

4

Who Were the Galileans?

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, we had an overall look at what Judean identity entailed in the first century. Now the question must be asked, how does Galilee fit into this overall picture? This question is important as the eventual focus of our study, the hypothetical source Q, has been plausibly located in Galilee, in particular along the north-western shore of the lake in Capernaum. It is for this reason that the cultural characteristics of Galilee be treated separately. As we shall attempt to demonstrate, there was a fundamental continuity between the people of Galilee and that of Judea. There was a continuity in terms of that both shared the same cultural heritage, and importantly, both occupied the ancestral *land* of Israel. Although geographically it was separated from Judea (only by a few days walk) and was at times ruled politically separate from Judea, culturally, first century Judeanism was not some foreign import into Galilee.

Our focus will here, as in the previous chapter, be on the question of ethnic identity, hence our investigation is not aimed at doing a detailed historical reconstruction of the region. We can mention that the situation of Galilee was very different in the early history of Israel. Originally it was the territory of the tribes of Naphtali, Zebulun and probably Issachar as well (Jdg 5:7-21). In time they became subordinated to the monarchy and Temple in Jerusalem, and after Solomon's death (931 BCE), became part of the northern kingdom of Israel (1 Ki 12), although there was persistent rebellion against kingly rule (Horsley 1995:23-25). What is of critical importance is what happened to these tribes after the conquest of the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser in 733/2 BCE. Did many of these Israelites remain behind and survive across the generations until the first century CE?

4.2 THE GALILEANS AS DESCENDANTS OF NORTHERN ISRAELITES

Horsley is one scholar in particular who understands the people of Galilee in our period as descendants of northern Israelites. He is aware of surface surveys that seem to demonstrate that after the campaigns of Tiglath-pileser III, Lower Galilee was devastated and that virtually the entire population was deported. "Yet continuity of the Israelite population seems far more likely, despite the fragmentary evidence and often inferential interpretation on which the hypothesis is based" (Horsley 1995:26). So Horsley argues that the vast majority of the peasantry would have been left behind.

Horsley continues by tracing the separate historical development of Galilee from Judeans in the south and Israelites in the central hill country until it came to be part of the Hasmonean, and eventually Roman political system (Horsley 1995:27-157). Throughout this period the Israelites of Galilee would have cultivated their own oral traditions. Josephus also ordinarily distinguishes between "the Galileans" and "the Judeans", and in certain instances he even indicates that the Galileans were a separate *ethnos* from the Judeans (War 2.510; 4.105).¹ In the time of the Hasmonean expansion, they were subjected "to the laws of the Judeans", but even long after this annexation there is evidence that the distinctive Galilean traditions and customs continued. But

¹ In his other major work on Galilee, Horsley (1996:27) actually states that ordinarily "Josephus makes clear distinctions between the Galileans and Idumeans and Judeans as separate *ethnoi* or peoples".

kinship and shared traditions would have been factors in the incorporation of Galileans under the Hasmonean-Judean Temple state.

As descendants of northern Israelite tribes the inhabitants of Galilee would have shared with the Judean temple-state traditions such as the exodus story, the Mosaic covenant (including the sabbath), stories of independent early Israel prior to the Solomonic monarchy and its temple, and certain traditions akin to some of those subsumed in the Judean Torah and early sections of the Deuteronomic history (including circumcision, ancestor legends, victory songs) ... Nevertheless, even as descendants of Israelites, the Galileans would have found “the laws of the Judeans” different from their own indigenous customs and traditions ... [T]hey had undergone more than eight centuries of separate development.

(Horsley 1995:50-51)

So the Judean Temple, its dues, and the role of the high priest was something foreign to the Galileans and was superimposed on their own customs. This means that for the Galileans to have been incorporated into the Judean Temple-state, it would have required an intense program of social engineering. “For that to have happened, the officers or retainers of the Hasmonean government ... would have had to undertake a program of resocialization of the Galileans into the Judean laws as well as a detailed application of the Judean laws to local community life”. But Horsley continues; “A survey of the subsequent history of the Hasmonean regime and its governing activities suggests that little such effort could have been made in Galilee” (Horsley 1995:51, 52). Indeed, even the period after Hasmonean rule would not have been conducive for “the law of the Judeans” to take a firm hold over Galileans. The Galileans continued to assert their independence from the principal institutions of Jerusalem rule such as the revolt that occurred after Herod’s death. Even during the Great Revolt, high priestly-Pharisaic council in Jerusalem through Josephus commanded little authority in Galilee. Horsley (1995:156) basically concluded that there is little evidence to indicate that either the Judean Temple-state, or the Temple and Torah “established a defining importance for life in Galilee during the time of Jerusalem rule”.

4.3 GALILEE AFTER THE ASSYRIAN CONQUEST

The critical issue is what happened in Galilee after the campaigns of the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III in 733-32 BCE. Were there indeed some northern Israelites that continued living in the area? 2 Kings 15 claims that Tiglath-pileser III conquered Hazor, as well as Gilead, Galilee and the land of Naphtali, and led the population into exile in Assyria (2 Ki 15:29). Fragmentary Assyrian texts offer the complete names of Hannathon and Merom, and give four numbers of people being exiled from Galilee (625, 650, 656, and 13 520) (Reed 2000:28). This evidence in itself is ambiguous,² but a recent surface survey of Lower Galilee, “when coupled with the results of stratigraphic excavations in Upper and Lower Galilee, paint a picture of a totally devastated and depopulated Galilee in the wake of the Assyrian campaigns of 733/732 B.C.E” (Reed 2000:29; cf 1999:90-95). The survey of Lower Galilee found no evidence of occupation from the seventh to sixth centuries (Iron Age III³) at any of the eighty or so sites inspected. Surveys also illustrate that even Upper Galilee was not spared by the Assyrians. This leads to the conclusion that Galilee was depopulated in the wake of the Assyrian conquest. Horsley’s (1996:23) objection that the sites where the surface surveys have been conducted were not subjected to systematic excavations is

² It is said in 2 Chr 30:10-11 that in the time of Hezekiah (ca 727-699 BCE), members of Asher, Manasseh and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem. This may suggest that some northern Israelites in Galilee remained in the area.

³ The chronological periods employed by archaeologists and historians are as follows (cf Reed 2000:21):

Iron II	1000 – 733/32 BCE
Iron III	733/32 – 586 BCE
Persian	586 – 332 BCE
Early Hellenistic	332 – 167 BCE
Late Hellenistic	167 – 63 BCE
Early Roman	63 BCE – 135 CE
Middle Roman	135 – 250 CE
Late Roman	250 – 363 CE

legitimate, although other stratigraphic excavations conducted confirm that Galilee was abandoned in the seventh and sixth centuries. Conflagration layers dated to the end of the eighth century are found at many sites in and around Galilee. A few sherds have been found at Gush Halav, otherwise the evidence is limited to a few structures in Hazor (the Huleh Valley) and Tel Chinnereth (north-western shore of the Sea of Galilee) which were probably Assyrian military or administrative buildings. But there is no evidence for a surrounding population (Reed 2000:30-31). An Assyrian-style decorated bronze cup further points to an Assyrian presence in Kefar Kanna (Chancey 2002:33). Generally, however, there

was simply an insufficient amount of material culture in Galilee following the campaigns of Tiglath-pileser III for serious consideration of any cultural continuity between the Iron Age and subsequent periods ... There are no villages, no hamlets, no farmsteads, nothing at all indicative of a population that could harvest the Galilean valleys for the Assyrian stores, much less sustained cultural and religious traditions through the centuries.

(Reed 2000:32)

The above picture is in keeping with Assyrian policy which often deported all classes of people to Assyria or other regions for agricultural labour. Reed (2000:34) concludes that the position of Horsley that an Israelite village culture spanned the Iron Age to Roman periods “must be abandoned”. Chancey (2002:34) refers to various texts that assume the presence of Israelites in Galilee (2 Chr 30:10-11; 34:6; 2 Ki 21:19; 23:36) in addition the archaeological evidence for Assyrians, but he too concludes that for the most part Galilee was unpopulated. Claims of a continuity between the pre-Assyrian conquest and Second Temple population “are difficult to maintain” (Chancey 2002:34). Archaeological evidence further illustrates that Galilee was resettled during the Persian and Early Hellenistic periods, but even here the evidence is limited and the ethnic identity of the people is difficult to determine (Reed 2000:35-39). Josephus’ description of Hyrcanus’ defeat of Scythopolis describes that Galilee was open for resettlement, which implies that no other major defensible Gentile sites were present in Galilee, or alternatively, that it had a small population (Ant 13.28; War 1.64). Chancey (2002:36) similarly argues that the interior of Galilee “was still relatively sparsely populated on the eve of the Maccabean campaigns.”

4.4 THE SETTLEMENT OF GALILEE IN THE LATE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

We now move ahead to the history of Galilee during the Hasmonean period. According to 1 Maccabees, news came from Galilee that Galilean Israelites were persecuted by people from Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon and *πᾶσαν Γαλιλαίαν ἄλλοφύλων*, “all Galilee of the foreigners” (1Mac 5:14-22).⁴ Based on the archaeological evidence reviewed above, it should not be assumed that these people were descendants of northern Israelites. In fact, it is said that the Judeans deliberated on how they should help “their brothers” (*τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν*; 1 Mac 4:16), thus implying that these Galileans were Judeans themselves. 1 Maccabees explains that Simon went to help these Galileans and so defeated the Gentiles with three thousand men. The people of Galilee, but evidently not all of them (cf Chancey 2002:41), were brought back to Judea (1 Mac 5:23), although Horsley (1995:40; but see 243) expresses doubt as to the historical veracity of this incident. It could well be that these Galileans settled in the area sometime after the Babylonian exile. Gamla, located in the Golan Heights, was resettled in 150 BCE after being uninhabited for centuries. Syon (1992) conjectures that the settlers of Gamla were Judeans (“Jews”) from Babylon and we may infer a similar situation for the people of Galilee (Josephus, however, speak of Gamla’s conquest by Alexander Jannaeus; War 103-5; Ant 13.393-97).

1 Maccabees 11:63-74 and Josephus (Ant 13.158-62) relate that later on Demetrius III encamped at Kedesh in the western part of Upper Galilee (ca 144 BCE). Josephus (Ant 13.154) specifically says that it was Demetrius’ intention to draw Jonathan to Galilee, as the latter would not allow the Galileans, “who were his own people, to be attacked”. So not all the people of Galilee were evacuated by Simon, and importantly, Josephus understood the Galileans to be Judeans. Jonathan in response attacked the forces of

⁴ *Γαλιλαία ἄλλοφύλων* also appears in LXX Joel 4:4. Along with 1 Maccabees 5:15, this phrase refers to the coastal regions that surrounded Galilee which were dominated by Gentiles. In the LXX, *ἄλλοφύλος* is frequently used to translate “Philistine”, although literally it means “foreigner”, and was later used for “Gentile” (e.g. Ant 1.338; 4.183; War 5.194; Ac 10:28) (Chancey 2002:37-39). This phrase is probably an allusion to *galil ha-goyim*, “circle of the peoples”, in Isaiah 9:1 (*Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν* in LXX Is 8:23). According to Horsley (1995:20), “circle of the peoples” was likely “a reference to the ‘peoples,’ ‘city-states,’ and other rulers who surrounded and competed for political-economic domination in the area”. When it comes to the region of Galilee itself, the Hebrew term *ha-galil* was probably a shortening of *galil ha-goyim*. “Galilee of the Gentiles” occurs very rarely in ancient literature and the single word “Galilee” was the region’s common name (Chancey 2002:170-172).

Demetrius twice; once in the plain of Hazor in Upper Galilee pursuing them back to Kedesh, and at Hammath in Lebanon (1 Mac 11:24ff).

It was much later when the Hasmoneans took actual control of northern Palestine. The account of Josephus does not make explicit reference to Galilee. It is said that Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE) “made war on the Itureans and acquired a good deal of their territory for Judea and compelled the inhabitants, if they wished to remain in the country, to be circumcised and to live in accordance with the law of the Judeans.” This is according to Strabo (who follows Timagenes) who is used by Josephus (Ant 13.318-19). According to Horsley (1995:41), in this scenario the “territory acquired for Judea” must have been (part of) Galilee. But were there Itureans based in northern Galilee? Josephus does not specify Galilee as the locale and the archaeological evidence does not support the presence of Itureans in Upper Galilee, their settlements being limited to the Hermon Range and the Lebanon Range and the northern Golan. According to Reed (2000:38-39, 54) this means that the conversion of the Itureans is not an important factor for assessing the ethnicity of the Galileans. In this scenario Horsley suggests an alternative interpretation, however, in that Josephus might be “correcting” his source(s) Strabo-Timagenes who assumed that Galilee was Iturean because it was ruled by Itureans. “Josephus’ ‘correction’ distinguishes between ‘the inhabitants ... in the land’ (*chora*) and their previous rulers, ‘the Itureans,’ on whom Aristobulus made war and from whom he wrested territory for Judea” (Horsley 1995:41). Building on the supposition that the Galileans were basically descendents of northern Israelites, Horsley subsequently understands the passage of Josephus (Ant 13.318-19) in that the Galileans were “subjected” in a political-economic-religious sense to the Hasmonean high priesthood in Jerusalem. The requirement of (re-)circumcision – what this means is not clear – for Galileans “is comprehensible as a sign of being joined to the [Judean] ‘body-politic’” and so the Hasmoneans “were now requiring peoples of subjected areas to accept new laws, the laws of the Judeans” (Horsley 1995:48, 49).

It is hard to detect any “correction” on the part of Josephus to his source(s), although it might well be that the passage of Josephus was relevant to some *Gentiles* that lived in Galilee (cf Horsley 1995:243-44). Chancey (2002:43-44, 47), who states that no archaeological finds indicate a massive influx of Itureans into Galilee, suggests that the Galilean population was a matrix of some Itureans, Phoenicians, and “Jews” (be they

northern Israelites or more recent immigrants). Based on his analysis, it is possible that the already circumcised Itureans who chose to remain behind subjected themselves to Hasmonean rule. Phoenicians and peoples of other Gentile stock were compelled to undergo circumcision, though many, based on the archaeological evidence chose to leave. The “Jews” presumably welcomed Hasmonean rule.

The above text of Josephus and the various interpretations that are offered is not very helpful. Simplifying matters is that who the original population was in Galilee is probably not that important as what occurred when the Hasmoneans took over the region. As already mentioned, Galilee was only thinly resettled during the Persian and Early Hellenistic periods after it was virtually depopulated. When the Hasmoneans took control of the region it began to experience an increase in sites and an overall population growth during Hasmonean rule.

The vast majority of stratigraphically excavated sites from the Roman-Byzantine Period contain their earliest recoverable strata, that is to say the earliest architecture and first significant pottery assemblage, from the Late Hellenistic Period or first century B.C.E. This is the case at Capernaum, Hammath Tiberias, Horvat Arbel, Yodefath, Khirbet Shema, Meiron, Nazareth, and Sepphoris ... The population of Galilee continued to increase through the Early Roman period, and several stratigraphically excavated sites reveal initial settlement around the turn of the millennium or in the first century C.E. This is the case at Beth Shearim, Nabratein, Chorazin, and of course, Herod Antipas's Tiberias.

(Reed 2000:40-41)

The numismatic evidence is also quite instructive in that beginning in the early first century BCE, a significant amount of Hasmonean, particularly Jannaean, coins were used by the people of Galilee, in addition to Tyrian coinage. This means that Galilee was economically and politically orientated towards Judea and that Galilee's population growth was connected to Hasmonean policies (Reed 2000:41-43; Chancey 2002:46).

Overall, the Hasmonean expansion northwards to Galilee must have been part of restoration hopes and the “greater Israel” ideology as referred to in the previous chapter.

The Tanak relates that the northern tribes failed to occupy the territories allotted to them (Jos 13:4-5; 11:8; cf Jdg 3:3). When Jonathan campaigned in the north against Demetrius, he went as far as Hammath, situated on the ideal border of the “greater Israel”. Freyne (2004:79) explains: “What the northern tribes had failed to accomplish, Jonathan, like a new Joshua, was achieving by military prowess in the name of reclaiming the allotted land”. We saw that Eupolemus, akin to Ezekiel, held hopes for an enlarged land. Combined with the military exploits of the Maccabees as set out in 1 Maccabees, Freyne (2004:79) argues that these samples of writers “indicate that the notion of ‘the land remaining’ was highly pertinent to the thinking and ideological legitimation of the Hasmonean expansion ...”. The Phoenicians to the north, and Rome’s advance in the east, however, made it impossible to realise the ideal boundaries as articulated by Ezekiel (Freyne 2001:301; 2004:80). But this land ideology, combined with the archaeological evidence for a depopulated Galilee, has led Freyne (2004:62) himself to abandon his earlier position (Freyne 1988:170) of a continued northern Israelite presence in Galilee, and says that by

the first century CE the successors of these Hasmonean settlers constituted the bulk of Galilean [Judeans], even if other elements, [Judean] and [non-Judean], had entered the mix as a result of the conquests and rule of Herod the Great and his son, Antipas. It is important to acknowledge, therefore, contrary to several modern claims about Galilean opposition to Jerusalem, that there was a strong attachment to the mother-city, its temple and customs, among Galilean [Judeans] of Jesus’ day.

(Freyne 2004:82)

4.5 THE CULTURAL CONTINUITY BETWEEN JUDEA AND GALILEE

This attachment, as described by Freyne, to Jerusalem, its Temple and customs, is verified by the archaeological record. The “thinking” of the Temple extended to Galilee as well, as will be seen in our investigation to follow. Apart from that, Galilee did experience a measure of Hellenisation as well, although it was mostly limited to public architecture, forms of government and the use of the Greek language. No Gentile cultic sites or shrines were present in Galilee during the Late Hellenistic Period. This means that the Hasmoneans did not tolerate Gentile religion, and even the Herodians later

showed a general sensitivity to the local people as no elements characteristic of Roman-Hellenistic religion were present during their tenure.

So what do the archaeological excavations in Galilee tell us about its people's ethnic identity? Importantly, the "Galilean's ethnic identity in the first century can be best determined by examining the material culture inside domestic or private space, since it indicates the populace's behavior and selection of artefacts". Reed (2000:44) continues by saying that the "archaeological artifacts found in Galilean domestic space are remarkably similar to those of Judea". Indeed there are four indicators pointing to a Judean religious identity: 1) the chalk or soft limestone vessels, 2) stepped pools or *miqva'ot*, 3) secondary burial with ossuaries in *loculi* tombs, and 4) bone profiles that lack pork (Reed 2000:44-51; 1999:95-102). The stone vessels indicate a concern for purity as the Mishnah prescribes that vessels made of stone can not contract impurity (m.Kel 10:1). Stone vessels are ubiquitous in Jerusalem and Judea, in Galilee and the Golan. Reina, a village north of Galilee, has also been identified as a centre of production for limestone measuring cups and other vessels (Chancey 2002:68). The stepped pools similarly indicate a concern for ritual purity.⁵ As already mentioned in the previous chapter, of the 300 plus *miqva'ot* discovered so far in Palestine, they are most frequent in Judea, Galilee and Golan, but only a few have been found along the coast and are basically absent in Samaria. These two indicators, along with secondary burial in *kokhim* or *loculi* tombs were distinctively Judean. The absence of pork in the bone profile is not evidence for Judean (as opposed to northern Israelite) ethnicity in itself, but when combined with the other indicators they form strong evidence for Judean religious identity as is also well established for Jerusalem and Judea in our period. The archaeological profile of private space of sites outside Galilee and Golan also lack the four religious-ethnic indicators discussed above. The conclusions for the ethnic identity of Galileans seem to be self-explanatory. So the settlement of Galilee during the Hasmonean period in the first century BCE and the Galilean material culture which match that of Judea

⁵ According to Kloppenborg (2000:257), *miqva'ot* in Galilee were restricted to places of priestly settlement, a few private homes, and sites identified with oil production. Galileans resisted or ignored an extension of purity practices. Chancey (2002:118) lists Sepphoris and Jotapata as places where *miqva'ot* have been found. Reed (2000:49-51) speaks of *miqva'ot* at Sepphoris, Tiberias, Yodefath, Nazareth, Gamla, Chorazin, Beit Yinan, Beth-Shearim, Har Arbel (?), Khirbet Shema and Sasa.

essentially rules out the possibility that Galileans were descendants of either [northern] Israelites or Itureans. Because of the evidence within domestic space, Hasmonean rule in Galilee should not be construed as a political-economic or administrative veneer over an indigenous Galilean population; wherever archaeologists have excavated, [Judean] religious indicators permeate Galilean domestic space in the Early Roman period.

(Reed 2000:53)

This archaeological profile corroborates the understanding that it is more likely that Judeans colonised the Galilee during the Hasmonean expansion (cf Freyne 2001:299) and/or overwhelmed the few prior inhabitants, regardless of who they were, but the point is that Galilee's population "adhered to or adopted patterns of behavior in private space that is also found in Jerusalem and Judea, so that in terms of ethnicity, the Galileans should be considered [Judean]" (Reed 2000:53). Also the view that Galilee had many Gentiles (e.g. Fitzmyer 1992) must be abandoned. Any significant Gentile presence in the first century is not attested by the archaeological record (Chancey 2002:117-19). This stands in glaring contrast to the surrounding regions.

Literary sources and archaeological data corroborate each other in the images they suggest of the surrounding regions. These areas were predominantly gentile, though all had [Judean] minorities. The unanimity and clarity of the remains of paganism in these territories starkly contrast with the minimal evidence for paganism within the interior of Galilee itself.

(Chancey 2002:165)

4.6 GALILEE AND JUDEANISM: OTHER EVIDENCE

Other textual evidence, supplied to us mainly by Josephus, only compliment the understanding that Galileans were ethnic Judeans. For example, the attack of Ptolemy Lathyrus on Asochus, as it is described by Josephus (Ant 13.337-338), suggests that the Sabbath was already observed in Galilee at the beginning of the first century BCE. For now we will only concentrate on some relevant evidence applicable to the first century

CE.⁶ The examples discussed below have been used by Horsley to show that Galilean behaviour was rooted in Northern Israelite traditions, but as we shall argue here, they make more sense when seen within the context outlined above.

First, Judas the Galilean, in collaboration with Zaddok the Pharisee, spearheaded a rebellion in response to the requirement of Roman taxes (War 2.117f; Ant 18.1-10), using the slogan “no Master but God”. It would be strange for a Pharisee, one who is wholly committed to Judeanism, to cooperate with a Galilean who was not.

Second, a Judean (Ἰουδαῖος) of Galilee by the name of Eleazar, who had a reputation of being very strict when it came to “the ancestral laws”, required the circumcision of the king of Adiabene after the latter converted to Judeanism (Ant 20.34-48).

Third, Gischala was evidently the location of the production of olive oil that satisfied the demands of ritual purity. Judeans of Ceasarea-Philippi was supplied as they wanted to avoid Gentile food production (Life 74; War 2.591-93). This should not be seen as some foreign cultural import into Galilee from the south. When combined with the presence of *miqva’ot*, the stone vessels found all over Galilee, and the fact that Reina was a centre of production for limestone vessels, it demonstrates that purity concerns were a common aspect of life in the region.

Fourth, when Gaius wanted to erect a statue of himself in the Temple in Jerusalem, Judeans and supposedly Galileans as well (Chancey 2002:54) protested by leaving their lands unsown, and so no harvest and payment of tribute would be possible (Ant 18.263-72; War 2.192-93). Evidently, the Galileans showed concern for the sanctity of the Temple, and certainly far more is involved here than merely making common cause “with the Judeans when faced with a threat to the basic covenantal principles they shared from ancient Israelite tradition” (Horsley 1995:71). According to Kloppenborg (2000:227), whose understanding of the Galileans is similar to that of Horsley, Tobit 1:6-8 suggests that most Galileans did not participate in pilgrimages. But Josephus takes for granted that a priest representing the Temple would have status among Galileans at

⁶ Not all the doings of Galileans will therefore be discussed. For example, Antipas’ palace was attacked in 66 that contained pictures of animals, but the mob responsible were not necessarily motivated by religious concerns (Life 65-66).

the outbreak of the revolt, especially so if they have outstanding credentials. Josephus also states that he refused priestly tithes offered to him by the Galileans (Life 63, 80, 195-98) (cf Freyne 2001:300; Chancey 2002:55-56). In addition, Josephus writes that the Galileans visited the Temple, “as was their custom” (Ant 20.118; War 2.232), suggesting the visits were regular enough from this region. Here Josephus is speaking of some Galileans, or alternatively, only one, that was killed by Samaritans while en route to Jerusalem. It must also be taken into account that a trip from Galilee to Jerusalem would have taken around seven to eight days. A pilgrim staying about a week in Jerusalem would then require a three week period away from home (cf Sanders 1992:130). Purely for logistical reasons pilgrimage from Galilee on a regular basis would not have been practical. Yet some Galileans did go on pilgrimage,⁷ even if they only came “by the hundreds” (Horsley 1995:145), which is being conservative.

We can also add to this that nowhere do our sources suggest that Galileans and Israelite Samaritans ever made common cause against a common ideological enemy, namely, the “Judeans”. The hostility between Galileans and Samaritans is properly explained if cultural and ethnic continuity existed between Judea and Galilee.

Fifth, when two renegade royal officials from Agrippa II sought to remain in Sepphoris in 66-67, “the Judeans” (τῶν Ἰουδαίων) demanded that they be circumcised and so conform to the customs of their hosts (Life 112-113, 149-154).

Sixth, Josephus dismissed his soldiers for the Sabbath in Taricheae (Life 159), in order not to cause offence for the city’s residents.

Seventh, Jesus son of Sapphias, the magistrate of Tiberias, took “the laws of Moses” (a Torah Scroll) into his hand whom he accused Josephus of betraying. Josephus himself states that he was suspected that his ultimate intention was “to betray the country to the Romans”, and that some Galileans attempted to kill him (Life 132-48; War 2.598-610). Here Galileans were accusing Josephus of betraying “covenantal nomism”, or of not being truly Judean. Naturally, the main focus would seem to be that the Roman control

⁷ The Gospels assume that the Temple was a natural place of worship and pilgrimage for Jesus the Galilean. Luke also mentions some Galileans who were killed by Pilate in Jerusalem (Lk 13:1).

of the land is in opposition to the “laws of Moses”, an opposition which Josephus is recognised not to uphold.

Eighth, Tiberias boasted a “prayer-house”, which was a regular feature of Judean communities in the Diaspora (Life 277, 280, 290-303), and we would add the existence of a synagogue at Capernaum (Chancey 2002:104).

Horsley’s (1995:152-155, 172; cf Kloppenborg 2000:223-234) subtle hermeneutics in order to illustrate that the above texts of Josephus are not indicative of Galilean Torah observance, that is, of “the laws of the Judeans”, is difficult to accept. Rather than merely attesting to basic covenantal traditions common to Israel in general, when seen in conjunction with the overall archaeological profile of Galilee, these texts make perfect sense in that the Galileans shared the same symbolic universe as Judeans to the south. There is a concern for ritual purity, for Judean religion and covenantal praxis, and of course, the land. Also conspicuous by its absence is Horsley’s inability to rally any evidence where “the Galileans” give any concrete opposition to the Judean Temple or Torah as religious-cultural institutions. Reed (2000:540) also states that “Josephus’s ambiguous use of Galileans contrasts with his unequivocal description of Idumeans, Itureans, and Samaritans as non- or half-[Judeans]”. As we saw above, Josephus on occasion even refers to Galileans as *Judeans*. And we must also remember that Josephus refers to Judeans as Galileans, Idumeans and Pereans and distinguishes them from Judeans who were born and lived in Judea itself (War 2.43ff; cf Ant 17.254).⁸ So even if Josephus refers to the Galileans as an *ethnos* (cf Horsley’s argument above), it does not mean they were not Judean (cf Esler 2003:72-73).

We might add here, that as we shall see in the next chapter, the Q source that probably originated in Galilee often freely makes use of Isaiah, Daniel and the Wisdom traditions that originated in the “south”. There was no ideological conflict between Galilee and Judea on a religious or cultural level during our period and the interpreter superimposes it upon the evidence.

⁸ See introduction, pp. 3-4.

4.7 WOE TO CHORAZIN, BETHSAIDA AND CAPERNAUM

We will concentrate on these three towns because as we shall see in the next chapter, they have been plausibly identified as the location for the Q community, Capernaum in particular. Most of our information is available for Capernaum since it has been subject to extensive archaeological excavations, and is often referred to in the Gospels as the basis of Jesus' ministry.

Chorazin is identified with the site of Khirbet Karaze located in the foothills that rise above the north-eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. Archaeological excavations performed in the 1980's uncovered next to nothing of the first-century village (Yeivin 1987). It is claimed that a first century *miqveh* and synagogue has been found there (Reed 2000:51, 158; Shanks & Strange 1990), but according to Chancey (2002:105), all finds post-date the time of Jesus. The earliest pottery finds are dated to the late first or early second century CE.

Today Bethsaida is located by archaeologists on et-Tell (the Mound), about two and a half km from the shore of the Sea of Galilee. Luke places the feeding of the five thousand at Bethsaida (Lk 9:12-17). According to Mark Jesus cured a blind man there (Mk 8:22-25) and the location where Jesus walked on water happened close by (Mk 6:45-51). According to John 1:44 (cf 12:21), Peter, Andrew and Philip came from Bethsaida. The city was refounded by Herod Philip as the *polis Julias* around 30 CE most probably in honour of the wife of Augustus, Julia-Livia, the mother of Emperor Tiberius (cf Ant 18.28). It would have been more Hellenised than the surrounding villages. It is suggested that a Roman style temple has been found there which may have been constructed as part of the renaming ceremony. Two incense shovels have been found near the temple, and combined this evidence suggests that Bethsaida could have been a centre of the Roman imperial cult (Arav & Freund 1997; Arav et al 2000; Hengel 1979:16). Chancey (2002:108) questions this identification as incense shovels can be found in buildings other than temples and states that no cultic objects, altar or dedicatory inscriptions have been found. Generally, archaeological excavations have illustrated that Bethsaida was far more modest in stature and wealth than other Herodian cities, including Philip's own Caesarea located at the springs of the Jordan River. According to Chancey (2002:108), the archaeological finds do not tell us much whether

the city's inhabitants were Judean or Gentile. The Gospel texts infer that many Judeans were resident in Bethsaida and its surrounding villages and were culturally orientated towards Galilee. One must therefore consider that a lot of interaction took place between the Judeans of Bethsaida and Galilee, in particular Capernaum (Reed 2000:146, 184).

Capernaum, also known as Kefar Nahum ("village of Nahum"), appears frequently in the Gospels and is portrayed as the centre of Jesus' ministry. In Q (7:1), it is the only named place where a saying or act of Jesus takes place. In Mark, it is the scene of Jesus' first miracle (Mk 1:21), and thereafter it describes Jesus as being "at home" in Capernaum (Mk 2:1; 9:33). Matthew similarly states that Jesus "settled down" there (Mt 4:13) and calls it "his own city" (Mt 9:1). In Luke Capernaum is recognised as an important centre for Jesus' miracles (Lk 4:23), while the Gospel of John has Jesus stay in Capernaum for a few days after the miracle in Cana (Jn 2:12). He further healed the centurion's child there (Jn 4:46), withdrew to it and was sought by the crowds in Capernaum (Jn 6:17, 24), and John also has Jesus teaching in the synagogue (Jn 6:59). Other than this the Gospels say that fishermen lived there (Mt 4:12-22), suggest that a tollhouse was there (Mk 2:13-14; see with Mk 2:1), and make it the location of a "centurion" (Q 7:1-10; Jn 4:46-54).

Archaeologically there is no evidence of occupation for the site in the Iron II – Iron III Ages (1000-587 BCE), and the first significant evidence date to the Late Hellenistic Period, at the end of the second century BCE. This coincides with the rise in settlements during the Hasmonean expansion or colonisation of Galilee. Capernaum, along with other Judean villages, formed a bridge of settlements ranging from Galilee, across the Jordan into the Golan, which was surrounded by Gentile settlements and cities. "To the north, Itureans inhabited the mountainous regions of the Hauran and at the foot of Mount Hermon, and Syro-Phoenicians (Tyrians) had settled in the Huleh Valley and north of Upper Galilee; on the eastern shore of the lake were the territories of the Decapolis cities of Hippos and Gadara" (Reed 2000:145). During the reign of Herod the Great these diverse ethnic groups and cities to the north and east of the lake were united into a single political kingdom. Thereafter Philip, with the exception of the Decapolis cities, inherited the multi-ethnic area, including Judeans, to the east of the Jordan while Antipas received the Judean Galilee (War 2.94-100). The Jordan so formed both a natural and

political boundary between the territories of Philip and Antipas. Capernaum was therefore the closest site to Philip's territory, located about 4 km from the Jordan River and the residents must have interacted often with Judeans from Philip's territory (see above).

Interregional traffic through Capernaum, including Gentiles, would have increased with the founding of Tiberias in 18 CE and Bethsaida in 30 CE, so enhancing its role in the regional economy (Reed 2000:146-48). Laughlin (1993) points to the possibility of a first-century bathhouse, which may confirm the existence of a Roman centurion and garrison at Capernaum. He also argues that the village, of about 1 000 people, was quite prosperous while being home to Judeans as well as Gentiles. It is not clear whether the Gentiles are the Romans already mentioned, or others. But overall the archaeological evidence does not support the presence of Roman troops or many Gentiles in Capernaum, especially in the first century. The Roman-style bathhouse has been dated to the second century CE, and evidence for Roman Legionnaires at Capernaum dates to long after the First Revolt (Reed 2000:155-56).

Overall Capernaum lacks centralised planning, illustrating organic growth. Reed (2000:152) estimates that it would have had a population of between 600 to 1 500 people. The little evidence available for the archaeology of public and private space suggests that the inhabitants of Capernaum were Judean (Reed 2000:152-60). Most of the houses are clustered by threes or fours around a central courtyard utilising crude construction with local basalt stones and boulders and the roofs would have been made of thatched reeds (cf Mk 2:5). There are no buildings typical of a Roman-Hellenistic city and no evidence for expensive decorative elements. Neither are Gentile artefacts found connected to shrines and temples. The pottery is mostly common and each and every domestic unit revealed stone vessels, indicating concerns for purity. No *miqva'ot* have been found at Capernaum, but according to Reed (2000:50, 157-58) this can be attributed to the fact that the lake could be used for suitable immersion (m.Mik 1:1; 1:6) – indeed, with the exception of Tiberias, there is virtually a complete absence of immersion pools around the shore of the lake (Reich 1990). Also, where *miqva'ot* have been found in homes, they are restricted to the more wealthier urban homes in Jerusalem and Sepphoris. In the villages or rural areas immersion pools are more public in nature, sometimes attached to synagogues (e.g. Gamla and Chorazin) or near olive press

installations (e.g. Mansur el-Aqeb, Gamla and Yodefat) (cf Kloppenborg 2000:231-34), indicative of the socio-economic status of the resident Judeans. One may also suspect that with the lake providing suitable water for ritual immersion, “the arduous task of digging through basalt ground would diminish a family’s interest in having a private [*miqveh*]” (Reed 2000:158). Besides the scholarly scepticism that exists, we accept that Capernaum had a synagogue building as well (Shanks & Strange 1990; Chancey 2002:104; Lk 7:5).

4.8 SEPPHORIS AND TIBERIAS

In this section various aspects of these two cities will be discussed. Sepphoris and Tiberias had both a religio-political and socio-economic impact on Galilee, and both led to tensions that flared up before and during the Great Revolt.

Sepphoris had already been Galilee’s most important city. When the Romans took control of Palestine, Gabinius, the Roman proconsul of Syria, made it a centre for one of the five Judean councils in 63 BCE. Located in Lower Galilee it was perched on a hill “like a little bird” (Hebrew, *Zippori*; b.Meg 6a). After the death of Herod the Great, whose reign was met with fierce resistance in Galilee (War 1.315-16; Ant 14.432-33),⁹ Judas the Galilean, the son of the bandit leader Hezekiah (who was killed by Herod the Great), led an insurrection against Roman-backed rule. Judas armed his group with weapons from Sepphoris’ armory (Ant 17.271; cf War 2.56).¹⁰ Judas’ revolt was widely supported in Galilee and in retaliation, the Roman legate Varus destroyed the city and sold its inhabitants into slavery in 4 BCE for their role in the rebellion (Ant 17.288-89; War 2.68-69). The archaeological evidence, however, does not support Josephus’ claim that the city was destroyed and burned (Meyers 1999:114). Herod Antipas (4 BCE-39 CE), the new ruler of Galilee,¹¹ then rebuilt Sepphoris as the “ornament of all Galilee” and

⁹ Even those who went over to Herod (Ant 14.395), probably Hasmonean officers, were drowned by the Galileans in the lake (Ant 14.450) (Horsley 1995:139).

¹⁰ Some Galileans also went to Jerusalem during the festival of Pentecost to join the protests in Jerusalem after Herod’s death (Ant 17.254-55; War 2.42-44).

¹¹ After Herod Antipas, Galilee was ruled by Agrippa I (39-44 CE), where after a series of Roman governors followed: Cuspius Fadus (44-45); the Alexandrian Judean Tiberius Alexander (46-48); Cumanus (49-52); Felix (52-59); Festus (60-62); Albinus (62-64); Florus (64-66). But Nero transferred eastern Galilee around Taricheae and Tiberias to Agrippa II in 54 CE.

renamed it Autocratoris (“Imperial/Capital City”) and made it his capital (Ant 18.27). The Greek word for ornament (πρόσχημα) does not only imply beauty, but also has a military connotation, suggesting a fortification or impregnable city. Antipas then built a new capital, Tiberias, on the site of a graveyard on the western shore of the lake in 18 CE (Ant 18.37-38). Josephus explains that Antipas forced peasants from the surrounding villages and countryside to live in the new capital or otherwise offered people land. This also illustrates that the local population was Judean as they did not desire to be in a constant state of ritual impurity. These two cities were quite foreign culturally as the client ruler of the Romans demonstrated his cultural orientation by building them introducing Roman city planning as well as Roman-Hellenistic architecture – this is something that Galilee never experienced before. In Sepphoris, two main perpendicular streets have been uncovered, the north-south *cardo* (colonnaded main street) and the east west *decumanus*. The *cardo* in Tiberias is also indicative of Roman city planning (Reed 2000:90-91). The buildings and decorative elements used within the cities also represented Roman-Hellenistic culture. Since more information is available for Sepphoris, our investigation will focus on this city.

First of all, we will look at its public architecture in further detail. Sepphoris had a basilical building, and perhaps a bathhouse. Some interiors of buildings were decorated with frescoes. Yet at the same time some typical features of a Roman city are entirely absent (Reed 2000:95, 117-24; Chancey 2001:136; 2002:77). There is no evidence in the first century for a hippodrome, amphitheatre or circus, stadium, gymnasium, odeons, nymphaea, statues, monuments and temples typical of Roman cities. In relation to this we can mention that the coins that were minted at Sepphoris in 68 CE to illustrate its peaceful intentions during the revolt bear no pagan, or rather, Gentile motifs. This is similar to the coins that were minted by Antipas in Tiberias (Chancey 2002:91). The theatre probably dates to the late first or early second century CE (Chancey & Meyers 2000:24; Chancey 2002:75). Aqueducts brought water to Sepphoris, but this was of the more humble type, which were cut into the bedrock (Tsuk 2000). As can be seen from the above, Jerusalem, the geographical centre of the Judean symbolic universe, was far more Hellenised architecturally than Sepphoris.

Public architecture is of course more instructive as to the ruler’s cultural orientation than that of the ordinary people (Reed 2000:43). That is why we will now investigate the

archaeology of private space. Archaeological investigations have revealed that Sepphoris was overwhelmingly inhabited by Judeans (Chancey 2001; 2002:79-80).¹² The four religious indicators found all over Galilee are also present in the excavations conducted in Sepphoris. The inhabitants avoided eating pork, *miqva'ot* have been found,¹³ as well as stone vessels, and burial was in *kochim* or *loculi* tombs with ossuaries. Objections have been raised that the pools in Sepphoris be identified as *miqva'ot* (Eshel 2000), but it seems to be generally accepted that the pools are such (Meyers 2000; Reich 2002).

Batey (1992) points out correctly that the setting of Jesus' upbringing and ministry was more urban and sophisticated than previously thought, but he was incorrect to say that Sepphoris was cosmopolitan with a mixed population of Judeans, Arabs, Greeks and Romans. Contrary to this opinion held by some earlier, Sepphoris was a Judean city, although it did have some Roman-Hellenistic features especially in its public architecture and forms of government. So in terms of religious and ethnic indicators, although the people of Sepphoris would have been more "Hellenised" than rural Galileans, cultural continuity existed between the villages and the city (Reed 2000:117-38).¹⁴

Besides their religio-political impact, the construction of Sepphoris and Tiberias had quite a dramatic socio-economic affect in Galilee. Traditionally, Galilee was made up of small villages and hamlets from which peasant families worked their land. As with the rest of Palestine, Galilee was therefore a traditional agrarian society (Apion 1.60). With the construction of these two cities the demographics of Galilee changed dramatically over the course of a single generation. As consumer cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias

¹² Cf Horsley (1995:168) who argued that there is "little concrete evidence for Judean presence and culture in Sepphoris in the first century". But rabbinic traditions also preserve memories of Sepphorean priests that participated in the Temple cult (t.Yom 1:4; t.Sot 13:7; m.Yom 6:3).

¹³ Cf Sawicki (2000:99), who suggests that the presence of *miqva'ot* in Sepphoris may suggest that the residents "routinely incurred ritual impurity every day when they visited the municipal baths, but just as routinely grounded themselves in the right kind of water when they returned home to a Jewish house". Intriguing is her suggestion that Judean water architecture was a response to Roman water architecture such as aqueducts, public baths and decorative pools. As such the *miqveh* was a technology of symbolic resistance, "designed to correct the disruption of the circulation patterns for 'fluids' (water, food, caste, labor, ethnic identity) and 'containers' (women, men, pots) that the Romans had wrought ..." (Sawicki 2000:99-101).

¹⁴ According to Reed (2000:135) theories of Greek education or Cynic philosophical schools at Sepphoris are therefore implausible since the city was not home to a significant number of Romans or Greeks.

centred agriculture onto themselves, and as bases for the ruling and social elite, exacted rents or taxes from the countryside.¹⁵ Reed (2000:80, 82) estimates that Sepphoris had a population of around 8 000 to 12 000 inhabitants; Tiberias that of between 6 000 to 12 000 inhabitants. Self-sufficiency and subsistence of peasant farmers had to give way to paying tribute and taxes to support the administration, construction and population growth of these cities. Not having enough food left until the next harvest, at least some peasant farmers had to make loans and so became gripped by indebtedness. With time they were increasingly controlled by their creditors, some becoming their tenants, or they lost their land entirely, with some becoming day labourers, beggars or even bandits.

Although Freyne (1988:165-66) has argued that the level of oppression in Galilee was not on the level of that in Judea, and banditry, located on the border regions, was not a dominant feature of Galilean life in the first century. Neither do we hear of a destruction of debt records at Sepphoris such as occurred in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, tense urban-rural relations did exist which flared up during the Great Revolt, which will be further discussed below (Reed 2000:66-93; Horsley 1995:215-21). As with the Judean peasant farmers in the south, the economic control of the land and its produce by the Galilean urban elite must have been a violation of what impoverished Galilean peasants thought was theirs by virtue of the covenant. No wonder the imperial granaries were a source of dissatisfaction (Life 71, 118). Acts 12:20 also mentions that Agrippa I sold food to the coastal cities of Tyre and Sidon. These Roman-Hellenistic style cities, regardless of their Judean inhabitants, then much like Jerusalem symbolised social and economic control by the elite in collaboration with the Romans.

4.9 HELLENISATION AND THE USE OF GREEK IN GALILEE

In addition to the architectural character of Sepphoris and Tiberias, Hellenisation would have occurred due to the fact that Galilee was completely surrounded by Hellenistic cities. Acco-Ptolemais, Tyre and Sidon was located to the west and north-west, Panias-Caesarea Philippi, Hippos and Gadara to the north-east, east and south-east, and Scythopolis and Gaba to the south (cf Hengel 1989:14-15). It is even claimed that

¹⁵ Horsley (1995:218-19) suggests the Galileans were subject to pay tribute to three layers of rulers (tithes and offerings for the priesthood in the temple, Herodian taxation, and Roman tribute) which together amounted to over one-third of their crops. For more on this see the previous chapter.

Galilee had a “genuinely cosmopolitan flavour” based on its supposed economic ties with these regions (Porter 1994:135), but based on our analysis above, such a view is questionable. Several of these cities were recently founded or refounded in the Early Hellenistic period. Ptolemeis, Galilee’s nearest port, was refounded as a *polis*. On the periphery of Galilee several *poleis* were founded, including the Decapolis cities of Scythopolis, Hippos and Gadara. Naturally Gentile religion and customs came with it. For example, Scythopolis (Beth Shean) had two altars, one dedicated to Dionysus and the other to Serapis (*Biblical Archaeology Review* 1990). Once part of the Hasmonean kingdom, which did not tolerate Gentile religion, these cities were restored to their Gentile inhabitants when the Romans invaded Palestine. As such, the Hellenistic culture of these cities again surrounded Galilee in the first centuries BCE and CE. These cities, however, and in particular Scythopolis had sizeable Judean minorities, therefore living in a dominant Gentile culture. Horsley (1995:161-63) suggests that these surrounding cities had little cultural influence on Galilee, which came more from the local two cities which came to prominence during the rule of Antipas. But even in Chabulon, so Josephus suggests, there were houses that imitated the Hellenistic style of Tyre, Sidon and Berytus (War 2.504).

Based on the broader pattern identified in the previous chapter, however, the adoption of the Greek *language* by Judeans in Galilee must have also been in progress, and certainly the Gentile cities on the periphery of Galilee, and the two major cities located in Lower Galilee itself played their part in this process. Porter (1994:133) argues that “the evidence supports the idea that, besides their being a sizable number of first-language Greek speakers, there were a large and significant number of bilingual Palestinians especially in Galilee who had productive (not merely passive) competence in Greek and may even on occasion have preferred their acquired language, Greek, to their first language, Aramaic”. Porter bases his argument firstly on the geography of Galilee that was surrounded by Hellenistic culture. Second, the epigraphic and literary evidence points to the widespread use of Greek in Palestine, including Galilee (see previous chapter). Greek would have been the language of administration in Sepphoris and Tiberias. The centre of the fishing industry in Galilee had a Greek name, Taricheae (the Judean Magdala). Reed (2000:134) suggests that the more “Hellenised” Judeans of Sepphoris (we can add Tiberias as well) would have operated in a more bilingual atmosphere and so much of their life would have operated in Greek, while the rural

areas would have tended to be pronouncedly Aramaic.¹⁶ According to Chancey & Meyers (2000:33), however, there is very little evidence for the use of Greek before and during the time of Jesus. The first century evidence is as follows: (1) the Greek inscriptions on coins minted by Antipas, Agrippa I, and at Sepphoris during the Great Revolt; (2) inscriptions in Greek on two market weights, probably from Tiberias; and (3) an inscription near Nazareth, dating to the mid-first century CE, which warns against grave robbing. The hundreds of Greek inscriptions found at the Judean tomb complexes of Beth Shearim in south-western Galilee date mostly to the third-century CE and later. In fact, Chancey (2002:109) states that “only a few of the village’s tombs date to the first century CE, and these do not contain inscriptions”. Horsley states that recent surveys of inscriptions at seventeen sites along the western shore of the lake and in southern Lower Galilee found around 40 per cent in Greek, 40 per cent in Hebrew, and more than 50 per cent in Aramaic, suggesting “that some people of Lower Galilee were bilingual, knowing some Greek as well as Aramaic and/or Hebrew” (Horsley 1995:248). Otherwise very few inscriptions in Upper Galilee have been found in Greek, where Aramaic and/or Hebrew must have been more dominant.

From the above we can conclude that Greek did penetrate Galilee to varying degrees. This is true for the interior, especially Lower Galilee. The same can be inferred for the towns and villages on the outskirts of Galilee. For example, Beth Shearim, compared with other Galilean sites, was in close contact with Hellenistic cities such as Ptolemais. A similar situation is true of Capernaum, the likely location for Q, which was most probably written in Greek (see next chapter).

4.10 GALILEE DURING AND AFTER THE GREAT REVOLT

It is noticeable that the same religio-political and socio-revolutionary dynamics identified in the previous chapter that centred on Jerusalem also affected Galilee during the Great Revolt (66-70 CE). One can say that Galilee was almost a dress rehearsal for what

¹⁶ Evidently the Galileans had a peculiar Aramaic accent (Mt 26:73), something also hinted at in the Talmud. According to the Talmud, a Galilean went to the market place and asked for something called *amar*. The merchants ridiculed him by replying:

You stupid Galilean, do you want something to ride on (a donkey = *hamar*)? Or something to drink (wine = *hamãr*)? Or something for clothing (wool = *amar*)? Or something for a sacrifice (lamb = *immar*)? (b.'Erub 53b)

happened later in Jerusalem. Josephus was sent to Galilee by the council formed in Jerusalem to organise the region's defences, or more likely, to convince them to cease their rebellion. As a result, he was an eye witness to many of the events that transpired in Galilee, taking into account possible exaggerations and his self-serving interests in his various accounts.

First, the tense urban-rural relations that existed came to a head in this period. Sepphorites and (upper-class) Tiberians were prime targets for rural Galileans (Life 384). Sepphoris was attacked twice who even hired the bandit Jesus and his followers for protection (Life 104-11). Besides the negative economic impact that Sepphoris had, the city was probably also attacked for its pacifist stance during the revolt (War 2.574-75; 3.61-62; Life 348, 373-80). Early on, the city admitted a garrison of Caesennius Gallus' soldiers (War 2.511; Life 394), and later it accepted troops of Vespasian (War 3.31; Life 411). Coins minted during this period describes Sepphoris as a "City of Peace" (Chancey & Meyers 2000:33), which concurs with Josephus' statement that the city's people "thinks peace" (War 3.31). Josephus also states that the people of Sepphoris failed to defend the Temple "common to us all" (Life 348).

At Tiberias, the local residents, some sailors and the poor, joined forces with Galileans under the leadership of Jesus son of Sapphias, the city magistrate, and burned and looted the royal palace and killed "all the Greeks" – probably Syro-Phoenicians from the coast or Tyrian Plain. Afterwards Jesus and his followers led the active resistance at Tiberias and then at Taricheae, whose inhabitants we are told did not want to fight (War 3.492, 500-501).

Gischala, located in Upper Galilee was attacked by the people from Gabara, Sogane, Tyre and Gadara, who attacked them in return (Life 44). Later Gabara and Gischala formed an alliance. Presumably Gabara had similar problems with the peasants in their district as had Sepphoris and Tiberias (Horsley 1995:80). Gischala was under the leadership of John ben Levi, who later became Josephus' most important rival for control of Galilee. It must be remembered that Josephus describes John as a not so observant Levite (War 7.264), which nevertheless, still makes him a Judean!

As with the situation in Jerusalem later on, internal conflict had to refocus on the advance of the Roman army. Galilee was the first area of reconquest for the Romans during the first revolt. First on the Roman path of destruction were places like Chabulon (War 2.503-5; Life 213-14) and Gabara and the surrounding villages. At Gabara there was no-one who offered armed resistance, but Vespasian killed all the men and burned all the surrounding villages and towns (War 3.132-34). When the Romans finally sent troops to protect Sepphoris, it was used as a basis to subdue the surrounding villages and countryside. Roman infantry and cavalry enslaved and killed many in the process (War 3.59-63, 110). Jotapata, after a long siege, fell around June/July 67 CE. It should also be noted that Josephus describes the defenders of Jotapata as Ἰουδαῖοι (Chancey 2002:88). The inhabitants were killed or taken into slavery while the city itself was destroyed (War 3.141-288, 316-408). At Japha close to Nazareth, the Galileans even advanced to meet the Romans (War 3.289-306). Tiberias opened its gates to the Romans, who then took Taricheae (War 3.492-502), Gamla, located in the Golan Heights (War 4.1-83), and Gischala (War 4.84-120), who surrendered peacefully after John of Gischala escaped from the city. At Mount Tabor many offered resistance to the Roman reconquest (War 4.54-61) but to no avail. Vespasian had control of Galilee by the end of 67 (Jagersma 1986:141).

Horsley (1995:87-88) places great stock in the fact that the Galileans were continuously suspicious of Josephus and that the high priestly-Pharisaic council in Jerusalem could not assert their authority in Galilee during the Great Revolt. This can not be used as evidence, however, that the Galileans were not Judeans and were striving for independence. Even those of Judea were suspicious of some of their priests in Jerusalem and even killed them. It is also noticeable that nowhere are there reports in Josephus' accounts that "the Galileans" attacked any local "Judeans". They attacked the Greeks in Tiberias and also participated in conflicts with Gentiles in the regions surrounding Galilee (Chancey 2002:56, 132). After Galilee was taken by the Romans, some Galileans even went to Jerusalem to join the resistance there. It is difficult to see how in all of this that there was any attempt to assert independence from Jerusalem or Judeanism ("the laws of the Judeans"). In addition, based on the account given by Josephus, there were no extensive struggle between Galileans and Gentiles within Galilee, undermining any hypothesis that many Gentiles were present within Galilee itself. As already mentioned, there was fighting between Galileans and Gentiles in the

surrounding territories (Chancey 2002:132). In addition, the cities of Scythopolis, Hippos, Gadara, and Damascus killed many of their own Judean inhabitants while Gerasa refrained from doing so (War 2.457-80). We can assume that a lot of ethnic tension lurked beneath the surface that exploded in indignation during the revolt. Can we extrapolate from our review of the evidence that Galileans were also in pursuit of the millennium? It would seem to be the case, although some, such as the people of Sepphoris, the “city of peace”, preferred a more pragmatic approach to the revolt.

After the revolt, the western part of Galilee continued to be governed directly by the Romans as part of the province of Judea. The region around the lake was given back to Agrippa II, but after his death it also came under Roman jurisdiction. Evidently much of the land remained in the hands of Galilean peasants that remained, as it appears that Galilee was not taken as imperial land after the revolt of 66-67 (Horsley 1995:90-91). The Sixth Legion (Legio VI Ferrata) was reassigned from Syria to Galilee from around 120 CE and cohorts were stationed at Tiberias, Sepphoris and Legio. Rome was to make its unwelcome control of the region permanent. The pacifist stance of Sepphoris during the revolt was rewarded with close relations with Rome and by the time of Hadrian or Antoninus Pius it adopted the official name Diocaesarea (i.e. dedicated to the imperial Zeus, or “City of Zeus-Caesar”) (Horsley 1995:93, 165; Reed 2000:101; Chancey 2002:59-60).

After the assembly of Judean sages and priests at Yavneh, Lydda and Joppa in the wake of the Great Revolt (66-70 CE), some rabbinic schools appear to have taken shape at Usha and Beth Shearim in western Lower Galilee after the Bar Kokhba Revolt. Thereafter, around 200 CE, they established themselves more prominently in Sepphoris and Tiberias. With time Galilee became the centre of rabbinic activity, and eventually, the nucleus of rabbinic Judaism. But even when the Mishnah was compiled (200 CE), the rabbis did not provide leadership or did not have any substantial influence over the region (Horsley 1995:90-99, 181).

4.11 FINDINGS

Based on our overview, it seems clear enough that the overwhelming majority of first century Galileans would have operated within the exclusive realm of covenantal nomism.

They shared the same symbolic universe as those Judeans that live within Judea. Some evidently adopted the Greek language, yet their consciousness of difference vis-à-vis other peoples were objectified in the same religious and cultural practices. Based on Josephus, they observed the Sabbath, practiced circumcision, and went to Jerusalem on pilgrimage and were committed to the Torah. Tiberias had a prayer-house while we accept that Capernaum had a synagogue building. Otherwise Galilean religion and covenantal praxis are concretely expressed by the archaeological profile of private space, which is similar to that of Jerusalem and Judea. A concern for purity is evident in the discovery of *miqva'ot*, while stone vessels are ubiquitous throughout Galilee. Secondary burial with ossuaries is a further marker of distinct Judean religious practices, which is complimented by the bone profile that lacks pork. This profile is applicable to both the urban and rural areas of Galilee, although the cities of Sepphoris and Tiberias were more Hellenised in terms of its public architecture. But overall, the “thinking” of the Temple was also operating in Galilee.

When it comes to the land, the Hasmonean expansion to the north coincided with the “greater Israel” ideology. With the northern Israelite population deported after the conquest by Assyria, the increase in settlements and overall population growth during the Hasmonean period suggests that most of the first century Galileans were descendants of Judeans that moved to the region during the period of Hasmonean expansion. Importantly, Galileans, like their co-ethnics to the south, lived on the same ancestral land of Israel. The Galileans would therefore have had the same ancestry and historical memories as those living in Judea dating back to the Maccabean revolt, including the rule of the Diadochoi, the Babylonian Exile and beyond. They lived under the same “Sacred Canopy”, which would have given rise to hopes of restoration. Overall, the evidence combines to suggest that from the Hasmonean annexation of the territory, Judeans dominated the region (Chancey 2002:62). “Galilean [Judeans] had a different social, economic and political matrix than [Judeans] living in Judea or the Diaspora ... but they all were [Judean]” (Reed 2000:55).