

110462

Where Jesus Worked

Towns and villages of Galilee
studied with the help of
local history

by

ALBRECHT ALT

translated by

KENNETH GRAYSTON

from 'Die Stätten des Wirkens Jesu in Galiläa territorialgeschichtlich betrachtet', first published in *Beiträge zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde* 68 (1949) p. 51-72; republished in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Munich 1953, 2 edn. 1959)

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS

225.91
A465W

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1961

© THE EPWORTH PRESS 1961

Book Steward

FRANK H. CUMBERS

SET IN MONOTYPE GARAMOND AND PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN BY THE CAMELOT PRESS LTD
LONDON AND SOUTHAMPTON

ABBREVIATIONS

JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JRSt	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
KS	Albrecht Alt, <i>Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel</i> , Zweiter Band (1959)
PJB	<i>Palästina-Jahrbuch des Deutschen evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes in Jerusalem</i>
QDAP	<i>Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine</i>
RAO	Clermont-Ganneau <i>Recueil d'archéologie orientale</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
TWNT	Kittel-Friedrich <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Verein</i>
Josephus Ant.	(<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>)
Josephus Bell.	(<i>de Bello Judaico</i>)

Place-names are conformed as much as possible to the usage in Dalman's *Sacred Sites and Ways* (1935).

WHERE JESUS WORKED

WHEN THE OFTEN discussed question of the origin of Jesus is in mind, the geographical scope and limits of His public ministry, especially in Galilee, still merit fresh consideration. Was He indeed 'sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel', as a saying attributed to Him asserts?¹ That is to say, was His ministry confined to the part of His native country inhabited by an Israelite population which, in His day, formed the large mass of the peasantry in the villages of the Galilean hill country belonging to the dominion of the princes of the Herodian house?² Or did He feel Himself more (or even exclusively) drawn towards the people, in part at least non-Israelite, who lived in the more or less Hellenistic kind of towns? Some of these towns had existed for centuries on the plains bordering Galilee; and a few others in Jesus' own day had been established in the heart of the hill country by Herod's successors.³ It must be evident that a definite decision between these alternatives would provide a useful basis for answering the question to which of these groups Jesus belonged by origin. Is it possible, however, to obtain such a decision from the knowledge available to us?

The statements in the Gospels naturally merit first consideration, but unfortunately they deny us the information we need. Their writers seem on the whole to have been unaware of the contrast involved in our approach to the question.

¹ Matthew 15²⁴, in contrast to the Gentiles; cf. 10⁶, referring to the division between Jews and Samaritans.

² Cf. *PJB*, XXXV (1939) 67ff = *KS*, II.409ff; *ZDPV*, LXVII (1944) 71ff.

³ For the first group, cf. *PJB*, XXXIII (1937) 76ff, XXXV (1939) 64ff, XXXVI (1940) 79ff.; for the second group, *PJB*, XXXVI (1940) 88ff [= *KS* II. 385ff, 407ff, 424ff, 432ff.]. Without doubt the non-Israelite element, representing the Hellenistic way of life, predominated more in towns of the former group, at least among their own townspeople, than in the newer Herodian foundations.

Matthew once says 'all the cities and villages' to designate the scope of Jesus' journeyings in Galilee;⁴ and Luke groups 'cities and villages' or 'towns and villages' in similar general expressions of the same theme.⁵ Yet it is easily seen that the evangelists, both in such general expressions and also in their statements about particular places, for the most part do not use the Greek words *πόλις* and *κώμη* to differentiate towns and villages, though such a distinction would have been suitable and would indeed have corresponded to the special position of the Hellenistic cities in relation to all other settlements.⁶ The evangelists, however, normally use the word *πόλις*, exactly as the old Greek translation of the Old Testament used it, in the sense of the Hebrew 'ir, to designate any place whose inhabitants form a community; and they can do so quite fittingly since in the majority of places mentioned they are concerned (as we shall see) with Israelite inhabitants and local government.⁷ The word *κώμη*, like the Hebrew *chāšēr*, which it generally renders in the old Greek translation of the Old Testament,⁸ refers strictly only to solitary farms or

⁴ 9³⁵; cf. 10¹¹. ⁵ 8¹, 13²².

⁶ Yet at first sight one might be inclined to discover this distinction in the special Lucan material where the localities not mentioned by name, especially those in the region of Samaria, are uniformly called *κῶμαι* (9⁵², 56, 17¹²; also Emmaus in 24¹³, 28; cf. Acts 8²⁵), and the same word is often used alone in general expressions (5¹⁷, 9⁶). Otherwise the common use of the two words in the other gospels prevails in Luke. The word *κωμόπολις*, occurring once only (Mk 13⁸), which looks like an attempt to combine the otherwise separate words in a single expression, can scarcely designate a special kind of locality (as Schürer thought, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*⁴, II [1907] 227; E.T., *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* [1885], II (1) 154); it probably arises from a secondary distortion of the text (cf. K. L. Schmidt, *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt* [1939], p. 12 note 26).

⁷ The Galilean localities mentioned are considered individually below. Apart from Jerusalem, the remainder are Bethlehem (Lk 24⁴, 11; Jn 7⁴², but called *κώμη*), Arimathaea (Lk 23⁵¹), Sychar (Jn 4^{5ff}), Ephraim (Jn 11⁵⁴), and an unnamed *πόλις Ἰουδα* (Lk 13⁹)—simple places which were certainly not Hellenistic towns. It is well known that Josephus frequently used *πόλις* in this sense; cf., for his own period in Galilee, especially *Bell.*, II. 20, § 571 where clearly isolated Israelite communities are intended. In the parables of Jesus only *πόλις* occurs in this sense, never *κώμη*.

⁸ Cf. the stereotyped concluding formulae of the place lists in Joshua 15^{18ff} in which 'ir is uniformly translated by *πόλις* and *chāšēr* almost always by *κώμη*.

hamlets near to but standing separate from the main town of a community, and this is probably its usual meaning in the Gospels, especially where it occurs in general expressions either alone or in combination with *πόλις*, or *ἀγροί*, or both.⁹ This use of words, however, is not consistent and by itself cannot help us to arrive at a clear picture of the actual conditions of the area within which Jesus carried out His work.

But the imprecise way of designating localities in the Gospels is not too serious a disadvantage; for Hellenistic cities in the region of Galilee are known to us from other sources, yet the Gospels do not name a single one of them as a city where Jesus was at work—neither the ancient centres of Scythopolis (*bēsān*) and Gabai (*kāre?*),¹⁰ nor the newer Sefphoris (*šaffūrieh*) and Tiberias (*tabarīyeh*).¹¹ From this we must conclude that places named in the Gospels as the scenes of Jesus' ministry, whether called cities or villages, in reality were only hamlets which lacked the distinctive marks of Hellenistic cities as regards organization and probably also as regards the composition of their population. But this result scarcely provides an adequate basis for answering the question raised at the beginning—for the silence of the Gospels about the presence of Jesus in the Galilean cities does not entirely exclude the possibility that He visited them occasionally, though probably only in passing through. And it must be remembered that many of the villages, particularly of

⁹ Especially significant is the grouping of *κῶμαι* with *ἀγροί* (Mk 6^{36, 56}, Lk 9¹²). For combinations with *πόλις* see notes 4 and 5 above; *κῶμαι* alone Mt 14¹⁵, Mk 6⁶, Lk 5^{17, 9⁶}. The fact that all four Gospels unanimously call Bethphage and Bethany, on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, *κῶμαι* (Mt 21², Mk 11², Lk 10^{38, 19³⁰}, Jn 11^{1, 30}) is easily understood if we presume that these small and apparently recent hamlets were dependent on nearby Jerusalem. For outlying farmsteads in this area, see for an earlier time Nehemiah 12²⁸⁻⁹ and the treatment in *PJB*, XXVIII (1932) 10f. The Galilean localities called *κῶμαι* in the Gospels will be dealt with separately below.

¹⁰ Cf. *ZDPV*, LXII (1939) 3ff.

¹¹ That the sea of Galilee is once casually mentioned (Jn 21¹) by the name of the city Tiberias which lies on it, is an isolated fact. For references in the Gospels to the cities Julias (Beth-Saida) and Caesarea Philippi which belonged to another administration, see below pp. 20 and 28.

course those in the neighbourhood of towns, were linked politically and administratively to them and would be under their immediate influence in matters of culture and population. Other villages, farther away from the towns, may have lived much more independently in their own traditional manner. It can be assumed with certainty that this difference played a considerable part in Galilee in the time of Jesus, for at that time the Hellenistic municipal organization was still developing, especially in the heart of the hill country, and for a long time did not draw the whole territory within its jurisdiction. Indeed, the few cities then in existence seem to have possessed only small territories. Large areas in Galilee, like similar ones in Judaea and Samaria, were grouped together on their own in special regions, called toparchies, round non-urban centres. Hence their inhabitants were able to remain in untroubled possession of their ancient customs and there was no considerable increase in the foreign element. Only after the final incorporation of the territory in the Roman Empire, after A.D. 70, was the position different; for it was a basic principle of Roman political administration to divide out provincial regions as completely as possible among cities already existing or newly founded. So too in Galilee, the previously independent rural districts were necessarily drawn into the city territories practically without exception.¹² If however in the time of Jesus this rearrangement had not yet even got under way, let alone been carried to completion, we cannot avoid the question whether each particular place named in the Gospels as an occasional or constant centre of Jesus' work belonged to a city territory or an independent rural district. Only when this question has been answered, place by place, have we any prospect of dealing successfully with the larger question whether the prophet of Nazareth's sphere of work lay on one side only, or on both sides, of the boundary between Israel and Hellenism. Such an examination of the Gospel statements about the Galilean localities has not

¹² Cf. Jones, *JRS*, XXI (1931) 78ff; *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937), p. 274ff.

to my knowledge been undertaken, at least with sufficient fullness. Hence I think it necessary to fill the gaps in the investigations by the following development of my earlier studies of the territorial history of Galilee in pre-Roman antiquity.¹³

At first sight it might seem that such an investigation would be very limited. Although the Gospels make many statements which throw some light on the nature and population of particular places in Galilee where Jesus exercised his ministry, they never name the urban or rural region to which they belonged. This deficiency however can in large measure be compensated by using our knowledge of the historical development of the territory and taking into account evidence from other sources, either about the same localities or neighbouring ones or about whole regions. Even when such evidence does not apply immediately to the time of Jesus but to a somewhat earlier or later period, it loses scarcely anything of its value since, everywhere in the world, territorial groupings once created commonly cling very tenaciously to their lands and as a rule still persist under the surface, as it were, when apparently far-reaching changes take place. Yet it is a great pity that we possess almost no detailed information about Galilean localities for the last few centuries before the time of Jesus. However, Jewish writings for the period immediately following provide a rich substitute, especially the works of Flavius Josephus at the end of the first century A.D. The value of these for our purpose is all the greater because the author writes from his own first-hand knowledge about the affairs in Galilee and has especially in mind the final pre-Roman stage, only a generation after the appearance of Jesus.¹⁴ Later information about the affiliation

¹³ *KS*, II, 363-435.

¹⁴ Josephus' statements about Galilean localities are gathered together regionally, though without consideration of their territorial affiliations, and topographically illustrated by Oehler, *ZDPV*, XXVIII (1905) 1ff, 49ff. For other Jewish literature of this and later times, see especially S. Klein, *Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas* (1909) and *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie Galiläas* (1923), as well as his article *Galiläa von der Makkabäerzeit bis 67* (1928).

of particular villages to certain urban territories, such as is found in the fourth-century A.D. *Onomasticon* of Eusebius,¹⁵ may be used to reconstruct the position in Jesus' day only if the Romans' far-reaching interference with the territorial divisions of the country is borne in mind, for under their rule whole rural regions were then brought within the orbit of the cities.¹⁶ Even so, such information allows us to make more reliable inferences about the immediately pre-Roman period and so provides a very necessary supplement to the picture, in many ways defective, which is obtainable from the earlier sources of information. Hence if no possible source of information is to be neglected it is necessary to work with material of very different kinds, differing in its source from instance to instance, but held together by the fact that it refers to the same localities and regions though not necessarily to the same period of time. In my view the special attraction of studying a territory's historical development appears in this very difficulty.¹⁷

I begin with Jesus' Galilean home town of Nazareth (*en-nāṣīrah*). Though Matthew and Luke call it a 'city',¹⁸ neither in the time of Jesus nor in later antiquity was it a city in the Hellenistic and Roman sense.¹⁹ Everything which we

¹⁵ Most recently collected by Noth, *ZDPV*, LXVI (1943) 55ff. Even when Eusebius determines the position of a village by noting its distance and direction from a city though without explicitly saying that it belonged to that city's territory (Noth, *ibid.* p. 41ff), it usually means that the village did so belong.

¹⁶ In distinguishing cities and villages Eusebius confines himself almost invariably to the actual situation of his own day.

¹⁷ For topographical and archaeological problems of individual places, so far as they have no bearing on territorial development, I refer to the still unsurpassed work of Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*³ (1924), E.T., *Sacred Sites and Ways* (1935).

¹⁸ Matthew 2²³, Luke 1²⁶, 24, 39, 42⁹. Mark and John do not give it a more exact designation. On its name and words derived from it see Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*³, 61ff (E.T., 57ff); Schaefer, *TWNT*, IV (1941) 879ff.

¹⁹ This is shown, not only by the express evidence for the fourth century of the native Palestinian bishop Epiphanius of Salamis (*Panarion haer.* 29.6.8); but also, towards the end of antiquity, by the lack of any mention of Nazareth in the statistical writings of Hierocles and of Georgius Cyprius, or in the episcopal lists.

learn of it in the Gospels rather suggests that we should think of it as a modest village, with Israelite inhabitants, which apparently could not look back on a lengthy past.²⁰ The only question is the territorial region to which the village belonged at that time. Since Nazareth lay only about $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles south-west of Sepphoris (*saffūrieh*), one would think at first sight that it was most probably already attached by the time of Jesus (and all the more so afterwards under the Romans) to its larger neighbourhood which had been raised to city status by Herod Antipas, and that it was thereby exposed in some degree to Hellenistic influences.²¹ But several considerations decisively contradict such an assumption. To deal first with the nature of the country, Nazareth and Sepphoris did not belong so closely together as their nearness might lead one to suppose. Rising steeply to the immediate north of the small Nazareth basin and overtopping it by more than 600 feet there stretched a long ridge running east and west. This lay between Nazareth and Sepphoris and had to be climbed in going from one to the other. The separation produced by this dividing wall was the greater because the Nazareth basin was drained through a short southerly defile towards the northern edge of the Plain of Megiddo, whereas Sepphoris lay deep in the catchment area of the Jephthah-El valley (*wādy el-melekb*) which led westward to the plain of Acco. Of course, the historical grouping of territories was not necessarily restricted by the limits drawn by nature if for various reasons the association of neighbouring regions in a greater unity seemed desirable. It is therefore worth noting that Eusebius in his *Onomasticon* fixes the position of Nazareth not as one might expect from Sepphoris, but from the much more distant Legio (*el-lejjūn*)—about 15 Roman miles (or 14 English miles) away according to his own inexact estimate, some 11

²⁰ It is well known that Nazareth is not named among the old inhabited localities of the tribe of Zebulon (Jos 19^{10ff}).

²¹ On the elevation of Sepphoris to be a city and on its previous history, cf. PJB, XXXVI (1940) 82, 84, 88 [=KS, II.426, 428, 432]; Yeivin in Waterman, *Preliminary Report of the University of Michigan Excavations at Sepphoris in 1931* (1937), pp. 17ff.

miles as the crow flies—which at that time was the chief town of the plain of Megiddo with the official name of Maximianopolis.²² Moreover, five hundred years later the Arab geographer Mas'ūdi designates Nazareth as a village in the territory of *el-lejjūn*.²³ This is probably strong evidence that from the Roman period Nazareth was included in the territory of Legio; and hence it is most probable that earlier still, even in the time of Jesus, Nazareth did not belong to the territory of Sepphoris. If this is so, then in Roman times indeed the boundary between the territories of Legio and Sepphoris must have taken a distinct, broad northward sweep just in the neighbourhood of Nazareth. According to Eusebius, in his own day the territory of Sepphoris, then officially called Diocaesarea, included not only Gabatha (*jebāta*) lying on the northern edge of the plain of Megiddo about $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles west-south-west of Nazareth, but also Dabira (in Josephus called Dabaritta, in the Old Testament Daberath, and today *dabūriēh*) lying at the extreme north-east corner of the plain about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles east of Nazareth.²⁴ Only in the neighbourhood of Nazareth did the territory of Legio extend up into the lower Galilean hill country, and the ridge already mentioned, immediately to the north of Nazareth, was its boundary with the territory of Sepphoris. To the west and east, the territory of

²² *Onomasticon*, 140. 1f. Klostermann. Since Eusebius names Mount Tabor as a reference point for the measurement of distances, he must have had in mind a Roman road (so far not demonstrated but certainly to be presumed) from Legio to Tiberias which ran to the foot of Tabor either via Chsalus (*iksāl*) or via Nain (*nēn*), but in either route leaving Nazareth on one side. On the other hand, the Roman road from Legio to Sepphoris (Diocaesarea), according to the evidence of milestones recently discovered at the Jewish colony of Sarid, south-west of *el-mudshēdīl* (Avi Yonah, *QDAP*, XII [1946] 96f, Nos. 13-16) possibly ran via *jebāta* and *ma'lūl*, and hence well to the west of Nazareth.

²³ Cf. Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems* (1890), p. 301; Beyer, *ZDPV*, LXVII (1945) 245, with note 5.

²⁴ *Onomasticon*, 70.9f, 78.6f. These and other statements about places belonging to the territory of Diocaesarea (16.13, 30.24f) as well as distances reckoned from Diocaesarea (22.4f, 28.22f, 98.23f, 140.17f) show that Eusebius was well informed about this neighbourhood and must have had good reasons for locating Nazareth in the territory of Legio and not of Diocaesarea.

Sepphoris reached as far as the northern border of the plain of Megiddo, and certainly included as well those fields on the plain which belonged to localities on its border.²⁵

This way of drawing the boundary needs explanation. It is probably not sufficient to point to the fact (though it is one worth noting) that in the very area between Gabatha and Nazareth the Lower Galilean hill country thrusts out farther southwards into the plain than it does elsewhere on the western and eastern sides and so, as it were, offers itself temptingly to the grasp of Legio on the opposite, southern side of the plain; for the decisive factors in determining historical boundaries are never purely natural circumstances but always in the first place historical considerations. The question therefore arises whether the southerly projection of the Lower Galilean hill country near Nazareth occupied a position before the old rural areas were divided up between the towns (i.e. before the final incorporation of Galilee into the Roman provincial system) which would explain its being assigned not to nearby Sepphoris but to more distant Legio. About Nazareth nothing relevant is known from the time we are concerned with to the great Jewish revolt of the years A.D. 66-70. But in this revolt it is probable that Japha (*jāfa*) situated scarcely 2 miles south-west of Nazareth on a higher hill-top, well isolated and at that time fortified, came into considerable prominence as a rallying point for the armed opposition to the invading Roman army.²⁶ Japha was undoubtedly the oldest and most important settlement in this part of the hill country. In all probability Nazareth was

²⁵ One of the milestones at Sarid (No. 15; see note 22, above) bears the distance 6 miles reckoned from Maximianopolis. Hence the boundary of the city's territory will have run between this point and Gabatha, and consequently near the northern border of the plain.

²⁶ Josephus, *Bell.*, II.20.6§§573, III.7.31§§289ff; *Vita* 37§188, 45§§230, 233, 52§270. The existence of this locality earlier than the fourteenth century B.C. is demonstrated by one of the Amarna letters, and it is noteworthy that already at that time (though perhaps only temporarily) it was dependent on the city of Megiddo, the predecessor of Legio (*PJB*, XX [1924] 38).

founded from Japha, and therefore always belonged to Japha's local region. The attitude of Japha in the Jewish revolt would be scarcely explicable if we had to represent it as dependent on Sepphoris, one of the cities which was friendly to the Romans and so remained neutral. Hence it follows that, at an earlier period and so for the time of Jesus also, we must assume a separate rural area which cannot indeed have lacked contacts with neighbouring Sepphoris, but which was not incorporated into its urban region and apparently also remained opposed to its semi-Hellenistic character. And if, later on, it joined with Legio and not Sepphoris the reason must probably be sought in the role which its chief centre Japha had played in the Jewish revolt. Legio, which was first raised to the status of town with the new name of Maximianopolis at the turn of the third century,²⁷ was the legitimate successor, as far as territory was concerned, of the *Legio VI Ferrata* which had been stationed as garrison there since Hadrian's time. The scope of this legion's territory in the great plain between Galilee and Samaria consisted of areas which had come into the direct possession of the Romans since Vespasian's time and had probably in the meantime already been under military occupation and administration.²⁸ The Jewish rebel centre of Japha was at first destroyed by the Roman troops but was apparently soon resettled, and its incorporation together with its local region into the *territorium legionis* could not fail to commend itself on military and political grounds.²⁹ Even if no such far-reaching conclusions should be drawn from Eusebius' topographical information about Nazareth and we were to assume that Nazareth with its

²⁷ Eusebius never uses the new name, but sticks to the old familiar name derived from its garrison.

²⁸ For the earlier history of this territory which had mostly been Hasmonean and Herodian royal lands, cf. *PJB*, XXXIII (1937) 80ff [=KS, II.388ff].

²⁹ The remains of a synagogue from the Roman period found in Japha shows that it soon revived as a Jewish village (Vincent, *RB*, XXX [1921] 434ff). That Nazareth persisted as an exclusively Jewish locality until the fourth century is shown by Epiphanius (*Panarion haer.*, 30.11.10).

local region was joined to Sepphoris in Roman times,³⁰ it would still be true that, up to the time of the Jewish revolt (hence all the more so in Jesus' day), this local region was not subject to a city and could still peacefully carry on its traditional rural life.³¹ The little information which the Gospels provide about the circumstances of the Jewish inhabitants of Nazareth agrees entirely with that conclusion.

At the same time we may consider the neighbouring site of Nain (mentioned, as a place where Jesus exercised His ministry, in a single Lucan narrative—7¹¹) although it belonged to another topographical and territorial grouping. Like its present-day successor, the small village *nēn*, it was situated some 6 miles south-south-east of Nazareth on the northern slope of an isolated hill which is still crowned by the Muslim holy place of *nebi dahi*. Thus it did not lie in the Lower Galilean hill country, but was separated from it by a spur of the plain of Megiddo extending north-eastwards as far as Tabor. In the Roman period it was not connected with the city territories of Sepphoris-Diocaesarea, or of Legio-Maximianopolis, or of Scythopolis (*bēsān*), but formed the chief centre of an independently administered rural area which also included Exaloth (also written Xaloth or Chsalus, and today *iksāl*), the later episcopal seat of the area, and probably

³⁰ Unfortunately Eusebius makes no relevant contemporary reference to Japha (*Onomasticon*, 108.29f).

³¹ Confirmation of the special position of this local region is perhaps provided in a letter of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin to Galilean Jewry in the period immediately before the great revolt. In the superscription, Simonias and probably Mahalol (the text here is defective) are named alongside other local regions and their centres (Klein, *Galiläa von der Makkabäerzeit bis 67* [1928] p. 46). Since Simonias (*semūnieh*) and Mahalol (*ma'lūl*), both to the west of Nazareth and Japha, are only 2 miles apart they must have been situated very much on the edge of the local regions to which they belonged. The local region of Simonias would have been provided by the protrusion of the plain of Megiddo to the north-west of the projecting part of the Lower Galilean hill country already referred to; and the territory of Mahalol would be this projection itself whose chief centre at that time would no longer have been Japha but Mahalol situated 2½ miles away in the hill country. Then in the Roman period the former region would be joined to the territory of Sepphoris, the latter to the territory of *Legio VI Ferrata* and later to Maximianopolis.

also Endor (*endūr*) and Sulem (*sōlam*).³² Thus, in this enclave between the surrounding city territories, a remnant of the ancient rural system survived until the end of antiquity. Hence it follows that Nain, like the other places of its area, must have been only a village and not a city although Luke, preserving the Hebraic language of his tradition, calls it one.³³ The population of the whole area can scarcely have been any other than Jewish, descended from the ancient Israelite inhabitants of the locality.³⁴

After this excursion beyond the southern boundary of the Lower Galilean hill country,³⁵ let us return to the only other locality besides Nazareth in its central part to be named (also in one Gospel only) as a place visited by Jesus and as the home of one of His disciples, namely Cana 'in Galilee'.³⁶ As a result

³² Georgius Cyprius, *Descriptio orbis Romani*, 1042 Gelzer. Eusebius fixes the position of Chsalus from Diocaesarea (*Onomasticon*, 22.4f); of Endor, Nain, and Sulem from Thabor (34.9f, 140.4f, 158.11f); though of none of these places does he say that it belongs to a city territory. Hence indirectly he confirms the special administrative position of the rural area. On the history of its bishopric, see ZDPV, LXIV (1941) 91ff.

³³ Both Eusebius and Georgius Cyprius call Nain a village. That this place and the area belonging to it was first separated from the territory of Sepphoris-Diocaesarea after the time of Eusebius, as Avi-Yonah assumes (*QDAP*, V [1936] 172), I regard as very unlikely on the analogy of other areas of the same kind.

³⁴ The neighbouring Dabira at the foot of Thabor was still, according to *Onomasticon* (78.6), at the beginning of the fourth century a Jewish village; and earlier, according to Klein's conjecture about the letter of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin already mentioned (see note 31 above), it was the chief place of a Jewish toparchy (cf. its role in the Jewish revolt; see Josephus, *Bell.*, II.21.3§595, *Vita*, 26§126, 62§318). It is conceivable that the Nain area also belonged to this toparchy. How in that case it came into the new boundaries of the Roman period still remains to be discovered.

³⁵ At this point I say nothing about the locality mentioned by Luke (17^{11, 12}), and correctly called a village, in the boundary region between Samaria and Galilee where Jesus met ten lepers; for its name is not recorded. On the whole section of Luke's Gospel placed in Samaria, see McCown, *JBL*, LVII (1938) 51ff.

³⁶ John 21. 11, 44^b, named as Nathaniel's home in 21². The constant addition 'in Galilee' to the place name is intended to distinguish this locality from another of the same name, probably that situated 7½ miles south-east of Tyre within the city's territory, though that too came within the original scope of the name Galilee. (*PJB*, XXXIII [1937] 64, note 4 = *KS*, II.374, note 3.)

of the discussion of the last hundred years it must be regarded as proved that what is meant is not the modern *kufr kenna* on the road from Nazareth to Tiberias, but *khirbet kāna* on the northern edge of the *baṭṭōf* plain.³⁷ Now *khirbet kāna* is only about $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles north of Sepphoris and, unlike Nazareth, not separated from it by a high ridge but merely by the *baṭṭōf* plain and the low hillocks on its southern edge. All the more likely would seem to be the assumption that ancient Cana belonged to this city's territory. For the Roman period, indeed, it is scarcely possible to suppose otherwise; we have no knowledge of any independently administered rural area existing in that locality, or of any city territory other than that of Sepphoris-Diocaesarea which could have reached as far as Cana.³⁸ In the pre-Roman period however this territorial arrangement did not necessarily obtain, and there is one historical fact which points decisively in another direction. Just as Japha lies close to Nazareth, so Jotapata (*khirbet ejfāt*) lies about 2 miles west-north-west of Cana, set back from the edge of the *baṭṭōf* plain on a projecting summit of the adjacent high ridge to the north. It is familiar as the final place of refuge of the Galilean Jews in the great revolt against Rome. It can scarcely have been dependent on Sepphoris, for that would presumably have meant sharing the city's friendly political attitude to the Romans.³⁹ Hence until the revolt (and so in the time of Jesus) Jotapata and the neighbouring Cana must still have belonged to a rural area separate from the territory of Sepphoris.⁴⁰ The small territory with which

³⁷ See Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*³, 108ff (E.T., pp. 101ff); Kopp, *Das Kana des Evangeliums* (1940).

³⁸ That the territory of Tiberias could have reached so far west is in itself not very probable and is expressly excluded by Eusebius' statement that Araba, the modern 'arrābe, $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles north-east of *khirbet kāna*, lay in his day in the territory of Diocaesarea (*Onomasticon*, 16.13).

³⁹ Josephus, *Bell.*, II.20.6§573, III.6.1§111, 7.3ff§§141ff, 7.33ff§§316ff, etc. The valley beginning in the immediate neighbourhood of *khirbet ejfāt* reaches the northern edge of the *baṭṭōf* plain just south-west of *khirbet kāna*.

⁴⁰ Josephus spent some time in Cana during the revolt (*Vita*, 16§86). According to Klein's conjecture (see note 31 above), Araba (mentioned in note 38) was the chief centre of a toparchy to which probably Cana and

Sepphoris had been provided by its founder Herod Antipas⁴¹ therefore lay exactly between the areas to which Nazareth and Cana belonged, and the shortest and best way between the two places went through it. It is all the more remarkable that not a single narrative in the Gospels is located in the urban centre of the Lower Galilean hill country. Moreover apart from Nazareth and Cana, the Gospels do not mention a single one of the many villages in this region which are known to us from Josephus and later Jewish literature, though it can scarcely be doubted that Jesus visited at least some of them in His journeys and probably exercised His ministry among them.

The Gospel tradition, in so far as it is concerned with topography, is more informative about His farther journeyings in Galilee, predominantly around the 'Sea of Galilee',⁴² 'Sea of Tiberias',⁴³ the 'Lake of Gennesareth',⁴⁴ especially its northern shore with Capernaum (*tel hūm*)⁴⁵ and Chorazin (*khirbet kerāzīeh*)⁴⁶ west of Jordan, and Beth-Saida (in the neighbourhood of *khirbet el-a'raj*)⁴⁷ to the east. These places were only 2 or 3 miles from one another but in Jesus' day were in separate territories. Beth-Saida belonged to the domain of Herod's son Philip, who desired to build it up to be a city;⁴⁸ whereas

Jotapata belonged, as well as the Kochaba which according to Julius Africanus (Eus. *H.E.*, I.7.14) was temporarily the residence of Jesus' relatives, if indeed this corresponds to the modern *kōkab*, 2 miles west of *khirbet effāt* (cf. Harnack *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*³, II [1915] 100, with note 3; E.T., *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* [1905], II. 253f; Klein, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie Galiläas* [1923], p. 35; Kundsīn, *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe im Johannesevangelium* [1925], p. 24).

⁴¹ We may compare the small original territory of the city of Tiberias when at a later time it was founded by Herod Antipas (*PJB*, XXXVI [1940] 91 = *KS*, II.434f).

⁴² Matthew 4¹⁸, 15²⁹, Mark 1¹⁶, 7³¹, John 6¹.

⁴³ John 21¹. ⁴⁴ Luke 5¹.

⁴⁵ Matthew 4¹³, 8⁵, 11²³, 17²⁴, Mark 1²¹, 2¹, 9³³, Luke 4²³, 3¹, 7¹, 10¹⁶, John 2¹², 4⁴⁶, 6¹⁷, 24.

⁴⁶ Matthew 11²¹, Luke 10¹³.

⁴⁷ Matthew 11²¹, Mark 6⁴⁵, 8²², Luke 9¹⁰, 10¹³, John 14⁴, 12²¹

⁴⁸ On the attempt to elevate Beth-Saida to the status of a city bearing the name Julius, probably soon abandoned and hence in the end unsuccessful, see *PJB*, XXXIII (1937) 85, and note 4 (= *KS*, II.393, note 2). The Gospels sometimes call it a village (Mk 8²³, 26), sometimes a city (Lk 9¹⁰, Jn 14⁴).

Capernaum and Chorazin were clearly only villages in the territory of his brother Herod Antipas.⁴⁹ This gave rise to a peculiar boundary situation between two Herodian principalities about which the Gospels provide some information. Occasionally they mention a tax office and a small military or police garrison in Capernaum.⁵⁰ Jesus however moved about freely to and fro across the boundary, especially in his journeyings on the lake, and among his closest disciples both shores were represented.⁵¹ So it is clear that when, after Herod's death in 4 B.C., Caesar Augustus divided the dominion in accordance with his will and so made a political separation between the banks of the Jordan at the northern end of the lake, relations between neighbouring localities on this side and the other were not broken. This is not surprising in view of the natural economic connexion, and moreover the inhabitants long settled in Beth-Saida as well as those in Capernaum and Chorazin were Israelite in origin and Jewish in religion.⁵² So when Philip wished to turn Beth-Saida into a city like other Herodian foundations, his attempt (we do not know how successful it was) certainly did not displace the previous inhabitants but probably supplemented them with newly introduced elements from other territories and probably also from foreign groups, and thereby no longer left them to their own concerns.⁵³ Even so, scarcely any essential contrast can have arisen between Beth-Saida and its neighbours

⁴⁹ In the Gospels Capernaum is more than once called a city (Mt 9¹, Lk 4³¹).

⁵⁰ Mark 2¹⁴, Matthew 8⁵, Luke 7², cf. John 4⁴⁶.

⁵¹ According to John 1⁴⁴, 12²¹, Andrew, Simon (Peter) and Philip, belonging to the Twelve, came from Beth-Saida.

⁵² That the local population of the region round Beth-Saida was Jewish is shown by the synagogue ruins (admittedly later) of *ed-dikeeb* and *er-rāfid* on the left bank of the Jordan north of Beth-Saida, and by those of *kannef* and *khirbet umm el-kanātir* in the adjoining hill country of *jōlān* to the east. Cf. Kohn and Watzinger, *Antike Synagoge in Galiläa* (1916), pp. 112ff, 125ff; Sukenik, *The Ancient Synagogue of el-Hammeh* (1935), pp. 85ff.

⁵³ On the bringing together of the populations of the Herodian cities, see PJB, XXXVI (1940) 88ff (=KS, II.432ff). The Greek names of the disciples from Beth-Saida may be noted (see note 51, above).

on the west of Jordan; for these also were situated in an area which, in the time of Jesus, experienced many intrusions into its population and customary life.

It is true that the founding of the city of Tiberias by Herod Antipas about A.D. 20 at a more southerly point on the western shore of the lake would most directly affect Capernaum and Chorazin, since probably they like other Galilean localities would have had to give up some of their inhabitants to help people the new city. They themselves however were certainly not incorporated into the territory of Tiberias until the Roman period.⁵⁴ All the probabilities favour the view that they belonged earlier to the toparchy of their nearer southern neighbour Tarichaeae (*el-mejdel*—granted by Nero to Agrippa II as an independent region alongside that of Tiberias);⁵⁵ and that after the founding of Tiberias they remained in this toparchy. But the simultaneous existence of the newer Greek name Tarichaeae with the presumably older semitic name Magdala (in full Magdal-Nunaiya), mentioned in the Gospels,⁵⁶ shows that there must have been special circumstances which can scarcely be explained as a spontaneous development within the scope of the old indigenous population, for then a Greek name would have been unnecessary. Since this name indicates an important centre of fish curing on the lake (perhaps the only one), it can be conjectured that the Hellenistic spirit of commercial enterprise had been at work here, though naturally with the co-operation of the previous

⁵⁴ Cf. *PJB*, XXXVI (1940) 91 (=KS, II.434).

⁵⁵ Josephus, *Bell.*, II.13.2§252; cf. *Ant.*, XX.8.4§159. Nothing is known of any other Galilean toparchy which could have stretched (perhaps from the mountain hinterland) to the environs of Capernaum and Chorazin. The inclusion of these villages in the territory of Tarichaeae was justified by the nature of the district.

⁵⁶ The semitic name of this locality appears not only in *Μαγδαληνή* indicating the native place of one of the women disciples of Jesus (Mt 27⁶⁶, 61, 28¹, Mk 15⁴⁰, 47, 16¹, Lk 8², 24¹⁰, Jn 19²⁵, 20¹, 18) but very probably also in various distorted forms in the parallel passages Matthew 15³⁹ and Mark 8¹⁰, where the alluvial plain *el-rumār* which adjoins *el-mejdel* to the north is designated as belonging to Magdala by τὰ ὄρια Μαγαδάν or as τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά. Cf. Sickenberger, *ZDPV*, LVII (1934) 281, where the older literature is also given.

inhabitants. The presence of a Hellenistic element in the population of Tarichaeae is further evidenced by an account which shows that soon after the time of Jesus there must have been a hippodrome there.⁵⁷ It is a pity that we cannot determine how much earlier this industrial and commercial development had begun.⁵⁸ To me it seems clear, however, that from the very first Tarichaeae was never a Hellenistic city in the full sense of the word nor ever became one. After the founding of Tiberias close at hand such a possibility finally disappeared.⁵⁹ If this is true, however, in my opinion there is only one explanation of the importance of Tarichaeae with its Hellenistic tendencies. It must have been the rulers of Galilee (either the last Hasmonians or at the latest Herod) who, in order to further their commercial endeavours, created industrial installations to exploit the rich fisheries of the lake by bringing in foreign experts, and so gave the place a new character. The ancient position of the whole Jordan valley as a private estate provided them with a convenient management for such an enterprise, just as it did later for Herod Antipas and Philip when founding cities in the same region.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Josephus, *Bell.*, II.21.3§599. It is also noteworthy that this lake-side place was walled on the landward side (*Bell.*, III.10.1.3§§463, 486ff).

⁵⁸ As early as the middle of the first century B.C. Tarichaeae appears as the chief centre of its district and had to be forcibly subjugated by the Romans (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV.7.3§120; *Bell.*, 1.8.9§180); but even so the beginning of its development has not yet been reached. Probably the rise of Tarichaeae was ultimately bound up with the decline of the earlier Hellenistic city of Philoteria at the southern end of the lake; cf. *PJB*, XXXIII (1937) 77ff, XXXIV (1938) 80, note 1 (=KS, II.386ff).

⁵⁹ Pliny's mention of Tarichaeae among the *oppida* in the environs of the lake (*Hist. nat.*, V.15) is no proof of its character as a city; nor however is its absence from the city system of the succeeding Roman period a proof of the contrary.

⁶⁰ Cf. *PJB*, XXXIII (1937) 83ff (=KS, II.391ff). On fish-curing as a branch of industry in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubien*, I (1899) 137ff; *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I.1 (1912) 252 (royal monopoly?); other literature in Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*², II (1907) 78, note 208; E.T., *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (1885) II(1).42, note 177. (For a parallel in Armenia (2nd century B.C.) see inscriptional examples in Dupont-Sommer, *Syria*, XXV (1948) 53ff.)

Antipas was thus acting entirely in his own interests when he left Tarichaeae as it was, or further developed it as a commercial source of revenue, and established his own capital Tiberias 3 miles away.⁶¹

Since the Gospels are silent about any visits of Jesus to Tarichaeae, Sepphoris, or Tiberias,⁶² we should probably draw this conclusion at least, that He did not devote the main part of His public ministry to those places in the region controlled by Herod Antipas which in his day certainly contained the largest foreign element mixed with the old indigenous Israelite population. That may partly be explained by the specially close connexion of these places, each in its own way, with the reigning princes towards whom Jesus took up an admittedly critical attitude.⁶³ It may further be supposed, however, that the semi-Hellenistic nature of life in these places repelled rather than attracted Him, and did not suggest that His mission would be furthered by a public ministry of any long duration.⁶⁴ However, it has already been mentioned that Capernaum and Chorazin, the villages where much more of His work took place, were probably situated in the toparchy of Tarichaeae. They lay between Tarichaeae and Beth-Saida which also had become an experimental area for princely ventures,⁶⁵ and so they too were probably within the ancient royal estates. One would presume that their population of peasants and fishermen was more closely connected with the

⁶¹ This position of Tarichaeae may explain why Antipas chose for the foundation of his new city a site without any previous settlement, and so determined the subsequent historical scene on the western shore of the lake.

⁶² The passage which mentions a landing by Jesus in the neighbourhood of Tarichaeae (see note 56, above) unfortunately lacks information about the immediate goal of his journey.

⁶³ Luke 13^{31ff.}, 23⁷ and parallels.

⁶⁴ Too much must not be made of the Hellenistic attitude of the foreign officials, merchants, and workmen who lived in Tarichaeae or frequently visited it. The possession of a hippodrome (see p. 23) does not tell us much.

⁶⁵ It can readily be supposed that the industrial development of the fisheries of the lake was one of Philip's motives too for his projected development of Beth-Saida.

chief towns of the district than the people of Nazareth and Cana were with Sepphoris.⁶⁶ Thus Jesus' removal from Nazareth to Capernaum meant transferring the main weight of His activity, not only geographically but also historically, from the heart to the circumference of Israelite Galilee. There the old rules of life, religion and justice had not yet been invalidated, especially in the villages; but in the urban and semi-urban localities particularly, through the introduction of foreign elements, they had lost their exclusive importance. During the last decades B.C., the influence of the rulers on conditions in this border area was more far-reaching than anywhere else in Galilee except Sepphoris.⁶⁷ Even the inhabitants of villages like Capernaum and Chorazin must have known something of the changes taking place in the neighbouring towns, although they were not directly concerned in them and, as far as possible, held on firmly to their traditional ways, as country people do.⁶⁸ On this freshly ploughed soil Jesus now scattered His seed; and the results showed, despite disappointments which even there were not lacking, that it was more acceptable than on the stony ground of Nazareth.

Since this new area of Jesus' activity was on the border of Herod Antipas' domain, He could extend His public ministry to areas in other jurisdictions on the eastern shore of the lake without travelling far from His starting-point. Nearest of all lay the territory of Philip, which must have stretched from the point where the Jordan flows into the lake as far as the

⁶⁶ That the long-established inhabitants of Capernaum and Chorazin were Israelite is shown by statements in the Gospels (e.g. the semitic names of the disciples who came from Capernaum); and probably also by the fact that both places contain ruins of synagogues. They date from a later time, but the synagogues were certainly not provided for Jewish inhabitants who later migrated there.

⁶⁷ Our sources for the later part of the reign of Herod Antipas do not show how Sepphoris developed as a city after he had transferred his residence to Tiberias.

⁶⁸ Since Chorazin was more remote it would be less in touch with events than Capernaum on the lake shore and on the direct road between Tarichaeae and Beth-Saida; on the latter, cf. Josephus, *Vita*, 72§§399ff.

wādy es-samak, and we have already seen that its chief town Beth-Saida was a favourite setting for Jesus' work. He seems also to have paid visits to more southerly points on the shore line of this region in the course of His journeys across the lake, though no place name is in evidence in the Gospels.⁶⁹ At least on isolated occasions He went farther south still and visited the neighbouring territories of the old Hellenistic cities of Hippos (*kal'at el-ḥoṣn* near *kufr ḥārib*) and Gadara (*umkēf*), according to a synoptic narrative which is located in the latter place.⁷⁰ That narrative however does not deal with a visit to Gadara itself, but only to the lands belonging to it on the lakeside. These were north of the Yarmuk and therefore at some distance from the city which lay south of the river on the hill-top.⁷¹ In that area Jesus would scarcely have come across a large number of Hellenistic Gadarenes; it is much more likely that He would have met the peasant population who were their subjects. These we may assume to have been mostly of Israelite origin and Jewish religion like those of the neighbouring villages to the north in Philip's domain.⁷² Thus such a journey did not take Jesus to any

⁶⁹ This is the neighbourhood one would think of for locating the narrative of the feeding of the multitudes (Mt 14^{13ff}, 15^{29ff}, Mk 6^{32ff}, 8^{1ff}, Lk 9^{10ff}, Jn 6^{1ff}); cf. Procksch, *PJB*, XIV (1918) 24ff. Dalman however prefers the adjoining territory of Hippos on the south (*Orte und Wege Jesu*³, pp. 184ff, E.T., pp. 166ff).

⁷⁰ Matthēw 8^{28ff}, Mark 5^{1ff}, Luke 8^{26ff}. All three indicate Jesus' destination by *eis tēn chōran tōn Gadareniōn* (to which the divergent readings must be corrected) and clearly intend it in the territorial sense.

⁷¹ I cannot resolve the contradiction between the assumption which is probably made here that the territory of Gadara extended to the south-east shore of the lake and Josephus' statement (*Vita*, 9§42) that the villages of the Hippenes and the Gadarenes adjoined the regions around Tiberias and Scythopolis, so that the territory of Hippos extended to the Jordan and excluded Gadara from the lake shore.

⁷² Luke probably represents the circumstances better than Matthew when he calls the people who requested Jesus to leave the territory *παν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν* (8³⁷), not *πᾶσα ἡ πόλις* (Mt 8³⁴). The presence of a Jewish population in the region of Gadara at a later time is demonstrated by the ruins of a synagogue at the hot springs in the Yarmuk valley; cf. Sukenik, *The Ancient Synagogue of el-Hammeh* (1935). On Jewish villages in the territory of Hippos, see Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, p. 183; E.T., pp. 169f.

great extent away from the kind of people with whom He was already at work in the north and north-west borders of the lake.⁷³

Jesus seems to have departed farther from this environment on another occasion when He passed through the regions of Tyre (*sūr*) and Sidon (*sēda*)⁷⁴ and extended His wanderings as far as the territory of Caesarea Philippi (*bāniās*), north of the most northerly Jordan lake.⁷⁵ Only in the latter case was he travelling within the Herodian dominions, though not those of Antipas but of his brother Philip, as at Beth-Saida. On the other hand the regions of Tyre and Sidon never belonged to their province. From a much earlier time they were probably for the most part under the Phoenician coastal cities from which they are named in the Gospels; and, viewed from Herodian Galilee, they were foreign territory. But if we are to understand what Jesus was doing there we must take into account the extension of the region from the coast into the hinterland; for the suggestion that Jesus may have visited the Phoenician coast itself is neither indicated by the only relevant synoptic narrative, nor is it probable.⁷⁶ At that time the territory of Tyre extended eastward beyond the whole northern part of Upper Galilee as far at least as the final stages of the descent from the hills towards the basin of the most northerly Jordan lake, perhaps even to the western

⁷³ There is insufficient basis for assuming a further extension of the ministry of Jesus in the areas of the ancient Hellenistic cities east of the lake (those which had been incorporated in Herod's kingdom) in the vague and geographically inadequate mention of a journey 'through the midst of the borders of Decapolis' (Mk 7³¹). Similarly the mention of Decapolis in another passage in the same Gospel (Mk 5²⁰, cf. the parallel Lk 8³⁹) must rest upon a misunderstanding of the tradition. In Matthew 4²⁵ the thought is primarily of the Jewish inhabitants of the Decapolis.

⁷⁴ Matthew 15²¹, Mark 7²⁴, 31.

⁷⁵ Matthew 16¹³, Mark 8²⁷.

⁷⁶ The coastal area of Tyre and Sidon is expressly mentioned only in Luke 6¹⁷ which speaks, not of a visit by Jesus, but of people coming to him from that region; but this probably arises merely from a mistaken understanding of the tradition; cf. the parallel, Mark 3⁸.

shore of the lake itself and of the river Jordan.⁷⁷ The territory of Sidon extended across the southern part of the Lebanon mountains and the neighbouring rift valley to the far side of the watershed of the Antilebanon, north-east of mount Hermon, where it adjoined the region of Damascus.⁷⁸ Hence when Jesus visited the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi and chose not to take the road going north from Beth-Saida in Philip's territory, but started from Capernaum and went through the most southerly part of Upper Galilee (still within the territory of Antipas) to the neighbourhood of Gishala (*ed-jish*) in the north,⁷⁹ He would necessarily have travelled for a greater or lesser distance within the eastern part of Tyrian territory, or at the very least have been close to its frontier.⁸⁰ On the other hand He would first have reached the region of Sidon north of Caesarea Philippi. It seems to me doubtful that we should suppose that He journeyed so far north simply on the evidence of the Gospels which here, as elsewhere, name Tyre and Sidon in the same breath and clearly have no traditions of the words and deeds of Jesus definitely connected with the regions of these two cities.⁸¹ Probably therefore

⁷⁷ This is shown by the fact that Kadasa (*kadas*) belonged to it, though we do not know how long this had been so (Josephus, *Bell.*, II.18.1§459). At an earlier time the authority of the Itureans had probably reached as far as this area.

⁷⁸ Josephus, *Ant.*, XVIII.6.3§153; cf. ZDPV, LVII (1939) 209ff.

⁷⁹ It is probable that Jesus would have visited this part of Upper Galilee, which would have been a toparchy on its own (Klein, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie Galiläas* (1923) 46f; cf. PJB XXXIII (1937) 88 (=KS, II.395)), though the Gospels do not name any localities there.

⁸⁰ If Tyrian territory extended to the Jordan, the main north-south road which followed the western side of the Jordan valley lay within its boundaries.

⁸¹ Only Mark (7²⁴, 31) treats the regions of Tyre and Sidon separately; but he has no knowledge of any particular event during Jesus' journey through the territory of Sidon, and gives a very odd general picture of this journey (see note 73, above). Tyre and Sidon occur together also in Matthew 11^{21f}, Mark 3⁸, Luke 6¹⁷, 10^{13f}, as they already do in 1 Maccabees 5¹⁶ and Judith 2²⁸. This arises from the circumstances of an earlier time when the kings of the island city of Tyre had become the lords of Sidon as well, i.e. of the whole south Phoenician coast (1 Kings 16³¹, Isa 23^{1ff}, Ezek 27⁸, Joel 4⁴ (3⁴), 1 Chr 22⁴, Ezra 3⁷; cf. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*², II.2 [1931] 63f, 126f).

the narrative of his visit to the territory, or more precisely according to Mark to the villages, of Caesarea Philippi (but not apparently to the city itself) indicates the limit of his progress in this direction.⁸² At this point he had reached the most northerly outposts of previous Israelite settlements and sovereignty. Until there is proof to the contrary we must assume that the descendants of the tribes who settled there more than a thousand years earlier had not, in the time of Jesus, finally died out or been dispersed elsewhere, despite all the subsequent political changes. This must be taken into account not only in the Tyrian region, but also in the city of Caesarea, first founded with an admixture of foreign population in the year 2/1 B.C.⁸³ Jesus would primarily have been concerned with these outposts of Israelite people and Jewish religion when He extended His ministry so far north. That His visit should attract others of different descent apparently surprised Him.⁸⁴ Therefore this final area in which Jesus exercised His ministry, just as much as the neighbourhood of the lake of Tiberias, was on the outer edge and not in the centre of Israelite territory. But neither in the one place nor in the other did Jesus definitely cross the national boundaries; and the real goal of his journeyings, deliberately chosen, lay in Jerusalem, not in Galilee.

⁸² When Matthew mentions 'the parts of Caesarea' as the goal of Jesus' journeyings (16¹³) he can scarcely intend anything different than Mark who speaks of the city's villages (8²⁷).

⁸³ For the Assyrian deportation, cf. *PJB*, XXXV (1939) 67f (=KS, II.409ff). The entirely credible statements about the deportation of the priesthood of the Israelite royal sanctuary at Dan (Jd 18³⁰) naturally provide no information about the fortunes of the peasantry. On the later history of the upper reaches of the Jordan valley, cf. *PJB*, XXXIII (1937) 78, 83f (=KS, II.386f, 391f). It can probably be taken as an indication of continued Jewish settlement near Caesarea Philippi and even northwards that the Book of Enoch (6⁶, 13⁷.⁹) locates several of the scenes of biblical pre-history in these northern parts; cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *RAO*, V (1903) 362ff. Lastly, if Aithalu, a village mentioned in the Talmud, corresponds to 'ēterūm, 3 miles west of kadas (Klein, *Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas* [1909] 46ff), we very probably have evidence of a Jewish village in the Tyrian part of Upper Galilee (against this view, Avi-Yonah, *QDAP*, V [1936] 175).

⁸⁴ Matthew 15^{21ff}, Mark 7^{24ff}.

From the Epworth list

THE ABINGDON BIBLE COMMENTARY

Edited by Prof. F. C. Eiselen, Prof. Edwin Lewis
and David G. Downey

55s.

With thumb index 63s.

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE

10s. 6d.

ON READING THE ENGLISH BIBLE

T. E. Jessop

5s.

BIBLE CAVALCADE

H. F. Mathews

10s. 6d.

THE GOSPELS. *A short introduction*

Vincent Taylor

6s. 6d.

PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

John T. Wilkinson

6s.

LONDON : THE EPWORTH PRESS

3s. 6d. net