MORTEN HØRNING JENSEN

Herod Antipas in Galilee

2nd edition

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 215

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

215

Morten Hørning Jensen

Herod Antipas in Galilee

The Literary and Archaeological Sources
on the Reign of Herod Antipas
and its Socio-Economic Impact on Galilee

2nd, revised edition

Mohr Siebeck

Morten Hørning Jensen, born 1972; 2001 M. Theol. (cand.theol.) from the University of Aarhus, Denmark; 2005 Ph.D.; 2006–2008 Postdoc from the Carlsberg Foundation, University of Aarhus; since 2009 Associate Professor at The Lutheran School of Theology, Aarhus.

eISBN PDF 978-3-16-151565-1
ISBN 978-3-16-150362-7
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.

1st edition 2006

The book was printed and bound by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper.

Printed in Germany.

For Jeanette

Preface to the Second Edition

I am very grateful for the opportunity of issuing a second print of *Herod Antipas in Galilee* with an updated bibliography. I am grateful to Henning Ziebritzki and Tanja Mix from Mohr Siebeck for smooth and professional cooperation throughout the process; to my doctoral supervisor, Per Bilde, for continuous support; to the international community engaged in Galilean studies for many fine discussions, not least at the annual SBL-meetings; to my wife and family for their indulgence towards me for my participation in conferences and excavations; and finally to the various reviewers of the initial print for their kind words, which have been of great encouragement to me.

In the years following the initial publication, I have been able to continue my engagement in Galilean research through first a three-year post-doc grant from the Danish Carlsberg Research Foundation in cooperation with the faculty of theology at Aarhus University, and now as associate professor at Lutheran School of Theology, Aarhus. Whereas *Herod Antipas in Galilee* focuses on Galilee mainly from "the top," my recent research has focussed on Galilee "from below" by tracking the socio-economic conditions and changes in rural Galilee. While being separate topics of research, they are also highly interconnected. I thus kindly refer the reader to my subsequent publications for updates and further discussion of a number of issues relevant not least to chapter 5 (listed in the bibliography). For further updates, see also the accompanying website, www.herodantipas.com.

Aarhus, May 2010 Morten Hørning Jensen

Acknowledgements

In 2000/01 I was given the opportunity to spend the academic year at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem as a graduate student. While initially pursuing the catchphrase *'The Quest for the Historical Jesus,'* I somehow ended up in 'Galilee.' In retrospect, this was a fortunate 'detour' that also kept me busy throughout the succeeding period of PhD study at the Faculty of Theology, University of Aarhus, Denmark in 2002–5. Not only has the issue of Roman Galilee provided an unrivalled opportunity for training in the classical deeds of source-oriented history writing, with a focus on such interesting areas as archaeology, Josephus studies, New Testament studies and rabbinica, but it also opened the door to a vibrant international research community in which – obviously – youth and ignorance are no hindrance to a warm welcome!

When currently publishing a revised edition of my dissertation, *Herod Antipas in Galilee,* submitted in August 2005, there is therefore a list of perso qns that I genuinely need to thank for their help and guidance. As my email archive reveals, a large number of scholars have taken time to discuss various issues with me, provided me with the unique opportunity to read through unpublished manuscripts, or even – outstandingly – commented on one or more chapters. I wish to thank Sean Freyne, Jürgen Zangenberg, Douglas Edwards, Steve Mason, Jonathan L. Reed, James F. Strange, Mordechai Aviam, Mark A. Chancey, John Dominic Crossan, Andrea M. Berlin, Danny Syon, David Hendin, Morgan Kelly, James S. McLaren, Milton Moreland, Douglas E. Oakman, Carolyn Osiek, Anders Runesson, Donald T. Ariel, Uriel Rappaport, Peter Richardson, Halvor Moxnes, Marianne Sawicki, John S. Kloppenborg, Nikos Kokkinos, Svend Fodgaard Jensen, Gunnar Haaland, Monika Bernett, Haim Gitler, Moshe Hartal, Yizhar Hirschfeld, and my colleagues at the Department of New Testament Studies.

A special thanks goes to my doctoral advisor, Per Bilde, for his continuous guidance and sincere interest in my project. During a year-long tutorial on Josephus' *Antiquities* 18 I profited tremendously from his great classical wisdom; and thanks to his consistently thorough response, each and every page of what follows benefited from his 'red-inked' error corrections and suggestions for improvement. For what remains of errors and shortcomings, I have solely myself to blame.

I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to the editor of the WUNT II series, Jörg Frey, for inviting me to present my dissertation at a conference in Munich as well as for accepting it for publication, to Jesper Tang Nielsen for mentioning my work to Jörg Frey, and to Henning Ziebritzki and the editorial staff of Mohr Siebeck Publishing House for competent guidance throughout the process of preparing the manuscript for publication.

I also want to express my gratitude to the research foundation known as Forskningsrådet for kultur og kommunikation, which has covered the main expense of my three-year employment as a PhD student; and to the Faculty of Theology, University of Aarhus, for providing me with such superior facilities for a PhD programme. Participation in several international conferences and three seasons of digging in the campaign in Tiberias directed by Yizhar Hirschfeld was made possible through the generous support of Aarhus Universitets Forskningsfond, Knud Højgårds Fond, Frimodt-Heineke Fonden, Brorsons rejselegat and Torben & Alice Frimodts Fond, for which I am deeply grateful.

I wish to conclude by explaining why this entire project is dedicated to Jeanette – the love of my life. The completion of the project has demanded a number of working hours beyond what is reasonable – not to mention periods during which I was abroad, leaving her alone with the responsibility for caring for our three children, Johanne, Benjamin and Oliver, and for this I am deeply grateful. At the same time, I have experienced a warm concern from her for the subject matter of this dissertation. During our visits to Israel together, we have both learned to treasure the historical, geographical and archaeological scenery behind the books of our Bible.

Aarhus, May 2006 Morten Hørning Jensen

Table of Contents

Part III: Assessment

Abbreviations and Preliminary Remarks

All translations of written texts and epigraphic material are, unless otherwise indicated, facilitated by the author. Greek and Latin texts are taken from the Loeb Library if nothing else is noted. The texts from the New Testament follow the Nestle-Aland 27th edition.

When referring to individuals from antiquity, I generally prefer the names that are commonly used in the research, though they may not reflect the actual names used in antiquity. Thus, Herod the King is referred to as 'Herod the Great,' though this term is only used in *Ant.* 18.103, 133 and 136, where it might just translate as "the elder" (cf. Feldman 1965, 89, note c and Richardson 1999, 12). Similarly, I refer to Herod the Tetrarch as Herod Antipas or just Antipas, although every coin and inscription we have uses the designation 'Herod the Tetrarch.'

In general, the book and the bibliography are formatted by following *The SBL Handbook of Style* (ed. P.H. Alexander et al., 3rd edition 2003) using its prescriptions regarding abbreviations of biblical books, ancient authors, ordinary abbreviations etc. In general, abbreviations apart from common ones are avoided, with the exception of the following:

ESI:	Excavations and Surveys in Israel.
IEJ:	The Israel Exploration Journal.
LS:	*A Greek-English Lexicon*, compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, 9th edition with supplements (1996), electronic version by Logos Bible Software.
NA 27:	*Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by E. Nestle and B. et K. Aland, 1993.
NEAEHL:	E. Stern, ed. 1993. *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.* 4 Vols. Jerusalem: Carta, The Israel Exploration Society.
PG:	*Patrologia Graeca.* Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.
TJC:	Meshorer, Y. 2001. *A Treasury of Jewish Coins: From the Persian Perod to Bar Kokhba.* Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press.

The time periods used follow *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East* (edited by Eric M. Meyers, 1997), the article "Periodization" (Herr 1997):

Hellenistic period:	332 – 63 BCE.
Roman Period:	63 BCE – 135 CE.
Middle Roman period:	135 – 250 CE.

Late Roman period:	250 – 325 CE.
Byzantine period:	325 – 640 CE.

References to figures concern the figures at the back of the present volume. Besides these essential figures, the book's accompanying website found at the url: www.herodantipas.com features the *Herod Antipas in Galilee Image Gallery* containing additional images grouped in the following categories: Tiberias, Sepphoris, Yodefat, Cana, Capernaum, Gamla, Scythopolis, Hippos, Caesarea Maritima and Picturesque Galilee. Most of the figures are also displayed in colour in the Image Gallery.

Tables and Figures

Full-colour versions of the figures are accessible on the website www.herodantipas.com.

Part I

Settings

Chapter 1

Approaching Herod Antipas

1.1 All Roads Lead to Galilee…

During the last three decades, the question of "Roman Galilee" has become an issue of intense interest, and the quest for its historical, cultural, political and religious secrets has had a magnetic attraction, uniting different fields of research such as historical Jesus research, Josephus research, research on Rabbinic Judaism, and archaeological field work. Broad 'roads of interest' lead to Galilee from each of these areas of study.

Although Galilee has always been an area of focus to some extent, at least for New Testament research,[1] this recent scholarly enterprise is an entity of its own catalyzed by two important factors. First, in 1980 Sean Freyne published his seminal work, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Freyne 1980b). Freyne's study provided, for the first time ever, a thorough one-volume investigation of the historical, cultural, political, economic and religious conditions of Hellenistic and Roman Galilee. Second, based on the socio-archaeological paradigm of 'New Archaeology' (cf. section 5.2), large-scale archaeological investigations were launched. In the 1970s, the 'Meiron Project' surveyed and excavated sites mainly in Upper Galilee.[2] In 1981, the director and co-director of this project, Eric

[1] Ever since Byzantine times, Galilee has attracted pilgrims as described in the travel reports of Egeria and elsewhere (cf. Wilkinson 1977; Wilkinson 1981). The European re-occupation of Palestine in the 19th century brought Galilee back into focus through several new travel reports authored by E. Renan, Condor & Kitchener and others (Renan 1991; Conder and Kitchener 1881, cf. the instructive presentations in Shepherd 1987; Freyne 2000c, 2–7 and Moxnes 2001b, 26–33). In the early 20th century, the question of the ethnicity of the Galileans created a fierce debate between those who followed Schürer's thesis of the Galileans as recently converted Itureans (cf. below), which taken to the extreme meant that Jesus was detached from Judaism since the "Galiläa heidnisch war", which means that "Jesus kein Jude war" (W. Grundmann, quoted after Freyne 1995, 599), and A. Alt, who argued that there was a continued Israelite presence in Galilee (Alt 1953, see further Bilde 1980; Freyne 2000c, 8–9 and Moxnes 2001b, 33–34).

[2] A list of the excavated sites during the Meiron project can be found in Meyers, Strange and Groh 1978, 7. The final reports are presented in the series *Meiron Excava-*

M. Meyers and James F. Strange, published the small, but influential book, *Archaeology, The Rabbis, and Early Christianity*, in which they summarized the impact which the archaeological fieldwork should have on studies of the social and cultural background for the Jesus movement as well as the rabbinical movement. The impact of archaeology on traditional text-based historical studies of Galilee became even more evident through the largest single excavation in Galilee, which began in 1983 and continues today: the excavation of Sepphoris conducted by teams from the University of South Florida, Duke University and the Hebrew University (cf. section 5.4).

Consequently, the question of 'the social world of Galilee' became a topic of discussion at international conferences conducted under the auspices of the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) and others. Four papers were published in the 1988 edition of the SBL seminar papers (Lull 1988). In 1989, the first international conference on Galilee was held at Kibbutz Hanaton in Galilee. The papers from this event were published in Levine 1992, covering questions related to Josephus, the New Testament, and archaeological and rabbinic studies. In 1996, the second international Galilee conference was held at Duke University in connection with an exhibit of archaeological finds from Sepphoris at the North Carolina Museum of Art. The papers from this conference were published in Meyers 1999, and a beautifully illustrated book with instructive articles accompanied the exhibit (Nagy 1996). In the meantime, Galilee had again been discussed at the SBL, and four papers focusing specifically on the relationship between archaeology and the historical Jesus quest were published in Lovering 1994. In 1997, an important collection of articles was presented in the festschrift to James F. Strange, *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Edwards and McCollough 1997a). As will become clear below, several independent articles as well as monographs were published in the same period. Most recently, a research programme entitled "Galilee, Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Galilee" was hosted by the University of Wuppertal and Yale University, including several conferences and a major final publication now published in Attridge, Martin and Zangenberg 2007.

---

tion Project Reports (ed. Eric M. Meyers), counting a total of six volumes covering the four main excavations of Khirbet Shema, Meiron, Gush Halav and Nabratein (all sites in Upper Galilee). See also Hanson 1980, 51 and Meyers 1997, 57–58 for additional lists of the excavated sites.

1.1.1 Historical Jesus Research

At the same time as the interest in Galilean studies began to spread, the so-called third quest for the historical Jesus gradually evolved. Compared with the two earlier 'quests' or phases, this third quest is marked by a clear interest in establishing a 'plausible' context around Jesus through which he needs to be interpreted (cf. Meier 1991, 167–195; Wright 1996, 85–86; Theißen and Winter 1997; Holmén 1999 and others). Freyne states as an example: "The Bultmann era of New Testament scholarship did not encourage research into the Palestinian background of either Jesus or his movement. Nor indeed did the so-called new quest for the historical Jesus, inaugurated by Ernst Käsemann in his now famous lecture of 1953, generate any particular attention in that direction either" (Freyne 2000c, 20). In contrast, the recent development in the historical Jesus research incorporates new material from the archaeological excavations and textual sources shedding light on first-century Palestine. Consequently, "there has been an explosion of interest in all aspects of the social world of first century Palestine" (Freyne 1994, 75, cf. also Wright 1996, 84–85; Reed 2000, 7).

Thus it is obvious that the descriptions of the social and cultural conditions of first-century Galilee constitute an important factor in the most recent historical Jesus research. As noted by Jonathan L. Reed: "Since descriptions of the realities in Galilee to a large extent determine the interpretation of Jesus' teachings and his life, it is not surprising that the renewed quest has witnessed variously shaded Galilees to make the competing descriptions of the historical Jesus more credible" (Reed 2000, 8). Similarly, Freyne states: "The quest for Jesus is rapidly in danger of becoming the quest for the historical Galilee" (Freyne 1994, 76). As the primary locus for the historical Jesus, Galilee provides *the* historical context, which has the potential to verify or undermine certain proposals about the historical Jesus. Incisively, Andrew Overman notes how Galilee has become "fodder and fuel for the Quest for the historical Jesus… Galilee is quickly emerging – in certain circles – as epiphenomenal to the Quest for the historical Jesus" (Overman 1997, 67).

1.1.2 Four Important Issues

The discussion within this lively and voluminous debate on Ancient Galilee has focused on several key questions, of which four stand out.[3] First, it

[3] It is not possible here to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the research history of the Galilean research as I was able to do in my MA thesis, *Galilæa på Jesu tid: En præsentation og vurdering af de sidste to årtiers Galilæa-forskning* ('Galilee at the Time of Jesus: A Presentation and Evaluation of the Last Two Decades of Galilean Research', Jensen 2002b). A summary of the archaeological contributions can also be found

has been discussed if Galilee was a special hotbed for revolutionary tendencies, and if the term οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι as used by Josephus in his *Life* should be interpreted as a technical term for revolutionaries. In short, the proposal of interpreting οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι as "a particular rebel group" (Loftus 1974, 183, cf. Zeitlin 1974; Loftus 1977–1978) did not resist the closer analyses performed by Feldman, Freyne and Armenti, who argue that the term is used mainly geographically by Josephus with an occasionally reference to the rural population as opponents to the city-dwellers of Tiberias and Sepphoris (cf. Freyne 1980a; Feldman 1981–1982; Armenti 1981–1982 and Feldman 1996, 111–113, cf. further section 3.3.8). In the context of Galilean research, the connected question of Galilee as a hotbed for revolutionaries has mainly been discussed by Freyne and Horsley. Aimed at the view of Horsley (Horsley 1979a; Horsley 1981), Freyne argues for a relatively quiet and stable Galilee with Antipas as a buffer against direct Roman rule, describing the few known upheavals as Hasmonean resistance to Herodian rule (Freyne 1980b, 190–192; Freyne 1988a; Freyne 1988b, 163–167). Of Horsley's many publications on this topic, Horsley 1988 (reproduced in Horsley 1995c) is interesting as a direct answer to Freyne. In this publication he agrees that Galilee did not witness a long-standing organized (zelotic) resistance group. However, building on Hobsbawn's idea of 'social bandits' defined as "a prepolitical form of social protest against particular local conditions and injustices" (Horsley 1995c, 259, cf. Hobsbawn 1969), Horsley maintains that Galilee witnessed such groups concerned with "righting wrongs" (Horsley 1988, 185).[4]

Second, the question of the origins of the Galileans has been debated as an inherited unsolved issue from the earlier nineteenth and twentieth centuries debates between E. Schürer, who argued that the Galileans were Iturean tribes converted by the Hasmoneans (cf. Schürer 1901, 275–276; Schürer 1907, 9–12, for instance), and A. Alt, who argued that the Galileans were remnants of the old Israelite tribes (Alt 1953, 363–435). On the basis of new archaeological surveys, such as Zvi Gal's survey on Iron Age settlements in Galilee (Gal 1992), and M. Aviam's on settlement patterns in the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman periods (Aviam 1993), this discussion seems to have been settled in favour of a third solution, namely that the Galileans consisted largely of newcomers from Judea, who moved to the area shortly before, during and after the Hasmonean takeover under Aristobulos (cf. Freyne 1997a, 72; Freyne 2000a, 177ff.; Freyne 1999, 42;

---

in Overman 1993, and a bibliographical survey has been conducted in Meyers et al. 1995. Shorter but highly instructive overviews can also be found in Freyne 1994; Freyne 2000c and Reed 2000, 1–22.

[4] For a more thorough treatment, see Jensen 2002b, 13–18, 75–76.

Reed 1999; Reed 2000, 23–61 and others). This seems to be the case, even though Richard A. Horsley has maintained the thesis of Alt (cf. Horsley 1995c, 19–61; Horsley 1996, 15–27; Horsley 1999 and others), and scholars arguing for a Jesus inspired by Cynic philosophy still operate within the old paradigm of Schürer (cf. below).[5]

Third, the most intensively debated issue concerns the question of the cultural milieu of Galilee. Freyne's study from 1980 advocated a picture of Galilee as a quiet, rural, isolated Jewish area with close connections to Jerusalem, to which the reign of Antipas brought stability and protection against "direct Roman intervention" (Freyne 1980b, 69, cf. Freyne 1988b, 155–156). The archaeological excavations conducted in both Upper and Lower Galilee have led archaeologists to describe the cultural ethos of Galilee in a radically different way from Freyne. In an early article on "Galilean regionalism", Meyers stated that a "more cosmopolitan atmosphere" prevailed in Lower Galilee (Meyers 1976, 95, cf. Meyers 1979, 689). Strange proposed that the expanding urban civilisation of Rome had resulted in an "Urban Overlay" of Galilee manifested most clearly in Sepphoris (Strange 1992c, 32, cf. Strange 1991). Richard A. Batey and Andrew J. Overman, assistants of Strange in the Sepphoris excavations, advanced this idea even further, stressing the "cosmopolitan atmosphere" of Sepphoris (Batey 1984, 251, cf. Batey 1991, 56), determining that "life in lower Galilee in the first century was as urbanized and urbane as anywhere else in the empire" (Overman 1988, 168, cf. also Overman 1993, 47). In turn, this picture of a cosmopolitan first-century Galilee has played a role in the historical Jesus research as one of the arguments for a Jesus inspired by Cynic philosophy, presented by (among others) F. Gerald Downing (cf. Downing 1987; Downing 1988; Downing 1992), John Dominic Crossan (Crossan 1991; Crossan 1997; Crossan 1999; Crossan and Reed 2001),[6] and not least Burton L. Mack, who has boldly described Galilee as "an epitome of Hellenistic culture on the eve of the Roman era" (Mack 1988, 66) and as "a no-man's-land" (Mack 1993, 53, cf. Mack 1997).

As summarized in Jensen 2002a, important studies by Jonathan L. Reed, Sean Freyne, Richard Horsley, Eric M. Meyers and most recently Mark Chancey have contributed significantly to this discussion to an extent that

[5] For a more thorough treatment, see Jensen 2002b, 11–12, 20–21, 76–78, 83–86.

[6] The works of Crossan represent an interesting development in this question. Even as early as *'The Historical Jesus'* he tried to keep a balance by describing Jesus as a "peasant Jewish Cynic" (Crossan 1991, 421). In *'The Birth of Christianity'* this is recalled, and criticizing Batey and others, Crossan concludes that "new evidence" is needed to settle the case (Crossan 1999, 215). Finally, in his book co-authored with Jonathan L. Reed, *Excavating Jesus,* Jesus is described as one of "those first-century apocalypticists and/or protesters" (Crossan and Reed 2001, 174).

has largely settled the issue in their favour. Unless new material data is presented, Galilee in the *Early* Roman period was not 'as Hellenized as anywhere else', but instead possessed a Jewish culture similar to that of Judea and a level of urbanization not comparable with larger urban centres such as Caesarea Maritima and Scythopolis. To summarize, their arguments are centred on the following four points:[7] (a) The population density of Lower Galilee was not as high as suggested by some (cf. Reed 1992; Reed 1994a; Reed 1994b; Reed 1999; Reed 2000, and Crossan and Reed 2001). (b) Several cultural/religious identity markers are traceable in the archaeological data that clearly point to a predominantly Jewish population of Lower Galilee, such as Jewish ritual baths, *mikvaot* (מקוות), widespread use of limestone vessels, lack of pig bones, Jewish religious symbols like incense shovels, special burial customs including use of *loculi* and a high percentage of Hasmonean coinage (cf. Meyers and Chancey 2000; Chancey 2001; Chancey 2002b; Aviam 2004a; Reed 2000, 100–138; Crossan and Reed 2001, 165–172; Freyne 1997a and others).[8] (c) In contrast, the identity markers expected of a highly romanised and urbanised area are missing (cf. Meyers and Chancey 2000, 27–28; Reed 2000, 123–131; Reed 1994b, 215; Horsley 1996, 59 and others). (d) It is necessary to pay close attention to the archaeological stratigraphy, since Galilee experienced a great political and cultural change around the Bar Kochba rebellion leading to a much heavier presence of Roman soldiers and Roman administration (cf. Meyers 1997; Meyers and Chancey 2000; Chancey 2003 and most recently Chancey 2005, 43–70, for instance). Based on this, the thesis of a Cynic-like Jesus has often been rejected as unwarranted or even impossible due to the material culture (cf. Horsley 1994, 127; Horsley 1999, 57–64 Freyne 1997a; Reed 2000, 135; Betz 1994; Aune 1997; Marshall 1997 and others).

Fourth, the issue of how the internal relationship between town and village should be pictured in Ancient Galilee has been debated with increasing intensity. When it gradually became evident that at least early-first-century Galilee did not possess the kind of Greco-Roman culture known from other places at that time, the focus shifted to an investigation of what *then* went on in this period, on an internal socio-economic level. Galilee did perhaps experience some radical changes with the advent of its first lo-

[7] Much of this will be dealt with in detail in chapter five.

[8] It should be noted that Horsley contests the assumption that ethnicity and religion can be traced in archaeological data (cf. Horsley 1996, 108ff.). Though a valid point of caution, the implications of the identity markers are not overstated (cf. Chancey 2001, 139 and others). The argument based on identity markers concerns first and foremost the accumulated amount of material, which taken together is assumed to offer "a reliable indicator of Jewish religious identity" (Reed 1999, 100).

cally placed ruler for many years, Herod Antipas. It is possible to trace exactly how this question has attracted growing attention, and how Herod Antipas has increasingly become 'a factor of explanation and verification' of the various presentations of his Galilee. To this we now turn.

1.2 Urban-Rural Relations – Conflict or Harmony?

1.2.1 Two Pictures of Galilee

The short survey above has made two things clear. First, archaeology has acquired an increasingly vital role in the discussion. The question of the origin and ethnic character of the Galileans has been advanced due to new material data, just as the question of the cultural conditions of Galilee largely involved a discussion of the archaeological findings. Second, as briefly mentioned, the main focus has shifted from a comparison of Galilee with the wider Roman world to a more localized discussion of the urban-rural relations of early-first-century Galilee in the wake of Antipas' programme of urbanization. However, while it is agreed that archaeology must be incorporated on an equal footing with texts,[9] and that 'the question of Antipas' is a vital key to understanding the socio-economic conditions of early-first-century Galilee, no consensus has been reached on how to depict his Galilee. As pointed out by Halvor Moxnes, two pictures have evolved. *Either* Antipas is viewed as a buffer against direct Roman rule and exploitation, thereby providing a good basis for trade and mutual enrichment of both urban and rural areas (a 'picture of harmony'); *or* Antipas is depicted as a typical tyrant extracting heavy taxes from his region for the financing of his building programme, which resulted in economic upheaval with increasing indebtedness and tenancy (a 'picture of conflict', cf. Moxnes 1998, 107; Moxnes 2001a). Thus, the Galilean research is currently in a state of impasse on this important question. In the following, these two pictures will be presented, and a possible way out of the impasse will be discussed.

[9] The most important archaeological contributions to the discussion are: (a) The excavations of Sepphoris and Tiberias. (b) Excavations of rural sites in Lower Galilee like Yodefat, Cana, Capernaum, Gamla and others. (c) Studies of specific items and subjects such as David Adan-Bayewitz's neutron activation analyses of pottery (from here of, NAA, cf. Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman 1990; Adan-Bayewitz and Wieder 1992; Adan-Bayewitz 1993 and note 10), and studies of coin distributions like Richard S. Hanson's of Tyrian coinage in Upper Galilee (Hanson 1980) and the very recent study by D. Syon of the general coin distribution pattern in Upper and Lower Galilee (Syon 2004). Chapters five and six are devoted to a discussion of these issues.

1.2.2 'A Picture of Harmony' – Reciprocal Urban-Rural Relations

As mentioned above, in his early works Freyne describes the reign of Antipas as a buffer against direct Roman rule and influence (cf. Freyne 1980b, 69, 192; Freyne 1988b, 155–156). Freyne does not deny that such a Hellenistic-style monarchy meant heavy taxes, or that there was great pressure on the small landowners. However, the peace and stability provided by Antipas is viewed as a more important factor than the high tax burden, which had been a basic fact of life since Ptolemaic rule (cf. Freyne 1980b, 186). As early as in his book from 1988, Freyne footnotes T.F. Carney's sociological study, *The Shape of the Past: Models in Antiquity* (Carney 1975, cf. Freyne 1988b, 156 note 47), and it is made clear that the new way of life in the cities led to a clash with the more homogenous life in the villages (Freyne 1988b, 146). In these early works, however, it is important for Freyne to stress that life in the rural areas went on relatively undisturbed by events occurring in the cities, and that we have no evidence of a socio-economic recession in Galilee either under Antipas or even immediately before the war of 66–70 CE:

> It is now time to ask whether or not this Galilean economy had within it those alienating forces as far as the majority of Galileans are concerned, which are so often assumed to have been operative in the background to Jesus' ministry. Here attention must be drawn to the conclusions arrived at in the previous study of Galilee, namely, that the province was not at the time of the first revolt seething with disaffection and in a state of revolutionary turmoil. (Freyne 1988b, 161–162, cf. also p. 152)

Thus, while Freyne describes the cities as potentially disruptive forces for life in the rural areas, he does maintain in his early works that life in rural Galilee fared better than elsewhere due to the peaceful reign of Antipas.

This view is supported and expanded by several of the archaeologists working in Sepphoris, such as Eric M. Meyers, D. Edwards, J. Strange and J. Reed. With various nuances they describe the urban-rural situation as a reciprocal relationship marked by interaction, trade and mutual enrichment. Meyers admits that Antipas' building programme

> …had an enormous impact on everyday life. Numerous villages, farms, and hamlets were now called upon to provide food for the growing populations of the cities, and the fertile lands nearby, which until now had sustained independent, self-subsistent farmers, were now transformed into places where products were grown on a much larger scale for cash. (Meyers 1997, 62)

However, this development is not perceived as overtly negative. As "centers of consumption" (Meyers 1997, 62), the cities also provided new mar-

kets, and with reference to Adan-Bayewitz's NAA analyses,[10] Meyers states that "the data surely indicates a continuum of positive interaction between city and town in the Early Roman period. Theories that suggest that urban centers exploit the surrounding countryside are to be soundly rejected on the basis of archaeological evidence alone" (Meyers 1997, 61). Instead, "the Galilean context of Jesus was such that both its incipient urbanism and its predominantly rural village culture could live in harmony. City and town were economically interlinked as we have demonstrated from ceramics" (Meyers 1997, 64).

James F. Strange also deduces from the NAA analyses of Adan-Bayewitz to a reciprocal trade pattern. Furthermore, he argues that the internal road grid of Galilee was far more developed than described in earlier investigations, which "hardly seemed to allow the traveller of the first century access to Galilee" (Strange 1997a, 39, cf. Strange 1994a, 82 and Strange 2000a, 393), providing the necessary logistics for "a highly developed, local trade network in Galilee" (Strange 1997a, 39). Strange substantiates this claim with references to mainly unpublished studies of wine presses, glass production of Sepphoris, and subsequent rabbinical traditions, which all point to a Galilean culture with highly specialised production centres for "olives, barley, wine, fish, herbs, and flax, and for finished products such as cloth, clothing, dye-stuffs, basketry, furniture, breads, perfumes, and metal fittings" (Strange 1997a, 41). Strange's point is "that an extensive specialized agricultural and industrial production implies a vigorous trade network" (Strange 1997a, 42). Thus, "we must give up the view that there is a sharp distinction between city dwellers and the peasants in the countryside" (Strange 1997b, 300). Finally, Strange includes analyses of New Testament metaphors and parables pointing at a complex setting "that uses urban as well as rural metaphors" (Strange 1992c, 47, cf. also Strange 2000aa).

On a similar basis, Jonathan Reed uses Adan-Bayewitz's analyses as an indicator of how Sepphoris functioned as a "lucrative market thereby compensating for the relatively lengthy overland transport" (Reed 1994b, 218). In this way, mutually beneficial interaction between the rural production centres of Shiknin and Kefar Hananya, for instance, and the market centres of Sepphoris and Tiberias was a fact of life. Reed advances this proposal

[10] In short, neutron activation analysis can determine "a site-specific manufacturing provenience to the majority of the common pottery" (Adan-Bayewitz and Wieder 1992, 189) by revealing the specific chemical profile of the clay. The result of the 350 analyzed potsherds points to the conclusion that the major part of the common pottery of Galilee was produced in Kefar Hananya, Shiknin or Nahf. However, the excavations at Yodefat revealed that the same kind of pottery was produced there, and the former conclusions might have to be reconsidered (private communication with M. Aviam).