

“JEWS BY NATURE”: PAUL, ETHNICITY AND GALATIANS

R. Barry Matlock

In an insightful introduction to a pioneering collection of essays, Mark Brett remarks thus on the debate over “ethnicity” taking place within the pages of the Bible itself: “Two extreme positions... are well known: first, the ‘radicalized’ marriage policies of Ezra/Nehemiah, and second, Paul’s vision in Gal. 3.28-29 that within the social space defined by Jesus Christ ‘there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, slave nor free’; Christ has erased the categories of ethnic group, gender and class” (Brett 1996: 11). Corresponding to these two extremes, Brett introduces the “nature vs. culture” debate in social-scientific theory between a “primordialist” and an “instrumentalist” approach to ethnicity, associated particularly with Clifford Geertz and Fredrik Barth, respectively: “Over against Ezra/Nehemiah’s ‘primordial’ nativism, one might be justified in seeing Barth’s [approach] as a kind of Pauline constructivism” (Brett 1996: 12–13). This characterization of the issues implicitly introduces a number of matters I want to raise here, about the theory of ethnicity itself, and about where Paul might be thought to fit in.

With his manifest interest in relations between “Judeans” (Gal 2:13, 14, 15; 3:28; “the circumcision”: 2:7, 8, 9) and “Hellenes” (2:3; 3:28; *ethnoi*: 1:16; 2:2, 8, 9, 12, 14; 3:8, 14; “the uncircumcision”: 2:7), Paul is an obvious point of entry for the application of social-scientific theory of ethnicity to biblical interpretation. Such analysis is still in its relative infancy, making it perhaps a bit premature to speak of “trends” in the field. Nevertheless, certain tendencies may already be observed which, if not corrected, might well pose barriers to progress. Compare Philip Esler’s recent characterization of the field:

Two dominant trends as to the meaning of ethnicity are visible in recent research... The first—associated with... Clifford Geertz [among others]—focuses on what are perceived to be cultural or “primordial” features of ethnicity, such as kinship and a common territory, language and religious tradition, which together allegedly produce a powerful and abiding affiliation... The second, newer trend, which illustrates the recent tendency among anthropologists... to emphasise the role of individuals in manipulating social arrangements for their own ends, was articulated by Fredrik Barth... and

reverses the relationship between a sense of belonging and associated cultural features. Given this view, ethnicity is not primordial (Eller and Coughlan 1993). (Esler 1998: 78)

Here Esler (like Brett) signals the importance of the primordialism vs. instrumentalism debate, identifying the same key figures. The issue is seen to be a question of cause or origin (“primordial” features “allegedly produce” ethnicity, whereas in fact “ethnicity is not primordial”), and is a matter of being up to date in our social-scientific theory. Esler’s monograph is a model of social-scientific criticism, an insightful and creative piece of interdisciplinary work; but on the matter specifically of “ethnicity,” it gives an incomplete and somewhat misleading picture, reflecting and exacerbating those tendencies alluded to above. These tendencies include a certain theoretical one-sidedness (extending to a preference for a single theorist, Fredrik Barth), and a certain essentialism in the employment of the category “ethnicity.” Such tendencies may lead to lapses in clarity and to conceptual confusion in application to Paul. Before coming to that, we must attend to this debate over “ethnicity” within the field of social anthropology (on the theory of “ethnicity,” see R. Cohen 1978; Yinger 1985; Jenkins 1986; Rex and Mason 1986; B. F. Williams 1989; Calhoun 1993; Eriksen 1993; Banks 1996; Hutchinson and Smith 1996; Jenkins 1997).

Theory of Ethnicity

Among the social sciences, anthropology has a particular claim on the theory of ethnicity. For our purposes, we may take the background to the theoretical debate in question to be the shift of language, and focus, from “tribe” to “ethnic group” (see Eriksen 1993: 9–10; Banks 1996: 24–39; Jenkins 1997: 16–24). This shift is, among other things, a move from an “etic” to an “emic” perspective, which in this context means a shift from colonial schemes of human classification to categorization in the terms of the groups in question. This distinction maps more or less neatly onto that between an “objectivist” and a “subjectivist” approach, the former indicating a listing of putatively differential cultural traits, the latter focusing on participant ascription and self-ascription of identity and difference (cf. Eriksen 1993: 10–12, 56; Jones 1997: 56–65). And both (apparent) distinctions between an “outsider” and an “insider” point of view bear some relation to the distinction between a “primordialist” and an “instrumentalist” (or “interactionist,” or “circumstantialist,” or “constructivist”) approach to “ethnicity.” To add further layers of complexity, this set of disciplinary shifts stands in some relation to a broad conceptual distinction between “nature” and “culture,” and more broadly still to a shift at a more popular discursive level from the language of “race”

to that of "ethnicity." Fredrik Barth is held to be a pivotal figure in this set of conceptual shifts. We turn, then, to the salient features of his approach.

Barth's theoretical synthesis on "ethnicity" comes in the form of a programmatic introduction to a collection of essays published in 1969. This collection, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, has had an influence that would have been difficult to predict. But looking back, Barth's introduction manages to crystallize the sense of disciplinary revolution identified above and provide it with a coherent alternative point of view. Barth lists the following as distinctive features of the approach followed: "we give primary emphasis to the fact that ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves, and thus have the characteristic of organizing interaction between people"; "rather than working through a typology of forms of ethnic groups and relations, we attempt to explore the different processes that seem involved in generating and maintaining ethnic groups"; "we shift the focus of investigation from internal constitution and history of separate groups to ethnic boundaries and boundary maintenance" (Barth 1969: 10). The conventional attempt to list ideal-typical features of "ethnic groups" in general (matters of biology, culture, language, and identification), or to define particular groups in terms of lists of cultural traits, "implies," argues Barth, "a preconceived view of what are the significant factors in the genesis, structure, and function of such groups" (p. 11). Such an approach "allows us to assume that boundary maintenance is unproblematical and follows from the isolation which the itemized characteristics imply: racial difference, cultural difference, social separation and language barriers, spontaneous and organized enmity"; thus "we are led to imagine each group developing its cultural and social form in relative isolation," producing "a world of separate peoples, each with their cultures and each organized in a society which can legitimately be isolated for description as an island to itself" (p. 11).

Thus, on the model that Barth overturns, there are different groups of people out there because...there are groups of people out there that are different. Where that approach is circular, Barth's is counter-intuitive. Over against the common-sense notion that "the sharing of a common culture" is of the essence of an "ethnic group," Barth asserts: "In my view, much can be gained by regarding this very important feature as an implication or result, rather than a primary and definitional characteristic of ethnic group organization" (p. 11). "[A]lthough ethnic categories take cultural differences into account, we can assume no simple one-to-one relationship between ethnic units and cultural similarities and differences. The features that are taken into account are not the sum of 'objective' differences, but only those which the actors themselves regard as significant" (p. 14). "[O]ne cannot predict from first principles which features will be emphasized and made

organizationally relevant by the actors” (p. 14). “When defined as an ascriptive and exclusive group, the nature of continuity of ethnic groups is clear: it depends on the maintenance of a boundary” (p. 14). “The critical focus of investigation from this point of view becomes the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses” (p. 15). By definition, group identity “entails criteria for determining membership and ways of signalling membership and exclusion” (p. 15). Also entailed are “situations of social contact between persons of different cultures,” “a structuring of interaction which allows the persistence of cultural differences,” “a set of prescriptions governing situations of contact, and allowing for articulation in some sectors or domains of activity, and a set of proscriptions on social situations preventing inter-ethnic interaction in other sectors, and thus insulating parts of the cultures from confrontation and modification” (pp. 15–16). The “social organization of culture difference” effected by ethnic identity serves systematically to manage economic resources, whether co-operatively or competitively (pp. 16–38). “[P]eople’s categories are for acting, and are significantly affected by interaction rather than contemplation” (p. 29). In summary: “ethnic groups” are approached in terms of social organization and interaction, rather than as an expression of underlying culture; the focus is on the boundary and on processes of boundary maintenance, not “the cultural stuff” that the boundary encloses; “ethnic identity” depends on ascription and self-ascription in terms of those cultural differences used by ethnic actors themselves to mark the group boundary (on Barth, see Eriksen 1993: 36–58; Barth 1994: 11–13; Vermeulen and Govers 1994: 1–9; Banks 1996: 11–17; Jenkins 1996b: 90–113; 1997: 16–24).

I should be clear that my attempt to correct an imbalance found in biblical criticism’s appropriation of theory of ethnicity is not a denial of Barth’s perspective. Quite the contrary, the central features of his approach still stand as important insights. Indeed, if we had to choose a single theoretical guiding light, we could hardly do better than Fredrik Barth. But then we hardly need limit ourselves so. The work of Barth in question is now over thirty-five years old, and neither the theory of ethnicity, nor Barth himself, have stood still in the meantime (see Vermeulen and Govers 1994; Barth 2000). The one-sidedness I detect is a question of conceptual clarity in our use of the theory. To spell this out more clearly, I turn to the debate over “primordialism” and “instrumentalism” and their relation to Barth.

Primordialism and Instrumentalism

We can focus a number of issues by attending to one extreme in the debate, an essay by J. D. Eller and R. M. Coughlan under the polemical title “The Poverty of Primordialism” (cited by Esler, above). The principal target of

their polemic is Clifford Geertz, to whom they attribute the "primordialist" theses that ethnic identities "are 'given,' *a priori*, underived, prior to all experience or interaction," "'natural'...rather than sociological," that they are "'ineffable,' overpowering, and coercive," that "they cannot be analysed in relation to social interaction," and that a member of such a group "*necessarily* feels certain attachments to that group and its practices" (Eller and Coughlan 1993: 187). "A more unintelligible and unsociological concept would be hard to imagine," they assert (p. 187). Furthermore, they express concern that "a concept specifically drawn from sociological discourse" might "shore up the structures of social and racial inequality" (p. 186). But their main gripe is that "primordialism" does not *explain* ethnicity, and their principal remedy is to commend a *social constructionist* point of view (pp. 184, 194, 197).

It is important to avoid the confusions of this ill-considered polemic, patent on even a cursory reading of Geertz himself (cf. Jenkins 1997: 45):

By a primordial attachment is meant one that stems from the "givens"—or, more precisely...the assumed "givens"—of social existence: immediate contiguity and kin connection mainly, but beyond them the givenness that stems from being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices. These congruities of blood, speech, custom, and so on, are seen to have an ineffable, and at times overpowering, coerciveness in and of themselves. One is bound to one's kinsman, one's neighbor, one's fellow believer, *ipso facto*; as the result not merely of personal affection, practical necessity, common interest, or incurred obligation, but at least in great part by virtue of some unaccountable absolute import attributed to the very tie itself. The general strength of such primordial bonds, and the types of them that are important, differ from person to person, from society to society, and from time to time. But for virtually every person, in every society, at almost all times, some attachments seem to flow more from a sense of natural—some would say spiritual—affinity than from social interaction. (Geertz 1973: 259–60)

Geertz offers a "merely descriptive" list of the typical "foci" around which such ethnic bonds variably "crystallize": "assumed blood ties" (an "untraceable but yet sociologically real kinship"), "race" (i.e. "phenotypical physical features"), "language," "region," "religion," and "custom"; and Geertz remarks that these factors "need not in themselves be particularly divisive," that "vitaly opposed groups may differ rather little in their general style of life," while widely divergent groups may lack "any sense of primordial discontent" (pp. 261–63). It should be clear that Geertz's remarks are as social constructionist as can be; and rather than presenting an explanatory theory that might play into the hands of racists, Geertz offers a fairly straightforward description of the ethnic actor's point of view, or what we might call "folk anthropology" (already in "the wrong hands," often enough).

And where does Barth fit in here? As a good social constructionist, he is usually numbered among the “instrumentalist” faithful, and not without reason. But consider the following: “A categorical ascription is an ethnic ascription when it classifies a person in terms of his basic, most general identity, presumptively determined by his origin and background”; wherever “actors use ethnic identities to categorize themselves and others for purposes of interaction, they form ethnic groups” in Barth’s sense; “ethnic identity is superordinate to most other statuses,” “it is *imperative*,” its “constraints... tend to be absolute” (Barth 1969: 13–14, 17). For some at least, such claims make *Barth* a “primordialist” (see A. Cohen 1974: xii–xiii; cf. Eriksen 1993: 54–56; Banks 1996: 13, 39; Jenkins 1997: 45). Rather than attempt to adjudicate this charge, I take its very possibility to suggest that Barth’s own target lies elsewhere, that he was not, or not exactly, opposing “primordialism.” He opposed the reification of “culture” implicit in the (then) customary anthropological conceit of drawing up lists of cultural traits held to be definitive of given ethnic groups.

Nor will it do to characterize Geertz and Barth as reflecting the old and new approaches to “ethnicity.” Both perspectives grew out of work done in the 1950s and 1960s—though of the two, Barth’s work has the distinction of focusing more pointedly on theory of ethnicity as such. And the two may only be seen as competitive if both are imagined to be offering a causal account of the genesis of ethnic groups, which Geertz manifestly is not doing (and so it is not to the point to fault him, with Eller and Coughlan, for failing in this regard). “Social construction” is a given for both Geertz and Barth, and “primordialism” vs. “instrumentalism” is a contemporary debate arising from their work. Geertz does not assert the actual claims of nature as over against culture; rather, he draws attention to claims made on the putative basis of nature as opposed to culture. Analytically, this work is of ideological and rhetorical import: in certain circumstances, claims based on “what is written by the gods in the book of nature” tend to carry greater moral authority than those based on “the way we happen to do things around here.”

What is more, the two perspectives may be taken as complementary, and indeed the most “up to date” approach would be to attempt to overcome an unproductive opposition between them (see, e.g., Jenkins 1996b and 1997; on the debate generally, see, in addition to the works on theory of “ethnicity” cited above, Isajiw 1974; Burgess 1978; Okamura 1981; Armstrong 1982; McKay 1982; Smith 1984; Horowitz 1985; Bentley 1987; Douglass 1988; Meadwell 1989; Scott 1990; Grosby 1994; Jenkins 1994; R. M. Williams 1994; Jenkins 1996a; Tilley 1997; Jones 1997; Hall 1997; Gil-White 1999; Fearon and Laitin 2000; Hale 2004). It may even be said that the two need each other, that each is strong where the other is weak. Consider Barth’s

apparent suggestion that the cultural differences used to mark ethnic boundaries might be just anything (see Barth 1969: 14). Such a representation is in danger of appearing ideological if it ignores such widely recurrent patterns as Geertz analyzes; and indeed, when Barth reflects back on *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* after a span of twenty-five years, he frankly admits that he “overstated” himself on this point (Barth 1994: 12, 16). Another development in Barth’s retrospective is his division of the processes of ethnic identity into micro, median, and macro levels, the personal level of social identity formation, the inter-group level of ethnic interaction, and the political level of ethnic mobilization. Although Barth does not relate this elaboration of his theory to the “primordialism” vs. “instrumentalism” debate, it may readily be seen that Geertz’s perspective concerns the first and third (the levels of identity on the one hand and the nation-state on the other), while Barth’s attention is focused primarily on the median level (that of inter-group processes and transactions).¹

Paul, Ethnicity, and Galatians

A final observation on Barth’s approach brings us back to Paul. Barth’s perspective on “ethnicity” is clearly an external analyst’s point of view. This seems to have become confused due to the “etic” vs. “emic,” “objectivist” vs. “subjectivist,” “primordialist” vs. “instrumentalist,” “outsider” vs. “insider” issues and Barth’s emphasis on “self-ascription.” Now, Paul’s evaluation of his ethnic-religious past, and the comparisons he draws with others, are complex matters (see Gal 1:13–17; Phil 3:2–11; 2 Cor 11:16–12:10). But if you were to suggest to him that his “earlier life in Judaism” (Gal 1:13) was simply a matter of his successful manipulation for his own advantage of the appropriate diacritical markers of Jewish ethnic identity, I suspect that he would reconsider his renunciation of religious violence.

Mistaking Barth’s theoretical perspective for the insider’s point of view goes hand in hand with a peculiar tendency of social-scientific approaches to turn Paul into a self-conscious social scientist—a curious reluctance to take an external analytical point of view, particularly one that might stand in tension with Paul’s own. In the “new perspective on Paul” generally, it is common to regard Paul as self-consciously concerned with “ethnic boundary markers.” Even such theoretically sophisticated critics as Esler prove susceptible to this tendency. “Paul ditches the Mosaic law in its entirety in order to create and maintain a boundary between his congregations and the Jews” (Esler 1996: 233). Esler’s “social identity” reading of Galatians purports to

1. The arguments of this and the previous section are now accepted by Esler, with whom the first draft of the present study was shared; see Esler 2003: ix, 40–49. Chapter 3 of Esler’s 2003 volume is an excellent overview of issues relating to Paul and ethnicity.

lay bare Paul's own "concern" and "strategy," his "intent," what he "wants" and "seeks" to accomplish; and "righteousness" for Paul is said to be the "glittering prize," the "prestigious asset" that comes with—that consists in—belonging to Paul's group (Esler 1998: 42–44, 48, 54, 159–60, 169; see, more generally, pp. 141–77; 2003: 155–70). I credit Esler with knowing that his interpretive perspective does not match Paul's own, and that such language might be misleading, at least; but I suspect that this tendency is fed by a desire to avoid any impression of "reductionism," or of reading against the grain, or knowing better than Paul (cf. Esler 1998: 83, 176–77).

At any rate, for Paul law observance is not a humanly negotiable "boundary issue" (Gal 3:19), and the power of "righteousness" is wielded by God alone (Gal 3:8, 11). Paul is not a "constructivist" who rises above "ethnicity": that requires a "new creation" (Gal 6:15—not "*his* new creation," as Esler has it [Esler 1998: 89, emphasis added]). When Paul touches explicitly on what we would regard as matters of "ethnicity," he does so in entirely conventional ways: he appeals to those who are "Jews by nature" (Gal 2:15), gesturing to his formerly superlative zeal for "the traditions of [his] ancestors" (Gal 1:13–14), he the Hebrew of Hebrews, circumcised the eighth day, a member of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, of the sect of the Pharisees (Phil 3:4–6; cf. 2 Cor 11:22; Rom 9:1–5; 11:1). "Ethnic identity" for Paul is a matter of genealogy, language, and culture. And the boundary between Israel and the nations is a function of "the cultural stuff" of the Torah (not really "cultural"), rather than the reverse—Fredrik Barth's shift of critical focus, according to which the law stands in service of the boundary, could only seem perverse to Paul. Moreover, for him both the boundary and the stuff enclosed have the status of divine law. The former requirement of law observance, and the present relegation of the same to a matter of indifference (Gal 5:6; 6:15; cf. 1 Cor 7:19; 2 Cor 5:17)—a matter of mere *culture*, one may say—both are God's doing, a question, then, of being in tune with divinely ordered *nature*. A theory like Fredrik Barth's will map roughly indeed onto one like Paul's. That is not a reason to ignore Barth, but to avoiding Barthianizing Paul (or Paulinizing Barth).

So Paul is a "primordialist," then—not in any theoretical sense, but in the unreflective or folk-anthropological sort of way that ethnic actors tend to be (see, e.g., Gil-White 1999; also now Esler 2003: 46). Then again, he relativizes—or rather holds that God has relativized—ethnic identity (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 12:12–13), now indeed available for instrumental use in a higher cause (1 Cor 9:19–23!). And in fact, his personal experience, as persecutor, of being slow on the uptake in this regard seems to have endowed him with a *critical* perspective: he can distinguish between divinely established ethnic identity, so to speak (Rom 9:3–5; 11:28b–29), and human manipulation of the same in defiance (yet somehow in service) of a more encompassing

divine plan (Gal 1:13–17; 3:8, 22; 6:16; Phil 3:2–4; Rom 10:1–2; 11:25–32). Perhaps our best approximation to Paul's own point of view is to say that he has a theology, if not a theory, of ethnic identity, but one that resists or cuts across our theoretical categories.

In any case, Paul need not dictate our own theorizing. Here we could usefully bring our social constructionist sensitivities to bear on our own theoretical constructions. To assert that "ethnicity is not primordial" may be in danger of reifying or essentializing the concept of "ethnicity." "Primordial" ethnicity is *socially* real. So too is "instrumental" ethnicity. Sidestepping the loaded question of the "really real," we may regard anthropological theory of ethnicity as offering a disciplinary point of view, an attempt to look at things in an admittedly unaccustomed way, whose usefulness lies in what it lets us do. In the words of Barth, the perspective he articulated in 1969

goes against much ethnic rhetoric and seemed counter-intuitive and paradoxical, judged by the assumptions about culture that prevailed at the time. It contains, perhaps, one of the first anthropological applications of a more postmodern view of culture... [W]e certainly argued for what would now be recognized as a constructionist view. Likewise in our view of history: we broke loose from the idea of history as simply the objective source and cause of ethnicity, and saw it as a synchronic rhetoric—a struggle to appropriate the past... (Barth 1994: 12–13)²

Such was Paul's struggle—and likewise our struggle over Paul.

I conclude with (the merest sketch of) a proposal inspired by Barth (which I hope to develop further elsewhere), concerning the "opponents" and situation reflected in Galatians. For Barth, the drawing and maintenance of an ethnic boundary is a matter of local interaction and the management of resources; whereas with Galatians *as normally read*, what should presumably be such a boundary issue (circumcision) is being enjoined by rival "Jewish Christian" (a double anachronism, but unavoidable shorthand here) *missionaries* who, like Paul, traverse the gentile world, but preach a law-observant gospel to the gentiles. Now, it has not always been recognized how difficult it is to supply these opponents with a good motive, either "Jewish" or "Christian," for seeking the circumcision of these gentiles (Fredriksen 1991 is a notable exception). But a local, ethnic-political reading of the Galatian crisis might help resolve this. (Though made independently, this proposal may gain some support from two other recent proposals of a local situation, while hoping to avoid their weaknesses: Esler 1998; Nanos 2002.) The background to my proposal includes: (1) ethnic conflict and

2. See Tonkin, MacDonald, and Chapman 1989; and Grosby 2002, and Smith 2003 (though the latter two may tend to elide the "synchronic" part of Barth's emphasis here).

competition for material and political resources specifically between *Judeans* and *Hellenes* in the cities of Asia Minor in the first century CE (Stanley 1996; more broadly, Barclay 1996: 259–81); (2) the political or cultural significance of circumcision or “judaizing” (Gal 2:14) in the period, “siding with the Judeans” (alongside the more familiar theological significance of conversion, “joining the people of God”) (S. J. D. Cohen 1999); (3) former affiliates of the local synagogues figured prominently among Paul’s gentile converts in these cities, forming communities that were socially distinct from the synagogues (cf. Fredriksen 1991: 562–63; Barclay 1996: 279, 386, 393–95). Paul’s opponents in Galatia are members of the local Jewish communities who are also affiliates of the Jesus-movement, enlisted as emissaries from the synagogues to the Pauline communities and tasked with recovering their lost associates as valuable assets in their local ethnic-political cause (and under some pressure to succeed, or else to consider their own position). But they are not recognized by Paul as members of his communities (the letter directly addresses a gentile audience, 4:8–9 and throughout, and the opponents are always in the third person, 1:7, 9; 3:1; 4:17; 5:7–12; 6:12–13); and he wants them thrown out (4:30).

On this reading, the principal cause of the need for circumcision is *Paul’s own activity*: he has pried these gentile affiliates loose from the Jewish community, and the only way to reclaim them is (with their consent!) to draw the definitive line of inclusion around them. But it is entirely in character that Paul’s response is theological. (A distinction between “politics” and “theology” is anachronistic for the period—so too is theory of ethnicity—but it serves our own descriptive and analytical purposes.) Such a scenario has the virtue of rendering everyone’s action reasonable *by their own lights*. And notice, finally, that we are able to recover, more or less on the surface of Paul’s text, an ethnic boundary process operating along classic instrumentalist lines *and recognized as such by Paul*, while managing to avoid making Paul into a Barthian constructivist or putting ourselves in the impossible position of mirror-reading Paul’s text while claiming to know better than he does. For he knows well enough what is going on, but in no way regards Judean or Israelite identity as a game or his opponents as proper players (he rates them neither as good “Christians” [6:12] nor as good “Jews” [6:13]). And strong theorist that he is, he characteristically moves the discussion onto his own preferred ground.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, J.
1982 *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Banks, M.
1996 *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions*. London: Routledge.
- Barclay, J. M. G.
1996 *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Barth, F.
1969 "Introduction." In F. Barth, ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
1994 "Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis of Ethnicity." Pages 11–32 in Vermeulen and Govers 1994.
2000 "Boundaries and Connections." Pages 17–36 in A. P. Cohen, ed., *Signifying Identities: Anthropological Perspectives on Boundaries and Contested Values*. London: Routledge.
- Bentley, G. C.
1987 "Ethnicity and Practice." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29: 24–55.
- Brett, M. G. ed.
1996 *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Leiden: Brill.
- Burgess, M. E.
1978 "The Resurgence of Ethnicity: Myth or Reality?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1: 265–85.
- Calhoun, C.
1993 "Nationalism and Ethnicity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 211–39.
- Cohen, A.
1974 "Introduction: The Lesson of Ethnicity." Pages ix–xxiv in A. Cohen, ed., *Urban Ethnicity*. London: Tavistock.
- Cohen, R.
1978 "Ethnicity: Problem and Focus in Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7: 379–403.
- Cohen, S. J. D.
1999 *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Douglass, W. A.
1988 "A Critique of Recent Trends in the Analysis of Ethnonationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 11: 192–206.
- Eller, J. D., and R. M. Coughlan
1993 "The Poverty of Primordialism: The Demystification of Ethnic Attachments." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16: 181–202.
- Eriksen, T. H.
1993 *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.

- Esler, P. F.
 1996 "Group Boundaries and Intergroup Conflict in Galatians: A New Reading of Galatians 5:13–6:10." Pages 215–40 in Brett 1996.
 1998 *Galatians*. London: Routledge.
 2003 *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Fearon, J. D., and D. D. Laitin
 2000 "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity." *International Organization* 54: 845–77.
- Fredriksen, P.
 1991 "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." *JTS* 42: 532–64.
- Geertz, C.
 1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gil-White, F. J.
 1999 "How Thick is Blood? The Plot Thickens...: If Ethnic Actors Are Primordialists, What Remains of the Circumstantialist/Primordialist Controversy?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22: 789–820.
- Grosby, S.
 1994 "The Verdict of History: The Inexpungeable Tie of Primordality—A Response to Eller and Coughlan." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17: 164–71.
 2002 *Biblical Ideas of Nationality, Ancient and Modern*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Hale, H. E.
 2004 "Explaining Ethnicity." *Comparative Political Studies* 37: 458–85.
- Hall, J. M.
 1997 *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horowitz, D.
 1985 *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hutchinson, J., and A. D. Smith eds.
 1996 *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Isajiw, W. W.
 1974 "Definitions of Ethnicity." *Ethnicity* 1: 111–24.
- Jenkins, R.
 1986 "Social Anthropological Models of Inter-Ethnic Relations." Pages 170–86 in Rex and Mason 1986.
 1994 "Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17: 197–223.
 1996a "Ethnicity Etcetera: Social Anthropological Points of View." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19: 807–22.
 1996b *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
 1997 *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. London: Sage.
- Jones, S.
 1997 *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*. London: Routledge.
- McKay, J.
 1982 "An Exploratory Synthesis of Primordial and Mobilizationist Approaches to Ethnic Phenomena." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 5: 395–420.

- Meadwell, H.
1989 "Cultural and Instrumental Approaches to Ethnic Nationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 12: 309–28.
- Nanos, M. D.
2002 *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Okamura, J. Y.
1981 "Situational Ethnicity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4: 452–65.
- Rex, J., and D. Mason eds.
1986 *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, G. M., Jr.
1990 "A Resynthesis of the Primordial and Circumstantial Approaches to Ethnic Group Solidarity: Towards an Explanatory Model." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13: 147–71.
- Smith, A. D.
1984 "Ethnic Myths and Ethnic Revivals." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 25: 283–305.
2003 *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, C. D.
1996 "'Neither Jew Nor Greek': Ethnic Conflict in Graeco-Roman Society." *JSNT* 64: 101–24.
- Tilley, V.
1997 "The Terms of the Debate: Untangling Language about Ethnicity and Ethnic Movements." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 20: 497–522.
- Tonkin, E., M. MacDonald, and M. Chapman eds.
1989 *History and Ethnicity*. London: Routledge.
- Vermeulen, H., and C. Govers eds.
1994 *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries."* Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Williams, B. F.
1989 "A Class Act: Anthropology and the Race to Nation Across Ethnic Terrain." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 401–44.
- Williams, R. M., Jr.
1994 "The Sociology of Ethnic Conflicts: Comparative International Perspectives." *Annual Review of Sociology* 20: 49–79.
- Yinger, J. M.
1985 "Ethnicity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 1: 151–80.