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THE TRANSFORMATION FROM GALIL HA-GOYIM TO JEWISH GALILEE

The Archaeological Testimony of an Ethnic Change

Mordechai Aviam*

While the letter was being read, other messengers arrived from Galilee with their garments torn, bearing similar news, “The people of Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon have joined forces with the whole of gentile Galilee to destroy us!” When Judas and the people heard this, they held a great assembly to decide what should be done for their oppressed countrymen who were under attack from their enemies. Judas said to his brother Simon, “Pick your men and go and relieve your countrymen in Galilee, while my brother Jonathan and I make our way into Gilead.” He left Joseph son of Zechariah and the people’s leader, Azariah, with the remainder of the army in Judea to keep guard and gave them these orders, “You are to be responsible for our people. Do not engage the gentiles until we return.” Simon was allotted three thousand men for the expedition into Galilee, Judas eight thousand for Gilead. Simon advanced into Galilee, engaged the gentiles in several battles and swept all before him; he pursued them to the gate of Ptolemais, and they lost about three thousand men, whose spoils he collected. With him, he took away the Jews of Galilee and Arbatta, with their wives and children and all their possessions, and brought them into Judea with great rejoicing. (1 Macc. 5:15-23)

This paragraph of debated historical value1 gives us a picture of the ethnic structure of Galilee in the mid-second century BCE. Regardless of whether it accurately reports an event in which
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* This article is dedicated to the blessed memory of my good and beloved friend Modi Brodetzki, who passed away while I was writing this chapter. Together we read and discussed Josephus’s writings and hiked the tracks of Galilee.

1. For a short discussion, see Uzi Leibner, *Settlement and History in Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine Galilee: An Archaeological Survey of the Eastern Galilee* (TSAJ 127; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 277–79.
a Jewish force commanded by Simon the Maccabee marched from Jerusalem to the Galilee to rescue his “brothers” or is largely legendary, in my view it reflects an ethnic landscape of this period. After the conquest of the Galilee by the Assyrians and the massive deportation of its population, many Galilean towns and villages were completely abandoned. Even the very recent excavations in the Galilee continue to reveal destruction and abandonment layers in Iron Age II sites. One of the very few sites with continued occupation after the Assyrian conquest is Tel Dan, especially at the cultic site. There, beginning in the eighth and seventh centuries and continuing to the fourth century BCE, the activity looks as if it was connected to the region of Phoenicia. Some figurines from Dan bear some similarities to those found at the Phoenician temple at Mount Mizpe Yamim. During the Hellenistic period, the cultic site had a revival that is reflected mainly in the famous bilingual Greek and Aramaic inscription, “Zoilos made his vow to the God of Dan.”

Who is the God of Dan? One reasonable hypothesis is that the inscription reveals the memory of a “great God” who resided here and who probably was later syncretized with Zeus. It is also important to note that in the Hellenistic period the cultic site at Dan was within the territory that may have belonged to the Itureans. In the Hellenistic levels at Dan, a few storage jars were found that are identical to Iturean jars from the northern Golan. Moreover, similar to a few other jars from the Golan, one of them bears an inscribed Greek name. This cultic site most likely bordered on two Lebanese cultural regions: the Phoenician coast and the Itureans along the Hermon ridge and the Bakaa.

Continuing farther southwest, we come to Kedesh. The excavations at the site revealed a large administrative building that was first built in the Persian period; it continued in use into the Hellenistic period but was mostly abandoned in the second century BCE. In the Hellenistic period, some rooms were beautifully decorated with frescoes and stucco. A hoard of more than two thousand bullae found in one of the rooms demonstrates connections between Kedesh’s inhabitants and Tyre. One of the storage rooms contained a series of storage jars. Although the excavators do not use this terminology, these jars are similar to the Galilean jars that we identified in the Galilee survey and excavations as “Galilean Coarse Ware” (GCW, discussed below). In any case, they do not resemble either the Golan types or those found in Tel Dan. Sharon C. Herbert and Andrea M. Berlin suggest that this administrative building was destroyed in the mid-second century BCE as the result of the Hasmonean victory on the Hazor plain (1 Macc. 11:63-74), after which Jonathan’s forces chased Demetrius’s defeated army to Kedesh, where they encamped.


Two kilometers east of Kedesh, atop a high hill that goes by the modern name of Qeren Naftali, stand the remains of a massive fortress. My excavations there showed that the fortress was built in the Hellenistic period, in the third or second century BCE, probably to guard and control both the central administration center of southern Phoenicia at Kedesh and the main highway in the Huleh Valley below. At a second stage, a mikveh was inserted into one of the fortress rooms. Together with the appearance of Hasmonean coins, it is one of the clearest pieces of evidence supporting the Hasmonean conquest of the Galilee. There are no clear historical records for the annexation of the Galilee to the young Hasmonean state. According to Flavius Josephus, in around 112–110 BCE, John Hyrcanus I set out north from Jerusalem on a campaign in which he took Samaria and Scythopolis and went as far as Mount Carmel (J.W. 1.2.7 §§64–67). The last line of Josephus’s description says, “and all the land beyond it” (§64). Some scholars have suggested that this phrase refers to conquering the Jezreel Valley, but I have suggested that it refers to most parts of the Galilee, perhaps mainly the Lower Galilee. I do not suggest that the conquest of the fortress near Kedesh took place at the same time as Jonathan’s
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attack in around 160 BCE. Rather, it probably happened much later, during the expansion of the Hasmonean kingdom, whether at the time of Hyrcanus I after his father’s campaign against Beth She’an, during the one-year reign of Aristobulus, as many scholars suggest, or during the days of Jannaeus himself. Josephus tells us that Hyrcanus I sent young Jannaeus to be raised in the Galilee, and, if this story is true, the Galilee was taken during the days of his father.

There are four more excavated sites in the Galilee that display Hellenistic settlements that were destroyed in the second half of the second century BCE and that provide evidence for the Hasmonean conquest. Ten kilometers west of Kedesh, a team and I excavated a small site by the modern Arabic name of esh-Shuhra. It was probably a small farmstead dating after the late Persian period and existing to the second half of the second century BCE. The few rooms that we excavated had been destroyed by fire. On the floors we found pottery vessels clearly dating to the second century BCE and coins. We also found two large, broken pithoi from the GCW group on the floor. The twenty-two silver coins from a hoard found many years before the dig were minted between the years 148 and 140 BCE. The coins from the dig itself are evidence of the use of Tyrian/Seleucid coins up to around 125 BCE, followed by the appearance of Jewish Hasmonean coins, which we found in and on top of the ash layer at the site.

6. Ample evidence for the destruction and abandonment of Scythopolis/Beth She’an was found in the excavations. See Rachel Bar-Natan and Gabi Mazor, “Beth-Shean during the Hellenistic Period” (in Hebrew), Qadmoniot 27 (1994): 87–92.
The remains of a Persian and Hellenistic period temple on top of Mount Mizpe Yammim have been excavated and recently published. For a long time, many scholars (I among them) discussed the remains as mainly dating to the Hellenistic period. Berlin analyzed the ceramic evidence and suggested that most of it had to be dated earlier, to the Persian period. She also suggested that the temple with its temenos and tower, together with their location on a strategic point, reflect not only a sacred place but also the limit of Phoenician control of the southern territory of Tyre. Although almost all the ritual activity at the site dated to the late Persian period, Berlin suggested that the final activity dated to the Late Hellenistic period. She based this argument on the Tyrian coin found at the late level, the violent desecration of the figurines, and the mutilation of the offerings, mainly the juglets, some of which were thrown out of the doorway. In her summary, she provides two possible perpetrators: the Hasmonean forces raiding the Galilee after the victory over Demetrius’s forces on the Hazor plain, or new settlers from Judea. Berlin’s reconstruction of the events leaves an open question: What happened at the site between the late Persian period (ending with Alexander the Great’s conquest in 332) and the desecration of the site sometime in the mid-second century BCE? Was the site abandoned with the offerings left in place until the intruders came to desecrate it, or was there continued (probably minor) activity at the site that left only a few Hellenistic remains in the temple—a small number of cooking pots, bowls, and jars, a coin or two, and a handle of an imported amphora?

Three kilometers west of Mizpe Yammim lie the remains of the ancient site identified as Beer Sheba of the Galilee. The Greek name Bersabe appears for the first time in Flavius Josephus’s histories of the region as one of the nineteen settlements he fortified before the Roman invasion of the Galilee. I surveyed the site during the 1980s, and Uzi Leibner has conducted a more recent survey. During my survey, we collected a large amount of GCW pottery as well as other Persian and Hellenistic types of pottery. (Naturally, the site continued into the Roman period.)

Notably, we found three small bronze figurines. The first was a tiny figurine that could have been used as either a pediment or a standing representation of Horus the Infant, a well-known Egyptian figurine. This design can be dated to the Persian and Hellenistic periods. A similar figurine was recovered at Gamla, where no Persian-period pottery was found; the figurine from Beer Sheba, therefore, should be dated to the Hellenistic period. The second was the headless bust of a female figurine holding an object to its belly. Although the figure is clearly nude, it is unclear whom this figurine represents. The naturalistic design hints at a Hellenistic origin rather than a local Semitic origin, and the figurine could very well be a repre-

The third was the base (5 x 3 cm) of an Apis figurine. One hoof of a bull’s extended front leg was preserved on the base. Three sides of the base were preserved, each one carrying an inscription. An incomplete hieroglyphic inscription on one of the long sides probably has to do with giving a gift. This inscription is very shallow and eroded, and was probably the original inscription on this Egyptian object. The only preserved short side carries the three Aramaic letters קרב, which probably means “sacrifice.” The second long side carries an indecipherable inscription, but the few identifiable letters are Greek, including Γ, Ε, and Λ written in mirror writing. Although these three figurines were found in a survey, they clearly reflect pagan society in the Hellenistic period. The Apis base (see fig. C) was imported from Egypt, similar to some of the cultic objects from Mount Mizpe Yamim, and bears an original inscription in hieroglyphs, with a second, Aramaic inscription later chiseled into the metal at Beer Sheba. The Greek inscription was added by the same hand as the Aramaic, and although it is indecipherable, it is clear that Greek was familiar to these people. In addition, the female figurine is depicted in a western style, which is not typical in the Persian period.
In two different areas of the excavations at Yodefat, we discovered below the later Early Roman period a layer from the Hellenistic period. On the hill’s northern side, this layer was found beneath the Hasmonean wall that encircled the summit. On the floor of this room we found two GCW pithoi together with an imported wine jar with a stamped handle that was dated to the beginning of the second half of the second century BCE.11

Kh. ‘Aika was partially excavated on the summit of a hill in the eastern Lower Galilee. The rich Hellenistic-period level yielded a large building that had been destroyed by fire. The building contained many GCW pithoi together with other vessels. Based on the date of stamped imported wine jars, coins, and other vessels, the excavator suggested that the destruction happened in the mid-second century BCE.12

11. See the chapter on Yodefat in this volume, pp. 109–26.
Finally, below the Hasmonean layer of Magdala (Migdal) on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, an earlier Late Hellenistic layer containing GCW pithoi has recently been identified for the first time.

Summing up the discoveries from different excavations and surveys, mainly in Upper Galilee but also in eastern Lower Galilee, the material culture reflects a pagan, autochthonic, mountainous population. On the one hand this population had a strong relationship with the Phoenician world, as reflected in the Phoenician inscription from Mount Mizpe Yamnim, imported vessels from the Phoenician coast, and of course the distribution of Phoenician city coins. On the other hand, the Aramaic inscriptions from Dan and Beer Sheba of the Galilee, together with the local pottery, mainly the GCW, point to a population whose economic and cultural ties were mostly local.

Following this situation came a change. Many of the sites with GCW ceased to exist, and in other sites a new layer was established that contained Hasmonean coins. A Jewish ritual bath was installed in one of the rooms of a former Seleucid fortress at Keren Naftali, and the temple at Mizpe Yamnim was finally abandoned and its offerings and figurines desecrated. (Something similar may have happened at Beer Sheba of the Galilee.) What was the religion of the new population? Here we have no clear answers but can only compare what we find with what we know from Josephus’s other references to the ethnic ideals of the Hasmoneans.

One of John Hyrcanus’s first acts was to destroy the Samaritan temple, a religious/ethnic act. Following that, he conquered Adora and Marisa and “permitted [the Idumeans] to remain in their country so long as they had themselves circumcised and were willing to observe the laws of the Jews” (Ant. 13.256–258). After conquering Samaria, Hyrcanus sold its citizens into slavery (J.W. 1.65). The archaeological evidence from Marisa, Samaria, Mount Gerizim, and Beth She’an/Scythopolis shows a massive destruction and complete abandonment. According to Josephus, Aristobulus conquered part of the Iturean land and forced them to convert to Judaism (J.W. 13.318–319).

There is no good reason why we may not identify these events with the conquest of the Galilee. I assume that, as the Idumeans and the Itureans did, some of the pagan citizens of rural Galilee also “had themselves circumcised and were willing to observe the laws of the Jews,” some of them were exiled, others were sold to slavery, and others were killed. The Galilee was now “purified” from any idolatry, and the land was open to Judean immigrants. Scholars agree that the Galilean population at the turn of the first century BCE was a mixture of Jewish remnants, converted pagans, veterans of the Hasmonean army, and many new immigrants from Judea.

Many Galilean sites can be classified as Jewish based on their identification in Josephus’s narratives of Galilee in 67 CE, or by the presence of a synagogue, mikva’ot, and Hasmonean coins. Although today we know that Hasmonean coins were in circulation in the Jewish
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territory until the end of the revolt, there is little doubt that the existence of a large quantity of coins dates the establishment of the Jewish villages to the time of the Hasmonean dynasty, sometimes on the remains of an abandoned pagan village and sometimes as a new settlement.

Two types of evidence provide strong support for the Hasmoneans’ royal investment in the Galilee. The first is the existence of the military. The mikveh from Keren Naftali is evidence not only that Jewish forces conquered the Seleucid/Phoenician fortress but also that a Jewish garrison occupied the northern edge of the kingdom. (It is, however, possible that the border with Phoenicia lay even farther north of Keren Naftali.) Support for this argument comes from Josephus’s description of the Herodian attack on Galilee in 38 BCE: “and [Herod] proceeded to Galilee to capture some of the strongholds which had been occupied by the garrisons of Antigonus” (Ant. 14.413–414). It is clear from both archaeological evidence and ancient texts that the Hasmoneans held garrisons in fortresses at least on the Galilee’s borders, if not in its inner areas. This reality is probably reflected in the remains of a large (military?) structure at the top of the hill of Sepphoris, with a large mikveh dated to the early first century BCE,14 and perhaps in the fortified settlement on the hilltop of Yodefat.15 This evidence also hints at the settlement of Jewish veterans in the new conquered territories.

The second type of evidence is the archaeological/economic data. The surprising identification of the Hellenistic-type bathhouse at Magdala is evidence for the existence of a large town on the coast of the Sea of Galilee. Magdala’s central location and status are strengthened by the important discovery of the royal port at Magdala. Behind the Herodian pier, the archaeologists discovered an earlier pier with mooring stones and a massive tower to its north. (Was this tower the origin of the Hebrew name Migdal?) This substantial pier, unfamiliar in other parts of the lake and second only to the Herodian port in Caesarea, is strong evidence for royal investment in the Galilee. The port was probably used to increase the quantity of fishing boats, and consequently to increase the quantity of fish for the fishing industry of Magdala/Taricheae.16

I suggest that the second royal investment in the Galilee was the development of a large-scale olive oil industry.17 The Galilee’s soil and weather provide an ideal environment for cultivating olive trees, and olive oil was produced there during its entire history. There is evidence for a few oil presses at different sites during the Iron Age, mostly on a domestic scale. The Galilee’s oil production during the Hellenistic period is reflected in the Zenon papyri. When Zenon arrived in the Galilee, he visited the royal estate at Kedesh, where the main products were wine and grain. This produce is depicted by symbols on the official bulla found at the

15. See the chapter on Yodefat in this volume, pp. 109–26.
16. See the chapter on Magdala in this volume, pp. 280–342.
17. For a larger discussion see Aviam, Jews, Pagans and Christians, 51–58.
At present, we have no remains of an industrial oil press in any Hellenistic site in the Galilee; nevertheless, such developed machines have been found in Hellenistic sites in the Judean Shephelah, and they are especially characteristic of the oil production of Marisa in its later phase before its conquest and destruction by the Hasmoneans. At Mazor, in the northern Shephelah, a Hellenistic-period oil press was excavated and dated to the third and second centuries BCE, and Hasmonean coins were found in the next phase. It seems as if during the Hasmonean expansion, after conquering towns and villages, the Jews were more familiar with the industrial oil press and started to use it in their agricultural industry. These machines were built in the Galilee while the new immigration wave came from Judea after the conquest of the region by the Hasmoneans. The earliest one excavated is at Gamla and has been dated by the excavators to the time of the Hasmoneans, no later than the turn of the first century. From that time forward, we find a growing number of oil presses in the Jewish settlements during the Early Roman period. The growth of this product is well reflected in both Josephus’s writings (\textit{J.W.} 2.590–595) and talmudic sources (\textit{b. Men.} 85b; \textit{Sifrei Deut.} 316).

Most scholars today agree that the existence of Hasmonean coins at a site clearly reflects Jewish life there. The appearance of Hasmonean coins in sites that in earlier phases contained GCW, figurines, and decorated figurative oil lamps points to the ethnic change discussed here. An ongoing question concerning Hasmonean coins in the Galilee is this: When did the first Hasmonean coins appear in the Galilee? Was it only after the final conquest of the Galilee, or were there coins of Hyrcanus I even before the annexation? Josephus provides the earliest evidence that Jannaeus took Gamla, yet Danny Syon claims in his new book that there are enough coins of Hyrcanus at Gamla to point to the existence of a Jewish population before Jannaeus’s conquest. Syon suggests that settlers from Judea immigrated to the Galilee from crowded Judea and settled in empty areas such as Gamla. I prefer another explanation, as I find it difficult to explain why a small group of Judean Jews would travel far into a hostile area, build a settlement there, and import Jewish coins minted in Jerusalem. It is more plausible to see this settlement as a long branch of the victory of Hyrcanus I and his sons over Scythopolis and the area “north of there.” Syon’s maps 34 and 35 show the distribution of coins of Hyrcanus I and Aristobulus I, which covers Lower Galilee, eastern Upper Galilee, and central Golan.

\begin{itemize}
\item[19.] The term \textit{industrial} points to the arrival of new machines that appear in the Mediterranean area in the Hellenistic period. These machines include (a) a crushing installation consisting of a round stone basin in which a stone wheel is turned around by the power of a donkey, mule, or horse; and (b) a squeezing installation consisting of a large beam from which three or four heavy stone weights are hung using a winch that can lower the beam by shortening the rope.
\item[22.] Syon, \textit{Small Change in Hellenistic-Roman Galilee}.
\item[23.] Ibid., 165–66.
\end{itemize}
distribution hints that the first campaign that annexed the Galilee occurred between 112 and 110 BCE.

Finally, in a recent study, Berlin suggests a process by which Judean Jews who immigrated to the Galilee brought with them their tradition of pottery manufacture and established the local Jewish pottery industry. Indeed, there are similarities between Late Hellenistic Judean vessel shapes and those of the Galilee in the Hasmonean layers, but there is still a missing piece: the typical Judean Hasmonean “pinched” oil lamp. Presently, we have no pinched oil lamps from a Galilean Hasmonean layer. Such a discovery would provide an important piece of evidence for Berlin’s suggestion.

Summing up, there is no doubt that we have enough archaeological data to identify an ethnic change in the Galilee during the last decade of the second century BCE. The disappearance of the GCW ceramics, which are good indicators of a pagan population, together with abandonment of the sites, is probably the most significant testimony for this change. At the same time or shortly thereafter, sites were settled with people who built stepped pools that we identify today as mikva’ot (Keren Naftali), who started using Jewish coins, and who stopped using imported wine in amphorae. Consequently, although we have no literary sources telling of such a change, we have to rely on the archaeological evidence to create the Galilee’s historical and ethnic framework. Leibner discusses such a framework in his detailed study on the survey of eastern Lower Galilee, and he suggests a number of steps in the Jewish settlement of the Galilee similar to what I have suggested. Leibner tries to avoid any identification of the Jewish inhabitants in the Hasmonean time as “native” Jews or as converts and rejects both references in the book of Maccabees to Simon’s campaign to the Galilee and Josephus’s note on the conversion of the Itureans.

I propose that there is no reason to reject these stories as reflections of historical events. No dig will be able to prove either claim, as no one has found archaeological evidence for the conversion of the Idumeans. Although I base some of my own conclusions on surveys, we have to remember that arguments based on pottery gathered in surveys can quickly change when a site is excavated. For example, Leibner used evidence from Migdal (Magdala) to argue that the Hasmoneans established the town on a previously unoccupied site. Three years after his book was published, the excavations at Magdala revealed a Hellenistic layer with GCW jars in situ. The fact that the GCW sites also contain coastal Phoenician pottery does not mean that the inhabitants were Phoenicians from the coast. I still believe that, although Josephus named the territory north of the Jewish Galilee “the land of the Tyrians,” he himself did not think that
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25. In few preliminary reports and in oral communication, however, Moshe Hartal has suggested that GCW continued into the Roman period, at least at Gush Halav (Giscala), where he conducted a few salvage excavations. See Moshe Hartal, “Gush Halav A-5471,” HA-ESI 122 (2010): http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=1517&mag_id=117 [cited May 8, 2015]. At present, there is no information about Roman period GCW from any other Roman period sites.
the inhabitants had anything to do with the city of Tyre. He refers to the large hinterland of Tyre, but the people were local, mountainous, pagan tribes. There is no clear evidence that they were not being converted and joining the new, large wave of Judean immigrants who arrived and settled in the Galilee. These gentiles brought with them the knowledge of the industrial oil press; they were probably subsidized by the Judean authorities of the Hasmonean kingdom; and they were able to develop a strong economy very quickly.

Today we know about two small urban centers—Sepphoris in western Galilee and Migdal in the eastern Galilee—that the Hasmoneans developed and that no doubt strongly influenced the rural areas surrounding them. Although we do not yet have evidence for an indigenous population that identified itself as Jews and called Judah the Maccabee for rescue, I do think that they existed and were a minor part of the new Jewish Galilee formed by the Hasmonaeans. From c. 110 BCE to the year 66 CE, a period of almost 180 years, Jewish Galilee rapidly developed, and, according to Josephus’s account of the Jewish settlements in this region (both Galilees and central Golan), there were 204 Jewish settlements. I think that the inhabitants of the Galilee in 38 BCE were obligated and loyal to the Hasmonean dynasty, not only because the Hasmonaeans were priests and kings but also because the Galileans kept alive the memories of the settlement of the Galilee two to three generations earlier.
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