Within Judaism? Interpretive Trajectories in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam from the First to the Twenty-First Century

Edited by

Karin Hedner Zetterholm
Anders Runesson

LEXINGTON BOOKS/FORTRESS ACADEMIC
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Chapter 12

John Within Judaism

Wally V. Cirafesi

For nearly two thousand years, the Gospel of John has dwelt comfortably in the halls of Christian theological normativity, occupying a prized place in the formation of almost every major Christian doctrine, from the trinity to christology to salvation. Indeed, it is not an understatement to suggest that John's Gospel has, since antiquity, been the quintessential "Christian" text. After all, it has fundamentally shaped not only large swathes of Christian theology but also centuries of Christian praxis—a big part of which, historically, has been Christian hatred of Jewish people.

We need not, although we could, look further back in time than the 20th and 21st centuries to see John-inspired hate at its murderous apex. The words *Der Vater der Juden ist der Teufel*—a close paraphrase of John 8:44—were plastered on a public street sign in Nazi-era Eschenbach to inspire hatred of Jews among its residents.[1] The same text played a motivating part in two expressions of anti-Semitism in recent American history, the 2017 rally of the KKK in Charlottesville, Virginia, and the 2018 massacre of Squirrel Hill, Pennsylvania, at the Tree of Life Synagogue.[2] While a case could be, and has been, made that both sets of "readers" took John "out of context" by acting out their own hatred of Jews, another case could be equally made that such anti-Jewish hatred is intrinsic to John itself. In either case, there is no denying the moral problem that the Gospel of John poses to Christian interpreters who consider John to be in some way a sacred text.[3]

In light of John's being deeply rooted in the annals of Christian (anti-Jewish) normativity, what might it mean to read it "within Judaism"? Initially, for some, it might come across simply as a well-intentioned apologetic to expiate John from the sins of its past. Certainly, this has been the case in some forms of Christian theological scholarship.[4] I will say more about the concern of "doing apologetics" in the conclusion below. But here

I want to raise—and affirm—the distinction between the analytical posture of the historian and that of the believer.[5] The task of the historian is neither to rescue the reputation of ancient texts nor demand that they conform to our modern ethical norms. A historical reading of John "within Judaism" does not mean that we will have solved the moral challenges that it presents today's readers, such as its rhetorical othering and socio-religious exclusivism. What I am interested in as a historian is problematizing the normative categories that have largely determined John's reception history and thereby rethink John's place in our historical imaging of "Christianity" and "Judaism" in the early centuries CE. In my view, the term "anti-Judaism" itself is one of those normative categories that needs the most critical attention.[6]

In the remaining parts of this chapter, I outline an approach to John "within Judaism" using a quasi-Ricoeurean three "worlds of the text" simply as a structuring device: the world outside John's text, the world inside John's text, and the world in front of John's text.[7] In the conclusion, I address the questions of what is at stake and what changes when John is read "within Judaism" rather than as Judaism's antithesis.

THE WORLD OUTSIDE JOHN'S TEXT

How do we, from an analytical perspective, talk about something that John never does, at least not explicitly? While the term "Judaism" floods the pages of contemporary Johannine scholarship, including my own, the Greek term from which it derives, *Ioudaïsmos*, is entirely absent in John. But, alas, it is absent in *most* Greek literature from before the second century CE, and it does not really emerge with any force until the 4th century in Christian heresiological literature. The author of 2 Maccabees uses *Ioudaïsmos* four times, the author of 4 Maccabees once, and Paul twice. A number of scholars over the past decade or so have suggested that our English term "Judaism" does not map neatly onto the ancient term *Ioudaïsmos*.[8] This is certainly the case if, by "Judaism," one has in mind modern forms of Judaism, most of which trace their origins, somehow or another, not to the *Ioudaïsmos* of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods but to the rabbinic Judaism of Late Antiquity. From this perspective, to talk about "John within 'Judaism'" might actually be anachronistic, since, in and around the 1st century CE, there was no ossified system of belief and practice called "Judaism" for John to be "within" or outside of, just as, equally, there was no "Christianity" for John to encourage its readers to "convert" to.[9]

In the study of John, then, the term "Judaism" needs critical reflection. Are we dealing with an ethnic category, a category of religion, or some combination of the two? What do the terms "ethnicity" and "religion" even mean in

the study of Mediterranean antiquity, and what difference do these concepts make when we interpret John?[10] To provide some initial answers to these questions from a "John within Judaism" approach, we also need to consider a related term that we actually *do* find in John, and that scholars have argued about intensely. That term, of course, is *Ioudaios*.

Two challenges have preoccupied scholarly attention to this term. The first is translation: should *Ioudaios* be rendered today with the cultural-religious term "Jew," or with the ethnic-geographical term "Judean"? Beyond the problematic binary this question creates for antiquity, in my view the *Ioudaios*-translation debate is ultimately a nonstarter.[11] While the question of translation might be important for the task of making readable translations of ancient texts for modern readers, translation should not be the determining factor for ascertaining a word's meaning, or even its ultimate goal. After all, as Jon Solomon has noted, every act of translation is an act of metaphorical violence.[12] Something is always lost, or worse, erased in the act of translation. That is to say, neither the term "Judean" nor the term "Jew" can capture all that *Ioudaios* could refer to in antiquity. Neither term can capture the fact that groups of *Ioudaioi* could form their identities around very different interpretations of what it meant to be a member of the *ethnous Ioudaion*.[13] Thus, in my view, Daniel Schwartz is ultimately right to argue that, for analytical purposes, we need *both* "Judean" *and* "Jew" to talk about *Ioudaioi* in antiquity, and that our work does not stop with making a choice about translation.[14] Rather, we need to evaluate instances of the term's use *within particular contexts* and attempt to discern what sorts of identity-orientations and values have been rhetorically and ideologically mapped onto a specific group of *Ioudaioi*.

THE WORLD INSIDE JOHN'S TEXT

The second challenge—which takes us to the world inside John's text—has to do with the "sense" of *Ioudaios* as presented in the pages of John's Gospel.[15] It is one thing for us, as scholars, to acknowledge the great variation of Jewish identities that existed in antiquity; it is quite another thing to say that John is aware of this diversity in the world outside its text or cares to represent it from a compositional standpoint. It seems to me that a common, or perhaps even *the most* common, approach within Johannine scholarship has been to see John as presenting the *Ioudaioi* as a mainly flat, symbolic, or rhetorical character group, which has little to no connection to actual *Ioudaioi* in the world outside John's textual universe. This view, in some way, shape, or form, is traceable back at least to the work of Rudolph Bultmann, who understood John as presenting the *Ioudaioi* as a timeless group that symbolized the

rejection of God's revelation.[16] In this reading, John's *Ioudaioi* become representative of "Judaism" as a whole, and thus the Johannine Jesus's conflict with them is framed as a conflict with "Judaism" *tout court*.[17] Concomitantly, John's strategies concerning the institutions of the *Ioudaioi*, such as the temple, synagogues, the Law, holy days, and even the covenant itself are understood in terms of "replacement," "supersessionism," or "expropriation," which place, in some way or another, the Johannine Jesus and his followers outside of, or at least on a direct path away from, "Judaism" *in toto*.

On the one hand, such readings are understandable. There is no doubt that John's *Ioudaioi* serve a rhetorical function and, for the most part, serve as a negative example in John's story. Furthermore, *Ioudaios* is, after all, a general term; efforts to restrict the *Ioudaioi* in John simply to the "religious leaders" or to a particular sociopolitical party within first-century Judea have been largely unpersuasive. On the other hand, if we could move beyond the term itself and to consider what types of identity-orientations John has discursively mapped on to this group, we might, indeed, see that the Johannine *Ioudaioi* have identity-values that other groups of Jews outside John's text also shared and were hotly contested in the world of Jewish antiquity. In other words, the term *Ioudaioi* might be broad and indefinite, but the ideology with which John imbues it might not be.[18] That is to ask, might John's *Ioudaioi* represent *one expression* of Jewishness, not "Judaism" as a whole?

From this perspective, we would be wrong to reduce "Judaism" in John—that is, the performance of Jewish ethnic identity—down to John's use of the term *Ioudaioi*. Similarly, the non-use of *Ioudaioi* for other characters and groups in John should not be immediately taken to mean that John doesn't consider them to be "Jewish." While it is true that none of Jesus's followers are explicitly called an *Ioudaios*, neither are Caiaphas, the chief-priests, the crowds in Judea and Jerusalem, and, arguably, the Pharisees, who at times seem to be presented as a separate group, although this is certainly a matter of interpretation (9:13–17; 11:45–52). Conversely, Jesus himself is called an *Ioudaios* by the Samaritan woman, a label he seems happy to identify with in 4:22 using the first-person plural "we" to mark himself as a member of the *Ioudaioi*; Nicodemus, although a bit more of an ambiguous character, is both Pharisee and *Ioudaios*; and Lazarus and his sisters, Mary and Martha, while not called *Ioudaioi* themselves, clearly have very close relationships with *Ioudaioi*. Thus, to me, it might be better to understand the world inside John's text as being populated with characters who have competing ideas about Jewishness, about what it means to be a member of the Jewish *ethnos*, or as the Johannine Jesus describes Nathanael, what it means to be "truly an Israelite," whether or not they are explicitly called an *Ioudaios*.

From John's vantage point, being a part of the Jewish *ethnos* continues to be soteriologically meaningful. For example, in John 11:49–53, Jesus's impending death is prophesied to be *for the benefit* of the *laos*, that is, *for* the Jewish people and *for* their *ethnos*. Indeed, even for the few non-Jews in John's narrative world, being in the orbit of Jewishness seems to be a presupposed soteriological criterion, upon which one's encounter with Jesus is based. The Greeks mentioned in John 7:35 and those who come to "see" Jesus in 12:20 are, *before* encountering Jesus, envisioned to be ethnic boundary-crossers who are already participating in Jewish life. That is, they are *Judaizers*; and John gives us no indication that their "come-to-Jesus moment," so to say, functions to turn them *away from* this established behavior. The Samaritan woman, the only non-*Ioudaios* in John who had a historic claim to also being a "true Israelite," is both critiqued by Jesus for some perceived lack in her Samaritan identity *and* invited into a "salvation" that comes "by means of the *Ioudaioi*" (4:22). Worshiping Israel's god Jewishly is not an option for her; it's mandatory. So, one could say that, in the world inside John's text, there might be Jewishness without salvation, but there is no salvation without Jewishness, without attachment to the Jewish *ethnos*.

Seeing the world inside John's text as a witness to the ideologically congested universe of Jewish antiquity suggests that we understand John's engagement with Jewish institutions not in binary terms—"reject" or "accept"—but rather as part of its own competitive negotiation of Jewish identity. This is where the concept of self-identification in the interpretive process of categorization is worth highlighting.[19] John does not need to be doing exactly the same things as other Jewish texts for us, as modern interpreters, to speak of "John within Judaism." We need to resist our normative impulses, being careful not to have a "fixed" or "ideal" vision of the ancestral customs we call "first-century Judaism" and then attempt to measure John against "that," whatever "that" is. As Anders Runesson has noted, there was no "original," "pure," "fixed," or "ideal" "Judaism," no "universally accepted authoritative melody on which variations elaborate. There is no 'starting point'; we have only variations."[20]

On the other hand, a self-professed loyalty to the Jewish god seems to keep all the variations of Jewish ancestral customs together as a recognizable group. And, to me, it seems fairly clear that, despite its differences from other variations both inside and outside the text, John itself claims such loyalty (John 8:54). Yet this loyalty is expressed through a textualized negotiation of Jewishness using strategies of meaning-making that we, arguably, see used in other Jewish texts and among other Jewish groups. As John negotiates categories of ancient ethnicity that many, if not most, Jews cared deeply about—such as notions of kinship and genealogy, ancestral laws and territory, and "nation" cult—it does so by asking its readers not to leave the Jewish

ethnos entirely but to imagine its major sites of meaning-making along the lines of what Jonathan Z. Smith has called "diasporic religion"[21]: the Jewish national cult is envisioned around individuals, communities, and apocalyptic revelation; Jewish ancestral laws are not statutory regulations but primarily ethical or eschatological in nature; real political territory is metaphorized and oriented toward another world; and kinship relations are constructed culturally, not just genealogically.[22]

At the same time, framing John's approach to Jewishness as a textualized negotiation of Jewish ethnic identity allows us to appreciate the sense of "separation," "disaffiliation," or even "supersessionism" in John that scholars have long detected, but to do so from a "within Judaism" analytical perspective. There is no doubt that John intends, on the textual level, to facilitate separation between its Christ-confessors and *Ioudaioi* who are antagonistic toward Jesus, and that it places Jesus himself at the hermeneutical center of Jewish institutions. John's use, for example, of *aposynagōgos*, the metaphor of the vine and the broken branches, and its depiction of its antagonists in diabolical terms are certainly strategies of disaffiliation, as Adele Reinhartz argues.[23] However, *all* of them are strategies used within intragroup conflict, and *none* of them can be easily reduced to John's rejection of Jews and Judaism *in toto*. *Aposynagōgos* has to do with John's Christ-confessors' conflict within and expulsion from the Jerusalem public assembly, not expulsion from the Jewish *ethnos*.[24] And the vine and branch metaphor, as well as the diabolical depiction of Jesus's opponents, are helpfully seen through the lens of populist or "anti-establishment" discourse, by which a minority group presents itself as constitutive of the whole—we are the "true Canadians," the "true Swedes," the "true Americans," the "true Israelis"—while their enemies are associated with the cosmic forces of evil.[25] In John, it is Jesus and his followers who are the "true Israel," and, perhaps in typical apocalyptic fashion, their enemies are not simply the *Ioudaioi* who have jurisdiction over Judean public institutions but the cosmos itself.

If the Johannine Jesus and his followers are also Jews competing for the status of "true Israelites," or, in the case of Samaritans and Greeks, have access to "salvation" via Jewishness; and if John, like other Jewish texts, ideologically interprets Jewish institutions without rejecting them, then, to me, it is unlikely that *John* intends by its rhetoric of separation or disaffiliation to move its readers away from Jewishness and *toward something other than Jewishness, toward something other than loyalty to the Jewish ethnos and its ethnic deity*. The move, rather, is from one expression of "Judaism" to another expression of "Judaism." John, from the perspective of "self-identification," intends to stay on the spectrum of Jewish identity.

THE WORLD IN FRONT OF JOHN'S TEXT

Lastly, the question of John's audience—which brings us to the world in front of John's text—has played an important role recently in how some scholars have conceptualized the Gospel's relationship to Judaism. To be sure, John, like other New Testament texts, clearly came, in later centuries, to be read by non-Jewish Christians from a vantage point outside of and in opposition to Judaism. The question some scholars have asked, however, is whether John's intended readers were non-Jews themselves. The mention of Greeks in John 7:35 and 12:20 is at the interpretive center here. In this view, John's goal is to construct a new identity for its gentile readers.[26] On the one hand, this new identity is disaffiliated from Jews, but, on the other hand, it is constructed on the basis of a colonized or expropriated Jewishness: Jewish institutions, including the covenant between the Jewish god and the Jewish people, are usurped from Jews and appropriated to non-Jewish readers. The supposition of a gentile audience, then, becomes the hermeneutical key to uphold the paradox of John's being both "Jewish" and "anti-Jewish."

I want to make two brief comments here. First, while, in the Ricoeurean sense, the world in front of a text—that is, the needs of its readers, their values and attitudes, and their historical and cultural situatedness—is just as important as the other "worlds" in the interpretive process, it is also the most difficult to access for any ancient narrative that lacks an explicit addressee. How do we really determine the identity of John's audience, let alone the values and presuppositions they would have brought to their reading or listening? If the view of a gentile audience for John is mostly based on two small passages in which Greeks are mentioned, a similar—or perhaps even stronger—case might be made for a Samaritan audience, which has, in fact, been made plenty of times in the history of Johannine scholarship.[27]

Second, it is important to note that a "John within Judaism" approach does not actually require that the Gospel have a Jewish or Jewish Christ-following audience. A gentile audience is possible, too, and I actually think it has a number things going for it. Historically speaking, many ancient Jews, whether Christ-followers or not, were concerned with issuing instruction concerning how non-Jews could or should relate to Jewish communities. There are a range of sources that suggest that Jews invited—or could require—a range of possible Judaizing behaviors from gentiles, from full ethnic "conversion" to general sympathy. My colleagues working in the "Paul within Judaism" paradigm have shown that Paul's writings represent a form of Jewish instruction for gentiles who were likely already in some way sympathetic to Judaism. Paul's intent to include gentiles in the covenant between the Jewish god and the Jewish people through Christ-adherence, and thus through some level of

Jewish behavior, is not a program of Jewish cultural and covenantal expropriation but, as Paula Fredriksen has argued, a program of gentile *Judaization*.[28]

I mention "Paul within Judaism" here simply to illustrate the point that the possibility of a gentile audience for John does not mean that we must understand the Gospel to be in the business of disinheriting the Jewish people of their covenant status.[29] After all, as mentioned above, John explicitly associates "salvation" with the Jewish people (John 4:22) and interprets the death of Jesus to be "in behalf of" the Jewish *ethnos* (11:51–52; 18:14, where *laos* is used). As John 7:35 and 12:20 hint at, John does have an interest in the inclusion of gentiles. But a mission aimed at gentile *inclusion* is fundamentally different from a mission aimed at gentile *appropriation and usurpation* of Jewish covenantal identity. Thus, a gentile audience for John would not, in and of itself, render John "outside Judaism" but rather establish it as another "Jewish pattern of universalism."[30]

CONCLUSION: WHAT IS AT STAKE?

For some scholars, reading John "within Judaism" is perceived to be simply "doing apologetics," a convenient and comfortable way for Christian scholars to avoid the hard question of John's anti-Judaism.[31] In this view, regardless of how many "Jewish features" John has, because of its harsh statements about *Ioudaioi* and its assertion that salvation is only attainable through Jesus, scholars should simply accept that John is incommensurate with "Judaism," and take its espousal of anti-Judaism as self-evident and a foregone conclusion. Furthermore, by claiming "John for Judaism,"[32] scholars actually make things *worse*; they turn John into a text that validates and promotes the Christian missionizing of modern Jews, which is, indeed, a form of anti-Judaism, since it presupposes that something is inherently wrong with non-Christ-believing Jews and Judaism. In other words, a "John within Judaism" approach is vulnerable to the *same* accusations of anti-Judaism as are contemporary movements like "Jews for Jesus"; while such groups might claim a Jewish identity, they also assert that Jews who reject Jesus are somehow lost or condemned. Hence, these groups are, like the old adage about John's Gospel, both Jewish and anti-Jewish.

The accusation that reading "John within Judaism" is, and can only be, "apologetic" seems to stem from the assumption that scholars who read John this way think they have "rescued" John from its unethical attitudes toward Jews. As I mentioned in the introduction, however, this does not have to be the case: a "John within Judaism" approach does not mean that we, all of a sudden, have an "ethical" John, at least not in the sense of our modern conception of that term. John is obviously not a document of modern liberal

pluralism (anachronism noted); but, as an ancient text, neither should we expect it to be, certainly not any more than we should expect the Qumran covenanters, the Jewish apocalypses, or the early rabbis to be—all of whom, arguably, have exclusionary and (intra-Jewish) supersessionist ideologies. In my view, treatments of John that turn the Johannine Jesus into an ecumenical universalist are surely misguided in this regard.[33]

On the other hand, in my view, what a "John within Judaism" approach *does* do is question whether the term "anti-Jewish/Judaism" is really the right way for scholars to describe analytically John's hostility toward the *Ioudaioi*. The terminology of "anti-Jewish/Judaism" is deeply rooted in modern normative and normativizing discourses on the boundaries of "Judaism" and "Christianity," both in antiquity and today. To say that something or someone who claims to be "Jewish" is also "anti-Jewish" means that one has a clear and stable view of what "Judaism" was and was not, what it is and is not; one has put oneself in a position of power to adjudicate and reject the legitimacy of another person's or group's own self-identification. From this perspective, one might even hesitate to assert that modern "Jews for Jesus" movements are "anti-Jewish," since that would presuppose—and impose—a certain normative view of "Judaism" and a dismissal of the self-identification of such groups as "Jewish." To be sure, these types of groups, like John, are certainly "anti-*something*," and one might think that they are "intolerant," "exclusionary," and "unethical"; but are they "anti-Jewish"? A competition or debate over the question of "who is truly a Jew?" between two groups simultaneously claiming a Jewish identity is, in my view, quite a different story than, for example, the horrific Jew-hatred we see spewing from the pens and mouths of non-Jewish Christians (or other Others) in antiquity and the middle ages, and from far-right white supremicists today. The latter are legitimately described as "anti-Jewish" (and "anti-Semitic") because they hurl their hate from the position of outsiders, from a position that does not self-identity as Jewish.

In conclusion, I want to state clearly that, while, naturally, any interpretation of any text should be subject to critical examination, the charge that any attempt to read John "within Judaism" by interrogating the categories that have shaped both scholarly and religious normativizing discourses is akin to doing "apologetics" as opposed to "scholarship" does nothing to advance the academic conversation. Not only is this an ad hominem argument, but it also reproduces the normativizing discourses that we, as historians, seek to interrogate in the first place. And this, to me, is what is really at stake in the "John within Judaism" project. It is not about having an ulterior theological or moral agenda; I do not hold religious convictions that, in principle, would prevent me from viewing John as "anti-Jewish," and I certainly do not think the Johannine Jesus provides an ethical model for contemporary speech and

behavior. Rather, what is at stake is challenging the normativizing impulses that have fed for centuries the notion that John is somehow "owned" by Christianity via the Christian canon, that John is, and must be read as, "Christian Scripture" that is incommensurate with "Judaism." To claim that John is a Jewish text and can be read "within Judaism" creates a problem for those normative categories and impulses; it creates a hermeneutical "asymmetry," as Runesson has described it,[34] for both modern Christians *and* modern Jews. Indeed, Christians do not typically like to hear claims that John's view of "salvation" inherently envisions a life lived "Jewishly"; and Jews tend not to be comfortable with the claim that a text that has been used for centuries as a vile tool of Jewish oppression is actually an expression of Second Temple period Jewishness. My experience tells me that a "within Judaism" approach to John is anything but comfortable or convenient for both Christians and Jews to engage.

NOTES

1. A photograph of this street sign is accessible on the website of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (photograph number: 74571, https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/pa1179582).

2. According to a report in Time Magazine by Andrew Katz, photographer Jill Mumie captured a powerful image on July 8, 2017, of a black police officer named Darius Nash protecting a group of white supremacists who were demonstrating at a rally of the KKK in Charlottesville, Virginia (https://time.com/4899668/charlottesville-virginia-protest-officer-kkk-photo/). This image would go viral only after another such rally held a few weeks later, on August 12, which was widely covered by American media outlets and involved the death of Heather Heyer. In the background of the photo, seen over the right shoulder of Officer Nash, a man carries a Confederate flag in one hand and a poster board in the other with the words "Jews are Satans [sic] children." Three passages from the New Testament are cited on the post board; John 8:31–47 is the first. The massacre of Squirrel Hill, during which eleven worshipers at a Pittsburgh-area synagogue were shot and killed in cold blood, took place on October 27, 2018. The killer, Robert Gregory Bowers, had apparently used John 8:44 as a biographical description on a social media account. See https://www.cbsnews.com/news/jews-are-the-children-of-satan-john-8-44-danger-of-taking-biblical-passages-out-of-context/.

3. R. Alan Culpepper, "Anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel as a Theological Problem for Christian Interpreters," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Reimund Bieringer, Didier Pollefeyt, and Frederique Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 61–82.

4. As pointed out by Adele Reinhartz recently: https://www.ancientjewreview.com/read/johnwithinjudaism.

5. This distinction is noted by Shaye J. D. Cohen in his, "The Unfinished Agenda of Jewish–Christian Dialogue," *JES* 34, no. 3 (1997): 326–29.

6. For my larger treatment of the issue, see Wally V. Cirafesi, *John within Judaism: Religion, Ethnicity, and the Shaping of Jesus-Oriented Jewishness in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2022).

7. For another approach, which, while very sensitive to the range of methodological issues involved, is more skeptical of a "John within Judaism" framework, see Jörg Frey, "'John within Judaism'? Textual, Historical, and Hermeneutical Considerations," in *Jews and Christians—Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* ed. Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall, and Joseph Verheyden (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2021), 185–215.

8. See especially Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.

9. See Paula Fredriksen, "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time Has Come To Go," *SR* 35, no. 2 (2006): 231–46.

10. For my treatment of these questions, see Cirafesi, *John within Judaism*, 29–51.

11. See discussion in Cirafesi, *John within Judaism*, 71–75.

12. Jon Solomon, "Translation, Violence and the Heterolingual Intimacy," *Transversal* 11 (2007): https://transversal.at/transversal/1107/solomon/en, where he says: "Translation is related to violence in two, essential ways. The first intrinsically occurs in the operation of translation itself, precisely because it is never definitive and always bears some kind of metaphorical violence towards the original enunciation or text."

13. On the variety of ways ancient Jews self-defined, were defined by others, and boundaries were drawn around Jewishness, see the important recent contribution of John Van Maaren, *The Boundaries of Jewishness in the Southern Levant, 200 BCE – 132 CE: Power, Strategies, and Ethnic Configurations* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2022).

14. Daniel R. Schwartz, *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).

15. The concept of "sense and reference" has been used by some scholars with varying degrees of success in the study of John's *Ioudaioi*. See especially John Ashton, "The Identity and Function of the Ἰουδαῖοι in the Fourth Gospel," *NovT* 27, no. 1 (1985): 40–75. It seems to me that a common, or perhaps even the most common, approach within Johannine scholarship has been to posit a great chasm between "sense" and "reference" in John's use of *Ioudaios*. Thus, a term's "reference" is its object, in the case of John's *Ioudaioi* an ethno-religious people group known from antiquity. Its "sense"—whether positive, negative, or neutral, its relationship to other groups, and its defining features of identity—is entirely dependent on literary context.

16. Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 86.

17. For Bultmann, specifically, real Jews and Judaism were not even on John's mind. They represent for John the existential category of cosmic unbelief.

18. For example, see 1 Macc. 14:44, where *Ioudaioi* and priests are mentioned alongside each other.

19. On self-identification/self-ascription as a key criterion in discerning Jewishness, see Van Maaren, *Boundaries of Jewishness*, 14–15.

20. Anders Runesson, "What Does 'Within Judaism' Mean for the Study of the New Testament?" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SNTS, Leuven, July 26, 2022).

21. Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 121–43.

22. For detailed treatment of each of these sites of meaning-making, see Cirafesi, *John within Judaism*, chs. 3–6.

23. Adele Reinhartz, *Cast Out of the Covenant: Jews and Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of John* (Lanham: Lexington/Fortress Academic, 2018).

24. Cirafesi, *John within Judaism*, 269–77.

25. On features of populism used to interpret the Gospel of Matthew, see Bruce Worthington, "Populist Features of the Gospel of Matthew," in *Class Struggle in the New Testament*, ed. Robert J. Myles (Minneapolis: Fortress Academic, 2021), 153–67.

26. See, e.g., Jörg Frey, "Heiden—Griechen—Gotteskinder: Zu Gesalt und Funktion der Rede von den Heiden im 4. Evangelium," in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*, ed. Reinhard Feldmeier and Ulrich Heckel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 255; Adele Reinhartz, "Forging a New Identity: Johannine Rhetoric and the Audience of the Fourth Gospel," in *Paul, John, and Apocalyptic Eschatology: Studies in Honour of Martinus C. de Boer*, ed. J. Krans et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 124.

27. John Bowman, "Samaritan Studies," *BJRL* 40 (1957–1958): 298–327; Edwin D. Freed, "Samaritan Influence in the Gospel of John," *CBQ* 30 (1968): 580–87; Charles H. H. Scobie, "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity," *NTS* 19 (1972–1973): 390–414 (407).

28. Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56, no. 2 (2010): 232–52.

29. As is argued throughout Reinhartz, *Cast Out of the Covenant*.

30. To invoke the subtitle of Terence Donaldson's book, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007).

31. As noted by Adele Reinhartz in https://www.ancientjewreview.com/read/johnwithinjudaism.

32. The phrase "John for Judaism" here is Reinhartz's, used in her Ancient Jew Review piece.

33. On this point, I am in full agreement with Reinhartz.

34. Runesson, "What Does 'Within Judaism' Mean?"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashton, John. "The Identity and Function of the Ἰουδαῖοι in the Fourth Gospel." *Novum Testamentum* 27, no. 1 (1985): 40–75.

Bowman, John. "Samaritan Studies." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957–1958): 298–327.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by George R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Cirafesi, Wally V. *John within Judaism: Religion, Ethnicity, and the Shaping of Jesus-Oriented Jewishness in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 2022.

Culpepper, R. Alan. "Anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel as a Theological Problem for Christian Interpreters." In *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Reimund Bieringer, Didier Pollefeyt, and Frederique Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, 61–82. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. "The Unfinished Agenda of Jewish–Christian Dialogue." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 34, no. 3 (1997): 326–29.

Donaldson, Terence. *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time Has Come To Go." *Studies in Religion* 35, no. 2 (2006): 231–46.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 2 (2010): 232–52.

Freed, Edwin D. "Samaritan Influence in the Gospel of John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 580–87.

Frey, Jörg. "'John within Judaism'? Textual, Historical, and Hermeneutical Considerations." In *Jews and Christians—Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE? Reflection on the Gains and Losses Model*, edited by Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall, and Joseph Verheyden, 185–215. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2021.

Frey, Jörg. "Heiden—Griechen—Gotteskinder: Zu Gesalt und Funktion der Rede von den Heiden im 4. Evangelium." In *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*, edited by Reinhard Feldmeier and Ulrich Heckel, 228–68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.

Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 457–512.

Reinhartz, Adele. *Cast Out of the Covenant: Jews and Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of John*. Lanham: Lexington/Fortress Academic, 2018.

Reinhartz, Adele. "Forging a New Identity: Johannine Rhetoric and the Audience of the Fourth Gospel." In *Paul, John, and Apocalyptic Eschatology: Studies in Honour of Martinus C. de Boer*, edited by Jan Krans, L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, Peter-Ben Smit, and Arie W. Zwiep, 123–34. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Runesson, Anders. "What Does 'Within Judaism' Mean for the Study of the New Testament?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SNTS, Leuven, 26 July 2022.

Schwartz, Daniel R. *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Scobie, Charles H. H. "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972–1973): 390–414.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Solomon, Jon. "Translation, Violence and the Heterolingual Intimacy," *Transversal* 11 (2007): https://transversal.at/transversal/1107/solomon/en.

Van Maaren, John. *The Boundaries of Jewishness in the Southern Levant, 200 BCE–132 CE: Power, Strategies, and Ethnic Configurations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2022.

Worthington, Bruce. "Populist Features of the Gospel of Matthew." In *Class Struggle in the New Testament*, edited by Robert J. Myles, 153–67. Minneapolis: Fortress Academic, 2021.