Putting Paul in His Place: Diverse Diasporas and Sideways Spaces in Hellenistic Judaism

Jill Hicks-Keeton
University of Oklahoma | jhk@ou.edu

In his letter to the Galatian churches, Paul combats with personal urgency the position that the Galatian gentiles-in-Christ should engage in the Torah-prescribed practice of circumcision. He mobilizes arguments both exegetical (3:16–18) and emotional (3:1a), by turns meticulous and bordering on reckless (5:12). One of these efforts simultaneously plays with place, as his allegory of Sarah and Hagar in chapter 4 spills from the scriptural to the spatial. His key move occurs in 4:25–26, in which he compares Abraham's two sons, one born by enslaved Hagar and one born by free Sarah, to two covenants which correspond to two Jerusalems: "Now Hagar…corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the other woman corresponds to the Jerusalem above; she is free, and she is our mother" (Gal 4:25–26).[1] Paul's extant corpus reveals his overall ambivalence toward Jerusalem,[2] and this moment

---

[1] I am persuaded by Stephen C. Carlson's argument ("'For Sinai is a Mountain in Arabia': A Note on the Text of Galatians 4,25" *ZNW* 105 [2014]: 80–101) that the phrase "for Sinai is a mountain in Arabia" (along with its variations in the manuscript tradition) is not original to Galatians but is more likely to be an interpolated marginal note — a conjecture originally suggested by Richard Bentley (*Epistola ad Joannem Millium* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962], photographic reprint of Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Works of Richard Bentley, D. D.*, 3 vols. [London: Macpherson, 1836], 2: 361–65). In addition to surveying external evidence in support of this possibility, Carlson shows that the phrase's inclusion is both semantically and structurally problematic in Galatians 4. Though the case is cumulative, one particularly compelling point against the phrase's originality is that in Gal 1:17 Paul takes great pains to distinguish Arabia from (his present-day) Jerusalem.

[2] Jerusalem as the location of the temple would have made the locus special to Paul (regardless of his belief in the Christ), and his ambivalence is likely a result of his conflating Jerusalem with the Jerusalem apostles with whom he had a fraught relationship. See the treatment in F. F. Bruce, "Paul and Jerusalem," *TynBul* 19 (1968): 3–25. Bruce articulates the push-and-pull dynamic operative in Paul's positioning of himself

captures an uneasy balance of two competing accounts of the degree to which Jerusalem (and *which* Jerusalem) should, or should not, figure in the self-understanding of the Galatian Christ-followers. They, along with Paul, belong to Jerusalem their mother. But — Paul insists — earthly Jerusalem has been displaced by a non-terrestrial, heavenly Jerusalem. In the course of defending his own conception of the proper relationship of gentile Christ-followers to the Jewish practice of circumcision, Paul reconceives the Jerusalem familiar to friend and foe as external to the "real" metropolis to which he thinks loyalty is actually owed, a point on his map that does not correspond to the physical territory of the ancestral Jewish homeland. Put differently, Paul here *diasporizes* Jerusalem.

In his 1995 essay "Paul Among Diaspora Jews: Anomaly or Apostate?," John Barclay insisted, rightly, that Paul should be treated as a diasporic Jewish figure and that he therefore merited comparison not only with Palestinian Jewish thinkers but also (and perhaps especially) with those writing outside of the ancestral Jewish homeland.[3] Paul, moreover, should be included in surveys of diasporic Jewish thought. Scholars' description of Paul as a diaspora *Ioudaios* (among other labels, to be sure) is now commonplace. A great deal of intellectual energy and ink has been committed to harnessing a contextually-appropriate meaning of *Ioudaios* — a moniker whose flexibility in antiquity and whose defiance of modern categories of "religion" and "ethnicity" have engendered great debate about how best to render it in English so as to avoid anachronism and imprecision.[4] Paul's relationship to his own status as *Ioudaios*, moreover,

---

in relation to Jerusalem in this way: "Paul himself is independent of Jerusalem, as he repeatedly insists, yet he can never dissociate himself from Jerusalem. *Dissociation* from Jerusalem would imply in practice severance from the birthplace of Christianity; yet *dependence* on Jerusalem would be a denial of his receiving his apostolic call direct from Christ" (5; emphasis original). It is of course anachronistic to describe Paul's positive attachment to Jerusalem in terms of "Christianity," but in my judgment the impulse to see Paul as unable or unwilling to be severed from Jerusalem because of its originating importance in the Jesus Movement is fundamentally correct. Relevant for this issue is also Paul's collection for Jerusalem and the status of Judea as Jewish ancestral homeland. On this, see esp. Ronald Charles, *Paul and the Politics of Diaspora* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 201–46. On Paul's tendency to use "Jerusalem" as a metonym for the Jesus Movement in Jerusalem, see J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 25–28.

[3] John M. G. Barclay, "Paul Among Diaspora Jews: Anomaly or Apostate?," *JSNT* 60; (1995): 89–120.

[4] It is possible that an inherent bias toward the ancient geographical center in our scholarly discourse has contributed to our guild's tendency to be more terminologically

has been turned over and over among scholars who categorize themselves and each other within various named schools of thought on Paul's relationship to "Judaism."[5]

The first descriptor — "diaspora" (or "diasporic") — is by comparison under-theorized in the study of Paul and Hellenistic Judaism.[6] Like *Ioudaios*, however, "diaspora" is in fact a slippery term. Its instability has historically been masked by biblical scholars' easy adoption of (1) its etymological meaning (*dia* +

---

careful with the way in which we identify the centralized people group(s) chronologically (from "Hebrews" to "Israelites" to "Israelites/Judahites" to "Judeans/Jews," and so on). The literature on *Ioudaios* in this period is too extensive to cite in full here. See esp. Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512; Mark D. Nanos, "Paul's Non-Jews Do Not Become 'Jews,' But Do They Become 'Jewish'?: Reading Romans 2:25–29 Within Judaism, Alongside Josephus," *JJMJS* 1 (2014): 26–53. For recent summaries of the history and state of the question as well as excellent bibliographies, see the three-part *CBR* series by David M. Miller: "The Meaning of *Ioudaios* and its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient 'Judaism'," *CBR* 9 (2010): 98–126; "Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for *Ioudaios*," *CBR* 10 (2012): 293–311; and "Ethnicity, Religion, and the Meaning of *Ioudaois* in Ancient 'Judaism,'" *CBR* 12 (2014): 216–65. See further Cynthia M. Baker, *Jew* (Key Words in Jewish Studies*)* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2017).

[5] Here I refer to the so-called "New Perspective on Paul" and the camps variously termed "Radical Perspective," "Beyond the New Perspective," and/or "Paul Within Judaism." See in particular Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005)*;* Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006 [orig. University of British Columbia Press, 1987])*;* Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* (New York: HarperCollins, 2010); Mark D. Nanos and Marcus Zetterholm, eds., *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015); Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

[6] The absence of an entry for "diaspora" in as exhaustive a resource as, for example, the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, is telling. A major recent exception is Ronald Charles's *Paul and the Politics of Diaspora*. See especially his theoretical work in the Introduction (pp. 1–41) and his framing of Paul as a diasporic figure whose "social positioning in the Diaspora allows him to imagine, think through, and wrestle with issues of spaces, identities (social, economic, gender), cultures, and traditions" (pp. 87–123 [here, 87–88]).

sperein = the "scattering" of the Jewish people "throughout" parts of the world external to the ancestral homeland),7 or (2) its negative connotation among some biblical writers (e.g., Deut 28:25 LXX, in which it is punishment for disobedience; Jer 13:14 LXX, in which it is a synonym for destruction that glosses imagery of fraternal/paternal shattering [נפץ]), or both.8 In this essay, I draw on contemporary cultural critic Khachig Tölölyan's theorization of diaspora as polythetic in order to challenge the notion that the term "diasporic" is used most productively merely to refer to the fact that Paul and his compatriots lived in, worked in, and were influenced by territory or culture outside of Judea. My central question is not how ancient Jewish thinkers reacted to "diaspora," but rather what kinds of "diasporas" they produced and what discursive work those productions did for them. Providing a broader literary context in which Paul's construal of diaspora-homeland relations should be situated, I suggest, yields a useful analytical tool through which we can describe Paul as *Ioudaios* and by which we can fruitfully compare him to other Hellenistic Jewish writers. To answer Barclay's title question: Paul, by this index of comparison, was not anomalous. His spatial imaginary fits squarely within an ongoing practice among diasporic Judeans in the Hellenistic world: they made and remade mental maps advancing variegated viewpoints about the centrality of the ancestral homeland as they argued about collective identity and standards of behavior.

Diaspora as Discursive Process

In his essay "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment," Khachig Tölölyan outlines what he sees to be a terminological shift with respect to the meaning and usages of the word "diaspora."9 An earlier concept, he writes, dominated scholarship through the mid-20th century — one he describes as "Jewish-centered" and "paradigmatic," since it derives its character from the ancient Jewish diaspora and has been applied to other

---

7 In the "Glossary of Technical Terms" in his survey work *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, Shaye J. D. Cohen defines it as "[t]he 'scattering' of the Jews throughout the world outside the land of Israel" (3rd ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014 [orig. 1987], 273).

8 This negative view is not pervasive in the Greek scriptures, however. See Joseph Mélèze Modrzejewski, "How to be a Jew in Hellenistic Egypt?," in *Diasporas in Antiquity*, ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen and Ernest S. Frerichs, (BJS 288; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 65–92 (esp. 69–70).

9 Khachig Tölölyan, "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment," *Diasporas* 5 (1996): 3–36.

displaced people groups since. Tölölyan outlines the constitutive elements of this kind of diaspora as (1) the result of a coerced rather than voluntary migration of (2) a group with a clearly delimited homeland identity that (3) maintains "a collective memory" that enables them to construct a community of distinction in the host land. As a distinct group, they (4) patrol the borders of their community, (5) communicate with members of their group dispersed in other locations, and (6) maintain contact with the homeland (when it exists). Tölölyan describes the newer model, by contrast, as a more fluid, "accommodating," and "empowering" paradigm. The emphases in this conception of diaspora are on "discursive and representational practices" — that is, how a community experiences and represents itself. This model enables disparate global migrations in the modern period to be termed "diasporas" as well: Asian, Caribbean, Irish, African, and so on. Whereas diasporic identity in the first model is viewed as static and essentialist, diasporic subjects in the second are understood to be marked by hybridity and heterogeneity.[10]

While the first model of diaspora that Tölölyan articulates *may* be accurate for describing Israelites displaced as a result of the Babylonian exile, the second is much more fruitful for analyzing the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora because of its participants' diversity and resilience.[11] Indeed, Erich Gruen has

---

[10] On hybrid diasporic identities as continually forming and transforming, ever delaying a fixed positionality, see Stuart Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*, eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 392–403. See also Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge Classics, 2004 [orig. Routledge, 1994]), and Robert J. C. Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

[11] This point may appear banal to some readers, but it is worth bearing in mind that the principal paradigm among biblical scholars in the twentieth century for understanding the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora did so in terms of the Babylonian exile. The Jewish homeland was a celebrated place, while the diaspora was characterized as less authentic. Such an understanding is evident, for example, in the language of Louis Feldman, whose article "The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt" *JSS* 22 (1960): 215–37, surveyed literary and non-literary evidence of Egyptian Judaism in order to illustrate the "deviations from orthodoxy" in this community, by which he meant variations from Palestinian (homeland) Judaism. Feldman's category of "deviations" appears again in his highly influential work on diaspora Judaism more broadly (*Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993]), though in this work Feldman writes of "deviation…from the traditional norms of Judaism" (see, for example, pp. 23, 62, 65, 67, 74, 76, 83, 421, 422). His very categories bastardize diasporic Judaism, thereby participating in the assumption

argued that our extant literary evidence provides a picture of Jews living throughout the ancient Greco-Roman world perfectly *at home* in Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, Rome, and elsewhere.[12] He suggests that much of their literature shows that these thinkers on the whole were more comfortable than anxiety-ridden, characterized by productive agility rather than by disempowering lament and longing. Providing a useful theoretical tool for our guild's need to distinguish "diaspora" from exile, Tölölyan's taxonomy allows us to accommodate the conclusion that not all Hellenistic Jews were burdened by diaspora-as-displacement.[13] Yet, in the study of the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora, Tölölyan's two models cannot be seen as mutually exclusive, and Gruen's conclusion cannot be understood as thoroughgoing. Some of the self-representational practices of diasporic Jews in the Greco-Roman era *include* elements inherent to Tölölyan's first model: an attachment to a distinct

---

that there is a non-diasporic Judaism that is normative and "pure" because of its genesis in the homeland of Palestine. This dichotomy between pure Palestinian Judaism and deviant diaspora Judaism is representative of almost all biblical scholars before the 1969 publication of Martin Hengel's *Judentum und Hellenismus*, which argued persuasively that Palestine was also Hellenized and consequently demolished the previous consensus that there was a pure, homeland Judaism (*Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zur ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts vor Christus*, 3rd ed., [WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr, 1988]; idem, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine in the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden, 2 vols. [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974]). John Barclay (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE –117 CE)* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996], 83–84 [cf. 4–9]) articulates the paradigm shift that Hengel helped initiate in this way: "It is thus no longer possible to analyse Diaspora Judaism by simple measurements against Palestinian Judaism" because of the pluralism of Judaisms in the ancient world. Barclay's book attempts to characterize diaspora Judaism on its own terms, highlighting its diversity without assuming normativity. It is within this trajectory that I locate the current discussion.

[12] Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) and, idem, *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002). See also Cynthia M. Baker, "'From Every Nation under Heaven': Jewish Ethnicities in the Greco-Roman World," in *Prejudice and Christian Beginnings: Investigating Race, Gender, and Ethnicity in Early Christianity*, eds. Laura Nasrallah and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 79–100.

[13] Contra, for example, N. T. Wright's claim (*The New Testament and the People of God* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 268–71) that most Jews in the Roman period understood themselves to be yet in exile.

homeland, a patrolling of borders of identity, and an engagement with collective memory. Ancient Jewish constructions of the Jewish diaspora as a temporary dislocation that constitutes punishment for disobedience and that is less legitimate than "homeland" Judaism are precisely that: constructions. And, contra Gruen, some Hellenistic Jews indeed construed center-periphery spatial relationships in these terms. With this framework in mind, I analyze three examples of ancient Jewish literary maps produced in the Second Temple period — that of Tobit, 3 Maccabees, and Joseph and Aseneth — as a means of situating Paul's mapmaking in Galatians 4 within a literary practice among Hellenistic Jews. My central questions are these: To what degree (or not) is Jerusalem/Palestine as ancestral homeland imagined as central, envisioned as a locus of return, or held to exercise control of territories or people beyond its borders? To what degree (or not) is diasporic space imagined as dependent on, subject to, or organized in relationship to Jerusalem/Palestine? And how does each resulting map support the rhetorical aims animating each text?

Tobit's Spatial Imaginary: Diaspora as Problem

The book of Tobit is a useful example of a text from this period that invites the collapse of the categories exile and diaspora. The novella (3rd/2nd c. BCE) deals with questions both theological and practical raised by the fact that its Israelite protagonist, Tobit, along with his compatriots, has been taken from his homeland and resettled in the strange land of Assyria.[14] Though the narrative takes place in the eighth-century world of Israelites in the Assyrian exile, its setting is most likely meant to be read as a proxy for diasporic existence in the author's own centuries-later timeframe.[15] In a humorous scene that makes a serious point, a bird with uncanny aim lets it drop right into Tobit's eyes, depriving him of sight. For Tobit, then, diaspora is literally dark. As the

---

[14] Tobit exists in two principal recensions that scholars have designated GI and GII. I treat the latter, using the translation and versification from the NRSV. For an account of a similar Jerusalem-versus-Nineveh dynamic in GI, see Michael Dick, "Tales of Two Cities (in the Second-Century BCE): Jerusalem and Nineveh," *JSP* 26 (2016): 32–48.

[15] Gruen (*Diaspora*, 235) objects to this correlation as a "simplistic leap" and points out that Tobit is optimistic about forthcoming divine mercy in the midst of suffering and that he takes delight in envisioning an enduring temple rebuilt. Yet the same evidence is better understood to support the opposite conclusion: Tobit's confidence centers around a return to the homeland, an expectation that has not yet been accomplished during the time of the author(s). On this, see esp. Jill Hicks-Keeton, "Already/Not Yet: Eschatological Tension in the Book of Tobit," *JBL* 132 (2013): 97–117. The narrative invites 3rd/2nd c. BCE-readers to understand themselves as part of the larger story of exile/diaspora and return.

narrative progresses, the reader discovers that it is also dangerous, populated with murderous demons and vengeful foreign overlords.[16] Unable to get his bearings, Tobit finds the usual measures of stability of no help, as apparently not even faithfulness to God can spare him (or others) from misery (1:16–20; 2:4–10).[17]

The characters' diasporic precarity is magnified to a grander scale in the reader's experience as various actors advance both historical and geographical claims that do not match reality, thereby unsettling both time and space.[18] With respect to the latter, for example, even divine agent Raphael grossly misrepresents the distance between the cities of Rages and Ecbatana as he posits an impossibly short journey of two days to cover 325 kilometers.[19] Raphael also engages in creative topography as he interchanges the places' relative elevations, claiming erroneously that Ecbatana is on a plain and Rages is in the mountains (5:6, 10). Up is down and down is up. As Amy-Jill Levine articulates, "[t]he disjunction between the real and the recounted indicates the problem of Diaspora existence: things are not as they should be."[20] Diaspora destabilizes

---

[16] Amy-Jill Levine ("Redrawing the Boundaries: A New Look at 'Diaspora as Metaphor: Bodies and Boundaries in the Book of Tobit,'" in *A Feminist Companion to Tobit and Judith*, eds. Athalya Brenner-Idan and Helen Efthimiadis-Keith [London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015], 3–22) has argued persuasively against those who claim that Tobit's dire circumstances are not fundamentally the result of his diasporic condition (contra, e.g., John Collins, "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit,' in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology: Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20–21 May 2004*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, [JSJSup 98; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005], 23–40). Levine's essay cited here is a revised and updated version of her essay published in *Diaspora and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*, ed. J. Andrew Overman and Robert S. McLennan, (SFSHJ 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 105–17. On the need not to automatically collapse the position held by Tobit the character with that of the book as a whole, see Hicks-Keeton, "Already/Not Yet," 100. In this case, there is evidence that both the character and the book understand Tobit's geography as a problem.

[17] Levine, "Redrawing the Boundaries," 4. See also Micah Kiel, *The "Whole Truth": Rethinking Retribution in the Book of Tobit*, (LSTS 82; London: T&T Clark, 2014); and Dick, "Tales of Two Cities," 45–48.

[18] Levine, "Redrawing the Boundaries," 5–6.

[19] Geoffrey D. Miller, "Raphael the Liar: Angelic Deceit and Testing in the Book of Tobit," *CBQ* 74 (2012): 492–508 (here, 504–5). Miller reads Raphael's geographical mix-ups not as errors but as lies, as one component of a program of deceit intended to create conditions in which to test Tobit.

[20] Levine, "Redrawing the Boundaries," 6.

even the most fundamental categories of making sense of the world. Diaspora is displacement — a threatening condition from which one must be rescued by divine intervention. Diaspora is exile.

By contrast, the ancestral homeland looms large as divinely ordained center and expected locus of return. The title character complains about what he conceives to have been the illegitimate decentralizing of Jerusalem in cultic practice even prior to Assyria's victory, polemicizing against the competing places of sacrifice erected by King Jeroboam (1:4–8). For Tobit, Jerusalem is the city that "had been chosen from among all the tribes of Israel, where all the tribes of Israel should offer sacrifice and where the temple, the dwelling of God, had been consecrated and established for all generations forever" (1:4). The ideal eternal centrality of Jerusalem informs this tale's ultimately happy ending as divine intervention brings healing to Tobit's eyes in anticipation of the nation's restoration to (what is conceived to be) its true homeland. The geographical structure of the narrative is suggestive of such a return. The mental pilgrimage that Tobit's reader makes by virtue of moving through the story takes her from Jerusalem (1:3–13) to Assyria to Jerusalem (13:9–18; 14:5–7), and then back to diaspora just long enough for its end to be foreshadowed: the concluding sentence of the story affirms that before his death Tobit heard that Nineveh had been destroyed.[21]

Within this mental map that reveals a priority of and longing for the homeland, the book of Tobit makes concerted effort to patrol the borders of collective Israelite/Jewish identity by promoting Israel-centric ethics. Tobit piously gives alms, and he buries the dead — actions directed principally toward Israelites (1:3, 16–18; 2:2–4). The narrative also endorses endogamy. Tobit celebrates having married a kinswoman (1:9), and Tobias is instructed that he too should marry a kinswoman (4:12).[22] The book's felicitous conclusion is partially predicated on the divinely catalyzed fulfillment of this demand through Tobias's marriage to Sarah, another exilic Israelite. By marrying within the tribe, Tobias not only follows the esteemed examples of "Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," but also preserves their lineage for a future return (4:12).[23] Indeed, for Tobit, it is the descendants of these figures who "will inherit the land" (4:12), a claim that connects the homeland — and an expected *return* to that homeland — to biological filiation with common ancestors whose stature populates Jewish collective memory. Ultimately, the goal for Tobit is not to negotiate diaspora. It

---

[21] Hicks-Keeton, "Already/Not Yet," 108.

[22] Levine, "Redrawing the Boundaries," 5.

[23] Levine, "Redrawing the Boundaries," 10.

is to survive it. It is to eliminate it. Diaspora becomes synonymous with exile — a phenomenon expected to be temporary because it deviates from the desired norm of homeland existence.

Third Maccabees's Spatial Imaginary: Domesticating Diaspora

Tobit's dark depiction of diaspora — part of a discourse that longs for a climactic return to a homeland — is but one cartographical production. Third Maccabees, to take one example, makes a very different map. This narrative erodes rather than reinforces a dichotomy of homeland/diaspora through its inventive geographical reciprocity.[24] The tale begins with Jerusalem Jews in distress because King Ptolemy Philopator intends to profane the temple's holy of holies. God prevents the king's entry, however, and with Philopator's plans foiled, the ruler quickly turns his ire toward Jews residing in Egypt, where the bulk (and indeed the remainder) of the plot unfolds. There is thus unidirectional movement from Palestine to Egypt, and yet the narrative constructs a fictive spatial plane in which events that take place among Jerusalem Jews directly affect Egyptian Jews, and vice versa.[25] Egyptian Jews are to be killed, that is, because Jews in Jerusalem denied Philopator entrance to the holy of holies, and once the Jews of Egypt have been rescued through divine intervention, Philopator resolves in anger to march against Jerusalem (2:27–28; 3:1; 5:43). Diasporic

---

[24] On the date and provenance of 3 Maccabees, see H. Anderson, "3 Maccabees: A New Translation and Introduction," in *OTP* 2:510–12; and Sara Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: 3 Maccabees in Its Cultural Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 133–41. For a compelling case in favor of assigning the work to a date prior to 100 BCE, see Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 132–41.

[25] See David S. Williams, "*3 Maccabees*: A Defense of Diaspora Judaism?," *JSP* 13 (1995): 17–29; Noah Hacham, "Sanctity and Attitude towards the Temple in Hellenistic Judaism," in *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?: On Jews and Judaism Before and After the Destruction of the Second Temple*, ed. Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss in collaboration with Ruth A. Clements, (AJEC 78; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 155–80. Both argue that 3 Maccabees was written in part to defend the legitimacy of Egyptian Judaism vis-à-vis Palestinian Judaism. It was likely also meant to be a polemic against worship of Dionysus. On this, see Noah Hacham, "3 Maccabees: An Anti-Dionysian Polemic," in *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*, ed. Jo-Ann A. Brant, Charles W. Hedrick, and Chris Shea, (SBLSymS 32; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 167–83; see also J. R. C. Cousland, "Dionysus Theomachos? Echoes of the Bacchae in 3 Maccabees," *Bib* 82 (2001): 539–48; N. Clayton Croy, "Disrespecting Dionysus: 3 Maccabees as Narrative Satire of the God of Wine," in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, (NovTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 3–19.

Judaism is authorized, moreover, as God intervenes with providential care for Jews in both Palestine and in Egypt (2:21–27; 5:11–12; 6:16–19). And if God is playing favorites at all in 3 Maccabees, it is diasporic Jews who have the edge, as God's intervention in their cause comes more swiftly and directly than it had in Jerusalem. Egypt eclipses Palestine as people supplant place: "the final salvation," Noah Hacham writes, "takes place in an unexpected location, the hippodrome in Alexandria, and not in the ostensibly suitable place — the Temple of Jerusalem. Moreover…God reveals Himself in Egypt, rather than in the Temple — not for the sake of His desecrated place but on behalf of His endangered people."[26] Sanctity is mobile because God is mobile, and as a result, 3 Maccabees's map looks very different from Tobit's.[27]

Furthermore, whereas in Tobit the gathering of the Jewish people is a solution to their dispersal, which is understood as a predicament, in 3 Maccabees we find the reverse. The act of gathering is ominous rather than promising. Rounding up the Jews of Egypt and placing them in one central location is a key element in Philopator's plan to eliminate them. As the narrator describes the king's ire, the reader is invited to think geographically (notably, with Alexandria as a central location vis-à-vis the Egyptian countryside): "[Philopator] became so infuriated that not only was he enraged against those Jews who lived in Alexandria, but was still more bitterly hostile toward those in the countryside; and he ordered that all should be promptly gathered into one place, and put to death by the most cruel means" (3:1). Rather than salvation, an atrocious fate awaits the Jewish people who are meant to be collected into one place.

If assembling the Jewish people in 3 Maccabees is part of the problem that must be overcome, *dispersal* becomes both a means of resistance and the *telos* of redemption. The king's plan to register the Jews as a precursor to their anticipated murder is thwarted not only by the fact that the Jewish population is too numerous but also by the reality that they are spread out. The scribes commissioned to record their names (4:14–15) complain that they cannot complete their task due to the "immense number" of Jews, most of whom are — to the scribes' dismay — "still in the country, some still residing in their homes, and some at the place [some mss: 'on the way']" (4:17–18). By divine providence, the scribes exhaust their writing supplies before they can get to all the Jewish

---

[26] Hacham, "Sanctity,"161.

[27] Hacham ("Sanctity," 155–56) has shown that that the language of "sanctity/holiness" in 3 Maccabees is most often attributed to God, a phenomenon he usefully contrasts with 2 Maccabees's use of this language in relation to Judea, Jerusalem, or the Jerusalem temple.

residents of Egypt (4:20–21). Fortuitous dispersal is thus one way in which Philopator's scheme is thwarted.

Moreover, whereas Tobit's tale ends forward-looking, Jerusalem-focused, and homeward-bound, 3 Maccabees concludes with Jews partying in Egypt. The ultimate goal of 3 Maccabees's redemption narrative is the triumphant return of the Jewish characters to their own homes in Egypt, rendered habitable. God miraculously rescues the Jews assembled in the Alexandrian hippodrome who had been awaiting death (6:18–21), and this deliverance makes it possible for (faithful [7:10–16]) Jews to live and thrive as Jews in Egypt:

> There [in Ptolemais] they celebrated their deliverance, for the king [Ptolemy] had provided all the things to them for their journey until all of them had arrived at their own houses. And when they had all landed in peace with appropriate thanksgiving, there too in like manner they decided to observe these days as a joyous festival during the time of their stay. Then, after inscribing them as holy on a pillar and dedicating a place of prayer at the site of the festival, they departed unharmed, free, and overjoyed, since at the king's command they had all of them been brought safely by land and sea and river to their own homes (7:18–20).

They celebrate. And then, with all of their confiscated property returned (7:21–22), they happily disperse to their Egyptian homes. The concluding line praises God for such deliverance (7:23). Third Maccabees, in the end, disrupts a neat partition of homeland/diaspora by taking pains to *domesticate* diaspora. Diasporic Jews are not so much scattered as settled. Redemption is local. Egypt is home. Diaspora is deliverance.

Joseph and Aseneth's Spatial Imaginary: Diasporizing Jerusalem
At first glance, the ancient theological romance Joseph and Aseneth seems an unlikely object of analysis in a discussion of spatial imaginaries. Unlike in Tobit and 3 Maccabees, the notion of diaspora is not a principal animating trope or source of conflict.[28] Set in Egypt during the patriarch Joseph's tenure, this story

---

[28] Joseph and Aseneth exists in pluriform. A "shorter version" has been reconstructed by Marc Philonenko (*Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, [SPB 13; Leiden: Brill, 1968]) and a "longer version" by Christoph Burchard (*Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Asenath: Überlieferung-Ortsbestimmung*, [WUNT 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1965]; idem, "Ein vorläufiger griechisher Text von Joseph und Aseneth," *DBAT* 14

from the first-century BCE or CE wrests characters familiar from the book of Genesis to tell a tale of a transformation.[29] Aseneth, the beautiful daughter of an Egyptian priest, dramatically forsakes her native gods in favor of exclusive worship of Joseph's God — a move the narrative conceives to be a prerequisite to her subsequent happy marriage to the Hebrew patriarch and bearing of his children. Yet Aseneth undergoes a further transformation in her tale: she becomes imagined in spatial terms as a (mythic) city. Like Tobit, Joseph and Aseneth draws on prophetic eschatological traditions to imagine a future, idealized central gathering place of the people of God. As in 3 Maccabees, though, a local center challenges the primacy of Jerusalem. In fact, Aseneth-in-Egypt displaces Jerusalem as center.

At the conclusion of seven days of Aseneth's repentance from (what Joseph and Aseneth polemically conceives to be) idol worship, she is visited by an angelic being who confirms that Joseph's God has accepted her by bestowing on her a new name:

> And your name shall no longer be called Aseneth, but your name shall be City of Refuge, because in you many nations will take refuge with the Lord God, the Most High, and under your wings many peoples trusting in the Lord God will be sheltered, and behind your walls will be guarded those who attach themselves to the Most High God in the name of Repentance (15:7; Burchard text and trans.).[30]

Aseneth is represented here as a walled shelter — a *place* — in which others who follow her example of repentance may be afforded a safe welcome with the God of Israel. After a mystical experience involving a honeycomb and bees, the angelic being repeats the city imagery with different language: "And

---

[1979]: 2–53; and idem, *Joseph und Aseneth* [assisted by Carsten Burfeind and Uta Barbara Fink; PVTG 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003]). Both of the two earliest streams of textual transmission represent Aseneth as a "City of Refuge," but because the witnesses forming the basis of Burchard's reconstruction additionally refer to Aseneth as "metropolis," it is that form of the story I focus on here (without passing judgment as to its originality).

29 The date and provenance of Joseph and Aseneth are disputed. I read the tale, with a majority of scholars, as a Jewish literary product from Greco-Roman Egypt from sometime in the two centuries surrounding the turn of the era. See Jill Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth: Gentile Access to Israel's "Living God" in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford University Press, 2018), esp. 16-40.

30 On the scriptural background of "City of Refuge" and its connection to Aseneth's honeycomb, see Anathea E. Portier-Young, "Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth's Honeycomb," *JSP* 14 (2005): 133–57.

you [Aseneth] shall be like a walled mother-city of all who take refuge with the name of the Lord God" (16:16; Burchard text and trans.). Joseph and Aseneth thus capitalizes on Aseneth's position as matriarch (Gen 41:50; 46:20 [LXX]) in order to represent her as a mother-*city*.

This spatial imaginary implicitly invokes discourse of center and periphery. The ancient Greeks coined the word "metropolis" to denote a central *polis* from which outlying colonies (*apoikiai*) were established.[31] While Joseph and Aseneth does not use the vocabulary to refer explicitly to Jerusalem, Philo provides an example of an ancient Hellenistic Jewish thinker who drew on the Greek model of metropolis/colony as a way of framing the relationship between Jerusalem and the Jewish diaspora: he uses "mother-city" six times, exclusively in reference to Jerusalem — never to his own Alexandria.[32] Metropolis/colony is a fundamentally different way of construing center/periphery than is homeland/exile. Indeed, Philo follows closely the logic internal to Greek colonization that assumes the reason for the dispersal of people from a mother-city outward is the need of the booming population to spread out.[33] The movement outward is emphatically *expansion* — not exile.[34] That is to say: while the progression of peoples out from the center to dispersed peripheries mirrors that of exile, the connotative charge is reversed since ultimately the colonies are established as a result of the mother-city's prosperity, not punishment. In Philo's model, then, diasporic Jews live apart from their mother-city of Jerusalem as a sign of Jerusalem's success.[35]

Joseph and Aseneth never explicitly mentions Jerusalem. In the narrative setting, after all, the Hebrews have not yet even become enslaved in Egypt, let alone rescued and given a land to call home. But given the extensive

---

[31] On the complexities of the relationship between lexical representations and historical realities, with comparison of the Greek "diasporas" to that of Hellenized Jews, see Modrzejewski, "How to be a Jew," 65–92.

[32] *Flacc.* 46, *Legat.* 203, 281, 294, 305, 334. See David T. Runia, "Polis and Megalopolis: Philo and the Founding of Alexandria," *Mnemosyne* 42 (1989): 398-412 (405); See esp. Sarah Pearce, "Jerusalem as 'Mother-City' in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria," in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, ed. John M. G. Barclay, (LSTS 45; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 19–36.

[33] Pearce, "Jerusalem as 'Mother-City,'" 29–30.

[34] This basic idea is already found in the Greek translations of Jeremiah and Ezra, where *golah* is sometimes rendered *apoikia* or *apoikesia* (Modrzejewksi, "How to be a Jew," 68).

[35] Sarah Pearce ("Jerusalem as 'Mother-City,'" 36) has argued, convincingly in my view, that for Philo "there is no tension between the notion of Jerusalem as mother-city and Alexandria as home."

use of scriptural language and imagery in the narrative,[36] I posit that the tale's use of "metropolis" invokes Isaiah 1:26 OG, where Jerusalem is deemed "a city of righteousness, the faithful mother-city (μητρόπολις) Zion" (my trans.).[37] In fact, the thematic and textual resonances between Joseph and Aseneth's Aseneth and Greek Isaiah's Jerusalem suggest that the latter has provided an interpretive prism through which Aseneth's identity as mother-city is conceived in her narrative. Both Aseneth and Isaiah's Jerusalem are portrayed in their respective texts, for example, as cities and as mothers, with conceptual slippage between the two images: whereas Aseneth is a mother whose maternity is extended to a role as a city, Isaiah's Jerusalem is a city whose role is extended to motherhood. Isaiah 66 (OG) develops a detailed image of restored Jerusalem as a physical mother — as one who bears the nation (66:11), nurses her children (66:11), and comforts them (66:12b).[38] The prophet simultaneously makes use of Eden imagery — which also provides Joseph and Aseneth with literary resources (e.g., 2:11; 8:9; 9:5; 12:1–2) — to depict the nation's renewal.[39]

Both Aseneth and Isaiah's Jerusalem follow a grand narrative of sin (so-conceived), repentance, and renewal — movement toward (or, in the case of Jerusalem, *back* toward) Israel's God. And yet Isaiah also posits movement by "many nations" (Isa 2:2–3 OG; cf. Jos. Asen. 15:7) toward Jerusalem to worship the God of Israel.[40] In her narrative, Aseneth becomes this city to which

---

[36] On the use of the Greek scriptures in Joseph and Aseneth, see esp. Gerhard Delling, "Einwirkungen der Sprache der Septuaginta in 'Joseph und Aseneth'," *JSJ* 9 (1978): 29–56; and Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, (JAJSup 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 233.

[37] For a more developed case in favor of Joseph and Aseneth's creative use of Isaiah, see Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 57-59. Parts of this section are adapted (and expanded) from the argument presented therein. Because I am interested in how an ancient writer received and re-appropriated Isaian imagery, I disregard in what follows the modern scholarly consensus that there are at least three different historical contexts represented in the current form of Isaiah.

[38] See esp. John Schmitt, "The Motherhood of God and Zion as Mother," *RB* 92; 1985): 557–69. On the theme of women as God's city/tower in the apocalyptic genre, including part of Joseph and Aseneth, see Edith M. Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas*, (JSPSup 17; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995).

[39] Susan Ackerman, "Isaiah," in *Women's Bible Commentary* (expanded edition), ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ridge (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 174.

40 On the treatment of "the nations" in Isaiah, see esp. Christopher T. Begg, "The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh in the Book of Isaiah," in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible:*

penitents are said to stream in order to receive comfort. Joseph and Aseneth's portrayal of the Egyptian heroine's turn to worship the God of Israel with language of mercy, imagery of walls, and the motif of renaming likely draws on the prophecies of gentile worship in Jerusalem developed in Isaiah 56, where it is said that God will soon reveal mercy (Isa 56:1 OG) to "the foreigner who attaches himself to the Lord" (Isa 56:3 OG; cf. Jos. Asen. 15:7: [οἱ προσκείμενοι]). These will find protection within God's wall and be given "an everlasting name" (Isa 56:5 OG). Joseph and Aseneth appropriates Isaiah's image of a transformed, faithful mother-city to assign Isaian Jerusalem's role to Aseneth, a gentile convert in Egypt in whom "many nations" are predicted to take refuge. That is, a transformed Egyptian woman who bore two of the twelve tribes of Israel, and yet who lived and died exclusively in Egypt, and who is characterized not only as a hero of Israel's scriptures but also in terms of Ptolemaic Egyptian royalty,[41] is now conceived as the locus for the promise of restored Jews and gentiles who repent of idolatry. Mother(-city) Aseneth in Egypt thereby displaces Jerusalem as geographical center as she usurps its role.

Paul's Spatial Imaginary in Galatians: Two Jerusalems

City-as-mother is a trope that likewise appears in Paul's spatial imaginary. The apostle's extant writings depart generically from Joseph and Aseneth, Tobit, and 3 Maccabees. He is also (apparently) distinct from the authors of these texts in his conviction that the plan of the Jewish God somehow centers on Jesus. Yet Paul shares with these authors the rhetorical project of (re)configuring space. His displacement of an enslaved "present Jerusalem" with the free "Jerusalem above" (Gal 4:25–26) fits comfortably in concert with his attempts throughout Galatians to mark himself — and his Galatian gentiles — as autonomous with respect to early Jesus followers in Jerusalem. His spatial arrangement in the allegory is consistent with his bifurcation of two planes earlier in the letter: one horizontal (= human, frequently associated with [earthly] Jerusalem) and one vertical (= direct from God or revelation of the risen Jesus). In his opening

---

Essays in Honour of John T. Willis, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Rick R. Marrs, and Steven L. McKenzie, (JSOTSup 284; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 35–55; John N. Oswalt, "The Nations in Isaiah: Friend or Foe; Servant or Partner," BBR 16 (2006): 41–51; and Gary Stansell, "The Nations' Journey to Zion: Pilgrimage and Tribute as Metaphor in the Book of Isaiah," in *The Desert will Bloom: Poetic Visions in Isaiah*, ed. Joseph A. Everson and Hyun Chul Paul Kim, (SBLAIL 4; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 233–55.

[41] Patricia Ahearne-Kroll, "*Joseph and Aseneth* and Jewish Identity in Greco-Roman Egypt" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2005).

sentence, for example, Paul insists that he has not been sent by "human commission" or "human authorities" but rather through Jesus and the God who raised him (1:1). It is "God's approval" that he seeks rather than "human approval" (1:10). His gospel is not "of human origin"; it came directly from Jesus through revelation (1:11–12). The horizontal plane becomes more geographically specific as Paul reports his first post-revelation movement. He did not "confer with any human being"; in fact, he traveled away from Jerusalem (1:16–17). Paul thus takes pains to represent his call as legitimate because it came straight from Jesus (the vertical plane) and was unadulterated by human mediation (the horizontal plane) — and *especially* not by the Jerusalem apostles (Gal 1:17–24). It is one of Paul's sassier moments.

When he finally did go to Jerusalem, Paul insists, his contact with the Jerusalem apostles was limited (1:18–24; cf. 2:2). Even when he places himself in Jerusalem, then, his narration attempts to create distance between himself and the Jerusalem leaders. In his adjacent account of a second trip to Jerusalem, Paul continues to prefer the vertical over the horizontal as he asserts that a revelation incited his travel (2:2). The implication is that he was *not* summoned by anyone in Jerusalem. The vertical plane, in his mind, makes him independent of Jerusalem and its representatives. In Paul's account of this second meeting in Jerusalem we see him defending the authority (2:5) and the autonomy (2:6) of his message — his gospel — which does *not* include circumcision for gentiles (2:2–3), the very position of which he now seeks to convince his Galatian audience. Anticipating the slavery/freedom binary in chapter 4, Paul here links circumcision of gentiles to slavery in opposition to "the freedom [they, including Paul] have in Christ Jesus" (2:4).[42]

In chapter 4, Paul differentiates between two Jerusalems in order to persuade his gentile auditors not to observe Jewish law, which from his view was fundamentally mediated (3:19–20) and is antithetical to his gentiles' access to the God of Israel through Jesus because it enslaves them rather than renders them free (3:25–26; 4:31– 5:2). In keeping with his consistent preference for the vertical plane throughout the letter, Paul colonizes his gentiles-in-Christ as children of the free, heavenly Mother Jerusalem. His main objective is to combat

---

[42] Paul goes on to defend his own authority as he claims his gentile territory as distinct from Peter's mission to Jews (Gal 2:7–9). On the probable influence of the Table of Nations on Paul's geographical understanding of his mission, see James M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul's Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians*, (WUNT 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).

the human interference that has led his gentiles to perform (or to consider performing) an action he deems antithetical to his message. Paul's allegory is tactical.[43] He bifurcates Jerusalem as a means of fighting the interference and influence of (other) humans in his Galatian assemblies. He constructs earthly Jerusalem as a symbol of this human tampering by equating it with law — the very thing he wants his gentiles not to do, the very thing the interferers are apparently preaching[44] — and by associating law with slavery. His gentiles belong to the heavenly, free Jerusalem. They should not circumcise. They should listen only to Paul, whose circumcision-less message he has taken great pains throughout the letter to separate from the horizontal human plane and to associate instead with the vertical plane — with direct revelation from God.[45]

As Paul deploys creative cartography in the course of (attempted) persuasion, we see that he fits well within a broader trend of Hellenistic Jewish mapmaking involving diaspora and Jewish homeland.[46] While Tobit depicts an

---

[43] For a compelling account of the way in which Paul employs rhetoric of violence to accomplish this practical goal of de-authorizing the rival teachers, see Charles, *Paul and the Politics of Diaspora*, 176–190 (though I disagree with Charles's description of Paul's gospel as one "of freedom from the law" [p. 180], since gentiles were never *supposed* to keep Jewish law; they are, according to Paul, free without the law, not free from it).

[44] On identifying the position against which Paul argues, see J. Louis Martyn, "A Law-Observant Mission to Gentiles: The Background of Galatians," *SJT* 38 (1985): 307–24 (cf. *Theological Issues*, 7–24); and John M. G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73–93.

[45] Such an interpretation of Galatians 4 runs counter to seeing Paul as engaged in crafting a grand narrative (contra, for example, the position summarized in Karen H. Jobes's comment that the allegory contains "a radical historical and theological reversal" in which the apostle "claims that Christians, and not Jews, are the promised sons of Abraham and are the true heirs of the promises of the Abrahamic covenant." See Jobes, "Jerusalem, Our Mother: Metalepsis and Intertextuality in Galatians 4:21–31," *WTJ* 55 (1993): 299–320 (here, 299).

[46] These four are of course not the only participants. And this ancient project extends beyond only Greek-language Jewish documents. See the treatment of sacred space in the book of Jubilees, for example, in James M. Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Space in the Book of Jubilees*, (JSJSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 2005). Additionally, Paul was not the only first-century Jewish member of the Jesus movement producing a "Jerusalem" in the course of recruiting gentiles (a constituency that would have had different "homelands"). See Merrill P. Miller, "Antioch, Paul, and Jerusalem: Diaspora Myths of Origins in the Homeland," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, ed. Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller, (SBLSymS 28; Atlanta: *SBL* (2004): 177–236. The theme of "new Jerusalem" is developed in many post-70 apocalypses,

idealized vision of Jerusalem, a vision which, in the author's view, rightly conditions the practices of diasporic Jews, Paul constructs two Jerusalems as a means of determining the practices of his gentiles seeking access to the Jewish God. While 3 Maccabees uses geography to subvert the primacy of Jerusalem in the course of advocating for diasporic Jewish existence, Paul rhetorically displaces earthly Jerusalem in the course of defending the autonomy and authority of his own message. Joseph and Aseneth is the most instructive conversation partner, though, since both Paul and its author deploy spatial rhetoric in the course of working out the implications and possibilities of gentiles' turning to worship Israel's God.[47] That is, their maps are developed not principally as an exercise in staking claims about the relationship that *diasporic Jews* (should) have to their ancestral homeland; rather, they each construct spatial imaginaries as they negotiate entry for *ethnic non-Jews* into the people of Israel's God. Comparison with Joseph and Aseneth reveals where Paul fits in the spectrum of possibilities for such rhetorical mapmaking among Hellenistic Jewish thinkers in antiquity. Each employs maternal city imagery as they incorporate gentiles. Paul's non-Jews who have turned to worship the God of Israel are now, in his conception, children of a heavenly, free Jerusalem ("*our* mother"). Aseneth, in her narrative, is the mother-city of penitent foreigners who will stream to her to worship Israel's God. Yet unlike in Joseph and Aseneth, where Jerusalem is not only *dis*placed but *re*placed by a locus outside of the ancestral Jewish homeland, in Paul's map the category "Jerusalem" still has purchase.[48] Mirroring his ambivalence toward Jerusalem, Paul's discourse of decentralization does not escape a model of center-periphery with Jerusalem at

---

including the book of Revelation, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch. On Revelation, see, e.g., Pilchan Lee, *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition*, (WUNT 2/129; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001). On 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, see, e.g., Carla Sulzbach, "The Fate of Jerusalem in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*: From Earth to Heaven and Back?," in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski, (LSTS 87; London: Bloomsbury, 2015).

[47] For a reading of Joseph and Aseneth as a theological defense of gentile access to the Jewish God, see Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*. Cf. Matthew Thiessen, "Aseneth's Eight-Day Transformation as Scriptural Justification for Conversion," *JSJ* 45 (2014): 229–49.

[48] Cf. Charles's statement (*Paul and the Politics of Diaspora*, 182) that "the importance of Jerusalem is still obvious to [Paul]," even as the apostle argues that "the Jerusalem that is above, which is free, chases the present Jerusalem that lingers in its mess, in its slavery under the law."

the core. To return in closing to John Barclay's framing terminology, then: when it comes to the spatial imaginaries produced among ancient Hellenistic Jews, Paul was not only not anomalous, but he was also not an "apostate" whose thinking goes beyond some limit of Jewishness. The Jewish author of Joseph and Aseneth goes further afield than does Paul by dispensing entirely with the centrality of mother Jerusalem.

Conclusion

Mapping — whether the representation of territorial place, the rhetorical production of space, or some combination — is never done in a vacuum. Geographical (or cartographical) thinking is an activity always conditioned by position and always related to power.[49] This dynamic is also true of ancient Jewish spatial imaginaries that constructed "diasporas" in various shapes in the course of advancing disparate ideologies. This article has suggested an alternative way of using the category "diaspora" in our assessment of Paul and other ancient Jews. Scholars like Gruen have usefully examined our literary evidence for "the realities of diaspora experience" for ancient Jewish life (that is, for example, how living outside the ancestral homeland conditioned the possibilities for their social status, relations, and mobility) and for "traces of diaspora as a concept *that imposed itself* (however subconsciously) upon Jews prior to the destruction of the Temple" (emphasis mine).[50] Viewing diaspora as an etic category of analysis means understanding it not only (or principally) as a physical phenomenon that conditioned ancient Jewish human experience, but also as a series of variegated, constructed projections that result from ancient persons' concern for organizing themselves in the world. "Diaspora" was not merely something that *happened to* ancient Jews. It was something they produced, and framing it in this way helps us see new possibilities for putting them in conversation with one another — for our own mapping of the varieties of Jewish thought in the Second Temple period.

---

[49] J. B. Harley, "Maps, Knowledge, and Power," in *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*, eds. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1988), 277–312. For an excellent, accessible discussion applying spatial theory to the study of Paul and, particularly, the communities who received his letters, see Laura S. Nasrallah, "Spatial Perspectives: Space and Archaeology in Roman Philippi," in *Studying Paul's Letters: Contemporary Perspectives and Methods*, ed. Joseph A. Marchal (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 53–74.

[50] Gruen, *Diaspora*, 7.

Such a theorization of diaspora helps us, I think, to put Paul in his place. While the apostle has traditionally spent centuries in the limelight, with interpreters poring over his words, attempting to determine his meaning — his theology — I suggest that a shift in focus toward his tactical production of diaspora shows that the apostle's allegory in Galatians 4 was just as desperate as deliberate, closer to a mode of hermeneutical frenzy than to what Richard Hays has described as "hermeneutical jujitsu,"[51] and more illustrative of Paul's argumentative agility in the face of conflict than determinative of, as Daniel Boyarin has argued, "the allegorical key to Paul."[52] Such a reading cuts across fundamentally different conclusions reached by, to take these examples, a traditional Pauline scholar (Hays) and a postmodern Jewish interpreter (Boyarin) since it wrests Paul's allegory from the realm of constructive theologizing and places it in the realm of rhetoric amidst contest. Paul deployed all resources at his disposal, including the possibility of playing with space and place — of making diaspora what he needed it to be. Paul thus finds a home among other Hellenistic Jewish writers whose creative spatial imaginaries helped them organize their world and articulate their place within it, wherever they happened to live.

---

[51] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scriptures in the Writings of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 112.

[52] Boyarin, *A Radical Jew*, 32.