

# JUDEN

## Part One

*For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.*  
(Rom 2:28,29)

Christians are very mixed up about the Jews, and have been for a long time. This will be an attempt to rectify that. It is not meant to be offensive, though it may offend. But it is an effort to find the truth about an important part of our reality that has been cloaked in a shroud of lies, obfuscation, and confusion since Moses was a baby.

The first thing to understand is that our modern “Jews” are not the Jews of the Bible. Or if they are, then we’ve misunderstood what the biblical term means—and that’s a distinct possibility. It would seem self-evident though not to conflate the ancient Jews with modern Jews, just as one would not confuse ancient Greeks with modern Greeks. But this does not seem to be the case. This confusion comes partly from biblical and historical ignorance, but partly from deliberate subterfuge. The Jews certainly know who they are, and they know who Christians are, but it benefits *them* that Christians remain unsure about either. That’s the first bite we need to swallow.

Probably not one in a thousand can claim to fully understand what a “Jew” meant in the Bible—particularly in the New Testament. I’m one of the 999, but I’ve come much closer to the truth than I was while in “church”. There was probably even a brief time when I thought I was a “Judeo-Christian” and that Jesus was a “Jewish Carpenter”, but I’ve long since repented of those things and I hope you will also forgive me. After much thought and Bible study, and much reading of history, I’ve concluded a few things about the Jews. Some of those conclusions are worth sharing, and I will do so here, but we will by no means exhaust the subject.

Therefore in Part One of this study, we’ll examine the biblical background for the ancient Jew (and speculate about whether Jesus was a Jew) ... and in Part Two, we’ll look at the modern Jew in all of his glory, and try and untangle the two.

Part of the reason for the enigma is that the term we’ve translated as “Jew” can and does have different meanings by the biblical context. We’ll get to that shortly. *Jew* is a (relatively recent) [English word](#) that’s come to mean something consistent in every language now—and not accidentally. (By the way, that link is instructive and recommended reading before we go on).

But it's also worth noting up front that the original 1611 King James Bible translated *Idumaean-Judean* into *Jewes*, and it wasn't until the revised editions of the KJV that the word *Jew* appears... And *Idumaean* was from the Greek, *Ioudaios*, which by the time of Jesus had been translated (or transliterated) from the word for [Edom](#) or *Edomites*. Also, the Pharisaism of Jesus' day is one and the same with the *religion* of Judaism today... That's a hint.

In the OT, the Hebrew *y'hudi* is rendered "Jew" in our English Bibles and simply means "Judahite" (of the tribe or land, or kingdom of Judah). We find it about 100 times—mostly in the book of Esther. What it doesn't mean, and never meant, is *Israel*. In other words, "Jew" was not synonymous with "Israel". At the time of the split of the northern Kingdom of Israel and the southern Kingdom of Judah, the distinction was made. Thence, not all Israelites were "Jews", but all Jews were Israelites (in the OT). And "Israel" could mean the Northern Kingdom, or ALL of the tribes of Israel, but Jews were Judahites (of *Judah*).

But the NT is a bit more ambiguous. [Ioudaioi](#) is the NT Greek from which we get "Jew" or "the Jews". In the three synoptic Gospels *hoi Ioudaioi* or its equivalent occurs only 16 times, almost always in the title "king of the Jews" (referring to Jesus of course). Here the situation is rather straight forward because it's taken for granted in the oldest gospels (Matt, Mark, and Luke) that *everyone is a Jew* unless otherwise indicated. And the ordinary reader at that time would know this. But the word is found about 180 times in all of the NT—*more than 150 of which are in John and Acts*. And this is where things start to get squirrely.

Some of the explanations of the "theologians" tend to lean towards a theory that in the early biblical writings (i.e., the Gospels), the Jews were easily seen as one, more or less, homogenous group, among whom came out a sect which believed in Jesus as the Messiah, leaving the majority of the Jews as unbelievers. The unbelieving Jews were at times hassling (and occasionally murdering) their cultic brethren, but otherwise were content to go on their merry way just being "Jews"—thus not much controversy over definitions. But later in the first century, once Roman persecution began and the Jews were itching to revolt, the Christian sect began to distance itself from the Jews—rejecting all forms and paraphernalia of Judaism, and even stopped calling themselves Jews altogether. This is nearer to the time of John's gospel, and also Paul's writings, which tended to be disparaging of the "Jews". Hence, the term took on a different meaning, and began to become the [byword](#) it is today. Perhaps, also this is a direct fulfilment of the words of the prophet, and to which Jesus was specifically referencing in [Matt 21](#)...

*Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. **And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen:** for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name. (Isaiah 65:15-16)*

This angle makes the most sense in my mind, but we'll see if it holds water later.

The modern controversy over the ["Jewish Question"](#) and the rise of something called "anti-Semitism" (perhaps the greatest misnomer in history) has led to some bizarre theatrics and ideologies among Christians and God-haters alike. Some well-meaning brethren have tried to smooth over the problem by saying the term "Jew" in the Bible should just be translated as "Judean" or "Judahite" as that's what it really means anyway. But this is only correct for the OT usage. In fact, the NT uses a *different* word to denote "people of Judea"—G2449, *ioudaia*. And a *Judean* might be one of descent from the tribe of Judah, or one living in the land of Judah (Judea), or as mentioned before, an *Edomite*. So it's ambiguous as well. The translators did their best with the Greek in interpreting it honestly into the English, and that's all we can ask from them. Understanding the meaning is left to us. But in like manner must we treat [Ioudaios](#), the word for *Jew/Jews*. In fact it's analogous to the NT word for "[law](#)"—effectively non-specific, as in most cases it's found without an identifier (e.g., "mosaic law", or "ceremonial law", or "moral law"). It's often just "*law*". Not being cognizant of HOW Paul, for example, is using the word can lead to a bewilderment of doctrine—and frequently has.

So we are left to our own devices, it seems, in discerning what the Bible means with the word *Jew*... And how it compares with our modern understanding of the word. But it's not an unsolvable puzzle.

Today I find it most irritating to hear the oft repeated, "Jesus was a Jewish Carpenter"... He was not **Jew-ISH**. He was only a *Jew* in the sense that He was a Judahite (of the tribe of Judah), yet he was not a Judean, but a [Galilean](#) (as were all of the disciples). We therefore need to be careful in calling Jesus a "Jew". It's not typically biblical, nor is it historical. Furthermore, you will never find a modern Jew who would refer to Jesus of Nazareth as "Jewish"—and hard-pressed to find one that would even refer to Him as a "Jew" at all. Indeed, I believe the common Talmudic imprecation is that Jesus was actually a "[goy](#)", and a *usurper*, and many more blasphemous and detestable things which I shall not repeat. But not a Jew. They are insistent that He was not one of *them*. This is also revealing.

In fact the term "Jewish" is itself a bit of an etymological enigma. We know what it means, although it's hard to define technically—much like pornography—we know it when we see it. Commonly speaking, we understand *Jewish* to mean "of the Jews' religion or culture". Hollywood executives, dreidels, yarmulkes, Zionism, the State of Israel, Barbara Streisand, etc. ...these are *Jewish*. Jesus was none of these things.

The fact is Jesus never once referred to Himself as a "Jew" in the Bible. He was called the "King of the Jews" in all four Gospels, and He confessed that He was that King (Mark 15:2). But that

He *was* a Jew (of Judah), we know. Also, both Peter and Paul refer to themselves as a “Jew” in the book of Acts, but in those instances it is clear they refer to their nationality.

Those instances of Peter and Paul as “Jews” deserve a moment of inspection. Please see Acts 10:28, 21:29, and 22:3. We see the clear intent there. And an interesting occurrence happens in the book of Galatians when there is a dispute of Peter and Paul over Peter’s doublemindedness between the “gentile” Christians and his Jewish homeys...

*“But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, **being a Jew**, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? **We who are Jews by nature**, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ...”(v.14-16)*

Here Paul demonstrates this use of the word as it applies to themselves.. *Jews by nature* (G5449 *physis*)—by birth or physical origin. It also reveals the beginnings of Paul’s divergence from his Jewish ways—“*living as do the Jews*”. The worm was beginning to turn...

Later, Paul goes on to say he was a “Hebrew of the Hebrews”, a Pharisee, and technically a Jew in [the negative sense](#). That was his old life; the *old man*. The new man said this: “*And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews.*” Perhaps that means he wore the yarmulke. Yet after being converted unto Christ, he’d begun to renounce his former *Judaism* as worthless, “counting it but dung” (Phil 3:8). Eventually, he became the angry and crusty anti-Semite that we know today, utterly rejecting the unbelieving Jews—even warning his followers away from them, calling them “**the concision**”. This was an interesting cussword (*katatomē*)—used only once in the NT, meaning “the mutilation”—a derogatory reference to ritual circumcision! (Read that rhetorically friends). Yet, Paul, as he matured in Christ, began to renounce everything that was once [Jewish](#) about him, including his own circumcision (nothing could be done about that!), and even later, [baptisms](#). He concludes:

*For **WE are the concision**, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.* (Phil 3:3)

And again,

*For **he is NOT a Jew**, which is one outwardly; neither is that concision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and concision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.* (Rom 2:28,29)

In other words, as Paul [begins to say](#) later in another way, ‘Not all Jews are Israel, and not all Israel are Israel’.

Paul is here alluding to something profound, and we are close to solving the puzzle... As the Old Covenant age was passing away, so too were the “Old Covenant people”. That is, the *identity* of those people who would inherit the Kingdom in the New Covenant Age would NOT be the *Jews* of the former age. Christ had said in Matthew 21 that He would “give the Kingdom to another [nation](#) which would bring forth the fruits thereof.” We need to reconcile the fact that He came “but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” because *that was to whom the Promise was made*. But that’s not the end of it. Jesus was to be the [Savior of the World](#). The New Covenant revealed that **paternity would no longer be the identifying mark of the People of God**.

We’ll conclude this part of the study with a comparative passage from John’s gospel which I think will be enlightening. Interestingly, the concepts of the racial distinction of Christ and that of the “Jew” converge here for both the ‘Israel-Identity’ Christians and the Evangelicals alike. This passage is often used by the churchians, in fact, as the proof-text that ‘Jesus was a Jew’. Let’s look at it and draw some conclusions, for I think it will reveal quite the opposite of what is usually presumed... It is the story of the Samaritan woman at the well of John chapter 4.

*Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, **being a Jew**, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.*

Well, how did she know He was a “Jew” (rather than a Samaritan)? The Samaritans were a mixed people, but largely of the stock of Israel as these were the descendants of those who were left in the land when the Assyrians conquered and carried away the Northern Kingdom of Israel (many of the poor were left behind). But the peoples they’d mixed with were largely Hellenistic (Greeks)—Mediterranean Europeans (fair skin, light eyes, brown to blond hair). Contrary to popular belief, true racial Judahites did not look like modern Arabs. They were Israelites, after all, just as the Samaritans predominantly were, and they appeared racially similar. Not surprisingly, I don’t have an answer to this question. But I’m not sure it’s important. The fact is, she was clearly referring to Jesus’ *nationality* with her question, rather than his religion.

And this is what *is* important, because then Jesus says a curious thing to her:

*Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: **for salvation is of the Jews**.*

Without a doubt, whatever Jesus meant by that, He did NOT mean salvation would come from *Judaism*, nor that the current Temple worship in Jerusalem would save anyone, and nor did He mean that modern Jews in the State of Israel would be the promised Kingdom of God. Rather, that salvation would come from the *Jews’ Messiah*, which He then confessed to her that **He indeed was** (John 4:21-26).

And she believes on Him and begs him to stay in their city, which He does, preaching to those Samaritan mutts for two days... After which, the men of the city said, and here is the point:

*And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, **the Saviour of the world** (John 4:42)*

This important incident leads us to one final thought. It occurs in John 8 in which Jesus is debating with the *Jewish* Pharisees (whom He'd just told were of "their father, the devil"), and they oddly call him a "Samaritan"...

*Then answered the **Jews**, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a **Samaritan**, and hast a devil? (John 8:48)*

In this sense of the word here, "*Jews*" definitively DOES NOT mean 'of the tribe of Judah', rather Jesus is making a very important distinction to the Pharisees. It is here:

*Then said Jesus to **those Jews which believed on him**, IF ye continue in my word, THEN are ye my disciples indeed.*

This is the key to the whole passage, and to this discussion. Jesus was speaking to *two groups*, both called *Jews*. One was legitimate, the other, a fraud. We know which is which by those who heard and believed on Him, and those who did not. To the Pharisaic Jews, He said this:

*If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word... Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do... He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.*

They were obviously not the children of the Promise.

The Pharisees He was arguing with were Edomites. They called Jesus a Samaritan because he *looked* like a Samaritan (Israelite) and *unlike themselves*.

That racial distinction being made, we now need to realize that it only had a *temporary* application to the identity of the true "Chosen of God". We'll see in Part Two how this has been twisted in meaning, and stretched into an age where it no longer belongs. But it also must be pointed out (as some do not understand this) that Jesus was NOT the genetic spawn of Mary, a Judahite, and God the Father. There was no physical hereditary descent. He [\*took upon himself\*](#) a body "**like unto His brethren**". Jesus was a manifestation of God. He became Flesh in order to become the [\*sacrificial lamb\*](#). He is not any specific flesh, but as God Incarnate, transcends earthly distinctions. And now, as [\*Paul said\*](#), "*we henceforth know Him not after the **flesh**.*"

In contrast, the Jews of today are RACIAL SUPREMACISTS. They do not trace their lineage back through Judah, or Isaac (and most not even through Abraham—or even believe in his historical existence). See [The Thirteenth Tribe](#), written by a Jew. But like gypsies, they are a racially cohesive group with a common ideology that spans millennia. Their *Judaism* unites them whether they practice it or not. Some have cared to sort out their genetic origins, but for most their ultimate ancestry is irrelevant—rather they believe in a metaphysical ethnicity, and they've been very careful over the centuries to maintain it with their deliberate inbreeding. The FLESH is ALL that matters to them.

The Jew of the Bible is not *one thing*. It is many things. But it came to be one thing. In time, once the Kingdom was established and the New Covenant Age had begun, the former *Jew* as the people of God in Christ's time became a Christian and *left that name for a curse*. The remnants of a former nation of misbred people, the sons of their "father the devil" probably emerged on the other side of the Roman desolation as stragglers, and by and by mixed themselves with other peoples and began to take up residence among the nations which arose out of the fallen Roman Empire. They kept their cultic Babylonian religion and carried with them the ember of that ancient feud of Esau and Jacob, cherishing it... Likewise, their eternal hatred of Jesus Christ. But, [Changelings](#) as they are, concealed their identity and enfolded their ideology into the "church" over the centuries as "the leaven of the Pharisees" began to leaven the whole loaf in an [evil analogy](#) to Christ's Kingdom.

The mystery of that now cursed name which was "left unto them" may possibly be understood in the great effort the Jews have undertaken—and appear to be nearing success—in causing God's People to accept a lie. In re-imagining the Gospel of Jesus Christ as "Judeo-Christianity" they have attempted to *reapply* that name to their enemies in a cosmic game of "tag"—*your it*.