finality (9:27-28 quoting Isa 10:22-23).

Meanwhile some of the Gentiles, who are not heirs to this history of relationship with God, who are not known as "my people", will become "my people" (9:25 quoting Hos 2:23).

"Israel" at 9:31 is opposed to "Gentiles" in v30. Paul recognises that there is a problem with the foregoing argument: it could imply that all of the history of Israel has been unnecessary. If Gentiles could become "people of God" without trying whilst "Israel" is rejected despite having lived within the Law, what is the point of talking about ancestors, covenant and Law at all? Why not forget them and start again? The ensuing argument is about the grounds of relationship with God. In it Paul recognises that his "kinsmen by race" are as much "Israelites" as he is (9:4) and that he is one "flesh" with them (11:14).

Within the tradition of Israel (according to Paul) relationship with God is based on faith. By quotations from the Law and the Prophets he claims to show that this is not an innovative approach. "Israel" is often disobedient but is not rejected, God still expects them to turn again (according to Isa 65:21 as quoted in Rom 10:21). Paul is himself an example of "Israel" which is not rejected. He claims to be another example of God keeping a remnant when judging the nation. The foundation of this idea is the Elijah narrative of 1 Kgs 19:10-18, cited in Rom 11:3, "the scripture says of Elijah that he pleads with God against Israel". Elijah is wrong, however, because "Israel" is not all corrupt.

Paul then develops the argument that part of "Israel" "did not obtain what it sought" (11:7). He concludes that "Israel has experienced a hardening until the full number of the Gentiles has come in, and so all Israel will be saved" (11:25-26).

This conclusion is intimately related to Paul's narrative about the olive tree in 11:16-24 [753]. The Gentiles are like wild olive shoots. Israel is the roots and trunk of the tree as well as its branches. Some of those branches, being unproductive, have been "broken off" but others continue to flourish. The place of the broken off branches has been taken by the ingrafted wild olive shoots. According to Ziesler and Baxter the purpose of grafting wild olive shoots into an olive is to improve the health and productivity of the cultivated tree [754]. However, Paul's main point is not that "it is an old tree which has been injected with new life" [755] but that the Gentiles had no connection with God until they were joined into a relationship with Israel. He stresses not that Israel has gained new vigour and productivity but that the Gentiles must not be either proud of their new life nor unproductive in it. What Israel gains by the ingrafting of Gentiles is "jealousy" (11:11-12). Seeing the fruitful acceptance of the Gentiles by God Israel may believe and be grafted back in again (11:23-24). Despite Baxter and Ziesler's interpretation, Paul does talk not only of the proper practice of grafting wild shoots into cultivated trees but also of the unnatural, and impossible, regrafting of unproductive and previously pruned branches back into the tree. God, however, "has power to graft them back in" (11:23) so that, in the end, "all Israel will be saved" (11:26).

A consistent picture emerges from the ten occurrences of "Israel" in Rom 9-11. Only if read on its own could 9:6 be read as support for the use of the phrase "True Israel". In context "Israel" is used as the name of a mixed group including believers like Elijah and Paul (followers of the example of Abraham's faith) and those who are "hardened against the word of God" (a state which is normative for "outsiders" like Pharaoh). "Israel" is not used of Gentiles even when they are part of what the prophecies call "my people". Paul quotes the prophecies but does not re-evaluate what "Israel" might mean. It is not removed from those who are also ioudaioi to be applied to what might be labelled as "everyone within the 'new' covenant".

In Romans Paul labels two not (yet) entirely separate entities, "Israel". One is an "Israel after the flesh", descendants of Abraham. The other is a community of those who have believed in Jesus. The latter are a sub-group of the former, do not replace it and remain, for Paul, linked to it. The Gentiles who believe are joined into this believing group and are told not to despise those they have joined nor those who have been

"cut off" to make room for them. Paul could answer the question, "Who is Israel" by saying, "the children of Abraham and Sarah" as well as by invoking the "political metaphor" of "people" or "nation" [756].

Later Christians found the genealogical metaphor "inconsequential" if not damning. "Israel after the flesh" having rejected the Church's claims now had no reason, in the Church's view, to continue existing. That they did exist added to their culpability. To other writers than Paul

Israel's disobedience is not only not accidental to God's plan of salvation, it has become an essential part of its fulfilment" [757].

Paul's other "Israel", the "people of God" was the only "Israel" to which later Christians would apply the name. "Israel after the flesh" could be labelled "Jews" as soon as its overwhelmingly derogatory overtones (absent from Paul's writings [758]) were established.

11.6 1 CORINTHIANS

The sole occurrence of "Israel" in 1 Corinthians is at 10:18. The chapter is concerned to show that participation in christian communion wine and bread invalidates the worship of idols. Readers are invited to "consider the people of Israel after the flesh, blepete ton israēl kata sarka" (10:18), to see that eating food from a sacrifice is different from eating ordinary food. This could be a reference to šēlamim or pesah offerings (consumed partly by the offerer and partly by the altar) or to the fact that priests are permitted to eat from other sacrifices.

"Israel" is synonymous with "our fathers, hoi pateres hēmōn", rather than "brothers", adelphoi, in 10:1. That is to say, it is previous generations or, more specifically, tradition itself which readers are asked to consider. They are therefore expected to know about the sacrificial system from their knowledge of scripture rather than from participation in Jerusalem's cult. The qualification kata sarka is not a derogatory epithet (cp. "carnal" in 3:1) but should be translated as "the racial group". "Flesh" frequently means "kinship" (e.g. Gen 2:23 [759] or "blood relatives". Here it stresses the unity of the nation as a racial group [760]. The passage does not talk about a "carnal Israel" nor does it imply the existence of any other

("spiritual, kata pneuma") Israel. Phrases like ho israel tou theou (Gal 6:16) may imply the possibility of a phrase such as israel kata pneuma but they are not relevant in this context. Some commentators are motivated in their search for such phrases by their need to prove that Christians are the "new Israel of God" rather than by concern to discuss the text [761].

11.7 2 CORINTHIANS AND PHILIPPIANS

"Israel" occurs at 2 Cor 3:7,13 and 11:22. At 3:7,13 it means the generation of Moses. "Israel, huios israel, could not look at Moses' face because of the splendour" when he gave the Law. "Moses veiled his face so that Israel, huios israel, did not see the glory fading". The present generation are related to that of Moses because "even today when Moses is read a veil covers their hearts" (3:15). The contrast is with the Christian group who are said to be like Moses in that "when he turned to God the veil was removed" and therefore they "reflect the splendour of the Lord". The name "Israel" is applied, explicitly, only to Moses' generation and only implicitly to the present generation. It is not, however, applied to the Christian group.

At 11:22 israelitai is used of the present generation and of Paul himself. In boasting his credentials [762] he asks,

Are they Hebrews, hebraioi? So am I. Are they Israelites, israelitai? So am I. Are they Abraham's descendants? So am I. Are they servants of Christ? So am I. Are they servants of Christ? I am out of my mind to talk like this but I can outdo any one of them (11:22-23).

From the fourth question and the context it is clear that the argument is with Christians. Despite the claim that "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile" (Gal 3:28) the community was divided along these lines. "Hebrews" is a claim to be following tradition, to be "orthodox" and non-innovative. "Israelite" here means more than "not a Gentile", it is a claim to be one of "God's people". The same point is made in Phil 3:5 where the credentials listed are,

circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as to Law a Pharisee, as to zeal a

persecutor of the Church, as to righteousness under the Law blameless (3:5-6).

These credentials are said to be worthless and a new position "in Christ" is sought after. Whilst a different sort of righteousness is looked for no new names are offered.

11.8 GALATIANS

Gal 6:16 reads, "Peace and mercy to all who follow this rule, even the Israel of God". It is this verse more than any other which lends itself to the "True Israel" interpretation. "Israel" is used as a name for the people addressed by the letter, Christians. It is implied that there is an "Israel" which is not "of God", i.e. there is a "True Israel" and a "False Israel".

The immediate context is a final warning against those who want to administer circumcision as a mark of true faith (thereby using their own circumcision as a mark of authority). The writer claims that neither circumcision nor un-circumcision mean anything. Once this "dividing wall" is demolished the name "Israel" is available for application to either group in the dispute. This polemic [763] is similar to that of 2 Cor 11:22 where various groups, each claiming to be most representative of what God wants, use the same names to reinforce their claim. In 2 Corinthians the answer was "I am all those things but I still disagree with you". Here it is "all those names and signs are irrelevant because we are talking about something new and God decides what Israel is".

Indeed, the whole work argues this case. "Israel" is a synonym of "the children of Abraham". These "children" are "those who believe, hoi ek pisteōs" (3:7). Tradition has it that "in Abraham all nations shall be blessed" (3:8-9). It is no longer a question of "Jews" on one side and "Gentiles" on the other, because the faith of Abraham (displayed prior to the Law and circumcision [3:15-18]) is now displayed among the Gentiles. Thus the associations of names need to be rethought. ioudaios is no longer (if it ever was) synonymous with "the people of God" and "Gentile" is no longer (if it ever was) synonymous with "strangers to God". Since "Israel" has always been associated with "the people of God" it will now, in this polemic, serve to demonstrate that when all the barriers are down God has one people regardless of their origin. Outside of

this polemic "Israel" is not used of the new group. In as much as this polemic interacts with other uses of "Israel" the name cannot be said to have been usurped by the Christian group at this date.

11.9 EPHESIANS

In Ephesians the division between "Israel" and the "Gentiles" is again in view.

Remember that at one time you Gentiles in the flesh, ethnē en sarki, called the uncircumcision by what is called the circumcision (which is made in the flesh by hands) - remember that you were at that time separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of "Israel" and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world (2:11-12).

After the work of Christ, however, these Gentiles are said to have become "members of the household of God, fellow citizens" (2:19). The Christian group is seen as a continuity from ancient "Israel" - part of the one people of God. Originally the members of this group came from those who could be called "the circumcision", or "Jews", a group very much aware of a tradition of relationship with God. Then Gentiles were welcomed into this group and became citizens with "Israel".

11.10 REVELATION

The first occurrence of "Israel" in Revelation uses the example of Balaam against the Church of Pergamum, "Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before Israel, ton huion israēl" (2:14). This warning with its use of the name "Israel" only makes sense if there is perceived to be a link between the generation of "Balaam and Balak" and that of the writer. The writer claims that the church in Pergumum inherits traditions from "Israel" through the Church's inheritance of the bible.

At 7:4 and 21:12 the phrase "the tribes of Israel", phulēs huiōn israēl, is used. Chapter 7 lists the names of the twelve tribes and says that out of each tribe 12000 are sealed as "the servants of God". In chapter 21 the twelve gates of the new Jerusalem are said to be inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes. These

occurrences claim a continuity from the bible's "12 tribes of Israel" through the twelve apostles (whose names are inscribed on the twelve foundations) to the revealed "new or heavenly Jerusalem" and its inhabitants. This interest in a "new" or "restored" Jerusalem is similar to that at Qumran and Leontopolis [764]. Revelation draws much of its symbolism from Judaeon imagery, such as the "lion of the tribe of Judah" (5:5), and this interest in the new Jerusalem is at its heart.

In short, Revelation claims that the Church is the only community to be properly called ioudaioi and to correctly appreciate what God is doing. "Israel" in Revelation is the name of a community descending from ancient times through to the current generation. It labels both good and bad, but within "Israel" are some who are correctly named ioudaioi and others who incorrectly name themselves ioudaioi.

11.11 CONCLUSION

In CCL "Israel" refers to a people with an ancient tradition and association with a God who is claimed to be active in their history. It is not applied to a pure community, but to "good" and "bad".

The collocations, "the God of Israel", "the twelve tribes of Israel" and the messianic title "king of Israel" link the people with past cultic events and to a religious ideal, a community responding to God. "Israel" is the audience for God and for prophets, Jesus, apostles and preachers. However, this audience does not always respond positively. Although this does not mean that they cease being "Israel" it does, in some of the literature, notably in Luke and John, add to the culpability of the people. The community has always offered a mixed reception to God and to the prophets. Now they are blamed for rejecting and killing God's anointed "king of Israel".

Later Christian writings saw no value in the "Israel after the flesh" that Paul said had so many benefits. They stressed the name's associations with "good" and rejected its associations with "an audience who might reject".

Generally "Israel" links the current generation with all previous ones. The name reminds people of the tradition. The address "men of Israel", an honorific,

stresses these links and invites a positive response. Contemporary "Israel" is invited to respond to Jesus as the ancestor "Jacob" responded to God and became "Israel".

"Israel" is also associated with an ancestor who had a vision of angels "ascending and descending". This association is picked up by John and made central to the idea of proper response to Jesus. "Israel" ought to "see God" (or at least the open heaven) but is often taught by those who do not understand. Those who do not respond adequately remain "Israel" although John prefers to name them "Jews" and disparages them as the rejecting "world" by whatever name he gives them.

Apart from in the Johannine association of "Israel" with "the world", the title "Israel" is frequently opposed to "Gentiles" and sometimes to "Samaritans". However, it is not synonymous with "the kingdom of God", which can not only include "Gentiles" but also excludes "the lost sheep of Israel".

The association of "Israel" with a territory is of little significance in CCL except when used to associate contemporary actions of God, or God's messengers, with things that happened in the past in "the land of Israel".

"Israel" in CCL is a supra-temporal entity linking past, present and future generations of God's chosen audience. The audience is one which has never consistently responded positively but is continuously invited to do so. CCL, almost uniquely among ancient Jewish literature, contains passages which say that "now it is too late, the audience which rejects is itself rejected". I have argued, however, that this rejection of "Israel" is to be found not in the Pauline writings but elsewhere, especially in Luke and John.

CHAPTER TWELVE

CONCLUSION

According to Hill the habitual usage of patristic authors is echoed in the Old English poem Andreas, which claims that,

when God contemplated the sufferings of Matthew,
he was mindful of how He had often shown love
for the 'Hebrews' and the 'Israelites', the
traditional names for the Jews as the people of
God; and He also remembered how He had withstood
the 'galdorcraeftum' [blasphemous deceits] of
the Jews [765].

This usage is a development from ancient Jewish usage mediated by later Christian usage [766]. Whilst Justin Martyr's distinctive collocation, "True Israel", was an innovation dependent on the divorce of Christianity from Judaism, it is also an extrapolation from ancient Jewish usage.

In ancient Jewish literature the three names "Jew", "Hebrew" and "Israel" were not exactly synonymous. Although there are places where the names could be interchanged, there is also sufficient separation in the range of their associations to say that writers generally had clear reasons for using one name rather than another.

1. "Jew" in ancient Jewish Literature

Previous studies of the name "Jew" have been, for the most part, accurate descriptions of its actual usage. The chief inadequacy of some of them is their use of the "insider versus outsider" dichotomy which assumes that ancient authors were interested in accurately recording the words of "outsiders" and also assumes that "insiders" and "outsiders" consistently used different designations. Users of this approach claim that "Jew" is a name given by "outsiders", or used by "insiders" when "outsiders" are listening, for a people who preferred to name themselves, "Israel".

However, many of the narratives in which "insiders" and "outsiders" are in contact are not reports of actual meetings inserted by a writer but were written by and for a particular context. For example, it is misleading to assume that the MT records the actual words of historical Philistines or John's Gospel those of an

historical Nicodemus. The literature available to us is by "insiders" for "insiders" and the names used are those of writer, readers and hearers. Other reasons for the diversity of names in some narratives are required. These should be looked for within the context and the wider associations of the names used.

"Popular etymology", in which "Judah, yehudah" is derived from "praise, hodah", has not dominated discussion of the name as it has in the case of the names "Hebrew" and "Israel". Clearly neither Judaeans nor individuals named Judah are consistently praiseworthy, but are frequently judged or condemned. Neither is the association with the first ancestor named "Judah" determinative of its later associations.

"Jew" is often a neutral term. It is not strongly associated with cultic activity or with a God, though that activity occurs in Jerusalem and the activity of "the God of Israel" is focussed on Jerusalem. "Jew" is more generally applicable than "Hebrew" or "Israel" which carry distinctive, limiting, associations.

The major associations of the name "Jew" are with a territory centred on Jerusalem. "Jews", even when happily settled in distant places, are "people related to Judah and Jerusalem". However rooted they have become in these foreign places, even to the extent of adopting foreign names, those who name themselves "Jews" are linked to Jerusalem. Various means of expressing this link were available, for example, paying temple taxes, pilgrimage and supporting Judaeian causes. Some communities and individuals continued to use "Jew" as a self-designation even when they ceased sending these taxes or refused to support Jerusalem, for example in its revolt against Rome. The name "Jew" was still used by them and of them because aspects of their customs and religion were associated with those of their ancestral home.

The neutral associations of "Jew" made it more widely applicable than "Hebrew" or "Israel". It was therefore taken up by "outsiders" such as the Romans who used the name for the people whether they lived in Judaea or in Rome.

The adjective "Jewish" was also available in the period of interest. It meant more than the distinctive language of the people, for which the term "Hebrew" was now used, and could apply to various aspects of the people's culture and institutions and eventually to their distinctive religion.

Not all groups within ancient Judaism associated Jerusalem and its surrounding area with positive values. In QL and CCL Jerusalem was the perceived location of present opposition and rejection. Though both considered the city to have been the site of their God's past self-manifestations and also hoped that the city would one day either be purified or replaced by a "new Jerusalem", the contemporary city was corrupt. Although people related to Jerusalem and Judaea (the Qumran community and Paul for instance) are named "the House of Judah" or "Jews", or portrayed as a Judaeans (like Jesus in the Fourth Gospel), these designations only serve to highlight the culpability of those "Jews" who have not joined the community.

The contemporary rediscovery of the "Jewishness of Jesus" is motivated by opposite and healthier concerns than early Christianity's initial use of the idea. What once highlighted the culpability of the Jews (as rejectors and even killers of Jesus) now points to the importance of Judaism (ancient and modern) for understanding Christianity.

The problem in both QL and CCL was the "Judaeans" or "Jews", whether they lived in Jerusalem or elsewhere. If they did not join the group responsible for the literature they became "opponents", though they are not (yet) denied the appellation, "Israel". The possibility of leaving the opposing group was greater in QL than in CCL, in which "Jew" becomes increasingly negative. The term "Judaizer" is a clear example of this trend towards negative associations. From being a neutral or positive term for people who sympathise with or join the Jewish community, it becomes a derogatory epithet for a hostile group.

"Jew" is primarily associated with Jerusalem and Judah. The value put on the name, whether positive, neutral or negative, depends on the writer's view of the area and events which have happened, or are happening or will happen there.

2. "Hebrew" in ancient Jewish Literature

Studies of the name "Hebrew" have suffered from an obsession with the origins of the people. This is not a concern of the literature discussed which is unaware of the existence of a group labelled habiru or 'apiru. A synchronic reading of the MT is liberated from the quest for original meanings. It is able to see that the text itself is an attempt to create and mould the character

of the people rather than an attempt at recording their historical origins. In this reading it is more important to ask how the text uses the name than where the name originated.

The primary association of the designation "Hebrew" in the literature discussed is not with the language named "Hebrew". Nor is the opposition between "Hellenistic" and "Hebrew" in a few passages in CCL indicative of the strongest associations of "Hebrew". Distinctions in language and culture are not as central to "Hebrew" as they are to "Hellenistic" in ancient literature in general.

The strongest association of the name "Hebrew" is with Abraham, the first individual to be named "the Hebrew" in scripture and tradition. The name is primarily associated with a period before any divisions among the people, to a time of unity and close association with their God. In contrast, "Jew" and "Israel" are both associated with later individuals, events and locations of disunity.

The similarity of consonant sequences in ḥabar, "to cross", and ḥibrim, "Hebrews", suggested to some authors the popular etymology, "Hebrews are those who cross boundaries". However, this is not a dominant association even in those texts where such a link is drawn.

All "Hebrews" are compared, in the occurrence of the name if nowhere else, with Abraham. "Hebrew" implies conservatism or traditionalism. Exactly what was involved in being conservative, or which traditional values were stressed, varied in different literatures. If sabbath law observance was central to the conflict between conservatives and innovators (or syncretists) then the "Hebrews" ought to be those loyal to the tradition. Josephus' "Hebrews" are those who do not desecrate the sabbath by killing people, and do not forcibly circumcise Gentiles.

It is in the nature of religious conflict that innovators claim to be within the tradition. Therefore, the name "Hebrew" is often used as a self-designation by innovators or those doing strange things, such as Paul preaching a new Judaism or Jonah fleeing the God he claims to serve.

In the extant literature, all of it more or less polemical, "Hebrew" is often a self-designation of those who changed the tradition. The name was used precisely

because such innovators wanted to claim that their actions were in some way authorized by more widely accepted traditions. This was possible because, as noted in the introduction, there was no orthodoxy in this period. Among the many alternative Judaisms the name "Hebrew" was available as a self-designation to assert the positive value of a person's own version. "Hebrews" are "good Jews".

3. "Israel" in ancient Jewish Literature

The quest for a "True Israel", or pure community, and overwhelming interest in etymology and archaeology have seriously affected previous studies of the name "Israel". "Israel" has been claimed to be an "insider's" name for a community linked with "the God of Israel".

"Israel" can refer to a territory or to a people. When it refers to a people it is, unlike "Jew", not primarily associated with a geographical area. The inhabitants of the territory (the borders of which are different in different narratives) are given various names. When the territory "Israel" is the northern kingdom its inhabitants are often named "Ephraim". When "Israel" refers to the whole of Palestine its inhabitants are often "Jews".

"Israel" is primarily the name of a people. It is linked to an eponymous ancestor, also named "Jacob" whose actions and character (good and bad) are those of the people. Although it is linked with a God in the phrase "the God of Israel" (and is distinct from "Jew" in this way also) "Israel" is never a totally pure community: it can be either commended or condemned. "Israel" is an audience for this God and for the authors of the literature discussed.

"Israel" does not have the associations of conservatism that "Hebrew" does, nor does it have the strong links with a territory that "Jew" has. Collocations like "the God of Israel" and "the congregation of Israel" suggest strong links with sacred things. However, "Israel" is not a pure community. Conversely, it is not continuously condemned and even "under judgement" people are not denied the appellation, "Israel".

Unlike "Jew" and "Hebrew" the name "Israel" can be used as a designation for the people in distinction from priests, levites and other cultic officials. It can

also refer to the majority of the nation in distinction from a smaller group whose minority status is the concern of the passage.

A number of popular etymologies for "Israel" are offered in the literature discussed but are not especially important in the wider usage of the name. However, the association of "Israel" with "seeing God" is central to Philo's use of the name. The association of the people with an eponymous ancestor and the various popular etymologies linked with the name provide a useful foundation for exhortation in Genesis and Hosea. In none of these, however, is "Israel" either completely praiseworthy or completely contemptible.

"Israel" is a primarily a designation for an audience addressed by God, prophets and writers. The Shema invites the people to "hear", Hosea exhorts them to stop being as devious as Jacob, Philo encourages them to really become "those who see God", Paul (in Acts) tries to persuade them to listen to his speech. "Israel" names an audience which the user is attempting to convince or convert.

NOTES

- [1] Cohen, S.J.D., "Crossing", 14.
- [2] Schmitt, "Gender". Also see Callaway, Sing, 73-90.
- [3] I have no confidence that this God can be named "she" and believe that those who wish to speak of a non-sexist divinity should find or create a different tradition.
- [4] Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet 2.2.43,44.
- [5] Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho 125, 1-3.
- [6] This trend is also exemplified in Karl Barth; see Romans, 335 and CD 195-259 which applies "Israel" to Christians alone and delegitimises Jews.
- [7] See Kraft, Nickelsburg, (eds.), Early Judaism, for a recent survey of modern interpretations.
- [8] BCE and CE now commonly replace the Christian BC and AD. The ambiguity of a "common era" dated (roughly) by the birth of Jesus only thinly veils a reference to a "Christian era" in the newer terms. "Christian era" was used, for example, by Jackson, Josephus, 63.
- [9] Vermes, "Methodology".
- [10] See discussion in Klein, Anti-Judaism, especially 15-38. The terms are used, for example, in the title of Cullmann, Der johanneische Kries: sein Platz im Spätjudentum and Cavallin, "Leben"; and in the title of the series Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums (see Finkel, Pharisees).
- [11] Koch, "Ezra", 174,n4.
- [12] Again see Klein, Anti-Judaism, 15-38. Noth, History, 448.
- [13] Chilton, Galilean Rabbi, 39.

- [14] Although Gottwald (Light, 533) says "there was never so productive a period in Jewish literary history" he devotes only 5 pages to "Intertestamental Judaism".
- [15] My interest in this period was provoked by one such course which saw in the period nothing but "apostasy" or a "preparation for the gospel". Also see Hengel (Jews, preface) who says that he is dealing with a period prior to the "New Testament period" in which a "preparation for the gospel" was made. The OED definition of the word "propaedeutic" includes a usage from 1849, "Judaism was a propaedeutic to Christianity".
- [16] Kraft, Nickelsburg, (eds.), Early Judaism, 1-2.
- [17] See, e.g. Grabbe, Etymology; Chilton, Galilean Rabbi, 21. Neusner's "Formative Judaism", applied to the Judaism of the Mishnah and related literature, is useful for that period. See, e.g. Vanquished Nation.
- [18] Would Jewish makers of magical charms have recognised an Orthodoxy which condemned them?
- [19] The labels "normative" and "sectarian" are therefore inappropriate.
- [20] Often used by, for example, Stone, see "Three Transformations".
- [21] By which I mean the "Tanak" or "Hebrew bible" (which is not at all the same thing as the "Old Testament") and versions in Greek and Aramaic.
- [22] See Sawyer, "Hebrew Terms", "Role" and "Original".
- [23] See Goldberg ("Diskurs", 5-6) and Schafer ("Research", 145) on the "fundamental synchronicity" of texts (here rabbinic ones) "once they have been written".
- [24] Danell, Studies, 13.
- [25] LXX will be used to mean all Greek versions of the bible (including literature belittled as "apocryphal" or "pseudepigraphical"). This somewhat inaccurate use of "LXX" has now become so commonplace that to reserve it for

the Greek version of the Torah alone would appear pedantic, especially while devoting little space to "original meanings".

- [26] E.g. see LXX Amos 3:12, discussed by Sawyer, "Those Priests". It is, of course, true that all the literature of the period is "polemic", in that it chooses how to tell a story that it has chosen to tell rather than any alternative stories (which are simultaneously suppressed). See Flanagan, David's Social Drama 224. Hendel ("Demigods", 21) points out that the "function of the Nephilim in Israelite tradition is to die" and not to play an historical role.
- [27] I continue to use this term in the absence of a better one. See Delcor ("Apocrypha", 409-415) for a discussion of the applicability of the labels "apocrypha" and "pseudepigrapha". "Non-Canonical Jewish literature" is, in the present context, too inclusive.
- [28] Again this term is inadequate in that Genesis and, sometimes, Judith, are also "Canonised Christian Literature". My use of CCL in place of NT does no more than avoid the implication of "old" versus "new" and therefore "outdated" versus "important").
- [29] Any date dividing one period from another is bound to be controversial and, to some extent, arbitrary. The literature discussed here did not exist in a vacuum, either in terms of time or of influences, and the argument of the thesis could be carried into a number of neighbouring areas.
- [30] See Davies, P.R., "Eschatology", and Golb, "Khirbet Qumran".
- [31] Coote, "Meaning".
- [32] Margalith, "Origin".
- [33] Matsuda, "Structure", 80.
- [34] Barr, Semantics, 109.
- [35] Sawyer, "Root-meanings", Semantics, 62, 89-90; Barr, "Did Isaiah", 242, "Etymology"; Rabin, "Hebrew", 315.

- [36] Gray, Hābirū-Hebrew Problem; Loretz, Habiru-Hebraër. Further bibliography can be found in Na^caman, "Hābiru".
- [37] E.g. Tomson, Names and Arazy, Appellations.
- [38] See Kraemer, "Meaning of the Term".
- [39] In addition to the works already cited in this section, see especially Ullmann, Principles and Semantics and Lyons, Structural, Semantics and Language. Also see Falck, Myth, especially 22; and Cotterell, Turner, Linguistics. Gibson (Biblical Semantic) and Silva, (Biblical Words) also discuss and apply semantics to biblical studies. One phase of this research made use of the clustering programs Twinspan and Decorana, with considerable help from Stephen Rushton of the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Science. See Everitt, Cluster Analysis.
- [40] Riches, Jesus, 18.
- [41] Kennedy, "Root", 57n17.
- [42] See Riches, "Works", 60.
- [43] See the section on Aramaic occurrences, where Ezra 5:5 implies "God of the Jews". The phrase, "the God of the Jews" is used by later, Christian, writers, such as Origen (In Johannis 2.34) commenting on YHWH as a "demiurge".
- [44] Borges, "Garden", 53.
- [45] Zobel, "yehuda", 486.
- [46] Barr, "Etymology".
- [47] Speiser, Genesis, 365.
- [48] Arguments about etymology are common. Broadly speaking, there are two camps: one in which yehudah is seen as a theophoric name (either meaning "God is praised", "God be praised" or "YHWH is/be praised"), the other in which the name has to do with territory only. As usual Alt stands in one camp opposed by Albright in the other. Millard ("Meaning", 216-218) summarises the positions.

- [49] The relationship between the two words is not the same in either place. At Gen 29:35 praise is given because of Judah's birth. At 49:8 Judah is praiseworthy.
- [50] In the section on "Judah" as the name of an individual, below, I refer to Rashi's comments on the "Judith" as the name of a foreigner.
- [51] Also in Gen 29:35; 35:23; 37:26; 38:1,2,6,7,8,11,12,12,15,20,22,23,24,24,26; 43:3,8; 44:14,16,18; 46:12,28; 49:8,9,10; Exod 1:2; Num 26:19; Ruth 4:12; Neh 11:24; 1 Chr 2:1,3,3,4; 4:1,21; 9:4.
- [52] Zobel, "yehuda", 485.
- [53] Zobel, "yehuda", 485.
- [54] Jer 40:15; 42:15,19; 43:5; 44:12,14,28.
- [55] In 2 Kgs 18:26,28 aramit (in contrast with yehudit) might refer to "the language spoken in Aram" rather than "the language of the Arameans". yehudit also occurs at Isa 36:11,13 and 2 Chr 32:18. See HALAT, 377.
- [56] 150 occurrences. There is also a single occurrence of "kingdom of Judah" at 2 Chr 11:17.
- [57] Though these are idealized borders rather than realised ones.
- [58] E.g. Jer 42:17-18; 44:26-29.
- [59] See Sawyer, "Blessed be my people"; Garbini, History and Ideology, 148.
- [60] Zobel, "yehuda", 486.
- [61] Ex 31:2; 35:30; 38:22; Num 1:27; 7:27; 13:6; 34:19; Jos 7:1,18; 21:4.
- [62] 2 Sam 19:41; 2 Kgs 14:21; Jer 25:1,2; 26:18; Ezra 4:4; 2 Chr 26:1.
- [63] 1 Sam 17:52; 2 Sam 2:4; 1 Kgs 1:9; Ezra 10:9.
- [64] 1 Sam 23:23; Mic 5:1. "Clans of Judah" seems preferable to "thousands of Judah" in these cases.

- [65] 1 Kgs 2:32.
- [66] Ezra 4:1.
- [67] Isa 11:13.
- [68] 2 Chr 20:5; 30:25.
- [69] Singular: Jer 17:1. Plural: Jer 50:20.
- [70] 1 Sam 30:26; 2 Sam 19:12; 2 Kgs 23:1; Ezra 8:1;
2 Chr 34:29.
- [71] Jos 7:17; Judg 17:7.
- [72] Listed above.
- [73] Neh 11:24; 1 Chr 4:21; 9:4.
- [74] Gen 46:12; Num 26:19; 1 Chr 2:3,4; 4:1,21.
- [75] Num 26:22.
- [76] In the context it is enough that she is Hittite to
be problematic: Rebekah claims to be "weary of
life because of these Hittite women",
presumably including her daughter-in-law (Gen
27:46).
- [77] Ahlström, "Who", 42.
- [78] Dan 3:8,12; Ezra 4:12,23; 5:1,5; 6:7,7,8,14.
- [79] Dan 2:25; 5:13,13; 6:14; Ezra 5:1,8; 7:14.
- [80] See Japhet, "Sheshbazar" and Smith, "Jewish
Religious Life", 219.
- [81] 42 occurrences in J.W. 1; 13 in 2; 28 in Ant. 12;
36 in 13 and 40 in 14.
- [82] 67 occurrences in 1; 118 in 2; 67 in 3; 22 in 4;
59 in 5; 69 in 1 and 71 in 7. There are an
additional seven occurrences in some versions.
- [83] 34 occurrences in 1 and 38 in 2, with three
further disputed occurrences in 2.
- [84] 91 occurrences in 11; 85 in 12; 90 in 13; 111 in
14; 39 in 15; 24 in 16; 39 in 17; 60 in 18; 22
in 19 and 59 in 20. Again there are 10
disputed occurrences in addition to these 525.

- [85] No occurrences in Ant. 2,3 and 5; 6 in 1; 1 in 4; 8 in 6; 2 in 7,8 and 9; and 7 in 10. There are a further 7 disputed occurrences.
- [86] Once in J.W. 4 and four times in 5.
- [87] 3 times in Ant. 11; 1 in 14 and 1 in 18.
- [88] See my chapter on the uses of "Hebrew". Cp. Paul's self-designations "Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil 3:3) and "we Jews" (Gal 2:15).
- [89] Cohen, S.J.D., "Masada", 404; cp. Neusner (Vanquished Nation, especially 17-25) who shows that the "virtues of formative Judaism" largely involve being almost invisible to a generally hostile outside world.
- [90] Ant. 13.298.
- [91] For a discussion of Josephus' historiography see Rajak, "Josephus".
- [92] Whilst archethen means "formerly, in the past" at Ant. 3.283 and "from basic principles" at Life 366, it means "fundamentally, truest" at Ant. 5.261, and "from the past until now" at Ant. 4.196. "Archaically" should be understood to mean, not "outdated" but "original and still current".
- [93] There are 18 occurrences in Ant. 1-10 and 163 in Ant. 11-20.
- [94] In 10 there are only 8 occurrences, in 11 there are only 14 and none in the remaining books.
- [95] In his summary of the Law, or Constitution, of Moses it is introduced as "the land of Canaan, tēn chananaiōn gēn" (Ant. 4.199,200) but soon becomes "the land the Hebrews shall conquer" (Ant. 4.203). Josephus prefers to use hebraios in this section rather than any other name for the people, because it is the heart of the people's traditions.
- [96] "Judaea" was used by the Romans as the name of the area, e.g. Pilate is named [Praef]ectus Iudaa[ea]ie on the Caesaraea inscription.

- [97] See Altshuler, "Treatise".
- [98] The noun "circumcision" occurs ten times: J.W. 2.454; Ant. 1.192,214; 8.262; 12.241; 13.258,319; 20.41; Apion 2.137,143. The verb "to circumcise" occurs twenty-two times: Ant. 1.192,193,214,214; 8.262; 11.285; 12.254,256,278,278; 13.257,318; 20.38,41,139,145; Life 113; Apion 1.169,170,171; 2.141,142,143.
- [99] Paton, Esther, 281; Berg, Esther, 115n8.
- [100] Suggested as one possibility by Berg, Esther, 172.
- [101] Thackeray, Josephus, Vol 2, 499,503.
- [102] Rengstorf, Complete Concordance, 2.383.
- [103] Cohen, S.J.D., Josephus, 147n159.
- [104] Farmer, Maccabees, 60-65.
- [105] Smith, Palestinian Parties, 182 n.33.
- [106] This should be born in mind when considering the "taxic indicators" of "Judaism" in this period.
- [107] Ant. 14.202,206,213; 16.163.
- [108] Beall, Josephus' Description, 37.
- [109] Once in Ant. 1 (304), once in 7 (372) and 6 times in Ant. 2 (32,116,139,159,159,178,184). These are misleadingly listed along with references to the area "Judah" under "ioudas Sohn Jakobs" in Schalit, Namenwörterbuch, 63.
- [110] These individuals are sometimes mentioned briefly in J.W. and again, sometimes in more detail, in Ant., e.g. the Essene "Judas" occurs at J.W. 1.78 and Ant. 13.311; "Judas" of Sepphoris occurs at J.W. 1.648 and Ant. 17.149,151,157,214.
- [111] Ant. 1.304; 2.32,116,139,159,178,184; 7.372.
- [112] The latter reading exomologēsomai kuriō "I will give thanks to the Lord".

- [113] J.W. 2.118 introduces him as "a Galilean man, aner galilaios", Ant. 18.23 as "the Galilean, ho galilaios".
- [114] J.W. 2.118, 433; 7.253; Ant. 18.4, 9, 23; 20.102.
- [115] Mos. 1.1, 7, 34; 2.17, 25, 41, 193, 216. Decal. 96. Spec. 1.97; 2.163, 166; 4.179, 224. Virt. 65, 108, 206, 212, 226. Probus 29, 43, 57, 68, 75. Aet. 19. Flac. 1, 21, 23, 24, 29, 29, 43, 45, 47, 49, 54, 55, 55, 56, 66, 80, 85, 86, 86, 94, 96, 116, 116, 116, 170, 170, 189, 191. Legat. 115, 117, 129, 133, 134, 154, 155, 158, 158, 159, 160, 170, 178, 182, 194, 198, 200, 205, 205, 210, 216, 222, 226, 245, 248, 253, 278, 282, 307, 311, 313, 315, 316, 330, 333, 335, 346, 350, 355, 368, 370, 370, 371, 373. As listed by Mayer, Index Philoneus, 149.
- [116] Flac. 55, 73, 74. Legat. 157, 159, 170, 184, 201, 245, 256, 282.
- [117] Mos. 2.31. Legat. 199, 200, 207, 215, 257, 281, 294, 299. Hypoth. 8:2.1.
- [118] They are also named hebraiois at Mos. 1.105 under the influence of the biblical text.
- [119] See also Leg.All. 1.80; 3.146; Somn. 2.34.
- [120] Grabbe, Etymology, 170.
- [121] Grabbe, Etymology, 171.
- [122] Yadin, War, 256-257.
- [123] I.e. the Assyrian Exile of 721 BCE, see discussion of šby yśr²l by Davies, P.R., Damascus Covenant, 92-94.
- [124] Davies, P.R., 1QM, 114 and n7.
- [125] DJD 5, 57-60.
- [126] Lubbe ("Reinterpretation", 196) stresses this "contemporary rather than future import" of the text.
- [127] Also absent from the LXX and Tg.Onkelos.

- [128] DJD 1, 80.
- [129] Vermes (DSSE, 85) renders the phrase, "the converts of Israel". Davies, P.R., (Damascus Covenant, 93) argues that whilst this is grammatically possible it is "questionable" in this context. Dimant, ("Qumran", 492) translates the phrase "the Repenters of Israel" because of the community's "recognition of their own sinfulness and the need to repent". In 1QM 1:2,3 "Exiles", in gwlt hmdbr and gwlt bny ʿwr are self-designations.
- [130] Murphy-O'Connor, especially in "Essenes".
- [131] Vermes, Scripture, 43-49.
- [132] "Exile", 109-110.
- [133] Pixner, "Unravelling", 336, 350 and 358.
- [134] Milikowsky, "Again", 97-106.
- [135] See Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary Analysis", 224 and n.38; and Davies, P.R., Damascus Covenant, 150-155.
- [136] See Strickert, "Damascus Document", 330. For a Karaite use of Hos 5:10 see Wieder, Judean Scrolls, 141.
- [137] See Murphy-O'Connor, "Critique".
- [138] Davies, P.R., Damascus Covenant, 190-194.
- [139] Davies, P.R., Damascus Covenant, 265. Lohse (Texte, 107) translates, alle Frevler Judas, which does not support this position. Elsewhere he finds ambiguous German words for ambiguous Hebrew words (eg. Umkehrenden for šby at 4:2).
- [140] Davies, P.R., Damascus Covenant, 103; Schwarz, "To Join Oneself". Also see Garnet, Salvation, 91 and nn.3,4.
- [141] Dupont-Sommer, Écrits, 143, n2.
- [142] Burrows, (ed.), Dead Sea, pls. 60-61. Cross, Scrolls, 149-163. Lohse, Texte.

- [143] Vermes, DSSE, 289. Although "Lebanon" is another name for the group here, it is synonymous with "Kittim" in 4Q161 (pIsa) 8-10, 7-8 (and possibly also in 4Q169 [pNah] 1-2, 7).
- [144] Silberman ("Unriddling", 363) thinks that the Council, the Poor and the Simple are one group not three. This would complicate the analysis of the Peshar. Probably "the Simple" and "the Poor" are names of one group separate from "the Council". For a discussion of the uses of "Simple" see Pan, Vocabulary.
- [145] DJD 5, 37-42. Amusin, "Reflections".
- [146] Allegro's "seekers of smooth things" seems preferable to Amusin's "interpreters of 'slippery things'".
- [147] DJD 1, 77-80. Vermes, DSSE, 278.
- [148] DJD 5, 42-50.
- [149] Baillet, "Recueil".
- [150] y²dh or ywdh instead of yhdh. Baillet, "Recueil", 221.
- [151] Vermes, DSSE, 218.
- [152] Vermes, DSSE, 260.
- [153] Vermes, DSSE, 260. Allegro, "Further Messianic", 174-176.
- [154] Unfortunately only a possible fragment of Psalm 78 (6Q 5) survives among QL and is only of vv36-37. DJD 3, 112.
- [155] DJD 1, 100-101. Two further occurrences of "Judah" in 1Q25 have even less of a context than 5:5, ie 2:4 (which may read yhwh not yhwdh) and 3:2.
- [156] DJD 5, 67-74.
- [157] DJD 5, 53-57, 75-77; Brooke, Exegesis, 86-97.
- [158] See index of DJD 2 for further texts.

- [159] Zobel, "yhwdh", 485-486.
- [160] Matt 2:6,6; Luke 1:39; Heb 7:14; 8:8; Rev 5:5 7:5.
- [161] Matt 1:2,3; Luke 3:33.
- [162] Matt 10:4; 26:14,25,27; Mark 3:19; 14:10,43; Luke 6:16; 22:3,47,48; John 6:71; 12:4; 13:2,26,29; 18:2,3,5; Acts 1:16,25.
- [163] Luke 6:16; John 14:22; Acts 1:13.
- [164] McComiskey, "iouda", 319.
- [165] Such as the Maccabean Judah and Judith.
- [166] Matt 2:1,5,22; 3:1,5; 4:25; 19:1; 24:16; Mark 1:5; 3:7; 10:1; 13:14; Luke 1:5,65; 2:4; 3:1; 4:44; 5:17; 6:17; 7:17; 21:21; 23:5; John 4:3,47,54; 7:1,3; 11:7; Acts 1:8; 2:9; 8:1; 9:31; 10:37; 11:1,29; 12:19; 15:1; 21:10; 26:20; 28:21; Rom 15:31; 2 Cor 1:16; Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14.
- [167] Matt 2:2; 27:11,29,37; 28:15; Mark 7:3; 15:2,9,12,18,26; Luke 7:3; 23:3,37,38,51; John 1:19; 2:6,13,18,20; 3:1,22,25; 4:9,9,22; 5:1,10,15,16,18; 6:4,41,52; 7:1,2,11,13,15,35; 8:22,31,48,52,57; 9:18,22; 10:19,24,31,33; 11:8,19,31,33,36,45,54,55; 12:9,11; 13:33; 18:12,14,20,31,33,35,36,38,39; 19:3,7,12,14,19,20,21,21,21,31,38,40,42; 20:19; Acts 2:5,10,14; 9:22,23; 10:22,28,39; 11:19; 12:3,11; 13:5,6,43,50; 14:1,1,2,4,5,19; 16:1,3,20; 17:1,5,10,13,17; 19:2,2,4,5,12,14,19,24,28; 19:10,13,14,17,33,34; 20:3,19,21; 21:11,20,21,27,39; 22:3,12,30; 22:3,12,30; 23:12,20,27; 24:5,9,18,24,27; 25:2,7,8,9,10,15,24; 26:2,3,4,7,21; 28:17,19,29; Rom 1:16; 2:9,10,17,28,29; 3:1,9,29; 9:24; 10:12; 1 Cor 1:22,23,24; 9:20,20,20; 10:32; 12:13; 2 Cor 11:24; Gal 2:13,14,15, 3:28; Col 3:11; 1 Thess 2:14; Rev 2:9; 3:9.
- [168] BAG (p379) lists the following occurrences: Matt 2:1,5,22; 3:1; 4:25; 24:16; Mark 3:7; 13:14; Luke 2:4; 3:1; 5:17; John 4:3,47,54; 7:1,3; 11:7; Acts 1:8; 8:1; 9:31; 12:19; 15:1; 21:10; 26:20; 28:21; Rom 15:31; 2 Cor 1:16; Gal 1:22. Matt 3:5 is said to use the name of the land as a metaphor for the people.

- [169] BAG (p379) lists the following: Luke 1:5; 4:44; 7:17; 23:5; Acts 10:37; 11:1,29; 1 Thess 2:14. Acts 26:20 refers to "the whole Jewish country"; Matt 19:1 to the "Jewish territory beyond the Jordan"; and "Judaea" is referred to at Acts 2:9.
- [170] Lowe, "Who".
- [171] These may or may not be intended to be understood as "Messianic" titles. Early Christianity as reflected in its surviving literature is already distinct enough from other Judaisms to have its own distinct ideas about what "Messiah" might mean. See Neusner, Green, Frerichs, (eds.), Judaisms and their Messiahs, especially Macrae, "Messiah and Gospel", 169.
- [172] Sanders, J.A., "Jew, Jews, Jewess", 897-8.
- [173] I would avoid the use of this title were it not for its widespread use in the secondary literature. Alternative suggestions have not been accepted despite the merits of some of them. See Reigel, "Jewish Christianity"; Murray, "Jews, Hebrews and Christians" and "Disaffected Judaism".
- [174] Apart from the difficulty of dividing religion from other cultural concerns, there is the problem of what "religion" might mean as an entity in its own right. See Smith, J.Z., Imagining Religion, especially xi-xiii.
- [175] Sanders, J.A., "Jew", 897.
- [176] This needs to be qualified by the observation that male-circumcision was practiced by other Near-Eastern peoples, as Josephus and others note of the Egyptians.
- [177] Scholars of CCL are themselves divided about which texts are most representative of the positions concerned. For example, there is almost a competition to find the clearest expression of anti-Judaism (or anti-semitism) in different texts and to exonerate ones blamed by others. See, for example the various essays in Davies, A.T., (ed.), AntiSemitism, in which one article particularly points the finger at Matthew (Hare, "Rejection") while another points at John's Gospel (Townsend, "John").

Other options are suggested. See also Richardson, Granskou, Wilson, (eds.), Anti-Judaism, both volumes.

- [178] Sanders, J.T., Jews.
- [179] Brawley, Luke-Acts. Jervell, Luke is also significant and forms the foundation of a large part of the current debate.
- [180] Sanders, J.T., Jews, 71-74.
- [181] Townsend, "John" in AntiSemitism, (ed.: Davies, A.T.) 80.
- [182] Donaldson ("Moses Typology") claims that "in Luke's purposes Stephen's speech does not serve as the introduction to the Gentile mission, but to a mission to the Samaritans and Diaspora Judaism". This overstates the case.
- [183] Sanders, J.T., Jews, 72.
- [184] Moessner, "Paul in Acts".
- [185] Lindeskog, "Israel", 59.
- [186] Stendahl, Paul Among Jews, 11.
- [187] Donaldson ("Moses Typology", 30) suggests that these three condemnations represent "Luke's own attitude towards unbelieving Israel" but notes with Jervell (Luke) that "Jewish-Christians" have an important role in Luke-Acts.
- [188] Donaldson, "Moses Typology", 44 and 47n18.
- [189] Brawley, Luke-Acts, 159.
- [190] van Goudoever, "Place of Israel", 123.
- [191] Young, "Temple", especially 332. Despite recognising that "there are many traces of an apologetic purpose" in Acts, Young says, "its extent has almost certainly been exaggerated". Also see Shepherd, "Jews", 96. Especially notable is the claim that, "the usage of "Jews" in Acts is invariably accurate from a historical viewpoint, but lacks the subtle, theological nuances of the Gospel of

John".

- [192] Conzelmann, Theology of St Luke.
- [193] Carroll ("Luke's Portral", especially 604) discusses the three meals which Jesus eats with Pharisees, noting that these occasions all end in conflict.
- [194] Tatum, "Epoch of Israel", 186.
- [195] This is not what Paul's letters suggest, see Sanders, E.P., Paul, the Law, 182-184; against the views of Munck, Paul, 204-6. Tannehill (Review, 280) notes the "striking emphasis on Paul's loyalty to Judaism".
- [196] Tannehill, Review, 280.
- [197] A major weakness of Williamson and Allen's Interpreting Difficult Texts is the contradiction involved in saying, "how can preachers avoid repeating [the Christ-killing] slander, particularly when dealing with texts in which it appears? Chiefly by remembering that they are commissioned to preach the gospel, which does not lie" (p.5). This can only be done if "the gospel" is something other than that which Luke writes. This would imply that the text can lie by teaching that the "Jews killed Jesus" when "the Gospel" is something different.
- [198] Lowe, "Who". Tomson (in a personal communication) says Lowe "propounds the view that ["the Jews" in John] means "Judeans", which to my knowledge is anachronistic nonsense".
- [199] Ashton, "Identity", 43.
- [200] Ashton, "Identity", 44.
- [201] Lowe, "Who", 129.
- [202] Ashton, "Identity", 44.
- [203] Meeks, "Am I a Jew?", 180n66.
- [204] Meeks, "Am I a Jew?", 181. For the text see Lifshitz, "Papyrus", 241 and Loewe, "Salvation", 352n1. Also see Mor, "Bar-Kokhba" for a discussion of whether

Soumaios is Bar Kochba or not.

- [205] Lowe ("Who", 117) notes this as the only exception to his argument but claims it is an interpolation.
- [206] Whether in the original manuscript or as later insertions. White (Identity) claims that John is a "patchwork gospel" put together "without any attempt to unify the material in either language or theology" (abstract). Cp. Shepherd ("Jews", 98) who describes it as an "intricately woven fabric".
- [207] Ashton, "Identity", 46.
- [208] Lowe, "Who", 112.
- [209] Lowe, "Who", 119-124. See also Cumming, "Jews", 290-92.
- [210] Scobie, "Origins". Also see Purvis, "Fourth Gospel", 161 and n1.
- [211] Epp, "Jews and Judaism", 87.
- [212] Ashton, "Identity", 58.
- [213] See the discussion of Nicodemus in my chapter on "Israel" in CCL.
- [214] Schram, Use, 250n24.
- [215] Bowker, "Origin", 400.
- [216] Tomson, "Names", 281.
- [217] See Loewe, "Salvation".
- [218] Meeks, "Man from Heaven", 68.
- [219] He is introduced in John 1 in Judea and when he goes to Galilee (1:43) it is as if he goes to a strange place. He easily gravitates to Jerusalem as if that was the natural place to be. Galilee and Samaria are strange lands in which he might find honour, unlike Judea (4:43-45). For other evidence see Meeks, "Galilee" and Ashton, "Identity", 48-53; contrary to Lowe, "Who", 125n75.

- [220] Ashton, "Identity", 52 (his emphasis).
- [221] Smith, D.M., Johannine Christianity, 200-201.
- [222] Ashton, "Identity", 71.
- [223] Ashton, "Identity", 74-75.
- [224] This includes the vast majority of Christians since his day as is suggested by the title and argument of Epp's work, "Anti-Semitism and the Popularity of the Fourth Gospel in Christianity". Also see Martyn, John.
- [225] Bultmann, John, 86. Also see Pryor, "Jesus".
- [226] White, Identity, 252-3; Also see Bultmann, John, 86.
- [227] Fortna, "Theological Use", 94-95.
- [228] Also see Hengel, Johannine, 119.
- [229] E.g.: Shepherd, "Jews", 103-104.
- [230] Schussler Fiorenza, "Biblical Interpretation", 14.
- [231] Smith, J.Z., ("Fences and Neighbours") discusses the use of circumcision as a taxic indicator and makes it clear that it is particularly used as such by Paul. Also see Neusner, Judaism and its Social Metaphors, 217.
- [232] Davies, W.D., "Galatians", in his Jewish and Pauline Studies.
- [233] Rowland, Christian Origins, 201.
- [234] There is nothing in the covenantal nomism of other Judaisms (including the Pharisaism that Paul alleges he belonged to) which would invalidate these expressions of divine grace. See Stendahl, "Apostle Paul" and Paul among Jews, 10; Sanders, E.P., Paul and Palestinian, Paul, the Law.
- [235] Cp. the language of prophetic calls, particularly that of Jeremiah.
- [236] Rowland, Christian Origins, 64. Also see Davies, W.D., "Paul and the People", 24,27 and Campbell, "Separation".

- [237] Lategan, "Is Paul Defending". For the opposite conclusion see Dunn, "Relationship". Also see Betz, "Literary Composition", Galatians and Lyons, Pauline Autobiography, 171.
- [238] Davies, W.D., "Galatians", 177.
- [239] Sanders, E.P., (Paul, the Law, 171-206, especially 207-210) debates whether a Christo-centric faith or being apostle to Gentiles was more significant in Paul's understandings and actions. Macrae, ("Messiah and Gospel", 170) writes, "the Messiahship of Jesus is simply not an issue" in Paul's writings.
- [240] The RSV choses to translate peritomēs by "the circumcision party" at Acts 11:2; Gal 2:12; Titus 1:10.
- [241] This makes the claim of Beker ("Paul's Theology", 373) that in Galatians especially "the role of the Jew in salvation-history is a purely negative one and has in fact become obsolete with the coming of Christ" improbable.
- [242] Martyn, "Law-Observant Mission".
- [243] Dunn ("New Perspective", 103) believes that their view was that Jewish Christians ought to respect every possible injunction on food and eating.
- [244] Acts 10-11 and 15 show that other Christians would have agreed with Paul's stance. In Galatians the more extreme question of whether anyone at all should exhibit any of the "works of the law" is not raised, because it is not an attempt to talk about any other "Judaism". It is arguable that Acts 10-11 and Galatians 2 are two conflicting traditions to explain Christian abandonment of the "works of law", with Acts playing down early conflicts over the issue.
- [245] Paul's claim that he is "all things to all people" (1 Cor 9:22) suggests that he might have done exactly what he accused Peter of doing.
- [246] Ziesler, Pauline Christianity, 102. That the need to explain this suggests that the "Law's traditional role was misunderstood" is possible. However, the "traditional view" was

evidently attractive enough to Gentiles to be a cause of concern to Roman writers and authorities.

- [247] As Dunn ("New Perspective", 110) claims.
- [248] See Dunn, "Incident", especially 25-28.
- [249] Smith, J.Z., "Fences and Neighbours".
- [250] Smith, J.Z., "Fences and Neighbours". Also see Neusner, Judaism and its Social Metaphors, 217-218.
- [251] Raisanen, Paul and the Law, 184.
- [252] Richardson, Israel. Also see Gaston ("Israel's Enemies", 402) who notes Marcion's textual emendation of 4:21-31 to read "the synagogue of the Jews" in place of "the present Jerusalem" which opposes "the Holy Church", in place of "the Jerusalem above".
- [253] Cosgrove, "Arguing", 548. Sanders, E.P., Paul, the Law, 52n20 (cf. p.20); Dunn, "New Perspective", 121.
- [254] The "two" covenants of 4:21-31 are different understandings of the one covenant between God and Abraham, the one via Sarah the other via Hagar. The difference is that one is an attempt to enact the covenant by "the Spirit" and God's choice, the other by "human" means. They are simultaneous, concurrent and not successive. Paul does not refer to the "newness" of the covenant, it is important that it is the same one made with Abraham. See Richardson, Israel, 99,100; Gaston, "Israel's Enemies", 408; Lategan, "Is Paul Defending".
- [255] Though the issue of their conflict continued. Kerygmata Petrou deepens the conflict between Peter and Paul, see Deidun, "Galatians", 247.
- [256] As Fraikin ("Rhetorical Function", 93) notes concerning the context of early Christian texts.
- [257] Also see Dunn, "Judaizers".

- [258] Bel and the Dragon says that the Babylonians thought their king had "become a ioudaios" but reads ioudaios gegonen rather than ioudaizōv (v 28). See Ziegler, Susanna, 220.
- [259] As EncJud 10.398 translates it.
- [260] Epictetus distinguishes between those who only are only "acting" and are therefore "not Jews" and those who have "been immersed and have made their choice" and are therefore "both is in fact and is called a Jew".
- [261] Josephus (at Ant. 11.285) does not follow either MT or LXX but says that "from fear of the ioudaioi they had themselves circumcised, and thereby managed to save themselves".
- [262] Stern (Greek and Latin 1.566) notes that in Cicero's own work (Divinatio in Caecilium) no mention is made of Caecilius being either Jewish or a freed slave. It is therefore doubted whether this is more than an apocryphal pun.
- [263] See Barrett, "Jews and Judaisers" and Schweizer, "Christianity of the Circumcised".
- [264] Filson, "Judaizing", 1006. For the Greek text see Tischendorf, Evangelia, 214-216.
- [265] Scheidweiler, Higgins, Acts of Pilate, 167.
- [266] Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary", 33.
- [267] Filson, "Judaizing", 1006.
- [268] Christian uses of "Judaize" as an accusation continue throughout history. For some examples, see EncJud 10.398-402. The accusation, "our opponents are Judaizing" is a frequent one in intra-Christian polemics, e.g. ones between Catholics and Protestants or between Quakers and the "Established Church". For the later example see the seventeenth century Apology of Robert Barclay, "proposition 12" concerning Baptism which repeats exactly this allegation.
- [269] 1:16; 2:9,10,17,28,29; 3:1,9,29; 9:24; 10:12; 15:31.

- [270] Ruether, Faith and Fratricide, 104.
- [271] Ruether, Faith and Fratricide, 104 (her emphases).
- [272] Gaston, "Paul and Torah", 48.
- [273] Gaston, "Paul and Torah", 49.
- [274] Gaston, "Israel's Enemies", 411 and 415.
- [275] Lindeskog, "Israel", 92.
- [276] See the section on Romans in my chapter on "Israel in early Christian literature".
- [277] I am grateful to Brian Yhearm for changing my understanding of this passage.
- [278] See Hemer, Letters, especially 12,67.
- [279] See Barrett, "Jews and Judaisers", 220-244.
- [280] Barrett, "Jews and Judaisers". Also see Gaston, "Judaism of the Uncircumcised".
- [281] Lochman, "Which Christian", 55.
- [282] It therefore avoids presenting the occurrences according to a reconstructed chronological order.
- [283] Redford, "Land". Also see Anbar, "'eres ha'ibrim".
- [284] The exception, Exod 21:2, will be treated separately.
- [285] Tomson, "Names", 128. Also see Childs, Exodus, 468 and Kline, "Hebrews", 627.
- [286] Phillips, "Laws of Slavery", 55.
- [287] Lauterbach, (trans.), Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael 3.
- [288] See also t.Kiddushin 22b. and Pesiqta Rabbati 33.3.
- [289] Blenkinsopp, (Gibeon, 63) sees all six as the words of Philistines by reading 13:3 "when the Philistines heard that the ibrim had revolted". Weippert (Settlement, 97) also lists, without comment, 13:3 among the

occurrences of "the expression... in the mouths of the Philistines as a designation, with a somewhat contemptible ring, of their opponents." This reading depends on a reading of only part of the LXX text. See also: Driver, Samuel, 98.

[290] The occurrences in chapters 13 and 14 follow much the same pattern.

[291] 5:7,8,10,11; 6:3 and others.

[292] Na^caman, "Habiru and Hebrews".

[293] Magonet, Form and Meaning. The entire discussion is relevant but in particular see the table on p14. On p.15 br is noted as a link between chap.2 and chap.3 but it is hard to see any real link between the three occurrences of this consonant sequence.

[294] Allen, Joel, 209, citing Gen 40:15 and Exod 1:19 as evidence. Also see van Seters, Abraham, 55.

[295] Perhaps this is too sophisticated a distinction as Jonah, in his Psalm, intends to return to the Temple (2:5, Eng.2:4), suggesting a southern provenance for the work. It is also questionable whether the the writers in that period would have carefully avoided, or even been aware of, anachronism.

[296] Allen, Joel, 176.

[297] Allen, Joel, 209.

[298] Thiselton, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation", 92 (his emphasis).

[299] See Loretz ("Hebraer") for arguments against the attempt to find ‘eber and thus Israelite "Hebrews" at Ebla.

[300] yehudit, 2 Kgs 18:26,28; Isa 36:13; Neh 13:24; 2 Chr 32:18. šep̄hat kena^can, Isa 19:18.

[301] Ullendorf, "Knowledge", 456.

[302] Gray, "Ḥābirū-Hebrew Problem", 174.

- [303] The group centred on Shechem and Gerizim rather than those whose capital, in this period, was Sebaste.
- [304] See Murray ("Jews", 198) who notes that "use of the terms 'Jews', 'Jewish' and 'Judaism'" to include the Samaritans "obviously introduces tension and complication into the sense of 'Jew' (etc.)".
- [305] Lowy, Principles, 12, 56-57, 404-405n390.
- [306] Macdonald (Theology, 212), "The Epistle to the Hebrews may well have been more influential as far as the Samaritans (=Hebrews!) were concerned than has hitherto been realised".
- [307] See Bickermann, "Document" and Alon, "Origin", 360.
- [308] Wevers, Septuaginta; Swete, Old Testament in Greek; Redpath, Supplement.
- [309] Migr. 20.
- [310] Some differences of spelling in different manuscripts do not effect the argument.
- [311] This is supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch and by Pseudo-Philo 9:1. See Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo", 315.
- [312] de Vaux, Early History, 211 n157.
- [313] Lewy, "Origin", 2 and n1. Gray, "Habiru-Hebrew Problem", 179 and n330.
- [314] Codex Alexandrinus refers to ebraiois here. See Swete, Old Testament 1, 553.
- [315] Gray, "Ḥābirū-Hebrew Problem", 181-182.
- [316] Driver, Samuel, 99-100. Hertzberg, 1 and 2 Samuel, 101 k, 105. The subject of v7 is the same as that of v6: the fleeing Israelites. Hertzberg's use of the LXX to justify a different reading to that of the MT whilst not following the LXX is inadmissible.
- [317] In the inflected form ebraious. Two variants are noted by Wevers (Septuaginta 3.1): ebaious and heber.

- [318] Noth, Numbers, 194.
- [319] I am grateful to Peter Hayman for suggesting that the LXX's reading could be the beginning of the Christian tradition (represented by Vulgate and Syriac readings) of interpreting this verse as a prediction of the Roman defeat of the Jews.
- [320] Num 27:12; 33:47,48; Deut 32:49; Jer 22:20. Another problem was the ʿiye haʿabarim in Num 21:11; 33:44,45. The translators solution was to read ʿbr and to translate as to peran. A variant reading at 21:11 also reads hebraion.
- [321] Gray, "Hābirū-Hebrew Problem", 189.
- [322] A variant reading at 15:37 reads ioudaion in place of hebraion.
- [323] Lowe, "Ioudaioi", 68 n.47.
- [324] Prologue, 23.
- [325] Charles, (ed.), Apocrypha, 2. Charlesworth, (ed.), Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.
- [326] 12:26,27; 39:10; 43:15; 47:7).
- [327] Gray, "Hābirū-Hebrew Problem", 191.
- [328] Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo", 315.
- [329] Charles, Greek Versions; de Jonge, Testaments.
- [330] Charles, Testaments, Appendix 2, 243.
- [331] APOT (2.289) dates the whole of T.Naphtali to the second century BCE, but the Hebrew fragment is not attested until much later according to Charles (Testaments, li-liii). Also see Russell, Method and Message, 247. de Jonge, "Main Issues".
- [332] de Jonge, Testaments, 144-166. Dated to between 140 and 110 BCE by Russell, Method and Message, 37.
- [333] Other manuscripts read gēs chanaan.

- [334] A variant reading at 13:1 also reads chanaan in place of hebraion. The Armenian version supports the reading of chanaan. De Jonge, Testaments, 203. Stone, Armenian Version.
- [335] APOT 2, 83-122.
- [336] Eusebius' version of Epistle of Aristeeas also uses ioudaios for the nation but hebraikon for the language, Prep.Ev 8:4. Elsewhere Eusebius does use hebraioi as a designation for the nation.
- [337] Sib.Or. 5 contains two further uses of hebraioi which are Christian interpolations.
- [338] "Israelite" occurs at 18:1 and "sons of Abraham" is used in 6:17,22 and 18:23.
- [339] I.e. it is not used at Jub. 13:24 where it is to be expected.
- [340] See Levine, Aramaic Version.
- [341] Berliner, Targum Onkelos; Sperber, Bible in Aramaic 1.
- [342] Levine, Aramaic Version, 189.
- [343] Sperber, Bible in Aramaic 2 and 3.
- [344] The Targum's use of ʿbd as a translation equivalent of ʿśh is not related to the use of ʿibri in the Hebrew Vorlage. It would have added to an argument that ʿibrim had derogatory associations had the translators specifically chosen to use ʿbd in place of ʿśh. ʿbd also occurs in close proximity to ʿibri in Tg.Jon Jonah 1:9 but is again merely the normal translation equivalent for ʿśh as, for example, in Gen 1:26,31.
- [345] Ginsburger, Pseudo-Jonathan.
- [346] Cf. Exod 22:3 and the similar interpretation of Exod 21:2 in the Mekilta de R. Ishmael Nez. 1:23-30.
- [347] Ginsburger, Fragmententhargum; Klein, Fragment Targums.

- [348] Diez Macho, Neofiti 1.
- [349] Gen 39:17.
- [350] Gen 41:12; Exod 2:11.
- [351] Exod 2:6.
- [352] Gen 39:14; 43:32; Exod 5:3; 10:3; 21:2.
- [353] Gen 14:13.
- [354] Exod 3:18.
- [355] Exod 2:13; 7:16.
- [356] Exod 1:15,16,19; 2:7.
- [357] Hebrew and Greek writings were found in a jar near Jericho during the reign of Caracalla (211-17 CE), one of which survived to become column six of the Hexapla on Psalms. See Golb, "Khirbet Qumran", 103. Timotheus 1, "Patriarch" of Seleucia reported another find of the around 800 C.E. Also see Wieder, Judean Scrolls, 257.
- [358] Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon.
- [359] Italicised words are those of the MT.
- [360] de Jonge, van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek"; see also the critical note of Miller, "Function" and the works cited there.
- [361] DJD 1, 83; DJD 3, 77-78.
- [362] DJD 3, 5-6.
- [363] DJD 5, 3-4.
- [364] DJD 2, 80-86.
- [365] Lifshitz, "Papyrus"; Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 35-36.
- [366] hellēnisti is written elēnisti and hebraisti is written hebraesti.
- [367] Colson, Whitaker, Philo; Cohn, Wendland, Reiter, Philonis; Leisegang, Philonis 7; Mayer, Index.

- [368] Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, 19-25.
- [369] Eusebius, H.E. II iv.2. For the contrast see, Photius, Bibliotheca cod.105.
- [370] Schalit, Namenwörterbuch, 41. Thackeray, Marcus, Feldman, Josephus, 679-681. There are six further occurrences in some manuscripts.
- [371] Ant. 10.8,8; 11.159.
- [372] See Rajak (Josephus, 230-323) for a discussion of Josephus' "native language".
- [373] J.W. 5,381; Ant. 2.78; Ant. 9.211; Ant. 2.299; J.W. 4.459; Ant. 6.268,344.
- [374] E.g. Ant. 6.373 = 1 Sam 31:7; 6.369 = 1 Sam 31:1; Ant. 7.53 = 2 Sam 5:1. Josephus also prefers the form israēlitai to israēl and uses it to render MT's yīśra'el also, e.g. Ant. 6.368 = 1 Sam 31:1.
- [375] Omitted by Codex Parisinus Graecus 1425 (9th or 10th century) and by Eusebius. Thackeray and Williamson disagree as to whether Josephus claims to be "a native of Jerusalem and a priest" or "a priest from Jerusalem".
- [376] E.g. Moses is not only "a Hebrew" but also "the legislator of the ioudaiōn" (Ant. 1.95). David is named both "king of Judaea" and "king of the Hebrews" in close proximity (Ant. 7.101,105).
- [377] Rajak, Josephus, 21. Also see Ilan, "Names", Fuks, "Josephus" and Goodman, "Bad Joke" for further evidence of Josephus' aristocratic connections.
- [378] For a discussion of Josephus' negative opinion of the rebels see Hengel, Zeloten, 42-51; and Donaldson, "Rural Bandits". That this view of the revolutionaries is propaganda is clear from Josephus' narration of the insult to Florus which provoked the outbreak of hostilities, in which he carefully avoids blaming the aristocracy. See Goodman, "Bad Joke" and Ruling Class.

- [379] Cohen, S.J.D., "Masada", 404.
- [380] Mor, "Persian", 15.
- [381] Luke 23:38; John 5:2; 19:13,17,20; 20:16; Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14; Rev 9:11; 16:16. The occurrence of hebraikois at Luke 23:38 is a gloss dependent on John.
- [382] Acts 6:1; 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:5 and in the title of the Letter to the Hebrews.
- [383] John 19:20; 20:16; Rev 9:11; 16:16. However, they use "Hebrew" at 2 Kgs 18:26 where "the language of the Jews" would have been closer to yehudit.
- [384] Black, "Aramaic Studies", 27 (his emphasis). Also see Barr, "Hebrew" and Grintz, "Hebrew", 42-45.
- [385] Fitzmyer, "Jewish Christianity", 237.
- [386] Rowland, Christian Origins, 201.
- [387] Murray, "Disaffected Judaism", 264.
- [388] Martin, New Testament Foundations, 85.
- [389] Bruce, Acts, 151.
- [390] Barrett, Corinthians, 293. Also see his "Paul's Opponents" and "Pauline Controversies".
- [391] Brown, S., "Matthean Community", 200. Also see Schussler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her, 162,166; and Beare, Philippians, 106-107.
- [392] E.g.: Bruce, Acts, 153.
- [393] Cadbury, "Hellenists", 59-74.
- [394] Moule, "Once More", 101.
- [395] Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 54-58.
- [396] Wedderburn ("Paul and Jesus", 175) claims that Paul was not persuaded to convert Gentiles by his Damascus road vision but by "authentic Christian tradition... mediated to him by those very Hellenist Christians whom he had previously persecuted". The "tradition" of

converting Gentiles is "authentic" because it is based on "Jesus' openness to Jewish sinners". Thus both Paul and Jesus are closer to the "Hellenists" than the "Hebrews". This elaboration counters not only Paul's own writings but also Luke's text. Marshall ("Palestinian", 278) notes that "it is not clear whether Paul was a 'Hebrew' or a 'Hellenist' in the eyes of Luke". Simon (Stephen) also portrays Stephen as a reformer within Judaism.

- [397] Räisänen, Paul and the Law, 251.
- [398] Dunn, Unity and Diversity, 269-270.
- [399] Haenchen, Acts, 266-268.
- [400] Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 55.
- [401] Moule, "Once More", 101.
- [402] Haenchen, Acts, 267-268. Also see Schrage, Ethics, 125,126.
- [403] Cullmann, "Significance".
- [404] Brown, S., "Matthean Community", 201.
- [405] Brown, S., "Matthean Community", 205.
- [406] Munck, Acts.
- [407] Murray, "Jews", 204.
- [408] Murray, "Jews", 204. Also see: Brown, R.E., Critical Meaning, 129-132; "Not Jewish", 74-79; and Brown, Meier, Antioch and Rome.
- [409] Chrysostom, Homily 14 on Acts 6:1.
- [410] Chrysostom, Homily 21 on Acts 9:29.
- [411] Barrett, Corinthians, 293.
- [412] Barrett, Corinthians and New Testament Background, 50-51.
- [413] Goulder ("Two Roots", esp. 67,79 and 85n13) uses the inscriptions to support his claim for the Samaritan contribution to the origins of Christianity.

- [414] See Reynolds, Tannenbaum, Jews and Godfearers, 132. Also see van der Horst, "Jews" and Kraabel, "Social Systems" for discussion of inscriptions in Sardis.
- [415] Richardson, Israel, 118 and n2.
- [416] This is not what Besancon-Spencer ("Wise Fool", 352) intends when she says that "when the six sentences in ix:22 are reduced to their simplest propositions they appear to be identical". She clearly recognises that they are distinguishable, but does not discuss the differences beyond a footnote.
- [417] Bruce, Paul: Apostle, 42.
- [418] Black, Scrolls, 79.
- [419] Davies, P.R., "Hasidim". Despite Davies' convincing arguments the existence of a "Hasidean" group is still maintained by Kampen (Hasideans) who finds the origin of the Pharisees among them.
- [420] Bruce, "Hebrews", 231.
- [421] Although "Gnosticism" is often labelled "heresy" it was one of the varieties of early Christianity.
- [422] Chron. 8. For this and the following references see de Lange, Origen, 36.
- [423] Sel. in Gen. XIV.13.
- [424] In Matth. XI.5.
- [425] Black, Scrolls, 78,79.
- [426] Werner, "Melito"; Kraabel, "Melito"; Hall, Melito; Wilson, "Melito", 81-102.
- [427] It is possible that the three appellations of "the city" refer to the three divisions of the bible in their Christian form: Law, Histories and Prophets. This would make "Hebrews" a reference to the "Historians".
- [428] Kraabel, "Melito", 84.

- [429] Kraabel, "Social Systems", 85.
- [430] Further noted and discussed in my chapter on the use of ioudaios in early Christianity.
- [431] Para.2 (Syriac). Also in Armenian. The Greek text, at para.15, says he was born of a "holy maiden, ek parthenos hagian.
- [432] Richardson, Israel 17-18.
- [433] In Matth. XI.5.
- [434] PE VII.8.
- [435] de Lange, Origen, 31.
- [436] In discussing Acts 6.
- [437] Homily 8:6-7. Quoted by Gaston, "Retrospect", 166.
- [438] Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, 118-165.
- [439] Apol. 18.6.
- [440] Jerome, Commentary on Isaiah IV on Isa 11:2.
- [441] References to the Gospel of Philip refer to the manuscript pages and line numbers as cited in the edition of Layton, Gnostic. See also Wilson, R.McL., Gospel of Philip.
- [442] Siker, "Gnostic Views", 286.
- [443] 51:29,29; 52:21; 55:28; 62:5,13.
- [444] Siker, "Gnostic Views", 277.
- [445] Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha 276.
- [446] Occurs seven times in this Gospel (52:24; 62:32; 64:24; 67:26; 74:14,27; 75:32) and only once in any other Nag Hammadi text (Testimony of Truth 31:25).
- [447] 62:26; 75:30-32.
- [448] Siker, "Gnostic Views", 277.

- [449] Mayer, "Israel", 310.
- [450] Ignatius, Magnesians 10:3.
- [451] Hill, "Hebrews". Contrast the use of "Jews, Iudaeis" in, e.g. Cynewulf's Elene and Isidore's De fide catholica contra Iudaeos in which "Jews" are the opponents of the Church in need of "converting" into "the Church". See Anderson, "Cynewulf's Elene".
- [452] See Stern, Greek and Latin. Texts in Stern are cited in the format, Stern, #51a; page numbers are given for Stern's notes or other discussion.
- [453] One of Alexander's Jewish sources, not the prophet.
- [454] Stern, #51a. Eusebius, Prep.Ev. IX,29.
- [455] Stern, #52.
- [456] Stern, Greek and Latin 1.164.
- [457] Stern, #236.
- [458] Stern, #281.
- [459] Quoted by Porphyrius, Vita Pythagorae 11. Stern, #250.
- [460] Stern, #258.
- [461] See Stern, Greek and Latin, 1.559 note to 6:1.
- [462] Stern, #331.
- [463] Stern, #335.
- [464] Stern, #53.
- [465] Stern, #349.
- [466] Stern, Greek and Latin, 2.191.
- [467] Stern, #353.
- [468] Stern, #354.

- [469] Stern, #356.
- [470] Stern, #357 and #358.
- [471] Stern, #373.
- [472] See 3:1. Motyer, Day, 66; Wolff, Joel and Amos, 164; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 563-565.
- [473] Also see 7:12. Although Wolff (Joel and Amos, 311) thinks this does not mean "go home!", but that Judah was "a political realm in which he might 'support himself' unhindered", elsewhere he cites it as evidence that Amos was a Judean (p.90). Also see Mays, Amos, 3.
- [474] BDB 975 says 2507 occurrences; ES lists 2512. However, BDB's notation is said to "denote the (approximate) number of occurrences of such words, conjugations, etc.". ES evidently lists some occurrences in more than one section (and has some inaccurate listings).
- [475] Williamson, Israel, 38,62,89. Also see Allen, "Kerygmatic Units".
- [476] Japhet, "Conquest", 217.
- [477] Not followed by RSV.
- [478] See Williamson, Israel, 62-64.
- [479] This does not include references to yiśra'elah and yiśra'eli which I note later.
- [480] For such a list see Danell, Studies, 23; and the bibliography of Westermann, Genesis 12-36, 512-513. Also see Fowler, Theophoric, 108,361.
- [481] Particularly see Vermes, "Impact", 12-14.
- [482] Coote, "Meaning", 137.
- [483] Danell, Studies, 18.
- [484] Cohen, A., (ed.), Soncino Chumash 195-228. The Sephardic Haftarah is Obadiah, which deals with the relationship between Jacob and Esau in the contemporary expressions Judah and Edom.

- [485] There are a number of "etymological" plays on names in Hosea; e.g. "Jacob" at 12:4; and "Ephraim" at 8:9; 9:16; 13:15 and 14:9. See Watson, Classical Hebrew, 244.
- [486] Wolff (Hosea, 206) sees "Judah" as a replacement of an original "Israel" by a Judean redactor. Danell (Studies, 139-140) argues against the temptation "to emend the rather inconvenient 'Judah'" because it is "safest to stick to the Massoretic text" where "Israel" and "Jacob" (v1) refer both to the northern kingdom alone and to the wider group inclusive of Ephraim and Judah. Also see Emmerson, Hosea, 63-65 and 85.
- [487] See Good, "Hosea", 141.
- [488] Good, "Hosea", 141.
- [489] Wolff, Hosea, 211,212.
- [490] Fishbane, Biblical, 378.
- [491] Margalit, "Origin", 237.
- [492] Good, "Hosea", 142.
- [493] Coote, "Meaning", 142. This is supported with reference to 1 Sam 2:26.
- [494] CD 1:14.
- [495] CD 6:6.
- [496] Vermes, "Impact", 12-14.
- [497] Except in Jonah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Ruth, Esther, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations.
- [498] 870 according to BDB, 876 according to ES.
- [499] In the parallel 23:7,8 bene yiśraʿel becomes bet yiśraʿel. That this does not make a difference to the meaning of the prophecy shows that bene yiśraʿel and bet yiśraʿel are the same group.

- [500] Weinfeld, "Jeremiah".
- [501] E.g.: Ezra 3:1; Neh 1:6,6; 7:72; 9:1.
- [502] Esd 5:46 reads "some of the people settled in Jerusalem". This is followed by commentators and versions. E.g.: Batten, Ezra, 106; Blenkinsopp, Ezra-Nehemiah, 95; RSV.
- [503] Batten, Ezra, 106.
- [504] Blenkinsopp, Ezra-Nehemiah, 95.
- [505] Blenkinsopp, Ezra-Nehemiah, 96,282.
- [506] Other examples at 6:21; 7:7; Neh 10:40.
- [507] Neh 7:7 introduces the same information.
- [508] Good, Sheep.
- [509] This is an extension to the use of cam which is "a consanguineous term" in Hebrew though not in cognate languages, see Kutler, "Structural", 77.
- [510] 1 Sam 9:16; 2 Sam 3:18; 7:11; 1 Kgs 6:13; 8:16,16; 14:7; 16:2,2; Jer 7:12; 30:3; Ezek 14:9; 25:14; 36:8,12; 38:14,16; 39:7; Amos 7:8,15; 8:2; 9:14; 1 Chr 11:2; 17:7,10; 2 Chr 6:6. The occurrence at Dan 9:20 is dealt with in the final paragraph of this section.
- [511] Carroll, Jeremiah, 571.
- [512] Sawyer (Semantics, 5) is actually referring to the words šrot hekal, but his words are applicable to the whole passage in which they occur.
- [513] Num 25:8,8,14; Deut 27:14; 29:9; Josh 9:6; 10:24; Judg 7:8,14,23; 8:22; 9:55; 20:11,17,20,20,22,33,36,39,39; 20:41,42,48; 21:1; 1 Sam 13:6; 14:22,24; 17:2,19,24,25; 2 Sam 15:13; 16:15,18; 17:14,24; 19:42,43,44,44; 20:2; 23:9; 1 Kgs 8:2; 1 Chr 10:1,7; 2 Chr 5:3.
- [514] Ross, "Individual", 54,58.

- [515] JPS translation of Judg 20:33.
- [516] 1 Sam 7:11; 8:22; 11:10; 17:52; 31:1,7,2. 2 Sam 2:17; 15:6.
- [517] McKane, 1 and 2 Samuel, 249-250.
- [518] Hertzberg, 1 and 2 Samuel, 336-337.
- [519] Exod 12:3,6,19 47; Lev 4:13; Num 16:9; 32:4 Josh 22:18,20; 1 Kgs 8:5; 2 Chr 5:6.
- [520] Lev 16:17; Deut 31:30; Josh 8:35; 1 Kgs 8:14,14,22,55; 12:3; 1 Chr 13:2; 2 Chr 6:3,3,12,13.
- [521] Pope, "Congregation".
- [522] Schmidt, "kaleō".
- [523] Ahlström, Who, 101.
- [524] The remaining occurrences are in Exodus (1), Leviticus (4), Numbers (1), Joshua (1), 1 Samuel (2), 2 Samuel (5), 1 Kings (1), Isaiah (4), Hosea (5), Amos (8), Micah (3), Zechariah (1), Psalms (3), Ruth (1). ES wrongly lists Ezek 25:3 as an occurrence of bet yiśraʿel. It is also, correctly, listed as ʿadmat yiśraʿel. Lev 17:10 is incorrectly listed among the occurrences of bene yiśraʿel, perhaps supported by the variant readings of the apparatus of BHS, cp. 17:3.
- [525] Williamson, Israel, 109.
- [526] The parallel between "Bethel" and "Chemosh" need not imply that "Bethel" is the name of a divinity. The impression given is that the town (and its sanctuary?) are being referred to. If there was once a divinity named "Bethel" this has been forgotten by later readers. Thus the parallel between is merely a literary one.
- [527] Clements, Isaiah 1-39 59.
- [528] Wade, Isaiah, 31.
- [529] The variant reading bene in place of bet is unimportant.

- [530] Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 563.
- [531] See chap.45 where bet yiśraʿel (also named "my people") are all the tribes, with access to the land and freedom from the oppression of the princes.
- [532] Whilst variant readings in all three cases offer bene yiśraʿel in place of bet yiśraʿel the parallel use of bene yiśraʿel in 17:1,5,12 and elsewhere show that the two phrases are interchangeable.
- [533] Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 386.
- [534] The phrases, "Book of the kings of Israel and Judah" (2 Chr 16:11; 27:7; 35:27; 36:8) and "the Book of the kings of Judah and Israel" (2 Chr 16:11; 25:26; 32:32) have similar applications and implications.
- [535] Gen 49:16,28. Exod 24:4. Deut 33:5. Josh 3:12; 12:7; 24:1. Judg 18:1; 20:2,10,12; 21:5,8,15. 1 Sam 2:28; 9:21; 10:20; 15:17. 2 Sam 5:1; 7:7; 15:2,10; 19:10; 20:14; 24:2. 1 Kgs 8:16; 11:32; 14:21. 2 Kgs 21:7. Ezek 37:19; 47:13,21,22; 48:19,29,31. Hos 5:9. Zech 9:1. Ps 78:55. Ezra 6:17. 1 Chr 27:16,22; 29:6. 2 Chr 6:5; 11:16; 12:13; 33:7.
- [536] This count is taken from various sources, none of which are complete; e.g. ES has 198 occurrences of ʿelohe yiśraʿel under yiśraʿel, but under ʿelohim lists 204 occurrences. Some occurrences may have been missed.
- [537] 2 Chr 32:19 (parallel to "the God of Israel") and Ezra 7:19 (in Aramaic).
- [538] 1 Chr 15:12,14; 16:4; 22:6; 23:25; 24:19; 28:4 (all of which are unique to 1 Chronicles); 16:36 (paralleled by Ps 106:48); 2 Chr 2:11; 6:17; 11:16; 13:5; 15:4; 20:19; 29:10; 30:1,5; 32:17; 33:16,18; 36:13 (all unique to 2 Chronicles); 6:4,7,10,14,16 (parallel to 1 Kgs 8:15,17,20,23,25); and 34:23,26 (parallel to 2 Kgs 22:15,18). Another, 2 Chr 6:17, is almost parallel to 1 Kgs 8:26 except that YHWH is missing in Kings.

- [539] Of these Deuteronomic uses eight are paralleled in Chronicles.
- [540] Christensen, "Huldah".
- [541] As Huldah is included as a key figure, "men" is inaccurate.
- [542] Exod 24:10; Num 16:9; 2 Sam 23:3; 1 Kgs 8:26; 2 Kgs 18:5; Isa 29:23; 41:17; 45:3,15; 48:2; 52:12; Jer 35:17; 38:17; 44:7; Ezek 8:4; 9:3,10,19; 10:20; 11:22; 43:2; Pss 59:6; 68:9; 69:7; 72:18; Ezra 3:2; 6:22; 9:4; 1 Chr 5:26; 2 Chr 15:13.
- [543] Ezra 8:35; 1 Chr 4:10 and 2 Chr 29:7 (again the Chronicler's uses are unparalleled).
- [544] 5:7,8,8,8,10,11; 6:3.
- [545] The narrative should not be used to reconstruct the actual words of historical Philistines.
- [546] Jer 7:3,21; 9:14; 16:9; 19:3,15; 25:27; 27:4,21; 28:2,14; 29:4,8,21,25; 31:23; 32:14,15; 35:13,17,18,19; 38:17; 39:16; 42:15,18; 43:10; 44:2,7,11,25; 46:25; 48:1; 50:18; 51:33. The remaining five are: 2 Sam 7:27; Isa 21:10; 37:16; Zeph 2:9; 1 Chr 17:24.
- [547] ES, 973-74.
- [548] Ishida, "Leaders".
- [549] Kang, Divine War, 202.
- [550] See Polley, Amos 55-82.
- [551] "Thus says YHWH of Hosts" and "Thus says YHWH" are also commonly found (e.g. 9:16). Also, ne²um YHWH is common in both prose and poetry (e.g. 1:8; 12:17).
- [552] kol hagoyim, v15, kol hamamlekot ha²ares, v26, kol yo²sebe ha²ares, v29.
- [553] At Isa 30:29 sur yi²sra²el refers to Zion.
- [554] Cp. Ezekiel 34.

- [555] The emmendation ʔet to ʔel and of mišam to mišem (accepted by the RSV, for example) is unnecessary. A translation closer to the MT is given by the JPS version.
- [556] Sawyer, Isaiah 2.75.
- [557] Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 119-126.
- [558] Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, 82.
- [559] Watson, Classical Hebrew, 206.
- [560] Although Isa 1:24 is the sole occurrence of "Mighty One of Israel" the phrase "Mighty One of Jacob" occurs five times in MT, Gen 49:24; Isa 49:26; 60:16; Ps 123:2,5.
- [561] Watson, (Classical Hebrew, 295-6) notes that these verses are a refrain. Within the refrain the address "O God" and "YHWH the God of Hosts" are "insertions and/or additions". They highlight the development in the Psalm.
- [562] Cp. the addition at Ps 84:6 which specifies that "the highways" are "to Zion".
- [563] 2 Kgs 19:22; Isa 1:4; 5:19,24; 10:20; 12:6; 17:7; 29:19; 30:11,12,15; 31:1; 37:23; 41:14,16,20; 43:3,14; 45:11; 47:4; 48:7; 54:5; 55:5; 60:9,14; Jer 50:29; 51:5; Pss 61:22; 68:41; 79:19. ES omits Isa 54:5.
- [564] Thompson (Jeremiah, 743) incorrectly says that only in 50:29 does Jeremiah use this name of YHWH. His note on 51:5 (p750) says to "see note on 50:29-32".
- [565] Barker ("Reflections") argues that the "Holy One of Israel" was represented by the king in the continual struggle against other "Holy Ones".
- [566] 17:7 is a borderline case in that YHWH occurs in the context but not collocated with "Holy One of Israel".
- [567] 10:20; 37:23; 43:3.
- [568] 30:1; 37:23; 43:3.

- [569] 43:14; 47:4.
- [570] 49:7; 55:5.
- [571] The feminine suffixes refer back to "Zion", the object of the whole prophecy (52:1). In the immediate context she is "the barren one" who is about to be repopulated. See Sawyer, "Daughter of Zion".
- [572] Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 129.
- [573] Procksch, "hagios", 93-94.
- [574] Vriezen, Outline, 71-72.
- [575] Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, 9.
- [576] Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, 68.
- [577] Sawyer, Isaiah, 1.9.
- [578] Clements, Isaiah, 31.
- [579] Sawyer, Isaiah 1, 116.
- [580] 7:2; 11:17; 12:19,22; 13:9; 18:2; 20:38,42;
21:7,8; 25:3,6; 33:24; 36:6; 37:12; 38:18,19.
- [581] 37:12 is similar.
- [582] Cp. 18:2 and 21:7,8.
- [583] Cp. 20:38.
- [584] LXX's erēma (reflecting šimmat) is strange, why would anyone boast of owning ancient deserts?
- [585] The phrase hare yiśraʿel, which also occurs only in Ezekiel, is functionally similar to ʿadmat yiśraʿel. See 6:2,3; 19:9; 33:28;34:13,14; 35:12; 36:1,1,4,8; 37:22; 38:8; 39:2,4,17.
- [586] Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2.563.
- [587] 17:23; 20:40.
- [588] 34:14.
- [589] Cp.: 20:40.

- [590] Ahlström, Who. Also see Jobling, Sense, 122-123; and Gray, J., "Israel", 452-453.
- [591] Ahlström, Who. See figure 2 on p.68, by way of summary.
- [592] And a further 31 occurrences in the MT.
- [593] Jeremiah also uses hare šomron rather than har šomron. Amos is unique in MT in using har šomron, which occurs twice (4:1; 6:1). At 6:1 har šomron is parallel to har sion, though the former is delegitimated as a sacred centre.
- [594] ES omits 2 Chr 34:7 from the list on p509 under "Israel" but includes it under ʔeres on p112.
- [595] Josh 11:22.
- [596] 27:17; 40:2; 47:18.
- [597] 1 Sam 13:19; 2 Kgs 5:2,4; 6:23.
- [598] 1 Chr 13:2; 22:2; 2 Chr 2:16; 30:25; 34:7.
- [599] Followed by modern interpreters, e.g. the RSV.
- [600] RSV.
- [601] The 13 listed are: Judg 19:29; 1 Sam 7:13; 11:3,7; 27:1; 2 Sam 21:5; 1 Kgs 1:3; 2 Kgs 10:32; 14:25; Ezek 11:10,11; Mal 1:5; 1 Chr 21:12. gebul occurs 240 times.
- [602] Adler, "Mother in Israel", 247.
- [603] Adler ("Mother in Israel") argues that "woman's creative aspect has been diminished while her nurturant [and, therefore, protective] has been greatly augmented".
- [604] Hos 5:5; 7:10; Nah 2:3.
- [605] Hos 10:8.
- [606] 1 Sam 9:20.
- [607] 2 Kgs 17:19.
- [608] Ps 81:5; 85:10; 1 Chr 16:17.

- [609] Josh 10:30,32; 11:8; Judg 3:30; 1 Sam 14:12,37.
- [610] Ps 14:7.
- [611] Ps 53:7.
- [612] Mic 1:15. kebod bene yiśra²el occurs at Isa 17:3.
- [613] 1 Kgs 2:4; 9:5; 8:20,25; 10:9; 2 Kgs 10:30; 15:12;
2 Chr 6:10,16.
- [614] 2 Kgs 13:4.
- [615] 1 Sam 15:28.
- [616] 1 Sam 24:21.
- [617] 1 Sam 2:29.
- [618] 2 Chr 17:4.
- [619] Exod 9:4,7.
- [620] 2 Sam 21:17.
- [621] Jer 50:20.
- [622] Judg 10:16.
- [623] 2 Kgs 14:26.
- [624] Amos 2:6; 3:14; Mic 1:13.
- [625] Num 21:3.
- [626] Hos 1:5.
- [627] 2 Kgs 21:8; 2 Chr 33:8.
- [628] 2 Kgs 2:12; 13:14.
- [629] Jer 33:7.
- [630] 2 Kgs 14:27; Isa 48:1; Ps 83:5.
- [631] Ps 22:4.
- [632] Lam 2:1.
- [633] Jer 3:23.

- [634] BHS's emendation to gepen yisra'el and gepen ya'agob would make the same point: the majesty of the nation being renewed fertility after the wilderness years.
- [635] Though Am ha'ares might distinguish "peasants" from "returning exiles" it is not divorced from "Israel". See Oppenheimer, Am ha-Aretz.
- [636] Ahlström, Who, 101 n.1.
- [637] Leg.All. 2.34; Leg.All. 3.15; Sacr. 119,120,134; Post. 63; Immut. 121; Conf. 72,92,147,148; Ebr. 82; Migr. 39,201; Heres. 78,279; Cong. 51; Fug. 208; Mut. 81,83; Somn. 1.114,129,171,172; Somn. 2.45; Praem. 44.
- [638] Leg.All. 2.77,93; Leg.All. 3.11,133,186,212,214; Sacr. 118,134; Deter. 67,94; Post. 54,92; immut. 144; Plant. 59,63; Ebr. 77,82; Sobr. 19; Conf. 36,56,72,93; Migr. 15,54,113,125,168,224; Heres. 113, 117,124; Cong. 86; Mut. 207; Somn. 1.62,89,117,172; Somn. 2.173,222,271,280; Abr. 57; Legat. 4. Two of these (Ebr. 82 and Somn. 1.172) are also listed as references to Jacob as either could be intended.
- [639] Leisegang, Philonis Alexandrini, 7.13. Philo also does more than either offer "history" or "allegory", see Brooke, Exegesis, 17-25.
- [640] Wolfson, Philo, 91-2. Also see Kahn, "y'sr'l" and Dellling, "One who sees God", 41.
- [641] Psalms of Solomon 17:25 talks of gathering the "holy nation" from its exile. See Swete, Old Testament, 3.765-787; Gray, G.B., "Psalms"; Trafton, "Psalms", 236.
- [642] Neusner, Judaism and its Social Metaphors, 221 and (after the *) note 12.
- [643] Jerome, Vir.Illust. 11.
- [644] Winston, Philo, 351-2, n240.
- [645] Smallwood, Philonis, 154.
- [646] Paed 1.9 (PG 8.341).

- [647] Princ 4.3 (PG 11.395); In Num 16.7 (PG 12.699); In Rom 7.14 and 8.7 (PG 14.1141 and 1171).
- [648] Prep.Ev. 7.8,28; 11.6,31.
- [649] Lib. de Nomin Hebr Exodus (PL 23.1039) and Lib.Hebr.Quaest.in Gen 32 (PL 23.1039). Jerome also says that "Israel" means, "the Rightness of God"; see Margalith, "Origin".
- [650] Contra Noetum 5 (PG 10.809-12); in Genes fr. 16; and also On the Origin of the World 2.5; 105:24.
- [651] Winston, Philo 351-2, n240. Namely Constitutiones Apostolorum 7.36.2; 8.15.7 and Seder Eliyyahu Rabbah 27.
- [652] Cited by Origen at In Joh. 2.25 [PG 14, 168-69]. See Smith, J.Z., "Prayer of Joseph".
- [653] Winston, Philo, 351-2, n240.
- [654] Smallwood, Philonis, 153.
- [655] Winston, Philo, 37.
- [656] Dahl, Volk Gottes, 105-118.
- [657] Several texts and translations are used in this discussion, in particular DJD, Lohse, Texte, and Vermes, DSSE.
- [658] Also see 5:4,5.
- [659] Also see 9:3.
- [660] 1:3,5,7,14,14; 3:13,14,19; 4:1,2,4,13,16; 5:3,19,20; 6:1,2,5; 7:12,18,20; 8:16; 10:5; 12:8,19,22; 13:1; 14:4,5,19; 15:5,9; 16:1,3,14; 19:11,27,29; 20:1,16,23,26. This list is drawn from Kuhn, (Konkordanz).
- [661] E.g.: 3:13,14; 4:1-5; 4:11; 5:3; 5:19,20; 7:12,18; 15:5,9.
- [662] See also 13:1; 14:19; 16:14; 19:11.
- [663] Douglas, Purity and Neusner, Idea.

- [664] "šby yśr²l who went out from the land of Judah to sojourn in the land of Damascus" occurs four times in CD (4:2; 6:5; 8:16; 19:29). In šby pš^c (2:5 and 20:17) šby "clearly has a religious meaning", according to Knibb ("Exile"), 105.
- [665] Reading of the 'B' text. Carmignac ("Comparison", 62) argues that this is due to haplography in the 'A' text. White ("Comparison", 549) says, "this is possible, but since the second letters are yod and aleph respectively, the scribe would have had to be extremely careless" and says that it is an "explanatory gloss" pointing out that Moses is speaking to "Israel" and not to God. Also see Strickert, "Damascus Document".
- [666] The MT does not list three groups, "Priests, Levites and the sons of Zadok", but only one, "the Levitical Priests, the sons of Zadok". The change reflects both the organisation of the group responsible for the scroll, and the interpretation which follows.
- [667] See Davies, P.R., Damascus Covenant, 71,72.
- [668] 1:10; 6:6; 10:8; 13:2,13; 14:4,4; 15:13; 16:1; 17:5; 18:3,6; 19:13. The remaining fifteen occurrences are at 2:7,9; 3:13,14; 5:1; 10:3,9; 11:6,7; 12:16; 15:1; 17:2. This last occurrence is only a possible reading, Lohse, (Texte, 219) offers "Volkes".
- [669] Also see 13:2.
- [670] Lohse (Texte, 218) reads bryt yśr²l, "Covenant of Israel".
- [671] Baillet, "Un Recueil", 249,50.
- [672] Allegro, "Further Messianic", 174-6.
- [673] DJD 1.92.
- [674] Vermes, DSSE, 280.
- [675] Lohse, Texte, 264; Allegro, DJD 5, 38.
- [676] For a discussion of the uses of "the Simple, pty" see Pan, Vocabulary, 124-133. Note that in 1QSa 1:19-21 pty is best translated

"simpletons" whereas here it is a positive self-designation.

[677] DJD 5.53-57; Vermes, DSSE, 293-294.

[678] For example, frg. 6-7 quotes Deut 33:8-11 in which "Israel" occurs.

[679] Also quoted and interpreted in CD 7:19-20 and 1QM 11:4-7.

[680] DJD 7.105-36; Vermes, DSSE, 234; Baumgartner, "4 Q 503".

[681] The second person address, brwk 2th, is also addressed to God in QL, see 1QH 5:20; 4Q512 frgs. 29-32, 41, 42-44.

[682] E.g. its "day" begins at night-fall and not with sun-rise. This is the normal method in the period. Baumgartner argues that although Jubilees tried to "eliminate the lunar reckoning" of the calendar, neither it, nor any other QL, attempts to alter the beginning of the "day". See Baumgartner, "Beginning", "Reply" and "4 Q 503". Also see Talmon, "Calendar".

[683] Frg. 1, 2:4, 17; frgs. 2-4, 2, 5, 8.

[684] Milik, "4Q Visions"; Vermes, DSSE, 262-263.

[685] Heinemann, "210 Years").

[686] 18:16; 19:14; 21:2; 21:8; 22:11, 11;
23:frg. 42.178g; 26:11; 27:2; 27:4; 29:5;
37:5, 12; 38:5; 39:7, 12; 40:3; 42:14; 49:9;
51:6, 8; 55:6, 20; 56:10, 11; 57:2, 21; 58:4, 5, 6;
59:15, 18; 60:12; 63:6, 7; 64:6, 10; 65:15.

[687] israēl(ites) occurs in CCL at Matt 2:6, 20, 21;
8:10; 9:33; 10:6, 23; 15:24, 31; 19:28; 27:9, 42.
Mark 12:29; 15:32. Luke 1:16, 54, 68, 80;
2:25, 32, 34, [38]; 4:25, 27; 7:9; 22:30; 24:21.
John 1:31, 47, 49; 3:10; 12:13. Acts 1:6;
2:22, 36; 3:12; 4:10, 27; 5:21, 31, 35;
7:23, 37, 42; 9:15; 10:36; 13:16, 17, 23, 24;
21:28. Rom 9:4, 6, 27, 31; 10:19, 21;
11:1, 2, 7, 25, 26. 1 Cor 10:18. 2 Cor 3:7, 13;
11:22. Gal 6:16. Eph 2:12. Phil 3:5. Heb
8:8, 10; 11:22. Rev 2:14; 7:4; 21:12.

- [688] israēl(ites) occurs only five times in John.
- [689] 2:6,20,21; 8:10; 9:33; 10:6,23; 15:24,31; 19:28; 27:9.
- [690] The MT of Mic 5:2 names Bethlehem "Bethlehem Ephratheh" and says "though you are small among the thousands of Judah".
- [691] Gutbrod, "Israel", 385.
- [692] Mayer, "Israel", 310.
- [693] Lowe, "Who", 110,112.
- [694] E.g. 10:23 does not mean "the cities in the land Israel" nor "the cities listed in sacred texts as having been ruled by Solomon" (like some ancient equivalent of the ideological "Greater Israel") but "the cities in which the people Israel live". More obviously, 9:33 does not mean "this is a novelty in this country although it has happened elsewhere before now".
- [695] 2:22; 3:13; 4:12,15,18,23,25; 15:29; 17:22; 19:1; 21:11; 26:32; 27:55; 28:7,10,16. see also 26:29.
- [696] See my discussion of "Judah" in CCL.
- [697] It is strange that the early Christians, who claimed to have great success among the Samaritans, did not take their side in the propaganda war about whether they were of Israelite descent or not. See Coggins, "Old Testament", and Samaritans.
- [698] Isa 29:13 has already been quoted in Matt 15:8,9 making it more than likely that this is what the writer has in mind in this expansion of Mark 7:32-37.
- [699] Gundry, Matthew, 319. Gundry's idea here does depend on more than the phrase "the God of Israel" although this is the only reason he cites. In fact he wishes to interpret the "feeding of the five thousand" as "the feeding of the Jews" and the "feeding of the four thousand" as the "feeding of the Gentiles". He also claims that the phrase the "house of Israel" in 15:24 "establishes a Gentile

setting here too". This inference is not "indubitable" (p319) as Gundry's own comments show that the Gentiles are not the sole subject of that section (p313).

[700] This is also clear in 27:9 and its context.

[701] Sanders, E.P., Paul and Palestinian, 245.

[702] Whether "teacher of the Law" is opposed to "Sadducees" or refers to a Sadducee is uncertain. The preceding verses have already dealt with a number of groups, including Pharisees and Herodians, who come into contact or conflict with Jesus.

[703] Lowe ("Who", 118) argues that basileus tōn ioudaiōn is synonymous with basileus tes ioudaias and should be translated by "king of Judaea" or by "the king of the Judaeans".

[704] In CCL there are only eleven uses of "Roman(s)": John 11:48. Acts 2:10; 16:21,37,38; 22:25,26,27,28; 23:27; 25:16; 28:17. There is one reference to the language "Roman", ie. Latin: John 19:20 (some manuscripts and versions of Luke 23:38 use it also). The city of Rome is referred to by name eight times: Acts 18:2; 19:21; 23:11; 28:14,16; Rom 1:7,15; 2 Tim 1:17. In Mark ioudaios occurs seven times: 1:5; 7:3 15:2,9,12,18,26. "Galilean" occurs once: 14:10. "Samaritan(s)" does not occur and "Gentiles" occurs only once, 11:47, in a quotation of Isa 65:7. There is also a single reference to a "Greek", who is also called a "Syro-Phoenician", at 7:26, i.e. Matthew's "Canaanite woman". Regions are also infrequently mentioned: "Judaea" or "Judah" occurs four times: 1:5; 3:7; 10:1; 13:14. "Galilean" occurs once: 14:10. "Galilee" occurs nine times 1:14,16,28,39; 3:7; 6:21; 7:31; 9:30; 15:41; "Idumea" once: 3:8; "Tyre" three times: 3:8; 7:24,31; "Sidon" twice: 3:8; 7:31 (some manuscripts also read "and Sidon" at 7:24); and the "Decapolis" twice: 5:20; 7:31.

[705] The principle of hereditary, once established, means that the king's heir is God's chosen king.

- [706] 1:1; 8:29; 9:41; 13:21; 14:61; 15:32. The reading at 1:34 is probably derived from Luke 4:41.
- [707] "Son of God" (1:1), although huiou theou is lacking in many manuscripts it is arguably preferable to read it than to omit it; "Son of the Blessed" (14:14) and "Son of David" (12:35).
- [708] Matera, Kingship, 28.
- [709] He is "God's Son" (1:11; 3:11) and "the Christ" (8:29).
- [710] Is he "the Christ the Son of the Blessed" (14:61) or "the king of Judaea" (15:2)? See Matera, Kingship, 14.
- [711] Mal 2:6 and 3:1 also inform Luke's text. Malachi is interested not only in the coming of the prophet Elijah but also in the character of the true priest Levi, who "turned many from iniquity".
- [712] Brown (Birth, 349) notes that there are even closer parallels in contemporary hymns, e.g. in 1 Maccabees, Judith, 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, Qumran Hodayoth and War Scroll.
- [713] The enemies of "Israel" in 1:68 are Gentiles.
- [714] Sanders, J.T., Jews, 162.
- [715] Flacc. 6-7.
- [716] Neusner, Judaism and its Social Metaphors, 86-87.
- [717] 1:6; 2:22,36; 3:12; 4:10,27; 5:21,31,35; 7:23,37,42; 9:15; 10:36; 13:16,17,23,24; 21:28; 28:20.
- [718] Schwartz ("End of the GE") thinks that the "end of the earth" means "The Land of Israel". Schwartz does not think that Luke 24:47-9 (referring to the mission to all the nations, Luke's real concern in these books) supports the same meaning in Acts 1:8.
- [719] Whilst "sons" has positive associations (from its links with traditional phrases like "sons of Israel") it is also the kind of diminutive used by teachers to pupils, cp. the uses of

"son" in Proverbs.

[720] At Acts 7:42 it is paralleled by the use of "house of Jacob" in some texts, although the passage is plainly about the Temple and "house for the God of Jacob" makes better sense. The phrase "house of Jacob" does occur at Luke 1:33 where it refers to Jesus' Davidic kingship over Israel.

[721] The reading "beyond Babylon" in Acts, in place of the MT's "beyond Damascus" would be significant in a discussion of QL but adds little to the present discussion.

[722] Some texts read presbuteroi tou (laou) israēl. It is outside of my purpose to discuss the use of laos or its synonyms and antonyms (such as ethnos and demos), a useful summary can be found in Abbott-Smith, Manual, 264,265.

[723] The speeches in Acts, being notoriously similar in style and content, are probably the work of one hand. Hence the comments of Dibelius (Studies in the Acts, 111) "by developing the same scheme several times Luke wants to show his readers what Christian preaching is and ought to be. It is a literary-theological, not a historical task, which he wants to fulfil". See also the analysis of the speeches by Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts".

[724] 1:31,47,49; 3:10; 12:13. 1:47 reads israēlites rather than "Israel".

[725] Barrett, John, 177.

[726] Against: Bernard, John 1.48.

[727] Bultmann (John, 104n4) says, "alēthōs is attributive, with much the same force as alithinōs, i.e. 'one who is worthy of the name of Israel'". Despite Plato and Ignatius, wider usage in CCL does not support this argument, neither does Ruth 3:12 which also means "truly" or "certainly". Barrett (John, 184-185) suggests that "for the thought, cf. Rom 2:28f., the man who is alethos israēlites is ho en tō kruptō ioudaios". However, John's usage of ioudaios argues against this.

- [728] Bultmann (John, 104 n6) considers it an attractive possibility that Nathanael was studying scripture beneath the tree although he thinks the identification of the passage being studied as Gen 28:10-18 or Gen 32:22-32 to be saying too much.
- [729] If israēlītēs was used as an adjective then an adverbial alēthōs could qualify it.
- [730] This is intended as a comment on the versions and commentators and not as an aspect of semantic analysis, in which "translation is inadequate". Sawyer, "Role", 201-202.
- [731] 1:47; 4:42; 6:14; 7:26,40; 8:31; 17:8.
- [732] E.g.: Matt 14:33; 26:73 (parallel to Mark 14:70; Luke 9:27; 12:44; 21:3); 27:54 (parallel to Mark 15:39); Acts 12:11; 1 Thess 2:13; 1 John 2:5.
- [733] Brown, R.E., John (i-xii), 83-88.
- [734] Schmoller, Handkonkordanz, 302.
- [735] Cf. Pancaro, "Relationship", 396-405, especially 398.
- [736] In the following discussion I rely upon the arguments of Telford, Barren Temple, especially: 218-224; and Roffe, Prophetic Vision, especially 98-148.
- [737] Despite Bultmann, this is certainly not be thought of as a typical place for the study of Torah. See Derrett, "Figtrees", 262 and Telford, Barren Temple, 221-222.
- [738] Trowbridge, John 1:51, abstract.
- [739] Jesus' remarkable knowledge of people is a theme in John, (e.g. 4:17-18 and 5:2-9) which itself supports the theme of the misunderstanding of Jesus' strange words.
- [740] Cp. the Simeon passage in Luke's Introduction.
- [741] Roffe, Prophetic Vision. It is only the use of the name "Israel" that is not adequately dealt with in that thesis.

- [742] Trowbridge, John 1:51.
- [743] Meeks, "Man from Heaven", 68.
- [744] Sylva, "Nicodemus", 148-151.
- [745] Smith, J.Z., "What a Difference", 5.
- [746] Bassler, "Mixed Signals", 643, 646. Allison ("Jesus", 73) stresses that a response is demanded of everybody, "sinners" and "good Israelites". "The question of who is 'in' is completely open".
- [747] Schram (Use, 250n24) claims that ioudaios at 3:1 is the "address of the evangelist to his readers" but "Israel" is the "reported usage of a Jewish speaker (Jesus) addressing a Jewish hearer (Nicodemus)".
- [748] 9:4, 6, 27, 31; 10:21; 11:1, 2, 7, 25, 26.
- [749] 1:16; 2:9, 10, 17, 28, 29; 3:1, 9, 29.
- [750] Stendahl, Paul among Jews, 85 and 132.
- [751] Lindeskog, "Israel", 59.
- [752] Gaston, "Israel's Enemies", 411. Cf. Dinkler ("Historical") who argues that Rom 9-11 is largely interested in an "eschatological Israel" rather than an "historical Israel".
- [753] For which Neusner (Judaism and its Social Metaphors, 215-220) "can find no counterpart in this context" in the other Judaisms he discusses.
- [754] Baxter, Ziesler, "Paul and Aboriculture" and Ziesler, Romans, 273.
- [755] Ziesler, Romans, 273.
- [756] Neusner, Judaism and its Social Metaphors, 149.
- [757] Gager Origins, 258.
- [758] See my discussion of Paul's use of ioudaios.
- [759] Schweizer, Baumgartel, Meyer, "sarx".

- [760] It might even be possible to translate kata sarka by "ordinary" by analogy with 3:3 where sarkikos is parallel to anthrōpon peripateite, "ordinary person" or "man in the street".
- [761] Lindeskog, "Israel". In the same article Lindeskog claims that Paul coined the term israēl kata sarka because he has understood that "Christianity must take the step out of Judaism" (74). Despite noting that "Paul has not expressively [sic] spoken of the israēl kata pneuma" he claims that "it follows from the term israēl kata sarka" (74n23).
- [762] A common Greek and Roman rhetorical device. See Judge, "Paul's Boasting"; "St. Paul and Classical Society"; "Social Identity".
- [763] Richardson, Israel, 76.
- [764] E.g. 5Q 15 provides a specific blue-print for the buildings of the new Jerusalem. See Riley, "Temple". Also see Hayward, "Jewish Temple", particularly for discussion of the literature concerned with Leontopolis.
- [765] Hill, "Hebrews", 360.
- [766] See Blumenkranz, Auteurs cretiens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott-Smith, G.,
A Manual Greek Lexicon of the NT (3rd edition;
 Edinburgh: Clark, 1981).
- Ackroyd, P.R.,
Exile and Restoration: a Study of Hebrew
 Thought of the Sixth Century BC (London: SCM:
 1976).
- Adler, M.K.,
Naming and Addressing; a Sociological Study
 (Harburg: Burke, 1978).
- Adler, R.,
 "A Mother in Israel: Aspects of the Mother
 Role in Jewish Myth", Beyond Androcentrism:
 New Essays on Women and Religion (ed.: Gross,
 R.M.; Missoula: Scholars, 1977) 237-258.
- Ahlström, G.W.,
Who were the Israelites? (Winona Lake, In.:
 Eisenbraun, 1986).
- Allegro, J.M.,
 "Further Messianic References in Qumran
 Literature", JBL 75 (1956) 174-187.
- Allen, L.C.,
The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah
 (NICOT; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976).
- Allen, L.C.,
 "Kerygmatic Units in 1 & 2 Chronicles", JSOT
 41 (1988) 21-36.
- Allison, D.C.,
 "Jesus and the Covenant: a Response to
 E.P. Sanders", JSNT 29 (1987) 57-78.
- Allison, D.C.,
 "Gnilka on Matthew", Biblica 70 (1989)
 526-538.
- Alon, G.,
 "The Bounds of the Laws of Levitical Cleaness"
 in Jews, Judaism, 190-234.

- Alon, G.,
 "The Origin of the Samaritans in the Halakhic Tradition" in Jews, Judaism, 354-373.
- Alon, G.,
Jews, Judaism and the Classical World
 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977).
- Alon, G.,
 "The Original Sanhedrin: Retrospect" in Jews in their Land, 185-205.
- Alon, G.,
The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age
 (70-640 C.E.) (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1980).
- Altshuler, D.,
 "The Treatise Peri ethnōn kai eitiōn, 'On Customs and Causes' by Flavius Josephus", JQR 69 (1979) 226-232.
- Amussine, J.D.,
 "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshêr de Nahum", RQ 15 (1963) 389-396.
- Amusin, J.D.
 "The Reflections of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166)", HUCA 48 (1977) 123-152.
- Anbar, M.,
 "'eres ha'ibrim <<le pays des Hebreux>>", Or 41 (1972) 383-386.
- Anderson, E.R.,
 "Cynewulf's Elene 115b-24, the Conversion of the Jews: Figurative or Literal?", English Language Notes 25.3 (1988) 1-3.
- Arazy, A.,
The Appellations of the Jews (ioudaios, hebraios, israel) in the Literature from Alexander to Justinian (unpublished PhD dissertation, Ann Arbor, 1977).
- Ashton, J.,
 "The Identity and Function of the ioudaioi in the Fourth Gospel", NovT 27 (1985) 40-75.

- Aus, R.D.,
 "Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and the 'Full Number of the Gentiles' of Rom. XI 25", NovT 21 (1979) 232-262.
- Baillet, M.,
 "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân grotte 4: <<Les paroles des luminaires>>", RB 68 (1961), 195-250.
- Bal, M.,
Anti-Covenant: Counter-Reading Women's Lives in the Hebrew Bible (Sheffield: Almond, 1989).
- Barker, M.,
 "Some Reflections on the Enoch Myth", JSOT 15 (1980) 7-29.
- Baron, S.W.,
A Social and Religious History of the Jews (2nd ed.; 15 vols; NY: Columbia, 1952-).
- Barr, J.,
The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford: OUP, 1961).
- Barr, J.,
 "Did Isaiah know about Hebrew 'root meanings'?", ExpT 75 (1964) 242.
- Barr, J.,
 "Etymology and the Old Testament", OTS 19 (1974) 1-28.
- Barr, J.,
 "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Hellenistic Age" in CHJ 2.79-114.
- Barrett, C.K.,
New Testament Background: Selected Documents (London: SPCK, 1956).
- Barrett, C.K.,
 "Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians", NTS 17 (1970) 233-254.
- Barrett, C.K.,
The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (London: Black, 1973).

- Barrett, C.K.,
 "Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period", NTS 20 (1974) 229-245.
- Barrett, C.K.,
 "Jews and Judaisers in the Epistles of Ignatius" in Jews, Greeks, (eds.: Hammerton-Kelly, Scroggs) 220-244.
- Barrett, C.K.,
The Gospel According to St. John (London: SPCK, 1978).
- Barth, K.,
 The Epistle to the Romans (6th edition; London: OUP, 1957).
- Barth, K.,
Church Dogmatics II/2 The Doctrine of God (Edinburgh: Clark, 1957).
- Bassler, J.M.,
 "Mixed Signals: Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel", JBL 108 (1989) 635-646.
- Batten, L.W.,
The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1913).
- Baumgartner, J.M.,
 "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees", JBL 77 (1958) 355-360.
- Baumgartner, J.M.,
 "Reply", JBL 78 (1959) 157.
- Baumgartner, J.M.,
 "4 Q 503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar", RQ 12 (1986) 399-407.
- Baxter, A.G., Ziesler, J.A.,
 "Paul and Aboriculture: Romans 11:17-24", JSNT 24 (1985) 25-32.
- Beall, T.S.,
Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls (Cambridge: CUP, 1988).
- Beare, F.W.,
A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (NTC; London: Black, 1959).

- Beker J.C.,
 "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent?", NTS 34 (1988) 364-377.
- Berg, S.B.,
The Book of Esther (SBLDS 44; Missoula: Scholars, 1979).
- Berliner, A.,
Targum Onkelos (Berlin: Gorzelancyk, 1884).
- Bernard, J.H.,
The Gospel according to St. John 1; (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1962).
- Besançon-Spencer A.,
 "The Wise Fool (and the Foolish Wise), a Study of Irony in Paul", NovT 23 (1981) 349-360.
- Betlyon, J.W.,
 "The Provincial Government of Persian Period Judea and the Yehud Coins", JBL 105 (1986) 633-642.
- Betz, H.D.,
 "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians", NTS 21 (1974) 353-79.
- Betz, H.D.,
Galatians (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979).
- Bickermann, E.,
 "Un document relatif a la persecution d'Antiochus IV Epiphane", RHR 115 (1937) 188-223.
- Bickermann, E.J.,
The Jews in the Greek Age (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard, 1988).
- Black, M.,
The Scrolls and Christian Origins (London: Thomas Nelson, 1961).
- Black, M.,
 "Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus", in In Memoriam Paul Kahle (eds.: Black, Fohrer) 17-28.

- Black, M., Fohrer, G., (eds.),
In Memorium Paul Kahle (BZAW 103; Berlin:
 Topelmann, 1968).
- Blenkinsopp, J.,
Gibeon and Israel: The Role of Gibeon and the
 Gibeonites in the Political and Religious
 History of Early Israel (Cambridge: CUP,
 1972).
- Blenkinsopp, J.,
Ezra-Nehemiah (OTL; London: SCM, 1988).
- Blumenkranz, B.,
Les auteurs cretiens latins du Moyen Age sur
 les Juifs et le Judaisme (Paris: Mouton,
 1963).
- Borgen, P.,
 "Observations on the Theme 'Paul and Philo'"
 in Die Paulinische Literature und Theologie
 (ed.: Pedersen, S.; Aarhus: Aros, 1980)
 85-102.
- Borgen, P.,
Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men and
 other essays on Christian Origins (Trondheim:
 Tapir, 1983).
- Borges, J.L.,
 "The Garden of Forking Paths" in Labyrinths,
 Selected Stories and Other Writings (London:
 Penguin, 1970) 44-54.
- Bowker, J.,
 "The Origin and Purpose of St. John's Gospel",
NTS 11 (1965) 398-408.
- Braude, W.G.,
The Midrash on the Psalms (2 vols.; New Haven:
 Yale, 1959).
- Braude, W.G.,
Pesikta Rabbati (2 vols.; New Haven: Yale,
 1968).
- Brawley, R.L.,
Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and
 Conciliation (SBLMS 33; Atlanta: Scholars,
 1987).

- Brettler, M.Z.,
God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor (JSOTss 76; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989).
- Bright, J.,
A History of Israel (London: SCM, 1974).
- Brooke, G.J.,
Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).
- Brown, C., (ed.),
NIDNTT (3 vols; Exeter: Paternoster: 1975-1978).
- Brown, R.E.,
The Gospel According to John (i-xii) (AB; London: Chapman, 1971, repr. 1977).
- Brown, R.E.,
The Birth of the Messiah (NY: Doubleday, 1977).
- Brown, R.E.,
The Critical Meaning of the Bible (NY: Paulist, 1981).
- Brown, R.E.,
 "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity", CBQ 45 (1983) 74-79.
- Brown, R.E., Meier, J.P.,
Antioch and Rome: NT Cradles of Catholic Christianity (London: Chapman, 1983).
- Brown, S.,
 "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission", NovT 22 (1980) 193-221.
- Bruce, F.F.,
 "'To the Hebrews' or 'to the Essenes'?", NTS 9 (1962-63) 217-232.
- Bruce, F.F.,
The Acts of the Apostles (Leicester: IVP, 1976).
- Bruce, F.F.,
Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).

- Bultmann, R.,
The Gospel of John (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).
- Burrows, M., (ed.),
The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery 1
 (New Haven: ASOR; 1950).
- Cadbury, H.J.,
 "The Hellenists" in The Beginnings of Christianity 5 (eds.: Jackson, F.J.F., Lake, K.; London: Macmillan, 1933), 59-74.
- Callaway, M.,
Sing, O Barren One: a study in Comparative Midrash (SBLDS 91; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986).
- Cameron, R., (ed.),
The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts
 (Guildford: Lutterworth, 1983).
- Campbell, W.S.,
 "Did Paul Advocate Separation from the Synagogue? A Reaction to Francis Watson: Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: a Sociological Approach", SJT 42 (1989) 457-467.
- Carmignac, J.,
 "Comparison entre les manuscrits <<A>> et <> du Document de Damas", RQ 2 (1959) 53-67.
- Carroll, R.P.,
Jeremiah: a Commentary (London: SCM, 1986).
- Carroll, J.T.,
 "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees", CBQ 50 (1988) 604-621.
- Cavallin, H.C.,
 "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum", ANRW II.19.1.240-345.
- Cazelles, H.,
 "The Hebrews" in Peoples, (ed.: Wiseman) 1-28.
- Charles, R.H.,
The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (London: Black, 1908; reprinted, OUP, 1966).

- Charles R.H., (ed.),
The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913).
- Charlesworth, J.H., (ed.),
The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (2 vols; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983-85).
- Childs, B.S.,
 "Midrash and the Old Testament" in
Understanding the Sacred Text (Valley Forge, PA.: Judson, 1972).
- Childs, B.S.,
Exodus: a Commentary (OTL; London: SCM, 1974).
- Chilton, B.,
A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible: Jesus' own Interpretation of Isaiah (London: SPCK, 1984).
- Christensen, D.L.,
 "Huldah and the Men of Anathoth: Women in Leadership in the Deuteronomistic History",
SBLSP (Chico, CA.: Scholars, 1984) 399-404.
- Clements, R.E.,
Isaiah 1-39 (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980).
- Coenen, L.,
 "Church, Synagogue", NIDNTT 1.291-307.
- Cogan, M.,
 "For we, like you, worship your God: Three Biblical Portrayals of Samaritan Origins", VT 38 (1988) 286-292.
- Coggins, R.J.,
 "The Old Testament and Samaritan Origins",
ASTI 6 (1968) 35-48.
- Coggins, R.J.,
Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of the Samaritans Reconsidered (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975).
- Coggins, R.J., Houlden, J.L., (eds.),
A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation, (London: SCM, 1990).

- Cohen, A., (ed.),
The Soncino Chumash (Hindhead: Soncino, 1947).
- Cohen, S.J.D.,
Josephus in Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian (Leiden: Brill, 1979).
- Cohen, S.J.D.,
 "Masada: Literary Tradition, Archaeological Remains and the Credibility of Josephus", JJS 33 (1982) 385-405.
- Cohen, S.J.D.,
 "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew", HTR 82 (1989) 13-33.
- Cohen, S.J.D.,
 "The Rabbinic Conversion Ceremony", JJS 41 (1990) 177-203.
- Cohn, L., Wendland, P., Reiter, S.,
Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae Supersunt (7 vols.; Berlin: Reimer, 1896-1930).
- Collins, J.J.,
 "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century" in "To See Ourselves", (ed: Neusner) 163-86.
- Colson, F.H., Whitaker, G.H.,
Philo of Alexandria (10 vols.; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1929-1962).
- Conzelmann, H.,
The Theology of St Luke (London: Faber & Faber, 1960).
- Coote, R.,
 "The Meaning of the Name Israel", HTR 65 (1972) 137-142.
- Coser, L.A.,
The Functions of Social Conflict (NY: Free, 1956).
- Cosgrove, C.H.,
 "Arguing like a Mere Human Being: Gal 3:15-18 in Rhetorical Perspective", NTS 34 (1988) 536-549.

- Cotterell, P., Turner, M.,
Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation
 (London: SPCK, 1989).
- Cross, F.M.,
The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (London: Duckworth, 1952).
- Cross, F.M.,
Scrolls from Qumran Cave 1: the Great Isaiah Scroll, the Order of the Community, the Pesher to Habakkuk (Jerusalem: Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and the Shrine of the Book, 1972).
- Crown, A.D., (ed.),
The Samaritans (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989).
- Cullmann, O.,
 "The Significance of Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity", JBL 74 (1955) 213-26.
- Cullmann, O.,
Der johanneische Kries: sein Platz im Spätjudentum, in der Jüngerschaft Jesu und im Urchristentum, zum Ursprung der Johannesevangeliums (Tübingen: Mohr, 1975).
- Cumming, C.J.,
 "The Jews in the Fourth Gospel", ExpT 60 (1948) 290-292.
- Dahl, N.A.,
Das Volk Gottes: eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums (Oslo: Dybwad, 1941).
- Danell, G.A.,
Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament (Uppsala: Appelbergs, 1946).
- Daube, D.,
The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Athlone, 1956).
- Davies, A.T., (ed.),
AntiSemitism and the Foundations of Christianity (NY: Paulist, 1979).

- Davies, P.R.,
1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran: its Structure and History (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977).
- Davies, P.R.,
 "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period", JJS 28 (1977) 127-140.
- Davies, P.R.,
The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document" (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983).
- Davies, P.R.,
 "Eschatology at Qumran", JBL 104 (1985) 39-55.
- Davies, W.D.,
 "Paul and the People of Israel", NTS 24 (1977) 4-39.
- Davies, W.D.,
Jewish and Pauline Studies (London: SPCK, 1984).
- Davies, W.D.,
 "Galatians: a Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia", in Jewish and Pauline Studies (London: SPCK, 1984).
- Davies, W.D., Finkelstein, L., (eds.), The Cambridge History of Judaism 1: The Persian Period (Cambridge: CUP, 1984).
- Davies, W.D., Finkelstein, L., (eds.),
The Cambridge History of Judaism 2: The Hellenistic Age (Cambridge: CUP, 1989).
- Deidun, T.J.,
 "Galatians" in DBI, 247-249.
- Delcor, M.,
 "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Hellenistic Period" in CHJ 2.409-503.
- Delling, G.,
 "The 'One who sees God' in Philo" in Nourished with Peace, (ed.: Greenspahn) 27-41.
- Derrett, J.D.M.,
 "Figtrees in the New Testament", HeythJ 14 (1973) 249-265.

- Dibelius, M.,
Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (London: SCM, 1956).
- Díez Macho, A.,
Neofiti 1. Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana (3 vols.; Madrid - Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968-1971).
- Dimant, D.,
 "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in Jewish Writings (ed.: Stone) 483-550.
- Dinkler, E.,
 "The Historical and the Eschatological Israel in Romans 9-11: a Contribution to the Problem of Predestination and Individual Responsibility", JR 36 (1956) 109-127.
- Donaldson T.L.,
 "Moses Typology and the Sectarian Nature of Early Christian Anti-Judaism: a Study in Acts 7", JSNT 12 (1981) 27-52.
- Donaldson, T.L.,
 "Rural Bandits, City Mobs and the Zealots", JSJ 21 (1990) 1-18.
- Doran, R.,
 "2 Maccabees and the Samaritan Question", HTR 76 (1983) 481-485.
- Douglas, M.,
Purity and Danger: an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).
- Driver, S.R.,
Notes of the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913; reprinted 1960).
- Dumont, L.,
Homo Hierarchicus: the Caste System and its Implications (London: Weidenfeld, 1970).
- Dunn, J.D.G.,
Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity (London: SCM, 1977).

- Dunn, J.D.G.,
 "The New Perspective on Paul", BJRL 65 (1983)
 95-122.
- Dunn, J.D.G.,
 "The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem
 according to Galatians 1 and 2", NTS 28 (1982)
 461-478.
- Dunn, J.D.G.,
 "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18)", JSNT
 18 (1985) 3-57.
- Dunn, J.D.G.,
 "Judaizers" in DBI, 369-371.
- Dupont-Sommer, A.,
Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer
Morte (Paris: Payot, 4th edition: 1980).
- Emmerson, G.I.,
Hosea: an Israelite Prophet in Judean
Perspective (JSOTss 28; Sheffield: JSOT,
 1984).
- Epp, E.J.,
 "Anti-Semitism and the Popularity of the
 Fourth Gospel in Christianity", CCARJ 22
 (1975) 36-45.
- Epp, E.J.,
 "Jews and Judaism in The Living New Testament"
 in Biblical (ed.: Tuttle) 86-96.
- Eslinger, L., Taylor, G., (eds.),
Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and other
studies in Memory of Peter C. Cragie JSOTss
 67; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988).
- Even-Shoshan, E.,
Ha-Milon he-Hadaš (7 vols.; Jerusalem: Kiryat
 Sepher, 1980).
- Even-Shoshan, E.,
Konkordansia Hadašah leTorah Nebi'im uKetubim
 (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1983).
- Everitt, B.,
Cluster Analysis (SSRC: RCR 11; London:
 Heinemann, 1980).

- Falck, C.,
Myth, Truth and Literature: Towards a True Post-Modernism (Cambridge: CUP, 1989).
- Farmer, W.R.,
Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: an Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period (NY: Columbia, 1956).
- Filson, F.V.,
 "Judaizing", IDB 2.1005-1006.
- Finkel, A.,
The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums 4; Leiden: Brill, 1964).
- Fishbane, M.,
Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).
- Fitzmyer, J.A.,
 "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls" in Studies in Luke-Acts (eds.: Keck, Martyn) 233-257.
- Fitzmyer, J.A.,
The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (SBLMS 25; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971).
- Fitzmyer, J.A.,
A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays (Missoula: Scholars, 1979).
- Flanagan, J.W.,
David's Social Drama: a Hologram of Israel's Early Iron Age (Sheffield: Almond, 1988).
- Fortna, R.T.,
 "Theological Use of Locale in the Fourth Gospel", ATR 3 (1974) 58-94.
- Fowler, J.D.,
Theophoric Names in Ancient Hebrew: a Comparative Study (JSOTss 49; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988).
- Fraikin D.,
 "The Rhetorical Function of the Jews in Romans" in Anti-Judaism, (eds.: Richardson, Granskou) 1.91-105.

- Fredriksen, P.,
From Jesus to Christ: the Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus (New Haven: Yale, 1988).
- Freedman, H., Simon, M., (eds.),
Midrash Rabbah (10 vols.; London: Soncino, 1951).
- Freiday, D., (ed.),
Barclay's Apology in Modern English (Philadelphia: Friends, 1967).
- Fuks, G.
 "Josephus and the Hasmoneans", JJS 41 (1990) 166-176.
- Gager, J.,
Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism (SBLMS 16; Nashville: Abingdon, 1972).
- Gager, J.,
The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity (Oxford: OUP, 1983).
- Garbini, G.,
History and Ideology in Ancient Israel (London: SCM, 1988).
- Garnet, P.,
Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977).
- Gaston, L.,
 "Paul and Torah" in Anti-Semitism, (ed.: Davies, A.T.), 48-71.
- Gaston, L.,
 "Israel's Enemies in Pauline Theology", NTS 28 (1982) 400-423.
- Gaston, L.,
 "Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers" in Anti-Judaism, 1 (ed.: Richardson, Granskou) 33-44.
- Gaston, L.,
 "Retrospect" in Anti-Judaism, 2 (ed.: Wilson) 163-174.

- Getty, M.A.,
 "Paul and the Salvation of Israel: a Perspective on Romans 9-11", CBQ 50 (1988) 456-469.
- de Geus, C.H.J.,
The Tribes of Israel: an Investigation into some of the Presuppositions of Martin Noth's Amphictyony Hypothesis (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 18; Assen: van Gorcum, 1976).
- Gibson, A.,
Biblical Semantic Logic (NY: St.Martin's, 1981).
- Gibson J.C.L.,
 "Observations on some Important Ethnic Terms in the Pentateuch", JNES 20 (1961) 217-238.
- Ginsberg, H.L.,
The Israelian Heritage of Judaism (NY: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1982).
- Ginsburger, M.,
Das Fragmententhargum (thargum jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch) (Berlin: Calvary, 1899).
- Ginsburger, M.,
Pseudo-Jonathan (thargum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch) (Berlin: Calvary, 1903).
- Golb, N.,
 "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judaeen Wilderness: Observations on the Logic of their Investigation", JNES 49 (1990) 103-114.
- Goldberg, A.,
 "Der Diskurs im babylonischen Talmud: Anregungen für eine Diskursanalyse", FJB 11 (1983) 1-45.
- Good, E.M.,
 "Hosea and the Jacob Tradition", VT 16 (1966) 137-151.
- Good, R.M.,
The Sheep of his Pasture: a Study of the Hebrew Noun 'am(m) and its Semitic Cognates (HSM 29; Chico, CA.: Scholars, 1983).

- Goodenough, E.R.,
The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory (NY: Yale, 1938).
- Goodenough, E.R.,
Introduction to Philo Judaeus (Oxford: Blackwells, 1962).
- Goodman, M.,
 "A Bad Joke in Josephus", JJS 36 (1985) 195-199.
- Goodman, M.,
The Ruling Class of Judaea: the Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome AD 66-70 (Cambridge: CUP, 1987).
- Goodman, M.,
 "Proselytising in Rabbinic Judaism", JJS 40 (1989) 175-185.
- Gottwald, N.K.,
A Light to the Nations: an Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Harper & Row, 1959).
- van Goudoever, J.,
 "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel", NovT 8 (1966) 111-123.
- Goulder, M.,
 "The Two Roots of the Christian Myth" in The Myth of God Incarnate (ed.: Hick, J.; London: SCM, 1977) 64-86.
- Grabbe, L.L.,
Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: the Hebrew Names in Philo (Brown Judaic Studies 115; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988).
- Gray, G.,
1 and 2 Kings (London: SCM, 1964).
- Gray, G.B.,
 "The Psalms of Solomon", APOT 625-652.
- Gray, J.,
 "Israel in the Song of Deborah" in Ascribe to the Lord (eds.: Eslinger, Taylor) 422-455.
- Gray, M.,
 "The Ḥābirū-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present", HUCA 29

(1958) 135-197.

Green, W.S., (ed.),
Approaches to Ancient Judaism 2 (Brown Judaic Studies 9; Chico, CA.: Scholars, 1980).

Greenspahn, F.E., Hilgert, E., Mack, B.L., (eds.),
Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel (Chico: Scholars, 1984).

Grintz, J.M.,
"Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple", JBL 79 (1960) 32-47.

Gundry, R.H.
Matthew: a commentary on his Literary and Theological Art (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

Gutbrod, W.,
"ioudaios, israel, hebraios in the New Testament", TDNT 3.375-391.

Gutmann, J.,
Ancient Synagogues: the State of Research (Brown Judaic Studies 22; Chico: Scholars, 1981).

Haenchen, E.,
The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).

Hall, S.G.,
Melito of Sardis "On Pascha" and Fragments (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979).

Halpern, B., Levenson, J.D., (eds.),
Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith (Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 1981).

Hammerton-Kelly, R., Scroggs, R., (eds.),
Jews, Greeks and Christians: Essays in Honour of W.D. Davies (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

Hare, D.A.R.,
"The Rejection of the Jews in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts" in Anti-Semitism, (ed.: Davies, A.T.) 27-47.

- Harrington, D.J.,
"Pseudo-Philo" in Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
 2 (ed.: Charlesworth) 297-377.
- Harvey, A.E., (ed.),
Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study
 (London: SPCK, 1985).
- Hayward, R.,
 "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: a
 Reconsideration", Essays in Honour of Yigael
Yadin, JJS 33 (1982) 430-443.
- Hecht, R.,
 "The Exegetical Context of Philo's
 Interpretation of Circumcision" in Nourished
with Peace (eds: Greenspahn, Hilgert, Mack)
 51-79.
- Heinemann, J.,
 "210 Years of Egyptian Exile", JJS 22 (1971)
 19-30.
- Hemer, C.,
The Letters to the Seven Churches in Asia in
their Local Setting (Sheffield: JSNT, 1986).
- Hendel, R.S.,
 "Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an
 Interpretation of Gen 6:1-4", JBL 106 (1987)
 13-26.
- Hengel, M.,
Judaism and Hellenism (2 vols.; Philadelphia:
 Fortress, 1974).
- Hengel, M.,
Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen
Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I
bis 70 N.Chr. (Leiden: Brill, 1976). Now see
Zealots.
- Hengel, M.,
Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of the
Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian
Period (London: SCM, 1980).
- Hengel, M.,
The Charismatic Leader and his Followers (NY:
 Crossroads, 1981).

- Hengel, M.,
Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the
 Earliest History of Christianity (London: SCM,
 1983).
- Hengel, M.,
The Johanne Question (London: SCM, 1989).
- Hengel, M.,
The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish
 Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I
 until 70 AD (Edinburgh: Clark, 1989).
- Hennecke, E.,
New Testament Apocrypha (London: Lutterworth,
 1963).
- Hertzberg, H.W.,
1 and 2 Samuel: a Commentary (London: SCM,
 1964).
- Hill, T.D.,
 "Hebrews, Israelites, and Wicked Jews: An
 Onomastic Crux in 'Andreas' 161-67", Traditio
 32 (1976) 358-79.
- Holladay, W.L.,
 "The Background of Jeremiah's
 Self-understanding", JBL 83 (1964) 153-64.
- Holladay, W.L.,
 "Jeremiah and Moses: Further Observations",
JBL 85 (1966) 17-27.
- van der Horst, P.W.,
 "Jews and Christians in Aphrodisias", NedTTs
 43 (1989) 106-121.
- Ilan, T.,
 "The Names of the Hasmoneans in the Second
 Temple Period", Eretz-Israel 19 (1987)
 240-241.
- Ishida, T.,
 "The Leaders of the Tribal Leagues <<Israel>>
 in the Pre-Monarchic Period", RB 80 (1973)
 514-530.
- Ishida, T.,
 "The Structure and Historical Implications of
 the Lists of Pre-Israelite Nations", Biblica
 60 (1979) 461-490.

- Iwry, S.,
 "Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of šby yśr²l", W.F.Albright Volume, Eretz-Israel 9 (1969) 80-88.
- Jackson, F.J.F.,
Josephus and the Jews (London: SPCK, 1930).
- James M.R.,
The Biblical Antiquities of Philo (New York: Ktav, 1971).
- Japhet, S.,
 "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles", JBL 98 (1979) 205-218.
- Japhet, S.,
 "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah", ZAW 94 (1982) 66-98.
- Japhet, S.,
 "The Relationship between the Legal Corpora in the Pentateuch in Light of Manumission Laws", in Studies in Bible (Scripta Hierosolymitana 31; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986) 63-89.
- Jervell, J.,
Luke and the People of God (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).
- Jobling, D.,
The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible 2 (JSOTss 39; Sheffield: JSOT, 1986).
- de Jonge, M., van der Woude, A.S.,
 "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament", NTS 12 (1966) 301-326.
- de Jonge, M.,
The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Leiden: Brill, 1978).
- de Jonge, M.,
 "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", NTS 26 (1980) 508-524.

- Judge, E.A.,
 "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice", AusBR 16 (1968) 37-50.
- Judge, E.A.,
 "St. Paul and Classical Society", JAC 15 (1972) 19-36.
- Judge, E.A.,
 "The Social Identity of the First Christians: a Question of Method in Religious History", JRH 11 (1980) 201-217.
- Kahn, J.G.,
 "yśr'1 - rw'h '1", Tarbiz 40 (1970-71) 285-292.
- Kaiser, O.,
Isaiah 1-12 (OTL; London: SCM, 1983).
- Kallai, Z.,
 "Judah and Israel in Israelite Historiography", IEJ 28 (1978) 251-261.
- Kampen, J.,
The Hasideans and the Origin of the Pharisaism: a study in 1 and 2 Maccabees (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 24; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989).
- Kang, S-M,
Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989).
- Keck, L.E., Martyn, J.L., (eds.),
Studies in Luke-Acts (London: SPCK, 1968).
- Kennedy, J.M.,
 "The Root G'R in the Light of Semantic Analysis", JBL 106 (1987) 47-64.
- Klein, C.,
Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology (London: SPCK, 1975).
- Klein, M.,
Fragment Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources (2 vols; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1980).

- Kline, M.G.,
 "Hebrews" in IBD 2.626-627.
- Knibb, M.A.,
 "Exile in the Damascus Document", JSOT 25
 (1983) 99-117.
- Koch, K.,
 "Ezra and the Origins of Judaism", JSS 19
 (1974) 173-197.
- Kraabel, A.T.,
 "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at
 Sardis: Text and Context" in Studies Presented
 to George M.A. Hanfmann (eds.: Mitten, D.G.,
 Pedley, J.G., Scott, J.A.; Mainz: von Zabern,
 1971) 77-85.
- Kraabel, A.T.,
 "Social Systems of Six Diaspora Synagogues" in
 Ancient Synagogues, (ed.: Gutmann) 79-91.
- Kraemer, R.S.,
 "On the Meaning of the Term 'Jew' in
 Greco-Roman Inscriptions", HTR 82 (1989)
 35-53.
- Kraft, R.A.,
 "The Multiform Heritage of Early Christianity"
 in Christianity, Judaism, 3 (ed.: Neusner)
 174-199.
- Kraft, R.A., Nickelsburg, G.W.E., (eds.),
 Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters
 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).
- Kuhn, K.G.,
 Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexte (Gottingen:
 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
- Kung, H., Kasper, W., (eds.),
 Christians and Jews (Concilium 8.10; NY:
 Seabury, 1975).
- Kutler, L.,
 "A Structural Semantic Approach to Israelite
 Communal Terminology", JANES 14 (1982) 69-77.
- de Lange, N.,
 Origen and the Jews: Studies in
 Jewish-Christian Relations in Third Century
 Palestine (Cambridge: CUP, 1976).

- Lategan, B.,
 "Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1:11-12 and 2:19-20 in the Development of Paul's Argument", NTS 34 (1988) 411-430.
- Lauterbach, J.Z., (trans.),
Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (3 vols.; Philadelphia: JPS, 1935 and 1976).
- Layton, B.,
The Gnostic Scriptures (London: SCM, 1987).
- Leisegang, I.J.,
Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae Supersunt (7 vols.; Berlin: de Gruyter 1927).
- Lemche, N.P.,
 "The Manumission of Slaves - the Fallow Year - the Jubel Year", VT 26 (1976) 38-59.
- Lemche, N.P.,
 "<Hebrew> as a National Name for Israel", StTh 33 (1979) 1-23.
- Levine, E.,
 "The Biography of the Aramaic Bible", ZAW 94 (1982) 353-379.
- Levine, E.,
The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context (BZAW 174; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988).
- Lewis, D.M.,
 "The First Greek Jew", JSS 2 (1957) 264-266.
- Lewy, J.,
 "Origin and Signification of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew'", HUCA 28 (1957) 1-13.
- Lifshitz, B.,
 "Papyrus grecs du desert du Juda", Aegyptus 42 (1962) 240-256.
- Linder, A.,
The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation (Detroit: Wayne State, 1987).
- Lindeskog, G.,
 "Israel in the New Testament: Some Few Remarks on a Great Problem", SEÅ 26 (1961) 57-92.

- Lochman, J.M.,
 "Which Christian is a Good Christian?" in
 Christians and Jews (eds.: Kung, Kasper),
 50-55.
- Loewe, R.,
 "Salvation is not of the Jews", JTS 32 (1981)
 341-368.
- Lohfink, N.,
 "hopsi", TDOT 5, 114-118.
- Lohse, E.,
 Die Texte aus Qumran, Hebräische und Deutsch
 (München: Kosel; 3rd edition: 1981).
- Loretz, O.,
 Habiru-Hebraer, Eine Sozio-linguistische
 Studie über die Herkunft des Gentiliziums
 ‘ibrî von Appellativum habiru (BZAW 160;
 Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).
- Loretz, O.,
 "Hebraer in Ebla? Eine Fehlanzeige zu ‘ibrî
 'Hebraer' und dem 'Hebraer Abram' (Gen.14,13)"
 in Studies on the Language of Ebla (ed.:
 Fronzaroli, P.; QS 13; Florence: Istituto di
 Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università'
 di Firenze, 1984) 253-281.
- Lowe, M.,
 "Who were the IOUDAIOI?", NovT 18 (1976)
 101-130.
- Lowe, M.,
 "Ioudaioi of the Apocrypha, a Fresh Approach
 to the Gospels of James, Pseudo-Thomas, Peter
 and Nicodemus", NovT 23 (1981) 56-90.
- Lowy, S.,
 The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis
 (Leiden: Brill, 1977).
- Lubbe, J.,
 "A Reinterpretation of 4 Q Testimonia", RQ 12
 (1986) 187-197.
- Lyons, G.,
 Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New
 Understanding (SBLDS 73; Atlanta: SBL, 1985).

- Lyons, J.,
Structural Semantics (Publications of the
Philological Society 20; Oxford: Blackwell,
1963).
- Lyons, J.,
Semantics (Cambridge: CUP, 1977).
- Lyons, J.,
Language and Linguistics (Cambridge: CUP,
1981).
- Macrae, G.,
" Messiah and Gospel " in Judaisms and their
Messiahs, (eds.: Neusner, Green, Frerichs)
169-185.
- MacDonald, J.,
Theology of the Samaritans (NTL; London: SCM,
1964).
- MacDonald, J.,
The Samaritan Chronicle No.II (or: Sepher
Ha-Yamim) from Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar (BZAW
107; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969).
- Magonet, J.,
Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary
Techniques in the Book of Jonah (BET 2;
Bern/Frankfurt: Lang, 1976).
- Maier, J.,
The Temple Scroll (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).
- Margalith, O.,
" On the Origin and Antiquity of the Name
>>Israel<< ", ZAW 102 (1990) 225-237.
- Marshall, I.H.,
" Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity ",
NTS 19 (1972-73) 271-287.
- Martin, J.D., Davies, P.R., (eds.),
A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William
McKane (JSOTss 42; Sheffield: JSOT, 1986).
- Martin, R.P.,
New Testament Foundations 2 (Exeter:
Paternoster, 1978).

- Martin, R.P.,
 "The Life-Setting of the Epistle of James in the Light of Jewish History" in Biblical, (ed.: Tuttle) 97-103.
- Martyn, J.L.
The Gospel of John in Christian History (NY: Ramsey, 1978).
- Martyn, J.L.,
 "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: the Background to Galatians", MQR 20 (1983) 221-236.
- Matera, F.T.,
The Kingship of Jesus (SBLDS 66; Chico, CA.: Scholars, 1982).
- Matsuda, I.,
 "The Structure of Mental Activities in Biblical Hebrew", AJBI 2 (1976) 79-99.
- Mayer, G.,
Index Philoneus (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974).
- Mayer, R.,
 "Israel", NIDNTT 2.304-316.
- Mays, J.L.,
Amos (OTL; London: SCM, 1969).
- Mays, J.L.,
Micah (OTL; London: SCM, 1976).
- McKane, W.,
1 and 2 Samuel (London: SCM, 1963).
- McComiskey, T.,
 "iouda", NIDNTT 2.319-320.
- Meeks, W.A.,
 "Galilee and Judea in the Fourth Gospel", JBL 85 (1966) 159-169 .
- Meeks, W.A.,
 "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism", JBL 91 (1972) 44-72.
- Meeks, W.A.,
 "'Am I a Jew?' - Johannine Christianity and Judaism", in Christianity, Judaism, 1 (ed.: Neusner) 163-186.

- Meyer, B.F., Sanders, E.P., (eds.),
Self-definition in the Graeco-Roman World (3
vols.; London: SCM, 1982).
- Milik, J.T.,
Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of
Judaea (SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959).
- Milik, J.T.,
"4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation
d'Origenè", RB 79 (1972) 77-97.
- Milikowsky, Ch.,
"Again: Damascus in the Damascus Document and
in Rabbinic Literature", RQ 11 (1982) 97-106.
- Millard, A.R.,
"The Meaning of the Name Judah", ZAW 86 (1974)
216-218.
- Millard, A.R.,
"A Wandering Aramean", JNES 39 (1980) 153-155.
- Miller, M.P.,
"The Function of Isa 61:1-2 in 11Q
Melchizedek", JBL 88 (1969) 467-469.
- Moessner, D.P.,
"Paul in Acts, Preacher of Eschatological
Repentance to Israel", NTS 34 (1988) 96-104.
- Moore, G.F.,
"Christian Writers on Judaism", HTR 14 (1921)
197-254.
- Moore, G.F.,
Judaism in the First Centuries of the
Christian Era (3 vols; Cambridge, MA.:
Harvard, 1927-1930).
- Mor, M.,
"The Bar-Kokhba Revolt and Non-Jewish
Participants", JJS 36 (1985) 200-209.
- Mor, M.,
"The Persian, Hellenistic and Hasmonean
Period" in The Samaritans (ed.: Crown A.D.).
- Moran, W.L.,
"Hebrews", NCE 6 978.

- Motyer, J.A.,
The Day of the Lion: the Message of Amos
 (Leicester: IVP, 1974).
- Moule, C.F.D.,
 "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?", ExpT 70
 (1959) 100-102.
- Munck, J.,
Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (London:
 SCM, 1959).
- Munck, J.,
The Acts of the Apostles (AB; Garden City, NY:
 Doubleday, 1967).
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.,
 "A Literary Analysis of CD VI,2-VIII,3", RB 78
 (1971) 210-232.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.,
 "The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14",
HTR 64 (1971) 379-386.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.,
 "The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD
 VIII, 3-19)", RB 79 (1972) 200-216.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.,
 "The Essenes and their History", RB 81 (1974)
 215-244.
- Murray, R.,
 "Jews, Hebrews and Christians: Some Needed
 Distinctions", NovT 24 (1982) 194-208.
- Murray, R.,
 "'Disaffected Judaism' and Early Christianity:
 Some Predisposing Factors" in "To See
 Ourselves", (eds.: Neusner, Frerichs) 263-281.
- Na^caman, N.,
 "Habiru and Hebrews: the Transfer of a Social
 Term to the Literary Sphere", JNES 45 (1986)
 271-88.
- Naidoff, B.D.,
Israel and the Nations in Deutero-Isaiah: the
 Political terminology in form-critical
 perspective (unpublished PhD Vanderbilt
 University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1980.

- Neusner, J.,
A History of the Jews of Babylonia (5 vols.;
Studia Post-Biblica 9,11,12,14,15; Leiden:
 Brill, 1965-70).
- Neusner, J., (ed.),
Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Honour of
Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough (Leiden: Brill,
 1968).
- Neusner, J.,
The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees
Before 70 (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1971).
- Neusner, J.,
The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism (Leiden:
 Brill, 1973).
- Neusner, J., (ed.),
Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman
Cults (4 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1975).
- Neusner, J.,
Judaism Evidence of the Mishnah (Chicago:
 Chicago, 1981).
- Neusner, J., Frerichs, E.S., (eds.),
"To See Ourselves as Others See Us",
Christians, Jews and "Others" in Late
Antiquity (Atlanta: Scholars, 1985).
- Neusner, J.,
Vanquished Nation, Broken Spirit: the Virtues
of the Heart in Formative Judaism (Cambridge:
 CUP, 1987).
- Neusner, J., Green, W.S., Frerichs, E.S., (eds.),
Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the
Christian Era (Cambridge: CUP, 1987).
- Neusner, J.,
Judaism and its Social Metaphors: Israel in
the History of Jewish Thought (Cambridge: CUP,
 1989).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E.,
Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the
Mishnah: a Historical and Literary
Introduction (London: SCM, 1981).

- Noth, M.,
The History of Israel (2nd edition; London: Black, 1960).
- Noth, M.,
Numbers (OTL; London: SCM, 1968).
- Ogawa, A.,
 "Paraboles de l'Israel véritable? Reconsidération critique de Mt.XXI 28 - XXII 14", NovT 21 (1979) 121-149.
- Oppenheimer, A.,
The 'Am ha-Aretz: a Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period (Leiden: Brill, 1977).
- Oswalt, J.N.,
The Book of Isaiah 1-39 (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).
- Pan, C-W,
A Study of the Vocabulary of Education in Proverbs 1-9 (unpublished PhD thesis; Newcastle upon Tyne, 1987).
- Pancaro, S.,
 "The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of John", NTS 21 (1975) 396-405.
- Paton, L.B.,
The Book of Esther (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1964).
- Phillips, A.,
 "The Laws of Slavery: Exodus 21:2-11", JSOT 30 (1984) 51-66.
- Pixner, B.,
 "Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code: a Study of the Topography of 3Q15", RQ 11 (1983) 323-365.
- Polley, M.E.,
Amos and the Davidic Empire: a Socio-Historical Approach (Oxford: OUP, 1989).
- Pope, M.H.
 "Congregation", IDB 1.669-670.

- Porten, B., Yardeni, A.,
Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986-1989).
- Porten, B.,
 "Fragmentary Aramaic Deeds of Obligation and Conveyance: New Collations and Restorations",
JNES 48 (1989) 161-183.
- Procksch, O.,
 "hagios", TDNT 1.88-97.
- Pryor, J.W.,
 "Jesus and Israel in the Fourth Gospel - John 1:11", NovT 32 (1990) 201-218.
- Purvis, J.D.,
 "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans", NovT 17 (1975) 161-198.
- Purvis, J.D.,
 "The Samaritan Problem: a Case Study in Jewish Sectarianism in the Roman Era" in Traditions in Transformation, (eds.: Halpern, Levenson) 323-350.
- Rabin, Ch., Yadin, Y., (eds.),
Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Scripta Hierosolymitana 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965).
- Rabin, Ch.,
 "Hebrew" in Current Trends in Linguistics 6 (ed.: Sebeok, T.A.; The Hague: Mouton, 1971) 304-346.
- Räisänen, H.,
Paul and the Law (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
- Rajak, T.,
 "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews",
JSS 33 (1982) 465-477.
- Rajak, T.,
Josephus: the Historian and his Society (London: Duckworth, 1983).
- Rankin, O.S.,
Jewish Religious Polemic of Early and Later Centuries, a Study of Documents Rendered in English (NY: Ktav, 1970).

- Rappaport, U.,
 "The First Judean Coinage", JJS 32 (1981)
 1-17.
- Rappaport, U.,
 "Numismatics" in CHJ 1.25-59.
- Redford, D.B.,
 "The 'Land of the Hebrews' in Gen 40:15", VT
 15 (1965) 529-532.
- Redpath, H.A.,
Supplement to A Concordance to the Septuagint
 and the other Greek Versions of the Old
 Testament (ed.: Hatch, Redpath; Oxford:
 Clarendon, 1906).
- Reigel, S.K.,
 "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and
 Terminology", NTS 24 (1978) 410-415.
- Rengstorf, K.H.; (ed.)
A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus (4
 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1973-83).
- Reynolds, J., Tannenbaum, R.,
Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias: Greek
 Inscriptions with Commentary (Cambridge:
 Cambridge Philological Society, 1987).
- Richardson, P.,
Israel in the Apostolic Church (Cambridge:
 CUP, 1969).
- Richardson, P., Granskou, D., (eds.),
Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, 1: Paul
 and the Gospels, (Studies in Christianity and
 Judaism 2; Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier, 1986).
- Riches, J.,
Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism
 (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980).
- Riches, J., Millar, A.,
 "Conceptual Change in the Synoptic Tradition"
 in Alternative Approaches, (ed.: Harvey)
 37-60.
- Riches, J.,
 "Works and Words of Jesus the Jew", HeyJ 17
 (1986) 53-62.

- Riley, W.,
 "Temple Imagery and the Book of Revelation: Ancient Near Eastern Temple Ideology and Cultic Resonances in the Apocalypse" PIBA 6 (1982) 81-102.
- Roffe, T.J.,
The Prophetic Vision of the Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel (unpublished PhD thesis: Newcastle upon Tyne; 1984).
- Ross, B.L.,
The Individual in the Community: Personal Identification in Ancient Israel (unpublished PhD dissertation; Graduate School, Drew, 1979).
- Roth, C., Grintz, Y.M.,
 "Jew", EncyJud 10.21-25.
- Rothbart, M., John, O.P.,
 "Social Categorization and Behavioral Episodes: a Cognitive Analysis of the Effects of intergroup Contact", JSI 41 (1985) 81-104.
- Rowland, C.,
Christian Origins: an Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism (London: SPCK, 1985).
- Rowton, M.B.,
 "Dimorphic Structure and the Problem of the 'Apirû-'Ibrîm", JNES 35 (1976) 13-20.
- Ruether, R.R.,
Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism (NY: Seabury, 1974).
- Russell, D.S.,
The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC-AD 100 (London: SCM, 1964).
- Safrai, S., Stern, M., (eds.),
The Jewish People in the First Century (Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum; 2 vols; in co-operation with Flusser, D., van Unnick, W.C.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976).
- Sanders, E.P.,
Paul and Palestinian Judaism: a Comparison of Patterns of Religion (London: SCM, 1977).

- Sanders, E.P.,
Paul, the Law and the Jewish People (London: SCM, 1985).
- Sanders, E.P.,
Jesus and Judaism (London: SCM, 1985).
- Sanders, E.P.,
Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah (London: SCM, 1990).
- Sanders, J.A.,
 "Jew, Jews, Jewess", IDB 2, 897-898.
- Sanders, J.T.,
The Jews in Luke-Acts (London: SCM, 1987).
- Sandmel, S.,
Judaism and Christian Beginnings (Oxford: OUP, 1978).
- Sandmel, S.,
 "Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity: the Question of the Comfortable Theory", HUCA 50 (1979) 137-148.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "The Qumran Reading of Isaiah 6:13", ASTI 3 (1964) 111-114.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "Root-meanings in Hebrew", JSS 12 (1967) 137-147.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "'Those Priests in Damascus', a Possible Example of Anti-sectarian Polemic in the Septuagint Version of Amos 2:12 LXX", ASTI 8 (1970) 123-30.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation (London: SCM, 1972).
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "Hebrew Terms for the Resurrection of the Dead", VT 23 (1972) 218-234.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
Isaiah 1 (Edinburgh: St.Andrew, 1984).

- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
Isaiah 2 (Edinburgh: St.Andrew, 1985).
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "The Role of Jewish Studies in Biblical Semantics" in Scripta signa vocis, J.H. Hospers Festschrift (eds.: Vanstiphout, H.L.J., Jongeling, K., Laemuis, F., Reinick, G.J.; Groningen: Forster, 1986) 201-208.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "'Blessed be My People Egypt' (Isaiah 19:16-25): the Context and Meaning of a Remarkable Passage" in Word in Season, (ed.: Martin, J.D., Davies, P.R.) 57-71.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "The Daughter of Zion and the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah: a Comparison", JSOT 44 (1989) 89-107.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "The Original Meaning of the Text and other Legitimate Subjects for Semantic Description", in Questions disputées d'Ancien Testament, (ed.: Brekelmans; BETL 33 [1974]) 63-70; revised and enlarged edition by Vervenne, M.; (1989) 63-70, 211-3.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "Etymology", DBI, 212-214.
- Sawyer, J.F.A.,
 "Semantics", DBI, 616-618.
- Schafer, P.,
 "Research into Rabbinic Literature: an Attempt to Define the Status Quaestiones", JJS 37 (1986) 139-152.
- Schalit, A.,
Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus, Supplement 1 of A Complete Concordance, (ed.: Rengstorf; 1968).
- Scheidweiler F., Higgins, A.J.B.,
The Acts of Pilate in The Other Gospels, (ed.: Cameron) 165-182.
- Schmidt, K.L.,
"kaleō", TDNT 3.487-536.

- Schmitt, J.J.,
 "The Gender of Ancient Israel", JSOT 26 (1983)
 115-125.
- Schmoller, A.,
Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen neuen Testament
 (Stuttgart: Wütermbergische Bibelanstalt, 1938).
- Schrage, W.,
The Ethics of the New Testament (Edinburgh: Clark, 1988).
- Schram, T.L.,
The Use of IOUDAIOS in the Fourth Gospel
 (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Utrecht, 1974).
- Schurer, E.,
The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC - AD 135) (3 vols.; revised and ed.: Vermes, Millar; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973-86).
- Schussler Fiorenza, E.,
In Memory of Her: a Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins (London: SCM, 1983).
- Schussler Fiorenza, E.,
 "Biblical Interpretation and Critical Commitment", StTh 43 (1989) 5-18.
- Schwarz, D.R.,
 "'To Join Oneself to the House of Judah', (Damascus Document IV,11)", RQ 10 (1981) 435-446.
- Schwartz, D.R.,
 "The End of the GE (Acts 1:8): Beginning or End of the Christian Vision?", JBL 105 (1986) 669-676.
- Schweizer, E.,
 "Concerning the Speeches in Acts" in Studies in Luke-Acts, (eds.: Keck, Martyn) 208-216.
- Schweizer, E., Baumgartel, F., Meyer, R.,
 "sarx", TDNT 7.98-151.
- Schweizer, E.,
 "Christianity of the Circumcised and Judaism of the Uncircumcised: the Background of

- Matthew and Colossians" in Jews, Greeks,
(eds.: Hammerton-Kelly, Scroggs) 245-260.
- Scobie, C.H.H.,
"The Origins and Development of Samaritan
Christianity", NTS 19 (1973) 390-414.
- Segal, A.T.,
Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity
in the Roman World (London: Harvard, 1986).
- van Seters, J.,
Abraham in History and Tradition (New Haven:
Yale, 1975).
- Shepherd, M.H.,
"The Jews in the Gospel of John: Another Level
of Meaning", ATR 3 (1974) 95-112.
- Siker, J.S.,
"Gnostic Views on Jews and Christians in the
Gospel of Philip", NovT 31 (1989) 275-288.
- Silberman, L.H.,
"Unriddling the Riddle: a Study in the
Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshier
(1QpHab)", RQ 3 (1961) 323-264.
- Silva, M.,
Biblical Words and their Meanings: an
Introduction to Lexical Semantics (Grand
Rapids: Zondervan, 1983).
- Simon, M.,
St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive
Church (London: Longmans Green, 1958).
- Simon, M.,
Verus Israel (Paris: de Boccard, 1964).
- Smallwood, E.M.,
Philonis Alexandrini: Legatio ad Gaium
(Leiden: Brill, 1961).
- Smallwood, E.M.,
The Jews under Roman Rule, from Pompey to
Diocletian (Studies in Judaism in Late
Antiquity 20; Leiden: Brill, 1975).
- Smith, D.M.,
Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting,
Sources and Theology (Edinburgh: Clark, 1984).

- Smith, J.M.P., Ward, W.H., Bewer, J.A.,
The Books of Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1911).
- Smith, J.Z.,
 "The Prayer of Joseph" in Religions in Antiquity, (ed.: Neusner) 253-294.
- Smith, J.Z.,
 "Fences and Neighbors: Some Contours of Early Judaism" in Approaches to Ancient Judaism 2, (ed.: Green) 1-25; also Smith, J.Z., Imagining Religion, 1-18.
- Smith, J.Z.,
Imagining Religion: from Babylon to Jonestown (Chicago: Chicago, 1982).
- Smith, J.Z.,
 "What a Difference a Difference Makes" in "To See Ourselves", (eds.: Neusner, Frerichs) 5-???? .
- Smith, M.,
Palestinian Parties that Shaped the Old Testament (NY: Columbia, 1971).
- Smith, M.,
Jesus the Magician (London: Gollancz, 1978).
- Smith, M.,
 "Jewish Religious Life in the Persian Period" in CHJ 1.218-278.
- Solin, H.,
 "Exkurs zu Iudaeus" in "Juden und Syrer", 647-651.
- Solin, H.,
 "Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der römischen Welt: eine ethnisch-emographische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der sprachlichen Zustände", ANRW II.29.2. 587-789.
- Speiser, E.A.,
Genesis (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964).
- Sperber, A.,
The Bible in Aramaic (4 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1959-73).

- Stanton, G.N.,
 "Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic", NTS 31 (1985) 377-392.
- Stendahl, K.,
 "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West", HTR 61 (1963) 199-215.
- Stendahl, K.,
Paul among Jews and Gentiles (London: SCM, 1977).
- Stern, M.,
 "The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature" in Jewish People, 2 (eds.: Safrai, Stern) 1101-1159.
- Stern, M.,
Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences, 1974-84).
- Stone, M.E.,
The Testament of Abraham: the Greek Recensions (Pseudepigrapha Series 2; Cambridge, MA.: SBL, 1972).
- Stone, M.E., (ed.),
Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).
- Stone, M.E.,
The Armenian Version of the Testament of Joseph (SBLTT 6, Pseudepigrapha Series 5; Missoula: Scholars, 1975).
- Stone, M.E.,
Scriptures, Sects and Visions: a Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).
- Stone, M.E.,
 "Three Transformations in Judaism: Scripture, History, and Redemption", Numen 32 (1985) 218-235.
- Strickert, F.M.,
 "Damascus Document VII 10-20 and Qumran Messianic Expectations", RQ 12 (1985) 327-349.

- Swete, H.B.,
The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint (3 Vols.; Cambridge: CUP, 1895).
- Sylva, D.D.,
 "Nicodemus and his Spices (John 19:39)", NTS 34 (1988) 148-151.
- Tal, A.,
The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: a Critical Edition (2 vols.; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv, 1980-1981).
- Talmon, S.,
 "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaeian Desert", Aspects, (eds.: Rabin, Yadin) 162-199.
- Tannehill, R.C.,
 Review of Brawley, Luke-Acts, in Biblica 70 (1989) 278-282.
- Tatum, W.B.,
 "The Epoch of Israel: Luke 1-11 and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts", NTS 13 (1966) 184-195.
- Tchericover, V., Fuks, A., Stern, M.,
Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum (3 vols; Cambridge, MA.: Harvard, 1957-64).
- Telford, W.R.,
The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: a Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relationship to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition (Sheffield: JSNT; 1980).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., Marcus, R., Feldman, L.,
Josephus, (9 Vols; LCL; London: Heinemann, 1926-1965).
- Thiselton, A.C.,
 "The Semantics of Biblical Language as an Aspect of Hermeneutics", Faith and Thought 103 (1976) 108-120.
- Thiselton, A.C.,
 "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation", in New Testament Interpretation, (ed.: Marshall, I.H.; Exeter: Paternoster, 1977) 75-104.

- Thompson, J.A.,
The Book of Jeremiah (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1980).
- Tischendorf, C.,
Evangelia Apocrypha (Leipzig: Avenarius et Mendelssohn, 1853).
- Tomson, P.J.,
 "The Names Israel and Jew in Ancient Judaism and in the New Testament", Bijdr, 47 (1986) 120-140, 266-289.
- Townsend, J.T.,
 "The Gospel of John and the Jews: the Story of a Religious Divorce" in AntiSemitism, (ed.: Davies, A.T.) 72-97.
- Townshend, R.B.,
 "4 Maccabees" in APOT 2, 653-685.
- Trafton, J.L.,
 "The Psalms of Solomon: New Light from the Syriac Version?", JBL 105 (1986) 227-237.
- Trowbridge, S.M.,
John 1:51. An Examination of the Background of a Johannine Saying and of its Purpose in this Gospel [unpublished MLitt Thesis, Newcastle upon Tyne, 1980]).
- Tuttle, G.A., (ed.),
Biblical and Near Eastern Studies (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
- Ullendorf, E.,
 "The Knowledge of Language in the Old Testament", BJRL 44 (1961-62) 455-465.
- Ullmann, S.,
The Principles of Semantics (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957).
- Ullmann, S.,
Semantics: an Introduction to the Science of Meaning (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962).
- de Vaux, R.,
The Early History of Israel: from the Beginnings to the Exodus and Covenant of Sinai (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1978).

- Vermes, G.,
Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies (SPD 4; 2nd edition; Leiden: Brill, 1973).
- Vermes, G.,
 "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies in the Last Twenty-Five Years", JJS 26 (1975) 1-14.
- Vermes, G.,
 "A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus", NovT 24 (1982) 289-303.
- Vermes, G.,
Jesus and the World of Judaism (London: SCM, 1983).
- Vermes, G.,
 "Methodology in the Study of Jewish Literature in the Graeco-Roman Period", JJS 36 (1985) 145-158.
- Vermes, G.,
Dead Sea Scrolls in English (3rd edition; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987).
- Vriezen, Th.C.,
Outline of Old Testament Theology (2nd edition; Oxford: Blackwell, 1970).
- Wade, G.W.,
The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (London: Methuen, 1911).
- von Wahlde, U.C.,
 "The Johannine 'Jews': a Critical Survey", NTS 28 (1982) 33-60.
- Watson, W.G.E.,
Classical Hebrew Poetry (JSOTss 26; Sheffield: JSOT, 1984).
- Wedderburn A.J.M.,
 "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and Continuity", NTS 34 (1988) 161-182.
- Weinfeld, M.,
 "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel", ZAW 88 (1976) 17-56.

- Weippert, M.,
The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine (London: SCM, 1971).
- Werblowsky, R.J.Z.,
 "A Note on Purification and Proselyte Baptism" in Judaism, Christianity, (ed.: Neusner) 3.200-205.
- Werner, E.,
 "Melito of Sardis: The First Poet of Deicide", HUCA 37 (1966) 191-210.
- Westermann, C.,
Isaiah 40-66 (OTL; London: SCM, 1969).
- Westermann, C.,
Praise and Lament in the Psalms (Edinburgh: Clark, 1981).
- Westermann, C.,
Genesis 12-36: a Commentary (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985).
- Wevers, J.W.,
Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum
 (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954-cont).
- White, M.C.,
The Identity and Function of the Jews and Related Terms in the Fourth Gospel
 (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Emory, 1972).
- White, S.A.,
 "A Comparison of the "A" and "B" Manuscripts of the Damascus Document", RQ 12 (1987) 537-553.
- Whybray, R.N.,
Isaiah 40-66 (London: Oliphants, 1975).
- Wieder, N.,
The Judean Scrolls and Karaism (London: East & West Library, 1962).
- Wilcoxon, J.A.,
 "Some Anthropological Aspects of Israel's Sacred History", JR 48 (1968) 333-350.

- Williamson C.M., Allen, R.J.,
Interpreting Difficult Texts: Anti-Judaism and Christian Preaching (London: SCM 1989).
- Williamson, G.A.,
Josephus, the Jewish War, Translated with an Introduction (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978).
- Williamson, H.G.M.,
Israel in the Books of Chronicles (Cambridge: CUP, 1977).
- Williamson, H.G.M.,
1 and 2 Chronicles (London: Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1982).
- Wilson, R.McL.,
The Gospel of Philip (London: Mowbray, 1962).
- Wilson, S.G., (ed.),
Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, 2: Separation and Polemic (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2; Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier, 1986).
- Wilson, S.G.,
 "Melito and Israel" in Anti-Judaism, (ed.: Wilson) 81-102.
- Winston, D.,
The Wisdom of Solomon (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1979).
- Winston D.,
Philo of Alexandria: the Contemplative Life, the Giants and Selections (London: SPCK, 1981).
- Wiseman, D.J., (ed.),
Peoples of Old Testament Times (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973).
- Wolff, H.W.,
Hosea - a Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).
- Wolff, H.W.,
Joel and Amos - a Commentary on the Books of Joel and Amos (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

- Wolfson, H.A.,
Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in
 Judaism, Christianity and Islam (2 vols.;
 Cambridge: Harvard, 1948).
- Wright, G.,
 "The Samaritans of Shechem", HTR 55 (1962)
 357-366.
- Wright, G.,
 "Newly Discovered Temples on Mount Gerizim in
 Jordan", HTR 58 (1965) 234-237.
- Yadin, Y.,
The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light
 Against the Sons of Darkness (Oxford: OUP,
 1962).
- Young, F.M.,
 "Temple, Cult and Law in Early Christianity; a
 Study in the Relationship between Jews and
 Christians in the Early Centuries", NTS 19
 (1972) 325-38.
- Zeitlin, I.M.,
Jesus and the Judaism of his Time (Cambridge:
 Polity, 1988).
- Zeitlin, S.,
 "The Names Hebrew, Jew and Israel: a
 Historical Study", JQR 44 (1953) 365-379.
- Ziegler, J.,
Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco (Gottingen:
 Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).
- Ziesler, J.A.,
Pauline Christianity (OBS; Oxford: OUP, 1983).
- Ziesler, J.A.,
Paul's Letter to the Romans (London: SCM,
 1989).
- Zimmerli, W.,
Ezekiel (2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia:
 Fortress, 1979-83).
- Zobel, H.J.
 "yehuda", TDOT 5.482-499.