

Paul Beyond the Jew/Gentile Dichotomy: A Perspective from Benjamin

GLENN E. SNYDER

Indiana University/Purdue University Indianapolis

Pauline studies is a distinct subfield in biblical studies. Since at least the 1960s, two research programs have dominated Pauline studies in North America: one is a traditional Christian research program that studies Paul with a database of all of the thirteen letters included in the “New Testament,” plus the narrative in the canonized Acts of the Apostles (occasionally adding the epistle to the Hebrews); the other is a modern historical research program that studies only seven “undisputed” Pauline letters (Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Phil, 1 Thess, and Phlm),¹ normally with selective use of Acts. Each of these research programs works with its determined database of primary source materials, rendering its data into evidence for its observations, analyses, and conclusions. Circumscribed by these presuppositions, most advances in Pauline scholarship² have occurred by analyzing texts materially and linguistically, locating one or more texts in the appropriate historical contexts, selecting and using comparative materials, and/or critiquing ancient or modern categories of analysis.³ For this “roundtable discussion” on biblical studies, I would like to reflect critically on a particular category of analysis used in Pauline studies: the Jew/Gentile dichotomy.

Pauline studies is an important subfield in biblical studies, because it is one of the sites where scholars debate ancient and modern definitions and identities of Judaism and Christianity, Jews and Christians. The canonized gospels,⁴ as short biographies of Jesus,⁵ are often assumed to be the earliest and/or most reliable sources of data for the origins of Christianity. But the authentic letters of Paul would have been written between the late 40s to early 60s C.E., whereas extant forms of the gospels were produced no earlier than 70 C.E. The Pauline letters are therefore the earliest witnesses to one or more kinds of “Christianity.”⁶

But who was Paul, and why do his letters matter? Formerly a “Pharisee of Pharisees,” Paul claimed to have seen the once-dead Jesus, an experience that changed his life. Thereafter, he traveled through Rome’s eastern provinces (modern day Greece and Turkey), establishing *ekklēsiai* (Greek, “assemblies,” normally translated “churches”) and communicating with them via visits, messengers, and letters. Of those media of communication, only Paul’s letters remain as evidence for who Paul was, what his experience may have been, and how and why he may have proclaimed “the gospel” to the peoples he visited. A traditional Christian perspective—sometimes labeled “Traditional,” “Old,” “Protestant,” or “Lutheran”—is that Paul converted from one religion (Judaism) to another religion (Christianity), and that he proclaimed his new religion (Christianity) as good news for all people, including both Jews and Gentiles. A perspective that

developed basically in the 1970s—sometimes labeled “the New perspective”⁷—is that Paul converted within the religion Judaism from one kind of Judaism (e.g., the Pharisees)⁸ to another (e.g., the Christians), and that he called either all people or only Gentiles to a new way of life. The study of Paul and his letters is thus related to and determined by the categories used by scholars, including “the Jew/Gentile dichotomy.”

Scholars in Pauline studies normally assume that Paul divided humanity into two groups based on ethnicity, religion, geography, politics, language, and/or some other category. One of most common dichotomies ascribed to Paul is between “Jews” and “Gentiles,” so I am using the phrase “the Jew/Gentile dichotomy” to refer broadly and loosely to the division of Paul’s diverse Greek-language terms into two categories of social groups. One category is normally labeled “Jews” (or “Judeans”): it is labeled according to interpretations of the masculine singular and plural terms *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi*, but it normally includes the collective singular *Israēl*, “Israel,” and the masculine singular and plural *Israēlitēs* and *Israēlitai*, “Israelite(s).” The other category is normally labeled “Gentiles” (or “nations”): it is labeled according to interpretations of the plural term *ethnē*, but it normally includes singular and plural terms *Hellēn* and *Hellēnes*, “Greek(s).” Four related terms occur only in Galatians: three are ascribed to the first category (the verb *ioudaizō*, Gal 2:14; noun *Ioudaismos*, 1:13, 14; and adverb *Ioudaikōs*, 2:14), and one to the second (the adverb *ethnikōs*, 2:14). These categories are conceived and function differently for various interpreters, Jewish, Christian, and otherwise. But common to practically all interpretations is the segregation of humans into two groups—a categorization that both describes and determines a scholar’s own interpretive perspective, while ascribing its dichotomy to Paul and prescribing it for others.

One option has been to understand “Jews” as an *ethnic* category that refers genealogically to insiders: Jews are a “we” who (at least in theory) are descended physically from common ancestors. On this interpretation, the term “Jews”—normally equated with “Israelites”—refers to a distinct ethnic group, whereas “Gentiles” is the category that groups together all others: Gentiles are the “not us” of the Jews. Most Pauline scholars work with this particular form of the Jew/Gentile dichotomy. Scholars from an “Old” perspective view Paul primarily as a religious Christian who was sent to both Jews and Gentiles, whereas scholars from a “New” perspective view Paul primarily as an ethnic Jew who was called either to both Jews and Gentiles (similar to the “Old” perspective) or only to Gentiles (a so-called “Radical” new perspective, which is sometimes complemented with a positive valuation of Judaism as a religion for ethnic Jews).

A related but distinct interpretive option has been to understand “Jews” as a *social* or *cultural* category that refers to people who identify themselves as Jewish: Jews are a “we” who have affiliated themselves with Israel’s ancestors, at least in story and normally also in beliefs, practices, socialization, etc. On this interpretation, one’s “ethnic” identity is malleable, fluid, adaptable,

multiple, hybrid, or even exchangeable, so that some Gentiles (who are ethnically non-Jewish) may become partly or even wholly “Jews.”⁹

Other interpretive options abound. Many scholars have understood “Jews” to represent primarily a *religious* category, so that “Gentiles” are by definition the people(s) who are not religiously Jewish.¹⁰ On this interpretation, Gentiles remain the “not us” of Jews, but since Jews are defined primarily by their religion, Gentiles can convert religiously to become Jews. Other scholars, often with reference to contemporary non-Pauline materials, have understood “Jews” to represent the people associated with *Ioudaia*, the feminine singular normally translated “Judea” (or “Judaea,” to approximate the Latin *Iudaea*). On this interpretation, “Jews”—ethnic and/or religious—are understood also in relation to a geographic region. Moreover, some scholars have argued that *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* are so geographically-based that the terms should not be translated as “Jew(s),” because in their opinion the English term “Jew(s)” normally connotes ethnicity and/or religion; rather, according to these scholars, *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* should more accurately be translated as “Judean(s),” in order to communicate that the people were historically associated primarily with the Roman province *Ioudaia*, “Judea.”¹¹

At least three types of arguments have been proposed for (re-)translating the Greek terms *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* as “Judean(s)”: geopolitical, ethnographic, and religious. First of all, during most of the Second Temple era (516 B.C.E.–70 C.E.), neither the borders nor jurisdiction of the land were autonomously determined by its inhabitants.¹² In particular, during the mid-first century C.E., the geographic region of *Ioudaia* was politically, legally, and economically a Roman province (*Judaea* in Latin). Irrespective of their ethnicity and/or religion, inhabitants of *Ioudaia* were labeled by the Romans as *Ioudaioi* (*Judaei* in Latin). Therefore, to be an *Ioudaios* was not necessarily to be a Jew ethnically or religiously; it was to inhabit or to originate from *Ioudaia*. According to this geopolitical argument, *Ioudaia* was either one of or was distinct from other *ethnē*, “nations.” Second, not all citizens of *Ioudaia* were ethnically Jewish (to use the modern category); and occasionally some ethnic Jews claimed to renounce their provincial citizenship, including the particular rights, privileges, and *nomos* (“custom; law”) of the land of *Ioudaia*.¹³ Hence, the labels *Ioudaioi* and Jews do not “map” each other ethnographically, even if most of the *Ioudaioi* were ethnically Jews.¹⁴ Third, it has occasionally been argued that “Judaism(s)” —at least, the kinds of rabbinic Judaisms represented today—did not develop to maturity until sometime after Paul: either after the destruction of the Israelite Temple in Jerusalem in 70 C.E., after the end of the Bar Kokhba uprising in 135 C.E. (when the Romans officially renamed the region *Palaestina*), or even later (e.g., in the fourth or seventh centuries).¹⁵ So if there was no religion “Judaism,” the argument claims, neither were there religious “Jews.” According to this argument, the translation “Jew(s)” is anachronistic to the religions of mid-first-century Judea. For these and other reasons (e.g., agendas to decrease Christian anti-Judaism), some scholars have argued for translating *Ioudaios/Ioudaioi* as “Judean(s).”¹⁶

But the arguments for using “Judean(s)” in translation have not been received well by all, perhaps especially by Jewish scholars. Some scholars¹⁷ have argued against (re-)translating *Ioudaios/Ioudaioi* consistently as “Judean(s),” since many if not most of the *Ioudaioi* were ethnically and religiously Jewish—or, at least, were the biological and religious ancestors of Jews. To translate *Ioudaioi* as “Judeans,” it is argued, would be to write Jews out of early Christian history and hence, perhaps for some readers, to write off the anti-Jewish reception histories of these texts, if not also to further some contemporary forms of anti-Judaism. Others have rebutted these objections,¹⁸ arguing that the translation “Judeans” is no more (or less) inaccurate or unethical than other categories used to describe different times and/or places in Jewish history, such as the ancient categories of “Hebrews,” “the sons of Israel” (“Israelites”), or “Judahites,” or the modern category of “Israelis.”¹⁹

Most scholars who intentionally and explicitly participate in this debate about the translation of *Ioudaioi* share two goals: accurate historical description and ethical contemporary interpretation. But opinions differ about whether, when, why, where, how, and by and for whom it is accurate and/or ethical to translate *Ioudaioi* as “Jews” or “Judeans.” These differences of opinion have been based on a variety of factors, including the historical and/or contemporary interests, questions, concerns, etc., of the scholars in question, as well as their own ethnic and/or religious identifications. For some, it is no less than the identities and relations of Judaism and Christianity, Jews and Christians, that are at stake. A few scholars have argued that, in order to reinscribe the difficulty of translation, it is preferable not to translate but to transliterate the Greek terms; some prefer to translate *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* consistently as “Jew(s),” and others as “Judean(s);” and yet others have preferred to translate the terms differently based on the contexts of particular occurrences.²⁰ Many of the issues and options for these preferences are intrinsic to the art of interpreting and translating ancient, foreign-language texts into modern English. For, at least implicitly, every translation requires a reconstruction of the historical author(s) and/or reader(s); identification of imagined contemporary readers; determination of the scope, goals, and contexts for the translation; valuation of “word-for-word” versus “thought-for-thought” philosophies of translation, as well as preferences for the source language (an “emic” translation) or target language (an “etic” translation); and so forth.

The debate about whether and how to translate *Ioudaioi* is also related to how to interpret other terms whose functions have normally been reduced to playing parts in a Jew/Gentile dichotomy. Normally on the same side of *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaioi* are the collective singular *Israēl*, “Israel,” and singular and plural demonyms *Israēlitēs* and *Israēlitai*, “Israelite(s).” Often these designators are equated sociologically, so that Israelites are Jews/Judeans and Jews/Judeans are Israelites. But occasionally a distinction has been made: for example, *Israēlitai* as an ethnic designator versus *Ioudaioi* as religious, or *Israēlitai* as ethnic versus *Ioudaioi* as geopolitical.²¹ Regardless, terms on that side of the dichotomy are often interpreted and translated in context of and by contrast to one

or more terms on the other side: the plural term *ethnē* and/or the singular and plural terms *Hellēn* and *Hellēnes*, “Greek(s).” Some participants in the Paul and Politics Group of the Society of Biblical Literature have argued that Paul’s contrasts between *Ioudaioi/Israēl(itai)* and *ethnē* are evidence for a geopolitical distinction between Judea and other nations and/or for the subordination of all nations, including *Ioudaia*, under the colonizing *imperium* of Rome.²² Others—for example, select volumes in the recent *Paul in Critical Contexts* series by Fortress Press—have argued that, as part of his own postcolonial discourse, Paul portrays his own and others’ ethnic identities as multiple and hybridized.²³ But whether Jews and Gentiles or Judeans and nations, there is a tendency in Pauline scholarship to dichotomize Paul’s Greek-language terms, interpreting and translating these terms with ancient and/or modern categories of geography, politics, religion, and/or ethnicity.

How will Pauline studies be able to advance beyond its current perspectives? In my opinion, division of Paul’s sociological (and related) terms into a Jew/Gentile dichotomy is a practice that unnecessarily delimits the sociological and other historical possibilities for interpreting Paul and his letters. Therefore, rather than continuing a practice that is common to both research programs and most interpretive perspectives, I propose that further historical and comparative work should be done on Paul’s contrasted terms, in order to adduce categories that are more accurate for interpreting the authentic letters of Paul.

In particular, I propose that the key to unlocking Paul’s sociological (and related) categories is to begin with his own identity-formative statements and rhetoric. For, not once does Paul explicitly identify himself as a *Ioudaios* (*pace* Gal 2:15);²⁴ and 1 Cor 9:20 may even imply his denial of such an identity (“for the *Ioudaioi* I became [as] a *Ioudaios*”). Instead, Paul identifies himself generally as an Israelite and specifically as a member of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom 11:1, *Israēlitēs, phylēs Benjamin*; Phil 3:5–6, *ek genous Israēl, phylēs Benjamin*).²⁵

The perspective of the historical Paul was thus determined by his identity as a Benjaminite, a tribal identification that he used both to identify with a broader ethnic group (*Israēl*, “Israel”) and also to differentiate himself from another of its tribes (*Ioudaia*, “Judah”). According to the stories preserved in the Hebrew Bible,²⁶ Benjamin was the only one of Israel’s twelve legendary tribes to submit to Judah’s rule after the death of David’s son, king Solomon of *Yəhūdāh* (Hebrew, “Judah”; d. 928/922 B.C.E.). Through the Assyrian crisis (722 B.C.E.), the destruction of the southern kingdom (586 B.C.E.), the deportation to Babylon (586–539 B.C.E.), and the subsequent repatriations and reformations of the occupied territory called *Yahud* (Persian era, 538–332 B.C.E.), *Ioudaia* (Greek era, 332–63 B.C.E.), and also *Iudaea* (Roman era, 63 B.C.E.–135 C.E.), Judah had claimed authority over Benjamin in particular and Israel in general. But according to Paul, the contemporary state of *Ioudaia*, including its *nomos* (“custom; law”), was not the ideal for “Israel” (Hebrew *Yisrā-’ēl*, “God rules” or “May God rule”). For, irrespective of its Temple in Jerusalem, *Ioudaia* had been conquered by and was subordinated to Rome. Rather, Paul’s hope for Israel was

that an *anastasis* (Greek, “uprising”; cp. Latin *superstitio*) had been initiated in Jesus, whom “the rulers” had executed on account of political sedition but whom God resurrected. Now “anointed” (*Christos*) and declared “son of God” (*huios theou*) and “Lord” (*kyrios*), Paul proclaimed that this Jesus was the Davidic king whose heavenly arrival and earthly triumph would end in God’s rule, with justice for all who were saved from the Lord’s wrath (Rom 1; 1 Cor 15; 1 Thess 4–5). It was as a Benjaminite that Paul proclaimed this message to peoples outside the land of *Ioudaia*, in order to call for the reunion of “all Israel” (Rom 9–11; cp. Gal 6).²⁷

I have proposed this “Benjaminite perspective” as a new way to interpret the Greek-language terms²⁸ formerly divided into “the Jew/Gentile dichotomy.” For, this theory explains how Paul was strategically positioned as a Benjaminite to affirm his affiliation with *Israēl* (intraethnically) but also to critique contemporary *Ioudaioi* (intertribally, including geopolitically, religiously, etc.).²⁹ My hope is that the Benjaminite hypothesis will advance our collective goals—as historians, Jews, Christians, and other interested peoples—of accurately describing and ethically interpreting the letters of Paul.

Notes

1. Within “the” Christian New Testament, thirteen Greek-language letters are written in the name of Paul (Greek *Paulos*, based on the Latin *Paulus*, “little, small”). The categories “disputed” and “undisputed” were invented in order to label these canonized epistles according to generalizations about their authenticity of authorship. Six letters were labeled as “disputed” based on some scholars’ valuations of the kinds, quantities, and qualities of arguments made against their authenticity: these are the three “deutero-Pauline” letters (Eph, Col, and 2 Thess), plus the three “pastoral” letters (1 Tim, 2 Tim, and Tit). The other seven letters were grouped together as “undisputed” (Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Phil, 1 Thess, and Phlm). Precisely how, when, where, why, and by whom these categories were produced and popularized is beyond the scope of this contribution.
2. For general studies of the subfield, see, for example, Baird 1992–2013; Zetterholm 2009; Given 2010; Marchal 2012; Wright 2015.
3. Accuracy, thoroughness, precision, and innovation are the criteria most valued in contemporary Pauline scholarship; and most “innovation” occurs by applying the interests, values, questions, theories, and methods of other disciplines to Pauline studies. For an introduction to theories and methods for biblical studies, see, for example, Hayes 2004; Adam 2000; and the *Guides to Biblical Scholarship* series by Fortress Press. See also Given 2010 and Marchal 2012.

4. “Gospel” is an old English term for “good news,” which is a literal translation of the Greek noun *euangelion*. Originally untitled and anonymous, the four narratives later included in most collections of Christian Scripture have been titled “the gospel” according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John since the second century C.E. Dozens of additional “gospels” were composed in similar and differing genres.
5. The Greek *Iēsous* is normally rendered as “Jesus” or “Joshua” in English, but it is a transliteration of the Hebrew *Yēshūa*, “he will save.”
6. The term “Christianity” is anachronistic to Pauline studies. Derived from a Latin suffix (-*ianus*, -*a*, -*um*), the Greek term *Christianos* originally referred to an alleged “partisan of *Christos*.” Within the history of Israel, occasionally someone was elected for a particular function or position (e.g., king, priest, prophet) through a ritual of anointing and was subsequently called “anointed” (Hebrew *māshîach*; Greek *christos*). Some early followers of Jesus understood him to be “anointed” as a prophet, priest, and/or king, and on this basis they were labeled—perhaps originally and pejoratively by outsiders—as “Christians” (Latin *Christiani*; Greek *Christianoi*).
7. See, for example, Dunn 2007; Wright 2013; Westerholm 2004; and Nanos and Zetterholm 2015. According to most histories of the discipline, antecedents for the development of the New Perspective(s) were works by Krister Stendahl and E. P. Sanders in the 1960s and 1970s. But the New Perspective(s) was also developed to propose alternate explanations for what Heikki Räisänen had presented as insoluble “internal conceptual problems” within a Traditional Perspective: see, for example, Gager 2000.
8. In addition to “Pharisaic,” scholars have labeled Paul’s former and/or continuing Judaism with terms such as rabbinic, Palestinian, Essene, Zealot, Diasporic, Hellenistic, apocalyptic, etc. For a helpful introduction, see Engberg-Pedersen 2001.
9. See, in general, Cohen 1999; within Pauline studies, see especially Buell and Hodge 2004; Hodge 2007; Hodge 2005; Garroway 2012; Concannon 2014.
10. A religious interpretation of “Jews” normally occasions debates about the “religions” Judaism and Christianity. Was “Judaism” a religion in Paul’s era? If so, how many Judaisms were there, and what made a religious “Jew” Jewish? Similarly, was “Christianity” a religion? If so, how many Christianities were there, and how did it/they relate to Judaism(s)? A related site for such debates is Paul’s “call” and/or “conversion.” Normally assuming that Judaism and/or Christianity was a religion, the debate has been: when Paul experienced his vision(s) of Jesus, did he stay a Jew and/or become a Christian?

11. See, for example, Esler 2012 and Mason 2007.
12. Exceptions may have occurred during parts of the Hasmonean era (164–63 B.C.E.), part of the reign of Herod “the Great” (37–4 B.C.E.), and Herod Agrippa I (41–44 C.E.).
13. Smallwood 1981; Williams 1998. Conspicuous is the case of the old man whose penis was inspected for the marker of circumcision by Domitian.
14. To map the categories ethnographically, two Boolean sets would overlap. Most of the smaller set of *Ioudaioi* would be within the larger set of Jews; but part of the set labeled “*Ioudaioi*” would be outside the set “Jews,” indicating that other ethnicities may be *Ioudaioi*, and some of the set labeled “Jews” would be outside the set “*Ioudaioi*,” indicating that some ethnic Jews did not identify as *Ioudaioi*. (For the sake of analogy, consider an ethnographic model for modern Israelis and Jews: today, most Israelis are Jews, but some are not; and today, many Jews are not Israelis. Would it be sociographically accurate to substitute an original-language reference to “Israelis” with an English-language interpretation of “Jews”? According to this argument, such a substitution would be inaccurate as a general principle for translation.)
15. See, for example, Boyarin 2004.
16. Crossley (2014) has noted that some scholars have argued for the same retranslation with very different motives. For example, in several publications Bruce Malina has argued that in Paul’s letters (and other early Christian literature), *Ioudaioi* should be retranslated “Judeans” in order to distinguish the ancient people from modern day “Jews.” For, based on a form of the Khazar theory, one of Malina’s presuppositions is that many modern-day Jews (including Israelis) are ethnically unrelated to ancient Israelites. That theory is a marginal and minority opinion.
17. See Schwartz 2011 and Levine 2006.
18. See, for example, Mason 2014.
19. For a recent history of scholarship, see the series of articles by David M. Miller in the *Currents in Biblical Research* (especially vols. 9.1 [2010] and 10.2 [2012], but also 12.2 [2014]). For a representative selection of positions, see also “Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts” (August 26, 2014), available at <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/>. Participants in *Marginalia*’s forum were Adele Reinhartz, Steve Mason, Daniel Schwartz, Annette Yoshiko Reed, Joan Taylor, Malcolm Lowe, Jonathan Klawans, Ruth Sheridan, and James Crossley.

20. See, for example, Schwartz 2007; see also his contribution to *Marginalia*'s forum "Jew and Judean."
21. See, for example, Stanley 2011, especially 118–20; Staples 2011, especially 374–78.
22. See, for example, selections in Horsley 1997; Horsley 2000; and Horsley 2004. For two distinct perspectives on Romans, compare the "New" perspective in Stowers 1994 and the "Roman imperial" perspective in Elliott 2010.
23. In addition to some of the volumes in the Fortress Press series, see also the works cited in n. 9 above.
24. See the forthcoming article by Jeremy Hultin (working title, "Who Rebuked Cephas? A New Interpretation of Gal 2:14–17"). Based partly on the verbs *eidon* and *eipon* (which, as first aorists, are morphologically either the first person singular or third person plural), Hultin argues that the statement "we (who are) by nature *Ioudaioi*" is not Paul's claim (i.e., the first person singular, as normally interpreted) but rather is ascribed to the people from James (i.e., third person plural).
25. For "(non-)boastful" comparison with *Israēlitai*, see also 2 Cor 11:22. Another lineal phrase used twice in "undisputed" letters is "Abraham's seed" (Rom 11:1, *ek spermatos Abraam*; 2 Cor 11:22, *sperma Abraam*). Whether Paul conceived his call to include the non-Israelite "seed of Abraham" (i.e., the descendants of the sons of Hagar and Keturah, and/or the sons of Jacob's elder twin brother Esau/Edom) is an interesting question, which would affiliate Paul with yet broader "ethnic" identity.
26. Practically all of the writings collected in the Hebrew Bible (Tanakh/Old Testament) preserve the stories of Israel from the perspectives of Judah, including some Benjaminites and Levites. Historically, it is uncertain to what extent these texts were coextensive with the *nomos* ("custom; law") of *Ioudaia* in the mid-first century C.E., but it is clear that diverse opinions were represented by groups such as the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, "fourth philosophy," *sicarii*, "Zealots," etc., many of which accepted additional and/or different sources of authority.
27. According to the so-called New Perspective, Paul was a Jew who was called as a prophet only to ethnic Gentiles (i.e., non-Jews). But according to this Benjaminite perspective, Paul's call to peoples outside *Ioudaia* was not necessarily a call to non-Israelites: Paul's call for the reunion of Israel may even have been that of a shepherd recalling his flocks, the dispersed, non-Judahite tribes of Israel. Using intertexts from Hosea and Jeremiah to interpret Rom 9–11, Staples (2011) has argued that Paul understood "Ephraim" (including

the other tribes from the former northern kingdom) to be dispersed and “intermixed” with other peoples, so that Paul’s gathering of *ethnē* was part and parcel with collecting the dispersed tribes of Israel.

28. Translation is another matter. For the Benjaminite hypothesis, “Judah,” “Judahite,” and “Judahites” are probably the most useful translations for understanding Paul’s references to *Ioudaia*, *Ioudaios*, and *Ioudaioi* in the proposed tribal, geopolitical, and religious contexts. But *ethnē* is more difficult to interpret and to translate, as it is used variously to refer to peoples (geographically outside the land of *Ioudaia*, and in Paul’s opinion geopolitically outside the boundaries of its *nomos*) who are not in allegiance with Israel’s “Lord.”
29. In the canonized Acts, Paul is portrayed even at the end of his life as a member of the Pharisees—one of the political parties in *Ioudaia* between the 150s B.C.E. and 70 C.E. But in the undisputed letters, particularly Gal 1 (where his former allegiance with the Pharisees is implicit) and Phil 3 (where it is explicit), Paul seems to have separated from the Pharisees. Whether Paul’s separation with the Pharisees may also imply a renunciation of citizenship in *Ioudaia* is unclear but is worth considering.

Works Cited

- Adam, A. K. M., ed. 2000. *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*. St. Louis: Chalice Press.
- Baird, William. 1992–2013. *History of New Testament Research*. 3 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Boyarin, Daniel. 2004. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Buell, Denise Kimber, and Caroline Johnson Hodge. 2004. “The Politics of Interpretation: The Rhetoric of Race and Ethnicity in Paul.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123.2: 235–51.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. 1999. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Concannon, Cavan W. 2014. *“When You Were Gentiles”’: Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul’s Corinthian Correspondence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Crossley, James. 2014. "What a Difference a Translation Makes! An Ideological Analysis of the *Ioudaios* Debate." *The Marginalia Review of Books* August 26. <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/difference-translation-makes-ideological-analysis-ioudaios-debate-james-crossley/>. Accessed June 2, 2015.
- Dunn, James D. G. 2007. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Elliott, Neil. 2010. *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, ed. 2001. *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Esler, Philip F. 2012. "Identity Matters: Judean Ethnic Identity in the First Century C.E." *The Bible and Interpretation*. <http://www.bibleinterp.com/opeds/esl368002.shtml>. Accessed June 2, 2015.
- Gager, John G. 2000. *Reinventing Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garraway, Joshua D. 2012. *Paul's Gentile-Jews: Neither Jew nor Gentile, but Both*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Given, Mark D., ed. 2010. *Paul Unbound: Other Perspectives on the Apostle*. Peabody, MA: Hendricksen Publishers.
- Hayes, John H. ed. 2004. *Methods of Biblical Interpretation: Excerpted from the Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Hodge, Caroline Johnson. 2005. "Apostle to the Gentiles: Constructions of Paul's Identity." *Biblical Interpretation* 13.3: 270–88.
- _____. 2007. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Horsley, Richard A., ed. 1997. *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.
- _____, ed. 2000. *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.
- _____, ed. 2004. *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

- Levine, Amy-Jill. 2006. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Marchal, Joseph A., ed. 2012. *Studying Paul's Letters: Contemporary Perspectives and Methods*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Mason, Steve. 2007. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38.4–5: 457–512.
- _____. 2014. "Ancient Jews or Judeans? Different Questions, Different Answers." *The Marginalia Review of Books* August 26. <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/ancient-jews-judeans-different-questions-different-answers-steve-mason/>. Accessed June 2, 2015.
- Nanos, Mark D., and Magnus Zetterholm, eds. 2015. *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. 2007. "'Judean' or 'Jew'? How Should We Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?" In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. Eds. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripenotrog. AGJU 71. Leiden: Brill. 3–27.
- Schwartz, Seth. 2011. "How Many Judaisms Were There?: A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization." *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2.2: 208–38.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. 1981. *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 2011. "Paul the Ethnic Hybrid? Postcolonial Perspectives on Paul's Ethnic Categorizations." In *The Colonized Apostle: Paul through Postcolonial Eyes*. Ed. Christopher D. Stanley. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. 110–26.
- Staples, Jason A. 2011. "What Do the Gentiles Have to Do with 'All Israel'? A Fresh Look at Romans 11:25–27." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130.2: 371–90.
- Stowers, Stanley K. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Westerholm, Stephen. 2004. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Williams, Margaret H. 1998. *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wright, N. T. 2013. *Pauline Perspectives: Essays on Paul, 1978–2013*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____. 2015 (forthcoming). *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Zetterholm, Magnus. 2009. *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.